

## **Northern Territory Reports**

**Hofer v Anti-Discrimination Commissioner** (NTSC — Barr J) (2011) **163.70**

**K & J Burns Electrical Pty Ltd (ABN 68 009 633 827) v GRD Group (NT) Pty Ltd (ABN 42 009 645 498)** (NTCA — Full Court) (2011) **163.17**

**R v LB** (NTCCA — Full Court) (2011) **163.1**

## CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART

- AJ Lucas Operations Pty Ltd v Mac-Attack Equipment Hire Pty Ltd (2009) 25 NTLR 14; [2009] NTCA 4, applied 163.17\*\*
- Banditt v R (2005) 224 CLR 262; 223 ALR 633; [2005] HCA 80, considered 176.1\*
- Cadbury Schweppes Pty Ltd v Darrell Lea Chocolate Shops Pty Ltd (2007) 159 FCR 397; 239 ALR 662; 72 IPR 261; [2007] FCAFC 70, applied 277.611
- Commercial Building Centre v NRMA Insurance Ltd (2004) 40 MVR 370; [2004] ACTCA 3, distinguished 176.38\*
- DIB Group Pty Ltd (t/as Hill & Co) v Cole [2009] Aust Torts Reports 82-022; [2009] NSWCA 210, applied 176.38\*
- Estate of the late M T Mutton (by its Executors & R W Mutton t/as Mutton Bros) v Howard Haulage Pty Ltd [2007] NSWCA 340, applied 176.38\*
- GIO General Ltd v ABB Installation & Service Pty Ltd (2000) 19 NSWCCR 720; [2000] NSWCA 118, overruled 277.611
- Government Insurance Office (NSW) v R J Green & Lloyd Pty Ltd (1966) 114 CLR 437; [1967] ALR 106, applied 176.38\*
- Greg Gedling v Anti Discrimination Commission and Charles Darwin University [2004] NTMC 34, doubted 163.70\*\*
- HG v R (1999) 197 CLR 414; 160 ALR 554; [1999] HCA 2, applied 277.611
- ICI Australia Operations Pty Ltd v Workcover Authority (NSW) (2004) 60 NSWLR 18; [2004] NSWCA 55, overruled 277.611
- JLT Scaffolding International Pty Ltd (in liq) v Silva (unreported, NSWCA, Kirby P, Mahoney and Priestley JJA, 30 March 1994, BC9402337), applied 277.611
- Lambe v Anti-Discrimination Commission and Commissioner of Police [2001] NTMC 54, doubted 163.70\*\*
- Makita (Australia) Pty Ltd v Spowles (2001) 52 NSWLR 705; [2001] NSWCA 305, applied 277.611
- Mercantile Mutual Insurance (Australia) Ltd v QBE Workers Compensation (NSW) Ltd (2004) 61 NSWLR 655; 43 MVR 256; [2004] NSWCA 409, applied 176.38\*
- Nominal Defendant v GLG Australia Pty Ltd (2006) 228 CLR 529; 225 ALR 643; 45 MVR 133; [2006] HCA 11, distinguished 176.38\*
- Ocean Marine Mutual Insurance Association (Europe) OV v Jetopay Pty Ltd (2000) 120 FCR 146; [2000] FCA 1463, applied 277.611
- Papakosmas v R (1999) 196 CLR 297; 164 ALR 548; [1999] HCA 37, followed 176.1\*
- Quick v Stoland Pty Ltd (1998) 87 FCR 371; 157 ALR 615; 29 ACSR 130, not followed 277.611
- R v Flitter [2000] EWCA Crim 68, followed 176.1\*
- v Khan [1990] 1 WLR 813; [1990] 2 All ER 783, followed 176.1\*
- v Morgan [1976] AC 182; [1975] 2 All ER 347, considered 176.1\*
- v Jenkins; Ex parte Morrison [1949] VLR 277; [1949] ALR 468, applied 277.611
- v Juric (2002) 4 VR 411; [2002] VSCA 77, applied 277.611
- v Maddison [2007] ACTCA 18, explained 176.1\*
- v Sieders; R v Somsri (2008) 72 NSWLR 417; [2008] NSWCCA 187, considered 176.1\*
- v Sloane (1990) 49 A Crim R 270, considered 176.18\*
- Ramsay v Watson (1961) 108 CLR 642; [1963] ALR 134; [1961] HCA 65, applied 277.611
- Sims v Drewson (2008) 188 A Crim R 445; [2008] ACTSC 91, followed 176.1\*

*(Continues on p vi of cover)*

**CASES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED IN THIS PART** — *continued*

Sydneywide Distributors Pty Ltd v Red Bull Australia Pty Ltd (2002) 55 IPR 354; [2002] FCAFC  
157, not followed 277.611

## STATUTES, RULES ETC CITED IN THIS PART

### COMMONWEALTH

Australian Crime Commission Act 2002	
s 28 . . . . .	<b>163.1**</b>
Crimes Act 1914	
s 15GD(1) . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
s 15HA . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
s 15KQ . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
Pt IAB . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
Pt IAC . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
Criminal Code Act 1995	
s 11.2 . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
s 474.26 . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
Evidence Act 1995	
s 66(2) . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
s 136 . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
High Court Rules 2004	
r 25.06.1 . . . . .	<b>277.667</b>
Migration Act 1958	
s 486A(1) . . . . .	<b>277.667</b>

### AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

Court Procedures Rules 2006	
r 1616 . . . . .	<b>176.38*</b>
Crimes Act 1900	
s 54(1) . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
s 60(1) . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
Criminal Code 2002	
s 8(1) . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
s 20(2) . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
Road Transport (General) Act 1999	
s 63 . . . . .	<b>176.38*</b>
s 163 . . . . .	<b>176.38*</b>
s 171 . . . . .	<b>176.38*</b>
Supreme Court Act 1933	
s 37S . . . . .	<b>176.1*</b>
Workers Compensation Act 1951	
Sch 4 r 9 . . . . .	<b>176.38*</b>

### NORTHERN TERRITORY

Anti-Discrimination Act 1992	
s 67 . . . . .	<b>163.70**</b>

### NEW SOUTH WALES

Dust Diseases Tribunal Act 1989	
s 3 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 11 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 11A . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 25 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 25B . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 32 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
Dust Diseases Tribunal Rules	
r 9 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
Evidence Act 1995	
s 55 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 56 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 57 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 76 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 78 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 79 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 80 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 135 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 136 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 138(1) . . . . .	<b>176.18*</b>
s 189 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
Interpretation Act 1987	
s 3 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>
s 34 . . . . .	<b>277.611</b>

### VICTORIA

Accident Compensation Act 1985	
s 68(4) . . . . .	<b>277.654</b>
s 104B(12) . . . . .	<b>277.654</b>
s 134AB . . . . .	<b>277.654</b>

## INDEX OF CASES IN THIS PART

### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

**Judicial review** — Commissioner to accept or reject complaint within time limit — Whether acceptance of complaint in breach of provision invalid — Meaning of vexatious — Whether commissioner must consider whether complaint is vexatious: *Hofer v Anti-Discrimination Commissioner* 163 NTR 70

### BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION

**Building contracts** — Determination by adjudicator as to monies payable by contractor to subcontractor under construction contract — Application to single judge for judicial review — Declaration by him that adjudicator jurisdiction not enlivened save as to balance of retention fund payable to appellant under relevant contract — Whether impugned summary invoice constituted a payment claim giving rise to a payment dispute under the Act which was properly the subject of adjudication — Whether prior invoices rendered constituted valid payment claims under cl 12.2 of contract — Consideration of mandatory requirements of that clause — Whether, if valid payment dispute did not arise in relation to claims for monies payable in respect of work done, it nevertheless remained open to trial judge to uphold adjudication for payment of balance of retention monies unpaid: *K & J Burns Electrical Pty Ltd (ABN 68 009 633 827) v GRD Group (NT) Pty Ltd (ABN 42 009 645 498)* 163 NTR 17

### CITIZENSHIP AND MIGRATION

**Refugees** — Well-founded fear of persecution — Plaintiff applied for protection (class XA) visa which delegate of defendant refused to grant — Delegate found plaintiff's fear not well-founded due to possibility of relocation within country of residence — Delegate did not consider whether relocation was reasonable or practicable for plaintiff — Whether delegate required to consider particular circumstances of plaintiff and impact upon plaintiff of relocation — Whether time for commencing proceeding should be extended: *Plaintiff M13/2011 v Minister for Immigration and Citizenship* 277 ALR 667

### CRIMINAL LAW

**Appeals** — Reference by Director of Public Prosecutions on questions of law — Whether appropriate to answer questions posed — Whether questions sufficiently related to trial — Relevance of failure to ask for redirection by trial judge: *Director of Public Prosecutions v Walker* 176 ACTR 1

**Crime and corruption commissions** — Australian Crime Commission — Summons to give evidence before examiner — Defendant charged with refusing to be sworn or affirmed — Whether examiner was reasonable in all the circumstances to issue summons — Whether judge decided case on basis not argued by parties: *R v LB* 163 NTR 1

**General** — Application for stay of proceedings or exclusion of evidence of online procuring of child — United States police officer posing as child introduced accused to Australian police officer also posing as child — Whether police operation was inappropriately targeted because police knew who they were dealing with and how he was likely to behave — Whether police officer incited, encouraged or induced commission of offence — Whether police officer aided, abetted, counselled or procured commission of offence: *R v Priest* 176 ACTR 18

**Intent** — Sexual intercourse without consent — Act of indecency without consent — Each offence committed where person did relevant act knowing victim did not consent, or being reckless as to whether victim consented — Whether indictment could charge knowledge and recklessness as alternatives — Whether two offences created based on differing mental element: *Director of Public Prosecutions v Walker* 176 ACTR 1

### ESTOPPEL

**Issue estoppel** — Whether issue estoppel arose out of medical panel opinion: *Cashman v Brown* 277 ALR 654

### EVIDENCE

**Expert opinion** — Admissibility — Relevance — Specialised knowledge based on person's training, study or experience — Dust diseases — Whether expert witness expressed opinion about numerical or qualitative level of exposure to respirable silica — Whether opinion could form basis of trial judge's calculation of time weighted average level of exposure of worker — Basis rule — Whether matter should be remitted: *Dasreef Pty Ltd v Hawchar* 277 ALR 611

**Hearsay** — Evidence of "fresh" complaint — Whether direction as to use as evidence of truth of contents appropriate: *Director of Public Prosecutions v Walker* 176 ACTR 1

(Continues on p xii of cover)

**INDEX — continued**

**INSURANCE**

**General insurance** — Double insurance — Contribution — Workers' compensation policy — Compulsory third party insurance policy — Whether employee's injuries result of employer's negligence — State of evidence — Where accident occurred away from employer's premises — Failure to provide safe system of work — Breach of duty — Requiring employees to lift heavy baggage — Causation — Whether employee responsible for his own injuries — Whether employee's injuries arose out of, or were caused by, use of motor vehicle — Whether unloading of bus constitutes use of motor vehicle — Where employee's workers compensation claim settled — Manner of settlement — Co-ordinate liability between insurers — Proper construction of settlement agreement — Statutory interpretation — Delay in delivery of judgment — Pre-judgment interest: *QBE Insurance (Australia) Ltd v Insurance Australia Ltd* 176 ACTR 38

**PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE**

**Applications** — Rulings — Voir dire — Admissibility of evidence — Where trial judge did not rule on admissibility of evidence at end of voir dire — Where trial judge deferred ruling on admissibility of evidence until final judgment — Proper course for dealing with challenges to admissibility of evidence: *Dasreef Pty Ltd v Hawchar* 277 ALR 611

**Proceedings** — Specialist tribunal — Whether trial judge erred in taking into account experience in specialist jurisdiction — Where specialist tribunal bound by rules of evidence — Judicial notice: *Dasreef Pty Ltd v Hawchar* 277 ALR 611

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION**

**Courts and tribunals** — Medical panel opinion — Medical panel assessed worker as having 30% psychiatric impairment — Worker deemed to have "serious injury" and entitled to commence common law proceeding for damages — Whether employer precluded from asserting at trial that worker did not suffer serious injury: *Cashman v Brown* 277 ALR 654