

---

# Index

## Volume 13

---

Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act –  
    *see also* Judicial review  
    history of, 170–174  
    jurisdictional requirements for judicial review  
        under, 169–185  
        Griffith University v Tang, 174–177  
        approach of majority: requirement of  
            statutory effect on rights or  
            obligations, 178–183  
        impact on Australian Broadcasting  
        Tribunal v Bond, 177–178  
        Kirby J and s 4(b), 183  
Administrative determinations – *see* Enforcement  
Administrative notices  
    judicial review of, 194–199  
Administrative tribunals – *see* State administrative  
    tribunals; Superannuation Complaints  
    Tribunal  
Advocates – *see* Costs  
Australian Defence Force – *see under* Judicial  
    review  
  
Bureaucratic impact – *see under* Judicial review  
  
Causation – *see* Expert evidence  
Cohabitation rule, 135–146  
    AAT decisions, 139–143  
    administration and surveillance, 143–146  
    Social Security Act 1991 (Cth), 137–139  
Costs  
    non-lawyer advocates, 80–86  
        general approach, 85  
        generally, 81  
        Industrial Court of Queensland, 81–82  
        Northern Territory Lands and Mining  
        Tribunal, 83–84  
        Queensland Land and Resources Tribunal,  
        82–83  
Courts – *see* State administrative tribunals  
Determinations – *see* Enforcement  
Enforcement of administrative determinations,  
    121–134

debt recovery, 122–123  
interstate determinations, 128–130  
mandatory and restraining orders, 123–124  
monetary penalties, 123  
registration, 125–128  
self-regulatory determinations, 131–133  
whether required, 124–125  
Expert evidence  
    medico-scientific evidence before tribunals, 69–  
        79  
        complementary and alternative medicine, 78  
        contentious issues, 77  
        procedures for evaluating expert opinions,  
        75–77  
    proof, 70–72  
        legal principles, 70  
        scientific concept (cancer cause), 70–72  
    stress and illness, 77–78  
    who are experts?, 73  
        cancer causation, 74  
        rules of evidence, 74–75  
            basis rule, 75  
            expertise rule, 74  
  
Freedom of information  
    United Kingdom  
        book review, 5–7  
  
High Court – *see also* Procedural fairness  
  
Judicial review  
    Australian Defence Force, adverse  
        administrative decisions affecting careers  
        of members of, 8–46  
    adverse administrative action, 11  
    anti-discrimination laws, 37  
    age discrimination, 39–40  
        Hamilton case, 39–40  
        Manning case, 40  
    disability discrimination, 37–39  
        Williams case, 38–39  
        X's case, 37–38

## Index

---

### Judicial review – *continued*

- Australian Defence Force, adverse administrative decisions affecting careers of members of– *continued*
- case law post-Coutts, 30–35
  - amenability of command power to judicial review, 34–35
  - Bromet cases, 32–34
  - Clark cases, 35
  - Paterson case, 31
  - Shand cases, 31–32
  - Sherston case, 30–31
- command and legal framework, 11–19
  - command environment, 15
  - Defence Act, 19
  - nature of command, 15–16
  - philosophy of command, 16–17
  - relationship between Crown and armed forces, 14
  - servants of the Crown, 12–14
  - source of command power, 17–18
  - statute, 14–15
- compensation, 44–45
  - Smith case, 45
- Coutts case, 24–27
  - analysis, 25–26
  - majority, 24–25
  - minority, 25
  - Patton case and, 26–27
- existing ADF review mechanisms, 8–11
  - Australian Public Service, 10–11
  - external review, 9–10
  - internal review, 8–9
- industrial laws, 36
  - Armed Forces Federation of Australia, 36
  - Williams case, 36
- jurisdictional error: recent developments, 40–44
  - Bromet cases, 42–43
  - Clark cases, 43–44
  - Doyle case, 44
- justiciability, 23–24
- legislative reforms, 28–30
- mystique of military, 20–22
  - observations regarding command, 21–22
- recent judicial interpretation of power of command, 19–20

### bureaucratic impact

- review of improvement notice decision in Bailey v Dall, 194–199

### statutory

- decisions under an enactment, 169–185

### Judicial Review Act 1991 (Qld)

- history of, 170–174
- jurisdictional requirements for judicial review under – *see* Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act

### Medical evidence – *see* Expert evidence

### Non-lawyer advocates – *see* Costs

### Procedural fairness

- High Court decisions in SAAP and VEAL, 186–193
  - reconciling with earlier case law, 190–192
- SAAP, 186–188
- VEAL, 188–190

### Proof – *see* Expert evidence

### Representation by non-lawyers– *see* Costs

### Rule of law

- alternative approaches, 100–101
- as an ideal, 87–88
- embodiment in legal system, 89–90
- High Court view, 88–89
- scope and force of rule of law in Australia, 101–102
- Woolworths Ltd v Pallas Newco Pty Ltd (case study), 91–102
  - assessment of statutory scheme, 94–95
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act s 101, 95–98
  - application in Woolworths, 97–98
  - issues in relation to interpretation, 98–100
    - certainty, 98–99
    - lack of absolute bar, 98
    - parliamentary intention, 99–100
    - public notice of decision, 98
  - privative clauses, 96–97
  - time limitations, 95

- Rule of law— *continued*
- Woolworths Ltd v Pallas Newco Pty Ltd (case study) — *continued*
    - jurisdictional fact, 91–94
      - characterisation prior to Woolworths, 91–92
    - judicial deference, 92
      - application in Woolworths, 93–94
      - Londish case, 93
    - rule of law and, 91
- Scientific evidence — *see* Expert evidence
- Social security law — *see* Cohabitation rule
- State administrative tribunals — *see also* Western Australia State Administrative Tribunal
- as “courts”, 103–116
    - Commonwealth v Wood, 115–116
    - consequences if not “courts”, 112–114
      - determination of federal matters by exercising State judicial power, 114
    - valid exercise of non-judicial powers, 113–114
      - proceedings involving Commonwealth, 113–114
      - what powers are judicial, 113
  - definition of “court” tied to constitutional factors, 107–112
    - difference from “balance sheet” approach, 112
    - effect of Constitution on States’ powers to define “courts”, 107–108
    - establishment as “court”, 111–112
      - “court” in some functions, 111–112
    - exercise of judicial power, 108–109
      - manner of performing judicial functions, 108–109
      - proportion of judicial functions, 109
    - independence and qualifications of members, 109–
      - qualifications, 110–111
      - tenure and remuneration, 109–110
    - definition of State “court”: existing case law, 104–106
      - “balance sheet” approach, 105–106
      - Orellana-Fuentes; NSW Workers Compensation Commission not a “court”, 106
      - Radio 2UE: NSW Tribunal is “court”, 106
      - Re Maltall: VCAT not a “court”, 105–106
      - “court of law” approach, 105
      - Shell Co of Australia case: some “negative propositions”, 104–105
  - Superannuation Complaints Tribunal, 147–163
    - public/private distinction in Australian law, 160–161
    - quasi-private nature, 158–160
    - review of tribunal decisions, 153–154
    - review of trustee decisions, 149–150
    - review otherwise than under Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act, 156–158
    - review under Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act, 154–156
    - role, 148–149
    - standards for trustees under statute, judicial review and equity, 151–153
    - trust applied to public bodies, 161–162
  - Tribunals — *see* State administrative tribunals; Superannuation Complaints Tribunal
  - Western Australia State Administrative Tribunal, 47–64
    - establishment, 47
      - reasons for and history of, 48–51
    - jurisdiction, 51–52
    - merit review standards, 52–59
      - independence from executive, 53–55
      - informality, flexibility and accessibility, 55–59
      - objectives and type of merit review, 52–53
    - role in improving government accountability, 59–63
      - accountability of SAT, 61–62
      - agency decision making, 60
      - evaluation of SAT, 62–63