



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF VICTORIA
COMMON LAW DIVISION
GROUP PROCEEDINGS LIST

S ECI 2022 00739

Case: S ECI 2022 00739

Filed on: 26/08/2026 02:15 PM

BETWEEN

TINA LOMBARDO AND OTHERS (according to the schedule)

Plaintiffs

and

**DERMATOLOGY AND COSMETIC SURGERY SERVICES
PTY LTD AND OTHERS (according to the schedule)**

Defendants

DEFENCE TO THIRD FURTHER AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Date: 26 August 2026	Solicitors Code: CR114828
Filed on behalf of: the second defendant	Telephone: (03) 9498 6613
Prepared by:	Ref: 1110360
Kennedys (Australasia) Partnership	Email: Cindy.Tucker@kennedyslaw.com
Level 9, 360 Elizabeth Street	
Melbourne VIC 3000	

In answer to the third further amended statement of claim filed on 16 July 2026, the second defendant says as follows:

A. Parties

A.1 Group Proceeding formalities

1. As to paragraph 1, the second defendant:
 - (a) denies having caused loss or damage to any plaintiff or group member by reason of any alleged negligence, breach of contract or consumer law breach; and
 - (b) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
- 1A. Paragraph 1A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

2. The second defendant does not admit paragraph 2.

A.2 Dermatology and Cosmetic Surgery Services Pty Ltd

3. As to paragraph 3, the second defendant:
 - (a) admits subparagraph (a);
 - (b) denies subparagraph (b);
 - (ba) does not plead to subparagraph (ba) as it does not relate to any cause of action pleaded against him;
 - (c) admits that DCSS provided services incidental to cosmetic surgery, but does not admit the balance of subparagraph (c);
 - (d) admits that DCSS provided services referred to in the preceding subparagraph from the locations listed in subparagraph (d); and
 - (e) denies subparagraph (e).

A.3 Dr Lanzer

4. As to paragraph 4, the second defendant:
 - (a) admits subparagraph (a);
 - (b) admits subparagraph (b);
 - (c) admits subparagraph (c);
 - (d) in response to subparagraph (d) says that DCSS employed from time to time other professionals including Dr Braham Goldberg and qualified nursing staff;
 - (e) does not admit subparagraph (e); and
 - (f) otherwise denies the allegations.
5. As to paragraph 5, the second defendant:
 - (a) denies subparagraph (b); and

- (b) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
6. As to paragraph 6, the second defendant:
- (a) admits subparagraph (a) and says further that he:
 - (i) was a registered medical practitioner from about 1 December 1982 to about 1 December 2021;
 - (ii) obtained specialist qualifications as a Fellow of the Australasian College of Dermatologists in 1988;
 - (b) in response to sub-paragraph (b), says that he practised as a dermatologic surgeon in the course of which he performed medical, cosmetic, and dermatologic surgery and associated services;
 - (c) admits subparagraph (c);
 - (d) denies subparagraph (d);
 - (e) denies subparagraph (e); and
 - (f) otherwise denies the paragraph.

A.4 Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants

7. The second defendant admits paragraph 7.

A.4.1 Liability of Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants directly

8. Save to admit that the Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants were registered medical practitioners and not members of the Royal Australian College of Surgeons or the Royal Australian College of Physicians, the second defendant otherwise does not admit paragraph 8.
9. Paragraph 9 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

A.4.2 Liability of DCSS and/or Lanzer as principals

10. He denies the allegations at paragraph 10 so far as they relate to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
11. The second defendant denies paragraph 11 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
- 11A. The second defendant denies paragraph 11A so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

A.5 Wainstein

12. As to paragraph 12, the second defendant:
 - (a) admits sub-paragraph (a);
 - (b) admits sub-paragraph (c);
 - (c) denies sub-paragraph (b)(ii) so far as it relates to him; and
 - (d) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
13. Paragraph 13 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

B. The Plaintiffs

B.1 First Plaintiff — Tina Lombardo

14. As to paragraph 14, the second defendant:
 - (a) admits that Lombardo made an inquiry through the www.drlanzer.com.au website; and
 - (b) otherwise denies the allegations.
15. The second defendant admits paragraph 15.
16. As to paragraph 16, the second defendant says that:

- (a) he performed a telehealth consultation with Lombardo on 17 February 2021 in which he:
 - (i) took a history and examined photographs provided by Lombardo (**the information**);
 - (ii) advised Lombardo, *inter alia*, as to the following:
 - (1) that three surgical options were available, being mini tuck, full abdominoplasty and dermolipectomy;
 - (2) that the surgical options carried risks, including but not limited to risk of bleeding requiring emergency hospitalisation, scarring, asymmetry, imperfect results and need for a repeat surgery with a plastic surgeon;
 - (3) that she would be required to read and sign a consent form and have at least a one week cooling off period before surgery could be performed.
 - (iii) said based on the information that Lombardo was likely to be a candidate for a mini tuck;
 - (iv) said that a further in-person consultation was necessary;
- (b) when Lombardo attended the Sydney Clinic on 18 March 2021, the second defendant did not provide any advice to Lombardo as alleged;
- (c) during Lombardo's 18 March 2021 consultation with the sixth defendant, it was specifically recorded that Lombardo was aware of the option not to undergo surgery; and
- (d) he otherwise denies the allegations.

17. As to paragraph 17, the second defendant:

- (a) admits that on 18 March 2021 Maria provided by email to Lombardo the documents listed at sub-paragraphs a., b, and c; and
- (b) otherwise does not admit the allegations.

18. Paragraph 18 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
19. Paragraph 19 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
20. The second defendant admits paragraph 20.
- 20A. Paragraph 20A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
21. As to paragraph 21, the second defendant:
 - (a) admits that Lombardo attended at the Surry Hills Day Hospital on or about 15 November 2021;
 - (b) admits that Lombardo consulted with the third defendant;
 - (c) otherwise does not admit subparagraph (a);
 - (d) says that the third defendant telephoned Lombardo on 15 November 2021 prior to Lombardo attending at the Surry Hills Day Hospital, during which telephone call:
 - (i) the third defendant sought to postpone Lombardo's procedure in light of adverse media coverage;
 - (ii) Lombardo insisted on proceeding with Lombardo's procedure;
 - (e) admits subparagraph (b);
 - (f) denies subparagraph (c)(iv) and otherwise does not admit subparagraph (c).
 - (g) does not admit subparagraph (d).
22. The second defendant does not admit paragraph 22.
- 22A. As to paragraph 22A the second defendant:
 - (a) admits that Lombardo was admitted to St Vincent's Hospital between 16 November 2021 and 27 November 2021;

- (b) denies subparagraph (e); and
- (c) otherwise does not admit paragraph 22A.

B.2 Second Plaintiff — Tina Bonnici

23. As to paragraph 23, the second defendant:

- (a) admits that Bonnici made an inquiry with DCSS as alleged; and
- (b) otherwise denies the allegations.

24. As to paragraph 24, the second defendant:

- (a) admits that on or about 8 February 2021, a cosmetic nurse named Ying emailed Bonnici in response to her inquiry and explained how Bonnici could book in for a free consultation; and
- (b) otherwise denies paragraph 24.

25. The second defendant admits paragraph 25.

26. Paragraph 26 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

27. The second defendant admits paragraph 27.

28. The second defendant admits paragraph 28.

29. Paragraph 29 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

30A. As to paragraph 30A, the second defendant:

- (a) admits that Bonnici attended a telephone consultation with Wainstein on or about 7 June 2021; and
- (b) admits that Wainstein wrote a letter addressed to him concerning her telephone consultation with Bonnici; and
- (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

- 30. The second defendant admits paragraph 30.
- 31. Paragraph 31 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 32. Paragraph 32 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 33. Paragraph 33 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 34. Paragraph 34 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 35. Paragraph 35 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 36. Paragraph 36 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 37A. Paragraph 37A does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 37. Paragraph 37 does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 38A. Paragraph 38A does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

B.3 Third Plaintiff — Simone Russell

- 38B. Paragraph 38B does not make any allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 38C. Save to deny that the email was sent by an employee, servant or agent of the second defendant, he otherwise admits paragraph 38C.
- 38D. He admits that at 8:21pm on 31 July 2021 Russell emailed maria@drlanzer.com.au, who was not the second defendant or an employee, servant or agent of the second

defendant, photos of herself. He otherwise denies the allegations contained in paragraph 38D.

38E. Insofar as the allegation relates to him, he admits the allegations contained in paragraph 38E.

38. The second defendant admits paragraph 38.

39. Insofar as the allegations relate to him, he admits subparagraph (a) and otherwise does not admit the allegations contained in subparagraph (b).

39A. As to paragraph 39A. the second defendant:

(a) admits calling Russell on 27 August 2021 and advising her to come in for an appointment at the Malvern Clinic; and

(b) otherwise does not admit the allegations contained in paragraph 39A.

39B. Save to admit that he advised Russell during his call with her on 27 August 2021 that she could come in for a cosmetic consultation at 4pm that day, he otherwise does not admit the allegations contained in paragraph 39B.

40. The second defendant admits paragraph 40.

40A. He does not admit the allegations contained in paragraph 40A and says further that he had not consulted with the Russell as at 27 August 2021.

40B. As to paragraph 40B, the second defendant:

(a) says that he saw Russell during her pre-operative consultation on 17 September 2021 and identified the presence of varicose veins on her legs;

(b) otherwise denies paragraph 40B.

40C. Insofar as the allegations relate to him, he denies the allegations contained in paragraph 40C.

41. Save to not admit subparagraph (c), the second defendant admits the balance of paragraph 41.

42. Save to deny that Shieka was his employee, the second defendant admits paragraph 42 insofar as it relates to him. .
43. Save to deny that the nurse was his employee, the second defendant admits paragraph 43 insofar as it relates to him. He says further that on 6 September 2021 Russell attended a telehealth consultation with Dr Darbyshire at which Russell was advised of the following matters, *inter alia*:
- (a) that there was a risk of her skin looking worse including increased cellulite, denting, loose skin or poor retraction of skin;
 - (b) that the result would not look perfect and was intended for her to look better in clothes only;
 - (c) that with surgery came risks including, but not limited to, weeping, scarring, numbness, dimpling, infection, seroma, necrosis and haematoma;
 - (d) that surgery was a painful process;
 - (e) that some patients are less sensitive to local anaesthetic and she may feel pain during surgery;
 - (f) that other pain management options existed; and
 - (g) that she had the option not to undergo surgery.
44. The second defendant denies paragraph 44 and says further that:
- (a) Russell spoke with Wainstein on or about 13 September 2021 (**the Wainstein consultation**);
 - (b) in the course of the Wainstein consultation, Wainstein noted that Russell appeared well informed, aware of the risks and has realistic expectations; and
 - (c) Russell was offered a further pre-operative consultation with a doctor but declined and advised she was comfortable to wait until the presurgical consultation on the day of surgery.

PARTICULARS

Wainstein's notes of Russell's consultation on 13 September 2021 are recorded on Russell's file.

45. Save to say that Russell advised that she no longer required the mini thigh lift on or after 10 September 2021, the second defendant admits paragraph 45.
46. The second defendant admits paragraph 46.
47. Save to say that Russell paid the sum of \$20,250.00 to DCSS's account, the second defendant admits paragraph 47 and says further that:
 - (a) the total amount transferred comprised:
 - (i) \$15,000 in respect of a thigh liposuction procedure;
 - (ii) \$5000 in respect of a mini thigh lift procedure;
 - (iii) \$50 in respect of the Wainstein Consultation;
 - (iv) \$200 in respect of compression garments;

PARTICULARS

Russell attended a consultation on 27 August 2021 with Brad Dembo at which she informed Dembo that she was on a budget, and she was quoted separate amounts of \$15,000 in respect of a thigh liposuction procedure and a further \$5000 in respect of a mini thigh lift procedure.

- (b) Russell subsequently elected not to undertake the mini thigh lift procedure;
 - (c) \$5,000 was refunded to Russell on 19 September 2021; and
 - (d) that refund was by reason of the fact that Russell had elected not to undertake the mini thigh lift procedure.
48. Paragraph 48 makes no allegation against the second defendant and the paragraph is not admitted.
49. The second defendant admits paragraph 49.
50. As to paragraph 50, the second defendant:

- (a) admits that he consulted with Russell and that he did not advise Russell to undergo surgical stripping of her varicose veins prior to liposuction but does not admit the balance of sub-paragraph (a) so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says that during the pre-operative consultation:
 - (i) he reviewed a medical referral provided by a general practitioner dated 30 August 2021 on behalf of Russell indicating that the purpose of her liposuction of the thighs was medical in nature, being due to chafing and irritation of the thighs;
 - (ii) says that he advised Russell of, *inter alia*, the following:
 - (1) that she could expect only a limited cosmetic improvement due to her lipoedema;
 - (2) that proceeding with just a liposuction that day would more adequately address her concerns regarding chafing, irritation and pain from her lipoedema;
 - (3) that she should return for a thigh lift on a later date.
 - (iii) says that Russell informed him, *inter alia*, of the following:
 - (1) that the purpose of her undergoing thigh liposuction was predominantly medical in nature, due to pain, chafing and rashes caused by her lipoedema;
 - (2) that she understood that she could only achieve a limited cosmetic improvement from the liposuction procedure and that she was content to proceed provided the size of her legs could be reduced.
- (c) admits paragraph (b) so far as it relates to him.

51. As to paragraph 51, the second defendant:

- (a) admits sub-paragraph (a) and says further that Russell's pain:
 - (i) was at the level expected for the type and duration of surgery;

- (ii) was reported as not exceeding 4/10 at any time;
 - (iii) was managed with local anaesthesia and intravenous analgesia at dosages appropriate for her weight;
 - (b) does not admit sub-paragraph (b);
 - (c) does not admit sub-paragraph (c), says further that routine questions as to pain levels were asked by nursing staff, and otherwise refers to and repeats sub-paragraph (a) above; and
 - (d) as to sub-paragraph (d):
 - (i) He admits sub-paragraph (i);
 - (ii) Save to admit that Russell's medical records document 9.1 litres removed, including 6.8 litres of fat removed, he does not admit sub-paragraph (ii);
 - (iii) Save to admit that intravenous access was not used during Russell's surgery and say further that intravenous access was not reasonably necessary, he otherwise denies the allegations in sub-paragraph (iii);
 - (iv) He denies the allegations contained in subparagraph (iv).
52. The second defendant admits paragraph 52 and says further that the refund was by reason of the matters at paragraph 47 above.
53. Save to deny that the nurse was his employee, the second defendant admits paragraph 53 insofar as it relates to him.
54. Save to deny that the nurse was his employee, the second defendant admits paragraph 54 insofar as it relates to him.
55. The second defendant does not admit paragraph 55.
56. The second defendant admits that Russell attended a follow-up consultation with the second defendant but otherwise does not admit paragraph 56.
57. As to paragraph 57, the second defendant says that during the follow-up consultation the second defendant:

- (1) observed swelling;
- (2) administered local anaesthetic and made a single 2mm incision with a No. 11 scalpel blade to ensure there was no seroma present;

and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

57A. The second defendant denies paragraph 57A and repeats paragraph 57 above.

B.4 Fourth Plaintiff — Julie Rose Morrison

58. The second defendant admits paragraph 58.

59. Save to admit that during her First Pre-engagement Consultation, the following was noted:

- (a) Wong consulted with Morrison in respect of ‘360’ liposuction to the abdomen, flanks, waist, fat transfer to the to the hip dips and a Brazilian Butt and discussed the possibility of “*add neck*”;
- (b) Wong provided a cost estimate in respect of the foregoing procedure;

he otherwise does not admit the allegations contained in paragraph 59.

60. Save to deny that Kristy was his employee, the second defendant admits paragraph 60 insofar as it relates to him.

61. The second defendant admits paragraph 61.

62. The second defendant admits paragraph 62.

63. The second defendant admits paragraph 63.

64. Paragraph 64 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

65. The second defendant admits paragraph 65.

66. Paragraph 66 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

- 67. The second defendant admits paragraph 67.
- 68. The second defendant admits paragraph 68.
- 69. Paragraph 69 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 70. Not used.
- 71. Not used.
- 71A. Insofar as the allegations relate to him, the second defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 71A.
- 72. Save to not admit the particulars under paragraph 72, the second defendant otherwise admits paragraph 72.
- 73. The second defendant admits paragraph 73.
- 74. Paragraph 74 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 75. Paragraph 75 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 76. Paragraph 76 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 77. Not used.
- 78. Not used.
- 79. Not used.
- 80. Paragraph 80 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 81. Not used.
- 82. The second defendant denies paragraph 82 and says further the pre-admission checklist dated 1 October 2021 records that Morrison had spoken to Wainstein.

83. Insofar as the allegations relate to him, the second defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 83.
84. Paragraph 84 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
85. Paragraph 85 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

C. Alleged Misleading or Deceptive Conduct

C.1 DCSS Sales System

86. As to paragraph 86, the second defendant says that:
- (a) the first defendant published the website ‘www.drlanzer.com.au’ (**the website**);
 - (b) persons were able to make an initial inquiry using a form on the website or contact information on the website;
 - (c) the second defendant’s qualifications, experience and training were set out on the website;
 - (d) the second defendant, Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants and Wong consulted with and provided advice to prospective patients;
 - (e) where appropriate, the second defendant, Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants or Wong provided or arranged for quotes to be provided to prospective patients;
 - (f) he otherwise denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him; and
 - (g) he otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

87. Paragraph 87 makes no allegation against the second defendant and it is not admitted.

C.2 Representations

C.2.1 The Representations

88. The second defendant denies paragraph 88.

88A. The second defendant denies paragraph 88A and says further that the second defendant, Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants and Wong were qualified to perform cosmetic surgery procedures.

89. The second defendant denies paragraph 89 and says further that:

- (a) the facts alleged are rationally incapable of rendering the alleged Pre-Eminence Representation misleading or deceptive; and
- (b) he had completed appropriate training and qualifications to perform cosmetic surgery procedures.

90. As to paragraph 90, the second defendant:

- (a) says that he was qualified to perform cosmetic surgery procedures;
- (b) says that each of the Third to Seventh Defendants was qualified to perform cosmetic surgery procedures;
- (c) admits that neither he, the Other Cosmetic Doctor Defendants nor Wong were specialist plastic surgeons; and
- (d) otherwise denies the allegations.

91. The second defendant denies paragraph 91.

92. The second defendant denies paragraph 92 and says further that disclosure of Wainstein's marriage to Aronov had no bearing on her independence.

93. The second defendant denies paragraph 93 and says further that the alleged fact is rationally incapable of rendering the alleged Excellent Service Representation misleading or deceptive.

C.2.2 Making the Representations to potential patients

94. The second defendant denies paragraph 94 so far as it relates to him and otherwise he does not admit the paragraph.

95. Paragraph 95 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

96. Paragraph 96 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

C.2.3 How the Representations were allegedly made to the Plaintiffs and the Group Members

96A. The second defendant denies paragraph 96A as far as it relates to him and otherwise he does not admit the paragraph.

97. The second defendant denies paragraph 97 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the allegation.

98. The second defendant denies paragraph 98 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the allegation.

99. The second defendant denies paragraph 99 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the allegation.

100. The second defendant denies paragraph 100 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the allegation.

101. Not Used.

102. Paragraph 102 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

103. Paragraph 103 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

104. The second defendant denies paragraph 104 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

105. Insofar as paragraph 105 makes any allegation against the second defendant it is denied, and he otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

C.2.4 Contraventions

106. Paragraph 106 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

107. The second defendant denies paragraph 107.
108. Paragraph 108 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
109. Paragraph 109 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
110. Paragraph 110 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

D. STATUTORY GUARANTEES

D.1 Statutory guarantees

111. As to paragraph 111, the second defendant:
- (a) specifically denies that he was a supplier within the meaning of ss 60 or 61 of the ACL in respect of cosmetic surgery services provided to Plaintiffs or Group Members for payment made to DCSS;
 - (b) denies paragraph 111 so far as it relates to him; and
 - (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
112. As to paragraph 112, the second defendant:
- (a) admits that where a Plaintiff or Group Member acquired cosmetic surgery services, those services were acquired by them as consumers within the meaning of section 3(3) of the ACL;
 - (b) denies that Wong was an employee, servant or agent of the second defendant;
 - (c) repeats paragraph 111 above; and
 - (d) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
- 112A. Paragraph 112A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

113. As to paragraph 113, the second defendant:

- (a) denies paragraph 113 so far as it relates to him;
- (b) repeats paragraph 111 above;
- (c) denies that Wong was an employee, servant or agent of the second defendant;
- (d) says that Plaintiffs and Group Members acquired services for varied purposes;
- (e) says that patients including Russell and potential unidentified Group Members acquired services for purposes other than the particular purpose of enhancing their body's appearance; and

PARTICULARS

Russell had been referred by a General Practitioner for medical treatment to address lipoedema of the thighs.

- (f) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

114. As to paragraph 114, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) repeats paragraph 111 above;
- (c) says that Plaintiffs and Group Members acquired services to achieve a variety of results;
- (d) says that patients including Russell and potential unidentified Group Members acquired services for purposes other than for the particular purpose of enhancing their body's appearance; and

PARTICULARS

The second defendant repeats to the particulars to paragraph 113 above.

- (e) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

115. The second defendant denies paragraph 115.

116. The second defendant denies paragraph 116.

116A. Paragraph 116A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

D.2 Non-compliance with guarantees

117. As to paragraph 117, the second defendant:

- (a) denies paragraph 117 so far as it relates to him;
- (b) refers to and repeats the matters at paragraphs 153–158 below; and
- (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

117A Paragraph 117A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph

118. The second defendant denies paragraph 118.

118A Paragraph 118A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph

119. The second defendant denies paragraph 119.

119A Paragraph 119A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph

120. The second defendant denies paragraph 120.

121. Paragraph 121 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

121A Paragraph 121A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph

122. The second defendant denies paragraph 122.

123. Paragraph 123 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

124. The second defendant does not admit paragraph 124.

124AA. Paragraph 124AA makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

124A. The second defendant denies paragraph 124A so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph

125. The second defendant denies paragraph 125 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

125A. Paragraph 125A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph

E. NEGLIGENCE

E.1 Alleged Duties

126. Paragraph 126 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

127. Paragraph 127 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

128. As to paragraph 128, the second defendant:

- (a) admits that he owed a duty to exercise the degree of care and skill expected of a reasonably competent cosmetic surgeon in respect of the care he personally provided to Lombardo and Russell;
- (b) cannot admit that he owed a duty of care to presently unidentified persons; and
- (c) otherwise denies paragraph 128.

129. Paragraph 129 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

130. Paragraph 130 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

- 131. Paragraph 131 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 132. Paragraph 132 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 133. Paragraph 133 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 134. Paragraph 134 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 135. Paragraph 135 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

E.2 DCSS alleged breaches

- 136. Paragraph 136 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 137. Paragraph 137 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 138. Paragraph 138 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 139. Paragraph 139 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 140. Paragraph 140 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 141. Paragraph 141 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph
- 142. Paragraph 142 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

143. Paragraph 143 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
144. Paragraph 144 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
145. Paragraph 145 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
146. Paragraph 146 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
147. Paragraph 147 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
148. Not used.
149. Not used.
150. Not used.
151. Paragraph 151 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
152. Paragraph 152 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

E.3 Lanzer alleged breaches

153. The second defendant denies paragraph 153.
154. The second defendant denies paragraph 154.
155. The second defendant denies paragraph 155, refers to paragraph 16 above and says further that:
- (a) the correct standard of care is reasonable medical practice;

- (b) reasonable medical practice in the circumstances did not require the second defendant to examine Lombardo in person before providing her with advice as to surgical options;
- (c) he did in fact consult with Lombardo personally prior to providing her with advice as to surgical options;
- (d) Lombardo was provided with a range of treatment options and was aware of the option not to undergo surgery.

156. The second defendant denies paragraph 156 so far as it relates to him, refers to and repeats paragraphs 16 and 153–155 above and says further:

- (a) by at least 18 March 2021, Lombardo was aware of the option not to undergo surgery and nevertheless elected to undergo the treatment;
- (b) prior to undergoing Lombardo’s surgery with Aronov, Lombardo completed a questionnaire and answered the question “*is this surgery an important decision to you? Have you considered this appropriately?*” by writing that “*its hugely important & something Ive wanted for 25 years*” [sic].

157. The second defendant denies paragraph 157.

158. The second defendant denies paragraph 158 and says further that:

- (a) Russell’s stated purpose to the second defendant for undergoing surgery was medical in nature, due to the chafing, pain and irritation caused by her thigh lipoedema, not cosmetic in nature;
- (b) the correct standard of care is reasonable medical practice;
- (c) Russell was examined by both Aronov and Darbyshire before the day of Russell’s surgery;
- (d) Russell was offered and declined the option of a further pre-surgical consultation prior to the day of Russell’s surgery;
- (e) Russell was aware of the option not to undergo surgery;

- (f) at the commencement of Russell’s surgery on 17 September 2021:
 - (i) 10mg of morphine was administered, being at or near the recommended dose;
 - (ii) 100mcg of fentanyl was administered, being at or near the recommended dose;
- (g) during Russell’s surgery, she received 4500mcg of xylocaine, being at or near the recommended dose;
- (h) routine observations taken by nursing staff following the surgery recorded Russell’s pain level as “minimal”;
- (i) at the time of discharge:
 - (i) Russell’s pain was recorded as “minimal 0 to 3 on pain scale”;
 - (ii) Russell was provided with prescriptions for Paracetamol, Tramadol and Endone (**the analgesia**);
- (j) Russell was provided with instructions regarding managing her pain after the surgery and analgesia use;
- (k) Russell was warned of the risk of pain;
- (l) Russell was warned of the risk of poor aesthetic outcome, bleeding and scarring;
- (m) Russell was warned of a range of risks and potential complications including but not limited to weeping, scarring, numbness, dimpling, infection, seroma, necrosis, haematoma, poor retraction of skin and imperfect aesthetic outcome; and
- (n) Russell was referred to Wainstein for psychological assessment and noted to be well informed and aware of the risks of surgery.

159. The second defendant denies paragraph 159 so far as it relates to him and refers to and repeats paragraphs 153, 154 and 158 above.

160. Paragraph 160 makes no allegation, and the second defendant does not admit the paragraph.

160A. Further, the second defendant says in respect of Lombardo's claim against him that:

- (a) he is a professional within the meaning of s 59(1) of the *Wrongs Act 1958*;
- (b) In his treatment and management of Lombardo, he acted in a manner that, as at February – September 2021, was widely accepted in Australia by a significant number of respected practitioners in the field as competent professional practice in the circumstances; and
- (c) In the premises, he was not negligent in his treatment and management of Lombardo.

E.4 Aronov alleged breaches

- 161. Paragraph 161 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 162. Paragraph 162 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 163. Paragraph 163 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 164. Paragraph 164 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 165. Paragraph 165 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 166. Paragraph 166 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 167. Paragraph 167 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 168. Paragraph 168 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

E.5 Darbyshire alleged breaches

- 169. Paragraph 169 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 170. Paragraph 170 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 171. Paragraph 171 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 172. Paragraph 172 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 172A. Paragraph 172A makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

E.6 Wells alleged breaches

- 173. Paragraph 173 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 174. Paragraph 174 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 175. Paragraph 175 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 176. Paragraph 176 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 177. Paragraph 177 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 178. Paragraph 178 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

E.7 Fallahi alleged breaches

- 179. Paragraph 179 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 180. Paragraph 180 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 181. Paragraph 181 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 182. Paragraph 182 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 183. Paragraph 183 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 184. Not used.
- 185. Not used.
- 186A. Not used.
- 186. Not used.
- 187. Not used.

E.9 Wainstein alleged breaches

- 188. Paragraph 188 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 189. Paragraph 189 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 190. Paragraph 190 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

E.10 Loss

191. The second defendant denies paragraph 191 so far as it relates to him and further denies that Lombardo has suffered injury, loss and damage as alleged.
192. Paragraph 192 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
193. The second defendant denies paragraph 193 so far as it relates to him and further denies that Russell has suffered injury, loss and damage as alleged.
- 193A The second defendant denies paragraph 193A.
194. Not used.
195. The second defendant denies paragraph 195 and says further that aggravated damages are not available in respect of the plaintiffs' and group members' claims.

F. Contract

196. Paragraph 196 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 196A. The second defendant denies paragraph 196A so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.
- 196B. The second defendant does not admit paragraph 196B and says further:
- (a) in respect of Lombardo, the second defendant refers to paragraph 16 and 155 above and says that Lombardo was aware of the possibility of asymmetry, scarring, need for a repeat procedure and imperfect results;
 - (b) in respect of Russell, the second defendant refers to paragraph 43 and 158 above and says that Russell was aware of the possibility of scarring, dimpling, poor retraction of skin, imperfect outcome and that the surgery was intended to make her look better whilst wearing clothes.
197. Paragraph 197 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

198. Paragraph 198 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
199. Paragraph 199 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
200. Not used.
201. Paragraph 201 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
202. Paragraph 202 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.
- 202A. The second defendant denies paragraph 202A so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G. CAUSATION, LOSS AND DAMAGE

G.1 Misleading or deceptive conduct

G.1.1 Lombardo

203. The second defendant denies paragraph 203.
- 203A. The second defendant denies paragraph 203A.
204. In response to paragraph 204, the second defendant:
- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
 - (b) says further that if Lombardo has suffered loss and damage by reason of the allegations (which are not admitted but denied), the loss and damage relates to, arises from or constitutes a personal injury within the meaning of applicable civil liability legislation, including Part VB and VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958* (Vic), Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW), and s 137C of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth); and
 - (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.1.2 Bonnici

205. The second defendant denies paragraph 205.

205A. The second defendant denies paragraph 205A.

206. In response to paragraph 206, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says further that if Bonnici has suffered loss and damage by reason of the allegations (which are not admitted but denied), the loss and damage relates to, arises from or constitutes a personal injury within the meaning of applicable civil liability legislation, including Part VB and VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958* (Vic), Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW), Chapter 3 of the *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld) and s 137C of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth); and
- (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.1.3 Russell

207. The second defendant denies paragraph 207.

207A. The second defendant denies paragraph 207A.

208. In response to paragraph 208, second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says further that if Russell has suffered loss and damage by reason of the allegations (which are not admitted but denied), the loss and damage relates to, arises from or constitutes a personal injury within the meaning of applicable civil liability legislation, including Part VB and VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958* (Vic), Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW), and s 137C of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth); and
- (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.1.4 Morrison

209. The second defendant denies paragraph 209.

209A. The second defendant denies paragraph 209A.

210. In response to paragraph 210, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says further that if Morrison has suffered loss and damage by reason of the allegations (which are not admitted but denied), the loss and damage relates to, arises from or constitutes a personal injury within the meaning of the applicable civil liability legislation, including Part VB and VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958* (Vic), Chapter 3 of the *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld), Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (WA), and s 137C of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth); and
- (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.1.5 Group Members

211. The second defendant denies paragraph 211 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

211A. The second defendant denies paragraph 211A so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

212. In response to paragraph 212, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says further that if a Group Member has suffered loss and damage by reason of the allegations (which are not admitted but denied), the loss and damage relates to, arises from or constitutes a personal injury within the meaning of the applicable civil liability legislation, including Part VB and VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958* (Vic), Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW), Chapter 3 of the *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld), Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (WA), and s 137C of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth); and

- (c) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.1.6 Liability of the Defendants for the Representation Contraventions

213. As to paragraph 213, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says that the Plaintiffs and Group Members are not entitled to recover any amount of the alleged loss or damage pursuant to s 236(1) of the ACL;

PARTICULARS

Section 137C of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth).

- (c) says that Group Members whose claim accrued more than 6 years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding are statute barred from bringing this claim pursuant to s 236(2) of the ACL; and
- (d) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.2 Statutory Guarantee Non-Compliances

214. The second defendant denies paragraph 214 so far as it relates to him and otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

215. As to paragraph 215, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) says that, where the law of New South Wales is the proper law of the contract to which the alleged guarantee relates, then by reason of s 275 of the ACL the law of New South Wales applies to limit or preclude liability for the alleged failure, and recovery of that liability (if any) including by reason of:
 - (i) the limitations on liability in Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW);
 - (ii) in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding, the statutory

limitation in s 50C(1), alternatively, s 18A, of the *Limitation Act 1969* (NSW);

- (c) says that, where the law of Victoria is the proper law of the contract to which the alleged guarantee relates, then by reason of s 275 of the ACL the law of Victoria applies to limit or preclude liability for the alleged failure, and recovery of that liability (if any) including by reason of:
 - (i) the limitations on liability in Part VB and Part VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958*;
 - (ii) in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding, the statutory limitation in s 27D of the *Limitation of Actions Act 1958*; and
- (d) says that, where the law of Queensland is the proper law of the contract to which the alleged guarantee relates, then by reason of s 275 of the ACL the law of Queensland applies to limit or preclude liability for the alleged failure, and recovery of that liability (if any) including by reason of:
 - (i) the limitations on liability in Chapter 3 of *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld);
 - (ii) in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding, the statutory limitation in s 11 of the *Limitation of Actions Act 1974* (Qld); and
- (e) says that, where the law of Western Australia is the proper law of the contract to which the alleged guarantee relates, then by reason of s 275 of the ACL the law of Western Australia applies to limit or preclude liability for the alleged failure, and recovery of that liability (if any) including by reason of:
 - (i) the limitations on liability in Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (WA);
 - (ii) in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding, the statutory limitation in s 14 of the *Limitation Act 2005* (WA); and
- (f) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.3 Negligence

216. As to paragraph 216, the second defendant:

- (a) denies the paragraph so far as it relates to him;
- (b) to the extent that the law of the alleged tort was the law of Victoria:
 - (i) relies on the limitations on liability in Part VB and Part VBA of the *Wrongs Act 1958*;
 - (ii) says in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding that their claim is statute barred; and

PARTICULARS

Section 27D of the *Limitation of Actions Act 1958*.

- (c) to the extent that the law of the alleged tort was the law of New South Wales:
 - (i) relies on the limitations on liability in Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW); and
 - (ii) says in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding that their claim is statute barred;

PARTICULARS

Section 50C(1), alternatively, s 18A, of the *Limitation Act 1969* (NSW).

- (d) to the extent that the law of the alleged tort was the law of Queensland:
 - (i) relies on the limitations on liability in Chapter 3 of the *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld);

- (ii) says in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding that their claim is statute barred;

PARTICULARS

Section 11 of the *Limitation of Actions Act 1974* (Qld)

- (e) to the extent that the law of the alleged tort was the law of Western Australia:
 - (i) relies on the limitations on liability in Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (WA);
 - (ii) says in respect of any Group Member whose claim accrued more than three years prior to the commencement of their claim in this proceeding that their claim is statute barred;

PARTICULARS

Section 14 of the *Limitation Act 2005* (WA).

- (f) otherwise does not admit the paragraph.

G.4 Contract

217. Paragraph 217 makes no allegation against the second defendant and he does not admit the paragraph.

H Common questions

218. NOT USED.

I. Proportionate Liability

219. The claims made by the Plaintiffs and Group Members under s 236 of the ACL (**the apportionable claims**) are apportionable claims within the meaning of:

- (a) Part VIA of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth);
- (b) Part 4 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (NSW);
- (c) Part IVAA of the *Wrongs Act 1958* (Vic);
- (d) Part 1F of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (WA); and
- (e) Chapter 2 Part 2 of the *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld)

(the proportionate liability legislation).

220. If the plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the first defendant's acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats the matters alleged at paragraphs 3, 10, 14 – 86, 88 – 94, 96A, 97 - 100, 104, 106, 111 – 127, 136 – 147, 152, 191 – 193, 203 – 215 (and any particulars under the foregoing paragraphs) in the further amended statement of claim.

221. If the plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the third defendant's

acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats the matters alleged at paragraphs 8, 9, 14 – 85, 87 – 104, 108, 109, 111 – 125, 129, 161 – 167, 191 – 193, 203 – 215 (and any particulars under the foregoing paragraphs) in the further amended statement of claim.

222. If the plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the fourth defendant's acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats the matters alleged at paragraphs 1A, 8, 9, 14 – 85, 87 – 94, 96 – 103, 109, 111 – 125, 130, 169 – 172, 191 – 193, 203 – 215 (and any particulars under the foregoing paragraphs) in the further amended statement of claim.

223. If the plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the fifth defendant's acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats the matters alleged at paragraphs 8, 9, 14 – 85, 87 – 104, 108, 109, 111 – 125, 131, 173 – 177, 191 – 193, 203 – 215 (and any particulars under the foregoing paragraphs) in the further amended statement of claim.

224. If the plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the sixth defendant's

acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats the matters alleged at paragraphs 8, 9, 14 – 85, 87 – 94, 96 – 103, 109, 111 – 125, 132, 179 – 183, 191 – 193, 203 – 215 (and any particulars under the foregoing paragraphs) in the further amended statement of claim.

225. If plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the seventh defendant's acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats paragraph 11 of the further amended statement of claim and the matters alleged at paragraphs 58 – 85, 88 – 93, 95, 100, 103(d), 104(d), 117- 119, 123 – 125, 184 – 187, 194, 209 – 211, 213 of the amended statement of claim dated 7 November 2024.

226. If the plaintiffs or Group Members have suffered loss and damage as alleged in the apportionable claims (which are not admitted but expressly denied), the eighth defendant's acts or omissions caused the claimed loss and damage within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

PARTICULARS

The second defendant refers to and repeats the matters alleged at paragraphs 12, 13, 14 – 85, 92, 96A – 100, 105, 110, 134, 188 – 193, 203 – 213 (and any

particulars under the foregoing paragraphs) in the further amended statement of claim.

227. If the second defendant is liable to any plaintiff or Group Member as alleged by the apportionable claims (which is not admitted but expressly denied), then the first and third through eighth defendants are:

- (a) persons who are one of 2 or more persons whose acts or omissions caused the alleged loss or damage that is the subject of the apportionable claims; and
- (b) concurrent wrongdoers within the meaning of the proportionate liability legislation.

228. In the premises, if the second defendant is liable to any plaintiff or Group Member in relation to the apportionable claims (which is not admitted but is expressly denied) then his liability is limited by the proportionate liability legislation to an amount reflecting that proportion of the claimed loss that the Court considers just having regard to the extent of the second defendant's responsibility for the claimed loss and judgment must not be given against the second defendant for more than that amount.

Date **26 AUGUST 2026**

ANDREW McCLELLAND

FIONA RYAN

ANGUS CHRISTOPHERSEN

KAREN LIU

Signed:



.....
KENNEDYS

Solicitors for the second defendant