The Authorised Law Reports of the Supreme Court of Western Australia

THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN REPORTS 2021

ERIC HEENAN SC

REPORTERS IN THIS PART
HUGH KOPSEN
JAMES O'HARA

VOL 58 — PART 6

PAGES 464-571

The mode of citation of this part will be: 58 WAR

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 6 — Pages 464-571

Chappell as Executor of the Estate of Hitchcock v Goldspan	
Investments Pty Ltd	503
Chevron (Tapl) Pty Ltd v Pilbara Iron Company (Services) Pty Ltd	102
Girgis; Poliwka v	205
Goldspan Investments Pty Ltd; Chappell as Executor of the Estate	
of Hitchcock v	503
Halford v Halford	254
Halford; Halford v	254
Investment Club Pty Ltd; Trimat Holdings Pty Ltd v	. 45
JEL v Western Australia	295
Macmahon Mining Services Pty Ltd; Micon Mining and Construction	
Products GMBH & Co KG v	
Meyer v Solomon	464
Micon Mining and Construction Products GMBH & Co KG v	
Macmahon Mining Services Pty Ltd	
O'Leary v Western Australia	
Pilbara Iron Company (Services) Pty Ltd; Chevron (Tapl) Pty Ltd v	102
Poliwka v Girgis	
R v T	. 77
Solomon; Meyer v	464
Stefanski v Western Australia	1
Stevenson v Zafra Pty Ltd	383
T; R v	. 77
Trimat Holdings Pty Ltd v Investment Club Pty Ltd	. 45
Western Australia; JEL v	295
Western Australia; O'Leary v	170
Western Australia; Stefanski v	1
Zafra Pty Ltd; Stevenson v	383

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

© State of Western Australia 2023

This publication is copyright. Except as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part of this publication may be reproduced or communicated by any process without the prior written permission of the Attorney General of Western Australia.



2023 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited
ABN 64 058 914 668
Published in Sydney

ISSN 0083-8764

Lawbook Co.

INDEX

Part 6 — Pages 464-571

DEFAMATION
Limitation of actions — Appeal against refusal by primary judge to grant extension of time to commence proceedings under s 40 of the Limitation Act 2005 (WA) — Whether, if the court is satisfied it was not reasonable in the circumstances for the plaintiff to have commenced an action within one year from publication, the court has a discretion in respect of the length of any extension of time, subject to the three year limit prescribed by s 40(3) — Whether the primary judge erred in the exercise of his discretion in dismissing the appellant's extension application and in dismissing the appellant's action against the respondent by deciding that the appropriate extension under s 40(2) was for a period ending before the appellant filed his writ of summons. Meyer v Solomon
MISLEADING OR DECEPTIVE CONDUCT
Death of original plaintiff before trial — Abatement — Substitution of the original plaintiff's executor as the plaintiff in the pending proceedings — Whether the original plaintiff's executor was a person who had suffered loss or damage for the purposes of the statutory claims based on misleading or deceptive conduct — Proper construction of the term "person" in each of s 1041I of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), s 12GF of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001 (Cth) and s 236 of the Australian Consumer Law (WA) — Proper construction of s 4 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1941 (WA) — Whether s 79 of the Judiciary Act 1903 (Cth) picked up and applied s 4 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act — Whether the causes of action under s 1041I of the Corporations Act, s 12GF of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act and s 236 of the Australian Consumer Law (WA) which were subsisting or vested in the original plaintiff survived for the benefit of his estate. *Chappell as Executor of the Estate of Hitchcock v Goldspan Investments Pty Ltd and Others
WORDS AND PHRASES
"Cause of action" — Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1941 (WA), s 4. Chappell as Executor of the Estate of Hitchcock v Goldspan Investments Pty Ltd and Others
"Person" — Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), s 1041I — Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001 (Cth), s 12GF — Australian Consumer Law (WA), s 236. Chappell as Executor of the Estate of Hitchcock v Goldspan
Investments Pty Ltd and Others