

# BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION LAW JOURNAL

Volume 30, Number 1

February 2014

## EDITORIAL

<b>“Professional” construction consultants .....</b>	<b>3</b>
--	----------

## TOPIC OF INTEREST

<b>Best endeavours and reasonable endeavours: Is there any material difference? – Elisabeth Moran and Cameron Ross .....</b>	<b>4</b>
--	----------

## ARTICLES

### **Time bars after *Andrews v ANZ* – Andrew P Downie**

When a contractor does not comply with a notice requirement in a time-bar, that contractor may become disentitled to a claim that would otherwise be available but for that non-compliance. The 2012 High Court decision of <i>Andrews v Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd</i> has been regarded by some as standing for the proposition that time-bars are unenforceable as penalties, thereby giving relief to a contractor that has not complied with a time-bar. This article considers the <i>Andrews</i> decision and seeks to reconcile it with earlier decisions on whether or not time-bars and conditions precedent generally are penal. The article also explores other considerations in equity that might apply when a court is faced with an argument that a time-bar is a penalty. ....	7
--	---

### **Building bridges in the classroom: A view from the academy – Matthew Bell, Dr Paula Gerber and Dr Phil Evans**

Over the past two decades, the rise of specialist practice in the area of construction law has led to – and been fostered by – a proliferation in construction law teaching. This article examines this trend, offering observations about what makes for “best practice” in teaching students across construction-related disciplines – lawyers, construction professionals, undergraduates and graduates – and how the academy can assist in building bridges between those disciplines. ....	24
---	----

## REPORTS

<b>CH2M Hill v New South Wales .....</b>	<b>35</b>
--	-----------

