

APRIL 2024

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

THE
TASMANIAN
REPORTS
2020-2023

EDITOR
L W MAHER

REPORTERS
BENEDICT BARTL
ROLAND BROWNE
ELLA SYNNOTT

VOL 35 — PART 3

PAGES 252-361

**PUBLISHED FOR THE COUNCIL OF LAW REPORTING
OF TASMANIA BY THOMSON REUTERS (PROFESSIONAL) AUSTRALIA LTD.**

The mode of citation of this part will be:
35 Tas R

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 3 — Pages 252-361

Andrews; Rowe v	43
Anti-Discrimination Commissioner v White	209
AWC Pty Ltd; Clark v	346
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd	252
Clark v AWC Pty Ltd	346
Connector Park Pty Ltd (No 4); RV Pty Ltd v	183
Dann; Port Sorell Bowls Club Inc v	141
Donohue v Tasmania	106
Hansen Yuncken Pty Ltd v Parliament Square Hobart Landowner Pty Ltd	56
JSP; Director of Public Prosecutions v	1
Kendall; Director of Public Prosecutions v	128
Khalafallah v Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal	195
Legal Practitioner, A; Legal Profession Board of Tasmania v	221
Legal Profession Board of Tasmania v A Legal Practitioner	221
Parliament Square Hobart Landowner Pty Ltd; Hansen Yuncken Pty Ltd v	56
Port Sorell Bowls Club Inc v Dann	141
Public Prosecutions, Director of v JSP	1
Public Prosecutions, Director of v Kendall	128
Rowe v Andrews	43
RV Pty Ltd v Connector Park Pty Ltd (No 4)	183
Tasmania v Thompson	98

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



© 2024 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0085-7106

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Tasmania, State of v Tripptree	356
Tasmania; Donohue v	106
Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal; Khalafallah v	195
Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd; Brocklands Pty Ltd v	252
Thompson; Tasmania v	98
Tripptree; State of Tasmania v	356
White; Anti-Discrimination Commissioner v	209

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

INDEX

Part 3 — Pages 252-361

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

- Judicial review — Grounds — Error of law — Statutory construction — Time limits — Notice of objection to bill of costs delivered to successful party but not delivered to Registrar within time limit — Unsuccessful party taken to admit items in bill of costs — No error of law — Appeal dismissed — Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Regulations 2021 (Tas), r 16(1).
State of Tasmania v Trippree 356

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

- Pleadings — Cause of action — Obligation to plead material facts — Torts — Negligence — Duty of care — Trial judge dismissing claim on basis of failure to plead existence of duty of care — Plaintiff not required to plead duty — Pleaded particulars of negligence sufficient to set out plaintiff's claim — Supreme Court Civil Procedure Act 1932 (Tas) — Supreme Court Rules 2000 (Tas), r 227(3) — Civil Liability Act 2002 (Tas), ss 11, 13, 14.
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd 252

PROCEDURE

- Civil proceedings in State and Territory courts — Workers compensation claim — Road construction project — Employee injured by co-worker reversing a truck and striking plaintiff — Truck driver employed by separate labour hire company — Summary disposal — Summary judgment for defendant or respondent: stay or dismissal of proceedings — Reliance by defendant on statutory defence to worker's action for damages — Whether defendant a deemed employer — Arguable questions of fact and law — Allegation of vicarious tortious liability — Trespass to the person — Battery — Elements of cause of action — Whether truck driver utterly without fault — Live issue best left to trial — Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988 (Tas), ss 29, 138AA(5), 138AD — Supreme Court Rules 2000 (Tas), rr 367(2)(b), (3)(a).
Clark v AWC Pty Ltd 346

STATUTORY INTERPRETATION

- Deeming provisions.
State of Tasmania v Trippree 356
- Distinction between directory and obligatory provisions.
State of Tasmania v Trippree 356

INDEX

TORTS

- Negligence — Causation — Breach of duty of care — Evidence — Proof of causation generally — Multiple causes asserted — Three possible reasonable hypotheses — Plaintiff not required to prove specific breach was causative.
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd 252
- Negligence — Damages — Procedure and evidence — Assessment of damages by trial judge — Judgment for defendant — Successful appeal — Re-assessment of damages — Trial judge not precluded by ostensible bias — Re-assessment by Full Court not practicable — Order for re-assessment by another judicial officer.
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd 252
- Negligence — Damages — Procedure and evidence — Wholly circumstantial case — Causation — “Strands in a cable” case — Expert evidence — Damage to nursery business equipment — Not mere economic loss.
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd 252
- Negligence — Duty of care — Economic loss — Electricity network — Interruption to transmission — Tree branch falling on high voltage transmission line — Repeated interruptions to transmission — Junction between main line and purpose-built pole and line to private property — Failure of transmission equipment to correct interruption — Damage caused by high voltage electricity entering low voltage system on business premises — Nursery business — Damage to automated plant potting equipment system — Liability of network operator — Civil Liability Act 2002 (Tas), s 13.
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd 252

WORDS AND PHRASES

- “Principal”.
Clark v AWC Pty Ltd 346
- “Reasonably explicit notice ... of all grounds of action”.
Brocklands Pty Ltd v Tasmanian Networks Pty Ltd 252
- “Within 14 days after the date of service of the bill of costs”.
State of Tasmania v Triptree 356