

MAY 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

2024-2025

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

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

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 4 — Pages 351-482

2nd Chapter Pty Ltd v Sealey (No 2) (Vic Sup Ct)	1
Atanaskovic Hartnell Corporate Services Pty Ltd v Kelly (Fed Ct of Aust)	394
Australian Cabling Solutions Pty Ltd, Re (Fair Work Commission)	122
Australian Paramedics Association (NSW) v Health Secretary (NSW Indus Relations Commn)	165
Australian Rail Track Corp Ltd v Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union (Fed Ct of Aust)	328
Chin v Visual Thing Australia Pty Ltd (Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 2))	243
Complainant 202258 v Southern Restaurants (Vic) Pty Ltd (ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal)	460
Fair Work Ombudsman v Make Dough Enterprises Pty Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust)	446
Kurtev v KCB Australia Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	226
Ridings v Fedex Express Australia Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	351
Ridings v Fedex Express Australia Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	372
Samad v Phosphate Resources Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	129
State Super Enterprise Agreement 2024-2027, Re (NSW Indus Relations Commn)	145
Sydney Trains v Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union (Fed Ct of Aust)	318
Trademax Australia Ltd v Huang (NSW Sup Ct)	205
Whitnall-Comfort, Re (Fair Work Commission)	126

(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 4 — Pages 351-482

APPEAL

Application for permission to appeal — Where employee alleged numerous errors of fact — Submissions were impermissible attempt to reargue case — No appealable error of fact or law — Permission to appeal refused — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), s 604.

Ridings v Fedex Express Australia Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission) 372

Industrial law — Adequacy of reasons for judgment — Where respondent formerly employed by first appellant — Where respondent sued appellants for payment of leave entitlements and unpaid salary — Where appellants brought cross-claims regarding alleged breaches of contract by respondent — Where appellants relied on cross-claims to set off against respondent's claim — Where value of cross-claims exceeded that of respondent's claims — Where primary judge allowed respondent's claim and dismissed cross-claims — Where primary judge extensively copied respondent's submissions in part of reasons for judgment considering cross-claims — Whether copying of respondent's submissions so significant that inference should be drawn that primary judge did not bring independent mind to resolution of cross-claims — Primary judge did not bring independent mind to resolution of cross-claims — Appeal allowed — Matter remitted for rehearing — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 90(2), 323.

Atanaskovic Hartnell Corporate Services Pty Ltd v Kelly (Fed Ct of Aust) 394

DAMAGES

Assessment — Application for aggravated damages — Where applicant contended that nature of respondent's conduct and how respondent ran its case supported aggravated damages — Whether some separately identifiable, compensable damage or loss shown which would warrant aggravated damages — Where nature and conduct of respondent's defence did not rise to this level — Stressful nature of proceedings without more insufficient as basis for award of aggravated damages — Application dismissed.

Complainant 202258 v Southern Restaurants (Vic) Pty Ltd (ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal) 460

INDEX

DAMAGES — *continued*

Assessment — Application for general damages — Where ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal found employer respondent liable for unlawful discrimination against employee applicant — Where applicant had returned from maternity leave — Where applicant had been mistreated by respondent in respect of her breastfeeding needs on returning to work — Where separate hearing on remedy held — Where applicant and respondent each relied upon medical evidence in relation to general damages — Applicant claimed that pre-existing diagnosis had been aggravated by respondent and that treatment by respondent did not comport with community expectations — Respondent claimed that applicant suffered from no such pre-existing condition and no longer suffered from any diagnosable condition — How to reconcile competing evidence — Evidence did not establish that applicant's condition had ceased — Insufficient evidence to causally link applicant's employment and aggravation of any pre-existing condition — Respondent's conduct nonetheless contributed materially to applicant's condition — Whether and to what degree community expectations required to be considered — Where focus properly on actual harm to applicant and not punishment of respondent — Where respondent's conduct failed to meet community expectations as to what applicant could have reasonably expected on returning from maternity leave — Applicant's loss of unencumbered opportunity to breastfeed first child significant — Effect of stress together with power imbalance between parties, applicant's diagnoses, impact on applicant's self-worth and satisfaction, and consequences for applicant's career all relevant considerations — Application granted — General damages of \$80,000 ordered — Desirability of consistency with previous decisions not paramount to requirements to make appropriate award in circumstances.

Complainant 202258 v Southern Restaurants (Vic) Pty Ltd (ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal) 460

Assessment — Application for special damages — Whether appropriate to order special damages — Application granted — Where medical evidence supported order requiring respondent to meet cost of psychiatric treatment for 12 months up to \$10,000.

Complainant 202258 v Southern Restaurants (Vic) Pty Ltd (ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal) 460

INDEX

INDUSTRIAL LAW

Accessorial liability — Determination of separate question — Where determination necessary in order for parties to prepare for trial — Where applicant alleged multiple contraventions of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) against first respondent employer company, its directors, and fourth respondent franchisor — Alleged contraventions of record-keeping and other obligations by first respondent — Fourth respondent allegedly accessorially liable under s 588B of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) — Where first respondent in liquidation and not participating in proceedings — Where s 557C of Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) established reverse onus for employer to prove compliance with record-keeping obligations — Where that section only provided for reverse onus being borne by employer and not by responsible franchisor — Where resolution of question required separately in order for parties to prepare for trial — Whether s 557C permitted fourth respondent as responsible franchisor to adduce evidence to discharge reverse onus given non-participation by first respondent as employer — Where fourth respondent's accessorial liability under s 588B contingent upon proof of contravention of s 557C by first respondent — No obstacle in text of s 557C preventing responsible franchisor from adducing evidence to shift reverse onus — Where responsible franchisor possessed of equal rights to adduce evidence as party to proceedings entitled to procedural fairness — Where clear language of Parliament required to restrict operation of s 557C to employers only — No such clear language disclosed in section or its legislative history — Separate question answered in affirmative — Applicant entitled to rely on s 557C in accessorial liability case against fourth respondent despite that section referring only to employer and not to responsible franchisor — Fourth respondent entitled to make case to shift reverse onus despite not being employer for purposes of s 557C given that proof of employer contravention relevant to accessorial liability under s 588B — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 557C, 588B.

Fair Work Ombudsman v Make Dough Enterprises Pty Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust) 446

INDEX

INDUSTRIAL LAW — *continued*

- Application to deal with dispute — Where employee's wife and children had disabilities requiring employee to care for them — Where employee worked part time four days a week largely from home — Where employee requested to work all four days a week from home — Employer refused request — Where employee applied to Fair Work Commission to resolve dispute regarding flexible working — Where Deputy President determined employer's refusal of request not based on reasonable business grounds — Where Deputy President still ordered employee to work in office one day a week — Appeal — Whether Deputy President erred by ordering employee to return to office even though employer's refusal not based on reasonable business grounds — Commission not compelled to grant employee's request even if it found employer did not have reasonable business grounds for refusal — Whether Deputy President erred by failing to allow employee to work from home due to his full-time carer responsibilities — Caring responsibilities not *prima facie* justification for working from home on full-time basis — Whether Deputy President discriminated against employee by failing to uphold rights of full-time carer — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 3(d), 65A(5), 65B, 65C — Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth), ss 5, 6(1)(b), 6(2)(b).
Ridings v Fedex Express Australia Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission) 372
- Application to deal with dispute — Where part-time employee requested to work exclusively from home to support disabled family — Where employee resistant to employer's requests for further information or updated documentation regarding request — Where employer refused request and offered hybrid working week — Where employer highlighted benefits of working in office to employee in reasons for refusal — Where employee ignored offer and worked exclusively from home — Whether employer genuinely tried to reach agreement with employee — Whether employer had reasonable business grounds to refuse request — Employer genuinely tried to reach agreement with employee — Employer did not articulate reasonable business grounds to refuse request — Flexible working arrangement order made — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 65A(3)(a)(ii), 65B, 65C(1)(f)(ii).
Ridings v Fedex Express Australia Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission) 351