

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VICTORIA AT BALLARAT COMMON LAW DIVISION MAJOR TORTS LIST

BETWEEN

MICHAEL KARL SCHMID

and

Plaintiff

Filed on: 18/06/2019 05:10 PM

ROGER JAMES SKIMMING & ORS (ACCORDING TO THE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

and

Defendants

HARLEY INDUSTRIAL PTY LTD (ACN 115 230 905)

Third Party

AMENDED THIRD PARTY NOTICE

(Pursuant to the Orders of Judicial Registrar Clayton dated 6 June 2019)

Date of document: 5 June 2019

Filed on behalf of: The Fourth Defendant

Prepared by:

Hall & Wilcox

Lawyers

Level 11, Rialto South Tower

525 Collins Street

MELBOURNE VIC 3000

Solicitors code: 163

DX 320

Telephone no. +61 3 9603 3555

Fax: +61 3 9670 9632

Attention: Kate Lawford

Email: kate.lawford@hallandwilcox.com.au

KALM PM 142042

TO HARLEY INDUSTRIAL PTY LTD (ACN 115 230 905)

TAKE NOTICE that the plaintiff has brought this proceeding against the defendants for the claim set out in the writ and statement of claim served herewith.

AND TAKE NOTICE that the fourth defendant disputes the plaintiff's claim on the grounds set out in the fourth defendant's defence served herewith, and claims to be entitled to relief against you on the grounds set out in the statement of claim indorsed on this notice.

IF YOU INTEND TO DISPUTE the plaintiff's claim against the fourth defendant, or the fourth defendant's claim against you, **YOU MUST GIVE NOTICE** of your intention by filing an appearance within the proper time for appearance stated below.

YOU OR YOUR SOLICITOR may file the appearance. An appearance is filed by-

- (a) filing a "Notice of Appearance" in the Prothonotary's office, 436 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne, or, where the writ has been filed in the office of a Deputy Prothonotary, in the office of that Deputy Prothonotary; and
- (b) on the day you file the Notice, serving a copy, sealed by the Court, at the fourth defendant's address for service, which is set out at the end of this notice.

IF YOU FAIL to file an appearance within the proper time you will be taken to admit the validity of any judgment against the fourth defendant and your own liability to the fourth defendant to the extent claimed in the statement of claim indorsed on this notice, and the fourth defendant may OBTAIN JUDGMENT AGAINST YOU without further notice.

THE PROPER TIME TO FILE AN APPEARANCE is as follows—

- (a) where you are served with the notice in Victoria, within 10 days after service;
- (b) where you are served with the notice out of Victoria and in another part of Australia, within 21 days after service;
- (c) where you are served with the notice in Papua New Guinea, within 28 days after service;
- (d) where you are served with the notice in New Zealand under Part 2 of the Trans-Tasman Proceedings Act 2010 of the Commonwealth, within 30 working days (within the meaning of that Act) after service or, if a shorter or longer period has been fixed by the Court under section 13(1)(b) of that Act, the period so fixed;
- (e) in any other case, within 42 days after service of the notice.

FILED:

Prothonotary

AMENDED THIRD PARTY STATEMENT OF CLAIM

The parties

- 1. The fourth defendant (Agrison) is and was at all material times:
 - a) a corporation incorporated under the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth); and
 - b) carrying on a business of supplying products, including tractors and slashers, to customers under the trade mark, Agrison.

2. The third party (Harley):

- a) is and was at all material times a corporation incorporated under the Corporations Act 2001
 (Cth);
- b) in or around 2011, in the business of supplying commercial grade steel chain to customers, including Agrison.

Group claim against Agrison

- 3. In the third amended statement of claim dated 16 May 2018 (3SOC), the Plaintiff alleges that Agrison is liable to the Plaintiff and group members in respect of loss arising from the Scotsburn Bushfire (as defined in paragraph 1 of the 3SOC) because (inter alia):
 - a) on or about 24 January 2012, Agrison supplied an Agrison Gen II 50 horsepower tractor (Tractor) and an Agrison branded 6ft slasher (Slasher) to Cesil Nominees Pty Ltd (Cesil Nominees) (paragraph 34A of the 3SOC);
 - b) Agrison owed a duty of care to the Plaintiff and group members when supplying the Tractor and Slasher to Cesil Nominees (paragraph 34G of the 3SOC);
 - Agrison breached its duty of care by failing to take the precautions identified in paragraph
 34I, including by failing to:
 - i) supply the Tractor and Slasher without a defective stabilising chain;
 - supply a stabilising chain adequate to support the weight of the Slasher deck during operation and use of the Tractor and Slasher;
 - iii) implement adequate quality control, inspection and testing procedures to:
 - iv) detect the presence of defective chain links in stabilising chains used in the supply of its products; and
 - ensure stabilising chains supplied with the Tractor and Slasher were adequately manufactured and/or of sufficient quality so as not to fail during operation of the Tractor and Slasher;

(paragraph 34J of the 3SOC)

d) the Tractor and Slasher contained safety defects within the meaning of s 9 of the Australian

Consumer Law (paragraph 34L of the 3SOC); and

e) the Scotsburn Bushfire was caused by Agrison's negligence and/or the safety defects in the stabilising chain (paragraph 34N of the 3SOC).

Negligence by Harley - duty owed to Agrison

4. Between about 27 September 2011 and 8 December 2011, Harley supplied Agrison with 10mm and 8mm commercial chain (the Chain).

Particulars

The particulars of the chain supplied by Harley Industrial are set out in invoices 00008011 and 00008221 from Harley to Agrison dated 27 September 2011 and 8 December 2011. Copies of those invoices have been provided to Harley by Agrison's solicitors.

- 5. At all material times, Harley knew or ought reasonably to have known that:
 - the Chain supplied to Agrison was likely to be used as stabilising chain on tractors and slashers sold by Agrison to its customers;
 - b) defects in the Chain (and in particular defective welds in links in the Chain):
 - i) were difficult to detect and not something that purchasers of chain, like Agrison, were likely to be able reliably to detect;
 - ii) could impair the capacity of the Chain to bear the loads associated with use as a stabilising chain on equipment like tractors and slashers;
 - iii) could lead to a failure of the Chain while in use, including use while bearing the loads associated with use as a stabilising chain on equipment like Tractors and Slashers.

Particulars

The knowledge on the part of Harley is to be inferred from the nature of Harley's and Agrison's respective businesses and Harley's dealings with Agrison.

- 6. In the premises set out in the preceding paragraph, in supplying the Chain to Agrison as alleged in above:
 - a) Harley owed Agrison a duty of care to take reasonable care; and
 - b) the said duty include to take reasonable steps to ensure that the welding joints on links in the Chain were free of defects likely to impair the capacity of the Chain to bear the loads associated with use as a stabilising chain on equipment like tractors and slashers.
- 7. If, which is denied, the Tractor and Slasher caused or contributed to the causing of the Scotsburn Bushfire as alleged in the 3SOC (which is denied), then:
 - a) the Chain caused or contributed to the Scotsburn Bushfire because it failed during the

ordinary course of use as a stabilising chain between the Tractor and the Slasher;

Particulars

Agrison relies upon the expert report of Professor Simon Barter filed on behalf of the Plaintiffs in the proceeding. Further particulars may be provided following discovery and receipt of expert reports.

b) the failure in 'a' was caused by Harley's breach of its duty of care to Agrison; and

Particulars

Harley breached its duty of care by failing to have or implement any or any adequate manufacturing, testing and inspection procedures to:

- i) prevent misaligned welding joints on links used in its chains;
- ii) detect the presence of defective chain links;
- test its chains to verify they were of sufficient quality so as not to fail during the operation of tractor and slashers of the type supplied by Agrison to its customers.

Further particulars will be provided following discovery and receipt of expert reports.

c) in the premises in 'a' and 'b', Agrison has suffered loss and damage by reason of Harley's breach of its duty of care.

[paragraphs 8 to 12 are deleted]

Claim for contribution

- 13. Further and in the alternative, Agrison repeats against Harley the matters set out in paragraph 47(a), (b), (l)(iii), (l)(iv) and (l)(vi)(2) of Agrison's Amended Defence and Counterclaim.
- 14. If, which is denied, Agrison is liable to the Plaintiff and group members in respect of any loss arising from the Scotsburn Bushfire:
 - (a) by reason of the matters pleaded in:
 - paragraphs 4 to 7 and Error! Reference source not found. to Error! Reference source not found. above; further or alternatively
 - (ii) paragraph 13 above;

Harley is liable in respect of the same damage; and

(b) pursuant to ss 23B and 24 of the Wrongs Act 1958 (Vic) (Wrongs Act), Agrison is entitled to contribution from Harley in an amount that the Court considers just and equitable having regard to Harley's responsibility for the damage.

Proportionate liability

15. Further or alternatively, if (which is denied) Agrison is liable to the Plaintiff and group members

(claimants) in respect of any loss arising from the Scotsburn Bushfire:

(a) the claimants' claims against Agrison include claims for economic loss or damage to

property arising from alleged failures to take reasonable care;

(b) the said claims against Agrison are apportionable claims within the meaning of s 24AE

and 24AF of the Wrongs Act;

(c) Agrison repeats against Harley the matters set out in paragraph 47 of its Amended

Defence and Counterclaim;

(d) in the premises in (c):

(i) the acts and omissions of Harley also caused the loss arising from the Scotsburn

Bushfire;

(ii) Harley and Agrison are concurrent wrongdoers within the meaning of s 24AH of the

Wrongs Act; and

(e) accordingly, pursuant to s 24AI(1) of the Wrongs Act, any liability to the claimants on the

part of Agrison is limited to an amount that the Court considers just, having regard to

Agrison's responsibility for the loss or damage, and judgment must not be given against it

for more than that amount.

IF AGRISON IS LIABLE TO THE PLAINTIFF AND GROUP MEMBERS, AGRISON CLAIMS

AGAINST HARLEY:

A. Contribution.

B. Alternatively to (A), a declaration that Harley is a concurrent wrongdoer within the meaning of s

24AH of the Wrongs Act.

C. Costs.

D. Such further or other orders as the Court deems appropriate.

LWL ARMSTRONG

E BATROUNEY

DATED: 29 March 2019 5 June 2019

6

Hall & Wilcox

- This notice was filed for the fourth defendant by Matt McDonald, solicitor, of Hall & Wilcox, Level 11 Rialto South Tower, 525 Collins St, Melbourne, VIC 3000.
- 2. The address of the fourth defendant is Suite 2, Building 2, 270 Ferntree Gully Road, Notting Hill, VIC 3168.
- 3. The address for service of the fourth defendant is c/- Level 11, Rialto South Tower, 525 Collins Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000.
- 4. The email address for service of the fourth defendant is matt.mcdonald@hallandwilcox.com.au.
- 5. The address of the third party is 13 Lara Way, Campbellfield, VIC 3061.

SCHEDULE OF PARTIES

BETWEEN:

Plaintiff

MICHAEL KARL SCHMID

And

ROGER JAMES SKIMMING

First Defendant

MAUREEN LYNETTE JOHNS

Second Defendant

AUTO AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED

Third Defendant

(ACN 111 586 353)

EL MINING SOLUTIONS PTY LTD (ACN 151 983 603)

Fourth Defendant

AUTO AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED

Plaintiff by Counterclaim

(ACN 111 586 353)

MICHAEL KARL SCHMID

Defendant by Counterclaim

HARLEY INDUSTRIAL PTY LTD (ACN 115 230 905)

Third Party