

# Cases

---

## BRITISH CASES

*Millar v Kinkaid* (1750) 4 Burr.  
2319, Eng Rep. 210 **55**

*Tonson v Collins* (1760) 1 Black.  
W 301, 96 Eng. Rep. 169 **55,**  
**57, 58**

*Osborne v Donaldson* (1765) 2  
Eden. 328, 28 Eng. Rep. 924  
**55**

*Millar v Taylor* (1769) 4 Burr.  
2303, 98 Eng. Rep. 201 **55, 56**

*Donaldson v Becket* (1774) 4 Burr.  
2408, 98 Eng. Rep. 257 **55, 58,**  
**70–71, 93**

*Sayre v Moore* (1785) 1 East 361  
n., 102 Eng. Rep. 139 **60, 66,**  
**83**

*Dodsley v Kinersley* (1761) Amb.  
403, 27 Eng. Rep. 270 **60, 66, 72**

*Cary v Kearsley* (1802) 4 Esp. 168,  
170 Eng. Rep. 679 **72, 83**

*Spiers v Brown* (1858) 6 WR  
352 **72, 83**

*Kenrick v Lawrence* (1890) LR 25,  
Q.B.D. 99 **155**

*University of London Press Ltd v*  
*University Tutorial Press Ltd*  
(1916) 2 Ch 602 **72, 74, 83**

## AUSTRALIAN CASES

*Victoria Park Racing and*  
*Recreation Grounds Co Ltd v*

*Taylor* (1937) 58 CLR 479  
**73**

*Milpirrum v Nabalco Pty Ltd*  
(1971) 17 FLR 141 **117, 118,**  
**126**

*Foster v Mountford & Rigby Ltd*  
(1977) 14 ALR 71 **22, 117, 118,**  
**126**

*Coe v Commonwealth of Australia*  
(1979) ALRJ 40 **155**

*Pitjantjatjara Council Inc & Peter*  
*Nganingu v John Lowe & Lyn*  
*Bender* (1983) Victoria Supreme  
Court, unreported **127**

*Yanggarnny Wunungmurra v Peter*  
*Stipes* (1983) Federal Court,  
unreported **1, 15, 89**

*Kalamazoo (Aust) Pty Ltd v*  
*Compact Business Systems*  
*P/L* (1985) 5 IPR 213  
**73, 74**

*Muschinki v Dodds* (1985) 160  
CLR 583 **156**

*Mabo v Queensland [No1]*(1988)  
166 CLR 186 **35, 36**

*Bulun Bulun v Nejlam Pty Ltd,*  
(1989) Federal Court, unre-  
ported **89, 142**

*Yumbulul v Reserve Bank of*  
*Australia & Others* (1991) 21  
IPR 481 **22, 110–111, 213–214,**  
**219**

*Mabo v Queensland [No.2]* (1992)  
175 CLR 1 **35, 122, 143, 149,**  
**155, 156**

- Coe v Commonwealth of Australia*  
[1993] HCA 42; (1993) 118 ALR  
193 **155**
- Milpurruru & Others v Indofurn  
Pty Ltd* (1994) 30 IPR 209 **1–2,**  
**11–12, 91, 111, 122, 131–141,**  
**159–160, 198**
- Registrar, Accident Compensation  
Tribunal v FCT* (1993) 178 CLR  
145 **156**
- Wik Peoples v State of Queensland*  
(1996) 187 CLR 1 **64, 155**
- Bulun Bulun & Others v R & T  
Textiles Pty Ltd* (1998) 41 IPR  
513 **91, 131, 141–156, 157–160,**  
**209–210**
- Members of the Yorta Yorta*
- Community v State of Victoria*  
[1998] FCA 1606 **215, 220**
- Chapman v Luminis Pty Ltd and  
Others* [2001] FCA 1106 **220**
- Telstra Corporation Limited v  
Desktop Marketing Systems Pty  
Ltd* [2001] FCA 612 **74–76**
- Members of the Yorta Yorta  
Community v State of Victoria*  
[2001] FCA 45 **128, 220**
- Members of the Yorta Yorta  
Community v State of Victoria*  
[2002] HCA 58 **128, 220**
- Desktop Marketing Systems  
Pty Ltd v Telstra Corporation  
Limited* [2002] FCAFC 112 **54,**  
**74–76**



We decided to go and look at the site that was the subject of the painting. These were the waterhole paintings, right, and I thought that this waterhole was like, down the street, and it turned out it was in the most remote place. . .the waterhole that he [John Bulun Bulun] depicts, and has depicted throughout his whole artistic career. . .and others have depicted too was in fact a site he had never been to. . .it had never dawned on me before that for some of the artists, the first time that they saw the waterhole that they were depicting was with me from an aeroplane when we finally found it, using maps to locate it. We never landed, couldn't land there, it was in the most remote place. . .and I only realised then that what they were depicting was from their own sense of, you know, their own imagery. . .they had incorporated it into their own sense of the present and the real, something that they didn't know at all. . .it was amazing, that aspect of the Bulun Bulun case was amazing. I only realised that day that he had not actually been to the waterhole.

Colin Golvan (2002)

But the property here claimed is all ideal; a set of ideas which have no bounds or marks whatever, nothing that is capable of a visible possession, nothing that can sustain any one of the qualities or incidents of property. Their whole existence is in the mind alone; incapable of any other modes of acquisition or enjoyment, than by mental possession or apprehension; safe and invulnerable, from their own immateriality: no trespass can reach them; no tort affect them; no fraud or violence diminish or damage them. Yet these are the phantoms which the Author would grasp and confine to himself: and these are what the defendant is charged with having robbed the plaintiff of.

Justice Yates, *Millar v Taylor* (1769) 98 ER 233

To know the cause of a phenomenon is already a step taken in the direction of controlling it.

Ranajit Guha (1988)

