



## Supreme Court of NSW Court of Appeal

Decisions Reserved as at 27 May 2022

	Number	Case Name	Heard	Issues	Judgment Below
1	2020/00310603; 2020/00310609; 2020/00310590; 2020/00311015; 2020/00311016; 2020/00311017	Clancy v Plaintiff D; Clancy v Plaintiff A; Clancy v Plaintiff C; Bird v Plaintiff C; Bird v Plaintiff D; Bird v Plaintiff A	19/07/2021	TORTS (other) – first appellant owned 99% of shares in second appellant, which was a childcare centre – third respondent who worked at childcare centre was arrested and charged with two offences after a child made disclosures about him – “B” and “D” made disclosures about third respondent with police investigations resulting in criminal charges laid against him in relation to “B”, but none were laid in relation to “D” – “A” and “C” are “B” and “D”’s mothers respectively and also pursued claims for breach of contract due to childcare’s failure to provide quality childcare and to ensure that children were safe and adequately cared for – primary judge found in favour of “A”, “B”, “C” and “D” – whether primary judge erred in concluding that disclosures made by the four children and the admissions of third respondent were admissible as tendency evidence – whether primary judge erred in finding that “Child 1”	<i>Plaintiff A and B v Bird; Plaintiff C v Bird; Plaintiff D v Bird</i> [2020] NSWSC 1379

				<p>was unavailable to give evidence – whether primary judge erred in finding that third respondent’s admissions were admissible against appellants – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred in finding that appellants were negligent – whether primary judge erred in finding that appellants created and enhanced the risk of abuse which materialised – whether primary judge erred as to findings on vicarious liability – whether primary judge erred as to findings on a breach of duty of care – whether primary judge erred as to findings on breach of contract – whether primary judge erred as to the award of damages</p>	
2	2020/234084	Muriniti v Kalil	25/08/2021	<p>COSTS – underlying proceedings concerned claims in defamation, in which the defendant was at all times represented by the appellants – first respondent alleged that the appellants exhibited serious incompetence in their legal representation, and provided inadequate defences with respect to the claim of defamation – primary judge made personal costs orders against appellants – whether primary judge erred in not applying the correct test with respect to a finding of liability relating to serious incompetence pursuant to s 99 of the Civil Procedure Act 2005 (NSW) – whether primary judge erred by failing to provide adequate reasons – whether primary judge erred in not finding that the respondents were motivated by an improper collateral purpose in making the personal costs application – whether primary judge erred as</p>	<p><i>Kalil v Eppinga</i> [2020] NSWDC 407</p>

				to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred by taking into account irrelevant considerations – whether primary judge erred by failing to take into account relevant considerations – whether primary judge erred by denying the appellants procedural fairness – whether primary judge erred by failing to consider submissions made on behalf of the appellants – whether primary judge’s conduct and reasons gave rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias	
3	2021/194026; 2021/197122	State of New South Wales v Kaiser	21/09/2021	CRIME – appellant sought orders that the respondent be made the subject of an extended supervision order pursuant to the Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Act 2006 (NSW) – issue as to whether, for the purpose of the application of s 5B(b) of the Act, the appellant had shown that the respondent was a “supervised offender” – primary judge held that the respondent was not a supervised offender – whether primary judge erred in finding that the respondent was not a “supervised offender”	<i>State of New South Wales v Kaiser</i> [2021] NSWSC 646
4	2021/163352	Reid v Commonwealth Bank of Australia	22/02/2022	PROCEDURE – summary dismissal – deed of release - resolution of dispute by sale of applicant’s property by respondent – property vandalised prior to settlement with purchaser - respondent allowed \$370,000 as adjustment – whether respondent negligently allowed property to be damaged – whether deed ought to be set aside – whether primary Judge failed to consider pleading – whether denial of procedural fairness in not allowing applicant to seek to amend pleading	<i>Reid v Commonwealth Bank of Australia</i> [2021] NSWDC 225

5	2022/17218	Irlam v Byrnes	24/02/2022	TORTS (negligence) – appellant brought proceedings in negligence and battery against the respondent over a motor vehicle incident – primary judge found in favour of respondent – whether primary judge erred by admitting or having regard to certain evidence – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred as to the assessment of contributory negligence	Lower court decision not available on Caselaw
6	2019/110615	Nyunt v First Property Holdings Pte Ltd	4/03/2022	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW (other) – refusal to set aside registration of judgments under <i>Foreign Judgments Act 1991</i> (Cth) – whether respondent had submitted to jurisdiction of Singapore Courts – whether Joint Venture Agreement properly construed included a submission to the jurisdiction of Singapore Courts – whether Singapore Courts had jurisdiction when the facts particularised were already the subject of litigation in Myanmar – whether applicant had adequate notice of proceedings in order to defend – whether enforcement of judgment contrary to public policy	<i>First Property Holdings Pte Ltd v Nyunt</i> [2019] NSWSC 249

7	2021/235929	Sun v Chapman	11/03/2022	<p>SUCCESSION – the appellant sought a family provision order in the proceedings below, on the basis that she was the alleged de facto partner of the deceased – an issue arose as to whether the appellant and the deceased were in a de facto relationship at the time of his death – primary judge found in favour of the respondent – whether primary judge erred in failing to find that the appellant and the deceased were in a de facto relationship at the time of his death – whether primary judge erred in failing to find that there were factors which warranted the making of the application by the appellant, in circumstances where the primary judge found that the appellant and deceased were living in a close personal relationship at the time of his death</p>	<i>Sun v Chapman</i> [2021] NSWSC 955
8	2021/165193	Zong v Wang	14/03/2022	<p>TRADE PRACTICES – in 2018, discussions took place between first appellant and respondent concerning a proposed boating business venture – respondent alleged that first appellant made six representations to him which were misleading or deceptive within the meaning of s 18 of the ACL – primary judge found in favour of respondent – whether primary judge erred in determining that the first appellant’s representations were made in “trade or commerce” – whether primary judge erred by incorrectly making findings in relation to certain representations which had not been pleaded by the respondent – whether primary judge erred in his findings as to reliance and causation – whether primary judge erred as to the assessment of damages</p>	<i>Wang v Zong</i> [2021] NSWDC 181

9	2021/173153	Williams v Fraser	17/03/2022	MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE – undiagnosed congenital pars defect – radiologist failed to report of existence of defect – where appellant subsequent work alleged to have cause deterioration of her condition – whether no damage following breach of duty – whether primary Judge failed to address that condition would have stabilised with appropriate exercise – whether loss of chance	<i>Williams v Fraser</i> [2021] NSWSC 416
10	2021/195267	Morris v Leaney	18/03/2022	TORTS (negligence) – the appellants were the registered proprietors of property located in Kings Creek, NSW – in 2014, the appellants decided that they would develop their property to accommodate their growing family and their desire to have a “forever home” – the appellants brought proceedings against the respondent architect, in respect of an alleged breach of duty of care and misleading or deceptive conduct, as they alleged that he led them to believe that they could build their dream home within their financial limits – primary judge found in favour of respondent – whether primary judge erred in finding that the appellants suffered no loss – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings	<i>Morris v Leaney</i> [2021] NSWDC 224

11	2021/87464	Joldzic v Patrick	21/03/2022	<p>MOTOR ACCIDENTS – appellant was struck by the respondent’s vehicle in a motor accident in 2012, to which the respondent admitted that she breached her duty of care to the appellant – however, from about February 2016, the appellant suffered from an atypical psychotic disorder – issue arose as to whether by reason of her involvement in the motor vehicle accident in 2012, the appellant suffered personal injury in the form of mental harm and, if she did, whether any mental harm caused by that accident led to her current predicament – primary judge awarded the appellant damages in the sum of just under \$44k – whether primary judge erred in the quantum of damages assessed – whether primary judge erred in finding that the appellant’s incapacity would have come about independently of the motor vehicle accident – whether primary judge erred in failing to find that the appellant’s incapacity for employment in the future was caused by the psychological impact of the accident</p>	<p><i>Joldzic (bht Joldzic) v Patrick</i> [2021] NSWDC 55</p>
12	2021/299083	Centuria Property Funds Ltd v Thorn Australia Pty Ltd	24/03/2022	<p>CONTRACT – the respondent sought declaratory relief to the effect that it had not entered into a binding lease or agreement for lease, as lessee, with the appellants, as lessors, in respect of certain commercial premises in Eveleigh – underlying issue as to whether the respondent had delivered certain deeds so as to become bound by them – primary judge found in favour of respondent – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred as to the construction of the relevant</p>	<p><i>Thorn Australia Pty Ltd v Centuria Property Funds Ltd</i> [2021] NSWSC 1217</p>

				agreement	
13	2021/181818	Chisak v Presot	25/03/2022	<p>SUCCESSION – issue as to whether the deceased lacked testamentary capacity when making her will – primary judge found in favour of the respondents – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred in finding that the deceased had capacity – whether primary judge erred in relying on certain evidence – whether primary judge erred by failing to take into account certain evidence – whether primary judge failed to give adequate reasons in preferring the evidence of one expert over that of another expert – whether primary judge erred in not considering whether suspicious circumstances existed – whether primary judge erred in finding that the appellant was not an eligible person pursuant to s 57(1)(e) of the <i>Succession Act 2006</i> (NSW) – whether primary judge erred by failing to make adequate provision for the proper maintenance, education or advancement in life of the appellant</p>	<i>Chisak v Presot</i> [2021] NSWSC 597



14	2021/282503	Amaca Pty Ltd v Cleary	29/03/2022	TORTS (negligence) – the deceased was employed by the appellant between 1962 and 1964 at its Camellia factory and plant – whilst the appellant conceded that the deceased developed asbestos related pleural plaques, it disputed the claims for compensation for lung cancer and asbestosis injuries – primary judge found in favour of the respondent – whether the primary judge erred by failing to accept certain expert evidence – whether the primary judge erred as to certain factual findings	<i>Roseanne Cleary as the Legal Personal Representative of the Estate of the late Fortunato (aka Frank) Gatt v Amaca Pty Ltd [2021] NSWDDT 5</i>
15	2021/204042	Dwyer v Volkswagen Group Pty Ltd	30/03/2022	TRADE PRACTICES – the appellant brought representative proceedings on behalf of some 83,000 persons who purchased Volkswagen vehicles in which a Takata driver side airbag was installed between 2007 and 2018 – the appellant claimed that his vehicle was not of acceptable quality because, by reason of the installation of the Takata airbag, the vehicle was not free from defects and was not safe – primary judge found in favour of the respondent – whether primary judge erred in failing to find that the appellant’s vehicle was not of acceptable quality at the time of the supply to the appellant, within the meaning of s 54 of the Australian Consumer Law – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred by importing a negligence or fault standard into a strict liability regime – whether primary judge erred by rejecting certain expert evidence – whether primary judge ought to have held that the appellant was entitled to damages under s 272 of the ACL	<i>Dwyer v Volkswagen Group Australia Pty Ltd t/as Volkswagen Australia [2021] NSWSC 715</i>

16	2021/293686	Trustees for the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Lismore v GLJ	31/03/2022	PROCEDURE – dismissal of permanent stay – where applicant has no records nor access to senior persons who could provide instructions – where conduct alleged was not the grooming of males but a single sexual assault against a female – whether applicant unable to meaningfully engage with the claim for vicarious liability – application of <i>The Council of Trinity Grammar School v Anderson</i> [2019] NSWCA 292.	<i>GLJ v The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Lismore</i> [2021] NSWSC 1204
17	2021/257944	MP Water Pty Ltd v Veolia Water Australia Pty Ltd	4/04/2022	CONTRACT- declaration - construction of “step-in” right in a long term services agreement – notice given in exercise of that right - whether applicant entitled to give notice – whether gave power to applicant to direct the respondent as to its operations rather than operate the facility	<i>MP Water Pty Ltd v Veolia Water Australia Pty Ltd (No 3)</i> [2021] NSWSC 1023
18	2021/210509	Shepherd v State of NSW	5/04/2022	TORTS (other) – assault – shoulder charge by police officer - whether the primary judge failed to give proper weight to certain evidence – whether the primary judge erred by failing to give adequate reasons – whether the primary judge erred by making certain factual findings in the absence of evidence	Lower court decision not available on Caselaw

19	2021/269258	Dogramaci v DPP	5/04/2022	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW (judicial review) – whether appellant was denied the opportunity to cross-examine a particular witness – whether appellant was denied justice – whether primary judge displayed bias towards appellant	Lower court decision not available on Caselaw
20	2021/321969	Secretary, Dept of Communities and Justice v KH	6/04/2022	ADMINISTRATIVE (other) – judicial review sought of orders made in <i>Children and Young Person (Care and Protection) Act 1998</i> (NSW) – whether misconstrued requirement in s83(5) that there be a “realistic possibility of restoration within a reasonable period” – whether failed to apply s9(1) in consideration the safety, welfare and well-being of child being paramount – whether taking into account alleged denial of procedural fairness in Children’s Court	<i>KH v Secretary, Department of Communities and Justice</i> [2021] NSWDC 498
21	2021/240231	Massoud v Nationwide News Pty Limited	12/04/2022	DEFAMATION – appellant was suspended and dismissed from his employment as a journalist for a statement that he made to an 18-year-old cadet – the appellant brought proceedings against the respondent media organisations for misquoting what he said in otherwise factually correct reports – primary judge found in favour of the respondents – whether primary judge erred in his findings as to imputations and contextual imputations – whether primary judge erred in upholding the defence of justification – whether primary	<i>Massoud v Radio 2GB Sydney Pty Ltd; Massoud v Fox Sports Australia Ltd; Massoud v Commonwealth Broadcasting Corporation Pty Ltd; Massoud v Nine Digital Pty Ltd; Massoud v Nationwide News Pty Ltd</i> [2021] NSWDC 336

				judge erred as to the assessment of damages	
22	2022/20519	Clark v Attorney General of NSW	14/04/2022	<p>ADMINISTRATIVE LAW (judicial review) – crime – appeal and review – application pursuant to s 78 of the <i>Crimes (Appeal and Review) Act 2001</i> (NSW) – on 26 June 2009, Applicant was convicted of one count of doing an act with one count of doing an act with intent to pervert the course of justice contrary to s 319 of the <i>Crimes Act 1900</i> (NSW) and one count of aggravated sexual intercourse with a child between 14 and 16 years of age contrary to s 66C(4) of the <i>Crimes Act 1900</i> (NSW) – Applicant’s appeal against conviction dismissed in 2011 – in October 2017, Applicant made application under s 78 of the <i>Crimes (Appeal and Review) Act 2001</i> (NSW) for a review of his convictions – that application was dismissed – application for judicial review of that decision was subsequently also dismissed – Applicant brought a fresh application for review of his convictions pursuant to s 78 – Applicant contended that his convictions ought to be referred for inquiry by a judicial officer on various bases – that Crown withheld evidence</p>	<p><i>Application by Peter Frederick Clark pursuant to s 78 of the Crimes (Appeal and Review) Act 2001 (NSW) [2021] NSWSC 1364</i></p>

				and misdirected jury – that jury verdicts were inconsistent and/or unreasonable – that convictions on counts relating to single event offended rule against double jeopardy – judge dismissed application for review – whether judge fell into jurisdictional error – by proceeding on misapprehensions of fact and law – by failing to address arguments put by Applicant	
23	2021/286249	Bryant v Quinn	19/04/2022	CONTRACT – the respondent uncle sued his appellant niece for the repayment of monies in excess of \$100,000 – the appellant claimed that the monies were a gift, and were not provided to her by way of loan – primary judge found in favour of respondent – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred by making findings on the basis of a conditional gift, which had not been pleaded by the respondent – whether primary judge erred by denying the appellant procedural fairness	<i>Quinn v Bryant</i> [2021] NSWDC 570
24	2021/189912	Nitopi v Nitopi	21/04/2022	SUCCESSION – the appellant and respondent were respectively daughter and son of the deceased – the respondent alleged that the appellant took unconscientious advantage of the deceased, who was suffering a special disadvantage of which the appellant ought to have known – primary judge found in favour of the respondent – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred in concluding that since the appellant had notice of the deceased's special	<i>Estate of Nitopi (No 2)</i> [2021] NSWSC 748

				disadvantage, there was an equitable presumption that she unconscientiously took advantage of the opportunities presented by that disadvantage – whether primary judge erred in finding that constructive notice or notice less than actual notice of the special disadvantage was sufficient – whether primary judge erred by making findings not available on the evidence	
25	2020/257794	Nashco Pty Ltd v Yang	21/04/2022	<p>CONTRACT – the appellant is a fabricator of metal building materials and, between July 2018 and October 2019, supplied these goods to Grand Metal Pty Ltd pursuant to a contractual arrangement – in the proceedings below, Grand Metal claimed damages from the appellant arising out of the appellant’s failure to allow it to purchase goods on credit up to \$1,400,000, which Grand Metal claimed was a breach of an implied term of the contract – by cross-claim, the appellant sought to recover from Grand Metal and also from the respondent guarantors the balance that it contended was owing to it by Grand Metal, totalling some \$940,000 – primary judge held that the appellant’s claims against the respondent guarantors be dismissed – whether primary judge erred in not giving full effect to the guarantees – whether primary judge erred in his interpretation of the deed of assignment – whether primary judge erred in failing to give reasons</p>	<i>Grand Metal Pty Ltd v Nashco Pty Ltd</i> [2021] NSWSC 1005

26	2021/152128	Eddy v Goulburn Mulwaree Council	26/04/2022	TORTS (negligence) – appellant sustained injuries when he fell on a ramp outside a shopping centre in Goulburn, which he alleged that the respondent Council had a duty to take care, control and management of – whether primary judge erred in applying s 45 of the <i>Civil Liability Act 2002</i> (NSW) – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred in finding that the respondent did not have actual or constructive knowledge of the particular risk	<i>Ricky Eddy v Goulburn Mulwaree Council and Golden Star Import &amp; Export Pty Ltd</i> [2021] NSWDC 150
27	2021/268236	O'Connor v O'Connor	27/04/2022	EQUITY – the appellants claimed that in 2005, they entered into an oral agreement with the respondent, who held 75% of the shares in an earth-moving services company (the Company), that the respondent would transfer to them an 8.33% shareholding in the company for \$150,000 – each appellant claimed that they paid the money, but were never issued with any shares in the company or entered onto its share register – in July 2015, the parties settled their disputes by entering into a Settlement Deed, which provided for the Company to pay the appellants certain sums of money, and under which they released the respondent and the Company from all claims – in late 2014, Calibre Group Limited approached the Company, and expressed an interest in acquiring 100% of the shares in the Company – the appellants claimed that the respondent owed them a fiduciary duty to disclose the existence of the Calibre offer, and that they were entitled to equitable compensation – primary judge found in favour of the	<i>O'Connor v O'Connor</i> [2021] NSWSC 1056

				<p>respondent – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred by failing to find that the respondent breached a fiduciary duty owed to the appellants</p>	
28	2021/195258	Hobhouse v Macarthur-Onslow	28/04/2022	<p>LAND LAW – appellant and first respondent are siblings who were parties to a deed of settlement and release made in February 2021 – the deed conferred a number of options to purchase different properties on each of the appellant and first respondent – the present dispute involved a 60 day option given to the first respondent to purchase an apartment in Darling Point, which was to expire on 23 April 2021 – the first respondent purported to exercise it by a notice given on 22 April 2021, however the purchase price had not yet been determined in accordance with the deed – issue as to whether, on the proper construction of the deed, the call option could be exercised before the purchase price had been determined in accordance with the deed – primary judge found in favour of first respondent – whether primary judge erred by failing to find that the determination of the purchase price of the property was a condition precedent to the exercise of the option – whether primary judge erred as to the construction of the deed – whether primary</p>	<p><i>Hobhouse v Mount Gilead Pty Ltd</i> [2021] NSWSC 684</p>



				judge erred as to certain factual findings	
29	2021/328205; 2021/328225	McMurchy v Employsure Pty Ltd; Kumaran v Employsure Pty Ltd	29/04/2022	CONTRACT – restraint of trade – whether first applicant bound by restraint in contract – whether restraint unreasonable – whether breach of fiduciary obligation by accepting employment with second applicant whilst still employed by respondent – whether first applicant induced an employee of respondent to leave – whether second applicant knowingly assisted the first applicant in the breaches	<i>Employsure Ltd v McMurchy</i> [2021] NSWSC 1179
30	2021/247771	Ali v Insurance Australia Ltd	2/05/2022	INSURANCE – separate question – claim under policy made more than six years after refusal of claim – whether action statute barred - construction of respondent’s promise to indemnify under policy – whether time ran from refusal of claim or from incident - whether <i>Globe Church Inc v Allianz Australia Insurance Ltd</i> [2019] NSWCA 27 ought to be confined or distinguished	<i>Ali v Insurance Australia Ltd</i> [2021] NSWDC 369

31	2021/288657	Health Care Complaints Commission v Robinson	3/05/2022	<p>DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS – medical practitioner – Respondent is a medical practitioner – Appellant applied to the Occupational Division of the New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal for disciplinary findings and orders under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law 2009 (NSW) – in relation to consultation with a patient referred to as Patient A – Appellant alleged that Respondent was guilty of unsatisfactory professional conduct by conducting a physical examination of Patient A’s breasts and abdomen without medical indication – Respondent conceded that adequate clinical records of the consultation had not been kept – Appellant alleged that the particulars of the complaints against Respondent amounted to professional misconduct – Tribunal held that whilst Respondent was guilty of unsatisfactory professional conduct in relation to the consultation with Patient A, he was not guilty of professional misconduct – whether Tribunal failed to give adequate reasons for conclusion that Respondent was not guilty of professional misconduct – whether Tribunal failed to conduct an assessment of the degree to which the Respondent’s conduct fell short of the expected professional standard – whether Tribunal failed to consider effect of Respondent’s conduct on reputation of and confidence in the medical profession – whether Tribunal erroneously took account of clinical basis for breast examination – whether Tribunal failed to consider inherent sexuality</p>	<p><i>Health Care Complaints Commission v Robinson</i> [2021] NSWCATOD 142</p>
----	-------------	-------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				of Respondent's conduct	
32	2021/364497	Commonwealth of Australia v Kupang Resources Limited	3/05/2022	PROCEDURE – setting aside a notice to produce for production of confidential taxpayer information of non-parties to proceedings – effect of subdivision 355-B in Part 5-1 of Ch 5 of Sch 1 of Taxation Administration Act 1953 (Cth) – whether Act applies to notice to produce – whether Court can order disclosure merely because it assesses that it would enable a fair trial – whether there is a distinction between production to party or to the Court	<i>Kupang Resources Pty Ltd v Commonwealth of Australia</i> [2021] NSWSC 1580
33	2021/364260	BSA Advanced Property Solutions (Fire) Pty Ltd v Ventia Australia Pty Ltd	4/05/2022	BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION – First Respondent is a company providing maintenance and facilities-management services – First Respondent entered into head contract with NSW Land and Housing Corporation to provide services in respect of approx. 68,000 social housing properties – in May 2016, First Respondent subsequently entered into subcontract with Appellant for provision of fire safety services and equipment – First Respondent would issue “work orders” to Appellant in respect of specific works to be	<i>Ventia Australia Pty Ltd v BSA Advanced Property Solutions (Fire) Pty Ltd</i> [2021] NSWSC 1534

			<p>performed under the subcontract – in February 2021, First Respondent terminated subcontract – Appellant served payment claim on First Respondent, pursuant to s 13 of the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 1999 (NSW), in the sum of \$2.98 million – particulars of payment claim itemised according to “work orders” – First Respondent objected to payment claim on basis that it was brought in respect of multiple contracts – First Respondent contended that each work order constituted a separate contract – over objection of First Respondent, adjudicator issued determination in favour of Appellant in the sum of \$2.69 million – First Respondent commenced proceedings seeking to quash adjudicator’s determination on basis of its objection – Appellant argued that payment claim prima facie related solely to the subcontract – primary judge found in favour of First Respondent and quashed adjudicator’s determination – whether primary judge erred in concluding that a payment claim “in respect of” multiple contracts is invalid – whether primary judge erred in finding that this was a jurisdictional issue to be determined by a court – whether primary judge failed properly to consider Appellant’s argument that payment claim “prima facie” related to a single contract – whether primary judge erred in concluding that each “work order” constituted a separate contract – whether primary judge erred in failing to conclude that payment claim concerned a single “arrangement” between</p>	
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

				the parties – whether primary judge erred in application of subcontract to s 34 of the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act	
34	2022/106590; 2021/74201	Morsingh v Health Care Complaints Commission	9/05/2022	DISCIPLINARY – cancellation of registration under s149C(1)(B) of Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (NSW) – alleged touching of patient’s breasts during examination - whether seriousness of conduct warranted cancellation – whether right to practice with restrictions ought to have to ordered	Lower court decision not available on Caselaw
35	2021/326602	Khadarou v Antarakis	10/05/2022	SUCCESSION – the appellant applied for a family provision order under s 59 of the Succession Act 2006 (NSW) in respect of the deceased’s estate, on the basis that he and the deceased were living in a close personal relationship at the time of the death of the deceased – primary judge dismissed the application – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings	<i>Khadarou v Antarakis</i> [2021] NSWSC 743

36	2021/204029	Ming v DPP	12/05/2022	JUDICIAL REVIEW (other) – judicial review of criminal appeal from Local Court to District Court – whether jurisdiction error in failing to provide reasons for finding that applicant acted dishonestly – whether charge should have failed when conduct relied upon as deception did not accompany the transmissions of funds – failure to identify basic facts contended for by the Crown – failure to take into account relevant evidence – whether failed to address that request was actually honest	<i>Ming v R</i> [2021] NSWDC 223
37	2021/243855	Krolczyk v Winner	16/05/2022	BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION – whether primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge failed to have regard to certain evidence – whether primary judge erred by failing to give adequate reasons	<i>Lower Court decision not available on Caselaw</i>
38	2021/269154	Hardy v Coates Hire Operations Pty Ltd	17/05/2022	CONTRACT – whether the primary judge erred as to certain factual findings – whether primary judge erred by failing to find that the guarantee, indemnity and charge was unjust in the circumstances relating to the guarantee at the time it was made, and erred by failing to make an order declaring the guarantee void, in whole or in part – whether primary judge erred by finding that there was no reliable medical opinion that the appellant suffered from any relevant impairment in May 2016	<i>Lower Court decision not available on Caselaw</i>

39	2021/242905	<p>Cassaniti v Ball; Ball v AKA (NSW) Pty Ltd; Ball v Cassaniti; Ball v Borg Family Pty Ltd; Khalil v Diamondwish Pty Ltd (in liq); Khalil v Rackforce Pty Ltd (in liq); Khalil v Earth Civil Pty Ltd (in liq); Khalil v RCG CBD Pty Ltd (in liq); Khalil v Bluemine Pty Ltd (in liq)</p>	18/05/2022	<p>CORPORATIONS – accessorial liability – the First Appellant liquidator commenced the underlying proceedings seeking relief against a large number of corporate and individual defendants arising out of alleged conduct on the part of insolvent companies of engaging, on the advice or recommendation of an accounting firm, in certain “carousel payments” or round robin transactions – it was alleged that the insolvent companies, while under the control of certain “primary conspirators”, were used as “money transaction units” effectively for money laundering – these “primary conspirators” were alleged to have breached fiduciary duties owing to the insolvent Second Appellant company by conspiring in a course of conduct amounting to equitable fraud – the Respondents were alleged to have been accessories to the breaches of fiduciary duties by the primary conspirators – by their participation in the relevant transactions – primary judge found in favour of the First Appellant as against the “primary conspirators” – primary judge found in favour of Respondents in respect of accessorial liability and dismissed claims brought against them – whether primary judge failed to provide adequate reasons – whether primary judge erred in making various findings of fact – whether primary judge erred in finding that Second Respondent lacked requisite knowledge to make out accessorial liability – whether primary judge failed to make inferences reasonably open on the evidence –</p>	<p><i>In the matters of Earth Civil Australia Pty Ltd, RCG CBD Pty Ltd, Bluemine Pty Ltd, Diamondwish Pty Ltd and Rackforce Pty Ltd (all in liq) [2021] NSWSC 966</i></p>
----	-------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				whether primary judge erred in failing to consider concept of imputed knowledge	
40	2021/323942	Fisher v Degnan	18/05/2022	<p>CONTRACT – construction of Deed – Deed concerning parcel of land at Sawtell – parcel of land contained a primary dwelling – Respondent is mother of First Appellant and mother-in-law of Second Appellant – Appellants purchased parcel of land at Sawtell in May 2011 and constructed secondary dwelling on the land – Appellants lived in secondary dwelling whilst Respondent occupied primary dwelling – on 2 July 2012, Respondent transferred \$250,000 into Appellants’ bank account and recorded transaction as payment for “house purchase” – on 20 July 2012, parties executed a Deed entitled “Deed of Loan” – Deed recorded a principal sum of \$250,000 advanced from Respondent to Appellants for purpose of “assist[ing] in purchase of property situate at [Sawtell]” – in January 2019, parcel of land was subdivided into separate lots for primary and secondary dwellings – in February 2019, Appellants sold primary dwelling and demanded that Respondent vacate the property – in November 2019, Appellants sold</p>	<i>Degnan v Fisher</i> [2021] NSWSC 1334



				<p>secondary dwelling for \$645,000 and paid Respondent the sum of \$250,000 from proceeds of sale – Respondent brought claim against Appellants – Respondent contended that, pursuant to Deed, Appellants were obliged to transfer primary dwelling to her upon subdivision of the land – Respondent sought relief in the form of Appellants accounting to her for net proceeds of sale of primary dwelling – Appellants contended that Deed was nothing more than an interest-free loan – primary judge found in favour of Respondent – whether primary judge erred in construing Deed as agreement for sale of property – whether primary judge erred in referring to correspondence post-dating Deed – whether primary judge erred in treating cl 3 of Deed as operative provision – whether primary judge erred in various findings of fact</p>	
41	2021/278620	Pavlis v Pavlis	19/05/2022	<p>EQUITY – constructive trust – proprietary estoppel – Appellants are sons of the Respondents – Respondents are registered proprietors of a property at Strathfield – at the time of its purchase in 1986, the Property was in a very dilapidated state – over a period of 20 years, the Property was restored to its original condition by the Appellants – Appellants expended considerable time, effort and funds in the course of the Property’s restoration – as of 2017, a family dispute had resulted in the estrangement of the Appellants from the Respondents – Respondents made no provision for Appellants in their wills – Appellants commenced proceedings against Respondents seeking a declaration that the</p>	<i>Pavlis v Pavlis</i> [2021] NSWSC 1117

				<p>Respondents hold a 40% interest in the Property on constructive trust for each of the Appellants – Appellants pleaded alternative case on the basis of proprietary estoppel – Appellants contended that Respondents made an express representation in 1999 to the effect that Appellants would each receive a 40% interest in the Property in return for their contributions to the restoration – Respondents denied any such representation – primary judge found in favour of Respondents and dismissed proceedings – whether primary judge erred in failing to find that the restoration was a joint endeavour for the mutual benefit of the parties – whether primary judge erred in finding that Respondents were motivated by their own commercial benefit – whether primary judge erred in factual finding as to ownership of a separate property</p>	
42	2022/4794	NSW Trustee and Guardian v Togias	23/05/2022	<p>EQUITY – Trusts and trustees – Respondent claimed beneficial interest in two real properties located at Glenwood and Seven Hills – Respondent's de facto partner charged with the supply of prohibited drugs – NSW Crime Commission obtained a restraining order and a proceeds assessment order against the Respondent's de facto partner – A forfeiture order was made including the two properties – Respondent sought declaration of a Baumgartner v Baumgartner (1987) 164 CLR 137 constructive trust over the properties – Respondent alleged that the forfeiture order was limited to the de facto partner's interests in the properties, and not the Respondent's</p>	<p><i>Nicolitsa Togias v State of New South Wales</i> [2021] NSWSC 1588</p>

				<p>beneficial interest in the properties – Primary judge imposed a remedial constructive trust, notwithstanding that the Respondent could not show the exact money she had contributed to the purchase and maintenance of the properties – Primary judge found that the Respondent made significant contributions, financial and otherwise, to the maintenance of the properties, the business of her de facto partner, and raised the children – Whether the primary judge erred in holding that the Respondent established that she and the de facto partner formed a joint relationship and endeavour pursuant to which the Respondent made contributions to the acquisition of the properties – Whether primary judge erred in making various factual findings – Whether primary judge erred in finding that money borrowed for and contributed to expenses of the property following the breakdown of the relationship were payments pursuant to the joint endeavour which had since terminated – Whether primary judge erred in holding that the beneficial interest should be shared equally as an application of the maxim “equity is equality”</p>	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

43	2019/363483; 2021/214357	Foundas v Arambatzis	24/05/2022	PROCEDURE – second application to reopen appeal – availability of new evidence as to ownership of subject property – whether appeal ought to be reopened – whether further appeal available following determination of earlier appeal	<i>Foundas v Arambatzis</i> [2020] NSWCA 47
44	2021/273007	Old English Tiles Australia Pty Ltd v Transport for NSW	27/05/2022	LAND & ENVIRONMENT – compulsory acquisition – compensation – the Appellant had exclusive occupation of land in Annandale which was owned by its two directors and shareholders for the purposes of carrying on a business of manufacturing tiles – the Respondent compulsorily acquired the land which was occupied by the Appellant – the Appellant was offered compensation in the sum of \$1,061,379 in accordance with s 55(d) of the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 (NSW) but objected to that amount pursuant to s 66 of that Act – the Appellant claimed that it was entitled to compensation on the bases of disturbance or disturbance and special value under ss 59(1) and 55(b) of the Act – where parties agreed that the determination of the nature of the Appellant’s interest in the acquired land was an essential precondition to its claim for compensation – where the Appellant contended that its right to exclusive occupation constituted an “interest” in the acquired land, being a “right ... power or	<i>Olde English Tiles Australia Pty Ltd v Transport for New South Wales</i> [2021] NSWLEC 90

				<p>privilege over, or in connection with" it, for the purposes of s 4(b) of the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 (NSW) – primary judge found in favour of the Respondent and held that the Appellant had no relevant compensable interest in the acquired land – whether primary judge erred in the construction of an "interest in land" as defined in s 4 of the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 (NSW) in finding that the Appellant did not have a "right, power or privilege over, or in connection with", the acquired land – whether primary judge erred in concluding that any such right must be capable of alienation, by reference to Dial a Dump Industries Pty Ltd v Roads and Maritime Services (2017) 94 NSWLR 554</p>	
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--