

HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

NOTICE OF FILING

This document was filed electronically in the High Court of Australia on 03 Sep 2024 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: M44/2024

File Title: BIF23 v. Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultu

Registry: Melbourne

Document filed: Form 27F - Respondent's Outline of oral argument

Filing party: Respondent
Date filed: 03 Sep 2024

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.

Respondent M44/2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA MELBOURNE REGISTRY

BIF23

Appellant

MINISTER FOR IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP AND MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Respondent

SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENT

I. CERTIFICATION

10

20

1. This outline of oral submissions is in a form suitable for publication on the internet.

II. PROPOSITIONS TO BE ADVANCED IN ORAL ARGUMENT

Ground 1: "Practicable" does not take account of legal capacity or incapacity

- 2. **Text, context and purpose (EFX17):** Statutory interpretation considers text, context and purpose. *EFX17* establishes: (a) "give" and "receive" in s 501CA(3) connote the performance of a physical act, not the consequences for the recipient; (b) requiring the Minister to ensure the person understands the notice would go beyond attributing meaning to text; and (c) the gravity of the consequences for the person is <u>not</u> a sufficient foundation for an interpretation that is contrary to the ordinary words.
 - EFX17 (2021) 271 CLR 112 at [23], [28], [30] **JBA 3:13**; RS [14], [17]
 - Notification does not require <u>knowledge</u>: Nguyen (1997) 74 FCR 311 at 325 (Sundberg J) JBA 6:45
- 3. *Ordinary meaning:* The ordinary meaning of "practicable" is feasible, from the perspective of the person performing the task.
 - M38/2002 (2003) 131 FCR 346 at [65] **JBA 6:31**; RS [15]
- 4. **Scheme requires certainty:** The statutory scheme requires being able to identify the time of notification with certainty, to determine the time permitted for making representations and the lawfulness of detention. Those matters tend against "practicable" depending on the recipient's subjective understanding: RS [26]-[27].

- 5. **Legal incapacity would not invalidate notice:** At most, the fact that the recipient lacks legal capacity could only affect the validity of any step taken by them (such as making representations), not the prior giving of notice to them: RS [20]-[21].
- 6. However, the better view is that the validity of any representations made under s 501CA does <u>not</u> depend on the person's legal capacity they should be permitted to keep this benefit.
 - *SBAH/2001* (2002) 126 FCR 552 at [1], [32] **JBA 6:38**; *SFTB* (2003) 129 FCR 222 at [7], [10]-[11] **JBA 6:39**; *RS* [23]-[25]. Those cases do not depend on the ability to regularise court proceedings by appointing a guardian: *cf Reply* [8]
- 7. The Minister's interpretation is supported by the use of "as soon as practicable" in other provisions of the Act, which could not depend on subjective understanding.
 - Migration Act 1958 (Cth) ss 163(3), 253(3), 487M(3) **JBA 1:03**
 - Other provisions expressly require the Minister to ensure that the recipient understand a notice: *EFX17* (2021) 271 CLR 112 at [27] **JBA 3:13**
 - 8. Any individual unfairness cannot displace text: Arguments about the unfairness of the application of the provision in individual cases cannot displace the clear text. Potential unfairness in individual cases is inherent in any fixed time limit, and the Act contains mechanisms to overcome unfairness in individual cases (eg s 195A).
 - AEU (2012) 246 CLR 117 at [28], [32] **JBA 3:07**
- 9. **Practicability is not a jurisdictional fact:** The practicability of giving notice is a matter of assessment for the person giving notice (subject to judicial review for unreasonableness and other grounds), not a jurisdictional fact: RS [38]. The scheme requires certainty in the time of notification (as above), and "practicability" is assessed from the perspective of the person giving notice: RS [36]-[37], [39]-[40].
 - Chattaway (2020) 136 SASR 347 at [34] JBA 5:25
 - 10. There is no guidance from cases considering whether removal is "<u>reasonably</u> practicable" under s 198(6): *MS* [38].
 - cf *AJL20* (2021) 273 CLR 43 at [30] **JBA 3:08**; *Beyazkilinc* (2006) 155 FCR 465 at [42], [44] **JBA 5:24**

Ground 2: Notice given under s 501CA(3) can only be given once

11. The scheme of the Act requires a single notification, given as soon as practicable after excludes s 33(1) of the Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (Cth). the cancellation under s 501(3A). This scheme evinces a contrary intention which

12. be received (within 28 days after being given the notice: reg 2.52(2)(b)). A failure to require there to be a single notification. from Australia as soon as reasonably practicable (s 198(2B)). These provisions make representations within the prescribed time engages a duty to remove the person decision. The date of notification establishes the time in which representations must The time for giving notice is tethered to a single event: the making of the cancellation

BDS20 (2021) 285 FCR 43 at [98]-[99], [110]-[112] JBA 5:22

10

- Manaf (2009) 111 ALD 437 at [48] JBA 6:34; RS [45]-[48]
- 13. injustice in the individual case is addressed in the Act through other means, such as s 195A: RS [51]. inchoate duty is contrary to the scheme of the Act: RS [49]-[50]. The potential for If more than 1 notification were possible, then the duty to re-notify could crystallise (presumably whenever there is a material change in circumstances). This floating at any point where it would be legally unreasonable not to issue a further notice
- *BDS20* at [103], [116]-[118]

20 Dated: 3 September 2024

GRAEME HILL

JONATHAN BARRINGTON