

Update Summary

PLEASE CIRCULATE IMMEDIATELY!

UPDATE 334

JULY 2024

VICTORIAN COURTS

G Nash KC

Material Code 42609466
Print Post Approved PP255003/00400

© Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited 2024

Looseleaf Support Service

You can now access the current list of page numbers at

http://www.thomsonreuters.com.au/support/product-support.aspx?id=/mediaTree/58599. If you have any questions or comments, or to order missing pages, please contact Customer Care LTA ANZ on 1300 304 195 Fax: 1300 304 196 Email: <u>Care.ANZ@thomsonreuters.com</u>

New and updated commentary has been provided by **Sandra Karabidian**:

Orders 11 - 25

Updated:

- The court possesses an inherent jurisdiction to stay its proceedings as an abuse of process. See *Kermani v Westpac Banking Corporation* (2012) 36 VR 130; [2012] VSCA 42, at [CPR23.01.10].
- The court granted an application to dismiss a plaintiff's originating motion seeking orders quashing a mediation certificate that a mediation had failed. See *Koronczyk v Victorian Small Business Commissioner* [2023] VSC 431, at [CPR23.01.40].
- The proceeding may constitute an abuse of process if it 'can be clearly seen to be foredoomed to fail' or where it will 'inevitably fail'. See R v Smith [1995] 1 VR 10, 15, at [CPR23.01.60].
- That the balance of convenience favours another jurisdiction or that some other
 jurisdiction would provide a more appropriate forum does not justify such an
 order. See *Oceanic Sun Line Special Shipping Co v Fay* (1988) 165 CLR 197;
 [1988] HCA 32; at [CPR23.01.160].
- The Court made orders to strike out the plaintiff's pleading. See *Magriplis-Hampton v MM LP Holdings Pty Ltd* [2023] VSC 150, at [CPR23.01.360].
- It is necessary for a defendant to establish that it would be futile to allow the statement of claim to go forward in its present form. See *Uber Australia Pty Ltd v Andrianakis* (2020) 61 VR 580; [2020] VSCA 186, at [CPR23.02.20].
- Any difference between whether a proceeding is considered scandalous, frivolous or vexatious or an abuse of process of a court is now 'largely irrelevant'.
 See Knight v Bell [2000] VSCA 48, at [CPR23.02.20].
- The court rejected the plaintiff's submission that the strike out application be dismissed on the basis that any deficiencies can be remediated by a notice to admit. See *Sobh v Ali* [2023] VSC 225, at [CPR23.02.20].
- Summary judgement test also regulates when pleadings may be amended. See
 Charleton v Department of Education and Training Victoria [2024] VSC 141,
 at [CPR23.02.40].
- If the court forms a view that the conduct of the plaintiff may potentially be considered an abuse of process, the court may award costs against the plaintiff on an indemnity basis. See *Hambleton v State Trustees Ltd* [2016] VSC 215, at [CPR25.02.60].
- The court holds a discretion as to the award of costs in circumstances which has been described as "absolute, unconfined or unfettered". See Soteriadis v Nillumbik Shire Council [2015] VSC 363, at [CPR25.05.20].
- It is appropriate to consider the conduct of the defendant prior to the commencement of proceedings. See *Prodromos Anastasi Foukkare v Angreb Pty Limited* [2006] NSWCA 335, at [CPR25.05.20].

Parties may seek orders of the court barring the party seeking to leave to discontinue or withdraw from recommencing the proceeding. See *The Kronprinz* (1887) 12 App Cas 256; *Lawson v Wallace* [1968] 3 NSWR 82, 86, at [CPR25.06.20].

New:

- Costs, has been inserted, at [CPR23.01.400]
- Leave to discontinue, has been inserted, at [CPR25.02.20]
- Costs of strike out application, has been inserted, at [CRP23.02.180]
- Notice of discontinuance or withdrawal, has been inserted, at [CPR25.04.40]