



Back row, L to R: Andrew Bulley, John-Paul Redmond, David Logan, Gerard Dalton, David Pritchard SC, David Rayment, Vahan Bedrossian, Don Farrands, Alex Foel, Richard Wilson.

Third row, L to R: Tracy Fantin, Nicolette Bearup, Hugh Stowe, Terry Ower, Philip Davies, Daniel Star, Greg Sarginson, Susan McNeil, Kylie Day, Gary Doherty.

Second row, L to R: Jodi Truman, Rick O’Gorman-Hughes, Nicholas Newton, Heather Gordon, Christian Bova, Michael Holmes, Levente Jurith, Dee Brooker, Susan Anderson, Anne Healey, Andrew Maryniak.

Front row, L to R: Madeleine Avenell, Reg Graycar, Emma Swart, Sitesh Bhojani, Craig Harding, Patrick Over, Mark Richmond, James Gibson, Theresa Baw, Angelina Gomez.

participants). As the date of the course approaches, and the reality of the commitment sets in, you may find yourself wishing you had not enrolled. But particularly if you are a junior barrister, and you are not getting into court as much as you would like to (or if you would like to work on aspects of your performance), then ‘just

do it’. I am grateful for the people who encouraged me to do the same – and I doubt that you’ll regret it.

Verbatim

Garsec Pty Ltd v His Majesty Sultan of Brunei Darussalam & Anor [2009] HCATrans 21 (13 February 2009)

Mr Hutley: I accept that, your Honour. Can I take your Honours to Article 84B(1) - - -

Gummow J: I have not finished yet.

Mr Hutley: It gets worse, does it?

Agricultural and Rural Finance Pty Limited v Gardiner & Anor [2009] HCATrans 12 (12 February 2009)

Mr Smith: Simply this. As it would be obvious from the submissions in a sense the summons has been filed out of a sense of neurotic caution. It is pretty clear that any file - - -

Gummow J: Neurotic caution?

Mr Smith: Neurotic caution, yes.

Hayne J: That will make an interesting catchword, I think, in the reasons.

Lane v Morrison & Anor [2009] HCATrans 1 (13 January 2009)

Mr Street: Your Honour, could I just supplement that oral outline by these propositions. We say in relation to ground 3 that we have put forward that that raises the existence of what I will call the parallel universe. Your Honour will recall that the theory of military disciplinary law being advanced on a proposition that it is subordinate to the existence of criminal law. That parallel universe and its existence is what we have raised in ground 3. What grounds 4 and 5 do are raise the physical laws, or physical constitutional principles in existence in that - - -

His Honour: Sorry, what is a physical constitutional principle?

Mr Street: I am seeking to use the analogy, if I may, in this way, your Honour. We say ground 3 challenges the existence of the universe.

His Honour: Let us not get lost in metaphor.

....

His Honour: Thank you. Yes, Mr Solicitor.

Mr Gageler: Your Honour, there are, of course, degrees of arguability, but once you get to the point of challenging the existence of the universe, you must have crossed the line.