

Friday, 21 June 2024

## Weekly Environmental Law A Weekly Bulletin listing Decisions of Superior Courts of Australia covering Environmental Law

### 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 (One Minute Read)

**Webster on behalf of Ngarigo Peoples v State of New South Wales (FCA)** - Court refused restrain the NSW Government from horse culling in the Kosciuszko National Park where the statutory authority for this was alleged to be inconsistent with of the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth)

**M. & S. Investments (NSW) Pty Ltd v Affordable Demolitions and Excavations Pty Ltd (NSWCA)** - summonses stated a wrong date for commission of an environmental offence, which was before the relevant section commenced - primary judge erred by dismissing the summonses and refusing leave to amend the date

**Snowy Mountain Bush Users Group Inc v Minister for the Environment (NSWSC)** - interlocutory injunction restricting wild horse culling operations in the Kosciuszko National Park refused - Court resisted the temptation to discount the significance of costs in a contest between government and well-meaning and passionate members of the community



## HABEAS CANEM

Small dog, big surf



# Benchmark

## Summaries With Link (Five Minute Read)

### **Webster on behalf of Ngarigo Peoples v State of New South Wales [2024] FCA 615**

Federal Court of Australia

Raper J

Discrimination law - the applicant was a Ngarigo man, authorised to represent the Ngarigo peoples, who he asserted had existing and unextinguished common law Aboriginal property and water rights over the Kosciuszko National Park and surrounding areas, including the Australian Capital Territory - he sought urgent interlocutory relief restraining the NSW Government from culling wild horses and other native animals pursuant to the *Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Act 2018* (NSW) - he claimed the Government had failed to recognise the Ngarigo peoples' rights over the land, inhibiting or limiting their enjoyment of it and are trespassing on it - he contested the validity of the *Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Act's* authorisation of culling measures by reason of purported inconsistency with s10 of the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth) - held: s78B of the *Judiciary Act 1903* (Cth) provides a mechanism by which the Court must be satisfied in matters arising under the Constitution that notice is given to the Attorneys-General of the Commonwealth and of the States, and does not provide justiciable rights nor protection - further, s78B(5) states that nothing in that section prevents the Court from proceeding without delay to hear and determine proceedings involving urgent interlocutory relief - the applicant had made no substantive application associated with his claims, and all that he had filed was the claim for injunctive relief - the applicant's submissions appeared to misunderstand the relationship between native title and the common law, and the meaning of common law recognition provided by s223 of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) - to the extent that the applicant sought to rely on a native title interest recognised by the common law, assuming the Court had jurisdiction to determine such a claim (contrary to s213 of the *Native Title Act*, which provides native title must be determined in accordance with the Act), the applicant had not identified the nature of that interest - there was therefore no apparent basis for the claim of inconsistency with the *Racial Discrimination Act* - the applicant had not satisfied the Court there was a serious question to be tried - the balance of convenience did not favour the injunction being granted because of the weakness in the applicant's claim - further, grant of the injunction would cause significant prejudice and hardship to the Government, third persons, and the public generally, as a pause in the horse removal operations would result in: environmental degradation of a kind that the operations are specifically intended to reduce, including habitat loss, reduced water quality, soil compaction and erosion, and loss of vulnerable and endangered species; significant resourcing and personnel consequences for the National Parks and Wildlife Service, including on contracting arrangements; and (c) prolonging of the closure of parts of the National Park, comprising the ability of the public to enjoy the National Park - application for interlocutory injunction refused.

[Webster on behalf of Ngarigo Peoples](#)

[From Benchmark Monday, 17 June 2024]

### **M. & S. Investments (NSW) Pty Ltd v Affordable Demolitions and Excavations Pty**

AR Conolly & Company Lawyers

Level 29 Chifley Tower, 2 Chifley Square, Sydney NSW 2000

Phone: 02 9159 0777 Fax: 02 9159 0778

[www.arconolly.com.au](http://www.arconolly.com.au)

# Benchmark

## **Ltd [2024] NSWCA 151**

Ward P, Mitchellmore JA, Preston CJ of LEC

Environmental law - M&S commenced proceedings, charging the defendants with each committing an offence against s144AAA of the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997* (NSW) by unlawfully disposing of asbestos waste - the summonses stated that the offence was committed during a particular period - this period was before the Act had been amended to add s144AAA - M&S sought to amend the summonses to alleged breaches after s144AAA commenced, and the defendants applied to have the summonses dismissed - the primary judge dismissed the summonses - by two applications, M&S sought to appeal from and sought review of the primary judge's decision - held: s15(2) and s16(1) and (2) of the *Criminal Procedure Act 1986* (Cth) provided that the summonses were not "bad, insufficient, void, erroneous or defective" on the ground that they stated time wrongly or stated an "impossible day", and that no objection could be taken to the summonses on the grounds of any alleged defect in substance or form - the general rule is that a statement in an indictment or other process by which criminal proceedings are commenced, including a summons, of the date on which the offence was committed is not a material matter, unless it is actually an essential part of the alleged offence - contrary to the primary judge's finding, the summonses did disclose an offence known to law, and so were not nullities for failing to do so - the stated date of the offence may have been "an impossible day" on which to commit the offence, but that did not make the offence one that is now not known to the law - the primary judge erred in deciding to dismiss M&S's notice of motion seeking leave to amend the summonses - appeal allowed.

[View Decision](#)

[From Benchmark Friday, 21 June 2024]

## **Snowy Mountain Bush Users Group Inc v Minister for the Environment [2024] NSWSC 711**

Supreme Court of New South Wales

Harrison CJ at CL

Administrative law - an environment group sought a declaration that aerial horse culling operations in the Kosciuszko National Park contravened of s10 of the *Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Act 2018* (NSW), an injunction prohibiting those operations, and a declaration that the *Amended Kosciuszko National Park Wild Horse Heritage Management Plan* was invalid - the plaintiff also sought urgent interlocutory relief prohibiting culling operations where it appeared this would reduce wild horse numbers below 3,000 - held: although the plaintiff's prospects were no more than arguable, its case did not seem hopeless or doomed to fail - the outcome would depend upon a detailed analysis of what the Plan, on its proper construction, required, and then a comparison with the activities in fact taking place - there was therefore a serious question to be tried - whether the plaintiff had standing should await a more detailed exploration with the benefit of cross-examination and a better understanding of the role the plaintiff played in consultations with the government - the plaintiff conceded it did not have sufficient financial resources to meet an adverse costs order - the Court must resist the temptation to discount the significance of costs in a contest between government and an incorporated body representing

well-meaning and passionate members of the community with genuinely held and commendable concerns - the absence of an undertaking as to damages weighed heavily in favour of refusing interlocutory relief - the balance of convenience favoured refusing interlocutory relief - there was no evidence to satisfy the Court on the balance of probabilities that horses were being killed in a way that caused them unnecessary and unjustifiable pain, and aerial culling operations had been ongoing for some considerable time, and had been, and would be, subject to observation and assessment by the RSPCA - further, suspension of the control operations threatened the environment, with feral horses being recognised as a key risk to the park, including a number of vulnerable species - interlocutory injunction refused.

[View Decision](#)

[From Benchmark Wednesday, 19 June 2024]

# Benchmark

## INTERNATIONAL LAW

### Executive Summary and (One Minute Read)

**Food and Drug Administration v Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine** (SCOTUS) - Plaintiff pro-life doctors and medical associations challenged Food and Drug Administration (FDA) decision to relax prescribing restrictions on a drug used to terminate pregnancies. The Court held the plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge the FDA decision

### Summaries With Link (Five Minute Read)

**Food and Drug Administration v Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine [2024] 602 US \_\_\_\_**  
Supreme Court of the United States

In 2021, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) relaxed regulations for prescribing mifepristone, an abortion drug, to make the drug more accessible to women. The plaintiffs, consisting of pro-life doctors and medical associations, brought suit, alleging that the FDA regulations violated the *Administrative Procedure Act*. The District Court granted plaintiffs an injunction. The Court of Appeals found that plaintiffs had standing to sue and were likely to win on the merits. Reversing the lower courts, a unanimous Supreme Court held that the doctors and medical societies lacked standing to bring suit. Article III of the US Constitution limits the jurisdiction of federal courts to actual cases and controversies. The Court said that this is a matter of separation of powers. General complaints about how the government conducts its business are matters for the legislative and executive branches, not the judiciary. To establish standing, a plaintiff must demonstrate that (1) the plaintiff will likely suffer an injury in fact; (2) that the injury would likely be caused by the defendant; and (3) that the injury can be redressed by judicial relief. The plaintiffs are pro-life and do not prescribe the abortion drug. Nothing contained in the FDA regulations requires doctors to prescribe this drug. In short, the plaintiffs are acting to restrict the availability of the drug to others. While plaintiffs argued that they have suffered injury because doctors may suffer conscience objections when forced to perform abortions or perform abortion related treatment, the argument failed because federal conscience laws explicitly protect doctors from being required to perform abortions or other treatment that violates their consciences. The Court also rejected arguments that, if plaintiffs were not allowed to sue, then no one would have standing to challenge the FDA's actions. The Court said that even if this were true, it could not create standing and that some issues must be dealt with through the political and democratic processes and not the courts.

[Food and Drug Administration](#)



## Poem for Friday

**"Hope" is the thing with feathers (314)**

**By** Emily Dickinson (10 December, 1830-15 May, 1886)

Hope is the thing with feathers -  
That perches in the soul -  
And sings the tune without the words -  
And never stops - at all -

And sweetest - in the Gale - is heard -  
And sore must be the storm -  
That could abash the little Bird  
That kept so many warm -

I've heard it in the chilliest land -  
And on the strangest Sea -  
Yet - never - in Extremity,  
It asked a crumb - of me.

Emily Dickinson [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson)

Emily Dickinson Museum [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson\\_Museum](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson_Museum)

Hope is the thing with feathers, sung by Nazareth College Treble Choir, Linehan Chapel,  
Nazareth College

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gDlSo4hEzmE>

Recitation by **Patricia Conolly**. With seven decades experience as a professional actress in three continents, Patricia Conolly has credits from most of the western world's leading theatrical centres. She has worked extensively in her native Australia, in London's West End, at The Royal Shakespeare Company, on Broadway, off Broadway, and widely in the USA and Canada.

Her professional life includes noted productions with some of the greatest names in English speaking theatre, a partial list would include: Sir Peter Hall, Peter Brook, Sir



# Benchmark

Laurence Olivier, Dame Maggie Smith, Rex Harrison, Dame Judi Dench, Tennessee Williams, Lauren Bacall, Rosemary Harris, Tony Randall, Marthe Keller, Wal Cherry, Alan Seymour, and Michael Blakemore.

She has played some 16 Shakespearean leading roles, including both Merry Wives, both Viola and Olivia, Regan (with Sir Peter Ustinov as Lear), and The Fool (with Hal Holbrook as Lear), a partial list of other classical work includes: various works of Moliere, Sheridan, Congreve, Farquar, Ibsen, and Shaw, as well as roles such as, Jocasta in Oedipus, The Princess of France in Love's Labour's Lost, and Yelena in Uncle Vanya (directed by Sir Tyrone Guthrie), not to mention three Blanche du Bois and one Stella in A Streetcar Named Desire.

Patricia has also made a significant contribution as a guest speaker, teacher and director, she has taught at The Julliard School of the Arts, Boston University, Florida Atlantic University, The North Carolina School of the Arts, University of Southern California, University of San Diego, and been a guest speaker at NIDA, and the Delaware MFA program.

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