

Based on BEECH-JONES J's reasoning, I will reconstruct the chain of arguments into a formal modus ponens structure:

1. If a State law provides that a person is taken never to have been convicted of an offense for any purpose, then s 85ZR(2) of the Crimes Act is engaged (para 37).

The Children Proceedings Act provides that the plaintiff is taken never to have been convicted of offenses sentenced by the Children's Court when under 16 for any purpose (para 41).

Therefore, s 85ZR(2) of the Crimes Act is engaged.

2. If s 85ZR(2) of the Crimes Act is engaged, then the delegate is precluded from considering the plaintiff's "youth offending" and "findings of guilt" related to offenses sentenced by the Children's Court when under 16 (para 46).

S 85ZR(2) of the Crimes Act is engaged (from conclusion 1).

Therefore, the delegate is precluded from considering the plaintiff's "youth offending" and "findings of guilt" related to offenses sentenced by the Children's Court when under 16.

3. If the delegate considered matters they were precluded from considering, then the delegate's decision was affected by jurisdictional error (para 47).

The delegate considered matters they were precluded from considering (from conclusion 2).

Therefore, the delegate's decision was affected by jurisdictional error.

4. If a decision is affected by jurisdictional error and the error is material to the decision, then a writ of certiorari should issue quashing the decision (para 47).

The delegate's decision was affected by jurisdictional error (from conclusion 3) and the error was material to the decision (para 47).

Therefore, a writ of certiorari should issue quashing the delegate's decision.

Final conclusion: A writ of certiorari should issue quashing the delegate's decision to cancel the plaintiff's visa, and the Minister should pay the plaintiff's costs (para 47).

This final conclusion directly reflects the culmination of the argument chain and the disposition of the case as stated in the judgment.