

# SUPREME COURT OF TASMANIA

## PRACTICE DIRECTION

**No. 3 of 2008**

**3 October 2008**

The following Practice Direction is published by direction of the Chief Justice, the Honourable Justice Crawford.

This Practice Direction replaces 3/2005.

### CITATION OF JUDGMENTS

The Direction concerns the citation of judgments in lists of authorities and written submissions.

#### **Tasmanian unreported judgments:**

For judgments delivered prior to 2000, the numbering system used by AustLII may not correspond with the systems used by this Court when the judgment was delivered. For example, a judgment which was handed down in December 1997 as number 158/1997 was given the medium neutral citation [1997] TASSC 161 when made available on AustLII.

To assist in citing judgments in electronic form, unreported judgments of this Court, whether at first instance or appellate level in the Full Court or Court of Criminal Appeal, will be cited in the following form:

*Smith v Brown* [1997] TASSC 161

If the medium neutral reference is not the same as the Court's original reference, the Court's original reference should be included. For example:

*Smith v Brown* [1997] TASSC 161 (Judgment No. 158/1997)

If a judgment has consecutively numbered paragraphs, it should be referred to by paragraph numbers rather than page numbers. The use of square brackets enclosing the paragraph number is a convenient method of distinguishing references to paragraphs from page references. The citation of a specific paragraph is to be in the following form:

*Smith v Brown* [1997] TASSC 161 at [15]

**Reported judgments:**

When a judgment has been published it is given a print citation. An authorised report is preferred to an unauthorised report. Once a judgment has been published in the Tasmanian Reports, which are the authorised reports of this Court, the only appropriate citation is to this series.

For judgments published in reports other than the Tasmanian Reports, references may be to the medium neutral AustLII citation but the print citation should also be included as follows:

*Smith v Brown* [1997] TASSC 161; (1997) 95 A Crim R 50