

Student Name: _____

LEGAL STUDIES
UNITS 3&4
2021 Written Trial Examination

Reading time: 15 minutes

Writing time: 2 hours

QUESTION AND ANSWER BOOK

Structure of book

<i>Section</i>	<i>Number of questions</i>	<i>Number of questions to be answered</i>	<i>Number of marks</i>
A	7	7	40
B	2	2	40
			Total 80

- Students are to write in blue or black pen.
- Students are permitted to bring into the examination room: pens, pencils, highlighters, erasers, sharpeners and rulers.
- Students are NOT permitted to bring into the examination room: blank sheets of paper and/or correction fluid/tape.
- No calculator is allowed in this examination.

Materials supplied

- Question and answer book of 30 pages
- Additional space is available at the end of the book if you need extra paper to complete an answer.

Instructions

- Write your **student name** in the space provided above on this page.
- All written responses must be in English.

Students are NOT permitted to bring mobile phones and/or any other 1authorized electronic devices into the examination room.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

SECTION A

Instructions for Section A

Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.

Question 1 (3 marks)

Dean v Puleio 2021

In July 2021, the County Court’s Judge July Clayton awarded periodontist Dr Alison Dean, aggravated damages of \$170,000 and all legal costs. Dr Dean’s successful claim found four Google Reviews by one of her patients, Catherine Puleio, had defamed her in March 2020. Consequently, she suffered damage to her health and professional reputation. Ms Puleio refused to remove the reviews, did not apologise or attend judicial mediation.

Source: Austlii, <<http://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/vic/VCC/2021/848.html>>

- a. Identify who holds the burden of proof in this case. 1 mark

- b. Distinguish between the standard of proof required in *Dean v Puleio* and a trial involving armed robbery. 2 marks

Question 5 (4 marks)

- a. Using examples, compare the extent of Victoria's residual and concurrent law-making found in the Commonwealth Constitution.

SECTION B**Instructions for Section B**

Use stimulus material, where provided, to answer the questions in this section. It is not intended that this material will provide you with all the information to fully answer the questions.

Answer **all** questions in the spaces provided.

Source 1

The following are extracts of Judge Wraight's sentencing remarks in the County Court case *DPP v LEES 2020* (VCC 375).

In January 2019, unlicensed driver, Robert Lees was speeding in a stolen car, when he veered onto the wrong side of the road, seriously injuring two people. In April 2020, after a plea negotiation, Lees entered a plea of guilty, to seven charges. Judge Wraight sentenced Lees to a "maximum of 7 years and 9 months imprisonment".

- a) Prosecutor Ms D Piekusis QC, submitted "rather than offer assistance to the victims, Lees grabbed a bag from the boot and fled, shouting "My DNA is all over the car".
- b) Mr James Anderson, who was appointed as Lees' Victoria Legal Aid barrister, submitted his client's conduct was "callous", but the offending was "mid-range".
- c) Judge Wraight considered matters in mitigation. Lees apologised to the victims reflecting "remorse" and "acceptance of responsibility". Lees' guilty plea "avoided the need for the victims to relive the trauma at trial and has facilitated the course of justice".
- d) Judge Wraight remarked, "I have considered 7 victim impact statement detailing ongoing pain and mental anguish. Lees' dysfunctional upbringing "where alcoholism, violence and addiction to drugs since the age of 12, were also considered".
- e) Judge Wraight remarked, "I commend the defendant's plea and your commitment during remand to rehabilitate yourself. At the same time, denunciation of your conduct also weighs heavily in my sentencing. You had no regard for the law and put the community at great risk because of your serious offending. Your actions and their consequences are a very important component of the overall assessment of the seriousness of your offending."

Question 1 (19 marks)

a. Identify the two parties in this case.

2 marks

b. Explain how the purpose of denunciation is achieved in this case.

2 marks

Question 2 (21 marks)**Source 1**

The following is an extract from an article by Christopher Knaus, published in *The Guardian* on 29 June 2021.

High Court to hear bid to overturn New South Wales hidden camera laws

Animal rights activists, The Farm Transparency Project (FTP), have launched a landmark High Court bid, to overturn laws suppressing secretly recorded vision of animal cruelty.

The FTP is arguing NSW's "ag gag laws are not compatible with the system of representative and responsible government".

Many states, including New South Wales have passed "ag gag laws". Section 11 of the *Surveillance Devices Act (NSW) 2007* has been criticised, as police have pursued and laid criminal charges against animal rights activists, for exposing "private activities" in commercial animal-use industries, like intensive factory farms.

In 2015, The FTP's Director Chris Delforce, was charged with breaching Section 11 of *The Surveillance Devices Act (NSW) 2007* which carries a penalty of 5 years imprisonment.

Delforce said the case has broader implications. "Ag gag laws are a serious threat to democratic debate. Our parliaments are not representing us on this issue. High Court action has the capacity to challenge the validity of these laws and lead Parliaments throughout Australia to scrap these unconstitutional laws".

The FTP is now crowdfunding to finance the case and change national ag gag laws.

Source: *The Guardian*, <<https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/jun/29/high-court-to-hear-bid-to-overturn-new-south-wales-ag-gag-laws>>

Source 2

The following is a summary of the High Court case of *Australian Broadcasting Corporation v Lenah Game Meats Pty Ltd 2001 HCA [63]*.

The Australian Constitution has no explicit right to freedom of expression, however, in a majority 6-1 decision, the High Court's Case, *ABC v Lenah Game Meats Pty Ltd 2001*, recognised the implied freedom of political communication extends to animal welfare issues. Lenah Meats sought an injunction to stop the ABC's Four Corners from infringing its "privacy" by showing illegally secured footage of animal abuse on their business practices. The High Court argued an "injunction would not be properly exercised if it prevented free and open debate in areas of legitimate public concern".

Source: <<https://eresources.hcourt.gov.au/showCase/2001/HCA/63>>

Source 3

The following excerpt is from the Hon. Justice Kirby, in the High Court case *Australian Broadcasting Corporation v Lenah Game Meats Pty Ltd 2001 HCA [63]*.

"Parliamentary democracies, such as Australia, operate effectively when they are stimulated by debate promoted by community groups, that often requires media attention. Improvements in live sheep exports and in the condition of battery hens followed such community debate."

- c. Describe **one** reason that it will be necessary for the High Court to interpret the words “private activities” in the *Surveillance Devices Act (NSW) 2007*. 3 marks

- d. Explain **one** effect of the High Court’s statutory interpretation of “private activities” may have on the Victorian County Court when adjudicating similar cases. Justify your answer. 3 marks
