OFFICE OF THE
Information Commissioner
QUEENSLAND

Decision and Reasons for Decision

Citation:	**N74 and Queensland Police Service [2026] QICmr 114 (30 June 2026)**
Application Number:	**319042**
Applicant:	**N74**
Respondent:	**Queensland Police Service**
Decision Date:	**30 June 2026**
Catchwords:	**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW – RIGHT TO INFORMATION – REFUSAL TO DEAL WITH ACCESS APPLICATION – PREVIOUS APPLICATION FOR SAME DOCUMENTS – whether applicant has previously applied to the same agency for the same documents – section 43 of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld)** **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW – RIGHT TO INFORMATION – REFUSAL OF ACCESS – EXEMPT INFORMATION – information subject to legal professional privilege – sections 47(3)(a) and 48, and schedule 3, section 7 of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld)** **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW – RIGHT TO INFORMATION – REFUSAL OF ACCESS – CONTRARY TO PUBLIC INTEREST INFORMATION – workplace grievance/complaint information – accountability and transparency – personal information and privacy – administration of justice – confidential information – agency management function – whether disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest – sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld)**

DECISION

1. I vary[1] the reviewable decision[2] of Queensland Police Service (**QPS**) under the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld) (**RTI Act**) by finding as follows:

[1] Under section 110(1)(b) of the *Right to Information Act 2009* (Qld).
[2] See paragraph 8 of these reasons.

a) QPS was entitled to refuse to deal with part of the access application on the basis of a previous application by the applicant for the same documents
b) QPS was not entitled to refuse access to information on the ground of legal professional privilege; and
c) QPS was entitled to refuse access to information (including the information in b) above) on the ground that its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

2. This means that no further information is to be released to the applicant.

3. My reasons for the decision follow.

[redacted]

R Moss
Principal Review Officer

Date: 30 June 2026

REASONS FOR DECISION

Summary

4. The applicant applied to QPS under the RTI Act for access *to 'Application 2 of 8 – Injury Mgt File … Emails from 2020, as referenced in the OIC correspondence dated 11 July 2025* [in review 318511]*'*.[3]

5. QPS located 713 responsive pages. QPS decided[4] to refuse to deal with 30 pages under section 43 of the RTI Act. In respect of the remainder, it gave full access to 121 pages, partial access to 526 pages, and refused access to 36 pages. Access was refused on both exemption and public interest grounds. QPS also decided that 26 pages contained irrelevant information that could be deleted under section 73(2) of the RTI Act.

6. The applicant applied[5] to Office of the Information Commissioner (**OIC**) for external review of QPS's decision.

Background

7. This is another in a series of access applications that the applicant has made to QPS in connection with his former employment by QPS.

Reviewable decision

8. The decision under review is the decision of QPS dated 16 October 2025.

Evidence considered

9. The evidence, submissions, legislation and other material I have considered in reaching my decision are set out in these reasons (including footnotes). I have taken account of the applicant's submissions[6] to the extent that they are relevant to the issues for determination in this review.

10. I have also had regard to the *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) (**HR Act**), particularly the right to seek and receive information. I consider a decision-maker will be *'respecting and acting compatibly with'* that right and others prescribed in the HR Act, when applying the law prescribed in the IP Act and the RTI Act. I have acted in this way in making this decision, in accordance with section 58(1) of the HR Act. I also note the observations made by Bell J on the interaction between equivalent pieces of Victorian legislation: *'it is perfectly compatible with the scope of that positive right*

---

[3] Application received on 18 August 2025. External review 318511 was resolved informally on the basis that the applicant and QPS agreed that the access application in question (which QPS had refused to process on the grounds of substantial and unreasonable diversion of resources) would be divided into eight parts and that the applicant would lodge consecutive access applications for each part, with the next application in the series not to be lodged until the previous application had been decided by QPS. The application under consideration in this review is application number 2 in the series.
[4] Decision dated 16 October 2025.
[5] On 3 November 2025.
[6] In the external review application and in an email on 12 May 2026.

in the Charter for it to be observed by reference to the scheme of, and principles in, the Freedom of Information Act'.

Information in issue

11. The information to which QPS refused access comprised 526 part pages and 36 full pages. However, much of the information refused by QPS in the part pages consists of contact details of QPS officers, or out of scope/irrelevant information. The applicant advised in his email of 12 May 2026 that he did not seek to pursue access to this material.[7] It is therefore no longer in issue and will not be considered further in this decision. The information that remains in issue consists mainly of internal QPS communications that discuss workplace injury management issues concerning the applicant (**Information in Issue**).[8]

Issues for determination

12. The issues for determination in this review are:

- whether QPS was entitled to refuse to deal with part of the access application under section 43 of the RTI Act - previous application for same documents
- whether access to information may be refused because it is exempt information under sections 47(3)(a) and 49, and schedule 3, section 7, of the RTI Act (legal professional privilege); and
- whether access to information may be refused because its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest under sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act.

Previous application for same documents

Relevant law

13. Under the RTI Act, Parliament intends for an agency or Minister to deal with an access application unless to do so would not be in the public interest.[9] The circumstances outlined in sections 40, 41, and 43 of the RTI Act are the only circumstances in which Parliament considers it would not be in the public interest to deal with an access application.[10] Even if an agency is entitled to refuse to deal with an access application, Parliament has expressly intended the RTI Act should be administered with a pro-disclosure bias.[11]

14. Relevantly, an agency may refuse to deal with an access application under section 43 of the RTI Act where:

---

[7] The applicant stated that, *'My interest is in the correspondence, discussions, internal handling, and related material to which I was not a party'*.
[8] All or part of pages 36, 37, 41, 165-166, 175, 183, 184, 185, 186, 264-265, 267-268 (duplicate), 270-271 (duplicate), 282-290, 396-407 and 540-547.
[9] Section 39(1) of the RTI Act.
[10] Section 39(2) of the RTI Act.
[11] Section 39(3) of the RTI Act.

(a) an applicant has made a first application and one of the circumstances set out in sections 43(3)(b) or 43(3)(d) apply; and

(b) the applicant makes another access application to the same agency for access to one or more of the same documents sought under the first application and the later application does not, on its face, disclose any reasonable basis for again seeking access to the documents.

Findings

15. QPS identified 30 pages[12] as having been the subject of a previous access application by the applicant - RTI/55252[13] - and in respect of which QPS had issued a decision under section 54 of the RTI Act on 18 August 2025. As the applicant's current application did not, on its face, disclose any reasonable basis for again seeking access to these documents, QPS decided to refuse to deal with the access application to the extent that it sought access to these documents again.

16. Having considered the information relied upon by QPS in making its decision, and having reviewed the terms of the applicant's access application in this review, I am satisfied that the requirements of section 43 of the RTI Act are satisfied and that QPS was entitled to refuse to deal with the 30 pages in this review. The access application does not, on its face, disclose any reasonable basis for seeking access to these pages again.

17. I have considered the applicant's submissions that oppose this position, however, I am satisfied that they do not disturb the application of section 43 of the RTI Act. Rather, they evidence a misunderstanding of the way in which the provision operates:[14]

> *I do not accept that the issue is answered merely by characterising the pages as overlapping with an earlier application. If the pages now said to overlap are documents from 2020 that ought to have been released when first requested, that raises a fresh and additional concern rather than disposing of the issue.*
>
> *The apparent position now advanced is troubling. If those pages existed, were within scope, and were not released at the time despite being sought, that goes directly to the adequacy of the original searches, the handling of the application, and the fairness of the process. It would be helpful if OIC could elaborate on the basis upon which it is said that the mere existence of a previous application is sufficient in circumstances where the failure to release the pages earlier is itself part of the concern.*[15]

18. The applicant's submission that the documents *'ought to have been released when first requested'*, and that fairness therefore requires that the documents be considered again in this review, is misconceived. Firstly, the applicant was given full or partial access to some of the documents in the earlier review. Secondly, in

[12] Pages 6-8. 216-238 and 534-537.
[13] This application sought access to documents from the applicant's QPS injury management file, including emails.
[14] The operation of section 43 was explained in a decision issued to the applicant on 30 April 2026 in a related external review.
[15] In his email of 12 May 2026.

respect of any information to which access was refused by QPS, the applicant had the right to seek external review of QPS's decision. The fact that he elected not to exercise that right at the relevant time does not invalidate QPS's decision or suggest any unfairness in the process. Nor can it in any way logically lead to a conclusion that all of the documents ought to have been released in response to the applicant's first application, or that a sufficiency of search issue is somehow raised. QPS dealt with the 30 pages in its earlier decision and gave reasons for its decision. That decision was not disputed by the applicant at the relevant time.

19. In addition, I do not accept the validity of the applicant's submission that his current involvement in various legal proceedings against QPS means that there is *'a reasonable and proper basis for the documents to be* [re]*considered now'*. The applicant is, in effect, seeking to retrospectively provide a reasonable basis for making the overlapping request. However, section 43 of the RTI Act is clear in permitting an agency to refuse to deal with the later access application if it does not, *on its face*, disclose any reasonable basis for again seeking access to the same documents. I am satisfied in this case that it does not.

Exempt information – legal professional privilege

Relevant law

20. The RTI Act gives a right of access to documents of government agencies.[16] However, this access right is subject to other provisions of the RTI Act, including grounds on which access may be refused.

21. Access may be refused to exempt information.[17] Relevantly, information will qualify as exempt if it would be privileged from production in a legal proceeding on the ground of legal professional privilege.[18] Legal professional privilege protects confidential communications between a lawyer and their client, made for the dominant purpose of seeking or giving legal advice or professional legal assistance, or for use in legal proceedings either on foot, or reasonably anticipated, at the time of the relevant communication.[19]

22. Relevantly, in the circumstances of this case, the privilege may protect communications between salaried employee legal advisers and their employer as the client (including communications through other employees of the same employer) provided there is a professional relationship of legal adviser and client, which secures to the advice an independent character, notwithstanding the employment.[20]

---

[16] Section 23(1)(a) of the RTI Act.
[17] Sections 47(3)(a) and 48 of the RTI Act. Schedule 3 of the RTI Act identifies the types of information which Parliament has determined will comprise exempt information.
[18] Schedule 3, section 7 of the RTI Act. This exemption reflects the requirements for establishing legal professional privilege at common law.
[19] *Esso Australia Resources Ltd v Commissioner of Taxation* (1999) 201 CLR 49; *Daniels Corporation International Pty Ltd v Australian Competition and Consumer Commission* (2002) 213 CLR 543 at 552. These principles were confirmed by the High Court in *Glencore International AG v Commissioner of Taxation* [2019] HCA 26 at [23]-[25].
[20] *Waterford v Commonwealth* (1987) 163 CLR 54 at 95 per Mason and Wilson JJ.

Findings

23. Following a review of the communications claimed by QPS to attract privilege,[21] the involvement of an independent legal adviser was not clear on the face of the communications. QPS was therefore asked to provide further information to establish that the communications met the relevant test for attracting privilege.

24. In response, QPS advised that its Legal Services unit had had ongoing involvement in the applicant's injury management matters given their complexity, and that an officer involved in the communications in question had provided professional legal advice and assistance while a legal officer in the Legal Services unit:

> *While* [the officer] *may have been acting in another role during part of that period (as noted on page 396* [of the information in issue]*), the advice sought from her was provided on an ongoing basis in her capacity as a legal practitioner and reflected her professional legal opinion.*
>
> ...

25. I acknowledge QPS's submissions about the officer's previous involvement in matters concerning the applicant in her capacity as a legal adviser employed in QPS's Legal Services unit. However, to the extent that the communications in issue indicate, on their face, the role that the officer was discharging at the time of the communications, it is stated to be an acting director position in QPS's Safety and Wellbeing/People Capability Command unit. While the officer may be legally qualified, the communications in issue that she authored do not indicate, at the time of the communication, the existence of a professional relationship of legal adviser and client, such as to secure to the advice an independent character.

26. For this reason, I am not satisfied that the communications in question attract legal professional privilege. Access may therefore not be refused under schedule 3, section 7 of the RTI Act.

27. However, for the reasons that I will discuss below, I am satisfied that disclosure of the communications under the RTI Act would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

Contrary to public interest information

Relevant law

28. Access to information may be refused where its disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.[22]

[21] Pages 36-37, 165, 282-290, 396-407, and 540-547.

[22] Sections 47(3)(b) and 49 of the RTI Act. The 'public interest' refers to considerations affecting the good order and functioning of the community and government affairs for the well-being of citizens. This means that, in general, a public interest consideration is one which is common to all members of, or a substantial segment of, the community, as distinct from matters that concern purely private or personal interests, although there are some recognised public interest considerations that may apply for the benefit of an individual: Chris Wheeler, 'The Public Interest: We Know It's Important, But Do We Know What It Means' (2006) 48 AIAL Forum 12, 14.

29. In assessing whether disclosure of information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest, a decision-maker must take certain steps as set out in section 49(3) of the RTI Act, including, identifying and disregarding irrelevant factors, identifying factors for and against disclosure, and deciding whether, on balance, disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest.

30. Schedule 4 of the RTI Act contains factors that may be relevant in determining where the balance of public interest lies in a particular case. I have considered these,[23] together with all other relevant information, in reaching my decision. I have also applied the RTI Act's pro-disclosure bias[24] and considered Parliament's intention that grounds for refusing access to information are to be interpreted narrowly.[25]

Submissions

31. In his submission of 12 May 2026, the applicant argued as follows:

> *The substantive information should be released because:*
>
> *a. it concerns my own personal information and the handling of workplace, injury management, complaint, and medical matters involving me;*
> *b. it bears directly on accountability and transparency in QPS decision-making and conduct;*
> *c. it may reveal the reasons for decisions, actions, inaction, and the background or contextual information informing those matters;*
> *d. it is relevant to procedural fairness and natural justice, particularly where I have been excluded from internal discussions about matters materially affecting me;*
> *e. there are ongoing proceedings, including a matter presently at QCAT, and the unresolved matters remain live and significant;*
> *f. the complaints and associated handling are important, not trivial, and go to the failure of QPS to properly address serious issues and the deterioration of my health over time; and*
> *g. any legitimate privacy concern can be addressed by targeted redaction rather than broad refusal.*
>
> *I am particularly concerned by the continued pattern whereby QPS relies on fragmentation, delay, and imbalance of power to thwart accountability and transparency. That pattern is documented and noted. Material demonstrating how complaints, medical issues, and case conferencing were internally discussed is central to understanding what occurred. Where discussions around conferencing or third party details include genuinely sensitive material, those specific aspects can be redacted while still releasing the substance of the communications.*
>
> *The mere fact that information sits within workplace complaints or management discussions should not immunise it from disclosure where it concerns the agency's handling of my matters and where those matters have continuing legal and practical*

[23] I have considered each of the public interest factors outlined in schedule 4 of the RTI Act, and any relevant factors are discussed below. Some factors clearly have no relevance, for example, the factor concerning innovation and the facilitation of research.
[24] Section 44 of the RTI Act.
[25] Section 47(2)(a) of the RTI Act.

consequences. The public interest in accountability, transparency, and fair process is strong here.

Findings

32. I have considered all of the factors favouring disclosure listed in Schedule 4 and identified the following as relevant:

    a) enhancement of QPS's accountability and transparency[26]
    b) the information is the applicant's personal information[27]
    c) disclosure could reasonably be expected to advance the fair treatment of individuals and other entities in accordance with the law in their dealings with agencies[28]
    d) disclosure could reasonably be expected to reveal the reason for a government decision and any background or contextual information that informed the decision;[29] and
    e) disclosure could reasonably be expected to contribute to the administration of justice for a person.[30]

33. I have considered all of the nondisclosure/harm factors listed in Schedule 4 and identified the following as relevant:

    a) disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause a public interest harm through disclosure of the personal information of another individual[31]
    b) disclosure could reasonably be expected to prejudice an individual's right to privacy[32]
    c) disclosure could reasonably be expected to prejudice an agency's ability to obtain confidential information;[33] and
    d) disclosure could reasonably be expected to prejudice the management functions of an agency or the conduct of industrial relations by an agency.[34]

34. The words *'could reasonably be expected to'* call for a decision-maker to discriminate between unreasonable expectations and reasonable expectations, between what is merely possible or merely speculative, and expectations that are reasonably based: that is, expectations for the occurrence of which real and substantial grounds exist.[35]

[26] Schedule 4, part 2, items 1 and 3 of the RTI Act.
[27] Schedule 4, part 2, item 7 of the RTI Act.
[28] Schedule 4, part 2, item 10 of the RTI Act.
[29] Schedule 4, part 2, item 11 of the RTI Act.
[30] Schedule 4, part 2, item 17 of the RTI Act.
[31] Schedule 4, part 4, section 6 of the RTI Act.
[32] Schedule 4, part 3, item 3 of the RTI Act.
[33] Schedule 4, part 3, item 16 of the RTI Act.
[34] Schedule 4, part 3, item 19 of the RTI Act.
[35] See *Cannon and Australian Quality Egg Farms Limited* (1994) 1 QAR 491 at [62]-[63].

35. In terms of public interest factors favouring disclosure, the RTI Act recognises a strong public interest in an individual accessing their own personal information.[36] I accept that the Information in Issue contains the applicant's personal information. While most of this information is solely about the applicant, there are occasions where the personal information of the applicant is inextricably intertwined with the personal information of other QPS employees, meaning that the applicant's personal information cannot readily be separated and access given to it alone.[37] Given the nature of the information, which relates to workplace disputes and grievances, I am satisfised that it cannot properly be characterised as routine personal work information of public sector employees. While the RTI Act may recognise a strong public interest in a person obtaining access to their own personal information, it recognises an equally strong public interest in protecting both the personal information, and right to privacy, of other individuals.[38] An automatic public interest harm arises simply through disclosure of another individual's personal information under the RTI Act. Account must also be taken of the fact that there are no restrictions upon what a person may do with information that is disclosed to them under the IP Act, including the possibility of further dissemination.[39] Given the sensitivity of the information in question, and the fact that it was provided in the context of a workplace complaint and/or injury management process, I afford significant weight to the harm and nondisclosure factors concerned with protecting the personal information and right to privacy of other individuals.

36. As to the accountability factors favouring disclosure,[40] I afford them moderate weight when balancing the public interest. I accept that disclosure of some information could reasonably be expected to enhance the accountability and transparency of QPS regarding the way in which it managed the applicant and his workplace injury claim, and the decisions it made. The disclosure of some information may provide background or contextual information that informed the decision-making process. In affording moderate weight to these factors, I have taken into account the significant volume of information already disclosed to the applicant in response to his complaints about QPS's management of him, both through his various RTI or IP access applications, and in the responses and information provided to him by QPS during the relevant period.[41] I consider this information has furthered, to a significant extent, the applicant's understanding of how QPS handled his workplace issues, and that disclosure of the Information in Issue would enhance that understanding to only a moderate extent.

---

[36] Factor b) in paragraph 32. 'Personal information' is defined as *'information or an opinion, including information or an opinion forming part of a database, whether true or not, and whether recorded in a material form or not, about an individual whose identity is apparent, or can reasonably be ascertained, from the information or opinion'*: section 12 of the *Information Privacy Act 2009* (Qld).

[37] See, for example, the refused information on pages 164-165.

[38] See factors a) and b) in paragraph 33.

[39] As Judicial Member McGill SC of QCAT observed *'... the effect of the...* [RTI Act] *is that, once information has been disclosed, it comes under the control of the person to whom it has been disclosed. There is no provision of that Act which contemplates any restriction or limitation on the use which that person can make of that information, including by way of further dissemination.'*: *FLK v Information Commissioner* [2021] QCATA 46 at [17].

[40] Factors a) and d) in paragraph 32 above.

[41] As evidenced by the volume of released information in both this and in other reviews involving the applicant. See, for example, pages 163-171 in this review.

37. Turning to the administration of justice factors,[42] I note that factor c) recognises that the public interest necessarily comprehends an element of justice to the individual.[43] In appropriate cases, this means that a particular applicant's interest in obtaining access to particular documents is capable of being recognised as a facet of the public interest, which may justify giving a particular applicant access to documents that will enable the applicant to assess whether or not fair treatment has been received and, if not, to pursue any available means of redress, including any available legal remedy.

38. As noted, the applicant has advised that he is currently involved in various legal proceedings against QPS in connection with workplace issues.[44] The precise nature of those proceedings, and the specific issues to be determined in them (and, therefore, the relevance or otherwise of the Information in Issue to those issues) are not matters before OIC. I am also restricted in the level of detail I am able to provide about the Information in Issue, as section 108(3) of the RTI Act prohibits the Information Commissioner from including, in the reasons for decision, information that is claimed to be exempt information or contrary to the public interest information. I would simply note that it is doubtful that some information would have ongoing relevance to the applicant's grievances against QPS. But accepting that some or all of the Information in Issue may have a degree of relevance to the applicant's various actions against QPS, I afford moderate weight to the factors. Again, taking account of the nature of the Information in Issue itself, and the substantial volume of information already provided to the applicant by QPS in response to his workplace grievances and management of his workplace injury claim, I am not satisfised that disclosure of the Information in Issue could reasonably be expected to advance significantly the fair treatment of the applicant, or the administration of justice for him more generally. In terms of any legal proceedings, I would also note that it is reasonable to expect that relevant court disclosure processes are available, which require the parties to disclose documents that are directly relevant to the issues to be decided. As the Information Commissioner has previously determined, the RTI and IP Acts are not designed to serve as an adjunct to court processes and court disclosure rules. Rather, they are stand-alone mechanisms for enabling public access to government-held information and, as such, are subject to the qualifications upon, and limitations to, the right of access imposed by the Acts.[45]

39. In summary, I afford significant weight to the personal information public interest factor that favours disclosure of the Information in Issue, and moderate weight to the accountability and administration of justice factors.

40. Turning to the nondisclosure/harm factors listed in paragraph 33 above, I have already explained above why I afford significant weight to the public interest harm caused by disclosing the personal information of other individuals under the RTI Act, and the associated prejudice to the protection of their right to privacy.

---

[42] Factors c) and e) in paragraph 32 above.
[43] Sometimes referred to as an applicant's 'justifiable need to know'.
[44] The applicant has advised OIC in other of his reviews that he is involved in *'multiple live matters involving QPS across jurisdictions'* (email of 19 February 2026).
[45] *Phyland and Department of Police* (Unreported, Queensland Information Commissioner, 31 August 2011) at [24].

41. As regards nondisclosure factors c) and d), the RTI Act recognises that public interest factors favouring nondisclosure arise where disclosure of information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the flow of information to an agency that relates to workplace issues, with an associated prejudice caused to the ability of the agency to discharge its workforce management functions as efficiently and effectively as possible. The bulk of the Information in Issue was communicated between QPS staff in the course of discussing the applicant's workplace injury management and related processes, as well as draft correspondence.

42. There is a strong public interest in protecting the ability of QPS staff, who are involved in management roles, to communicate openly and candidly with each other about staff management issues and the handling of workplace grievances. There is also a strong public interest in protecting the flow of confidential information about workplace issues from staff to managers and that assists managers to discharge their management functions efficiently and effectively.[46] I am satisfied that disclosing these types of discussions under the RTI Act, where there is no restriction on their further use, dissemination or publication, could reasonably be expected to have a chilling effect on the willingness of managers and staff to provide such information, and to express candid opinions when discussing options for managing workplace issues. Disclosure under the RTI Act could reasonably be expected to substantially erode confidence in workplace management processes and procedures, and the manner in which workplace grievances and disputes are handled by an agency. This, in turn, would cause significant prejudice to QPS's ability to manage its workforce efficiently and effectively.[47] I therefore afford significant weight to both factor c) and factor d).

43. In summary, I afford significant weight to nondisclosure factors a) to d) in paragraph 33.

44. After weighing the competing public interest factors favouring disclosure and nondisclosure of the Information in Issue, I am satisfied that the nondisclosure factors outweigh the disclosure factors, such that disclosure would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest. Access to the Information in Issue under the RTI Act may therefore be refused on that basis.

Conclusion

45. The above are the reasons for my decision set out in paragraph 1 above.

46. I have made this decision as a delegate of the Information Commissioner, under section 145 of the RTI Act.

--End--

[46] See *Tol and University of Queensland* [2015] QICmr 4 (18 February 2015) at [27].
[47] See *S41 and Griffith University* [2023] QICmr 64 (7 December 2023) at [50].