# The Authorised Reports of Decisions of the Supreme Court of South Australia

# SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STATE REPORTS 2022

HIS HONOUR JUDGE HANDSHIN KC Judge of the District Court of South Australia

**GENERAL EDITOR** 

**SENIOR REPORTER** 

**DANIEL LORBEER** 

REPORTER IN THIS PART

MITCHELL BRUNKER

**VOL 141 — PART 1** 

**PAGES 1-141** 

# The mode of citation of this part will be: 141 SASR

### TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 1 — Pages 1-141

Blong Ume Nominees Pty Ltd and Others; Meirod Investments Pty	
Ltd and Others v	1
Elliott v Return to Work Corporation of South Australia	43
Melrob Investments Pty Ltd and Others v Blong Ume Nominees	
Pty Ltd and Others	1
Queen, The; Roberts v	
Return to Work Corporation of South Australia; Elliott v	43
Roberts v The Queen	73

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



© 2023 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0049-1470

## **INDEX**

Part 1 — Pages 1-141

CORPORATIONS
Membership, rights and remedies — Members' remedies and internal disputes — Oppressive or unfair conduct — Company's activity comprised acting as trustee of a trust — Whether conduct oppressive — Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), ss 53, 232, 233.  Melrob Investments Pty Ltd and Others v Blong Ume Nominees Pty
Ltd and Others1
Winding up — Other grounds for winding up — Conduct of directors — Oppressive, unfairly prejudicial or unfairly discriminatory conduct — Trustee company leasing trust property to entities associated with directors at less than market rents — Whether trustee should be wound up — Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), s 461(1).
Melrob Investments Pty Ltd and Others v Blong Ume Nominees Pty Ltd and Others
CRIMINAL LAW
Appeal against sentence — Grounds for interference — Whether the sentence was manifestly excessive.
Roberts v The Queen
Procedure — Jury trial — Intervention by trial judge — Whether interventions were excessive — Whether interventions created an impression that the trial judge was aligned with the prosecution case — Whether the interventions were productive of a miscarriage of justice.
Roberts v The Queen
Procedure — Summing up — Duty to sum up on the defence case — Whether inadequate summary of the defence case.
Roberts v The Queen73
Procedure — Summing up — Imbalance in summing up — Comments by trial judge — Whether the impugned comments were productive of a miscarriage of justice.
Roberts v The Queen
EQUITY
Trusts and trustees — Appointment, removal and estate of trustees — Retirement and removal — Removal by the court — Jurisdiction and powers — Whether good reason to revoke the trust, direct the sale of the property and order the distribution of the proceeds — Whether orders sought in accordance with the spirit of the trust — Trustee Act 1936 (SA), s 59C.
Melrob Investments Pty Ltd and Others v Blong Ume Nominees Pty  Ltd and Others

### INDEX

### WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Assessment and amount of compensation — Review of weekly payments — Where adjustments must be made to reflect any other relevant changes in the circumstances of the recipient — Where the recipient ceased to receive social security benefits — Whether changes in social security benefits are impliedly excluded from consideration — Return to Work Act 2014 (SA), s 60.  Elliott v Return to Work Corporation of South Australia	. 43
Assessment and amount of compensation — Review of weekly payments — Where adjustments must be made to reflect any other relevant changes in the circumstances of the recipient — Where the recipient ceased to receive social security benefits — Whether "other relevant changes" is confined to circumstances other than sources of income related solely to the individual circumstances of the recipient — Return to Work Act 2014 (SA), s 60.  Elliott v Return to Work Corporation of South Australia	. 43
Assessment and amount of compensation — Review of weekly payments — Where the recipient's circumstances have changed — Whether, on review, payments can be increased beyond the level of dependency as originally assessed — Return to Work Act 2014 (SA), ss 59, 60.	
Elliott v Return to Work Corporation of South Australia	. 43