Table of Cases

 \rightarrow References are to paragraph numbers.

Carrafa v Asfar, [2020] NSWSC 530[5]
Flowers v State of New South Wales, [2020] NSWSC 526 [6]
Hu v Blue Whale Entertainment Pty Ltd, [2020] NSWSC 562 [3]
International Management Group of America Pty Ltd v Media Niugini Ltd t/as EMTV, [2020] NSWSC 559[10] Ippolito v Cesco, [2020] NSWSC 561[1]
R v Munshizada, Danishyar and Baines, [2020] NSWSC 566 [2] R v Tangi (No 12), [2020] NSWSC 547 [9]
Steven Binetter as the representative of the Estate of the Late Ida Wolff v Ronald Binetter, [2020] NSWSC 552 [7] Strata Plan 87060 v Loulach Developments Pty Ltd, [2020] NSWSC 550 [8]
The Trust Company (PTAL) Limited v Samuel M Holdings Pty Ltd, [2020] NSWSC 556[4]
Table of Statutes
ightarrow References are to paragraph numbers.
Home Building Act 1989 (NSW)[1]

Some New South Wales Supreme Court decisions, as at mid-May 2020.

- [1] A compensation case¹ under the *Home Building Act 1989* (NSW).
- [2] In a criminal matter, the trial date was vacated "because it was not possible to assemble a jury panel under current public-health restrictions"².
- [3] In an equity case, the question was whether the Court should take the "unusual" step of ordering specific performance of an agreement where one party had agreed to pay another party an amount in settlement of the proceedings³.
- 4. In a dispute about whether service on the receivers of a claim for possession of real property in the Illawarra was sufficient (it was), if there were any potential dispute about costs, the parties had leave "to file dot point written submissions about costs of no more than three pages in length within one week of today"⁴.
- A long and complicated matter involving a will and a property, with a change in the pleadings sought⁵: "It can be inferred from any review of the amended pleading that gaining a proper understanding of the case and re-pleading it properly is something that would have taken guite a number of weeks."
- **6.** A case where an application for trial by jury was refused 7 .
 - ... The resources of this Court and others like it are finite and delays are often unavoidable despite the best efforts of all concerned. Mr Flowers wants his case heard and the State of New South Wales evidently shares his view. In such circumstances it is very important that Mr Flowers not become diverted by unhelpful voices chattering on the sidelines or by loud drums being beaten by folk with unhelpful agendas that are inevitably destined to frustrate

¹Ippolito v Cesco [2020] NSWSC 561.

²R v Munshizada, Danishyar and Baines [2020] NSWSC 566, [2].

³Hu v Blue Whale Entertainment Pty Ltd [2020] NSWSC 562.

⁴The Trust Company (PTAL) Limited v Samuel M Holdings Pty Ltd [2020] NSWSC 556, [38].

⁵Carrafa v Asfar [2020] NSWSC 530.

⁶ibid [47].

⁷Flowers v State of New South Wales [2020] NSWSC 526.

his progress before eventually discarding him and moving on to their next target. There must necessarily be a limit to the amount of valuable court time Mr Flowers (or anyone like him) can be permitted to dedicate to silly arguments or confected obsessions that clog the court and waste everybody's time without advancing his case.⁸

- [7] An application for security of costs against an executor⁹.
- [8] A building and construction case where there was a mistake in the name of a party¹⁰.
- [9] A sentencing hearing: "murder, the most serious crime in the criminal calendar" 11.
- [10] A contracts case, with an originating process being served outside Australia¹².

---0000000---

⁸ibid [19].

⁹Steven Binetter as the representative of the Estate of the Late Ida Wolff v Ronald Binetter [2020] NSWSC 552.

¹⁰Strata Plan 87060 v Loulach Developments Pty Ltd [2020] NSWSC 550.

¹¹R v Tangi (No 12) [2020] NSWSC 547, [1].

¹²International Management Group of America Pty Ltd v Media Niugini Ltd t/as EMTV [2020] NSWSC 559.