

HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

NOTICE OF FILING

This document was filed electronically in the High Court of Australia on 04 Dec 2020 and has been accepted for filing under the *High Court Rules 2004*. Details of filing and important additional information are provided below.

Details of Filing

File Number: B43/2020

File Title: Minister for Immigration and Border Protection v. EFX17

Registry: Brisbane

Document filed: Form 27F - Outline of oral argument-4.12.2020

Filing party: Appellant
Date filed: 04 Dec 2020

Important Information

This Notice has been inserted as the cover page of the document which has been accepted for filing electronically. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties and whenever the document is reproduced for use by the Court.

Appellant B43/2020

IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA BRISBANE REGISTRY

BETWEEN:

MINISTER FOR IMMIGRATION AND BORDER PROTECTION

Appellant

and

10 **EFX17**

Respondent

APPELLANT'S OUTLINE OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS

Part I: Certification

1. This outline is in a form suitable for publication on the Internet.

Part II: Outline

20

- 2. Construction of s 501CA(3):
 - a. The Minister is not required to have regard to "capacity matters".
 - b. Actual understanding of the cancellation decision, particulars and invitation by the former visa holder is not required: AS [3]-[4].
- 3. Section 501CA(3)(a): The text requires the Minister to "give" the former visa holder the two things clearly identified in sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii): "a written notice that sets out the original decision" and "particulars of the relevant information" (defined in s 501CA(2)). To physically deliver those things is to "give" them. That is the ordinary sense of the word: AS [36]; Reply [2]-[4]; cf Greenwood J at CAB 193-194 [89], 206-207 [132]-[133], Rares J at CAB 218-219 [171], 220 [175].
 - a. WACB (2004) 79 ALJR 94 (WACB) at 101 [37].
- 4. The Act does not distinguish between notification to persons with differing levels of education or literacy: AS [37]-[39], [43]-[44]; Logan J at CAB 236-237 [231].
 - a. *WACB* at 102 [43].

- 5. If capacity matters are required to be considered, or if actual understanding is required, different words would have been used: AS [42], [44]. *cf* s 57(2)(b): AS [49]. *WACB* is not relevantly distinguishable: Reply [5].
- 6. Neither *context* nor *purpose* produces a different result.

10

20

- a. There are other provisions of the Act that also require documents to be "given" e.g., s 57(2)(a): AS [42] fn 9.
- b. Section 501(5) does not aid the majority's construction: AS [40]. Section 501CA presupposes a cancellation decision having already been made.
- c. The fact that compliance with s 501CA(3) is necessary before the person can make representations does not mean that it is to be interpreted as requiring more than its terms provide: AS [40]; Reply [7].
- d. Extrinsic material does not support the majority's construction, which departs from *WACB* and the actual text used: AS [41].
- 7. The words "in the way that the Minister considers appropriate in the circumstances" are concerned with the physical method or manner of "giving". They do not add a requirement to explain or ensure understanding: AS [46]-[47]; Reply [5].
 - a. That is similarly consistent with context and purpose. Other provisions in the Act use similar language: e.g., ss 359A(1)(a), 424A(1)(a), 501C(3)(a).
- 8. The implication of an obligation to consider capacity matters or ensure understanding is too large a departure from the words actually used: *Taylor v Owners Strata Plan No* 11564 (2014) 253 CLR 531 at 548 [38] (AS [48]).
 - 9. Section 501CA(3)(b): The same considerations apply to the majority's construction of s 501CA(3)(b). That sub-section also applies "indifferently" to persons with differing literacy / comprehension capacities: AS [54]; Reply [9]; Logan J at CAB 240 [245]; cf Greenwood J at CAB 194 [90], 208-209 [136]-[138], Rares J at CAB 219-220 [173], [175].
 - a. WACB at 102 [43] is still a complete answer.
 - b. Sections 360 / 425 are not analogous and do not impact s 501CA(3): AS [55]-[56]; Reply [8].
- 30 10. The majority's construction would also cause uncertainty, unworkability or a significant burden that Parliament is unlikely to have intended: AS [45], [50]-[53]; Reply [6].

11. Onus: If the Minister succeeds on construction, this issue does not arise. Otherwise, the respondent did not discharge his onus to show that the Minister was aware of, but did not consider, capacity matters: AS [5], [58]-[61]; Reply [10]-[12].

12. Section 497:

10

- a. The steps described in s 501CA(3)(a) and (b) are "tasks" for the purposes of s 497(2) and the person performing them did not need a delegation under s 496(1): AS [62]-[71]; Reply at [13]; Logan J at CAB 242 [255]; *cf* Greenwood J at CAB 212-213 [149]-[153], 215-216 [162]-[163], Rares J at CAB 220 [179].
- b. Section 497(2) draws no distinction between "mere" tasks and those that affect substantive rights or obligations: AS [67]-[68]; Reply [14]; *cf* Greenwood J at CAB 212-213 [151]-[153], 215-216 [162], Rares J at CAB 220 [179].
- c. The word "task" in s 497(2) applies to all tasks "in connection with the cancellation" (save for the decision to cancel itself): AS [65]; Reply [16].
- d. In any event, the steps in s 501CA(3) can be characterised as administrative tasks: AS [69].
- e. It cannot have been intended by Parliament that the steps in s 501CA(3) need to be performed by some other delegate; otherwise, s 497(2) would be rendered superfluous: AS [64], [70]; Reply [15]; *McCulloch* [2019] FCA 54 at [44]; *cf* Greenwood J at CAB 211-212 [147].
- 20 13. Notice of contention: This is addressed at Reply [17]-[20]. The invitation under s 501CA(3)(b) was valid despite the statement at CAB 11, for the reasons given at Reply [18] or, alternatively, [19].

Dated: 4 December 2020

Geoffrey Johnson SC

Bora Kaplan