

JULY 2024

The Authorised Law Reports of the
Supreme Court of Western Australia

THE
WESTERN
AUSTRALIAN
REPORTS
2022

EDITOR

ERIC HEENAN SC

REPORTER IN THIS PART

GREGORY STOCKTON

VOL 59 — PART 5

PAGES 316-390

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

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 5 — Pages 316-390

Allen (No 2); Metalicity Ltd v	167
DFD Rhodes Pty Ltd v Hancock Prospecting Pty Ltd	316
Electricity Networks Corporation (t/as Western Power); Herridge Parties v	69
Gold Valley Iron Pty Ltd (in liq) v OPS Screening & Crushing Equipment Pty Ltd	232
Hancock Prospecting Pty Ltd; DFD Rhodes Pty Ltd v	316
Herridge Parties v Electricity Networks Corporation (t/as Western Power)	69
JHN; Western Australia v	143
Legal Profession Complaints Committee; Young v	1
Metalicity Ltd v Allen (No 2)	167
OPS Screening & Crushing Equipment Pty Ltd; Gold Valley Iron Pty Ltd (in liq) v	232
Western Australia v JHN	143
Young v Legal Profession Complaints Committee	1

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

© State of Western Australia 2024

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.



THOMSON REUTERS

2024 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0083-8764

INDEX

Part 5 — Pages 316-390

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

Arbitration agreement — Commercial Arbitration Act 2012 (WA) s 8(1) — Application for stay of matters in curial proceedings which were the subject of an arbitration agreement — Where relevant matters arose in paragraphs of reply — Where party requesting stay not a party to relevant matters the subject of the arbitration agreement — Whether primary judge erred in granting application for stay. <i>DFD Rhodes Pty Ltd and Another v Hancock Prospecting Pty Ltd</i> <i>and Others</i>	316
--	-----

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Discovery — Where primary judge made orders for co-defendants to give discovery to each other — Scope of court's power to order discovery against co-defendants — Whether primary judge erred in making discovery orders. <i>DFD Rhodes Pty Ltd and Another v Hancock Prospecting Pty Ltd</i> <i>and Others</i>	316
Pleadings — Application to strike out pleadings — Application for separate trial — Whether proceedings could be determined without deciding matters raised in defence — Whether primary judge erred in refusing strike-out application and refusing to order separate trial. <i>DFD Rhodes Pty Ltd and Another v Hancock Prospecting Pty Ltd</i> <i>and Others</i>	316