TRADE PRACTICES LAW JOURNAL

Volume 15, Number 2

June 2007

EDITORIAL	7	7	
	,		•

ARTICLES

The baffling intruder: Section 82(1B) of the Trade Practices Act — Part I — Danielle Gatehouse

Section 82(1B) was introduced into the *Trade Practices Act 1974* (Cth) in July 2004 by the *Corporate Law Economic Reform Program* (Audit Reform and Corporate Disclosure) Act 2004 (Cth). The amendment introduced previously irrelevant concepts into misleading or deceptive conduct jurisprudence such as "reasonable care", "intent", and "fraud". In two parts, this article will explore the reasons and aims of this change, its elements and possible application, and comment on the suitability of these changes to the goals of s 52 and of the *Trade Practices Act* itself. This article does not provide a definitive answer to the interpretation of s 82(1B); indeed this section has introduced complexities into this area of law that will require much High Court guidance. However, the article suggests that, on its proper interpretation, the impact of s 82(1B) could be very minimal. If this is correct, it is submitted that this is because the amendment reveals an inherent misunderstanding of the history and rationale of s 52 and the *Trade Practices Act*, and the conduct it was brought in to address.

Promoting fairer consumer contracts: Lessons from the United Kingdom and Victoria – $Frank\ Zumbo$

As jurisdictions around Australia move towards implementing a uniform legislative framework for dealing with unfair terms in consumer contracts, the United Kingdom and Victoria have not only implemented such a framework, but consumers in those jurisdictions are already benefiting from its operation. Significantly, it is the involvement of the relevant regulatory agency in those jurisdictions that has maximised the benefits for consumers. In contrast to the existing concepts of unconscionability where the impact of any successful litigation is essentially restricted to individual consumers or contractual arrangements affected by the conduct, the United Kingdom and Victorian frameworks dealing with unfair terms in consumer contracts allow the relevant regulatory agency in the jurisdiction to secure fairer consumer contracts across a whole industry. Indeed, where a term is considered to be unfair under such frameworks, the regulatory agency can seek to prevent the term's continued use across all consumer contracts in which the term is found. In this regard, these frameworks operate quite effectively to prevent the industry-wide use of an unfair term without the need for each and every consumer to individually challenge each use of the particular term. Within this context, this article will assess the experiences of the United Kingdom and Victoria with their frameworks for dealing with unfair contract terms, and identify the key factors contributing to the effectiveness of those frameworks.

84

74

ACCESS TO SERVICES Sydney Airport Corp Ltd v ACT: Are we coming or going? – Liana Crowne 96 **CONSUMER PROTECTION** Of Butcher and Brokers: The liability of agents passing on misleading information – Bernard McCabe **CASE NOTES** Is all fair in your Victorian consumer contract? – Mandy Bodger and Anthony Haly 106 misleading deceptive conduct: **Principles** or assessment – Warren Pengilley 109 COUNCIL CONSIDERATIONS – David Owens 113 REPORT FROM EUROPE

Guidelines for Contributors

Submission and licence agreement instructions

All contributions to the journal are welcome and should be sent, with a signed licence agreement, to the Production Editor, *Trade Practices Law Journal*, Lawbook Co., PO Box 3502, Rozelle, NSW 2039 (mail), 100 Harris St, Pyrmont, NSW 2009 (courier) or by email to tplj@thomson.com.au, for forwarding to the Editor. Licence agreements can be downloaded via the internet at http://www.thomson.com.au/support/as_contributors.asp. If you submit your contribution via email, please confirm that you have printed, signed and mailed the licence agreement to the attention of the Production Editor at the mailing address noted above.

Letters to the Editor

By submitting a letter to the editor of this journal for publication, you agree that Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, trading as Lawbook Co., may edit and has the right to, and may license third parties to, reproduce in electronic form and communicate the letter.

Manuscript

- · Manuscript must be original, unpublished work that has not been submitted for publication elsewhere.
- Personal details (name, qualifications, position) for publication and a delivery address, email address and phone number must be included with the manuscript.
- · Manuscript must be submitted electronically via email or on disk in Microsoft Word format.
- Manuscript should not exceed 7,000 words for articles or 3,000 words for section commentary or book reviews. An
 abstract of 100-150 words is to be submitted with article manuscripts.
- Proof pages will be sent to contributors. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of case names, citations and other references. Excessive changes to the text cannot be accommodated.
- This journal complies with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) Specifications for peer review. Each manuscript is, prior to publication, reviewed in its entirety by a suitably qualified expert who is independent of the author.

Style

1. Levels of headings should be clearly indicated (no more than four levels).

2 Cases

- Case citation follows case name. Where a case is cited in the text, the citation should follow immediately rather than as a footnote. Give at least two and preferably all available citations, the first listed being the authorised reference.
- Australian citations should appear in the following order: authorised series; Lawbook Co./ATP series; other company series (ie CCH, Butterworths); media neutral citation.
- "At" references should only refer to the best available citation, eg: *Mabo v Queensland [No 2]* (1992) 175 CLR 1 at 34; 66 ALJR 408; 107 ALR 1.
- Where only a media neutral citation is available, "at" references should be to paragraph, eg: YG v Minister for Community Services [2002] NSWCA 247 at [19].
- For international cases best references only should be included.

3. Legislation should be cited as follows:

Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), s 51AC. The full citation should be repeated in footnotes.

4. Books should be cited as follows:

Macken JJ, O'Grady P, Sappideen C and Warburton G, The Law of Employment (5th ed, Lawbook Co., 2002) p 55.

- In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. The following style is preferred:
- 4. Austin RP, "Constructive Trusts" in Finn PD (ed), Essays in Equity (Law Book Co, 1985).
- 5. Austin, n 4, p 56.

5. Journals should be cited as follows:

Odgers S, "Police Interrogation: A Decade of Legal Development" (1990) 14 Crim LJ 220.

Wherever possible use official abbreviations not the full name for journal titles.

- In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. The following style is preferred:
- 6. Sheehy EA, Stubbs J and Tolmie J, "Defending Battered Women on Trial: The Battered Woman Syndrome and its Limitations" (1992) 16 Crim LJ 220.
- 7. Sheehy et al, n 6 at 221.

6. Internet references should be cited as follows:

Ricketson S, *The Law of Intellectual Property: Copyright, Designs and Confidential Information* (Lawbook Co., subscription service) at [16.340], http://subscriber.lawbookco.com.au viewed 25 June 2002. Underline the URL and include the date the document was viewed.

For further information visit http://www.thomson.com.au/legal/ or contact the Production Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Trade Practices Law Journal comprises four parts a year.

Customer service and sales inquiries:
Tel: 1300 304 195 Fax: 1300 304 196
Web: www.thomson.com.au/legal/p_index.asp
Email: LRA.Service@thomson.com

Editorial inquiries: Tel: (02) 8587 7000

HEAD OFFICE 100 Harris Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 Tel: (02) 8587 7000 Fax: (02) 8587 7100



© Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited ABN 64 058 914 668 trading as Lawbook Co.

ISSN 1039-3277

Typeset by Lawbook Co., Pyrmont, NSW

Printed by Ligare Pty Ltd, Riverwood, NSW