

# LIST G BARRISTERS

## Adam Segal



A banking and insolvency specialist with a commercial practice, Adam is an experienced trial and appellate advocate

---

### QUALIFICATIONS

Bachelor of Economics  
Bachelor of Laws (Hons)

### CORRESPONDENCE

P 03 9225 8558  
E [adam.segal@vicbar.com.au](mailto:adam.segal@vicbar.com.au)

### CHAMBERS

Owen Dixon Chambers West  
Level 23 Room 14  
525 Lonsdale Street  
Melbourne VIC 3000

---

### COMMERCIAL LAW

Appellate | Banking & Finance | Bankruptcy | Contractual Disputes | Corporate Insolvency | Corporations & Securities | Equity & Trusts | Real Property | Residential & Retail Tenancies

### TORT LAW

Professional Negligence

Adam joined the Bar in 2006. Prior to coming to the Bar, Adam worked as a solicitor in Melbourne and in London. Adam was a Senior Associate at Mallesons and Legal Counsel for Barclays Bank PLC.

Adam has developed a broad practice in general commercial litigation. He also has specialist expertise in bankruptcy and insolvency, corporations, banking and property law. Adam is the current editor of Bankruptcy: Federal Civil Litigation Precedents (Lexis Nexis).

Adam's expertise is recognised as a Leading Junior Counsel in Victoria by Doyle's Guide in two categories; in Insolvency and Restructuring, and in Commercial Litigation and Dispute Resolution.

Adam is also recognised in *The Legal 500 (Legalease)* for his expertise in Commercial Disputes and in *Best Lawyers in Australia* for his work in Banking and Finance Law and in Litigation.

Adam is a nationally accredited mediator under the Australian Mediator and Dispute Resolution Accreditation Standards (AMDRAS) and works hard to achieve commercial resolutions.

Adam's instructors find him to be an approachable and intellectual barrister who enjoys the camaraderie of the people he works with.

*Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation*

## Recent Cases

### NOTABLE CASES

Notable cases which Adam has appeared in recently include:

*Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Keystone Asset Management Limited (Receivers and Managers appointed) (in liquidation) (No 4)* [2026] FCA 89 – appeared with Mark James at the hearing of an application to set aside subpoenas which had been issued by the Receivers to various banks. While the subpoenas were held to be not relevant to any issue currently before the Court, the subpoenas were not set aside in light of the broad powers of receivers to identify and secure property of the company.

*Re Keystone Asset Management Limited (in liq)* [2026] VSC 25 – appeared for the plaintiff where the Court made orders for the transfer of proceedings to the Federal Court of Australia pursuant to s1337H of the *Corporations Act* 2001 (Cth). The Court noted the contrast between the transfer regime under the *Corporations Act* and the cross-vesting legislation (which was not applicable). The proceeding was transferred because of the overlap of issues already before the Federal Court and the risk of inconsistent findings, as well as other potential efficiencies.

[\*Wight \(liquidator\), in the matter of Responsible Entity Services Limited \(in liquidation\)\* \[2025\] FCA 1219](#) – appeared for the liquidators to successfully obtain directions as to reasonableness and appropriateness of dealings under s 90-15 of the *Insolvency Practice Schedule (Corporations)* and orders under s477(2A) of the *Corporations Act* 2001 (Cth). The judgment helpfully considered the meaning of “compromise a debt” and made observations as to whether a “compromise” was involved where the compromise concerned modifying or releasing a security interest.

*Re WEII Pty Ltd (in liquidation)* [2025] VSC (12/9/25) – appeared for liquidators to successfully obtain ex parte freezing orders and ancillary orders against the defendant and related parties where steps had been taken to transfer assets from the defendant to her parents and their related companies where there was a danger or real risk that assets would be dealt with in a way that would prevent recovery.

[Geron \(Bankrupt\) v Cull \(Trustee\), in the matter of Geron \[2025\] FedCFamC2G 1044](#) – appeared on behalf of the Trustee in Bankruptcy to successfully obtain an order for security for costs. The applicant was an undischarged bankrupt residing overseas who had commenced proceedings seeking an annulment of his bankruptcy.

*Keystone Asset Management Limited (Receivers and Managers appointed) (in liquidation) v Filippini* [2025] FCA 604 – Appeared at the hearing of an application for a stay of proceedings where criminal prosecution of the first respondent (Mr Filippini) and the eighth respondent (Mr Chiodo) was a “reasonable possibility” based on the evidence of ongoing investigations by ASIC and issued search warrants. Ultimately, while criminal prosecution was a realistic possibility, the Court held that it was not appropriate to stay the proceeding while there were further steps that could take place without causing prejudice to the respondents’ accusatorial rights.

*Cull (Trustee), in the matter of Houghton (Bankrupt)* [2025] FedCFamC2G 709 – appeared on behalf of the Trustee in Bankruptcy at the hearing of an ex parte application under s146 of the *Bankruptcy Act* 1966 (Cth) where no statement of affairs filed by the Bankrupt with the Official Receiver. Orders were made that the distribution of dividends proceed as if the Bankrupt had filed a statement of affairs as required by the Act.

*Re Torbeckin Pty Ltd (in liq) (Intervention)* [2025] VSC 237 – appeared on behalf of the Liquidators to resist an application for leave to intervene - Applicant sought orders for leave to intervene as interested party. The application was refused on the basis that, inter alia, any submission or evidence relied upon by applicant would not assist Court in reaching correct determination of relevant issues.

*Re Torbeckin Pty Ltd (in liq) (Stay* [2025] VSC 234 - appeared on behalf of the Liquidators to resist an application for a stay of costs orders. In resisting the application the Court determined that it was *functus officio* and did not have jurisdiction to entertain further application for, or to simply reconsider, stay of cost orders sought by applicant who was second respondent in substantive proceeding. Further, even if it did have jurisdiction, the Court should exercise discretion to refuse to stay the cost orders obtained in favour of the Liquidators.

*Cheung v Aust Landing Group Pty Ltd & Anor* [2025] VSC 139 – appeared on behalf of the plaintiff in a dispute which arose resulting from unsuccessful property venture. The subject property was purchased by respondent, company. In the proceeding, the plaintiff sought relief for oppression under ss232 – 3 of the *Corporations Act* 2001. In response, there was a counterclaim for repayment by applicant of various sums paid to the plaintiff. In determining the counterclaim, the Court considered the principles of issue estoppel and director authority.

[Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Hopkins \[2024\] FCA 1371](#) – appeared on behalf of liquidators to ensure that they were also appointed as the receivers and managers over the unregistered managed investment schemes which had previously been operated by the company now in liquidation. ASIC had sought pecuniary penalties and disqualification orders against Sascha Hopkins who had previously operated property investment schemes under the “The A Team Property Group”.

[Re Lendly Pty Ltd \[2024\] VSC 540](#) – appeared on behalf of the plaintiff (minor shareholder) in a complex oppression proceeding under s232-3 of the *Corporations Act* 2001. Each party had made allegations of oppression against the other. Only the plaintiff’s allegations of oppression succeeded. Following a joint expert conclave, orders were made for the majority shareholder to buy out the plaintiff at fair value, taking in the current market value of the novated leasing business. The plaintiff also successfully demonstrated that the majority’s shareholders director had breached his duties as a director under s181(1)(b) and 182 resulting in a significant compensation order being made.

*In the matter of Parwan Valley Mushrooms Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2024] FCA 1164 – appeared on behalf on the liquidators to successfully obtain an order for the issue of an arrest warrant. A summons have been issued by the Court for

the public examination of a director pursuant to s596A of the *Corporations Act* and the director failed to attend at the hearing.

*In the matter of Parwan Valley Mushrooms Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2024] FCA 1164 – appeared on behalf of the liquidations in a derivative leave application pursuant to the Court’s inherent jurisdiction. The second defendant (a guarantor) sought leave to file a defence and counterclaim on behalf of the company in liquidation (principal borrower). The proposed application was opposed on the basis that there was no solid foundation for the proposed claims and no indemnity was offered. The application was successfully resisted.

[\*Secure Funding Pty Ltd v Torbeckin Pty Ltd \(in liq\)\* \[2024\] VSC 609](#) – appeared on behalf of the liquidators (as interveners) to successfully obtain an order for costs on the basis that their attendance was necessary to protect their interests. Also obtained an order for a gross sum costs order.

*Scott Trustee v Maher, in the matter of bankrupt estate of Maher* [2024] FCA 831 - appeared for a former partner in a long standing farming partnership dispute. The partnership was dissolved upon the bankruptcy of one of the former partners. The trustee in bankruptcy commenced proceedings for the sale of properties owned by the former partners. The application was successful in having a receiver appointed over the assets of the partnership and satisfied the Court that it had jurisdiction to make those orders.

*Cull (Trustee), in the matter of Holmes (Bankrupt)* [2024] FedCFamC2G 432 – appeared for the bankruptcy trustee to obtain orders under s146 of the *Bankruptcy Act* 1966 (Cth) for distribution of dividends in circumstances where no statement of affairs had been filed by the Bankrupt.

*Cull v Singh* [2024] FCA 258 – appeared for the trustee in bankruptcy (applicant) in successfully obtaining vexatious proceedings orders under s37AO of the *Federal Court of Australia Act* 1976 against the bankrupt respondent. The respondent had commenced proceedings that constituted abuses of court processes, including commencing proceedings against judicial officers who had delivered adverse judgments against him, as well as relitigating matters that had been decided adversely to him.

*Fidge v Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd and Moderna Australia Pty Ltd* [2024] FCA 161 – appeared on behalf of the second respondent (Moderna). The Applicant commenced proceedings for injunctive relief against the Respondents, the two largest distributors of COVID-19 vaccinations in Australia on the basis that the vaccinations contained GMOs (genetically modified organisms) without a licence in contravention of the *Gene Technology Act* 2000 (Cth) (**GTA**). The Respondents successfully brought applications for summary dismissal under s31A(2) of the *Federal Court of Australia Act* 1976 (Cth) on the basis that the Applicant was not an “*aggrieved person*” within the meaning of s 147(1) of the *GTA* and therefore lacked standing to bring the application.

*Vouris (liquidator) v Johnson, in the matter of Zivaust Pty Ltd (deed administrator appointed)* [2024] FCA 150 – appeared for the applicant in relation to an application for directions as to whether certain shares formed part of a Deed Fund under a deed of company arrangement.

*Chiodo Corporation Pty Ltd v Coolangatta & Tweed Heads Golf Club Ltd* [2023] FCA 1566 – appeared with Jonathan Moore KC on behalf of the applicant to obtain an injunction to restrain the respondent from conducting a vote of members at an EGM to execute a proposed development agreement on the basis that the material distributed to members was potentially misleading or deceptive within the meaning of the *Australian Consumer Law*.

[\*Wight, in the matter of Verve Portraits Pty Ltd \(administrators appointed\)\* \[2023\] FCA 1014](#) – appeared on behalf of the administrators in the Federal Court of Australia. The Administrators had been appointed over a corporate trustee and sought to be appointed as receivers of trust assets – administrators sought to effect sale of business as

a going concern. The administrators also sought direction that they be justified in treating the property in the name of the company as property of the trust.

[\*Sino Group International Limited, in the matter of Toddler Kindy Gymparoo Pty Ltd \(in liq\) v Toddler Kindy Gymparoo Pty Ltd \(in liq\) \[2023\] FCA 904\*](#) – appeared in the Federal Court of Australia on behalf of the plaintiff creditors to seek the appointment of replacement liquidators where deed of company arrangement terminated by the Court. The former deed administrators (who had become the liquidators) had informed the Court that they intended to resign and were acting in a caretaker capacity. The director opposed the application of the plaintiff creditors and put forward alternate liquidators. The Court held that it was appropriate for the Court, rather than creditors to appoint a new liquidator and determined that the plaintiff creditors' nomination was appropriate.

*Sino Group International Limited v Toddler Kindy Gymparoo Pty Ltd [2023] (Final Orders) FCAFC 119* - appeared in the Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia following the handing down of the appeal. On behalf of the appellant, sought and obtained orders under s 43 of the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 (Cth)* and/or s 90-15 of the *Insolvency Practice Schedule (Corporations)* that the deed administrators should be deprived of indemnity out of assets of the company for costs they are ordered to pay and their own costs of conducting the proceedings on the basis that the costs were a consequence of their own conduct.

[\*Sino Group International Limited v Toddler Kindy Gymparoo Pty Ltd \(2023\) 168 ACSR 311\*](#) - appeared with Philip Crutchfield KC in the Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia at the hearing of the appeal. At first instance, the trial judge dismissed the application to terminate the deed of company arrangement (DOCA) pursuant to s 445D(1) of the *Corporations Act 2001 (Cth)*. The Full Court overturned the decision and terminated the DOCA on the basis that the statement in the Administrators' Report to the effect that it was estimated that unrelated creditor would receive a dividend of 100 cents in the dollar under the proposed DOCA was misleading. Further, at trial, the 'aide memoire' handed up by the Deed Administrators' counsel seeking to explain the effect of deeds of subordination executed by related creditors after the first day of trial was found to have led the trial judge into error as it obscured the significance of the subordination deeds from the trial judge in terms of the impact these deeds had on the unrelated creditors' likely recovery if the DOCA was terminated.

[\*Wang v HMG Capital Pty Ltd \(No 2\) \[2023\] VSC 399\*](#) – appeared with Jonathon Moore KC on behalf of the defendants in the Supreme Court of Victoria. The claim arose after the plaintiff had sold his share in a company, which itself had shares in an indoor leisure entertainment business (Latitude Australia). The case principally concerned allegations of breach of contract arising from the share sale agreement and related contracts. In particular, it was alleged that there was an implied terms to maintain and preserve the value of security granted and obligations of good faith. Allegations of misleading or deceptive conduct in the pre-contractual negotiations were also made. The claim was dismissed.

*Cull v Davies [2023] FCA 763* – appeared on behalf of the bankruptcy trustee in the Federal Court of Australia to obtain ex parte interlocutory freezing orders where the proceeds of the sale of the former matrimonial property had been transferred by the bankrupt (ex-wife) to the first respondent after she had been served with a bankruptcy notice.

*Meletsis v Yeo (in his capacity as trustee of the bankrupt estate of Karas (2023) 412 ALR 68* – appeared with Stewart Maiden KC in the Full Court of the Federal Court of Australia at the hearing of the appeal. The plaintiffs, as the trustees of the bankrupt estate had also taken an assignment of the "right, title and interest" of 70 Nicholson Street Pty Ltd (in liq) in all causes of action against the defendants, arising out of, or relating to, dealings in a property at 70-74 Nicholson Street, Fitzroy. On the assigned claims, the trustees successfully demonstrated that the defendants had carried out a concerted plan to transfer the Nicholson St property in order to avoid potential

claims of creditors to the benefit of themselves. The trustees also successfully demonstrated as against Mr Karas that his personal mortgage was discharged for nil consideration and that the discharge is void as against the trustees pursuant to ss 120 and 121(1) of the *Bankruptcy Act 1966* (Cth), alternatively an alienation of property with intent to defraud creditors of the bankrupt and void as against the trustees under s 172 of the *Property Law Act 1958* (Vic).

*Roberts v Carrafa (Trustee), in the matter of Roberts (Bankrupt)* [2023] FedCFamC2G 463 – appeared on behalf of the bankruptcy trustee in the Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia to successfully resist an application that the bankruptcy trustee had a conflict of interest or perceived conflict of interest from acting as the bankruptcy trustee. The applicant had contended where the bankruptcy trustee were also the trustee in bankruptcy of the estranged spouse of the bankrupt.

*Cull (Trustee), in the matter of Cuthbertson (Bankrupt) v Cuthbertson* [2023] FedCFamC2G 442 – appeared on behalf of the bankruptcy trustee in the Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia to obtain declaratory relief and orders for possession of delivery up of property which had vested in the bankruptcy trustee pursuant to sections 58 and 132 of the *Bankruptcy Act 1966* (Cth).

*In the matter of All in One Contracting Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2023] VSC 330 – appeared in the Supreme Court of Victoria on behalf of the plaintiff liquidator at the hearing of an application to enable the liquidator to realise trust assets. The corporate trustee, which had only acted as a trustee, was now a bare trustee in circumstances where the trust deed contained an automatic removal clause upon the company going into liquidation.

*National Australia Bank v Trani & Anor* [2023] VSC 142 – appeared in the Supreme Court of Victoria on behalf of the plaintiff bank at the hearing of an appeal against the refusal to set aside default judgment where the defendant borrower sought to raise issues concerning the *Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006 (the Charter)* and allegations that the lender had ‘securitised the mortgage’.

*Dixon (Liquidator), in the matter of Victoria Project Pty Ltd v Austhome Group Pty Ltd* (2023) 167 ACSR 609 – appeared in the Federal Court of Australia on behalf of the majority shareholders of the company. The proceeding concerned, in part, an application by the liquidator as to the enforceability and the proper construction of an indemnity clause in a deed of settlement which provided that one shareholder would indemnify the company if the “Costs of the Liquidation” (as defined) exceeded the Costs Cap. There was also a cross-claim by the indemnifying shareholder for misleading or deceptive conduct against representations made by the liquidator that he would cap his fees in the liquidation. The Court rejected the liquidator’s claim that the indemnifying clause was void for uncertainty and in giving the clause its proper construction also determined that the scope of the indemnity clause did not include expenses that the company would have incurred in any event in the conduct of its business as a property developer and landlord if a liquidator had not been appointed.

*Rambaldi (Trustee) v Meletsis, in the matter of the bankrupt estate of Karas (No 4)* [2022] FCA 1516 – appeared with Stewart Maiden KC in the Federal Court of Australia. On behalf of the Trustees, and in circumstances where judgment had been given in favour of the Trustees and where freezing orders had also been made against the defendants, the Trustees were successful in obtaining orders pursuant to s57 of the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* (Cth) for the appointment of interim receivers and managers of properties controlled by the defendants pending the determination of an appeal by the Full Court. In the circumstances, including the concerns about the compliance with the freezing orders and the limited impact of the appointment of interim receivers, the Court determined that it was justified in making orders for the appointment of interim receivers.

*Re W.W. Property Development Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2022] VSC 607 – appeared in the Supreme Court of Victoria on

behalf of the liquidators who sought and obtained an order for the release of funds previously paid into Court by the company (Funds). Previously, the company had been ordered to pay the Funds into Court out of total net proceeds of the sale of property lots. After their appointment, the liquidators sought the release of the Funds on the basis that the respondents (plaintiffs) were unsecured creditors who had no interest in the Funds and that the Funds were not subject of any pre-existing security of property in favour of respondents being made in respect of Company's assets. In the circumstances, the proper characterisation of the payment of the Funds was that they were paid into Court as an alternative to a freezing order and so did not create an interest (proprietary or otherwise) in those funds in favour of the respondents.

*Sino Group International Ltd & Anor v Toddler Kindy Gymparoo Pty Ltd (admins apptd) and others* (2022) 160 ACSR 568 – appeared with Michael Gronow KC in the Federal Court of Australia. On behalf of the substantial creditors of the company, an application was made to have a deed of company arrangement (DOCA) terminated pursuant to s 75-41 of the *Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations) 2016* (Cth) and alternatively, s445D and/or s445G of the *Corporations Act 2001*.

Consideration as to whether to set aside or terminate the DOCA focused on two main issues; Firstly, whether the administrators report to creditors provided materially misleading information to creditors and/or there was such an omission from the Report, in that the estimated return to participating creditors under the DOCA would not be 100 cents in the dollar. Secondly, whether there would likely be a return to the company's creditors on a winding up that was better than under the DOCA. The application was unsuccessful, and the appeal against the dismissal of the application was heard in November 2022. The appeal was successful.

*Rambaldi v Meletsis, in the matter of Karas (Bankrupt)* (2022) 157 ACSR 652 – appeared with Stewart Maiden KC in the Federal Court of Australia. An appeal was heard against the judgment in November 2022 and was subsequently dismissed.

*Rambaldi (Trustee) v Sumpton, in the matter of the Bankrupt Estate of Sumpton* [2021] FCA 1119 – appeared in the Federal Court of Australia for the applicants, who were the trustees of the bankrupt estate of the Respondent. The Trustees sought and obtained ex parte freezing orders and ancillary orders to preserve the Trustees' interest in foreign company shares for the benefit of the creditors.

*Ganesh v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2021] VSCA 45 - appeared in the Court of Appeal at the hearing of the appeal to set aside an order discontinuing the proceeding after the plaintiff elected not to proceed with its claim. There was a complex procedural history relating to a counterclaim pursued by the self-represented litigant defendants. Consideration was also given to the entitlement of self-represented litigants to costs orders following the decision of the High Court of Australia in *Bell Lawyers v Pentelow*.

*Joint v Program IT Pty Ltd & Ors* [2020] VSC 867 and [2020] VSC 486 - Appeared on behalf of the Defendants in oppression proceedings which concerned claim by applicant for purchase of shares in respondent company by third respondent at price to be determined by Court. The claim involved allegations of oppressive conduct in that second respondent director paid excessive remuneration to himself and family which had effect of reducing profit of company. An issue in the proceeding concerned the decision to appoint an administrator and whether this should be set aside under s447A of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth).

*Queenfield Pty Ltd v Gordon Finance Pty Ltd & Ors* [2020] VSCA 282 – appeared with Hamish Austin KC in the Court of Appeal to successfully resist an appeal from a decision permitting the rectification of a Sale of Units Deed. The trial judge had found that the parties had a common intention that deed included term that intercompany loans be assigned to second respondent as trustee for family trust. The Court of Appeal held that the trial judge did not err

in finding that there was a sufficiently clear common intention to exclude loans from sale. Further, there was no error in granting relief in the form of an assignment of a debt to a debtor in circumstances where the effect would cause the intercompany loans to be released.

*Fernandez v EJ Industries Ltd* [2020] VSCA 139 - appeared in the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria at the hearing of an application for leave to set aside summary judgment. The application was successfully resisted on the basis that, inter alia, the alternative claim for money had and received was not inconsistent with the contractual loan arrangements applying the principles in *Mann v Paterson Constructions Pty Ltd* and *Lumbers v W Cook Builders Pty Ltd (in liq)*.

*Ganesh v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2020] VSCA 39 - appeared in the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Victoria at the hearing of an application for leave to set aside an order dismissing the proceeding on the grounds that a counterclaim was still on foot at the time that the plaintiff sought to discontinue its claim against the defendants.

*Queenfield Pty Ltd v Gordon Finance Pty Ltd & Ors* (2019) 60 VR 118 and [2020] VSC 292 – appeared with Hamish Austin KC in the Supreme Court of Victoria to successfully defend a debt claim on the basis that the parties shared a common intention which required the Sale of Units Deed to be rectified accordingly. At the time the Sale of Units Deed was executed, the Trustee's books recorded various intercompany loans. The claim was brought by the Trustee of a Unit Trust against a unitholder and a related party. The Court was also required to consider a defence based on conventional estoppel and whether, based on pre-contractual negotiations, the plaintiff should be estopped from demanding repayment of the debts.

#### GENERAL COMMERCIAL/CORPORATIONS CASES

*Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Keystone Asset Management Limited (Receivers and Managers appointed) (in liquidation) (No 4)* [2026] FCA 89

*Re Keystone Asset Management Limited (in liq)* [2026] VSC 25

*Keystone Asset Management Limited (Receivers and Managers appointed) (in liquidation) v Filippini* [2025] FCA 604

*Cheung v Aust Landing Group Pty Ltd & Anor* [2025] VSC 139

[Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Hopkins](#) [2024] FCA 1371

[Re Lendly Pty Ltd](#) [2024] VSC 540

*Fidge v Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd and Moderna Australia Pty Ltd* [2024] FCA 161

*Chiodo Corporation Pty Ltd v Coolangatta & Tweed Heads Golf Club Ltd* [2023] FCA 1566

[Wang v HMG Capital Pty Ltd \(No 2\)](#) [2023] VSC 399

*Wang v HMG Capital Pty Ltd* [2022] VSC 748

*Rambaldi (Trustee) v Meletsis, in the matter of the bankrupt estate of Karas (No 3)* [2022] FCA 807

*Asparq Consolidated Pty Ltd v Chameron Pty Ltd & Ors* [2021] VSC 697

*Queenfield Pty Ltd v Gordon Finance Pty Ltd & Ors* [2020] VSCA 282

*Joint v Program IT Pty Ltd & Ors* [2020] VSC 867 and [2020] VSC 486

*Fernandez v EJ Industries Ltd* [2020] VSCA 139

*Queenfield Pty Ltd v Gordon Finance Pty Ltd & Ors* (2019) 60 VR 118 and [2020] VSC 292 *Gordon Nominees Pty Ltd v JPA Finance Pty Ltd* [2019] HCATrans 248

*Pages Property Investments Pty Ltd v Boros* [2019] NSWSC 1778

*JPA Finance Pty Ltd v Gordon Nominees Pty Ltd* [2019] VSC 171 and [2019] VSCA 159

*Grace Christian Chapel v Canaan Holdings Pty Ltd* [2019] VSC 5

*Pages Property Investments Pty Ltd v Boros* [2018] NSWCA 269 and [2018] NSWSC 986

*Vasudevan & Ors v Becon Constructions (Aust) Pty Ltd & Anor* (2014) 41 VR 445

*Stamford Aus-Trade & Press Pty Ltd v Aloysius David Pty Ltd & Anor (No 2)* [2014] VSC 436

*Stamford Aus-Trade & Press Pty Ltd v Aloysius David Pty Ltd & Anor* [2014] VSC 324

*Black v Rafa Pastoral Pty Ltd & Ors* [2013] VSC 317

*Casama Group Pty Ltd v Four Sisters Pty Ltd & Ors* [2012] VSC 376

*City of Canning v Avon Capital Estates (Australia) Ltd* [2012] WASC 410

*Vigliaroni v CPS Investment Holdings Pty Ltd* (2009) 74 ACSR 282

*Australian Securities and Investments Commission v HLP Financial Planning (Aust) Pty Ltd* (2007) 164 FCR 487

**BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY CASES**

[\*Wight \(liquidator\), in the matter of Responsible Entity Services Limited \(in liquidation\)\* \[2025\] FCA 1219](#)

*Re WEI Pty Ltd (in liquidation)* [2025] VSC (12/9/25)

[\*Geron \(Bankrupt\) v Cull \(Trustee\), in the matter of Geron\* \[2025\] FedCFamC2G 1044](#)

*Cull (Trustee), in the matter of Houghton (Bankrupt)* [2025] FedCFamC2G 709

*Re Torbeckin Pty Ltd (in liq) (Intervention)* [2025] VSC 237

*Re Torbeckin Pty Ltd (in liq) (Stay)* [2025] VSC 234

*In the matter of Parwan Valley Mushrooms Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2024] FCA 1164

*Scott (Trustee) v Maher, in the matter of bankrupt estate of Maher* [2024] FCA 922

[\*Scott \(Trustee\) v Maher, in the matter of bankrupt estate of Maher\* \[2024\] FCA 831](#)

*Cull (Trustee), in the matter of Holmes (Bankrupt)* [2024] FedCFamC2G 432

*Cull v Singh* [2024] FCA 258

*Vouris (liquidator) v Johnson, in the matter of Zivaust Pty Ltd (deed administrator appointed)* [2024] FCA 150

[\*Wight, in the matter of Verve Portraits Pty Ltd \(administrators appointed\)\* \[2023\] FCA 1014](#)

[\*Sino Group International Limited, in the matter of Toddler Kindy Gymparoo Pty Ltd \(in liq\) v Toddler Kindy\*](#)

[Gymbaroo Pty Ltd \(in liq\) \[2023\] FCA 904](#)

*Sino Group International Limited v Toddler Kindy Gymbaroo Pty Ltd* (Final Orders) [2023] FCAFC 119

[Sino Group International Limited v Toddler Kindy Gymbaroo Pty Ltd \[2023\] FCAFC 110](#)

*Cull v Davies* [2023] FCA 763

*Meletsis v Yeo (in his capacity as trustee of the bankrupt estate of Karas)* [2023] FCAFC 93

*Roberts v Carrafa (Trustee), in the matter of Roberts (Bankrupt)* [2023] FedCFamC2G 463

*Cull (Trustee), in the matter of Cuthbertson (Bankrupt) v Cuthbertson* [2023] FedCFamC2G 442

*In the matter of All in One Contracting Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2023] VSC 330

*Dixon (Liquidator), in the matter of Victoria Project Pty Ltd v Austhome Group Pty Ltd* (2023) 167 ACSR 609

*Re W.W. Property Development Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2022] VSC 607

*Re W.W. Property Development Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2022] VSC 606

*Rambaldi (Trustee) v Meletsis, in the matter of the bankrupt estate of Karas (No 4)* [2022] FCA 1516

*Sino Group International Ltd & Anor v Toddler Kindy Gymbaroo Pty Ltd (admins apptd) and others* (2022) 160 ACSR 568

*Rambaldi v Meletsis, in the matter of Karas (Bankrupt)* (2022) 157 ACSR 652

*Rambaldi (Trustee) v Sumpton, in the matter of the Bankrupt Estate of Sumpton* [2021] FCA 1119

*Rambaldi v Meletsis, in the matter of Karas (Bankrupt)* [2018] FCA 791

*HunterStone Pty Ltd (in liq) & Ors v Azad Mortazavi & Anor* [2018] VSC 261

*AshtonLomax v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2017] VCC 1231

*In the matter of Aced Kang Investments Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2017] FCA 476

*Modeca Investments Pty Ltd v Commonwealth Bank of Australia* [2017] VSC 119

*Ky Stockfeeds Pty Ltd v Kelvy* [2015] FCCA 3567

*BKA Practice Co Pty Ltd trading as Belleli King & Associates v Viking Group Holdings Pty Ltd (in liq) & Anor* [2015] VSC 699

*Yeo & Anor v Lenny's Commercial Kitchens Pty Ltd* [2015] VSC 539

*Viking Group Holdings Pty Ltd (in liq) & Anor v BKA Practice Co Pty Ltd trading as Belleli King & Associates* [2015] VSC 485

*Chan v Four C Realty Pty Ltd (in liq)* (2013) 95 ACSR 666

*Chan v Four C Realty Pty Ltd (in liq)* [2013] FCA 928

*Management 3 Group Pty Ltd (in liq) v Lenny's Commercial Kitchens Pty Ltd (No 3)* (2011) 278 ALR 754

*Management 3 Group Pty Ltd (in liq) v Lenny's Commercial Kitchens Pty Ltd (No 2)* (2011) 281 ALR 482

*Management 3 Group Pty Ltd (in liq) v Lenny's Commercial Kitchens Pty Ltd* [2011] FCA 662

*Re-Engine Pty Ltd (in liq) v Fergusson & Ors* (2007) 209 FLR 1

**BANKING AND FINANCE CASES**

[Secure Funding Pty Ltd v Torbeckin Pty Ltd \(in liq\) \[2024\] VSC 571](#)

[Secure Funding Pty Ltd v Torbeckin Pty Ltd \(in liq\) \[2024\] VSC 609](#)

*National Australia Bank v Trani & Anor* [2023] VSC 142

*Ganesh v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2021] VSCA 45

*Ganesh v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2020] VSCA 39

*Iloski v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2020] VCAT 124

*Iloski v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2019] VCAT 1039

*Ganesh v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2018] VSCA 224

*National Australia Bank Ltd v Ganesh & Ors* [2016] VSC 738

*National Australia Bank Ltd v Sgargetta* [2014] VCC 1883

*National Australia Bank Ltd v Sgargetta* [2014] VCC 48

*Thompson v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2013] VSC 400

*Norman v National Australia Bank Ltd* [2012] HCATrans 171

*National Australia Bank Ltd v Lawrence* [2011] VSC 556

*National Australia Bank Limited v Koller* [2011] VSC 228

*Siwicki v National Australia Bank Limited* [2010] VSC 547

*Popal v Accounts Control Management Services Pty Ltd & Anor* [2010] VSC 412

**PROPERTY LAW CASES**

*TL Rentals Pty Ltd v Youth on Call Pty Ltd* [2018] VSC 105

*Lakeland Plaza Pty Ltd v PNL Nominees Pty Ltd* [2017] VCC 1124

*National Australia Bank Ltd v Sgargetta* [2015] VSC 537

*National Australia Bank Ltd v Waldron* [2015] VSC 141

*Essendon Apartment Developments Pty Ltd (in liq) v Long & Ors* [2013] VSC 210

*Yeo v Brassil* [2010] VSC 344