



Thursday, 14 June 2018

Daily Civil Law A Daily Bulletin listing Decisions of Superior Courts of Australia

 Follow @Benchmark_Legal

Search Engine

[Click here](#) to access our search engine facility to search legal issues, case names, courts and judges. Simply type in a keyword or phrase and all relevant cases that we have reported in Benchmark since its inception in June 2007 will be available with links to each case.

Executive Summary (1 minute read)

F. Hoffman-La Roche AG v Sandoz Pty Ltd (FCA) - patent - interlocutory application to restrain competitor from launching medicine on basis it would infringe patents - relief granted (I B C G)

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Geowash Pty Ltd (Subject to a Deed of Company Arrangement) (No 2) (FCA) - discovery - claim of legal professional privilege over documents failed - leave to inspect documents granted (I B C G)

Chinatex (Australia) Pty Limited v Bindaree Beef Pty Limited (NSWCA) - contract - service kill agreement - claims for breach of agreement for 'failure to pay' - appeal dismissed (B C I G)

Kostov v Nationwide News Pty Ltd (NSWSC) - defamation - summary dismissal - imputations incapable of being carried by matter complained of - matter complained of incapable of defaming plaintiff - plaintiff's claim summarily dismissed (I)

Birketu Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corporation (NSWSC) - judgments and orders - application for order restraining ninth defendant from communicating with certain persons concerning proceedings - order refused (B C I G)

Australia Yinmore Holding Pty Ltd & Ors v Liu (No 2) (QSC) - costs - indemnity costs - offer of settlement - respondent to pay successful applicant's costs on indemnity basis (I B C G)

Huntingdale Village Pty Ltd (ACN 085 048 531) (Receivers & Managers appointed) v Corrs Chambers Westgarth (WASCA) - contract - solicitors costs - appellant companies not entitled to use provisions of *Legal Practice Act 2003 (WA)* to require law firm to provide detailed bills of costs - appeal dismissed (I B C G)

Summaries With Link (Five Minute Read)

F. Hoffman-La Roche AG v Sandoz Pty Ltd [2018] FCA 874

Federal Court of Australia

Burley J

Patent - interlocutory application - applicant sought to restrain competitor from launching medicine on basis it would infringe claims of four patents - respondent contended claims invalid due to want of inventive step - respondent also opposed injunction on basis of balance of convenience and justice - ss7, 18, 40 & 117 *Patents Act 1990 (Cth)* - held: applicant established prima facie case for patents' infringement with 'probability of success' - serious question to be tried established - balance favoured granting of interlocutory relief - Court granted interlocutory injunction in more limited form than applicant sought.

[F. Hoffman-La Roche AG](#) (I B C G)

Australian Competition and Consumer Commission v Geowash Pty Ltd (Subject to a Deed of Company Arrangement) (No 2) [2018] FCA 879

Federal Court of Australia

Colvin J

Discovery - legal professional privilege - applicant commenced proceedings against first respondent franchisor and second respondent director of franchisor - subpoena issued at second respondent's request to law firm representing some franchisees - documents produced - claim of legal professional privilege made in respect of documents - whether legal professional privilege applied to documents - whether documents brought into existence for dominant purpose of provision of legal advice to franchisees - whether documents provided legal advice to franchisees - whether documents brought into existence for dominant purpose of providing professional legal services concerning proceedings in respect of which franchisees were, or were to be, parties to - ss118 & 119 *Evidence Act 1995 (Cth)* - held: legal professional privilege claim over documents failed - leave to inspect documents granted.

[Australian Competition and Consumer Commission](#) (I B C G)

Chinatex (Australia) Pty Limited v Bindaree Beef Pty Limited [2018] NSWCA 126

Court of Appeal of New South Wales

McCull & White JJA; Barrett AJA

Contract - appeal arising from contract between parties known as 'Service Kill Agreement' - primary judge upheld respondent's claims against appellant for breach of agreement for failure to pay 'Total Product Fee' for non-performance periods - appellant contended primary judge

Benchmark

erred in finding that respondent had performed obligations under contract in non-performance periods, and erroneously rejected its defence of frustration of contract - appellant contended respondent, due to its 'complete failure' to perform contract, was not entitled to terminate contract or recover damages - whether respondent 'ready, willing and able' to perform obligations under contract - validity of respondent's termination of contract - whether proper characterisation of claim as unliquidated damages claim for breach of contract - whether appellant's breach caused respondent's loss - held: grounds of appeal failed - appeal dismissed.

[View Decision](#) (B C I G)

Kostov v Nationwide News Pty Ltd [2018] NSWSC 858

Supreme Court of New South Wales

McCallum J

Defamation - action arising from publication of article in newspaper - defendant contended matters complained of were incapable of conveying specified imputations and could not defame plaintiff - alternatively defendant contended that claim did not surmount "threshold of seriousness" - whether principle in *Thornton v Telegraph Media Group Ltd* [2010] EWHC 1414 applied in Australia - whether imputations "could reasonably be found by a jury" - held: Court not satisfied imputations capable of being carried by matter complained of - matter complained of not capable of defaming plaintiff - plaintiff's claim summarily dismissed.

[View Decision](#) (I)

Birketu Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corporation [2018] NSWSC 879

Supreme Court of New South Wales

McDougall J

Judgments and orders - plaintiffs sought order under s 61(1) *Civil Procedure Act 2005* (NSW) (Civil Procedure Act) or r2.1 *Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 2005* (NSW) (Uniform Civil Procedure Rules) that ninth defendant 'not communicate directly' concerning proceedings with certain persons who were plaintiffs' principals or employees - plaintiffs contended correspondence would 'tend to undermine' plaintiffs' confidence in their lawyers and weaken their 'resolve to proceed' - plaintiffs also submitted correspondence could delay hearing and increase costs - whether basis for application of s61(1) Civil Procedure Act or r2.1 Uniform Civil Procedure Rules - held: Court not satisfied to make order sought.

[View Decision](#) (B C I G)

Australia Yinmore Holding Pty Ltd & Ors v Liu (No 2) [2018] QSC 136

Supreme Court of Queensland

Mullins J

Costs - applicants succeeded in proceedings - applicants sought indemnity costs in reliance on offer of settlement which was rejected by respondent - orders made no less favourable to applicant than offer - r360(1) *Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999* (Qld) - offer's timing - evidence - whether genuine offer of compromise - risks which respondent assumed in rejecting

Benchmark

offer - whether respondent established that order other than an indemnity costs order should be made - held: Court satisfied to grant indemnity costs order in applicant's favour.

[Australia Yinmore](#) (I B C G)

Huntingdale Village Pty Ltd (ACN 085 048 531) (Receivers & Managers appointed) v Corrs Chambers Westgarth [2018] WASCA 90

Court of Appeal of Western Australia

Martin CJ; Mitchell & Beech JJA

Contract - solicitors' costs - appellants were companies in receivership and their director - first respondent law firm provided legal services in respect of appellant companies while in receivership - primary judge found appellant companies not entitled to use provisions of *Legal Practice Act 2003* (WA) (LPA Act) to require first respondent to serve detailed bills of costs on them - 'proper construction and effect' of agreements (2006 agreements) between receivers and first respondent concerning legal services' provision - efficacy of agreements (2015 agreements) between receivers and first respondent concerning legal services first respondent provided, including services it provided previously - whether LPA Act applied to services law firm provided under 2006 agreements or 2015 agreements - whether proper law of retainer agreements was Western Australia or New South Wales - held: grounds of appeal failed - appeal dismissed.

[Huntingdale](#) (I B C G)

[Click Here to access our Benchmark Search Engine](#)