Veterans: Court and Tribunal Litigation Matt Black, Barrister, Quay 11 Chambers Veterans Legal Issues Conference LegalWise Seminars 1 December 2020

Statutory power to terminate service: Defence Regulation 2016, r 24(1).

Grounds for termination:

r24(1)(a) the member is medically unfit for service

in the Defence Force;

Grounds for termination:

r24(1)(b) the member cannot usefully serve

because of redundancy in the Defence Force

Grounds for termination:

r24(1)(c) retention of the member's service is not

in the interests of the Defence Force.

Power to reduce a member's rank on similar

grounds, including that retention of rank not in the

interests of the Defence Force: r14(1).

Reasons for something being or not being in the interests of the Defence Force *include* reasons

relating matters specified in r6(2).

Not in interest of the Defence Force: r6(2)(a): member's performance.

Not in interest of the Defence Force:

r6(2)(b): member's behaviour (including any

convictions for criminal or service offences).

Not in interest of the Defence Force: r6(2)(c): member's suitability to serve.

Not in interest of the Defence Force:

r6(2)(f): the morale, welfare and discipline of the

Defence Force.

Not in interest of the Defence Force:

r6(2)(g): the reputation and community standing of

the Defence Force.

In summary, broad grounds for termination of a member's Defence service.

Redress of grievance: *Defence Regulation 2016*, Part 7. For termination, lodge complaint within 14 days: r41(2).

Decision to terminate service is subject to judicial review: *Martincevic v Commonwealth of Australia* [2007] FCA 453, [100].

Standard grounds under Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977, s 5 – natural justice; error of law; relevant / irrelevant considerations,

etc.

Randall v Chief of the Defence Force [2020] FCA 1327: scope of termination power?

Member charged with disciplinary offences, acquitted by Defence Force Disciplinary Appeal Tribunal.

Defence then terminated member's service on the same or substantially the same grounds as charges of which he was acquitted – permissible?

Scope and limits of judicial review.

Shafran v Repatriation Commission [2019] FCA 1833: operation of s 137 of VEA.

Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986, s 137: procedure when veteran applies for review to the VRB.

Section 137 also imported by *Military*

Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 2004, s 353.

Section 137:

Requires Department to prepare a report referring

to relevant evidence and serve on the applicant.

Section 137:

Applicant then has 28 days (or longer if granted)

to furnish comments concerning the report.

Section 137:

Contemplates that Department may make further

investigation as a result of applicant's comments.

Section 137:

Requires Department to give VRB all relevant documents, including applicant's comments and

evidence obtained in any further investigation.

Shafran v Repatriation Commission [2019] FCA

1833: Applicant requested further time to make

comments in response to Department's report.

Shafran: Department sent the s137 report to VRB

without waiting for Applicant's comments.

Shafran: VRB directed Applicant to provide the comments under s 137 within 28 days.

Shafran: Federal Court held that receipt of all

"relevant documents" is a condition precedent to

exercise of VRB's procedural powers under s 148 (including listing hearing of review).

Shafran: Federal Court held that power to extend

time for making comments rests with Department,

but any extended time must be reasonable.

Section 137 procedure a potential important

avenue for applicants to influence decision-

making process or achieve positive outcome.