

JANUARY 2023

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

THE
TASMANIAN
REPORTS
2021

EDITOR
L W MAHER

REPORTER
ROLAND BROWNE

VOL 33 — PART 4

PAGES 365-513

**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 4 — Pages 365-513

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	353
CGU; Thomas v	244
Churchman; Motor Accidents Insurance Board v	127
CMB v Mental Health Tribunal	306
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)



THOMSON REUTERS

© 2023 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0085-7106

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Mental Health Tribunal; CMB v	306
MFC; State of Tasmania v	12
MFC; State of Tasmania v	21
Motor Accidents Compensation Tribunal; Rush v	326
Motor Accidents Insurance Board v Churchman	127
Mrgic v Judges	203
Neill-Fraser v Tasmania	365
Ohl v Tasmania	264
Public Prosecutions (Cth), Director of; Ashrafi v	234
Rattigan; State of Tasmania v	224
Rush v Motor Accidents Compensation Tribunal	326
Rutland; Jordan v	81
Tasmania Police; Gandini v	320
Tasmania v AB and CD	1
Tasmania, State of v MFC	12
Tasmania, State of v MFC	21
Tasmania, State of v Rattigan	224
Tasmania; Bell v	95
Tasmania; CBF v	353
Tasmania; Elnami v	60
Tasmania; Neill-Fraser v	365
Tasmania; Ohl v	264
Tasmanian Industrial Commission; Gutwein v	107
Tassal Operations Pty Ltd v Lese	337
Thomas v CGU	244
Triffitt v McTaggart	220
TT Line Company Pty Ltd v Burrows	163
Turner v Horan	213
Wilkie; Hopkinson v	153

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

INDEX

Part 4 — Pages 365-513

CRIMINAL LAW

Appeal and new trial — Miscarriage of justice — Generally — Second or subsequent appeal — Substantial miscarriage of justice not demonstrated — Criminal Code (Tas), s 402A(6).	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365
Appeal and new trial — Particular grounds of appeal — Fresh evidence — Availability at trial — Materiality and cogency — Generally — Evidence not compelling — Criminal Code (Tas), s 402A(6).	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365
Appeal and new trial — Particular grounds of appeal — Fresh evidence — Availability at trial, — Materiality and cogency — Evidence in possession of Crown not disclosed to defence — Not established that evidence could not, even with the exercise of reasonable diligence, have been adduced at trial — Criminal Code (Tas), s 402A(6).	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365

WORDS AND PHRASES

“Fresh and compelling evidence”.	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365
“Highly probative”.	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365
“Reliable”.	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365
“Substantial miscarriage of justice”.	
<i>Neill-Fraser v Tasmania</i>	365