

To reconstruct the reasoning of Judges Gageler CJ, Gordon, and Edelman JJ from the judgment in a formal modus ponens structure, I have identified the key premises and conclusions from the document. Below is the reconstructed chain of arguments:

1. **Premise 1 (P1)**: If a person enters into an agreement to commit a specific criminal act, intending that the act be committed, they are liable for the offence if the act is committed in accordance with that agreement (Paragraphs [7:1†source], [7:10†source], [7:11†source]).
2. **Premise 2 (P2)**: Mr. Rohan, MK, and WF entered into an agreement to supply cannabis to Daisy and Katie and then engage in sexual activity with Daisy, intending that these acts be committed (Paragraphs [7:2†source], [7:3†source], [7:12†source]).
3. **Conclusion 1 (C1)**: Therefore, Mr. Rohan, MK, and WF are liable for the offences of supplying cannabis and engaging in sexual activity with Daisy if these acts were committed in accordance with the agreement (derived from P1 and P2).
4. **Premise 3 (P3)**: The acts of supplying cannabis to Daisy and Katie and engaging in sexual activity with Daisy were committed in accordance with the agreement (Paragraph [7:32†source]).
5. **Conclusion 2 (C2)**: Therefore, Mr. Rohan, MK, and WF are liable for the offences of supplying cannabis to Daisy and Katie and engaging in sexual activity with Daisy (derived from C1 and P3).
6. **Premise 4 (P4)**: Knowledge of the victim's age is not an element of the offences of supplying cannabis to a child and sexual penetration of a child under the relevant sections of the Crimes Act (Paragraphs [7:5†source], [7:6†source], [7:19†source]).
7. **Premise 5 (P5)**: The prosecution does not need to prove that the accused knew the ages of Daisy and Katie at the time of entering into the agreement to establish liability under the relevant sections of the Crimes Act (Paragraphs [7:1†source], [7:5†source], [7:10†source]).
8. **Conclusion 3 (C3)**: Therefore, the prosecution does not need to prove that Mr. Rohan knew the ages of Daisy and Katie at the time of entering into the agreement to establish his liability for the offences (derived from P4 and P5).
9. **Premise 6 (P6)**: The trial judge did not misdirect the jury by not instructing them that the prosecution needed to prove Mr. Rohan knew the ages of Daisy and Katie (Paragraphs [7:10†source], [7:17†source]).
10. **Premise 7 (P7)**: Misleading the jury on the necessary elements of the offence constitutes a substantial miscarriage of justice (general legal principle).
11. **Conclusion 4 (C4)**: Therefore, there was no substantial miscarriage of justice in the trial of Mr. Rohan (derived from P6 and P7).
12. **Premise 8 (P8)**: If there was no substantial miscarriage of justice, the appeal against conviction should be dismissed (general legal principle).

13. **\*\*Conclusion 5 (C5)\*\***: Therefore, the appeal against Mr. Rohan's conviction should be dismissed (derived from C4 and P8).

14. **\*\*Premise 9 (P9)\*\***: If the appeal against conviction is dismissed, the original conviction stands, subject to any other legal remedies available to the appellant (general legal principle).

15. **\*\*Conclusion 6 (C6)\*\***: Therefore, Mr. Rohan's original convictions stand (derived from C5 and P9).

16. **\*\*Premise 10 (P10)\*\***: The Court has the authority to remit the appeal against the sentence to the Court of Appeal for rehearing (Paragraph [7:1†source]).

17. **\*\*Conclusion 7 (C7)\*\***: Therefore, the appeal against the sentence should be remitted to the Court of Appeal for rehearing (derived from P10).

18. **\*\*Final Conclusion (FC)\*\***: The appeal is allowed; paragraphs 2 to 10 of the orders of the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria of 4 October 2022 are set aside, the appeal against conviction is dismissed, and the respondent's appeal against the sentence is remitted to the Court of Appeal for rehearing (Paragraph [7:43†source]).

Here is the full chain of arguments:

1. If a person enters into an agreement to commit a specific criminal act, intending that the act be committed, they are liable for the offence if the act is committed in accordance with that agreement (P1).
2. Mr. Rohan, MK, and WF entered into an agreement to supply cannabis to Daisy and Katie and then engage in sexual activity with Daisy, intending that these acts be committed (P2).
3. Therefore, Mr. Rohan, MK, and WF are liable for the offences of supplying cannabis and engaging in sexual activity with Daisy if these acts were committed in accordance with the agreement (C1).
4. The acts of supplying cannabis to Daisy and Katie and engaging in sexual activity with Daisy were committed in accordance with the agreement (P3).
5. Therefore, Mr. Rohan, MK, and WF are liable for the offences of supplying cannabis to Daisy and Katie and engaging in sexual activity with Daisy (C2).
6. Knowledge of the victim's age is not an element of the offences of supplying cannabis to a child and sexual penetration of a child under the relevant sections of the Crimes Act (P4).
7. The prosecution does not need to prove that the accused knew the ages of Daisy and Katie at the time of entering into the agreement to establish liability under the relevant sections of the Crimes Act (P5).
8. Therefore, the prosecution does not need to prove that Mr. Rohan knew the ages of Daisy and Katie at the time of entering into the agreement to establish his liability for the offences (C3).
9. The trial judge did not misdirect the jury by not instructing them that the prosecution needed to prove Mr. Rohan knew the ages of Daisy and Katie (P6).
10. Misleading the jury on the necessary elements of the offence constitutes a substantial miscarriage of justice (P7).

11. Therefore, there was no substantial miscarriage of justice in the trial of Mr. Rohan (C4).
12. If there was no substantial miscarriage of justice, the appeal against conviction should be dismissed (P8).
13. Therefore, the appeal against Mr. Rohan's conviction should be dismissed (C5).
14. If the appeal against conviction is dismissed, the original conviction stands, subject to any other legal remedies available to the appellant (P9).
15. Therefore, Mr. Rohan's original convictions stand (C6).
16. The Court has the authority to remit the appeal against the sentence to the Court of Appeal for rehearing (P10).
17. Therefore, the appeal against the sentence should be remitted to the Court of Appeal for rehearing (C7).
18. Therefore, the appeal is allowed; paragraphs 2 to 10 of the orders of the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria of 4 October 2022 are set aside, the appeal against conviction is dismissed, and the respondent's appeal against the sentence is remitted to the Court of Appeal for rehearing (FC).

This logical chain follows the format of modus ponens, where each step logically follows from the premises provided, leading to the final conclusion.