Judicial Commission of New South Wales

CIVIL TRIALS BENCH BOOK

Update 47

March 2022

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS OVERLEAF

Judicial Commission of New South Wales

Level 5, 60 Carrington Street, Sydney NSW 2000

GPO Box 3634, Sydney NSW 2001

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Update 47

Update 47, March 2022

The following changes have been incorporated in this Update:

[1-0000] Disqualification for bias

The decision of *Gleeson v DPP (NSW)* [2021] NSWCA 63 has been added at **[1-0020] Apprehended bias**, as a recent example of where a fair-minded observer would likely be concerned about a close personal relationship between a trial judge and prosecutor who had earlier advised police on the bringing of charges in the case. B Cairns, "Bias and procedural fairness at trial" (2021) 9 *Journal of Civil litigation and Practice* 182 has been added to **Further references**.

[1-0900] Interpreters

Commentary regarding the interpretation of words used in a foreign language in a sworn affidavit and the competence of the deponent to provide such interpretation has been added at **[1-0900] Introduction**. The cases of *Maria Coppola v NSW Trustee and Guardian as Administrator of the Estate of the Late Giuseppina Buda (No 2)* [2019] NSWSC 948 and *Sun v Chapman* [2021] NSWSC 955 have been added as examples.

[2-0700] Amendment

Commentary at **[2-0710] General principles** has been amended to include a discussion of he High Court decision of *Aon Risk Services Australia Ltd v Australian National University* (2009) 239 CLR 175. Additional cases have been added at **[2-0730] Grounds for refusal of amendment** as examples of other matters which may result in the refusal of an amendment.

[2-1200] Change of venue and transfer between New South Wales courts

Local Court Practice Note Civ 1 — Case management of civil proceedings in the Local Court has been added at **[2-1200] *Change of venue between Local Courts.*** At **[2-1210] Transfer of proceedings between courts**, the case of *Mahommed v Unicomb* [2017] NSWCA 65 has been added, which discusses s 144(2) of the *Civil Procedure Act* 2005 being mandatory in its terms. ***Transfer between Supreme Court and Industrial Court*** has been removed. Part 9, Div 3 and r 4.1 of the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules were repealed as of 8 December 2016. ***Transfer between Small Claims Division and General Division of Local Court*** has been added, noting that Pt 2, Div 2 of the Local Court Rules 2009 provide for the transfer of proceedings from the Small Claims Division to the General Division where the jurisdictional limit of the Small Claims Division is exceeded (r 2.2) or the matters in dispute are so complex or difficult, or are of such importance, that the proceedings ought more properly to be heard in the court's General Division: r 2.3(1).

[2-1800] Consolidation and/or joinder of proceedings

Skinner v Shine Pty Ltd [2019] NSWSC 1709 has been added at **[2-1800] Consolidation of proceedings**, as an example of when consolidation or joint hearings is not appropriate.

[2-4600] Persons under legal incapacity

[2-4630] Tutors/Guardians ad litem has been amended as a consequence of the decision in *Choi v NSW Ombudsman* (2021) 104 NSWLR 505, and the subsequent amendment of the *Civil and*

Administrative Tribunal Act 2013, commencing 8 December 2021, so that a valid appointment of a guardian ad litem may now be ordered without naming a particular person to be appointed: see s 45(4C).

[2-6600] Setting aside and variation of judgments and orders

The cases of *Lichaa v Boutros* [2021] NSWCA 322 and *Williams v Harrison* [2021] NSWSC 1488 have been added at **[2-6700] Denial of procedural fairness**.

[7-0000] Damages

The case of *Arsalan v Rixon; Nguyen v Cassim* [2021] HCA 40 has been added under a new heading ***Loss of amenity of the use of a chattel*** at **[7-0020] Actual loss**. In this case, the High Court unanimously agreed that the conclusion of the majority of the NSWCA should be upheld on the basis the respondents suffered heads of damage of physical inconvenience and loss of amenity of use of their negligently damaged motor vehicles, and that it was not unreasonable for them to take steps to mitigate both aspects of their loss by the hire, at a reasonable rate, of an equivalent car for a reasonable period of repair.

[7-1000] Interest

The decision of *Tjiong v Tjiong (No 2)* [2018] NSWSC 1981 has been added at **[7-1070] Interest after judgment**.

Practice Note SC Gen 16 — Pre-judgment interest rates and Practice Note DC (Civil) 15 — Pre-judgment interest rates have also been added.

[8-0000] Costs

The decision in *Spencer v Coshott* [2021] NSWCA 235, where the NSWCA held that the abrogation of the *Chorley* exception by the High Court in *Bell Lawyers Pty Ltd v Pentelow* [2019] HCA 29, did not deny the recovery of costs by a solicitor litigant who is represented by an incorporated legal practice of which he or she is the principal and sole director and shareholder, because of the separate legal personality of an incorporated legal practice, has been added at **[8-0090] Self-represented litigants (including lawyers)**.

[10-0300] Contempt generally

The decisions of *Thunder Studios Inc (California) v Kazal (No 2)* [2017] FCA 202 and *Seven Network (Operations) Ltd v Dowling (No 2)* [2021] NSWSC 1106 have been added at a new paragraph **[10-0305] Sentencing principles for contempt**.

Judicial Commission of New South Wales

CIVIL TRIALS BENCH BOOK

Update 47

March 2022

FILING INSTRUCTIONS OVERLEAF

Judicial Commission of New South Wales

Level 5, 60 Carrington Street, Sydney NSW 2000

GPO Box 3634, Sydney NSW 2001

FILING INSTRUCTIONS

Update 47

Please file the Summary and Filing Instructions behind the "Filing instructions" tab card at the back of the Bench Book.

Please discard previous filing instructions and summary sheets before filing these instructions and summary.

Tab Card	*Discard Old Pages*	*Insert New Pages*
Preliminary		
	101–105	101–105
	345–346	345–346
Procedure generally		
	503–504	503–504
	711–715	711–714
	821–823	821–823
	975–977	975–977
	1765–1771	1765–1771
	2125–2127	2125–2127
Damages		
	7051–7092	7051–7093
	7501–7505	7501–7505
Costs		
	8065–8070	8065–8070
Contempt		
	10001–10002	10001–10002
	10111–10118	10111–10119

Disqualification for bias

[1-0000] Introduction

Bias may involve actual or apprehended bias.

[1-0010] Actual bias

A judge affected by actual bias would be unable to comply with the Judicial Oath, and would be disqualified from sitting. In such a case, the question for determination is whether there is bias in fact. See *Collier v Country Women's Association of NSW* [2018] NSWCA 36 at [27]–[46] for a summary of the relevant principles.

[1-0020] Apprehended bias

The test for determining whether a judge should disqualify himself or herself by reason of apprehended bias is objective: "whether a fair-minded lay observer might reasonably apprehend that the judge might not bring an impartial and unprejudiced mind to the resolution of the question the judge is required to decide": *Johnson v Johnson* (2000) 201 CLR 488 at [11], affirmed in *Ebner v Official Trustee in Bankruptcy* (2000) 205 CLR 337; applied in *Michael Wilson & Partners Ltd v Nicholls* (2011) 244 CLR 427 and *Charisteas v Charisteas* [2021] HCA 29; distinguished in *British American Tobacco Australia Services Ltd v Laurie* (2011) 242 CLR 283; see also *Slavin v Owners Corporation Strata Plan 16857* [2006] NSWCA 71; *Barakat v Goritsas (No 2)* [2012] NSWCA 36 and *Isbester v Knox City Council* (2015) 255 CLR 135.

The application of the test requires two steps: first, "it requires the identification of what it is said might lead a judge ... to decide a case other than on its legal and factual merits"; and, second, there must be articulated a "logical connection" between that matter and the feared departure from the judge deciding the case on its merits: *Ebner* at [8]. Once those two steps are taken, the reasonableness of the asserted apprehension of bias can then ultimately be assessed: *Ebner* at [8]; *Charisteas* at [11].

See also *Chamoun v District Court of NSW* [2018] NSWCA 187 per Gleeson JA at [39] (citing *Tarrant v R* [2018] NSWCCA 21) for discussion as to the four discrete elements required for the "double might" test.

An intermediate appellate court dealing with allegations of apprehended bias should address the issue of bias first as the necessary result, if bias is established, is a retrial: *Concrete Pty Ltd v Parramatta Design & Developments Pty Ltd* (2006) 229 CLR 577 at [2]–[3]; [117].

As to the former association of the judge with legal representatives and litigants, see *Bakarich v Commonwealth Bank of Australia* [2010] NSWCA 43. As to an example of where a fair-minded observer would likely be concerned about a current close personal relationship between judge and a prosecutor connected with the proceedings, see *Gleeson v DPP (NSW)* [2021] NSWCA 63 at [29]. As to the relevance of non-disclosure to issues of apprehended bias, see *Whalebone v Auto Panel Beaters & Radiators Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2011] NSWCA 176. As to a party being a member of the trial court, see *Rouvinetis v Knoll* [2013] NSWCA 24.

As to inappropriate contact or communication between the judge and a party's barrister during proceedings and while judgment was reserved which might reasonably be considered to compromise judicial impartiality, see *Charisteas v Charisteas* at [12], [15], [21]–[22].

[1-0030] Procedure

Present authority supports the proposition that an application for disqualification can be made without the filing of a formal motion (*Barton v Walker* [1979] 2 NSWLR 740; *Bainton v Rajski* (1992) 29 NSWLR 539), although there have been instances where a motion has been presented.

Such authority also supports the view that such an application should be determined by the judge whose disqualification is sought, and should not involve a contest on the facts: *Australian National Industries Ltd v Spedley Securities Ltd (in liq)* (1992) 26 NSWLR 411 at 436; and *Wentworth v Graham* [2003] NSWCA 240.

As to the approach to be adopted where there are disputed issues of fact, see *CUR24 v DPP* (2012) 83 NSWLR 385. In that case, it was held that where there is plausible evidence as to an out of court statement or other conduct of a judicial officer, the relevant principles do not require a court exercising appellate or supervisory jurisdiction to first resolve, by making findings of fact, any dispute about what was said or done before applying the fair-minded bystander test. Rather, the objective assessment called for by the test should take account of the dispute and whether the evidence, if accepted, is sufficient to give rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias: at [41], [52]. A judge asked to disqualify himself or herself may need to apply the fair-minded observer test in respect of the evidence, in other words, unless the hypothetical observer would reject the evidence as entirely implausible the judge should consider whether, if accepted, it had the relevant quality to raise a reasonable apprehension of bias: [22], [38], [44]. The denial of a judge alleged to have made a relevant statement cannot settle the question which depends upon the view of a fair-minded observer: [22].

A refusal by a judge to accede to an application for disqualification can be relied upon as a ground of appeal in relation to the substantive judgment. However, the conventional view has formerly been that no appeal lies from the rejection of a refusal application as such although a litigant could usually find an interlocutory order upon which to base an appeal: *Barton v Walker* and *Barakat v Goritsas* [2012] NSWCA 8 at [10].

Following strongly expressed obiter dicta in *Michael Wilson & Partners Ltd v Nicholls* (2011) 244 CLR 427 at [74]–[86] and the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Barakat v Goritsas (No 2)* [2012] NSWCA 36 that is no longer the position. Further, "it will frequently be appropriate to grant leave to appeal, assuming the challenge is not patently untenable and where a long and costly trial would be avoided if the decision below were incorrect": *Barakat v Goritsas (No 2)* at [64].

Failure to seek such leave may found an issue of waiver: *Michael Wilson & Partners Ltd v Nicholls* at [74]–[86].

In respect of refusal by judicial officers of the District Court and Local Court the discretionary remedy of an order in the nature of prohibition may be available.

Generally an application should be made as soon as reasonably practicable after the party seeking disqualification becomes aware of the relevant facts. Otherwise the right to do so may be waived: *Vakauta v Kelly* (1989) 167 CLR 568; *Cassegrain v Commonwealth Development Bank of Australia Ltd* [2003] NSWCA 260 and *Royal Guardian Mortgage Management Pty Ltd v Nguyen* [2016] NSWCA 88 per Basten JA at [23]–[34].

Where there are matters that might properly arise for consideration, which are known to the judge, it is desirable that they be drawn to the attention of the parties, even if it is believed that they are aware of them: *S & M Motor Repairs Pty Ltd v Caltex Oil (Australia) Pty Ltd* (1988) 12 NSWLR 358 and *Dovade Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corporation* (1999) 46 NSWLR 168 at [105]–[107].

In *Laws v Australian Broadcasting Tribunal* (1990) 170 CLR 70, the High Court recognised that there are exceptions for necessity, or where there are special circumstances, or where there is consent. For a discussion on the exceptions, see *Australian National Industries Limited v Spedley Securities Ltd (in liq)*, above.

An indication by a party that it wishes a judge to disqualify himself or herself is not of itself a proper ground for the judge to recuse: *Fitzgerald v Director of Public Prosecutions* (1991) 24 NSWLR 45.

Judges are required to discharge their professional duties unless disqualified by law. They should not accede too readily to applications for disqualification, otherwise litigants may succeed in

effectively influencing the choice of judge in their own cause: see *Re JRL; Ex p CJL* (1986) 161 CLR 342 at 352; *Attorney General of New South Wales v Lucy Klewer* [2003] NSWCA 295; *Ebner v Official Trustee*, above, at [19]–[23]; and *Raybos Australia Pty Limited v Tectran Corporation Pty Ltd* (1986) 6 NSWLR 272.

Where a legal representative does object to the conduct of a judge, or contends actual or apprehended bias on the part of the judge, there is an obligation to endeavour to have those objections and contentions noted and recorded.

Inter alia, this may assist in a correction of an attitude which has possibly gone too far; at the least it will make the complaint easier for resolution if the matter goes to appeal: *Goktas v GIO of NSW* (1993) 31 NSWLR 684.

[1-0040] Circumstances arising outside the hearing calling for consideration

(a) The fact that a judge was a customer of a bank which is a party to litigation is normally not a ground for disqualification unless the judge has some special connection with the bank or is in a position of obligation toward, or animus against, the bank: *Dovade Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corporation*, above.

(b) The fact that the judge, or a close family member, holds shares in a litigant party is normally not a ground for disqualification, unless the value or income stream of the shares could be affected by the outcome of the litigation: *Dovade Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corporation* and see *Ebner v Official Trustee*, above.

(c) The fact that the judge has a direct pecuniary interest in the proceedings will however lead to automatic disqualification: *Dimes v Proprietors of Grand Junction Canal Pty* (1852) 10 ER 301 and *Dovade Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corporation*.

(d) The fact that the trial judge has expressed views in previous decisions, or in extra-judicial publications in relation to the kind of litigation before the court, which may have questioned an existing line of authority is not normally a reason for disqualification unless those views were expressed with such trenchancy, or in such unqualified terms, as to suggest that the judge could not hear the case with an "open mind": *Timmins v Gormley* [2000] 1 All ER 65, *Newcastle City Council v Lindsay* [2004] NSWCA 198 and *Gaudie v Local Court of New South Wales* [2013] NSWSC 1425 at [175] ff.

(e) The fact that the judge has made findings in related proceedings which are critical of the recollection, credit and behaviour of those who are also parties to a case in which the same issues of fact and credit would arise for determination, will normally be a ground for disqualification: *Australian National Industries Ltd v Spedley Securities Ltd (in liq)*, above, and *Livesey v NSW Bar Association* (1983) 151 CLR 288. Express acknowledgment by a judge who is asked to try an issue that he or she has previously determined that different evidence may be led at the later trial may be insufficient to remove the impression that the judge's previous views might influence the determination of the same issue in the later trial: see *British American Tobacco Australia Services Ltd v Laurie* (2011) 242 CLR 283 where a judge was disqualified after making relevantly unqualified findings of serious fraud against a party. For a case where a series of undisclosed ex parte hearings did not support a finding of apprehended bias, see *Michael Wilson & Partners Ltd v Nicholls* (2011) 244 CLR 427.

(f) The fact that the judge is related to a party, or to one of the party's legal representatives, at least where that legal representative is actually involved in the litigation, will normally be a ground for disqualification. However, where association with somebody with an interest in the litigation is relied upon there must be shown to be a logical connection between the matter complained of and the feared deviation from impartial decision making: *Smits v Roach* (2006) 227 CLR 423.

(g) The fact that a prior complaint has been made to the Independent Commission Against Corruption, or to some other body such as the Judicial Commission or the Bar Association, in

relation to the judge, has also arisen for consideration: *Briscoe-Hough v AVS Australian Venue Security Services Pty Ltd* [2005] NSWCA 51; see also *Attorney General of NSW v Klewer*, above.

(h) The fact that the judge knows a party or witness may be a ground for disqualification, depending upon the degree and the circumstances of the acquaintanceship and association.

(i) The fact that the judge has acted in a professional capacity in another matter or matters for a party will not normally be a ground for disqualification: *Re Polites; Ex p Hoyts Corporation Pty Ltd* (1991) 173 CLR 78 and *Australian National Industries v Spedley Securities Ltd (in liq)*, above.

(j) The statement of findings at an interlocutory stage in terms of finality, for example, in relation to the admissibility of evidence where those findings are related to the ultimate issue in the case, will normally give rise to disqualification: *Kwan v Kang* [2003] NSWCA 336.

(k) An association may give rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias without there being a connection between the association and one of the issues in dispute: *Murlan Consulting Pty Ltd v Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council* [2009] NSWCA 300.

(l) For an example of a claim of a reasonable apprehension of bias founded upon remarks made by a judge in a social setting, see *CUR24 v DPP* (2012) 83 NSWLR 385.

[1-0050] Circumstances arising during the hearing

(a) The conduct of the trial judge involving adverse observations, in relation to one party's case, or in relation to witnesses called by that party, especially where adverse findings are also made against that party or witnesses without proper substantiation, may lead to disqualification, see *Mistral International Pty Ltd v Polstead Pty Ltd* [2002] NSWCA 321 and *Damjanovic v Sharpe Hume & Co* [2001] NSWCA 407, see also *Vakauta v Kelly*, above, where remarks made by the trial judge critical of evidence given by the defendant's medical witnesses, in previous cases, which were effectively revived by what was said in the reserved judgment, arose for consideration.

It does not, however, follow that trial judges must sit in stony silence, without exposing their views, at risk of being accused of bias. Genuine engagement and debate about critical issues is permissible: *Re Keely; Ex p Ansett Transport Industries (Operations) Pty Ltd* (1990) 64 ALJR 495 and *Barbosa v Di Meglio* [1999] NSWCA 307. However, undue interference by a judge, for example, in questioning parties or witnesses, or in taking up the arguments of one party, may cross the line, as can expressions of opinion as to the likely outcome of the case prior to the conclusion of the evidence and submissions. For guidelines concerning the extent to which judicial intervention is or is not permissible, see *Galea v Galea* (1990) 19 NSWLR 263 at 281–282 and *Royal Guardian Mortgage Management Pty Ltd v Nguyen*, above.

(b) The fact that the judge has had communication with a party, a witness or a legal representative, at or about the time of the hearing, in the absence of, and without the consent or approval of the other party, can also lead to disqualification: *Re JRL Ex p CJL*, above. See also *Royal Guardian Mortgage Management Pty Ltd v Nguyen*.

An increasingly common potential source of difficulty is the use of email to communicate with a judge's chambers. A useful set of guidelines was given in *Ken Tugrul v Tarrants Financial Consultants Pty Ltd (In liq) (No 2)* [2013] NSWSC 1971:

> [21] There should be no communication (written or oral) with a judge's chambers in connection with any proceedings before that judge without the prior knowledge and consent of all active parties to those proceedings. Particularly in relation to written communications, given the ubiquity and speed of emails, the precise terms of any proposed communication with a judge's chambers should be provided to the other parties for their consent.

There are four exceptions to this:

1. trivial matters of practice, procedure or administration (eg the start time or location of a matter, or whether the judge is robing)
2. ex parte matters
3. where the communication responds to one from the judge's chambers or is authorised by an existing order or direction (eg for the filing of material physically or electronically with a judge's associate), and
4. exceptional circumstances.

[22] There are three other matters. First, any communication with a judge's chambers which falls into any of the categories set out in sub-paragraphs [21] (2), (3) and (4) above should expressly bring to the addressee associate's or tipstaff's attention the reason for the communication being sent without another parties' knowledge or consent. Second, where consent has been obtained, that fact should also be referred to in the communication. Third, all written communications with a judge's chambers in relation to proceedings should always be copied to the other parties.

It is desirable for judges to have developed a clear policy with their own staff as to when emails or any other written communications received from or on behalf of litigants are shown to the judge. It is not appropriate for that decision to be left to staff without guidance from the judge: *Stanizzo v Bardane* [2014] NSWSC 689 at [73]–[80]. See also M Groves, "Emailing judges and their staff" (2013) 37 *Aust Bar Rev* 69.

(c) The fact that a judge has decided an issue in a particular way and is likely to decide it in the same way when it arises again, does not necessarily give rise to apprehended bias: *Fitzgerald v Director of Public Prosecutions*, above, but see also *Kwan v Kang*, above.

(d) Complained of conduct should be considered in the context of the trial as a whole and the possibility of the dissipation of effect or express withdrawal of material taken into account: *Jae Kyung Lee v Bob Chae-Sang Cha*, above, at [32]. *Jae Kyung Lee v Bob Chae-Sang Cha* contains a useful discussion of disqualification for apprehended bias.

[1-0060] Immunity from suit

No action lies against a judge for damages in consequence of bias, in respect of acts done in the performance of judicial duties: *Gallo v Dawson* (1988) 63 ALJR 121 and *Yeldham v Rajski* (1989) 18 NSWLR 48. The Registrar has the same protection and immunity by reason of s 44C of the *Judicial Officers Act* 1986 (NSW).

Further references

- B Cairns, "Bias and procedural fairness at trial" (2021) 9 *Journal of Civil Litigation and Practice* 182
- J Sackar, "Disqualification of judges for bias", at www.supremecourt.justice.nsw.gov.au/Documents/Publications/Speeches/2018%20Speeches/Sackar_20180116.pdf, accessed 16 May 2018.

[The next page is 151]

Interpreters

[1-0900] Introduction

Over 300 languages are spoken in Australian households, and one fifth of Australians speak a language other than English at home according to the 2016 Census.[1] This means judicial officers will encounter litigants and witnesses who will require the assistance of an interpreter both in the preparation of evidence such as affidavits and to give their evidence in court. In this context "languages" includes Auslan and other methods of communication by deaf or mute persons. "Interpreting" refers to the spoken word and "translating" refers to written text.

Interpreters have a part to play in the preparation of affidavits relating to oral communications in a foreign language. It is not uncommon to have an affidavit sworn or affirmed by a deponent who is competent in English and a foreign language concerning an oral communication in the foreign language. In the affidavit, expressed in English, the deponent asserts that particular conversations occurred and sets out an English translation of the alleged conversations. In effect, the deponent is interpreting the words used in the foreign language without proper evidence as to the competence of the deponent to provide such an interpretation. More importantly, however, the words actually used in the foreign language may be critical. In such circumstances, it may be desirable for the court to have a competent independent interpreter to translate the words alleged to have been used in the foreign language: see *Maria Coppola v New South Wales Trustee and Guardian as Administrator of the Estate of the Late Giuseppina Buda (No 2)* [2019] NSWSC 948 at [16]–[25] and *Sun v Chapman* [2021] NSWSC 955 at [16]–[17].

[1-0910] Legal issues

Meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse persons in legal proceedings raises numerous practical and legal issues. These include:

- Procedural fairness requires litigants to be "linguistically present" in addition to being physically present: see, for example, *Gradidge v Grace Bros Pty Ltd* (1988) 93 FLR 414 (NSWCA).
- Section 30 *Evidence Act* 1995 (NSW) provides:

> 30 Interpreters
>
> A witness may give evidence about a fact through an interpreter unless the witness can understand and speak the English language sufficiently to enable the witness to understand, and to make an adequate reply to, questions that may be put about the fact.

[1-0920] Resources

The Council of Chief Justices of Australia and New Zealand has approved the Judicial Council on Cultural Diversity's (JCCD) *Recommended National Standards for Working with Interpreters in Courts and Tribunals*. The standards contain sections including "Plain English Strategies", "Four-part test for determining need for an interpreter" and "What judicial officers can do to assist the interpreter". The Recommended National Standards can be found on the JCCD website at https://jccd.org.au/publications/ (accessed 25 February 2022). See also an explanatory article in the *Judicial Officers' Bulletin*: S Olbrich, "Recommended National Standards for working with interpreters in courts and tribunals" (2018) 30 *JOB* 36.

---

[1]ABS, "2016 Census: Multicultural media release" at www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/lookup/Media%20Release3, accessed 23/7/2019.

An Addendum to the *Recommended National Standards for Working with Interpreters in Courts and Tribunals* has been published.

Information on working with interpreters can also be found in the *Equality before the Law Bench Book* at [3.3].

[1-0930] Implementation

The Uniform Civil Procedure Rules were amended on 8 November 2019 to insert Pt 31, Div 3 (r 31.55–31.64). This provides for rules concerning interpreters based on the JCCD's Model Rules set out in the *Recommended National Standards for Working with Interpreters in Courts and Tribunals*. The rules apply in all NSW civil proceedings. The application of the *Evidence Act* 1995 is unaffected by the amendments.

The amended rules also provide for the Court Interpreters' Code of Conduct at Sch 7A of the UCPR.

Practice Note SC Gen 21 — Interpreters in Civil Proceedings commenced operation on 4 March 2020 and applies to all civil proceedings commenced after its commencement and to any existing proceedings which the court directs should be subject to the Practice Note, in whole or in part. This Practice Note implements and applies the National Standards.

Practice Notes

- Supreme Court General Division — SC Gen 21

[The next page is 501]

Service of process outside New South Wales

Consolidation and/or joinder of proceedings

Set off and cross-claims

Discovery

Dismissal for lack of progress

Stay of pending proceedings

Interim preservation orders including interlocutory injunctions

Interpleader proceedings

Interrogatories

Amendment

[2-0700] Court's power of amendment

The court may, at any stage of the proceedings, on application by any party or of its own motion, order that any document in the proceedings be amended, or that any party have leave to amend any document in the proceedings, in either case, in such manner as the court thinks fit: CPA s 64. Such amendment may have the effect of adding or subtracting a cause of action which has arisen after the commencement of the proceedings or correcting a mistake in the name of a party (s 64(3), (4)), but the section does not apply to the amendment of a judgment, order or certificate: s 64(5).

[2-0710] General principles

Subject to the dictates of justice described in s 58 of the CPA, all necessary amendments shall be made for the purpose of determining the real questions raised by, or otherwise depending upon, the proceedings, correcting any defect or error in the proceedings and avoiding multiplicity of proceedings: s 64(2).

Prior to the High Court's decision in *Aon Risk Services Australia Ltd v Australian National University* (2009) 239 CLR 175 (*Aon*), the common law position was that case management was not an end in itself, but an important and useful aid for ensuring the prompt and efficient disposal of litigation: *State of Queensland v JL Holdings Pty Ltd* (1997) 189 CLR 146 at 154. However *Aon* disapproved *JL Holdings,* which predated the statutory enactment of principles of case management: at [6], [30]; [93], [111].See also *Dennis v Australian Broadcasting Corporation* [2008] NSWCA 37 at [28]–[29]. Prior to the enactment of case management principles, it was more readily assumed that an order for costs occasioned by the amendment would overcome the injustice to the amending party's opponent: *Cropper v Smith* (1884) 26 Ch D 700.

In *Aon* at [96], the plurality held that the approach taken by the plurality in *JL Holdings* proceeded upon an assumption that a party should be permitted to amend to raise an arguable issue subject to the payment of costs occasioned by the amendment. So stated, it suggested that a party has something approaching a right to an amendment. The plurality in *Aon* held that is not the case. The "right" spoken of in *Cropper v Smith* needs to be understood in the context of that case and the case management rule, which required amendment to permit the determination of a matter already in issue. It is more accurate to say that parties have the right to invoke the jurisdiction and the powers of the court in order to seek a resolution of their dispute. Subject to any rights to amend without leave given to the parties by the rules of court, the question of further amendment of a party's claim is dependent upon the exercise of the court's discretionary power: at [96]. The reference in r 21 of the Court Procedures Rules 2006 (ACT) to the need to minimise costs implies that an order for costs may not always provide sufficient compensation and therefore achieve a just resolution. It cannot therefore be said that a just resolution requires that a party be permitted to raise any arguable case at any point in the proceedings, on payment of costs: at [98].

[2-0720] Amendment of pleadings

A plaintiff may make one amendment to a statement of claim within 28 days after the date on which the statement of claim was filed, but not after a date has been fixed for trial (subject to the power of the court to otherwise order). The defendant may amend his or her defence within 14 days after service of the amended statement of claim (UCPR, r 19.1); but the court may disallow any such amendment: r 19.2.

[2-0730] Grounds for refusal of amendment

An amendment to a pleading will be refused if a party has deliberately framed his case a particular way and the opponent may have conducted his case differently had the new issues been previously raised: *Burnham v City of Mordialloc* [1956] VLR 239; *Harvey v John Fairfax Publications Pty Ltd* [2005] NSWCA 255. In particular, a late application to add a limitation defence may be refused if the parties have, until that stage, fought the case on other grounds: *Ketteman v Hansel Properties Ltd* [1987] 1 AC 189.

Other matters which may result in refusal of the amendment include:

- that the amendment is so futile that it would be struck out if it appeared in an original pleading: *Alamdo Holdings Pty Ltd v Australian Window Furnishings (NSW) Pty Ltd* [2006] NSWSC 1073
- that it will require a further hearing after judgment has been reserved
- that the application is made mala fides
- inadequate explanation for the delay to amend pleadings at a late stage: *Aon Risk Services Australia Ltd v Australian National University*: at [103]
- that an order for costs is not sufficient to cure any prejudice to another party to the proceedings: *Heath v Goodwin* (1986) 8 NSWLR 478, *Aon Risk Services Australia Ltd v Australian National University*, or
- that the application of case management principles so requires: see *Hannaford v Commonwealth Bank of Australia* [2014] NSWCA 297 at [14]–[21].

[2-0740] Pre-judgment interest

An amendment to the originating process so as to claim pre-judgment interest should normally be allowed: *Heath v Goodwin*, above.

[2-0750] Amendment to conform with evidence

If there emerges at the conclusion of the evidence facts which, if accepted, establish a cause of action factually different from the cause of action which the plaintiff has sued upon, then such issue must be considered by the tribunal of fact and the pleadings should be amended in order to make the facts alleged and the particulars precisely conform to the evidence which has emerged: *Leotta v Public Transport Commission of N*SW (1976) 50 ALJR 666 at 668. In the case of particulars, amendment, although desirable, is not essential: *Dare v Pulham* (1982) 148 CLR 658 at 664.

[2-0760] Effective date of amendment

As a general rule, an amendment, duly made, takes effect, not from the date when the amendment is made, but from the date of the original document which it amends. Formerly, an originating process (statement of claim or summons) could not be amended so as to add or substitute a new cause of action which did not exist at the date of the commencement of the proceedings: *Baldry v Jackson* [1976] 2 NSWLR 415 at 419.

Section 64(3) of the CPA now expressly authorises an amendment to an originating process which adds or substitutes a cause of action arising after the commencement of the proceedings and provides that, in such cases, the date of commencement of the proceedings is to be taken to be the date on which amendment is made.

Section 64(4) authorises an amendment if there has been a mistake in the name of a party. In such a case, the amendment takes effect from the date of the original document which it amends: *East West Airlines Ltd v Turner* (2010) 78 NSWLR 1.

[2-0770] Adding a party

UCPR r 19.2(4) provides that if a person is added as a party under that rule, the date of commencement of proceedings in relation to that party is to be taken to be the date on which the amended document is filed, and that is the relevant date for the purpose of computing the limitation period: *Fernance v Nominal Defendant* (1989) 17 NSWLR 710.

[2-0780] Limitation periods

Because an amendment is deemed to date from the date of the original document, there was a "settled rule of practice" that an amendment would not be permitted when it prejudiced the rights of the opposite party as existing at the date of such amendment: *Weldon v Neal* (1887) 19 QBD 394 at 395. In particular, that an amendment would not be allowed to an originating process which set up a cause of action which was statute-barred at the time of the amendment.

This "settled rule of practice" was abrogated by the former SCR Pt 20 r 40 and DCR Pt 17 r 4 which were in similar, though not identical, terms. Those rules have now been replaced by s 65 of the CPA which is as follows:

> (1) This section applies to any proceedings commenced before the expiration of any relevant limitation period for the commencement of the proceedings.
>
> (2) At any time after the expiration of the relevant limitation period, the plaintiff in any such proceedings may, with the leave of the court under section 64(1)(b), amend the originating process so as:
>
> (a) to enable the plaintiff to maintain the proceedings in a capacity in which he or she has, since the proceedings were commenced, become entitled to bring and maintain the proceedings, or
>
> (b) to correct a mistake in the name of a party to the proceedings, whether or not the effect of the amendment is to substitute a new party, being a mistake that, in the court's opinion, is neither misleading nor such as to cause reasonable doubt as to the identity of the person intended to be made a party, or
>
> (c) to add or substitute a new cause of action, together with a claim for relief on the new cause of action, being a new cause of action that, in the court's opinion, arises from the same (or substantially the same) facts as those giving rise to an existing cause of action and claim for relief set out in the originating process.
>
> (3) Unless the court otherwise orders, an amendment made under this section is taken to have had effect as from the date on which the proceedings were commenced.
>
> (4) This section does not limit the powers of the court under section 64.
>
> (5) This section has effect despite anything to the contrary in the *Limitation Act* 1969.
>
> (6) In this section, "originating process", in relation to any proceedings, includes any pleading subsequently filed in the proceedings.

Apart from the fact that the relevant provisions are now contained in the Act rather than in the rules, the effect appears to be the same.

The former provisions were discussed and applied in a number of cases including *McGee v Yeomans* [1977] 1 NSWLR 273; *Proctor v Jetway Aviation Pty Ltd* [1984] 1 NSWLR 166; and *Seas Sapfor Ltd v Far Eastern Shipping Co* (1995) 39 NSWLR 435.

The present provisions were discussed and applied in *Greenwood v Papademetri* [2007] NSWCA 221. In that case it was held that s 65(2)(b) permits multiple parties to replace a single party, and that a plaintiff may make a mistake in the name of a party, not only because the plaintiff mistakenly believes that a certain person, whom the plaintiff can otherwise identify, bears a certain name, but also because the plaintiff mistakenly believes that a person who assumes a particular description bears a certain name. See *Mitry v Business Australia Capital Finance Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2010] NSWCA

360 for a case where a liquidator sued in his own name to recover a debt due to the company, thereby failing to bring the action in the name of the company. This was truly "a mistake in the name of a party" in the sense contemplated by s 65(2)(b): at [43].

Greater Lithgow City Council v Wolfenden [2007] NSWCA 180 makes it clear that the specific provisions of s 65 do not limit the general power conferred by s 64. Under s 64 an amendment may be allowed even if its effect is to add a statute-barred cause of action which does not satisfy the provisions of s 65. See also *East West Airlines Ltd v Turner* (2010) 78 NSWLR 1.

A particular limitation in Federal legislation, such as s 34 of the *Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Act* 1959, which requires proceedings under that Act to be commenced within two years, will prevail over State legislation, such as the CPA s 65 (*Air Link Pty Ltd v Paterson* (2005) 79 ALJR 1407), so as to prevent an amendment to plead a new cause of action which is statute-barred at the time of the amendment. In that case, however, it was held that the proceedings had been validly commenced under the *Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Act* within the time fixed by that Act, although no reference had been made to the Act.

[2-0790] Costs

When leave to amend is granted, it is usually on terms that the party seeking leave pay the costs of the other parties caused by the amendment. This includes costs thrown away by the amendment and costs of any consequential amendments by the other parties.

[2-0800] Sample orders

1. I grant leave to the [*party*] to amend his/her/its [*document for example, statement of claim*] by [*set out the amendment, for example, "deleting in paragraph 5 the words and figures* [.....] *and inserting in lieu there of the words and figures* [.....]"]

   or

   in accordance with the document initialled by me and placed with the papers.

2. Such an amendment to be effected by 5:00 pm on [*date*].
3. [*If the amendment may require a response by any other party*] I grant leave to the [*other party*] to file and serve an amended [*document*] by 5:00 pm on [*date*].
4. I order the [*party*] to pay the costs occasioned by the amendment [*or otherwise as appropriate*].

[2-0810] Amendment of judgments

See section "Setting aside and variation of judgments and orders" at [2-6600].

Legislation

- CPA ss 56, 57, 58, 64, 65
- UCPR rr 19.1–19.6

[The next page is 765]

Change of venue and transfer between New South Wales courts

[2-1200] Change of venue

The venue for hearing is initially fixed by the plaintiff in the originating process (r 8.1(1)), and must be a venue at which the court is entitled to sit: r 8.1(2).

The court may order a change of venue on the application of either party: r 8.2(1). Its discretion in this respect is to be exercised according to the following test:

> [W]here can the case be conducted or continued most suitably, bearing in mind the interests of all the parties … and the most efficient administration of the court?: *National Mutual Holdings Pty Ltd v Sentry Corporation* (1988) 19 FCR 155 at 162.

Of particular relevance are:

- the place of residence of the parties and of the majority of the witnesses, as well as the locality where the cause of action arose: *Lehtonen v Australian Iron & Steel Pty Ltd* [1963] NSWR 323; *Hansen v Border Morning Mail Pty Ltd* (1987) 9 NSWLR 44;
- the possibility that the trial of any question arising, or likely to arise, might not be fair or unprejudiced, for example, by reason of pre-trial publicity or intense local feeling, if held at the selected venue (particularly jury trials): *Cording v Trembath* [1921] VLR 163; *Mowle v Elliott* (1937) 54 WN (NSW) 104; *Kings Cross Whisper Pty Ltd v O'Neil* [1968] 2 NSWR 289;
- the fact of undue delay or expense in conducting the hearing at the selected venue: *Central West Equipment v Gardem Investments* [2002] NSWSC 607;
- the fact of hardship to the parties or witnesses by reason of the need for lengthy travel or prolonged absences from home or work if the trial is held at the selected venue.

The court may direct that the proceedings commenced at one venue, be continued at another venue where it is authorised to sit (r 8.2(2)), to allow for the convenience of witnesses. Where that occurs however, it is desirable to maintain continuity of the hearing rather than to disrupt it by ordering that the trial stand over part-heard to be re-listed at some future date which might suit the convenience of the parties or their counsel.

An application for a change of venue should be made by motion on notice supported by affidavit.

In the Common Law Division of the Supreme Court, since the abolition of fixed circuit sittings, applications to have proceedings heard (wholly or partly) outside Sydney are dealt with by the Chief Judge of the Division.

Change of venue between Local Courts

A Local Court may make an order changing the venue of proceedings if it thinks it appropriate in the circumstances in accordance with s 55 *Local Court Act* 2007; UCPR Pt 8 and Local Court Practice Note Civ 1 (especially 10.1 – 10.9).

As a matter of practice, lengthy Local Court matters in the metropolitan area are transferred to the Downing Centre.

[2-1210] Transfer of proceedings between courts

Transfer to a higher court

Proceedings (including any cross-claims) pending in the District Court or in the Local Court may be transferred to the Supreme Court by order of the Supreme Court acting of its own motion or on application by a party to the proceedings: CPA s 140(1).

Proceedings pending in a Local Court (including any cross-claims) may be transferred to the District Court by order of the District Court acting of its own motion or on an application by a party to the proceedings: CPA s 140(2).

Proceedings in the District Court on a claim for damages arising from personal injury or death may only be transferred to the Supreme Court where it is satisfied of the matters set out in CPA s 140(3). For the determination of whether the likely award of damages will exceed the specified limit, the inquiry concerns the amount that the plaintiff could reasonably expect to obtain: *Delponte, Ex parte; Re Thiess Brothers Pty Ltd* [1965] NSWR 1468.

Proceedings in the Local Court may only be transferred to a higher court where the higher court is satisfied that there is sufficient reason for hearing the proceedings in the court: CPA s 140(4).

Subject to the s 140(3) limitation, the higher court has a discretionary power to order a transfer, which is to be exercised where a transfer is considered appropriate in the circumstances of the particular proceedings and matters in issue: *Dusmanovic, Ex parte; Re Dusmanovic* [1967] 2 NSWR 125 and *Sanderson Motors Pty Ltd v Kirby* [2000] NSWSC 924.

A transfer pursuant to s 140 does not confer on a transferee court additional jurisdiction that it does not otherwise have: *Rinbac Pty Ltd v Owners Corporation Strata Plan 64972* (2010) 77 NSWLR 601 (SC) at [11].

Terms may be imposed on the transfer, including the making of special costs orders to compensate for any prejudice which may be occasioned: *Delponte, Ex parte; Re Thiess Brothers Pty Ltd, above.*

Where an application for transfer has been made, but not determined, the higher court may stay the proceedings in the lower court, or the lower court may adjourn or stay the proceedings: s 142.

As to the effect of an order for transfer, see CPA ss 141 and 143.

There is further provision in CPA s 144 for the transfer of proceedings from the District Court to the Supreme Court in relation to proceedings under Subdiv 2 of Div 8 of Pt 3 (ss 133–135) of the *District Court Act* 1973, that is proceedings for possession of land, equity proceedings and proceedings under the *Frustrated Contracts Act* 1978, the *Contracts Review Act* 1980, and the *Fair Trading Act* 1987. Section 144(2) of the CPA is mandatory in its terms and is enlivened when the District Court reaches a decision that it lacks jurisdiction to deal with claims in its equitable jurisdiction but also where there is a doubt as to that matter: *Mahommed v Unicomb* [2017] NSWCA 65 at [52], [55].

Transfer to a lower court

The Supreme Court may order that proceedings pending in that court, including any cross-claims in the proceedings, be transferred to the District Court or a Local Court if it is satisfied that the proceedings, including any such cross-claims, could have been commenced in the District Court or a Local Court, as the case may be: s 146(1).

The District Court may order that proceedings pending in that court, including any cross-claims in the proceedings, be transferred to a Local Court if is satisfied that the proceedings, including any such cross-claims, could properly have been commenced in a Local Court: CPA s 146(2).

In considering whether any proceedings or cross-claims could properly have been brought in the lower court, the higher court must have regard to the limits of the lower court's jurisdiction when the proceedings or the cross-claims were commenced in the higher court: CPA s 146(3).

Proceedings in the Supreme Court on a claim for damages arising out of personal injury or death must be transferred to a lower court unless the conditions set out in CPA s 146(4) are satisfied.

If a matter is transferred from the Supreme Court to the District Court, the District Court has jurisdiction to hear and dispose of any proceedings transferred under CPA s 146(1), irrespective of the amount claimed: see s 44(1)(e) of the *District Court Act* 1973, and semble the same now applies to proceedings transferred to a Local Court by reason of CPA s 149.

As to the effect of an order for transfer, see CPA ss 147 and 148.

When proceedings are transferred to the District or a Local Court, it is desirable to specify the place of the court to which they are transferred.

Transfer between Supreme Court and Land and Environment Court

As to the transfer of proceedings between the Supreme Court and the Land and Environment Court, see CPA ss 149A–149E; and *JK Williams Staff Pty Ltd v Sydney Water Corp* [2020] NSWSC 220.

Transfer between Small Claims Division and General Division of Local Court

Part 2, Div 2 of the Local Court Rules 2009 provide for the transfer of proceedings from the Small Claims Division to the General Division where the jurisdictional limit of the Small Claims Division is exceeded (r 2.2) or the matters in dispute are so complex or difficult, or are of such importance, that the proceedings ought more properly to be heard in the Court's General Division: r 2.3.

[2-1220] Sample orders

I order:

1. That proceedings no 1234 of 2006 be transferred to the District Court at Newcastle.
2. Costs of the motion to be costs in the cause (or otherwise as appropriate).

Legislation

- CPA ss 139–149E
- *District Court Act* 1973, ss 44(1)(e), 133–135
- UCPR rr 8
- *Local Court Act* 2007, s 55
- Local Court Rules 2009, Pt 2, Div 2

Practice Notes

- Local Court Practice Note Civ 1 — Case Management of Civil Proceedings in the Local Court

[The next page is 875]

Consolidation and/or joinder of proceedings

[2-1800] Consolidation of proceedings

Where several proceedings are pending in the Supreme Court, District Court or General Division of the Local Court, or the Dust Diseases Tribunal, and it appears that:

- they involve a common question
- the relief claimed is in respect of, or arises out of, the same transaction or series of transactions, or
- for some other reason it is desirable;

the court may order:

- that they be consolidated
- that they be tried together, or one immediately after another, or
- that any of them be stayed until after the determination of any other of them: r 28.5.

Note: The rule does not apply to the Small Claims Division of the Local Court.

The development of the law and the current practice relating to consolidation and related matters were extensively considered by Austin J in *A Goninan & Co Ltd v Atlas Steels (Australia) Pty Ltd* [2003] NSWSC 956 in which his Honour made an order consolidating five separate proceedings involving seven different parties into one proceeding, where all the proceedings raised the common issue of whether the steel supplied and used in the manufacture of certain coal wagons was defective. The value of the order was that the five proceedings became one single proceeding, with one of the parties as plaintiff and two of the others as defendants, while each of the original parties was able to pursue their claims against the others by way of cross-claim, resulting in only one set of pleadings of lesser volume, avoiding repetition and potentially making it easier to identify the real issues, simplifying discovery and subpoenas, and reducing the complexity of the trial.

The power to order consolidation or joint hearings is discretionary and will not be exercised if a party can show a real possibility of prejudice. For example, a joint hearing was refused because it was held not to be in the interests of justice in *Skinner v Shine Pty Ltd* [2019] NSWSC 1709, where Adamson J stated: "This court ought not permit a situation where defendants will be, in effect, held hostage in proceedings in a substantial part of which they have little or no interest, merely because it might be more convenient for the plaintiff to have them assembled for the purposes of increasing the prospects of settlement": at [22].

An order can be made on terms, and such terms should, so far as appropriate in the particular case, identify the proceedings into which the others are to be consolidated, designate who is to be the plaintiff(s) and defendant(s), give directions as to pleadings and other matters, and, where appropriate, make special orders to preserve any party's rights under the *Limitation Act* 1969.

Note that if the effect of the order for consolidation is the joinder of a number of parties as plaintiffs, they must all act by the one solicitor, in accordance with the general rule that plaintiffs must always be represented by the same solicitor: *Herbert v Badgery* (1893) 14 LR (NSW) Eq 321; *Lewis v Daily Telegraph Ltd (No 2)* [1964] 2 QB 601.

A more common order is that two or more proceedings be heard together and the evidence in one is to be evidence in the other(s). In such a case, the parties and the pleadings remain as they were subject to any subsequent amendments, but there is only one hearing. Such an order is appropriate where the proceedings are less complex, even though they may involve common questions of law or fact such as where a number of persons sue in different proceedings for personal injuries arising out of the same accident, and there is a common issue as to the negligence of the defendant or defendants.

Similarly, a number of separate claims under the *Succession Act* 2006, Ch 3, where the different plaintiffs may be in effect competing against each other, are appropriate for orders that they be heard together.

The cases to be consolidated or heard together must all be in the one court; and, in the Supreme Court, in the one division. It may therefore be necessary to first move proceedings into a different court or division, so that appropriate orders can then be made.

[2-1810] Sample orders

For consolidation

I order:

1. That proceedings numbered 1234 of 2006, 4567 of 2006 and 6789 of 2005 be consolidated.
2. That the consolidated proceedings bear the number 1234 of 2006.
3. That in the consolidated proceeding:
   (a) AB is the plaintiff;
   (b) CD and EF are defendants;
   (c) AB, CD, EF and any other parties to any of the previous proceedings may be joined as cross defendants;
   (d) The statement of claim [or of cross-claim] in proceedings no [.....] of 2006 be the statement of claim;
   (e) The respective statements of claim [*or of cross-claim*] in proceeding nos [.....] and [.....] be cross-claims by the respective plaintiffs or cross defendants as cross-claimants against the respective defendants or cross defendants as cross defendants;
   (f) The plaintiff and cross-claimants in the consolidated proceedings are to re-plead and make any necessary applications for leave to join parties or add causes of action, and the defendants and cross defendants are to re-plead in response in accordance with a timetable to be settled by the Registrar;
   (g) For the purpose of the consolidated proceeding, claims are to be taken to have been first filed at the time and in the manner in which they were first filed in any of the previous proceedings;
   (h) Any particulars [*lists of documents or answers to interrogatories*] provided in any of the previous proceedings are to be particulars [*lists of documents or answers to interrogatories*] provided in the consolidated proceeding.
4. That the consolidated proceedings be stood over to [.....] am on [.....] before the Registrar for further directions.
5. Costs reserved (or otherwise as appropriate).

[2-1820] For proceedings to be heard together

I order that:

1. Proceedings numbers 1234 of 2006 and 5678 of 2006 be heard together and that the evidence in one case be evidence in the other.
2. Costs of the motion to be costs in the cause (or otherwise as appropriate).

Legislation

- *Limitation Act* 1969
- *Succession Act* 2006, Ch 3

Rules

- UCPR r 28.5

[The next page is 1031]

Persons under legal incapacity

[2-4600] Definition

Section 3 of the CPA defines a person under a legal incapacity as:

> any person who is under a legal incapacity in relation to the conduct of legal proceedings (other than an incapacity arising under section 4 of the *Felons (Civil Proceedings) Act* 1981 and, in particular, includes:
>
> (a) a child under the age of 18 years, and
>
> (b) an involuntary patient or forensic patient within the meaning of the *Mental Health Act* 2007, and
>
> (c) a person under guardianship within the meaning of the *Guardianship Act* 1987, and
>
> (d) a protected person within the meaning of the *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* 2009, and
>
> (e) an incommunicate person, being a person who has such a physical or mental disability that he or she is unable to receive communications, or express his or her will, with respect to his or her property or affairs.

Rule 7.13 of the UCPR provides that for the purpose of the relevant division of the Rules, such a person includes a person who is incapable of managing his or her affairs.

For a discussion of the definition of a person under a legal incapacity and how a challenge to a claimed state of such incapacity should be made, see *Doulaveras v Daher* (2009) 253 ALR 627 at [76]–[159].

For an application under s 4 of the *Felons (Civil Proceedings) Act*, see *Potier v Director-General, Department of Justice and Attorney General* [2011] NSWCA 105 and *Potier v Arnott* [2012] NSWCA 5, where the prisoner failed to establish before the Court of Appeal that there was prima facie grounds for the proceedings. Such grounds must be arguable and not hopeless: *Application of Malcolm Huntley Potier* [2012] NSWCA 222 at [17].

[2-4610] Commencing proceedings

A person under a legal incapacity may not commence or carry on proceedings, including defending proceedings, except by his or her tutor: r 7.14(1).

The court may, pursuant to CPA s 14, dispense with compliance with r 7.14(2): *Mao v AMP Superannuation Ltd* [2015] NSWCA 252 at [59]. As to the exercise of this power, see *Mao v AMP Superannuation Ltd* [2018] NSWCA 72 at [11]–[15], [37].

A tutor may not commence or carry on proceedings, including defending proceedings, except by a solicitor unless the court orders otherwise: r 7.14(2). As to such orders, see *Wang v State of New South Wales* [2014] NSWSC 909.

One purpose of the appointment of a tutor is to provide a person answerable to the defendant for the costs of the litigation: *NSW Insurance Ministerial Corp v Abualfoul* (1999) 162 ALR 417 at [28].

Another purpose is to provide a person regarded as an officer of the court to act for the benefit of the infant in the litigation: *Dey v Victorian Railways Commissioners* (1949) 78 CLR 62 at 113.

It is not necessary for a person under legal incapacity to have a tutor in order to be a group member in representative proceedings, however, such a person may only take a step in representative proceedings, or conduct part of the proceedings, by the member's tutor: s 160 of the CPA.

[2-4620] Defending proceedings

Following service of proceedings upon a person under a legal incapacity, the plaintiff may take no further steps in the proceedings until a tutor has entered an appearance on behalf of the defendant: r 7.17(1).

If no such appearance is entered the plaintiff may apply to the court under r 7.18 for an appointment of a tutor for the defendant, or for the removal of such a tutor: see Note to r 7.17(1).

A proviso to r 7.17 in respect of Local Court proceedings permits a plaintiff, where the reason for the legal incapacity of the defendant is minority only, to serve on the defendant a notice requiring a tutor of the defendant to enter an appearance in the proceedings. Unless an appearance is filed within 28 days after such service, the plaintiff may continue the proceedings as if the defendant were not a person under a legal incapacity unless the court otherwise orders: r 7.17(2).

[2-4630] Tutors/Guardians ad litem

A person may become a tutor without the need for any formal instrument of appointment or any order of the court: r 7.15(1). However, a tutor can only be changed by an order of a court: r 7.15(5).

Any person, but not a corporation, may be a tutor unless the person is:

- a person under a legal incapacity: r 7.15(2)(a);
- a judicial officer, a registrar or any other person involved in the administration of a court: r 7.15(2)(b);
- a person who has an interest in the proceedings adverse to the interests of the person under legal incapacity: r 7.15(2)(c).

Particular provision is made in respect of an estate managed under the *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* 2009: r 7.15(3) and (4). See *Bobolas v Waverley Council* (2012) 187 LGERA 63.

Consequent upon the decision in *Choi v NSW Ombudsman* (2021) 104 NSWLR 505 at [44], a legislative amendment now permits the Tribunal (NCAT) to order that a person be represented by a guardian ad litem without naming a particular person to be appointed: s 45(4C) *Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act* 2013 (commenced 8 December 2021). Similar amendments were made to the *Adoption Act* 2000, s 124AA and the *Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act* 1998, s 101AA regarding the appointment of guardian ad litem

The tutor may do anything that the rules allow or require a party, being under legal incapacity, to do in relation to the conduct of any proceedings: r 7.15(6).

A tutor may not commence or carry on proceedings unless there has been filed the tutor's consent to act as tutor (r 7.16(a) — Form 24) and a certificate signed by the tutor's solicitor in the proceedings, to the effect that the tutor does not have any interest in the proceedings adverse to the interest of the person under legal incapacity: r 7.16(b).

The court may appoint a tutor or remove a tutor and appoint another: r 7.18(1). For examples, see *South v Northern Sydney Area Health Service* [2003] NSWSC 479 and *Wang v State of NSW* [2014] NSWSC 909. The court may appoint a tutor for a person under legal incapacity who is not a party and join that person as a party: r 7.18(2). If the court removes a party's tutor, it may stay the proceedings until the appointment of a new tutor: r 7.18(3).

Unless the court otherwise orders, notices of motion under r 7.18 are to be served on the person under a legal incapacity and, if it proposes removal of a person's tutor, upon the tutor: r 7.18(4).

In proceedings on a motion to appoint a tutor the evidence must include evidence of legal incapacity, the consent of the tutor and absence of any adverse interest: r 7.18(5).

An application for appointment under r 7.18 may be made by the court on its own motion or by any person including the proposed tutor: r 7.18(6).

[2-4640] Proceedings commenced or continued by a person under legal incapacity without a tutor

Such proceedings are an irregularity which may be conveniently cured by the court appointing a tutor under r 7.18(1). The Supreme Court can also make such an appointment in the exercise of its parens patriae jurisdiction: *Bobolas v Waverley Council* (2012) 187 LGERA 63.

If there is no relative or suitable friend willing to so act and not having a conflicting interest, an independent solicitor is a suitable choice as a tutor: *Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v P* (1987) 11 NSWLR 200 at 204.

It would be inappropriate to dispense with the requirement of evidence of consent and absence of conflicting interest. However, it may be appropriate to dispense with the requirement that the solicitor tutor act by another solicitor: *Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v P*, above, at 206.

[2-4650] No appearance by tutor for a defendant under legal incapacity

In default of such an appearance, the plaintiff is unable to proceed until a tutor has been appointed and an appearance filed: r 7.17(1). This rule does not apply in respect of certain Local Court matters: r 7.17(2).

The plaintiff may apply to the court under r 7.18 for the appointment of a tutor of the defendant or for the removal of a tutor and the appointment of another: r 7.17(1) Note.

An independent solicitor would be a suitable nominee, however, the tutor must consent to being so appointed and may well require that the plaintiff indemnify him or her as to costs.

For discussions of possible approaches, see *Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v P*, above; *Iskanda v Mahbur* [2011] NSWSC 1056 and *Sperling v Sperling* [2015] NSWSC 286.

[2-4660] The end of legal incapacity

Should legal incapacity end during the course of the proceedings, typically, although not solely, by the plaintiff coming of age, the tutor is not entitled to take further steps in the proceedings: *Brown v Weatherhead* (1844) 4 Hare [122].

Upon the end of legal incapacity, the plaintiff's solicitor should ascertain whether the plaintiff elects to continue. If the plaintiff does elect to continue, the solicitor should file a notice to that effect and serve the other parties. The proceedings should be entitled accordingly. For example, "AB late an infant but now of full age, Plaintiff": *Feeney v Pieper* [1964] QWN 23; *Carberry (formerly an infant but now of full age) v Davies* [1968] 2 All ER 817.

[2-4670] Costs — legally incapacitated person's legal representation

A tutor is liable for the costs of the legally incapacitated person's own legal representation and is entitled to be indemnified by the legally incapacitated person for any costs reasonably and properly incurred in litigation: *Thatcher v Scott* [1968] 87 WN (Pt 1) (NSW) 461 at 463; *Chapman v Freeman* [1962] VR 259; *Murray v Kirkpatrick* (1940) 57 WN (NSW) 162 at 163.

[2-4680] Costs — tutor for plaintiff (formerly "next friend")

The tutor for a plaintiff is liable to pay the costs of a successful defendant. That defendant may enforce a costs order directly against a tutor where the plaintiff is legally incapacitated: *Poy v Darcey* (1898) 15 WN (NSW) 161; *Radford v Cavanagh* [1899] 15 WN (NSW) 226; *NSW Insurance Ministerial Corp v Abualfoul* (1999) 162 ALR 417.

The tutor's liability for further costs ceases at the time the incapacity ceases unless the tutor actively participates in the proceedings after that date: *Abualfoul*, above, at [40].

If the incapacitated person elects to continue the proceedings, he or she becomes liable for all the costs. There is no apportionment based on the change from being legally incapacitated to having full capacity: *Bligh v Tredgett* (1851) 5 De G & Sm [74]; *Abualfoul* at [39].

Similarly a replacement tutor is liable for the whole costs of the proceedings and not just those after appointment: *Bligh v Tredgett*, above at [77].

The tutor is ordinarily entitled to recover the costs from the legally incapacitated person's estate if he or she acted bona fide: *Abualfoul* at [28].

[2-4690] Costs — tutor for the defendant (formerly "guardian ad litem")

The tutor for a defendant is not, except in the case of misconduct, personally liable to pay the costs of an action which he or she has defended unsuccessfully: *Morgan v Morgan* (1865) 12 LT 199.

[2-4700] Compromise

A tutor can only compromise proceedings if the compromise is for the benefit of the person under legal incapacity: *Rhodes v Swithenbank* (1889) 22 QBD 577. The court cannot force a compromise upon a person under legal incapacity against the opinion of a tutor or his or her advisers: *Birchall, In re; Wilson v Birchall* (1880) 16 Ch D 41.

With some limited exceptions, see CPA s 74(2), compromises or settlements by persons under legal incapacity require the approval of the court.

Compromise of claims enforceable by proceedings in the court made on behalf of or against a person under legal incapacity may be approved by the court before proceedings are commenced: s 75(2). If not approved the agreement is not binding on the person under legal incapacity: s 75(3). If approved, the agreement is binding on the person under legal incapacity and his or her agents: s 75(4). Applications for such approval should be made by summons: r 6.4(1)(e).

In proceedings commenced by, on behalf of, or against a person under legal incapacity, a person who, during the course of the proceedings, becomes a person under legal incapacity or a person who the court finds to be incapable of managing his or her own affairs, there cannot be a compromise of the proceedings or an acceptance of money paid into court without the approval of the court: s 76(3). However approval is not required where the person under legal incapacity has attained the age of 18 years on the day the agreement for the compromise or settlement is made unless that person is otherwise under legal incapacity or found by the court to be incapable of managing his or her own affairs: s 76(3A).

The court may approve or disapprove an agreement for compromise: s 76(4). If not approved, the agreement does not bind the person by whom or on whose behalf it was made: s 76(5). If approved, it binds that person and his or her agent: s 76(6).

The court finding referred to above can only be made on the basis of evidence given in the proceedings and has effect only for the proceedings. As to findings of incapacity to manage affairs, see *Murphy v Doman* (2003) 58 NSWLR 51 at 58.

Principles dealing with the process of approval are collected in *Yu Ge v River Island Clothing Pty Ltd* [2002] Aust Torts Report ¶81-638. These principles do not depend upon the *Damages (Infants and Persons of Unsound Mind) Act* 1929 which has been repealed: CPA s 6. Consideration should be given to any deductions or payments required by statute or the terms of settlement.

In general, agreements for compromise on behalf of persons under legal incapacity should not be on an inclusive of costs basis to avoid a possible conflict between the interests of those persons and

their solicitors: Practice Note — Settlement of Claims for Damages for Infants [1967] 1 NSWR 276; *McLennan v Phelps* (1967) 86 WN Pt 1 (NSW) 86. Consideration should be given to any additional costs the plaintiff may be liable for.

[2-4710] NSW Trustee and Guardian Act 2009

Subject to the last paragraph below, once a settlement involving a plaintiff under legal incapacity (other than solely as a minor) has been approved by the court, an application should be made for a declaration under s 41 of the *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* 2009 that the plaintiff is incapable of managing his or her affairs and an order that the estate of the plaintiff be subject to management under that Act.

Such an application does not affect the requirement of s 77(2) of the CPA that the monies recovered should be paid into court. It is, however, inappropriate for an order under s 77(3), as to payment to such person as the court may direct rather than into court, to be made before the application is determined other than to provide for non-discretionary payments required by statute or the terms of settlement. For greater caution the order approving the compromise may order that the balance after such deductions be paid into court. See Sample orders — "Approval of settlement", at [2-4740].

The application is made by summons in the Supreme Court in accordance with the procedure provided by Pt 57 of the UCPR: *Ritchie's* [57.3.5] ff and *Thomson Reuters* [57.3] ff.

The plaintiff must be made a defendant and must be served: UCPR r 57.3. Usually the application will be dealt with within 28 days including the time for service.

Usually, it will be ordered that the estate of the plaintiff be managed by the NSW Trustee and Guardian, a named Trustee company or another person or persons. The cost of that management will often be recoverable as damages, and is a factor to be taken into account in consideration of the adequacy of the proposed settlement: *The Nominal Defendant v Gardikiotis* (1996) 186 CLR 49. Where the manager appointed is not the NSW Trustee and Guardian, the cost of management includes the cost of supervision of that manager by the NSW Trustee and Guardian.

An application will be unnecessary where the estate of the plaintiff is already under relevant management: *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* 2009 ss 44, 45 and 52; *Guardianship Act* 1987, s 25E. An application can be made under the *Guardianship Act* 1987, however, the procedure is more cumbersome and time consuming.

[2-4720] Directions to tutor

On application by a tutor the Supreme Court may give directions with respect to the tutor's conduct of proceedings in any court: s 80.

[2-4730] Money recovered

Money recovered in proceedings on behalf of a person under legal incapacity is to be paid into court: s 77(2). However, the court may order that the whole or part of such money be paid instead to such persons as the court may direct including the NSW Trustee and Guardian or manager of a protected person's estate: s 77(3). Money paid into court is to be paid out to such person as the court may direct including the NSW Trustee and Guardian or manager: s 77(4).

It has been argued that the effect of s 77(3) and (4) is to restrict payments made under those subsections to the NSW Trustee and Guardian where the person on whose behalf the money was recovered is a minor and to the manager of the protected person's estate where that person is a protected person. The better view would appear to be that upon their true construction the subsections do not impose such a limitation.

Whilst it is arguable that the terms of s 77 permit the court to order payment to a voluntary service provider in respect of some or all of amounts awarded under the *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer* (1977) 139 CLR 161 principles, the better course would appear to be to leave such a payment to the NSW Trustee and Guardian or other person appointed (but see below). A judge may usefully make a recommendation if so minded.

It is to be remembered that the moneys are the plaintiff's funds, there is no obligation to pay and the plaintiff is incapable of making the decision.

The NSW Trustee and Guardian has power to make such a payment under s 59 of the *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* 2009: *Protective Commissioner v D* (2004) 60 NSWLR 513. It remains doubtful if the NSW Trustee and Guardian has power to authorise other managers to make such payments. However, the Supreme Court, in its protective role, has inherent power to authorise them after a management order is made. The NSW Trustee and Guardian customarily makes such payments in appropriate cases.

For an example of an order for payment other than to the NSW Trustee and Guardian or manager, see *Lim v Nominal Defendant* (unrep, 27/6/97, NSWSC) and also see *Walker v Public Trustee* [2001] NSWSC 1133.

[2-4740] Sample orders

Removal of tutor

I order:

1. That AB be removed as the tutor of XY.
2. That the proceedings be stayed pending the appointment of a new tutor.
3. Costs [*as appropriate*].

Appointment of tutor and addition of party

I order:

1. That AB be appointed as the tutor of XY.
2. That XY be joined as a defendant in the proceedings.
3. That the plaintiff file an amended statement of claim with 28 days.
4. Costs [*as appropriate*].

Approval of settlement

Having considered the affidavits [identify] and other material tendered [if any], I approve the compromise.

By consent, I make the following orders:

1. Judgment for the plaintiff pursuant to term 1 [of the terms of settlement initialled by me and placed with the papers].
2. An order for costs pursuant to term 2.
3. Terms 3, 4, 5 and 6 are noted, as is the agreement as to non disclosure in term 7.

4. An order that the judgment sum payable pursuant to term 1 (after deductions permissible under term 4) be paid into court to await further order.

   OR

   An order that the judgment sum (after deductions permissible under term 4 be paid direct to the NSW Trustee and Guardian pursuant to s 77(3) of the CPA to be held and applied for the maintenance and education or otherwise for the benefit of the plaintiff.

Notes

1. The order will refer to the term numbering of the applicable terms of settlement.
2. Appropriate orders should be made in respect of any additional plaintiffs, however, expression of approval is not required unless one or more of them is also under a legal incapacity.
3. Commonly, term 4 [or as to case may be] will be all embracing, however, should it not cover all deductions, including those provided for by Statute, the order 4 [or as the case may be] may require qualification. It may be appropriate in a given case to identify the sum or a maximum sum to be so deducted.
4. The first form of order 4 will be appropriate where an application under the *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* is contemplated, the second where infancy is the sole ground of legal incapacity. Should the estate of the plaintiff be already under relevant management, an order for direct payment to the appointed manager could be made.

Legislation

- CPA ss 3, 6, 74–77, 80, 160
- *Felons (Civil Proceedings) Act* 1981 s 4
- *Guardianship Act* 1987, s 25E
- *Mental Health Act* 2007
- *NSW Trustee and Guardian Act* 2009, ss 41, 44, 45, 52 and 59
- Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013, s 45(4C)

Rules

- UCPR Form 24, rr 6.4, 7.13, 7.14, 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 7.18, Pt 57, r 57.3

[The next page is 1825]

[2-6660] In the case of possession of land, absence of a person ordered to be joined

Rule 36.16(2)(c) provides that, in the case of proceedings for the possession of land, the court may set aside or vary a judgment or order after the judgment or order has been entered if the judgment or order has been given or made in the absence of a person whom the court has ordered to be added as a defendant, whether or not the absent person had notice of the relevant hearing or of the application for the judgment or order.

[2-6670] Interlocutory order

Rule 36.16(3) provides that, without limiting subrules 36.16(1) and (2), the court may set aside or vary any order except so far as it determines a claim for relief or a question arising on a claim for relief or determines part of a claim for relief.

Orders relating to practice and procedure will be freely reviewed in the light of changing circumstances but not otherwise: *DPP (Cth) v Geraghty* [2000] NSWSC 228; *Hillston v Bar-Mordecai* [2002] NSWSC 477.

[2-6680] The slip rule

The court may, on application or of its own motion, correct a clerical mistake or an error arising from an accidental slip in a judgment, order or certificate: r 36.17. A "party" in this rule means any person who has an interest in the proceedings and is not limited to persons formally joined as parties to the proceedings: *JP Morgan Chase Bank, National Association v Fletcher* (2014) 85 NSWLR 644 at [100]–[147], [149], [162]–[164].

By reason of the overriding objective in s 56 of the CPA (to facilitate the just, quick and cheap resolution of the real issues in the proceedings), words such as "error" and "correct" in the slip rule should not be given a narrow interpretation: *Newmont Yandal Operations Pty Ltd v The J Aron Corp & The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc* (2007) 70 NSWLR 411 at [116]. Some earlier authorities should now be treated with caution: *Newmont Yandal*, above, at [117].

Commonplace applications of the rule include correcting an arithmetical mistake in the calculation of interest or a wrong figure or date in an order.

The rule extends to matters overlooked, such as specifying a date for compliance with an order (*Re Walsh* (1983) 83 ATC 4147), or adding an amount for interest to the judgment (*L Shaddock and Associates Pty Ltd v Parramatta City Council (No 2)* (1982) 151 CLR 590), or where the judge has misunderstood the evidence (*Hall v Harris* (1900) 25 VLR 455 at 457); or counsel's submissions: *Yore Contractors Pty Ltd v Holcon Pty Ltd* (unrep, 17/7/89, NSWSC).

The rule also extends to a correction made in order to carry into effect the actual intention of the judge and/or to ensure that the order does not have a consequence which the judge intended to avoid adjudicating upon: *Newmont Yandal*, above, at [114], [116], [185], [194].

The rule does not extend to correcting a deliberate decision (*Expo Aluminium (NSW) Pty Ltd v Pateman Pty Ltd (No 2)* (unrep, 29/4/91, NSWCA)) or to making further orders on a point not in issue at the hearing: *Lauer v Briggs (No 2)* (1928) 28 SR (NSW) 389; *D'Angola v Rio Pioneer Gravel Co Pty Ltd* [1977] 2 NSWLR 227.

In the Supreme Court at least, the inherent jurisdiction of the court extends to correcting a duly entered judgment where the orders do not truly represent what the court intended: *Newmont Yandal* at [74], [79], [83], [185], [194].

The court has power to make an order for restitution of an overpayment made in consequence of the error corrected under the rule: *Prestige Residential Marketing Pty Ltd v Depune Pty Ltd (No 2)* [2008] NSWCA 341 at [9].

The judge who made the orders is not disqualified from correcting them under the slip rule and should not recuse himself or herself: *Newmont Yandal*, per Spigelman CJ at [181] and Handley JA at [195], [196].

For an example of refusal to make an order on the ground of delay, see *Georgouras v Bombardier Investments (No 2) Pty Ltd* [2013] NSWSC 1549.

The court is not always obliged to give notice to the parties before exercising its powers of its own motion under UCPR r 36.17 to correct a mistake/error: see *Marlinspike Debt Acquisitions Pty Ltd v The Undone Pty Ltd* [2018] NSWSC 4 at [32]. Consideration must be given to whether procedural fairness requires notice to be given to the parties: *Marlinspike Debt Acquisitions Pty Ltd v The Undone Pty Ltd* at [33]-[42].

[2-6690] Varying a judgment or order against a person under an unregistered business name

A judgment or order against a person under a business name may be varied to make it a judgment or order in the person's own name: r 36.18.

[2-6700] Denial of procedural fairness

An appeal in criminal proceedings may be re-opened, notwithstanding that judgment on appeal has been entered, if there has been a denial of procedural fairness, for example, where it is found that the appeal has not been determined on the relevant evidence: *R v Burrell* [2007] NSWCCA 79 at [41]. The rationale is that, in such a case, there has been no hearing on the merits and, accordingly, the matter has not been finally determined: *Burrell* at [22] and [41].

In relation to civil proceedings the same principle applies: *DJL v The Central Authority*, above, per Callinan J, at [189]; *Miltonbrook Pty Ltd v Westbury Holdings Kiama Pty Ltd* (2008) 71 NSWLR 262 at [85]–[87]. But with the qualification that different considerations may arise in civil proceedings, as where questions of status or the rights of third parties are involved: *R v Lapa (No 2)* (1995) 80 A Crim R 398 at 403, cited in *Burrell* at [25].

Regarding denial of procedural fairness by failure to disclose judicial reasoning, see *Lichaa v Boutros* [2021] NSWCA 322 at [48]–[50]. See also *Williams v Harrison* [2021] NSWSC 1488, where a self-represented plaintiff was denied procedural fairness because he was not heard when he had a right to be heard and, as well, the magistrate failed to give reasons when obliged to do so: at [28].

[2-6710] Fraud

That the judgment was obtained by fraud is a further exception to the general rule: *DJL*, per Callinan J at [189]. However, in this instance, the judgment should be impeached in independent proceedings: *DJL*, n 258 at p 291.

[2-6720] Liberty to apply

The principles as to the usual scope of liberty to apply were stated in *Abigroup v Abignano* (1992) 112 ALR 497 at 509 as follows (per Lockhart, Morling and Gummow JJ):

> The reservation of liberty to all parties to apply to a court is a provision directed essentially to questions of machinery which may arise from the implementation of a court's orders. They include cases where a court may need to supervise the enforcement of orders after they have been made.

Their Honours went on to cite with approval the following passage in *Ritchie's* at [36.16.65]:

> Liberty to apply in relation to a final order, is limited to matters concerning the implementation of the earlier order: *Dowdle v Hillier* (1949) 66 WN (NSW) 155; *Cristel v Cristel* [1951] 2 KB 725 at 730; *Re*

Porteous [1949] VLR 383. It does not extend to the substantive amendment of the judgment or orders in respect of which the liberty to apply was granted (*Wentworth v Woollahra Municipal Council* (CA (NSW), 31 March 1983, unreported).

[2-6730] Self-executing orders

A self-executing order consists of an order that a party take a specified step in the proceedings by a certain date and that, failing compliance, a specified final order (such as for the entry of judgment or that the proceedings stand dismissed) will come into effect.

Earlier authorities held that the courts had no power to circumvent such an order once it came into effect, for example, *Whistler v Hancock* (1878) 3 QBD 83; *Bailey v Marinoff* (1971) 125 CLR 529. These authorities should now be disregarded. The court has power to extend the time for compliance with a self-executing order notwithstanding that the time for compliance has passed and the order has come into effect: *FAI General Insurance Co Ltd v Southern Cross Exploration NL* (1988) 165 CLR 268.

[2-6735] Consent orders

The Supreme Court may in the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction set aside consent orders if the underlying agreement upon which they were based is void or voidable: *The Owners Strata Plan No 57164 v Yau* [2017] NSWCA 341 at [72], [76], [80], [195] and [226]. Such relief is discretionary even if some basis for setting aside the order has been established: *The Owners Strata Plan No 57164 v Yau*, above, at [81]–[83], [195], [226].

[2-6740] Setting aside or varying a judgment or order ostensibly implementing a compromise or settlement

Section 73 of the CPA provides that the court may resolve any dispute as to whether and on what terms proceedings have been compromised or settled, and may make such orders as it considers appropriate to give effect to such a determination.

A consequential order giving effect to such a determination could include an order setting aside or varying the order or judgment ostensibly implementing a compromise or settlement.

For examples of the application of s 73, see *Yule v Smith* [2012] NSWCA 191 and *Mills v Futhem Pty Ltd* (2011) 81 NSWLR 538 at [42]–[43].

Legislation

- CPA ss 56, 63, 73

Rules

- UCPR rr 36.15(1), (2), 36.16(1), (2), (3), (3A), (3B), (3C), 36.17, 36.18

[The next page is 2181]

Damages

[7-0000] General principles

Many of general principles referred to in this chapter have been drawn from H Luntz and S Harder, *Assessment of damages for personal injury*, 5th edn, LexisNexis, 2021. This is an excellent general text that deals in detail with the assessment of damages in personal injury cases and provides examples of the practical application of these principles. Other texts used for reference purposes in the preparation of this chapter were D Villa, *Annotated Civil Liability Act* 2002, 3rd edn, Thomson Reuters, Sydney, 2018; and J A McSpedden and R Pincus, *Personal Injury Litigation in NSW*, LexisNexis, Sydney, 1995.

The application of the principles discussed below is subject to any relevant statutory provisions. One such provision is the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017 which applies to motor accidents that occur after 1 December 2017: see [7-0085].

The first basic principle requires that a distinction be recognised between the term *damage* and *damages*. Damage is an essential element of a claim in most tortious actions. It is only if a plaintiff is able to establish that he or she has suffered damage that a cause of action becomes available. The position is different with intentional torts, see [7-0130].

Damages are the sums assessed in monetary terms that are paid to a successful plaintiff. Damages may be awarded as compensatory damages for damage sustained, or as aggravated or exemplary damages, although in *State of NSW v Corby* (2009) 76 NSWLR 439 aggravated damages were described as a form of compensatory damages.

The fundamental principle is that of restitutio in integrum, meaning that damages should be assessed so that they represent no more and no less than a plaintiff's actual loss: *Livingstone v Rawyards Coal Co* (1880) 5 App Cas 25, Lord Blackburn at 39. See also *Haines v Bendall* (1991) 172 CLR 60 at 63; *Arsalan v Rixon* [2021] HCA 40 at [25].

In personal injury matters, it has been recognised that in most cases it is not possible to measure accurately that part of the award that deals with non-economic loss so as to restore a plaintiff to the health enjoyed pre-injury. The principle has been qualified by the term "so far as money can do so": *Robinson v Harman* [1848] All ER Rep 383.

The law recognises that an award will not necessarily be perfect. In *Lee Transport Co Ltd v Watson* (1940) 64 CLR 1 at 13–14, Dixon J said:

> No doubt it is right to remember that the purpose of damages for personal injuries is not to give a perfect compensation in money for physical suffering. Bodily injury and pain and suffering are not the subject of commercial dealing and cannot be calculated like some other forms of damage in terms of money.

The amount awarded is, however, required to be fair to both parties, although fairness to the defendant does not require that the award be less than full or adequate.

There are some qualifications that may have the result that the plaintiff recovers less than his or her actual loss. They arise out of the principles that govern remoteness of damage, the requirement to mitigate and the modifications to common law made by the *Workers Compensation Act* 1987, *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999, *Civil Liability Act* 2002 and *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017. In addition, claims arising out of the death of a relative are limited to the recovery of pecuniary loss.

Conversely, principles relating to aggravated or exemplary damages allow the recovery of greater than actual loss in appropriate circumstances.

In *Todorovic v Waller* (1981) 150 CLR 402 at 412 Gibbs CJ and Wilson J identified the following four basic principles that they said were so well established that it was unnecessary to cite authority to support them.

1. Damages are compensatory in character.
2. Damages for one cause of action must be recovered once and forever and in a lump sum, there being no power to order a defendant to make periodic payments.
3. The plaintiff is free to do what he or she wishes with the sum awarded; the court is not concerned to see how it is applied.
4. The onus is on the plaintiff to prove the injury or loss for which damages are sought.

The plaintiff bears the onus of proving that the defendant's conduct caused the losses claimed. At common law, the defendant bears the onus of proving:

- failure to mitigate on the plaintiff's behalf
- contributory negligence.

The onus is on the plaintiff throughout to quantify damages. This does not necessarily require proof of the loss in actual monetary terms. Evidence in the form of comparable wages is commonly provided to establish loss of wages. Medical expenses and care costs for the past are rarely disputed and those expected in the future are normally capable of reasonable estimation.

Once a loss is proved, the court is required to do its best to put a value on that loss even if the evidence is less than satisfactory. In the absence of evidence, a plaintiff cannot complain that inadequate damages have been awarded: *Dessent v Commonwealth* (1977) 51 ALJR 482. See *Ashford v Ashford* (1970) 44 ALJR 195, where the court dealt with the assessment of income loss in the absence of evidence of likely earnings from planned pre- and post-accident careers. See also *Layton v Walsh* (1978) 19 ALR 594 (FC) where the court drew inferences concerning the cost of medical treatment.

It is standard practice to itemise amounts awarded to a plaintiff under various heads of damage and to give reasons for arriving at each of the stated figures. Care needs to be taken to avoid the possibility that the amounts assessed under the various heads of damage might be duplicated. For instance, a court must balance, in assessing general damages, the effect on a plaintiff of any incapacity to undertake domestic responsibilities for his or her family against making allowance for the provision of voluntary or commercial carers.

The recognised heads of damage are:

1. **General damages:** this is the term applied to non-pecuniary damages or non-economic loss suffered as a result of pain, disability, loss of enjoyment and amenities of life, disfigurement or loss of expectation of life.
2. **Pecuniary loss:** this term covers out-of-pocket expenses involved in medical and other treatment expenses; aids and appliances, domestic and personal care.
3. **Income loss:** covering actual income loss to the date of trial and loss of income-earning capacity thereafter.
4. **Aggravated damages:** awarded to a plaintiff who suffers increased distress as a result of the manner in which a defendant behaves when committing the wrong or thereafter.
5. **Exemplary damages:** awarded to mark the court's disapproval of the conduct of the defendant and to deter its repetition by the defendant or others.
6. **Nominal or contemptuous damages:** this head of damage is of little relevance to claims in tort involving personal injury where actual damage is a necessary part of the cause of action. It commonly arises in cases of trespass to the person where the options available to the court range between nominal damages and a more substantial award depending on the circumstances.

Exceptions to these basic principles are found both in the common law and in legislation.

As noted in [2-6330] the generally accepted practice is that the court determine all issues in question. This extends to the assessment of damages notwithstanding that the case on liability fails. The purpose of the practice is to avoid the costs of a further hearing in the event that the decision on liability is overturned. In *Gulic v Boral Transport Ltd* [2016] NSWCA 269, the court expressed concern that the trial judge had not adopted this practice and confirmed that a judge should decide all issues to avoid the need for a new trial. On the question of exceptions to the general rule Macfarlan J said at [8]:

> There may of course be good reasons for not dealing contingently with issues that the judge does not consider decisive. One reason might be that the judge considers that because the outcome is so clear or there is so little at stake that there is no reasonable prospect of an appeal. Alternatively, the judge might consider that the expenditure of judicial time and effort required to determine other issues is not justified when balanced against the likely costs of a retrial and the likelihood of a retrial being necessary. Another reason might be that determination of an issue whose resolution is considered not to be decisive might require assumptions as to a party's credit diametrically opposed to the judge's findings. It might be difficult to give effect to this assumption.

[7-0010] The once-and-forever principle

Interim payments

Part 5, Div 2 *Supreme Court Act* 1970 and Pt 3, Div 3 and 4 *District Court Act* 1973 make provision for the awarding of interim damages when:

- the defendant admits liability or the plaintiff has judgment against the defendant for damages to be assessed, or
- the court is satisfied, if the action proceeded to trial, that the plaintiff would secure judgment against the defendant for substantial damages.

Orders of this nature may only be made against insured defendants, public authorities or persons of sufficient means: s 76E(4) SCA, s 58(4) DCA. These provisions do not apply to claims that are dealt with under the Motor Accidents legislation.

The legislation sets out the considerations to be taken into account, makes provision for amounts to be reserved in the event of a finding of contributory negligence, and for powers to review, revoke, vary or order repayment of amounts.

In *Frellson v Crosswood Pty Ltd* (1992) 15 MVR 343, Sully J held:

- the civil onus of balance of probabilities applies in establishing the plaintiff will recover substantial damages at trial
- caution must be exercised, and it is necessary to take into account the difficulty a defendant might encounter if required to recover from an unsuccessful plaintiff
- if there is more than one defendant, the court can order payment of interim damages against one or more defendants if satisfied the plaintiff will succeed against those defendants.

Section 83 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* imposes on a third party insurer the obligation to pay for reasonable, necessary and properly verified medical, rehabilitation, respite care and attendant care expenses where liability is admitted or determined, wholly or in part, to meet the care needs generated by injuries resulting from the motor accident.

As to the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017, see Pt 3.

Court structured settlements

Section 143 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* permits the parties to apply to the court for approval of a structured settlement agreement that provides for the payment of all or part of an award of damages in the form of periodic payments funded by an annuity or other agreed means.

Similarly, s 151Q of the *Workers Compensation Act* permits the court, at the request of a plaintiff and having considered the views of the defendant, to make orders for payment of damages by means of a structured settlement rather than a lump sum award.

Lifetime care and support

The *Motor Accidents (Lifetime Care and Support) Act* 2006 provides for support for victim of motor accidents who are catastrophically and permanently injured. It imposes on the Lifetime Care and Support Authority the obligation of paying for the expenses incurred in meeting the plaintiff's treatment and care needs.

[7-0020] Actual loss

Once the defendant's liability to the plaintiff is proved, the assessment of the plaintiff's loss and damage must take into account issues that may increase or reduce the amounts awarded under all heads of damages. Considerations to be addressed include: the prospective consequences of the injury; conduct of the plaintiff in failing to mitigate or in aggravating his or her condition; contributory negligence; unrelated conditions that affect the plaintiff before or after injury; causation and aggravated or exemplary damages.

Prospective consequences

Proof of damage and assessment of damages requires calculation of the consequence of events from the date of injury to the date of trial and of the chance that events will or will not occur. In*Malec v JC Hutton Pty Ltd* (1990) 169 CLR 638, Deane, Gaudron and McHugh JJ held at [7]:

> A common law court determines on the balance of probabilities whether an event has occurred. If the probability of the event having occurred is greater than it not having occurred, the occurrence of the event is treated as certain; if the probability of it having occurred is less than it not having occurred, it is treated as not having occurred. Hence, in respect of events which have or have not occurred, damages are assessed on an all or nothing approach. But in the case of an event which it is alleged would or would not have occurred, or might or might not yet occur, the approach of the court is different. The future may be predicted and the hypothetical may be conjectured. But questions as to the future or hypothetical effect of physical injury or degeneration are not commonly susceptible of scientific demonstration or proof. If the law is to take account of future or hypothetical events in assessing damages, it can only do so in terms of the degree of probability of those events occurring. The probability may be very high – 99% – or very low – 0.1%. But unless the chance is so low as to be regarded as speculative – say less than 1% – or so high as to be practically certain – say over 99% – the court will take that chance into account in assessing the damages. Where proof is necessarily unattainable, it would be unfair to treat as certain the prediction which has a 51% probability of occurring, but to ignore altogether a prediction which has a 49% probability of occurring. Thus, the court assesses the degree of probability that an event would have occurred, or might occur, and adjusts its award of damages to reflect the degree of probability. The adjustment may increase or decrease the amount of damages otherwise to be awarded.

Examples

1. **Loss of opportunity**: As noted in the *Malec* decision, damage and loss suffered to the date of the hearing are reasonably simple to prove and assess. There are, however, occasions when it becomes necessary to assess the effects of injury on, for instance, the opportunity to undertake a particular career path or succeed in a particular business. *Commonwealth v Amann Aviation Pty Ltd* (1992) 174 CLR 54 dealt with the recovery of the value of a lost opportunity in circumstances where it was a known fact that the opportunity was lost but there was no certainty

that availability of the opportunity would have resulted in a successful outcome. Deane J at [8] said it might be necessary to modify the conventional approach, when assessing damages for past income loss, of deciding an issue on the balance of probabilities and then proceeding on the basis of a certainty where none in fact existed. The *Amann Aviation* case involved a breach of contract claim but it was made clear that the same principles applied to claims in tort.

2. **Assessment of long-term risk**: This problem arises where exposure to risk has been established but there is uncertainty concerning the long-term consequence of that exposure. In such cases a plaintiff may be under-compensated or, in cases where thresholds apply, not compensated at all if serious damage is suffered after the date of assessment.

Extras and discounts

Damages may also be reduced for a number of reasons. The common law principle is that a defendant, who asserts that a reduction in damages is warranted, must provide evidence to support the claim. This principle has been modified in some circumstances by legislation.

Mitigation

The courts have accepted the following principles, as set out in H McGregor, *McGregor on Damages*, 16th edn, Sweet & Maxwell Ltd, UK, 1997 at [283]–[288], as an accurate statement of the law concerning mitigation.

1. The law disallows recovery of damages in respect of any loss that could have been avoided but which the plaintiff has failed to avoid through unreasonable action or inaction.

2. The plaintiff may recover loss or expense incurred in a reasonable attempt to mitigate.

3. The plaintiff may not recover loss in fact avoided, even though damages for that loss would have been recoverable because the efforts that went to mitigation went beyond what was required of the plaintiff under the first principle.

At common law, the failure of a plaintiff to take steps to mitigate a claimed loss may be raised as a defence to the claim. The onus of proof of an allegation of failure to mitigate rests with the defendant. This principle has been varied by s 136 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* and s 151L *Workers Compensation Act* that transfer an element of the onus of proof to plaintiffs.

If the defendant succeeds, damages are reduced to take account of the failure to mitigate. The extent of the reduction is assessed by calculating the value of the plaintiff's loss on the basis of the condition that he or she would be in, had reasonable steps to mitigate been taken.

In NSW, in respect of motor vehicle accidents, s 136 imposes a positive duty on the plaintiff to mitigate but maintains the onus of proving failure to mitigate on the person making the allegation: s 136(4). In *Brogan v McGeary* (1995) ATR ¶81-342, the Court of Appeal held that the plaintiff need do no more than was reasonable in order to comply with the requirements of this provision.

The Nominal Defendant v Aychahawchar [2015] NSWCA 58 dealt with aspects of the onus of proof of mitigation in the light of the provisions of s 136 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*. Basten JA noted that s 136 imposed a burden on the plaintiff to prove that all reasonable steps to mitigate damages have been taken and designated certain areas in which such steps must be taken. He said the provision left open the question of whether the onus of proving that reasonable steps were not taken would impose at least an evidentiary burden on the defendant. At [8] and [9] Basten JA discussed the tension between the requirement at common law and under s 136(1) that the plaintiff prove his or her loss and the requirement both at common law and under s 136(4) that the defendant provide evidence to support an allegation of failure to take reasonable steps in mitigation of the loss. He considered whether the solution might be found in *Adams v Ascot Iron Foundry Pty Ltd* (1968) 72 SR (NSW) 120 at 139. There it was suggested the onus was on the plaintiff to establish that he or

she was unfit for a particular type of employment, whereas if fitness were established, the defendant bore (the "somewhat exceptional") onus of showing that refusal to accept an offer of this type of employment was unreasonable.

Section 151L *Workers Compensation Act* imposes a burden on the claimant to establish that all reasonable steps to mitigate have been taken, except where it is established that the claimant was not told by his or her employer or the insurer that it was necessary to take steps to mitigate before it could reasonably be expected that any of those steps would be taken: *ACN 096 712 337 Pty Ltd v Javor* [2013] NSWCA 352, per Meagher JA.

The obligations imposed by both statutes, in addition to taking reasonable steps in relation to medical treatment, require a plaintiff to undergo appropriate rehabilitation, pursue alternative employment opportunities and give early notice of claims.

Loss of amenity of the use of a chattel

Where a plaintiff's chattel is damaged as a result of the defendant's negligence, the plaintiff will generally be entitled to damages for the costs of repair and for consequential loss: *Talacko v Talacko* [2021] HCA 15 at [45]. An assessment of consequential loss always requires the identification of the manner in which the loss of use of a chattel has adversely affected the plaintiff: *Arsalan v Rixon* [2021] HCA 40 at [18]. In *Arsalan*, the High Court recognised the loss of amenity, in the sense of loss of pleasure or enjoyment, in the use of a chattel, as a recoverable head of damage for a tort that involves negligent damage to a chattel: at [17], [25]. It was not unreasonable for the respondents to take steps to mitigate their loss, including loss of amenity consequent on negligent damage to their vehicles by the hire, at a reasonable rate, of an equivalent car for a reasonable period of repair.

Medical treatment and mitigation

The issue of mitigation frequently arises from a plaintiff's reluctance or refusal to undergo medical treatment. The defendant must show that, having regard to the prospect that treatment will alleviate the plaintiff's condition, refusal was unreasonable. The defendant must show how and to what extent the loss would have been diminished and that the plaintiff's refusal of treatment was unreasonable.

Factors that are relevant in determining whether the refusal is reasonable include the prospect of improving the plaintiff's condition versus the risk of death or aggravation, inconvenience, discomfort, cost to the plaintiff in actual expenditure and income loss.

The test of whether refusal is reasonable is objective but factors particular to the plaintiff must be considered. Factors considered include anxiety states, language difficulties, prior experience of medical treatment and cultural background. It is questionable whether religious beliefs would be regarded as a reasonable basis for refusing treatment.

It is not necessary to prove that the treatment would have been successful. What the defendant must establish is that, having regard to the prospects of success, a reasonable person in the plaintiff's position would have attempted to mitigate his or her damage by accepting treatment.

If failure to mitigate is established, a discount is normally applied to take account of any improvement that might reasonably be expected in the plaintiff's condition as a result of that treatment.

Aggravation

The defendant also bears the evidentiary onus of establishing that the plaintiff's conduct positively exacerbated his or her condition. In this respect, it is necessary to consider the following.

1. Whether there has in fact been a failure to mitigate. In *Munce v Vinidext Tubemakers Pty Ltd* [1974] 2 NSWLR 235 the court left open the question of whether refusal of a blood transfusion amounted to a failure to mitigate.
2. Whether the plaintiff's conduct that positively exacerbates the condition is itself the result of injuries caused by the defendant's tortious conduct.

Pre- and post-injury conditions

Damages may be denied or reduced where the symptoms of which a plaintiff complains are the result of a pre-existing condition. In *Watts v Rake* (1960) 108 CLR 158, prior to the accident, the plaintiff suffered from a commonly occurring degenerative spinal condition that might have produced the symptoms suffered after the accident. The High Court settled the issue of onus of proof, deciding that it was for the plaintiff to prove on a prima facie basis the difference between his or her pre- and post-accident condition; once the change in condition was satisfactorily established, the evidentiary onus was then on the defendant "to exclude the operation of the accident as a contributory cause": Dixon CJ at [160].

Purkess v Crittenden (1965) 114 CLR 164 confirmed *Watts v Rake*, above, and its reference to the evidential onus necessary to rebut the prima facie case made by the plaintiff. Barwick CJ, Kitto and Taylor JJ, at 168, said it was insufficient for the defendant merely to suggest that the plaintiff suffered from a progressive pre-existing condition or that there was a relationship between any condition and the plaintiff's present incapacity and that:

> On the contrary it was stressed that both the pre-existing condition and its future probable effects or its actual relationship to that incapacity must be the subject of evidence (ie substantive evidence in the defendant's case or evidence extracted by cross-examination in the plaintiff's case) which, if accepted, would establish with some reasonable measure of precision, what the pre-existing condition was and what its future effects, both as to their nature and their future development and progress, were likely to be. That being done, it is for the plaintiff upon the whole of the evidence to satisfy the tribunal of fact of the extent of the injury caused by the defendant's negligence.

Ipp JA delivered the majority decision in *Seltsam Pty Ltd v Ghaleb* [2005] NSWCA 208, a decision that involved consideration of the plaintiff's pre-existing health and the circumstances in which the evidentiary onus transfers to the defendant in accordance with the principles of *Watts v Rake* and *Purkess v Crittenden*. Ipp JA was concerned to emphasise that those principles in no way transferred to the defendant the primary onus of proof, namely the causal connection between the plaintiff's injury and the defendant's default. He said Dixon CJ in *Watts v Rake* at 160 dealt with the following contentions:

- the plaintiff's post-injury condition was traceable to causes other than the accident
- part of the plaintiff's post-injury condition was traceable to causes other than the accident
- if there had been no accident, the plaintiff would have been incapacitated by the pre-existing condition.

Ipp JA noted that Dixon CJ said that the evidentiary onus passed to the defendant only in respect of the second and third of these contentions. Further, in discharging the evidentiary onus, the defendant must produce more than a scintilla of evidence concerning a prior condition or the likely consequences thereof. If the evidence establishes a real chance that the prior condition will affect the plaintiff's quality of life and income-earning capacity, it must be assessed and allowed for.

In *Sampco Pty Ltd v Wurth* [2015] NSWCA 117 the Court of Appeal emphasised that the requirement in s 5D(1)(a) *Civil Liability Act* 2002, that factual causation be established, applies both to the issue of liability and injury.

The apportionment of damages where the plaintiff suffered injury in successive motor vehicle accidents was considered in *Falco v Aiyaz* [2015] NSWCA 202. Emmett JA at [13] set out the principles of *State Government Insurance Commission v Oakley* (1990) 10 MVR 570:

> where the negligence of a defendant causes injury and the plaintiff subsequently suffers further injury, the principles for determining the causal connection between the negligence of the defendant and the subsequent injury are as follows:
>
> - where the further injury results from a subsequent accident that would not have occurred had the plaintiff not been in the physical condition caused by the defendant's negligence, the added damage should be treated as caused by the negligence of the defendant;
> - where the further injury results from a subsequent accident that would have occurred had the plaintiff been in normal health, but the damage sustained is greater because of aggravation of the earlier injury, the additional damage resulting from the aggravated injury should be treated as caused by the negligence of the defendant;
> - where the further injury results from a subsequent accident that would have occurred had the plaintiff been in normal health and the damage sustained includes no element of aggravation of the earlier injury, the subsequent accident and further injury should not be treated as caused by the negligence of the defendant.

Material contribution

Where it is not possible to apportion damages to take account of other causes of damage, the plaintiff is required to establish that the defendant's negligence materially contributed to the loss or damage. The evidentiary onus is then on the defendant and, if the defendant is unable to establish an alternative cause, he or she may be held fully liable.

A commonly occurring scenario arises in cases of injuries suffered as a result of more than one accident or exposure to disease-causing dusts. Again, the plaintiff is required to prove that the defendant's conduct contributed materially to the injury. If this is done and it is not possible to apportion responsibility between one or more potential causes of damage, the plaintiff will recover in full. The onus is on the defendant to establish and quantify the extent of damage caused by another tortfeasor: *Bonnington Castings Ltd v Wardlaw* (1956) AC 613 (House of Lords); *Middleton v Melbourne Tramway & Omnibus Co Ltd* (1913) 16 CLR 572.

Where it is possible to divide the harm, the court must do its best to apportion the loss between tortious and non-tortious causes: *Adams v Ascot Iron Foundry Pty Ltd* (1968) 72 SR(NSW) 120, per Sugerman AP at 125–126.

Life expectancy

The defendant bears the evidential onus of establishing that the plaintiff's life expectancy is likely to be shorter than that estimated in standard life-expectancy tables: *Thurston v Todd* [1966] 1 NSWR 321; *Proctor v Shum* [1962] SR (NSW) 511. In *Golden Eagle International Trading Pty Ltd v Zhang* (2007) 81 ALJR 919, Gummow, Callinan and Crennan JJ at [4], and Kirby and Hayne JJ at [68]–[70], held "the Court of Appeal was right to conclude that, despite the then prevailing practice in the courts of New South Wales, the primary judge should have used the prospective rather than the historical tables".

The standard life expectancy was reduced by 10% in the case of a plaintiff who, although only 21 years old at the time of assessment, continued to be a heavy smoker and the nature of his injuries and their effect on his psychological condition suggested that he would not give up the habit: *Egan v Mangarelli* [2013] NSWCA 413.

Where the plaintiff's life expectancy is reduced as a result of injury, loss of income during those years is to be assessed by deducting the probable living expenses that would be incurred in maintaining the plaintiff if she or he had survived: *Commonwealth of Australia v McLean* (1996) 41 NSWLR 389. This principle was adopted by Sheller JA in *James Hardie & Co Pty Ltd v Roberts*

[1999] NSWCA 314 where he confirmed that compensation was directed at loss of income-earning capacity not wages. Damages of this nature were therefore not a windfall but compensation for the destruction of the asset.

[7-0030] Contributory negligence

At common law a defence of contributory negligence, if successful, defeated a claim, regardless of the extent of any negligence on the part of the defendant. This situation was remedied in NSW by the *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* 1965 where provision was made to apportion liability between the parties and to reduce the plaintiff's damages in accordance with this apportionment.

Contributory negligence must be specifically pleaded as a defence to a claim and, since it is raised by way of defence, the onus is on the defendant to prove that the plaintiff failed to use reasonable care, that had care been taken the plaintiff's damage would have been diminished, and the extent of that diminution.

The principles that apply to the determination of whether the plaintiff was negligent are the same as those that determine the question of the defendant's negligence. This involves the application of the general principles set out in s 5B *Civil Liability Act*. Further s 5R specifically provides that the standard to be applied in determining the issue of contributory negligence is that of a reasonable person in the position of the plaintiff on the basis of what he or she knew or ought to have known at the time. In other words, an objective test is applied without regard to the subjective situation of the plaintiff.

The *Motor Accidents Act* ss 74, 76, *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* ss 138, 140 and *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017 ss 4.17 and 4.18 compel a finding of negligence by a plaintiff where drugs or alcohol were involved or the plaintiff failed, contrary to the requirements of the law, to use a seatbelt or use other protective equipment. Some of these provisions do not apply to minors. The provisions concerning drugs and alcohol apply not only to an injured passenger's condition at the time of an accident; they encompass the situation where the plaintiff, as a passenger in a vehicle at the time of the accident, knew or ought to have known that the driver's capacity to drive was affected by alcohol.

As to the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017, see [7-0085] under the subheading **Contributory negligence**.

The *Civil Liability Act* goes further in relation to drugs or alcohol. Pt 6 deals with intoxication, defined in s 48 as:

> a reference to a person being under the influence of alcohol or a drug (whether or not taken for a medicinal purpose and whether or not lawfully taken).

These provisions apply to civil liability for personal injury or damage to property, except where excluded by s 3B. Section 49 replaces s 74 *Motor Accidents Act* and s 138 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* to the extent of any inconsistency.

Section 50 applies where the capacity of a plaintiff to exercise reasonable care and skill is impaired by intoxication. No damages are to be awarded where damage is unlikely to have occurred if the injured party had not been intoxicated. Otherwise, unless intoxication was not self-induced, the provision mandates a finding of a minimum 25% for contributory negligence on the part of the plaintiff. This provision applies to under-age drinkers. *Russell v Edwards* [2006] NSWCA 19 held that inexperience concerning the intoxicating effects of alcohol did not lead to the conclusion that intoxication was not self-induced. Ipp JA stating that "self-induced" equated to "voluntary": [21].

Apportionment

Once a finding is made that the plaintiff was guilty of contributory negligence, it is necessary to determine the proportions in which each of the parties is to be held liable for the damage suffered by the plaintiff.

The leading authorities on this issue are *Pennington v Norris* (1956) 96 CLR 10 and *Podrebersek v Australian Iron & Steel Pty Ltd* (1985) 59 ALR 529. In *Podrebersek*, above, at [10] it was said:

> The making of an apportionment as between a plaintiff and a defendant of their respective shares in the responsibility for the damage involves a comparison both of culpability, ie of the degree of departure from the standard of care of the reasonable man (*Pennington v Norris*, above, at 16) and of the relative importance of the acts of the parties in causing the damage: *Stapley v Gypsum Mines Ltd* (1953) AC 663, at p 682; *Smith v McIntyre* (1958) Tas SR 36, at pp 42–49 and *Broadhurst v Millman* (1976) VR 208, at p 219 and cases there cited. It is the whole conduct of each negligent party in relation to the circumstances of the accident which must be subjected to comparative examination. The significance of the various elements involved in such an examination will vary from case to case; for example, the circumstances of some cases may be such that a comparison of the relative importance of the acts of the parties in causing the damage will be of little, if any, importance.

In *Wynbergen v Hoyts Corporation* (1997) 149 ALR 25, the High Court decided that it was not possible, where a finding of contributory negligence is made, to conclude that damages recoverable by the injured party should be reduced to nothing because the effect of such a conclusion would be to hold the claimant wholly responsible. Section 5S *Civil Liability Act* now provides for a finding of contributory negligence of 100% with the result that no damages are to be awarded. The claim that a finding of 100% contributory negligence should be made is often coupled with a pleading that the defendant owed no duty of care and is most frequently encountered in motor accident cases where joint illegal purpose or intoxication of both passenger and driver are involved. To date the courts have shown great reluctance to reduce damages by 100% or, except where illegality is concerned, to find no duty of care.

In *Gala v Preston* (1991) 172 CLR 243 at 254, the High Court noted that there might be special and exceptional circumstances where participants could not have had any reasonable basis for expecting that a driver of a vehicle would drive it according to ordinary standards of competence and care. In *Joslyn v Berryman* (2003) 214 CLR 552, McHugh J at [29] accepted that the plea of no breach of duty or a plea of no duty in an extreme case remained open in the case of a passenger who accepted a lift with a driver known to the passenger to be seriously intoxicated.

Similarly in *Imbree v McNeilly* (2008) 236 CLR 510, Gummow, Hayne and Kiefel JJ said at [82]:

> The conclusion that the defendant owed a plaintiff *no* duty of care is open in a case like *Joyce* if, as Latham CJ said, "[in] the case of the drunken driver, *all* standards of care are ignored [because the] drunken driver cannot even be expected to act sensibly". And as indicated earlier in these reasons, it is that same idea which would underpin a conclusion that the plaintiff voluntarily assumed the risk of being driven by a drunken driver.

In *Miller v Miller* (2011) 242 CLR 446, the High Court confirmed that no duty of care to a co-offender is owed by a person committing a crime unless one party withdraws from the joint illegal enterprise and is no longer complicit in the crime. The duty of care is owed from the point of withdrawal. In deciding the issues in that case, the High Court considered in detail prior authority on issues of duty of care in circumstances of illegal conduct: *Henwood v Municipal Tramways Trust (SA)* (1938) 60 CLR 438; *Smith v Jenkins* (1970) 119 CLR 397; *Jackson v Harrison* (1978) 138 CLR 438; *Gala v Preston* (1991) 172 CLR 243; *Cook v Cook* (1986) 162 CLR 376; *Imbree v McNeilly* (2008) 236 CLR 510; *Insurance Commissioner v Joyce* (1948) 77 CLR 39.

The issues in *Zanner v Zanner* (2010) 79 NSWLR 702 concerned the extent to which the defendant, at 11 years of age, should be held liable to the plaintiff, his mother, who allowed him to drive his father's car. The defendant raised three issues in defence: the duty of care owed by the defendant when he was too inexperienced and incompetent to be expected to control the vehicle; causation, in circumstances where the plaintiff brought about the risk that eventuated; and whether, that if liability were established, contributory negligence should be assessed at 100%.

Tobias AJA rejected all of these defences. He did, however, reassess the plaintiff's contributory negligence, increasing it from 50% to 80%, a result he considered to be warranted by two aspects of the plaintiff's conduct. The first was allowing the defendant to drive the vehicle; the second was to stand in front of it while directing the defendant.

The NSW Court of Appeal has considered the issue of how the apportionment of liability is to be undertaken having regard to the provisions of the *Civil Liability Act*.

In *Joslyn v Berryman* (2003) 214 CLR 552, the High Court was concerned with the provisions of s 74 *Motor Accidents Act* (subsequently re-enacted as s 138 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* and now dealt with in s 49 *Civil Liability Act*). Although these provisions differed from those of the *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* in that they provided for damages in respect of a motor accident to be reduced by such percentage as the court thinks just and equitable in the circumstances of the case, Kirby J at [127] said that they supplemented common law and enacted law. He noted that the *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* did not address the extent to which the plaintiff's neglect caused the accident and that the responsibility for which it provided:

> is that which is "just and equitable having regard to the claimant's share in the responsibility *for the damage*". Such "damage", as the opening words of s 10(1) make clear, is the damage which the person has suffered as a "result partly of his own fault and partly of the fault of any other person or persons". [Emphasis in original.]

Doubt on whether these principles continue to apply has arisen from the decisions of the Court of Appeal in *Gordon v Truong* [2014] NSWCA 97 and *T & X Company Pty Ltd v Chivas* [2014] NSWCA 235. Both cases involved collisions between vehicles and pedestrians and both involved findings of breach of duty and contributory negligence. Basten JA proposed that s 5R *Civil Liability Act*, in its application of the general principles of negligence described in s 5B of the Act, altered the approach to be taken to apportioning liability. He took the view that the apportionment is now to be made having regard to the causative contributions of the lack of care of each party and not by reference to the extent to which each act of neglect contributed to the damage suffered by the plaintiff. See also his discussion of the inter-relationship between ss 5R and 49 *Civil Liability Act* and their application to motor vehicle accidents in *Nominal Defendant v Green* [2013] NSWCA 219.

Further clarification of the approach to be taken to apportionment was provided in the reasons of Meagher JA, with whom Gleeson JA and Sackville AJA agreed, in *Verryt v Schoupp* [2015] NSWCA 128. The appeal dealt, amongst other things with the trial judge's finding that, although there was negligence on the part of a 12-year-old skateboarder who "skitched" a ride uphill by holding onto the back of the appellant's motor vehicle, the appellant was overwhelmingly responsible and that there should therefore be no reduction in damages for contributory negligence.

Meagher JA noted the difference between the requirement of s 9(1) of the *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* 1965 that responsibility be apportioned according to what is just and equitable having regard to the claimant's share in the responsibility for the damage and that of s 138(3) of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* that damages recoverable be reduced by such percentage as the court thinks just and equitable in the circumstances of the case. This did not involve reference to s 5D to determine a causal connection between the contributory negligence and the injury. It involved, first, as required by s 5R(1) of the *Civil Liability Act*, the application of the principles of s 5B in determining whether the person who suffered harm has been contributorily negligent.

It was in the apportionment of responsibility that the issue of the extent to which each party was responsible for the accident and the injuries sustained became relevant. In this case, the Court of Appeal accepted that there was no evidence to support the contention that the respondent's failure to wear a protective helmet caused his brain injury, an element where the onus of proof rested with the appellant. There was, however, evidence that the 12-year-old respondent appreciated that the skitching exercise was dangerous and Meagher JA considered that his lack of care for his own safety was adequately reflected by reducing his damages by 10%.

This approach has been adopted in a number of decisions, including *Grills v Leighton Contractors Pty Ltd* [2015] NSWCA 72 and *Nominal Defendant v Cooper* [2017] NSWCA 280. In the latter case, McColl JA noted that the parties did not suggest that there was any significance in the differences between s 9(1) of the *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* 1965 and s 138(1) of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999. Her Honour said, using the principles derived from *Podrebersek* and *Pennington*, that both provisions required the court to arrive at an apportionment of the parties' respective shares in the responsibility for the damage by comparing the degree to which they had each departed from the standard of care of the reasonable person and the relative importance of their acts in causing the damage.

Appellate courts consistently note that the facts of earlier cases are rarely of assistance when determining an appropriate apportionment. They also maintain a degree of reluctance to interfere in the first instance determination: *Mobbs v Kain* [2009] NSWCA 301; *Harmer v Hare* [2011] NSWCA 229.

Section 5T *Civil Liability Act* requires the court to take account of the contributory negligence of the deceased in claims under the *Compensation to Relatives Act* 1897. Section 30 *Civil Liability Act* extends this requirement to the contributory negligence of a victim killed, injured or endangered by an act or omission of the defendant when assessing claims for nervous shock.

Blameless accidents

The application of the principles of contributory negligence to blameless accidents was considered by the Court of Appeal in *Axiak v Ingram* (2012) 82 NSWLR 36. A blameless accident is defined in s 7A *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* as follows:

> "blameless motor accident" means a motor accident not caused by the fault of the owner or driver of any motor vehicle involved in the accident in the use or operation of the vehicle and not caused by the fault of any other person.

Section 7F of the Act provides for the reduction of damages by reason of contributory negligence on the part of a deceased or injured person.

In *Axiak*, the Court of Appeal held that the words "and not caused by the fault of any other person" referred to tortious conduct of persons other than the plaintiff. In those circumstances the principles of *Podrebersek* had no application where, because of the provisions of the Act, the driver was not at fault so that comparisons of culpability and contributions to the damage suffered were inappropriate. Tobias JA said that contributory negligence was therefore to be assessed by reference to the extent to which the plaintiff departed from the standard of care imposed in taking care for his or her own safety. He rejected, as contrary to the intention of the legislature, the proposition that a plaintiff, guilty of contributory negligence in a blameless accident must always be the sole cause of his or her injuries and therefore guilty of negligence to the degree of 100%.

This decision was not challenged in *Davis v Swift* [2014] NSWCA 458 but the Court of Appeal was unanimous in the view that it required reconsideration. The court was divided on the question of whether, it being accepted that the plaintiff's conduct was the sole cause of the accident, contributory negligence should be assessed at 100%. Meagher and Leeming JJA, held that, since the defendant was, by s 7B(1), deemed to have been at fault, the assessment of culpability for the accident should be 20% to the defendant and 80% to the plaintiff. Adamson J agreed with the trial judge that the plaintiff's contributory negligence should be assessed at 100%. She suggested that the contributory negligence addressed by s 7F related to conduct, such as failure to wear a seatbelt, that aggravated damage but was not causative of the accident.

The approach taken in *Axiak* was adopted in *Nominal Defendant v Dowedeit* [2016] NSWCA 332.

Heads of Damage

[7-0040] Non-economic loss

This head of damage is also referred to as general damages or non-pecuniary loss. It covers the elements of pain, suffering, disability and loss of amenity of life, past and future. As already noted, in respect of the future, an element of hypothesis is involved.

There are few remaining areas in personal injury claims where damages remain at large. The *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* and the *Civil Liability Act* impose thresholds to the recovery of non-economic loss and an upper limit on the amounts that may be awarded. Common law damages for non-economic loss are no longer recoverable under the *Workers Compensation Act.*

The maximum sums recoverable for non-economic loss are adjusted annually by reference to fluctuations in the average weekly earnings of full-time adults as measured by the Australian Statistician: s 146 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*; s 16 *Civil Liability Act*. The adjustment takes effect on 1 October in each year. The maximum sum to be awarded is that which is prescribed at the date of the order awarding damages.

Section 3 *Civil Liability Act* contains the following definition:

> "non-economic loss" means any one or more of the following:
>
> (a) pain and suffering
>
> (b) loss of amenities of life
>
> (c) loss of expectation of life
>
> (d) disfigurement.

The same definition is found in s 3 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*.

Assessing non-economic loss

The *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* applies to injuries suffered in accidents occurring after midnight on 26 September 1995. Sections 131–135 deal with non-economic loss. To qualify for an award the plaintiff's level of whole-person impairment must be assessed at greater than 10%. If the parties disagree on this question, a medical assessor, whose determination is binding on the parties and the courts, is appointed by the Motor Accidents Authority. Unlike the *Motor Accidents Act* and the *Civil Liability Act*, s 134 does not require that the court assess damages as a proportion of the maximum sum fixed for an award of non-economic loss. Damages are assessed with the application of common law principles up to the maximum provided for in s 134. This was explained by Heydon JA in *Hodgson v Crane* (2002) 55 NSWLR 199 when he said it was not possible to construe the concept of proportionality out of the language of ss 131–134. When the threshold of 10% permanent impairment was passed, the court was required to assess non-economic loss without statutory restraint except for the maximum that may be awarded: at [39].

The *Motor Accidents Act* first introduced the concept of significant impairment to an injured person's ability to lead a normal life as the basis for assessment of non-economic loss and the assessment of the percentage of that impairment against a most extreme case.

As to the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017, see [7-0085] under the subheading **Non-economic loss**.

The *Civil Liability Act* contains provisions similar to those of the *Motor Accidents Act*. The threshold for recovery of non-economic loss is an injury assessed by the court to be at least 15% of a most extreme case: s 16(1). Where the severity of the plaintiff's injuries is assessed to be less

than 33% of a most extreme case, the amount to be awarded is to be calculated by reference to the deductibles set out in s 16(3). If the assessment exceeds 33%, the plaintiff is entitled to receive in full the proportion of the maximum sum applicable.

A note appended to s 16 *Civil Liability Act* describes the following method of assessing damages in accordance with the table of deductibles:

> The following are the steps required in the assessment of non-economic loss in accordance with this section:
>
> Step 1: Determine the severity of the claimant's non-economic loss as a proportion of a most extreme case. The proportion should be expressed as a percentage.
>
> Step 2: Confirm the maximum amount that may be awarded under this section for non-economic loss in a most extreme case. This amount is indexed each year under s 17.
>
> Step 3: Use the Table to determine the percentage of the maximum amount payable in respect of the claim. The amount payable under this section for non-economic loss is then determined by multiplying the maximum amount that may be awarded in a most extreme case by the percentage set out in the Table.
>
> Where the proportion of a most extreme case is greater than 33%, the amount payable will be the same proportion of the maximum amount.

The issue of what constitutes a most extreme case has been considered in a number of decisions arising out of provisions of the *Motor Accidents Act* that are identical to those now in the *Civil Liability Act*: *Matthews v Dean* (1990) 11 MVR 455; *Dell v Dalton* (1991) 23 NSWLR 528; *Kurrie v Azouri* (1998) 28 MVR 406. In each case, the courts involved confirmed that the use of the indefinite article "a" allowed for questions of fact and degree to be taken into account in determining whether the severity of injury was such that the maximum sum was to be awarded.

In *Dell v Dalton*, above, Handley JA said at 533:

> In my opinion the definition of non-economic loss and the bench mark in s 79(3) do not enact a statutory table of maims which reduces all human beings to some common denominator and require the impact of particular injuries on a given individual to be ignored.

Another issue that has been dealt with on several occasions is the manner in which damages as a proportion of the maximum are to be assessed. Cautions have been expressed against having regard to the consequences in monetary terms of deciding on a particular percentage, where assessments below 33% may have significant consequences. In *Clifton v Lewis* [2012] NSWCA 229 Basten JA said at [57]:

> It is true that a small variation in the assessment may have significant consequences for the amount of damages to be awarded. In the present case, according to the table provided in s 16 of the *Civil Liability Act*, a 25% assessment as a proportion of a most extreme case will permit an award of 6.5% of the maximum amount fixed by statute; a 33% assessment will result in 33% of the maximum amount. In rough terms, an increase of one-third in the assessment results in an increase of 500% in the award. However, the fact that a small change in the assessment can have a large consequence in monetary terms does not mean that the nature of the assessment changes or can be assumed to be a more precise exercise than it is. The relationship between the assessment and the consequence is fixed by Parliament. To assess the proportion of a most extreme case by reference to the consequence in monetary terms would be to adopt a legally erroneous course.

Consistent with the *Dell* approach, a trial judge, assessing the proportion of a most extreme case, is not required to arrive at an unrealistic level of precision provided the percentage falls within a reasonable range of assessment: *Berkeley Challenge Pty Ltd v Howarth* [2013] NSWCA 370, Basten JA.

The age of a plaintiff may have an effect on the assessment of non-economic loss under the *Civil Liability Act*. In *Reece v Reece* (1994) 19 MVR 103, the Court of Appeal remarked upon the need,

when assessing, on a proportionate basis, the severity of injury, to consider the age of a plaintiff and the likely length of the period over which the pain and suffering of progressive disability would be suffered. The court held that the consequence of particular injuries were likely to be more severe in the case of a younger person than that of an elderly plaintiff who had a much shorter period of life expectancy.

The requirement to consider the age of the plaintiff was confirmed in *Marshall v Clarke* (unrep, 5/7/94, NSWCA) and *Christalli v Cassar* [1994] NSWCA 48 at [3]. In *Varga v Galea* [2011] NSWCA 76, McColl J noted at [72] that age was only one of numerous matters to be taken into account in assessing non-economic loss by reference to the definition of that term in s 3 *Civil Liability Act*.

The principles adopted in *Reece v Reece* and *Varga*, above, did not apply to claims under the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* or the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017 where damages are not assessed by reference to a proportion of a most extreme case: *RACQ Insurance Ltd v Motor Accidents Authority (NSW) (No 2)* (2014) 67 MVR 551 per Campbell J.

The court is required to assess the totality of the plaintiff's injuries rather than assessing each injury on an individual basis: *Holbrook v Beresford* (2003) 38 MVR 285. However, where the plaintiff suffered injury in multiple accidents, the assessment is to be made by reference to the injuries suffered in each individual accident: *Muller v Sanders* (1995) 21 MVR 309.

The plaintiff in *Alameddine v Glenworth Valley Horse Riding Pty Ltd* [2015] NSWCA 219 claimed for damages both under the *Civil Liability Act* and the Australian Consumer Law. The issue to be determined was whether her claim for non-economic loss should be calculated according to the more generous provisions of s 16 of the *Civil Liability Act* or in accordance with s 87M of the *Competition and Consumer Act* 2010. Macfarlan JA, with whom Simpson JA and Campbell AJA agreed, rejected the argument that the Commonwealth legislation prevailed. He said the *Competition and Consumer Act* did not purport to, nor did it, have the effect of excluding recovery of non-economic loss under the *Civil Liability Act* notwithstanding that causes of action were available to the plaintiff under both Acts.

The Court of Appeal dealt with the principles to be applied in the assessment of damages for false imprisonment in *State of NSW v Smith* [2017] NSWCA 194. The court referred to texts and authorities that emphasised that "[e]ven apparently minor deprivations of liberty are viewed seriously by the common law" (see *Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs v Al Masri* (2003) 128 FCR 54; [2003] FCAFC 70 at [88]). Damages in such a case, therefore, are intended to take account of, in addition to the deprivation of liberty, the shock of the arrest and injury to feelings, dignity and reputation.

[7-0050] Pecuniary losses

This head of damage includes income loss, superannuation losses and out-of-pocket expenses such as voluntary and commercially provided care expenses.

Income loss

The authorities make it clear that damages for lost income, past and present, are awarded for impairment to income-earning capacity when the impairment is productive of income loss: *Graham v Baker* (1961) 106 CLR 340; *Medlin v SGIO* (1995) 182 CLR 1. There are therefore three questions to be answered in assessing income.

1. What was the plaintiff's income-earning capacity at the time of injury?
2. To what extent was it impaired by the injury?
3. To what extent was the impairment productive of income loss?

A very useful summary of the applicable principles, with reference to authority, was provided by McColl JA and Hall J in *Kallouf v Middis* [2008] NSWCA 61 at [44]–[61].

1. Damages for past and future loss of income are allowed because diminution of earning capacity is or may be productive of financial loss: *Graham v Baker*, above. An alternative way of expressing the principle is that the plaintiff is compensated for the effect of an accident on the plaintiff's ability to earn income: *Medlin v SGIO*, above, McHugh J at [16].
2. Although the exercise involves assessment of lost earning capacity and not loss of earnings, evidence of wage rates, known for the past and likely in the future, provides a basis for assessment.
3. Both the lost capacity and the economic consequences of that loss must be identified before it will be possible to assess the sum that will restore the plaintiff to his or her position but for injury.
4. What was earned in the past may be a useful guide to what might be earned in the future but it does not always provide certain guidance.
5. Assessment of future income loss necessarily involves the consideration of future possibilities or hypothetical events. The exercise is imprecise and carried out within broad parameters.
6. Evaluation of the extent to which a plaintiff may in future lose time from work and of the proper compensation to be allowed depends on the evidence.
7. An error of principle would be involved in concluding, in the absence of evidence, as a matter of certainty that a plaintiff will suffer future income loss.
8. The onus is on the plaintiff to provide evidence in support of the claimed diminution in earning capacity. Past income is relevant to this consideration but is not always determinative.
9. The onus is on the defendant who contends that the plaintiff has a residual earning capacity to provide evidence of the extent of that capacity and of the availability of employment.
10. In both cases the evidence must establish more than a mere suggestion of loss or capacity.
11. Where it is clear that income-earning capacity has been reduced but its extent is difficult to assess, the absence of precise evidence will not necessarily result in non-recovery of damages. The task is to consider a range of what may be possibilities only that a particular outcome might be achieved to arrive at an award that is fair and reasonable.

Tax treatment of a plaintiff's income may be relevant to the assessment of his or her income-earning capacity. There are cases where tax returns do not reflect the full amount of that capacity. For example, the case of a husband and wife partnership, where income is divided equally although one partner performs the work necessary to generate the income while the other undertakes the administrative tasks associated with the operation of the business.

Husher v Husher (1999) 197 CLR 138 was an example of such a case. The plurality of the High Court noted:

- all of the income of the partnership was the result of exploitation of the plaintiff's earning capacity
- the partnership continued at will; it was a matter for the plaintiff if he chose to continue it
- the plaintiff therefore had under his control and at his disposal the whole of the fruits of his skill and labour.

These principles were applied by the Court of Appeal in *Conley v Minehan* [1999] NSWCA 432.

In *Morvatjou v Moradkhani* [2013] NSWCA 157, it was said that it was glaringly improbable that the plaintiff earned only the income disclosed in his tax returns at a time when he was supporting himself, his wife and two children. McColl JA referred to reasons of von Doussa J in *Giorginis v Kastrati* [1988] 49 SASR 371 in which he said that, while such a discrepancy reflected on a plaintiff's credit so that his or her evidence generally needed to be scrutinised with special care, it did not necessarily disqualify him or her from recovering damages based on evidence of actual

earnings. McColl JA did not endorse the proposition that a plaintiff must admit failure to disclose income to tax authorities but she continued the Court of Appeal's emphasis on the need to assess diminution of income-earning capacity, acknowledging that evidence of actual income was the most useful guide when undertaking this exercise.

Malec v Hutton and *Medlin v SGIO*, above, were High Court decisions, the result of which was that, where a plaintiff demonstrates some loss of earning capacity extending beyond the date of trial, although difficult to assess, the courts are bound to award something unless, on the material before the court, it can be seen confidently that the damage suffered by the plaintiff will not in fact be productive of income loss.

The task of assessment of future loss, particularly where there is little or no evidence of loss to the date of hearing, was clarified in *State of NSW v Moss* (2002) 54 NSWLR 536 where the plaintiff's injuries clearly pointed to an effect on his capacity to earn and there was therefore evidence of impaired earning capacity. Heydon JA said it was wrong to conclude that damages to compensate for this loss should be minimal. He referred at [69] to authorities that he said contained two uncontroversial themes.

1. In general it was desirable for precise evidence to be called of pre-injury income and likely post-injury income.
2. Absence of that evidence will not necessarily result in an award of no or nominal damages for impaired earning capacity.

His Honour's summary at [89] was:

> In short, where earning capacity has unquestionably been reduced but its extent is difficult to assess, even though no precise evidence of relevant earning rates is tendered, it is not open to the court to abandon the task and the want of evidence does not necessarily result in non-recovery of damages. Statements to the contrary such as those made in *Allen v Loadsman* [1975] 2 NSWLR 787 at 792 are not correct: *Baird v Roberts* [1977] 2 NSWLR 389 at 397–8 per Mahoney JA; *J K Keally v Jones* [1979] 1 NSWLR 723 at 732–735 per Moffitt P; *Yammine v Kalwy* [1979] 2 NSWLR 151 at 154–5 and 156–7 per Reynolds JA and Mahoney JA; *Thiess Properties Pty Ltd v Page* (1980) 31 ALR 430; see also *Radakovic v R G Cram & Sons Pty Ltd* [1975] 2 NSWLR 751 at 761 where Samuels JA criticised the "meagre facts" provided but did not say it was not open to the jury to find a substantial sum for diminished earning capacity by the "application of their own knowledge and experience". The task of the trier of fact is to form a discretionary judgment by reference to not wholly determinate criteria within fairly wide parameters. Though the trier of fact in arriving at the discretionary judgment must achieve satisfaction that a fair award is being made, since what is involved is not the finding of historical facts on a balance of probabilities, but the assessment of the value of a chance, it is appropriate to take into account a range of possible outcomes even though the likelihood of any particular outcome being achieved may be no more than a real possibility.

In *Cupac v Cannone* [2015] NSWCA 114 the Court of Appeal noted the extremely difficult task of assessment of income loss facing the trial judge when dealing with wildly differing medical opinion and the failure to call any medical expert for cross examination. The court rejected the contention that the award for past income loss should be increased to take account of inflation from the date of the plaintiff's injury. This was because the trial judge was required to estimate loss when precise calculation was not possible and the figure arrived at took into account a range of factors, including the changing value of money.

In *Jopling v Isaac* [2006] NSWCA 299 the Court of Appeal confirmed that, notwithstanding the requirement of s 13(1) *Civil Liability Act* that the plaintiff's most likely future circumstances, but for injury, be taken into account, the principles of *State of NSW v Moss*, above, continued to apply when the evidence was deficient and that the option of awarding a cushion or buffer as compensation for future economic loss remained available. This was confirmed in *Black v Young* [2015] NSWCA 71, where the court also confirmed the need to address specifically the provisions of *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999 s 126 to the circumstances of each particular case.

A similar problem arose in *Younie v Martini* (unrep, 21/3/95, NSWCA) when the plaintiff suffered no income loss to the date of trial. The court held, however, that an assessment that the plaintiff suffered significant impairment to the extent of 18% should have resulted in a finding of impaired income capacity. In this case, given the nature of the plaintiff's duties as a nursing assistant, having found that the injury continued to the date of trial, some award ought to have been made for future economic loss.

Nevertheless, as pointed out by Young AJA at [111] in *Perisher Blue Pty Ltd v Harris* [2013] NSWCA 38, there can be no compensation for loss of income-earning capacity unless it is also established that diminished capacity is productive or is likely to be productive of actual loss.

In *Sharman v Evans* (1977) 138 CLR 563 the High Court dealt with the question of the adjustment to be made to the award for income loss where the plaintiff's injuries were such that she was not expected to live to retirement age. The court held that she was entitled to recover income loss during the lost years subject to the deduction of an amount to account for the expenses that she would have incurred in self maintenance. No deduction was required for the expense of maintaining dependants.

Wynn v NSW Insurance Ministerial Corporation (1995) 184 CLR 485 set aside any suggestion that a working mother's income should be reduced to account for expenses of providing childcare or domestic help or for the prospect that she "would at some stage (choose) or (be) forced to accept a less demanding job" because she "would be unable or unwilling to remain in her job which placed such heavy demands on her time, energy and health and the love and patience of her husband": Dawson, Toohey, Gaudron, Gummow JJ at [9]. They pointed out that it was necessary to call evidence that suggested a plaintiff was less able than any other career-oriented person, whether male or female, to combine successfully a demanding career and family responsibilities. Childcare and domestic-care responsibilities, they said, did not always involve expenditure. This was a matter of choice for the family and the expense involved was of a private or domestic nature.

White v Benjamin [2015] NSWCA 75 also rejected the proposition that a wife's future income loss should be discounted because her husband's secure employment in a flourishing business might persuade her to abandon her own career ambitions.

Specific evidence is required if a plaintiff proposes to work beyond retirement age: *Roads and Traffic Authority v Cremona* [2001] NSWCA 338. In that case the court accepted a general practitioner's evidence that he would continue to work to the age of 70 years but the assessment of his income loss beyond retirement age was reduced to take account of the likelihood that, as he advanced in age, he would earn less.

A certificate of assessment of whole person impairment issued under *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999 s 61 is not conclusive in respect of economic loss: *Pham v Shui* [2006] NSWCA 373, *Brown v Lewis* (2006) NSWLR 587; [2006] NSWCA 87, *Motor Accidents Authority of NSW v Mills* (2010) 78 NSWLR 125; [2010] NSWCA 82, *El-Mohamad v Celenk* [2017] NSWCA 242. While the content of the certificate may have some relevance, extreme caution was required in relying on the content of the certificate in assessing damages for economic loss: *Brown v Lewis*, above, Mason P at [23].

Vicissitudes

It is an acknowledged principle that life is not always certain and that unpredictable events can affect future income. These events or vicissitudes are dealt with by of the application of a discount to the sum assessed as compensation for future income losses.

In *State of NSW v Moss*, above, Mason P at [33], referring to *Wynn v NSW Insurance Ministerial Corporation*, above, at 497, said that the negative consequences or vicissitudes that are normally taken into account are sickness, accident, unemployment and industrial disputes.

In *Norris v Blake (No 2)* (1997) 41 NSWLR 49 Clarke JA confirmed that it was in order to add a sum against the positive contingency of success or income-earning capacity beyond pension age.

The generally accepted discount is 15%, although this figure may be varied to take account of particular circumstances. For instance, where the plaintiff is of advanced age with a relatively short period over which the assessment of future income loss is to be made, the percentage applied for vicissitudes may be reduced. It is more common, however, that the percentage is increased, particularly where there is evidence of a pre-existing condition, unrelated to the injury that is the subject of the claim, that is likely to affect the plaintiff's capacity to continue to earn income: *Berkley Challenge Pty Ltd v Howarth* [2013] NSWCA 370.

In *Taupau v HVAC Constructions (Qld) Pty Ltd* [2012] NSWCA 293, Beazley JA at [190]–[192] said that the plaintiff's past record of imprisonment should not have altered the principles on which his past and future income loss was assessed in any way differently from the principles applied to law abiding members of the community. However, it would have been appropriate to take the plaintiff's propensity to crime and imprisonment into account by way of the discount for vicissitudes.

Care should be exercised to avoid double counting. In *Smith v Alone* [2017] NSWCA 287, the plaintiff's pre-accident income had been limited by his pre-existing alcohol dependency. The trial judge took account of this factor in assessing the sum to be awarded for income loss and further decreased the award by 35% for vicissitudes. Macfarlan JA, with whom Meagher and White JJA agreed, said at [58]:

> Both parties accepted that the usual discount to damages for future economic loss that is made for contingencies or "vicissitudes" is 15%. As the plurality said in *Wynn v NSW Insurance Ministerial Corporation* (1995) 184 CLR 485 at 497; [1995] HCA 53, this discount is to "take account of matters which might otherwise adversely affect earning capacity" and "death apart, 'sickness, accident, unemployment and industrial disputes are the four major contingencies which expose employees to the risk of the loss of income'" (ibid, citing Harold Luntz, *Assessment of Damages for Personal Injury and Death*, (3rd ed 1990, Butterworths) at 285).

In re-assessing the deduction at 25%, Macfarlan JA at [63] said:

> After all, the average person can hardly be regarded as a paragon of virtue when it comes to heavy drinking.

Statutory provisions

The *Workers Compensation Act* places stringent limits on the recovery of common law damages from an employer, except where the claim is the result of a motor accident. Section 151G disallows any award of common law damages except that which arises out of past and future losses from impairment to income-earning capacity. In order to qualify for any right to claim, the plaintiff must have been assessed with a degree of permanent impairment of at least 15%: s 151H.

Any amount by which the plaintiff's net weekly earnings exceed or are likely to exceed the amount of gross weekly compensation payments payable under s 34 of the Act is to be disregarded: s 151I. Damages are payable only to pension age as defined by the *Social Security Act* 1991: s 151IA.

No damages for pure mental harm, or nervous shock, may be claimed where the injury was not a work injury: s 151AD. This provision disallows any claim for nervous shock by, for instance, a relative of an injured worker.

Damages are not to be reduced on account of contributory negligence to the extent that the amount awarded is less than the court's estimate of the value of the plaintiff's entitlements by way of commutation of weekly payments of compensation: s 151N.

The defence of voluntary assumption of risk is not available to a claim under the Act but damages are to be adjusted to take account of the plaintiff's negligence: s 151O.

The *Civil Liability Act* limits an award of damages for past or future income loss by providing that the court must disregard any amount by which the plaintiff's gross weekly earnings exceed average weekly total earnings of all employees in NSW in the most recent quarter prior to the date of the award as published by the Australian Statistician: s 12.

In respect of future income loss, s 13 requires a plaintiff to establish assumptions about earning capacity that accord with his or her most likely future circumstances but for the injury. The calculation based on those assumptions must be discounted against the possibility that those circumstances might not eventuate. The court is required to state the assumptions on which the award is based and the percentage by which it has been adjusted. The same provision appears in s 126 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*.

In *Coles Supermarkets Australia Pty Ltd v Fardous* [2015] NSWCA 82 Macfarlan JA said that the requirements of s 13 of the *Civil Liability Act* were in accordance with the principles established in *Purkess v Crittenden* (1965) 114 CLR 164 and *Morvatjou v Moradkhani* [2013] NSWCA 157, namely that a plaintiff at all times bears the onus of proof of the extent of injury and of consequential loss of income-earning capacity. They accorded also with the two-stage process of assessment described in *Malec v J C Hutton Pty Ltd* (1990) 169 CLR 638 that required a plaintiff to establish his or her theoretical earning capacity but for injury and the extent to which that earning capacity would, but for injury, have been productive of income.

Notwithstanding these requirements, common law principles relating to the assessment of income loss, vicissitudes or contingencies continue to apply: *Taupau v HVAC Constructions (Qld) Pty Ltd*, above, where Beazley JA said ss 12 and 13 made no change to the common law principles, established in *Graham v Baker* and *Medlin v SGIO*, that damages for economic loss, past and future, are awarded for impairment to economic capacity resulting from the injury, provided the impairment is productive of income loss.

The *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* provides in s 125 for a limit on the weekly amount that may be awarded for income losses. The amount of the cap is indexed annually with effect from 1 October in each year. Section 130 requires the court to deduct from payments on account of income loss expenses paid to the plaintiff under the *Victims Compensation Act 1996* (repealed, now *Victims Rights and Support Act* 2013) or by the insurer or Nominal Defendant.

As to the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017, see [7-0085] under the subheading **Economic loss**.

The problems presented to a court in meeting the requirements of s 13 *Civil Liability Act* have been the subject of judicial comment in many decisions. In *MacArthur Districts Motor Cycle Sportsmen Inc v Ardizzone* [2004] NSWCA 145, Hodgson J noted that s 13 appeared to make no provision for the contingency that a plaintiff's income might increase significantly. He said it was doubtful that the court could make allowance as in *Norris v Blake (No 2)*, above, for the prospect of superstardom.

Hodgson J also expressed doubt about the power to award a lump sum or buffer when assessing income loss under s 13. This concern was put to rest in *Dunbar v Brown* [2004] NSWCA 103 where the court held that a buffer could be allowed to account for absences from work from time to time to allow for periods of respite or treatment. This principle has been applied in a number of subsequent decisions, including *Allianz Australia Insurance Ltd v Kerr* (2012) 83 NSWLR 302 where McColl JA said at [30]:

> there is a point (which may be differently assessed by different courts) beyond which the selection of a figure for economic loss is so fraught with uncertainty that the preferred course is to award a lump sum as a "buffer", without engaging in an artificial exercise of commencing with a precise figure, and reducing it by a precise percentage.

Each statute provides for the net present value of any lump sums paid on account of future income loss to be discounted at a prescribed rate, currently 5%: *Workers Compensation Act*, s 151J; *Civil Liability Act*, s 14; *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*, s 127.

Superannuation

The maximum recoverable for the loss of employer contributed superannuation is that required by law to be paid by the employer: *Civil Liability Act*, s 15C.

In general terms, where a claimant is injured during their working life, what is awarded in relation to superannuation benefits is the net present value of the court's best estimate of the fund that the claimant would have had at the date of retirement but for the injury; namely, a fund which would have generated the "lost" superannuation benefits. The capital asset that is being valued (because it is lost) is the present value of the future rights: *Amaca Pty Ltd v Latz* (2018) 92 ALJR 579 at [97] applying *Zorom Enterprises Pty Ltd v Zabow* (2007) 71 NSWLR 354 at [54], [59], [66]–[67]. The loss suffered is the diminution in value of the asset: *Amaca Pty Ltd v Latz* at [97].

In *Amaca Pty Ltd v Latz*, the respondent, who had retired, was in receipt of a superannuation pension and the Commonwealth age pension when diagnosed with terminal malignant mesothelioma. The Full Court of the Supreme Court of South Australia held the value of both pensions were compensable losses, but reduced the award to take into account a reversionary pension payable to his partner after death under the *Superannuation Act* 1988 (SA), s 38(1)(a). The High Court by majority held that the Full Court was correct to include in the damages award an allowance for the superannuation pension that he would have received for the remainder of his pre-illness life expectancy, less the reversionary pension. The majority held that that his superannuation benefits are a "capital asset", which has a present value, and which can be quantified: at [101]. As a result of the respondent's injury caused by the appellant, he would suffer an economic loss in respect of his superannuation pension, which is a capital asset and intrinsically connected to earning capacity. That loss was both certain and measurable by reference to the terms of the *Superannuation Act* — the net present value of the superannuation pension for the remainder of his pre-illness life expectancy, a further 16 years, and he should be entitled to recover that loss: at [109]. The age pension however is neither a part of remuneration, nor a capital asset. It is not a result of, or intrinsically connected to, a person's capacity to earn and no sum should be allowed on account of the age pension in the calculation of damages for the respondent's personal injuries: at [115].

In *Najdovski v Cinojlovic* (2008) 72 NSWLR 728 the court, by majority, confirmed the adopted practice of awarding 9% if the calculation is based on a gross earning figure or 11% if calculated on earning, net of tax.

The Fox v Wood component

This element of income loss arises in situations where a plaintiff has received weekly payments for loss of income under the workers compensation legislation upon which tax has been paid. The plaintiff when recovering common law damages is required to repay to the workers compensation insurer the gross amount of weekly payments received. The tax paid on those weekly payment was held to be recoverable in *Fox v Wood* (1981) 148 CLR 438 at 441.

[7-0060] Out-of-pocket expenses

Medical care and aids

Out-of-pocket expenses incurred by a plaintiff are recoverable to the extent that they are:

- reasonably incurred, and
- expended in the treatment of injuries arising out of the accident that is the basis for the claim.

In many cases where liability is not in issue, the insurer will pay for or reimburse out-of-pocket expenses that meet these requirements. Section 83 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* obliges an insurer, when liability is admitted in whole or in part, to meet the plaintiff's reasonable expenses of medical care, rehabilitation and certain respite and attendant care services. Payment of these expenses is commonly raised as a defence to a claim.

In general, claims for out-of-pocket expenses centre on needs for treatment, past and future, rehabilitation and aids to assist a plaintiff in overcoming disability arising from injury. As with

income loss, in determining the amount to be awarded, it is often necessary to take account of future requirements for treatment, particularly in the case of orthopaedic injuries that may involve ongoing degeneration and the need for surgery for fusion or replacement of joints.

The assessment for future needs involves consideration of the following:

- has the requirement been established as a probability?
- when is the expense likely to be incurred?
- the extent to which treatment will affect income-earning capacity, so that loss of income may have to be taken into account
- in a plaintiff of relative youth, the extent to which surgery may need to be repeated.

Aids to assist in overcoming disability include items such as artificial limbs, crutches, wheelchairs and special footwear as well as the costs of providing or modifying accommodation to meet the plaintiff's needs. In addition, allowance may be made for the cost of providing special beds, tools or equipment designed to assist an impaired plaintiff in the functions of everyday living.

Section 3 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* includes in the definition of "injury" damage to artificial members, eyes or teeth, crutches and other aids or spectacle glasses. Thus, the cost of repair or replacement of these items is compensable. Other items held to be compensable include clothing damaged in the course of the accident or treatment.

As to the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017, see [7-0085].

The fact that the treatment fails or is ineffective does not preclude recovery (*Lamb v Winston (No 1)* [1962] QWN 18) but the cost of experimental treatment that offers no cure will not be recoverable. *Neal v CSR Ltd* (1990) ATR ¶81-052 held that the cost of a treatment that remained at trial stage was disallowed.

The issue of whether an expense could be regarded as reasonable was discussed in *Egan v Mangarelli* [2013] NSWCA 413. The plaintiff claimed the considerable cost of a C-leg prosthesis, a specialised computerised device. He explained that he did not, prior to trial, use his conventional prosthesis regularly or for extended periods because it caused him pain. The cost of the C-leg prosthesis was held to be reasonable because, properly fitted, it would reduce the plaintiff's pain, lead to greater use and improve his mobility.

McKenzie v Wood [2015] NSWCA 142 dealt with the issue of whether the plaintiff should recover the cost of a hip replacement. The evidence established that prior to his accident, the plaintiff suffered from symptoms of osteoarthritis and it was inevitable that he would at some stage require hip replacement that could have been undertaken in a public hospital at no expense to him. The Court of Appeal accepted that the replacement that would have been required as a result of the pre-accident progressive condition was unlikely to involve the urgent intervention necessitated by the injury suffered in the accident. Accordingly the plaintiff was entitled to recover the cost.

The capital costs of modifications to accommodation to meet the needs of a disabled plaintiff are recognised as recoverable out-of-pocket expenses and no allowance is to be made for the increase in the capital value of a property modified for that purpose: *Marsland v Andjelic* (1993) 31 NSWLR 162. In most cases, the cost of the basic accommodation itself is not recoverable. In *Weideck v Williams* [1991] NSWCA 346, the court said this was not a strict rule and that, in accordance with the principles of *Todorvic v Waller* (1981) 150 CLR 402, each case was to be decided on its facts. In *Weideck*, the injured plaintiff could no longer live in the caravan he occupied prior to his injury. He was allowed the full capital costs of modifications required to deal with his disability. In addition, he was allowed the costs of land and a basic house, heavily discounted to set off the rent he otherwise would have continued to pay and the income that ordinarily would have been diverted to the provision of a capital asset, such as a house.

The majority in the High Court in *Cattanach v Melchior* (2003) 215 CLR 1 awarded damages for the cost of raising and maintaining a child born as the result of medical negligence. The right to damages of this nature has since been withdrawn by s 71(1) *Civil Liability Act*, except where the child suffers from a disability. In such circumstances, the additional costs of rearing and maintaining the child are recoverable.

Attendant care

There are two varieties of attendant care: those that are provided by friends or family on a gratuitous basis and those that are commercially provided and paid for. As with all heads of damage, a plaintiff may recover compensation for the loss of capacity for self and domestic care only if the need for the care arises out of injuries suffered as a result of the defendant's negligence and provided that the amount claimed is reasonable.

The issue that has been most productive of judicial and legislative scrutiny is that arising out of claims for services provided on a gratuitous basis.

The High Court in *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer* (1977) 139 CLR 161 dealt with the issue of whether a plaintiff could be said to have suffered a compensable loss when her attendant care needs of a domestic and nursing nature were met by an unpaid third party and to whom she owed no obligation of payment. The argument was that the loss was in truth suffered by the person who provided the services. Gibbs CJ at [12], discarding prior authority, said that damages for gratuitously provided services were payable if three conditions were met.

1. It was reasonably necessary to provide the services.
2. It would be reasonably necessary to do so at a cost.
3. The character of the benefit that the plaintiff received by the gratuitous provision of services was such that it ought to be brought to the account of the wrongdoer.

Mason J at [30] set out the principle upon which compensation was payable to the plaintiff rather than the volunteer as follows:

> The respondent's relevant loss is his incapacity to look after himself as demonstrated by the need for nursing services and this loss is to be quantified by reference to the value or cost of providing those services. The fact that a relative or stranger to the proceedings is or may be prepared to provide the services gratuitously is not a circumstance which accrues to the advantage of the appellant. If a relative or stranger moved by charity or goodwill towards the respondent does him a favour as a disabled person then it is only right that the respondent should reap the benefit rather than the wrongdoer whose negligence has occasioned the need for the nursing service to be provided.

The issue in *Van Gervan v Fenton* (1992) 175 CLR 327 was the basis upon which this element of compensation was to be valued. In a majority decision, the High Court rejected the argument that the plaintiff's loss of capacity was to be valued by reference to the income lost by the person providing gratuitous services. Mason CJ, Toohey and McHugh JJ said at [16] that the true basis of a claim was the need of the plaintiff for gratuitous services and the plaintiff did not have to establish that the need was or might be productive of income loss. The value of the plaintiff's loss, they said, was the ordinary market cost of providing the services.

Kars v Kars (1996) 187 CLR 354, where the defendant was the plaintiff's husband and provided attendant care services, involved the argument that the defendant thereby met his obligations as a tortfeasor and no further compensation could be recovered. In rejecting the argument, the High Court confirmed that *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer* principles are directed at the loss of capacity suffered by a plaintiff and that, although the resulting need for care is quantified by reference to what the care provider does, the focus remains on the plaintiff's needs.

Justices Toohey, McHugh, Gummow and Kirby said:

> The plaintiff might, or might not, reimburse the provider. According to the repeated authority of this Court, contractual or other legal liability apart, whether the plaintiff actually reimburses the provider is entirely a matter between the injured plaintiff and the provider.

…

> The starting point to explain our conclusion is a clear recollection of the principle that the Court is not concerned, as such, to quantify a plaintiff's loss or even to explore the moral or legal obligations to a care provider. It is, as has been repeatedly stated, to provide the injured plaintiff with damages as compensation for his or her need, as established by the evidence. The fact that a defendant fulfils the function of providing services does not, as such, decrease in the slightest the plaintiff's need.

In *CSR v Eddy* (2005) 226 CLR 1, the High Court noted at [26] that the *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer* principles were anomalous and controversial. The anomaly arose from the departure from the general rule that damages, other than damages for loss not measurable in money, were not recoverable unless the injury involved resulted in actual financial loss. The controversy arose because the result could be disproportionately large awards when compared to sums payable under traditional heads of damage.

These principles were confirmed in *Hornsby Shire Council v Viscardi* [2015] NSWCA 417 and *Smith v Alone* [2017] NSWCA 287. In *Smith* Macfarlan JA at [75]–[77] referred to authority that supported the proposition that consideration must be given to a plaintiff's family circumstances in deciding whether the provider of gratuitous care will continue to do so in the future. He also accepted that in appropriate circumstances a deduction for vicissitudes might be appropriate when assessing a claim for attendant care costs.

Legislative provisions

The legislation that attempts to address the concerns expressed by the High Court appears in ss 15, 15A and 15B *Civil Liability Act* at and in ss 141B, 141C and 142 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*. There are some substantial differences between these provisions. The *Civil Liability Act* sets out in s 15(1) definitions of attendant care services and gratuitous attendant care services and, in s 15(2) specifies the conditions to be satisfied to qualify for compensation, namely: a reasonable need for the services, a need created solely because of the injury to which the damages relate, and services that would not be provided but for the injury.

Both statutes impose a threshold on the recovery of damages that requires that not less than six hours per week be provided for a period of at least six consecutive months: s 15(3) *Civil Liability Act*; s 141B(3) *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*. In each case the maximum amount recoverable is set, where services are provided for more than 40 hours per week at the weekly sum that is the Australian Statistician's estimate of the average weekly total earnings of all employees in NSW, and where the weekly requirement is less than 40 hours, at the hourly rate that is one-fortieth of this figure: s 15(4) *Civil Liability Act*, s 141B(4) *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*.

As to the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017, see [7-0085].

In *Hill v Forrester* (2010) 79 NSWLR 470, the Court of Appeal confirmed that both requirements of s 15(3), as amended following the decision in *Harrison v Melham* (2008) 72 NSWLR 380, must be met in order to qualify for compensation. The issue in *Hill v Forrester* was whether the right to compensation applied to services provided before the threshold of six hours per week of care over a period of six consecutive months was met. Sackville AJA held that only one six-month qualifying period was involved and it was not a continuing requirement. The result was that compensation was payable for services provided both before and after the threshold requirements were met.

The *Civil Liability Act* contains no equivalent provision to s 141C *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* where specific provision is made for the cost of reasonable and necessary respite care for a seriously injured plaintiff who is in need of constant care. It is probable however that these services would be covered within the definitions of attendant care services in s 15(1).

As to services that would have been provided in any event, the High Court in *Van Gervan v Fenton*, above, recognised that in the ordinary course of a marriage there is an element of give and take in the provision of mutually beneficial services. Deane and Dawson JJ at [4] said:

> The qualification is that such services will be taken out of the area of the ordinary give-and-take of marriage to the extent that the injuries to the wife or husband preclude her or him from providing

> any countervailing services. To that extent, the continuing gratuitous services provided by the spouse assume a different character and should be treated as additional services which have been or will be provided by that spouse to look after the accident-caused needs of the injured plaintiff.

Ipp JA in *Teuma v CP & PK Judd Pty Ltd* [2007] NSWCA 166 at [64] noted that this part of the minority judgment supported the majority in *Van Gervan* to the effect that no reduction should be made to attendant care damages to take account of the mutual obligations of family life.

White v Benjamin [2015] NSWCA 75 involved issues of the extent to which the time required to meet the need for attendant services could be determined separately from the needs of a household as a whole. The principle accepted by both Beazley ACJ and Basten JA was that where the elements of the claim were severable as between a plaintiff and those who also benefit from those services, no aspects of those services may be commingled for the purpose of determining whether the thresholds of six hours per week for a continuous period of six months have been met. Where those elements are not severable, the element of mutuality referred to in *Van Gervan v Fenton*, *CSR v Eddy*, above, *Hodges v Frost* (1984) 53 ALR 373 and *Coles Supermarkets Australia Pty Ltd v Haleluka* [2012] NSWCA 343, applied so that the commingled needs of a plaintiff remained the plaintiff's needs even if they were of mutual benefit.

Basten JA pointed out that s 15 of the *Civil Liability Act* did not apply to claims made under the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* where they were dealt with in s 141B which did not mirror exactly the provisions of s 15. However, s 15B of the *Civil Liability Act* applied to motor accident claims so that it was necessary to distinguish between damages awarded for the plaintiff's personal loss and those awarded for the loss of capacity to provide services to dependents and to apply the six hour/six month thresholds separately to each claim.

Nor is it permissible to aggregate the needs created by successive breaches of duty, for example, where those needs are generated by successive accidents, in order to meet the threshold requirements of the legislation: *Muller v Sanders* (1995) 21 MVR 309; *Falco v Aiyaz* [2015] NSWCA 202.

The question of whether the need for services was generated solely by the relevant injury was dealt with in *Woolworths Ltd v Lawlor* [2004] NSWCA 209 where it was argued that the plaintiff had a pre-existing asymptomatic degenerative condition that might at some later stage produce symptoms and generate the need for services. Thus, it was argued, the need for services did not arise solely out of the aggravation of the condition for which the defendant was responsible. Beazley JA, although she said the section was not without difficulty, preferred a construction that was based on the definition of injury. This included impairment of a person's physical or mental condition so that gratuitous services provided solely as a result of such an injury, although an aggravation, were compensable. The same approach to this requirement was taken in *Basha v Vocational Capacity Centre Pty Ltd* [2009] NSWCA 409; *Angel v Hawkesbury City Council* [2008] NSWCA 130 and *Westfield Shoppingtown Liverpool v Jevtich* [2008] NSWCA 139.

Daly v Thiering (2013) 249 CLR 381 dealt with the issue of whether the plaintiff, a participant in the scheme established by the *Motor Accidents (Lifetime Care and Support) Act* 2006, was entitled to compensation for the gratuitous services provided by his mother. The plaintiff's mother agreed with the Lifetime Care and Support Authority to provide domestic services for the plaintiff without pay. Although recovery of damages for gratuitously provided services is regarded as compensation for the plaintiff's loss of capacity, the High Court held that the claim was for economic loss and was precluded by s 130A *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* (now repealed) for so long as the services were provided for under the scheme. It was irrelevant that the services provided by the plaintiff's mother without expense might result in a windfall to the Authority.

Commercially provided services

Where care is not provided on a gratuitous basis, the reasonable cost of reasonably required commercially provided services is recoverable both for the past and future: *Matcham v Lyons*

[2004] NSWCA 384. The issue of what was reasonable was dealt with in *Dang v Chea* [2013] NSWCA 80, where Garling J dealt with competing arguments concerning the services to be provided to the plaintiff who required 24-hour care. There was a considerable difference between the cost of 24-hour care in a rented apartment, as claimed by the plaintiff, and the cost of nursing-home care that the defendant argued would meet her reasonable requirements. Garling J rejected the plaintiff's contention after consideration of authority, including:

1. The test established by Barwick CJ in *Arthur Robinson (Grafton) Pty Ltd v Carter* (1968) 122 CLR 649 that the aim of an award of damages was not to meet the ideal requirements for an injured plaintiff but rather his or her reasonable requirements.
2. The following extract from the reasons of Windeyer J in *Chulcough v Holley* (1968) 41 ALJR 336 at 338:

> A plaintiff is only entitled to be recouped for such reasonable expenses as will reasonably be incurred as a result of the accident. What these are must depend upon all the circumstances of the case — including the particular plaintiff's way of life, prospects in life, family circumstances and so forth. It does not follow that every expenditure which might be advantageous for a plaintiff as an alleviation of his or her situation or which could give him or her happiness or satisfaction must be provided for by the tortfeasor.

3. The following extract from the reasons of Gibbs and Stephen JJ at 573 in *Sharman v Evans* (1977) 138 CLR 563:

> The touchstone of reasonableness in the case of the cost of providing nursing and medical care for the plaintiff in the future is, no doubt, cost matched against health benefits to the plaintiff. If cost is very great and benefits to health slight or speculative the cost-involving treatment will clearly be unreasonable, the more so if there is available an alternative and relatively inexpensive mode of treatment, affording equal or only slightly lesser benefits. When the factors are more evenly balanced no intuitive answer presents itself and the real difficulty of attempting to weigh against each other two incomparables, financial cost against relative health benefits to the plaintiff, becomes manifest.

Accepting that the need for care was demonstrated because, although the plaintiff continued to perform domestic tasks, he did so with difficulty, the court in *Berkeley Challenge Pty Ltd v Howarth* [2013] NSWCA 370 also accepted that his needs should be assessed on the basis that commercial services would be required after the plaintiff's family would no longer be available to care for him gratuitously. Tobias AJA rejected the argument, as without legal basis, that the court must be satisfied that the amount awarded would actually be spent. It was contrary to the authority of *Todorovic v Waller* (1981) CLR 402 at 412 that the court has no concern as to the manner in which a plaintiff uses the amount awarded.

In *Perisher Blue Pty Ltd v Nair-Smith* (2015) 320 ALR 235 the Court of Appeal accepted that the plaintiff was entitled to recover damages for the cost of commercially provided services at the established market rate rather than at the lower rate she paid for domestic assistance at the time of trial. The court continued its practice of preferring the commercial rate on the basis that it was not known how much longer the current service provider would continue to work at the lower rate.

Loss of capacity to care for others

In *Sullivan v Gordon* (1999) 47 NSWLR 319, the Court of Appeal held that the injured plaintiff was entitled to compensation for the lost capacity to care for a child on the same basis as that established in *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer*. This approach was set aside by the High Court in *CSR v Eddy* (2005) 226 CLR 1. The court reinstated the principles of *Burnicle v Cutelli* (1982) 2 NSWLR 26 that damages for loss of capacity to care for family members was compensable but as a component of general damages and not on *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer* principles.

Damages for the loss of capacity to provide domestic services are now dealt with in s 15B *Civil Liability Act*, a provision that applies also to claims brought under the *Motor Accidents*

Compensation Act, unless the care needs have been met through the *Motor Accidents (Lifetime Care and Support) Act* or payments made by the insurer under s 83 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*: s 15B(8), (9).

The section provides definitions of assisted care and dependants and in s 15B(2) lists four preconditions to the award of damages:

> (a) in the case of any dependants of the claimant of the kind referred to in paragraph (a) of the definition of "dependants" in subsection (1) — the claimant provided the services to those dependants before the time that the liability in respect of which the claim is made arose, and
>
> (b) the claimant's dependants were not (or will not be) capable of performing the services themselves by reason of their age or physical or mental incapacity, and
>
> (c) there is a reasonable expectation that, but for the injury to which the damages relate, the claimant would have provided the services to the claimant's dependants:
>
> (i) for at least 6 hours per week, and
>
> (ii) for a period of at least 6 consecutive months, and
>
> (d) there will be a need for the services to be provided for those hours per week and that consecutive period of time and that need is reasonable in all the circumstances.

These requirements received scrutiny in *State of NSW v Perez* (2013) 84 NSWLR 570. Recognising the ambiguities of s 15B(2)(b), Basten JA said that the activities of a plaintiff prior to the date at which the liability arose set the upper limit of what can be claimed, provided the other requirements of the section are met. On the question of what was reasonable in all the circumstances (s 15B(2)(d)), he said the qualification did not apply to the word "need" in isolation. It qualified and required that a need for six hours of care per week for six consecutive months be reasonable. It was therefore necessary to consider the particular needs of the dependants involved.

Macfarlan JA at [39] said it was irrelevant that other family members took over the role of providing care because that care would always have to be provided by some alternative means. The right to damages addressed the needs of the dependants that would, but for injury, have been satisfied by the claimant and the question of whether those needs were reasonable in the circumstances.

The thresholds of six hours per week for six consecutive months apply and damages are quantified by reference to the limits imposed by s 15(5). The balance of s 15B is directed at avoiding duplication in the award of compensation so that:

1. If damages are awarded under the section, the assessment of non-economic loss must not include an element to compensate for loss of capacity to provide services to others: s 15B(5).
2. Damages are not recoverable:
   - by the plaintiff, if the dependant has previously received compensation for the loss of capacity for self-care: s 15B(6), or
   - by a dependant for loss of capacity for self-care, if a plaintiff has previously recovered compensation for loss of capacity to provide those services: s 15B(7)
   - to the extent that gratuitous attendant care services, for which the plaintiff is compensated under s 15, also extend to the care of dependants: s 15B(10).
3. A plaintiff who participates in the Motor Accidents (Lifetime Care and Support) Scheme cannot recover under s 15B if services provided under the scheme include those provided to dependants: s 15B(8).
4. In respect of a claim under the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*, the plaintiff may not recover if payments in respect of services to dependants are made under s 83 of that Act: s 15B(9).
5. Other matters to be taken into account in the assessment of compensation are: the extent of the plaintiff's pre-injury capacity to provide services to dependants; the extent to which services provided pre-injury also benefited non-dependants; and vicissitudes: s 15B(11).

In *Amaca Pty Ltd v Novek* [2009] NSWCA 50, the plaintiff lived with her daughter and partner and cared for their two children while they worked. The defendant challenged the claim that the children were the plaintiff's dependants, arguing that the parents had partially delegated to her some of the moral and legal obligations for their care. Campbell JA, after reference to extensive authority dealing with the many aspects of dependency, said that the nature and extent of the care provided by the claimant to the children were such that a finding of dependence was open. On the same basis, he rejected the claim that the services were in fact provided to the parents and not to the children. Rejecting the claim that it was not reasonable nor within the intention of the legislation to compensate parents for the expense of providing childcare, Campbell JA said it was not clear that Parliament did not have this intention.

Liverpool City Council v Laskar (2010) 77 NSWLR 666 dealt with the situation where, prior to his injury, the plaintiff and his wife provided services in the nature of therapy for his profoundly disabled daughter. The defendant argued that these services were not services of a domestic nature so that they were not compensable. The defendant contrasted the definitions "attendant care services" contained in s 15 *Civil Liability Act* with the term "domestic services" appearing in the heading to s 15B. Whealy J rejected this argument. He said ss 15 and 15B addressed different objectives. Section 15B was directed, not at the care needs of an injured party, but the loss of capacity of a plaintiff to attend to the needs of dependants. Those needs, he said, should not be subjected to a restricted or narrow interpretation, they extended beyond cooking and cleaning to incorporate the very considerable personal care needs of young children and, as in this case, the needs of the plaintiff's daughter.

In contrast to ss 15, 15B does not cap the number of hours for which compensation may be provided. It caps only the hourly rate by which compensation is to be assessed. The plaintiff in *Amaca Pty Ltd v Phillips* [2014] NSWCA 249 provided 18 hours per day of care for his wife, who was suffering from dementia. Following his diagnosis with mesothelioma, he lost the capacity to provide this care, and his wife was admitted to a nursing home. The Court of Appeal upheld the award of compensation for 18 hours per day at the statutory hourly rate, rejecting the defendant's claim that the lesser cost of nursing home care should be adopted as the measure of damage and pointing out that compensation was awarded for the plaintiff's loss of capacity to provide services, not the value of those services to the recipient. Ward JA, delivering the judgment of the court, said the partial reinstatement of *Sullivan v Gordon* damages created a new statutory entitlement that did not require the plaintiff's loss of capacity to be measured by reference to the cost of providing alternative services, nor did it require account to be taken of how the plaintiff would spend the damages recovered in accordance with that entitlement.

The six hour/six month threshold must be separately assessed in respect of both the claim for the plaintiff's personal loss of capacity and to the claim of lost capacity to care for others: *White v Benjamin* [2015] NSWCA 75.

[7-0070] Compensation to relatives

The *Compensation to Relatives Act* provides for actions to be brought on behalf of dependants of deceased victims of compensable injury to recover for loss of financial support and funeral expenses. Only one such action may be brought so that all potential beneficiaries should be nominated as plaintiffs. Insurance, superannuation, payments from provident funds or statutory benefits are not to be taken into account in assessing an award of compensation: s 3(3). The definition of dependants appears in s 4.

De Sales v Ingrilli (2002) 212 CLR 338 involved the very similar provisions of the *Fatal Accidents Act* 1959 (WA) and concerned the extent to which a widow's prospects of remarriage were to be taken into account in the assessment of compensation. Although unanimously recognising changing social circumstances that cast doubt on prior authority, the High Court was divided on the issue. The majority, Gaudron, Gummow, Hayne JJ and Kirby J decided that the prospect of remarriage

should not be considered separately from the general, and similarly unpredictable, vicissitudes of life unless at the time of the trial there was evidence of an established new relationship. Kirby J referred to the uncertainty, distaste, cause of humiliation and judicial inconsistency likely to arise in determining the claimant's prospects of remarriage.

Gleeson CJ, McHugh and Callinan JJ said that the prospects of remarriage should be taken into account. Gleeson CJ accepted that this contingency should be dealt with when determining an appropriate adjustment for vicissitudes. He questioned the continued use of the term dependency to describe the right to compensation when, in modern society, it was common for both parties to a relationship to earn income and to have the capacity for financial self-support. He accepted, however, that each party to the relationship might have expectations of direct financial support. He also said that all elements involved in the calculation of compensation involved some speculation, including the benefits the deceased would be expected to bring to the family, the share that might be enjoyed by each dependent during the deceased's lifetime and the period of support reasonably expected by each claimant. Allowances for contingencies, he said, might take into account the deceased's health or evidence of a failing marriage.

McHugh J thought that failing to take into account the prospects of remarriage presented a danger of providing a windfall to the surviving spouse. He pointed to the anomaly involved in taking into account an established new relationship at the time of trial while making no allowance for repartnering when there was none.

In *Taylor v Owners – SP No 11564* (2014) 306 ALR 547, the High Court rejected the claim that the loss of financial support occasioned by the death of the principal income earner should be limited by the cap provided for in s 12(2) *Civil Liability Act*. They pointed out that s 125(2) *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* and the *Workers Compensation Act* referred to the deceased person's earnings and the deceased worker's earnings, terms that were not used in the *Civil Liability Act* and therefore could not be read into that Act.

The Court of Appeal, in *Norris v Routley* [2016] NSWCA 367, considered the question of an adjustment of the personal consumption figures set out in Table 9.1 "Percentage of dependency of surviving parent and children" in H Luntz, *Assessment of Damages for Personal Injury and Death*, 4th edn, Butterworths, Sydney, 2002, at [9.3.3] on the basis that the appellant's deceased husband lived frugally. Having reviewed the principles involved the court concluded that there was no legal rule that prescribed the way in which the proportion of the deceased's consumption of the household income was to be proved. This was a factor to be proved in the usual way and there was no special legal or evidentiary status attaching to the Luntz tables.

[7-0080] Servitium

The cause of action actio per quod servitium amisit was abolished in claims arising out of motor accidents by s 142 *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*. The *Civil Liability Act* makes no reference to actions of this nature. The question of whether, nevertheless, the Act applied to claims of this nature was considered by Howie J in *Chaina v The Presbyterian Church (NSW) Property Trust* (2007) 69 NSWLR 533. He held that the limits on recovery of lost income provided for in s 12 did not apply.

The High Court was asked, in *Barclay v Penberthy* (2012) 246 CLR 258, to consider whether the per quod claims had been absorbed into the law of negligence and no longer existed as separate causes of action. They answered in the negative, the plurality pointing out:

1. The action was available when:
   - the injury to an employee was wrongful, that is when injury was inflicted intentionally or through a breach of the duty of care to the employee, not to the employer, and
   - the result was that the employer was deprived of the services of the employee.
2. It was not an exception or variation to the law of negligence but remained a distinct cause of action.

See also *Chaina v Presbyterian Church (NSW) Property Trust (No 25)* [2014] NSWSC 518 Davies J at [623]–[632].

On the issue of the measure of damages available in per quod actions, the court in *Barclay v Penberthy*, above, at [57] adopted the following from H McGregor, *McGregor on Damages*, 13th edn, Sweet & Maxwell Ltd, UK, 1972 at [1167]:

> the market value of the services, which will generally be calculated by the price of the substitute less the wages the master is no longer required to pay the servant.

The court indicated that caution should be exercised in expanding the scope of recoverable damages in such actions and confirmed that they did not extend to loss of profits or recovery of sick pay, pension or medical expenses payable to the employee.

[7-0085] Motor Accident Injuries Act 2017

The *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017 applies to motor accidents that occur after 1 December 2017 and provides for compensation by way of *statutory benefits* and *damages* defined in s 1.4(1) as:

> "statutory benefits" means statutory benefits payable under Pt 3.
>
> "damages" means damages (within the meaning of the *Civil Liability Act* 2002) in respect of the death of or injury to a person caused by the fault of the owner or driver of a motor vehicle in the use or operation of the vehicle, but does not include statutory benefits.

Statutory benefits provide for compensation in the form of income loss; medical and other treatment expenses and attendant care services. The regime for the payment of statutory benefits for medical expenses and attendant care services applies to all claims. The statutory benefits payable for income loss extend to those claims that do not proceed to claims assessment or court.

Part 4 of the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* deals with awards of damages by a court and the assessment of damages by a claims assessor in respect of motor accidents. It provides for modified common law damages.

Court proceedings may only be commenced in the circumstances provided for in s 6.31; namely when the Principal Claims Assessor certifies that the claim is exempt from assessment. A certificate may be issued when:

1. it is exempted from assessment by regulation: s 7.34(1)(a)
2. a claims assessor with the approval of the Principal Claims Assessor determines that the claim is not suitable for assessment: s 7.34(1)(b)
3. in the case of a finding on liability by a claims assessor, any party does not accept the assessment: s 7.38(1) or,
4. where liability is not in issue, a claimant fails to accept the assessment of quantum within 21 days of the issue of the claims assessor's certificate: s 7.38(2).

The only *damages* that may be awarded are those that compensate for economic loss as permitted by Div 4.2 and for non-economic loss as permitted by Div 4.3.

Courts and claims assessors are no longer concerned with assessment of damages for minor injuries defined in s 1.6 as:

> (1) For the purposes of this Act, a "minor injury" is any one or more of the following:
>
> (a) a soft tissue injury,
>
> (b) a minor psychological or psychiatric injury.

(2) A "soft tissue injury" is (subject to this section) an injury to tissue that connects, supports or surrounds other structures or organs of the body (such as muscles, tendons, ligaments, menisci, cartilage, fascia, fibrous tissues, fat, blood vessels and synovial membranes), but not an injury to nerves or a complete or partial rupture of tendons, ligaments, menisci or cartilage.

(3) A "minor psychological or psychiatric injury" is (subject to this section) a psychological or psychiatric injury that is not a recognised psychiatric illness.

…

This definition is amplified in cl 4 of the *Motor Accident Injuries Regulation* 2017 as follows:

Meaning of "minor injury" (section 1.6(4) of the Act)

(1) An injury to a spinal nerve root that manifests in neurological signs (other than radiculopathy) is included as a soft tissue injury for the purposes of the Act.

(2) Each of the following injuries is included as a minor psychological or psychiatric injury for the purposes of the Act:

(a) acute stress disorder,

(b) adjustment disorder.

…

(3) In this clause "acute stress disorder" and "adjustment disorder" have the same meanings as in the document entitled *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)*, published by the American Psychiatric Association in May 2013.

Nor are they concerned with expenses incurred for "treatment and care" or "attendant care services". In s 1.4(1) of the *Motor Accident Injuries Act*, "treatment and care" is defined as:

(a) medical treatment (including pharmaceuticals),

(b) dental treatment,

(c) rehabilitation,

(d) ambulance transportation,

(e) respite care,

(f) attendant care services,

(g) aids and appliances,

(h) prostheses,

(i) education and vocational training,

(j) home and transport modification,

(k) workplace and educational facility modifications,

(l) such other kinds of treatment, care, support or services as may be prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition,

but does not include any treatment, care, support or services of a kind declared by the regulations to be excluded from this definition.

"Attendant care services" are defined in s 1.4(1) as:

… services that aim to provide assistance to people with everyday tasks, and includes (for example) personal assistance, nursing, home maintenance and domestic services.

These expenses are dealt with through the statutory benefits regime. The Act expressly provides that no compensation is payable for gratuitous attendant care, leaving open the question of whether

the loss of capacity to provide these services remains for assessment under the umbrella of non-economic loss: see discussion in *Griffiths v Kerkemeyer* (1977) 139 CLR 161; *Kars v Kars* (1996) 187 CLR 354.

Economic loss

There is little change to the parameters for the assessment of loss of capacity to earn income: see [7-0050]. Section 4.5 limits awards for economic loss as follows:

> (1) The only damages that may be awarded for economic loss are (subject to this Division [Div 4.2]):
>
> (a) damages for past or future economic loss due to loss of earnings or the deprivation or impairment of earning capacity, and
>
> (b) damages for costs relating to accommodation or travel (not being the cost of treatment and care) of a kind prescribed by the regulations, and
>
> (c) damages for the cost of the financial management of damages that are awarded, and
>
> (d) damages by way of reimbursement for income tax paid or payable on statutory benefits or workers compensation benefits arising from the injury that are required to be repaid on an award of damages to which this Part [Pt 4] applies.

These limits do not apply to awards of damages in claims brought under the *Compensation to Relatives Act* 1897. Those claims are effectively unchanged by the *Motor Accident Injuries Act*.

Income loss is permitted only up to the maximum weekly statutory benefits amount, notwithstanding that this is a gross earnings amount: s 4.6(2). This amount is adjusted annually on 1 October: see Motor Accident Injuries (Indexation) Order 2017. Credit must be given for any weekly payments made under the statutory benefits provisions: see s 3.40 for the effect of recovery of damages on statutory benefits.

Superannuation contributions are recoverable at the minimum percentages required by law to be paid as employer superannuation contributions s 4.6(3).

Section 4.7 mirrors s 126 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999 in requiring that the claimant satisfy the court or claims assessor of assumptions on which future losses may be calculated (s 4.7(1)); that the court state the assumptions that form the basis for the award (s 4.7(2)); and, the relevant percentage by which economic loss damages have been adjusted (s 4.7(3)).

The discount rate continues to be 5%, unless adjusted by the regulations: see s 4.9(2)(b).

Non-economic loss

Assessment of non-economic loss remains essentially unchanged: see [7-0020].

The threshold of 10% as the degree of permanent impairment continues to apply: see s 1.7(1). The assessment is made by a medical assessor and remains binding on the court or claims assessor, except in the limited circumstances provided for s 7.23. They are the same as those set out in s 61 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*.

A maximum amount continues to apply, adjusted annually on 1 October: s 4.13 of the *Motor Accident Injuries Act*.

The provisions relating to mitigation in s 4.15 are the same as those in s 136 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*. Those relating to the payment of interest in s 4.16 of the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* are essentially the same as s 137 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*.

Contributory negligence

Section 4.17 of the *Motor Accident Injuries Act* repeats the provisions of s 138 of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* when dealing with the circumstances in which a finding of contributory negligence must be made with the addition of a provision to include other conduct as prescribed

by regulation: see [7-0030]. Section 4.17(3) leaves the assessment of the percentage reduction for contributory negligence to the discretion of the court of claims assessor, except where the regulations fix a percentage in respect of specified conduct. At this stage this aspect remains unregulated.

Miscellaneous

Provisions concerning voluntary assumption of risk (s 4.18) (see [7-0030]) and exemplary and punitive damages (s 4.20) (see [7-0110]) are unchanged.

Blameless accidents are now referred to as *no-fault motor accidents*. They are dealt with in the same way under Pt 5 of the *Motor Accident Injuries Act*: see [7-0030].

[7-0090] Funds management

In *Gray v Richards* (2014) 88 ALJR 968 the High Court, dealing with a claim under the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*, confirmed that, in ordinary circumstances, a plaintiff is not entitled to recover the cost of managing the fund comprised by a lump sum award of damages. This was because those costs are not the consequence of the plaintiff's injury. The court also confirmed the principles of *Nominal Defendant v Gardikiotis* (1996) 186 CLR 49 and *Willett v Futcher* (2005) 221 CLR 627, namely, that damages of this nature may be recovered where the plaintiff's intellectual capacity was impaired by injury to the point of putting the plaintiff in need of assistance in managing the fund.

The issues in *Gray v Richards*, above, were whether the right of recovery extended to the cost of managing the sum awarded for management of the fund (the fund management damages issue) and whether it extended to the cost of managing the predicted future income of the managed fund (the fund management on fund income issue).

In dealing with the fund management damages issue, the court referred to s 127(1)(d) of the Act entitling a plaintiff, without imposing a limit, to compensation for loss that was referable to a liability to incur expense in the future. The court held that s 127(1)(d) invited assessment of the present value of all future outgoings based on evidence that established likely future expenditure. Expenses of fund management by whatever trust company was appointed were to be included in this assessment.

The court rejected the claim for the costs of fund management on fund income. They said s 127 did not alter the principles expressed in *Todorovic v Waller* (1981) CLR 402.

1. Having applied the discount rate to damages awarded to cover future loss no further allowance should be made. It was inconsistent with this comprehensive dismissal of any further allowance to suggest that the cost of managing the income generated by the fund to ensure that it maintains a net income at a given rate was a compensable loss.
2. The capital and income of the lump sum award for future economic loss would be exhausted at the end of the period over which that loss was expected to be incurred.
3. The cost of managing the income generated by the fund was not an integral part of the plaintiff's loss arising out of injury. It would be contrary to the principles of *Todorovic v Waller*, above, to assume that the fund would generate income that would be reinvested and swell the corpus under management, an assumption that could not be made when drawings from the fund might exceed its income.

[7-0100] The Workers Compensation Act 1987, s 151Z

The provisions of s 151Z are somewhat complex. They relate to situations in which a party other than an injured worker's employer is wholly or partly responsible for the injury suffered by the worker.

It deals with the mechanism by which an employer (effectively the workers compensation insurer) is able to recover from a third party workers compensation paid to a worker, either out of damages awarded to the worker in common law proceedings brought against the third party, or by a separate action in the employer's own right. The employer's action arises under the indemnity provided for in s 151Z(1)(d).

It also deals in s 151Z(2) with situations where a worker brings a claim at common law against a third party in circumstances where the third party and the employer are joint tortfeasors. In such actions, the worker may or may not join the employer. The provision applies where the worker takes or is entitled to take proceedings against both the third person and the employer: ss 151Z(2)(a) and (b).

Campbell JA described the circumstances in which it became necessary to provide for adjustment as provided for in s 151Z(2) in *J Blackwood & Son v Skilled Engineering* [2008] NSWCA 142. The need arose because, upon the introduction of the scheme for modification of the common law rights of a worker against an employer, it was no longer possible to determine the respective liabilities of an employer and a third party by reference simply to the proportions in which they were held to be responsible for the damage suffered by the employee.

The provisions of the section have generated discussion concerning the circumstances in which a worker becomes entitled to bring proceedings; the process for determination of the employer's contribution; and the manner in which the third party's proportion of damages is to be calculated.

Entitlement

The right of a worker to recover common law damages against an employer has been increasingly limited to the point where, commonly, no rights exist. Under the current scheme a worker must be assessed as having suffered a degree of impairment of at least 15%: s 151H. If that threshold is met, the worker's right to recover damages is limited to loss of income-earning capacity. If the threshold is not met, there is no right of recovery of any common law damages against the employer. This outcome has prompted the argument that there is no entitlement to take proceedings against the employer.

The Court of Appeal has consistently rejected this argument. The construction adopted in *Grljak v Trivan Pty Ltd (In liq)* (1994) 35 NSWLR 82 at 88 held that the term entitlement in s 151Z(2)(b) referred to the right to take proceedings and not to a right to recover damages. Once established that an employer owed a duty of care that was breached, causing loss to the plaintiff, the entitlement was established. The right to recover damages was irrelevant: *Izzard v Dunbier Marine Products (NSW) Pty Ltd* [2012] NSWCA 132.

Calculation of the employer's contribution

To determine the amount of an employer's contribution, it is necessary to calculate what the worker would recover against the employer under the modified common law provisions of the *Workers Compensation Act*. In *J Blackwood & Son v Skilled Engineering*, above, at [40] Campbell JA pointed out that ss 151Z(1)(d) and 151Z(2)(d) required that a contribution be calculated in accordance with the modified common law provisions of the Act and not that damages be assessed in accordance with those provisions.

A worker who takes action against the employer must undergo medical assessment to determine if the threshold of impairment of at least 15% is met and the process of calculation is relatively simple. A worker who does not join the employer cannot be compelled to undergo assessment. In those circumstances the calculation of the employer's contribution involves a hypothetical exercise analogous to that involved in dealing with professional negligence cases as outlined in *Johnson v Perez* (1988) 166 CLR 351: *Izzard v Dunbier Marine Products (NSW) Pty Ltd*, above, Macfarlan J at [117].

The court is required to undertake that exercise in accordance with the principles established by Pt 7 *Workplace Injury Management and Workers Compensation Act*. In so doing, it may rely on an assessment provided by a medical expert who has not been appointed under those provisions as an approved medical specialist, provided the assessment is made in accordance with WorkCover Guidelines as required by s 322(1) of the Act: *Berkeley Challenge Pty Ltd v Howarth* [2013] NSWCA 370.

The third party's contribution

The provisions of s 151Z(2) are designed to avoid the recovery by a worker, whose rights to recover damages from an employer are restricted, of the shortfall from a non-employer third party.

Having determined that the third party and the employer are jointly liable to the worker in damages (for example, in the sum of $100,000) and the appropriate percentage of responsibility to each of them is allocated (for example, 70% third party, 30% employer), the section therefore requires that the following steps be taken.

1. Calculate the contribution the third party would recover from the employer but for the modified common law provisions of the Act (the common law sum), in the example — $30,000.
2. Calculate the amount the worker would recover from the employer under the modified common law provisions of the Act, say — $15,000.
3. Apply to this amount the percentage representing the employer's share of responsibility (the modified common law sum), — $5,000.
4. Reduce the amount that the worker can recover from the third party by deducting from the modified common law sum the common law sum, $30,000–$5,000 = reduction of $25,000.

[7-0110] Punitive damages

No compensation in the nature of aggravated or exemplary damages is recoverable through claims made under the statutory schemes: *Workers Compensation Act,* s 151R; *Motor Accidents Compensation Act*, s 144; *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017 s 4.20; *Civil Liability Act*, ss 21, 26X. Damages under these heads remain available in the limited categories of personal injury claims that are not dealt with under these schemes.

It is very important to distinguish between aggravated and exemplary damages. In the past, courts have tended to award a single sum to account for both types of damage but it is now accepted that the better practice is to distinguish between amounts awarded under these heads and to provide reasons in each case.

In *Lamb v Cotogno* (1987) 164 CLR 1 the High Court drew the distinction between the compensatory nature of aggravated damages and the punitive and deterrent nature of exemplary damages.

A further explanation of the distinction is found in the judgment of Spigelman CJ in *State of NSW v Ibbett* (2005) 65 NSWLR 168 where he said at [83]:

> In this regard it is relevant to note that the matters to which I have referred as justifying an award of exemplary damages are also pertinent, as is often the case, to an award of aggravated damages. The difference is that in the case of aggravated damages the assessment is made from the point of view of the Plaintiff and in the case of exemplary damages the focus is on the conduct of the Defendant. Nevertheless, it is necessary, as I have noted above, to determine both heads of compensatory damages before deciding whether or not the quantum is such that a further award is necessary to serve the objectives of punishment or deterrence or, if it be a separate purpose, condemnation.

The award of damages under these heads is discretionary and caution is required to ensure that the circumstances in which they awarded are appropriate. In *Day v The Ocean Beach Hotel Shellharbour Pty Ltd* (2013) 85 NSWLR 335, Leeming JA noted that this discretionary quality conferred considerable leeway in the assessment of both aggravated and exemplary damages, although the assessment must bear some proportion to the circumstances to which it relates.

The extent to which the plaintiff provoked the assault by one of the defendants was the subject of consideration in *Tilden v Gregg* [2015] NSWCA 164 in the context of whether it was appropriate to award aggravated or exemplary damages. Meagher JA quoted from Salmon LJ in *Lane v Holloway* [1968] 1 QB 379 at 391 as follows:

> There is no doubt that if a plaintiff is saying: "This man has behaved absolutely disgracefully and I want exemplary damages because of his disgraceful conduct," when the court is considering how

> disgraceful the conduct was or whether it was disgraceful at all, it is material to see what provoked it. This is relevant to the question of whether or not exemplary damages should be awarded, and, if so, how much.

Meagher JA also noted that the defendant's assault on the plaintiff resulted in a criminal charge to which he entered a guilty plea. He referred to *Gray v Motor Accidents Commission* (1998) 196 CLR 1 at [46] in noting the principle that a civil court, when considering whether it was appropriate to award aggravated or exemplary damages, would ordinarily proceed on the basis that the criminal conviction and sentence of the assailant had adequately dealt with the elements of punishment and deterrence.

This principle was applied in *Cheng v Farjudi* (2016) 93 NSWLR 95; [2016] NSWCA 316 where Beazley P, with whom Ward JA and Harrison J agreed, having reviewed *Gray v Motor Accidents Commission*, above, and the many authorities in which these principles have been applied said at [87]:

> Accordingly, the position in Australia is that exemplary damages may not be awarded where substantial criminal punishment has been imposed. However, the High Court in *Gray* did not preclude an award of exemplary damages where something other than substantial punishment was imposed, and in accordance with the authorities in this Court exemplary damages may be awarded in some circumstances notwithstanding that a criminal sanction has been imposed.

Her Honour concluded that conviction for assault and the imposition of a bond was a substantial punishment such that exemplary damages were not warranted on this basis. Her Honour did, however, accept at [105] the other basis for the award of exemplary damages, namely, that the manner in which the appellant defended the claim for damages was unusual in the sense used in *Gray v Motor Accidents Commission*.

Aggravated damages

Damages under this heading may be awarded to a plaintiff who suffers increased distress as a result of the manner in which a defendant behaves when committing the wrong or thereafter. The qualification for their award is that the conduct of the defendant is of the type that increased the plaintiff's suffering. In *Lamb v Cotogno*, above, at 8, aggravated damages were described as compensatory in nature, being awarded for injury to the plaintiff's feelings caused by insult, humiliation and the like.

The leading case in this area is *Uren v John Fairfax & Sons Pty Ltd* (1966) 117 CLR 118 where Windeyer J at 152 described the necessary conduct as insulting or reprehensible or capable of causing the plaintiff to suffer indignity or outrage to his or her feelings.

A plaintiff's own conduct may be relevant to determining whether damages of this nature should be awarded or the amount to be awarded, for instance, where a plaintiff retaliates in the case of an assault or is of bad repute.

In *Kralj v McGrath* [1986] 1 All ER 54 Woolf J rejected a claim for aggravated damages in a case based on medical negligence but said that compensatory damages could be increased to take account of consequences that made it difficult to overcome the distress caused by the negligent medical treatment.

The availability of aggravated damages in negligence clams was debated in *Hunter Area Health Service v Marchlewski* (2000) 51 NSWLR 268 where Mason P listed the torts for which damages under this head might be claimed including defamation, intimidation, trespass to the person and malicious prosecution. He expressed serious doubt about when they might be claimed in negligence actions or about the need for such damages when elements such as injured feelings and distress could be dealt with in an award for general damages.

These concerns were dealt with in *State of NSW v Riley* (2003) 57 NSWLR 496; [2003] NSWCA 208, and in *MacDougal v Mitchell* [2015] NSWCA 389. In *MacDougal*, an appeal challenging the trial judge's decision against the award of both aggravated and exemplary damages, Tobias AJA, with whom Meagher JA, Bergin CJ in Eq agreed, cited at length passages from the

reasons of Hodgson JA in *State of NSW v Riley*, above, where he addressed the issue of how, in a personal injury case, having assessed the appropriate level of damages, the compensatory nature of aggravated damages leaves room for the award of further compensation without incurring the risk of double counting.

Justice Hodgson's answer was reasoned at [131] as follows:

> In my opinion, the only principled explanation must be along the following lines. It is extremely difficult to quantify damages for hurt feelings. In cases of hurt feelings caused by ordinary wrong-doing, of a kind consistent with ordinary human fallibility, the court must assess damages for hurt damages neutrally, and aim towards the centre of the wide range of damages that might conceivably be justified. However, in cases of hurt to feelings caused by wrong-doing that goes beyond ordinary human fallibility, serious misconduct by the defendant has given rise to a situation where it is difficult to quantify appropriate damages and thus where the court should be astute to avoid the risk of under-compensating the plaintiff, so the court is justified in aiming towards the upper limit of the wide range of damages which might conceivably be justified.

He added further at [133] that there must be a justification for this approach, which he acknowledged was one of degree so that "the worse the defendant's conduct, the further from the centre of the range and towards the upper limit of the range the court may be justified in going".

Exemplary damages

Exemplary damages are awarded as a form of punishment: to deter repetition of reprehensible conduct by the defendant or by others, or to act as a mark of the court's disapproval of that conduct. They may be awarded for a tort committed in circumstances involving a deliberate, intentional or reckless disregard for the plaintiff and his or her interests. The objects of the award may include condemnation, admonition, making an example of the defendant, appeasement of the plaintiff in order to temper an urge to exact revenge, or the expression of strong disapproval.

The term repeatedly relied upon as the basis for the award of exemplary damages, first expressed by Knox CJ in *Whitford v De Lauret & Co Ltd* (1920) 29 CLR 71 at 77, is conscious wrongdoing in contumelious disregard of another's rights. The defendant's conduct must be such that punishment is warranted. It may include elements of malice, violence, cruelty, high-handedness or abuse of power. In *Uren v John Fairfax & Sons Pty Ltd*, above, Windeyer J said at [11] that an award of exemplary damages should be based on something more substantial than mere disapproval of the defendant's conduct.

In *Lamb v Cotogno* (1987) 164 CLR 1 the defendant left the plaintiff in agony at the side of a road after attacking him by driving his car at him. This was considered to be conduct that was cruel or demonstrating reckless disregard or indifference towards the plaintiff's welfare.

In *Adams v Kennedy* [2000] NSWCA 152 the court awarded one aggregate figure for exemplary damages where different causes of action arose out of a series of closely connected events. Priestley JA stated at [36]:

> That figure should indicate my view that the conduct of the defendants was reprehensible, mark the court's disapproval of it. The amount should also be such as to bring home to those officials of the State who are responsible for the overseeing of the police force that police officers must be trained and disciplined so that abuses of the kind that occurred in the present case do not happen.

The High Court in *State of NSW v Ibbett* (2006) 229 CLR 638 at [38]–[40] similarly noted in particular the function served by exemplary damages as a tool to discourage and condemn the arbitrary and outrageous use of executive power: *Rookes v Barnard* [1964] AC 1129, Lord Devlin at 1226.

As a general principle, the power to award exemplary damages should be exercised with restraint and only when compensatory damages are insufficient to punish, deter or mark the court's disapproval of the defendant's conduct. There is a question mark over whether the defendant's means should be taken into account in deciding whether to award exemplary damages.

The award of exemplary damages is rare in actions for negligent conduct. There must be conscious wrongdoing in contumelious disregard of another's rights: *Gray v Motor Accidents Commission* (1998) 196 CLR 1.

This decision was referred to in *Dean v Phung* (2012) NSWCA 223 but ultimately the outcome of the plaintiff's claim was not based on negligence. The dentist's misrepresentations as to the need for and nature of treatment were held to negate the plaintiff's consent so that claim of trespass to the person was made out and the *Civil Liability Act* exclusion of the right to exemplary damages did not apply. In deciding that a substantial award of exemplary damages was warranted, the court noted that the dentist's conduct was carefully planned and executed over a period of more than 12 months with the purpose of self-enrichment. Damages were assessed by reference to the sum paid for the dental services and interest.

Although required to be proportionate to the circumstances, in an appropriate case, exemplary damages may exceed compensatory damages: *Day v The Ocean Beach Hotel Shellharbour Pty Ltd* (2013) 85 NSWLR 335 Leeming JA at [43].

State of NSW v Smith [2017] NSWCA 194 involved a claim of false imprisonment. The court regarded the police officer's conduct, in being unaware of provisions of the relevant statute, as the product of ordinary human fallibility and not a conscious wrongdoing in contumelious disregard of the respondent's rights, with the result that an award of exemplary damages was not warranted.

[7-0120] Offender damages

The *Civil Liability Act* makes special provision in Pt 2A to deal with claims by offenders in custody, including the application of the Act to claims that involve intentional torts. The legislation introduces a regime for assessment of claims that is similar to that provided for in relation to common law claims for workplace accidents.

In *State of NSW v Corby* (2009) 76 NSWLR 439, the Court of Appeal noted that Pt 2A of the Act, dealing with offender damages, had been extended by amendment to intentional torts and that nothing in the amending legislation indicated that claims for exemplary damages were to be excluded. The court was not prepared to accept that this was an oversight stating at [56]:

> The Parliament may well not have been prepared to exclude liability for exemplary damages, even in cases of relatively minor physical or mental impairment, where the conduct of its officers, for which it accepts vicarious liability, demonstrates egregious disregard of the civil rights of its citizens.

The court concluded, however, that aggravated damages were not available to an offender in custody. This was because s 26C defined damages as including any form of monetary compensation. Aggravated damages were designed to deal with matters such as humiliation and injury to feelings and provided compensation for mental suffering that fell short of a recognised psychiatric illness. In that sense, in contrast to exemplary damages they were compensatory.

[7-0130] Intentional torts

An intentional tort is described as the intentional infliction of harm without just cause or excuse. The presence of an intention to cause harm is central to the imposition of liability. The tort frequently involves conduct that results in criminal as well as civil liability, although it extends to conduct that causes harm to reputation, trade or business activity.

The American Law Institute, *Restatement of the Law — Torts 2d*, § 870, American Law Institute Publishers, St Paul, Minn,1979 describes intentional torts in the following terms:

> One who intentionally causes injury to another is subject to liability to the other for that injury, if his conduct is generally culpable and not justifiable under the circumstances. This liability may be imposed although the actor's conduct does not come within a traditional category of tort liability.

The concept of an intention to cause harm, in the context of the law of negligence, has been the subject of a degree of judicial consideration and much academic consternation concerning the extent to which intentional conduct can be described or pleaded as negligent.

The exclusion of intentional torts from the strictures of the *Civil Liability Act* 2002 has also generated judicial scrutiny of this class of tort. Section 3B(1)(a) provides:

> 1. The provisions of this Act do not apply to or in respect of civil liability (and awards of damages in those proceedings) as follows:
>
> (a) civil liability of a person in respect of an intentional act that is done by the person with intent to cause injury or death or that is sexual assault or other sexual misconduct committed by the person—the whole Act except:
>
> (i) section 15B and section 18(1) (in its application to damages for any loss of the kind referred to in section 18(1)(c)), and
>
> (ii) Part 7 (Self-defence and recovery by criminals) in respect of civil liability in respect of an intentional act that is done with intent to cause injury or death, and
>
> (iii) Part 2A (Special provisions for offenders in custody).

The attraction of this provision is that, if the wrong of which a plaintiff complains can be brought within its scope, the constraints on damages contained within the Act can be avoided, with the exception of those relating to the recovery for gratuitously provided care services. Damages in claims of intentional torts are at large, with the exception of those claimed for voluntarily provided care. They may therefore range from a nominal amount, where a plaintiff is unable to establish actual damage, to substantial damages on all heads for personal injury. Aggravated and exemplary damages are also available in appropriate cases. Application of the provisions of the section has not been straightforward, issues to date encompassing the following.

Pleadings

It is in this area that incongruity arises in the context of the law of negligence. In *New South Wales v Lepore* (2003) 212 CLR 511, a claim of vicarious liability against an employer, views diverged on the question of whether a claim of intentional infliction of harm could be pleaded in negligence. McHugh J at [162] took the view that the plaintiff was entitled to elect to plead negligence or trespass to the person. He said an action for the negligent infliction of harm was not barred because of the intentional act of the person causing the harm. Gummow and Hayne JJ took a different view. They said at [270], that while negligently inflicted injury to the person could sometimes be pleaded in trespass to the person, the intentional infliction of harm cannot be pleaded as negligence.

Consent

Barrett JA in *White v Johnston* (2015) 87 NSWLR 779 made it clear that the absence of consent was an essential element of the tort of assault and battery. He said it was meaningless at least in the civil sphere to speak of an assault that was consensual.

The difficulty created by the failure to plead separately the allegations of negligence and assault is most clearly demonstrated in claims of medical negligence where the question of consent to treatment arises.

In *White v Johnston*, above, Leeming JA pointed to the distinction between consent to medical treatment that is procured through negligence in explaining the risks of treatment and that which is fraudulently obtained. He referred to the reasons of Mason CJ, Brennan, Dawson, Toohey and McHugh JJ in *Rogers v Whittaker* (1992) 175 CLR 479 where they said at [15]:

> Anglo-Australian law has rightly taken the view that an allegation that the risks inherent in a medical procedure have not been disclosed to the patient can only found an action in negligence and not in trespass; the consent necessary to negative the offence of battery is satisfied by the patient being advised in broad terms of the nature of the procedure to be performed.

Leeming JA noted the following principles on the issue of consent to medical treatment:

1. Consent may be vitiated by fraud, misrepresentation, treatment that materially differs from that to which the consent was given or the improper purpose for the provision of the treatment.
2. The motive for the provision of medical treatment is relevant to the issue of whether consent was obtained through fraud or misrepresentation or for an improper purpose. In *Dean v Phung* [2012] NSWCA 223, the practitioner's purpose, being solely non-therapeutic, was sufficient to vitiate consent. The majority view in that case was that it was therefore unnecessary to consider further whether the practitioner acted fraudulently.
3. There may be circumstances where more than motive exists for misconduct. A person who enters land within the scope of his or her authority does not necessarily become a trespasser because he or she has some other purpose in mind.
4. Thus improper purpose, even if it falls short of fraud is relevant to the issue of whether medical treatment was outside the terms of any consent.
5. The withholding of information in bad faith is sufficient to vitiate consent.

It is not necessary that the plea of trespass to the person or assault contain a specific allegation of absence of consent. The plea itself is sufficient under the rules of common law pleading to amount to an allegation of non-consensual conduct: *White v Johnston*, Barrett JA.

Intent

The prerequisites to the operation of s 3B(1)(a) are:

- an intentional act; and
- an intentional act committed with intent to cause injury.

It is the second of these requirements that presents the greatest challenge to litigants. In *White v Johnston* Leeming JA at [132] noted that these requirements took matters further than the tort of assault and battery where it was unnecessary to establish that a defendant intended to cause harm. Even if a plaintiff was able to prove an intentional tort, he said, the action would be excluded from the *Civil Liability Act* only if it was also established that the defendant's conduct was carried out with intent to cause injury.

It is not necessary that the intended injury be physical. In *State of NSW v Ibbett* (2005) 65 NSWLR 168, a police officer pointed a gun at the plaintiff at the same time as threatening her. Spigelman CJ thought this was sufficient to establish that the officer acted with the intent to cause injury namely an apprehension of physical violence. Ipp JA agreed that it was intended to cause in the plaintiff's mind an apprehension of immediate personal violence.

It is not necessary that the intentional act be criminal in character. RS Hulme J in *McCracken v Melbourne Storm Rugby League Football Club* [2005] NSWSC 107 rejected the proposition that the s 3B exception was directed at criminal conduct and sexual misconduct. The spear tackle that resulted in the plaintiff's injury, although not a crime, was undertaken intentionally and with intent to cause injury.

In *Drinkwater v Howarth* [2006] NSWCA 222 Basten JA asked, hypothetically, whether an intentional act directed at someone other than a plaintiff might allow for the application of s 3B.

In *Hayer v Kam* [2014] NSWSC 126 Hoeben CJ at CL said it was unclear whether a defendant who is reckless as to the consequences of an intentional act has the requisite intention to cause injury. He noted, however, that in *Dean v Phung*, above, whilst the primary intention was that of monetary gain, the dentist was found to have the intention to cause harm sufficient to meet the requirements of the section because at the time of giving the relevant advice he knew that the treatment proposed was unnecessary.

Causation

Palmer Bruyn & Parker Pty Ltd v Parsons (2001) 208 CLR 388 involved a claim of injurious falsehood in the course of which the High Court considered whether the principles of reasonable foreseeability applied to intentional torts. Gleeson CJ, agreeing with Gummow J, said at [13] there was no reason for foreseeability to operate as an independent factor in limiting liability for damage if the relevant harm was intended or was the natural and probable consequence of the wrongdoer's conduct.

Gummow J, dealing with the role of intention in the context of intentional torts, said at [81]:

> That role is that, where the other elements of the tort are made out, a finding that the defendant intended the consequences which came to pass will be sufficient to support an award of damages against the defendant in respect of that consequence.

After reference to authority to the effect that the intention to injure a plaintiff disposes of any question of remoteness of damage, he said at [81]:

> It will not necessarily be sufficient that the wrongdoer intended damage different in kind from that which occurred … That is to say, it will depend upon the relation of that which the wrongdoer intended to the consequences which actually resulted. This relation will generally be assessed by asking whether the damage was the "direct and natural" result of the publication of falsehood.

These principles were referred to in *TCN Channel Nine Pty Ltd v Anning* (2002) 54 NSWLR 333, where it was stated that damages may be awarded for personal injury, in a claim alleging trespass to land, if the injury was a natural and probable consequence of the trespass.

Injury

The issue of whether the intended injury must be physical so that it did not extend to psychological injury has been disposed of by the principle that the wrongdoer intends the harm that is the natural and probable consequence of the conduct.

In *TCN Channel Nine Pty Ltd v Anning*, above, however, the Court of Appeal rejected the claim in the absence of evidence that the mental trauma claimed by the plaintiff amounted to a recognised psychiatric disorder. Humiliation, injured feelings and affront to dignity resulting from trespass, the court said, were compensable through the means of aggravated damages.

A different approach was taken in *Houda v State of New South Wales* [2005] NSWSC 1053, where the plaintiff recovered damages in claims for malicious prosecution, wrongful imprisonment, wrongful arrest and assault, all conduct that found to have been intentional with intent to cause injury. The defendant argued that the claimed injuries of deprivation of liberty, humiliation, damage to reputation, emotional upset and trauma were not injuries within the scope of s 3B(1)(a) because they were not physical injuries. Cooper AJ held that the section extended to all forms of injury, including those of the class that resulted from the actions of the defendant's police officers.

Onus

The issue of where the onus lies to establish the elements of s 3B(1)(a) was dealt with comprehensively by Leeming JA in *White v Johnston*. He approached the issue from two perspectives.

He said the onus was at all times on the plaintiff to prove that consent was vitiated by fraud because:

- in general principle, a party who asserts must prove
- there would be inherent injustice in requiring a defendant to disprove a fraud, and
- if the plaintiff produced evidence that provided a basis for a finding a fraud, the evidentiary onus shifted to the defendant.

After examining competing views he rejected the argument that the onus of proof was on a defendant who pleaded consent to a claim of assault and battery or trespass to the person. His major reason for doing so was to provide coherence between the criminal and civil law. He noted that a prosecutor bears the onus of negating consent in sexual assault cases and said at [128]:

> It does not strike me as jarringly wrong for a civil plaintiff to be obliged to discharge the same burden (albeit, only to the civil standard) in order to establish a tortious assault and battery.

Vicarious liability

The decision in *Zorom Enterprises Pty Ltd v Zabow* (2007) 71 NSWLR 354 established the extent to which an employer might be held liable for the intentional torts of an employee. The Court of Appeal held that an employer was vicariously liable in damages, including exemplary damages, where the intentional tort was committed:

- in the intended or ostensible pursuit of the employer's interest
- in the intended performance of a contract of employment, or
- in the apparent execution of ostensible authority.

Basten JA pointed out that liability of an employer was derivative in form from that of the employee and was not substantially different from the liability of the employee. He said the employer could not escape liability under the general law by demonstrating that it did not have the intention of its employee.

Legislation

- *Civil Liability Act* 2002, Pts 2A, 6, ss 3B, 5B, 5R, 5T, 7B(rep), 7F(rep), 12, 12(2), 13(1), 14, 15, 15(1), (2), (3), (5), 15A, 15B, (2)(b), (2)(d), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), 15C, 16, (1), (3), 17, 21, 26X, 26C, 34, 48, 49, 50, 71(1)
- *Compensation to Relatives Act* 1897, s 3(3)
- *District Court Act* 1973, Pt 3, Div 3, 4(rep), s 58(4)(rep)
- *Fatal Accidents Act* 1959 (WA)
- *Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act* 1965
- *Motor Accidents Act* 1974
- *Motor Accidents Act* 1988, ss 49, 74, 76, 79(3)
- *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999, ss 3, 7A, 7B(1), 7F, 83, 125, (2), 126, 127, (1)(d), 130, 130A(rep), 134, 131–135, 136, 138, 140, 141B, 141C, 142, 143, 144, 146
- *Motor Accidents (Lifetime Care and Support) Act* 2006
- *Workers Compensation Act* 1987, ss 151H, 151I, 151IA, 151AD, 151J, 151L, 151N, 151O 151Q, 151R, 151Z, (1)(d), (2), (2)(a), (b), (d)
- *Workplace Injury Management and Workers Compensation Act* 1998, Pt 7, s 322(1)
- *Social Security Act* 1991
- *Supreme Court Act* 1970, Pt 5, Div 2(rep), s 76E(4)(rep)
- *Victims Compensation Act* 1996 (rep, now *Victims Rights and Support Act* 2013)

Further references

- The American Law Institute, *Restatement of the Law — Torts 2d*, § 870, American Law Institute Publishers, St Paul, Minn,1979
- H Luntz and S Harder, *Assessment of damages for personal injury*, 5th edn, LexisNexis, 2021

- D Villa, *Annotated Civil Liability Act* 2002, 3rd edn, Thomson Reuters, Sydney, 2018
- J A McSpedden and R Pincus, *Personal Injury Litigation in NSW*, LexisNexis, Sydney, 1995
- J Dietrich, "Intentional conduct and the operation of the Civil Liability Acts: unanswered questions", (2020) 39(2) *University of Queensland Law Journal* 197
- H McGregor, *McGregor on Damages*, 16th edn, Sweet & Maxwell Ltd, UK, 1997
- H McGregor, *McGregor on Damages*, 13th edn, Sweet & Maxwell Ltd, UK, 1972

[The next page is 7501]

Interest

[7-1000] Introduction

While interest up to judgment is often the subject of agreement, particularly after some judicial encouragement, a range of issues may and do arise. In more complicated situations, particularly where statutory limitations might apply, it is often the better course to receive submissions on interest after the resolution of the principal issues.

Whilst statutory limitations must be complied with it remains the position that "the award of interest should always be approached in a broad and practical way [and] should not be allowed to assume disproportionate importance…": *Cullen v Trappell* (1980) 146 CLR 1 at 22. However, for a case requiring detailed consideration of issues relating to interest up to judgment, see *Gadens Lawyers Sydney Pty Ltd v Symond* (2015) 89 NSWLR 60 at [167]–[186].

Interest after judgment, other than interest on costs, is not, usually at least, an issue for first instances judges and is not, itself, an amount for which judgment is given: *Najdovski v Crnojlovic (No 2)* [2008] NSWCA 281.

[7-1010] Interest up to judgment

Section 100 of the CPA provides that in proceedings for the recovery of money, including any debt or damages or the value of any goods, the court may include interest in the amount for which judgment is given at such rate as the court sees fit: s 100(1). The interest may be awarded on the whole or any part of the money and for the whole or any part of the period from the time the cause of action arose until the time the judgment takes effect. As to the expression "proceedings for the recovery of money" see *Lahoud v Lahoud* [2011] NSWCA 405 at [37]–[45].

Section 100(2) makes similar provision for the situation where, in proceedings for the recovery of a debt or damages, payment of the whole or part of the debt or damages has been made after the proceedings commenced but before or without judgment.

Section 100(3) provides that s 100 does not authorise the giving of interest on interest (s 100(3)(a)), the giving of interest on a debt when interest is payable as a right (s 100(3)(b)) or the giving of interest on proceedings for amounts less than a prescribed amount (s 100(3)(c)). Section 100 does not affect the damages recoverable for the dishonour of a Bill of Exchange (s 100(3)(d)).

Section 100(4) provides that in any proceedings for damages, the court may not order the payment of interest under the section in respect of the period for which an appropriate settlement sum was offered (or first offered) by the defendant unless the special circumstances of the case warrant the making of such an order.

Appropriate settlement sum means a sum offered in settlement of proceedings in which the amount for which judgment is given, including interest up to and including the date of the offer, does not exceed the sum offered by more than 10 per cent: s 100(5).

See also Practice Note No SC Gen 16 "Pre-judgment interest rates" and Practice Note DC (Civil) 15 "Pre-judgment interest rates".

[7-1020] Discretionary power

The power to award interest is a discretionary one. For applicable principles see *Ritchie's* [s 100.10]–[100.95], *Thomson Reuters* [CPA.100.30]–[CPA.100.100]. For an example of the application of these principles to both before and after interest, see *Maestrale v Aspite (No 2)* [2014] NSWCA 302.

[7-1030] Statutory limitations

There are a number of legislative provisions, including the CPA itself, which impose limitations or restrictions on the interest which may be awarded.

Section 100(3)(c) of the CPA

The text of the provision appears sufficiently above. A Local Court may not order the payment of interest up to judgment in any proceedings in which the amount claimed is less than $1,000: UCPR r 36.7(2).

Subsection 100(4) of the CPA

The text of the provision appears sufficiently above.

In other contexts, the issue of whether an offer of settlement is an appropriate one can raise difficult questions. However, for the purpose of s 100(4) an appropriate settlement sum is defined as set out above.

There remains, however, the question whether the special circumstances of the case warrant the making of an order for interest.

As to the meaning of special circumstances and applicable principles see *Ritchie's* [s 100.25].

[7-1040] Motor Accidents Compensation Act 1999

A plaintiff has only such right to interest on damages payable in relation to a motor vehicle accident as is conferred by s 137.

That section excludes any entitlement to interest on those components of an award calculated under s 128 (dealing with attendant care service) and any amount for non-economic loss: s 137(2), (3).

Other damages payable in relation to a motor accident are subject to the following provision: s 137(4):

(a) Interest is not payable unless:

  (i) information that would enable a proper assessment of the plaintiff's claim has been given to the defendant and the defendant has had reasonable opportunity to make an offer of settlement (where it would be appropriate to do so) in respect of the plaintiff's full entitlement to all damages of any kind but has not made such an offer, or

  (ii) the defendant has had a reasonable opportunity to make a revised offer of settlement (where it would be appropriate to do so) in the light of further information given by the plaintiff that would enable a proper assessment of the plaintiff's full entitlement to all damages of any kind but has not made such an offer, or

  (iii) if the defendant is insured under a third party policy or is the Nominal Defendant, the insurer has failed to comply with its duty under s 83, or

  (iv) if the defendant has made an offer of settlement, the amount of all damages of any kind awarded by the court (without the addition of any interest) is more than 20 per cent higher than the highest amount offered by the defendant and the highest amount is unreasonable having regard to the information available to the defendant when the offer was made.

(b) The highest amount offered by the defendant is not unreasonable if, when the offer was made, the defendant was not able to make a reasonable assessment of the plaintiff's full entitlement to all damages of any kind.

(c) For the purposes of the subsection an offer of settlement must be in writing.

The amount of interest is to be calculated for the period from when the loss to which the damages relate was first incurred until the date on which the court determines the damages: s 137(5)(a). It is

to be calculated in accordance with the principles ordinarily applied by the court for that purpose subject to the section: s 137(5)(b). The rate of interest is to be three quarters of the rate prescribed for the purposes of s 101 of the CPA: s 137(6).

Nothing in s 137 affects the payment of interest on a judgment or order of the court: s 137(1).

Despite earlier views, the award of interest, once the provisions of s 137(4) are satisfied, remains discretionary in accordance with principles applicable with respect to s 100 of the CPA: *Najdovski v Crnojlovic (No 2)* (2008) 51 MVR 334 at [11].

For a discussion on a number of potential issues arising from the language of subsection 4 see *Najdovski* at [12]–[25].

On the issue of reasonableness, Basten JA at [26] said that it should be accepted that:

> too great a willingness to treat an offer as "reasonable", and therefore not unreasonable, will allow defendants to escape too readily the obligation to pay for the cost of keeping the plaintiff out of his or her damages. Ultimately reasonableness depends upon an objective assessment of the circumstances and, where the material before the court does not materially differ from that available to the defendant at the relevant time, the judgment of the Court must be treated as, subject to recognition that no precise figure is necessarily correct, a baseline for determining the reasonableness of the offer.

See [7-1060] as to the applicability of s 18(1)(c) of the *Civil Liability Act* 2002.

[7-1045] Motor Accident Injuries Act 2017

A claimant has only such right to interest on damages payable in relation to a motor vehicle accident as is conferred by s 4.16.

No interest is payable on damages awarded for non-economic loss: s 4.16(2).

Other damages payable in relation to a motor accident are subject to s 4.16(3):

(a) Interest is not payable (and the court or claims assessor cannot order the payment of interest) on such damages unless:

  (i) information that would enable a proper assessment of the claim has been given to the defendant and the defendant has had a reasonable opportunity to make an offer of settlement (where it would be appropriate to do so) in respect of the full entitlement to all damages of any kind but has not made such an offer, or

  (ii) the defendant has had a reasonable opportunity to make a revised offer of settlement (where it would be appropriate to do so) in the light of further information given by the claimant that would enable a proper assessment of the full entitlement to all damages of any kind but has not made such an offer, or

  (iii) if the defendant has made an offer of settlement, the amount of all damages of any kind that is awarded (without the addition of any interest) is more than 20% higher than the highest amount offered by the defendant and the highest amount is unreasonable having regard to the information available to the defendant when the offer was made.

(b) The highest amount offered by the defendant is not unreasonable if, when the offer was made, the defendant was not able to make a reasonable assessment of the full entitlement to all damages of any kind.

(c) For the purposes of this subsection, an offer of settlement must be in writing.

The amount of interest is to be calculated for the period from when the loss to which the damages relate was first incurred until the date on which the damages are awarded: s 4.16(4)(a). It is to be calculated in accordance with the principles ordinarily applied by a court for that purpose, subject to the section: s 4.16(4)(b). The rate of interest to be three-quarters of the rate prescribed for the purposes of CPA s 101: s 4.16(5).

Nothing in s 4.16 affects the payment of interest on a judgment or order of a court: s 4.16(6).

The discussion in [7-1040] as to discretion and issues arising under s 137(4) of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999 apply to the similar, although not identical, terms of s 4.16.

See [7-1060] as to the applicability of s 18(1)(c) of the *Civil Liability Act* 2002.

[7-1050] Workers Compensation Act 1987

A plaintiff has only such right to interest on damages as is conferred by s 151M: s 151M(1).

Subsections 151M(4)–(7) adopt the same language and scheme as s 137(4)–(7) of the *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999, except that s 137(4)(a)(iii), referring to a third party policy and the Nominal Defendant, is omitted.

While s 151M does not exclude interest on damages payable in respect of attendant care service or for non-economic loss, the schemes should otherwise be dealt with in the same way.

[7-1060] Civil Liability Act 2002

With respect to cases to which this Act applies, a court cannot order the payment of interest on damages awarded for non-economic loss (s 18(1)(a)), gratuitous attendant care services with some exceptions (s 18(1)(b)), or the loss of capacity to provide gratuitous services to dependants (s 18(1)(c)).

The provision that interest cannot be paid on damages awarded for the loss of capacity to provide gratuitous services to dependants applies to motor accidents: s 3B(2).

If interest is to be awarded, the amount of interest is to be calculated for the period from when the loss first occurred until the date when the court determines the damages: s 18(2)(a). It is to be calculated in accordance with the principles ordinarily applied by the court for that purpose (s 18(2)(b)). The interest rate is to be as provided by s 18(3), (4).

[7-1070] Interest after judgment

Section 101 provides for interest after judgment including interest on costs. Interest on costs is payable unless the court otherwise orders: s 101(4).

For a discussion of relevant issues see, *Ritchie's* [s 101.5]–[s 101.30], *Thomson Reuters* [CPA101.20]–[CPA 101.50], *Zepinic v Chateau Constructions (Australia) Ltd (No 2)* [2013] NSWCA 227 at [82]–[88], (just as a costs order must be sought at the time of judgment, or within any time limited by UCPR 36.16, so, too, must an interest on costs order); *Grills v Leighton Contractors Pty Ltd (No 2)* [2015] NSWCA 348; *Grima v RFI (Aust) Pty Ltd* [2015] NSWSC 332 (time from when interest should be paid) and *Tjiong v Tjiong (No 2)* [2018] NSWSC 1981 at [164] (an application for an award of interest on costs must be made, if the order proceeds to assessment, before the assessment is undertaken).

[7-1080] Rate of interest

Rates of interest are prescribed for interest after judgement: UCPR r 36.7 and Sch 5. However, there is no such rate for interest up to judgment. The rates in Sch 5 will usually be accepted as appropriate without evidence: *Hexiva Pty Ltd v Lederer (No 2)* [2007] NSWSC 49 at [9]. However, a party contending that the rate should be different is entitled to do so but will need, generally at least, to produce evidence in support of such a rate. "The plaintiff's loss and its quantum are to be found as a fact and assessed on the evidence…": *Hobartville Stud Pty Ltd v Union Insurance Co Ltd* (1991) 25 NSWLR 358. In undertaking this task it will generally be appropriate for the court to have regard to prevailing market rates.

An accepted method of calculating the interest on damages accruing progressively over a period of time is to halve the rate of interest, the period or the principal amount: *Cullen v Trappell*, as above, *Riddle v McPherson* (1995) 37 NSWLR 338 at 342 (Motor Accidents Act 1988, s 73(5)(a)).

Legislation

- CPA ss 100, 101
- *Civil Liability Act* 2002 ss 3B(2), 18
- *Motor Accidents Act* 1988, s 73(5)(a)
- *Motor Accidents Compensation Act* 1999 s 137
- *Motor Accident Injuries Act* 2017 s 4.16
- *Workers Compensation Act* 1987 s 151M

Rules

- UCPR r 36.7 Sch 5 (repealed)

Practice Notes

- Practice Note No SC Gen 16 — Pre-judgment interest rates
- Practice Note DC (Civil) 15 — Pre-judgment interest rates

[The next page is 8001]

cross-defendant's costs, or indemnify the defendant in respect of the costs it is required to pay the cross-defendant. However, although a defendant and a cross-defendant are adversarial parties, and a plaintiff resisting an order for costs on the basis of identity of their interests has an evidentiary onus to negative any conflict of interests, where there is a substantial identity of interests, the cross-defendant should co-operate with the defendant to avoid duplication of effort and costs, and the plaintiff may be relieved of part or all of those costs if the cross-defendant fails to do so: *Furber v Stacey* [2005] NSWCA 242 at [57]–[59] (cross-defendant awarded only one-quarter of costs against an unsuccessful plaintiff).

It is within the legitimate scope of the power under CPA s 98 to award costs in favour of a plaintiff against a cross-defendant not joined by that plaintiff, where the conduct of that cross-defendant was the real cause of the litigation: *Vameba Pty Ltd v Markson* [2008] NSWCA 266.

[8-0090] Self-represented litigants (including lawyers)

Generally

Legal costs may only be recovered by a party in relation to costs of legal practitioners. However, a litigant in person may recover reasonably incurred disbursements and witness expenses, including costs and disbursements for legal work done by others: *Malkinson v Trim* [2003] 2 All ER 356, but not travelling expenses or loss of earnings: *Cachia v Hanes* (1994) 179 CLR 403; *Dal Pont* 7.28–7.29. Ultimately, this is a question of quantification on assessment, not one of liability (for costs), and unless it is apparent that there could be no entitlement, there is no reason why an order for costs should not be made in favour of a successful self-represented litigant, leaving it to the assessor to quantify the precise entitlement.

Self-represented lawyers

Previously, legal practitioners acting on their own behalf in legal proceedings were not in the same position as a litigant in person, under the "Chorley exception": *London Scottish Benefit Society v Chorley, Crawford and Chester* (1884) 13 QBD 872, considered in *Guss v Veenhuizen (No 2)* (1976) 136 CLR 47; see also *Wang v Farkas* (2014) 85 NSWLR 390; *Ada Evans Chambers Pty Ltd v Santisi* [2014] NSWSC 538 at [24]–[34]. However, in *Bell Lawyers Pty Ltd v Pentelow* [2019] HCA 29, the High Court said that the exception was not only anomalous, but exalted the position of legal practitioners in the administration of justice to such an extent that it was an affront to the fundamental value of equality of all persons before the law. As such, it was held that the *Chorley* exception should not be recognised as a part of the common law of Australia. However, in *Spencer v Coshott* [2021] NSWCA 235, it was held that the abrogation of the *Chorley* exception by the High Court in *Bell Lawyers Pty Ltd v Pentelow* did not deny recovery of costs by a solicitor litigant who is represented by an incorporated legal practice of which he or she is the principal and the sole director and shareholder, because of the separate legal personality of an incorporated legal practice.

[8-0100] Representative, nominal and inactive parties

Generally speaking, any party to litigation, including those who act in a representative capacity, is amenable to a costs order, but representative parties are often entitled to indemnity from the relevant estate or fund.

Tutors

Ordinarily, a tutor for a disabled party is personally liable for any costs order against that party; indeed, one of the reasons why a tutor is required is so that there is a person answerable for costs: *Yakmore v Handoush (No 2)* (2009) 76 NSWLR 148 at [45]; *Dal Pont* at 22.68. However, although one of the reasons for the appointment of a tutor for a disabled person is to have a person on the

record that is personally liable for the costs of the litigation, that is not the sole function or purpose of the appointment of the tutor, which includes the protection of the person with the disability and of the processes of the court: *Smith v NRMA Insurance Ltd* [2016] NSWCA 250 at [29]–[36], citing *NSW Ministerial Insurance Corporation v Abuafoul* (1999) 94 FCR 247 at [27]–[29], and *Goddard Elliott (a firm) v Fritsch* [2012] VSC 87 at [552]. An order protecting a tutor from personal liability for costs may be made as an incidental term of an order appointing a tutor under UCPR r 7.18(1)(b), or pursuant to the power conferred by UCPR r 2.1, or in the inherent power in the parens patriae jurisdiction. Under UCPR r 42.24, if the court appoints a solicitor to be the tutor of a person under legal incapacity in connection with any proceedings, the court may order that the costs incurred by the solicitor in performance of the duties of tutor be paid by the parties to the proceedings or any of them, or out of any fund in court in which the person under legal incapacity is interested. The court may make orders for the repayment or allowance of the costs as the case requires.

Executors, trustees and mortgagees

Under UCPR r 42.25, a person who is or has been a party to proceedings in the capacity of trustee or mortgagee is entitled to be paid his or her costs of the proceedings, in so far as they are not payable by any other person, out of the fund held by the trustee or the mortgaged property. The court may, however, otherwise order if the trustee or mortgagee has acted unreasonably, or the trustee has in substance acted for its own benefit rather than for the benefit of the fund.

If a legal personal representative acts properly, their costs and/or the costs which they are ordered to pay in an unsuccessful defence of the estate may be ordered to be paid out of the estate: *Re Estate of Paul Francis Hodges Deceased; Shorter v Hodges* (1988) 14 NSWLR 698 at 709–710; see generally *Halsbury's Laws of England*, 4th ed, vol 17, pars 917–919, vol 37, par 721. However, if, in conducting a proceeding, the executor is not acting merely in that capacity but in substance prosecuting or defending his or her own interests, that principle does not apply: *Nowell v Palmer* (1993) NSWLR 574 at 581–582. These principles apply not only to personal representatives but to fiduciaries generally: *Miller v Cameron* (1936) 54 CLR 572 at 578–579; *Lewis v Nortex Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2006] NSWSC 480 at [47].

An executor who commences or defends an action in the capacity of executor is ordinarily entitled to be indemnified out of the estate for the costs incurred in doing so, even if the litigation is unsuccessful, the executor's conduct is found to have been mistaken, and the other party in the litigation is held to be entitled to an order for costs: *Drummond v Drummond* [1999] NSWSC 923 at [43]. As a rule, a trustee is allowed their costs out of the trust estate if their conduct has been honest, even though it may have been mistaken: *Miller v Cameron* at 578; *In re Beddoe; Downes v Cottam* [1893] 1 Ch 547 at 562; see also *Re Weall; Andrews v Weall* (1889) 42 Ch D 674 at 677, where Kekewich J spoke of the "tenderness which the Court is anxious to exhibit towards trustees honestly exercising discretion in discharge of their duties, often difficult and still more often thankless", and *Re Jones; Christmas v Jones* [1897] 2 Ch 190 at 197, where the same judge said that "a man who fulfils the difficult duties of an administrator, executor or trustee is, in common sense and common justice, entitled to be recouped to the very last penny everything that he has expended properly — that is to say, without impropriety — in his character of administrator, executor or trustee".

However, this does not apply where the executor has acted improperly*: Drummond v Drummond* at [44]–[45]; *In re Beddoe; Downes v Cottam* [1893] 1 Ch 547 at 562. Cases of impropriety include an executor taking or defending proceedings in breach of trust, or conducting the proceedings in such a way that the court, on a general view of the case, regards the executor's conduct as "not honestly brought forward", or "where the claim is of monstrous character, that is, one which no reasonable man could say ought to have been put forward": *Re Jones* [1897] 2 Ch 190 at 198; or where the trustees acted without "reasonable prudence": *Re Weall* at 678–679.

The rule relates only to costs incurred in the administration and distribution of the estate, as distinct from costs incurred by an executor in furtherance of a personal interest: *Drummond v Drummond* at [47]; *Miller v Cameron* at 578–579; *Re Jones* [1897] 2 Ch at 197–198; *Plimsoll v Drake (No 2)*

(unrep, 8/6/95, SCT). Executors who pursue personal interests in litigation are "not fighting for the estate any more than if they were not executors at all": *Skrimshire v Melbourne Benevolent Asylum* (1894) 20 VLR 13 at 18. Thus an executor who prosecutes or defends proceedings in the capacity of creditor or beneficiary of the estate rather than in the capacity as executor is not entitled to recoup the costs of the litigation from the estate simply because they are also an executor. A trustee who defends an action for their removal may be representing their own interests and not those of the trust estate: *Miller v Cameron* at 578–579, though this is not necessarily invariably so; likewise one who unsuccessfully demands a release before distributing the trust estate to the beneficiaries: *Plimsoll v Drake (No 2)*.

Liquidators

Analogous principles apply to liquidators in relation to proceedings in which they participate in their own name: *Re Buena Vista Motors Pty Ltd (In Liq) and the Companies Act* [1971] 1 NSWLR 72, in which Street J ordered a liquidator who brought an unsuccessful claim to pay the opponents' costs but to be indemnified out of the company's assets since, although "the claim had been unsuccessful, it could not be characterized as frivolous or vexatious. Nor could the liquidator be said to have been acting unreasonably in bringing the claim forward for litigation" (at 73). See also *Lewis v Nortex Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2006] NSWSC 480 at [47]; the same principles apply also in respect of proceedings which they conduct in the name of the company: *Mead v Watson as Liquidator for Hypec Electronics* [2005] NSWCA 133 at [11] ff; see also *Arena Management Pty Ltd (Receiver & Manager Appointed) v Campbell Street Theatre Pty Ltd* (2011) 80 NSWLR 652; *Joubert v Campbell Street Theatre Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2011] NSWCA 302. A liquidator whose determination is challenged and who, rather than taking no active part in the proceedings, actively defends his or her decision, becomes an adverse party and is liable for costs: *Tanning Research Laboratories Inc v O'Brien* (1990) 169 CLR 332 at 341; *Lewis v Nortex Pty Ltd (in liq)* at [34].

A liquidator who successfully contests an allegation of impropriety is entitled to costs out of the company funds, to the extent that they are not recoverable from the other party: *National Trustees Executors and Agency Co of Australasia Limited v Barnes* (1941) 64 CLR 268 at 279; *Expo International Pty Ltd v Chant (No 2)* (1980) 5 ACLR 193 at 197–198; *Lewis v Nortex Pty Ltd (in liq)* at [49].

Submitting parties

Ordinarily, a submitting party who genuinely takes no part in the proceedings will not be ordered to pay costs: *Highland v Labraga (No 3)* [2006] NSWSC 871 at [19]–[23]. However, this may be otherwise where the submitting party does in fact take some active part in the proceedings: *Hillig v Darkinjung Pty Ltd (No 2)* [2008] NSWCA 147 at [66]; *Hornsby Shire Council v Valuer General of NSW* [2008] NSWSC 1281 at [3]–[8]; see also *Mahenthirarasa v State Rail Authority of NSW (No 2)* (2008) 72 NSWLR 273, where the submitting party, while not actively opposing the orders sought, did not consent to them and thus occasioned the incurring of additional costs and was ordered to pay costs; cf *Lou v IAG Limited* [2019] NSWCA 319 where, in similar circumstances, by majority, no costs order was made. Similarly, in an application for preliminary discovery, it may be appropriate not to order costs against an unsuccessful but "innocent" respondent who does not oppose the application: *Totalise plc v Motley Fool Ltd* [2002] 1 WLR 1233; *Bio Transplant Inc v Bell Potter Securities Ltd* [2008] NSWSC 694; cf *Airways Corporation of New Zealand v Koenig* [2002] NSWSC 521, where the application was opposed.

Relators

The court may make an order for costs against a relator: *Wentworth v Attorney-General (NSW)* (1984) 154 CLR 518 at 524.

Interveners

An order may be made against an amicus curiae in an exceptional case: *Dal Pont* at 22.75-76.

Interpleaders

All participants in interpleader proceedings may claim their costs from the fund, where they do no more than present evidence and reasonable arguments as to how that fund should be distributed. Where their involvement goes further and amounts to raising issues that add to the costs of the litigation, on which they are unsuccessful, they may be deprived of costs on those issues, or may be ordered to pay costs: *Westpac Banking Corp v Morris* (unrep, 2/12/98, NSWSC).

[8-0110] Non-parties

The power to make costs orders extends to orders against non-parties: *Knight v FP Special Assets Ltd* (1992) 174 CLR 178.

Non-party orders were formerly rare, but the repeal of UCPR r 42.3 (formerly Supreme Court Rules 1970, Pt 52A r 4), removed restrictions on the making of costs orders against non-parties: *Arena Management Pty Ltd (Receiver & Manager Appointed) v Campbell Street Theatre Pty Ltd* (2011) 80 NSWLR 652 at [24]–[25]. However, the power is to be exercised with restraint: *Yu v Cao* [2015] NSWCA 276 at [136]–[139]; *HM&O Investments Pty Ltd (in Liq) v Ingram* [2013] NSWSC 1778 at [9]–[15], and having regard to principles of procedural fairness: *Flinn v Flinn* [1999] 3 VR 712, which sets out the procedure for notice to the non-party.

Most cases of costs orders against a non-party involve circumstances in which the non-party has effective control of the litigation: *Gore v Justice Corporation Pty Ltd* (2002) 119 FCR 429 (litigation funder); *Selig v Wealthsure Pty Ltd* (2015) 255 CLR 661(professional indemnity insurer); *Younan v GIO General Limited (ABN 22 002 861 583) (No 2)* [2012] NSWDC 149 (plaintiff's de facto partner the true plaintiff); *McVicar v S & J White Pty Ltd (No 2)* (2007) 249 LSJS 110 at [17]–[26]; *Naomi Marble & Granite Pty Ltd v FAI General Insurance Co Ltd (No 2)* [1999] 1 Qd R 518 (directors of a corporate party). However, such control is usually not of itself sufficient to warrant such an order; there must be something additional in the conduct of the non-party that makes it just that it should bear the costs: *Naomi Marble & Granite Pty Ltd v FAI General Insurance Co Ltd (No 2)* (fraudulent insurance claim); *Rickard Constructions Pty Ltd v Rickard Hails Moretti Pty Ltd* [2008] NSWCA 283 and *Melbourne City Investments Pty Ltd v Leightons Holdings Limited* [2015] VSCA 235 (abuse of process). Orders will also been made against a non-party (such as a solicitor) who conducts litigation in the name of another without proper authority: *Hillig v Darkinjung (No 2)* [2008] NSWCA 147 at [47]; and against non-parties who by some delinquency increase the costs, such as by failing to attend court in answer to a subpoena: see UCPR r 42.27.

These categories are not closed: *FPM Constructions v Council of the City of Blue Mountains* [2005] NSWCA 340 at [210] (per Basten JA); see also *Yates v Boland* [2000] FCA 1895; *Gore v Justice Corporation Pty Ltd*; *Kebaro Pty Ltd v Saunders* [2003] FCAFC 5 (approved by the Privy Council in *Dymocks Franchise Systems (NSW) Pty Ltd v Todd (No 2)* [2004] All ER (D) 420 (Jul); and see Leeming JA's summary of the principles in *PM Works Pty Ltd v Management Services Australia Pty Ltd trading as Peak Performance PM* [2018] NSWCA 168 at [22]–[39].

Legal aid providers

While courts are reticent to order costs against government bodies such as legal aid providers, such parties may be subject to costs orders in an extreme case: *Collins and the Victorian Legal Aid Commission* (1984) FLC ¶91-508; *Marriage of Millea and Duke* (1992) 122 FLR 449.

[8-0120] Legal practitioners

Inherent power

The Supreme Court has inherent power to make costs orders against legal practitioners, derived from its supervisory jurisdiction: *Myers v Elman* [1940] AC 282; *Lemoto v Able Technical Pty Ltd* (2005) 63 NSWLR 300 at [85]–[86]; *Re Felicity, FM v Secretary Department of Family and Community*

Services (No 4) [2015] NSWCA 19 at [18]–[20]. The object of the court's inherent power is primarily compensatory, so as to indemnify or compensate, and thus protect, the party or parties who have suffered: *Dal Pont* at 23.2; *Myers v Elman* at 289. While the principles that inform the exercise of this inherent power should not be conflated with those relevant to the statutory powers of the court contained in CPA s 99 and *Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act* 2014, Sch 2, to order a legal practitioner to pay a party's costs (*Whyked Pty Ltd v Yahoo 7 Pty Ltd* [2008] NSWSC 477 at [12]–[20]), similar circumstances are likely to be relevant in both cases. As to the continued existence of the Supreme Court's inherent power, see *Re Felicity; FM v Secretary, Department of Family and Community Services (No 4)* [2015] NSWCA 19 at [18]–[20]; *King v Muriniti* (2018) 97 NSWLR 991.

Civil Procedure Act 2005, s 99

Section 99 empowers the court to make a "wasted costs order" against a legal practitioner personally, where costs have been incurred by serious neglect, incompetence or misconduct of the practitioner, or improperly or without reasonable cause in circumstances for which the practitioner is responsible. This statutory power is available to the District Court and Local Court, which do not enjoy inherent jurisdiction, as well as to the Supreme Court : *Knaggs v J A Westaway & Sons Pty Ltd* (1996) 40 NSWLR 476 at 485.

As to the construction of s 99 and the "voluminous case law" with respect to the making of costs orders against legal practitioners in different statutory contexts (which was partially cautioned against), see *Re Felicity* at [21]–[24] and *Nadarajapillai v Naderasa (No 2)* [2015] NSWCA 209 at [7]–[11]. The court has a right and a duty to supervise the conduct of its solicitors, and to visit with consequences any conduct of a solicitor which is of such a nature as to tend to defeat justice in the very cause in which the solicitor is engaged professionally. The jurisdiction is exercised where it is demonstrated that the solicitor has failed to fulfil their duty to the court and to realise their duty to aid in promoting in their own sphere the cause of justice. The order is for payment of costs thrown away or lost because of the conduct complained of and is frequently exercised in order to compensate the opposite party in the action. Such an order may be made on the indemnity basis: *Mitry Lawyers v Barnden* [2014] FCA 918 at [112].

Where a solicitor is employed by another, the client's retainer is with the employer, and regardless of who is on the record, the firm may be liable: *Kelly v Jowett* (2009) 76 NSWLR 405; at [69]–[71]; *Re Bannister & Legal Practitioners Ordinance* 1970-75; *Ex Parte Hartstein* (1975) 5 ACTR 100; *Re Fabricius & McLaren and Re Legal Practitioners Ordinance* 1970 (1989) 91 ACTR 1; *Knaggs v J A Westaway & Sons Pty Ltd*. Thus the jurisdiction may be exercised even where there has been no personal complicity by the solicitor charged: *Kelly v Jowett* at [61]–[62], [65]; *Re Jones* (1870) 6 Ch App 497; *Myers v Elman* [1940] AC 282; *Harley v McDonald* [2001] UKPC 18; [2001] 2 AC 678.

Conduct which has been held to justify an order that a practitioner personally pay costs includes:

- commencing or conducting proceedings which are an abuse of process: *Young v R (No 11)* [2017] NSWLEC 34
- raising untenable defences, for the purpose of delay: *Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v Levick* [1999] FCA 1580; *Helljay Investments Pty Ltd v Deputy Commissioner of Taxation* [1999] HCA 56
- signing a certificate on a false affidavit of discovery: *Myers v Elman* [1940] AC 282 (a case involving the inherent power)
- repeatedly putting untenable submissions: *Buckingham Gate International v ANZ Bank Ltd* [2000] NSWSC 946 at [18]–[19]
- attempting to re-agitate previously decided issues: *Vasram v AMP Life Ltd* [2002] FCA 1286; see also *Gersten v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs* [2000] FCA 922; *Kendirjian v Ayoub* [2008] NSWCA 194 at [208]–[216]

- prosecuting an appeal which has no prospects of success: *Nadarajapillai v Naderasa (No 2)* [2015] NSWCA 209 at [17]
- acting in ignorance of the rules: *Riv-Oland Marble Co (Vic) Pty Ltd v Settef SPA* (unrep, 9/6/89, HCA), and
- unpreparedness, resulting in a hearing date being vacated, or in time being wasted during the hearing: *Stafford v Taber* (unrep, 31/10/94, NSWCA).

Breach of the practitioner's duty to ensure proceedings are conducted efficiently and expeditiously may sound in a personal costs order: *Baulderstone Hornibrook Engineering Pty Ltd v Gordian Runoff Ltd (No 2)* [2009] NSWCA 12 at [8]-[11]; *Ashmore v Corporation of Lloyds* [1992] 2 All ER 486; *Whyte v Brosch* (1998) 45 NSWLR 354 (late submissions). In considering the exercise of the discretion under s 99, the court may take into account a legal practitioner's failure to comply with the obligations imposed by CPA ss 56(3), (4) and (5), which require the parties and their representatives to assist the court to further the just, quick and cheap resolution of the real issues in the proceedings: *Kendirjian v Ayoub* at [208]–[210]. The obligations of legal practitioners to conduct litigation reasonably are described in *Ken Tugrul v Tarrants Financial Consultants Pty Ltd ACN 086 674 179 (No 5)* [2014] NSWSC 437 at [64]–[77].

Before such an order is made, the practitioner must first be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard: CPA s 99(2). The court may refer the matter to a costs assessor for inquiry and report: CPA s 99(3).

Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014, Sch 2

Schedule 2, cl 5 LPULAA, which applies in all courts, permits the making of costs orders against solicitors personally where legal services are provided in a claim for damages "without reasonable prospects of success". The court is empowered to order that the practitioner repay costs to a party in the proceedings, or otherwise indemnify that party in respect of their costs. The exercise of the power remains discretionary: *Lemoto v Able Technical Pty Ltd* at [130], and the due administration of justice should not be impaired by the "too liberal exercise" of this power: *Lemoto* at [126]. Where a practitioner believes he or she has available material providing a proper basis for alleging a fact, provided the belief was reasonable, the proceedings cannot be said to have been commenced "without reasonable prospects of success": *Fowler, Corbett & Jessop v Toro Constructions Pty Ltd* [2008] NSWCA 178 at [86]–[88]. Practitioners will be exposed to liability only when their belief that the material to support the claim "unquestionably fell outside the range of views which could reasonably be entertained" as to the objective justification for the proceedings: *Lemoto* at [131]–[132], approving the "fairly arguable" test proposed by Barrett J in *Degiorgio v Dunn (No 2)* (2005) 62 NSWLR 284.

However, the requirement that the practitioner have a "reasonable belief" is a continuing one: see *Lemoto* at [127], so that if circumstances change as a result of which the belief becomes no longer reasonable, then continuing to prosecute a claim may attract liability: *Eurobodalla Shire Council v Wells* [2006] NSWCA 5 at [31] (order made under the prior equivalent of this clause: s 348 of the *Legal Profession Act* 2004, where barrister and solicitor were found "reckless" in continuing to prosecute an appeal; see also *Nadarajapillai v Naderasa (No 2)* at [17].

The practitioner must be afforded procedural fairness before such an order is made: *Lemoto* at [151]ff; see also *Mitry Lawyers v Barnden* at [43]. The appropriate procedure for the making of an application and the giving of notice to the practitioner, is described in *Lemoto* at [8]–[10] and [143]–[149] and involves a three-stage process of some complexity: *De Costi Seafoods (Franchises) Pty Ltd v Wachtenheim (No 5)* [2015] NSWDC 8 at [42]–[45].

[8-0130] Basis for assessment: ordinary or indemnity costs

In NSW, two bases for costs orders are now recognised. CPA s 98(1)(c) provides that the court may award costs on the ordinary basis or on the indemnity basis. The ordinary basis subsumes what was

Contempt

[The next page is 10051]

Contempt generally

Nature of contempt

[10-0300] Civil and criminal contempt

Contempts of court still fall to be classified as civil or criminal. Contempt by breach of an order or undertaking is regarded as a civil contempt unless "it involves deliberate defiance or, as it is sometimes said, if it is contumacious": *Witham v Holloway* (1995) 183 CLR 525 at 530. See *He v Sun* [2021] 104 NSWLR 518 as to "contumacious disregard of orders".

The distinction has been described as "unsatisfactory" in *Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union v Mudginberri Station Pty Ltd* (1986) 161 CLR 98 at 109, and in *Witham v Holloway*, above, the High Court held that the criminal standard of proof applies to all contempts (cf *ASIC v Sigalla (No 4)* [2011] NSWSC 62 at [92]–[94]). However, the distinction remains for some purposes. For example, an appeal may be brought against acquittal on a charge of civil contempt: see s 101(6) of the SCA and *Hearne v Street* (2008) 235 CLR 125. For discussions of the distinction see *Matthews v ASIC* [2009] NSWCA 155 and *Pang v Bydand Holdings Pty Ltd* [2011] NSWCA 69.

Civil contempts are normally left to the offended party to enforce, whereas the Attorney General or the court has a more clearly defined role in the prosecution of criminal contempts since these more directly involve interference with the administration of justice.

In *Hinch v Attorney-General (Vic)* (1987) 164 CLR 15 at 89, *Witham v Holloway* (1995) 183 CLR 525 at 534 and *Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union v Boral Resources (Vic) Pty Ltd* (2015) 89 ALJR 622 at [35] the High Court held that while contempt of court may be criminal in nature, proceedings for punishment of contempt were brought in the civil jurisdiction of the court and were "civil proceedings". Hence, where a charge of criminal contempt is brought in the Supreme Court by motion in "civil proceedings", as defined in the CP Act, s 3(1), that Act and the UCPR apply: CPA, s 4(1), Sch 1; UCPR, r 1.5(1), Sch 1: *Kostov v YPOL Pty Ltd* [2018] NSWCA 306 at [16], [17].

The power to punish for contempt in civil proceedings is not fettered by criminal law statutes relating to procedure and sentencing: *Dowling v Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of NSW* (2018) 99 NSWLR 229; at [43]–[45]; *He v Sun* [2021] 104 NSWLR 518 at [66]. The *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act* 1999 does not apply to sentence proceedings for contempt in the court's civil jurisdiction: *Dowling v Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of NSW* (2018) 99 NSWLR 229 at [12], [57]–[58]; *He v Sun* [2021] NSWCA 95 at [38]; [62]. The power to suspend a sentence, although no longer available under the *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act* 1999, survives in cases of contempt by virtue of Pt 55 r 13 of the Supreme Court Rules. Rule 13(3) relevantly provides that the court may make an order for punishment on terms, including a suspension of punishment: *He v Sun* at [39]–[40]; [66]. In committing a person to prison for contempt in civil proceedings, while the court may apply general law protections afforded to persons accused of a criminal offence, the court is nevertheless operating in its civil jurisdiction and criminal statutes are not engaged: *Dowling* at [46], [57]–[58]; [139];

Section 101(5) of the *Supreme Court Act* 1970 provides that the Court of Appeal, rather than the Court of Criminal Appeal, has jurisdiction to hear and determine an appeal from a judgment or order of the Supreme Court in proceedings relating to contempt of court. Note also that the *Mental Health (Forensic Provisions) Act* 1990 (rep) has been held not to apply to criminal contempt proceedings: *Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of NSW v Chan (No 15)* [2015] NSWSC 1177; *Kostov v YPOL Pty Ltd* at [19]. Note: the 1990 Act has been replaced by the *Mental Health and Cognitive Impairments Forensic Provisions Act* 2020 (commenced 27 March 2021).

The common-law requirement that a criminal trial not proceed unless the accused is fit to plead is a safeguard applicable to civil proceedings for criminal contempt: *Kostov v YPOL*, at [18], [19].

[10-0305] Sentencing principles for contempt

See *Thunder Studios Inc (California) v Kazal (No 2)* [2017] FCA 202 at [4]–[5] and *Seven Network (Operations) Ltd v Dowling (No 2)* [2021] NSWSC 1106 at [2]–[12] for the principles and rationale for sentencing for contempt. See also *Sentencing Bench Book* at [20-155] and N Adams and B Baker, "Sentencing for contempt of court", National Judicial College of Australia and the Australian National University Sentencing Conference, 29 February 2020, Canberra.

Contempt by publication

[10-0310] Time at which the law of contempt commences

For the purposes of sub judice contempt, the law of contempt does not begin to operate until proceedings are pending in a court. It is not sufficient that proceedings be imminent: *James v Robinson* (1963) 109 CLR 593.

[10-0320] Test for contempt

To amount to a sub judice contempt of court, a publication must have, as a matter of practical reality, a tendency to interfere with the course of justice in a particular case: *John Fairfax & Sons Pty Ltd and Reynolds v McRae* (1955) 93 CLR 351. The tendency to prejudice proceedings must be clear, or "real and definite". There should be a substantial risk of serious interference: *Hinch v Attorney General (Vic)* (1987) 164 CLR 15. See also *R v The Herald & Weekly Times (Ruling No 2)* [2020] VSC 800 at [76]–[78], [84].

The tendency of a publication to prejudice proceedings is to be determined objectively having regard to the nature of the material published and the circumstances existing at the time of publication: *Attorney General v John Fairfax & Sons Ltd* [1980] 1 NSWLR 362 at 386; *Director of Public Prosecutions v Wran* (1987) 7 NSWLR 616 at 626. As to the time at which an internet publication takes place, see *Tate v Duncan-Strelec* [2014] NSWSC 1125 at [145].

[10-0330] Intention

While the act of publication must be intentional, an intention to prejudice the due administration of justice is not an element of contempt: *John Fairfax & Sons Pty Ltd and Reynolds v McRae*, above, at 371.

[10-0340] Relevant considerations

Factors to be considered in determining whether a publication has the necessary tendency to cause serious prejudice to a trial include (per Mason CJ in *Hinch*, above, at 28):

- the nature and the extent of the publication
- the mode of trial (whether by judge or jury), and
- the time which will elapse between publication and trial.

The practical tendency of a publication to endure and influence prospective jurors must be viewed against its background of pre-existing legitimate publicity: *Attorney General v John Fairfax & Sons Ltd and Bacon* (1985) 6 NSWLR 695 at 711.

The likely delay between the date of publication and the commencement of the subject proceedings is an important consideration. It is also appropriate to take into account that, during this period, jurors will be assailed by the media with sensational reports of other events: *Victoria, State*

of and Commonwealth of Australia v Australian Building Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation (1982) 152 CLR 25 at 136; *John Fairfax Publications Pty Ltd v District Court of NSW* (2004) 61 NSWLR 344, per Spigelman CJ at [100].

[10-0350] Influencing the tribunal of fact

The most common and obvious form of media contempt is influencing the tribunal of fact. There will generally not be a danger of this in civil proceedings, where no jury will usually be present. It is essentially established that a publication or broadcast will not be regarded as presenting a substantial risk of prejudice by influencing a judge: *Victoria, State of and Commonwealth of Australia v Australian Building Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation*, above, at 58.

The same principle has been extended to magistrates: *Attorney General v John Fairfax & Sons Ltd and Bacon*, above.

[10-0360] Influencing witnesses

Contempt may be committed by publications that have a real tendency to influence the evidence of witnesses or to deter them from attending. Publication of photographs may risk contamination of identification evidence: *Ex parte Auld; Re Consolidated Press Ltd* (1936) 36 SR (NSW) 596 at 598.

The premature publication of evidence may have a tendency to influence the evidence of witnesses or potential witnesses: see *Attorney General v Mirror Newspapers Ltd* [1980] 1 NSWLR 374.

[10-0370] Influencing parties

Improper public pressure upon litigants, which has a real tendency to deter or influence them in relation to proceedings, may amount to contempt: *Harkianakis v Skalkos* (1997) 42 NSWLR 22 at 27.

[10-0380] Fair and accurate report of proceedings permitted

A fair and accurate report of judicial proceedings may be published in good faith notwithstanding that it may present a risk of prejudice to pending proceedings: *Ex parte Terrill; Re Consolidated Press Ltd* (1937) 37 SR (NSW) 255 at 257.

[10-0390] Public interest in publication

No contempt will be established unless it can be demonstrated that the risk of prejudice to the administration of justice, is not outweighed by the public interest in freedom of discussion on matters of public concern: *Ex parte Bread Manufacturers Ltd; Re Truth & Sportsman Ltd* (1937) 37 SR (NSW) 242 at 249; *Hinch* per Mason CJ at 27, Wilson J at 43 and Deane J at 51; *Attorney General v X* (2000) 49 NSWLR 653.

[10-0400] Contempt by prejudgment

There is an arguable basis of contempt by prejudgment in that, even if the tribunal of fact is unlikely to be influenced, such as when it is constituted by a judge only, prejudgment by the media may undermine public confidence in the administration of justice. The principle has been doubted in Australia: *Civil Aviation Authority v Australian Broadcasting Corp* (1995) 39 NSWLR 540 at 553–560, 570, 571.

[10-0410] Scandalising contempt

Scurrilous, unjustified criticism of the court may amount to contempt by having a real tendency to undermine public confidence in the administration of justice: *The King v Dunbabin, Ex parte*

Williams (1935) 53 CLR 434 at 442. For more recent consideration, see *Dowling v Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of NSW* (2018) 99 NSWLR 229; *State Wage Case (No 5)* [2006] NSWIRComm 190; *Environment Protection Authority v Pannowitz* [2006] NSWLEC 219; *Tate v Duncan-Strelec* [2014] NSWSC 1125 at [193] et seq, and *Mahaffy v Mahaffy* (2018) 97 NSWLR 119 per Simpson JA at [170]–[244].

Misconduct in relation to parties, witnesses, etc

[10-0420] Misconduct in relation to pending proceedings

Conduct that has a real tendency to improperly influence or deter a witness, judicial officer, juror, party or other person having a role in judicial proceedings may amount to contempt.

The test at common law is whether the action taken against the person had a tendency to interfere with the administration of justice: In the matter of *Samuel Goldman, Re; sub nom Re Goldman* [1968] 3 NSWR 325 at 327, 328. It is not necessary to show actual interference: *Harkianakis v Skalkos* (1997) 42 NSWLR 22 at 29.

Cases involving pressure upon parties to proceedings will often require an assessment of whether that pressure was improper: *Bhagat v Global Custodians Ltd* [2002] NSWCA 160, per Spigelman CJ at [35]. The mere fact that something that is lawful is threatened does not mean that the pressure is necessarily proper: *Harkianakis*, above, at 30. Contempt by improper pressure on a party or witness may derive from misuse of the court's processes, such as by filing, or threatening to file, defamatory material by affidavit: eg *Y v W* (2007) 70 NSWLR 377.

As to threats to seek costs, including costs against lawyers, see *Nuclear Utility Technology & Environmental Corp Inc (Nu-Tec) v Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC)* [2009] NSWSC 78. As to inappropriate use of statutory powers to gain an advantage, see *NSW Food Authority v Nutricia Australia Pty Ltd* (2008) 72 NSWLR 456 cf *Zhang v Woodgate and Lane Cove Council* [2015] NSWLEC 10.

In *Ulman v Live Group Pty Ltd* [2018] NSWCA 338 at [77], the court noted the distinction to be drawn between a contempt arising from conduct that interferes with the administration of justice in a particular case and interference with the administration of justice generally. In the former case, no contempt will have been committed unless proceedings are pending: see *James v Robinson* (1963) 109 CLR 593 at 602–607. In *The Prothonotary v Collins* (1985) 2 NSWLR 549, McHugh JA observed, at 567:

> Time and again the courts have said that there can be no contempt unless proceedings are pending: see *James v Robinson* (1963) 109 CLR 593 at 602–607. Cases of interference with the administration of justice as a continuing process are no doubt an exception to this rule. Their rationale is different from publications which interfere with particular proceedings. They rest on the need to protect the courts and the whole administration of justice from conduct which seeks to undermine the authority of the courts and their capacity to function.

See also *Mirus Australia Pty Ltd v Gage* [2017] NSWSC 1046 per Ward CJ in Eq at [130]ff.

Improper pressure on prospective parties, before any proceedings have been commenced, can constitute a contempt. This is upon the basis that it represents an interference with the administration of justice generally: *Live Group Pty Ltd v Rabbi Ulman* [2017] NSWSC 1759.

[10-0430] Reprisals

Liability for misconduct in relation to those discharging a role in judicial proceedings is not confined to something said or done while the proceedings are pending, or even in the course of being heard. Reprisals may influence or deter the person affected, and persons generally, in relation to access to the courts (in the case of parties), or the performance of such roles. See *European Asian Bank*

AG v Wentworth (1986) 5 NSWLR 445 (witness); *Prothonotary v Wilson* [1999] NSWSC 1148 at [21(c)] (judge); *Clarkson v Mandarin Club Ltd* (1998) 90 FCR 354 (party); *Principal Registrar, Supreme Court of New South Wales v Katelaris* [2001] NSWSC 506 at [20] (counsel); *Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of NSW v Katelaris* [2008] NSWSC 389 (juror); *Tate v Duncan-Strelec* [2014] NSWSC 1125.

Temporal and geographical elements may be relevant, but it is immaterial whether the conduct was committed in or outside the court so long as it is an interference with the administration of justice.

[10-0440] Intention

An intention to interfere with the administration of justice is not an element of contempt of court: *John Fairfax & Sons Pty Ltd and Reynolds v McRae*, above, at 371; *Harkianakis* at 28. However, intention is relevant and sometimes important: *Lane v Registrar of the Supreme Court of NSW* (1981) 148 CLR 245 at 258.

What needs to be established is an intention to do an act that has a clear objective tendency to interfere with the administration of justice: *Principal Registrar v Katelaris*, above, at [23].

If the likely effect of the conduct is not self-evident (for example, if it is not clear whether the action has been taken to influence a person in relation to proceedings, or as a reprisal arising from proceedings) further inquiries may be made regarding motive, in order to demonstrate a nexus to the subject person's role in the legal proceedings, see *Registrar of the Supreme Court of NSW (Equity Division) v McPherson* [1980] 1 NSWLR 688 at 699, and, on appeal, *Lane*, above, reviewed in *X v Australian Prudential Regulation Authority* (2007) 226 CLR 630 at [54].

If intention to influence or deter can be proved, that is usually sufficient to establish liability: *Harkianakis* at 28.

[10-0450] Statutory offences

Part 7 Div 3 of the *Crimes Act* 1900 contains offences relating to threats to or reprisals against, judicial officers, witnesses, jurors, etc.

Breach of orders or undertakings

[10-0460] Validity of orders

An order made by an inferior tribunal is invalid if made without jurisdiction. It is regarded as a nullity and breach of it will therefore not constitute a contempt: *Attorney General v Mayas Pty Ltd* (1988) 14 NSWLR 342 at 357; *Pelechowski v Registrar, Court of Appeal* (1999) 198 CLR 435 at [27]. The situation is otherwise in respect of the order of a superior court of record, which is taken to be valid until set aside: *Jackson v Sterling Industries Ltd* (1987) 162 CLR 612 at 620; see also *Papas v Grave* [2013] NSWCA 308 and *Rumble v Liverpool Plains Shire Council* (2015) 90 NSWLR 506.

As to the validity of suppression orders see [1-0410].

[10-0470] Construction of orders

As to the construction of court orders (including the relevance of the context in which the order was made), see *Athens v Randwick City Council* (2005) 64 NSWLR 58. Hodgson JA observed at [27] that:

> [t]he construction of an order in respect of which a finding of contempt is sought may involve two inter-related questions. First, what does the order require, on its true construction? And second, is this sufficiently clear to the person affected by the order to support enforcement of that order against that person?

In order to support a prosecution for contempt, an order must be clear in its terms, but if it is, it is no defence that the contemnor may have been mistaken as to its effect: *Australian Consolidated Press Ltd v Morgan* (1965) 112 CLR 483.

For recent judicial consideration, see *City of Canada Bay v Frangieh* [2020] NSWLEC 81 at [61]; see also *Rafailidis v Camden Council* [2015] NSWCA 185 and *Brown Brothers v Pittwater Council* (2015) 90 NSWLR 717.

[10-0480] Breach of orders and undertakings

Wilful (rather than casual, accidental or unintentional) breach of an order or undertaking by which a person is bound and of which the person has notice, will amount to contempt: *Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union v Mudginberri Station Pty Ltd*, above. It is not necessary to prove a specific intention to disobey the court's order: *Anderson v Hassett* [2007] NSWSC 1310. For a review of applicable principles, see *Doe v Dowling* [2017] NSWSC 202 at [39]–[50].

As to the requirement for notice of orders, see *Amalgamated Televisions Services Pty Ltd v Marsden* (2001) 122 A Crim R 166. As to the availability of inferring notice of an order on the basis that "informed instructions" must have been given to legal representatives, see *Young v Smith* [2016] NSWSC 1051.

A court may generally accept an undertaking from a party in substitution for making an order, subject to the same jurisdictional limitations: *Thomson Australian Holdings Pty Ltd v Trade Practices Commission* (1981) 148 CLR 150 at 165. For the purposes of the law of contempt, an undertaking given to the court is treated as if it was an order. Aliter if undertaking given inter partes: *Srotyr v Clissold* [2015] NSWSC 1770.

While the Commonwealth and the State are expected to comply with court orders, enforcement by contempt proceedings is not available: *Hoxton Park Resident's Action Group Inc v Liverpool City Council* [2014] NSWSC 704.

Breach of suppression orders

There are several distinct categories of contempt of court under the common law; breach of suppression orders is one: *Hinch v Attorney-General (Vic)* (1987) 164 CLR 15 at 46; *R v The Herald & Weekly Times (Ruling No 2)* [2020] VSC 800 at [78]. To establish guilt, the applicant must prove beyond reasonable doubt that the respondent published the article (or caused it to be published); the publication of the article frustrated the effect of the suppression order because it contained material that was contrary to or that infringed the terms of the order; and when the article was published, the relevant respondent's knowledge of the terms and effect of the order was such that a reasonable person with that knowledge would have understood that the continued publication of the article would have the tendency to frustrate the efficacy of the order: *R v The Herald & Weekly Times (Ruling No 2)* [2020] VSC 800 at [81]. Where the breach of an order relied upon is deliberate breach of a suppression order, proceedings could be brought under s 16 of the *Court Suppression and Non-publication Orders Act* 2010 (NSW) which provides for a penalty of 1,000 penalty units or imprisonment for 12 months for breaching an order for an individual, or 5,000 penalty units for a body corporation.

[10-0490] Implied undertakings in relation to use of documents provided in proceedings

> Where one party to litigation is compelled, either by reason of a rule of court, or by reason of a specific order of the court, or otherwise, to disclose documents or information, the party obtaining the disclosure cannot, without the leave of the court, use it for any purpose other than that for which it was given unless it is received into evidence … : *Hearne v Street* (2008) 235 CLR 125 at [96].

The types of material disclosed to which this principle applies include documents inspected after discovery (as to which see also UCPR r 21.7), documents produced on subpoena, witness statements

served pursuant to a judicial direction and affidavits: *Hearne v Street* (2008) 235 CLR 125 at [96]. While previously categorised as an "implied undertaking" to the court, this is an obligation of substantive law, and binds third parties who receive the documents knowing of their origin.

As to considerations relevant to granting leave, see *Prime Finance Pty Ltd v Randall* [2009] NSWSC 361 (application for leave to provide copies of affidavits to police on the basis that they disclosed criminal offences). As to the scope of the obligation in relation to affidavits, see *Tim Barr Pty Ltd v Narui Gold Coast Pty Ltd* [2009] NSWSC 533 cf *Tate v Duncan-Strelec* [2014] NSWSC 1125 at [188].

[10-0500] Deliberate frustration of order by third party

Deliberate frustration of court orders will amount to contempt, provided that the purpose of the orders is clear: *CCOM Pty Ltd v Jiejing Pty Ltd* (1992) 36 FCR 524 at 531; *Attorney General v Mayas Pty Ltd*, above, at 355; *Baker v Paul* [2013] NSWCA 426.

For a consideration of the liability of a director for orders directed to a company, see *Mahaffy v Mahaffy* (2018) 97 NSWLR 119.

Refusal to attend on subpoena/give evidence

[10-0510] Liability for refusal to attend on subpoena or to give evidence

Refusal to attend in response to a subpoena is a contempt of court, though it is not a contempt "in the face of the court": *Registrar of the Court of Appeal v Maniam (No 1)* (1991) 25 NSWLR 459; see also UCPR r 33.12.

Refusal to be sworn, or refusal to answer material questions, will constitute contempt, in the absence of any relevant privilege: *Smith v The Queen* (1991) 25 NSWLR 1; *Registrar of the Court of Appeal v Craven (No 2)* (1995) 80 A Crim R 272.

See also procedure, including for the issue of warrant, under s 194 of the *Evidence Act* 1995.

As to proofs required for contempt by failure to comply with a subpoena to produce documents, see *Markisic v Commonwealth* (2007) 69 NSWLR 737; [2007] NSWCA 92 at 748; *Mahaffy v Mahaffy*, above, at [152].

[10-0520] Duress

Duress may be raised as a defence to contempt: *Registrar of the Court of Appeal v Gilby* (unrep, 20/8/91, NSWCA). The principles to be applied are those set out in *R v Abusafiah* (1991) 24 NSWLR 531 at 545. It is not sufficient that there be a generalised fear or apprehension of retaliation, although this may be a matter relevant to penalty: *Gilby*, above; *Principal Registrar of Supreme Court of NSW v Tran* (2006) 166 A Crim R 393; *R v Razzak* (2006) 166 A Crim R 132 at [24].

[10-0530] Prevarication

While the giving of false answers in the courts of evidence is likely to interfere with the administration of justice, such conduct will not usually constitute contempt. It may amount to contempt if it consists in giving palpably false answers so as to indicate that the witness is merely fobbing inquiry: *Coward v Stapleton* (1953) 90 CLR 573 at 578–579; see also *Keeley v Brooking* (1979) 143 CLR 162 at 169, 172, 174, 178; *Commissioner for the Police Integrity Commission v Walker (No 2)* [2006] NSWSC 696.

Jurisdiction and procedure

[10-0540] Supreme Court and Dust Diseases Tribunal

Contempt of court in the face, or in the hearing of, the Supreme Court may be dealt with under the summary procedure in SCR Pt 55 Div 2 (see [10-0060]) or by directing the registrar to commence proceedings under SCR Pt 55 Div 3. Contempt not in the face or hearing of the court must proceed under Div 3: see [10-0120].

Proceedings for contempt in the face or hearing of the Supreme Court, or for breach of orders or undertakings, are assigned to the division of the court (or the Court of Appeal, as the case may be) in which the contempt occurred: SCA ss 48(2), 53(3). Contempt proceedings in respect of contempts of the Supreme Court, or of any other court, are otherwise assigned to the Common Law Division: SCA s 53(4).

The Dust Diseases Tribunal has the same powers for punishing contempt of the tribunal as are conferred on a judge of the Supreme Court for punishing contempt of a division of the Supreme Court: *Dust Diseases Tribunal Act* 1989 s 26.

[10-0550] District Court and Local Courts

The District Court has power to punish contempt of court committed in the face of the court or in the hearing of the court: DCA s 199.

The Local Court has the same powers as the District Court in respect of contempt of court committed in the face or hearing of the court: LCA s 24(1).

The District Court may refer an apparent or alleged contempt to the Supreme Court under DCA s 203 and the Local Court may refer an apparent or alleged contempt to the Supreme Court under LCA s 24(4) (see [10-0130]).

A possible contempt may alternatively be referred to the Attorney General for consideration of appropriate action.

Legislation

- *Civil Procedure Act* 2005 (NSW), 3(1), 4(1), Sch 1
- *Crimes Act* 1900, Pt 7 Div 3
- DCA ss 199, 203
- *Dust Diseases Tribunal Act* 1989, s 26
- *Evidence Act* 1995, s 194
- LCA s 24(1), (4)
- *Mental Health (Forensic Provisions) Act* 1990 (rep)
- *Mental Health and Cognitive Impairments Forensic Provisions Act* 2020
- SCA ss 48(2), 53(3), 101(5), 101(6)

Rules

- SCR Pt 55 Div 2
- UCPR rr 1.5(1), 21.7, 33.12
- Supreme Court (General Civil Procedure) Rules 2005 (Vic)

Further reading

- N Adams and B Baker, "Sentencing for contempt of court", National Judicial College of Australia and the Australian National University Sentencing Conference, 29 February 2020, Canberra

[The next page is 10171]