



Friday, 14 March 2025

Weekly Family Law A Weekly Bulletin listing Decisions of Superior Courts of Australia covering family 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)

Durand & Gilson (FedCFamC1A) - add backs are notional balance sheet entries only, and, where there is no property actually held by the parties, there is no property for the Court to divide, and add backs, even if proper, do not change this situation

HABEAS CANEM

Dive with pike



Benchmark

Summaries With Link (Five Minute Read)

Durand & Gilson [2025] FedCFamC1A 36

Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Division 1) Appellate Jurisdiction

Aldridge J

Property - primary judge dismissed application for alteration of property interests under s79 of the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth) on the basis that there were no property interests to alter - wife had contended there were funds to make an adjustment of \$700,000 having regard to the list of assets in her affidavit - these assets had consisted largely of add backs in the amount of about \$1.5million - wife appealed - held: s79 speaks in the present tense of the property held by the parties at the time of order, and does not permit alteration of interests in property that was held by the parties but in which neither party still has an interest - in certain circumstances, the Court can take into account disposition of property under s75(2), or by way of add backs, to support particular orders - as set out in previous authority, the s75(2) option is preferable to the add back option, which the authority cited by the Court noted should only be used in exceptional circumstances - what the parties have disposed of is no longer property capable of division under s79 - Court noted that add backs in respect of such dispositions are far too commonly added to balance sheets as assets, and that this practice was apt to mislead - such add backs are notional only and do not represent property held by the parties, and cannot themselves be the subject of orders under s79 - they can only inform the appropriate division of property that actually exists in the hands of the parties - the first step in any property case is the identification of the property - the wife had identified no error by the primary judge in finding there were no assets capable of division - even if certain payments made by the husband could be categorised as payments that needed to be taken into account in adjusting the interests in the parties' property, there were no interests to adjust - appeal dismissed.

[Durand & Gilson](#)

[From Benchmark Friday, 14 March 2025]

Benchmark

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Executive Summary and (One Minute Read)

Dewberry Group v Dewberry Engineers (SCOTUS) - Disgorgement of profits in a trade mark infringement dispute brought under the United States Lanham Act may only be awarded against parties that are named defendants. Profits of defendant's affiliates are not statutorily subject to disgorgement

Summaries With Link (Five Minute Read)

Dewberry Group v Dewberry Engineers 604 US __ (2025)

Supreme Court of the United States

Plaintiff, Dewberry Engineers successfully sued Dewberry Group for trade mark infringement. Pursuant to the Lanham Act, the plaintiff sought damages measured by the amount of defendant's profits, known as disgorgement of profits. The plaintiff was awarded US\$43million. The judgment was affirmed by the Court of Appeals. However, the named defendant did not show any profits on its books. The profits attributable to the infringement appeared on the books of defendant's affiliated companies, and the trial court attributed the profits to the named defendant for purposes of ordering disgorgement. The Supreme Court (per Curiam by Kagan J; Sotomayor J concurring) reversed and remanded based on the plain meaning of the statutory language which permits as a measure of loss, disgorgement of the 'defendant's' profits. The Court found that the word 'defendant' in the statute can only refer to a party so named in the proceedings. The plaintiff had also argued that the Lanham Act allows for a 'just-sum' award of damages where a court is persuaded that the traditional measures of losses are inadequate. The Court declined to decide if the award of damages could be justified on the just-sum theory because this had not been employed by the trial court.

[Dewberry Group](#)



Poem for Friday

The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock

By T. S. Eliot

*S'io credesse che mia risposta fosse
A persona che mai tornasse al mondo,
Questa fiamma staria senza piu scosse.
Ma perciocche giammai di questo fondo
Non torno vivo alcun, s'i'odo il vero,
Senza tema d'infamia ti rispondo.*

Let us go then, you and I,
When the evening is spread out against the sky
Like a patient etherized upon a table;
Let us go, through certain half-deserted streets,
The muttering retreats
Of restless nights in one-night cheap hotels
And sawdust restaurants with oyster-shells:
Streets that follow like a tedious argument
Of insidious intent
To lead you to an overwhelming question ...

Oh, do not ask, "What is it?"
Let us go and make our visit.

In the room the women come and go
Talking of Michelangelo.

The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window-panes,
The yellow smoke that rubs its muzzle on the window-panes,
Licked its tongue into the corners of the evening,
Lingered upon the pools that stand in drains,
Let fall upon its back the soot that falls from chimneys,
Slipped by the terrace, made a sudden leap,
And seeing that it was a soft October night,
Curled once about the house, and fell asleep.

And indeed there will be time
For the yellow smoke that slides along the street,
Rubbing its back upon the window-panes;



There will be time, there will be time
To prepare a face to meet the faces that you meet;
There will be time to murder and create,
And time for all the works and days of hands
That lift and drop a question on your plate;
Time for you and time for me,
And time yet for a hundred indecisions,
And for a hundred visions and revisions,
Before the taking of a toast and tea.

In the room the women come and go
Talking of Michelangelo.

And indeed there will be time
To wonder, "Do I dare?" and, "Do I dare?"
Time to turn back and descend the stair,
With a bald spot in the middle of my hair —
(They will say: "How his hair is growing thin!")
My morning coat, my collar mounting firmly to the chin,
My necktie rich and modest, but asserted by a simple pin —
(They will say: "But how his arms and legs are thin!")
Do I dare
Disturb the universe?
In a minute there is time
For decisions and revisions which a minute will reverse.

For I have known them all already, known them all:
Have known the evenings, mornings, afternoons,
I have measured out my life with coffee spoons;
I know the voices dying with a dying fall
Beneath the music from a farther room.
So how should I presume?

And I have known the eyes already, known them all—
The eyes that fix you in a formulated phrase,
And when I am formulated, sprawling on a pin,
When I am pinned and wriggling on the wall,
Then how should I begin
To spit out all the butt-ends of my days and ways?
And how should I presume?

And I have known the arms already, known them all—



Arms that are braceleted and white and bare
(But in the lamplight, downed with light brown hair!)
Is it perfume from a dress
That makes me so digress?
Arms that lie along a table, or wrap about a shawl.
 And should I then presume?
 And how should I begin?

Shall I say, I have gone at dusk through narrow streets
And watched the smoke that rises from the pipes
Of lonely men in shirt-sleeves, leaning out of windows? ...

I should have been a pair of ragged claws
Scuttling across the floors of silent seas.

And the afternoon, the evening, sleeps so peacefully!
Smoothed by long fingers,
Asleep ... tired ... or it malingers,
Stretched on the floor, here beside you and me.
Should I, after tea and cakes and ices,
Have the strength to force the moment to its crisis?
But though I have wept and fasted, wept and prayed,
Though I have seen my head (grown slightly bald) brought in upon a platter,
I am no prophet — and here's no great matter;
I have seen the moment of my greatness flicker,
And I have seen the eternal Footman hold my coat, and snicker,
And in short, I was afraid.

And would it have been worth it, after all,
After the cups, the marmalade, the tea,
Among the porcelain, among some talk of you and me,
Would it have been worth while,
To have bitten off the matter with a smile,
To have squeezed the universe into a ball
To roll it towards some overwhelming question,
To say: "I am Lazarus, come from the dead,
Come back to tell you all, I shall tell you all"—
If one, settling a pillow by her head
 Should say: "That is not what I meant at all;
 That is not it, at all."

And would it have been worth it, after all,



Benchmark

Would it have been worth while,
After the sunsets and the dooryards and the sprinkled streets,
After the novels, after the teacups, after the skirts that trail along the floor—
And this, and so much more?—
It is impossible to say just what I mean!
But as if a magic lantern threw the nerves in patterns on a screen:
Would it have been worth while
If one, settling a pillow or throwing off a shawl,
And turning toward the window, should say:
 “That is not it at all,
 That is not what I meant, at all.”

No! I am not Prince Hamlet, nor was meant to be;
Am an attendant lord, one that will do
To swell a progress, start a scene or two,
Advise the prince; no doubt, an easy tool,
Deferential, glad to be of use,
Politic, cautious, and meticulous;
Full of high sentence, but a bit obtuse;
At times, indeed, almost ridiculous—
Almost, at times, the Fool.

I grow old ... I grow old ...
I shall wear the bottoms of my trousers rolled.

Shall I part my hair behind? Do I dare to eat a peach?
I shall wear white flannel trousers, and walk upon the beach.
I have heard the mermaids singing, each to each.

I do not think that they will sing to me.

I have seen them riding seaward on the waves
Combing the white hair of the waves blown back
When the wind blows the water white and black.
We have lingered in the chambers of the sea
By sea-girls wreathed with seaweed red and brown
Till human voices wake us, and we drown.

Jeremy Irons reads The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" by T. S. Eliot

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=adNOs1izBlS>



Thomas Stearns Eliot OM was born on 26 September 1888 in St Louis, Missouri. By the time he was 15, he spoke Greek, Latin, French and English, with some German. He was a leading poet, editor and publisher. He is also well known as an essayist. He started his working life as a clerk in the Colonial and Foreign department of Lloyd's as a linguist. By that time he had also studied Sanskrit, and knew French, Italian and German.

Well known works include *The Waste Land* and *The Hollow Men*. He regarded *Four Quartets* as his greatest masterpiece. He wrote that "*only those who will risk going too far can possibly find out how far one can go*". He received the Nobel Prize in Literature. He relinquished his American citizenship to become a British citizen. Having smoked heavily for most of his life, he suffered worsening problems with his lungs, until his death.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/T. S. Eliot](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/T._S._Eliot)

<https://tseliot.com/>

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