

SEPTEMBER 2023

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

THE
SOUTH
AUSTRALIAN
STATE REPORTS
2022

GENERAL EDITOR

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

REPORTERS IN THIS PART

MITCHELL BRUNKER
AARAHNAN RAGURAGAVAN

VOL 141 — PART 3

PAGES 262-397

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

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 3 — Pages 262-397

Adams (a pseudonym) v The Queen	204
BI (Contracting) Pty Ltd and Others; Return to Work Corporation of South Australia v	171
Blong Ume Nominees Pty Ltd and Others; Melrob Investments Pty Ltd and Others v	1
Drazetic, Dalibor, Director of Public Prosecutions v MJP; Public Prosecutions, Director of v	262
Elliott v Return to Work Corporation of South Australia	43
Henry v The Queen	230
JGS v The Queen (No 2)	288
Mahon; Police v	374
Melrob Investments Pty Ltd and Others v Blong Ume Nominees Pty Ltd and Others	1
Police v Mahon	374
Public Prosecutions, Director of v Dalibor Drazetic; Director of Public Prosecutions v MJP	262
Queen (No 2), The; JGS v	288
Queen, The; Adams (a pseudonym) v	204
Queen, The; Henry v	230
Queen, The; Roberts v	73
Queen, The; Sexton v	325
Queen, The; Tartaglia v	142
Return to Work Corporation of South Australia v BI (Contracting) Pty Ltd and Others	171
Return to Work Corporation of South Australia; Elliott v	43
Roberts v The Queen	73
Sexton v The Queen	325
Tartaglia v The Queen	142

(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 0049-1470

INDEX

Part 3 — Pages 262-397

CRIMINAL LAW

- Appeal against sentence — Where the defendant had a significant number of prior convictions and a suspended sentence bond — Whether the sentences were manifestly excessive.
Police v Mahon 374
- Appeal — Verdict unreasonable or insupportable having regard to the evidence — Whether inconsistencies in the complainant's evidence rendered the verdict unreasonable.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288
- Evidence — Admissibility of evidence before and after charged acts — Where evidence is given of the social structures of the group in which the charged acts were said to have occurred — Where the evidence relates to the periods before and after the charged acts.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288
- Evidence — Discreditable conduct evidence — Cross admissibility — Similarity of account evidence — Whether the similarities excluded independent concoction of imagination — Whether the evidence was admissible — Evidence Act 1929 (SA), s 34P.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Evidence — Discreditable conduct evidence — Where evidence of multiple complainants used as similarity of account evidence — Where evidence of a conversation between two of the complainants — Whether evidence was inadmissible as bolstering the credit of the complainants.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Evidence — Discreditable conduct evidence — Where evidence of multiple complainants used as similarity of account evidence — Where no allegation of collusion or contamination is put to the complainants — Whether prosecution bears the burden of disproving collusion or contamination.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Evidence — Hearsay — Complaint — Where a person copied or typed out online chat messages into a document — Where the maker is not called as a witness — Where another person adopts the document as true — Whether the document is admissible original evidence of complaint.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288
- Evidence — Where the defendant gives evidence — The rule in *Browne v Dunn* — Where the defendant is only challenged by a global proposition that they had committed the offences charged — Whether the defendant's denials could only be dismissed as not reasonably possibly true in the rarest of cases.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288
- Juries — Apprehended bias — Communications between a juror and witness post verdict — Where the juror expressed sympathy for the complainant — Whether there was an apprehension of bias.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288

INDEX

CRIMINAL LAW — *continued*

- Juries — Directions — Burden and standard of proof — Whether the directions were inadequate.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288
- Juries — Directions — Uncharged acts — Where the majority of the uncharged acts occurred after the charged acts — Where directions were given as to the permissible and impermissible uses of the evidence — Whether the directions were inadequate.
JGS v The Queen (No 2) 288
- Juries — Directions — Where evidence of multiple complainants used as similarity of account evidence — Whether directions were inadequate.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Juries — Directions — Where there was evidence of an erasure out of the defendant's diary — Where the evidence relied on as consciousness of guilt — Whether directions were inadequate.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Juries — Directions — Zoneff direction — Where the defendant's credibility was challenged — Where there was a risk the jury would find the defendant had lied — Whether there was a risk that conclusion would lead the jury to reason to guilt — Whether a Zoneff direction was required.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Procedure — Procedural fairness — Where there was evidence of an erasure out of the defendant's diary — Where the evidence relied on as consciousness of guilt — Whether the intended use of the evidence was sufficiently conveyed — Whether there was a denial of procedural fairness.
Sexton v The Queen 325
- Sentence — Where the Magistrate disclosed an association with a victim for the first time at sentencing — Where counsel determined to proceed to sentence and declined to object — Whether the sentencing process miscarried.
Police v Mahon 374

EQUITY

- Equitable remedies — Injunctions — Interlocutory injunctions — Preservation of status quo — Mareva Injunctions — Criminal law — Confiscation of property — Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005 (SA), ss 3(1), 6(1), 6A(3), 11, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 40, 47(3), 56, 56A, 59(1), 59A, 59B, 131, 133, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149, 150, 154, 160, 165, 171, 172, 209A — Criminal Assets Confiscation Regulations 2021 (SA), reg 6 — Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (SA), s 138(1) — Supreme Court Act 1935 (SA), s 17; Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (Cth), s 17(2)(b) — Criminal Assets Confiscation (Prescribed Drug Offenders) Amendment Act 2016 (SA) — Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006 (SA), r 247; Uniform Civil Rules 2020 (SA), rr 112.14, 112.15, 112.18 — Controlled Substances Act 1984 (SA), ss 32(1), 32(3) — Federal Court Rules 2011 (Cth), rr 7.32, 7.33 — Evidence Act 1995 (Cth), s 128A — Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), s 76 — Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 2012 (SA), Sch 2 — Royal Commissions Act 1917 (SA), s 11(1)(f).
Director of Public Prosecutions v Dalibor Drazetic; Director of Public Prosecutions v MJP 262

INDEX

JUDGES

Disqualification for interest or bias — Waiver of a right to object in criminal matters.	
<i>Police v Mahon</i>	374
Disqualification for interest or bias — Waiver of a right to object — Whether counsel was acting rationally within their ostensible authority when waiving the right to object.	
<i>Police v Mahon</i>	374
Disqualification for interest or bias — Waiver of a right to object — Whether waiver requires specific instructions from the client to be binding.	
<i>Police v Mahon</i>	374
Disqualification for interest or bias — Waiver — Where disclosure of knowledge of a victim made for the first time at sentencing — Whether counsel's failure to object constituted waiver — Whether disclosure was sufficient to found a basis for waiver.	
<i>Police v Mahon</i>	374