

CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Family Law Reports

Bondelmonte v Bondelmonte (FAMCAFC — Full Court) (2016) **55.65**

Madin v Palis (FAMCAFC — Full Court) (2016) **55.59**

Parke v Parke (FCCA — Judge Howard) (2015) **55.11**

Vadisanis v Vadisanis (FAMCAFC — Full Court) (2015) **55.1**

CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

Ansett Transport Industries (Operations) Pty Ltd v Commonwealth (1977) 139 CLR 54; 17 ALR 513, applied 55.11

Commercial Bank of Australia Ltd v Amadio (1983) 151 CLR 447; 46 ALR 402, considered 55.11

Derry v Peek (1889) 14 AC 337, considered 55.11

Hoult v Hoult (2013) 50 Fam LR 260; 276 FLR 412; [2013] FamCAFC 109, considered 55.11

Turner v Windever [2003] NSWSC 1147, considered 55.11

STATUTES, RULES, ETC CITED IN THIS PART

COMMONWEALTH

Acts Interpretation Act 1901

s 13 **55.1**

Family Law Act 1975

s 60CC **55.65**

s 90B **55.11**

s 90G **55.11**

s 90K **55.11**

s 117 **55.1**

s 117(1) **55.59**

s 117(2) **55.59**

Federal Proceedings (Costs) Act 1981

s 6 **55.59**

s 9 **55.1, 55.59**

INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

APPEALS

Costs — Where the Full Court made no order as to costs — Where the Full Court found that the applicant for costs could not rely on an offer for settlement because it impliedly purported to confer jurisdiction on the court subsequent to the trial judge's determination that the court did not have jurisdiction to hear the initiating application — Where although the respondent was ultimately wholly unsuccessful, the main appeal raised a novel issue upon which there was no existing authority — Where the Full Court reiterated that orders for indemnity costs would only be made in the most extreme cases because the primary rule in this jurisdiction is that each party bear their own costs: *Madin v Palis* 55 Fam LR 59

Jurisdiction — Where court indicated at conclusion of appeal hearing that directions would be made for the filing of submissions of costs pending outcome of the appeal — Where the court inadvertently made an order under s 9 of the Federal Proceedings (Costs) Act 1981 (Cth) in favour of the appellant wife — Where such an order would deny the wife her right to be heard on the issue of costs — Whether an order can be set aside under the slip rule — Whether the availability of the slip rule was affected by virtue of the fact the order was perfected — Whether the making of the order meant the court has exhausted its power to make a further order for costs — Whether the court had the power to reopen perfected orders — Where this case constituted an exception to the general rule that perfected orders cannot be reopened — Whether r 22.53 of the Family Law Rules 2004 (Cth) allows a party to apply for a costs order where the court has allowed an appeal: *Vadisanis v Vadisanis* 55 Fam LR 1

CHILDREN

International child abduction — Orders for children to be returned — Whether primary judge making orders adequately took into account children's best interests — Whether primary judge gave adequate weight to children's views: *Bondelmonte v Bondelmonte* 55 Fam LR 65

FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS

Setting aside — Whether party to financial agreement engaged in fraud — Whether party to financial agreement engaged in unconscionable conduct — Whether financial agreement voidable for ambiguity and uncertainty: *Parke v Parke* 55 Fam LR 11