



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
Fair Work Act 2009

**VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI
DEPUTY PRESIDENT KOVACIC
COMMISSIONER JOHNS**

s.156 - 4 yearly review of modern awards

**Four yearly review of modern awards
(AM2015/6)
Educational Services (Schools) General Staff Award 2010**

Melbourne

10.17 AM, MONDAY, 18 JULY 2016

PN1

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thanks, I'll have the appearances.

PN2

MS S KENNA: If it please the Commission I appear on behalf of the National Tertiary Education Industry Union. Kenna, initial S. Appearing with me is Mr McAlpine, initial K, and Ms Gale, initial L. May it please the Commission.

PN3

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thank you, Ms Kenna.

PN4

MR M BUTLER: If the Commission pleases, I appear for the Association of Professional Engineers, Scientists and Managers Australia, Butler, initial M.

PN5

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thank you, Mr Butler.

PN6

MR RUSKIN: If the Commission pleases, Ruskin. I appear for the Association of Australian Medical Research Institutes. With me is John Monroe. I think leave has been granted in this matter but I'm happy to seek it again if it hasn't been.

PN7

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Leave is granted to all the parties.

PN8

MR RUSKIN: Thank you.

PN9

MR S PILL: Commission pleases, Pill, initial S. I appear on behalf of the Group of 8 Universities, to shorthand it.

PN10

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thank you, Mr Pill.

PN11

MS C PUGSLEY: If the Commission pleases, Pugsley, initial C, from the Australian High Education Industrial Association.

PN12

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thank you, Ms Pugsley. I don't think there's anybody else. All right. These matters have been programmed in a particular way. This is the first opportunity before the matter's to come before the Full Bench and it may be, as we develop the matters that we have to re-visit how the matter is going to progress.

PN13

It did strike me, having had a preliminary read of the matters filed, that there are a number of housekeeping matters that need to be attended to, and I'll raise some of them for the parties' consideration and then we'll see how we go.

PN14

The first matter that needs to be dealt with is how we're going to deal with objections to witness statements throughout this matter? Whilst it is true that this is an award review, it doesn't mean that the witness statements should be sloppy or inefficient. And it may mean that some of the witness statements have to be re-looked at.

PN15

Coming out of the penalty rates view which I was involved in, we created a process where the parties should confer in relation to each of the witness statements and determine what matters are going to be objected to prior to the statements being tendered before the Bench. Have the parties engaged any such process at this stage?

PN16

MS KENNA: No, Your Honour.

PN17

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: All right, I'm not going to take any evidence before that process occurs. We're not going to use the Commission's time to deal with objections. That goes for the whole hearing, Ms Kenna. For every witness statement you are to confer - that means we may take an adjournment shortly. But that is the process we'll follow.

PN18

MS KENNA: Understood, Your Honour.

PN19

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: We then need to test whether, in relation to objections, what your objecting to is whether something goes to a question of real weight or whether there can be an accommodation. In the penalty rates case, for example, accommodations were made, for example, that a statement was made by one party or other saying, "Well, it's only going to go weight" and therefore it was allowed in. Alternatively, we accepted amendments to the statements so that we received a clean document as (indistinct) originally filed.

PN20

Now, I'm raising these issues because I've read this morning's statements and I have concerns about them. So it seems to me a bit of work needs to be done, and they flow through the whole case.

PN21

If there are serious objections in relation to statements, we may well assign that to one member of the Bench to deal with separately, as distinct from matters that we can deal with, with the three of us. But we'll see what happens in relation to that.

PN22

Secondly, I note that in relation to the first part of the case there is some suggestion being put that we should rely upon the transcript of the evidence of DP Smith, as he then was. Now, I would express, from this Bench's view, this being an award review which is three years after that material, if you propose to do that

you do it with serious problems. You really need to think about leading evidence as it is today.

PN23

And again, I look, for example, at Mr Sneddon's evidence for this morning. Try to link it back to 2013. Couldn't do it from his witness statement. So if that's the proposal you're going to go through with, Ms Kenna, we'll need to look at that. Because before us - we made a valiant attempt, as a Full Bench, to start extracting some of DP Smith's material and we could give you a folder of that material, but that's incomplete in itself and I think it's not satisfactory to rely upon something in 2013 and say "That founds the argument for 2016." Particularly in the context which he was dealing with at that time and the decision that he made at the time.

PN24

So, again, I'll take a short adjournment shortly, when I make all these comments. You may want to reconsider how we're going to deal with that part of the case. It may be that we don't deal with that part of the case today; that you have to re-cast. And whilst we've set a large number of dates at the moment, in all reality, no decision in this case would come out this year, even on the current timetable. If that means we have to add more days, we'll add more days, to do a proper award review that needs to occur, as distinct from a half-baked approach on serious matters. And it does seem to me, speaking for myself, that some of the material that's filed has been a bit of a rush. And even the objections, particularly in the first part of the case, which I apprehend coming from other parties, having read the material, if they're going to be able to challenge that material then it needs to be all there, and I would have thought that they would be having trouble saying they're going to simply accept the 2013 material themselves.

PN25

Now, are there any other housekeeping matters from your part, Ms Kenna, before we make some sort of more formal approach?

PN26

MS KENNA: Your Honour, the only other matter we were going to raise was the quite extensive witness statement of Mr McAlpine. We originally lodged the statement in bits because it was quite lengthy and we now have a statement to lodge that includes page numbers. The reason I raise that today is that the statement goes to the Research Institute's matter also. But we would need to lodge that and collect that during an adjournment because it's actually sitting in a car at the basement of the Fair Work Commission.

PN27

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Right.

PN28

MS KENNA: If it please Your Honour.

PN29

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: We're not dealing with Mr McAlpine until 21 July, is that right?

PN30

MS KENNA: That's right, Your Honour. It's just that some of the material goes to the Research Institute's case, but given your previous matters - sorry, your previous comments this morning, it might be as relevant today.

PN31

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes.

PN32

MS KENNA: I just thought I'd bring it to your attention. Thank you, Your Honour.

PN33

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: I agree with that. Any other parties have any preliminary comments about the process? Yes, Mr Pill?

PN34

MR PILL: Yes, Your Honour. Just briefly. If I can divide this case into two main parts, the first part relating to the Research Institute, and notionally it's listed for these first two days. My clients have filed a very brief submission about that, it only goes to two pages. The substance of that is that my clients don't seek to make submissions in relation to the merit or otherwise of those claims. They've briefly raised one issue about the definition of Research Institute. So depending upon what falls out of the other programming matters, and if there are going to be dedicated days for the Research Institute's, we just want to put before the Bench whether it is appropriate that we remain in the Commission or indeed whether we be released from the Commission and return for the part which is of main interest to my clients.

PN35

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes, I understand, Mr Pill.

PN36

MR PILL: Commission please.

PN37

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: It may well be that after we have a short adjournment, the Union takes a particular view as to how it wishes to proceed and it may be that it wishes some time to consider the way the Research Institute matter is going to continue, particularly in the comments I've made about the 2013 material and the nature of its evidence. That may mean a re-jigging of the timetable, which will accelerate, potentially, your client's interests. So I wouldn't want you to go quite yet.

PN38

MR PILL: Yes. Thank you, Your Honour.

PN39

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Any other preliminary comments? Right, Ms Kenna, what I propose to do is take an adjournment for about half an hour for you to consider the way you think is the best use of Commission's time in running

the matter. If we are going to proceed with any opening statements on the Research Institute matter we can do that then. If there is going to be a need to refine the evidence, we'll deal with that then. Also if there is going to be more time to deal with objections amongst yourselves, that should also occur. But notionally we'll return in half an hour. Thank you. The Commission is adjourned.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT [10.26 AM]

RESUMED [11.29 AM]

PN40

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes, Ms Kenna.

PN41

MS KENNA: Mr McAlpine is going to respond on behalf of NTEU, your Honour.

PN42

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thank you. Mr McAlpine.

PN43

MR MCALPINE: Thank you, your Honour. There has been discussion, obviously, in the time of the adjournment, essentially between ourselves, the parties with a specific interest in the research institutes' matter, and the other university employers.

PN44

Subject, obviously, to what the Commission considers appropriate, the course of action that I think we can say we jointly recommend is that the matters concerning the research institutes - the hearing of those matters should be delayed until after the hearings on 2 September in order that the witness schedules in relation to the other matters not be unduly disrupted. The employers, AAMRI and APESMA, I understand have no objection to that course of action.

PN45

And that we proposed that in relation - if that were to occur, the parties would confer to attempt, in relation to the witness and other evidence about the research institutes, to come to an agreement about any amendments that needed to be made to statements and any other matters about which objection was likely to be taken in relation to evidence and other materials.

PN46

In relation to the other matters - that is, the larger part of the whole case - we were proposing, I think with the agreement of the employers, that we would confer about all the other material that has been in with a view to coming up with agreed new versions of statements where that was necessary, and perhaps agreed statements about the status of various materials and how they're being relied upon or whether they're being relied upon at all.

PN47

And that we would hope to get agreement on a lot of that, but that if there was any need for a decision about that by the Commission, which there presumably would be anyway, we would propose that that should occur on the Thursday afternoon; and if possible, that we would deal with those matters on Thursday afternoon and then proceed, if possible, from then onwards openings and witness evidence on a program that would actually only, by the end, have been delayed by a day or so.

PN48

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: So just so I understand your proposal, your proposal is that we would vacate the hearing dates and resume on Thursday afternoon - - -

PN49

MR MCALPINE: Yes, that's correct.

PN50

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: - - - with some of them. Is there a - from my part I'm a bit reluctant to do that. Is there a way of dealing with some of the evidence in the second part of the case? Rather than having agreement on every single statement, if we took different adjournments so that we could start with some witnesses either tomorrow or Wednesday so that we're not wasting the current dates? You might want to give some thought to that.

PN51

And again, by analogy with the penalty rates case, it wasn't a requirement that every single statement had been dealt with on day one; so each day when we came to it we've had those statements already agreed between the parties, and we then limited the time. In some cases they did them in bulk, but, I mean, it's just sort of moving into a zone where you're just getting the stuff ready so that we don't use the court time to spend on objections of any length.

PN52

MR MCALPINE: Yes. Well, we didn't discuss that option, but I think in principle we have no objection to proceeding along that course. I should say at the outset that in our opening this morning and on Wednesday in relation to the other matters we were proposing to say that we thought there were a number of matters in the employer statements that we might want to take objection to, but we were going to propose to leave it to the Commission to attach appropriate weight to those things. Now, that means that we - - -

PN53

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: You will need to recast the opening.

PN54

MR MCALPINE: And it also means we haven't actually turned our mind specifically to any objections at this stage, so I'm not - it sounds to me like what your Honour has proposed is an efficient way to proceed, it's just that we would need a bit of time to consider that.

PN55

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes, I follow that.

PN56

MR MCALPINE: Thank you.

PN57

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Let me just hear from the other parties and see what the views are generally.

PN58

MR RUSKIN: Thank you, your Honour. We did have discussions and we are prepared to adjourn the research institute case. We're not thrilled by it because of the -I guess the cost and preparations which might be thrown away as a result.

PN59

But if it's convenient for these proceedings if the research institute case is done later, in October, to free up time for the other parties to redo their material, then we're content, if that suits the Commission, to reschedule those proceedings in October if there are appropriate dates available, and to redo our witness statements where they need to be redone, in discussions with the union - with the NTEU, I should say - after they get through the - after 31 July. So we provide you with updated witness statements and objections before October.

PN60

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes. In relation to the research institute part of the case, as I said, we've been trying to look at Smith DP, as he then was, his material, and we've been dragging some of that out. And in the break I went back and had a look at more material from that matter. You are going to have to give some thought as to what that material looks like that comes before us.

PN61

It's quite important because some of it is, on one view, historical and needs updating, and it's trying to link it all back in the most efficient way. What we don't want to be doing is getting lost in the detail without knowing what the right detail to look at. So for both the relevant main players in that part of the case it's really - and if you're not going to cross-examine witnesses and you're going to accept, for example, somebody's statement of 2013, we need to know why you say you don't cross-examine it. Right?

PN62

MR RUSKIN: Yes.

PN63

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Because you're then saying that is the state of play as of 2016.

PN64

MR RUSKIN: Most of our evidence, I don't think very much at all is based on 2013 on the decision, and responding to the unions saying we rely on some of the evidence in 2013. So I think Mr McAlpine indicates that he might provide to us what evidence from the past he wishes to use or rely upon, and we will let the Commission - - -

PN65

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: I mean, obviously - again, speaking for myself - the preference would be to have one easy document to follow, rather than having to cross-reference back to 2013.

PN66

MR RUSKIN: Yes.

PN67

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And if we do have to cross-reference to 2013 we need to be specific with what part of 2103 we're dealing with, because it was quite extensive.

PN68

MR RUSKIN: Yes, your Honour.

PN69

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And in fact, the 2013 case also goes back to the 2010 case, and I don't want to go through a trawl where we're extracting bits of 2010 to get to the point of 2016.

PN70

MR RUSKIN: Yes, your Honour.

PN71

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Because again, that's in a different environment completely. But I did notice, again when reading the 2013 material, referencing back to 2010's evidence. All right. Mr Pill, I don't think hear from you on that point, assuming - - -

PN72

MR BUTLER: Your Honour, if I could just advise that APESMA supports the process as outlined by Mr Ruskin.

PN73

MR PILL: Thank you, your Honour. Can I just address the question of the remainder of the award matters and why Thursday was suggested, and perhaps is appropriate. We certainly hear what your Honour says - - -

PN74

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes, because I was going to deal with the matters in two parts. One was the delay question first, and then I will deal with this restart question second.

PN75

MR PILL: Yes. In principle, no objection to the research institute matter essentially being put at the back of the case rather than the front of the case. In terms of the programming of the remainder, the suggestion of Thursday was to enable the parties today and tomorrow to discuss a number of matters in light of your Honour's comments. There are 21 witness statements that have been filed by

the NTEU; together, if I can put it that way, the employers have 11 witness statements.

PN76

In addition to issues about objections, there are, in amongst those, people who have been put forward as experts. We had intended to raise issues concerning a number of attachments to those statements. Each of them refer, for example, to a literature review. They don't appear to be the author of the literature review; and, indeed, the author of the literature review is not identified.

PN77

Those statements then are supported by some 5000-plus pages of material that the NTEU have filed under the umbrella of a submission that it's relevant and available to the Commission and available to the parties, but without necessarily telling the parties or, indeed, the Commission, what's intended to be dealt with.

PN78

In light of your Honour's comments, what we intended to do is to use the time to discuss that, see if we can reach agreement to identify those specific matters, and it largely falls to the NTEU, the specific matters that they say the Commission should have regard to. That's the second issue.

PN79

There are issues about experts and there are issues about how the remainder of the material, which is not witness material, but is, it appears, relied upon by the NTEU, is going to be dealt with, and whether the Commission, bluntly, is expected to take all of that into account. And in my cross-examination of their witnesses, am I required to have regard to that material?

PN80

And it's for that reason, and that last reason, that it was discussed between the parties that realistically, to be in a position to agree those matters, to file any fresh statements, but also to hopefully put to the Commission a joint position in relation to what it does with the materials; and failing which - and Mr McAlpine didn't mention this - but failing which the parties should file notices of objection in relation to anything that's not agreed, and to do that by end of Wednesday. That would enable the matter to come before the Commission on Thursday.

PN81

And so in that sense, respectfully, it would be both a false economy to push on with a couple of witnesses to morrow, and there's also the logistics issue. I'm not sure which of the witnesses might now be available to be brought forward to Tuesday and Wednesday.

PN82

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Mr Pill, one comment that you made which troubles me is the issue of experts. Is the current program - because I haven't done this analysis - are experts scattered in around other witnesses?

PN83

MR PILL: In a scheduling sense, yes, that is true.

PN84

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes. Well, that would not be - one of the things you may like to reconsider is actually how - for both sides, how the evidence is going to run. It's not useful to have experts scattered in with the non-experts.

PN85

MR PILL: Yes.

PN86

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: It makes it quite difficult when one is trying to then do the cross-examine and analysis. And again, by analogy with the penalty rates case, all the experts were dealt with together from both sides.

PN87

MR PILL: Yes.

PN88

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And in some cases there was an argument as to hot-tubbing of some of those experts which was looked at. So we - if they are, in fact, experts, which is another question.

PN89

MR PILL: Sorry, I was reluctant to ask, maybe I should, to be clear on it.

PN90

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Well, in terms of - - -

PN91

MR PILL: Hot-tubbing - - -

PN92

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: - - - in the sense of in the hot-tubbing you get - if the experts are from either side on the same point, they're both there together, and they're then examined together.

PN93

MR PILL: Yes. Well, it's probably more a matter for my friend at the other end of the table. There are three witnesses, as I see it, that they will be seeking to say are expert, and at the moment they are not grouped together.

PN94

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Who are those witnesses, Mr Pill?

PN95

MR PILL: They are - does your Honour have the document that was filed on Friday?

PN96

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: I have that document in front of me, yes.

PN97

MR PILL: So of 28 July, Robin May; and then over the page on 30 August - 29 July, Anne Junor; and then over the page we have Glenda Strahan - I understand it's pronounced - on 30 August.

PN98

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And who are the employer experts?

PN99

MR PILL: Well, the employers have called a number of senior academics who give evidence based upon their experience, but they're not giving expert evidence - - -

PN100

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes, but not as experts.

PN101

MR PILL: - - - in that sense.

PN102

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Okay.

PN103

MR PILL: Again, really a matter for Mr McAlpine; I understand that other than the usual issues about availability, there may be a medical issue concerning Dr Junor, as in she's going in for some surgery at some point in time, but that's really a matter for the NTEU.

PN104

And so subject to the issue that you've just raised, your Honour, what we would be envisaging, as I understand it, through discussions is we get our house in order; we narrow the issues that the Bench might be asked to determine as to admissibility of particular evidence, and that's all done up front; that puts the parties in a position by Friday to essentially proceed.

PN105

The witnesses who would have been called this week, subject to availability, we're reasonably confident we can deal with next week, and perhaps one of two of them at the start of the next week appearing, which is 28 August.

PN106

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: does anybody envisage that we will have to reconsider the adding of additional hearing dates at this point, or do we wait?

PN107

MR RUSKIN: Well, your Honour, it's hard to say, but there is - if we're to be heard in October, there's only 28 October and 2 and 3 November. I don't know about the availability of our witnesses; one who travels extensively overseas, but at least I know he's available on the 28th. It may be that if you propose to start the research institute case on the 28th you might need to consider that, your Honour.

PN108

COMMISSIONER JOHNS: I think we were looking to deal with the Bond University matter on those dates. The other programing issue is, Mr Pill, you wrote to us on 15 July about having the dates beginning 29 August listed in Sydney, it seems to be on the basis that most of the witnesses were from Sydney; on my analysis that's not true, and I'm wondering whether rather than have, where they are from Sydney or New South Wales, scattered throughout that week, if we could consolidate them all on one day, we could have that day in Sydney.

PN109

MR PILL: Yes. The Commissioner's observation is correct. There was - immediately preceding us writing to the Commission at that point, almost all of the union witnesses were going to be dealt with here in Melbourne this week and next week and all of the Sydney witnesses were going to be dealt with in Sydney on that week. And so whilst I think it's still the case that the majority of witnesses would be non-Melbourne based, it became less pure.

PN110

We're flexible. I don't make a big issue of it. We thought it was of assistance to the Commission, and indeed those giving evidence, that there be some day or days allocated in Sydney to reflect flexibility.

PN111

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: We are using video link and all the applicants seem to be in Melbourne. But anyway we will take that on board. But you need to actually recast the list, anyway, in light of where we're going.

PN112

MR PILL: Indeed, your Honour.

PN113

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: So one of the things, by Thursday there will be a new list, at least, for the first part of the case. Mr Ruskin, we're going to have to consider what we do with the second part of the case.

PN114

MR RUSKIN: Yes, your Honour.

PN115

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And we will - it does seem to me that we're unlikely to finish the case in the time allocated as it's currently structured.

PN116

MR RUSKIN: Yes, your Honour.

PN117

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: We may have to come back with other dates for later in this hearing, potentially next year. I think the Bench will take a short adjournment and we will consider first the issue of delay and how we're going to deal with that, I think.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[11.47 AM]

RESUMED

[11.58 AM]

PN118

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Thank you. We considered the various submissions of the parties as to the best way of progressing the matter. What we propose to do is to vacate the hearing dates until Thursday of this week. On Thursday at 9.30 Johns C will facilitate a conference to deal with objections. We will then start the matter proper at 2 o'clock for opening submissions. We also propose four additional hearing dates; 18, 19, 20 and 21 October.

PN119

Assuming they're suitable to all the parties, we would then ask the parties to re-look at the document, which is the witness list, and re-cast it so that you take into account those four extra dates we're allocating. Are there any preliminary comments people wish to make? Yes, Mr Ruskin.

PN120

MR RUSKIN: Your Honour, the objections, are they - on Thursday at 9.30 before Johns - are they limited to the second part of the case concerning - - -

PN121

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Yes, I - - -

PN122

MR RUSKIN: - - - not the research institute.

PN123

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: - - - we won't be dealing with the research matter.

PN124

MR RUSKIN: Right. And did you have an idea of - did you consider what days you had thought the research institutes' evidence would be heard - - -

PN125

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: By adding the four extra days - - -

PN126

MR RUSKIN: It's up to the - - -

PN127

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: - - - we thought the parties could then sort it out.

PN128

MR RUSKIN: Yes. Thank you, your Honour.

PN129

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And you would go towards the latter part of the - - -

PN130

MR RUSKIN: Yes. Thank you, your Honour.

PN131

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Anything from you, Mr McAlpine, Ms Kenna?

PN132

MS KENNA: No, thank you, your Honour.

PN133

MR RUSKIN: Your Honour, we will be excused from the proceeding until further notice in relation to research institute; is that the best way of - we don't need to be here on Thursday?

PN134

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: You don't need to be here on Thursday, but you will have to sort out your witness timetable in due course with the union.

PN135

MR RUSKIN: Thank you, your Honour.

PN136

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: And obviously when the witnesses have been clarified in that process, then we will set a time for objections for that. Now, that's going to be some months now, clearly, so it won't happen - but I wanted a similar process. We don't want to just start when we start your case - or the union's case in relation to that - without those facilitated discussions having occurred on objections.

PN137

MR RUSKIN: Thank you, your Honour.

PN138

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: Anything from your end, Mr Pill?

PN139

MR PILL: No, thank you, your Honour.

PN140

VICE PRESIDENT CATANZARITI: All right. The hearing of the matter will be adjourned until 2 o'clock on Thursday.

ADJOURNED UNTIL THURSDAY, 21 JULY 2016

[11.58 AM]