

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 4**

**PAGES 371-476**

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

---

---

## TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 4 — Pages 371-476

<b>Agrigrain Pty Ltd v Rindfleish (NSW Ct of App)</b> .....	400
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
<b>Elisha v Vision Australia Ltd (High Ct of Aust)</b> .....	432
<b>Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)</b> .....	371
Harman v Opus Recruitment Solutions — Australia Pty Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust) .....	169
Laing O'Rourke Australia Management Services Pty Ltd v Haley (Fed Ct of Aust) .....	197
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 4 — Pages 371-476

## APPEAL

Appeal against damages — Where respondent had commenced new employment subsequent to accident — Where new employment lower-paying and with fewer responsibilities — Where respondent earned greater net income in new employment by working much greater hours than pre-accident employment — Whether primary judge erred in finding as to future economic loss given fact of post-accident net income — No error — Where post-accident net income only greater due to respondent's industry — Where such long hours unsustainable in long-term — Where respondent otherwise would have had good prospects of remaining in pre-accident role but for accident — Where findings as to future out-of-pocket expenses and past gratuitous domestic assistance also challenged — Challenges without merit — Appeal ground dismissed.

*Agrigrain Pty Ltd v Rindfleish (NSW Ct of App)* ..... 400

## CONTRACT OF EMPLOYMENT

Where employee involved in incident at hotel during work trip — Where employer stood employee down on basis of hotel incident — Where employee disputed hotel incident — Where employer terminated employee purportedly on basis of hotel incident — Where real reason for terminating employee was due to allegations that employee had history of aggression and excuse making — Where employee was not informed of and had no opportunity to respond to real reason for termination — Where employee suffered psychiatric injury after termination — Where disciplinary process breached company policy on disciplinary procedure — Whether company policy incorporated into contract of employment — Reasonable person in position of parties would understand contract incorporated binding obligations — Reasonable person in position of parties would understand intention to incorporate policies and procedures as they might change from time to time — Broad recitals in policy did not detract from very specific assurances and promises — Whether damages for psychiatric injury beyond scope of contractual duty — Not beyond scope of contractual duty concerning manner of termination of employment contract to recover damages for psychiatric injury — Breach of contract established.

*Elisha v Vision Australia Ltd (High Ct of Aust)* ..... 432

## DAMAGES

Whether damages for psychiatric injury too remote — Starting point to identify circumstances of breach — General type of damage and general manner of occurrence must have been within reasonable contemplation of parties, at time of contract, as serious possibility — Circumstances included unfathomable nature of what occurred — Parties should reasonably have contemplated that serious breach of disciplinary procedures could cause serious psychiatric illness — Damages established.

*Elisha v Vision Australia Ltd (High Ct of Aust)* ..... 432

## INDEX

### EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE

Characterisation of employment relationship — True employer — Where respondent employed in grain-handling business between 2007 and 2011 — Where respondent's employer self-designated as "Agrigrain" — Where appellant incorporated by proprietor in 2012 alongside related company to operate new site — Where respondent testified that he "resumed" work in 2012 for same proprietor at new site — Where no written contracts governed either employment relationship — Where respondent injured in workplace accident — Proceedings subsequently brought — Where appellant admitted that its related company had employed respondent — Admission not withdrawn — Where primary judge accepted appellant's admission for purposes of compliance with procedural prerequisites to action — Where appellant contended on appeal that it had relevantly been respondent's employer such that respondent's action failed for want of procedural compliance — Whether failure to have regard to totality of parties' relationship was in error — Whether reliance upon appellant's admission as to employment by related company was in error — Whether insufficient weight afforded to respondent's subjective understanding of identity of his employer — Whether respondent had in fact "resumed" employment with appellant in 2012 — Whether insufficient weight afforded to control exercised by appellant over respondent in determining true employer — Whether excessive weight attributed to related company attending to administration such as pay and superannuation — Where error made by insufficient regard to control exercised by appellant over respondent — Where no error otherwise — Appeal grounds dismissed — Primary judge would have been justified in determining true employer based on appellant's admission alone.

*Agrigrain Pty Ltd v Rindfleish (NSW Ct of App)* ..... 400

Where employee employed by employer in full-time retail position — Where employee's roster spread over weekdays and weekends across four-week period — Where employee handbook stated that "unauthorised absences" may result in "disciplinary action" — Where employee summoned for jury duty pursuant to Jury Act 1977 (NSW) — Where employer notified employee of expectation for employee to work rostered shifts that did not coincide with jury duty — Where employee unable to work weekend shifts to make up for juror duties during weekdays — Where employee provided employer with certificate of attendance signed by applicant — Where judge wrote letters for employee to provide to employer in response to employee's jury note — Where employer sent email to employee indicating continued absence for weekend shifts as unauthorised absences (1 March Email) — Where employee served as juror in murder trial — Where employee returned to work following jury duty — Where employer provided letter inviting employee to disciplinary meeting (17 April Letter) — Where employee attended disciplinary meeting and resigned following day — Whether 1 March Email constituted "threat" of "injury" to employee's employment by reason that employee summoned to serve as juror — Threat of injury to employee's employment by reason of jury service — Whether 17 April Letter constituted "threat" to "alter" employee's position to her prejudice by reason that employee summoned to serve as juror — Threat to alter employee's position to her prejudice by reason of jury service — Guilty verdicts — Jury Act 1977 (NSW), ss 69, 69A.

*Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)* ..... 371

## INDEX

### EVIDENCE

- Admissions — Admission of material fact in issue — Where admission relied upon for finding that procedural requirements of action had been satisfied — Whether primary judge justified in relying upon admission — Finding justified — No error demonstrated — Appeal ground dismissed.  
*Agrigrain Pty Ltd v Rindfleish (NSW Ct of App)* ..... 400

### NEGLIGENCE

- Duty of care — Whether employer owed duty of care with respect to discipline and termination of employment — No duty of care should be imposed over law of contract and statute governing creation and termination of contract of employment.  
*Elisha v Vision Australia Ltd (High Ct of Aust)* ..... 432

### STATUTES

- Interpretation — Proper construction of s 69(7) of Jury Act 1977 (NSW) — Protective purpose of offence provision — Meaning of threat — Inquiry of whether threat made viewed objectively — Juror's subjective beliefs not relevant — Conduct which will induce belief that it will be carried into effect — Meaning of injury — Extends to any form of harm to juror in employment or differential treatment adverse to juror — Meaning of alteration — Overlap between “injury” and “alteration” in s 69 of Jury Act 1977 (NSW) — Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007 (NSW), s 13 — Evidence Act 1995 (NSW), s 55 — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Jury Act 1977 (NSW), ss 69, 69A — Jury Amendment Act 2010 (NSW).  
*Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)* ..... 371
- Limitation of actions — Where proceedings initially brought against separate corporate entity understood to have had responsibility for operation of site — Where subsequent advice and material subpoenaed from workplace safety regulator indicating responsible entity prompted substitution of appellant as defendant — Where primary judge determined application made within time — Whether respondent should have been on notice earlier that appellant was proper defendant — Where no reason for respondent to doubt legal advice or proceed against appellant prior to receipt of subpoena material — Whether respondent was “clearly” aware that appellant was his employer — Not supported by findings of fact — Appeal grounds dismissed — Limitation Act 1969 (NSW), ss 50C(1), 50D(1)(b).  
*Agrigrain Pty Ltd v Rindfleish (NSW Ct of App)* ..... 400

### WORDS AND PHRASES

- “Alteration” — Jury Act 1977 (NSW), s 69.  
*Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)* ..... 371
- “By reason of” — Jury Act 1977 (NSW), s 69.  
*Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)* ..... 371
- “Injury” — Jury Act 1977 (NSW), s 69.  
*Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)* ..... 371

## INDEX

### WORDS AND PHRASES — *continued*

“Threat” — Jury Act 1977 (NSW), s 69.

*Hall v Gilded Wombat Pty Ltd (Local Court of New South Wales)* ..... 371

“Totality of the relationship between the parties”.

*Agrigrain Pty Ltd v Rindfleisch (NSW Ct of App)* ..... 400