

Civil Procedure 70104

Case Notes

Table of Contents

1. Introduction to Civil Practice	2
Queensland v J L Holdings (1997) 189 CLR 146.....	2
AON Risk Service v Australian National University (2009) 239 CLR 175	3
7. Drafting Pleadings, Evidence in Proceedings	4
Gunns Ltd v Marr [2005] VSC 251	4
Dow Jones & Co v Gutnick [2002] HCA 56; 210 CLR 575.....	5
Bulldogs Rugby League Club Ltd Williams [2008] NSC 822	6
Markisic v Department of Community Service of NSW (No 2) [2006] NSWCA 321.....	7
Silversides Superfunds P/L v Silverstate Developments P/L [2008] NSWSC 904.....	8
9. Interlocutory Applications	9
Vaughan v Dawson [2005] NSWSC 33.....	9
10. Injunctions.....	10
Samsung Electronics Co Limited v Apple Inc [2011] FCAFC 156	10
11. Strike-out, summary disposal, vexatious litigants	11
General Steel Industries Inc v Commissioner for Railways (NSW) (1964) 112 CLR 125	11
Attorney General v Wentworth (1988) 14 NSWLR 481	12
Attorney General of NSW v Rahman [2014] NSWSC 42	13
12. Cost as a means of managing litigation and cost orders	14
Legal Services Commissioner v Mullins [2006] QLPT 12	14
Firth v Latham & Ors [2007] NSWCA 40.....	15
Kain v Mobbs (No 2) [2008] NSWCA 599	16

1. Introduction to Civil Practice

Queensland v J L Holdings (1997) 189 CLR 146

Topic	Civil Procedure/Civil Practice
Headline	Individual justice must take priority over case management
Date	14 January 1997
In brief	This decision of appeal from the High Court has found that greater emphasis should be placed on achieving justice in litigation when considering the efficacy of case management principles. It was considered that a party could present its case but with limitations, and considered whether case management can be used to justify the denial of bringing a valid defence.
Relevant Legal Principles	The relevant legal principle is that of case management principles and how much important should be given to them.
The relevant facts	<p>In this case, (case citation), the parties, State of Queensland and JL Holdings, were engaged in a long-running commercial dispute concerning a lease to develop certain land. The estimated length of trial was 4 months. After a number of interlocutory hearing and several amendments to the defence, the defendants applied again to amend their defence, and all were granted except one.</p> <p>In the Federal Court of Australia, where this case was heard previously, Kiefel J refused leave to add a defence, which, though arguable, was likely to result in the vacation of the date which had been fixed for the trial 6 months ahead, meaning that the amendment of defences would jeopardise the hearing dates. The judge considered that maintaining the specific date was a more pressing consideration than a party's right to present a further defence.</p>
The decision/ Reasons for the exercise of any discretion	In an unanimous decision, the judges agreed that the decision of the FCA should be overturned and the amendment be allowed. It was held that case management principles were a relevant consideration but they could not be used to prevent a party from litigating an issue that is fairly arguable. A party should be permitted to raise an arguable defence provided any prejudice to other parties could be compensated by costs. Further, the appropriate remedy for the increased costs would not be to disallow the defence, but to hold the party raising the defence liable for the costs involved with their litigation. The court said that 'case management is an important and useful aid for ensuring the prompt and efficient disposal of litigation ... the ultimate aim of the court is the attainment of justice and no principle of case management can be allowed to supplant that aim'. Also that: 'Case management [...] should not have been allowed to prevail over the injustice of shutting the applicants out from raising an arguable defence, thus precluding the determination of an issue between the parties ... the primary judge was, in our view, in error in the exercise of her discretion.' The court stated that the proposed amendments would likely be easily accommodated into a hearing estimated to last 4 months and if it is arguable, the defendant (QLD) should be permitted to argue it.
Lessons from the decision/ matters of consideration	The High Court of Australia placed greater emphasis on justice between the immediate parties to litigation when considering the efficacy of case management principles. Their Honours took into account the fact that Kiefel J had been responsible for the case since 1994 and was therefore in the best position to judge the effect of the requested amendment. Even so, they found she was in error. Though case management is endorsed, individual justice is the dominant criterion and take priority over case management.