

Update Summary

PLEASE CIRCULATE IMMEDIATELY!

UPDATE 244

MARCH 2025

ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES LAW NEW SOUTH WALES

Jeff Kildea, Olia Koudrina Russell Schmidt, Zaina Shahnawaz and Hon. Justice Brian Preston

Material Code 42725183 Print Post Approved PP255003/00418

© Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited 2025

Looseleaf Support Service

You can now access the current list of page numbers at http://www.thomsonreuters.com.au/support/product-support.aspx?id=/mediaTree/58599. If you have any questions or comments, or to order missing pages, please contact Customer Care LTA ANZ on 1300 304 195 Fax: 1300 304 196 Email: Care.ANZ@thomsonreuters.com

Environmental Responsibilities Law NSW

Update Summary

Annotations in the following chapters have been reviewed and updated by Jeff Kildea.

Land and Environment Court Act 1979

Updated commentary on Division 2 – Claims for Compensation, with reference to *Gill v Liverpool City Council* [2024] NSWLEC 133. See [LECA.PT3.DIV2.10].

Refusal to admit evidence is an interlocutory decision that would normally require leave to appeal. However, leave is not required if the rejected evidence would have had a material effect on the final decision. See [LECA.PT5.DIV2.10].

Civil Procedure Act 2005

In Mittagong Central Developments Pty Ltd v Secretary of the Department of Customer Service [2024] NSWLEC 104, Robson J declined to order that a judicial review proceeding transferred from the Sup Ct pursuant to s 149B(2) be heard separately and before a related merits review proceeding in the LEC. See [CPA.PT9.DIV2A.10].

Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 2005

Updated commentary regarding the award of costs in proceedings where there has been no hearing on the merits, with reference to *Slattery v Dunn (No 3)* [2024] NSWLEC 110. See [UCPR.PT42.DIV1.10].

Annotations in the following chapter have been reviewed and updated by Guy Dwyer.

National Parks and Wildlife

Updated commentary concerning case *Neilson v Secretary, Department of Planning and Environment* [2024] NSWCA 28; (2024) 260 LGERA 108 in which Payne JA (with whom Ward P agreed) held that Pain J was correct to conclude that the plan of management did not positively oblige the respondent to manage and maintain the particular road and trail. See [NPWA.81.10].