

The reasoning of Justice Beech-Jones in the judgment revolves around the legal interpretations and implications of several statutes that were relevant to the visa cancellation case under consideration. The case primarily involved the application of sections of the Crimes Act regarding how convictions, particularly those recorded or not recorded for youth offenders, should be treated in legal processes such as visa cancellations. Here's the reconstruction of the arguments in a modus ponens logical structure:

1. **Premise (P1):** If a person under 16 years of age is found guilty by the Children's Court and the court does not proceed to, or record, a conviction, then under section 85ZR(2) of the Crimes Act, this person is taken never to have been convicted for any purpose (including administrative decisions like visa cancellations).

- **Evidence:** This premise is based on the interplay between the Children (Criminal Proceedings) Act 1987 (NSW), particularly section 14(1)(a) which does not allow convictions to be recorded for children under 16, and section 85ZR(2) of the Crimes Act, which asserts that such findings should not be treated as convictions for any purpose **[4↑source]** .

2. **Premise (P2):** The delegate considered offenses for which no conviction was recorded (as they were committed by the plaintiff when he was under 16 years old) in the decision to cancel the plaintiff's visa.

- **Evidence:** The "National Police Certificate" provided to the delegate incorrectly stated the plaintiff was convicted of these offenses, influencing the delegate's decision-making process **[4↑source]** .

3. **Conclusion (C1) from P1 and P2:** Therefore, the delegate erroneously took into account matters that he was legally precluded from considering under sections 85ZR and 85ZS of the Crimes Act.

- **Logical Connective:** If a person is legally considered never to have been convicted (P1), and this non-conviction was considered in administrative decisions (P2), then the decision is influenced by an error regarding the legal status of those offenses (C1).

4. **Premise (P3):** If a decision is affected by jurisdictional error due to the consideration of legally non-recognizable convictions, then the decision must be quashed.

- **Evidence:** Legal principle that any decision influenced by jurisdictional error regarding the application of the law is subject to being overturned **[4↑source]** .

5. **Conclusion (C2) from C1 and P3:** Therefore, the delegate's decision to cancel the plaintiff's visa was affected by jurisdictional error and must be quashed.

- **Logical Connective:** Since the delegate's decision included errors in the consideration of the plaintiff's legal history (C1), and such errors invalidate decisions (P3), the decision to cancel the visa must be quashed (C2).

6. ****Final Conclusion:**** A writ of certiorari should issue quashing the decision of the delegate to cancel the plaintiff's Class BF 154 Transitional (Permanent) visa, and the defendant must pay the plaintiff's costs.

- ****Outcome Based on C2:**** The ultimate legal remedy is the quashing of the cancellation and the assignment of costs to the defendant, based on the established jurisdictional error **【** 4†source**】** .

Each step in this argumentative chain leads logically to the next, culminating in the final judgment to quash the visa cancellation decision based on jurisdictional error induced by the misconsideration of non-convictions as convictions.