



HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

NOTICE OF FILING

This document was filed electronically in the High Court of Australia on 08 May 2025 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: M60/2024
File Title: Stott v. The Commonwealth of Australia & Anor
Registry: Melbourne
Document filed: Form 27F - AG-SA Outline of oral argument
Filing party: Interveners
Date filed: 08 May 2025

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.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA
BRISBANE REGISTRY

No. B48/2024

BETWEEN:

**G GLOBAL 120E T2 PTY LTD as trustee for
THE G GLOBAL 120E AUT**

Appellant

and

COMMISSIONER OF STATE REVENUE

Respondent

No. B49/2024

BETWEEN:

**G GLOBAL 180Q PTY LTD as trustee for
THE G GLOBAL 180Q AUT**

Appellant

and

COMMISSIONER OF STATE REVENUE

Respondent

No. B50/2024

BETWEEN:

**G GLOBAL 180Q PTY LTD as trustee for
THE G GLOBAL 180Q AUT**

Appellant

and

COMMISSIONER OF STATE REVENUE

Respondent

IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA
MELBOURNE REGISTRY

No. M60/2024

BETWEEN:

FRANCIS STOTT

Plaintiff

and

THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

First Defendant

and

THE STATE OF VICTORIA

Second Defendant

**OUTLINE OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR THE
STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (INTERVENING)**

Part I: CERTIFICATION

1. These submissions are in a form suitable for publication on the internet.

Part II: OUTLINE OF ORAL SUBMISSION

***Metwally* should not be reopened or overruled**

2. Section 5(3) of the *International Tax Agreements Act 1953* (Cth) (**ITAA**) is effective, together with s 104 of the *Land Tax Act 2010* (Qld) and s 189 of the *Taxation Administration Act 2001* (Qld) (**TTA (Qld)**), and s 106A of the *Land Tax Act 2005* (Vic), to remove the inconsistency between the state tax laws and s 5(1) of the ITAA, such that no occasion arises for the Court to consider the correctness of *University of Wollongong v Metwally* (1984) 158 CLR 447 (***Metwally***), (V12, T82); SA, [10].¹
3. However, should the Court entertain the alternative pathway identified by the Commonwealth (CS(S), [31]-[37]), then *Metwally* should not be reopened for the following reasons:
 - 3.1. it is of long standing and has been repeatedly affirmed by this Court (SA, [11]);
 - 3.2. it achieves a useful result because it promotes legal certainty for citizens and polities alike: *Metwally*, 457 (Gibbs CJ) and 476 (Deane J); SA, [11] and [14];
 - 3.3. it is not inconvenient because an inadvertent historical inconsistency can be cured by the collective action of the Commonwealth and the States: *Metwally*, 469 (Murphy J) and 480 (Deane J); *Western Australia v The Commonwealth (Native Title Act Case)* (1995) 183 CLR 373 (V13, T86), 455 (Mason CJ, Brennan, Deane, Toohey, Gaudron and McHugh JJ); and,
 - 3.4. it is not plainly wrong. It does not depend upon assigning an individual rights purpose to s 109: *Metwally*, 457-458 (Gibbs CJ) and 477 (Deane J). Rather, it resolves an important question about how conflicting Commonwealth and State laws are to be resolved in a manner that promotes legal certainty: *Dickson v The Queen* (2010) 241 CLR 491 (V7, T54), 503-504 [19] (French CJ, Gummow, Hayne, Heydon, Crennan, Kiefel and Bell JJ).
4. If *Metwally* is reopened, then it should not be overruled.

¹ The Joint Book of Authority references are to the JBA filed in the G Global proceedings.

Sections 64 and 79 of the *Judiciary Act*

5. G Global’s contention that s 10A(3) of the *Limitation of Actions Act 1974* (Qld) (**LAA (Qld)**) and ss 36(2) and 188 of the TAA (Qld) are invalid by virtue of inconsistency with s 64 of the *Judiciary Act 1903* (Cth) (**Judiciary Act**) fails to grapple with the extended operation of s 79 brought about by the insertion of subs (2)-(4) and the limited operation of s 64 in so far as it purports to govern the substantive rights of the States: SA, [16]-[17].

Section 79

6. Section 79 was amended in response to this Court’s decision in *British American Tobacco Australia Ltd v Western Australia* (2003) 217 CLR 30 (**BAT**) (V5, T40), by the insertion of subs (2)-(4). Section 79(2) expressly prevails over other provisions of the *Judiciary Act*, such that if a provision falls within s 79(2)-(4) no further question about inconsistency with s 64 arises: SA, [18]-[22].

Section 64

7. It has long been doubted that s 64 operates to alter the substantive rights of the States: *Commonwealth v Evans Deakin Industries Ltd* (1986) 161 CLR 254 (V5, T45), 263 (Gibbs CJ, Mason, Wilson, Deane and Dawson JJ). It was unnecessary for the Court to resolve this question in *BAT*, 66 [85]-[87], [172] (McHugh, Gummow and Hayne JJ; Callinan J agreeing); SA, [24].
8. The Commonwealth does not possess general legislative authority to alter the substantive rights of the States, including those rights to be determined in the exercise of federal jurisdiction: *Rizeq v Western Australia* (2017) 262 CLR 1 (**Rizeq**) (V11, T75), 21 [46] (Bell, Gageler, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ), 68 [189] (Edelman J). No such power can be derived from ss 51(xxxix), 75, 76, 77, or 78 (or the laws made thereunder) of the *Constitution*: SA, [28].
9. The disapplication of s 64 proposed by G Global, namely that despite the absence of a general Commonwealth power s 64 must be given substantive operation with respect to the rights of the States that “lie within the reach of the legislative power”, is contrary to the conclusion reached by a majority of this Court: *BAT*, [85]-[87], [172] (McHugh, Gummow and Hayne JJ; Callinan J agreeing); cf *Maguire v Simpson* (1977) 139 CLR 362 (V9, T63), 402 (Mason J).

Application of ss 64 and 79

10. For these reasons, s 10A(3) of the LAA (Qld) and ss 36(2) and 188 of the TAA (Qld) are not inconsistent with s 64 because either:

10.1. they are provisions regulating the exercise of jurisdiction that are picked up by s 79(1), and because they are applicable “in connection with a suit relating to the recovery of an amount paid in connection with a tax that a law of State ... invalidly purported to impose” they are not prevented by s 64 (or any other provision of the *Judiciary Act*) from being given binding operation in the G Global proceedings (s 79(2)); or,

10.2. they are laws governing the substantive rights and duties of the parties to the G Global proceedings such that s 64 is incapable of operating so as to diminish the substantive rights of Queensland.

Dated: 8 May 2025



.....
MJ Wait SC
 Solicitor-General for South Australia
 T: (08) 7424 6583
michael.wait@sa.gov.au



.....
JF Metzger
 Counsel for the Attorney-General (SA)
 T: (08) 7322 7472
jesse.metzger@sa.gov.au