

JULY 2024

Reports of the District Court and State Administrative Tribunal of
Western Australia

THE STATE REPORTS (WESTERN AUSTRALIA) 2023

EDITORS

HIS HONOUR JUDGE M FLYNN
Judge of the District Court of Western Australia

DR B DE VILLIERS, BA, LLB, LLD
*Member of the State Administrative Tribunal of Western Australia
Adjunct Professor: School of Law, Curtin University (WA)*

CONSULTING EDITORS

PW NICHOLS, RFD, BA, LLM, M CRIM JUST
Barrister-at-Law

DR RJ DESIATNIK, BA, LLM (Hons), SJD

REPORTERS

DR RJ DESIATNIK
AARAHNAN RAGURAGAVAN

The mode of citation of this part will be:
113 SR(WA)

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 2 — Pages 51-100

Akrawy; Commissioner for Consumer Protection v	1
Consumer Protection, Commissioner for v Akrawy	1
Kepert v City of Melville	51
Love v Safari Charters Pty Ltd	81
Melville, City of; Kepert v	51
Nunis; Oak Capital Wholesale Fund Pty Ltd v	28
Oak Capital Wholesale Fund Pty Ltd v Nunis	28
Safari Charters Pty Ltd; Love v	81

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



INDEX

Part 2 — Pages 51-100

EVIDENCE

- Rule in *Browne v Dunn* (1893) 6 R 67 — Application of rule — Relevant principles
— No finding made by Magistrates Court — Whether rule applicable.
Kept v City of Melville 51

MAGISTRATES

- Jurisdiction — Whether Magistrates Court had jurisdiction over claim based on
promissory estoppel — Magistrates Court (Civil Proceedings) Act 2004 (WA),
s 6(1)(b).
Kept v City of Melville 51

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

- Appeal against decision of Magistrates Court in minor matter — Limited grounds of
appeal — Application by respondent to strike out appeal — Relevant principles
— Whether right of appeal on merits — Alleged errors in Magistrate's exercise
of Court's jurisdiction — Whether ground of appeal — Whether appellant
denied natural justice — Relevant factors — Whether strike out application
should be heard prior to or together with appeal — Relevant principle —
Magistrates Court (Civil Proceedings) Act 2004 (WA), ss 3, 26, 29, 32, 43.
Kept v City of Melville 51
- Proceedings in Magistrates Court — Proceedings became inactive — Dismissal of
application to set aside Inactive Case Notice — Appeal against dismissal to
District Court — Whether satisfactory explanation for delay provided —
Relevant factors — Inactive proceedings deemed to be dismissed — Whether
power existed to reinstate such proceedings — Whether any utility in appeal
against refusal to set aside Inactive Case Notice — Need for appellant in appeal
against dismissal of application to set aside such Notice to seek expedition of
such appeal — Magistrates Court (Civil Proceedings) Rules 2005 (WA),
rr 95B(1), 95C(1), 95E, 95F(1).
Love v Safari Charters Pty Ltd 81