

FEBRUARY 2025

Industrial Reports from the High Court, Federal Court, the State and Territory Supreme Courts, and Federal and State Industrial Courts and Tribunals

Incorporating the Authorised Reports of the Fair Work Commission, the Industrial Relations Commission of NSW, the Industrial Court of Queensland and the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission

INDUSTRIAL REPORTS

2024

CONSULTANTS

The Honourable JUSTICE ADAM HATCHER
President of the Fair Work Commission

The Honourable JUSTICE INGMAR TAYLOR
*President of the
Industrial Relations Commission of New South Wales*

The Honourable LANCE WRIGHT KC
*former President of the
Industrial Relations Commission of New South Wales*

ALICIA ASH BA LLB (Hons)

MANAGING EDITOR

MAHREEN HASAN BCom (Hons) LLB, MPP

VOL 334 — PART 2

PAGES 125-244

The mode of citation of this part will be:
334 IR

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 2 — Pages 125-244

AA v Trustees, Roman Catholic Church, Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle (NSW Sup Ct)	70
Danaratna v Arunatilaka (Fed Ct of Aust)	52
Kuiper Australia Pty Ltd v Australian Workers Union (Fair Work Commission)	125
Pilbrow v University of Melbourne (Fed Ct of Aust)	141
Transport Workers Union of Australia v Qantas Airways Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust)	187
TT v Diocese of Saint Maron, Sydney (No 3) (NSW Sup Ct)	1

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



© 2025 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0728-8417

INDEX

Part 2 — Pages 125-244

ADVERSE ACTION

Claim for compensation — Economic loss — Non-economic loss — Where respondents outsourced airport ground handling operations to third parties in 2020 — Where respondents thereafter terminated employment of ground handling staff — Where applicant sought compensation for relevant employees under ss 545(1) and 525(2)(b) of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Where compensation sought by reference to test case individuals — Where outsourcing decision held to constitute adverse action under s 340(1)(b) of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Where assessment of counterfactual necessary to determine loss suffered by employees because of respondents' contravention — Whether in counterfactual world outsourcing decision would have lawfully been made in 2020 or 2021 — Whether orders providing for statutory compensation for test case individuals should be made — Whether test case individuals should be compensated for non-economic loss — In counterfactual world outsourcing decision would likely have been made in late 2021 — Order providing for statutory compensation for economic and non-economic loss made for test case individuals — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 340(1)(b), 525(2)(b), 545(1).

Transport Workers' Union of Australia v Qantas Airways Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust) 187

Where employee was university lecturer — Where employer changed research focus of employee's department making employee redundant — Where employer notified employee of redundancy and terminated her employment — Where employer alleged employee engaged in misconduct before termination by deleting files — Where employee alleged she was dismissed and subject to misconduct allegation due to complaints she made against her employer — Whether employee dismissed for exercising workplace right — Primary judge found employer did not take adverse action due to employee complaints — Appeal — Whether employer failed to rebut statutory presumption that contravening conduct engaged in for reason alleged as employer did not give evidence from decision-maker of redundancy and termination — Court must interrogate not merely the state or states of mind of person or people who engaged in conduct but also that of others whose contribution to it rose beyond threshold level — Alleged decision-maker only charted course that ultimately led to employee's redundancy and termination but alleged decision-maker did not make decisions about specific employee — Whether employer failed to rebut statutory presumption that contravening conduct engaged in for reason alleged as employer did not prove who made decision to subject employee to misconduct allegation — Not possible for employer to rebut statutory presumption without first proving how and by whom decision to communicate serious misconduct allegation was made — Whether primary judge assessed all of evidence and had adequate reasons — Primary judge was alive to case raised by employee that dismissal was for another reason — Implicit that primary judge accepted employer's explanations as credible — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 340(1), 361(1).

Pilbrow v University of Melbourne (Fed Ct of Aust) 141

INDEX

APPEAL

- Application for permission to appeal and appeal from decision to grant protected action ballot order — Permission to appeal granted — Appeal dismissed — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 173(2A), 414(2)(a), 437, 443(1)(b), 443(5), 604(1).
Kuiper Australia Pty Ltd v Australian Workers' Union (Fair Work Commission) 125

INDUSTRIAL ACTION

- Protected action ballot order — Where protected action ballot order made at first instance in circumstances where only one bargaining meeting had occurred between appellant and respondent — Whether appellant union genuinely trying to reach agreement with respondent employer — Whether Deputy President erred in making protected action ballot order and not extending notice period to take account of evidence regarding employer's minimum notice period for workplace safety — Deputy President did not err — Appeal dismissed — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 173(2A), 414(2)(a), 437, 443(1)(b), 443(5), 604(1).
Kuiper Australia Pty Ltd v Australian Workers' Union (Fair Work Commission) 125