

## CUMULATIVE TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

### Motor Vehicle Reports

**Boga v AAI Ltd (t/as AAMI)** (NSWSC — Dhanji J) (2022) **100.30**

**Bosk v Burgess** (QSC — Wilson J) (2022) **100.52**

**Director of Public Prosecutions v Cummings** (VSC — Fox J) (2022) **100.90**

**Director of Public Prosecutions v Hennessy** (VSC — Fox J) (2022) **100.90**

**Harris v Leaman** (TASSC — Pearce J) (2022) **100.22**

**Motor Accidents (Compensation) Commission v Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Ltd**  
(NTSC — Huntingford A/AsJ) (2022) **100.72**

**Neskovski v R** (VSCA — Full Court) (2022) **100.12**

**R v McStay** (VSC — Croucher J) (2022) **100.126**

**Scylla v Police** (SASC — McDonald J) (2022) **100.1**

**Taleb v Rijal** (VSC — Tsalamandris J) (2022) **100.107**

## **CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART**

Brown v R (2019) 59 VR 462; [2019] VSCA 286, applied 100.126

Day v SAS Trustee Corp [2021] NSWCA 71, distinguished 100.30  
Dellar v Crawford (1992) 16 MVR 207; 62 A Crim R 171, applied 100.22

Holman v Johnson (1775) 1 Cowp 341, applied 100.107

McDonald v Nilsson (2009) 54 MVR 32; [2009] TASSC 83, applied 100.22  
Morgan v Johnson (1998) 44 NSWLR 578, considered 100.52

Pollard v R [2010] VSCA 156, applied 100.12; considered 100.12

R v Fairley (2004) 40 MVR 403; [2004] VSCA 15, considered 100.12

Tepko Pty Ltd v Water Board (2001) 206 CLR 1; 178 ALR 634; [2001] HCA 19, applied 100.72

Vasilevski v R (2018) 83 MVR 351; [2018] VSCA 7, considered 100.12  
Visser v Smart [1998] TASSC 151, applied 100.22

Wood v Major (1992) 3 Tas R 249; 16 MVR 392, applied 100.22

Yehia v Williams (2022) 99 MVR 393; [2022] VSC 197, distinguished 100.107  
Yoo v Allco Steel Corporation Pty Ltd (unreported, NSWSC, Giles J, 17 June 1998, BC8801827),  
distinguished 100.107

## STATUTES, RULES, ETC CITED IN THIS PART

### NEW SOUTH WALES

Interpretation Act 1987	
s 49 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
Motor Accident Injuries Act 2017 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
Motor Accidents Compensation Act 1999	
s 44 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
s 60 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
s 61 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
s 62 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
s 65 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
s 131 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
Personal Injury Commission Act 2020	
. . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
Supreme Court Act 1970	
s 69 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>
Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 2005	
r 59.3 . . . . .	<b>100.30</b>

### NORTHERN TERRITORY

Motor Accidents (Compensation) Act 1979	
s 4A . . . . .	<b>100.72</b>
s 38(4) . . . . .	<b>100.72</b>
s 38(5) . . . . .	<b>100.72</b>
Supreme Court Rules 1987	
r 29.02 . . . . .	<b>100.72</b>
r 29.05 . . . . .	<b>100.72</b>
r 47.05 . . . . .	<b>100.72</b>

### QUEENSLAND

Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999	
r 361 . . . . .	<b>100.52</b>

### SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Road Traffic Act 1961	
s 45(1) . . . . .	<b>100.1</b>

### TASMANIA

Road Safety (Alcohol and Drugs) Act 1970	
s 6(1) . . . . .	<b>100.22</b>
s 6(2) . . . . .	<b>100.22</b>

### VICTORIA

Crimes Act 1958	
s 318 . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>
Criminal Procedure Act 2009	
s 207 . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>
s 208 . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>
s 209 . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>
Magistrates' Courts Act 1989	
s 109(1) . . . . .	<b>100.107</b>
Road Safety Act 1986	
s 61(1) . . . . .	<b>100.12</b>
s 61(3) . . . . .	<b>100.12</b>
Sentencing Act 1991	
s 5 . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>
s 6AAA . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>
s 11A(4)(c) . . . . .	<b>100.126</b>

## INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

- Judicial review** — Appeal from determination of magistrate in respect of claim for damages following motor vehicle collision — Whether magistrate erred in evidentiary burden which was applied — Whether magistrate erred in evidentiary standard which was applied — Whether error in discretionary judgment in respect of interest: *Taleb v Rijal* 100 MVR 107
- Judicial review** — Injury suffered from motor accident — Degree of permanent impairment in issue — Additional surveillance footage and medical reports provided — Power to refer party for further medical assessment exercised — Whether delegate failed to view surveillance or to assess it separately to medical reports — Whether delegate erred in concluding that reports were additional relevant information — Whether delegate erred in concluding that reports were additional relevant information capable of having material effect on previous assessment — Whether delegate failed to exercise residual discretion — Proper officer failed to exercise residual discretion — Jurisdictional error found: *Boga v AAI Ltd (t/as AAMI)* 100 MVR 30

### CIVIL PROCEDURE

- Costs** — Where plaintiff engaged senior and junior counsel — Where defendant submits case did not warrant two counsel — Where liability was admitted — Where case involved evidence from overseas — Whether case warranted two counsel on behalf of plaintiff: *Bosk v Burgess* 100 MVR 52
- Costs** — Where second defendant made two formal offers to settle in accordance with Ch 9, Pt 5 of Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999 — Where offers were expressed entirely in Australian dollars — Where judgment was expressed in both Australian dollars and Euro — Where plaintiff alleged second defendant's offer would have been conditional on plaintiff agreeing to "extraneous terms" — Where offer made first in time was made prior to number of pieces of evidence being produced — Whether either of offers was more favourable to plaintiff than judgment — Whether plaintiff should pay second defendant's standard costs incurred after offer was made: *Bosk v Burgess* 100 MVR 52

### CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

- Appeal** — Conviction — Failure to stop after motor vehicle accident — Failure to render assistance — Whether discrete offences — Offences legally distinct — Whether double punishment — No overlap as separate offences — No contravention of pleading rules — Leave to appeal refused: *Neskovski v R* 100 MVR 12
- Appeal** — Sentence — Failure to stop after motor vehicle accident — Failure to render assistance — Whether double punishment — Separate offences — Whether error in sentencing applicant on basis he knew accident occurred — Open to make finding of actual knowledge — No error — Leave to appeal refused: *Neskovski v R* 100 MVR 12
- Application** — Application for particular discovery — PD6 compliance disputed — Relationship between PD6 obligations and discovery under Supreme Court Rules — Large number of potential documents — consideration of cost of compliance — Application granted: *Motor Accidents (Compensation) Commission v Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Ltd* 100 MVR 72
- Application** — Application for separate trial of preliminary question — Facts not admitted on pleadings — Need to determine facts — No likely saving of expense and inconvenience — Proposed question not clearly defined and dependent upon facts not agreed — Mixed fact and law — Risk of delay, extra expense and uncertainty — Application refused: *Motor Accidents (Compensation) Commission v Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Ltd* 100 MVR 72
- Offences** — Appeal — Appeal against conviction — Driving without due care and attention — Whether magistrate's conclusions reasonably open — Effects of purportedly inadequate investigation by police: *Scylla v Police* 100 MVR 1
- Reasons for decision** — Latitude given to judgments delivered ex tempore: *Taleb v Rijal* 100 MVR 107

### DAMAGES

- Personal injuries** — Where plaintiff had obtained judgment in personal injury proceedings — Where plaintiff identified five errors in calculation of award — Where defendant accepted that four errors were properly described as accidental slips or omissions — Whether contested error resulted from accidental slip or omission — Whether judgment should be corrected: *Bosk v Burgess* 100 MVR 52

(Continues on p vi of cover)

## INDEX — *continued*

### DAMAGES — *continued*

**Property damage** — Where plaintiff sought damages for costs of hiring motor vehicle in circumstances where he did not hold licence to drive vehicle — Where award of damages in those circumstances would have involved court allowing plaintiff to engage in ongoing illegality: *Taleb v Rijal* 100 MVR 107

### OFFENCES

**Causing death** — Principles applicable to youthful offenders: *Director of Public Prosecutions v Hennessy* 100 MVR 90

**Drink-driving** — Sentence — Appeal — Whether sentence manifestly inadequate — Driving with more than prescribed concentration of alcohol — Respondent repeat offender — Where magistrate imposed fine — Sentence manifestly inadequate — Sentence of imprisonment appropriate: *Harris v Leaman* 100 MVR 22

**Drink-driving** — Where respondent pleaded guilty to charge of driving with more than prescribed concentration of alcohol contrary to s 6(1) of Road Safety (Alcohol and Drugs) Act 1970 (Tas) — Where respondent also pleaded guilty to offence contrary to s 6(2) of that Act — Where it was offence contrary to s 6(2) for respondent to have driven with any alcohol at all — Whether magistrate erred in convicting respondent of both counts — Error established: *Harris v Leaman* 100 MVR 22

### SENTENCING

**Causing death** — Sentence following sentence indication — Culpable driving (by gross negligence) causing death — Where offender drove in erratic fashion over 12 km — Where vehicle that offender was pursuing stopped and offender's vehicle clipped right side of it — Where deceased stepped out of rear passenger seat at same moment as offender's vehicle clipped it — Deceased struck by utility, went onto bonnet momentarily and then fell under it — Where offender did not intend to collide with sedan or deceased and did not know that deceased had stepped out of other vehicle — Where deceased was dragged 58 m under offender's vehicle and then driven over — Where offender not aware that this had occurred — Where offender drove away temporarily and then returned to scene and waited for police — Offender unlicensed — Whether offender saw deceased on bonnet momentarily — Whether lead-up driving aggravated offending — Plea of guilty — Remorse — Limited criminal history — Delay between offence and sentence — Strong prospects of rehabilitation — Pandemic restrictions in custody — Current sentencing practices — Importance of general deterrence, denunciation, just punishment and rehabilitation — Specific deterrence and community protection of less weight — Parsimony — Standard sentence offence — Whether in interests of justice not to fix non-parole period of at least 60% of head sentence — Sentence of 6 years and 6 months' imprisonment with non-parole period of 3 years and 6 months — But for plea of guilty, sentence of 8 years and 6 months' imprisonment with non-parole period of 6 years: *R v McStay* 100 MVR 126

**Causing death** — Where one offender, Mr Hennessy, pleaded guilty to culpable driving causing death (gross negligence) — Where second offender, Mr Cummings, pleaded guilty to reckless conduct endangering life by instructing Mr Hennessy to drive as he did — Where deceased had jumped onto bonnet of vehicle when he saw both offenders on CCTV in street looking to steal from parked cars — Where Mr Hennessy drove so as to dislodge deceased from car roof — No drugs, alcohol or excessive speed involved — Standard sentence offence — Mr Hennessy sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment with non-parole period of 4 years, 3 months' imprisonment — Mr Cummings sentenced to 3-year community corrections order: *Director of Public Prosecutions v Hennessy* 100 MVR 90

### WORDS AND PHRASES

**“additional relevant information”**: *Boga v AAI Ltd (t/as AAMI)* 100 MVR 30

**“contravene”**: *Neskovski v R* 100 MVR 12

**“fail to comply with the requirements of”**: *Neskovski v R* 100 MVR 12