Australian Law Journal

GENERAL EDITOR
Acting Justice Peter W Young AO

THOMSON REUTERS EDITOR
Cheryle King

ASSISTANT GENERAL EDITOR

Angelina Gomez

Lawyer, Perth

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
Colleen Tognetti
Adam Weir

The mode of citation of this volume is: 86 ALJR [page]

(2012) 86 ALJ 793 793

THE AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL

Volume 86, Number 12

December 2012

CAUSATION IN SECURITIES LITIGATION

Gerard Craddock SC

Filings of shareholder class actions has grown steadily, but none has yet gone to judgment. The element of causation has engendered controversy. The plaintiffs eye jealously the fraud on the market theory accepted in the United States as permitting a presumption of reliance in efficient markets. Many Australian litigants could have sued in the United States, until that avenue was closed by Morrison v National Australia Bank Ltd 130 SC 2869 (2010). Congress may yet open the door a little by amendment to the Dodd-Frank Act. Ingot Capital Investments v Macquarie Equity Capital Markets (2009)

794 (2012) 86 ALJ 793

73 NSWLR 653 provides a non-binding, yet highly persuasive rebuttal of the plaintiff thesis that some form of market-based causation may be grafted onto statutory causes of action under the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth). The question whether the legislature should act to ease the legal and procedural burdens of providing the causal link between contraventions and shareholder losses requires input from businesses, regulators, economists and physicists, at least. Recent developments in high frequency trading and dark pools have thrown up conundrums that suggest that we do not understand the way financial markets work in the computer age. Better understanding is required in order to make sound policy choices as to interests that ought to be protected by enabling damages suits for investment losses.	813
PROTECTING THE WORKS OF INDIGENOUS ARTISTS UNDER COPYRIGHT LAW AND AT ITS BORDERS	
Mary Wyburn	
When copyright law has been used to protect indigenous creative works, the protection provided has not by any means amounted to full recognition of the particular features of indigenous ownership, such as the rights of the indigenous group and the special types of cultural harm suffered when such works are used without appropriate authority. In response to this gap in protection, some have proposed the introduction of more direct legislative measures but so far government has been reluctant to act. This article explores earlier instances where copyright protection has been available and examines two recent developments occurring at the outer edges of copyright law, the introduction of a resale royalty right and a voluntary code of conduct for dealers in the indigenous art industry. Its focus is on the way copyright law is able to craft protection, however imperfectly, that takes account of some of the special features of indigenous creative works. It leaves for others the separate question of whether more direct legislative protection is the appropriate response in this area.	829
BORROWED MANNERS: COURT ETIQUETTE AND THE MODERN LAWYER	
Thomas F Gaffney	
This article examines the origins of court etiquette in the English courts of the 13th century through the writings of early legal commentators. It explores the development of court etiquette in England and Australia until the present day. It analyses the nature and purposes of court etiquette in early and modern courts, and discusses the conventions of court etiquette that should be observed by the modern-day practitioner in Australia	842
BOOK REVIEWS – Editor: Angelina Gomez	
Substance and Procedure in Private International Law, by Richard Garnett	853
The Law of Torts in Australia (5th ed), by Kit Barker, Peter Cane, Mark Lunney, Francis Trindade	855
Ong on Equity, by Denis S K Ong	856

(2012) 86 ALJ 793 795

The Australian Law Journal Reports

HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Thomson Reuters

1	\Box	E	1	٦ī	(T	(1	١	J	2	Ţ	5	F	(٦r	7	ľ	17	E	ï	1	1	n	J	•	\cap	(7	Г	ī	3	Б	Ţ	5	2	1	۱1	1)

British American Tobacco Australasia Ltd v Commonwealth (Constitutional Law; Health	
Law; Intellectual Property) ([2012] HCA 43)	297
JT International SA v Commonwealth (Constitutional Law; Health Law; Intellectual Property) ([2012] HCA 43)	297
Plaintiff M47/2012 v Director-General of Security (Administrative Law; Citizenship and Migration; Defence and War; Statutes) ([2012] HCA 46)	372

796 (2012) 86 ALJ 793