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

THE TASMANIAN REPORTS 2020-2021

EDITOR L W MAHER

REPORTERS

BENEDICT BARTL CHRISTOPHER GROVES JENNIFER O'FARRELL LEWIS RINGWALDT

VOL 33 — PART 3

PAGES 244-364

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 3 — Pages 244-364

AB and CD; Tasmania v	1
Ashrafi v Director of Public Prosecutions (Cth)	234
Barnes; Hefny v	88
Barnes; Johnston v	194
Bell v Tasmania	95
Burrows; TT Line Company Pty Ltd v	163
CBF v Tasmania	
CGU; Thomas v	244
Churchman; Motor Accidents Insurance Board v	
CMB v Mental Health Tribunal	
Elnami v Tasmania	60
Gamble v Kingborough Council	43
Gandini v Tasmania Police	320
Gutwein v Tasmanian Industrial Commission	107
Hefny v Barnes	88
Hopkinson v Wilkie	153
Horan; Turner v	213
Johnston v Barnes	194
Jordan v Rutland	81
Judges; Mrgic v	203
Kingborough Council; Gamble v	43
Lese; Tassal Operations Pty Ltd v	337
McTaggart; Triffitt v	220
(Cases in bold reported in this part)	



© 2022 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited
ABN 64 058 914 668
Published in Sydney

ISSN 0085-7106

Lawbook Co.

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Mental Health Tribunal; CMB v)6
MFC; State of Tasmania v	2
MFC; State of Tasmania v	21
Motor Accidents Compensation Tribunal; Rush v	26
Motor Accidents Insurance Board v Churchman	27
Mrgic v Judges)3
Ohl v Tasmania	54
Public Prosecutions (Cth), Director of; Ashrafi v	34
Rattigan; State of Tasmania v	24
Rush v Motor Accidents Compensation Tribunal	26
Rutland; Jordan v	
Tasmania Police; Gandini v	20
Tasmania v AB and CD	1
Tasmania, State of v MFC	2
Tasmania, State of v MFC	21
Tasmania, State of v Rattigan	24
Tasmania; Bell v)5
Tasmania; CBF v	53
Tasmania; Elnami v	50
Tasmania; Ohl v	54
Tasmanian Industrial Commission; Gutwein v)7
Tassal Operations Pty Ltd v Lese	
Thomas v CGU	14
Triffitt v McTaggart	20
TT Line Company Pty Ltd v Burrows	53
Turner v Horan	3
Wilkie: Hopkinson v	53

INDEX

Part 3 — Pages 244-364

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Health law — Detention, involuntary treatment, care and protection of mentally ill persons — Mental Health Tribunal — Treatment order — Criteria — Determination of chance of serious harm to patient or others — Person diagnosed as suffering from schizophrenia — Likelihood of self-harm or harm to others in the absence of treatment — Something that might well happen — Mathematical probability test inappropriate — Mental Health Act 2013 (Tas), ss 40(b), 174. CMB v Mental Health Tribunal	
Judicial review — Grounds of review — Claims for motor vehicle accident medical benefits — Referral of claims by Motor Accidents Insurance Board to Motor Accidents Compensation Tribunal — Merits of referrals — Procedural fairness — Context — Variable content — Broad test — Reasonable opportunity to present case — Hearing — Nature of hearing — Direction that hearing of application be conducted by telephone — Applicant insisting that Tribunal schedule an in-person hearing — Refusal of applicant's adjournment application — Applicant warned that hearing might proceed in absence of applicant — No breach of duty to afford natural justice established — Motor Accidents (Liabilities and Compensation) Act 1973 (Tas). **Rush v Motor Accidents Compensation Tribunal**	•
CRIMINAL LAW	
Appeal and new trial — Particular grounds of appeal — Conduct of defence counsel — Alleged incompetence of trial counsel — Counsel said to have failed to abide by instructions — Broad discretion of counsel as to conduct of trial. Ohl v Tasmania	
Appeal and new trial — Particular grounds of appeal — Fresh evidence — Availability at trial, materiality and cogency — Availability at trial — Evidence said to be in possession of Crown not disclosed to defence. Ohl v Tasmania	
Appeal and new trial — Procedure — Notice of appeal — Time for appeal and extension thereof — Jury verdict returned in 2014 — High Court refusing special leave to appeal in 2015 — Application for extension of time for leave to appeal 18 months later — No merit in grounds of fresh evidence and incompetence of counsel — Criminal Code (Tas), s 418(2).	
Ohl v Tasmania	. 264

INDEX

CRIMINAL LAW — continued	
Procedure — Warrants, arrest, search, seizure and incidental powers — Warrants — Warrants for arrest and detention — Issue and validity — Person subject to police bail — Deliberate failure by person in court to answer to name on bail and court documents — Justices Act 1959 (Tas), s 34 — Bail Act 1994 (Tas), s 5(1)(a) — Road Safety (Alcohol and Drugs) Act 1970 (Tas), s 14(1)(b) — Police Offences Act 1935 (Tas), s 34B(1)(b). **Gandini v Tasmania Police**	320
Sentence — Sentencing orders — Community Protection — Orders and declarations relating to serious or violent offenders or dangerous sexual offenders — Dangerous sexual offender — Registration, reporting and like matters — Factors relevant to assessment of reporting period — Child offenders — Non-punitive nature of reporting orders — Maximum reporting period for child guilty of reportable offence — Community Protection (Offender Reporting) Act 2005 (Tas), ss 24, 25.	252
CBF v Tasmania	333
HUMAN RIGHTS	
Individual liberty — Arrest — Person charged with summary street offences — Person released from custody on police bail — Person appearing in court — Deliberate refusal to answer to name — Gravity of right to be free of detention — Motion to review magistrate's issue of warrant for arrest of person dismissed. Gandini v Tasmania Police	320
LEGAL PRACTITIONERS	
Obligations — Criminal Law — Appeal and new trial — Particular grounds of appeal — Cogent evidence not available at trial — Alleged failure of prosecution to disclose exculpatory evidence — No particulars given in application — Court of Criminal Appeal informed on hearing of application that it was filed on a speculative basis — Unsatisfactory explanation — Conduct bordering on misuse of Court process — Court finding it necessary to remind legal practitioners of obligations — To studiously avoid misusing Court process — Not to file documents containing unsupported assertions.	
Ohl v Tasmania	264
PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE	
Remedies — Availability — Discretion — Declarations — Supreme Court Civil Procedure Act 1932 (Tas), s 47(1) — Supreme Court Rules 2000 (Tas), r 103. CMB v Mental Health Tribunal	
STATUTES	
Interpretation — Use of extraneous material — Parliament — Second reading speech.	
Thomas v CCII	244

INDEX

WORDS AND PHRASES
"Likely".
CMB v Mental Health Tribunal306
"State where the worker is usually based".
<i>Thomas v CGU</i>
WORKERS COMPENSATION
Entitlement to compensation — Injury, disease or disability — Disease — Aggravation or acceleration of pre-existing disease or condition — General principles — Causation — Employment major or most significant contributing factor to aggravation, acceleration, exacerbation or deterioration of pre-existing disease — Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988 (Tas), ss 3, 25, 49(2)(a), 81A.
Tassal Operations Pty Ltd v Lese
Liability of employer to pay compensation — Reasonably arguable case — Whether requisite causal relationship between employment and injury. Tassal Operations Pty Ltd v Lese
Proceedings to obtain compensation — Appeals, judicial review — Question of law — Entitlement to compensation — Requirement that employment be relevantly connected with the State of Tasmania — Statutory indicia of connection — Requirement that evidence clearly showed connection — Cartage contractor with principal place of business in Tasmania — Employment of casual heavy vehicle driver to "help on mainland Australia" — Employment of worker resident in Victoria — Use of depot in Port of Melbourne for change of prime movers, trailers and loads — Worker visiting employer's place of business in Tasmania once in course of employment — Worker injured in New South Wales — Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Tribunal determination that worker's employment not relevantly connected with Tasmania — No error of law demonstrated — Appeal dismissed — Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988 (Tas), s 31A(1), (3), (5), (6) — Acts Interpretation Act 1931 (Tas), s 8A.
Thomas v CGU244
Proceedings to obtain compensation — Preliminary requirements — Interim payments — Reasonably arguable case for employer not established — No error established — Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988 (Tas), s 81A. **Tassal Operations Pty Ltd v Lese**