

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

Solicitors:

Complainant	Equal Opportunity Commission
Respondent	Crown Solicitor's Office

Case(s) referred to in judgment(s):

Boehringer Ingelheim Pty Ltd v Reddrop [1984] 2 NSWLR 13
Waterhouse v Bell (1991) 25 NSWLR 99

1

3

4

5

CV

told that in
permitted
approval of
student to i
and comm
communica
take the stu
requiremen
proposal, th

6 The V
Curriculum
participated
which woul

7 The se
SWL entit
Annexed to
Under the h

•

• T
P

• T
P.

○

○

8 It is a
endorsed by
SWL teache
and that rec

9 In prac
or her prefe

be
cc
se
ga
(T
co
sti
ac

10

19
co
dis
dic
Ms
cor
Jun
cor
by
pla
gar
by
wo
cor
the
We
Shi

11

sch
Cor
that
plac
the
Ms
stud
had
mot

The event

12

SWI

the cor
interve
arrange
subject
compla
radio c
quotati

"p
st
ho
W
wi
ne
sa
wi

13

M
restrain
decide
She we
employ
premise
of the r
meeting
evidenc
evidenc
her tele
19 June
witness
Ms Ell
convers
which
evidenc
the cor
persona
recalled
Tribuna
meeting
meeting

"Mr Sefton: So co
due t
Mr P

Ms Elliott: Yes.
call
comm
of the
hadn'
positi
alright
heard
I th
comm
have
which
hadn'
told t
thoug
and to
and M
her tr
that s
busine
well, t
reache
togeth
seeme
placen
sister
grade
differe
throug
Mr Pea
throug
doing r

Mr Sefton: And or
happen

Ms Elliott: Well a
comfor
they we

M

M

M

M

14 A
notwith
arrang
that R
becam
the cor

15 M
respon
that th
Ms Phi
be wo
Mr Pea

supervising the cor
not been the comple

*"... When Mr
thought if I w
made by her to
have a leg to
knew that we
went back and
straight to the*

16 The evidence r

17 Mr Rushforth's

"Mr Sefton:

Mr Rushforth:

Mr Sefton:

Mr Rushforth:

M

M

M

M

18

M
Mr Rus
The Tr
is a mo
told the

"M

Mi

Mr Rushforth's letter to

20 On 22 June 21
commencement of t
correspondence cou
contains the followi

*"My policy pos
with close fam
best for all s
integrity of the*

21 The reference
Structured Workp.
reasons.

Mr Pease's letter in reply

22 Mr Pease replie
other things, Mr Pea

*"Furthermore,
against Wendy
"unfortunate" s*

Mr Rushforth's reason fo

23 Mr Rushforth i
have concern over th

"Mr Sefton:

Mr Rushforth:

M

M

The aftermath

24 In
at the
Mr Pea
semester
the Trib

25 Th
commen
doing w

Analysis of th

26 Th
19 June
the com
ample t
second s
how the
unreason

27 The
himself
school w
the comp

28

29

J
S
C

30

d

31

T
R
M
W
O
P
T
E

The star

32

33

defi

(b) the status of

(c) the status of

34 Section 35I of the

"(1) It is unlawful
against a person
responsible

(a) by
app

(b) in the
to a

(2) It is unlawful
against a person
responsible

(a) by
stud
edu

(b) by e

(c) by s

(3) Nothing in
fide benefit
by reason
status."

The complainant's contentions

35 In essence, the complainant's contentions are based on sections 35A(1) and 35I(2)(e)

36 The complainant alleges that she was discriminated against because she sought an equal share of the business from her father and that because she was discriminated against she was denied access to an equal share of the business, to her detriment in that the business was not properly managed when grading

37

N
v
f
t

The res

38

th
st
at
th
th

39

as
gr
th
th
ha

40

fr
N:
ca
In
po
res
dis
Or
Tr
of
an
em
ob
gen
suc
in
v B

41

Bo

to the
refuse
becau
Mr Pe
was u
been a

Section 5 E

42 N
nevert
the fa
school
s.5 E
Rushf
the cir

The Compl

43 E
her fa
Tribun
notion
favour
would
not a f
family
some
have a
policy

44 H
the pol
TC 11
would
charge

45 A
Ltd v
and M
busines
Ms Ell
decisio



