Financial Relief

205

me Britt [1987] 1 Qd & est is whether a dechoon te dispute between then ther or not the practical acticable): Lewandowski i will consider the nature : Cowie v State Electricity 2) (application to extend n permitting the the of laudio [1970] Tas SR 231 ommence action not 25 an affidavit); Campbell · Gibbs J. SC(QLD) (the ermine the rights of the eeks leave to take further tal Life Assn of Australesia R 10 per Underwood J or other reasons); Jacobs 8 per Neasey J. SC(TAS)

3; 33 ALT 1 per Madden ible unless the source of Re Gleeson (decit) (1887) nds of belief goes to the

upporting an applicance

R 850; (1967) 29 LGRA ent is not limited to what 1. but where a reference conjectures, deductions c. Juson Pty Ltd (1992 8 disclosure of a source to entified).

C(WA) (in interlocutory earing by the trial judge. ible as it must also be son v Kerr, Ex pane Low hird party may apply to R 50 per Lutwyche J. ous matters disallowed

t may also be destroyed

QLD).

Lexis Nexis Butterau

## (c) Swearing of Affidavits

Who may take affidavits In all jurisdictions, people who hold 195-8800) In an jurisdictions, people who hold surfaces are empowered to take affidavits, for example, judicial officers of the peace: in addition certain or has a surface of the peace. aljustices of the peace; in addition, certain other persons may be authorised atke affidavits. In some jurisdictions, it is expressly provided that an affidavit arm or affirmed before a party to the proceedings may not be used.2

1. (CTH) Evidence Act 1995 s 186 (affidavits for use in certain proceedings)

(CTH) High Court Rules 2004 r 24.01.7

(CTH) Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 s 45(1) (affidavits taken in Australia),

45(2), 45(3) (affidavits taken abroad)

(ACT) Oaths and Affirmations Act 1984 s 11(1)(a) (affidavits taken in the Territory), 11(1)(b) (affidavits taken in another State or Territory), 11(1)(c) (affidavits taken abroad)

Oaths Act 1939 ss 13 (affidavits taken in the Territory), 17 (who may be a commissioner for oaths), 27 (affidavits taken out of the Territory); (NT) Supreme (NT) Court Rules r 43.10(3)

(NSW) Oaths Act 1900 s 26 (who may take affidavits), 27 (who may be authorised

to take affidavits)

Vito

(QLD) Oaths Act 1867 s 41 (who may take affidavits)

Evidence (Affidavits) Act 1928 ss 2 (power of justice to take affidavits), 2A (power of proclaimed members of police force to take affidavits); (SA) Oaths Act 1936 5 28 (who may be commissioners for taking affidavits); (SA) Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006 r 163(1)

(TAS) Supreme Court Rules 2000 rr 511(1) (affidavits taken in the State), 511(2)

(affidavits taken interstate), 512 (affidavits taken abroad)

(VIC) Evidence Act 1958 ss 123C (affidavits taken in the State), 124 (affidavits taken out of the State), 125 (where affidavits required to be taken before a justice, sufficient if affidavit is taken before a justice elsewhere than in the State);

(WA) Oaths, Affidavits and Statutory Declarations Act 2005 ss 9(6), 9(8) (affidavits taken in the State), 10 (affidavits out of the State).

2. (CTH) High Court Rules 2004 r 24.01.10

(ACT) Court Procedures Rules 2006 r 6722

Supreme Court Rules r 43,10 (affidavit sworn or affirmed before a party (NT) or his or her employee may not be used without leave of court)

(QLD) Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999 r 441 (affidavit sworn or affirmed before a party may not be filed or received by the court)

Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006 r 163(2) (affidavit sworn or affirmed before a party or his or her employee or agent is not sufficient)

(TAS) Supreme Court Rules 2000 r 513 (affidavit sworn or affirmed before a party is not sufficient)

Oaths, Affidavits and Statutory Declarations Act 2005 ss 8 ('experienced lawyer means a legal practitioner who has held a practice certificate for at least two years and who holds a current practice certificate), 9(7) (experienced lawyer involved in the proceedings or in preparing the affidavit is not an authorised witness for the

See also Ross v Shearman (1820) 2 Coop temp Cott 172; 47 ER 1109; Duke of Northumberland v Todd (1878) 7 Ch D 777. Compare Bourke v Davis (1889) +4 Ch D 110 at 126 per Kay J (duties of a person administering the oath).

[195-8865] Manner of taking affidavits In some jurisdictions, it is Pedically provided that, when making an affidavit, the deponent may either

& LetisNexis Butterworths

372,255

Service 293

Proof of Facts

Evidence out of Court

swear an oath or make an affirmation. In all jurisdictions, it is general provided that an affirmation may be used as an alternative to swearing an out In some jurisdictions, an affidavit may be used, whether it was taken before

or after proceedings commenced.3 The person taking the affidavit should ensure that the affidavit is legible and must not permit the swearing of an affidavit if:4

(1) he or she is aware that the affidavit is false; or

(2) he or she has reason to believe that the deponent does not understand the affidavit's contents or the nature of an oath or affirmation.

Notes

1. (ACT) Oaths and Affirmations Act 1984 ss 12 (swearing or affirmation), 13 force of jurat to be altered for affirmation), 17 (manner of swearing or affirmation) (NSW) Oaths Act 1900 s 32 (person may make declaration if not competent to see oath)

Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999 r 432 (swearing or affirmation) (QLD)

(SA) Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006 r 162(11)

Evidence Act 1958 s 102 (affirmation may be made instead of oab)? (VIC) Oaths, Affidavits and Statutory Declarations Act 2005 s 9 (swearing or (WA)

See McShane v Higgins [1997] 2 Qd R 373. CA(QLD) (requirements for an analysis) for an affidavit satisfied without physically touching a bible; all that is required a terms the form of oath employed should bind the conscience of the oath-taker to see

- See [195-7320], [195-7325]. See also (CTH) Acts Interpretation Act 1901 a 73 ('oath' includes 'affirmation').
- (CTH) Federal Court Rules O 14 r 1 Court Procedures Rules 2006 r 6714 (ACT)

Supreme Court Rules r 43.07 (affidavit may be used with lear of com-(NT)

Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006 r 162(10) (SA)

Supreme Court (General Civil Procedure) Rules 2005 r 43.07 (VIC)

4. Bourke v Davis (1889) 44 Ch D 110 at 126. For the formal requirements for the part where the deponent appears not to understand the contents of an affidance [195-8840]. A solicitor discovering that an affidavit is false after it has been file as remedy the matter immediately if he or she continues to act: see [195-8855] one

(5) REQUEST

Taking evidence for Power to give effect Manner of taking ev: Offences ..... Summary procedure

This chapter was up Alun Hill DipLaw( Law Extension Comr. Barrister of the Supres

[195-8920] Takin States and Territories effect to a request for in proceedings elsew production of docu: The court has a d granted. The court

- (1) the witness tribunal;4
- (2) the request (3) the foreign
- (4) the request (5) the request
- (6) the witness the matters
- (7) the proceed Australia; 10 3) there is fish
- I would an The court may r ermane what the respond to for everyone to

[The next page is 372,309]

Financial Relief

dictions, it is generally ve to swearing an oath. ther it was taken before

e affidavit is legible. and

nt does not understand h or affirmation.

ng or affirmation), 13 (ferm wearing or affirmation) on if not competent to sweet

wearing or affirmation.

made instead of oath oct 2005 s 9 (swearing or

) (requirements for an oath le: all that is required is that of the oath-taker to speak

pretation Act 1901 s 27/2

used with leave of coun

·s 2005 r 43.07.

requirements for the jural intents of an affidavit see after it has been filed mun act: see [195-8855] non

## REQUESTS BY FOREIGN STATES OR COURTS

## CONTENTS

| 10.49  | Para       |
|--|------------|
| thing evidence for proceedings in foreign courts | [195-8920] |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·            | [195-8925] |
| Number of taking evidence                        | [195-8930] |
| Offences   | [195-8935] |
| Senimary procedure                               | [195-8940] |
| Samuer & Least 1                                 |            |

Ins chapter was updated by
Alun Hill DipLaw(BAB)
Low Extension Committee, University of Sydney
Berister of the Supreme Court of New South Wales

[195-8920] Taking evidence for proceedings in foreign courts In all States and Territories, the Supreme Court (the 'court') may make an order giving effect to a request for evidence to be obtained within the jurisdiction to be used in proceedings elsewhere in Australia or overseas. The order may extend to the production of documents.

The court has a discretion whether to make the order.<sup>3</sup> Generally, it will be granted. The court may not make the order where:

- (I) the witness has been charged with an offence before the foreign tribunal:4
- (2) the request involves the enforcement of a foreign revenue law;5
- (3) the foreign tribunal has no jurisdiction in the matter;6
- (4) the request is oppressive;7
- 5) the request infringes the privilege against self-incrimination;8
- (6) the witness is an expert who has not been previously connected with the matters in issue: 9
- the proceeding would constitute a contempt of existing proceedings in Australia: 10
- (8) there is fishing for witnesses or evidence; 11 or
- (9) it would amount to a pre-trial discovery of documents. 12

The court may need to look beyond the request which it has received to determine what the substance of the matter requested is, particularly to see if request is for evidence to be used at a trial or whether it is for some other parpose. 13

C Lenis Vexis Butterworths

372,309

Service 293

C Lexis Nexis Bullerworks