

From the detailed judgment provided by the High Court of Australia in the case of *The King v Rohan*, here is a reconstruction of the reasoning of Gageler CJ, Gordon, and Edelman JJ, formatted in a modus ponens structure as requested:

1. **Initial Premise and Argument: The Legal Framework**

- **If** a person enters into an agreement to commit an offense, **then** they are complicit in the commission of that offense under s 323(1)(c) of the Crimes Act.
- **Premise:** The respondents entered into an agreement to supply drugs and engage in sexual activities with minors.
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, they were complicit in the commission of these offenses.

2. **Subsequent Argument: Nature of Complicity**

- **If** a person is complicit in the commission of an offense, **then** they are taken to have committed the offense and are liable to the maximum penalty for that offense under s 324(1) of the Crimes Act.
- **Premise:** The respondents were complicit in the commission of these offenses (from the conclusion above).
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, they are taken to have committed these offenses and are liable to the maximum penalty.

3. **Final Argument: Requirement of Knowledge**

- **If** the offense does not require the perpetrator to know the age of the victims as an element of the offense, **then** the person complicit in such an offense does not need to know the victim's age to be held liable.
- **Premise:** The offenses of supplying drugs to a minor and sexual penetration of a minor do not require knowing the victim's age as an element of the offense.
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, it was not necessary for the respondents to know the victims' ages to be held liable for these offenses.

Overall Conclusion and Final Order:

- **If** individuals are complicit in an offense where their knowledge of a victim's age is not required, **then** their convictions should stand unless there is a substantial miscarriage of justice.
- **Premise:** The respondents were found complicit in the offenses without the need for knowing the victims' ages, and there was no substantial miscarriage of justice.
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, the appeal against the convictions of the respondents is dismissed, and the convictions should stand.

This structured argument aligns with the judges' reasoning that underpins their decision to dismiss the appeal, essentially affirming the convictions based on statutory complicity as laid out in the Crimes Act, without the requirement for the accused to know the specific ages of the minors involved.