
Australian Law Journal

GENERAL EDITOR

Mr Justice P W Young AO

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Cheryle King

ASSISTANT GENERAL EDITOR

Angelina Gomez

Barrister-at-Law

The mode of citation of this volume is

(2012) 86 ALJ [page]

The Australian Law Journal is a refereed journal.

Australian Law Journal Reports

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Carolyn May

CASE REPORTERS

John Carroll

Sarah-Jane Greenaway

Alan Luchetti

Colleen Tognetti

The mode of citation of this volume is:

86 ALJR [page]

THE AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL

Volume 86, Number 4

April 2012

CURRENT ISSUES – Editor: Mr Justice P W Young AO

Sir Anthony Mason honoured in Hong Kong	219
Productivity and the law	220
Retired judges	221
Overseas adoptions	221
Mortgage problems	221
“Independent” hospital boards	222

CONVEYANCING AND PROPERTY – Editor: Peter Butt

Contract interpretation and conveyancing	223
Implication of terms into contracts for sale	225
Mortgagor’s caveat against own title	226
“Free of all deductions”	227
“Personal equities still prevail”	228

INTERNATIONAL FOCUS – Editor: Ryszard Piotrowicz

The state of state immunity: Germany defeats Italy at the ICJ	230
---	-----

RECENT CASES – Editor: Mr Justice P W Young AO

Negligence of valuer for mortgagee: Whether owed duty to purchaser	234
Criminal law: Man running on to road in front of truck – Whether a crime of violence	234
Equitable claim: Whether available where Statute of Limitations bars common law claim on same facts	234
Cohabitees holding home as joint tenants making unequal contributions	235
Property in preserved sperm	236
Tort: Vicarious liability of bishops for priests’ misconduct	237
De facto officers: Invalidly appointed public health committee	237
Partnership: Effect of dissolution	238
Crime: Murder – Rivals shooting at each other kill a bystander	238

ARTICLES

IMAGINING THE PAST, REMEMBERING THE FUTURE: THE DEMISE OF CIVIL LITIGATION

Hon John Doyle AC

“Civil litigation as we know it in the higher courts will come to an end.” This prediction of the end of civil litigation in the Supreme Court, District Court and Federal Court by the author is explored through a review of the distinctive features of the common law system. The author examines what has gone wrong; the strains on the system, proposing that the problems of the system come from within, from the characteristic features of the system. The impact of information technology, the increasing complexity of the law and the emergence of alternative dispute resolution are also discussed. Briefly, the author comments on parallels occurring in the criminal jurisdiction, albeit to a lesser degree, and the impact of the rise of therapeutic jurisprudence. The author concludes by suggesting an abandoning of the present system and recommends an alternative that embodies a concept that all civil claims be presented at a single registry and in simple form, after which judicial officers will take charge of them.

240

APPELLATE JUDGING: ONWARDS AND OUTWARDS TOWARDS MID-CENTURY

Ronald Sackville AO

The only confident thing that can be said about predictions is that they are bound to be wrong. With that comforting thought in mind, I propose to consider likely changes in the way the High Court and intermediate appellate courts in Australia discharge their respective functions in civil cases. Before doing so, however, I refer to the constitutional framework within which the courts operate and will continue to operate for the foreseeable future. Because the appellate courts, particularly the High Court, play a significant (but not exclusive) role in shaping public perceptions about the judicial system, I also consider likely changes in judicial attitudes towards engagement with the wider community.

249

THE CIVIL STANDARD OF PROOF AND THE “TEST” IN BRIGINSHAW: IS THERE A NEUROBIOLOGICAL BASIS TO BEING “COMFORTABLY SATISFIED”?

Hayley Bennett and G A (Tony) Broe

The High Court decision of *Briginshaw v Briginshaw* (1938) 60 CLR 336 is understood to lay down certain principles in relation to the civil standard of proof, that is, that the facts in issue must be proved to the satisfaction of the decision maker on the balance of probabilities. One of those principles relates to the state of mind of the decision maker and to the nature and quality of the decision-making process leading to the obtaining of the requisite satisfaction. In *Briginshaw*, the judges held that, in cases where serious and grave allegations have been made, a “reasonable satisfaction” of mind will not be achieved unless the decision maker “feels an actual persuasion”, feels “comfortably satisfied”, and is not “oppressed” with reasonable doubt. With this, the judges have suggested that what a judge feels and somatically experiences contributes to, and in fact may be decisive of, the decision-making outcome. These judicial insights from 1938 are

intriguing from a neurobiological perspective, given what is currently known about the participation of mental processes and somatic sensations in decision making. This article will review the decision in *Briginshaw* and the principles discussed therein. In particular however, the aim is to examine the decision-making processes described by the judges in order to determine whether the processes outlined are consistent with what is scientifically known today about decision-making processes and their neurobiological underpinnings. 258

BOOK REVIEWS – Editor: Angelina Gomez

Macken’s Law of Employment (7th ed), by C Sappideen, P O’Grady, J Riley and G Warburton 277

Islam: Its Law and Society (3rd ed), by Jamila Hussain. 277

Reluctant Democrat, Sir William Denison in Australia 1847-1861, by J M Bennett 278

The Australian Law Journal Reports

HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Thomson Reuters

DECISIONS RECEIVED IN FEBRUARY/MARCH 2012

ALH Group Property Holdings Pty Ltd v Chief Commissioner of State Revenue (NSW) (*Contracts; Interpretation; Taxes and Duties*) ([2012] HCA 6) 287

Equuscorp Pty Ltd v Bassat (*Personal Property; Procedure; Restitution*) ([2012] HCA 7)..... 296

Equuscorp Pty Ltd v Cunningham’s Warehouse Sales Pty Ltd (*Personal Property; Procedure; Restitution*) ([2012] HCA 7) 296

Equuscorp Pty Ltd v Haxton (*Personal Property; Procedure; Restitution*) ([2012] HCA 7)..... 296

Strong v Woolworths Ltd (t/as Big W) (*Torts*) ([2012] HCA 5) 267

Wotton v Queensland (*Administrative Law; Constitutional Law; Criminal Law*) ([2012] HCA 2) 246