

FEBRUARY 2025

Reports of the Supreme Courts of the Australian States when exercising Federal Jurisdiction, the Supreme Courts of the Northern Territory and Australian Capital Territory, the Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia and Federal Tribunals

THE FEDERAL LAW REPORTS 2024

EDITOR

VICTOR KLINE

CONSULTING EDITORS

DR OREN BIGOS KC
NICHOLAS POYNDR

SENIOR REPORTERS

SAMUEL CUMMINGS
VICTOR KLINE
RAFFAELE PICCOLO

VOL 385 — PART 4

PAGES 374-491

The mode of citation of this part will be:
385 FLR

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 4 — Pages 374-491

Australian Federal Police, Commissioner of the v Hills Greenery Pty Ltd (NSW Sup Ct)	114
Bigatton v The King (NSW Ct of Cr App)	34
Bourke v Styche (ACT Sup Ct)	418
Calatzis v Jones (ACT Sup Ct)	70
Chen v Chen (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1))	93
Chung (No 3); Vang v (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1))	125
Dalton v Naegeli (NSW Ct of App)	449
Drumgold v Board of Inquiry (No 3) (ACT Sup Ct)	255
Gustafsson v Jeanes (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1))	369
Hills Greenery Pty Ltd; Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police v (NSW Sup Ct)	114
Inquiry (No 3), Board of; Drumgold v (ACT Sup Ct)	255
Jeanes; Gustafsson v (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1))	369
Jones; Calatzis v (ACT Sup Ct)	70
Khail v RTA Gove Pty Ltd (NT Sup Ct)	148
Khanat v The King (NSW Ct of Cr App)	234
King, The; Bigatton v (NSW Ct of Cr App)	34
King, The; Khanat v (NSW Ct of Cr App)	234
Krantz; Oldham v (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1))	374
Leena v Leena (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1))	182
McKell; R v (NT Sup Ct)	386

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



© 2025 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0085-0462

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Naegeli; Dalton v (NSW Ct of App)	449
Okwechime (No 2); Director of Public Prosecutions v (ACT Sup Ct)	1
Oldham v Krantz (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia	
(Division 1))	374
Public Prosecutions, Director of v Okwechime (No 2) (ACT Sup Ct)	1
R v McKell (NT Sup Ct)	386
Rose; Zhang v (ACT Sup Ct)	379
RTA Gove Pty Ltd; Khail v (NT Sup Ct)	148
Styche; Bourke v (ACT Sup Ct)	418
Vang v Chung (No 3) (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia	
(Division 1))	125
Velichkov v Velichkov (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia	
(Division 1))	195
Zhang v Rose (ACT Sup Ct)	379

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

INDEX

Part 4 — Pages 374-491

APPEAL AND NEW TRIAL

Magistrates Court — Appeal from — Review appeal — Grounds of review —
Decision should not in law have been made — Failure to give adequate reasons
— Whether appeal competent — Magistrates Court Act 1930 (ACT), s 219D(c).
Bourke v Styche (ACT Sup Ct) 418

COMPETITION AND CONSUMER LAW

Unconscionability — Establishment of — Based on disadvantage — Requirements
for — Improvidence of transaction — Whether onus rests on defendant to prove
transaction fair, just and reasonable — Australian Securities and Investment
Commission Act 2001 (Cth), s 12CB(1).
Dalton and Others v Naegeli (NSW Ct of App) 449

CONTRACTS

Unjust contracts — Whether contract may be unjust whilst not unconscionable —
Contracts Review Act 1980 (NSW), s 7.
Dalton and Others v Naegeli (NSW Ct of App) 449

COURTS AND JUDGES

Jurisdiction — Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1) —
Whether Court has and should exercise jurisdiction to deal with real property of
third parties situated in a foreign country.
*Oldham v Krantz and Another (Federal Circuit and Family Court
of Australia (Division 1))* 374

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

Appeal — Review appeal — Review of decision of Magistrates Court — Grounds
of review — Decision should not in law have been made — Failure to give
adequate reasons — Whether appeal competent — Magistrates Court Act 1930
(ACT), s 219D(c).
Bourke v Styche (ACT Sup Ct) 418
Sentencing — Factual basis for sentence — Uncharged criminal conduct —
Whether can be taken into account — Whether “fair” to offender to take into
account — Circumstances relevant to determination of — Relevance to
determining leniency.
R v McKell (NT Sup Ct) 386

FAMILY LAW AND CHILD WELFARE

Real property — Of third parties — In foreign country — Whether Court has
jurisdiction to deal with.
*Oldham v Krantz and Another (Federal Circuit and Family Court
of Australia (Division 1))* 374

INDEX

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Service — Where a proceeding was taken to be dismissed in the event an affidavit of service of the process on the defendant had not been filed in the court within one year of the date on which the originating process was issued — Consideration of the process by which the Court issues an originating process — Court Procedures Rules 2006 (ACT), r 75(1)(a). <i>Zhang v Rose (ACT Sup Ct)</i>	379
--	-----