



"Richard McHugh"  
 <mchugh@banco.net.au>  
 u>

30/03/2005 12:33 PM

To: "Stephen Rushton SC" <srushton@selbornechambers.com.au>, <John.Dalzell@corrs.com.au>  
 cc: <richard.mchugh@banco.net.au>  
 Subject: RE: Ellis - IMPORTANT

I completely agree with Stephen as to 1, 2 and 3.

As to 4, I think it comes down to a judgment call as to how bad their report is as it stands. If it's really bad — and never having met the plaintiff is a flying start from our point of view — then the last thing we want to do is provoke a better report. Particularly given the opportunity now open to us to attack the report for any matter of factual significance which it doesn't address, my inclination is to agree with Stephen that the balance of tactical considerations at this stage favours not having the plaintiff examined.

Kind regards.

Richard

If this email has been received by someone other than the persons to whom it is addressed, please notify Richard McHugh immediately on (61) (2) 8239-0268 or by return email. The email and any attachments are confidential and may be subject to legal professional privilege. Privilege is not waived by reason of loss or mistaken delivery. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Liability is limited by a scheme approved under the Professional Standards Legislation.

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Rushton SC [mailto:srushton@selbornechambers.com.au]  
 Sent: Tuesday, 29 March 2005 12:04 PM  
 To: John.Dalzell@corrs.com.au  
 Cc: richard.mchugh@banco.net.au  
 Subject: RE: Ellis - IMPORTANT

John

Each of the tactical questions posed has inherent risks. However the main point is that we want to minimise the risk that the Ellis psychiatric evidence will get any better. Subject to Richard's views I think the best way forward is as follows:

- 1.No.
- 2.Yes.
3. Not at this point.
4. This is the most difficult question but on balance I do not think that we should require Ellis to be examined at this point. My reasons are as follows:
  - (a) if Westmore produces a strong report adverse to Ellis and the opinion of Dr Phillips then it is likely that Phillips will then examine Ellis and put forward an admissible report in reply. That might prove fatal on this sort of application as the court is unlikely to embark on a resolution of conflicting expert opinion.
  - (b) if Westmore produces something less than a very strong report then we would probably not want to serve it thereby giving rise to a possible *Brown v Dunn* problem (i.e. we had him examined but have not called the expert thereby giving rise to the inference that nothing Westmore could say would have assisted our case.)

In summary my opinion is that the strategy which has the greatest chance of limiting the impact of the psychiatric evidence is to deal with it as it currently stands. This strategy is by no means foolproof but the alternatives have a greater potential downside.

Kind regards

Stephen Rushton.

Stephen Rushton SC

7th Floor  
Selborne Chambers  
174 Phillip Street  
SYDNEY 2000  
DX 372  
Tel: 92316216  
Fax: 92215386

Liability limited by a scheme approved under the Professional Standards  
Legislation

\*\*\*\*\*

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and may be the subject of client-legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, interference with, disclosure or copying of this material is unauthorised and prohibited.

This e-mail and any attachments may also be subject to copyright. No part of them may be reproduced, adapted or transmitted without the written permission of the copyright owner.

If you have received this e-mail in error, please advise the sender by return e-mail and delete the message from your system.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: John.Dalzell@corrs.com.au [mailto:John.Dalzell@corrs.com.au]  
Sent: Tuesday, 29 March 2005 11:29 AM  
To: Stephen Rushton SC  
Cc: richard.mchugh@banco.net.au  
Subject: Re: Ellis - IMPORTANT

Dear Stephen and Richard

I am concerned that the only medical evidence in the limitation argument of case is the report of Dr Jonathan Phillips (annexed to the affidavit of David Begg sworn 12 November 2004) Attached.

As you may remember Doctor Phillips compiled his short report based solely on a select number of documents that were included in his instructions. Doctor Phillips has never met the Plaintiff. The solicitor for the Plaintiff assured me that they would not be putting on a more comprehensive medical report as evidence in this case. Indeed, they were satisfied that the evidence in this report supports their claim and discharges their burden under Section 60I(1) of the Limitation Act 1969 (NSW) (the Act). This raises a number of tactical questions:

1. Do we now put the Plaintiff on Notice that we take issue with the medical report of Doctor Phillips? This would almost certainly prompt the service of a more detailed report.
2. Do we simply say nothing and 'surprise' them with this submission at the Limitation Hearing?
3. In any event, do we put the Plaintiff on notice that we wish Doctor

Phillips to attend the Limitation Hearing for cross-examination (unlikely-given he has never met the Plaintiff)?

4. Do we require the Plaintiff to attend a medical examination by our medical expert (we have already sent a provisional brief to Doctor Bruce Westmore in this regard).

This matter is now listed for hearing on 25 July, and I appreciate that you are both extremely busy, perhaps you could advise by email or telephone, whichever is easier.

(See attached file: scan.pdf)

This is an email from Corrs Chambers Westgarth or Corrs Support Services Pty Ltd. The email and any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged and/or subject to copyright. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose or use the information contained in this e-mail. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately and delete the email and all copies. We do not guarantee that this email and any attachments are free from virus or other errors. We will not be responsible for loss or damage resulting (either directly or indirectly) from any such virus or error. We will only be responsible for a change to a document if we made the change. The content of and opinions expressed in non-business emails are not necessarily ours.

If this is a commercial electronic message within the meaning of the Spam Act, you may indicate that you do not wish to receive any further commercial electronic messages from us by sending an email to <mailto:privacy@corrs.com.au>