

AUGUST 2025

The Authorised Law Reports of the
Supreme Court of Western Australia

THE
WESTERN
AUSTRALIAN
REPORTS
2023

EDITOR

ERIC HEENAN SC

REPORTERS IN THIS PART

AMY JOSEPH
HUGH KOPSEN

VOL 60 — PART 4

PAGES 258-335

The mode of citation of this part will be:
60 WAR

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Part 4 — Pages 258-335

| | |
|---|-----|
| Billabong Gold Pty Ltd v Vango Mining Ltd (No 2) | 147 |
| Donaldson; Mammoth Investments Pty Ltd v | 1 |
| FGH v NOP | 299 |
| Gunn v Meiners | 90 |
| Mammoth Investments Pty Ltd v Donaldson | 1 |
| Meiners; Gunn v | 90 |
| NOP; FGH v | 299 |
| Puntigam v Western Australia | 26 |
| Taylor v Western Australia | 258 |
| Vango Mining Ltd (No 2); Billabong Gold Pty Ltd v | 147 |
| Western Australia; Puntigam v | 26 |
| Western Australia; Taylor v | 258 |

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

© State of Western Australia 2025

This publication is copyright. Except as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part of this publication may be reproduced or communicated by any process without the prior written permission of the Attorney General of Western Australia.



2025 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited

Lawbook Co.

ABN 64 058 914 668

Published in Sydney

ISSN 0083-8764

INDEX

Part 4 — Pages 258-335

CRIMINAL LAW

- Appeals against conviction and sentence — Appellant and two co-accused were jointly charged with murder and criminal damage by fire — Where the State alleged that one or both of co-accused were criminally responsible for murder as principal offenders under s 7(a) of the Criminal Code (WA), in the alternative as an aider of the other co-accused under s 7(b) or (c) — Where the State alleged that the appellant was criminally responsible for murder as an aider of one or both co-accused under s 7(b) or (c), or as a counsellor or procurer under s 7(d) — Whether the trial judge erred in directing the jury that the requirement for the appellant's criminal responsibility for murder, namely that a principal offender was criminally responsible under s 7(a), would be satisfied if the co-accused were guilty on the basis that they acted in concert with each of them doing one or more acts in a series of acts which in combination caused the deceased's death — Whether the trial judge erred in his directions to the jury in respect of the meaning of "counsel" and "procure" in s 7(d).
- Taylor v Western Australia* 258

WILLS AND ESTATES

- Family provision claim under s 6 of Family Provision Act 1972 (WA) — Where daughter claimant had debts substantially exceeding her assets — Where primary judge considered payment of a capital sum to claimant would not advance the objects of an award under s 6 — Whether s 6 empowers the court to order provision for a claimant by way of a discretionary trust the objects of which include other persons who are not successful claimants — Whether primary judge erred in the exercise of discretion under s 6.
- FGH v NOP* 299

WORDS AND PHRASES

- "Counsel" — Criminal Code (WA), s 7(d).
- Taylor v Western Australia* 258
- "Procure" — Criminal Code (WA), s 7(d).
- Taylor v Western Australia* 258