



# 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-WA 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**

**MELBOURNE REGISTRY**

**M60 of 2024**

**BETWEEN:**

**FRANCIS STOTT**

Plaintiff

and

**THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA**

First Defendant

**THE STATE OF VICTORIA**

Second Defendant

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

## PART I: CERTIFICATION

---

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

## PART II: PROPOSITIONS TO BE ADVANCED IN ORAL ARGUMENT

---

### Commonwealth Amendment Act cleared the way for the Victorian Amendment Act

2. Before the *Treasury Laws Amendment (Foreign Investment) Act 2024* (**Amendment Act**), ss 7, 8, 35, 104B and cl 4.1 to 4.5 of Sch 1 to the **Land Tax Act 2005** (Vic) were inconsistent with the Australia-Germany double-taxation agreement given effect by s 5(1) of the *International Tax Agreements Act 1953* (Cth) (**ITA Act**).
3. On the authority of *University of Wollongong v Metwally* (1984) 158 CLR 447 (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 94**), s 5(3) of the ITA Act cannot operate to retroactively remove that inconsistency.
4. The particular concern of the majority in *Metwally* was that the removal of a past inconsistency would elevate legislation above the Constitution and alter the facts of history: *Metwally* 457-458 (Gibbs CJ), 469 (Murphy J), 474-475 (Brennan J), 478-479 (Deane J) (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 94, 5396-5397, 5408, 5413-5414, 5417-5418**).
5. However, as two members of the majority expressly recognised, and consistently with the focus of the majority's concern, the Commonwealth Parliament can legislate to clear the way for a State Parliament to make a fresh State Act to apply retrospectively to the same effect: *Metwally* 469 (Murphy J), 479, 480 (Deane J) (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 94, 5408, 5418-5419**).
6. The Commonwealth and State legislation in this case is consistent with *Metwally*. Section 5(3) of the ITA Act cleared the way for s 106A of the *Land Tax Act* and s 135A of the *Taxation Administration Act 1997* (Vic) to impose the land tax surcharge afresh.

### If necessary, *Metwally* should be re-opened and overruled

7. If the Court considers it necessary or otherwise appropriate to consider Question 2 of the Special Case, *Metwally* should be re-opened and overruled.
8. As Edelman J observed in *Spence v Queensland* (2019) 268 CLR 355 [371] (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 91, 5311**), the majority in *Metwally* adopted a restrictive interpretation of the term "law of the Commonwealth" in s 109 of the Constitution which excludes

content arising from subsequent, retroactive Commonwealth laws. With respect, the majority's approach is difficult to reconcile with:

- (a) the ability of the Commonwealth to make retroactive laws: *Mabo v Queensland* (1988) 166 CLR 186, 211-212 (Brennan, Toohey and Gaudron JJ) (**JBA Vol 8 Tab 70, 3249-3250**); and
- (b) the requirement for "law of the Commonwealth" to have a consistent meaning throughout the Constitution in order to ensure coherence: *Vunilagi v The Queen* (2023) 97 ALJR 627 [207] (Edelman J) (**JBA Vol 18 Tab 117, 6883**).

9. Two members of the majority in *Metwally*, Gibbs CJ and Deane J, considered that the purpose of s 109 extends to informing the ordinary citizen which of two inconsistent laws they are required to observe: *Metwally* 458 (Gibbs CJ), 477 (Deane J) (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 94, 5397, 5416**).
10. *If* the purpose of s 109 so extends, that might support a narrower interpretation of the term "law of the Commonwealth": *Spence* [371] (Edelman J) (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 91, 5311**). However, while that may be an *effect* of s 109, it is not the *purpose* of s 109.
11. Its *purpose* is to secure the paramountcy of Commonwealth laws over inconsistent State laws: *Metwally* 461-463 (Mason J) (**JBA Vol 14 Tab 94, 5400-5402**).
12. If *Metwally* is re-opened and overruled, the effect of the Amendment Act was to revive the operation of the *Land Tax Act* provisions from 1 January 2018, meaning Question 2 would be answered 'yes'.

#### **Commonwealth Amendment Act is not a s 51(xxxi) law**

13. It is necessary to consider the practical operation and precise legal effect of s 5(3) of the ITA Act in order to determine whether it is a law with respect to the acquisition of property: *Smith v ANL Ltd* (2000) 204 CLR 493 [119] (Hayne J) (**JBA Vol 13 Tab 89, 5041**).
14. If the Amendment Act did not retroactively remove the inconsistency that previously existed, no question of an acquisition other than on just terms arises. The Amendment Act did not modify a cause of action, as occurred in *ANL*. In the present case, the fact that the Amendment Act allowed for a mere possibility that future legislation by a separate polity may affect the cause of action does not result in the Commonwealth law authorising or effecting an acquisition.

15. If *Metwally* is overruled and s 5(3) did retroactively remove the inconsistency, s 51(xxxi) of the Constitution is still not engaged.
16. The plaintiff has no action in restitution and accordingly no 'property' that can be said to have been acquired: *Haskins v Commonwealth* (2011) 244 CLR 22 [42] (French CJ, Gummow, Hayne, Crennan, Kiefel and Bell JJ) (**JBA Vol 7 Tab 63, 2810**). That is so because:
- (a) section 96(2) of the *Taxation Administration Act 1997* (Vic), which applies in federal jurisdiction by reason of s 79(1) of the *Judiciary Act 1903* (Cth), relevantly provides that no court has jurisdiction or power to consider any question concerning an assessment except as provided by the statutory objection process; and
- (b) the payments made by the plaintiff were made in discharge of a debt and so there can be no claim in restitution: *Commissioner of State Revenue (Vic) v ACN 005 057 349 Pty Ltd* (2017) 261 CLR 509, [87] (Bell and Gordon JJ) (**JBA Vol 5 Tab 48, 1878**).
17. In addition, any rights of the plaintiff arising from the agreements given force by s 5(1) of the ITA Act were inherently susceptible of variation and such a variation does not constitute an acquisition of property: *Health Insurance Commission v Peverill* (1984) 179 CLR 226, 237 (Mason CJ, Deane and Gaudron JJ) (**JBA Vol 7 Tab 64, 2846**).

**If necessary, s 5(3) of the ITA Act can be read down or severed**

18. Even if s 5(3) is invalid in its retroactive or retrospective operation (whether in light of *Metwally* or the operation of s 51(xxxi) of the Constitution), cl 2 of Schedule 1 to the Amendment Act can be read down (to have only retrospective and/or prospective effect) or severed.
19. In those circumstances, s 5(3) remains effective to clear the way for s 106A of the Land Tax Act and s 135A of the Taxation Administration Act to impose the land tax surcharge afresh for the relevant period prior to 8 April 2024.

Dated: 8 May 2025

  
Craig Bydder SC

Stuart Cobbett