AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF COMPETITION AND CONSUMER LAW

Volume 28, Number 2

		10	D	ΓΑ.	T
- н	\Box	 $^{\prime}$	R	Δ	

ARTICLES

2020

Section 18 and the Subtlety of the English Language 91

Online Auctions Going! Going! Gone! Sold by the Person Engaging in Misleading or Deceptive Conduct!!! – Adrian Coorey

Increased Civil Pecuniary Penalties – The "Cost of Doing Business" or an Effective Deterrent? – Cam H Truong QC and Luisa F Alampi

93

In this article, the authors look at the rise of the civil pecuniary penalty (CPP) as a tool for regulators. They examine how CPPs have been calculated in Australia with the community, regulators and businesses alike considering CPPs largely as the "cost of doing business" rather than a measurable and effective deterrent. The new statutory maximums under the *Australian Consumer Law* and the *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act* 2001 (Cth) will be discussed. The authors opine that regulators are likely to place less reliance on quantum "consent", and will instead push the boundaries for higher CPPs to more effectively deter business misconduct. The article concludes by expressing caution in setting too high a CPP as untoward consequences may flow which would undermine the goal of CPPs as an effective deterrent.

Why the Doctrine of Penalty Cannot Make Australian Unused and Expired Gift Cards Refundable? – Dr Wei Wen

Gift cards are valid for a short period of time in Australia, but consumers cannot get refunds for the remaining monetary value in expired gift cards. The *Treasury Laws Amendment* (Gift Cards) Act 2018 (Cth) mandates gift cards to be valid for minimum three years (longer than they used to be) but does not mandate expired gift cards to be refundable. Given the huge amount of money spent on gift cards, it is necessary to explore a remedy that deals

(2020) 28 AJCCL 89 89

with the no-refund problem. The author argues that the penalty doctrine, despite its prima facie relevance, cannot apply to strike down the non-refundable term both at law and in equity, because the no-refund term does not have the "terrorem" or "deterrent" nature. However, this exercise is desirable and necessary, because it points a clearer direction to the <i>Australian Consumer Law</i> which can give consumer more effective protection	116
ACCESS TO SERVICES – Editor: John Hedge	
The Case for Pt IIIB: Regulating Non-vertically Integrated Monopolies – John Hedge	121
CONSUMER PROTECTION – Editor: Bernard Mccabe	
Corporate Cartels and Criminal Sentencing: The Process of "Instinctive Synthesis" in K-Line – Stephanie Hayes	126
TRIBUNAL TABLEAUX	
The Australian Competition Tribunal in 2019	136
CASE NOTE – Editor: Christopher Hodgekiss SC	
Representative Proceedings and Misleading and Deceptive Conduct Claims: The Significance of Gill v Ethicon Sàrl – Aaron Taverniti	138
CONSUMER CONCERNS	
Good Grief: How the Funeral Industry Cashes in on the Bereaved – Julia Steward and Amy Pereira	145
REPORT FROM LATIN AMERICA – Omar Guerrero Rodríguez and Martín Michaus- Fernández	149
ODDS AND ENDS	169

90 (2020) 28 AJCCL 89