Complaints against Government—Administrative Law

CHAPTER CONTENTS

Introduction

Administrative law refers to the law to be followed by governments when acting and making decisions.

Administrative law exists in the common law (court-made law) and in the internal policy and legislation that binds government. It refers to the rules and procedures that regulate the conduct of government when undertaking administration, ensuring government applies the law correctly and acts fairly when making decisions.

Central to administrative law are systems of accountability for government decision making. A person adversely affected by a reviewable government decision or action may seek administrative review by:

- following an internal merit review process within the government agency
- making a complaint to an external complaint-handling organisation
- bringing an administrative appeal in an administrative tribunal
- commencing judicial review proceedings in a court.

Each administrative review option has benefits and disadvantages.

Judicial review is the most complex option. It has emerged from common (court-made) law as a set of grounds on which a court may review the administrative actions of government. Judicial review is usually focused on legal errors in the administrative decision-making process rather than the substance or merit of the decision itself. Proceedings must be commenced in the Supreme Court of Queensland or, for Commonwealth matters, in the Federal Court or Federal Circuit and Magistrates Court. Court proceedings for judicial review generally involve considerable expense, carry the risk of a costs order being made against an unsuccessful party, are time consuming and may eventually lead only to the same decision being made again.

In an effort to avoid the necessity for court proceedings, merits (or administrative) review processes have been developed as a review option for some government decisions. Pursued through internal review processes and administrative tribunals, merits review is generally faster, less complicated and carries less of a costs risk than judicial review. The Commonwealth Administrative Appeals Tribunal (AAT) has wide powers to review Commonwealth administrative decisions, while in Queensland the Queensland Civil Appeals Tribunal (QCAT) has jurisdiction to review certain decisions made by Queensland Government administrative officials.

There are also external complaint-handling organisations with oversight over some government decision making, including the Queensland Ombudsman and the Commonwealth Ombudsman. In Queensland, if a person believes that a government department or other public entity has failed to consider their human rights when acting or making a decision, a human-rights complaint may be an additional option alongside any administrative law remedy (see the *Human Rights Law in Queensland* chapter).

Administrative Law

Administrative law is concerned with:

- access to information held and generated by government
- rules that regulate government when undertaking administration
- the right to review government decisions including mechanisms for internal and external oversight.

Access to information

Access-to-information laws are a feature of administrative law, establishing free or low-cost access to government information.

Administrative law includes the right to access information held and generated by governments. Right-to-information laws provide members of the public with access to documents held by the government for free or at a low cost.

Right-to-information laws aim to ensure transparency in government, participation in government processes and provide individuals with avenues to access and amend information held by government about them.

For more information see the *Right to Information and Freedom of Information* chapter.

Undertaking administration

The rules of administrative law apply to the executive branch of government when undertaking administration, which include the daily operation of systems established in law.

Structure of government

Democratic governments based on the Westminster system traditionally consist of three branches: the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. The legislative branch is responsible for making laws. The administrative branch of government is responsible for putting the laws and policies of the legislature into effect, and the judicial branch is responsible for interpreting and enforcing laws.

Most government administrative work is carried out by a government department. The administrative head of a government department is a senior public servant with a title such as Director-General. The political head of a department is the minister, who is a member of the government in power. The minister is responsible for formulating government policy, which the department will put into effect. The minister is accountable to parliament and ultimately the people for the department's activities. However, in many departments power is delegated to departmental employees.

Departments are not the only administrative organ of government. Sometimes special statutory bodies are set up with a particular administrative function. An example of such a body at the Commonwealth level is the Repatriation Commission. Although most statutory bodies operate outside the confines of the normal public-service regime, they remain just as much a part of the government administrative branch as mainstream departments and are ordinarily equally accountable for their administrative actions and decisions.

Delegation

Legislation normally places the power to make decisions with the holder of a specific position such as the relevant minister or the permanent head of a department. Modern departments are often huge entities with thousands of employees. It would be impossible for one person to perform all of the functions entrusted to them, and it is quite usual for functions to be delegated to others.

For example, under the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld), the principal officer for a government agency must deal with an application to access or amend information held by the agency. Rather than relying on the principal officer to deal personally with every application, the law permits the principal officer to delegate this and much of the other day-to-day work within the agency. However, the principal officer remains responsible for ensuring that delegated functions are carried out properly (s 27A(10A) *Acts Interpretation Act 1954* (Qld)).

Administrative decisions

The rules of administrative law apply mainly to the activities of the executive branch, but some activities of the legislature and judiciary are administrative in character and may be subject to administrative law.

Administrative decisions made by local councils, government ministers, officers working in government department, lower courts (e.g. the Magistrates Court in Queensland) and tribunals are generally subject to administrative law. Examples of administrative decisions include:

- a judicial officer issuing a warrant
- the decision by a minister to cancel a visa on character grounds
- a local council placing conditions on a planning permit.

However, not all decisions by such bodies can be described as administrative. For instance, by-laws made by an elected local authority are legislative in character and not subject to judicial review under pt 3 of the *Judicial Review Act 1991* (Qld) (Judicial Review Act) (see *Paradise Projects Pty Ltd v Gold Coast City Council* [1994] 1 Qd R 314) but may be challenged under the common law as it is preserved in pt 5 of that Act. Similarly, judicial decisions made by lower courts are not administrative decisions (see *Stubberfield v Webster* [1996] 2 Qd R 211).

The head of the executive branch of government is the Governor-General in Council (for the Commonwealth Government) or the Governor in Council (for state governments). The High Court of Australia has made it clear that, at common law, the rules of administrative law apply to both the Governor-General and the state governors in the same way that they apply to other administrative decision makers. However, in judicial review applications in Queensland, the appropriate respondent in matters concerning decisions of the Governor in Council is the responsible minister (s 53 Judicial Review Act).

Administration versus policy

Another category of government action and decision making is policy. Policy matters are neither legislative, judicial or administrative. The formulation of policy is a political function. Courts and administrative tribunals cannot normally review government policy, unless it can be shown that the particular policy is unlawful or if a policy is being applied without proper regard to the merits of an individual case.

Policy is concerned with the implementation of a desired course of government action. For example, a decision to introduce a system by which an individual must be approved for working with children such as the Queensland Blue Card system. The decision to set up some form of working-with-children assessment to implement the policy forms part of the policy decision.

The daily operation of systems created as a result of policy decisions is administrative and is subject to the requirements of administrative law. For example, the assessment of Blue Card applications within the system that governs individual decisions to grant or refuse a Blue Card is administrative.

The distinction is important because the formulation of policy is a purely political matter, and none of the redress avenues of the administrative law discussed in this chapter will ordinarily apply.

Complaints about the administrative decisions made under a policy (e.g. decisions concerning the application of the policy to particular circumstances such as the refusal of a Blue Card) are, however, generally subject to review.

Some other decisions may not be subject to administrative law because they are contractual or managerial in nature (for more information as to which decisions are subject to administrative law see the *Complaints Against Government – Judicial Review* chapter).

Reviewing Government Decisions

Administrative law includes systems of accountability for government decision making. It incorporates merits review and administrative appeal, judicial review, and external review by complaint-handling organisations such as the Queensland Ombudsman, the Commonwealth Ombudsman and the Queensland Human Rights Commission (QHRC).

What follows is a summary of administrative law avenues of redress under Queensland and Commonwealth law. For further information see the following chapters:

- merits review (*Complaints against Government—Administrative Appeals*)
- judicial review (see *Complaints against Government—Judicial Review*)
- external complaint organisations (see *Complaints to the Ombudsman*, *Complaints against Police and Public Officials* and *Human Rights Law in Queensland*).

Legislation

Legislation has simplified the task of obtaining merits review, administrative appeals and judicial review of government decisions and actions.

Internal merits review and administrative appeal avenues are contained within the governing legislation and policy of the government department and tribunal with administrative appeal jurisdiction. For guidance on accessing relevant rules and legislation see 'Before commencing an administrative law action' below.

The *Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act* 2009 (Qld) (QCAT Act) and Regulation confer administrative review jurisdiction on the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal (QCAT) in relation to a wide range of government decision making. Similarly, the *Administrative Appeals Tribunal Act 1975* (Cth) (AAT Act) empowers the Administrative Appeals Tribunal (AAT) to review decisions by way of administrative appeal.

The Queensland Judicial Review Act brings together existing common law grounds for judicial review. The Commonwealth equivalent is the *Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977* (Cth) (Administrative Decisions Act). The Commonwealth and state judicial review Acts contain grounds upon which decisions can be reviewed, as well as remedies that can be ordered by the courts.

Merits review including administrative appeal

All types of administrative and judicial review are concerned with legal errors in the decision-making process, but not all types of review will also look at the merit or substance of the decision. Merits review is concerned with both, the merit and any legal errors of an administrative decision, and it involves a rehearing of the issues. A merit review, whether through an internal merit review or an administrative appeal to a tribunal, considers what the correct or preferable decision is on the facts of the case. A successful merits review may result in a fresh decision being made.

Administrative tribunals, including QCAT and the AAT, have been established to test decisions against the requirements of good government. Administrative appeal is a form of merits review undertaken by tribunals.

Administrative appeals reconsider the merits of an administrative action or decision (i.e. whether it was the 'correct or preferable decision on the facts of the case'). The tribunal member will stand in

the shoes of the original decision maker, exercising the same powers and discretion as the Act or Regulation gave the decision maker.

A successful administrative appeal may result in the tribunal member remaking the decision and substituting its own decision for that of the original decision maker. This is another difference between a merits review and a judicial review, A judicial review usually does not include the power to substitute the decision.

In Queensland, QCAT has jurisdiction to undertake merits review of certain decisions by way of administrative appeal (called a 'review of administrative decision' in that jurisdiction).

Under the QCAT Act, in most cases, each party bears their own costs of the administrative appeal so there is only a low risk of being ordered to pay the legal costs of the successful other party if an application is unsuccessful.

The AAT has wide powers to review Commonwealth administrative decisions. Like QCAT, the AAT is a low-costs jurisdiction, with the tribunal only able to make a costs order against an applicant in limited circumstances.

Applicants often self-represent in merits review proceedings in both QCAT and the AAT, although the right to representation is upheld in the AAT and usually also in QCAT if an applicant wishes to be represented by their own lawyer.

Judicial review

Judicial review is quite different from an administrative appeal. Judicial review examines the power or jurisdiction to make a decision or to take action, and whether the decision was made without any legal errors in the process. It is not concerned with the merits of the decision (i.e. whether it was the correct or preferable decision).

Judicial review involves a court reviewing an administrative action by government, and deciding whether the decision maker has breached grounds of judicial review (e.g. whether the decision maker took relevant considerations into account, whether the decision was affected by bias and whether the rules of natural justice were followed).

Judicial review will only be successful if the decision maker can be shown to have breached one or more of the relevant statutory grounds for review or common-law principles governing administrative functions. The Judicial Review Act and Administrative Decisions Act legislate the statutory grounds for judicial review in the Queensland and Commonwealth jurisdictions. Except in

the most exceptional circumstances, courts exercising judicial review are not concerned with the merits of the decision.

When a judicial review application is successful, the court will usually set aside the particular action or decision, and order the decision maker to reconsider their decision according to law. Judicial review laws do not normally permit the court to substitute the decision with what it considers to be the correct or preferable decision. If overturned, the decision must be returned to the original decision maker. The decision maker may then reach exactly the same decision the second time around, but this time in accordance with the correct legal procedures, or they may reach a different decision.

A person wishing to obtain judicial review of a state government action in Queensland must bring proceedings in the Supreme Court. The Federal Court and Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia can hear judicial review applications about decisions made by Commonwealth Government under the Administrative Decisions Act.

Applications for judicial review involve complicated legal questions, and it is very difficult to achieve a successful outcome without experienced legal representation. A successful applicant for judicial review will usually have their costs paid by the losing party. An unsuccessful applicant may be ordered to pay the costs of the successful other party, as well as having to pay their own costs.

External complaint organisations

External complaint-handling organisations such as the Commonwealth Ombudsman, the Queensland Ombudsman and the QHRC have statutory mechanisms to receive and investigate complaints about some administrative actions of government.

The Queensland Ombudsman may investigate complaints about Queensland state government departments, agencies and local councils. Government decision makers in Queensland are also required to apply human rights when acting and making decisions, and aggrieved individuals may complain to the QHRC. The Commonwealth Ombudsman's function is to receive and investigate complaints about administrative matters under Commonwealth law.

Complaints processes are generally free, and complainants do not require legal representation.

However, whilst such organisations may investigate, recommend and, in some cases, mediate a complaint, unlike a court or tribunal their decisions are not generally binding unless the parties agree, nor are they appealable.

Human Rights and Administrative Law in Queensland

The *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) (Human Rights Act) has enhanced the administrative law regime in Queensland.

The Human Rights Act provides statutory protections for 23 human rights and freedoms.

It requires that the Queensland Government (via public entities) act or make decisions in a way that is compatible with human rights and, in making decisions, give proper consideration to relevant human rights. See the *Human Rights Law in Queensland* chapter for a full discussion of what is included in the meaning of a 'public entity' under the Act.

The Human Rights Act establishes an external review option to a complaint-handling organisation, the QHRC.

The Human Rights Act has also changed the merits and judicial review framework in Queensland:

- for merits review—QCAT is a public entity when exercising merits review jurisdictions
- for judicial review—the Human Rights Act has expanded existing grounds of statutory review
- for both avenues of review—applicants may piggyback human-rights arguments onto their administrative appeals and judicial review applications, and QCAT and the Supreme Court must interpret laws in a way that is compatible with human rights.

See the *Complaints against Government—Judicial Review* and *Complaints against Government—Administrative Appeals* chapters for a more extensive examination of these changes.

Human rights may be relevant to the merits of a decision as well as whether the decision is lawful and procedurally correct. This means that a person aggrieved by the decision of a government entity may have grounds to complain to the QHRC, as well as a lawful basis to raise human-rights arguments in an administrative appeal or judicial review.

The Human Rights Act also improves the administrative law recourse available to individuals aggrieved by government decision making in Queensland. For example, a prisoner who may otherwise have no grounds to access administrative appeal or judicial review under the *Corrective Services Act 2006* (Qld) may now have grounds to lodge a complaint with the QHRC where government decision making contravenes their human rights.

However, there is no stand-alone legal remedy for contravention of the Human Rights Act. This means that a person who is complaining about a breach of their human rights cannot apply directly to a court or tribunal to resolve the complaint if it is not resolved in the QHRC. Human rights

arguments can only be raised in a tribunal or court where there is an existing complaints avenue available such as a right to administrative appeal or judicial review. Additionally, human rights are not absolute and may be limited and balanced in a way that is consistent with a free and democratic society based on human dignity, equality and freedom.

Before Commencing an Administrative Review

Before lodging a complaint about a government administrative decision, a person should:

- check whether a time limit applies to any review process
- find out what government entity is responsible for the decision
- access as much information as possible relevant to the decision
- work out the available administrative review avenues
- request and read the statement of reasons
- consider legal advice.

Find out what government entity is responsible

Before lodging a complaint about a government administrative decision, it is important to know which government department or entity is responsible for the decision. Different laws apply to the Commonwealth, state and local governments, and court proceedings must be started in the correct jurisdiction.

An easy way to distinguish between Commonwealth, state and local government agencies is to do an internet search of the relevant website or ring the agency and ask which government controls it. Alternatively, ask the Queensland or Commonwealth Ombudsman.

Access information relevant the decision

Guidelines, policy documents and instruction manuals are normally issued by departments to assist their officers in the performance of delegated functions. In framing a review of an administrative decision, it may be very important to see these documents, as they may contain incorrect interpretations of the law or may require some irrelevant or improper factors to be considered before administrative action is taken or a decision is made.

Information is often readily available through administrative access procedures. Search the government agency's website to see if the information is published, call or email the agency to ask for access. General information about where to direct enquiries for certain information may be obtained from the government enquiries line (in Queensland) or the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (for Commonwealth matters).

Where information is not freely available online or by request, it might be accessible to the public under right-to-information laws. The *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (Right to Information Act) and *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld) require Queensland government agencies to make information available to the public unless it is contrary to the public interest to give access. See the *Right to Information and Freedom Information* chapter for further information. For example, policy documents containing interpretations, rules, guidelines, statements of policy, practices or precedents must be made available to the public (s 20 Right to Information Act).

The Commonwealth *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (Cth) aims to give broad access to information held by Commonwealth Government agencies, and includes a requirement to both publish and facilitate access to information held by the government. The Office of the Australian Information Commissioner website has useful guidance about accessing information from the Commonwealth Government.

The refusal of access to information under right-to-information laws is an administrative decision that is generally reviewable.

Work out the available administrative review avenues

Available avenues for reviewing the act or decision should be set out in the governing legislation or policy that applies to the government department.

Generally speaking:

- where an internal review process exists, this must often be followed before an administrative appeal or judicial review can be commenced
- where the law or policy binding the government entity allows for an administrative appeal or merits review in an administrative tribunal, this can be utilised after the internal review
- where there is no external right of administrative appeal or merits review, generally the only means of challenging the decision will be judicial review to a court

- an external complaint to a complaint handling organisation such as an ombudsman or the Human Rights Commissioner may be considered at any stage, where a complaint right exists under the legislation governing that entity
- where there is no internal review, appeal or judicial review available, non-legal complaint options may be considered.

In order to determine whether there are grounds for merits review, judicial review or a complaint to an external organisation, it will often be necessary to check the governing legislation.

Relevant legislation, including Acts and Regulations that bind the government department or agency, is often available on the relevant entity's website, by contacting the government agency or relevant ombudsman. The complaints handling policy may also summarise relevant legislation.

Ombudsman and external complaints-handling organisations have comprehensive information circumstances in which they can accept a complaint about the actions or decisions of government on their websites.

Request the statement of reasons

A statement of reasons is designed to explain how a decision has been made. It should help the person affected by the decision to understand the reasons for the decision and will assist in deciding the appropriate course of review.

Administrative decision makers now routinely provide a statement of reasons with notification of their decisions. If the decision is subject to Queensland judicial review legislation, then the decision maker will be required to give reasons within 28 days of a request for reasons being made (s 38 Judicial Review Act). If the decision is reviewable in QCAT by way of administrative appeal, written reasons must accompany the decision (s 157 QCAT Act). Similar requirements exist under Commonwealth law.

If a decision maker fails to provide a statement of reasons within the required period, an application may be made to the court or tribunal for an order that a statement be provided.

Comprehensive guidance on obtaining a statement of decisions is set out in the *Complaints against Government—Judicial Review* and *Complaints against Government—Administrative Appeals* chapters.

Check time limits and consider legal advice

Time limits within which to make applications in relation to administrative decisions are relatively short, so it is important to find out the time limit and make the application within the time prescribed.

Review processes and time limits are generally set out in the governing legislation or the guidelines, and may be referred to in the statement of reasons, policy documents and instruction manuals relevant to the decision.

Time limits may apply to both internal and external review of a decision. Often if internal review processes have not been followed, an external review of the decision in a court or tribunal cannot be commenced. However, this may not be strictly applied in all cases.

Time limits also exist for complaints to external complaints organisation such as the QHRC.

Although tribunals and courts have the power to grant extensions of time to make applications for review, this power is discretionary and will normally only be granted in exceptional circumstances. If in any doubt about the relevant time limit or administrative law avenue to pursue, consult a solicitor.

Administrative Review of a Government Decision

A person aggrieved by a government decision or action may consider informal complaint avenues, merits review, administrative appeal, judicial review and/or complaint to an external complaints organisation.

Informal complaint

Before considering formal complaints options, an informal approach with the government agency concerned may be worthwhile, if time allows. Care must be taken to ensure that the informal process does not interfere with formal time limits if formal review processes are available for the decision.

An informal approach is inexpensive and may sort out the issue without further expense and time. At the very least, the position of the agency concerned should be clearer after a reply from the relevant department or minister.

Contacting the local member of parliament

A complaint to the local member of parliament can be useful, especially if no legal grounds for challenging an apparently unfair decision exist.

Contacting local interest and community groups

Where a decision of government affects a group of people, and there is unlikely to be a formal complaint avenue, joining or creating a community group can be a useful means of advocating for change.

Making an informal complaint to the government department or minister

A letter to the relevant government department or minister referring to any complaints policies and requesting a response within a specified time period can be useful.

To find out the relevant government minister for the department contact the government agency or relevant ombudsman.

Internal merits review

Many government departments have internal review processes, which allow a second decision maker to consider the merit of the decision. A successful internal review may result in a fresh decision being made. In cases where no administrative appeal exists, an internal merits review may be a cost-effective, timely and effective way of resolving the complaint.

Where an internal review is unsuccessful, particular attention should be paid to the timeframe within which an external administrative appeal or judicial review must be brought. This time limit is generally written in the decision letter or statement of reasons from the government department.

Where an internal merits review process exists, it often must be exhausted before an administrative appeal can be sought. For example, a person reviewing a decision by Blue Card Services not to issue a positive notice must first bring an internal merit review before commencing proceedings in QCAT.

Administrative appeal or judicial review

Avenues for challenging government decisions exist at a Queensland local law, state government and Commonwealth government level.

Before an application is made, it is important to find out whether there is an internal review process provided for in the relevant department or authority. Any internal review mechanisms should ordinarily be exhausted before an application is made to QCAT, the AAT or to a court for judicial review.

For further information *Complaints against Government—Judicial Review* and *Complaints against Government—Administrative Appeals* chapters.

Challenging Queensland local government decisions

In Queensland, the ultimate control of local councils rests with the Minister for Local Government and complaints about the actions of local councils are dealt with under Queensland law. Administrative decisions made by local government are subject to the rules of administrative law and, depending on the decision, may be reviewable internally through administrative appeal or judicial review.

Challenging Queensland Government decisions

Queensland State Government action may be challenged by:

- judicial review by the Supreme Court of Queensland
- appeal to QCAT, provided that QCAT has jurisdiction over the decision. A small number of state bodies are not subject to review in QCAT (e.g. the Mental Health Tribunal and the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission).

Challenging Commonwealth Government decisions

Commonwealth Government actions can be challenged by:

- judicial review by the High Court of Australia
- judicial review by the Federal Court of Australia or Federal Circuit and Magistrates Court
- application for review to the AAT where permitted.

External complaints organisations

A number of legislatively established independent organisations exist at a state and Commonwealth level to consider government actions and decision making. Review by these agencies can be considered alongside other avenues of administrative review.

Complaints against government departments may be made to the appropriate state or Commonwealth Ombudsman.

The Queensland Ombudsman

The Queensland Ombudsman can consider complaints about:

- Queensland Government organisation, including state schools and TAFE
- Queensland local council
- Queensland public university
- local governments
- public authorities

This is not an exhaustive list.

The Queensland Ombudsman may investigate and consult with the government organisation and make non-binding recommendations.

The Commonwealth Ombudsman

The Commonwealth Ombudsman can consider complaints about Australian Government agencies including:

- Australia Post
- the Department of Social Services
- the Australian Taxation Office
- the Australian Federal Police.

The Commonwealth Ombudsman may gather information, give an explanation and make non-binding suggestions for how the agency can act in future.

The Queensland Human Rights Commission

In Queensland, a person who believes that the action or decision by the government department was discriminatory or failed to consider their human rights, may also complain to the QHRC.

The Queensland Human Rights Commissioner can consider complaints under the Human Rights Act against public entities (including the Queensland Government, departments and local governments)

that are acting or making decisions in a way that is not compatible with human rights, or failing to give proper consideration to a human right that is relevant to the decision.

The Queensland Human Rights Commissioner may conduct a conciliation conference and publish de-identified reports about the complaint and recommendations for the public entity to act compatibly with human rights.

The Crime and Corruption Commission

The Crime and Corruption Commission handles complaints about corrupt conduct and some complaints about police.

The Office of the Information Commissioner

This office handles decisions of Queensland government agencies and ministers in relation to information access and amendment, as well as breaches of privacy.

The Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

This office handles complaints about the handling of personal information by a Commonwealth government agency.

Legal Notices

Disclaimer

The Queensland Law Handbook is produced by Caxton Legal Centre with the assistance of volunteers with legal experience in Queensland. The Handbook is intended to give general information about the law in Queensland as at the date stated on each page. The content of the Queensland Law Handbook does not constitute legal advice, and if you have a specific legal problem, you should consult a professional legal advisor.

External links

The Queensland Law Handbook provides links to a number of other websites which are not under the control of Caxton Legal Centre. These links have been provided for convenience only and may be subject to updates, revisions or other changes by the entities controlling or owning those sites. The inclusion of the link does not imply that Caxton Legal Centre endorses the content, the site owner or has any relationship with the site owner.

Limitation of liability

To the maximum extent permitted by law, Caxton Legal Centre and the contributors to the Queensland Law Handbook are not responsible for, and do not accept any liability for, any loss, damage or injury, financial or otherwise, suffered by any person acting or relying on information contained in or omitted from the Queensland Law Handbook.

Copyright