

JUNE 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

VOL 338 — PART 2

PAGES 108-226

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

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 2 — Pages 108-226

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust)	193
Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union v Pacific National Executive Services Pty Ltd (Industrial Court of New South Wales)	168
Communications, Electrical, Electronic, Energy, Information, Postal, Plumbing and Allied Services Union of Australia v Elecnor Australia Pty Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust)	58
Dupre v Excell Protective Group Pty Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	1
Infosys Technologies Ltd v Fox (Qld Ct of App)	97
J Hutchinson Pty Ltd; Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v (High Ct of Aust)	193
Primerano v Schisan Investments Pty Ltd (Fed Ct of Aust)	29
United Firefighters Union of Australia v Fire Rescue Victoria (Fed Ct of Aust)	48
Witherden v DP World Sydney Ltd (Fair Work Commission)	115
Woolworths Group Ltd v United Workers Union (Fair Work Commission)	108

(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 2 — Pages 108-226

ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

Application for bargaining order by employer — Collective bargaining — Woolworths distribution centres — Picketing and obstruction of site entrances by union members and officials — Good faith bargaining requirements — Capricious or unfair conduct — Unprotected industrial action prima facie undermines collective bargaining — Collective bargaining being undermined — Interim orders made — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 228, 229, 230, 589.

Woolworths Group Ltd v United Workers' Union (Fair Work Commission) 108

INDUSTRIAL ACTION

Imposition by employer of lockout — Whether employees had statutory entitlement to wages during period of lockout — Scope of statutory entitlement — Whether lockout comprised “employer response action” — Relevant factor — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 19, 323, 324, 408, 411, 414, 415, 416, 545.

Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union v Pacific National Executive Services Pty Ltd (Industrial Court of New South Wales) 168

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Unexplained failure to give evidence — Jones v Dunkel inference — Inference equally applies to both parties regardless of burden of proof.

Woolworths Group Ltd v United Workers' Union (Fair Work Commission) 108

Where common or key claims across four proposed enterprise agreements — Singular “notice of concern” was sufficient to embrace all enterprise agreements — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), s 229(4).

Woolworths Group Ltd v United Workers' Union (Fair Work Commission) 108

INDEX

STATUTES

Interpretation — Proper construction of ss 45E(3)(a) and 45EA(a) of Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth) — Prohibitions on person arriving at understanding with trade union containing provision to prevent continuing acquisition of services from another and giving effect thereto — Where subcontractor retained by construction company to complete waterproofing works not included on union's list of subcontractors with enterprise bargaining agreements — Where union threatened industrial action if subcontract not terminated by company — Where company succumbed to threat and terminated subcontract — Where company's intention to capitulate to threat neither expressly nor tacitly communicated to union — Where regulator contends that company's capitulation evinced and effectuated understanding with union to implement secondary boycott of subcontractor — Where regulator contends that union liable as accessory to company's contraventions of ss 45E(3)(a) and 45EA(a) of Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth) — Whether succumbing to threat of industrial action without express or tacit communication of commitment to do so constitutes arriving at understanding with union to prevent continuing acquisition of services from another — Appeals dismissed — No contraventions of ss 45E(3)(a) and 45EA(a) of Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth) established on case as run — Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1956 (UK), s 6(3) — Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), ss 45(2), 45E(1) — Trade Practices (Boycotts) Amendment Act 1980 (Cth), s 5 — Industrial Relations Reform Act 1993 (Cth), s 44 — Workplace Relations and Other Legislation Amendment Act 1996 (Cth), Sch 17, item 1 — Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth), ss 4, 45AC, 45AD, 45AF, 45AG, 45AH, 45AJ, 45AK, 45AL, 45AN, 45AO, 45AP, 45AQ, 45AR, 45AS, 45AT, 45AU, 45, 45D, 45DA, 45DD, 45E, 45EA, 76.

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson

Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust) 193

INDEX

TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

- Unfair dismissal — Breach by employee of employer's drug and alcohol policy — Where applicant employed as stevedore at respondent's container terminal for 25 years prior to events in issue — Safety critical nature of terminal not disputed — Breach of drug and alcohol policy not disputed — Where employee had taken cocaine day prior to shift without self-reporting and tested positive — Cocaine usage developed following protracted recovery from workplace injury as attempt to self-medicate mental health issues — Where respondent's policy expressed zero tolerance for drugs or alcohol in workplace — Where purpose of policy to prevent lingering effects of drug and alcohol use on work only included in covering email and excluded from policy proper — Where applicant given show cause letter by respondent to which he responded with contrition and responsibility for actions — Applicant thereafter terminated following meeting with respondent General Manager Operations — Where termination predicated upon "high range" nature of applicant's drug test reading — Whether dismissal of applicant unfair — Where valid reason for termination an opportunity to respond given to applicant — Where length of service and history of compliance with drug testing policy weighed in favour of unfairness — Where exclusion of policy purpose from policy itself had effect of leaving employees including applicant insufficiently informed — Where respondent's reliance upon "high range" nature of drug test result not supported by expert evidence as indicator of impairment and therefore contravention severity — Where available alternatives to dismissal such as rehabilitation not considered by respondent decisionmaker particularly given long and satisfactory service of applicant, lack of any safety incident on drug test date, and his disclosures of mental health issues to respondent — Combination of factors such that dismissal was unfair — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 385, 387(a), 387(b), 387(c), 387(h).
Witherden v DP World Sydney Ltd (Fair Work Commission) 115
- Unfair dismissal — Remedies — Reinstatement — Whether reinstatement appropriate — Where respondent professed to have lost trust in applicant — Where loss of trust predicated upon determination of severity of conduct not supported by expert evidence — Where applicant's long service and otherwise faultless compliance with drug and alcohol policy supported reinstatement — Reinstatement appropriate and ordered at applicant's previous level — Compensation — Whether award of compensation appropriate — Where reduction ordinarily applicable given applicant's contribution to circumstances of dismissal — Where incorrect evidence given by applicant falling below standard of false or misleading evidence nevertheless such that order for compensation not appropriate in circumstances — Compensation not ordered — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), ss 391(1), 391(2), 391(3), 678.
Witherden v DP World Sydney Ltd (Fair Work Commission) 115

WORDS AND PHRASES

- "Arrangement" — Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth), ss 45E(3), 45EA.
Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust) 193
- "Arrive at" — Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth), s 45E(3).
Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust) 193
- "Contract" — Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth), ss 45E(3), 45EA.
Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson

INDEX

WORDS AND PHRASES — *continued*

<i>Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust)</i>	193
“High range”.	
<i>Witherden v DP World Sydney Ltd (Fair Work Commission)</i>	115
“In full” — Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), s 323(1)(a).	
<i>Australian Rail, Tram and Bus Industry Union v Pacific National Executive Services Pty Ltd (Industrial Court of New South Wales)</i>	168
“Make” — Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth), s 45E(3).	
<i>Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust)</i>	193
“Understanding” — Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth), ss 45E(3), 45EA.	
<i>Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v J Hutchinson Pty Ltd (High Ct of Aust)</i>	193