

JUNE 2022

The Authorised Reports of the Decisions of the
Supreme Court of Tasmania

THE
TASMANIAN
REPORTS
2020-2021

EDITOR
L W MAHER

REPORTERS
BENEDICT BARTL
LEWIS RINGWALDT

VOL 33 — PART 1

PAGES 1-126

**PUBLISHED FOR THE COUNCIL OF LAW REPORTING
OF TASMANIA BY THOMSON REUTERS (PROFESSIONAL) AUSTRALIA LTD.**

The mode of citation of this part will be:
33 Tas R

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 1 — Pages 1-126

AB and CD; Tasmania v	1
Barnes; Hefny v	88
Bell v Tasmania	95
Elnami v Tasmania	60
Gamble v Kingborough Council	43
Gutwein v Tasmanian Industrial Commission	107
Hefny v Barnes	88
Jordan v Rutland	81
Kingborough Council; Gamble v	43
MFC; State of Tasmania v	12
MFC; State of Tasmania v	21
Rutland; Jordan v	81
Tasmania v AB and CD	1
Tasmania, State of v MFC	12
Tasmania, State of v MFC	21
Tasmania; Bell v	95
Tasmania; Elnami v	60
Tasmanian Industrial Commission; Gutwein v	107

(Cases in **bold** reported in this part)



THOMSON REUTERS

© 2022 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0085-7106

INDEX

Part 1 — Pages 1-126

COURTS

- Practice and procedure — Summary dismissal of civil proceeding — Pleading — Statement of Claim — Whether reasonable cause of action disclosed — Authorities perhaps indicative of no cause of action — Power to strike out not to be used to stultify development of common law — Defendant failing to establish very clear case that no cause of action pleaded — Discretion.
- State of Tasmania v MFC* 21

CRIMINAL LAW

- Appeal and new trial — Appeal against sentence — Grounds for interference — Sentence manifestly excessive or inadequate — Trafficking in crystalline methylamphetamine — Offender found in possession of 28.8 grams — Proof of three sales in previous 10 days — Prior conviction for trafficking in methylamphetamine — Evidence that appellant not an addict selling purely to fund addiction — Sentence of two years' imprisonment with non-parole period of 16 months not manifestly excessive.
- Bell v Tasmania* 95
- Evidence — Confessions and admissions — Statements — Admissions by accused or counsel at trial and after conviction — Concessions by defence counsel — Defence counsel precluded from arguing contrary to concession made at preliminary hearing — Evidence Act 2001 (Tas), ss 191 184.
- Gamble v Kingborough Council* 43
- General matters — Ancillary liability — Conspiracy — Evidence — Admissibility — Co-conspirator's rule — Preconditions for admissibility of hearsay representations of co-conspirator — Prejudice or embarrassment to accused — One accused charged with murder of victim two days after death of victim's husband — Victim's death occurring in her home — Death caused by lethal injection of drugs over a period of time on day of victim's death — Person who administered lethal dose charged with murder — That person and another person present charged with conspiracy to conceal cause of death and deceive police — Whether co-conspirator's rule applicable where evidence admitted to prove the existence of conspiracy — Purpose test — Criminal Code (Tas) ss 158, 297, 311(2), 326 — Evidence Act 2001 (Tas), ss 18, 66.
- Tasmania v AB and CD* 1
- Particular offences — Assault — Generally — Definition of assault — Elements of offence — Finding that the applicant was subjectively reckless in applying force to the complainant sufficient to amount to an assault.
- Jordan v Rutland* 81

INDEX

CRIMINAL LAW — *continued*

- Particular offences — Bestiality — Interpretation — Legislative history —
Demurrer pleaded by accused on basis that crime of bestiality only committed
where penetration is with a penis by, or of, an animal — Accused inserted finger
into dog's anus, attempted to masturbate dog's penis, attempted to induce dog to
lick his penis and attempted to penetrate dog's anus with his penis — Held that
s 122 of the Criminal Code required vaginal penetration or anal penetration by,
or of, an animal — Demurrer allowed — Accused discharged — Criminal Code
(Tas), ss 122, 354(4).
Elnami v Tasmania 60
- Sentence — Sentencing orders — Non-custodial orders — Other types of order —
Drug treatment order — Court required to order an assessment report if
considering making a drug treatment order — Sentencing judge declined to
order an assessment report — Inappropriate to order an assessment report if not
considering making the order — Sentencing Act 1997 (Tas), ss 27B, 27C, 27D.
Bell v Tasmania 95

ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

- Environmental planning — Planning offences — Prosecution for use of land
without planning permit — Motel operators permitting mobile coffee cart
owners to conduct business without land use permit — Whether operation of
cart involved use of land — Whether incidental to permitted use of land for
motel — Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993 (Tas), ss 51, 3(3), 65E.
Gamble v Kingborough Council 43

INDUSTRIAL LAW

- Tasmania — Registered agreements — Interpretation — Fairness — State Service
employees — State Service Act 2000 (Tas), s 37(3)(b).
Gutwein v Tasmanian Industrial Commission 107
- Tasmania — Registered agreements — Tasmanian Industrial Commission —
Jurisdiction and powers — Agreements — Approval — Retrospectivity —
Agreement increasing remuneration for former employees — Validity —
Whether agreement applied to former employees not employed at the time of the
agreement but employed during the relevant time — Industrial Relations Act
1984 (Tas) ss 3, 55(1), (4)(a), (6)(b).
Gutwein v Tasmanian Industrial Commission 107

INDEX

MAGISTRATES

- Hearing — Conduct of magistrates — Prosecution — Assault and resisting police — Procedural fairness — Apprehended bias — Unrepresented defendant — Prosecution witness — Ability to make himself understood in English — Magistrate not obliged to arrange for an interpreter to be supplied — Magistrate's participation in conduct of hearing — Controlling presentation of evidence-in-chief of unrepresented defendant and his witness — Magistrate — No unfairness in the circumstances.
Hefny v Barnes 88
- Hearing — Evidence — Other matters — Matters relating to decision — Appeal against finding of guilt on one count of assault and one count of trespass — Whether finding of guilt was reasonably open to magistrate — Conclusions drawn by magistrate clearly open.
Jordan v Rutland 81

PROCEDURE

- Civil proceedings in State and Territory Courts — Ending proceedings early — Summary disposal — Generally — Claim not clearly untenable — Application for judgment dismissed — Application to strike-out pleadings in respect of the tort of dismissed — Misfeasance in public office — Statutory immunity from liability — Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1997 (Tas), ss 18.
State of Tasmania v MFC 12
- Supreme Court procedure — Tasmania — Procedure under rules of Court — Associate Judges — Supreme Court Civil Procedure Act 1932 (Tas), ss 47, 191B.
State of Tasmania v MFC 12

STATUTORY INTERPRETATION

- Extrinsic aids — Parliamentary Debates — Minister's Second Reading Speech.
Elnami v Tasmania 60

TORTS

- Intentional torts — Misfeasance in public office — Publication of report of investigation of report of allegation by child of sexual assault by proprietor of foster home — Good faith — Recklessness — Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1997 (Tas), s 111.
State of Tasmania v MFC 12
- Miscellaneous torts — Misfeasance in public office — Public servant investigating and reporting as to circumstances of child alleged to have been sexually assaulted — Claim for damages by foster parent against State — Whether arguable that foster parent had a cause of action — Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1997 (Tas), s 111.
State of Tasmania v MFC 21

INDEX

WORDS AND PHRASES

“Act done, or omitted, in good faith in the performance or exercise, or purported performance or exercise, of a function or power”.	
<i>State of Tasmania v MFC</i>	12
“Bestiality”.	
<i>Elnami v Tasmania</i>	60
“Development”.	
<i>Gamble v Kingborough Council</i>	43
“Good faith”.	
<i>State of Tasmania v MFC</i>	21
“Industrial matter”.	
<i>Gutwein v Tasmanian Industrial Commission</i>	107
“Land”.	
<i>Gamble v Kingborough Council</i>	43
“Use”.	
<i>Gamble v Kingborough Council</i>	43