

MARCH 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 335 — PART 2

PAGES 101-196

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

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 2 — Pages 101-196

Alouani-Roby v National Rugby League Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust)	176
Australian Municipal, Administrative, Clerical and Services Union v Central Goldfields Shire Council (Fair Work Commission)	110
Diona Pty Ltd v SafeWork NSW (NSW Indus Relations Commn)	139
Harman v Opus Recruitment Solutions — Australia Pty Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust)	169
Loram Pty Ltd v Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union (Fair Work Commission)	101
Ma v Yan Massage Wynnum West Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	57
Qube Ports Pty Ltd v Construction, Forestry and Maritime Employees Union (Fed Ct of Aust)	73
Sydney Trains v Goodsell (Fair Work Commission)	1

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



INDEX

Part 2 — Pages 101-196

APPEAL

- Application for majority support determination — Fairly chosen requirement —
Where limited number of employees covered by proposed agreement —
Whether evidence of views of excluded employees necessary — Whether error
in finding employees covered by proposed agreement were fairly chosen —
Whether notional mobility workforce correlated to relevant employer's client —
Whether Commissioner took irrelevant matter into consideration — Whether
employees covered by proposed agreement chosen arbitrarily — Whether
negative impact on employer made group unfairly chosen — Whether decision
was unreasonable or plainly unjust — Appeal dismissed — Fair Work Act 2009
(Cth), ss 236, 237, 604.
Loram Pty Ltd v Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union
(*Fair Work Commission*) 101
- Practice and procedure — Additional ground of appeal introduced for first time in
written submissions — Where no application for leave to amend notice of appeal
— Additional grounds not part of appeal.
Loram Pty Ltd v Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union
(*Fair Work Commission*) 101
- Where appellant engaged under series of fixed-term contracts — Where first
respondent allowed extant maximum term contract to lapse — Where Deputy
President of Fair Work Commission dismissed general protections application on
jurisdictional objection that appellant not relevantly dismissed — Where primary
judge determined appellant had “not been dismissed” within meaning of
s 386(2)(a) of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Where primary judge construed
contract “for a specified period of time” as encompassing fixed-term contracts
that allowed for lawful early termination — Where primary judge determined
there was no error occasioned by Full Bench's construction of what is and is not
within contemplation of statutory conception of “dismissed” within meaning of
s 386(1)(a) of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Where primary judge determined
Full Bench had not erred in use of s 578 of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) —
Whether conclusions were products of error — Appeal dismissed — Fair Work
Act 2009 (Cth), ss 386(1)(a), 386(2)(a), 386(3), 578.
Alouani-Roby v National Rugby League Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust) 176

CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT

- Restraint of trade — Exclusive jurisdiction clause — Forum — Where applicant's
contract of employment with first respondent contained exclusive jurisdiction
clause for courts in New South Wales — Where shareholders' agreement
between applicant and seventh respondent contained exclusive jurisdiction
clause for courts in England and Wales — Where applicant's employment
terminated — Where applicant sought relief regarding payment upon termination
and efficacy of restraint clauses in agreements — Where sixth and seventh
respondents applied for stay of proceedings against them on basis of exclusive
jurisdiction clause in shareholders' agreement — Whether proceedings ought to
be stayed — Whether strong countervailing reasons why proceedings ought not
be stayed despite exclusive jurisdiction clause in shareholders' agreement —
Strong countervailing reasons why proceedings ought not be stayed —
Application dismissed.
Harman v Opus Recruitment Solutions — Australia Pty Ltd (Fed Ct
of Aust) 169

INDEX

ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT

Where respondents have identifiable common interests — Where respondents have reasonably comparable operations and business activities — Where applicant was bargaining representative for employees covered by proposed enterprise agreement — Where applicant discussed possibility of bargaining for multi-enterprise agreement to apply across Central Goldfields Shire Council and another local council — Where employees of respondents covered by separate enterprise agreements with identical nominal expiry dates — Where disagreement between applicant and Goldfields Council to commence bargaining for multi-enterprise agreement — Where Goldfields Council commenced discussions about bargaining process for single-enterprise agreement with Australian Nurses and Midwives' Federation (ANMF) — Where Goldfields Council sent correspondence to applicant and other employee organisations indicating intention to start bargaining — Where two bargaining meetings took place — Whether ANMF had agreed in writing to bargain for proposed single-enterprise agreement — Mere agreement to participate in bargaining or attend meetings did not foreclose contest in scope and nature of bargaining process — No agreement in writing to bargain for proposed single-enterprise agreement — Whether contrary to public interest to make single interest employer authorisation — Mere reference to objects of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) or fundamental workplace relationship principles did not make authorisation contrary to public interest — Single interest employer authorisation made — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 248, 249.

Australian Municipal, Administrative, Clerical and Services Union

v Central Goldfields Shire Council (Fair Work Commission) 110

STATUTES

Interpretation — Proper construction of ss 249(1B)(e) and 249(1D)(b) of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Meaning of “agreed in writing to bargain for a proposed single-enterprise agreement” — Agreement must be in writing — “In writing” did not dictate any particular form of written document or mechanism — Agreement to bargain must specifically be for “proposed single-enterprise agreement” — Mere agreement to participate in bargaining or attend meetings insufficient — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 249(1B)(e), 249(1D)(b).

Australian Municipal, Administrative, Clerical and Services Union

v Central Goldfields Shire Council (Fair Work Commission) 110

WORDS AND PHRASES

“Agreed in writing to bargain for a proposed single-enterprise agreement” — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), s 249(1D)(b).

Australian Municipal, Administrative, Clerical and Services Union

v Central Goldfields Shire Council (Fair Work Commission) 110

“Common interests” — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), s 249(3).

Australian Municipal, Administrative, Clerical and Services Union

v Central Goldfields Shire Council (Fair Work Commission) 110

INDEX

WORDS AND PHRASES — *continued*

- “Fairly chosen” — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), s 237(2)(c).
 Loram Pty Ltd v Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union
 (*Fair Work Commission*) 101
- “Reasonably believes” — Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (NSW), s 191(1).
 Diona Pty Ltd v SafeWork NSW (NSW Indus Relations Commn) 139

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY

- Improvement notice — External review — Where applicant engaged to install underground pipes — Where applicant engaged subcontractor to perform installation works — Where subcontractor engaged sub-subcontractor — Where employee of sub-subcontractor injured on construction site — Where inspector issued improvement notice to applicant regarding alleged contravention of obligation to ensure compliance with safe work method statement of subcontractor — Whether objective facts allowed inspector to form reasonable belief that applicant contravened relevant obligations — Inspector lacked necessary information to form reasonable belief due to failure to make relevant inquiries — Decision to issue improvement notice revoked — Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (NSW), ss 19, 191, 224, 229 — Work Health and Safety Regulation 2017 (NSW), cl 300.
 Diona Pty Ltd v SafeWork NSW (NSW Indus Relations Commn) 139