

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

Not Restricted

S ECI 2019 01926

**BETWEEN:**

NICOS ANDRIANAKIS

Plaintiff

- and -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC and others  
(according to the Schedule of Parties)

Defendants

**AND BETWEEN**

JAMAL SALEM in her capacity as executor  
for the estate of ANWAR SALEM

Plaintiff

- and -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC and others  
(according to the Schedule of Parties)

Defendants

S ECI 2020 03593

**AND BETWEEN**

PETER STEWART

Plaintiff

- and -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC and others  
(according to the Schedule of Parties)

Defendants

S ECI 2020 04787

**AND BETWEEN**

H.D. ANDREE & M. ANDREE (a partnership)

Plaintiff

- and -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC and others  
(according to the Schedule of Parties)

Defendants



---

JUDGE: Matthews J  
WHERE HELD: Melbourne  
DATE OF HEARING: 9 and 10 September 2024  
DATE OF JUDGMENT: 2 December 2024  
CASE MAY BE CITED AS: Andrianakis v Uber Technologies Inc and Others  
(Settlement Approval)  
MEDIUM NEUTRAL CITATION: [2024] VSC 733

---

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE – Application for approval of settlement of group proceeding – Whether terms of settlement fair and reasonable – Whether settlement distribution scheme fair and reasonable – Whether claim for legal fees and disbursements fair and reasonable – Settlement approved – *Supreme Court Act 1986 (Vic) Part 4A*.

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE – Applications by unregistered group members for leave to participate in the settlement – Rationale for soft class closure orders is consistent with requirement for unfair prejudice to be established as the basis for granting such leave – Adequacy of notification regime – Exercise of discretion partly by way of categories.

---

<u>APPEARANCES:</u>	<u>Counsel</u>	<u>Solicitors</u>
For the Plaintiffs in each proceeding	Ms M Szydzik SC, Mr T Farhall and Ms A Staker of counsel	Maurice Blackburn Pty Ltd
For the Defendants in each proceeding	Mr D Sulan SC and Ms M Ellicott of counsel	Herbert Smith Freehills
For the Harbour Fund III, L.P	Mr N De Young KC and Mr K Raghavan of counsel	Webb Henderson
As Contradictor	Ms K Burke SC and Mr T Rawlinson of counsel	None

## Contents

<b>A</b>	<b>Introduction and overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Summary of proposed settlement</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Materials before the Court</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Confidentiality</b>	<b>11</b>
D.1	The plaintiffs' application for confidentiality orders	11
D.2	Harbour's application for confidentiality orders	13
D.3	Consideration regarding confidentiality orders	14
<b>E</b>	<b>Legal principles</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Unregistered group members</b>	<b>18</b>
F.1	Maurice Blackburn's review and categorisation of the UGM Applications	19
F.2	Further materials	21
F.3	Applicable legal principles	22
F.4	General application of these principles to this case	26
F.5	Adequacy of the distribution of the Opt Out and Closure Notice	29
F.6	UGM Applications which do not meet key criteria	32
F.6.1	Invalid applications – Category 1 of the UGM Categorisation Register	33
F.6.2	Applications not supported by evidence – Category 2 of the UGM Categorisation Register	33
F.6.3	Applications which do not identify the basis on which leave ought be granted	35
F.6.4	UGM Applications by Gordon Legal clients which were not supported by affidavits by the individual UGMs	38
F.7	Categorisation of the UGM Applications after implementation of these key criteria	40
F.8	Re-review by Maurice Blackburn – Combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9	40
F.8.1	How the MB Re-Review came about	40
F.8.2	Description of how the MB Re-Review was conducted	41
F.8.3	Consideration of UGM Applications falling solely within combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9	43
F.9	The Court's review of the remaining UGM Applications	45
F.9.1	Category 3 – Applications which state the reason for missing the class closure deadline	46
F.9.2	Category 4 – No knowledge of proceeding	48
F.9.3	Category 5 – No knowledge of Class Closure Deadline	49
F.9.4	Category 6 – Statement of group membership	50
F.9.5	Category 7 – Medical reasons	50
F.9.6	Category 8 – Language or special vulnerabilities	52
F.9.7	Category 9 – Financial hardship	54
F.9.8	Category 10 – Travel	54
F.9.9	Categories 11 to 14 – Mistaken belief of registration	56
F.9.10	Category 15 – Other	58
F.10	Conclusions regarding UGM Applications	59
<b>G</b>	<b>Objections to the proposed settlement</b>	<b>62</b>

<b>H</b>	<b>Fairness and reasonableness of the proposed settlement</b>	<b>65</b>
H.1	Quantum of the proposed settlement and the risks associated with continuing the litigation	67
H.1.1	Plaintiffs' submissions	67
H.1.2	Contradictor's submissions	67
H.1.3	Objections	68
H.1.4	Consideration	70
H.2	Whether it is in the interests of group members for the litigation to continue	73
H.3	Reaction of group members, in particular complaints regarding consultation or transparency	74
H.3.1	Content of some of the objections	74
H.3.2	Plaintiffs' submissions	75
H.3.3	Contradictor's submissions	76
H.3.4	Consideration	76
H.4	Proposed SDS	77
H.4.1	Overview of the SDS	78
H.4.2	Plaintiffs' submissions	80
H.4.3	Contradictor's submissions	81
H.4.4	Objections	84
H.4.5	Consideration	85
H.5	Legal costs and uplift to Maurice Blackburn	88
H.5.1	Overview of what the plaintiffs seek	88
H.5.2	Principles	89
H.5.3	Costs Referee's Report	89
H.5.4	Plaintiffs' submissions	93
H.5.5	Contradictor's submissions	93
H.5.6	Harbour's submissions	94
H.5.7	Objections	94
H.5.8	Plaintiffs' reply submissions	96
H.5.9	Consideration	96
H.6	Funding commission	98
H.7	Payments to the plaintiffs and sample group members	103
<b>I</b>	<b>Appointment of settlement administrator</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>J</b>	<b>The Stewart and Andree proceedings</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>K</b>	<b>Conclusion and disposition</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>ANNEXURE A</b>		<b>109</b>
<b>ANNEXURE B</b>		<b>123</b>
<b>ANNEXURE C</b>		<b>125</b>
<b>ANNEXURE D</b>		<b>132</b>
<b>ANNEXURE E</b>		<b>156</b>
<b>ANNEXURE F</b>		<b>158</b>
<b>ANNEXURE G</b>		<b>160</b>
<b>ANNEXURE H</b>		<b>161</b>
<b>ANNEXURE I</b>		<b>181</b>

HER HONOUR:

**A Introduction and overview**

- 1 The entry of Uber ride-sharing services into the Australian point to point passenger transport market caused significant disruption to the taxi and hire car industries. It precipitated major changes to those industries, including to the regulatory framework. Thousands of drivers, operators, licence holders and network service providers lost significant income and/or capital value, and many experienced substantial declines in their livelihoods, which they attribute to the entry of Uber ride-sharing services into the market.
- 2 In 2019, the law firm Maurice Blackburn commenced a group proceeding, commonly referred to as a class action, against seven companies in the Uber group of companies (**Uber Entities**, or **Uber**). The group members were participants in the taxi and hire car industries in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia. Three other proceedings were subsequently commenced in relation to these issues.<sup>1</sup> On the eve of the trial, the parties entered into a proposed settlement. Without admission of liability, Uber agreed to pay \$271.8 million to settle the proceedings, inclusive of all legal and funding costs, and interest. A proposed settlement of a class action can only go ahead if Court approval of it is obtained.
- 3 Accordingly, this judgment concerns an application under s 33V and/or s 33ZF of the *Supreme Court Act 1986* (Vic) (**the Act**) for approval of the proposed settlement of four group proceedings brought against seven Uber Entities alleged to be responsible for introducing a ride-sharing service known as UberX to Australia and operating the service between 2014 and 2017. Specifically, the plaintiffs in each proceeding seek the approval of the settlement of their respective proceedings, on the terms set out in the deed of settlement entered into by the parties and dated 12 April 2024 (**Deed**) and the proposed Settlement Distribution Scheme (**SDS**), and related orders.<sup>2</sup>
- 4 For the reasons set out in this judgment, the proposed settlement should be approved and administered according to the proposed SDS.

---

<sup>1</sup> See paragraph 5 and the footnotes thereto.

<sup>2</sup> The plaintiffs' proposed orders include proposed confidentiality orders over certain materials.

5 The four proceedings subject to this settlement approval application are:

- (a) proceeding S ECI 2019 01926, commenced by Mr Nicos Andrianakis (the **Andrianakis proceeding**);<sup>3</sup>
- (b) proceeding S ECI 2020 01834, commenced by Ms Jamal Salem in her capacity as executor for the estate of Mr Anwar Salem (the **Salem proceeding**);<sup>4</sup>
- (c) proceeding S ECI 2020 03593, commenced by Mr Peter Stewart (the **Stewart proceeding**);<sup>5</sup>
- (d) proceeding S ECI 2020 04787, commenced by H. D. Andree & M Andree (a partnership) (the **Andree proceeding**).<sup>6</sup>

6 A fifth 'protective' proceeding was issued in Western Australia (the **Rosengrave proceeding**).<sup>7</sup>

7 In brief, the plaintiffs in the proceedings sought relief in the form of damages for alleged loss of income and a reduction in the value of taxi and hire car licences that they claim was caused to taxi and hire car drivers, licence owners, operators and network service providers by the unlawful introduction and operation of UberX services by the Uber entities in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western

---

<sup>3</sup> The Andrianakis Proceeding was commenced on 3 May 2019 by a licence-holder, taxi-cab operator and driver. He brought the proceeding on his own behalf and on behalf of all providers of point-to-point transport services (being taxi licence holders, operators, drivers and network service providers, and hire car licence holders, operators and drivers) in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia.

<sup>4</sup> The Salem Proceeding was commenced on 20 April 2020. Mr Salem was a taxi licence holder in Victoria who passed away in 2018. Ms Salem brings the Salem Proceeding on her own behalf, and on behalf of persons who had derivative claims of the kind alleged in the Andrianakis Proceeding.

<sup>5</sup> The plaintiffs say that the Stewart Proceeding is a 'protective' proceeding commenced in NSW, because of limitations arguments foreshadowed by the defendants and then alleged in their defence, and subsequently transferred to this Court.

<sup>6</sup> The plaintiffs say that the Andree proceeding is a 'protective' proceeding commenced in Queensland, also in connection with limitations arguments raised by the defendants, and subsequently transferred to this Court.

<sup>7</sup> The Rosengrave proceeding was commenced in Western Australia for the same or similar reasons as the two other protective proceedings. The Rosengrave proceeding was not transferred to this Court and does not form part of the application for approval before this Court. The Court is informed that, if the Court approves the settlement of the Proceedings, the plaintiff in the Rosengrave proceeding will apply to the WA Supreme Court to dismiss the claims in that proceeding and approve the settlement of the representative aspect of the Rosengrave proceeding.

Australia. The Uber entities are each part of a corporate group headed by the first defendant, Uber Technologies Incorporated.

8 The relevant cause of action in the proceedings is conspiracy by unlawful means. To establish that tort, the plaintiffs had to show that the defendants (or two or more of them) agreed or combined to commit an unlawful act, with an intention to injure the plaintiffs and group members, that the agreement or combination was carried into effect, and that the plaintiffs and group members consequently suffered pecuniary loss.<sup>8</sup>

9 The plaintiffs in each proceeding are represented by Maurice Blackburn and litigation funding in respect of all five proceedings was provided by Harbour Fund III, L.P. Aspects of the settlement requiring approval include amounts proposed to be paid to Maurice Blackburn in connection with legal costs and to Harbour in respect of a funding commission.

10 Since 2019, the proceedings have been hotly contested with a number of interlocutory disputes, including pleading disputes and strike out applications, discovery and privilege disputes, contested service on overseas defendants, and disputes over sample group members. Some of these interlocutory decisions were also the subject of appeals.

11 On 21 July 2023, Nichols J made orders in the Andrianakis and Salem proceedings,<sup>9</sup> providing for a registration process to occur and for what is known as ‘soft class closure’ (**Class Closure Orders**).<sup>10</sup> The Class Closure Orders relevantly included the following:

- (a) the time and date by which group members could opt out of the proceedings was fixed as 4:00pm on 2 October 2023 (**Class Closure Deadline**);

---

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, *Uber Australia Pty Ltd v Andrianakis* (2020) 61 VR 580, 593 [31].

<sup>9</sup> The three other protective proceedings had been temporarily stayed.

<sup>10</sup> See paragraph 7 of the order of Nichols J in *Andrianakis v Uber Technologies Inc and Ors* (Supreme Court of Victoria, S ECI 2019 01926, 21 July 2023) and paragraph 7 of the order of Nichols J in *Jamal Salem in her capacity as executor for the estate of Anwar Salem v Uber Technologies Inc and Ors* (Supreme Court of Victoria, S ECI 2020 01834, 21 July 2023). Those orders were amended by paragraph 12 of the Order of Nichols J made in each proceeding on 13 February 2024, to extend the date until which the class was closed from 3 March 2024 to 17 March 2024). See also *Andrianakis v Uber Technologies Inc* [2023] VSC 415 (Nichols J) (**Class Closure Reasons**).

- (b) by the Class Closure Deadline, a group member could register their claim with Maurice Blackburn (the means by which group members were to register their claim and what information they had to provide were set out in the orders);
- (c) subject to further order, only group members who had registered by the Class Closure Deadline (**registered group members**, or **RGMs**) were entitled to any relief or payment arising from an agreement to settle the proceedings where that agreement was reached any time between 21 July 2023 and 3 March 2024 (the date was later extended by Court order to 17 March 2024) and the agreement was subsequently approved by the Court;
- (d) any group member who did not opt out or register by the Class Closure Deadline would remain a group member for all purposes of the proceedings but would not, without leave of the Court, be permitted to seek any benefit pursuant to any such Court-approved settlement of the proceedings; and
- (e) the content of notices (**Opt Out and Closure Notice**) and advertisements and the manner in which Maurice Blackburn was to advertise and give notice were prescribed in the Class Closure Orders.<sup>11</sup>

12 While this will be discussed in greater detail later in these reasons, the rationale for the Class Closure Orders in this case was that it was not possible for the parties to engage in meaningful settlement discussions or to get their arms around the potential quantum of the group's claims without some knowledge of the size of the group.<sup>12</sup>

13 On 17 March 2024, the night before the trial in the Andrianakis and Salem proceedings, the parties reached an in-principle settlement in respect of all five proceedings. On 12 April 2024, the parties executed the Deed.

14 As at that time, there were 8,701 registered group members, around 98% of whom have signed a funding agreement with Harbour.

---

<sup>11</sup> The notice regime will be discussed later in these reasons.

<sup>12</sup> *Class Closure Reasons* [2023] VSC 415.



- 15 On 19 April 2024, I made orders (**19 April Orders**) for the conduct of the approval application, including:
- (a) orders for a notice of the proposed settlement to be given to group members (whether registered or not) (**Settlement Notice**);<sup>13</sup>
  - (b) a regime by which group members could object to the proposed settlement by submitting a completed notice of objection (the form of which was included in the Settlement Notice) and evidence (by way of affidavit), together with any written submissions (of no more than two pages) to Maurice Blackburn and to the Court by 4:00pm on 2 July 2024. The email addresses to which the objections were to be sent were set out in the orders;
  - (c) a regime in respect of group members who had not registered with Maurice Blackburn by the Class Closure Deadline as set out in the Class Closure Orders (**unregistered group members, or UGMs**), which included steps as follows:
    - (A) by 4:00pm on 7 May 2024, Maurice Blackburn was to make available on its website an online portal for the purpose of collecting the contact details of any person who is a UGM who wished to participate in the proposed settlement (**Online Portal**);<sup>14</sup>
    - (B) once a UGM entered their contact details on the Online Portal, Maurice Blackburn was to send them an additional notice (**Communication**)<sup>15</sup> and the Settlement Notice;
    - (C) by 4:00pm on 2 July 2024, UGMs who wished to seek leave from the Court to participate in the proposed settlement were required to identify the basis on which the Court should grant permission to do so and provide evidence by way of affidavit in support, and any written submissions of no more than two pages (**UGM**

---

<sup>13</sup> The content of the Settlement Notice and the manner in which it was to be given to group members was prescribed in the 19 April Orders.

<sup>14</sup> The form and content of the text to be displayed on the Online Portal was prescribed in the 19 April Orders.

<sup>15</sup> The content of the Communication was prescribed in the 19 April Orders.

**Application**) by email to Maurice Blackburn (the relevant email address being specified in the orders);<sup>16</sup> and

- (D) Maurice Blackburn was to provide the Court with a copy of UGM Applications received pursuant to sub-paragraph (C) above.
- (d) orders for the appointment of Ms Catherine Dealehr, an independent costs solicitor, as a special referee for the purpose of conducting an inquiry and making a written report to the Court stating, with reasons, the referee's opinion as to the reasonableness of the plaintiffs' legal costs and disbursements incurred in relation to the proceedings and as to the reasonableness of the sum proposed for settlement administration costs (**Costs Referee's Report**). The Costs Referee's Report was to be provided to the Court and to the plaintiffs, on a confidential basis, by 4:00pm on 2 July 2024; and
- (e) timetabling orders for the conduct of the settlement approval application, including:
- (A) setting the deadline of 4:00pm on 2 July 2024 (**2 July Deadline**) for submitting an Objection or a UGM Application;
  - (B) listing the proceedings for further directions on 25 July 2024 (subsequently changed to 24 July 2024 by orders made on 11 July 2024, which change of date was required to be advertised on the Court's website page for the Uber Group Proceedings and Maurice Blackburn's website for the Uber Group Proceedings);
  - (C) specifying a date and time of 4:00pm on 9 August 2024 by which the plaintiffs and Harbour<sup>17</sup> were to file and serve any affidavits or written submissions on which they seek to rely in relation to the approval application. Any affidavits or written submissions over which they wished to claim confidentiality were to be sent

---

<sup>16</sup> The Notice and the Communication included instructions to the effect of sub-paragraph (C), being how to make a UGM Application

<sup>17</sup> Harbour was granted leave to appear and make submissions in respect of the approval application.

to my Chambers by email, rather than filed and served, by that same deadline; and

- (D) listing the approval application for hearing at 10:00am on 9 and 10 September 2024.

16 Michael Donnelly of Maurice Blackburn has given evidence as to the plaintiffs' compliance with these orders, including as to the Settlement Notice and its publication and distribution. I am satisfied that the plaintiffs have complied with the 19 April Orders.

17 On 11 and 24 July 2024, the Court held directions hearings for the proceedings so as to receive updates regarding the processing of objections and UGM Applications, and to confirm timetabling matters. I made orders on 24 July 2024 which included, amongst other things:

- (a) orders appointing independent counsel, Ms Kate Burke SC and Mr Tom Rawlinson, as contradictor (the **Contradictor**) to review and make submissions about the objections and the UGM Applications at the hearing of the approval application; and
- (b) orders that unless the Court had separately granted an extension of time to submit a UGM Application or an objection following an application made to the Court for such an extension, UGM Applications and objections submitted after the 2 July Deadline would not be considered by the Court. On 29 July 2024, I published reasons for making these orders.<sup>18</sup>

18 A total of 634 objections were received by the Court-ordered deadline.<sup>19</sup> Of those objections, Maurice Blackburn identified that 549 were in fact purported UGM Applications (that is, objections that were or contained requests by unregistered group members to participate in the proposed settlement). Consideration of the objections which were in truth UGM Applications is found in section F.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Andrianakis v Uber Technologies Inc; Salem v Uber Technologies Inc (No 2)* [2024] VSC 436 (**UGM Application Extension Reasons**).

<sup>19</sup> Including the extension granted to Mr Greg Webb of Taxicab Investments Pty Ltd to lodge an objection.

19 A total of 6,476 UGM Applications were received by the Court-ordered deadline (or where extensions of time were granted).<sup>20</sup> The UGM Applications are considered in section E of these reasons.

**B Summary of proposed settlement**

20 It is proposed that Uber pay the proposed settlement amount of \$271.8 million, inclusive of all legal and funding costs, and interest. The settlement amount is to be distributed according to the SDS, subject to the following proposed deductions:

- (a) Legal costs, in the amount of approximately \$38.9 million, or around 14.2% of the settlement sum. This includes a 25% uplift on the conditional component of Maurice Blackburn's legal fees.<sup>21</sup>
- (b) Litigation funding charges to be paid to Harbour in the amount of \$81.54 million, representing approximately 30% of the settlement sum.
- (c) Reimbursement payments for the plaintiffs and sample group members in the amount of \$220,000.
- (d) Costs of administering the SDS. It is proposed that Maurice Blackburn be appointed as administrator of the SDS. The costs which will be incurred as a result of this work are not known, however, Maurice Blackburn proposes that a costs assessor provide four reports over the course of the administration in respect of those costs.

21 The SDS provides for distributions to be made to participating group members based on five types of claims: capital loss claims, lease income loss claims, operator claims, driver claims, and network service provider (**NSP**) claims. Each type of claim (other than an NSP claim) is assessed by identifying a starting loss value, and then applying a series of discounts. NSP claims are to be individually assessed by a consulting

---

<sup>20</sup> This figure includes the 549 objections identified as purported UGM applications. An extension of time to lodge an application to apply for leave to participate was granted in respect of certain UGMs who had applied for an extension: see my orders dated 24 July 2024 made in all four proceedings and my orders dated 7 August 2024 and 19 August 2024 in the Andrianakis proceeding.

<sup>21</sup> As at the date of the settlement approval application being made and heard, the exact amount of legal fees was not known because Maurice Blackburn had not finalised their legal costs and disbursements for the period from 1 May 2024 up to the date of the settlement approval hearing, including costs relating to the Contradictor's expenses.

accountant, and then a discount is applied. There are allowances made for partial ownership interests or industry participation over only part of the claim period. A group member may have multiple claims (ie, an individual who owned a taxi licence, operated the taxi vehicle and drove the taxi during the relevant period would have three claims: a capital loss claim, an operator claim and a driver claim).

22 Because of the way claims are proposed to be assessed, distributions will not reflect the actual loss suffered by an individual group member, but identically situated group members will receive identical payments. The assessment will not involve investigation of circumstances or losses of any individual group member, or require the production of financial records or other direct evidence of loss. The SDS provides for a right of review from decisions made as to the group member's claim data, eligibility, and ultimate assessment.

### C Materials before the Court

23 In respect of the application for settlement approval, the plaintiffs rely on the following materials:<sup>22</sup>

- (a) the affidavit of Mr Michael Harold Donnelly of Maurice Blackburn, solicitors for the plaintiffs, affirmed 15 April 2024;
- (b) the first confidential affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 9 August 2024 (the **First Confidential Affidavit**), and the confidential opinion of counsel which is exhibited to that affidavit (**Counsel Opinion**);
- (c) an open affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 9 August 2024 (the **Open Affidavit**);
- (d) an affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 9 August 2024 concerning objections made to the proposed settlement;<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> This paragraph describes the material relied upon by the plaintiffs up to and including the settlement approval hearing. There were two further affidavits prepared after the hearing, in circumstances which I describe later, upon which the plaintiffs also rely.

<sup>23</sup> The plaintiffs sought confidentiality orders over part of this affidavit.

- (e) an affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 9 August 2024 addressing the position of unregistered group members (**First UGM Affidavit**);<sup>24</sup>
- (f) a further affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 29 August 2024 concerning unregistered group members;<sup>25</sup>
- (g) a third affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 29 August 2024 concerning unregistered group members (**Third UGM Affidavit**);<sup>26</sup> and
- (h) a second confidential affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 29 August 2024 (**Second Confidential Affidavit**).

24 The plaintiffs also filed a written outline of submissions in support of the application, dated 9 August 2024, and a reply dated 5 September 2024 to the submissions of the Contradictor.

25 Harbour relies on an open affidavit of Mr Mark King, head of case management at Harbour, and a confidential affidavit of Mr King with exhibits, both dated 8 August 2024, in addition to a written outline of submissions dated 9 August 2024.

26 The Contradictor filed a written outline of submissions dated 2 September 2024, and short supplementary submissions dated 11 September 2024.

27 The Court also had before it the Costs Referee's Report filed on 28 June 2024 which addresses the reasonableness of the legal costs and disbursements incurred in the proceedings.

28 In addition, the Court was provided with a copy of all written objections and all UGM Applications. Several objectors appeared at the settlement approval hearing, either in person or via audio-visual link, to make submissions about their objections to the proposed settlement.

---

<sup>24</sup> The plaintiffs sought confidentiality orders over part of the First UGM Affidavit.

<sup>25</sup> The plaintiffs sought confidentiality orders over part of this affidavit.

<sup>26</sup> The plaintiffs sought confidentiality orders over part of the Third UGM Affidavit.

**D Confidentiality**

29 Orders to protect confidentiality in respect of certain matters or documents were sought by the plaintiffs and also by Harbour. For the purposes of conducting the hearing, the Court proceeded on the basis that the materials and information were to be treated as confidential. Nonetheless, I still need to determine whether it is appropriate to make the confidentiality orders sought.

**D.1 The plaintiffs' application for confidentiality orders**

30 The plaintiffs seek confidentiality orders in respect of certain materials before the Court, being:

- (a) the First Confidential Affidavit and exhibits (those being the Counsel Opinion and Annexures A to E of the SDS);
- (b) the Costs Referee's Report;
- (c) the Second Confidential Affidavit;
- (d) the Third Confidential Affidavit (described below);
- (e) redacted portions of the Contradictor's submissions; and
- (f) parts of the other affidavit evidence disclosing personal or sensitive information about group members.

31 Under the orders proposed by the plaintiffs, the materials in (a) to (e) of the preceding paragraph would be able to be disclosed to the plaintiffs and their legal advisors, Harbour and its legal advisors, the Contradictor, and the Court. In addition to those persons, the materials in (f) of the preceding paragraph would be able to be disclosed to the Uber Entities and their legal advisors.

32 The plaintiffs submit that the confidentiality orders sought are appropriately confined and necessary to prevent a real and substantial risk of prejudice to the proper administration of justice that cannot be prevented by other reasonably available means. The plaintiffs also submit that the confidential information has been disclosed

to the Court for the sole purpose of enabling me to perform my role of determining the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed settlement.

33 The plaintiffs rely on three principal reasons in respect of the confidentiality orders sought.

34 First, the plaintiffs submit that disclosure of the information over which the confidentiality orders are sought would be prejudicial to the claims of the plaintiffs and group members and conversely advantageous to the defendants if available to the defendants in the event that the proposed settlement was not approved. By way of example:

- (a) The Counsel Opinion contains counsel's analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the plaintiffs' case and on the prospects of success at trial.
- (b) Annexures A to E of the SDS disclose valuations contained in expert evidence which has not been read in open court, and assessments of risk by Maurice Blackburn and counsel.
- (c) The First Confidential Affidavit discloses the principles underpinning the SDS, which in turn disclose Maurice Blackburn's and counsel's assessment of the prospects of aspects of the case.

35 Second, many of the matters over which confidentiality orders are sought are based on materials protected by legal professional privilege. As well as the Confidential Affidavits, the Counsel Opinion, and aspects of annexures A to E of the SDS, the Costs Referee's Report falls into this category.

36 Third, the plaintiffs submit that personal or sensitive information about individual group members should be kept confidential.

37 In making these submissions, the plaintiffs note the following:

- (a) aspects of the Counsel Opinion, taken alone, are not confidential, such as the principles applicable in settlement approval applications. So that as much of the material as possible that is relied on by the plaintiffs is open, the plaintiffs'



written submissions in support of the approval application set out such aspects of the Counsel Opinion;

- (b) the confidential annexures A to E of the SDS were made available to group members on request from Maurice Blackburn and upon group members executing a confidentiality undertaking.

## **D.2 Harbour's application for confidentiality orders**

38 Harbour also seeks confidentiality orders over certain documents, being:

- (a) the material shaded grey in the Confidential King Affidavit;
- (b) Exhibit MAK-3 to the Confidential King Affidavit;
- (c) the material shaded dark grey in the sixth and seventh lines of paragraph 15 and in the last sentence of paragraph 29 of Harbour's written submissions;
- (d) the Confidential King Affidavit other than that material described in sub-paragraph(a);
- (e) Exhibit MAK-2 to the Confidential King Affidavit; and
- (f) the material shaded light grey in paragraphs 15 and 16, footnote 35, paragraph 26 and footnote 57 of Harbour's written submissions.

39 Under the proposed orders, the information contained in (a) to (c) of the preceding paragraph would be able to be disclosed only to Harbour and its legal advisors, the Contradictor and the Court. The information contained in (d) to (f) of the preceding paragraph would be able to be disclosed to those persons and to the plaintiffs and their legal advisors.

40 Harbour submits that these materials should be protected by confidentiality orders as they disclose commercially sensitive matters and/or assessments of the prospects of the claims. In particular, Mr King deposes that the material is:

- (a) information confidential to Harbour, such as information on how it assesses and monitors investment opportunities and its internal deliberations regarding the claims that are the subject of these proceedings. Mr King says that

disclosure of this information, including to the plaintiffs and their legal advisors, may prejudice Harbour's negotiating position in relation to other existing or future investments;

- (b) information confidential to the plaintiffs, including documents and communications protected by legal professional privilege; and
- (c) information confidential to the plaintiffs and Harbour, disclosure of which would be prejudicial to the claims of the plaintiffs and group members if the settlement is not approved. This includes confidential assessments of the merits and weaknesses of the claims and of Harbour's funding conditions.

41 Mr King deposes that Harbour has disclosed these matters to the Court for the sole purpose of enabling it to determine the fairness and reasonableness of the funding commission.

### **D.3 Consideration regarding confidentiality orders**

42 Confidentiality orders are not granted as of right. They will not be made automatically or by default. Open justice is an important principle and it is to be given effect to, unless it is necessary for the administration of justice for certain restrictions to be imposed.

43 In instances such as this, where the Court's approval is being sought and where the Court relies on the frank and comprehensive disclosure of all relevant information, including material which is confidential and/or protected by legal professional privilege, the interests of justice are served by the Court making confidentiality orders. Enabling the Court to fulfil its task is the only purpose for which the information is being provided to the Court. If the risk of disclosure of such information served to discourage the information being provided to the Court, then that is clearly contrary to the administration of justice. This is an important context for the consideration of confidentiality orders.

44 The confidentiality orders sought by the plaintiffs are partly justified on the basis of legal professional privilege which requires protection after settlement approval, and partly on the basis that not to make the orders would disclose analysis that might

provide the defendants with an unfair advantage if settlement is not approved (ie, justifications that fall away on approval of settlement, or on the expiry of any appeal period). The latter justification may be a basis for limiting the operation of the confidentiality orders in respect of some of the information until further order of the Court, or until after the expiry of all periods in which an appeal may be brought in relation to any orders of this Court in these proceedings. However, I do not consider this to be an appropriate course in the present circumstances, as here, there is substantial overlap; the information is also protected by legal professional privilege and therefore requires protection irrespective of whether the settlement is approved or not.

45 Insofar as Harbour's application regarding confidentiality is concerned, the information described in sub-paragraph 40(b) and (c) should be protected by confidentiality orders for the same reasons as expressed above, and also because of the commercial sensitivity of much of that information for Harbour. The justification for those orders is otherwise the same as it is for the plaintiffs' confidentiality orders. I accept that the information described in sub-paragraph 40(a) above is confidential to Harbour and that confidentiality orders are required in order to protect that information, on the basis that disclosure of it would bring commercially sensitive information into the public domain. Such information has been recognised as confidential in other cases and protected by confidentiality orders.<sup>27</sup>

46 Where necessary and appropriate, the plaintiffs and Harbour have allowed for access to the confidential information by each other and the Contradictor and, in some instances, the Uber Entities. In my view, this is a sensible course and the Court was assisted by the submissions each was able to make with the benefit of them having access to that material. Further, the restriction of access to Annexures A to E of the SDS to group members who executed confidentiality undertakings was reasonable.

47 Accordingly, I will make the confidentiality orders sought by the plaintiffs and Harbour.

---

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, *Iddles v Fonterra Aust Pty Ltd* [2023] VSC 566, [65] (Delany J) (*Iddles*).

E Legal principles

48 The legal principles which apply to the approval of settlements of Part 4A group proceedings are well-established and do not need to be repeated at length here.<sup>28</sup> The Court must consider whether the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable and in the interests of group members who are to be bound by the settlement.<sup>29</sup> This involves consideration of two questions:

- (a) whether the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable as between the parties, having regard to the claims of group members; and
- (b) whether the proposed settlement is in the interests of group members as a whole (ie, fairness between group members and not just the parties).<sup>30</sup>

49 As has been stated in numerous judgments, it is not the role of this Court to second guess or go behind the tactical or other decision-making of the plaintiffs' legal representatives.<sup>31</sup> Rather, the Court must be satisfied that the decision to enter into the settlement is within the range of reasonable decisions, given the known circumstances and the reasonably perceived risks of the litigation, without any hindsight bias.<sup>32</sup> The reasonableness of a settlement must necessarily involve consideration of the approval of any funding commission and legal costs, as this will affect what money group members obtain from the pool in the event that I approve the settlement.<sup>33</sup>

50 The courts have similarly expounded in detail the various factors which may be taken into account in determining whether the settlement is fair and reasonable.<sup>34</sup> There is no enumerated, exhaustive list of factors which will be relevant to the Court's determination in any particular case; this will depend on the circumstances which are

---

<sup>28</sup> The same considerations apply as for the settlement of a class action under Part IVA of the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* (Cth), and the statements of legal principles in Federal Court decisions are generally apposite.

<sup>29</sup> See *Botsman v Bolitho (No 1)* (2018) 57 VR 68, 111-2 [200]-[209] (Tate, Whelan and Niall JJA) (*Botsman*) and the authorities cited therein.

<sup>30</sup> *Downie v Spiral Foods Pty Ltd* [2015] VSC 190, [45] (J Forrest J) (*Downie*).

<sup>31</sup> *Kelly v Willmott Forests Ltd (in liquidation) (No 4)* (2016) 335 ALR 439, 456 [74] (Murphy J).

<sup>32</sup> *Murillo v SKM Services Pty Ltd* [2019] VSC 663, [32] (J Dixon J); *Darwalla Milling Co Pty Ltd v F Hoffman-La Roche Ltd (No 2)*, (2007) 236 ALR 322, 339 [50] (Jessup J) (*Darwalla Mining Co*).

<sup>33</sup> *Iddles*, [25], citing *Quirk v Suncorp Portfolio Services Ltd (No 2)* [2022] NSWSC 1457, [17]-[18] (Stevenson J).

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, *Iddles* [2023] VSC 566, [25]-[27]; *Williams v FAI Home Security Pty Ltd (No 4)* (2000) 180 ALR 459, 465-6 [19] (Goldberg J).

before the Court, and every case must be dealt with on its own merits.<sup>35</sup> In this case, all of the factors which are set out in paragraph 16.6 of the *Practice Note SC GEN 10 Conduct of Group Proceedings (Class Actions) (second revision)* appear to be relevant, being:

- (a) the complexity and likely duration of the litigation;
- (b) the reaction of the group to the settlement;
- (c) the stage of the proceeding;
- (d) the likelihood of establishing liability;
- (e) the likelihood of establishing loss or damage;
- (f) the risks of maintaining a group proceeding;
- (g) the ability of the defendant(s) to withstand a greater judgment;
- (h) the range of reasonableness of the settlement in light of the best recovery;
- (i) the range of reasonableness of the settlement in light of all the attendant risks of litigation; and
- (j) the terms of any advice received from counsel and/or from any independent expert in relation to the issues which arise in the proceeding.

51 Before I proceed to consider those matters, however, I need to deal with the issue of unregistered group members. It is plain that the outcome of the 6,476 applications by UGMs to participate in the proposed settlement has the potential to impact significantly on what this settlement looks like for group members. This potential impact means that it is necessary for me to determine the number of UGMs whose applications to participate in the settlement should be granted, before I turn my mind to whether the proposed settlement as a whole should be approved.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Wheelahan v City of Casey and Ors* [2011] VSC 215, [62] (*Wheelahan*); *Matthews v AusNet Electricity Services Pty Ltd* [2014] VSC 663, [42].

F **Unregistered group members**

52 Here, I describe briefly how UGM Applications were dealt with, before developing each aspect of this in more detail.

53 The Court has confronted practical difficulties with processing and considering the large volume of UGM Applications in a timely way while ensuring that the needs of access to justice are met.

54 The measures adopted to deal with the large volume of UGM Applications can be briefly described as follows:

- (a) Each of the 6,476 UGM applications lodged by the Court deadline (or which were the subject of an extension of time to be lodged, granted by the Court) have been reviewed and categorised by Maurice Blackburn.
- (b) The results of Maurice Blackburn's review and categorisation are contained in a spreadsheet (**UGM Categorisation Register**). That register, along with copies of all UGM Applications, have been provided to the Court and to the Contradictor.
- (c) Mr Donnelly has given detailed evidence as to the Maurice Blackburn categorisation process and outcome.
- (d) The Contradictor made submissions about the Maurice Blackburn review and about the Court's processes for reviewing the UGM Applications.
- (e) The Plaintiffs also made submissions about those matters.
- (f) As a result of discussion at the settlement approval hearing, the Contradictor re-reviewed applications in certain categories and made further submissions.
- (g) Also as a result of those discussions, Maurice Blackburn conducted a re-review of certain other categories, and provided further evidence (**MB Re-Review**). 2,595 UGM Applications were the subject of the MB Re-Review.
- (h) I considered the available options and determined the best approach for the Court to adopt. As will be explained later, this was that some categories would

be determined without individual review of applications by me, whereas others would be individually reviewed by me.

- (i) On that basis, I reviewed 726 UGM Applications individually. How these were selected for individual review is explained later.
- (j) In addition, I reviewed 677 of the UGM Applications that were in the MB Re-Review. These were randomly chosen. Of the 677 such applications, I considered that seven should be approved.

55 In all, I individually reviewed 1,403 UGM Applications and have decided to grant leave to participate in the proposed settlement to 140 unregistered group members.<sup>36</sup>

### F.1 Maurice Blackburn's review and categorisation of the UGM Applications

56 I note at the outset that the work undertaken by Maurice Blackburn was essential in triaging the applications in a manner that could be considered by the Court with efficiency. This was of great assistance to the Court.

57 Mr Donnelly describes the process for this task adopted by Maurice Blackburn in the Third UGM Affidavit.<sup>37</sup> In summary:

- (a) Maurice Blackburn undertook an initial review of some UGM Applications and consulted with the plaintiffs' counsel to develop a set of principles by which it would then review and categorise the UGM Applications (**Categorisation Principles**);<sup>38</sup>
- (b) each UGM Application was loaded onto a discovery platform and reviewed by solicitors and paralegals in accordance with the Categorisation Principles;
- (c) Maurice Blackburn reviewed and categorised the UGM Applications, having regard to those issues and themes which were raised expressly in the applications. Maurice Blackburn did not seek to infer issues and themes which were not expressly raised in the UGM Applications. For example, in order for an application to be categorised as 'states reason for missing class closure

---

<sup>36</sup> The 140 UGMs to whom I have granted leave to participate are identified in Annexure A.

<sup>37</sup> I note that this was prior to the MB Re-Review.

<sup>38</sup> The Categorisation Principles were in evidence.

- deadline’ it had to make reference to the Class Closure Deadline and provide a reason why the deadline was not met;
- (d) in identifying the common themes and therefore the categories, Maurice Blackburn sought to identify all categories of reasons included by group members which potentially provided a basis on which the applications may be assessed by the Court. For example, if an application was assessed as being in Category 4 and an explanation of any substance was provided beyond the mere statement of ‘no knowledge’, that application was also placed in another category. Where reasons were provided that were bespoke and did not fall within a common theme, that application was included in the ‘other’ category; and
- (e) many applications raised multiple categories, each of which are recorded in the UGM Categorisation Register.

58 While the various categories will be discussed in more detail below, the categories and the number of UGM Applications falling within them, according to Mr Donnelly’s evidence (prior to the MB Re-Review), are summarised in the below table:<sup>39</sup>

Category Number	Category Description	Number of UGM Applications
1	UGM Application is invalid	109
2	UGM application is not supported by evidence	619
	UGM Application is supported by an affidavit	5,303
	UGM Application is supported by a statutory declaration	439
3	States reason for missing Class Closure Deadline	544
4	No knowledge of proceeding - the UGM Application states that the UGM was unaware of the proceedings generally	3,393
5	No knowledge of Class Closure Deadline - the UGM Application states specifically that the UGM was unaware of the Class Closure Deadline	11

<sup>39</sup> A small number of applications were identified as falling within different categories in the course of the Contradictor’s review and my review, and there were also some duplicative applications identified and six further applications which were omitted from this table. This is detailed further below.



Category Number	Category Description	Number of UGM Applications
6	Statement of group membership – the UGM Application contains a form of statement, evidence or assertion that the UGM was a group member	6,113
7	Medical reasons – the UGM Application refers to medical or health issues	119
8	Language or special vulnerabilities – the UGM Application refers to English or language difficulties, or otherwise raises a special vulnerability such as age, legal guardianship or living in remote areas	277
9	Financial hardship – the UGM Application refers to the UGM as having suffered or currently suffering financial hardship	741
10	Travel – the UGM Application refers to the UGM either travelling or being overseas during parts of the proceeding	46
11-14	Mistaken belief of previous registration in proceedings – the UGM Application refers to the UGM having a mistaken belief that they had previously registered to participate in the proceedings	43
15	Other – the UGM Application raises other themes that are not addressed by the above categories	19

## F.2 Further materials

59 With respect to the question of whether the Court ought grant leave to unregistered group members seeking to participate in the proposed settlement, the plaintiffs rely on certain materials annexed or exhibited to materials identified in section B. The further materials were filed in support of the Class Closure Orders made in the Andrianakis and Salem proceedings, as follows:

- (a) the affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 15 June 2023 (**Opt Out and Registration Affidavit**);
- (b) the affidavit of Mr Cameron David Hanson, solicitor for the defendants, affirmed 15 June 2023; and
- (c) the affidavit of Mr Donnelly affirmed 11 July 2023 (**Further Opt Out and Registration Affidavit**).

60 The Court also has the benefit of detailed and well-considered submissions in the approval application from the Contradictor on the UGM applications.

### F.3 Applicable legal principles

61 The Class Closure Orders have effect unless the Court otherwise orders. I must determine whether I ought to permit a UGM to participate in the settlement pursuant to my discretion under s 33ZF of the Act. In exercising that power, I have a protective role in respect of group members as a whole, and primary consideration must be given to group members.<sup>40</sup> Section 33ZF empowers the Court to make any order the Court thinks appropriate or necessary to ensure that justice is done in the proceeding. Accordingly, in making my decision, I must be satisfied that it is appropriate or necessary to ensure that justice is done in the proceeding to permit the UGM to participate, or I will decline to order their participation. In doing so, I must be astute to protect the best interests of all group members.

62 It is self-evident that a group member will suffer prejudice if they are to be bound by the settlement but not able to partake because of the operation of the Class Closure Orders. However, mere prejudice is not enough. The potential for this prejudice was already considered by the Court in the making of the Class Closure Orders and balanced against the ‘desirable ends of settlement’ to be facilitated by the greater certainty about the size of the class and quantum obtained as a result of those orders.<sup>41</sup>

63 In order to be permitted to participate in the proposed settlement, the UGM must sufficiently demonstrate unfair prejudice to them in the operation of the Class Closure Orders, so that I am satisfied that it would be unjust to exclude the UGM from participating in the settlement.<sup>42</sup> This is a high threshold for the UGM to reach.

64 The Contradictor submits that the justification for the Class Closure Orders in the instant case is relevant to my consideration. I agree with this submission, although I would put it more strongly. In the context of these proceedings and when making the

---

<sup>40</sup> *Stallard v Treasury Wine Estates Ltd* [2020] VSC 679, [20] (Nichols J), citing: *Wigmans v AMP Ltd* (2019) 373 ALR 323, 345 [103]–[104] (Meagher and Payne JJ); *Wileypark Pty Ltd v AMP Ltd* (2018) 265 FCR 1, 7-8 [14]–[15] (Allsop CJ).

<sup>41</sup> *Class Closure Reasons* [2023] VSC 415, [27] (Nichols J).

<sup>42</sup> *Money Max Int Pty Ltd (Trustee) v QBE Insurance Group Ltd* (2018) 358 ALR 382, 392 [44]; *Class Closure Reasons* [2023] VSC 415, [30].

Class Closure Orders, Nichols J observed that there was significant uncertainty about the size of the class and the quantum of the losses of group members, and accepted the plaintiffs' evidence that, if the proceeding settled without the class having been closed, there was a significant risk that UGM claims would have the effect of diluting recoveries by RGMs and altering the basis on which the settlement had been reached.<sup>43</sup> In making the Class Closure Orders, Nichols J was also satisfied the notice regime put in place by the Court would provide group members with appropriate and sufficient notice of the requirement to register.<sup>44</sup> The justification for the Class Closure Orders is not just relevant to my consideration regarding the UGM Applications, but is an important consideration as to how they should be determined. In my view, the UGM Applications must be assessed in a manner which is consistent with the rationale for requiring group members to opt out or register by a certain date, as to do otherwise serves to undermine those orders. Further, I note that the evidence bears out this justification for the Class Closure Orders. In the First Confidential Affidavit, Mr Donnelly gives evidence of the work undertaken by the plaintiffs and their solicitors to estimate the likely quantum of the claims made in the proceedings. I am unable to go into the detail of this given the confidential and privileged nature of the information, but it is clear that the work undertaken was extensive and relied heavily on calculations and careful analysis done in turn by experts such as economists and statisticians. Having a known class, and class size, by that time was essential for this work. This work was all undertaken prior to the parties attending mediation ordered by the Court, and it is clear that sensible settlement discussions could only occur once the parties had a reasonable basis for estimating the quantum of the claims, so that Uber would be informed in making any settlement offers and the plaintiffs could assess the adequacy of any settlement proposals. The plaintiffs' assessment was heavily reliant on the modelling work that had been undertaken by them and experts they engaged. Thus the rationale for the Class Closure Orders is consistent with the requirement that in order to be granted leave to participate in the proposed settlement, UGMs must establish unfair prejudice.

---

<sup>43</sup> *Class Closure Reasons* [2023] VSC 415, [17], [26].

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid* [27]-[28].

- 65 It may be unjust to exclude a UGM from participating in the settlement in circumstances where they have provided persuasive evidence that they did not receive notice of the class closure, or where there is persuasive evidence that the notice regime was defective, as occurred in *Wetdal Pty Ltd v Estia Health Limited*.<sup>45</sup>
- 66 While the Class Closure Orders provided for the possibility that leave may later be granted to unregistered group members, such applications for leave still need to satisfy the relevant legal principles and evidence requirements.
- 67 The Contradictor also submits that it is likely that the grant of leave to UGMs will dilute funds available to satisfy claims of RGMs. UGMs who have made applications in this case have done so on the assumption that they are entitled to some amount from the settlement proceeds. The Contradictor says that the plaintiffs' confidential modelling, as described in the confidential section of the Third UGM Affidavit, supports the contention that the pool available for RGMs will be diluted.
- 68 I accept this submission, having reviewed the evidence of that confidential modelling. Obviously, the extent of the dilution depends on the number of UGM Applications which are accepted. In turn, that may impact upon whether the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable. Given the large number of UGMs, the potential for this to affect the Court's assessment of whether to approve the proposed settlement is real. Accordingly, I consider it necessary to first deal with the UGM Applications before dealing with other aspects of the approval application.
- 69 Consistent with the Court's obligation under s 33V to consider the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed settlement as between group members, it should critically assess the reasons and evidence provided by a UGM for failing to register by the Class Closure Deadline. In this regard, the Contradictor refers to the observations of J Forrest J in *Downie*,<sup>46</sup> who was satisfied in respect of the scheme for late registrants forming part of the settlement arrangements in that group proceeding that:

[It] appropriately balances the potential desirability of permitting group members who failed to register by the deadline to participate in the settlement on one hand, as against the interest of group members who registered in a

---

<sup>45</sup> [2021] FCA 475 (Beach J).

<sup>46</sup> [2015] VSC 190, [166].

timely fashion in not having the amount available to them reduced without proper reason.

70 In that case, a scheme for late registrants was included as part of the settlement<sup>47</sup> and the Court held that it was appropriate to approve the settlement. Here, there is no scheme for late registrants and there are many more UGMs seeking to participate. This context must be borne in mind.

71 The Contradictor submits, and I agree, that the critical assessment of the reasons and evidence provided by UGMs in support of their applications should, however, be undertaken having regard to the characteristics of the class and the Court's protective jurisdiction.<sup>48</sup> Many UGMs have limited proficiency in the English language and may not have much knowledge of the Australian legal system. As Merkel J observed in the context of a class action brought by persons refused refugee status and seeking judicial review:<sup>49</sup>

[T]he present matter involves a class action by a group of persons having little command of the English language and, I assume, even less knowledge and understanding of the Australian legal system. In these circumstances no assumption can be made that a failure to raise an issue is based on instructions. That fact, together with the additional fact that the action is a class action under Part IVA, can give rise to a greater responsibility on the part of the Court in relation to the conduct of the hearing.

72 The Contradictor has not been able to identify any authority which expressly addresses the question of how, where a proceeding has settled while class closure orders are in force, the Court must approach the determination of UGM Applications. In particular, must the Court consider each separate application, or can it assess like applications as a cohort? According to the Contradictor, the answer to this question involves balancing several competing considerations: the Court's obligations under the *Civil Procedure Act 2010* (Vic) (the CPA) to facilitate the just, efficient, timely and

---

<sup>47</sup> There were 82 late registrants who sought to participate in that case, and under the settlement arrangements the Court was asked to approve, Maurice Blackburn had the power to decide whether the late registrants could participate, having regard to factors including the length and reasons for delay, any likely prejudice to other group members, and the extent to which the late registrant acted promptly upon coming to know of his or her possible entitlement under the settlement. Maurice Blackburn were required under the scheme to give reasons for a refusal and there was an opportunity for a late registrant to have a refusal decision reviewed by the Court on payment of a bond within 14 days: *Downie* [2015] VSC 190, [87]-[91].

<sup>48</sup> *Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Richards* [2013] FCAFC 89, [8] (Jacobson, Middleton and Gordon JJ).

<sup>49</sup> *Nguyen v the Minister for Immigration Local Government and Ethnic Affairs* (1996) 66 FCR 239, 244-45.

cost-effective resolution of the real issues in dispute (ss 7, 8(1)(a)), 9); the interests of RGMs in having the settlement approved and the settlement funds distributed as cheaply and quickly as possible; and the process set out in the Settlement Notice for making a UGM Application. In respect of the latter, the Contradictor submits that the Settlement Notice provides group members with a legitimate expectation that their application will be considered by the Court. The Contradictor's submissions proceeded on the basis that the Court can determine certain cohorts of like UGM Applications on a collective basis, but that based on their review of the UGM Applications exhibited as examples to the Third UGM Affidavit, it may not be possible to determine a large percentage of the UGM Applications without reviewing each application. The Contradictor submits that the categorisation of the UGM Applications by Maurice Blackburn helpfully identified common themes, but that process was not designed or intended to assess the merits of the applications and cannot stand as a substitute for that process. That is not to say that significant guidance in that task cannot be derived from the principles described above.

73 I address specific aspects of this submission below, however, it suffices at this point for me to indicate that I consider that in the exercise of my discretion, some of the UGM Applications can be determined by category, whereas others need to be reviewed individually.

#### **F.4 General application of these principles to this case**

74 The plaintiffs take no position on the question of whether the UGMs, either individually or generally, ought be permitted to participate in the proposed settlement. That said, the plaintiffs acknowledge that this issue may impact upon the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed settlement, if the proportion of UGM Applications which are granted significantly affects the position of RGMs, as will be discussed later.

75 The Contradictor's submissions included a statement of general principles which they submit can guide my assessment of the merits of the UGM Applications. I approve of and adopt those principles, which are:

- (a) All UGM Applicants will suffer prejudice if they are excluded from participation in the proposed settlement. However, prejudice alone is insufficient to warrant inclusion. UGMs must demonstrate that they will suffer unfair prejudice if they are excluded from participation in the settlement.
- (b) Where a UGM was aware of the Class Closure Deadline at the time, but did not take any steps to register, and does not have a persuasive and credible reason for not doing so, they will not have established unfair prejudice.
- (c) Even if there is no deficiency in the distribution of the notice that would warrant a partial reopening of the class, that does not foreclose that a group member may have a credible explanation for not receiving the notice.
- (d) Where a UGM claims they were not aware of the Class Closure Deadline, but does not offer any explanation for their non-awareness (for example: they are not a member of an industry association charged with distributing the notice; they do not read the newspaper; they rarely or never see or speak to other taxi or hire car drivers, license holders, and operators; they were interstate, overseas, unwell or experiencing other difficulties at the relevant time),<sup>50</sup> then having regard to the principles set out at section F.3 above, and taking into account the purpose of the Class Closure Orders, the absence of any deficiency in the distribution of the notice, and the fact that many thousands of group members did register prior to 2 October 2023, it is open to the Court to decline their application.
- (e) Similarly, where a UGM claims they were not aware of the proceeding until the proposed settlement was announced, but does not offer any explanation for their lack of awareness (for example: they were not in any of the participating states in early to mid-2019; they do not read the newspaper; they rarely or never

---

<sup>50</sup> I note here that being able to point to one of these explanations was not of itself sufficient. Each such UGM needed to explain, with sufficient particularity, why that meant they did not register in time. This is discussed in more detail below.

see or speak to other taxi or hire car drivers, license holders, and operators),<sup>51</sup> it is open to the Court to decline their application.

- (f) Where the UGM claims they were unaware of the proceeding and/or the Class Closure Deadline, and provides an explanation for their lack of awareness, or provides any other reason in support of their application, the reason should be assessed on its merits, having regard to the matters set out in section F.3 above. Without intending to be exhaustive, reasons which specifically identify and address, for example, the time and place of relevant events, and the particular circumstances of the deponent, will be more persuasive than reasons which are vague and general in nature.
- (g) In other cases, courts have refused to accept applications by unregistered group members where the evidence of the failure to register consists of an unsupported assertion (for example, where the deponent asserts that they were overseas, but without exhibiting an airline ticket or passport record). However, in this case, UGMs were not advised in the 19 April Orders, the Settlement Notice or the other communications to UGMs approved in those orders that they should provide any evidence other than an affidavit. That is, they were not expressly directed to substantiate the evidence in their affidavit with records. Given it appears a large proportion of UGMs (if not group members) speak English as a second language, are unlikely to be familiar with the legal system, and in most cases are not represented or assisted by lawyers, if the evidence would be accepted as a good reason for non-registration, if substantiated, it is open to the Court to accept the reason as stated. The Contradictor also submitted that as an alternative, it would be open to the Court to give those group members an opportunity to substantiate their evidence (but not to provide any additional reasons) before their application is determined. I have adopted the former approach, for the reasons submitted by the Contradictor. It is simply unwieldy and inefficient for the latter approach to be adopted; it would involve another round of evidence from UGMs and result in further delay in the determination of the settlement approval

---

<sup>51</sup> Again, for the UGM to point to one of these explanations was not of itself sufficient. The UGM needed to explain, with sufficient particularity, why that meant they did not register in time.



application. The approach I have adopted strikes a suitable balance between requiring evidence (even if not supported by contemporaneous records) and efficiency.

## **F.5 Adequacy of the distribution of the Opt Out and Closure Notice**

76 While the adequacy of the distribution of the Opt Out and Closure Notice was one of the themes identified from the objections, it is also relevant to the Court's consideration of the UGM Applications. So much is apparent from the general principles referred to above, particularly in sub-paragraphs 75(c) and (d). It is therefore convenient to address this issue here.

77 In determining whether to make the Class Closure Orders, Nichols J considered the proposed notification regime and informed the parties that she was not satisfied on the evidence that the regime was adequate. Her Honour required the plaintiffs to submit evidence about the proposed arrangements with industry organisations and to provide a proposed schedule of newspaper advertisements for each relevant state.<sup>52</sup> That evidence was filed.<sup>53</sup> Having reviewed that evidence, her Honour was satisfied that the revised notification regime would provide group members with appropriate and sufficient notice of the requirement to register an interest in the proceedings in order to participate in any settlement reached before trial.<sup>54</sup>

78 The Class Closure Orders set out the notification regime required for the Opt Out and Closure Notice to be given to group members. This regime included the following:

- (a) making the Opt Out and Closure Notice available in downloadable form on the Court's websites for the Andrianakis proceeding and the Salem proceeding;
- (b) Maurice Blackburn making the Opt Out and Closure Notice available on its website for these proceedings;
- (c) Maurice Blackburn causing the Opt Out and Closure Notice to be sent to each person who had already registered with Maurice Blackburn in respect of the

---

<sup>52</sup> *Class Closure Reasons* [2023] VSC 415 [23].

<sup>53</sup> See *Ibid*, [24]-[25], for a summary of the evidence.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid*, [28].

- proceedings, via email where an email address was available and otherwise by post;
- (d) Maurice Blackburn sending a copy of the Opt Out and Closure Notice to each of the following industry associations, bodies or individuals, with a request that they distribute the notice to their members or networks and inform them of the proceedings and the Class Deadline:
- (i) Victorian Taxi Association;
  - (ii) Transport Matters Party;
  - (iii) New South Wales Taxi Council;
  - (iv) New South Wales Hire Car Association;
  - (v) Taxi Council Queensland;
  - (vi) Queensland Taxi Licence Owners Association;
  - (vii) Limo Action Group Queensland;
  - (viii) Mr Athan Tsirigotis;
  - (ix) Ms Julie Murray;
  - (x) Australian Taxi Industry Association; and
  - (xi) Black & White Cabs;
- (e) Maurice Blackburn causing an advertisement regarding the requirement to opt out or register by 2 October 2023 to be published once in one weekday edition of each of the Herald Sun, Daily Telegraph, Courier Mail and the West Australian newspapers. The form of the advertisement was prescribed in the orders and included all pertinent information, including that a consequence of not registering in time would be that the group member would be precluded from participating in any settlement reached before trial and from bringing an individual claim against the Uber Entities.

79 In addition, the Class Closure Orders required the Opt Out and Closure Notice to be translated into six other languages.

80 Mr Donnelly deposes as to the steps taken in respect of this notification regime. I am satisfied that the plaintiffs complied with the orders made in respect of publication and distribution of the Opt Out and Closure Notice.

81 Ignoring duplicate registrations, between 21 July 2023 and 4 October 2023, Maurice Blackburn processed approximately 726 new group member registrations.

82 As I observed in my *UGM Application Extension Reasons*:

[G]roup members were given extensive notice of the requirement to register prior to the Class Deadline and had over two months to do so. The advertisement and notice provisions contained in the [Class Closure Orders] were extensive and comprised many different methods ... It is apparent that this resulted in several hundred group members who had not already registered doing so by the Class Deadline.<sup>55</sup>

83 Some objectors criticised the notification regime on the basis that they were not members of the relevant associations and that there were other methods which could have been employed to distribute or publicise the Opt Out and Closure Notice. These other methods included showing the notice on the electronic screens used by network operators to communicate with drivers, being posted on noticeboards at taxi bases and airport taxi ranks, and holding town hall meetings at taxi bases.<sup>56</sup>

84 The Contradictor submits that this type of evidence is not sufficient to show that the notification regime was deficient or otherwise unfair to group members as a whole, for the following reasons:

- (a) the raw numbers of RGMs and UGM Applications do not support any firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the notification regime. There may be any number of reasons why a group member did not register following the Class Closure Orders, which could include not receiving the Opt Out and Closure Notice, deciding not to act on the notice, being unable to act on the notice, or adopting a 'wait and see' approach;

---

<sup>55</sup> [2024] VSC 436, [42].

<sup>56</sup> See, for example, the application identified as UBCA.001.002.0221.

- (b) the fact that an individual group member has a good explanation as to how they did not receive the notice does not mean that the notification regime was deficient; and
- (c) unfairness or prejudice to an individual group member arising from a lack of notice, if substantiated by appropriate evidence, may justify them being granted leave to participate in the proposed settlement.

85 I accept this submission. Further, I do not consider the fact that a large volume of late attempts to register, via making a UGM Application, is indicative of the notification regime being inadequate. In many ways, the fact that a large number of group members responded to the significant publicity and media attention when the proposed settlement was announced and when it was clear that there was a large amount of money to be distributed is not particularly surprising. It does not mean that the notice of the requirement to register was inadequate.

86 In short, the notification regime in the Class Closure Orders was adequate and there was compliance with those orders.

#### **F.6 UGM Applications which do not meet key criteria**

87 As observed above, I have reviewed certain UGM Applications by way of categories. Specifically, I have first considered categories of UGM Applications based on whether they meet certain criteria which I consider to be so fundamental to the requirements for a grant of leave that an application which fails to comply with that criteria will be dismissed. It is necessary to do so in order to dispose of the proceeding in a manner which is efficient and just, having regard to the requirements of fairness and principles outlined in sections F.3 and F.4 above. In triaging these applications, the Court has been assisted by the efforts of Maurice Blackburn, the submissions of the plaintiffs' Counsel, and the analysis of the Contradictor.

88 The Court has made its decision with respect to applications that do not meet key criteria based on the evidence and submissions. It is a matter for the Court how it approaches applications for leave to participate in the settlement by UGMs, in the same way as it is for the Court to determine applications for leave more generally. It is a matter of the Court's discretion and, in the circumstances of this case, I consider

that it is appropriate for certain applications to be determined by way of category. These include those applications that do not meet key criteria. Having reviewed a sizeable number of UGM Applications myself, and taking into account the reviews conducted by the Contradictor, I have sufficient confidence in the categorisation process to consider this a fair and reasonable way to deal with the large volume of UGM Applications.

#### ***F.6.1 Invalid applications - Category 1 of the UGM Categorisation Register***

89 Of the 6,476 UGM Applications made by the requisite time, Maurice Blackburn identified 109 applications as being invalid, either because the application is illegible, is a duplicate of another application, has been rescinded by the UGM, or is not made by a group member. The Contradictor agreed with this categorisation, as do I. During the Contradictor's re-review of some categories and during the Court's review and checks, 16 further duplicates were identified, along with eight applications in fact made by RGMs and three applications which were illegible. I do not need to review each application individually which has been categorised as invalid, because they are either illegible, duplicative, or no longer pressed. The 136 invalid UGM Applications are dismissed.<sup>57</sup>

90 This leaves 6,340 UGM Applications before the Court.

#### ***F.6.2 Applications not supported by evidence - Category 2 of the UGM Categorisation Register***

91 There are 618 UGM Applications which are not supported by evidence in the form of a signed affidavit or statutory declaration.<sup>58</sup>

92 The Contradictor says that the Court may require UGM Applications to be supported by evidence, as occurred here. I would put this more strongly; in this case the requirement for applications to be supported by evidence is inescapable. The *Class Closure Reasons* made clear that, in order to be re-admitted to the class, a group member must sufficiently demonstrate unfair prejudice to them in the operation of the

---

<sup>57</sup> The invalid applications are listed in Annexure B.

<sup>58</sup> There is one additional application without evidence which was made by a RGM, is therefore treated as having been rescinded, and has already been considered in connection with Category 1.

Class Closure Orders.<sup>59</sup> In order for the Court to be satisfied that there is unfair prejudice to a UGM in the operation of the Class Closure Orders, there must be evidence before the Court on this point. Critically, there was also an express requirement for evidence in the form of an affidavit stated in the 19 April Orders and the Settlement Notice.

93 The Contradictor submits that applications which are not supported by evidence may be dismissed without further consideration. This is said to be consistent with the principles arising from case law that applications for leave to participate in a settlement by UGMs should be supported by evidence in the form of a signed affidavit. Further, the Contradictor says that it would be unfair to UGMs who have provided evidence to waive this requirement for others. I agree with this submission.

94 Therefore, a UGM Application must be supported by evidence. While the 19 April Orders and the Settlement Notice stipulated that an affidavit was required, I agree with the position taken by Maurice Blackburn and the Contradictor that a signed statutory declaration should also be treated as evidence.

95 Accordingly, a UGM Application must be supported by evidence in the form of a statutory declaration or affidavit, which must be signed. The requirement for the material to be signed is more than a mere technicality. It is essential as, without a signature, there is no confirmation from the person giving that information that it is true and correct. However, given the profile of many group members in the proceedings, I tend to agree with the more relaxed approach taken by Maurice Blackburn in respect of certain other criteria in respect of the legal requirements that need to be followed when preparing an affidavit for use in this Court.<sup>60</sup> In this regard, I refer to the evidence of Mr Donnelly in the First UGM Affidavit:

I expect that the different approaches to evidence and compliance from UGMs reflects the nature of the group membership in these proceedings, which includes individuals who rarely interact with the legal system and/or speak languages other than English. In developing criteria to assess the sufficiency of evidence for the purpose of the [19 April Order], Maurice Blackburn has sought to be cognisant of this and avoid adopting overly strict interpretations, while still respecting the terms of the order made by the Court.

---

<sup>59</sup> [2023] VSC 415, [30].

<sup>60</sup> See order 43, chapter 1 of the *Supreme Court (General Civil Procedure) Rules 2015* (Vic).

96 Forms of evidence which do not comply with technical requirements (such as where the affidavit or statutory declaration has not been correctly witnessed, does not contain complete information between the 'tram tracks', includes one signature but is not signed on every page, or where documents are not exhibited in the proper manner) were treated by Maurice Blackburn as sufficient for the purposes of meeting the criterion of being supported by evidence. I consider that Maurice Blackburn has struck an appropriate and fair balance here, and I note that the Contradictor also agrees with this approach.

97 Given the above, it follows that there are 5,722 valid UGM Applications which are supported by evidence before the Court.<sup>61</sup>

### *F.6.3 Applications which do not identify the basis on which leave ought be granted*

98 It was a further key requirement of UGM Applications that they identify the basis on which leave ought be granted. This entails more than a statement of group membership; the UGM must provide an explanation for why they did not register by the Class Closure Deadline. This is a critical part of the Court's consideration in deciding whether leave ought to be granted to a UGM to participate in a settlement where orders had been made in the proceedings limiting participating group members to those who took steps to register by the Class Closure Deadline.

99 Of the 5,722 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence, 5,583 contain a statement by the UGM that they are a member of the group, that is, that they fall within Category 6. A subset of these, being 2,237 UGM Applications, fall only within Category 6. That is to say, there are 2,237 applications which consist of a bare statement that the UGM is a member of the group. Clearly, a bare statement of group membership is an insufficient basis for leave to be granted for those persons to participate in the settlement. They do not disclose any reason that they could not register in time. I consider that these 2,237 applications should be dismissed without individual review by the Court,<sup>62</sup> leaving 3,485 applications remaining before the Court.

---

<sup>61</sup> The applications which are not supported by evidence are listed in Annexure C.

<sup>62</sup> These 2,237 applications are listed in Annexure D.

100 Two of the valid UGM applications state that the UGM is experiencing financial hardship (ie, they fall within Category 9) where this statement is not linked to any reason why they did not register to participate at an earlier stage, nor is the financial hardship statement made in conjunction with an additional basis for participation in the settlement. Those two applications ought to be dismissed, as I consider that information that a person is experiencing financial hardship, without more, does not explain why the person did not register by the Class Closure Deadline.<sup>63</sup> This results in 3,483 valid applications supported by evidence remaining before the Court.

101 A further eight applications do not disclose a basis for leave to be granted; they are either an affidavit or statutory declaration which contains only the person's name and signature.<sup>64</sup> I dismiss those applications without conducting an individual review, leaving 3,475 valid applications supported by evidence.

102 A further cohort of UGMs have, in their applications, sought permission to participate in the settlement on the basis that they are a group member (Category 6), and they have suffered financial hardship (Category 9), without stating any other basis for their application for leave. I agree with the Contradictor's submission that financial hardship combined with group membership, where this is not linked to any other basis for leave, and where financial hardship is merely asserted rather than tied to a reason that the UGM was not able to register to participate earlier, is not sufficient for leave to be granted. Maurice Blackburn initially identified the number of applications falling into this cohort as 102. At the settlement approval hearing, the Contradictor proposed that they re-review all 102 applications in this cohort in order to confirm that the applications did not require further consideration by the Court on their merits. The Contradictor undertook this re-review and identified issues with nine applications. Two applications were identified as raising a possible basis for leave to be granted amounting to more than statements that they are a group member and they have suffered financial hardship, and requiring individual consideration on their merits. Three of the duplicate applications identified by the Contradictor were identified during this re-review (and these have already been declined by the Court).

---

<sup>63</sup> These two applications are UBCA.100.001.0171 and UBCA.100.002.1235.

<sup>64</sup> These eight applications are: UBCA.001.001.0047; UBCA.001.001.0059; UBCA.100.002.0382; UBCA.100.002.1433; UBCA.100.003.1312; UBCA.100.003.1407; UBCA.100.003.1420; and UBCA.100.005.0049.



Four were also categorised as falling within Category 4. A couple of other applications were also identified as invalid by the Court, such that there are 94 applications for which I decline to grant leave without further consideration (because they only raise Categories 6 and 9).<sup>65</sup> As a result, there are 3,381 applications remaining.

103 The UGM Categorisation Register lists 104 applications which can be categorised as consisting only of a statement that the UGM was unaware of the proceedings generally (Category 4). During the hearing, the Contradictor proposed that all applications in this category only be reviewed again by them so as to confirm that there are no other bases for leave mentioned in those applications.

104 Mr Donnelly's evidence about the Maurice Blackburn categorisation process confirms that it was consistent with the Contradictor's re-review of applications which only raised Category 4. In order for an application to fall within Category 4 and another category, it had to contain more than a bare assertion that the person did not know about the proceeding, or a 'bare assertion plus' some additional reason for having no knowledge of the proceeding but which otherwise did not 'add' anything to the merit or overall quality of the application.

105 The Contradictor confirmed in its supplementary submissions dated 11 September 2024 that 96 of these 104 applications consisted of a bare assertion that the group member was not aware of the proceeding generally, or a 'bare assertion plus'. Having reviewed the Contradictor's work, I removed one additional application from this subset of 96, because the applicant also referred to overseas travel and therefore I did not consider it appropriate to dismiss it as a bare assertion or 'bare assertion plus' without individual review.<sup>66</sup> Accordingly, there are 95 applications which are 'bare assertions' or 'bare assertions plus'. Consistent with my findings above, I do not consider such applications to warrant a grant of leave and dismiss those 95 applications without individual review by the Court.<sup>67</sup> This leaves 3,286 UGM Applications before the Court.

---

<sup>65</sup> These applications are listed in Annexure E.

<sup>66</sup> This application is UBCA.100.003.1776. I have included reasons in respect of why I have refused to grant leave to this UGM in Annexure I.

<sup>67</sup> These applications are listed in Annexure F.

106 Of the other eight applications in the UGM Categorisation Register as Category 4 only,<sup>68</sup> the Contradictor submitted that one appeared to be duplicative of another application and seven could also be viewed as falling into another additional category. Having reviewed each of these eight applications on an individual basis, I agree with the Contradictor's submission about them. Leaving aside the duplicative application which has already been declined, my decisions on the seven applications identified by the Contradictor as requiring further consideration on their merits are included in the below observations, however, I note here that I granted leave to only one of the seven.

**F.6.4 UGM Applications by Gordon Legal clients which were not supported by affidavits by the individual UGMs**

107 On 7 and 19 August 2024, I made orders allowing 205 UGMs (who had been identified and assisted by Gordon Legal as comprising a cohort of persons who had not registered or lodged an application for leave to participate by the 2 July Deadline) an extension of time in which to lodge their applications for leave to participate in the proposed settlement. This cohort shared characteristics including the fact of their being born outside of Australia, with most having a limited understanding of English and limited engagement with social media or news media. Importantly, they had cogent and persuasive reasons for not having met the 2 July Deadline, as the first law firm who attempted to assist them could not cope with the volume of clients and the steps which needed to be taken, and I determined that it was appropriate that such extension be granted. However, I noted when granting that extension to lodge UGM Applications that it would be a matter for those persons and their lawyers what their applications looked like and whether the applications are accompanied by affidavits (as was expressly required by the 19 April Orders and the Settlement Notice), or merely notify their application and rely on evidence such as the generalised evidence of Mr Andrew Grech of Gordon Legal, which had been filed in respect of the application for an extension for that cohort.<sup>69</sup> The Court made it clear that persons who did not comply with the express requirement of affidavit evidence would 'take

---

<sup>68</sup> Annexure A to the Contradictor's supplementary submissions includes comments in respect of 10 applications where potential issues are identified. Of those 10 applications, two are nevertheless submitted to amount to bare assertions or inadequate explanations: UBCA.100.003.1776 and UBCA.100.006.0068. Those two applications are declined for reasons outlined in the paragraph above.

<sup>69</sup> Transcript of Proceedings, *Andrianakis v Uber Technologies Inc and Ors* (Supreme Court of Victoria, S ECI 2019 01926, Matthews J, 7 August 2024) 17-26.

their chances' in terms of how their applications are ultimately dealt with at the approval hearing.

108 In the event, 161 UGMs in the Gordon Legal cohort made an application supported by an individual affidavit or statutory declaration and 44 did not. The 44 applicants who did not file individual affidavits rely on the two affidavits of Mr Grech affirmed on 2 and 6 August 2024, and the affidavit of Ms Florence Dato of the Migrant Workers' Centre affirmed on 2 August 2024. The affidavits of Mr Grech were filed in connection with the applications for extensions of time and detailed demographic characteristics of the cohort in a generalised way, based on a questionnaire prepared by Gordon Legal and distributed to the group. The questionnaires are not in evidence. The affidavit of Ms Dato identifies common barriers to the legal system experienced by migrants in Australia generally. The 44 applications also rely on written submissions from Gordon Legal filed in respect of the application for extension of time for this cohort to apply for leave to participate.<sup>70</sup>

109 For reasons of *inter se* fairness, I dismiss the 44 applications lodged with assistance from Gordon Legal which are not supported by an individual affidavit or statutory declaration from the UGM Applicant. Gordon Legal was on notice of the possibility that applications not supported by individual affidavits may not be sufficient. I accept the Contradictor's submission that these 44 applications do not provide evidence of sufficient weight to establish unfair prejudice, including because the Court cannot discern from the materials available when each UGM became aware of the proceeding and the actual explanation for why they did not register in time. The merits of these applications cannot be meaningfully assessed and, while I accept that persons with some or all of the identified demographic characteristics of this cohort may experience difficulties, I note that 161 persons within the cohort did manage to lodge their evidence within the extended timeframe allowed by the Court. I accept that the time between granting the extension and the date by which these UGM Applications had to be lodged was short, but that is not a reasonable basis for dispensing with the requirement for an affidavit from the UGMs.

---

<sup>70</sup> These applications are listed in Annexure G.

110 For the sake of clarity, I note that these 44 UGM Applications are not included in  
Category 2, as Category 2 consists of applications not supported by any evidence at  
all. The 161 UGM Applications in the Gordon Legal cohort which were supported by  
individual evidence were all individually reviewed by me.

#### **F.7 Categorisation of the UGM Applications after implementation of these key criteria**

111 As a result of the above decisions made by category, 3,242 valid UGM Applications  
supported by evidence remain to be determined.

112 For the remaining 3,242 applications, the Contradictor submits that, '[s]ave for some  
limited exceptions, it is not possible to assess the applications by category, because the  
merit of a particular application will turn on matters specific to that application'. This  
submission will be addressed below.

#### **F.8 Re-review by Maurice Blackburn – Combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9**

##### ***F.8.1 How the MB Re-Review came about***

113 In the triaging and categorisation of UGM Applications conducted by Maurice  
Blackburn prior to the hearing, a large number of applications were listed as  
combining Category 4 with one or both of Categories 6 and 9, as follows:

- (a) Maurice Blackburn categorised 2,042 UGM Applications as a combination of  
Category 4 and Category 6 (ie, the applicant stated that they were unaware of  
the proceeding generally and that they were a group member, without any  
further explanation of any substance for why they did not register or should be  
granted leave).
- (b) Maurice Blackburn categorised one UGM Application as a combination of  
Category 4 and Category 9 (ie, the applicant stated that they were unaware of  
the proceeding generally and that they were experiencing financial hardship,  
without any further explanation of any substance for why they did not register  
or should be granted leave).
- (c) Maurice Blackburn categorised 552 UGM Applications as a combination of  
Categories 4, 6 and 9 (ie, the applicant stated that they were unaware of the

proceeding generally, that they were a group member and that they were experiencing financial hardship, without any further explanation of any substance for why they did not register or should be granted leave).

114 The Contradictor's submission at paragraph 112 above led to discussion at the settlement approval hearing about measures which could be taken to deal with the large volume of UGM Applications to be reviewed which fell into a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9. My concern was primarily about how to deal with the 2,595 applications referred to in the preceding paragraph. I was concerned to ensure that it was correct that those applications contained combinations of only bare assertions of 'no knowledge' or 'financial hardship' (where the financial hardship did not have a causal link to the group member not having been registered) or 'group membership'. I was satisfied that the remaining applications (approximately 651)<sup>71</sup> would need to be individually reviewed and could not be approved or rejected on the basis of their categorisation alone.

115 One possibility which was canvassed at the hearing was that Maurice Blackburn would re-review those 2,595 applications. The plaintiffs agreed to this.

#### *F.8.2 Description of how the MB Re-Review was conducted*

116 On 25 September 2024, the plaintiffs provided an open affidavit from Mr Donnelly affirmed that day (**Fourth UGM Affidavit**) and a confidential affidavit of the same date also affirmed by Mr Donnelly (**Third Confidential Affidavit**). In the Fourth UGM Affidavit, Mr Donnelly outlines the process and results of the MB Re-Review, and also expands on the treatment of Categories 4, 6 and 9 in the first review. The Third Confidential Affidavit describes modelling undertaken by the plaintiffs to ascertain the effect on the settlement monies available to RGMs of permitting certain numbers of UGMs to participate in the proposed settlement.

117 Mr Donnelly supervised a small team at Maurice Blackburn, comprised of one lawyer and two paralegals, who conducted the MB Re-Review. Each UGM Application in combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9 was reviewed individually in a manner

---

<sup>71</sup> That is, the remaining 3,246 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence remaining after application of the key criteria, as referred to in paragraph 111 above, less the 2,595 applications falling within only combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9.

consistent with the original review, in order to identify if the applications contained an explanation of any substance and record if they also fall into one or more additional categories. This was so that Maurice Blackburn could confirm whether applications falling within combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9 (and no other categories) contained what the Contradictor referred to during the settlement approval hearing as ‘bare assertions’ or ‘bare assertions plus’. That is, the review was to confirm whether those applications contain a further explanation of any substance beyond the assertion of group membership, lack of knowledge of the proceeding or financial hardship, as to why the group member did not register in time.

118 Mr Donelly deposes that the results of the MB Re-Review were as set out in the below tables:

<b>Combination 1: Category 4 (no knowledge of proceeding) and Category 6 (statement of group membership) - 2042 applications</b>	
Re-Review category or category combination	Number of UGM Applications
Category 4 and Category 6	1,971
Category 4, Category 6 and Category 9 (financial hardship)	57
Category 6	6
Category 4	2
Category 4, Category 6 and Category 7 (medical reasons)	2
Category 4, Category, 6, Category 7 and Category 9	2
Category 6 and Category 13 (mistaken belief of previous registration in proceeding)	1
Invalid	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,042</b>

<b>Combination 2: Category 4 (no knowledge of proceeding) and Category 9 (financial hardship) - 1 application</b>	
Re-Review category or category combination	Number of UGM Applications
Category 4, Category 6 and Category 9 (financial hardship)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Combination 3: Category 4 (no knowledge of proceeding), Category 6 (statement of group membership) and Category 9 (financial hardship) - 552 applications</b>	
Re-Review category or category combination	Number of UGM Applications
Category 4, Category 6 and Category 9	537
Category 4 and Category 6	12
Category 6 and Category 9	1
Invalid	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>552</b>

119 Mr Donnelly deposes that of the 2,595 UGM Applications the subject of the MB Re-Review, 84 had their categories changed, which is approximately 3.2%.

**F.8.3 Consideration of UGM Applications falling solely within combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9**

120 It is convenient to set out here my consideration of UGM Applications falling solely within combinations of Categories 4, 6 and 9, given the MB Re-Review of those applications. There were 2,595 UGM Applications within these combined categories that were the subject of the MB Re-Review.

121 As noted above, 84 of those applications had their categories changed in the MB Re-Review. I think it is important to note, however, that three of these were re-categorised as invalid, and only five were re-categorised into a category other than Categories 4, 6 and 9. Thus only approximately 0.2% of UGM Applications previously categorised as falling within a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9 were re-categorised as also belonging to another substantive category. I note here that the five

applications re-categorised with another substantive category were individually reviewed by me.

- 122 I am generally satisfied with the evidence from Mr Donnelly as to the MB Re-Review. I consider it to be sufficiently rigorous to be confident of its outcome. The fact that the MB Re-Review produced a re-categorisation of only 3.2% overall and only 0.2% as belonging to another substantive category is indicative of this.
- 123 However, I considered it appropriate to go a step further than this. In order to test this conclusion and ensure that it was appropriate to deal with the 2,511 UGM Applications re-reviewed by Maurice Blackburn and falling solely within a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9, I decided to review a number of those applications, selected at random.
- 124 I randomly selected 677 such applications and then individually reviewed them. That is approximately 27% of the applications in that combined category. Of those 677 applications, I formed the view that seven of the applicants had provided a sufficient explanation to justify them being granted leave.<sup>72</sup> I also identified some applications which were invalid, or which were bare statements of group membership only (and for which no leave is granted for reasons already outlined above). The remainder (being 657 applications) contained no sufficient explanation warranting the grant of leave.<sup>73</sup> The applications which I did approve represent around 1% of the applications in this combined category which I reviewed. I consider that to be a very low proportion, and given that I chose the applications for review randomly and had a sufficient sample size, I have no reason to think that is not a fair representation of what the remainder would likely show.
- 125 Given all the factors discussed within these reasons about the need to balance fairness to UGMs with both RGMs and group members as a whole, issues associated with delay, the use of limited resources (especially public resources such as the Court), and the very low number of UGM Applications in this combined category who would likely be approved, together with my confidence in the outcome of the MB Re-Review and my random sampling, I consider it appropriate in the interests of justice to deal

---

<sup>72</sup> These applications are included in Annexure A.

<sup>73</sup> These applications are included in Annexure I.



with these UGM Applications in a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9 by category and without individual review. While I acknowledge the caution expressed by the Contradictor as referred to in paragraph 112 above, the steps undertaken since those submissions were made (re-review of some categories of applications by the Contradictor, the MB Re-Review, and my individual review of 677 applications selected randomly) mean that I am satisfied that the process I have described and adopted is appropriate.

126 Accordingly, UGM Applications falling only within a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9 are dismissed without individual review by the Court (except for where they were part of the random sample of 677 such applications which were individually reviewed by me as described in paragraph 124 above). There are 1,903 such applications which are dismissed without individual review.<sup>74</sup>

#### **F.9 The Court's review of the remaining UGM Applications**

127 Given the sheer volume of applications before the Court which have been individually reviewed, it is not practicable for each individual application to be summarised in this judgment. Instead, I have included two annexures which set out the results of all UGM Applications individually reviewed by me, containing a short statement of reasons for each application:

- (a) Annexure A lists the UGM Applications individually reviewed by me for which leave to participate in the proposed settlement will be granted.
- (b) Annexure I lists the UGM Applications individually reviewed by me for which leave to participate in the proposed settlement will not be granted.

128 Where an application was reviewed by me individually and found not to merit a grant of leave because, for example, it was invalid, I have not included it in Annexure I, but have made a note where it appears in another annexure confirming that it was individually reviewed by me.

---

<sup>74</sup> Those applications are listed in Annexure H.

129 As mentioned, Annexures A and I contain short statements of reasons for each application listed therein, and those short statements should be read alongside the general principles and reasons set out in this judgment, including as outlined below.

130 Some general observations regarding the applications falling into the abovementioned categories, the submissions on those UGM applications from the plaintiffs and Contradictor, my process of review, and the outcomes of those applications can be made.

131 Given the nature of the UGM Applications, my review and assessment focused on whether the UGM had explained, with sufficient particularity, why they had not registered by the Class Closure Deadline. For an application to be successful, it had to meet that requirement. Where other factors (such as those discussed below) were mentioned, those factors needed to be, or to be capable of being, linked to an explanation as to why the Class Closure Deadline was not met. Generalised statements without any specificity were not sufficient.

132 When reviewing individual UGM Applications, I kept this focus in mind, along with the matters identified in paragraph 75 above.

***F.9.1 Category 3 - Applications which state the reason for missing the class closure deadline***

133 There are 526 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence which stated the reason for missing the Class Closure Deadline. I have reviewed each of these applications individually.

134 The Contradictor submits that these applications fall into two sub-categories:

- (a) where the UGM states they were aware of the Class Closure Deadline, and provides a reason for missing it, the merits of the reason provided should be assessed. The reasons and evidence provided by an applicant falling into this sub-category should be held to a high standard to justify treating them differently to those RGMs who were aware of the class closure deadline and complied with it; or

- (b) where the UGM states they were not aware of the Class Closure Deadline (ie, also falls into Category 5), but provides a reason for missing it, their application should be determined on the merits of the reason provided, including the weight of the relevant evidence, and having regard to any determination by the Court as to the assessment of reasons falling into Categories 4 to 15.

135 I agree with this submission.

136 By way of example:

- (a) UGMs who had known of the Class Closure Deadline but made a deliberate decision not to register were not able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were not granted. An example of this is MP,<sup>75</sup> who did not register for this class action due to their ‘deep sense of disillusionment’ after being involved in an unsuccessful legal proceeding in Western Australia against the Western Australian Government and Uber.
- (b) UGMs who made generalised statements of not knowing of the Class Closure Deadline because they did not know about the class action, without any explanation for not knowing, were not able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were not granted.
- (c) On the other hand, UGMs who stated that they did not know of the Class Closure Deadline or the class action and who provided an explanation for that were, if the explanation was sufficiently cogent and persuasive, able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were granted. Examples of these were some UGMs who had left the industry prior to 2023, stated that they did not belong to any relevant industry association and did not keep in touch with industry participants, did not consume mainstream media, social media or read newspapers. It should be noted that of these, only a relatively small number provided sufficient detail or particularity of these matters so as to justify being granted leave.

---

<sup>75</sup> See the application identified as UBCA.100.002.0220.

- (d) UGMs who were executors of deceased estates or who held powers of attorney for UGMs, who did not know that the UGM had not registered and who had experienced difficulties in accessing the UGMs' records, were, in general terms, able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were granted.
- (e) UGMs who mentioned matters such as travel, medical issues, language difficulties or special vulnerabilities but did not provide any or enough information capable of explaining why they did not meet the Class Closure Deadline were, in general terms, not able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were dismissed.
- (f) UGMs who were aware of the Class Closure Deadline but did not register because they misunderstood the importance of registering were, without more, not able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were dismissed.<sup>76</sup>
- (g) UGMs who stated that they did not register by the Class Closure Deadline because they were mistaken about their eligibility or because they thought they would be automatically included were able to establish unfair prejudice and have their applications granted if they provided a cogent reason for that mistake, such as setting out the source of the mistaken information and where there were reasons for thinking that source reliable. However, those who simply made an assumption about their eligibility or being automatically included, without having been told that by a reliable source or checking their assumption, were not able to establish unfair prejudice and their applications were dismissed. Had they simply made enquiries or investigations as to their assumptions, they would have learned of the requirement to register.

137 Of the 526 valid applications supported by evidence in Category 3, 75 were granted leave to participate in the proposed settlement.

#### ***F.9.2 Category 4 – No knowledge of proceeding***

138 In respect of the 104 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence which fell into Category 4 alone, I refer to paragraph 103 above. Of these 104, only eight were not a

---

<sup>76</sup> An example of this is the application identified as UBCA.100.001.0435.

bare assertion of unawareness of the proceeding, of which one was a duplicate of another application. I reviewed each of these eight applications on their individual merits.

139 Where a valid UGM Application supported by evidence falls into Category 4 but does not offer an explanation for the UGM's unawareness of the class action, the Contradictor acknowledges that the question is finely balanced but submits that it is open to the Court to decline those applications on the basis that insufficient reasons have been provided to satisfy the Court that the UGM would suffer unfair prejudice if excluded and that would justify the prejudice to RGMs by their inclusion.

140 I agree with that submission. I do not consider a generalised claim that the UGM was not aware of the class action, without any explanation for that lack of awareness, to be sufficient for a grant of leave. This does not amount to a requirement that the UGM list exhaustively every method by which they did not come to know of the proceeding. However, the UGM must give evidence of something more than the mere fact that they did not know. The measures taken to publicise the proceedings and to engage group members and encourage them to sign up at the time when they were commenced and around the time of distribution of the Opt Out and Closure Notice were reasonable and sufficient to have brought the class action to the attention of participants in the industry. Where a group member nevertheless states that they did not know of the class action, but was an active participant in the industry at relevant times, they must do something more than merely assert ignorance of the proceeding. More particularity about the group member's circumstances (sufficient to explain why they did not register) is required.

141 Leaving aside the duplicative (and therefore invalid) application, of the remaining seven, I granted one application.

### ***F.9.3 Category 5 – No knowledge of Class Closure Deadline***

142 Eleven valid UGM Applications supported by evidence stated that the UGM had no knowledge of the Class Closure Deadline, and all were reviewed by me.

143 The Contradictor made the same submission regarding Category 5 as had been made regarding Category 4 (see paragraph 139 above).

144 I agree with that submission in respect of Category 5 as well. It is also consistent with sub-paragraph 75(d) above. I do not consider a generalised claim that the UGM was not aware of the Class Closure Deadline, without any explanation for that lack of awareness, to be sufficient for a grant of leave.

145 Applications lacking any, or any credible, explanation for having no knowledge of the Class Closure Deadline have been declined.

146 Of these 11 applications, one was a duplicate. Of the other 10 applications, I granted seven.

#### ***F.9.4 Category 6 – Statement of group membership***

147 At paragraph 99 above, I explain why applications that only contain a statement of group membership (that is, UGM Applications within Category 6 only) have not been granted.

#### ***F.9.5 Category 7 – Medical reasons***

148 There are 104 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence which mention medical reasons for the Class Closure Deadline being missed or as a basis for granting leave. I have reviewed each of these applications individually.

149 In respect of Category 7, the Contradictor submits that where the UGM states that they were not able to register prior to the Class Closure Deadline due to medical reasons, and the evidence is assessed as meritorious and persuasive, including by having regard to at least the matters in sub-paragraphs 75(f) and (g) above, then the UGM will likely have demonstrated unfair prejudice. However, where the medical issues identified are not sufficiently linked to the UGM's failure to register, they are unlikely to warrant inclusion, having regard to the interests of all group members.

150 I agree with this submission. In my view, a group member's assertion of medical issues (either their own issues or those of a family member for whom they have caring responsibilities) will not disclose unfair prejudice in the operation of the Class Closure

Orders unless there is something that ties the medical issues to why the group member was not able to register in compliance with the Class Closure Orders. Accordingly:

- (a) Where there is no, or no sufficient, link between the medical reason and missing the Class Closure Deadline, no unfair prejudice was established and such applications were dismissed. For instance, a UGM who described their medical condition but did not mention when they suffered from it or how it affected their ability to function or attend to matters such as registering for the class action was not able to establish unfair prejudice.
- (b) Where the UGM describes the medical reason with sufficient particularity and that reason is persuasive in explaining why the UGM missed the Class Closure deadline, unfair prejudice was established and the application was granted. This was the case whether the UGMs themselves experienced the medical condition or where they were heavily involved in caring for someone who had a medical condition.

151 The application of MH serves as a useful illustration of the above.<sup>77</sup> MH states that he has suffered from a range of physical and mental health issues, which were exacerbated by ‘the arrival of Uber and the [Victorian] government’s acquisition of my license’. The Contradictor submits that, accepting without reservation the truth of MH’s evidence as to his health challenges, the medical issues alone are expressed in too vague a way to constitute an adequate explanation for his lack of knowledge of the proceeding for a three-year period, such as to constitute unfair prejudice, noting that other grounds he relies on may justify his inclusion. I agree with this submission: the medical issues alone are insufficient to establish unfair prejudice. However, MH relies on other grounds, such as no longer paying attention to the news during ‘this overwhelming period’, not being a member of any taxi association, not mixing with others in the taxi industry, and the isolated nature of his particular work with clients with disabilities, as well as his medical issues, to explain why he did not know about the registration requirement. Taken together, MH established unfair prejudice.

152 Of the 104 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence in Category 7, I granted 53.

---

<sup>77</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.002.0438.

### F.9.6 Category 8 – Language or special vulnerabilities

153 There are 273 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence where the UGM mentions English being a second or subsequent language or other language difficulties, or otherwise raises a special vulnerability such as age, legal guardianship, or living in a remote area. I have reviewed each one of these applications individually.

154 The Contradictor submits that the nature of ‘special vulnerabilities’, combined with the Court’s protective jurisdiction under Part 4A of the Act,<sup>78</sup> mean that valid UGM Applications in this category are more likely to experience unfair prejudice if the UGM is excluded. The Contradictor submits that while these applications should be assessed on their merits, the nature of the special vulnerability identified may warrant some leeway in the assessment of whether the evidence is sufficiently probative.

155 I agree with this submission. Some leeway was given in the assessment of the evidence, but there still needed to be sufficient particularity and linking with the lack of awareness of the class action or the Class Closure Deadline for the application to be capable of establishing unfair prejudice. The majority of applications in Category 8 did not do so.

156 Below, I set out examples of applications in Category 8:

- (a) Almost all of the Gordon Legal clients fell into Category 8, because they had migrated to Australia from non-English speaking countries, but there was a significant range of proficiency in English that was indicated by those UGMs. Most deposed to having a reasonable, good, or strong understanding of English. This was not enough to establish unfair prejudice. These, and a number of other UGM Applicants who stated that they spoke English as a second language but did not provide any specificity as to their level of understanding, comprised most of the applications in Category 8.

---

<sup>78</sup> This protective and supervisory role is ‘a modern and far more specific mirror of Chancery’s *parens patriae* jurisdiction, whereby courts of equity could make a diverse range of orders for the protection of children and persons historically regarded as incapable (who could not be heard in a suit before the Court): *Dyczynski v Gibson* (2020) 280 FCR 583, 678 [402] (Lee J).



- (b) GF is a taxi driver and sometime licence owner in New South Wales.<sup>79</sup> He is 78 years old and does not use emails. His wife died from COVID-19 in March 2022 and she had been the one to keep track of all their work, finances, taxes, insurances, registrations and his health appointments. In January 2023, he was involved in a near fatal car accident while driving a taxi, as a result of which he endured three surgeries and several months in hospital and rehabilitation until early October 2023. This UGM Application contains sufficient particularity of GF's medical issues and special vulnerabilities, with a clear link to the relevant timeframe, so as to establish unfair prejudice. GF's application was accepted.
- (c) VM is a taxi license holder in Victoria.<sup>80</sup> At the time the Andrianakis proceeding was commenced, he was approximately 80 years old. He is not literate in English and has never used a computer in his life. On the day the proceeding was commenced, his son attempted to register VM's application with Maurice Blackburn by phone, and received an email with a link to the registration portal, which is annexed to VM's affidavit. Unfortunately, online registration was not then completed by his son, but VM assumed that his claim had been registered. The Contradictor submits that while there is no evidence from his son to explain why he did not take any further step to register his father's claim, it is evident that VM acted very quickly in seeking to register his claim, and has been forthcoming that he later learned the registration process was not completed. The Contradictor further submits that, in circumstances where VM is elderly, not literate in English, and not computer literate at all, his reliance on his son to protect his interests was plainly reasonable. The Contradictor submits that these circumstances combined would constitute a sufficient basis for the Court to conclude that VM would suffer unfair prejudice if excluded from the settlement. I accept this submission. VM's application illustrates the type of particularity and causation for a number of the categories which are capable of establishing unfair prejudice. His explanation for the mistaken belief in registration is substantiated and credible, and his special vulnerabilities also meet that criteria. VM's application was granted.

---

<sup>79</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.002.1486.

<sup>80</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.001.0141.

- (d) HB is a taxi driver in Victoria. He states that 'due to family circumstances I missed out on getting myself registered as member of class action before 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2023 due to my youngest daughter's ongoing medical issues'. Nothing more is said about the 'family circumstances' or his daughter's 'ongoing medical issues'. Nothing is said to explain how these prevented him from registering. This was not sufficient to establish unfair prejudice and his application was refused.

157 Of the 273 valid UGM Applications in Category 8, 31 were granted.

#### ***F.9.7 Category 9 - Financial hardship***

158 The two UGM Applications falling within Category 9 alone have been dismissed without individual review, for the reasons set out at paragraph 100 above.

#### ***F.9.8 Category 10 - Travel***

159 There are 41 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence which fall into Category 10. I have reviewed each of these applications individually.

160 The Contradictor drew a distinction between the merits of an application which is categorised as 'Travel' but may consist of a bare statement that the UGM was overseas, without identifying when, and an application that states that the UGM was overseas between 21 July and 1 October 2023 and therefore did not receive, or was not able to learn of, the Opt Out and Closure Notice. In respect of the latter, the Contradictor submits that this would be sufficient to establish unfair prejudice.

161 I agree with this submission. A bare statement of being overseas, without identifying the period, or where the period did not coincide with the commencement of the proceeding or the July 2023 to October 2023 period, was insufficient to establish unfair prejudice. In contrast, UGMs who provided specific detail that during that registration period they were travelling or living overseas or in an Australian state other than Victoria, Western Australia, Queensland or New South Wales (because these four states were the only states in which the Opt Out and Closure Notice was advertised) were able to establish unfair prejudice.

162 By way of example:

- (a) AQ and SR are former taxi drivers who moved to Pakistan in 2022 and 2020 respectively and both of their affidavits were witnessed in Pakistan.<sup>81</sup>
- (b) NI is a former taxi driver in Victoria who moved to Tasmania at the end of 2021, still lives there, and affirmed his affidavit there.<sup>82</sup>
- (c) PT relocated to Hong Kong in 2017, visits Australia infrequently, and only found out about the class action and the proposed settlement in about June 2024 from a TV news report in Hong Kong.<sup>83</sup> His affidavit was witnessed in Hong Kong.

163 The Contradictor made submissions about SR and NI, stating that the Opt Out and Closure Notice was not disseminated overseas, or in Tasmania, and while some national industry associations were asked to distribute the Opt Out and Closure Notice to their mailing lists, it is not known if those mailing lists included persons who no longer worked in the industry and/or whose physical address had changed. The Contradictor submits that depending on the Court's approach to evidence of this nature that is not supported by records, this may be sufficient to demonstrate unfair prejudice if persons in the position of SR and NI are not permitted to participate in the settlement.

164 I agree with this submission, and for the reasons already stated, have not required substantiating documents such as copies of travel records to be exhibited to the affidavits. Each of the applications referred to in paragraph 162 demonstrated unfair prejudice and all were granted.

165 Of the 41 valid UGM Applications in Category 10, 24 were granted.

---

<sup>81</sup> These applications are identified as UBCA.100.003.0890 and UBCA.100.003.2281.

<sup>82</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.002.0838.

<sup>83</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.003.2157.

**F.9.9 Categories 11 to 14 – Mistaken belief of registration**

166 There are 36 valid UGM Applications which are supported by evidence that fall into one or more of Categories 11 to 14. I have reviewed all of the applications in these Categories.

167 UGM Applications in Category 11 are recorded as indicating a mistaken belief that the applicant had previously registered to participate in the proceedings. UGM Applications in Category 12 indicate that the UGM registered a different entity with Maurice Blackburn but failed to register all their relevant entities. UGM Applications in Category 13 registered their interest in other legal proceedings but not these ones. Category 14 comprises UGM Applications giving other reasons for their mistaken belief as to registration.

168 In respect of Category 11, the Contradictor submits that where the evidence demonstrates that the UGM sought to register their interest in this proceeding and provides a persuasive and credible reason for the mistaken belief, that should be sufficient to demonstrate unfair prejudice.

169 However, where the applicant gives evidence that they completed what they thought was a registration process but there is no evidence that that process was connected to this proceeding (ie, it does not refer to Maurice Blackburn, or the Supreme Court, or it occurred at a time unconnected with these proceedings), then the Contradictor submits that the reasons are not sufficiently persuasive to constitute unfair prejudice. The Contradictor submits that it is not unreasonable for the Court to expect that a group member who is prepared to sign up to something, should have regard to what they are signing. The Contradictor submits that it would not be fair to RGMs to permit the inclusion of UGMs who, for example, ‘in or about 2018, signed registration paperwork at Melbourne Airport to join the class action against Uber Technologies’,<sup>84</sup> when there is no evidence that Maurice Blackburn conducted such a registration process at that time and the UGMs are not recorded in Maurice Blackburn’s records of RGMs.

---

<sup>84</sup> See, for example, the application identified as UBCA.100.001.0256.

170 In respect of Category 12, the Contradictor submits that, subject to their submission about evidence being sufficiently persuasive to explain the mistake (ie, specific as to time, place and the particular circumstances of the UGM), the nature of the mistake for this Category is sufficient to demonstrate unfair prejudice. The Contradictor submits that the fact that such UGMs registered in some capacity is probative evidence of their intention to register all of their claims.

171 The Contradictor submits that UGM Applications in Category 13, without more (such as a special vulnerability), will not be sufficient to demonstrate unfair prejudice.

172 The Contradictor submits that UGM Applications in Category 14 will each turn on their own facts, with the assessment of the merits having regard to the above submissions.

173 I agree with these submissions and have followed that approach.

174 By way of example:

(a) RN's application fell into Category 11 but contained insufficient particularity.<sup>85</sup> RN states that she was 'out of the country when I thought I had registered to be a group member of the class action,' but does not state when she was out of Australia, when she thought she had registered, and the steps she took that led her to think that she was registered. The Contradictor submits that is not sufficient evidence to establish unfair prejudice. I agree.

(b) CK and HK are a married couple in their seventies who held a taxi licence in Victoria and who fall within Category 14.<sup>86</sup> CK was also a taxi driver until about 2011. Both are Greek migrants with limited English, limited ability and capacity to use technology such as the internet and electronic communications, and rely on their adult children for their help and assistance. CK deposes that he was aware of this proceeding generally through the news and that he vaguely recalls meeting with other drivers and licence holders before proceedings were commenced and paying a fee to be involved in an action, but he cannot recall whether it pertained to this proceeding. CK also deposes that

---

<sup>85</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.002.0646.

<sup>86</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.005.0038.

he received a text message last year associated with this proceeding and asking one of his children or their partners to reply and confirm his participation. CK and HK therefore assumed they were registered as group members. The combination of all of CK's and HK's circumstances were sufficient to demonstrate unfair prejudice.

175 Of the 36 valid UGM Applications in Categories 11 to 14, 21 were granted.

#### *F.9.10 Category 15 - Other*

176 There are 19 valid UGM Applications supported by evidence which have been placed in Category 15. I have reviewed each of these applications individually. Of the 19 applications in this Category:

- (a) Two applications raise what the Contradictor describes as unique issues arising from the administration of deceased estates. Upon review, I was satisfied that these two applications established unfair prejudice. I should note here that not all applications involving deceased estates were granted: only ones which raised matters constituting a cogent explanation for failing to register were granted.
- (b) The other 17 applications state that the UGM did not register due to concerns about registration information being used for fraudulent purposes. For example, MI states as follows:<sup>87</sup>

In regards to originally not joining the class action, the reason I didn't join the class action was that there were lots of rumours going around among taxi industry that people were collecting our information to use it for fraudulent purpose.

Now I have found out that class action is indeed genuine and true and at that time, the information collected was to hold uber accountable. Hence, I would like to put my name as a participant in the class action.

177 I note that all 17 applications referred to in sub-paragraph (b) were in virtually the same form. The Contradictor submits that this is not a sufficient basis to demonstrate unfair prejudice, particularly where those concerns appear to have fallen away upon the announcement of the proposed settlement. The Contradictor also submits that it

---

<sup>87</sup> This application is identified as UBCA.100.002.1739.

was open to any UGM who genuinely held these concerns at the time to make their own inquiries, either directly to Maurice Blackburn, or by seeking legal advice. I agree with this submission. I also consider that the formulaic nature of these applications detracts from their credibility, when what is being relied upon is a particular idiosyncratic belief.

178 Of the 19 applications in Category 15, two were granted (being the ones referred to in sub-paragraph 176(a) above).

#### **F.10 Conclusions regarding UGM Applications**

179 Of the 5742 applications which were categorised by Maurice Blackburn as being valid UGM Applications supported by evidence, I reviewed 726 individually based on their categorisation, I reviewed another 677 individually randomly selected from the MB Re-Review applications, and I dealt with the remainder by category (without individual review) as described above.<sup>88</sup>

180 I confirm that the 656 UGM Applications identified in the Fourth UGM Affidavit as requiring individual review have been included in the applications individually reviewed by me as described above.

181 Of the total number of 1,403 UGM Applications reviewed individually by me, 140 were granted. Accordingly, those persons should be treated as RGMs for the purposes of administering the SDS.

182 Many of the UGMs referred to the difficult circumstances they had faced after Uber entered the market and the adverse effects that they say UberX, and the changed regulations, had on them, their families and their livelihoods. Many had heart-breaking stories to tell. All of the UGMs will be prejudiced by being bound by the proposed settlement (if approved) where they are not permitted to participate in that settlement. However, and in accordance with the authorities, that alone does not justify granting their applications to participate in the proposed settlement. As already set out, only UGM Applications which were able to demonstrate unfair prejudice were granted leave to participate in the proposed settlement. To allow

---

<sup>88</sup> I note that during the course of my review, I identified that not all of the 5,742 applications were indeed valid, as has been explained earlier in these reasons.

otherwise would not be fair as between all group members. As I have already explained, there were compelling reasons for the Court to have made the Class Closure Orders. Where group members failed to register in time in accordance with those orders, absent them establishing unfair prejudice, they should not be permitted to participate in the proposed settlement.

183 I do not consider that permitting 140 UGMs to participate in the proposed settlement has a significant impact on RGMs. Based on the modelling described in paragraphs 67 and 68 above, the dilution effect on RGMs is likely to be marginal.

184 During the hearing, Counsel for the plaintiffs indicated that they would need to revisit the Counsel Opinion once it was known how many UGM Applications were granted and that they may need to re-assess their view as to the reasonableness and fairness of the proposed settlement. Counsel requested that the Court inform them of the number of successful UGM Applications prior to the Court reaching a decision as to whether to approve the proposed settlement, so that the re-assessment could occur if this was necessary. Counsel stated that if the dilution of RGMs was in the realm of 10%, then they did not consider it would be necessary to go through those steps and I could determine the approval application on the basis of the Counsel Opinion and material already filed. In the Fourth UGM Affidavit, Mr Donnelly identified 656 UGM Applications as requiring individual review. He referred to Section C of his Third Confidential Affidavit which sets out additional modelling to estimate the quantum of claims by 656 group members and the effect on the proposed settlement if 656 UGMs were granted leave to participate. He says that the results of the modelling show that it would result in a reduction to RGMs of the settlement sum that is less than 10%.

185 On 29 October 2024, at my direction, my Associate sent an email to the parties and the Contradictor to inform them that while my review of UGM Applications was not at that time fully completed, I was in a position to indicate that the number of UGM Applications likely to be granted leave to participate would be less than 656, and asked for confirmation that the position of the plaintiffs' Counsel remained as described above. Later that day, the plaintiffs' solicitors confirmed that their Counsel continued



to hold the view that the proposed settlement remains fair and reasonable and that they did not need to file a supplementary opinion.

186 The large number of group members who applied for late registration in this proceeding served to illustrate the challenges and demands which are placed on the Court's resources in Part 4A proceedings. In this instance, the Court was assisted by the work of Maurice Blackburn to review and categorise those applications as it was not practicable for me to review each application individually. The work involved in reviewing these materials was extensive and undoubtedly costly, and those costs will ultimately form part of the costs of this proceeding, which will come out of the settlement amount. That is a legitimate expense which assisted the Court to balance the needs of the efficient administration of justice and fairness among group members and for the group as a whole. The Court was also greatly assisted by the work done by the Contradictor. The process of review also consumed significant time and resources of this Court. Nevertheless, it was important that this opportunity to participate be offered to UGMs, as the 140 applications which I have granted demonstrate that there were some circumstances in which the operation of the Class Closure Orders would, absent the ability to apply for and obtain leave to participate, have caused unfair prejudice.

187 At the settlement approval hearing, the plaintiffs and the Contradictor each identified a number of ways for the Court to consider dealing with the UGM Applications requiring individual review. These options included me doing that review, making orders for it to be done by a special referee, or referring the task to a judicial registrar or associate judge. In the end, after forming a view as to which applications could be dealt with by category so as to identify the number requiring individual review, I decided to do it myself. This will not always necessarily be the most appropriate course. The approach to determining such applications will depend on the circumstances of the particular proceeding, including matters such as the volume of applications for review and their complexity.

188 The scale of this exercise has led me to reflect on the process generally. The fact that there may be instances of group proceedings with large numbers of unregistered group members in itself is not problematic. If the overall number of group members

is known or readily ascertainable, it is not difficult to work out how many of them are unregistered. Instances where it is not possible to reliably estimate the size of the group, such that it is unknown whether there is a large number of unregistered group members, are likely to be rare. But it can happen and in this instance it has resulted in a large number of unregistered group members seeking to participate after the class has been closed. Whether there is potential for this to occur is likely to be known at the time orders are made for class closure. Indeed, it can be a significant reason for such orders being necessary. Without class closure orders, settlement negotiations in such instances would likely be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. The defendant would not be in a position to make a meaningful offer based on an informed estimate of the quantum of the claim, and similarly, the plaintiff and their legal team would have no reliable basis for a view as to whether any settlement offers are reasonable.

189 That said, the earlier such issues can be identified and mechanisms developed to deal with the likely outcomes, including dealing with large numbers of unregistered group members, the more efficient and effective the entire process will be.

#### **G Objections to the proposed settlement**

190 In considering whether the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable, I have taken into account the objections of group members and been assisted by the submissions of the Contradictor as to how to approach and assess those objections. However, it must be noted that I am not limited in my assessment of the fairness and reasonableness of the settlement by reference only to those matters expressly raised in objections. I make some preliminary comments here about the objections but will deal with particular objections later in these reasons, where they fit thematically. I have also taken into account the submissions made by the plaintiffs and the Contradictor about the objections.

191 It is important that each objector is able to exercise their right to object to the settlement and, consistent with my protective role, I am satisfied that procedural fairness has been accorded to each objector. There is no distinction to be drawn between an objection by a registered or unregistered group member. All group members have a right to object and I have considered all of the objections. I have read all of the written objections to the settlement and listened closely to objectors who spoke at the hearing.

In particular, I am grateful to all those who took the time to speak at the hearing. This could not have been easy but it was of great assistance to the Court. It is impossible to ignore the devastation that group members have experienced. Group members described how their livelihoods, retirement nest eggs, and health have suffered, and they attribute this suffering to Uber. They are also very critical of governments and regulatory authorities for not having enforced regulations which would have prevented UberX from operating and for changing regulations in a way which adversely impacted them and for which they do not consider they were properly compensated. Group members are aggrieved and there was almost a sense in which no amount of settlement money could alleviate or redress that impact and those grievances.

192 As noted above at paragraph 18, there were 85 objections made in writing, and around 369 purported UGM Applications were also identified as raising objections to the settlement. Of the 85 group members who provided written objections to the court, a number of group members made oral submissions in support of their objections at the approval hearing.

193 For the sake of brevity, I set out below a summary table of the objections to settlement, adapted from a table included in the Contradictor’s written submissions:

Number	Theme Description	Total number of objections	Number of objections made by UGMs	Number of objections made by RGMs
1(a)	Objection Notice is, in whole or in part, a Purported UGM Application	549 (all also treated as UGM applications)	541	8
1(b)	Objection Notice is a Purported UGM Application, and identifies no ground(s) of objection	180	177	3
1(c)	Objection Notice is both a Purported UGM Application, and a substantive objection, where the group member’s objection is that they were unaware of the proceeding	280	277	3
1(d)	Objection Notice is both a Purported UGM Application, and a substantive objection, where the group	136	133	3

Number	Theme Description	Total number of objections	Number of objections made by UGMs	Number of objections made by RGMs
	member's objection is that it would be unfair to exclude UGMs from participating in the settlement			
2	No grounds of objection identified (blank objection) <sup>89</sup>	27	22	5
3	Settlement amount inadequate	50	6	44
4	Lack of consultation or transparency	5	1	4
5	Proposed SDS	10	3	7
6	Trial should proceed/other defendants should be added	7	1	6
7	Plaintiffs' legal costs and/or proposed funding commission	5	1	4
8	Other <sup>90</sup>	23	19	4
9	Incomplete objections <sup>91</sup>	5	4	1

194 I refer to particular objections and evidence of objectors in respect of particular themes later in these reasons, as applicable.

195 However, I observe in respect of the objections in themes 1(a) and (b) that they are not, in fact, objections and do not require consideration as such.

196 Objections that fall within 1(c) and (d) have been partly addressed already in section F. In respect of objections within 1(c), the mere fact that an individual objector did not receive the Opt Out and Settlement Notice is not relevant to whether the settlement is fair and reasonable as a whole. In respect of 1(d), I agree with the Contradictor's submission that the objections raise a broader point about the fairness of approving the proposed settlement in light of asserted deficiencies in the notification process in the Class Closure Orders. This goes to whether group members were given proper

<sup>89</sup> Objections that fall within 2 do not assist the Court.

<sup>90</sup> The Contradictor reviewed Objections within this theme which were supported by evidence and did not identify any objections which were not addressed by other themes of objection, in substance. Having looked at these objections myself, I am satisfied that this is correct.

<sup>91</sup> These Objections comprised only a signature page, or an incomplete page or illegible image of a Notice of Objection. There is no need to consider these objections any further.

notice and thereby afforded an opportunity to take steps to protect their position.<sup>92</sup> However, I have found that the notice regime was not defective or inadequate, either in its conception or implementation, and so I have not given any weight to objections in this category.<sup>93</sup>

197 There is no reason for me to take objections which fall within theme 2 in the table at paragraph 193 above into account. Where grounds of objection are not raised, they can have no impact on my assessment of the fairness or reasonableness of the proposed settlement. That 22 group members object without giving a reason is immaterial to that assessment.

#### **H Fairness and reasonableness of the proposed settlement**

198 It has been said that there will rarely be an instance in which one outcome of a proceeding is the only fair and reasonable outcome,<sup>94</sup> in fact, it may never be true that there is only one fair and reasonable outcome. I am not required to be satisfied that the parties have reached the only fair and reasonable outcome in order to approve the settlement, just that it falls within the range of fair and reasonable outcomes, in all the circumstances.

199 I have formed the view that the proposed settlement of \$271.8 million to compromise the claims of the group is one such fair and reasonable outcome, as between the parties, having regard to the claims of group members. I am also satisfied that the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable as between the group members.

200 The Court has taken the Counsel Opinion on the proposed settlement into account. In this regard, it is not sufficient to assess whether the opinions of the plaintiffs' legal advisers appear reasonable on their face, as I must be independently satisfied of the fairness of the settlement of the proceeding.<sup>95</sup> I do not merely adopt the positions for which Counsel advocate in their opinion, however, I have been assisted by the Counsel Opinion in that it:

---

<sup>92</sup> *Camilleri* [2015] FCA 1468, [5(f)] (Moshinsky J).

<sup>93</sup> See Section F.5 above.

<sup>94</sup> *Darwalla Milling Co* (2006) 236 ALR 322, 339 [50]; *Gill v Ethicon Sàrl (No 10)* [2023] FCA 228, [72] (Lee J).

<sup>95</sup> *Lenahan v Powercor Australia Ltd (No 2)* [2020] VSC 159, [23] (Nichols J) (*Lenahan*).

- (a) addresses in detail the procedural history and background of the litigation;
- (b) includes an assessment of the risks of establishing liability, causation, loss and damage;
- (c) explores the quantum of settlement as against the potential value of claims of group members;
- (d) addresses each of the factors identified in the Practice Note (see paragraph 50 above);
- (e) includes an assessment of the SDS;
- (f) discusses the UGM Applications; and
- (g) discusses the deductions from the settlement sum.

201 Due to the confidential and legally privileged nature of the Counsel Opinion, I am limited in what I can say here about it. I can only talk about it in general terms. I can say that the analysis in the Counsel Opinion is sound. It discusses the abovementioned items in a frank and fulsome way and it fulfils the role required of counsel opinions in these sorts of applications.

202 While the assessment of whether the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable is to be approached in a holistic way, it is convenient to discuss that assessment with reference to certain themes and issues. In this case, such themes and issues include:

- (a) the quantum of the proposed settlement and the risks associated with continuing the litigation;
- (b) whether it is in the interests of group members for the litigation to continue;
- (c) the reaction of group members, in particular the complaints regarding consultation and transparency;
- (d) the proposed SDS;
- (e) the amount to be deducted from the settlement sum for legal costs;

- (f) the amount to be deducted from the settlement sum for the funding commission; and
- (g) the amount to be deducted from the settlement sum for payments to the plaintiffs and sample group members.

203 I will discuss each of these in turn.

## **H.1 Quantum of the proposed settlement and the risks associated with continuing the litigation**

204 As set out above, forming a view as to the fairness and reasonableness of the quantum of the proposed settlement is one of the key elements for assessment by the Court.

### ***H.1.1 Plaintiffs' submissions***

205 The plaintiffs submit that the settlement sum is fair and reasonable when one has regard to the strengths of the plaintiffs' case as known at the time of settlement, the various risks identified and the additional cost and delay associated with proceeding to trial. As noted earlier, the Counsel Opinion goes into a great deal of analysis about each of these elements and I have been assisted by it.

206 The plaintiffs submit that objections based on the quantum of settlement incorrectly assume that a substantially larger settlement sum could have been achieved by negotiation and/or if the matter proceeded to trial, the Court would necessarily have awarded a larger sum to group members. Insofar as the objectors suggest Uber should receive a greater penalty for its conduct or that this settlement sum is not sufficient to deter future unlawful conduct, they misapprehend the nature of the proceeding. This was a private claim for compensatory damages, not an enforcement or civil penalty proceeding.

### ***H.1.2 Contradictor's submissions***

207 The Contradictor submits that it is outside the scope of its appointment to make submissions on whether the total settlement sum is fair and reasonable. However, the Contradictor makes submissions regarding the relevance of the general themes raised by objectors regarding the total settlement sum.

- 208 The Contradictor notes that several objectors state that their likely share of the settlement sum will be insufficient to compensate for the loss they have suffered as a result of Uber's conduct, or to remedy financial insecurity that they find themselves experiencing as a result of Uber's conduct.
- 209 The Contradictor submits that objections of this nature emphasise the importance of the Court's task in scrutinising the proposed settlement. However, it is necessary and appropriate for the Court to assess group members' perspectives on the adequacy of the settlement sum against the risks, costs, and range of likely outcomes had the matter proceeded to trial.
- 210 The Contradictor notes that several group members objected on the basis that the settlement sum is not enough to deter Uber and other companies like it from future misconduct. The Contradictor submits that objections of this nature should not be given any weight, as it is not the purpose of civil proceedings for compensation to be awarded or determined based on deterrence of future civil wrongs.
- 211 The Contradictor notes that some objectors expressed confidence in the merits of the case, suggesting that they were of the view that taking the case to trial would certainly result in higher compensation. The Contradictor submits that objections of this nature should be considered against the assessment of the risks of the case set out in the Counsel Opinion.

### ***H.1.3 Objections***

- 212 Fifty written objections raised concerns about the quantum of the settlement. While several of those objections complained of the settlement amount overall when compared with the harm objectors alleged Uber had caused and with Uber's reported net worth, primarily the complaints were directed to what these objectors viewed as inadequate levels of compensation for individual group members. These concerns were also raised by some of the objectors who spoke at the hearing. The recovery for many group members will be less than the amounts of losses they attribute to Uber's actions and less than they had hoped or anticipated to recover through these proceedings.



213 By way of example, I will describe the submissions in this regard made by three of the objectors who appeared at the hearing:

- (a) Mr Paul Scaini,<sup>96</sup> a director of Cliffwood Pty Ltd, which is the owner of two Brisbane taxi licences, and who travelled down to Melbourne from Queensland for the hearing, said the following:

I'd also put it to Your Honour that Uber has directly caused my family damages of close to, if not, over \$1 million. I would communicate to Your Honour that my consideration that of the likely proportional settlement payments that might flow to us as a class member, I reasonably expect a likely shortfall of perhaps between 95 and 98% of that amount – those losses.

...

[I]f you put some numbers on the back of an envelope, you'll probably come up with about four or five times the amount of the current settlement offer. And the pub test just tells you that the current offer stinks.

- (b) Mr Eric Steinhouse, an owner of two NSW taxi plates during the relevant period, said the following:

Reading the amount of around \$21,000, as was made public, that each member would possibly receive, you can see that this was a devastating amount, and barely one twentieth of what I was expecting and thought would be reasonable.

...

I don't know how on Earth they came to accept such an amount when they had no idea what the actual amounts were of individual plaintiffs.

- (c) Mr Greg Webb, the managing director of Black & White Cabs, said the following:

I see a lack of transparency and available information around the settlement calculations or methodology. Clearly, the \$272 million, if I round it up, settlement amount is extremely low, when compared to individual group member losses.

---

<sup>96</sup> In general, I have opted to discuss matters pertaining to unregistered group members or objectors using either the anonymised application number associated with each UGM application or the initials of the name of group member. I refer by name to objectors who addressed the Court at the settlement approval hearing.

#### *H.1.4 Consideration*

214 I have considered at length the quantum of the settlement, as well as the objections raised in relation to it. I appreciate that the settlement amount is of utmost concern to many group members. Indeed, of all the objections relating to the terms of the settlement, objections to the settlement amount were the most common. Many objectors expressed concern that the settlement amount would not be enough to compensate group members properly for the losses they have suffered. It is likely they will not recover all that they say they have lost. For some objectors, ownership of a taxi licence was their retirement plan. The subsequent loss of income and/or capital value from these licences seriously impacted their financial security. Other objectors say they were forced to work longer hours for fewer fares to make ends meet. For many group members, the stress caused by their financial hardship had a detrimental impact on their health and interpersonal relationships. I have great sympathy for these group members, and I recognise their concerns as valid.

215 That being said, the Contradictor is correct when it says that the Court must balance these concerns against the risks, costs, and range of likely outcomes had the matter proceeded to trial. As such, in assessing the question of quantum, I have turned my mind to the Counsel Opinion, which was provided on a confidential basis to assist the Court to determine whether the proposed settlement of these proceedings is fair, reasonable, and in the interest of group members.

216 In providing their legal opinions, the authors of the Counsel Opinion were acting as officers of the Court, and not as advocates for the plaintiffs or group members. As such, they address matters relevant to the settlement approval candidly and without bias. Although I am limited in what I can say about the opinions expressed within, I will say that the Counsel Opinion:

- (a) explains the complexity of the proceedings and the likely duration of any trial;
- (b) considers the cost and delay of proceeding to trial;
- (c) assesses the risks of establishing liability on the part of Uber, as well as the risks of establishing causation, loss and damage; and

(d) evaluates the fairness and reasonableness of settlement sum, including an estimate of class-wide loss.

217 I consider the analysis provided in the Counsel Opinion to be robust and detailed. As was submitted by the plaintiffs, a compromise of proceedings is rarely ever perfect; it involves a calculation of risk. The Counsel Opinion supports a view that the outcome negotiated in this proceeding is reasonable, and I rely on that opinion in reaching the view that the settlement quantum is fair and reasonable. In addition, I make the following points.

218 It is clear from the First Confidential Affidavit that, armed with information as to how many RGMs there were, the plaintiffs' legal team did a great deal of work on estimating the quantum of the claims prior to the mediation. Again, I cannot go into detail on this because of the confidential and privileged nature of the material, but I am satisfied that the methodology and analysis was sound. That said, there are undoubtedly many ways of approaching the valuation of the group members' claims, which serves to highlight the risks associated with establishing loss and damage if the proceedings went to trial.

219 Some objectors were critical of the plaintiffs, Maurice Blackburn and Harbour for accepting the proposed settlement. This criticism appeared to be based on an assumption that they had just accepted Uber's first offer and that they should have held out for more. At the settlement approval hearing, none of the parties could go into any detail about their negotiations because of their without prejudice nature, but it was apparent that the negotiations had taken place over several months (the mediation having commenced in December 2023). It is to be expected that long-running negotiations would have involved the making of several offers and counter-offers.

220 It was also clear from reading the objections that a number of them were based on a misapprehension as to the Court's role in hearing the settlement approval application. A number of objectors said that I should reject the proposed settlement because it was not enough money, and that I should send Maurice Blackburn back to the negotiating table to get more money from Uber, or that I should tell Uber to pay more. Such objections do not recognise that the Court's role when determining whether to

approve the proposed settlement is to either approve or reject it. The Court may make orders different to the ones sought regarding deductions from the settlement amount (for example, the amounts to be deducted for legal fees or funding commissions), but the amount Uber is to pay is either the amount it has agreed to pay under a settlement approved by the Court or the amount it is ordered to pay following a trial. The Court cannot determine how much Uber should pay by way of settlement: all that the Court can do in that respect is determine whether the amount it has agreed to pay in the Deed is a fair and reasonable settlement of the proceedings and, if it is, approve the settlement.

221 While the proceedings settled at the Court's doorstep, as it were, and costs had been incurred to prepare for trial, there would still have been substantial costs incurred and which have been saved by not having to run a 10-week trial (and an appeal, if any). There would also be substantial delay to finalising the proceedings if they went to trial, which would be compounded by any appeal.

222 In my view, the claims made in these proceedings were complex and there were substantial risks associated with most elements of those claims. The cause of action relied upon, while not novel, is not a common one and that itself involves a heightened level of risk. Further, I am not aware of any other class action in Australia which has involved a cause of action such as the one at issue here.

223 No settlement is perfect. By its very nature, settlement involves a compromise, to at least some degree. It is common that with a settlement, not all losses are compensated for. That is to be contrasted with running a matter to verdict following a trial. In the latter instance, liability has to be established. In this case, as already explained, the risks associated with establishing liability on the part of Uber are substantial. If the trial judge does not find that Uber committed the tort of conspiracy by unlawful means (see paragraph 8 above), then that is the end of the proceedings, and Uber would not be liable to pay anything to any group member. If the trial judge does find Uber committed that tort, then the trial judge would likely proceed to determine general matters associated with loss and damage, but the only quantum which would be found at that point would be that associated with the individual plaintiffs, being Mr Andrianakis and Ms Salem, and possibly the sample group members. Further

hearings, including detailed evidence and submissions, would then be required for each individual group member. That would be a very lengthy and time-consuming process and there is no guarantee that it would result in a better financial outcome for group members.

224 One of the factors which may be relevant when considering the quantum of a proposed settlement is whether the defendant is capable of withstanding a greater amount. The rationale for this as a relevant factor is that the risks associated with not being able to recover a greater amount are small, if the defendant has sufficient resources available to it to pay that greater amount. In this case, the evidence suggests that Uber would be able to withstand a judgment of an amount greater than \$271.8 million, hence recovery risk is not a basis for approving the settlement sum. While I have had regard to this, I do not consider that the likelihood of Uber being able to pay more if ordered to do so outweighs the carefully and comprehensively considered Counsel Opinion and my own balancing of the prospects of a higher amount being ordered with the significant risks associated with taking the proceedings to verdict.

225 Given the significant risks associated with going to trial, which necessarily include the risk of losing, along with the significant costs and delays associated with that course even if the action is successful, I am satisfied that the quantum of the proposed settlement is within the range of fair and reasonable outcomes in all the circumstances.

## **H.2 Whether it is in the interests of group members for the litigation to continue**

226 Intimately connected with the previous issue is the question of whether it is in the interests of group members for the proceedings to continue to trial. I have largely already dealt with this above, but it is worth noting here the objections to the effect that Uber should have its day in Court, that the trial should proceed, or that defendants should be added to the proceedings.

227 Some objections to the settlement were along the lines that the proceedings should proceed to trial so that Uber is held up to public scrutiny, or that the proceedings should have included other defendants such as state governments or regulators. I agree with the Contradictor that these objections do not provide a reason to refuse

approval of the settlement. It was open to those objectors to opt out of these proceedings in order to bring a claim against Uber (or other defendants) and to prosecute that claim to trial. Insofar as those objectors seek public accountability for Uber, it is to be remembered that a civil trial is not a royal commission.<sup>97</sup> These proceedings are civil proceedings and are based on compensating group members for the loss and damage alleged to have been caused by the defendants. They are not based on notions of punishing the defendants. It may be that those group members who object because they want Uber to have its day in court do not recognise that the proceedings bore very substantial risks. The plaintiffs may not have won if the matter had proceeded to judgment. The claim was highly complex and the plaintiffs' burden to establish their case was significant. Had the matter proceeded to trial, those group members might well have found themselves similarly unsatisfied with the outcome, including potentially being in the position of receiving less compensation than under the proposed settlement or none at all.

### **H.3 Reaction of group members, in particular complaints regarding consultation or transparency**

228 The reaction of group members to the proposed settlement is also an important factor. In connection with this, I have considered some objections made to the proposed settlement on the grounds that there was insufficient consultation with group members about the proposed settlement before it occurred and/or a lack of transparency about it.

#### ***H.3.1 Content of some of the objections***

229 Five objections to the proposed settlement were raised on the basis that group members had not been adequately consulted about it, or concerned the requirement for confidentiality undertakings. For example, Mr John Glazebrook, an ex-taxi driver who appeared at the hearing, complained that Maurice Blackburn failed to respond to his questions in a timely way, and that he sees no reason for the need for group members to sign a confidentiality agreement before receiving full information about the proposed settlement.

---

<sup>97</sup> *Wheelahon* [2011] VSC 215, [112] (Emerton J).

230 In addition to those objections, at the hearing Mr Webb submitted:

Insufficient information is forthcoming, there has been no presentations, there's no Q & A sessions, there's been no consultation with members around how the settlement was achieved and how it was, particularly how it was calculated. I understand the confidentiality around some of the matters but surely, the methodology or modelling of it could quite easily be provided to members.

### *H.3.2 Plaintiffs' submissions*

231 In respect of consultation and transparency, referring to objections based on an alleged failure to respond to individual queries, the plaintiffs submit that the volume of contact from group members meant that Maurice Blackburn did not provide individualised responses to every enquiry it received before the 2 July Deadline. The Settlement Notice itself provided information about the key elements of the proposed settlement. However, information was available at all times on the Maurice Blackburn website. In his Open Affidavit, Mr Donnelly deposes that on 4 June 2024, Maurice Blackburn published a Settlement Distribution Scheme Explanatory Note (**SDS Explanatory Note**) on the Uber Class Action website. Mr Donnelly was of the view that the SDS Explanatory Note would help group members better understand the proposed SDS and how group member claims would be assessed under it (subject to Court approval).

232 The plaintiffs submit that even if group members did not receive an individualised response, they were able to access and review the Settlement Notice, the proposed SDS and the SDS Explanatory Note, which provided sufficient information for group members to assess the proposed settlement. The plaintiffs submit that it was also open to group members to seek their own legal advice (as explained in the Settlement Notice) and that the limited confidentiality regime over the confidential annexures to the SDS is appropriate in the interests of the group as a whole.

233 Mr Donnelly deposes as to the reasons for requiring confidentiality undertakings from group members at paragraph 101 of his Open Affidavit. The key reason was that the confidential annexures to the SDS contain material relating to claim valuations that is based on evidence that has not been read in open court, and assessments of risk by Maurice Blackburn and Counsel.

### ***H.3.3 Contradictor's submissions***

234 The scope of the Contradictor's appointment did not extend to submissions in respect of the number of objections or reactions of group members to the settlement, except insofar as those reactions were recorded in objections to the settlement and the themes arising from the same.

235 In respect of the requirement for confidentiality undertakings from group members raised in objections, the Contradictor submits that it is consistent with the interests of group members as a whole for these matters to be kept confidential and made available to group members upon provision of a confidentiality undertaking. Further, there is substantial public interest in maintaining confidentiality over Counsel's assessment of risks in the Counsel Opinion.

### ***H.3.4 Consideration***

236 It must be remembered that there are over 8,000 RGMs, the overwhelming majority of whom have not lodged any objections to the proposed settlement. As set out in Section G above, leaving aside those objections which were in truth UGM Applications or identified no grounds for objection, around 77 objections raised particular matters or grounds of any substance. This is not a simple numbers game – it is not a matter of weighing up the number of group members who have not objected compared with the number who do object. However, the fact that very few group members objected and the vast majority (in not raising objections) appear to have reacted positively to the settlement is a factor in favour of the settlement being approved. Rather than focusing on the number of objections, my approach has been to consider the substance and content of the objections.

237 I have dealt with other grounds raised by objections in other sections of these reasons. Here, I will address the issue of consultation and transparency as raised by some objectors.

238 First, it is unrealistic to expect that all group members will be consulted before the plaintiffs agreed to the proposed settlement, particularly in the context of large class actions such as the present. To consider otherwise is to ignore the very nature and features of group proceedings of this scale. Further, plaintiffs in group proceedings



are not required to consult with all group members. In part, that group members' interests and rights may be affected is one of the reasons that the Court exercises its protective jurisdiction in respect of the approval of settlements. In any event, the evidence establishes that throughout the proceedings, regular updates were provided to RGMs, and more generally via Maurice Blackburn's website.

239 Second, it is also unrealistic and impossible for the plaintiffs to share their legal advice regarding the proposed settlement with group members, as to do so is likely to constitute a waiver of legal professional privilege in that advice.

240 Third, I do not accept that insufficient information about the proposed SDS was made available to group members. In this regard:

- (a) the criticism that it is not known how much an individual group member will actually receive is misguided, in that this cannot be worked out until the total number of participating RGMs and the quantum of their claims is assessed, and those claims are then prorated to the proportion of the settlement sum available for distribution to group members;
- (b) the proposed SDS and the confidential annexures (which were available to group members on provision of a confidentiality undertaking) contain sufficient information for group members to see how the quantum of claims has been dealt with; and
- (c) the requirement that group members provide a confidentiality undertaking before being given the confidential annexures to the proposed SDS was reasonable in all the circumstances.

#### **H.4 Proposed SDS**

241 Because the proposed SDS provides for differentiation between the treatment of group members, I am required to determine whether that differentiation is fair and reasonable.<sup>98</sup> Differential treatment can be explicable, including because of differences in the nature of the claims made or damage sustained by the group

---

<sup>98</sup> *Downie* [2015] VSC 190, [51], [53] (J Forrest J); *Lenahan* [2020] VSC 159, [25] (Nichols J).

members. For the reasons that follow, the differential treatment in this case is fair and reasonable, and the SDS as a whole is fair and reasonable and ought be approved.

#### *H.4.1 Overview of the SDS*

242 I draw the following overview of the SDS from the plaintiffs' written submissions.

243 As noted earlier in these reasons, the SDS provides for five types of claims, reflecting the different claims made in the proceeding. They are: capital loss claims, lease income loss claims, operator claims, driver claims, and NSP claims. Each type of claim (other than an NSP claim) has been assessed by identifying a starting loss value, and then applying a series of discounts. NSP claims are to be individually assessed and a discount to the assessed loss is then to be applied.

244 The starting values reflect the plaintiffs' legal team's assessment of the claims themselves based upon the evidence, including expert evidence, and other analyses that they have done, including statistical modelling for each type of claim (except NSP claims). The discounts have been arrived at through a similar process and reflect the legal team's assessment of the relevant strengths, weaknesses and risks of the different types of claims.

245 The result of that process is the 'Assessment Figure' for the capital loss claims, lease income loss claims, operator claims and driver claims. It follows that identically situated group members will receive identical payments. For example, each registered group member who owned a single unrestricted taxi licence in Melbourne throughout the relevant period will receive the same payment.

246 As a result, for claims other than NSP claims, the scheme administrator will not conduct an enquiry into the circumstances or losses of any individual group member, or require group members to produce financial records or other direct evidence of loss. The distributions will therefore not be based on a calculation of the actual loss suffered by an individual group member.

247 The SDS involves the following key steps:

- (a) **Claim data determination:** The scheme administrator notifies registered group members of the 'Claim Data' recorded on the database in respect of their

- claim(s), such as the number and type of taxi licences the group member held during the relevant period. Registrants can then amend or update their claim data. The scheme administrator may take steps, including requesting material from third parties, to confirm the accuracy of a group member's claim data. The administrator then notifies the group member of the finalised claim data.
- (b) **Eligibility determination:** Once the claim data is finalised, the scheme administrator determines whether each registrant is eligible to receive compensation under the scheme. Eligible registrants are then referred to as 'participating group members'.
- (c) **Assessment:** The scheme administrator then assesses the claim(s) of each participating group member. This is done primarily by applying the relevant 'assessment figure' to each claim. The assessment figures prescribe a set loss assessment for each type of claim. Where a person only participated in the industry for part of the relevant period, or held a partial ownership interest, their claim will be prorated or assessed proportionally.
- (d) **Review:** A group member has a right of review of the scheme administrator's decision in respect of claim data; a decision that the group member is not eligible to participate in the settlement; and the assessment of the group member's loss. Reviews will be performed by a member of Counsel or a solicitor independent of Maurice Blackburn of more than five years' experience, engaged as an independent arbitrator. There are time limits for lodging reviews and payment of a bond is required (which is refunded depending on the outcome of the review).
- (e) **Distribution:** The settlement sum, less approved deductions, is then distributed to group members in the proportion which their final assessed loss bears to the aggregate assessed loss of all participating group members.

248 The plaintiffs note that one group member may have multiple claims, assessed by reference to separate 'Assessment Figures'. For example, an individual who owned a taxi licence, operated the taxi vehicle and drove the taxi during the relevant period would have three claims: a capital loss claim, an operator claim and a driver claim.

249 The SDS is not the subject of a confidentiality claim, save for the assessment figures. As has already been described, group members were provided with a copy of these assessment figures upon request, subject to providing an undertaking as to group membership and confidentiality. The assessment figures are treated as confidential because they reflect valuations contained in expert evidence that had not been read in open court, and assessments of relative risk by Maurice Blackburn and the plaintiffs' Counsel.

#### *H.4.2 Plaintiffs' submissions*

250 The plaintiffs submit that the proposed SDS will provide fair procedures for the distribution of the settlement sum for the reasons that follow.

251 First, registered group members will have an opportunity to confirm (and amend if necessary) their claim data. This is an important step, because the content of the claim data largely determines both a group member's eligibility to participate in the distribution at all, and the assessment figure to be applied to their claim(s). The claim data confirmation procedure enables group members to ensure that their claim data is accurate.

252 Second, the SDS provides a right of review at each critical stage of the distribution process: the determination of a registered group member's claim data, the determination of eligibility to participate in the scheme, and the assessment of the group member's loss. These stages are described as critical because the claim data is central to a group member's eligibility and the applicable assessment figure, and eligibility and assessment decisions respectively determine whether a person can participate in the settlement and the assessment of their loss.

253 Third, it is necessary for appropriate individuals to be appointed to administer the scheme. As noted above, it is proposed that Maurice Blackburn act in the role of scheme administrator. The plaintiffs are not aware of any matter that would suggest that Maurice Blackburn could not, or ought not, act as the scheme administrator. I will return to the identity and appointment of the scheme administrator later in these reasons.

254 Fourth, as noted above, the scheme administrator will not conduct an enquiry into the circumstances or losses of any individual registered group member, or require group members to produce financial records or other direct evidence of loss. Nor will the distributions precisely reflect the actual loss suffered by an individual group member.

255 The plaintiffs submit that this approach is justified given the complexity, delay and significant cost that a more individualised approach would entail. The proposed approach also avoids the evidentiary challenges associated with individual assessments.

256 In the plaintiffs' view, the costs and delay of an individualised assessment procedure would likely outweigh any benefits of a more exact distribution, and accordingly would not be in the best interests of group members. The plaintiffs consider that the proposed distribution by formula is fair and reasonable and will ensure the settlement sum is distributed as promptly as possible without being unnecessarily dissipated. Further, in the plaintiffs' view, the proposed SDS provides for broadly fair relativities as between classes of group members.

257 The plaintiffs submit that both the starting loss values and the proposed discounts are fair and reasonable, and that the scheme as a whole leads to a distribution that is fair as between all group members.

258 The plaintiffs note that NSP claims will be assessed on an individual basis, rather than by reference to a prescribed assessment figure. In this respect, the SDS treats NSP claims differently from the other types of claims. However, the plaintiffs consider that this approach is fair in the circumstances, and rely on the First Confidential Affidavit in this regard.

#### ***H.4.3 Contradictor's submissions***

259 Ten objections were identified by Maurice Blackburn as relating to the proposed SDS.

260 The Contradictor submits that objections to the proposed SDS are highly relevant to the overall reasonableness and fairness of the proposed settlement, because these objections go to the fairness of the settlement as between group members. Accordingly, the Contradictor reviewed each of the 10 objections in this category and

addressed each of the objections that raise detailed, substantive concerns about the SDS in their submissions. I outline these objections below.

- 261 Mr Steinhaus objected on the basis that, had each participant in the class action been given an opportunity to substantiate their individual losses upon registration, ‘Maurice Blackburn would have had a much more accurate picture of what the total settlement should have been’.
- 262 Mr Steinhaus’s objection is to the use in the proposed SDS of a categorical approach to assessing group members’ share of the settlement sum, rather than requiring the scheme administrator to conduct individualised loss assessments.
- 263 The Contradictor submits that Mr Steinhaus’ objection can be considered alongside the following points:
- (a) Courts have recognised that the benefits of individualised settlement allocations must be balanced against the costs and practicalities of conducting individualised loss assessments.
  - (b) The assessment of the appropriateness of the proposed SDS is essentially a pragmatic exercise. The scheme need not be perfectly accurate or efficient to be fair and reasonable. The process of assessing claims under a settlement distribution scheme ‘is intended to provide a reasonable process by which claims of group members can be processed fairly and efficiently without the need for court intervention’.<sup>99</sup> As Mortimer J (as her Honour then was) said in the context of approving a settlement, ‘[f]airness and reasonableness are moderate standards, rather than ones which require absolute certainty or confidence in a particular point of view about legal issues, if there can ever be such certainty in the law in any event.’<sup>100</sup>
  - (c) The plaintiffs have adduced evidence to the effect that the total costs of undertaking an individual loss assessment for each group member would be

---

<sup>99</sup> *Matthews v Ausnet Electricity Services Pty Ltd (Ruling No 43)* [2016] VSC 583, [32] (J Forrest J).

<sup>100</sup> *McAlister v New South Wales (No 2)* [2017] FCA 93, [32].

substantial, result in significant delays in making distributions, and would not necessarily generate more accurate results for many group members.

264 At the approval hearing, the Contradictor made the following submission:

As to the method of assessment, there is no doubt as a matter of law, that a flat distribution method under a settlement distribution scheme, is allowed. The question, therefore, is not whether this is permissible but whether it's fair and reasonable. That is to be assessed by reference to the internal workings of the settlement and the justification for differential treatment between group members. Scientific precisions is not required.

The features of the settlement distribution scheme have been the subject of submissions by the plaintiff. We have reviewed the settlement distribution scheme, the written submission and the affidavits. We note that the claims assessment process is not what I would describe as a simple flat distribution, where settlement sums are split equally between all group members. There is a considerable degree of granularities in the assessment scheme, as Ms Szydzik outlined yesterday.

Having regard to the interests of all group members, we consider that the assessment of each category of claim, so that is owner, drive and licence holder, by a set loss figure, is explicable in the circumstances. While individual assessment is possible, it will be complicated and for that reason, time consuming and expensive. The evidence in the confidential affidavit ... as to the estimated cost and time of preparing individual assessments is, we consider, persuasive.

265 Mr Stanley McCallum and Ms Marianne McCallum objected on the basis that, for capital loss claims and owner lease claims, the differentiation in loss assessments as between Brisbane and regional Queensland is disproportionate. They give the example of licence owners in Cairns, who enjoy four times as much lease income as licence owners in Brisbane. Relatedly, Taxicab Investments Pty Ltd states that the 'methodology utilised to determine the losses by region has not been disclosed'.

266 The Contradictor submits that evidence regarding the basis for the geographical differentiations in the SDS for capital loss claims and owner lease claims has been adduced by the plaintiffs, and that geographical discounts were calculated based on an analysis by Maurice Blackburn of discovered UberX trip data which showed the 'service areas' of UberX during the relevant period. The Contradictor submits that while the data underlying the 'Area of Operation Discount' is not in evidence, there appears to be a rational basis for applying discounts based on the geographical area of a relevant group member's operations.

267 Finally, Taxicab Investments objects on the basis that, because the total number of group members or their allocations to the various categories under the SDS have not been determined (or at least estimated), it is impossible to know whether the settlement is fair and reasonable. The Contradictor submits that, as a practical matter, it is only possible to determine the total number of group members and the loss categories into which they fall once the process of settlement administration has been conducted. It is inevitable that, at this stage, there will be uncertainty about how and to whom the settlement fund is ultimately to be distributed.

268 At the approval hearing, the Contradictor expanded upon this submission:

As to the submission that without knowing the amount that group members might receive, it's not possible to assess the fairness and reasonableness of the settlement scheme, we agree that this is important information.

...

As I stated earlier, it may be necessary for the court to first determine the number of unregistered group members who are permitted to participate, before a final decision can be made on whether the settlement is approved.

But to the extent that an objection concerns individual assessment, so the objection being that it's impossible to say if a settlement is fair and reasonable without knowing what each individual group member might receive, we don't agree that that is a basis for not approving the settlement.

That is because precision of return is not possible until the claims assessment process has been undertaken, which involves thousands of group members providing their claim data, having their eligibility determined, checking both of these matters and then awaiting the completion of the review process. Uncertainty at this stage is inherent in the nature of any settlement scheme and the return to individual group members is not determinative of the fairness and reasonableness of the settlement as a whole.

269 The Contradictor did not identify any objections to the claims assessment and review processes contained in the proposed SDS.

#### ***H.4.4 Objections***

270 Two of the objectors who appeared at the hearing expanded upon some of the themes identified in the written objections referred to above. In particular:

(a) Mr Glazebrook said the following:

Is it fair and reasonable that Maurice ...Blackburn has also accepted a modelling system that is their settlement distribution scheme has been



discredited? It was discredited by the Royal Commission into the Robodebt crisis.

...

So what we're seeing is that the court has accepted, passively accepted, a seriously flawed modelling scheme.

- (b) Mr Stephen Lacaze, who along with his wife owns a taxi in Brisbane, said the following:

[T]he notion that it is impossible to construct a fair settlement distribution, which was mentioned again today, when the size and composition of the class is unknown, has been perhaps little cursorily explored.

But it seems to be quite a definitive part. The burning question has to be, how is it even possible to conduct a fair - construct a fair settlement distribution scheme when the size and composition of the class remains unknown. We can deal with maybe one variable, but when we have two variables, it - it's not something we can work with. I cannot see any way to construct a fair and reasonable settlement distribution scheme. And the only way you could do it is to reduce it to percentages, and those percentages, as Mr Scaini revealed, start getting disturbingly small.

#### *H.4.5 Consideration*

271 I am satisfied that the proposed SDS provides a fair procedure for the distribution of the settlement sum for the reasons outlined by the plaintiffs. It provides for multiple types of claims, reflecting the different circumstances of the registered group members. It involves a robust, multi-stage process for amending or updating registrant claim data, determining registrant eligibility, assessing the value of each claim based on the type and duration of each registrant's interest, and the distribution of the settlement sum, less approved deductions. It also includes a mechanism by which registered group members can request a review of the scheme administrator's decision in respect of their claim data, eligibility determination, or assessment.

272 Objections were made, both in writing and during the hearing, to the claims assessment approach contained in the SDS, being one not involving individual assessment (save for NSP claims). As was submitted by the Contradictor, the benefits of assessing each group member's claim on an individual basis must be balanced against the cost and practicality of doing so. Mr Donnelly deposes that individual assessments of 8,701 claims (the number of RGMs) would involve legal and

accounting costs in the range of \$50-55 million and approximately three years to carry out. Mr Donnelly deposes that an individual loss assessment for each group member would not necessarily generate more accurate results for them. What is more, his estimate is based on the 8,701 registered group members and does not include the further 140 presently unregistered group members who have been granted leave to participate in the settlement.

273 If his estimate of the costs and time associated with individual assessments is correct, and I have no reason to think it is not, then in my view it would be prohibitively expensive and productive of significant delay. This significantly outweighs any benefits that individualised assessment might offer. I consider that these factors justify the approach taken in the SDS. In my view, the proposed assessment method fairly takes into account the different types of claims such that it is fair as between group members, and the assessment of all claims (except NSP claims) by category is a reasonable way to distribute the balance of the settlement sum to participating group members. I also accept that the assessment methodology for NSP claims is appropriate.

274 There are 8,701 registered group members in this proceeding. In addition to this, as stated at paragraph 181 above, I have accepted 140 of the 5742 UGM Applications. Without a streamlined distribution scheme, each of these 8,841 group members' claims would need to be assessed on an individual basis. If the cost of assessing each claim is even a fraction of the cost outlined by Mr Donnelly, an individualised distribution scheme would result in a substantial reduction of the settlement amount, and a dwindling payout to group members.

275 I anticipate that the individual assessment of the claims of all participating group members may be hindered by evidentiary challenges (as a significant proportion of group members may not have kept documents and records from the relevant period) and language barriers (as a significant proportion of group members do not speak English as their first language).

276 As was submitted by the Contradictor, the Court's assessment of the appropriateness of the proposed SDS is essentially an exercise in pragmatism. The SDS does not need to be perfectly accurate in its distribution to group members for me to find that it is

fair and reasonable. I am satisfied that the proposed SDS strikes an acceptable balance between the fairness to group members on the one hand and practicality on the other.

277 In relation to the question of whether the SDS ought to take into consideration the geographical location of group members, I agree with the Contradictor that there appears to be a rational basis for applying discounts based on the geographical area of a relevant group member's operations, and this should be reflected in the SDS.

278 Lastly, there were objections that until the total number of participating group members and their allocations to the various categories under the SDS have been determined, it is not possible to know whether the SDS is fair and reasonable. I accept that there exists a degree of uncertainty in the proposed SDS because of certain matters that are not known. However, I do not consider this warrants refusing the proposed SDS, for two reasons:

(a) First, I have only accepted a limited number of unregistered group member applications, and I do not consider that they dilute the settlement to an unacceptable degree. As such, the maximum number of participating group members is known (albeit the number of claims by each group member is not yet known).

(b) Second, I am of the opinion that if the categories of distribution under the SDS are fair and reasonable in their formulation, then it matters little how many group members ultimately fall within each category. While the settlement amount is large, so is the number of group members. The SDS categories work to distribute the settlement amount based on the nature of each participating group member's claim, so that each participating group member receives an amount that is reasonably proportionate in the circumstances. As such, how many participating group members fall into each category does not adversely affect the fairness of the scheme.

279 Furthermore, I agree with the Contradictor when it says that, as a matter of practicality, it is only possible to determine the total number of participating group members and the loss categories into which they fall once the process of settlement

administration has been conducted. I also accept the Contradictor's submission that uncertainty at this stage is inherent in any settlement scheme of this nature.

280 Finally, the Counsel Opinion also discusses the proposed SDS, providing a frank opinion about it, and concluding that it is fair and reasonable. I accept this opinion.

## **H.5 Legal costs and uplift to Maurice Blackburn**

### *H.5.1 Overview of what the plaintiffs seek*

281 The Settlement Notice included information about legal costs, stating that the Court would be asked to approve the deduction of reasonable legal costs and disbursements incurred by the plaintiffs in conducting these proceedings from the settlement sum, and that Maurice Blackburn estimates that these costs will total approximately \$36.5 million. The Settlement Notice also stated that the final amount the plaintiffs seek to have deducted from the settlement sum may vary from this estimate, since it was not possible to predict at that time the exact amount of legal costs that will be incurred to the finalisation of the proceedings.

282 By the time of the approval hearing, the plaintiffs sought approval for their legal costs and disbursements up to and including 10 September 2024 in the amount of \$38,600,494.37. This was based on the amount for the period up to 30 April 2024 assessed by the Costs Referee as reasonable, together with an estimate for the period from 1 May 2024 to the end of the settlement approval hearing (based on actuals to 31 August 2024 and an estimate thereafter, the total of which was less than the amount for that period estimated by the Costs Referee as reasonable), an estimate for the Rosengrave Proceeding (the estimate for which the Costs Referee had assessed as reasonable) and for the Contradictor's costs. Following the hearing, the information before me as to the legal costs and disbursements was updated by Mr Donnelly in the Third Confidential Affidavit, primarily on the basis that amounts which had previously been estimated were now known. That updated figure is \$38,698,628.81. This is more than contained in the Settlement Notice: Mr Donnelly deposes that this is due to that amount not including the costs of the Costs Referee, the Contradictor, the Rosengrave Proceeding, dealing with the significant and unexpected number of enquiries and applications from UGMs (including the costs of triaging, analysing and

reviewing those applications), or communicating the outcome of the approval hearing to group members and responding to their enquiries.

283 The amount sought to be approved as a deduction from the settlement sum for legal costs and disbursements does not include the amounts associated with administering the proposed SDS. A separate process will be put in place for those additional costs. The plaintiffs propose that a costs assessor provide four reports to the Court on the costs of administering the SDS over the course of the administration.

284 A portion of Maurice Blackburn's fees were not covered by Harbour. Included within the amount sought to be approved for legal costs and disbursements is a 25% uplift on that portion of the fees.

### ***H.5.2 Principles***

285 The relevant legal principles regarding the Court's role in approving the legal costs and the factors to be taken into account were comprehensively set out by Nichols J in *Lenehan v Powercor Australia Ltd.*<sup>101</sup> While I have not set these out here, I have had regard to and applied those principles.

286 In their submissions on legal costs, the plaintiffs provide a brief summary of the Court's role, with which I agree:

- (a) the Court must satisfy itself that the plaintiffs' legal costs, which are to be deducted from the settlement sum, are reasonable in all the circumstances;<sup>102</sup>
- (b) a Court-appointed referee may be used for the purpose of this assessment;<sup>103</sup> and
- (c) the Court's role in assessing costs is supervisory.<sup>104</sup>

### ***H.5.3 Costs Referee's Report***

287 As noted earlier in these reasons, I made orders in the proceeding appointing Ms Dealehr as a special referee, independent of the parties, for the purpose of

---

<sup>101</sup> [2020] VSC 82, [7]-[22] (*Powercor Australia*).

<sup>102</sup> *Botsman* (2018) 57 VR 68, 115 [220].

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid* 116-17 [225].

<sup>104</sup> *Botsman* (2018) 57 VR 68, 115-16 [222]-[223].

conducting an inquiry and making a written report stating, with reasons, her opinion on the reasonableness of the plaintiffs' legal costs and disbursements incurred in relation to the proceedings (up to and including the settlement approval hearing) and on the reasonableness of the sum proposed for settlement administration costs. Ms Dealehr provided the Costs Referee's Report on 28 June 2024.

288 Ms Dealehr's experience and expertise is described in the Cost Referee's Report and I am satisfied that she is appropriately qualified to perform this role. She has decades of experience as a costs lawyer and has prepared numerous independent expert costs reports, including as a court-appointed costs referee, for this and other courts in representative proceedings.

289 The voluminous materials considered by Ms Dealehr are described in the Costs Referee's Report. These were provided to her by Maurice Blackburn and she was also able to request further information if she required it. I am satisfied that the material available to Ms Dealehr was sufficient to enable her to carry out her task.

290 In her report, Ms Dealehr acknowledges the Court's protective role in relation to group members' interests resulting from the information asymmetry in class actions where group members do not commonly have a retainer with the law practice and/or where class members do not have any control over the costs incurred. Ms Dealehr cites the relevant section of *Powercor Australia* in the Costs Referee's Report.

291 Ms Dealehr uses the 'gross sum' costs method of calculating and assessing the legal fees charged by Maurice Blackburn. Ms Dealehr expresses the view that this method is the most costs effective procedure available where the claims for legal costs are substantial.

292 The method used by Ms Dealehr to assess the professional fees charged up to 30 April 2024 involved six discrete steps:

- (a) Verifying electronic time entries for accuracy.
- (b) Applying reasonable hourly rates to work performed by principal lawyers, special counsel, senior associates, associates, lawyers, trainee lawyers/law

graduates, paralegals/law clerks, litigation technology consultants, and client services officers.

- (c) Analysing time entries and categorising them based on:
  - (i) which phase in the proceeding they occurred;
  - (ii) which task was being performed in the relevant phase; and
  - (iii) the nature of the work done within the task.
- (d) Removing amounts associated for non-claimable time for task such as reviewing the costs agreement, and time recording entries which appeared to duplicate work that had already been claimed.
- (e) Applying discounts for activities such as communications within the internal team, solicitors performing clerical work, and single unit time recordings.
- (f) Applying the solicitors' uplift fee to the unfunded professional fees allowable.

293 Ms Dealehr reviewed the claimed disbursements. She examined each Counsel's hourly and daily rates and concluded that they were fair and reasonable. She also examined the fees charged by each Counsel, grouping them according to phases and time spent, and reviewing the seniority of Counsel in terms of the division of the work. She identified one entry which appeared to be a duplicate entry and disallowed it. With that exception, Ms Dealehr's opinion is that the disbursements for Counsels' fees were reasonable.

294 Maurice Blackburn engaged a number of experts over the course of these proceedings, three of which prepared expert reports that were ultimately filed. Ms Dealehr was provided the experts' reports, invoices and letters of engagement. In Ms Dealehr's opinion and experience, the hourly rates claimed by all of the experts (whether evidence of those experts was filed or not) are within a reasonable range for experts in their respective fields and appear proportionate to the work undertaken. The rates reflect their high level of expertise in specialised fields.

295 Maurice Blackburn incurred court-related expenses such as filing fees, eTrial services, transcription fees, and Assessor's Fees payable to Funds in Court. Maurice Blackburn

also incurred document management expenses, travel expenses for meeting with group members across Australia, as well as various other miscellaneous expenses. Invoices for all of these expenses were examined to confirm that they are relevant to these proceedings and checked for errors. With the exception of a small amount which Ms Dealehr considered should not be allowed, she viewed these expenses as reasonably incurred and of a reasonable amount.

296 Maurice Blackburn provided Ms Dealehr with an estimate of its future costs from 1 May 2024 up to and including the settlement approval hearing on 9 and 10 September 2024. In Ms Dealehr's opinion, Maurice Blackburn's estimated professional fees and disbursements, including the claim for an uplift fee, appear reasonable. Ms Dealehr bases her opinion on her experience in what legal costs have been allowed in class actions in which she was directly involved and which have been approved by the courts.

297 Lastly, Maurice Blackburn provided Ms Dealehr with a letter setting out the estimate of costs for the settlement administration should Maurice Blackburn be appointed settlement administrator. However, Ms Dealehr considered that it was too difficult at this stage as a costs expert to form an opinion on whether Maurice Blackburn's estimated future professional fees and disbursements post-approval to the completion of the scheme administration were reasonable.

298 Ms Dealehr notes that, pursuant to s 172 of the *Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014* (Vic), a law practice must charge costs that are no more than fair and reasonable in all the circumstances and that in particular are proportionately and reasonably incurred; and proportionate and reasonable in amount.

299 In Ms Dealehr's opinion, the legal costs incurred by Maurice Blackburn are not disproportionate to the work performed, taking into account the complexity and importance of the dispute, as well as the amount in dispute. Ms Dealehr bases her opinion on her experience in what legal costs have been allowed in class actions in which she was directly involved and which have been approved by the courts.



#### **H.5.4 *Plaintiffs' submissions***

300 In their written submissions, the plaintiffs note that the precise amount of legal costs and disbursements proposed to be deducted from the settlement sum is not presently known because Maurice Blackburn has not finalised its legal costs and disbursements for the period from 1 May 2024 up to the date of the settlement approval hearing, including costs relating to the Contradictor's expenses.

301 However, at the hearing, Counsel for the plaintiffs confirmed that the plaintiffs seek an order approving the payment of their costs and disbursements fixed in the sum of \$38.6 million across the four proceedings, up to and including 10 September 2024, but not including the costs of administering the SDS. The plaintiffs submit that the amount it seeks reflects the amount that Ms Dealehr opined is reasonable.

302 The plaintiffs note that that at the time Ms Dealehr was appointed as referee, there was by necessity some estimate involved in the future legal costs that were provided to her. Once these costs were actually incurred, the plaintiffs filed a further affidavit of Mr Donnelly that relates specifically to the costs that were incurred between the filing of the Costs Referee's Report and the hearing, including the costs of the Contradictor. The plaintiffs submit that its costs incurred during this period, including the Contradictor's costs, came in under what had been assessed as reasonable by Ms Dealehr.

303 In the First Confidential Affidavit, as well as during the submissions made at the hearing, the plaintiffs accept Ms Dealehr's opinion as to the costs and disbursements. The plaintiffs make no objection to the discounts applied by Ms Dealehr in arriving at this estimate.

304 The plaintiffs acknowledge that Ms Dealehr said she was not able to provide an opinion on Maurice Blackburn's proposed legal costs in relation to settlement administration. The plaintiffs propose that a costs assessor provide four reports on the costs of administering the SDS over the course of the administration.

#### **H.5.5 *Contradictor's submissions***

305 As noted above at paragraph 16, the Contradictor was appointed for a limited purpose, that being to review any notices of objection to the proposed settlement and

applications by unregistered group members to participate in the proposed settlement lodged by group members by the 2 July Deadline, and to make any submissions about the common themes arising from such a review.

306 One category of objections identified by the Contradictor concerned the plaintiffs' legal costs and/or the proposed funding commission. The Contradictor identifies five objections that fall into this category. According to the Contradictor, the substance of these objections is that Maurice Blackburn and Harbour are the primary beneficiaries of the litigation.

307 The Contradictor submits that it is beyond the scope of its appointment to make submissions regarding the appropriateness of allowing the proposed deductions from the settlement fund for legal fees and disbursements. However, it is submitted that the objections should be assessed by the Court as part of the overall assessment of the fairness and reasonableness of the settlement, in light of the likely costs and risks of the case, should it proceed. The Court can consider this category of objections against the findings of the Costs Referee's Report, which deals with the reasonableness of the plaintiffs' legal costs and disbursements.

#### ***H.5.6 Harbour's submissions***

308 Harbour made no written submission on the subject of the legal costs or uplift fee.

309 In oral submissions, Counsel for Harbour noted that a total of five written objections took issue with the plaintiffs' legal costs or the funding commission, but that none of those objections, on Harbour's review, contained an objection to the quantum or percentage of the funding commission. As such, Harbour said it made no submissions in relation to those objections.

#### ***H.5.7 Objections***

310 Four of the objectors appearing at the hearing objected to the amount of the legal costs and/or uplift fee proposed to be paid to Maurice Blackburn.

311 Mr Glazebrook said the following in reference to the settlement amount:

Forty percent of that is going out in costs. And many of us, like myself, have lost \$100,000. Maurice and Blackburn are not going to lose any money. None

of the other riders are not going to lose any money. Because the people have been lured into this scheme to make money for them, who are going to lose money. I think that's unfair, and if this court accepts it, I believe it's immoral.

312 Mr Scaini said the following:

I find it amazing that the legal team now considers it somehow equitable that class members be the big losers of their decision makers that collectively sees them and the funder walk away with well over \$100m and us virtually nothing.

I find it curious that the agreed settlement ensures that legal rewards and litigation funder rewards are provided for, if not perhaps in full, but with absolute certainty. Class members are faced with what seems to be an ever-diminishing amount of unfair financial returns with the possible admission of new members likely meaning even greater unfair and unreasonable returns to class members.

313 Mr Webb said the following:

I turn my mind then to the legal and administrative costs. My research indicates that legal costs, that the legal cost proposed of \$38.6m was mentioned yesterday, are at the very high or top end, when compared to other historical class actions. I read a paper recently from King & Wood Mallesons, a paper they prepared on class actions in Australia 2022/2023. And they had a very dynamic grid that set out, you know, the costs associated with class actions and it was good reading and from that, and looking at the amount of money that we're talking about here, for a case that's not going to trial, I found that the cost incurred or the cost proposed by Maurice Blackburn, to be extremely high, at the very high top end.

314 Mr Steinhouse said the following, referring to reports by Menzies Research Centre into class action litigation and litigation funding in Australia:

In accordance with the evidence provided in the form of the Menzies Research Centre documents mentioned above, they document an outrageous system that has developed in Australia, based on pure greed by law firms, financial funders of these cases, and are totally unreasonable.

...

Between Maurice Blackburn and Harbour, they have absorbed 40 per cent of the settlement amount. Is this just or reasonable or is it outrageous profiteering at the plaintiffs' expense?

If Maurice Blackburn have been already paid by Harbour for their expenses of 36.5m, then I object to Maurice Blackburn attempting to double-dip and ask to be paid a further 36.5m of a settlement amount. This - this doesn't seem to add up if Harbour's already paid them, how can they then request a - like - like, this amount out of settlement figures. I object to Maurice Blackburn seeking a 25 percent uplift.

This is normally only done if the law firm conducts a no win no fee case. This is not the case here. Maurice Blackburn seems to be wantonly double-dipping, and it's unreasonable as there was no financial risk here as they were being funded by Harbour. This should not be permitted, and these funds be kept for the general pool for compensation.

#### ***H.5.8 Plaintiffs' reply submissions***

315 In response to the suggestion that there was double-dipping by Maurice Blackburn in relation to costs, Counsel for the plaintiffs submitted that this is not the way payment from the settlement sum occurs. The approved amount for legal fees and disbursements is paid to Maurice Blackburn, who then passes on to Harbour the amount it has already funded during the course of the litigation. It is not that Maurice Blackburn gets paid twice; rather, Harbour is reimbursed for legal costs and disbursements it has already paid. Maurice Blackburn keeps the remainder, which represents the fees for which its agreement with Harbour provided that it was not funded, and the uplift fee. That uplift fee of 25% applies only to the unfunded portion of its legal fees.

#### ***H.5.9 Consideration***

316 The plaintiffs make few submissions on the reasonableness of Maurice Blackburn's legal fees, disbursements and uplift fee, save for the fact that the fees and disbursements fall within the range viewed by Ms Dealehr to be reasonable. That approach is appropriate. The plaintiffs are hardly in a position to comment objectively on the reasonableness of the costs charged by their own legal representatives.

317 The Contradictor, having not been appointed to make submissions on the reasonableness of Maurice Blackburn's legal costs, likewise does not make many submissions on this topic. The Contradictor instead refers the Court to the Costs Referee's Report.

318 Turning then to the Costs Referee's Report. I am somewhat constrained in what I am able to say in these reasons about the Costs Referee's Report, given its confidential status. However, I have carefully read and considered it, and I am satisfied that Ms Dealehr conducted her inquiry and made her written report in a satisfactory way and that the opinions she expresses therein are reasonably held. The assessment of costs in a group proceeding such as this is a lengthy and complex process.

Appropriately, the Costs Referee's Report is detailed and well-considered, authored by an experienced costs specialist, and its conclusions are consistent with the costs order sought by the plaintiffs. As such, I am satisfied that the legal costs and uplift fee proposed to be paid to Maurice Blackburn are reasonable in all the circumstances.

319 The amount sought by the plaintiffs for professional fees incurred to 30 April 2024 is less than the amount which Ms Dealehr considered would be reasonable after applying the above methodology.

320 I note that Maurice Blackburn's estimated costs in administering the SDS have not been assessed as reasonable by Ms Dealehr, not because she regards them as unreasonable, but because those costs are not yet known and so Ms Dealehr is not in a position to express an opinion. The plaintiffs' proposal that regular reports on the costs of administering the SDS be given to the Court by a costs assessor is an appropriate one, as it will allow the Court to retain ongoing supervision of costs incurred.

321 Finally, I have given due consideration to the objections on this topic. I appreciate that some group members are dissatisfied with the quantum of the settlement amount, and that most will receive a share of the settlement that is considerably less than the losses they attribute to the conduct of the Uber Entities. In such circumstances, it is understandable that many group members are frustrated that a significant portion of the settlement will go to paying the plaintiffs' legal costs and disbursements. However, it is important to note that group proceedings such as this one are large, complex and time consuming. They require significant amounts of work from teams of experienced lawyers and involve myriad expenses in order to litigate the claims effectively. Group proceedings often take many years to get to trial or settlement, during which time these costs continue to be incurred. As observed early in these reasons, the proceedings have been on foot for some years. There have been many complex contested interlocutory disputes and some appeals. All of the work required for preparation of evidence and for trial had been done before the proposed settlement was reached. The costs associated with all of this work are considerable, because the work done was sizeable and time-consuming. Having dealt with some of the interlocutory disputes myself, principally those concerning discovery, I have seen

first-hand the product of some of that work. I am confident that Ms Dealehr has paid due consideration to all of the relevant factors when making her report. Her conclusion was that the legal costs, disbursements and uplift fee are reasonable and I accept her findings, which have enabled me to be satisfied that the legal costs, disbursements and uplift are reasonable. In respect of the uplift, this is calculated only on the portion of Maurice Blackburn's fees which were not funded by Harbour. In circumstances where Maurice Blackburn bore the risk associated with those fees, an uplift fee is reasonable.

## **H.6 Funding commission**

322 Part of the Court's consideration of the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed settlement involves determining whether a funding commission should be paid to Harbour.

323 Harbour's litigation funding agreement with the plaintiffs and some group members provides that Harbour is to receive 30% of the amount awarded by the Court if successful at trial or of the settlement sum if the proceedings are settled. Approximately 98% of RGMs have entered into a funding agreement with Harbour.

324 In these proceedings, Harbour proposes that the Court make a common fund order for the payment of a funding commission in the amount of \$81.54 million, which is approximately 30% of the total settlement sum. If awarded, Harbour would not seek to enforce its contractual rights under the funding agreement.

325 A common fund order is where the Court orders that the funding commission is to be paid from the proceeds available for all participating group members, irrespective of whether they have signed up to a funding agreement with Harbour. Without a common fund order, the costs and funding commission would be payable from the proceeds available for participating group members who have signed a funding agreement. Participating group members who had not signed a funding agreement with Harbour would not be liable for any payment to Harbour.

326 Thus, there are two issues for me to consider: whether to make a common fund order; and whether to approve a funding commission in the amount of \$81.54 million.

327 The rationale for common fund orders and the basis of the Court’s power to make them were matters set out by the Court of Appeal in *Botsman*.<sup>105</sup> While there is some controversy in other jurisdictions about the power to make common fund orders, the present state of the law is that this Court clearly has power under s 33V(2) of the Act to do so.<sup>106</sup>

328 I consider that this is an appropriate case for a common fund order to be made. I do not think it fair or reasonable for the burden of the funding commission to fall only on those who signed up to Harbour’s funding agreement, as would occur in the event that I decline to make a common fund order. Common fund orders operate to address a ‘free rider’ problem that might otherwise occur, by allowing all those who benefit from the outcome to share in the payment of the funding commission. After all, it is the funder which facilitated the bringing of the proceedings by paying the legal costs associated with running them. Those who stand to benefit from the settlement (being all participating group members) ought not be permitted to do so without bearing their share of the burden associated with bringing the proceedings (being the funding commission and legal costs). It is inequitable for unfunded participating group members to get the benefit without sharing in the costs.

329 In *Botsman*, the Court of Appeal referred to *Money Max Int Pty Ltd v QBE Insurance Group Ltd (Money Max)*<sup>107</sup> where the Full Court of the Federal Court identified a number of relevant but non-determinative factors for assessing whether a proposed funding commission rate should be approved. *Money Max* concerned an application for a funding commission early in the proceeding and in advance of any settlement having been reached, however, my view is that many of the principles are also relevant to the decision I have to make as to the funding commission at this late stage of the present proceedings. The principles elaborated by the Full Court in *Money Max* and referred to by the Court of Appeal in *Botsman* can be summarised as follows:<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> (2018) 57 VR 68, 113 [210]-[216], 141 [371], 142 [374], 143 [379]-[381], 144-5 [389], 145 [391].

<sup>106</sup> In *Iddles* [2023] VSC 566, [105]-[109], Delany J described some of the cases articulating this apparent uncertainty in respect of the Federal Court and the Supreme Court of New South Wales, before concluding that there is no such uncertainty in Victoria due to the Court of Appeal’s decision in *Botsman*. I agree with his Honour’s analysis and conclusion.

<sup>107</sup> (2016) 245 FCR 191.

<sup>108</sup> *Botsman* (2018) 57 VR 68, 114-5 [217]-[218].

- (a) whether the funding commission rate had been agreed by sophisticated group members and the number of group members who had agreed;
- (b) the information provided to group members as to the commission;
- (c) a comparison of the proposed commission with commissions in other group proceedings and the broad parameters of the funding commission rates available in the market;
- (d) the litigation risks of providing funding in the proceedings, to be assessed prospectively and avoiding hindsight bias;
- (e) the quantum of adverse cost exposure that the funder assumed;
- (f) the legal costs expended and to be expended, and the security for costs provided, by the funder;
- (g) the amount of any settlement or judgment;
- (h) any substantial objections made by group members in relation to any litigation funding charges; and
- (i) the likely actual recovery for group members under any pre-existing funding arrangements.

330 Those factors which I consider relevant in these proceedings have been addressed in the below discussion.

331 The materials before the Court support a conclusion that the funding commission is fair and reasonable.<sup>109</sup> In particular, the evidence confirms the significant risks borne by Harbour. I am unable to go into a lot of the detail as it is confidential, but the material in the Confidential King Affidavit is compelling evidence as to the risks borne by Harbour, particularly at the time at which it agreed to fund the proceedings. This was long-running, hard-fought litigation in respect of a complex cause of action. Harbour incurred costs of around \$35.2 million and those funds were progressively at risk for over six years, from when investigations began. There was by no means a

---

<sup>109</sup> *Money Max* (2016) 245 FCR 191, 209-10 [80].



guaranteed victory for the plaintiffs' camp should this matter have proceeded to trial and final judgment. This was also by no means an ordinary or 'cookie cutter' class action, as is clear from the complex interlocutory disputes involved. I note that the amount actually funded by Harbour to date has exceeded the amount it initially agreed to fund. Harbour's expected return from its funding of the proceedings was higher than the amount that has been achieved by the proposed settlement. I have had regard to the adverse costs exposure Harbour assumed, its significant expenditure to date and its payment of security for costs. I consider that the commission properly reflects the costs and risks assumed by Harbour. Harbour obtained after the event (ATE) insurance, but this covered only part of the adverse costs risks assumed, and Harbour is not seeking reimbursement of the costs of its insurance.<sup>110</sup>

332 Litigation funding is often important in providing access to justice, and I think it has been important here. There is no suggestion that the solicitors for the plaintiffs were prepared to run this case on a no-win-no-fee basis and the expenditure has been such that the case may not have been pursued without third-party funding. Simply put, without the involvement of Harbour, there may not have been any compensation available for group members at all.

333 I also note that group members were provided with clear information about the proposed commission, both in the funding information statement of May 2019 and in the Settlement Notice.

334 It is also relevant that a very high proportion of RGMs signed up to funding agreements with Harbour which entitle Harbour to a funding commission of 30% from their recovered amounts (in addition to the amount of Harbour's investment and ATE insurance costs).<sup>111</sup> The proposed funding commission matches that contractual rate. In the event that the funding commission is approved, Harbour waives its contractual rights to the commission under the funding agreements as well as those additional entitlements under the contracts. However, I acknowledge that registered group members who signed up were likely not in a position to negotiate different

---

<sup>110</sup> The cost of the ATE insurance is \$3,345,156.

<sup>111</sup> The 'investment' being the payment of legal costs and disbursements.

terms for those contracts and that there is likely a range of levels of sophistication among them, in terms of their knowledge of legal matters and business acumen. Nonetheless, those issues do not militate against approving the funding commission.

335 Harbour submits that there have been ‘virtually no objections’ to the quantum of the proposed funding commission. While there may not have been many express objections about the quantum or percentage proposed, I consider that statements in written objections to the effect that the settlement benefitted Maurice Blackburn and/or Harbour over group members amount to objections to the amount or percentage of the settlement directed to legal costs and/or the funding commission. Indeed, one objector stated expressly at the hearing that, in their view, the proposed funding commission was grossly unfair. However, I view these objections in the context of the discussion outlined above regarding the risks and significant expenditure to date. I do not agree that the proposed funding commission is grossly unfair.

336 What is more, if I were to refuse to make a common fund order or an order approving the funding commission, the burden of paying the funder would fall on those 98% of RGMs who signed up to funding agreements, as Harbour would then rely on its contractual rights. The free-rider problem in this instance may be less significant as a result of the large proportion of registered group members who have signed up to funding agreements, but it is not non-existent.<sup>112</sup>

337 Because of the large number of RGMs who signed up to funding agreements, the differential between participating group members who signed up to funding agreements and those who did not is relatively small. Harbour submits that the fact that there would be an increase in the differential between participating group members who signed up to funding agreements and those who did not, based on the admission to the class of a number of UGMs, should not weigh against the funding commission. In the event, the number of UGMs to be admitted is relatively small, with such a small impact on this differential that there is no need to consider this submission further. However, even if many more UGMs had been granted leave, my view is that this change in the differential would not undermine the basis for the

---

<sup>112</sup> *Ewok Pty Ltd as trustee for the E & E Magee Superannuation Fund v Wellard Limited* [2024] FCA 296, [87].

common fund order, either in terms of it being made or the quantum of commission ordered. There is no need to delve into counterfactuals to reach this view. It is simply the case that an increase in participating group members who have not signed up to funding agreements increases the free-rider problem. The rationale for the common fund order being made is even more apparent where the free-rider problem is bigger.

338 Lastly, I note that the funding commission is within the range of commissions approved by the courts in respect of other group proceedings, and within the range of commissions common in the litigation funding market at the relevant time.<sup>113</sup> While it is towards the higher end of such commissions, it still appears to me to be reasonable in the context of such complex litigation with a risk profile quite distinct from, for example, a shareholder class action.<sup>114</sup> It has been suggested in other cases that, where there is a very large settlement, there may need to be a lower funding commission rate to ensure proportionality of the amount of the commission to the risk assumed.<sup>115</sup> This is undoubtedly a large settlement, however, I do not consider that the funding commission rate should be lowered here, noting the significant risks assumed by the funder over such an extended period, and the monies expended by the funder, which in this case, appear to me to justify the commission sought.

339 Accordingly, I will make a settlement common fund order with the charges in favour of Harbour as proposed under the SDS, pursuant to s 33V(2) of the Act.

## **H.7 Payments to the plaintiffs and sample group members**

340 The plaintiffs seek orders for payment of the following amounts from the settlement sum to:

- (a) Mr Andrianakis in the amount of \$80,000;

---

<sup>113</sup> See, for example, *HFPS Pty Limited (Trustee) v Tamaya Resources Limited* [2017] FCA 650, [88]; *Money Max* (2016) 245 FCR 191, 221 [148]; *Casson Investments Pty Limited v Cao* [2018] FCA 527, [174(c)] (*Casson Investments*); *Bradgate (Trustee) v Ashley Services Group Limited (No 2)* [2019] FCA 1210, [19(2)]. See also Vince Morabito, 'Group Costs Orders and Funding Commissions' (Monash Business School, January 2024) 27.

<sup>114</sup> See *Iddles* [2023] VSC 566, [126(e)] (Delany J).

<sup>115</sup> See, for example, *Casson Investments* [2018] FCA 527, [174(g)], citing: *Money Max* (2016) 245 FCR 191, 211 [86]-[89]; *Blairgowrie Trading Ltd v Allco Finance Group Ltd (Receivers & Managers Appointed) (in liq) (No 3)* (2017) 343 ALR 476, 516 [160].

- (b) Ms Salem, in her capacity as executor of the estate of Mr Salem, in the amount of \$40,000; and
- (c) each of the five sample group members in the amounts of \$20,000.

341 These payments total \$220,000 and represent 0.08% of the total settlement sum.

342 Each plaintiff and sample group member took steps in the proceeding including producing documents for discovery, preparing outlines of evidence, assisting in the formulation of assumptions for the expert accountant, making additional affidavits as required, and attending conferences with Maurice Blackburn and Counsel. In addition to these matters, Mr Andrianakis invested further time in relation to the mediation and settlement negotiations, and receiving communications from other group members and industry participants about the proceeding.

343 I consider that these payments should be made, in light of the work undertaken and time spent by those persons for the progress of the litigation and benefit of the group.<sup>116</sup> In particular, I observe that the sum to be paid to Mr Andrianakis is commensurate with his high-level of involvement in the proceeding over many years, and I refer to the evidence of Mr Donnelly in that regard. The quantum of the proposed payments is also within the range identified in empirical research conducted by Professor Vince Morabito of Monash Business School.<sup>117</sup>

## **I Appointment of settlement administrator**

344 The plaintiffs submit that it is necessary for appropriate individuals to be appointed to administer the scheme, and propose that Maurice Blackburn act in that role. The plaintiffs submit that, on the evidence, Maurice Blackburn would be an appropriate scheme administrator for the following reasons:

- (a) Maurice Blackburn has experience in administering large and complex settlement administrations in class action proceedings. In his Open Affidavit, Mr Donnelly deposes that Maurice Blackburn has administered approximately

---

<sup>116</sup> See, for example, *Rowe v AusNet Electricity Services Pty Ltd & Ors* [2015] VSC 232, [138]-[142].

<sup>117</sup> That research shows that up to 2018, reimbursement to individual class representatives in this Court ranged from \$10,000 to \$100,000: Vince Morabito, 'An Evidence-Based Approach to Class Action Reform in Australia: Common Funder Orders, Funding Fees and Reimbursement Payments' (Monash Business School Ethical Regulation Research Group, January 2019) 22.

65 settlement distributions. Of these, around nine were distributions of settlements approved in mass tort class action proceedings.

- (b) It is proposed that the distribution would be managed by a dedicated settlement administration team within Maurice Blackburn. Mr Donnelly deposes that Maurice Blackburn has well-established systems and procedures in place to perform the role of scheme administrator.
- (c) That team has access to staff and expertise, including Maurice Blackburn staff with detailed knowledge of these proceedings, and can expand or contract in size as necessary to ensure the efficient and effective administration of the settlement.

345 I accept these submissions and will make orders appointing Maurice Blackburn as the settlement administrator.

346 I agree with the remarks made by Lee J in *Lifeplan Australia Friendly Society Limited v S&P Global Inc (Formerly McGraw- Hill Financial, Inc) (A Company Incorporated in New York)*,<sup>118</sup> that the appointment of the plaintiffs' solicitors to administer a settlement should not be by default or amount to a *fait accompli*, particularly where the calculation of distributions is a simple matter of arithmetic, especially where the settlement is large and is to be distributed to a sizeable group of participants.

347 I also note that an objection to Maurice Blackburn being appointed as the settlement administrator was made at the hearing by Mr Webb, who argued that the work should be put to tender and carried out by more suitable and less expensive administrators.

348 It might be that another entity could administer the settlement efficiently and more cost-effectively, but that is just speculation and, in any event, is by no means certain. In my experience, the usual type of organisation proposed as an alternative scheme administrator is another law firm or an accounting firm, both of whom have similar charge-out rates to those of Maurice Blackburn. I appoint Maurice Blackburn in this instance because, on the evidence before me, it appears to me that this course will maximise efficiency and minimise further costs. Maurice Blackburn has detailed

---

<sup>118</sup> [2018] FCA 379, [52]-[54].

background and information as to the calculation methodologies to be used and as to these proceedings generally, as well as experience in administering complex and large settlements such as this one. I am also cognisant of the delay and costs that a tender process would involve, including inevitable handover costs.

349 The plaintiffs note in their written submissions that clause 16 of the SDS provides (inter alia) that the scheme administrator will provide reports on the settlement to the Court every six months, that the scheme administrator may refer any issues relating to the SDS to the Court, and the Court may vary or amend the terms of the SDS. I am satisfied that these processes will allow the Court to perform its supervisory and protective role effectively.

## **J The Stewart and Andree proceedings**

350 The plaintiffs' written submissions set out why the proposed settlements of the Stewart and Andree proceedings are subject to approval by this Court pursuant to s 33V of the Act, notwithstanding that they were respectively commenced in the Supreme Court of New South Wales and the Supreme Court of Queensland.

351 Section 33A of the Act provides that a group proceeding is a proceeding commenced under Part 4A of the Act. The Stewart and Andree proceedings were each transferred to this Court pursuant to the applicable cross-vesting legislation.<sup>119</sup>

352 The effect of the equivalent Victorian legislation is that as the transferee court, this Court is to deal with the proceeding as if the steps taken in the proceeding in the transferor court had been taken in the transferee court.<sup>120</sup> Thus the steps of commencing the Stewart and Andree proceedings are taken to have occurred in this Court such that they were commenced pursuant to Part 4A of the Act and therefore they are group proceedings for the purposes of s 33V of the Act, with any settlement being subject to approval by this Court.

---

<sup>119</sup> Being the *Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Act 1987* (NSW) and the *Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Act 1987* (Qld) respectively.

<sup>120</sup> *Jurisdiction of Courts (Cross-vesting) Act 1987* (Vic), s 11(3). See *Johnson Tiles Pty Ltd v Esso Australia Pty Ltd (No 3)* [2003] VSC 244, [36] (Gillard J); *Sunland Waterfront (BVI) Ltd v Prudentia Investments Pty Ltd (No 3)* [2012] VSC 399, [20] (Croft J).

353 I agree with these submissions. For the same reasons as given in respect of the Andrianakis and Salem proceedings, the settlement of the Stewart and Andree proceedings will be approved.

**K Conclusion and disposition**

354 For the reasons set out above, I approve the proposed settlement in the amount of \$271,800,000 as fair and reasonable pursuant to s 33V(1) of the Act. I consider the settlement to be in the interests of group members, and to be fair and reasonable as between the parties and as between group members. I also approve the deductions to be made from the settlement sum under s 33V(2) of the Act, for legal costs (fees, disbursements and uplift fees) in the amount of \$38,698,628.81, funding commission in the amount of \$81,540,000, and payments to the plaintiffs and sample group members totalling \$220,000.

355 The orders to be made will include an order permitting the 140 UGMs listed by application number in Annexure A to be treated as registered group members for the purposes of administering the SDS. For privacy reasons, UGMs are referred to by application numbers, but their identities and contact details are known to the Court and to Maurice Blackburn. I will also direct Maurice Blackburn to inform UGMs of the outcome of their applications. Information should be relayed to UGMs by the most cost-effective means available.

356 I also approve the SDS and appoint Maurice Blackburn as the administrator of the SDS.

357 I direct Maurice Blackburn to prepare draft orders giving effect to these reasons, to be provided to my Chambers by no later than 4.00pm on 4 December 2024.

List of Annexures	
A	List of unregistered group members to be granted leave to participate in the settlement, with short reasons
B	List of invalid applications by unregistered group members
C	List of applications by unregistered group members that are not supported by evidence
D	UGM Applications containing only a statement of group membership (ie, Category 6 only)
E	UGM Applications categorised as a combination of Categories 6 and 9
F	UGM Applications which amount to a bare assertion that the UGM was not aware of the proceeding (ie, Category 4 only)
G	UGM Applications not supported by individual evidence
H	UGM Applications categorised as falling into a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9 not individually reviewed by the judge
I	List of unsuccessful UGM Applications reviewed individually, with short reasons



## ANNEXURE A

### Unregistered Group Members to be granted leave to participate in the settlement

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.001.002.0165	The applicant had retired from the taxi industry in 2019 due to serious illness, for which they needed to undergo lengthy treatment. The applicant provided a sufficient explanation for not having registered (either initially or within the class closure deadline). I consider that unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.001.002.0179	The applicant provided a specific outline of why they were not aware of the class action or the class closure deadline, being that they had retired in March 2020, were not a member of any relevant organisation, and did not consume any media. I consider that unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.001.002.0221	This application contained a sufficiently specific explanation for why the applicant was not aware of the class action or the class closure deadline. They were not a member of any organisation, with no consumption of media. I consider that unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.100.001.0001	The applicant explained why they were not aware of the class action or the class closure deadline in a sufficiently specific way. The applicant left the taxi industry in 2021, was not on social media and had only sporadic consumption of media. From 2021 to 2024, they were employed as a FIFO worker, and they were not a member of any organisation, nor did they have contact with anyone in industry since they ceased taxi driving. I consider that unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.100.001.0005	The application included a sufficiently specific explanation for why the applicant was not aware of the proceeding. The applicant does not watch TV or read newspapers. I consider that they have provided a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline and unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0038	The applicant's evidence was that they suffered from serious medical conditions and underwent treatment, with this being sufficiently linked to why they were not aware of the proceeding and class closure deadline. The application was specific and unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0045	The applicant is a widow of driver who died in December 2022. The applicant did not know that the driver had not previously registered; their access to the driver's email and personal accounts was delayed and they could not complete registration process. The applicant provided a specific explanation and I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0048	The applicant's evidence was that they left the taxi industry in 2019 and had no awareness of the class action and class closure deadline, being a full-time carer for elderly parents and a sibling living with a disability and on the NDIS. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0080	The applicant is a retired taxi driver and owner, living with a medical condition. The application provided sufficient reasons tied to their lack of awareness and failure to register within the deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.001.0086	The applicant provided a specific and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, tied to their specific characteristics and access to information and resources. The application establishes unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0103	The applicant provided a specific explanation for why they were not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline. The applicant is 91 years' old, does not check emails, and finds it difficult to keep up with events. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0106	The applicant was living with a serious illness throughout 2023 and did not keep up with anything in this time. The applicant did not have access to a computer or email. They provided a sufficiently specific explanation for why they were not aware of the class action or class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0141	The application included a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including in relation to their individual characteristics and vulnerabilities which I do not need to set out here in detail. Unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.100.001.0153	The application included a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including because the applicant was overseas at the time of the class closure registration window and struggled to register while overseas but mistakenly believed that he had registered at that time. Unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.100.001.0213	This application included a sufficient explanation for why the applicant had a mistaken belief as to registration. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0220	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, and provided a specific explanation in that regard. They retired from the industry in March 2020 to be a full-time carer for an ill spouse and had no interaction or very limited interaction with outside world, and no contact with industry participants or publications. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0239	The applicant was experiencing a serious medical condition during the registration window for the proceeding and was unaware of the proceeding in connection with this. They provided a specific explanation which is cogent and sufficient. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0244	This applicant's reason for missing the deadline for registration concerned their medical condition. They provided sufficient reasons and particularity for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0252	The applicant was not aware of class closure deadline and the proceeding, having left the hire car industry March 2020. In my view, this and the other reasons given constitute a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0267	This application included a sufficient and cogent explanation for the applicant's mistaken belief that they were already registered. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.001.0285	This applicant was unaware of the proceeding and the class closure deadline. A specific explanation was provided, being that they retired from the industry in 2017 due to ill health, and have ongoing health issues. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0350	The evidence provided by the applicant provides sufficient particulars for the Court to infer the basis for missing class closure deadline. Based on the evidence before me, I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0400	The applicant was unaware of the proceeding and class closure deadline, having retired from the industry in around 2021 and being in ill health since August 2022. There was a specific explanation provided and I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0430	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it warrants a grant of leave. They state that they did not have electronic communication or a phone and did not find out about the proceeding until family members showed them media coverage of the settlement. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0440	The applicant says that they were aware of the proceeding and attended a meeting in February 2019 to register to participate, but there were no hard copy forms left, and they were told that they would be contacted for registration. The applicant also has a medical condition. On the basis of the information before me, taken together, there is a sufficient explanation provided. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0465	The evidence of this applicant is that they left the hire car industry in 2016, and completely distanced themselves from it. They have provided a sufficient explanation for why they were not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0480	The applicant was abroad in the period June to August 2019 and between June to September 2023, with limited access to internet and no reliable sources of information at that time. By the time they heard about the class closure deadline it had expired. I accept this evidence and it provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0484	The applicant has provided a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including that they were not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, having retired from the industry Jan 2022. Based on the information before me, I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0044	The evidence of this applicant is that they were not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline due to having retired from the industry 2017. They provide a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0051	I consider that unfair prejudice is established in respect of this applicant, who was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline. They group member retired from the industry in 2019 due to serious illness. They provide a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.0063	The applicant was not aware of the class closure deadline or the proceeding, as they were overseas from 3 July 2023 to 28 October 2023. They provided a sufficient explanation given for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0073	This applicant was not aware of the class closure deadline or the proceeding, as they were abroad from 6 June 2023 to 26 October 2023. A sufficient explanation is given for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0082	The applicant was not aware of the class closure deadline or the proceeding. They provide a sufficient explanation for the failure to register; they were not in the industry at time, had family members experiencing illness and had caregiving responsibilities. It is sufficiently specific and tied to the lack of awareness. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0094	There is a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline connected to a deceased estate which does not require further elaboration. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0098	There is a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline provided, relating to the applicant's mistaken belief in registration and medical condition. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0125	The applicant says they were not aware of the class closure deadline or the proceeding. They had limited media consumption, no contacts in the taxi industry, they were not member of any organisation, lived with medical conditions, and experienced financial hardship. As outlined in the application and in conjunction, the reasons amount to a sufficient explanation. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0147	The applicant's evidence outlined significant caring responsibilities for family members in ill-health, which among other things, meant that they were not following media such as social media. As a result, they were not aware of the opportunity to register. The applicant has provided a sufficient explanation for why they did not register and I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0164	The applicant's evidence, which I accept, was that they filled in a registration form in 2019 and posted it to Maurice Blackburn. The plaintiffs' solicitors confirmed receipt of the form by phone a few days later. After the media announcement of the settlement, the applicant contacted MB who said they were not registered. While the applicant did not expressly refer to the class closure deadline, they believed they were registered by that deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0165	The applicant's evidence provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including overseas travel, personal stressors and medial issues affecting their immediate family. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.0174	The applicant has provided a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline for registration. They were not aware of the proceeding until close to the end of the registration period, however, they had health issues at that time and made attempts to register. They tried to register before 2 October 2023 and made numerous calls before then to the plaintiffs' solicitors and on 3 October 2023. Based on the information before me, in particular, in connection with their medical issues and action taken, I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0198	The applicant provided evidence as to his medical condition which supports a grant of leave. Sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline has been provided. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0222	The applicant was recovering from significant health problems in the registration window and therefore missed the class closure deadline. There is a sufficient explanation provided. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0224	The applicant's reasons for missing the class closure deadline provide a sufficient explanation. The applicant's reasons include health concerns, lack of membership of relevant organisations, and financial and personal pressures. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0236	The applicant registered with Maurice Blackburn on 5 January 2019 for the taxi licence held in their own name. They had a mistaken belief that they were also registered for the licence in the name of the family trust. The evidence provides a sufficient explanation for that mistaken belief. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0280	This applicant explains that they have a low level of English comprehension and receive news from particular non-English radio sources and from their community. The applicant's personal circumstances and barriers to access to information provide a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, as the explanation was set out in a fulsome way. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0281	The applicant's evidence provides sufficient particulars concerning how one corporate entity was registered, while inadvertently another was not. The applicant also provides sufficient explanation for the mistaken belief in respect of the unregistered entity. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0342	The applicant's evidence contains a sufficient explanation for why they did not register. They were no longer a plate owner in 2023 and did not register because they thought they were no longer eligible, as well as experiencing medical issues. The information provided is such that I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0343	While the applicant's corporate entity was registered, the individual mistakenly believed all taxis under their other company and in their own name would be covered by that registration, based on advice that they received at the time and on which they relied. Sufficient particulars have been provided and there is a sufficient basis for that mistaken belief. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.0370	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for their mistaken belief in registration, having relied on an acquaintance who told the applicant that they would register on behalf of the applicant, and the applicant relied on this, having provided the acquaintance with their personal and business information. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0381	This taxi licence holder sold their licence before the registration window and did not consume media which would have drawn the class action to their attention. They provide a sufficient explanation for not knowing of and missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0387	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including concerning their personal characteristics and lack of access to information. I do not need to set out these matters in detail here. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0391	This application provides sufficient explanation for why the class closure deadline was missed by the applicant, including as a result of their personal characteristics, as outlined in their evidence. I do not need to set out these matters in detail here. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0421	The application includes a detailed explanation for the applicant missing class closure deadline, including serious medical issues which they experienced alongside caring responsibilities for family with health issues, and having sold their taxi plate in 2020. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0438	The applicant's explanation for why they were not aware of the proceeding and class closure deadline is cogent and detailed, including detail as to their health and financial stressors and access to information. It is sufficient to warrant leave and unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0461	The application outlines the applicant's serious medical condition, advanced age and limited access to information and communications. The application provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0479	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including caring responsibilities for multiple family members experiencing serious medical issues in the relevant registration period. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0530	The applicant's evidence confirmed serious medical issues during the period for registration and provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0533	This applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, they were registered by a family member and relied on correspondence received from the plaintiffs' solicitors which stated that they were registered. The family member subsequently withdrew the registration without informing the applicant and without the applicant's consent. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.0534	This application concerns a deceased estate and sets out a sufficient explanation for the applicant missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0604	The applicant's evidence is that they were not aware of class closure deadline due to medical issues they had at the time. Their explanation for missing the class closure deadline is sufficient. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0605	The applicant's evidence as to their personal characteristics and difficulties experienced in the registration period including medical issues, when viewed in combination and noting the detail provided, provides a sufficient explanation for a grant of leave. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0639	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline, including as to their serious medical conditions, caring responsibilities and other personal circumstances, and time abroad. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0640	The applicant says they held a mistaken belief of registration as their spouse had registered previously for a licence held in their own name and they received correspondence which was addressed to both spouses, which they understood to be confirmation of having registered. I accept their evidence and consider it is a sufficient explanation for the mistaken belief. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0673	The applicant's explanation for missing the class closure deadline is that they were overseas in the relevant registration period and unable to present required documents for completion. Their evidence is sufficiently detailed and cogent. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0737	This application contains a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, concerning a deceased estate. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0756	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, as they were abroad from 12 July to 9 October 2023, in addition to experiencing medical issues. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0767	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. They were overseas from 14 July 2023 to 2 December 2023. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0783	The applicant outlines a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including overseas travel and their personal circumstances including caring responsibilities, illness and disability. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0792	The applicant has a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, based on their age, personal characteristics and lack of consumption of media. Taking all of the circumstances outlined in their evidence together, I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.0838	I consider that this applicant has set out in sufficient detail the reasons why they were not aware of the class closure deadline, which include matters concerning their relocation interstate to Tasmania in 2021. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0848	This applicant has a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including overseas travel and work and caring responsibilities during the registration window. They also outline active steps taken to attempt to register. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0877	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline in connection with a bereavement and the impact of the loss on them. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1183	The application provides a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline and I consider that unfair prejudice is established. The application concerns a deceased estate.
UBCA.100.002.1242	The applicant has a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including that they were out of the industry by about 2017 or 2018. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1256	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for their mistaken belief in registration, in connection with the registration of a business partner. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1267	The application provides a cogent and sufficient explanation for the applicant missing the class closure deadline, concerning a deceased estate. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1275	The applicant has a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, having lived abroad since March 2021. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1278	The applicant has a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including that they were out of the industry by 2019. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1447	The application contains a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline relating to a deceased estate. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1449	The application contains a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline relating to the serious health issues of the licence owner at the time of registration being open. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1464	The applicant's reasons (being their age, illness, and being out of the industry by the time the class actions were commenced) provide a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.



Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.1479	The application sets out a sufficient explanation for the applicant missing the class closure deadline, including providing detail regarding their personal characteristics and circumstances, including their age and level of comprehension of English. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1486	The applicant provides a cogent and sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including experiencing a serious illness in 2023 at relevant times. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1500	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline, relating to family illness and caring responsibilities. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1541	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, being out of the industry by 2017. They give a sufficiently detailed explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1543	The applicant has a sufficient reason for their mistaken belief as to registration, as a son informed the applicant that they would register on the applicant's behalf but provided the son's details rather than the applicants. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1556	The applicant has a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline, being overseas in the relevant time for registration, elderly and not using technology. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1615	The applicant provides a detailed explanation for their failure to register, including lack of access and communication with the industry and no consumption of media. Unfair prejudice has been established.
UBCA.100.002.1657	The applicant is a licence holder and shareholder in a corporation that owns and operates taxis. They are elderly and have limited access to technology or involvement with the industry. The application discloses a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1713	The applicant dealt with significant medical issues affecting their children and had caring responsibilities and stressors as a result which provide a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1771	This applicant was incorrectly advised by a taxi base worker that they were ineligible as a lessee of a taxi licence, having made enquiries and taken steps to try to register. I find this to be a sufficient explanation for the failure to register. Unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1781	The application provides a sufficient explanation for the applicant missing the class closure deadline, relating to significant health issues. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1783	I accept the evidence of this applicant, who says that they had registered before the deadline and do not know why they are not recorded as registered. Based on the evidence before me, this is a sufficient reason for a mistaken belief and I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.002.1810	The applicant explains in detail their lack of awareness and consequent failure to register, including their lack of involvement in the industry as a lessor of plates who does not consume media. Because of the detailed explanation given, unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1841	The applicant's time overseas at relevant times and caring responsibilities provide a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1885	The applicant was not aware of the class action and failed to register because of their lack of involvement in the industry as a lessor of plates who does not consume media. Because of the detailed explanation given, unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1886	The applicant's evidence is that they filled in a form with the plaintiffs' solicitors a long time ago. They provide a sufficient reason for their mistaken belief of having already registered. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1919	The applicant had a lack of awareness of the class closure deadline, as they left the industry in 2019. They give a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0011	The applicant has already registered as a licence owner, and provided evidence of that registration. They did not understand that their claim as a driver was separate and did not register in that capacity. This is a sufficient reason to grant leave to participate. The explanation for their mistaken belief is cogent and detailed. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0095	This applicant left the industry and did not follow information on developments in the industry, and therefore was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline. They set out a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0169	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, having left the industry and moved interstate to Tasmania in 2020. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0267	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including in relation to their health issues, lack of information and participation in taxi industry associations and the nature of their work. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0890	The applicant gives a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline and having not heard about the deadline. They left the industry in 2020 and relocated to Pakistan in 2022 where they still reside today. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0897	The applicant has a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, as the power of attorney for a licence holder who lives abroad, not having received information or correspondence concerning the proceeding or being involved in the industry, and having a family member with significant medical issues. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.003.1097	The applicant says that they were not aware of the proceeding before the deadline because they had retired from industry and were overseas for most of the registration window. On the information before me, I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1108	The applicant gives a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, concerning serious health issues. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1134	The application provides sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, concerning a deceased estate. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1157	The applicant outlines a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including their personal characteristics, such as age and English language comprehension and difficulties understanding the relevant information. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1166	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, concerning the death of a family member who looked after the applicant's financial affairs including their taxi licence and lack of any information regarding the class action. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1230	The applicant's full-time caring responsibilities for a family member with health challenges is set out in detail and it provides sufficient explanation for why they were not aware of the proceeding and deadline, and therefore missed the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1291	The applicant outlines family health issues and lack of information in sufficient detail to constitute a sufficient explanation for why they missed the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1375	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, as they had exited taxi industry by around 2017. They provide a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline, supported by a detailed affidavit. Unjust prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1473	The applicant missed the class closure deadline because they had been told by other drivers that only operators could join the case. Their evidence provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1588	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, as they had exited the taxi industry by around 2017. They give a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. Unjust prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1635	The applicant made an attempt to register; they include a sufficient and cogent explanation for missing the deadline for registration. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.003.1742	The applicant's evidence is that they missed the class closure deadline due to their spouse's illness and having caregiving obligations. I consider that this is a sufficient explanation, albeit not detailed. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1751	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, they had moved interstate to South Australia by January 2021. They give a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1852	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, they had moved interstate to Tasmania in 2019. They give a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2038	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including lack of access to correspondence, health and financial difficulties, and leaving the industry in 2020. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2157	The application provides a sufficient explanation for the applicant having missed the class closure deadline and for their lack of awareness. They relocated to Hong Kong in 2017 and left the industry, and have only made intermittent visits to Australia since that time. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2158	The application provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline and not knowing about the registration deadline. This applicant has lived in Hong Kong since 2017 and has made on intermittent visits to Australia since. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2281	This applicant exited the industry in July 2019, moved abroad to Pakistan in 2020, and continues to reside there. I consider they have given a sufficient explanation for their lack of awareness and missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2466	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, as they had exited taxi industry in around 2016. Their affidavit evidence and submission provides a sufficiently detailed explanation for missing the class closure deadline and lack of awareness of that deadline or the proceeding. Unjust prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2493	The applicant moved abroad to Pakistan in March 2022. They evidence provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2546	The applicant details in their evidence why they did not know about the deadline or proceeding, giving a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, including in respect of their consumption of media, comprehension of English and other personal characteristics. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2669	The medical reasons set out in the evidence of this applicant provide a sufficient explanation for their lack of knowledge of the proceeding or class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.100.004.0062	The applicant was overseas at relevant times caring for a relative with health issues, and without adequate internet access. This is a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0151	The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, as they had exited the industry by 2019. They give a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0201	The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for their mistaken belief in registration, having registered with Maurice Blackburn in respect of another proceeding and misunderstanding the effect of that registration. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0202	I consider that unfair prejudice is established by this application. The applicant provides a sufficient explanation for their mistaken belief in registration, having registered with Maurice Blackburn in respect of another proceeding and misunderstanding the effect of that registration.
UBCA.100.004.0257	This application details how the applicant was not aware of the proceeding or deadline because of her personal characteristics, including her age and English comprehension level, and her health concerns. It sets out a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline, and steps taken to attempt to register when made aware of the proceeding. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.005.0038	The application gives a sufficient explanation for the applicant missing the class closure deadline due to lack of awareness, and I consider that unfair prejudice is established. The explanation concerns the personal characteristics of the applicant, including their age and English comprehension level, their lack of consumption of media and use of technology, and a mistaken belief that they may already be registered due to having provided money to other taxi drivers on one occasion, as what the applicant understood to be a fee to join the proceeding.
UBCA.100.005.0039	The applicant's evidence regarding their significant medical history provides a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.006.0006	The applicant exited the industry in 2018 and does not have access to email, internet or social media. The applicant contacted Maurice Blackburn on three occasions prior to the registration deadline and was informed each time by a receptionist that his information was noted down and someone would contact him. As the receptionist had taken down all the applicant's details, they believed that they were, in fact registered. They outline a sufficient explanation for their mistaken belief in registration. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.200.001.0003	The applicant's evidence outlines a lack of knowledge of the proceeding, due to the fact that they do not consume newspapers, radio or taxi magazines. The evidence sets out a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons for grant of leave
UBCA.200.001.0008	The applicant was overseas from 2020 to June 2024, and provides a sufficient explanation for not knowing about the deadline and missing the class closure deadline because of being abroad.
UBCA.200.001.0009	The applicant had a lack of knowledge of the proceeding, with no consumption of newspapers, radio or taxi magazines. They have set out a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.200.001.0010	The applicant's evidence is that they had a lack of knowledge of the proceeding, as they did not consume newspapers, radio or taxi magazines. They provide a sufficient explanation for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.200.001.0013	The applicant details their lack of knowledge of the proceeding, as they did not consume newspapers or taxi magazines. They give a sufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.200.002.0105	The applicant retired from the taxi industry 2020 and did not have any further involvement in the industry or awareness of developments in the industry. In their application, they give a sufficient reason for missing the class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice is established.

## A N N E X U R E B

### Invalid applications by Unregistered Group Members

UBCA.001.001.0214	UBCA.100.002.0039	UBCA.100.002.1905	UBCA.100.003.2264
UBCA.001.001.0220	UBCA.100.002.0056	UBCA.100.002.1906	UBCA.100.003.2305
UBCA.001.002.0004	UBCA.100.002.0072	UBCA.100.002.1913	UBCA.100.003.2308
UBCA.001.002.0082	UBCA.100.002.0088	UBCA.100.002.1918	UBCA.100.003.2366
UBCA.001.002.0107	UBCA.100.002.0259	UBCA.100.002.1972	UBCA.100.003.2367
UBCA.001.002.0117	UBCA.100.002.0293	UBCA.100.002.1997	UBCA.100.003.2376
UBCA.001.002.0157	UBCA.100.002.0328	UBCA.100.003.0256	UBCA.100.003.2397
UBCA.001.002.0209	UBCA.100.002.0358	UBCA.100.003.0311	UBCA.100.003.2467
UBCA.001.002.0226 <sup>121</sup>	UBCA.100.002.0376	UBCA.100.003.0323	UBCA.100.003.2539
UBCA.001.003.0008	UBCA.100.002.0402	UBCA.100.003.0363	UBCA.100.003.2580
UBCA.001.003.0028	UBCA.100.002.0404	UBCA.100.003.0397	UBCA.100.003.2610
UBCA.001.003.0037	UBCA.100.002.0424	UBCA.100.003.0490	UBCA.100.003.2680
UBCA.001.005.0012	UBCA.100.002.0439	UBCA.100.003.0549	UBCA.100.003.2681
UBCA.001.005.0014	UBCA.100.002.0457	UBCA.100.003.0631	UBCA.100.003.2683
UBCA.001.005.0015	UBCA.100.002.0636	UBCA.100.003.0728	UBCA.100.004.0031
UBCA.001.005.0016	UBCA.100.002.0794 <sup>122</sup>	UBCA.100.003.0900	UBCA.100.004.0036
UBCA.001.005.0017	UBCA.100.002.0825	UBCA.100.003.1079	UBCA.100.004.0088
UBCA.001.005.0020	UBCA.100.002.1085	UBCA.100.003.1103	UBCA.100.004.0094

---

<sup>121</sup> I reviewed this application individually and confirmed that it was a duplicative application.

<sup>122</sup> As set out in the Court's reasons at paragraph 124, this application was one randomly selected by me and individually reviewed. The application is incomplete so as to be in effect illegible and is treated as invalid.

UBCA.001.005.0025	UBCA.100.002.1238	UBCA.100.003.1406	UBCA.100.004.0125 <sup>123</sup>
UBCA.001.005.0030	UBCA.100.002.1262	UBCA.100.003.1456	UBCA.100.004.0258
UBCA.001.005.0031	UBCA.100.002.1326	UBCA.100.003.1530 <sup>124</sup>	UBCA.100.004.0267
UBCA.001.005.0032	UBCA.100.002.1428	UBCA.100.003.1546	UBCA.100.004.0269
UBCA.100.001.0013	UBCA.100.002.1483	UBCA.100.003.1549	UBCA.100.004.0277
UBCA.100.001.0087	UBCA.100.002.1512	UBCA.100.003.1564	UBCA.100.006.0053
UBCA.100.001.0105	UBCA.100.002.1522	UBCA.100.003.1671	UBCA.100.006.0058
UBCA.100.001.0134	UBCA.100.002.1599 <sup>125</sup>	UBCA.100.003.1729	UBCA.100.006.0059
UBCA.100.001.0169	UBCA.100.002.1607	UBCA.100.003.1772	UBCA.100.006.0069
UBCA.100.001.0197	UBCA.100.002.1642	UBCA.100.003.1777 <sup>126</sup>	UBCA.100.006.0075
UBCA.100.001.0318	UBCA.100.002.1649	UBCA.100.003.1934	UBCA.100.006.0079
UBCA.100.001.0355 <sup>127</sup>	UBCA.100.002.1717	UBCA.100.003.1968	UBCA.100.006.0087 <sup>128</sup>
UBCA.100.001.0448	UBCA.100.002.1779	UBCA.100.003.2061	UBCA.100.006.0114 <sup>129</sup>
UBCA.100.001.0478	UBCA.100.002.1782	UBCA.100.003.2137	UBCA.100.006.0159
UBCA.100.002.0001	UBCA.100.002.1847	UBCA.100.003.2176	UBCA.100.006.0160
UBCA.100.002.0022	UBCA.100.002.1866	UBCA.100.003.2254	UBCA.100.006.0161

---

<sup>123</sup> As set out in the Court's reasons at paragraph 124, this application was one randomly selected by me and individually reviewed. The application is illegible and is treated as invalid. See section F.6.1 of the Court's reasons.

<sup>124</sup> As set out in the Court's reasons at paragraph 124, this application was one randomly selected by me and individually reviewed. The application is illegible and is treated as invalid.

<sup>125</sup> I reviewed this application individually and identified that it was an incomplete duplicate of another application.

<sup>126</sup> I reviewed this application individually and identified that it was a duplicate of another application.

<sup>127</sup> I reviewed this application individually, as it was flagged by Maurice Blackburn as an application which required individual review, and identified that it was a duplicative application.

<sup>128</sup> I reviewed this application individually, as it was flagged by Maurice Blackburn as an application which required individual review and identified that it was a duplicative application.

<sup>129</sup> I reviewed this application individually, as it was flagged by Maurice Blackburn as an application which required individual review and identified that it was a duplicative application.



## ANNEXURE C

### Applications by Unregistered Group Members that are not supported by evidence

UBCA.001.001.0004	UBCA.100.001.0069	UBCA.100.002.1257	UBCA.100.003.2113
UBCA.001.001.0008	UBCA.100.001.0072	UBCA.100.002.1282	UBCA.100.003.2131
UBCA.001.001.0020	UBCA.100.001.0077	UBCA.100.002.1283	UBCA.100.003.2139
UBCA.001.001.0025	UBCA.100.001.0085	UBCA.100.002.1284	UBCA.100.003.2193
UBCA.001.001.0026	UBCA.100.001.0088	UBCA.100.002.1286	UBCA.100.003.2226
UBCA.001.001.0035	UBCA.100.001.0093	UBCA.100.002.1300	UBCA.100.003.2234
UBCA.001.001.0036	UBCA.100.001.0104	UBCA.100.002.1317	UBCA.100.003.2268
UBCA.001.001.0042	UBCA.100.001.0111	UBCA.100.002.1332	UBCA.100.003.2269
UBCA.001.001.0043	UBCA.100.001.0114	UBCA.100.002.1342	UBCA.100.003.2387
UBCA.001.001.0051	UBCA.100.001.0116	UBCA.100.002.1461	UBCA.100.003.2389
UBCA.001.001.0057	UBCA.100.001.0117	UBCA.100.002.1471	UBCA.100.003.2396
UBCA.001.001.0060	UBCA.100.001.0118	UBCA.100.002.1472	UBCA.100.003.2408
UBCA.001.001.0061	UBCA.100.001.0119	UBCA.100.002.1515	UBCA.100.003.2435
UBCA.001.001.0065	UBCA.100.001.0125	UBCA.100.002.1521	UBCA.100.003.2472
UBCA.001.001.0067	UBCA.100.001.0149	UBCA.100.002.1558	UBCA.100.003.2480
UBCA.001.001.0080	UBCA.100.001.0156	UBCA.100.002.1571	UBCA.100.003.2502
UBCA.001.001.0087	UBCA.100.001.0162	UBCA.100.002.1610	UBCA.100.003.2566
UBCA.001.001.0088	UBCA.100.001.0163	UBCA.100.002.1613	UBCA.100.003.2583
UBCA.001.001.0089	UBCA.100.001.0164	UBCA.100.002.1618	UBCA.100.003.2604
UBCA.001.001.0093	UBCA.100.001.0165	UBCA.100.002.1709	UBCA.100.003.2608
UBCA.001.001.0097	UBCA.100.001.0172	UBCA.100.002.1757	UBCA.100.003.2615
UBCA.001.001.0099	UBCA.100.001.0174	UBCA.100.002.1759	UBCA.100.003.2634

UBCA.001.001.0108	UBCA.100.001.0181	UBCA.100.002.1809	UBCA.100.003.2635
UBCA.001.001.0112	UBCA.100.001.0185	UBCA.100.002.1834	UBCA.100.003.2647
UBCA.001.001.0120	UBCA.100.001.0191	UBCA.100.002.1839	UBCA.100.004.0001
UBCA.001.001.0121	UBCA.100.001.0198	UBCA.100.002.1853	UBCA.100.004.0002
UBCA.001.001.0122	UBCA.100.001.0200	UBCA.100.002.1869	UBCA.100.004.0008
UBCA.001.001.0131	UBCA.100.001.0201	UBCA.100.002.1870	UBCA.100.004.0014
UBCA.001.001.0134	UBCA.100.001.0205	UBCA.100.002.1884	UBCA.100.004.0017
UBCA.001.001.0135	UBCA.100.001.0209	UBCA.100.002.1891	UBCA.100.004.0024
UBCA.001.001.0138	UBCA.100.001.0222	UBCA.100.002.1898	UBCA.100.004.0026
UBCA.001.001.0141	UBCA.100.001.0229	UBCA.100.002.1909	UBCA.100.004.0029
UBCA.001.001.0144	UBCA.100.001.0237	UBCA.100.002.1911	UBCA.100.004.0053
UBCA.001.001.0149	UBCA.100.001.0250	UBCA.100.002.1973	UBCA.100.004.0092
UBCA.001.001.0152	UBCA.100.001.0253	UBCA.100.002.2012	UBCA.100.004.0111
UBCA.001.001.0158	UBCA.100.001.0255	UBCA.100.002.2017	UBCA.100.004.0116
UBCA.001.001.0163	UBCA.100.001.0257	UBCA.100.003.0013	UBCA.100.004.0117
UBCA.001.001.0166	UBCA.100.001.0259	UBCA.100.003.0015	UBCA.100.004.0158
UBCA.001.001.0167	UBCA.100.001.0260	UBCA.100.003.0030	UBCA.100.004.0168
UBCA.001.001.0179	UBCA.100.001.0264	UBCA.100.003.0052	UBCA.100.004.0199
UBCA.001.001.0181	UBCA.100.001.0266	UBCA.100.003.0060	UBCA.100.004.0206
UBCA.001.001.0186	UBCA.100.001.0281	UBCA.100.003.0073	UBCA.100.004.0243
UBCA.001.001.0187	UBCA.100.001.0284	UBCA.100.003.0080	UBCA.100.004.0244
UBCA.001.001.0192	UBCA.100.001.0286	UBCA.100.003.0083	UBCA.100.005.0025
UBCA.001.001.0194	UBCA.100.001.0295	UBCA.100.003.0106	UBCA.100.005.0032
UBCA.001.001.0195	UBCA.100.001.0300	UBCA.100.003.0122	UBCA.100.006.0002

UBCA.001.001.0196	UBCA.100.001.0306	UBCA.100.003.0145	UBCA.100.006.0003
UBCA.001.001.0199	UBCA.100.001.0307	UBCA.100.003.0162	UBCA.100.006.0010
UBCA.001.001.0211	UBCA.100.001.0313	UBCA.100.003.0163	UBCA.100.006.0011
UBCA.001.001.0212	UBCA.100.001.0314	UBCA.100.003.0189	UBCA.100.006.0012
UBCA.001.001.0213	UBCA.100.001.0317	UBCA.100.003.0209	UBCA.100.006.0013
UBCA.001.001.0219	UBCA.100.001.0321	UBCA.100.003.0229	UBCA.100.006.0014
UBCA.001.001.0222	UBCA.100.001.0322	UBCA.100.003.0233	UBCA.100.006.0015
UBCA.001.001.0225	UBCA.100.001.0323	UBCA.100.003.0238	UBCA.100.006.0017
UBCA.001.001.0226	UBCA.100.001.0325	UBCA.100.003.0295	UBCA.100.006.0018
UBCA.001.001.0234	UBCA.100.001.0327	UBCA.100.003.0326	UBCA.100.006.0019
UBCA.001.001.0243	UBCA.100.001.0338	UBCA.100.003.0332	UBCA.100.006.0020
UBCA.001.001.0244	UBCA.100.001.0341	UBCA.100.003.0352	UBCA.100.006.0021
UBCA.001.001.0245	UBCA.100.001.0348	UBCA.100.003.0368	UBCA.100.006.0022
UBCA.001.001.0253	UBCA.100.001.0349	UBCA.100.003.0379	UBCA.100.006.0023
UBCA.001.001.0254	UBCA.100.001.0351	UBCA.100.003.0398	UBCA.100.006.0024
UBCA.001.001.0255	UBCA.100.001.0354	UBCA.100.003.0403	UBCA.100.006.0025
UBCA.001.001.0256	UBCA.100.001.0359	UBCA.100.003.0445	UBCA.100.006.0026
UBCA.001.001.0257	UBCA.100.001.0364	UBCA.100.003.0461	UBCA.100.006.0027
UBCA.001.001.0259	UBCA.100.001.0367	UBCA.100.003.0496	UBCA.100.006.0028
UBCA.001.001.0261	UBCA.100.001.0371	UBCA.100.003.0526	UBCA.100.006.0029
UBCA.001.002.0003	UBCA.100.001.0372	UBCA.100.003.0541	UBCA.100.006.0031
UBCA.001.002.0006	UBCA.100.001.0380	UBCA.100.003.0542	UBCA.100.006.0032
UBCA.001.002.0009	UBCA.100.001.0387	UBCA.100.003.0559	UBCA.100.006.0034
UBCA.001.002.0016	UBCA.100.001.0401	UBCA.100.003.0574	UBCA.100.006.0036

UBCA.001.002.0026	UBCA.100.001.0403	UBCA.100.003.0580	UBCA.100.006.0038
UBCA.001.002.0032	UBCA.100.001.0415	UBCA.100.003.0589	UBCA.100.006.0039
UBCA.001.002.0054	UBCA.100.001.0423	UBCA.100.003.0592	UBCA.100.006.0041
UBCA.001.002.0060	UBCA.100.001.0425	UBCA.100.003.0602	UBCA.100.006.0042
UBCA.001.002.0080	UBCA.100.001.0431	UBCA.100.003.0603	UBCA.100.006.0043
UBCA.001.002.0096	UBCA.100.001.0437	UBCA.100.003.0647	UBCA.100.006.0044
UBCA.001.002.0118	UBCA.100.001.0438	UBCA.100.003.0654	UBCA.100.006.0045
UBCA.001.002.0125	UBCA.100.001.0451	UBCA.100.003.0659	UBCA.100.006.0047
UBCA.001.002.0130	UBCA.100.001.0455	UBCA.100.003.0671	UBCA.100.006.0048
UBCA.001.002.0134	UBCA.100.001.0456	UBCA.100.003.0716	UBCA.100.006.0049
UBCA.001.002.0142	UBCA.100.001.0457	UBCA.100.003.0717	UBCA.100.006.0050
UBCA.001.002.0145	UBCA.100.001.0459	UBCA.100.003.0721	UBCA.100.006.0051
UBCA.001.002.0148	UBCA.100.001.0463	UBCA.100.003.0727	UBCA.100.006.0056
UBCA.001.002.0154	UBCA.100.001.0474	UBCA.100.003.0752	UBCA.100.006.0057
UBCA.001.002.0158	UBCA.100.001.0482	UBCA.100.003.0783	UBCA.100.006.0060
UBCA.001.002.0166	UBCA.100.001.0487	UBCA.100.003.0799	UBCA.100.006.0061
UBCA.001.002.0170	UBCA.100.002.0013	UBCA.100.003.0858	UBCA.100.006.0062
UBCA.001.002.0171	UBCA.100.002.0016	UBCA.100.003.0866	UBCA.100.006.0064
UBCA.001.002.0178	UBCA.100.002.0018	UBCA.100.003.0894	UBCA.100.006.0066
UBCA.001.002.0182	UBCA.100.002.0021	UBCA.100.003.0903	UBCA.100.006.0067
UBCA.001.002.0186	UBCA.100.002.0024	UBCA.100.003.0913	UBCA.100.006.0070
UBCA.001.002.0197	UBCA.100.002.0026	UBCA.100.003.0936	UBCA.100.006.0072
UBCA.001.002.0201	UBCA.100.002.0029	UBCA.100.003.0949	UBCA.100.006.0076
UBCA.001.002.0202	UBCA.100.002.0053	UBCA.100.003.0997	UBCA.100.006.0077

UBCA.001.002.0215	UBCA.100.002.0096	UBCA.100.003.1023	UBCA.100.006.0080
UBCA.001.002.0220	UBCA.100.002.0112	UBCA.100.003.1045	UBCA.100.006.0081
UBCA.001.002.0224	UBCA.100.002.0114	UBCA.100.003.1058	UBCA.100.006.0082
UBCA.001.002.0233	UBCA.100.002.0124	UBCA.100.003.1059	UBCA.100.006.0086
UBCA.001.002.0236	UBCA.100.002.0143	UBCA.100.003.1067	UBCA.100.006.0088
UBCA.001.002.0239	UBCA.100.002.0214	UBCA.100.003.1068	UBCA.100.006.0089
UBCA.001.002.0244	UBCA.100.002.0228	UBCA.100.003.1089	UBCA.100.006.0090
UBCA.001.002.0245	UBCA.100.002.0287	UBCA.100.003.1090	UBCA.100.006.0094
UBCA.001.002.0248	UBCA.100.002.0303	UBCA.100.003.1124	UBCA.100.006.0095
UBCA.001.002.0252	UBCA.100.002.0308	UBCA.100.003.1139	UBCA.100.006.0096
UBCA.001.002.0254	UBCA.100.002.0313	UBCA.100.003.1169	UBCA.100.006.0098
UBCA.001.002.0256	UBCA.100.002.0317	UBCA.100.003.1170	UBCA.100.006.0099
UBCA.001.002.0269	UBCA.100.002.0321	UBCA.100.003.1176	UBCA.100.006.0104
UBCA.001.002.0271	UBCA.100.002.0322	UBCA.100.003.1189	UBCA.100.006.0105
UBCA.001.002.0273	UBCA.100.002.0336	UBCA.100.003.1197	UBCA.100.006.0107
UBCA.001.002.0276	UBCA.100.002.0395	UBCA.100.003.1208	UBCA.100.006.0108
UBCA.001.002.0283	UBCA.100.002.0399	UBCA.100.003.1213	UBCA.100.006.0109
UBCA.001.003.0005	UBCA.100.002.0412	UBCA.100.003.1217	UBCA.100.006.0110
UBCA.001.003.0007	UBCA.100.002.0416	UBCA.100.003.1235	UBCA.100.006.0111
UBCA.001.003.0010	UBCA.100.002.0417	UBCA.100.003.1307	UBCA.100.006.0112
UBCA.001.003.0014	UBCA.100.002.0458	UBCA.100.003.1349	UBCA.100.006.0113
UBCA.001.003.0015	UBCA.100.002.0531	UBCA.100.003.1361	UBCA.100.006.0115
UBCA.001.003.0020	UBCA.100.002.0535	UBCA.100.003.1382	UBCA.100.006.0117
UBCA.001.003.0022	UBCA.100.002.0548	UBCA.100.003.1405	UBCA.100.006.0118

UBCA.001.003.0036	UBCA.100.002.0551	UBCA.100.003.1452	UBCA.100.006.0119
UBCA.001.003.0040	UBCA.100.002.0659	UBCA.100.003.1461	UBCA.100.006.0121
UBCA.001.004.0003	UBCA.100.002.0670	UBCA.100.003.1466	UBCA.100.006.0122
UBCA.001.004.0004	UBCA.100.002.0714	UBCA.100.003.1475	UBCA.100.006.0124
UBCA.001.004.0007	UBCA.100.002.0731	UBCA.100.003.1479	UBCA.100.006.0125
UBCA.001.005.0029	UBCA.100.002.0741	UBCA.100.003.1482	UBCA.100.006.0127
UBCA.100.001.0002	UBCA.100.002.0743	UBCA.100.003.1483	UBCA.100.006.0128
UBCA.100.001.0003	UBCA.100.002.0759	UBCA.100.003.1574	UBCA.100.006.0129
UBCA.100.001.0004	UBCA.100.002.0760	UBCA.100.003.1638	UBCA.100.006.0130
UBCA.100.001.0006	UBCA.100.002.0785	UBCA.100.003.1657	UBCA.100.006.0131
UBCA.100.001.0007	UBCA.100.002.0806	UBCA.100.003.1688	UBCA.100.006.0134
UBCA.100.001.0008	UBCA.100.002.0859	UBCA.100.003.1714	UBCA.100.006.0136
UBCA.100.001.0009	UBCA.100.002.0861	UBCA.100.003.1719	UBCA.100.006.0137
UBCA.100.001.0010	UBCA.100.002.0891	UBCA.100.003.1760	UBCA.100.006.0138
UBCA.100.001.0012	UBCA.100.002.0895	UBCA.100.003.1781	UBCA.100.006.0139
UBCA.100.001.0016	UBCA.100.002.0908	UBCA.100.003.1790	UBCA.100.006.0140
UBCA.100.001.0020	UBCA.100.002.0914	UBCA.100.003.1870	UBCA.100.006.0141
UBCA.100.001.0021	UBCA.100.002.0937	UBCA.100.003.1873	UBCA.100.006.0143
UBCA.100.001.0023	UBCA.100.002.0955	UBCA.100.003.1878	UBCA.100.006.0145
UBCA.100.001.0029	UBCA.100.002.0959	UBCA.100.003.1889	UBCA.100.006.0146
UBCA.100.001.0030	UBCA.100.002.0965	UBCA.100.003.1931	UBCA.100.006.0147
UBCA.100.001.0031	UBCA.100.002.0968	UBCA.100.003.1933	UBCA.100.006.0148
UBCA.100.001.0032	UBCA.100.002.1016	UBCA.100.003.1938	UBCA.100.006.0149
UBCA.100.001.0033	UBCA.100.002.1023	UBCA.100.003.1941	UBCA.100.006.0151

UBCA.100.001.0036	UBCA.100.002.1025	UBCA.100.003.1954	UBCA.100.006.0154
UBCA.100.001.0040	UBCA.100.002.1033	UBCA.100.003.2008	UBCA.100.006.0155
UBCA.100.001.0042	UBCA.100.002.1051	UBCA.100.003.2024	UBCA.100.006.0156
UBCA.100.001.0043	UBCA.100.002.1053	UBCA.100.003.2030	UBCA.100.006.0157
UBCA.100.001.0047	UBCA.100.002.1064	UBCA.100.003.2045	UBCA.100.007.0001
UBCA.100.001.0051	UBCA.100.002.1074	UBCA.100.003.2048	UBCA.100.008.0003
UBCA.100.001.0053	UBCA.100.002.1082	UBCA.100.003.2051	UBCA.100.008.0004
UBCA.100.001.0055	UBCA.100.002.1165	UBCA.100.003.2056	UBCA.100.008.0006
UBCA.100.001.0058	UBCA.100.002.1174	UBCA.100.003.2062	UBCA.100.008.0007
UBCA.100.001.0059	UBCA.100.002.1193	UBCA.100.003.2082	UBCA.100.008.0008
UBCA.100.001.0061	UBCA.100.002.1204	UBCA.100.003.2089	UBCA.100.008.0009
UBCA.100.001.0065	UBCA.100.002.1253	UBCA.100.003.2093	
UBCA.100.001.0068	UBCA.100.002.1255	UBCA.100.003.2094	

**ANNEXURE D**

**Applications which contain only a statement of group membership (Category 6 only)**

UBCA.001.001.0019	UBCA.100.002.0678	UBCA.100.003.0006	UBCA.100.003.1520
UBCA.001.001.0024	UBCA.100.002.0681	UBCA.100.003.0007	UBCA.100.003.1521
UBCA.001.001.0030	UBCA.100.002.0682	UBCA.100.003.0008	UBCA.100.003.1524
UBCA.001.001.0033	UBCA.100.002.0686	UBCA.100.003.0009	UBCA.100.003.1525
UBCA.001.001.0037	UBCA.100.002.0688	UBCA.100.003.0010	UBCA.100.003.1526
UBCA.001.001.0038	UBCA.100.002.0694	UBCA.100.003.0012	UBCA.100.003.1529
UBCA.001.001.0040	UBCA.100.002.0705	UBCA.100.003.0014	UBCA.100.003.1536
UBCA.001.001.0045	UBCA.100.002.0707	UBCA.100.003.0017	UBCA.100.003.1537
UBCA.001.001.0046	UBCA.100.002.0709	UBCA.100.003.0018	UBCA.100.003.1540
UBCA.001.001.0050	UBCA.100.002.0710	UBCA.100.003.0019	UBCA.100.003.1544
UBCA.001.001.0058	UBCA.100.002.0716	UBCA.100.003.0021	UBCA.100.003.1547
UBCA.001.001.0074	UBCA.100.002.0717	UBCA.100.003.0022	UBCA.100.003.1551
UBCA.001.001.0076	UBCA.100.002.0718	UBCA.100.003.0024	UBCA.100.003.1553
UBCA.001.001.0077	UBCA.100.002.0720	UBCA.100.003.0026	UBCA.100.003.1554
UBCA.001.001.0078	UBCA.100.002.0722	UBCA.100.003.0029	UBCA.100.003.1557
UBCA.001.001.0081	UBCA.100.002.0729	UBCA.100.003.0032	UBCA.100.003.1563
UBCA.001.001.0082	UBCA.100.002.0730	UBCA.100.003.0033	UBCA.100.003.1568
UBCA.001.001.0086	UBCA.100.002.0732	UBCA.100.003.0035	UBCA.100.003.1569
UBCA.001.001.0096	UBCA.100.002.0733	UBCA.100.003.0036	UBCA.100.003.1571
UBCA.001.001.0102	UBCA.100.002.0735	UBCA.100.003.0040	UBCA.100.003.1572
UBCA.001.001.0103	UBCA.100.002.0736	UBCA.100.003.0044	UBCA.100.003.1573
UBCA.001.001.0106	UBCA.100.002.0739	UBCA.100.003.0049	UBCA.100.003.1576



UBCA.001.001.0117	UBCA.100.002.0742	UBCA.100.003.0051	UBCA.100.003.1582
UBCA.001.001.0125	UBCA.100.002.0744	UBCA.100.003.0053	UBCA.100.003.1589
UBCA.001.001.0132	UBCA.100.002.0747	UBCA.100.003.0055	UBCA.100.003.1593
UBCA.001.001.0139	UBCA.100.002.0748	UBCA.100.003.0056	UBCA.100.003.1595
UBCA.001.001.0142	UBCA.100.002.0753	UBCA.100.003.0058	UBCA.100.003.1599
UBCA.001.001.0143	UBCA.100.002.0755	UBCA.100.003.0059	UBCA.100.003.1600
UBCA.001.001.0146	UBCA.100.002.0757	UBCA.100.003.0062	UBCA.100.003.1605
UBCA.001.001.0147	UBCA.100.002.0758	UBCA.100.003.0064	UBCA.100.003.1612
UBCA.001.001.0150	UBCA.100.002.0761	UBCA.100.003.0065	UBCA.100.003.1613
UBCA.001.001.0164	UBCA.100.002.0762	UBCA.100.003.0066	UBCA.100.003.1614
UBCA.001.001.0165	UBCA.100.002.0763	UBCA.100.003.0067	UBCA.100.003.1620
UBCA.001.001.0169	UBCA.100.002.0765	UBCA.100.003.0069	UBCA.100.003.1625
UBCA.001.001.0200	UBCA.100.002.0766	UBCA.100.003.0070	UBCA.100.003.1627
UBCA.001.001.0202	UBCA.100.002.0768	UBCA.100.003.0074	UBCA.100.003.1628
UBCA.001.001.0210	UBCA.100.002.0770	UBCA.100.003.0076	UBCA.100.003.1634
UBCA.001.001.0229	UBCA.100.002.0771	UBCA.100.003.0077	UBCA.100.003.1636
UBCA.001.001.0233	UBCA.100.002.0772	UBCA.100.003.0078	UBCA.100.003.1642
UBCA.001.001.0237	UBCA.100.002.0773	UBCA.100.003.0079	UBCA.100.003.1644
UBCA.001.001.0249	UBCA.100.002.0775	UBCA.100.003.0081	UBCA.100.003.1652
UBCA.001.001.0258	UBCA.100.002.0778	UBCA.100.003.0082	UBCA.100.003.1654
UBCA.001.001.0262	UBCA.100.002.0779	UBCA.100.003.0085	UBCA.100.003.1658
UBCA.001.002.0015	UBCA.100.002.0781	UBCA.100.003.0088	UBCA.100.003.1660
UBCA.001.002.0021	UBCA.100.002.0782	UBCA.100.003.0097	UBCA.100.003.1662
UBCA.001.002.0024	UBCA.100.002.0791	UBCA.100.003.0098	UBCA.100.003.1665

UBCA.001.002.0025	UBCA.100.002.0793	UBCA.100.003.0109	UBCA.100.003.1668
UBCA.001.002.0037	UBCA.100.002.0799	UBCA.100.003.0110	UBCA.100.003.1669
UBCA.001.002.0048	UBCA.100.002.0800	UBCA.100.003.0112	UBCA.100.003.1672
UBCA.001.002.0055	UBCA.100.002.0801	UBCA.100.003.0113	UBCA.100.003.1676
UBCA.001.002.0056	UBCA.100.002.0803	UBCA.100.003.0114	UBCA.100.003.1679
UBCA.001.002.0066	UBCA.100.002.0804	UBCA.100.003.0116	UBCA.100.003.1681
UBCA.001.002.0067	UBCA.100.002.0805	UBCA.100.003.0118	UBCA.100.003.1682
UBCA.001.002.0068	UBCA.100.002.0812	UBCA.100.003.0123	UBCA.100.003.1685
UBCA.001.002.0069	UBCA.100.002.0814	UBCA.100.003.0124	UBCA.100.003.1689
UBCA.001.002.0071	UBCA.100.002.0816	UBCA.100.003.0125	UBCA.100.003.1691
UBCA.001.002.0073	UBCA.100.002.0822	UBCA.100.003.0128	UBCA.100.003.1694
UBCA.001.002.0076	UBCA.100.002.0824	UBCA.100.003.0129	UBCA.100.003.1701
UBCA.001.002.0089	UBCA.100.002.0828	UBCA.100.003.0132	UBCA.100.003.1702
UBCA.001.002.0092	UBCA.100.002.0829	UBCA.100.003.0133	UBCA.100.003.1705
UBCA.001.002.0100	UBCA.100.002.0830	UBCA.100.003.0134	UBCA.100.003.1706
UBCA.001.002.0101	UBCA.100.002.0834	UBCA.100.003.0140	UBCA.100.003.1709
UBCA.001.002.0105	UBCA.100.002.0835	UBCA.100.003.0144	UBCA.100.003.1710
UBCA.001.002.0106	UBCA.100.002.0836	UBCA.100.003.0147	UBCA.100.003.1718
UBCA.001.002.0110	UBCA.100.002.0839	UBCA.100.003.0149	UBCA.100.003.1722
UBCA.001.002.0114	UBCA.100.002.0841	UBCA.100.003.0151	UBCA.100.003.1725
UBCA.001.002.0115	UBCA.100.002.0842	UBCA.100.003.0154	UBCA.100.003.1728
UBCA.001.002.0119	UBCA.100.002.0843	UBCA.100.003.0155	UBCA.100.003.1731
UBCA.001.002.0123	UBCA.100.002.0845	UBCA.100.003.0159	UBCA.100.003.1734
UBCA.001.002.0128	UBCA.100.002.0847	UBCA.100.003.0160	UBCA.100.003.1737

UBCA.001.002.0153	UBCA.100.002.0851	UBCA.100.003.0161	UBCA.100.003.1738
UBCA.001.002.0155	UBCA.100.002.0854	UBCA.100.003.0164	UBCA.100.003.1741
UBCA.001.002.0168	UBCA.100.002.0855	UBCA.100.003.0166	UBCA.100.003.1743
UBCA.001.002.0169	UBCA.100.002.0856	UBCA.100.003.0167	UBCA.100.003.1744
UBCA.001.002.0180	UBCA.100.002.0857	UBCA.100.003.0172	UBCA.100.003.1745
UBCA.001.002.0192	UBCA.100.002.0858	UBCA.100.003.0176	UBCA.100.003.1750
UBCA.001.002.0194	UBCA.100.002.0864	UBCA.100.003.0178	UBCA.100.003.1752
UBCA.001.002.0195	UBCA.100.002.0866	UBCA.100.003.0180	UBCA.100.003.1758
UBCA.001.002.0198	UBCA.100.002.0867	UBCA.100.003.0181	UBCA.100.003.1763
UBCA.001.002.0199	UBCA.100.002.0868	UBCA.100.003.0182	UBCA.100.003.1767
UBCA.001.002.0203	UBCA.100.002.0869	UBCA.100.003.0184	UBCA.100.003.1769
UBCA.001.002.0208	UBCA.100.002.0870	UBCA.100.003.0185	UBCA.100.003.1770
UBCA.001.002.0211	UBCA.100.002.0871	UBCA.100.003.0191	UBCA.100.003.1771
UBCA.001.002.0216	UBCA.100.002.0872	UBCA.100.003.0194	UBCA.100.003.1773
UBCA.001.002.0222	UBCA.100.002.0881	UBCA.100.003.0195	UBCA.100.003.1775
UBCA.001.002.0223	UBCA.100.002.0887	UBCA.100.003.0198	UBCA.100.003.1783
UBCA.001.002.0242	UBCA.100.002.0889	UBCA.100.003.0199	UBCA.100.003.1784
UBCA.001.002.0243	UBCA.100.002.0890	UBCA.100.003.0207	UBCA.100.003.1785
UBCA.001.002.0253	UBCA.100.002.0892	UBCA.100.003.0210	UBCA.100.003.1787
UBCA.001.002.0259	UBCA.100.002.0897	UBCA.100.003.0211	UBCA.100.003.1788
UBCA.001.002.0274	UBCA.100.002.0898	UBCA.100.003.0212	UBCA.100.003.1792
UBCA.001.002.0282	UBCA.100.002.0900	UBCA.100.003.0213	UBCA.100.003.1794
UBCA.001.002.0286	UBCA.100.002.0901	UBCA.100.003.0214	UBCA.100.003.1795
UBCA.001.002.0290	UBCA.100.002.0902	UBCA.100.003.0219	UBCA.100.003.1797

UBCA.001.003.0002	UBCA.100.002.0906	UBCA.100.003.0227	UBCA.100.003.1798
UBCA.001.003.0009	UBCA.100.002.0909	UBCA.100.003.0230	UBCA.100.003.1799
UBCA.001.003.0012	UBCA.100.002.0910	UBCA.100.003.0234	UBCA.100.003.1800
UBCA.001.003.0019	UBCA.100.002.0913	UBCA.100.003.0237	UBCA.100.003.1802
UBCA.001.005.0001	UBCA.100.002.0917	UBCA.100.003.0246	UBCA.100.003.1804
UBCA.001.005.0005	UBCA.100.002.0919	UBCA.100.003.0249	UBCA.100.003.1807
UBCA.001.005.0008	UBCA.100.002.0923	UBCA.100.003.0250	UBCA.100.003.1810
UBCA.001.005.0009	UBCA.100.002.0925	UBCA.100.003.0252	UBCA.100.003.1812
UBCA.001.005.0010	UBCA.100.002.0927	UBCA.100.003.0254	UBCA.100.003.1813
UBCA.001.005.0011	UBCA.100.002.0930	UBCA.100.003.0255	UBCA.100.003.1814
UBCA.001.005.0021	UBCA.100.002.0931	UBCA.100.003.0259	UBCA.100.003.1817
UBCA.001.005.0023	UBCA.100.002.0932	UBCA.100.003.0261	UBCA.100.003.1820
UBCA.001.005.0026	UBCA.100.002.0933	UBCA.100.003.0263	UBCA.100.003.1821
UBCA.001.005.0027	UBCA.100.002.0936	UBCA.100.003.0264	UBCA.100.003.1822
UBCA.100.001.0011	UBCA.100.002.0939	UBCA.100.003.0266	UBCA.100.003.1827
UBCA.100.001.0015	UBCA.100.002.0940	UBCA.100.003.0271	UBCA.100.003.1832
UBCA.100.001.0017	UBCA.100.002.0942	UBCA.100.003.0274	UBCA.100.003.1833
UBCA.100.001.0018	UBCA.100.002.0943	UBCA.100.003.0278	UBCA.100.003.1836
UBCA.100.001.0022	UBCA.100.002.0944	UBCA.100.003.0284	UBCA.100.003.1838
UBCA.100.001.0024	UBCA.100.002.0947	UBCA.100.003.0285	UBCA.100.003.1843
UBCA.100.001.0025	UBCA.100.002.0951	UBCA.100.003.0286	UBCA.100.003.1844
UBCA.100.001.0034	UBCA.100.002.0952	UBCA.100.003.0294	UBCA.100.003.1845
UBCA.100.001.0035	UBCA.100.002.0958	UBCA.100.003.0297	UBCA.100.003.1846
UBCA.100.001.0037	UBCA.100.002.0960	UBCA.100.003.0298	UBCA.100.003.1848

UBCA.100.001.0041	UBCA.100.002.0961	UBCA.100.003.0299	UBCA.100.003.1853
UBCA.100.001.0046	UBCA.100.002.0962	UBCA.100.003.0302	UBCA.100.003.1854
UBCA.100.001.0049	UBCA.100.002.0963	UBCA.100.003.0303	UBCA.100.003.1856
UBCA.100.001.0050	UBCA.100.002.0964	UBCA.100.003.0304	UBCA.100.003.1857
UBCA.100.001.0052	UBCA.100.002.0966	UBCA.100.003.0306	UBCA.100.003.1860
UBCA.100.001.0056	UBCA.100.002.0967	UBCA.100.003.0307	UBCA.100.003.1861
UBCA.100.001.0057	UBCA.100.002.0971	UBCA.100.003.0308	UBCA.100.003.1863
UBCA.100.001.0062	UBCA.100.002.0972	UBCA.100.003.0309	UBCA.100.003.1866
UBCA.100.001.0070	UBCA.100.002.0973	UBCA.100.003.0312	UBCA.100.003.1867
UBCA.100.001.0071	UBCA.100.002.0974	UBCA.100.003.0313	UBCA.100.003.1868
UBCA.100.001.0074	UBCA.100.002.0976	UBCA.100.003.0314	UBCA.100.003.1869
UBCA.100.001.0075	UBCA.100.002.0977	UBCA.100.003.0315	UBCA.100.003.1871
UBCA.100.001.0076	UBCA.100.002.0978	UBCA.100.003.0316	UBCA.100.003.1875
UBCA.100.001.0078	UBCA.100.002.0980	UBCA.100.003.0317	UBCA.100.003.1881
UBCA.100.001.0079	UBCA.100.002.0982	UBCA.100.003.0319	UBCA.100.003.1882
UBCA.100.001.0095	UBCA.100.002.0984	UBCA.100.003.0320	UBCA.100.003.1884
UBCA.100.001.0096	UBCA.100.002.0985	UBCA.100.003.0321	UBCA.100.003.1886
UBCA.100.001.0099	UBCA.100.002.0987	UBCA.100.003.0324	UBCA.100.003.1891
UBCA.100.001.0101	UBCA.100.002.0989	UBCA.100.003.0325	UBCA.100.003.1892
UBCA.100.001.0102	UBCA.100.002.0990	UBCA.100.003.0327	UBCA.100.003.1895
UBCA.100.001.0108	UBCA.100.002.0991	UBCA.100.003.0329	UBCA.100.003.1896
UBCA.100.001.0109	UBCA.100.002.0992	UBCA.100.003.0337	UBCA.100.003.1897
UBCA.100.001.0112	UBCA.100.002.0993	UBCA.100.003.0340	UBCA.100.003.1898
UBCA.100.001.0122	UBCA.100.002.0994	UBCA.100.003.0342	UBCA.100.003.1899

UBCA.100.001.0123	UBCA.100.002.0995	UBCA.100.003.0343	UBCA.100.003.1900
UBCA.100.001.0130	UBCA.100.002.0998	UBCA.100.003.0348	UBCA.100.003.1903
UBCA.100.001.0133	UBCA.100.002.0999	UBCA.100.003.0349	UBCA.100.003.1904
UBCA.100.001.0135	UBCA.100.002.1000	UBCA.100.003.0350	UBCA.100.003.1908
UBCA.100.001.0136	UBCA.100.002.1003	UBCA.100.003.0362	UBCA.100.003.1909
UBCA.100.001.0138	UBCA.100.002.1004	UBCA.100.003.0364	UBCA.100.003.1910
UBCA.100.001.0139	UBCA.100.002.1011	UBCA.100.003.0367	UBCA.100.003.1912
UBCA.100.001.0140	UBCA.100.002.1012	UBCA.100.003.0369	UBCA.100.003.1915
UBCA.100.001.0142	UBCA.100.002.1014	UBCA.100.003.0372	UBCA.100.003.1916
UBCA.100.001.0143	UBCA.100.002.1015	UBCA.100.003.0377	UBCA.100.003.1920
UBCA.100.001.0145	UBCA.100.002.1017	UBCA.100.003.0380	UBCA.100.003.1921
UBCA.100.001.0146	UBCA.100.002.1018	UBCA.100.003.0382	UBCA.100.003.1923
UBCA.100.001.0148	UBCA.100.002.1021	UBCA.100.003.0384	UBCA.100.003.1926
UBCA.100.001.0150	UBCA.100.002.1022	UBCA.100.003.0385	UBCA.100.003.1930
UBCA.100.001.0151	UBCA.100.002.1024	UBCA.100.003.0386	UBCA.100.003.1935
UBCA.100.001.0154	UBCA.100.002.1026	UBCA.100.003.0388	UBCA.100.003.1936
UBCA.100.001.0157	UBCA.100.002.1031	UBCA.100.003.0389	UBCA.100.003.1945
UBCA.100.001.0158	UBCA.100.002.1032	UBCA.100.003.0392	UBCA.100.003.1946
UBCA.100.001.0159	UBCA.100.002.1036	UBCA.100.003.0393	UBCA.100.003.1952
UBCA.100.001.0160	UBCA.100.002.1040	UBCA.100.003.0396	UBCA.100.003.1953
UBCA.100.001.0167	UBCA.100.002.1041	UBCA.100.003.0401	UBCA.100.003.1972
UBCA.100.001.0168	UBCA.100.002.1042	UBCA.100.003.0402	UBCA.100.003.1976
UBCA.100.001.0170	UBCA.100.002.1043	UBCA.100.003.0404	UBCA.100.003.1977
UBCA.100.001.0173	UBCA.100.002.1047	UBCA.100.003.0406	UBCA.100.003.1978

UBCA.100.001.0175	UBCA.100.002.1049	UBCA.100.003.0407	UBCA.100.003.1981
UBCA.100.001.0177	UBCA.100.002.1052	UBCA.100.003.0409	UBCA.100.003.1983
UBCA.100.001.0179	UBCA.100.002.1054	UBCA.100.003.0412	UBCA.100.003.1984
UBCA.100.001.0180	UBCA.100.002.1055	UBCA.100.003.0415	UBCA.100.003.1987
UBCA.100.001.0182	UBCA.100.002.1057	UBCA.100.003.0416	UBCA.100.003.1991
UBCA.100.001.0184	UBCA.100.002.1061	UBCA.100.003.0418	UBCA.100.003.1995
UBCA.100.001.0186	UBCA.100.002.1067	UBCA.100.003.0422	UBCA.100.003.1997
UBCA.100.001.0187	UBCA.100.002.1071	UBCA.100.003.0424	UBCA.100.003.1999
UBCA.100.001.0188	UBCA.100.002.1075	UBCA.100.003.0428	UBCA.100.003.2000
UBCA.100.001.0189	UBCA.100.002.1076	UBCA.100.003.0429	UBCA.100.003.2002
UBCA.100.001.0190	UBCA.100.002.1078	UBCA.100.003.0432	UBCA.100.003.2007
UBCA.100.001.0192	UBCA.100.002.1083	UBCA.100.003.0433	UBCA.100.003.2013
UBCA.100.001.0194	UBCA.100.002.1087	UBCA.100.003.0435	UBCA.100.003.2016
UBCA.100.001.0196	UBCA.100.002.1088	UBCA.100.003.0436	UBCA.100.003.2021
UBCA.100.001.0202	UBCA.100.002.1090	UBCA.100.003.0437	UBCA.100.003.2022
UBCA.100.001.0204	UBCA.100.002.1093	UBCA.100.003.0441	UBCA.100.003.2025
UBCA.100.001.0206	UBCA.100.002.1097	UBCA.100.003.0442	UBCA.100.003.2031
UBCA.100.001.0212	UBCA.100.002.1098	UBCA.100.003.0443	UBCA.100.003.2032
UBCA.100.001.0214	UBCA.100.002.1100	UBCA.100.003.0444	UBCA.100.003.2033
UBCA.100.001.0215	UBCA.100.002.1109	UBCA.100.003.0446	UBCA.100.003.2049
UBCA.100.001.0216	UBCA.100.002.1110	UBCA.100.003.0447	UBCA.100.003.2052
UBCA.100.001.0219	UBCA.100.002.1111	UBCA.100.003.0448	UBCA.100.003.2054
UBCA.100.001.0221	UBCA.100.002.1113	UBCA.100.003.0449	UBCA.100.003.2063
UBCA.100.001.0228	UBCA.100.002.1117	UBCA.100.003.0450	UBCA.100.003.2072

UBCA.100.001.0230	UBCA.100.002.1118	UBCA.100.003.0453	UBCA.100.003.2073
UBCA.100.001.0234	UBCA.100.002.1120	UBCA.100.003.0455	UBCA.100.003.2074
UBCA.100.001.0235	UBCA.100.002.1122	UBCA.100.003.0457	UBCA.100.003.2076
UBCA.100.001.0238	UBCA.100.002.1124	UBCA.100.003.0462	UBCA.100.003.2080
UBCA.100.001.0241	UBCA.100.002.1126	UBCA.100.003.0463	UBCA.100.003.2085
UBCA.100.001.0242	UBCA.100.002.1129	UBCA.100.003.0464	UBCA.100.003.2088
UBCA.100.001.0243	UBCA.100.002.1130	UBCA.100.003.0471	UBCA.100.003.2091
UBCA.100.001.0246	UBCA.100.002.1131	UBCA.100.003.0474	UBCA.100.003.2097
UBCA.100.001.0248	UBCA.100.002.1132	UBCA.100.003.0478	UBCA.100.003.2100
UBCA.100.001.0249	UBCA.100.002.1133	UBCA.100.003.0479	UBCA.100.003.2102
UBCA.100.001.0251	UBCA.100.002.1134	UBCA.100.003.0480	UBCA.100.003.2103
UBCA.100.001.0258	UBCA.100.002.1136	UBCA.100.003.0481	UBCA.100.003.2108
UBCA.100.001.0262	UBCA.100.002.1137	UBCA.100.003.0482	UBCA.100.003.2110
UBCA.100.001.0265	UBCA.100.002.1138	UBCA.100.003.0484	UBCA.100.003.2112
UBCA.100.001.0271	UBCA.100.002.1142	UBCA.100.003.0488	UBCA.100.003.2114
UBCA.100.001.0272	UBCA.100.002.1146	UBCA.100.003.0491	UBCA.100.003.2115
UBCA.100.001.0275	UBCA.100.002.1148	UBCA.100.003.0492	UBCA.100.003.2117
UBCA.100.001.0277	UBCA.100.002.1152	UBCA.100.003.0493	UBCA.100.003.2118
UBCA.100.001.0282	UBCA.100.002.1153	UBCA.100.003.0504	UBCA.100.003.2121
UBCA.100.001.0287	UBCA.100.002.1154	UBCA.100.003.0506	UBCA.100.003.2127
UBCA.100.001.0289	UBCA.100.002.1158	UBCA.100.003.0511	UBCA.100.003.2128
UBCA.100.001.0290	UBCA.100.002.1166	UBCA.100.003.0512	UBCA.100.003.2129
UBCA.100.001.0291	UBCA.100.002.1167	UBCA.100.003.0521	UBCA.100.003.2132
UBCA.100.001.0292	UBCA.100.002.1168	UBCA.100.003.0522	UBCA.100.003.2136



UBCA.100.001.0293	UBCA.100.002.1173	UBCA.100.003.0524	UBCA.100.003.2140
UBCA.100.001.0294	UBCA.100.002.1175	UBCA.100.003.0525	UBCA.100.003.2143
UBCA.100.001.0296	UBCA.100.002.1176	UBCA.100.003.0530	UBCA.100.003.2144
UBCA.100.001.0297	UBCA.100.002.1180	UBCA.100.003.0532	UBCA.100.003.2145
UBCA.100.001.0298	UBCA.100.002.1182	UBCA.100.003.0534	UBCA.100.003.2146
UBCA.100.001.0301	UBCA.100.002.1184	UBCA.100.003.0537	UBCA.100.003.2148
UBCA.100.001.0304	UBCA.100.002.1192	UBCA.100.003.0539	UBCA.100.003.2149
UBCA.100.001.0305	UBCA.100.002.1196	UBCA.100.003.0540	UBCA.100.003.2150
UBCA.100.001.0309	UBCA.100.002.1197	UBCA.100.003.0544	UBCA.100.003.2151
UBCA.100.001.0311	UBCA.100.002.1199	UBCA.100.003.0548	UBCA.100.003.2152
UBCA.100.001.0312	UBCA.100.002.1200	UBCA.100.003.0550	UBCA.100.003.2170
UBCA.100.001.0315	UBCA.100.002.1201	UBCA.100.003.0551	UBCA.100.003.2174
UBCA.100.001.0316	UBCA.100.002.1203	UBCA.100.003.0552	UBCA.100.003.2187
UBCA.100.001.0326	UBCA.100.002.1205	UBCA.100.003.0553	UBCA.100.003.2198
UBCA.100.001.0328	UBCA.100.002.1206	UBCA.100.003.0554	UBCA.100.003.2199
UBCA.100.001.0329	UBCA.100.002.1210	UBCA.100.003.0556	UBCA.100.003.2200
UBCA.100.001.0330	UBCA.100.002.1215	UBCA.100.003.0564	UBCA.100.003.2203
UBCA.100.001.0331	UBCA.100.002.1219	UBCA.100.003.0565	UBCA.100.003.2209
UBCA.100.001.0335	UBCA.100.002.1220	UBCA.100.003.0567	UBCA.100.003.2218
UBCA.100.001.0336	UBCA.100.002.1223	UBCA.100.003.0569	UBCA.100.003.2219
UBCA.100.001.0337	UBCA.100.002.1225	UBCA.100.003.0570	UBCA.100.003.2230
UBCA.100.001.0340	UBCA.100.002.1227	UBCA.100.003.0571	UBCA.100.003.2231
UBCA.100.001.0342	UBCA.100.002.1232	UBCA.100.003.0575	UBCA.100.003.2237
UBCA.100.001.0344	UBCA.100.002.1236	UBCA.100.003.0576	UBCA.100.003.2239

UBCA.100.001.0347	UBCA.100.002.1243	UBCA.100.003.0577	UBCA.100.003.2240
UBCA.100.001.0357	UBCA.100.002.1244	UBCA.100.003.0579	UBCA.100.003.2243
UBCA.100.001.0358	UBCA.100.002.1248	UBCA.100.003.0595	UBCA.100.003.2245
UBCA.100.001.0360	UBCA.100.002.1249	UBCA.100.003.0598	UBCA.100.003.2248
UBCA.100.001.0362	UBCA.100.002.1252	UBCA.100.003.0599	UBCA.100.003.2249
UBCA.100.001.0363	UBCA.100.002.1254	UBCA.100.003.0601	UBCA.100.003.2250
UBCA.100.001.0365	UBCA.100.002.1260	UBCA.100.003.0604	UBCA.100.003.2252
UBCA.100.001.0369	UBCA.100.002.1266	UBCA.100.003.0606	UBCA.100.003.2255
UBCA.100.001.0373	UBCA.100.002.1271	UBCA.100.003.0607	UBCA.100.003.2256
UBCA.100.001.0374	UBCA.100.002.1274	UBCA.100.003.0608	UBCA.100.003.2262
UBCA.100.001.0376	UBCA.100.002.1276	UBCA.100.003.0610	UBCA.100.003.2263
UBCA.100.001.0381	UBCA.100.002.1279	UBCA.100.003.0612	UBCA.100.003.2270
UBCA.100.001.0382	UBCA.100.002.1280	UBCA.100.003.0616	UBCA.100.003.2271
UBCA.100.001.0385	UBCA.100.002.1281	UBCA.100.003.0617	UBCA.100.003.2274
UBCA.100.001.0388	UBCA.100.002.1285	UBCA.100.003.0618	UBCA.100.003.2280
UBCA.100.001.0389	UBCA.100.002.1290	UBCA.100.003.0619	UBCA.100.003.2283
UBCA.100.001.0392	UBCA.100.002.1294	UBCA.100.003.0621	UBCA.100.003.2284
UBCA.100.001.0393	UBCA.100.002.1298	UBCA.100.003.0628	UBCA.100.003.2285
UBCA.100.001.0394	UBCA.100.002.1301	UBCA.100.003.0629	UBCA.100.003.2288
UBCA.100.001.0399	UBCA.100.002.1302	UBCA.100.003.0635	UBCA.100.003.2290
UBCA.100.001.0404	UBCA.100.002.1303	UBCA.100.003.0636	UBCA.100.003.2292
UBCA.100.001.0405	UBCA.100.002.1308	UBCA.100.003.0637	UBCA.100.003.2296
UBCA.100.001.0406	UBCA.100.002.1309	UBCA.100.003.0643	UBCA.100.003.2297
UBCA.100.001.0407	UBCA.100.002.1311	UBCA.100.003.0645	UBCA.100.003.2300

UBCA.100.001.0408	UBCA.100.002.1312	UBCA.100.003.0650	UBCA.100.003.2302
UBCA.100.001.0409	UBCA.100.002.1313	UBCA.100.003.0655	UBCA.100.003.2303
UBCA.100.001.0411	UBCA.100.002.1314	UBCA.100.003.0657	UBCA.100.003.2309
UBCA.100.001.0417	UBCA.100.002.1316	UBCA.100.003.0658	UBCA.100.003.2310
UBCA.100.001.0418	UBCA.100.002.1318	UBCA.100.003.0663	UBCA.100.003.2311
UBCA.100.001.0419	UBCA.100.002.1319	UBCA.100.003.0665	UBCA.100.003.2313
UBCA.100.001.0421	UBCA.100.002.1323	UBCA.100.003.0666	UBCA.100.003.2314
UBCA.100.001.0422	UBCA.100.002.1328	UBCA.100.003.0668	UBCA.100.003.2316
UBCA.100.001.0424	UBCA.100.002.1331	UBCA.100.003.0669	UBCA.100.003.2318
UBCA.100.001.0426	UBCA.100.002.1335	UBCA.100.003.0670	UBCA.100.003.2323
UBCA.100.001.0429	UBCA.100.002.1336	UBCA.100.003.0673	UBCA.100.003.2324
UBCA.100.001.0433	UBCA.100.002.1337	UBCA.100.003.0675	UBCA.100.003.2328
UBCA.100.001.0434	UBCA.100.002.1338	UBCA.100.003.0677	UBCA.100.003.2331
UBCA.100.001.0436	UBCA.100.002.1345	UBCA.100.003.0678	UBCA.100.003.2334
UBCA.100.001.0441	UBCA.100.002.1346	UBCA.100.003.0679	UBCA.100.003.2337
UBCA.100.001.0444	UBCA.100.002.1350	UBCA.100.003.0681	UBCA.100.003.2342
UBCA.100.001.0445	UBCA.100.002.1352	UBCA.100.003.0682	UBCA.100.003.2345
UBCA.100.001.0446	UBCA.100.002.1357	UBCA.100.003.0683	UBCA.100.003.2349
UBCA.100.001.0449	UBCA.100.002.1358	UBCA.100.003.0684	UBCA.100.003.2350
UBCA.100.001.0453	UBCA.100.002.1359	UBCA.100.003.0686	UBCA.100.003.2351
UBCA.100.001.0461	UBCA.100.002.1361	UBCA.100.003.0689	UBCA.100.003.2352
UBCA.100.001.0464	UBCA.100.002.1362	UBCA.100.003.0690	UBCA.100.003.2354
UBCA.100.001.0466	UBCA.100.002.1363	UBCA.100.003.0694	UBCA.100.003.2355
UBCA.100.001.0468	UBCA.100.002.1366	UBCA.100.003.0695	UBCA.100.003.2358

UBCA.100.001.0472	UBCA.100.002.1368	UBCA.100.003.0698	UBCA.100.003.2362
UBCA.100.001.0479	UBCA.100.002.1369	UBCA.100.003.0700	UBCA.100.003.2365
UBCA.100.001.0481	UBCA.100.002.1370	UBCA.100.003.0702	UBCA.100.003.2369
UBCA.100.001.0483	UBCA.100.002.1371	UBCA.100.003.0703	UBCA.100.003.2373
UBCA.100.002.0003	UBCA.100.002.1373	UBCA.100.003.0705	UBCA.100.003.2375
UBCA.100.002.0004	UBCA.100.002.1376	UBCA.100.003.0708	UBCA.100.003.2381
UBCA.100.002.0006	UBCA.100.002.1377	UBCA.100.003.0710	UBCA.100.003.2382
UBCA.100.002.0007	UBCA.100.002.1379	UBCA.100.003.0711	UBCA.100.003.2383
UBCA.100.002.0008	UBCA.100.002.1380	UBCA.100.003.0718	UBCA.100.003.2384
UBCA.100.002.0010 <sup>130</sup>	UBCA.100.002.1381	UBCA.100.003.0719	UBCA.100.003.2385
UBCA.100.002.0012	UBCA.100.002.1382	UBCA.100.003.0720	UBCA.100.003.2388
UBCA.100.002.0015	UBCA.100.002.1385	UBCA.100.003.0729	UBCA.100.003.2391
UBCA.100.002.0023	UBCA.100.002.1386	UBCA.100.003.0730	UBCA.100.003.2392
UBCA.100.002.0028	UBCA.100.002.1388	UBCA.100.003.0731	UBCA.100.003.2393
UBCA.100.002.0031	UBCA.100.002.1393	UBCA.100.003.0734	UBCA.100.003.2394
UBCA.100.002.0036	UBCA.100.002.1394	UBCA.100.003.0739	UBCA.100.003.2399
UBCA.100.002.0038	UBCA.100.002.1395	UBCA.100.003.0741	UBCA.100.003.2402
UBCA.100.002.0043	UBCA.100.002.1396	UBCA.100.003.0742	UBCA.100.003.2411
UBCA.100.002.0045	UBCA.100.002.1398	UBCA.100.003.0745	UBCA.100.003.2416
UBCA.100.002.0048	UBCA.100.002.1400	UBCA.100.003.0756	UBCA.100.003.2418
UBCA.100.002.0049	UBCA.100.002.1404	UBCA.100.003.0759	UBCA.100.003.2419
UBCA.100.002.0054	UBCA.100.002.1408	UBCA.100.003.0763	UBCA.100.003.2420
UBCA.100.002.0057	UBCA.100.002.1411	UBCA.100.003.0764	UBCA.100.003.2421

---

<sup>130</sup> I note that I reviewed this application individually.

UBCA.100.002.0058	UBCA.100.002.1417	UBCA.100.003.0765	UBCA.100.003.2423
UBCA.100.002.0062	UBCA.100.002.1419	UBCA.100.003.0766	UBCA.100.003.2426
UBCA.100.002.0064	UBCA.100.002.1422	UBCA.100.003.0768	UBCA.100.003.2429
UBCA.100.002.0067	UBCA.100.002.1427	UBCA.100.003.0770	UBCA.100.003.2430
UBCA.100.002.0068	UBCA.100.002.1430	UBCA.100.003.0772	UBCA.100.003.2431
UBCA.100.002.0069	UBCA.100.002.1432	UBCA.100.003.0773	UBCA.100.003.2432
UBCA.100.002.0071	UBCA.100.002.1434	UBCA.100.003.0775	UBCA.100.003.2433
UBCA.100.002.0074	UBCA.100.002.1435	UBCA.100.003.0776	UBCA.100.003.2436
UBCA.100.002.0077	UBCA.100.002.1436	UBCA.100.003.0777	UBCA.100.003.2437
UBCA.100.002.0078	UBCA.100.002.1437	UBCA.100.003.0778	UBCA.100.003.2440
UBCA.100.002.0080	UBCA.100.002.1438	UBCA.100.003.0779	UBCA.100.003.2441
UBCA.100.002.0081	UBCA.100.002.1439	UBCA.100.003.0786	UBCA.100.003.2442
UBCA.100.002.0083	UBCA.100.002.1440	UBCA.100.003.0788	UBCA.100.003.2443
UBCA.100.002.0085	UBCA.100.002.1441	UBCA.100.003.0789	UBCA.100.003.2447
UBCA.100.002.0086	UBCA.100.002.1448	UBCA.100.003.0790	UBCA.100.003.2451
UBCA.100.002.0089	UBCA.100.002.1450	UBCA.100.003.0792	UBCA.100.003.2453
UBCA.100.002.0091	UBCA.100.002.1451	UBCA.100.003.0793	UBCA.100.003.2456
UBCA.100.002.0092	UBCA.100.002.1453	UBCA.100.003.0798	UBCA.100.003.2458
UBCA.100.002.0093	UBCA.100.002.1458	UBCA.100.003.0803	UBCA.100.003.2459
UBCA.100.002.0095	UBCA.100.002.1459	UBCA.100.003.0804	UBCA.100.003.2464
UBCA.100.002.0097	UBCA.100.002.1460	UBCA.100.003.0806	UBCA.100.003.2469
UBCA.100.002.0099	UBCA.100.002.1462	UBCA.100.003.0811	UBCA.100.003.2473
UBCA.100.002.0101	UBCA.100.002.1468	UBCA.100.003.0812	UBCA.100.003.2474
UBCA.100.002.0104	UBCA.100.002.1469	UBCA.100.003.0813	UBCA.100.003.2476

UBCA.100.002.0107	UBCA.100.002.1470	UBCA.100.003.0814	UBCA.100.003.2479
UBCA.100.002.0108	UBCA.100.002.1474	UBCA.100.003.0815	UBCA.100.003.2481
UBCA.100.002.0111	UBCA.100.002.1475	UBCA.100.003.0817	UBCA.100.003.2482
UBCA.100.002.0115	UBCA.100.002.1477	UBCA.100.003.0820	UBCA.100.003.2486
UBCA.100.002.0116	UBCA.100.002.1484	UBCA.100.003.0828	UBCA.100.003.2488
UBCA.100.002.0120	UBCA.100.002.1485	UBCA.100.003.0829	UBCA.100.003.2490
UBCA.100.002.0121	UBCA.100.002.1489	UBCA.100.003.0833	UBCA.100.003.2491
UBCA.100.002.0122	UBCA.100.002.1490	UBCA.100.003.0834	UBCA.100.003.2496
UBCA.100.002.0128	UBCA.100.002.1492	UBCA.100.003.0837	UBCA.100.003.2497
UBCA.100.002.0129	UBCA.100.002.1497	UBCA.100.003.0839	UBCA.100.003.2499
UBCA.100.002.0130	UBCA.100.002.1498	UBCA.100.003.0840	UBCA.100.003.2501
UBCA.100.002.0131	UBCA.100.002.1499	UBCA.100.003.0841	UBCA.100.003.2503
UBCA.100.002.0132	UBCA.100.002.1501	UBCA.100.003.0842	UBCA.100.003.2504
UBCA.100.002.0134	UBCA.100.002.1502	UBCA.100.003.0843	UBCA.100.003.2505
UBCA.100.002.0135	UBCA.100.002.1503	UBCA.100.003.0845	UBCA.100.003.2509
UBCA.100.002.0136	UBCA.100.002.1506	UBCA.100.003.0847	UBCA.100.003.2514
UBCA.100.002.0137	UBCA.100.002.1511	UBCA.100.003.0848	UBCA.100.003.2517
UBCA.100.002.0138	UBCA.100.002.1516	UBCA.100.003.0852	UBCA.100.003.2518
UBCA.100.002.0145	UBCA.100.002.1517	UBCA.100.003.0853	UBCA.100.003.2522
UBCA.100.002.0146	UBCA.100.002.1518	UBCA.100.003.0855	UBCA.100.003.2525
UBCA.100.002.0148	UBCA.100.002.1520	UBCA.100.003.0857	UBCA.100.003.2529
UBCA.100.002.0149	UBCA.100.002.1523	UBCA.100.003.0863	UBCA.100.003.2533
UBCA.100.002.0150	UBCA.100.002.1525	UBCA.100.003.0867	UBCA.100.003.2534
UBCA.100.002.0152	UBCA.100.002.1528	UBCA.100.003.0869	UBCA.100.003.2536

UBCA.100.002.0154	UBCA.100.002.1530	UBCA.100.003.0871	UBCA.100.003.2543
UBCA.100.002.0155	UBCA.100.002.1532	UBCA.100.003.0872	UBCA.100.003.2544
UBCA.100.002.0157	UBCA.100.002.1533	UBCA.100.003.0874	UBCA.100.003.2545
UBCA.100.002.0158	UBCA.100.002.1534	UBCA.100.003.0876	UBCA.100.003.2547
UBCA.100.002.0159	UBCA.100.002.1535	UBCA.100.003.0877	UBCA.100.003.2548
UBCA.100.002.0162	UBCA.100.002.1539	UBCA.100.003.0888	UBCA.100.003.2550
UBCA.100.002.0169	UBCA.100.002.1540	UBCA.100.003.0892	UBCA.100.003.2551
UBCA.100.002.0177	UBCA.100.002.1546	UBCA.100.003.0893	UBCA.100.003.2552
UBCA.100.002.0179	UBCA.100.002.1551	UBCA.100.003.0896	UBCA.100.003.2553
UBCA.100.002.0180	UBCA.100.002.1552	UBCA.100.003.0898	UBCA.100.003.2556
UBCA.100.002.0183	UBCA.100.002.1553	UBCA.100.003.0899	UBCA.100.003.2558
UBCA.100.002.0185	UBCA.100.002.1561	UBCA.100.003.0901	UBCA.100.003.2559
UBCA.100.002.0187	UBCA.100.002.1563	UBCA.100.003.0905	UBCA.100.003.2562
UBCA.100.002.0188	UBCA.100.002.1564	UBCA.100.003.0914	UBCA.100.003.2564
UBCA.100.002.0189	UBCA.100.002.1565	UBCA.100.003.0916	UBCA.100.003.2568
UBCA.100.002.0199	UBCA.100.002.1566	UBCA.100.003.0918	UBCA.100.003.2572
UBCA.100.002.0204	UBCA.100.002.1569	UBCA.100.003.0920	UBCA.100.003.2573
UBCA.100.002.0210	UBCA.100.002.1572	UBCA.100.003.0921	UBCA.100.003.2576
UBCA.100.002.0211	UBCA.100.002.1574	UBCA.100.003.0922	UBCA.100.003.2589
UBCA.100.002.0213	UBCA.100.002.1576	UBCA.100.003.0924	UBCA.100.003.2591
UBCA.100.002.0217	UBCA.100.002.1578	UBCA.100.003.0925	UBCA.100.003.2592
UBCA.100.002.0218	UBCA.100.002.1582	UBCA.100.003.0926	UBCA.100.003.2594
UBCA.100.002.0223	UBCA.100.002.1583	UBCA.100.003.0927	UBCA.100.003.2595
UBCA.100.002.0227	UBCA.100.002.1585	UBCA.100.003.0932	UBCA.100.003.2601

UBCA.100.002.0230	UBCA.100.002.1586	UBCA.100.003.0933	UBCA.100.003.2602
UBCA.100.002.0231	UBCA.100.002.1593	UBCA.100.003.0934	UBCA.100.003.2603
UBCA.100.002.0232	UBCA.100.002.1595	UBCA.100.003.0935	UBCA.100.003.2607
UBCA.100.002.0237	UBCA.100.002.1596	UBCA.100.003.0941	UBCA.100.003.2609
UBCA.100.002.0238	UBCA.100.002.1597	UBCA.100.003.0944	UBCA.100.003.2611
UBCA.100.002.0239	UBCA.100.002.1598	UBCA.100.003.0945	UBCA.100.003.2612
UBCA.100.002.0240	UBCA.100.002.1602	UBCA.100.003.0950	UBCA.100.003.2613
UBCA.100.002.0243	UBCA.100.002.1604	UBCA.100.003.0954	UBCA.100.003.2614
UBCA.100.002.0246	UBCA.100.002.1605	UBCA.100.003.0955	UBCA.100.003.2617
UBCA.100.002.0249	UBCA.100.002.1608	UBCA.100.003.0971	UBCA.100.003.2620
UBCA.100.002.0250	UBCA.100.002.1620	UBCA.100.003.0972	UBCA.100.003.2627
UBCA.100.002.0252	UBCA.100.002.1622	UBCA.100.003.0975	UBCA.100.003.2629
UBCA.100.002.0255	UBCA.100.002.1627	UBCA.100.003.0982	UBCA.100.003.2630
UBCA.100.002.0257 <sup>131</sup>	UBCA.100.002.1628	UBCA.100.003.0987	UBCA.100.003.2632
UBCA.100.002.0264	UBCA.100.002.1631	UBCA.100.003.1001	UBCA.100.003.2636
UBCA.100.002.0266	UBCA.100.002.1632	UBCA.100.003.1002	UBCA.100.003.2637
UBCA.100.002.0268	UBCA.100.002.1637	UBCA.100.003.1008	UBCA.100.003.2638
UBCA.100.002.0269	UBCA.100.002.1640	UBCA.100.003.1010	UBCA.100.003.2641
UBCA.100.002.0270	UBCA.100.002.1641	UBCA.100.003.1012	UBCA.100.003.2642
UBCA.100.002.0271	UBCA.100.002.1646	UBCA.100.003.1016	UBCA.100.003.2656
UBCA.100.002.0273	UBCA.100.002.1650	UBCA.100.003.1020	UBCA.100.003.2657
UBCA.100.002.0276	UBCA.100.002.1654	UBCA.100.003.1024	UBCA.100.003.2665
UBCA.100.002.0278	UBCA.100.002.1655	UBCA.100.003.1025	UBCA.100.003.2666

---

<sup>131</sup> I note that I reviewed this application individually.



UBCA.100.002.0279	UBCA.100.002.1656	UBCA.100.003.1026	UBCA.100.003.2667
UBCA.100.002.0282	UBCA.100.002.1659	UBCA.100.003.1029	UBCA.100.003.2668
UBCA.100.002.0284	UBCA.100.002.1660	UBCA.100.003.1033	UBCA.100.003.2670
UBCA.100.002.0285	UBCA.100.002.1661	UBCA.100.003.1034	UBCA.100.003.2671
UBCA.100.002.0288	UBCA.100.002.1662	UBCA.100.003.1042	UBCA.100.003.2678
UBCA.100.002.0295	UBCA.100.002.1665	UBCA.100.003.1043	UBCA.100.003.2679
UBCA.100.002.0299	UBCA.100.002.1666	UBCA.100.003.1044	UBCA.100.003.2684
UBCA.100.002.0300	UBCA.100.002.1670	UBCA.100.003.1046	UBCA.100.004.0009
UBCA.100.002.0302	UBCA.100.002.1671	UBCA.100.003.1052	UBCA.100.004.0015
UBCA.100.002.0306	UBCA.100.002.1678	UBCA.100.003.1055	UBCA.100.004.0016
UBCA.100.002.0309	UBCA.100.002.1680	UBCA.100.003.1063	UBCA.100.004.0021
UBCA.100.002.0312	UBCA.100.002.1683	UBCA.100.003.1064	UBCA.100.004.0022
UBCA.100.002.0316	UBCA.100.002.1686	UBCA.100.003.1069	UBCA.100.004.0023
UBCA.100.002.0325	UBCA.100.002.1690	UBCA.100.003.1070	UBCA.100.004.0030
UBCA.100.002.0333	UBCA.100.002.1692	UBCA.100.003.1071	UBCA.100.004.0033
UBCA.100.002.0334	UBCA.100.002.1693	UBCA.100.003.1075	UBCA.100.004.0034
UBCA.100.002.0335	UBCA.100.002.1696	UBCA.100.003.1086	UBCA.100.004.0037
UBCA.100.002.0337	UBCA.100.002.1699	UBCA.100.003.1091	UBCA.100.004.0038
UBCA.100.002.0345	UBCA.100.002.1701	UBCA.100.003.1092	UBCA.100.004.0040
UBCA.100.002.0346	UBCA.100.002.1704	UBCA.100.003.1093	UBCA.100.004.0059
UBCA.100.002.0348	UBCA.100.002.1705	UBCA.100.003.1095	UBCA.100.004.0060
UBCA.100.002.0349	UBCA.100.002.1707	UBCA.100.003.1099	UBCA.100.004.0061
UBCA.100.002.0351	UBCA.100.002.1711	UBCA.100.003.1101	UBCA.100.004.0065
UBCA.100.002.0352	UBCA.100.002.1712	UBCA.100.003.1105	UBCA.100.004.0067

UBCA.100.002.0354	UBCA.100.002.1720	UBCA.100.003.1106	UBCA.100.004.0068
UBCA.100.002.0357	UBCA.100.002.1721	UBCA.100.003.1107	UBCA.100.004.0069
UBCA.100.002.0360	UBCA.100.002.1722	UBCA.100.003.1111	UBCA.100.004.0074
UBCA.100.002.0361	UBCA.100.002.1724	UBCA.100.003.1113	UBCA.100.004.0076
UBCA.100.002.0365	UBCA.100.002.1726	UBCA.100.003.1114	UBCA.100.004.0079
UBCA.100.002.0371	UBCA.100.002.1731	UBCA.100.003.1117	UBCA.100.004.0085
UBCA.100.002.0378	UBCA.100.002.1733	UBCA.100.003.1118	UBCA.100.004.0086
UBCA.100.002.0383	UBCA.100.002.1737	UBCA.100.003.1122	UBCA.100.004.0087
UBCA.100.002.0384	UBCA.100.002.1738	UBCA.100.003.1126	UBCA.100.004.0089
UBCA.100.002.0386	UBCA.100.002.1740	UBCA.100.003.1128	UBCA.100.004.0091
UBCA.100.002.0390	UBCA.100.002.1743	UBCA.100.003.1129	UBCA.100.004.0093
UBCA.100.002.0394	UBCA.100.002.1745	UBCA.100.003.1130	UBCA.100.004.0100
UBCA.100.002.0398	UBCA.100.002.1746	UBCA.100.003.1133	UBCA.100.004.0101
UBCA.100.002.0400	UBCA.100.002.1751	UBCA.100.003.1141	UBCA.100.004.0104
UBCA.100.002.0403	UBCA.100.002.1754	UBCA.100.003.1146	UBCA.100.004.0105
UBCA.100.002.0408	UBCA.100.002.1756	UBCA.100.003.1147	UBCA.100.004.0114
UBCA.100.002.0409	UBCA.100.002.1758	UBCA.100.003.1150	UBCA.100.004.0120
UBCA.100.002.0413	UBCA.100.002.1762	UBCA.100.003.1152	UBCA.100.004.0122
UBCA.100.002.0420	UBCA.100.002.1766	UBCA.100.003.1158	UBCA.100.004.0129
UBCA.100.002.0426	UBCA.100.002.1768	UBCA.100.003.1159	UBCA.100.004.0131
UBCA.100.002.0428	UBCA.100.002.1769	UBCA.100.003.1160	UBCA.100.004.0133
UBCA.100.002.0429	UBCA.100.002.1775	UBCA.100.003.1161	UBCA.100.004.0140
UBCA.100.002.0430	UBCA.100.002.1776	UBCA.100.003.1162	UBCA.100.004.0141
UBCA.100.002.0434	UBCA.100.002.1778	UBCA.100.003.1163	UBCA.100.004.0143

UBCA.100.002.0435	UBCA.100.002.1785	UBCA.100.003.1165	UBCA.100.004.0144
UBCA.100.002.0436	UBCA.100.002.1786	UBCA.100.003.1172	UBCA.100.004.0154
UBCA.100.002.0440	UBCA.100.002.1787	UBCA.100.003.1173	UBCA.100.004.0157
UBCA.100.002.0443	UBCA.100.002.1788	UBCA.100.003.1174	UBCA.100.004.0160
UBCA.100.002.0445	UBCA.100.002.1789	UBCA.100.003.1175	UBCA.100.004.0161
UBCA.100.002.0450	UBCA.100.002.1791	UBCA.100.003.1178	UBCA.100.004.0163
UBCA.100.002.0451	UBCA.100.002.1793	UBCA.100.003.1186	UBCA.100.004.0165
UBCA.100.002.0454	UBCA.100.002.1796	UBCA.100.003.1187	UBCA.100.004.0166
UBCA.100.002.0455	UBCA.100.002.1797	UBCA.100.003.1190	UBCA.100.004.0169
UBCA.100.002.0456	UBCA.100.002.1798	UBCA.100.003.1191	UBCA.100.004.0170
UBCA.100.002.0459	UBCA.100.002.1800	UBCA.100.003.1193	UBCA.100.004.0171
UBCA.100.002.0462	UBCA.100.002.1801	UBCA.100.003.1194	UBCA.100.004.0173
UBCA.100.002.0464	UBCA.100.002.1805	UBCA.100.003.1195	UBCA.100.004.0174
UBCA.100.002.0468	UBCA.100.002.1808	UBCA.100.003.1199	UBCA.100.004.0175
UBCA.100.002.0469	UBCA.100.002.1814	UBCA.100.003.1201	UBCA.100.004.0178
UBCA.100.002.0472	UBCA.100.002.1815	UBCA.100.003.1202	UBCA.100.004.0179
UBCA.100.002.0475	UBCA.100.002.1817	UBCA.100.003.1205	UBCA.100.004.0182
UBCA.100.002.0477	UBCA.100.002.1818	UBCA.100.003.1206	UBCA.100.004.0184
UBCA.100.002.0480	UBCA.100.002.1820	UBCA.100.003.1207	UBCA.100.004.0185
UBCA.100.002.0481	UBCA.100.002.1824	UBCA.100.003.1209	UBCA.100.004.0186
UBCA.100.002.0482	UBCA.100.002.1825	UBCA.100.003.1216	UBCA.100.004.0191
UBCA.100.002.0484	UBCA.100.002.1827	UBCA.100.003.1218	UBCA.100.004.0195
UBCA.100.002.0485	UBCA.100.002.1828	UBCA.100.003.1219	UBCA.100.004.0196
UBCA.100.002.0487	UBCA.100.002.1829	UBCA.100.003.1225	UBCA.100.004.0197

UBCA.100.002.0488	UBCA.100.002.1833	UBCA.100.003.1226	UBCA.100.004.0198
UBCA.100.002.0492	UBCA.100.002.1840	UBCA.100.003.1228	UBCA.100.004.0200
UBCA.100.002.0505	UBCA.100.002.1844	UBCA.100.003.1233	UBCA.100.004.0209
UBCA.100.002.0508	UBCA.100.002.1845	UBCA.100.003.1234	UBCA.100.004.0211
UBCA.100.002.0513	UBCA.100.002.1848	UBCA.100.003.1242	UBCA.100.004.0216
UBCA.100.002.0514	UBCA.100.002.1849	UBCA.100.003.1249	UBCA.100.004.0221
UBCA.100.002.0515	UBCA.100.002.1850	UBCA.100.003.1252	UBCA.100.004.0226
UBCA.100.002.0518	UBCA.100.002.1851	UBCA.100.003.1254	UBCA.100.004.0228
UBCA.100.002.0519	UBCA.100.002.1855	UBCA.100.003.1264	UBCA.100.004.0231
UBCA.100.002.0527	UBCA.100.002.1860	UBCA.100.003.1271	UBCA.100.004.0235
UBCA.100.002.0529	UBCA.100.002.1862	UBCA.100.003.1278	UBCA.100.004.0238
UBCA.100.002.0537	UBCA.100.002.1865	UBCA.100.003.1284	UBCA.100.004.0246
UBCA.100.002.0539	UBCA.100.002.1867	UBCA.100.003.1286	UBCA.100.004.0248
UBCA.100.002.0540	UBCA.100.002.1873	UBCA.100.003.1287	UBCA.100.004.0249
UBCA.100.002.0541	UBCA.100.002.1877	UBCA.100.003.1289	UBCA.100.004.0251
UBCA.100.002.0542	UBCA.100.002.1879	UBCA.100.003.1295	UBCA.100.004.0252
UBCA.100.002.0545	UBCA.100.002.1880	UBCA.100.003.1296	UBCA.100.004.0253
UBCA.100.002.0549	UBCA.100.002.1882	UBCA.100.003.1297	UBCA.100.004.0260
UBCA.100.002.0552	UBCA.100.002.1883	UBCA.100.003.1302	UBCA.100.004.0262
UBCA.100.002.0553	UBCA.100.002.1888	UBCA.100.003.1303	UBCA.100.004.0263
UBCA.100.002.0554	UBCA.100.002.1890	UBCA.100.003.1310	UBCA.100.004.0264
UBCA.100.002.0556	UBCA.100.002.1892	UBCA.100.003.1313	UBCA.100.004.0268
UBCA.100.002.0557	UBCA.100.002.1894	UBCA.100.003.1317	UBCA.100.004.0275
UBCA.100.002.0558	UBCA.100.002.1895	UBCA.100.003.1326	UBCA.100.004.0276

UBCA.100.002.0562	UBCA.100.002.1896	UBCA.100.003.1330	UBCA.100.004.0281
UBCA.100.002.0564	UBCA.100.002.1897	UBCA.100.003.1331	UBCA.100.005.0001
UBCA.100.002.0565	UBCA.100.002.1899	UBCA.100.003.1336	UBCA.100.005.0002
UBCA.100.002.0566	UBCA.100.002.1903	UBCA.100.003.1337	UBCA.100.005.0005
UBCA.100.002.0567	UBCA.100.002.1907	UBCA.100.003.1340	UBCA.100.005.0006
UBCA.100.002.0573	UBCA.100.002.1910	UBCA.100.003.1342	UBCA.100.005.0007
UBCA.100.002.0575	UBCA.100.002.1914	UBCA.100.003.1343	UBCA.100.005.0010
UBCA.100.002.0576	UBCA.100.002.1915	UBCA.100.003.1347	UBCA.100.005.0011
UBCA.100.002.0577	UBCA.100.002.1916	UBCA.100.003.1348	UBCA.100.005.0013
UBCA.100.002.0582	UBCA.100.002.1917	UBCA.100.003.1353	UBCA.100.005.0015
UBCA.100.002.0586	UBCA.100.002.1920	UBCA.100.003.1356	UBCA.100.005.0019
UBCA.100.002.0588	UBCA.100.002.1925	UBCA.100.003.1360	UBCA.100.005.0020
UBCA.100.002.0591	UBCA.100.002.1927	UBCA.100.003.1363	UBCA.100.005.0021
UBCA.100.002.0592	UBCA.100.002.1928	UBCA.100.003.1364	UBCA.100.005.0036
UBCA.100.002.0593	UBCA.100.002.1929	UBCA.100.003.1366	UBCA.100.005.0037
UBCA.100.002.0594	UBCA.100.002.1930	UBCA.100.003.1367	UBCA.100.005.0040
UBCA.100.002.0595	UBCA.100.002.1931	UBCA.100.003.1369	UBCA.100.005.0041
UBCA.100.002.0596	UBCA.100.002.1934	UBCA.100.003.1370	UBCA.100.005.0042
UBCA.100.002.0597	UBCA.100.002.1937	UBCA.100.003.1371	UBCA.100.005.0044
UBCA.100.002.0599	UBCA.100.002.1938	UBCA.100.003.1378	UBCA.100.005.0046
UBCA.100.002.0600	UBCA.100.002.1939	UBCA.100.003.1381	UBCA.100.005.0048
UBCA.100.002.0601	UBCA.100.002.1943	UBCA.100.003.1388	UBCA.100.005.0050
UBCA.100.002.0602	UBCA.100.002.1944	UBCA.100.003.1399	UBCA.100.006.0001
UBCA.100.002.0607	UBCA.100.002.1948	UBCA.100.003.1401	UBCA.100.006.0004

UBCA.100.002.0610	UBCA.100.002.1949	UBCA.100.003.1409	UBCA.100.006.0005
UBCA.100.002.0612	UBCA.100.002.1956	UBCA.100.003.1410	UBCA.100.006.0008
UBCA.100.002.0615	UBCA.100.002.1958	UBCA.100.003.1414	UBCA.100.006.0016
UBCA.100.002.0616	UBCA.100.002.1962	UBCA.100.003.1421	UBCA.100.006.0046
UBCA.100.002.0617	UBCA.100.002.1968	UBCA.100.003.1432	UBCA.100.006.0054
UBCA.100.002.0618	UBCA.100.002.1970	UBCA.100.003.1438	UBCA.100.006.0055
UBCA.100.002.0622	UBCA.100.002.1975	UBCA.100.003.1444	UBCA.100.006.0063
UBCA.100.002.0623	UBCA.100.002.1978	UBCA.100.003.1447	UBCA.100.006.0078
UBCA.100.002.0625	UBCA.100.002.1979	UBCA.100.003.1448	UBCA.100.006.0083
UBCA.100.002.0626	UBCA.100.002.1982	UBCA.100.003.1457	UBCA.100.006.0084
UBCA.100.002.0630	UBCA.100.002.1984	UBCA.100.003.1459	UBCA.100.006.0092
UBCA.100.002.0631	UBCA.100.002.1987	UBCA.100.003.1460	UBCA.100.006.0093
UBCA.100.002.0632	UBCA.100.002.1988	UBCA.100.003.1464	UBCA.100.006.0097
UBCA.100.002.0633	UBCA.100.002.1989	UBCA.100.003.1467	UBCA.100.006.0100
UBCA.100.002.0634	UBCA.100.002.1990	UBCA.100.003.1468	UBCA.100.006.0101
UBCA.100.002.0635	UBCA.100.002.1993	UBCA.100.003.1469	UBCA.100.006.0102
UBCA.100.002.0641	UBCA.100.002.1998	UBCA.100.003.1471	UBCA.100.006.0103
UBCA.100.002.0645	UBCA.100.002.2002	UBCA.100.003.1472	UBCA.100.006.0116
UBCA.100.002.0647	UBCA.100.002.2003	UBCA.100.003.1476	UBCA.100.006.0120
UBCA.100.002.0648	UBCA.100.002.2004	UBCA.100.003.1477	UBCA.100.006.0123
UBCA.100.002.0649	UBCA.100.002.2005	UBCA.100.003.1478	UBCA.100.006.0133
UBCA.100.002.0652	UBCA.100.002.2009	UBCA.100.003.1484	UBCA.100.006.0142
UBCA.100.002.0653	UBCA.100.002.2011	UBCA.100.003.1485	UBCA.100.006.0153
UBCA.100.002.0656	UBCA.100.002.2015	UBCA.100.003.1490	UBCA.100.006.0158

UBCA.100.002.0657	UBCA.100.002.2018	UBCA.100.003.1491	UBCA.100.006.0162
UBCA.100.002.0663	UBCA.100.002.2019	UBCA.100.003.1494	UBCA.100.006.0163
UBCA.100.002.0665	UBCA.100.002.2020	UBCA.100.003.1498	UBCA.100.006.0164
UBCA.100.002.0667	UBCA.100.002.2023	UBCA.100.003.1502	UBCA.100.006.0165
UBCA.100.002.0668	UBCA.100.002.2027	UBCA.100.003.1503	UBCA.100.006.0168
UBCA.100.002.0669	UBCA.100.002.2029	UBCA.100.003.1504	UBCA.100.007.0003
UBCA.100.002.0671	UBCA.100.002.2035	UBCA.100.003.1508	UBCA.100.007.0004
UBCA.100.002.0672	UBCA.100.002.2038	UBCA.100.003.1512	UBCA.100.007.0006
UBCA.100.002.0674	UBCA.100.002.2040	UBCA.100.003.1513	UBCA.100.008.0010
UBCA.100.002.0675	UBCA.100.003.0001	UBCA.100.003.1515	
UBCA.100.002.0676	UBCA.100.003.0003	UBCA.100.003.1518	
UBCA.100.002.0677	UBCA.100.003.0005	UBCA.100.003.1519	

## A N N E X U R E E

### Applications which have been categorised as a combination of Categories 6 and 9

UBCA.001.001.0091	UBCA.100.002.0106	UBCA.100.002.0706	UBCA.100.003.0904
UBCA.001.001.0107	UBCA.100.002.0109	UBCA.100.002.0754	UBCA.100.003.1047
UBCA.001.001.0133	UBCA.100.002.0117	UBCA.100.002.0764	UBCA.100.003.1168
UBCA.001.001.0136	UBCA.100.002.0221	UBCA.100.002.0840	UBCA.100.003.1183
UBCA.001.001.0151	UBCA.100.002.0226	UBCA.100.002.0846	UBCA.100.003.1204
UBCA.001.001.0183	UBCA.100.002.0234	UBCA.100.002.0885	UBCA.100.003.1288
UBCA.001.001.0188	UBCA.100.002.0251	UBCA.100.002.0945	UBCA.100.003.1358
UBCA.001.001.0221	UBCA.100.002.0315	UBCA.100.002.1013	UBCA.100.003.1690
UBCA.001.002.0014	UBCA.100.002.0319	UBCA.100.002.1037	UBCA.100.003.1696
UBCA.001.002.0022	UBCA.100.002.0375	UBCA.100.002.1060	UBCA.100.003.1778
UBCA.001.002.0031	UBCA.100.002.0389	UBCA.100.002.1096	UBCA.100.003.1840
UBCA.001.002.0035	UBCA.100.002.0418	UBCA.100.002.1139	UBCA.100.003.2155
UBCA.001.002.0087	UBCA.100.002.0427	UBCA.100.002.1226 <sup>132</sup>	UBCA.100.003.2175
UBCA.001.002.0183	UBCA.100.002.0495	UBCA.100.002.1261	UBCA.100.003.2286
UBCA.001.002.0185	UBCA.100.002.0497	UBCA.100.002.1299	UBCA.100.003.2374
UBCA.100.001.0155	UBCA.100.002.0500	UBCA.100.002.1507	UBCA.100.003.2515
UBCA.100.001.0273	UBCA.100.002.0511	UBCA.100.002.1698	UBCA.100.004.0006
UBCA.100.001.0319	UBCA.100.002.0517	UBCA.100.002.1719	UBCA.100.004.0007
UBCA.100.001.0332	UBCA.100.002.0525	UBCA.100.002.1874	UBCA.100.004.0164
UBCA.100.001.0343	UBCA.100.002.0563	UBCA.100.002.1932	UBCA.100.004.0259
UBCA.100.001.0361	UBCA.100.002.0580	UBCA.100.002.1936	UBCA.100.005.0030

---

<sup>132</sup> I note that I reviewed this application individually.



UBCA.100.001.0384	UBCA.100.002.0603	UBCA.100.002.1942	UBCA.100.006.0073
UBCA.100.001.0414	UBCA.100.002.0624	UBCA.100.002.2037	
UBCA.100.002.0047	UBCA.100.002.0690	UBCA.100.003.0310	

**ANNEXURE F**

**Applications which amount to a bare assertion that the Unregistered Group Members were not aware of the proceeding (Category 4 only)**

UBCA.001.002.0225	UBCA.100.002.0032	UBCA.100.002.0750	UBCA.100.002.1831
UBCA.001.003.0023	UBCA.100.002.0034	UBCA.100.002.0769	UBCA.100.003.0020
UBCA.001.003.0029	UBCA.100.002.0040	UBCA.100.002.0790	UBCA.100.003.0050
UBCA.001.003.0039	UBCA.100.002.0059	UBCA.100.002.0815	UBCA.100.003.0054
UBCA.001.005.0003	UBCA.100.002.0060	UBCA.100.002.0853	UBCA.100.003.0138
UBCA.100.001.0044	UBCA.100.002.0127	UBCA.100.002.0876	UBCA.100.003.0203
UBCA.100.001.0063	UBCA.100.002.0133	UBCA.100.002.0911	UBCA.100.003.0305
UBCA.100.001.0081	UBCA.100.002.0172	UBCA.100.002.0928	UBCA.100.003.0438
UBCA.100.001.0084	UBCA.100.002.0184	UBCA.100.002.1027	UBCA.100.003.0543
UBCA.100.001.0097	UBCA.100.002.0202	UBCA.100.002.1058	UBCA.100.003.0769
UBCA.100.001.0100	UBCA.100.002.0248	UBCA.100.002.1079	UBCA.100.003.1493
UBCA.100.001.0176	UBCA.100.002.0301	UBCA.100.002.1125	UBCA.100.003.1496
UBCA.100.001.0195	UBCA.100.002.0307	UBCA.100.002.1144	UBCA.100.003.1585
UBCA.100.001.0203	UBCA.100.002.0359	UBCA.100.002.1397	UBCA.100.003.1736
UBCA.100.001.0218	UBCA.100.002.0446	UBCA.100.002.1401	UBCA.100.003.1774
UBCA.100.001.0261	UBCA.100.002.0465	UBCA.100.002.1418	UBCA.100.003.1806
UBCA.100.001.0280	UBCA.100.002.0496	UBCA.100.002.1444	UBCA.100.003.2043
UBCA.100.001.0302	UBCA.100.002.0560	UBCA.100.002.1455	UBCA.100.003.2066
UBCA.100.001.0310	UBCA.100.002.0570	UBCA.100.002.1480	UBCA.100.003.2105
UBCA.100.001.0333	UBCA.100.002.0629	UBCA.100.002.1531	UBCA.100.003.2538
UBCA.100.001.0391	UBCA.100.002.0637	UBCA.100.002.1545	UBCA.100.004.0010

UBCA.100.001.0485	UBCA.100.002.0655	UBCA.100.002.1562	UBCA.100.004.0279
UBCA.100.002.0005	UBCA.100.002.0664	UBCA.100.002.1763	UBCA.100.006.0068 <sup>133</sup>
UBCA.100.002.0017	UBCA.100.002.0699	UBCA.100.002.1822	

---

<sup>133</sup> I note that I reviewed this application individually.

**ANNEXURE G**

**Applications by Unregistered Group Members which were not supported by individual evidence**

UBCA.200.003.0001	UBCA.200.003.0012	UBCA.200.003.0023	UBCA.200.003.0034
UBCA.200.003.0002	UBCA.200.003.0013	UBCA.200.003.0024	UBCA.200.003.0035
UBCA.200.003.0003	UBCA.200.003.0014	UBCA.200.003.0025	UBCA.200.003.0036
UBCA.200.003.0004	UBCA.200.003.0015	UBCA.200.003.0026	UBCA.200.003.0037
UBCA.200.003.0005	UBCA.200.003.0016	UBCA.200.003.0027	UBCA.200.003.0038
UBCA.200.003.0006	UBCA.200.003.0017	UBCA.200.003.0028	UBCA.200.003.0039
UBCA.200.003.0007	UBCA.200.003.0018	UBCA.200.003.0029	UBCA.200.003.0040
UBCA.200.003.0008	UBCA.200.003.0019	UBCA.200.003.0030	UBCA.200.003.0041
UBCA.200.003.0009	UBCA.200.003.0020	UBCA.200.003.0031	UBCA.200.003.0042
UBCA.200.003.0010	UBCA.200.003.0021	UBCA.200.003.0032	UBCA.200.003.0043
UBCA.200.003.0011	UBCA.200.003.0022	UBCA.200.003.0033	UBCA.200.003.0044

**ANNEXURE H**

**Applications which have been categorised as falling into a combination of Categories 4, 6 and 9 which  
I have not individually reviewed**

UBCA.100.002.0886	UBCA.100.003.0048	UBCA.100.003.1056	UBCA.100.003.2040
UBCA.100.002.0893	UBCA.100.003.0057	UBCA.100.003.1057	UBCA.100.003.2041
UBCA.100.002.0894	UBCA.100.003.0061	UBCA.100.003.1060	UBCA.100.003.2044
UBCA.100.002.0896	UBCA.100.003.0068	UBCA.100.003.1061	UBCA.100.003.2046
UBCA.100.002.0899	UBCA.100.003.0071	UBCA.100.003.1062	UBCA.100.003.2047
UBCA.100.002.0904	UBCA.100.003.0072	UBCA.100.003.1065	UBCA.100.003.2050
UBCA.100.002.0905	UBCA.100.003.0075	UBCA.100.003.1066	UBCA.100.003.2053
UBCA.100.002.0907	UBCA.100.003.0086	UBCA.100.003.1072	UBCA.100.003.2055
UBCA.100.002.0912	UBCA.100.003.0087	UBCA.100.003.1074	UBCA.100.003.2057
UBCA.100.002.0915	UBCA.100.003.0089	UBCA.100.003.1076	UBCA.100.003.2058
UBCA.100.002.0916	UBCA.100.003.0090	UBCA.100.003.1078	UBCA.100.003.2059
UBCA.100.002.0918	UBCA.100.003.0091	UBCA.100.003.1081	UBCA.100.003.2064
UBCA.100.002.0920	UBCA.100.003.0092	UBCA.100.003.1082	UBCA.100.003.2065
UBCA.100.002.0921	UBCA.100.003.0093	UBCA.100.003.1084	UBCA.100.003.2067
UBCA.100.002.0922	UBCA.100.003.0094	UBCA.100.003.1085	UBCA.100.003.2068
UBCA.100.002.0924	UBCA.100.003.0096	UBCA.100.003.1087	UBCA.100.003.2069
UBCA.100.002.0929	UBCA.100.003.0099	UBCA.100.003.1088	UBCA.100.003.2071
UBCA.100.002.0934	UBCA.100.003.0100	UBCA.100.003.1094	UBCA.100.003.2075
UBCA.100.002.0935	UBCA.100.003.0101	UBCA.100.003.1096	UBCA.100.003.2077
UBCA.100.002.0938	UBCA.100.003.0102	UBCA.100.003.1098	UBCA.100.003.2078
UBCA.100.002.0941	UBCA.100.003.0103	UBCA.100.003.1100	UBCA.100.003.2079

UBCA.100.002.0946	UBCA.100.003.0104	UBCA.100.003.1102	UBCA.100.003.2081
UBCA.100.002.0948	UBCA.100.003.0105	UBCA.100.003.1104	UBCA.100.003.2083
UBCA.100.002.0949	UBCA.100.003.0107	UBCA.100.003.1109	UBCA.100.003.2084
UBCA.100.002.0953	UBCA.100.003.0111	UBCA.100.003.1110	UBCA.100.003.2086
UBCA.100.002.0954	UBCA.100.003.0115	UBCA.100.003.1112	UBCA.100.003.2087
UBCA.100.002.0956	UBCA.100.003.0117	UBCA.100.003.1115	UBCA.100.003.2090
UBCA.100.002.0957	UBCA.100.003.0119	UBCA.100.003.1116	UBCA.100.003.2092
UBCA.100.002.0969	UBCA.100.003.0120	UBCA.100.003.1119	UBCA.100.003.2095
UBCA.100.002.0970	UBCA.100.003.0121	UBCA.100.003.1120	UBCA.100.003.2096
UBCA.100.002.0975	UBCA.100.003.0127	UBCA.100.003.1121	UBCA.100.003.2098
UBCA.100.002.0979	UBCA.100.003.0130	UBCA.100.003.1125	UBCA.100.003.2099
UBCA.100.002.0981	UBCA.100.003.0131	UBCA.100.003.1127	UBCA.100.003.2101
UBCA.100.002.0983	UBCA.100.003.0135	UBCA.100.003.1131	UBCA.100.003.2104
UBCA.100.002.0986	UBCA.100.003.0136	UBCA.100.003.1132	UBCA.100.003.2106
UBCA.100.002.0988	UBCA.100.003.0137	UBCA.100.003.1136	UBCA.100.003.2107
UBCA.100.002.0996	UBCA.100.003.0141	UBCA.100.003.1137	UBCA.100.003.2109
UBCA.100.002.0997	UBCA.100.003.0142	UBCA.100.003.1138	UBCA.100.003.2111
UBCA.100.002.1001	UBCA.100.003.0146	UBCA.100.003.1140	UBCA.100.003.2116
UBCA.100.002.1002	UBCA.100.003.0148	UBCA.100.003.1142	UBCA.100.003.2120
UBCA.100.002.1005	UBCA.100.003.0150	UBCA.100.003.1143	UBCA.100.003.2122
UBCA.100.002.1006	UBCA.100.003.0153	UBCA.100.003.1144	UBCA.100.003.2123
UBCA.100.002.1007	UBCA.100.003.0156	UBCA.100.003.1149	UBCA.100.003.2124
UBCA.100.002.1008	UBCA.100.003.0157	UBCA.100.003.1151	UBCA.100.003.2125
UBCA.100.002.1009	UBCA.100.003.0158	UBCA.100.003.1153	UBCA.100.003.2126

UBCA.100.002.1010	UBCA.100.003.0165	UBCA.100.003.1155	UBCA.100.003.2130
UBCA.100.002.1019	UBCA.100.003.0168	UBCA.100.003.1156	UBCA.100.003.2133
UBCA.100.002.1020	UBCA.100.003.0170	UBCA.100.003.1167	UBCA.100.003.2134
UBCA.100.002.1030	UBCA.100.003.0171	UBCA.100.003.1171	UBCA.100.003.2135
UBCA.100.002.1034	UBCA.100.003.0173	UBCA.100.003.1177	UBCA.100.003.2138
UBCA.100.002.1039	UBCA.100.003.0174	UBCA.100.003.1181	UBCA.100.003.2141
UBCA.100.002.1044	UBCA.100.003.0175	UBCA.100.003.1182	UBCA.100.003.2142
UBCA.100.002.1045	UBCA.100.003.0177	UBCA.100.003.1188	UBCA.100.003.2147
UBCA.100.002.1046	UBCA.100.003.0179	UBCA.100.003.1192	UBCA.100.003.2153
UBCA.100.002.1048	UBCA.100.003.0183	UBCA.100.003.1196	UBCA.100.003.2154
UBCA.100.002.1050	UBCA.100.003.0186	UBCA.100.003.1200	UBCA.100.003.2156
UBCA.100.002.1056	UBCA.100.003.0187	UBCA.100.003.1203	UBCA.100.003.2159
UBCA.100.002.1059	UBCA.100.003.0190	UBCA.100.003.1210	UBCA.100.003.2160
UBCA.100.002.1062	UBCA.100.003.0193	UBCA.100.003.1211	UBCA.100.003.2161
UBCA.100.002.1063	UBCA.100.003.0196	UBCA.100.003.1212	UBCA.100.003.2162
UBCA.100.002.1066	UBCA.100.003.0197	UBCA.100.003.1214	UBCA.100.003.2163
UBCA.100.002.1068	UBCA.100.003.0200	UBCA.100.003.1215	UBCA.100.003.2166
UBCA.100.002.1069	UBCA.100.003.0201	UBCA.100.003.1220	UBCA.100.003.2167
UBCA.100.002.1070	UBCA.100.003.0202	UBCA.100.003.1223	UBCA.100.003.2168
UBCA.100.002.1072	UBCA.100.003.0204	UBCA.100.003.1224	UBCA.100.003.2169
UBCA.100.002.1073	UBCA.100.003.0205	UBCA.100.003.1227	UBCA.100.003.2171
UBCA.100.002.1077	UBCA.100.003.0206	UBCA.100.003.1229	UBCA.100.003.2172
UBCA.100.002.1080	UBCA.100.003.0208	UBCA.100.003.1231	UBCA.100.003.2173
UBCA.100.002.1081	UBCA.100.003.0215	UBCA.100.003.1232	UBCA.100.003.2177

UBCA.100.002.1084	UBCA.100.003.0216	UBCA.100.003.1236	UBCA.100.003.2179
UBCA.100.002.1089	UBCA.100.003.0217	UBCA.100.003.1238	UBCA.100.003.2180
UBCA.100.002.1091	UBCA.100.003.0218	UBCA.100.003.1239	UBCA.100.003.2181
UBCA.100.002.1094	UBCA.100.003.0221	UBCA.100.003.1240	UBCA.100.003.2182
UBCA.100.002.1095	UBCA.100.003.0222	UBCA.100.003.1243	UBCA.100.003.2183
UBCA.100.002.1099	UBCA.100.003.0223	UBCA.100.003.1245	UBCA.100.003.2184
UBCA.100.002.1102	UBCA.100.003.0224	UBCA.100.003.1246	UBCA.100.003.2185
UBCA.100.002.1103	UBCA.100.003.0225	UBCA.100.003.1250	UBCA.100.003.2186
UBCA.100.002.1104	UBCA.100.003.0226	UBCA.100.003.1251	UBCA.100.003.2188
UBCA.100.002.1105	UBCA.100.003.0228	UBCA.100.003.1253	UBCA.100.003.2189
UBCA.100.002.1106	UBCA.100.003.0231	UBCA.100.003.1255	UBCA.100.003.2190
UBCA.100.002.1107	UBCA.100.003.0232	UBCA.100.003.1257	UBCA.100.003.2191
UBCA.100.002.1108	UBCA.100.003.0235	UBCA.100.003.1258	UBCA.100.003.2192
UBCA.100.002.1112	UBCA.100.003.0236	UBCA.100.003.1259	UBCA.100.003.2194
UBCA.100.002.1114	UBCA.100.003.0239	UBCA.100.003.1260	UBCA.100.003.2195
UBCA.100.002.1115	UBCA.100.003.0240	UBCA.100.003.1262	UBCA.100.003.2196
UBCA.100.002.1116	UBCA.100.003.0241	UBCA.100.003.1263	UBCA.100.003.2197
UBCA.100.002.1119	UBCA.100.003.0242	UBCA.100.003.1265	UBCA.100.003.2201
UBCA.100.002.1121	UBCA.100.003.0243	UBCA.100.003.1266	UBCA.100.003.2202
UBCA.100.002.1123	UBCA.100.003.0244	UBCA.100.003.1267	UBCA.100.003.2204
UBCA.100.002.1127	UBCA.100.003.0245	UBCA.100.003.1268	UBCA.100.003.2205
UBCA.100.002.1135	UBCA.100.003.0247	UBCA.100.003.1270	UBCA.100.003.2207
UBCA.100.002.1140	UBCA.100.003.0253	UBCA.100.003.1273	UBCA.100.003.2208
UBCA.100.002.1141	UBCA.100.003.0257	UBCA.100.003.1274	UBCA.100.003.2210



UBCA.100.002.1143	UBCA.100.003.0258	UBCA.100.003.1275	UBCA.100.003.2211
UBCA.100.002.1145	UBCA.100.003.0260	UBCA.100.003.1276	UBCA.100.003.2212
UBCA.100.002.1149	UBCA.100.003.0262	UBCA.100.003.1277	UBCA.100.003.2213
UBCA.100.002.1150	UBCA.100.003.0265	UBCA.100.003.1279	UBCA.100.003.2214
UBCA.100.002.1157	UBCA.100.003.0268	UBCA.100.003.1280	UBCA.100.003.2215
UBCA.100.002.1159	UBCA.100.003.0269	UBCA.100.003.1281	UBCA.100.003.2216
UBCA.100.002.1161	UBCA.100.003.0270	UBCA.100.003.1282	UBCA.100.003.2217
UBCA.100.002.1162	UBCA.100.003.0272	UBCA.100.003.1285	UBCA.100.003.2220
UBCA.100.002.1164	UBCA.100.003.0273	UBCA.100.003.1290	UBCA.100.003.2221
UBCA.100.002.1169	UBCA.100.003.0275	UBCA.100.003.1292	UBCA.100.003.2222
UBCA.100.002.1170	UBCA.100.003.0276	UBCA.100.003.1293	UBCA.100.003.2224
UBCA.100.002.1171	UBCA.100.003.0277	UBCA.100.003.1294	UBCA.100.003.2228
UBCA.100.002.1172	UBCA.100.003.0280	UBCA.100.003.1298	UBCA.100.003.2229
UBCA.100.002.1177	UBCA.100.003.0281	UBCA.100.003.1299	UBCA.100.003.2232
UBCA.100.002.1179	UBCA.100.003.0282	UBCA.100.003.1301	UBCA.100.003.2233
UBCA.100.002.1181	UBCA.100.003.0283	UBCA.100.003.1305	UBCA.100.003.2236
UBCA.100.002.1185	UBCA.100.003.0287	UBCA.100.003.1306	UBCA.100.003.2238
UBCA.100.002.1186	UBCA.100.003.0288	UBCA.100.003.1308	UBCA.100.003.2241
UBCA.100.002.1187	UBCA.100.003.0289	UBCA.100.003.1309	UBCA.100.003.2242
UBCA.100.002.1188	UBCA.100.003.0290	UBCA.100.003.1311	UBCA.100.003.2244
UBCA.100.002.1189	UBCA.100.003.0291	UBCA.100.003.1314	UBCA.100.003.2246
UBCA.100.002.1190	UBCA.100.003.0293	UBCA.100.003.1315	UBCA.100.003.2247
UBCA.100.002.1191	UBCA.100.003.0296	UBCA.100.003.1316	UBCA.100.003.2251
UBCA.100.002.1194	UBCA.100.003.0300	UBCA.100.003.1318	UBCA.100.003.2257

UBCA.100.002.1195	UBCA.100.003.0301	UBCA.100.003.1319	UBCA.100.003.2259
UBCA.100.002.1198	UBCA.100.003.0318	UBCA.100.003.1320	UBCA.100.003.2261
UBCA.100.002.1202	UBCA.100.003.0322	UBCA.100.003.1322	UBCA.100.003.2265
UBCA.100.002.1207	UBCA.100.003.0328	UBCA.100.003.1323	UBCA.100.003.2266
UBCA.100.002.1208	UBCA.100.003.0330	UBCA.100.003.1324	UBCA.100.003.2267
UBCA.100.002.1209	UBCA.100.003.0331	UBCA.100.003.1325	UBCA.100.003.2272
UBCA.100.002.1211	UBCA.100.003.0333	UBCA.100.003.1327	UBCA.100.003.2273
UBCA.100.002.1213	UBCA.100.003.0334	UBCA.100.003.1332	UBCA.100.003.2276
UBCA.100.002.1214	UBCA.100.003.0335	UBCA.100.003.1333	UBCA.100.003.2277
UBCA.100.002.1216	UBCA.100.003.0338	UBCA.100.003.1334	UBCA.100.003.2278
UBCA.100.002.1217	UBCA.100.003.0339	UBCA.100.003.1335	UBCA.100.003.2279
UBCA.100.002.1218	UBCA.100.003.0341	UBCA.100.003.1338	UBCA.100.003.2291
UBCA.100.002.1221	UBCA.100.003.0345	UBCA.100.003.1339	UBCA.100.003.2293
UBCA.100.002.1224	UBCA.100.003.0346	UBCA.100.003.1341	UBCA.100.003.2294
UBCA.100.002.1228	UBCA.100.003.0347	UBCA.100.003.1344	UBCA.100.003.2295
UBCA.100.002.1229	UBCA.100.003.0351	UBCA.100.003.1346	UBCA.100.003.2298
UBCA.100.002.1230	UBCA.100.003.0353	UBCA.100.003.1351	UBCA.100.003.2299
UBCA.100.002.1231	UBCA.100.003.0355	UBCA.100.003.1352	UBCA.100.003.2301
UBCA.100.002.1233	UBCA.100.003.0356	UBCA.100.003.1354	UBCA.100.003.2306
UBCA.100.002.1237	UBCA.100.003.0357	UBCA.100.003.1355	UBCA.100.003.2312
UBCA.100.002.1239	UBCA.100.003.0358	UBCA.100.003.1357	UBCA.100.003.2315
UBCA.100.002.1240	UBCA.100.003.0360	UBCA.100.003.1359	UBCA.100.003.2317
UBCA.100.002.1245	UBCA.100.003.0361	UBCA.100.003.1362	UBCA.100.003.2319
UBCA.100.002.1246	UBCA.100.003.0365	UBCA.100.003.1365	UBCA.100.003.2320

UBCA.100.002.1250	UBCA.100.003.0366	UBCA.100.003.1368	UBCA.100.003.2321
UBCA.100.002.1251	UBCA.100.003.0370	UBCA.100.003.1372	UBCA.100.003.2322
UBCA.100.002.1258	UBCA.100.003.0371	UBCA.100.003.1373	UBCA.100.003.2325
UBCA.100.002.1259	UBCA.100.003.0373	UBCA.100.003.1374	UBCA.100.003.2327
UBCA.100.002.1263	UBCA.100.003.0374	UBCA.100.003.1376	UBCA.100.003.2330
UBCA.100.002.1264	UBCA.100.003.0375	UBCA.100.003.1377	UBCA.100.003.2332
UBCA.100.002.1265	UBCA.100.003.0376	UBCA.100.003.1379	UBCA.100.003.2333
UBCA.100.002.1268	UBCA.100.003.0378	UBCA.100.003.1380	UBCA.100.003.2335
UBCA.100.002.1269	UBCA.100.003.0381	UBCA.100.003.1383	UBCA.100.003.2336
UBCA.100.002.1270	UBCA.100.003.0383	UBCA.100.003.1384	UBCA.100.003.2338
UBCA.100.002.1272	UBCA.100.003.0387	UBCA.100.003.1385	UBCA.100.003.2339
UBCA.100.002.1273	UBCA.100.003.0390	UBCA.100.003.1386	UBCA.100.003.2340
UBCA.100.002.1277	UBCA.100.003.0391	UBCA.100.003.1387	UBCA.100.003.2341
UBCA.100.002.1288	UBCA.100.003.0394	UBCA.100.003.1389	UBCA.100.003.2343
UBCA.100.002.1289	UBCA.100.003.0395	UBCA.100.003.1390	UBCA.100.003.2344
UBCA.100.002.1291	UBCA.100.003.0400	UBCA.100.003.1391	UBCA.100.003.2346
UBCA.100.002.1292	UBCA.100.003.0405	UBCA.100.003.1392	UBCA.100.003.2347
UBCA.100.002.1293	UBCA.100.003.0408	UBCA.100.003.1393	UBCA.100.003.2348
UBCA.100.002.1295	UBCA.100.003.0410	UBCA.100.003.1394	UBCA.100.003.2353
UBCA.100.002.1296	UBCA.100.003.0411	UBCA.100.003.1395	UBCA.100.003.2356
UBCA.100.002.1297	UBCA.100.003.0413	UBCA.100.003.1396	UBCA.100.003.2357
UBCA.100.002.1304	UBCA.100.003.0414	UBCA.100.003.1397	UBCA.100.003.2359
UBCA.100.002.1305	UBCA.100.003.0417	UBCA.100.003.1398	UBCA.100.003.2360
UBCA.100.002.1306	UBCA.100.003.0419	UBCA.100.003.1400	UBCA.100.003.2361

UBCA.100.002.1307	UBCA.100.003.0420	UBCA.100.003.1402	UBCA.100.003.2363
UBCA.100.002.1310	UBCA.100.003.0421	UBCA.100.003.1403	UBCA.100.003.2364
UBCA.100.002.1315	UBCA.100.003.0423	UBCA.100.003.1404	UBCA.100.003.2368
UBCA.100.002.1320	UBCA.100.003.0425	UBCA.100.003.1408	UBCA.100.003.2370
UBCA.100.002.1321	UBCA.100.003.0426	UBCA.100.003.1411	UBCA.100.003.2371
UBCA.100.002.1322	UBCA.100.003.0427	UBCA.100.003.1412	UBCA.100.003.2372
UBCA.100.002.1324	UBCA.100.003.0430	UBCA.100.003.1413	UBCA.100.003.2377
UBCA.100.002.1325	UBCA.100.003.0431	UBCA.100.003.1415	UBCA.100.003.2378
UBCA.100.002.1327	UBCA.100.003.0434	UBCA.100.003.1416	UBCA.100.003.2379
UBCA.100.002.1329	UBCA.100.003.0439	UBCA.100.003.1417	UBCA.100.003.2380
UBCA.100.002.1330	UBCA.100.003.0440	UBCA.100.003.1418	UBCA.100.003.2386
UBCA.100.002.1333	UBCA.100.003.0451	UBCA.100.003.1419	UBCA.100.003.2390
UBCA.100.002.1334	UBCA.100.003.0452	UBCA.100.003.1422	UBCA.100.003.2398
UBCA.100.002.1339	UBCA.100.003.0454	UBCA.100.003.1423	UBCA.100.003.2400
UBCA.100.002.1340	UBCA.100.003.0456	UBCA.100.003.1424	UBCA.100.003.2401
UBCA.100.002.1341	UBCA.100.003.0458	UBCA.100.003.1425	UBCA.100.003.2404
UBCA.100.002.1343	UBCA.100.003.0459	UBCA.100.003.1426	UBCA.100.003.2405
UBCA.100.002.1344	UBCA.100.003.0460	UBCA.100.003.1427	UBCA.100.003.2406
UBCA.100.002.1347	UBCA.100.003.0465	UBCA.100.003.1428	UBCA.100.003.2410
UBCA.100.002.1348	UBCA.100.003.0466	UBCA.100.003.1429	UBCA.100.003.2412
UBCA.100.002.1349	UBCA.100.003.0467	UBCA.100.003.1430	UBCA.100.003.2413
UBCA.100.002.1351	UBCA.100.003.0468	UBCA.100.003.1433	UBCA.100.003.2414
UBCA.100.002.1353	UBCA.100.003.0469	UBCA.100.003.1434	UBCA.100.003.2415
UBCA.100.002.1355	UBCA.100.003.0470	UBCA.100.003.1435	UBCA.100.003.2417

UBCA.100.002.1356	UBCA.100.003.0472	UBCA.100.003.1436	UBCA.100.003.2422
UBCA.100.002.1360	UBCA.100.003.0473	UBCA.100.003.1437	UBCA.100.003.2424
UBCA.100.002.1364	UBCA.100.003.0475	UBCA.100.003.1439	UBCA.100.003.2425
UBCA.100.002.1365	UBCA.100.003.0476	UBCA.100.003.1440	UBCA.100.003.2427
UBCA.100.002.1367	UBCA.100.003.0477	UBCA.100.003.1441	UBCA.100.003.2428
UBCA.100.002.1372	UBCA.100.003.0483	UBCA.100.003.1442	UBCA.100.003.2434
UBCA.100.002.1374	UBCA.100.003.0485	UBCA.100.003.1443	UBCA.100.003.2438
UBCA.100.002.1375	UBCA.100.003.0486	UBCA.100.003.1445	UBCA.100.003.2439
UBCA.100.002.1378	UBCA.100.003.0487	UBCA.100.003.1449	UBCA.100.003.2444
UBCA.100.002.1383	UBCA.100.003.0489	UBCA.100.003.1450	UBCA.100.003.2445
UBCA.100.002.1387	UBCA.100.003.0494	UBCA.100.003.1451	UBCA.100.003.2446
UBCA.100.002.1390	UBCA.100.003.0495	UBCA.100.003.1453	UBCA.100.003.2448
UBCA.100.002.1391	UBCA.100.003.0497	UBCA.100.003.1454	UBCA.100.003.2449
UBCA.100.002.1392	UBCA.100.003.0498	UBCA.100.003.1455	UBCA.100.003.2450
UBCA.100.002.1399	UBCA.100.003.0499	UBCA.100.003.1462	UBCA.100.003.2452
UBCA.100.002.1402	UBCA.100.003.0500	UBCA.100.003.1463	UBCA.100.003.2454
UBCA.100.002.1403	UBCA.100.003.0501	UBCA.100.003.1470	UBCA.100.003.2455
UBCA.100.002.1406	UBCA.100.003.0502	UBCA.100.003.1474	UBCA.100.003.2457
UBCA.100.002.1407	UBCA.100.003.0503	UBCA.100.003.1481	UBCA.100.003.2460
UBCA.100.002.1409	UBCA.100.003.0505	UBCA.100.003.1486	UBCA.100.003.2461
UBCA.100.002.1410	UBCA.100.003.0507	UBCA.100.003.1488	UBCA.100.003.2462
UBCA.100.002.1412	UBCA.100.003.0508	UBCA.100.003.1489	UBCA.100.003.2463
UBCA.100.002.1414	UBCA.100.003.0509	UBCA.100.003.1492	UBCA.100.003.2465
UBCA.100.002.1415	UBCA.100.003.0510	UBCA.100.003.1497	UBCA.100.003.2470

UBCA.100.002.1416	UBCA.100.003.0513	UBCA.100.003.1499	UBCA.100.003.2471
UBCA.100.002.1420	UBCA.100.003.0514	UBCA.100.003.1500	UBCA.100.003.2477
UBCA.100.002.1421	UBCA.100.003.0515	UBCA.100.003.1501	UBCA.100.003.2478
UBCA.100.002.1425	UBCA.100.003.0516	UBCA.100.003.1505	UBCA.100.003.2483
UBCA.100.002.1426	UBCA.100.003.0517	UBCA.100.003.1506	UBCA.100.003.2484
UBCA.100.002.1429	UBCA.100.003.0518	UBCA.100.003.1507	UBCA.100.003.2485
UBCA.100.002.1431	UBCA.100.003.0519	UBCA.100.003.1509	UBCA.100.003.2487
UBCA.100.002.1443	UBCA.100.003.0520	UBCA.100.003.1511	UBCA.100.003.2489
UBCA.100.002.1452	UBCA.100.003.0523	UBCA.100.003.1514	UBCA.100.003.2492
UBCA.100.002.1454	UBCA.100.003.0527	UBCA.100.003.1516	UBCA.100.003.2494
UBCA.100.002.1457	UBCA.100.003.0528	UBCA.100.003.1517	UBCA.100.003.2495
UBCA.100.002.1463	UBCA.100.003.0529	UBCA.100.003.1522	UBCA.100.003.2498
UBCA.100.002.1465	UBCA.100.003.0531	UBCA.100.003.1523	UBCA.100.003.2500
UBCA.100.002.1466	UBCA.100.003.0533	UBCA.100.003.1527	UBCA.100.003.2507
UBCA.100.002.1467	UBCA.100.003.0535	UBCA.100.003.1528	UBCA.100.003.2508
UBCA.100.002.1473	UBCA.100.003.0536	UBCA.100.003.1532	UBCA.100.003.2511
UBCA.100.002.1476	UBCA.100.003.0538	UBCA.100.003.1533	UBCA.100.003.2512
UBCA.100.002.1482	UBCA.100.003.0545	UBCA.100.003.1534	UBCA.100.003.2513
UBCA.100.002.1487	UBCA.100.003.0546	UBCA.100.003.1535	UBCA.100.003.2519
UBCA.100.002.1488	UBCA.100.003.0547	UBCA.100.003.1538	UBCA.100.003.2520
UBCA.100.002.1491	UBCA.100.003.0555	UBCA.100.003.1539	UBCA.100.003.2521
UBCA.100.002.1493	UBCA.100.003.0557	UBCA.100.003.1541	UBCA.100.003.2523
UBCA.100.002.1494	UBCA.100.003.0558	UBCA.100.003.1542	UBCA.100.003.2524
UBCA.100.002.1495	UBCA.100.003.0560	UBCA.100.003.1552	UBCA.100.003.2526

UBCA.100.002.1504	UBCA.100.003.0561	UBCA.100.003.1556	UBCA.100.003.2527
UBCA.100.002.1509	UBCA.100.003.0562	UBCA.100.003.1558	UBCA.100.003.2528
UBCA.100.002.1510	UBCA.100.003.0563	UBCA.100.003.1560	UBCA.100.003.2530
UBCA.100.002.1513	UBCA.100.003.0566	UBCA.100.003.1562	UBCA.100.003.2531
UBCA.100.002.1514	UBCA.100.003.0568	UBCA.100.003.1565	UBCA.100.003.2532
UBCA.100.002.1519	UBCA.100.003.0572	UBCA.100.003.1566	UBCA.100.003.2535
UBCA.100.002.1527	UBCA.100.003.0573	UBCA.100.003.1567	UBCA.100.003.2540
UBCA.100.002.1529	UBCA.100.003.0578	UBCA.100.003.1570	UBCA.100.003.2542
UBCA.100.002.1536	UBCA.100.003.0581	UBCA.100.003.1577	UBCA.100.003.2549
UBCA.100.002.1537	UBCA.100.003.0582	UBCA.100.003.1580	UBCA.100.003.2554
UBCA.100.002.1538	UBCA.100.003.0583	UBCA.100.003.1583	UBCA.100.003.2555
UBCA.100.002.1544	UBCA.100.003.0584	UBCA.100.003.1584	UBCA.100.003.2557
UBCA.100.002.1547	UBCA.100.003.0585	UBCA.100.003.1586	UBCA.100.003.2560
UBCA.100.002.1549	UBCA.100.003.0586	UBCA.100.003.1587	UBCA.100.003.2561
UBCA.100.002.1550	UBCA.100.003.0587	UBCA.100.003.1590	UBCA.100.003.2563
UBCA.100.002.1554	UBCA.100.003.0588	UBCA.100.003.1591	UBCA.100.003.2565
UBCA.100.002.1555	UBCA.100.003.0590	UBCA.100.003.1592	UBCA.100.003.2567
UBCA.100.002.1557	UBCA.100.003.0591	UBCA.100.003.1596	UBCA.100.003.2569
UBCA.100.002.1560	UBCA.100.003.0593	UBCA.100.003.1597	UBCA.100.003.2570
UBCA.100.002.1567	UBCA.100.003.0596	UBCA.100.003.1598	UBCA.100.003.2571
UBCA.100.002.1570	UBCA.100.003.0597	UBCA.100.003.1602	UBCA.100.003.2577
UBCA.100.002.1577	UBCA.100.003.0609	UBCA.100.003.1603	UBCA.100.003.2579
UBCA.100.002.1579	UBCA.100.003.0611	UBCA.100.003.1604	UBCA.100.003.2581
UBCA.100.002.1580	UBCA.100.003.0613	UBCA.100.003.1606	UBCA.100.003.2582

UBCA.100.002.1584	UBCA.100.003.0615	UBCA.100.003.1607	UBCA.100.003.2584
UBCA.100.002.1587	UBCA.100.003.0622	UBCA.100.003.1609	UBCA.100.003.2585
UBCA.100.002.1588	UBCA.100.003.0624	UBCA.100.003.1610	UBCA.100.003.2586
UBCA.100.002.1590	UBCA.100.003.0625	UBCA.100.003.1611	UBCA.100.003.2588
UBCA.100.002.1591	UBCA.100.003.0630	UBCA.100.003.1615	UBCA.100.003.2590
UBCA.100.002.1592	UBCA.100.003.0632	UBCA.100.003.1616	UBCA.100.003.2593
UBCA.100.002.1594	UBCA.100.003.0633	UBCA.100.003.1617	UBCA.100.003.2596
UBCA.100.002.1601	UBCA.100.003.0638	UBCA.100.003.1618	UBCA.100.003.2597
UBCA.100.002.1603	UBCA.100.003.0640	UBCA.100.003.1619	UBCA.100.003.2598
UBCA.100.002.1606	UBCA.100.003.0641	UBCA.100.003.1621	UBCA.100.003.2599
UBCA.100.002.1609	UBCA.100.003.0642	UBCA.100.003.1622	UBCA.100.003.2618
UBCA.100.002.1611	UBCA.100.003.0646	UBCA.100.003.1623	UBCA.100.003.2619
UBCA.100.002.1612	UBCA.100.003.0648	UBCA.100.003.1624	UBCA.100.003.2621
UBCA.100.002.1616	UBCA.100.003.0649	UBCA.100.003.1626	UBCA.100.003.2622
UBCA.100.002.1617	UBCA.100.003.0651	UBCA.100.003.1629	UBCA.100.003.2623
UBCA.100.002.1619	UBCA.100.003.0652	UBCA.100.003.1630	UBCA.100.003.2624
UBCA.100.002.1621	UBCA.100.003.0653	UBCA.100.003.1631	UBCA.100.003.2625
UBCA.100.002.1624	UBCA.100.003.0656	UBCA.100.003.1632	UBCA.100.003.2626
UBCA.100.002.1625	UBCA.100.003.0660	UBCA.100.003.1633	UBCA.100.003.2631
UBCA.100.002.1626	UBCA.100.003.0661	UBCA.100.003.1637	UBCA.100.003.2633
UBCA.100.002.1629	UBCA.100.003.0662	UBCA.100.003.1640	UBCA.100.003.2640
UBCA.100.002.1630	UBCA.100.003.0664	UBCA.100.003.1641	UBCA.100.003.2643
UBCA.100.002.1633	UBCA.100.003.0667	UBCA.100.003.1645	UBCA.100.003.2644
UBCA.100.002.1634	UBCA.100.003.0672	UBCA.100.003.1646	UBCA.100.003.2645



UBCA.100.002.1635	UBCA.100.003.0674	UBCA.100.003.1647	UBCA.100.003.2646
UBCA.100.002.1636	UBCA.100.003.0676	UBCA.100.003.1648	UBCA.100.003.2649
UBCA.100.002.1638	UBCA.100.003.0680	UBCA.100.003.1650	UBCA.100.003.2650
UBCA.100.002.1639	UBCA.100.003.0685	UBCA.100.003.1651	UBCA.100.003.2652
UBCA.100.002.1643	UBCA.100.003.0688	UBCA.100.003.1653	UBCA.100.003.2653
UBCA.100.002.1644	UBCA.100.003.0691	UBCA.100.003.1655	UBCA.100.003.2654
UBCA.100.002.1645	UBCA.100.003.0692	UBCA.100.003.1656	UBCA.100.003.2658
UBCA.100.002.1647	UBCA.100.003.0693	UBCA.100.003.1663	UBCA.100.003.2659
UBCA.100.002.1648	UBCA.100.003.0696	UBCA.100.003.1664	UBCA.100.003.2660
UBCA.100.002.1651	UBCA.100.003.0697	UBCA.100.003.1666	UBCA.100.003.2661
UBCA.100.002.1652	UBCA.100.003.0699	UBCA.100.003.1670	UBCA.100.003.2662
UBCA.100.002.1653	UBCA.100.003.0701	UBCA.100.003.1673	UBCA.100.003.2663
UBCA.100.002.1658	UBCA.100.003.0704	UBCA.100.003.1674	UBCA.100.003.2664
UBCA.100.002.1663	UBCA.100.003.0706	UBCA.100.003.1677	UBCA.100.003.2672
UBCA.100.002.1668	UBCA.100.003.0707	UBCA.100.003.1678	UBCA.100.003.2673
UBCA.100.002.1669	UBCA.100.003.0709	UBCA.100.003.1680	UBCA.100.003.2674
UBCA.100.002.1672	UBCA.100.003.0713	UBCA.100.003.1683	UBCA.100.003.2675
UBCA.100.002.1673	UBCA.100.003.0714	UBCA.100.003.1684	UBCA.100.003.2676
UBCA.100.002.1674	UBCA.100.003.0715	UBCA.100.003.1686	UBCA.100.003.2677
UBCA.100.002.1675	UBCA.100.003.0722	UBCA.100.003.1687	UBCA.100.003.2682
UBCA.100.002.1676	UBCA.100.003.0724	UBCA.100.003.1692	UBCA.100.004.0003
UBCA.100.002.1677	UBCA.100.003.0725	UBCA.100.003.1693	UBCA.100.004.0004
UBCA.100.002.1681	UBCA.100.003.0726	UBCA.100.003.1695	UBCA.100.004.0005
UBCA.100.002.1682	UBCA.100.003.0732	UBCA.100.003.1697	UBCA.100.004.0011

UBCA.100.002.1685	UBCA.100.003.0733	UBCA.100.003.1698	UBCA.100.004.0012
UBCA.100.002.1687	UBCA.100.003.0735	UBCA.100.003.1699	UBCA.100.004.0018
UBCA.100.002.1688	UBCA.100.003.0736	UBCA.100.003.1700	UBCA.100.004.0020
UBCA.100.002.1689	UBCA.100.003.0737	UBCA.100.003.1703	UBCA.100.004.0025
UBCA.100.002.1691	UBCA.100.003.0738	UBCA.100.003.1704	UBCA.100.004.0027
UBCA.100.002.1694	UBCA.100.003.0740	UBCA.100.003.1707	UBCA.100.004.0028
UBCA.100.002.1695	UBCA.100.003.0743	UBCA.100.003.1708	UBCA.100.004.0032
UBCA.100.002.1697	UBCA.100.003.0746	UBCA.100.003.1711	UBCA.100.004.0035
UBCA.100.002.1700	UBCA.100.003.0747	UBCA.100.003.1712	UBCA.100.004.0039
UBCA.100.002.1702	UBCA.100.003.0748	UBCA.100.003.1713	UBCA.100.004.0043
UBCA.100.002.1706	UBCA.100.003.0749	UBCA.100.003.1717	UBCA.100.004.0045
UBCA.100.002.1710	UBCA.100.003.0750	UBCA.100.003.1720	UBCA.100.004.0046
UBCA.100.002.1714	UBCA.100.003.0751	UBCA.100.003.1721	UBCA.100.004.0048
UBCA.100.002.1715	UBCA.100.003.0753	UBCA.100.003.1723	UBCA.100.004.0049
UBCA.100.002.1716	UBCA.100.003.0754	UBCA.100.003.1724	UBCA.100.004.0051
UBCA.100.002.1718	UBCA.100.003.0755	UBCA.100.003.1726	UBCA.100.004.0052
UBCA.100.002.1723	UBCA.100.003.0757	UBCA.100.003.1730	UBCA.100.004.0055
UBCA.100.002.1725	UBCA.100.003.0758	UBCA.100.003.1732	UBCA.100.004.0057
UBCA.100.002.1727	UBCA.100.003.0761	UBCA.100.003.1735	UBCA.100.004.0058
UBCA.100.002.1729	UBCA.100.003.0762	UBCA.100.003.1739	UBCA.100.004.0063
UBCA.100.002.1730	UBCA.100.003.0767	UBCA.100.003.1740	UBCA.100.004.0064
UBCA.100.002.1732	UBCA.100.003.0771	UBCA.100.003.1746	UBCA.100.004.0066
UBCA.100.002.1734	UBCA.100.003.0774	UBCA.100.003.1747	UBCA.100.004.0070
UBCA.100.002.1735	UBCA.100.003.0780	UBCA.100.003.1748	UBCA.100.004.0071

UBCA.100.002.1736	UBCA.100.003.0781	UBCA.100.003.1749	UBCA.100.004.0072
UBCA.100.002.1741	UBCA.100.003.0784	UBCA.100.003.1753	UBCA.100.004.0073
UBCA.100.002.1742	UBCA.100.003.0785	UBCA.100.003.1754	UBCA.100.004.0075
UBCA.100.002.1744	UBCA.100.003.0787	UBCA.100.003.1755	UBCA.100.004.0077
UBCA.100.002.1747	UBCA.100.003.0794	UBCA.100.003.1757	UBCA.100.004.0078
UBCA.100.002.1748	UBCA.100.003.0795	UBCA.100.003.1759	UBCA.100.004.0080
UBCA.100.002.1749	UBCA.100.003.0800	UBCA.100.003.1761	UBCA.100.004.0081
UBCA.100.002.1750	UBCA.100.003.0801	UBCA.100.003.1762	UBCA.100.004.0082
UBCA.100.002.1752	UBCA.100.003.0802	UBCA.100.003.1764	UBCA.100.004.0083
UBCA.100.002.1755	UBCA.100.003.0805	UBCA.100.003.1765	UBCA.100.004.0084
UBCA.100.002.1760	UBCA.100.003.0807	UBCA.100.003.1768	UBCA.100.004.0090
UBCA.100.002.1761	UBCA.100.003.0808	UBCA.100.003.1779	UBCA.100.004.0099
UBCA.100.002.1764	UBCA.100.003.0809	UBCA.100.003.1780	UBCA.100.004.0106
UBCA.100.002.1765	UBCA.100.003.0810	UBCA.100.003.1782	UBCA.100.004.0108
UBCA.100.002.1767	UBCA.100.003.0816	UBCA.100.003.1786	UBCA.100.004.0113
UBCA.100.002.1770	UBCA.100.003.0818	UBCA.100.003.1791	UBCA.100.004.0115
UBCA.100.002.1772	UBCA.100.003.0819	UBCA.100.003.1793	UBCA.100.004.0118
UBCA.100.002.1773	UBCA.100.003.0821	UBCA.100.003.1796	UBCA.100.004.0119
UBCA.100.002.1774	UBCA.100.003.0822	UBCA.100.003.1801	UBCA.100.004.0124
UBCA.100.002.1777	UBCA.100.003.0823	UBCA.100.003.1803	UBCA.100.004.0126
UBCA.100.002.1780	UBCA.100.003.0824	UBCA.100.003.1805	UBCA.100.004.0127
UBCA.100.002.1784	UBCA.100.003.0825	UBCA.100.003.1808	UBCA.100.004.0128
UBCA.100.002.1790	UBCA.100.003.0826	UBCA.100.003.1809	UBCA.100.004.0130
UBCA.100.002.1792	UBCA.100.003.0830	UBCA.100.003.1811	UBCA.100.004.0134

UBCA.100.002.1795	UBCA.100.003.0831	UBCA.100.003.1816	UBCA.100.004.0135
UBCA.100.002.1802	UBCA.100.003.0832	UBCA.100.003.1818	UBCA.100.004.0136
UBCA.100.002.1803	UBCA.100.003.0835	UBCA.100.003.1819	UBCA.100.004.0137
UBCA.100.002.1804	UBCA.100.003.0836	UBCA.100.003.1823	UBCA.100.004.0138
UBCA.100.002.1806	UBCA.100.003.0844	UBCA.100.003.1824	UBCA.100.004.0139
UBCA.100.002.1807	UBCA.100.003.0846	UBCA.100.003.1825	UBCA.100.004.0142
UBCA.100.002.1811	UBCA.100.003.0849	UBCA.100.003.1826	UBCA.100.004.0146
UBCA.100.002.1812	UBCA.100.003.0850	UBCA.100.003.1828	UBCA.100.004.0147
UBCA.100.002.1813	UBCA.100.003.0851	UBCA.100.003.1829	UBCA.100.004.0148
UBCA.100.002.1816	UBCA.100.003.0854	UBCA.100.003.1830	UBCA.100.004.0149
UBCA.100.002.1819	UBCA.100.003.0856	UBCA.100.003.1831	UBCA.100.004.0150
UBCA.100.002.1823	UBCA.100.003.0859	UBCA.100.003.1834	UBCA.100.004.0152
UBCA.100.002.1826	UBCA.100.003.0860	UBCA.100.003.1835	UBCA.100.004.0153
UBCA.100.002.1830	UBCA.100.003.0861	UBCA.100.003.1837	UBCA.100.004.0155
UBCA.100.002.1832	UBCA.100.003.0862	UBCA.100.003.1839	UBCA.100.004.0156
UBCA.100.002.1835	UBCA.100.003.0864	UBCA.100.003.1841	UBCA.100.004.0159
UBCA.100.002.1836	UBCA.100.003.0868	UBCA.100.003.1842	UBCA.100.004.0162
UBCA.100.002.1837	UBCA.100.003.0870	UBCA.100.003.1847	UBCA.100.004.0167
UBCA.100.002.1838	UBCA.100.003.0873	UBCA.100.003.1849	UBCA.100.004.0172
UBCA.100.002.1842	UBCA.100.003.0875	UBCA.100.003.1850	UBCA.100.004.0176
UBCA.100.002.1843	UBCA.100.003.0878	UBCA.100.003.1851	UBCA.100.004.0177
UBCA.100.002.1846	UBCA.100.003.0879	UBCA.100.003.1855	UBCA.100.004.0180
UBCA.100.002.1854	UBCA.100.003.0880	UBCA.100.003.1858	UBCA.100.004.0181
UBCA.100.002.1856	UBCA.100.003.0881	UBCA.100.003.1859	UBCA.100.004.0183

UBCA.100.002.1857	UBCA.100.003.0882	UBCA.100.003.1862	UBCA.100.004.0187
UBCA.100.002.1858	UBCA.100.003.0883	UBCA.100.003.1864	UBCA.100.004.0188
UBCA.100.002.1859	UBCA.100.003.0884	UBCA.100.003.1865	UBCA.100.004.0189
UBCA.100.002.1861	UBCA.100.003.0886	UBCA.100.003.1872	UBCA.100.004.0190
UBCA.100.002.1863	UBCA.100.003.0887	UBCA.100.003.1874	UBCA.100.004.0193
UBCA.100.002.1864	UBCA.100.003.0889	UBCA.100.003.1876	UBCA.100.004.0194
UBCA.100.002.1868	UBCA.100.003.0891	UBCA.100.003.1877	UBCA.100.004.0203
UBCA.100.002.1871	UBCA.100.003.0895	UBCA.100.003.1879	UBCA.100.004.0204
UBCA.100.002.1872	UBCA.100.003.0902	UBCA.100.003.1880	UBCA.100.004.0205
UBCA.100.002.1875	UBCA.100.003.0906	UBCA.100.003.1883	UBCA.100.004.0207
UBCA.100.002.1876	UBCA.100.003.0907	UBCA.100.003.1885	UBCA.100.004.0208
UBCA.100.002.1878	UBCA.100.003.0909	UBCA.100.003.1887	UBCA.100.004.0212
UBCA.100.002.1887	UBCA.100.003.0910	UBCA.100.003.1888	UBCA.100.004.0213
UBCA.100.002.1893	UBCA.100.003.0912	UBCA.100.003.1890	UBCA.100.004.0214
UBCA.100.002.1900	UBCA.100.003.0915	UBCA.100.003.1893	UBCA.100.004.0215
UBCA.100.002.1901	UBCA.100.003.0917	UBCA.100.003.1894	UBCA.100.004.0218
UBCA.100.002.1902	UBCA.100.003.0919	UBCA.100.003.1902	UBCA.100.004.0219
UBCA.100.002.1904	UBCA.100.003.0923	UBCA.100.003.1905	UBCA.100.004.0222
UBCA.100.002.1908	UBCA.100.003.0928	UBCA.100.003.1906	UBCA.100.004.0223
UBCA.100.002.1912	UBCA.100.003.0929	UBCA.100.003.1907	UBCA.100.004.0224
UBCA.100.002.1921	UBCA.100.003.0937	UBCA.100.003.1911	UBCA.100.004.0225
UBCA.100.002.1922	UBCA.100.003.0938	UBCA.100.003.1913	UBCA.100.004.0227
UBCA.100.002.1923	UBCA.100.003.0939	UBCA.100.003.1914	UBCA.100.004.0229
UBCA.100.002.1924	UBCA.100.003.0940	UBCA.100.003.1917	UBCA.100.004.0230

UBCA.100.002.1933	UBCA.100.003.0942	UBCA.100.003.1918	UBCA.100.004.0232
UBCA.100.002.1935	UBCA.100.003.0943	UBCA.100.003.1922	UBCA.100.004.0233
UBCA.100.002.1940	UBCA.100.003.0946	UBCA.100.003.1924	UBCA.100.004.0234
UBCA.100.002.1941	UBCA.100.003.0947	UBCA.100.003.1927	UBCA.100.004.0236
UBCA.100.002.1945	UBCA.100.003.0948	UBCA.100.003.1928	UBCA.100.004.0239
UBCA.100.002.1946	UBCA.100.003.0951	UBCA.100.003.1929	UBCA.100.004.0240
UBCA.100.002.1947	UBCA.100.003.0952	UBCA.100.003.1932	UBCA.100.004.0241
UBCA.100.002.1950	UBCA.100.003.0953	UBCA.100.003.1937	UBCA.100.004.0245
UBCA.100.002.1952	UBCA.100.003.0956	UBCA.100.003.1939	UBCA.100.004.0247
UBCA.100.002.1954	UBCA.100.003.0957	UBCA.100.003.1940	UBCA.100.004.0250
UBCA.100.002.1955	UBCA.100.003.0959	UBCA.100.003.1942	UBCA.100.004.0255
UBCA.100.002.1957	UBCA.100.003.0960	UBCA.100.003.1943	UBCA.100.004.0256
UBCA.100.002.1959	UBCA.100.003.0961	UBCA.100.003.1944	UBCA.100.004.0261
UBCA.100.002.1960	UBCA.100.003.0963	UBCA.100.003.1947	UBCA.100.004.0265
UBCA.100.002.1961	UBCA.100.003.0964	UBCA.100.003.1948	UBCA.100.004.0266
UBCA.100.002.1963	UBCA.100.003.0965	UBCA.100.003.1949	UBCA.100.004.0271
UBCA.100.002.1964	UBCA.100.003.0966	UBCA.100.003.1950	UBCA.100.004.0272
UBCA.100.002.1965	UBCA.100.003.0967	UBCA.100.003.1951	UBCA.100.004.0273
UBCA.100.002.1966	UBCA.100.003.0968	UBCA.100.003.1955	UBCA.100.004.0280
UBCA.100.002.1967	UBCA.100.003.0969	UBCA.100.003.1956	UBCA.100.004.0282
UBCA.100.002.1969	UBCA.100.003.0973	UBCA.100.003.1957	UBCA.100.004.0283
UBCA.100.002.1971	UBCA.100.003.0974	UBCA.100.003.1958	UBCA.100.004.0285
UBCA.100.002.1974	UBCA.100.003.0976	UBCA.100.003.1959	UBCA.100.005.0003
UBCA.100.002.1977	UBCA.100.003.0977	UBCA.100.003.1960	UBCA.100.005.0004

UBCA.100.002.1980	UBCA.100.003.0978	UBCA.100.003.1961	UBCA.100.005.0008
UBCA.100.002.1981	UBCA.100.003.0979	UBCA.100.003.1962	UBCA.100.005.0009
UBCA.100.002.1983	UBCA.100.003.0980	UBCA.100.003.1963	UBCA.100.005.0012
UBCA.100.002.1985	UBCA.100.003.0981	UBCA.100.003.1964	UBCA.100.005.0014
UBCA.100.002.1986	UBCA.100.003.0983	UBCA.100.003.1965	UBCA.100.005.0017
UBCA.100.002.1991	UBCA.100.003.0984	UBCA.100.003.1966	UBCA.100.005.0018
UBCA.100.002.1992	UBCA.100.003.0985	UBCA.100.003.1967	UBCA.100.005.0022
UBCA.100.002.1994	UBCA.100.003.0986	UBCA.100.003.1969	UBCA.100.005.0023
UBCA.100.002.1995	UBCA.100.003.0988	UBCA.100.003.1970	UBCA.100.005.0024
UBCA.100.002.1996	UBCA.100.003.0989	UBCA.100.003.1971	UBCA.100.005.0026
UBCA.100.002.1999	UBCA.100.003.0990	UBCA.100.003.1973	UBCA.100.005.0028
UBCA.100.002.2000	UBCA.100.003.0991	UBCA.100.003.1974	UBCA.100.005.0029
UBCA.100.002.2001	UBCA.100.003.0992	UBCA.100.003.1979	UBCA.100.005.0031
UBCA.100.002.2007	UBCA.100.003.0993	UBCA.100.003.1980	UBCA.100.005.0033
UBCA.100.002.2008	UBCA.100.003.0994	UBCA.100.003.1982	UBCA.100.005.0034
UBCA.100.002.2010	UBCA.100.003.0995	UBCA.100.003.1985	UBCA.100.005.0035
UBCA.100.002.2013	UBCA.100.003.0996	UBCA.100.003.1986	UBCA.100.005.0043
UBCA.100.002.2014	UBCA.100.003.0998	UBCA.100.003.1988	UBCA.100.005.0045
UBCA.100.002.2016	UBCA.100.003.0999	UBCA.100.003.1990	UBCA.100.005.0047
UBCA.100.002.2021	UBCA.100.003.1000	UBCA.100.003.1992	UBCA.100.005.0051
UBCA.100.002.2022	UBCA.100.003.1003	UBCA.100.003.1993	UBCA.100.005.0052
UBCA.100.002.2024	UBCA.100.003.1006	UBCA.100.003.1994	UBCA.100.006.0007
UBCA.100.002.2025	UBCA.100.003.1007	UBCA.100.003.1996	UBCA.100.006.0009
UBCA.100.002.2026	UBCA.100.003.1013	UBCA.100.003.1998	UBCA.100.006.0033

UBCA.100.002.2028	UBCA.100.003.1014	UBCA.100.003.2003	UBCA.100.006.0035
UBCA.100.002.2030	UBCA.100.003.1015	UBCA.100.003.2004	UBCA.100.006.0037
UBCA.100.002.2031	UBCA.100.003.1017	UBCA.100.003.2005	UBCA.100.006.0040
UBCA.100.002.2034	UBCA.100.003.1018	UBCA.100.003.2006	UBCA.100.006.0052
UBCA.100.002.2036	UBCA.100.003.1019	UBCA.100.003.2009	UBCA.100.006.0065
UBCA.100.003.0002	UBCA.100.003.1022	UBCA.100.003.2011	UBCA.100.006.0071
UBCA.100.003.0004	UBCA.100.003.1027	UBCA.100.003.2012	UBCA.100.006.0074
UBCA.100.003.0016	UBCA.100.003.1028	UBCA.100.003.2014	UBCA.100.006.0085
UBCA.100.003.0023	UBCA.100.003.1030	UBCA.100.003.2015	UBCA.100.006.0091
UBCA.100.003.0025	UBCA.100.003.1031	UBCA.100.003.2017	UBCA.100.006.0106
UBCA.100.003.0027	UBCA.100.003.1032	UBCA.100.003.2018	UBCA.100.006.0132
UBCA.100.003.0028	UBCA.100.003.1035	UBCA.100.003.2019	UBCA.100.006.0135
UBCA.100.003.0031	UBCA.100.003.1036	UBCA.100.003.2020	UBCA.100.006.0144
UBCA.100.003.0034	UBCA.100.003.1037	UBCA.100.003.2023	UBCA.100.006.0150
UBCA.100.003.0037	UBCA.100.003.1038	UBCA.100.003.2026	UBCA.100.006.0152
UBCA.100.003.0038	UBCA.100.003.1039	UBCA.100.003.2027	UBCA.100.006.0166
UBCA.100.003.0039	UBCA.100.003.1040	UBCA.100.003.2028	UBCA.100.006.0167
UBCA.100.003.0041	UBCA.100.003.1041	UBCA.100.003.2029	UBCA.100.006.0169
UBCA.100.003.0042	UBCA.100.003.1048	UBCA.100.003.2034	UBCA.100.007.0002
UBCA.100.003.0043	UBCA.100.003.1050	UBCA.100.003.2035	UBCA.100.007.0005
UBCA.100.003.0045	UBCA.100.003.1051	UBCA.100.003.2036	UBCA.100.008.0002
UBCA.100.003.0046	UBCA.100.003.1053	UBCA.100.003.2037	UBCA.100.008.0005
UBCA.100.003.0047	UBCA.100.003.1054	UBCA.100.003.2039	



## ANNEXURE I

### Unsuccessful applications reviewed individually with reasons

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0022	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. I consider that the application does not establish unfair prejudice or a basis for leave.
UBCA.001.001.0031	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The statement that the applicant was unaware due to lack of communications is not sufficiently specific and does not amount to unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.001.0034	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. I consider that the application does not establish unfair prejudice or a basis for leave.
UBCA.001.001.0044	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0068	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0069	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as the applicant merely states that they were aware of the proceeding but assumed all were automatically eligible to participate. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.001.0072	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0085	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0090	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0098	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0100	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0101	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0104	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.
UBCA.001.001.0105	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not contain an explanation for missing the class closure deadline and there is no link between the medical issues raised and the deadline being missed. The application does not merit a grant of leave.
UBCA.001.001.0110	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0111	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0113	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0118	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0123	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0124	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

Application no.	Summary of reasons
UBCA.001.001.0126	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.
UBCA.001.001.0128	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0129	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0130	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline for registration, but there is no specificity. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.001.001.0137	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0140	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0145	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.
UBCA.001.001.0148	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0153	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0155	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0157	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0159	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline for registration, but there is no specificity. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.001.001.0160	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0161	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0162	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0168	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.
UBCA.001.001.0170	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0171	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0172	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0173	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0174	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0175	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0176	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0177	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They state 'I don't know how could be I was sick or may be overseas for family reasons.' The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0180	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0182	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0185	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0197	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as it does not contain sufficient specificity regarding missing the class closure deadline.
UBCA.001.001.0198	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0201	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0203	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.
UBCA.001.001.0204	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0205	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0206	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0207	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to some detail in respect of their lack of communications in respect of the deadline, for example, not having received that information from their depot or 13Cabs, however, the application still does not meet the threshold for unfair prejudice. The applicant was aware of the proceeding and took no active steps.
UBCA.001.001.0208	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0209	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. It lacks specificity and does not amount to unfair prejudice. The application also raises an objection regarding the adequacy of notification, and I have taken this objection into account along with all of the other objections before the Court.
UBCA.001.001.0218	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application raises reasons for lack of awareness which were common among several applications of working in a suburban part of Sydney where there are few other drivers. However, this is not sufficient for a grant of leave.
UBCA.001.001.0223	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0224	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0227	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0230	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0231	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0232	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0235	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0236	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0238	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0242	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0246	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0248	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.001.0251	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0252	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.001.0260	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise identify any basis for leave or establish unfair prejudice and I decline to grant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0001	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0002	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0005	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0007	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0008	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0010	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0011	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0012	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says 'I did not receive any notice, communication, or correspondence regarding the class action settlement, either by mail, email, or any other means.' However, there was no requirement for personal notification, and without more, I do not consider that this amounts to unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.002.0013	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. It does not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0017	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to family illness and being unaware of the proceeding but there is no link between the two and no particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0018	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0019	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as a registered group member by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. It does not otherwise disclose a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0020	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is insufficient specificity and, as the applicant was an active operator and driver, one would expect them to have knowledge of the proceeding. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0023	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0027	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0028	I reviewed this application individually, it being one which was identified by the Contradictor as including a bare statement that the applicant was not aware of the proceedings. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no reason given for missing the deadline and no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0030	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0033	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0034	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0036	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0038	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application was one of several which asserted that the applicant was a registered group member, however, the applicant is not recorded as registered by Maurice Blackburn. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. It does not otherwise disclose a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0039	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0040	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0041	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0042	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0044	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application lacks sufficient specificity in explaining why the applicant did not register by the deadline and why they ought to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0045	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The statement that the applicant left the industry in December 2022 is not tied to their lack of awareness; the explanation is very sparse with insufficient particulars provided.
UBCA.001.002.0046	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0047	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0049	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0050	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0051	I reviewed this application individually, it being one which was identified by the Contradictor as including a bare statement that the applicant was not aware of the proceedings. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no reason given for missing the deadline and no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0052	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant includes a letter outlining the financial and generalised health impacts of the entry of UberX into the market, expressed as being on behalf of the whole group, and includes a statement of unawareness. This is an inadequate reason for this applicant to be granted leave.
UBCA.001.002.0053	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline but they are a full-time driver and there is no specificity regarding their lack of knowledge. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0057	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0059	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0061	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0062	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0064	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0065	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. There is no explanation for missing the deadline, and the reference to having left the industry in 2019 is not tied to the reason they were not aware.
UBCA.001.002.0070	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0072	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0074	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to working in suburban Sydney where there are not many other drivers and as a result did not receive the information in time to register, however, this is not sufficient to establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.002.0075	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0077	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0078	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0079	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0081	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0083	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0084	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0085	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they misunderstood that proceeding was just for people who own taxi plates, and they were just a driver. There is no stated basis for this belief or evidence of enquiries made; there is no unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0086	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0088	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. It does not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0090	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0091	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0093	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0094	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they left the industry in around 2019 but they do not tie this to their lack of awareness. The explanation for failing to register is insufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.002.0095	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0097	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0098	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0099	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0102	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0103	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0104	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0108	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0109	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0112	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0113	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0116	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0120	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0122	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0124	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0126	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0129	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0131	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0132	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0133	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0135	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0136	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0137	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding but insufficient explanation for missing the class closure deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0138	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0139	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0140	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0141	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0143	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0144	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they have successfully registered, but this is not correct as Maurice Blackburn have not identified them as a registered group member. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise provide a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0146	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0147	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0149	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0150	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0151	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states: '[u]nfortunately, I was unaware of the class action lawsuit when it was necessary to sign up, as I was overseas during the relevant sign up period'. However, there is no further detail or particulars, such that it is not a sufficient explanation for the failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.002.0152	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0156	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0159	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action at the time of the deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0160	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0161	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0162	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they have successfully registered, but this is not correct as Maurice Blackburn have not identified them as a registered group member. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise provide a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0163	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0164	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0167	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0172	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0173	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0174	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0175	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0176	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0177	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0184	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0187	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0188	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0189	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0190	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0191	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. While the evidence is from Hyderabad there is nothing to show that the applicant was overseas at the time of the registration window. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0193	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0196	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0200	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0204	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0205	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0206	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0207	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0210	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0212	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they have successfully registered, but this is not correct as Maurice Blackburn have not identified them as a registered group member. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise provide a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0213	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they have successfully registered, but this is not correct as Maurice Blackburn have not identified them as a registered group member. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise provide a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0214	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0217	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0218	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0227	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0228	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0229	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0231	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0232	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0234	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0235	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0237	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0238	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0240	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0241	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0246	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0247	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0249	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0250	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they have successfully registered, but this is not correct as Maurice Blackburn have not identified them as a registered group member. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise provide a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.002.0255	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0257	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0260	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.002.0262	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0263	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0264	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0265	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0267	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0268	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0270	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0272	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.002.0277	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0278	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0279	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0280	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0281	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0284	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0285	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0287	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0288	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0289	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0291	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.002.0292	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0003	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0004	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.003.0011	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and the medical issues referenced, and I do not consider that the reasons provided are such as to merit leave. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.003.0013	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0016	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.003.0017	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0018	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0021	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0024	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they have successfully registered, but this is not correct as Maurice Blackburn have not identified them as a registered group member. It appears that the applicant has confused providing their details on the UGM portal with registering. The application does not otherwise provide a reason for leave to be granted.
UBCA.001.003.0025	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0026	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0027	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0030	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0031	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.003.0033	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as there is no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.003.0034	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.003.0038	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.004.0001	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.004.0002	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.004.0006	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0002	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0004	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0006	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This application asserts that the applicant was unaware due to working in a suburb, which is not an adequate explanation for not registering; there is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.005.0007	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0013	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0018	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application contains a statement that 'I did not receive any notice, communication, or correspondence regarding the class action settlement, either by mail, email, or any other means'. I do not consider this to be sufficient for leave. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.001.005.0019	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.001.005.0022	I reviewed this application individually. There is no reason given for the applicant missing the class closure deadline and there is nothing mentioned which explains why it has been categorised as Category 8. The application does not merit a grant of leave. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.001.005.0024	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0028	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.001.005.0033	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.100.001.0014	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0019	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Nothing in the application amounts to unfair prejudice such as to warrant leave.
UBCA.100.001.0027	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were not registered because they were overseas in the period 2019 to 2022 and not able to register on the Maurice Blackburn website, although they had attempted to do so. The applicant was not specific as to dates and I consider their explanation as to why they did not register by the deadline in 2023 to be insufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0028	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's explanation of why they held a mistaken belief as to registration is not cogent or sufficient. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0039	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They have not established unfair prejudice and, what is more, their application is not really evidence as it is a signed letter with the word 'affidavit' at the top.
UBCA.100.001.0054	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. There is insufficient specificity and no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0060	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0064	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0066	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's reference to being self-employed is not sufficient. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0067	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. There is insufficient specificity and no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0073	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0082	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. While the applicant states specifically those persons or entities who did not provide notice of the Class Closure Deadline or proceeding, they do not provide any particulars with respect to why they were not otherwise aware of the proceeding outside of individual notice (which is not required under Part 4A). They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0083	I reviewed this application individually and concluded that the application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant was not aware of the deadline for class closure but does not provide sufficient specificity as to the reasons that they missed the deadline. For example, they say they did not receive a notice from a named organisation, but that organisation was not one which was included in the Class Closure Orders. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0089	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0090	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0091	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0092	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant notes lack of awareness and communication as the reason for missing the deadline without any further detail. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0094	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0098	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant is a long-term driver who states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but without further specificity. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0107	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0110	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0113	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0115	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the deadline but is not sufficiently specific as to the reasons for missing it. They refer to medical issues in some detail but there is an insufficient link between those issues and the registration period as to show why the issues led to the deadline being missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0120	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0121	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0124	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0126	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0127	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's evidence does not draw a sufficient link between medical issues they experienced and the registration period. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0128	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0131	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0132	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0137	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0144	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0147	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0152	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0161	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0166	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0178	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0183	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0193	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0199	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's evidence is more than a bare statement of lack of knowledge, but they do not provide a sufficient explanation for why they did not register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0207	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0208	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0210	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Their reason for being unaware of was that they were a single parent, working to support their family. The application does not provide overall an adequate basis for the failure to register and unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.001.0211	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0217	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0223	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0224	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0225	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0226	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0227	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0231	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0233	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0236	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0240	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0245	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0254	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were unaware because of having children and being busy with them with no chance to get information from other sources. This is not an adequate explanation for the failure to register in my view and does not establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0256	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. An insufficient explanation for the mistaken belief in registration is given. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0263	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. This application was identified by the Contradictor as falling into Categories 4, 6 and 9, but that the applicant makes a bare assertion of being unaware of the proceeding. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0268	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were unaware because of having children and being busy with them and work. While more than a bare statement, it is still insufficient as a reason for their failure to register and does not establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0269	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0270	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0274	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0276	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare assertion of lack of knowledge of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0278	I reviewed this application individually. The applicant states that they did not check communications due to emotional stress and anxiety caused by the operation of Uber in the market. Expressed at this level of generality, this application does not merit a grant of leave, in my view. The explanation for missing the deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.001.0279	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0283	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0299	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0303	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0308	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0320	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0324	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0334	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The medical issues cited are not outlined with any particularity and, as such, do not provide sufficient reason for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0339	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0345	I reviewed this application individually and concluded that the application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant contacted Maurice Blackburn during the registration period but retracted their attempt at registration due to complexity of the documents and not being able to afford legal advice. I think that this is an insufficient reason for not registering, as a conscious decision was made not to register by the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0352	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0353	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave; the application refers to registering an interest in another proceeding in 2017 conducted by another law firm which is an insufficient reason for their failure to register in this proceeding. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0366	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0368	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0370	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0375	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0377	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0378	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0379	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0383	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0386	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0390	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant asserts they mistakenly believed that they were not eligible due to being outside of Melbourne and say that the proceeding was not widely advertised. There is no evidence that they made any enquiries about eligibility. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0395	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Assertions that they assumed they would automatically be part of the class is not an adequate explanation for failing to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0396	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0397	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0398	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they left the taxi industry in 2021 to become patient transport officer in NSW Health. They do not provide an adequate explanation for the failure to register and they have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0402	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0410	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0412	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were not adequately informed of recent developments. The applicant says that they may have missed emails or phone calls from Maurice Blackburn but is cautious responding to unknown sources. They do not state whether they were aware of the class action or registration deadline. The explanation for missing the deadline is not cogent or sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0413	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0416	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0420	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0432	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0435	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant was aware of the class action, received information about it, but found the information confusing and did not understand the urgency or importance of registering. It does not contain a sufficient or cogent explanation as to why they did not register. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0439	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0442	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0443	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0447	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0450	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0452	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0454	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0458	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0460	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as there is no explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0462	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. It does not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register and confirms that they were aware of the proceeding.
UBCA.100.001.0467	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0469	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class closure deadline and otherwise does not provide any explanation. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.001.0470	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant left the industry in 2016 and states they were no longer receiving information about the industry. However, the exhibits to the affidavit include correspondence from the WA Department of Transport in 2018 regarding that state's voluntary taxi plate buyback payment scheme and there is evidence of payments made after that time. Further, the applicant does not confirm why, for example, they were not able to receive notice through newspaper advertisements. The application is inadequate. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0471	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0473	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they left industry in 2019 to join Uber and moved home, and their postal address on record was not updated and nothing was forwarded to them. This is not sufficient to establish unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.001.0475	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0476	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0477	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.001.0486	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0002	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0009	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0011	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0014	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0019	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0020	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They do not provide a sufficiently particularised explanation for the failure to register.
UBCA.100.002.0025	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action and the class closure deadline. The application has no specificity. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0027	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0030	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they could not register because they didn't have enough information. This is not a sufficiently particularised explanation for the failure to register.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0033	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0035	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0037	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as the applicant states they were not aware of the deadline, without any other explanation. They do not clarify if they knew about the proceeding. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0041	I reviewed this application individually and concluded that the application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the deadline and does not provide any further explanation for the failure to register. They do not state whether they were aware of the proceeding. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0042	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0046	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0050	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0052	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0055	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0061	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave; the applicant states they did not know about the proceeding and so did not register to participate. They refer to challenges they are experiencing including health issues, but those are not linked to their failure to register or lack of awareness. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0065	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0066	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0070	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0075	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0076	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0079	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0084	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0087	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0090	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0100	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0102	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0103	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0105	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0110	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0113	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant was aware of the class action but did not understand the process. The evidence is unclear and provides an insufficient explanation of why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0118	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0119	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They say they had a mistaken belief as to automatic registration, which is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. There is insufficient specificity. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0123	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0126	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0139	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0140	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0141	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0142	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0144	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0151	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0153	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0156	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0160	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were overseas at the last date of the registration period but the evidence is not sufficiently detailed or specific. They do not say that they were not aware of the deadline or when they went abroad. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0161	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0163	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They say they had a mistaken belief as to automatic registration, which is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. There is insufficient specificity. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0166	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0167	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0168	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0170	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0171	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the deadline and did not receive communication about it, but provides an insufficient explanation of the failure to register and have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0173	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0175	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0176	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0178	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0181	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0182	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave; the applicant makes a bare statement of not getting information about registration. They give an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0186	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0190	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The lack of awareness of this applicant is linked to being on night shift, however, I do not consider this to be a sufficient explanation for their failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0191	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They say they had a mistaken belief as to automatic registration, which is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. There is insufficient specificity. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0192	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0193	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0194	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0195	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant is a trust beneficiary who assumed they were automatically registered. The trust aspect is not an explanation here, which is really a mistaken belief as to automatic registration. This is not adequate. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0196	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0197	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0200	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0201	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0203	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0205	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0206	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0207	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement that the applicant was not aware of the proceeding or deadline. Insufficient explanation provided. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0208	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0209	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0212	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0215	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0216	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0219	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0220	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant made the decision not to register due to disillusionment, but states that they changed their mind in April 2024. This is not a sufficient basis to give leave to participate. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0225	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0229	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains a bare statement of lack of awareness and limited English proficiency, however, the application demonstrates a sufficient level of proficiency. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0233	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0235	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0241	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were a passive licence owner which was inherited from a parent, that they had no contact with others in industry, no social media, and no emails or correspondence with the taxi industry. However, they also say that they joined in a fighting fund established by Black & White Cabs to fund proceedings to try and stop Uber, which were unsuccessful. This is, in my view, contradictory with the notion that they had no contact with the industry. I do not consider the explanation adequate. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0242	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant found information as to the class action confusing and says that there was a lack of communication that meant they did not know the importance of registering. They do not provide a sufficient basis for leave. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0244	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They have not established unfair prejudice. They left the industry prior to 2018 to move abroad and returned in 2018 without updating their address with the TSC, but this is not linked at all to the failure to register, as the TSC was not one of the organisations which was to forward the Opt Out and Closure Notice pursuant to the Class Closure Orders, and the applicant was not abroad when the registration deadline was advertised.
UBCA.100.002.0245	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0247	I reviewed this application individually. The applicant says they had an insufficient understanding of the process, and assumed they would be automatically included. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as this is not a sufficient basis for leave to be granted. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0253	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant attributes their lack of awareness to having moved house. I do not consider this to be a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline, especially given their active participation in the industry and ownership of several taxis. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0254	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0256	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0258	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0260	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0261	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0262	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0263	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0265	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0267	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0272	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It is not clear when the applicant left the taxi industry, and the application does not contain a sufficient explanation for the failure to register. The applicant states that they were not aware of the class action or registration deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0274	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0275	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0277	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0283	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application concerns a deceased estate, however, the family had been active in dealing with the taxi licence prior to the deceased's death and it is unclear why the estate would not have registered for the class action. No sufficient reason is given and no unfair prejudice is established
UBCA.100.002.0286	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0289	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as there is no explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0290	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0291	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. An insufficient explanation is given for missing the deadline and no unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0292	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0294	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0296	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0297	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0298	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0304	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0305	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0310	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0311	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0314	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0318	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0320	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0323	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0324	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0326	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0327	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0329	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0330	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0331	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0332	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0338	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Despite the personal characteristics of the applicants, being elderly and investors in licences, there is no adequate reason for their failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0339	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0340	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0341	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0344	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They have not established unfair prejudice, as this is a bare assertion of being unaware of the proceeding, insufficient to warrant leave.
UBCA.100.002.0347	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0350	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0353	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0355	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0356	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0362	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0363	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0364	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0366	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0367	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0368	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0369	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0372	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they did not have contact within the industry or media platforms, but this is, in my view, an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. For example, the applicant does not state they do not consume newspapers where they might have had the opportunity to learn of the proceeding. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0373	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0374	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0377	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0379	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0380	I reviewed this application individually. The applicant says they missed the opportunity to register because of the availability of information. This is an insufficient explanation and the application does not merit a grant of leave. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0385	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0388	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0392	I reviewed this application individually and found the explanation for missing the deadline to be inconsistent and not cogent. The application does not merit a grant of leave. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0393	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0396	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. An insufficient explanation is given for missing the deadline and there are some inconsistencies within the explanation. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0397	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0401	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0405	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0406	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0407	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class closure deadline and otherwise does not provide sufficient reason for not registering. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0410	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0411	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0414	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0415	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0419	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0422	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's lack of awareness is not sufficiently explained with any specificity. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0423	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0425	I reviewed this application individually . The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class closure deadline and otherwise does not provide sufficient reason for not registering. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0431	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0432	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0433	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0437	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0441	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0442	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0444	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0447	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0448	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The Contradictor reviewed this application and noted that it falls within Categories 4, 6 and 9, but that the reference to lack of awareness is a bare assertion. Having reviewed the application, I agree and do not consider that it establishes unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0449	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0452	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0453	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they are a regional worker who did not see the media coverage, but this is not an adequate explanation for the failure to register in my view. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0460	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0463	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient as it lacks any particularity, including about dates. There is no link between the medical issues raised and the missed deadline. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0466	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0467	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0470	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0471	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0473	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0474	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0476	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0478	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0483	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0486	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0489	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0490	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0491	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0493	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0494	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0498	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0499	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0501	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0502	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0503	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0504	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0506	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0507	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0509	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0510	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0512	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0516	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0520	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0521	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0522	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0523	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0524	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0526	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0528	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0532	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant gives internally inconsistent explanations for missing the deadline. The reasons for a grant of leave are not cogent or sufficient. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0536	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0538	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class closure deadline and otherwise does not provide sufficient explanation. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0543	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0544	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0546	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0547	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0550	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the class action or the deadline. The overseas travel noted in the application does not provide a sufficient basis for leave as it was not at the time of the registration period. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0555	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0559	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0561	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0568	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0569	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0571	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0572	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0574	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0578	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0579	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0581	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0583	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0584	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0585	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0587	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0589	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0590	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.  The name of the applicant recorded in the Maurice Blackburn Registers is incorrect.
UBCA.100.002.0598	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were uninformed of the progress of the class action and therefore missed the deadline. They speculate that this may be because they do not answer calls or look at emails from unknown senders. This is an insufficient explanation. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0606	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0608	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0609	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0613	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0614	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0619	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant was not aware of the proceeding or deadline and says they did not receive any documentation, referring to residing in NSW. This is insufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0620	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0621	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0627	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0628	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0638	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0642	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were informed by other drivers that they were not eligible as they were not an operator, but they did not make any enquiries of their own. This is not sufficient to establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0643	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0644	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0646	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered but provides insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0650	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were locked out of their emails with no detail as to when they could not see emails or how they were prevented from registering by the deadline as a result. They have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0651	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0654	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0658	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0660	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0661	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0662	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0666	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0679	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0680	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0683	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0684	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0685	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0687	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0689	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0691	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They have not established unfair prejudice. They left the industry in 2020 but this is not linked at all to the failure to register.
UBCA.100.002.0692	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0693	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0695	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0696	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0697	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0698	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0700	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It does not contain a sufficient explanation for the failure to register and unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.002.0701	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0702	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0703	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0704	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0708	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0711	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0712	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0713	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0715	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They held a mistaken belief they were not eligible as they were outside Victoria but this is not a basis for leave, as the source or basis for that mistaken belief has not been specified. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0719	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0721	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0723	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0724	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0725	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0726	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0727	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0728	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0734	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0738	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0740	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that in around September 2023 he discussed participating in the proceeding with his wife but in October 2023 his wife told him they had missed the deadline. This is not a sufficient explanation for failing to register on time. Unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.002.0745	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0746	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between medical issues raised and missing the deadline, and there is no sufficient explanation. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0749	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and a lack of specificity. No unfair prejudice established
UBCA.100.002.0751	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They held a mistaken belief that they were ineligible as they thought the group was only owners of taxi number plates, but they do not outline any enquiries made. The source or basis for that mistaken belief has not been specified. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0752	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0774	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0776	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0777	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0780	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0784	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0786	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0787	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0788	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0789	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0795	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0796	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0797	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0798	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0802	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0807	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were overseas on 2 October 2023, without any further detail as to the period of travel. The explanation is insufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0808	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0809	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0810	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant knew of the proceeding in September 2023 and did not contact Maurice Blackburn until late October 2023. There is an insufficient basis for missing the deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0811	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0813	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0817	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0818	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave; it does not link medical issues that are raised with the deadline that was missed. The explanation is not sufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0819	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0820	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0821	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0823	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0826	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0827	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0831	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0832	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0833	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0837	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0844	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0849	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0850	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0852	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0860	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0862	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to travel abroad, but not at the time of the proceeding being commenced or the registration period. Their reason for missing the deadline is not sufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0863	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0865	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0873	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0874	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0875	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0878	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0879	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.0880	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0882	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0883	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0884	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant was, in fact, sent an email about the proceeding in November 2018 but states that they missed it. I do not think this amounts to unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0888	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.0903	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. While the applicant refers to personal pressures and having left the industry in early 2020, there is no express explanation for why the applicant missed the deadline for registration. In those circumstances, I decline to grant leave as I do not consider that they have established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.0926	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.0950	I reviewed this application individually and have concluded that the application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant knew of the deadline for registration from messages on WhatsApp from fellow drivers, and knew a week before the expiry of the deadline that there was a week left, but did not follow this up. The applicant refers to a spouse with health issues during this period, whom they were supporting, however, there is insufficient explanation or particulars linking that circumstances with their failure to register before the deadline. On that basis, I consider that unfair prejudice has not been established.
UBCA.100.002.1028	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1029	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as there is no explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1035	The applicant states that they knew about the class action but not of the requirement for registration. They provide an insufficient explanation for the failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.1038	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1065	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant thought that 13Cabs would register for them but did not make any enquiries to confirm this. This is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1086	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they tried to participate in other class actions in the past and was unsure if they were registered. This is insufficient and there is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1092	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1101	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1128	I reviewed this application individually . The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1147	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1151	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1155	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1156	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1160	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.1163	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1178	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1212	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1222	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1234	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1241	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established. Note that the name recorded in the Maurice Blackburn Registers is incorrect.
UBCA.100.002.1247	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They refer to a mistaken belief of not being eligible due to not being both an owner and operator, but they do not outline any enquiries made about eligibility or any particulars such as the source or basis for that mistaken belief. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1287	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application pertains to an executor of a deceased estate, but no explanation is provided for the failure to register and no unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1354	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1384	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1389	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The reason for not registering is as follows: 'I moved to truck industry in 2020 for a while I have no information about taxi industry that is why I have missed first registry in 2023'. The notice regime was not limited to industry-only sources. I do not consider there to be an adequate reason for the failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.1405	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to a demanding work schedule and busy routine which caused them to miss important communications. This is not an adequate explanation such as to establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1413	I reviewed this application individually. The applicant makes a bare statement that they could not register as they hadn't heard the news and they, and their family, had the flu. There is insufficient particularity and explanation for their failing to register. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1423	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1424	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1445	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There are insufficient particulars of the overseas travel, without dates or a period. This is an insufficient reason for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1446	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There are insufficient particulars of the overseas travel, without dates or a period. This is an insufficient reason for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1456	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant knew of the class action through advertisements in newspapers and had intended to register by the deadline, but did not due to factors set out in their affidavit, none of which sufficiently (individually or together) explain why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1478	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they did not receive information or see it in any kind of news outlets. There is otherwise no particularity to the explanation and I do not consider it sufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1481	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant lived abroad for a period of time but this was not during the registration period and is an insufficient reason for missing the deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1496	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.1505	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1508	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1524	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1526	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1542	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1548	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1559	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1568	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1573	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1575	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they were unaware of the requirement to register, but does not give a sufficient explanation. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1581	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as there is no explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.1589	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1600	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1614	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave; the applicant knew of the class action but not the deadline and had been discussing bringing an action against Uber for over a year. They give an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and no unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1623	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1664	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1667	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and no link between financial hardship stated and the deadline missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1684	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.002.1703	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they forgot to register and their explanation lacks particularity. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1708	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There are insufficient particulars linking medical issues raised with the applicant having missed the deadline. Their explanation is insufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1728	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1739	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.1753	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1794	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1799	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1821	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1852	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There are insufficient particulars of the overseas travel, without dates or a period. This is an insufficient reason for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1881	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1889	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is no link between missing the class closure deadline and medical issues referenced. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1926	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1951	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.1953	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. I do not consider that making arrangements for travel provides a sufficient explanation for the failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.002.1976	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.002.2006	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.2032	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered, but without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.2033	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered, but without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.002.2039	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0063	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0084	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0108	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0126	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application raises some medical issues, but in my view these do not explain the failure to register. The applicant provides insufficient reasons for missing the deadline. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0139	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0143	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

Application no.	Summary of reasons
UBCA.100.003.0152	I reviewed this application individually. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, but they do not say when they left the industry (the only date mentioned is the class period, which is insufficient). Inadequate explanation for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice has not been established.
UBCA.100.003.0188	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant knew of the proceeding and says they gave their details at the taxi holding area at Sydney airport and taxi bases but had not properly been included. The applicant also says that they tried to make phone calls to the lawyers. There are no specifics given. There are insufficient reasons and particulars for the failure to register. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0192	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that the reason for their lack of awareness of the proceeding was that they were not actively monitoring court documents or following the progress of the case, with demanding family commitments and work schedule, which meant they did not have the time or resources to keep up to date. They also say they did not receive any direct communication from Maurice Blackburn. Overall, the explanation is still not sufficient to justify a grant of leave; it is not an adequate explanation for the failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0220	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0248	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0251	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0279	The applicant makes a bare statement that they did not originally join the proceeding as there were rumours in the taxi industry that people were collecting drivers' information to use it for a fraudulent purpose. Now they know the proceeding is genuine they want to participate. This is an insufficient explanation for failing to register. I consider that it lacks cogency. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0292	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.0336	I reviewed this application individually. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or class closure deadline, but they do not say when they left the industry (the only date mentioned is the class period, which is insufficient). Inadequate explanation for missing class closure deadline. I consider that unfair prejudice has not been established.
UBCA.100.003.0344	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant provides insufficient particulars regarding their overseas travel. They have not established unfair prejudice by giving a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline.
UBCA.100.003.0354	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0359	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0399	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0594	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant asserts that they mistakenly believed it was a closed class action with no option to register, however, this is not sufficient to warrant a grant of leave. They have not provided an adequate explanation for the mistaken belief and so have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0600	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0605	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0614	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0620	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says that, as an owner, they had no chance to hear through grapevine or from the industry about the proceeding. This is not an adequate explanation for the failure to register; there were multiple forms of notification, not all limited to active industry participants. No unfair prejudice is established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.0623	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant asserts that a false claim was spread that, as a driver, they were not eligible. This is not an adequate explanation for the failure to register; they did not make their own enquiries. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0626	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0627	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application refers to family and work as reasons for lack of awareness, but without specificity. The explanation is inadequate and they have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0634	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0639	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0644	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0687	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0712	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave; it does not include a reason for missing the deadline and has not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0723	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered, but without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0744	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0760	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they were not aware of the proceeding or deadline but the explanation for missing the deadline is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.0782	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0791	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0796	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0797	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0827	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant knew of the proceeding but did not know how to register, with reference to emails from the NSW Taxi Council. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.0838	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0865	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0885	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0908	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application includes a statement that a taxi company told them that it was making submissions on their behalf, which they understood to mean that company said it would register for them. This is not an adequate explanation for the failure to register. No particulars are given as to the taxi company and when they were allegedly told this. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0911	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0930	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The statement of having relocated to NSW is insufficient due to notices not being so geographically limited. They have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.0931	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.0958	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0962	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.0970	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1004	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It does not contain a sufficient explanation for the failure to register and unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.003.1005	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It does not contain a sufficient explanation for the failure to register and unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.003.1009	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It is a bare statement of lack of knowledge of the proceeding before the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1011	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1021	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1049	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1073	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says they missed the deadline due to unforeseen personal circumstances, and also that they were not aware of the deadline. The explanation has no specificity or particularity. It is also internally inconsistent. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1077	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that he was 'a confused and worried man during that time as I was struggling to put food on the table for my kids'. This is not sufficient as an explanation without any further detail. They have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1080	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1083	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1123	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1135	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application is made by an executor of a deceased estate, where the executor had been applying for taxi related government assistance and the executor states that they were not aware of the proceeding. There is insufficient particularity regarding the failure to register. There is no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1145	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered, but without sufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1148	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. Overseas travel referenced was not during the registration period and provides an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1154	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It does not contain a sufficient explanation for the failure to register and unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.003.1164	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant provides an insufficient explanation and particulars for their mistaken belief in prior registration. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1179	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1180	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1184	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant asserts they were informed they were not eligible as they were not an owner, without particulars of who informed them or what position they held (which may have been a reasonable explanation for them believing that person). This is not sufficient to establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1185	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1198	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application includes a statement of not reading papers, being busy with personal commitments that are specified, and that they received a WhatsApp message about the proceeding but thought it was a scam. In my view, they have not provided an adequate explanation for the failure to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1221	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. This is another application where the applicant states they were not in the industry but does not provide sufficient particulars or explanation of why they failed to register. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1222	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered without particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1237	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1241	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1244	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They say they had a mistaken belief as to already being registered as a taxi driver, and this is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. There are no adequate particulars for their mistaken belief. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1247	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1248	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1256	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1261	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1269	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1272	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1283	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1300	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1304	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says that the deadline was missed due to their child's ongoing medical issues but there is no specificity to this assertion or explanation as to how those medical issues caused the applicant to miss the deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1321	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1328	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1329	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1345	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1350	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1431	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1446	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1458	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1465	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1480	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant missed the deadline as they assumed they could not register because they lived in NSW. This is not a sufficient explanation; they made an assumption and did not take steps to confirm if that was correct. There is no unfair prejudice established. Note the name in the Registers of Maurice Blackburn is incorrect.
UBCA.100.003.1487	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's reasons for missing the deadline are generalised and internally contradictory, and without specificity or particulars. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1495	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1510	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1531	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant provides an insufficient explanation and particulars for their mistaken belief in prior registration. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1543	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1545	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1548	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1550	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It does not contain a sufficient explanation for the failure to register and unfair prejudice is not established.
UBCA.100.003.1555	I reviewed this application individually. The application was too generalised and the reasons given were internally contradictory at times and not supported by particulars. The application does not merit a grant of leave. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1559	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1561	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established
UBCA.100.003.1575	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. It includes a statement that the applicant does not read news about the industry, but I do not consider this an adequate explanation for the failure to register. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1578	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The reasons given for missing the deadline are generalised and at times internally contradictory. They do not provide a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline and have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1579	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1581	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1594	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1601	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1608	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. It is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. The stated financial hardship is not connected with the failure to register. The applicant gives inconsistent reasons for not registering: saying they initially did not register because of lack of knowledge of legal rights, then that they did not know of the class action. No unfair is prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1639	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. This group member provides an inconsistent and insufficient explanation for missing the deadline, simultaneously saying that they were unaware of the date and forgot to register by the date. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1643	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1649	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they already registered using a website portal without any particulars of this registration. Maurice Blackburn has not identified this group member as being already registered. It is likely that the applicant's reference to the portal refers to the portal for late registration by unregistered group members in 2024, and I infer this is the case. There is no reason for missing the deadline included in the application and unfair prejudice has not been established.
UBCA.100.003.1659	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1661	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1667	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1675	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1715	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1716	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1727	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.1733	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.1756	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1766	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's evidence is contradictory - they say they were unaware of the deadline because they are currently overseas but the affidavit is witnessed in Australia. The explanation is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1776	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains a bare assertion of being overseas without particulars given of dates or the period abroad. The explanation for missing the deadline is insufficient.
UBCA.100.003.1789	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant makes a bare statement of not knowing of the ability to register before 2 October 2023. There is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1815	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. This group member provides an inconsistent and insufficient explanation for missing the deadline, simultaneously saying that they were unaware of the date and forgot to register by the date. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1901	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1919	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant makes a bare statement of not knowing of the ability to register before 2 October 2023. There is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.1925	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.1975	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established
UBCA.100.003.1989	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2001	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2010	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2042	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant raises a mistaken belief in registration, however, there are insufficient particulars for this. Unfair prejudice has not been established.
UBCA.100.003.2060	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.2070	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant did not register because they misunderstood eligibility criteria, and thought it was only a proceeding for owners of licences. There is no specificity to that explanation. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.2119	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2164	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2165	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.2178	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2206	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2223	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2225	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There are insufficient particulars of the overseas travel, without dates or a period. This is an insufficient reason for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2227	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2235	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2253	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.2258	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2260	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2275	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2282	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.2287	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2289	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2304	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave, as it did not disclose a sufficiently specific reason for the failure to register or demonstrate unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.2307	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2326	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2329	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2395	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. Beyond a statement of having moved residence in 2017, there is no reason for failing to register and this is insufficient for leave. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.2403	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2407	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The application includes a statement that 'I was unaware of the class action due to my relocation to Queensland in 2016 and only recently became aware of its implications for affected taxi drivers.' That is not sufficient; the notification regime was not limited to direct notice to the addresses of group members or to one state or territory of Australia, and the Opt Out and Closure Notice was advertised in a Queensland newspaper. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.003.2468	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.2475	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2506	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2510	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2516	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave, as there is no explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2537	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2541	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered, but without particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2574	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The mistaken belief that they would be automatically included is not sufficient. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2575	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2578	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2587	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2600	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to pressures they were experiencing, including care for a newborn child, medical needs of other children and work, but there is no specificity around the timeframes given and insufficient particulars. They have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.003.2605	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2606	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class closure deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2616	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2628	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2639	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.003.2648	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2651	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a mistaken belief that they were registered, but without particulars. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.003.2655	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0013	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. They held a mistaken belief that they were not eligible as they did not own a licence plate, but this is not an adequate explanation as no particulars are given for the mistaken belief. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.004.0019	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to working at night-time as the reason that they did not know about the proceeding. This is not an adequate explanation in my view. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.004.0041	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.004.0042	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. It includes a bare statement of the applicant being overseas without any particulars. There is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and no unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0044	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0047	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0050	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states they assumed they were automatically registered. It is an inadequate explanation for the failure to register. No particulars are given for the mistaken belief. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0054	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to family circumstances as being the reason they could not register in time, but provide no specifics about those circumstances. Overall, their explanation is insufficient and does not amount to unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.004.0056	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0095	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0096	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. They say that they did not receive notices, but this alone is insufficient. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.004.0097	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0098	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0102	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application contains an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and insufficient particulars. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.004.0103	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0107	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0109	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0110	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0112	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0121	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0123	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0132	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant says that they did not receive notices but this by itself is not a sufficient explanation. They do not establish unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.004.0145	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0192	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0210	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.004.0217	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0220	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0237	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0242	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0254	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. This group member provides an inconsistent and insufficient explanation for missing the deadline, simultaneously saying that they were unaware of the date and forgot to register by the date. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0270	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0274	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.004.0278	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The explanation for missing the class closure deadline is insufficient. No unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.004.0284	I reviewed this application individually and determined that it did not merit a grant of leave. The applicant heard from other drivers that they had received correspondence inviting them to register and the applicant took this to mean that they were not eligible to participate, as they had not received correspondence. It is an inadequate explanation for failure to register. There is no explanation given for why they did not check.  Note the name on the Maurice Blackburn register is incorrect.
UBCA.100.005.0016	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant refers to having received no notices and provides an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.100.005.0027	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant had a lack of knowledge of the proceeding or deadline. They provide an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline and no unfair prejudice is established.
UBCA.100.006.0030	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims that they did not register for fear of the information being collected for a fraudulent purpose. This is an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.006.0126	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the class action with insufficient reason for missing the deadline. No unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.007.0007	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.100.008.0001	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The two persons in this application both raise health issues and financial difficulties but do not link those to the registration deadline being missed or state whether they knew of the deadline or proceeding. They do not provide a sufficient explanation and have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.100.009.0001	One of four applications omitted in error by Maurice Blackburn in original packaging up of applications. This application is not one of the 656 identified by MB for individual review (Fourth UGM affidavit, [58]-[59]). I reviewed this application individually. I am satisfied that it does not warrant a grant of leave.
UBCA.100.009.0002	One of four applications omitted in error by Maurice Blackburn in original packaging up of applications. This application is not one of the 656 identified by MB for individual review (Fourth UGM affidavit, [58]-[59]). I reviewed this application individually. I am satisfied that it does not warrant a grant of leave.
UBCA.100.009.0003	One of four applications omitted in error by Maurice Blackburn in original packaging up of applications. This application is not one of the 656 identified by MB for individual review (Fourth UGM affidavit, [58]-[59]). I reviewed this application individually. I am satisfied that it does not warrant a grant of leave.
UBCA.100.009.0004	One of four applications omitted in error by Maurice Blackburn in original packaging up of applications. This application is not one of the 656 identified by MB for individual review (Fourth UGM affidavit, [58]-[59]). I reviewed this application individually. I am satisfied that it does not warrant a grant of leave. Applicant says they were overseas from October 2023 to May 2024, which does not explain why they did not register by the class closure deadline, and no other explanation is given.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.001.0001	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0002	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0004	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0005	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0006	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0007	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0011	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.001.0012	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0001	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0002	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0003	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0004	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0005	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant first heard about the proceeding in October 2023 and provides an insufficient explanation for missing the deadline. There is no unfair prejudice.
UBCA.200.002.0006	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0007	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0008	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0009	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0010	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. There is a bare statement of lack of awareness of the proceeding and deadline without sufficient explanation for why the deadline was missed. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0011	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0012	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0013	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0014	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The application is based on their non-awareness that active steps were needed to register, but they knew of the proceeding. They have not provided sufficient explanation for missing the deadline. Unfair prejudice is not established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0015	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0016	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0017	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0018	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they knew of the proceeding but not that they needed to take active steps. Even having regard to their personal characteristics and vulnerabilities, I consider that this is not a sufficient explanation for failing to register by the deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.200.002.0019	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0020	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0021	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0022	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0023	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0024	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant states that they were aware of the proceeding but not of a requirement to register, and they don't provide an explanation with any sufficiency to warrant a grant of leave. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0025	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0026	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0027	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0028	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0029	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0030	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0031	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0032	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0033	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0034	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0035	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0036	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0037	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0038	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0039	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0040	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0041	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0042	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0043	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant knew about the proceeding in advance of the registration period but did not know that they had to do anything to participate. The applicant does not provide a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline and has not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.200.002.0044	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0045	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0046	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0047	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0048	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0049	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0050	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0051	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0052	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0053	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0054	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0055	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0056	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0057	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.



<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0058	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0059	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0060	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0061	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0062	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0063	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0064	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0065	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant did, in fact, know about the proceeding through a social media post in October 2023 and contacted Maurice Blackburn about this. They did not provide a sufficient explanation for why they missed the deadline while being aware of the proceeding. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.200.002.0066	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0067	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0068	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0069	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0070	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0071	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0072	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0073	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0074	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0075	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0076	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0077	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0078	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0079	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0080	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0081	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0082	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0083	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0084	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0085	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0086	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0087	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0088	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0089	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0090	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0091	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0092	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0093	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0094	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0095	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0096	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0097	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0098	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0099	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0100	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0101	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0102	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0103	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0104	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0106	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0107	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0108	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0109	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant's evidence is that they had no knowledge of the need to register, with no particularity. They do not provide a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline and have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.200.002.0110	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0111	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0112	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0113	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0114	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0115	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0116	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0117	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0118	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0119	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0120	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0121	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0122	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0123	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0124	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0125	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0126	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0127	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0128	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0129	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0130	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0131	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0132	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0133	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0134	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Summary of reasons</b>
UBCA.200.002.0135	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0136	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0137	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0138	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0139	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0140	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0141	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0142	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0143	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0144	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0145	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.



Application no.	Summary of reasons
UBCA.200.002.0146	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The evidence of the applicant is contradictory in respect of when they knew about the proceeding and there is an overall lack of specificity. They have not provided a sufficient explanation for missing the deadline. They have not established unfair prejudice.
UBCA.200.002.0147	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.
UBCA.200.002.0148	I reviewed this application individually. The application does not merit a grant of leave. The applicant claims a lack of knowledge of the class action but there is an insufficient explanation for missing the registration deadline. No unfair prejudice established.

---

**CERTIFICATE**

I certify that this and the 284 preceding pages are a true copy of the reasons for judgment of Matthews J of the Supreme Court of Victoria delivered on 2 December 2024.

DATED this second day of December 2024.



*Amelia Simpson*

.....  
Associate

SCHEDULE OF PARTIES

**S ECI 2019 01926**

NICOS ANDRIANAKIS Plaintiff

- v -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED (4849283) First Defendant

UBER INTERNATIONAL HOLDING B.V. (RSIN 851 929 357) Second Defendant

UBER B.V. (RSIN 852 071 589) Third Defendant

UBER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD (ACN 160 299 865) Fourth Defendant

RASIER OPERATIONS B.V. (RSIN 853 682 318) Fifth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS B.V. (RSIN 855 779 330) Sixth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS PTY LTD (ACN 609 590 463) Seventh Defendant

**S ECI 2020 01834**

JAMAL SALEM IN HER CAPACITY AS EXECUTOR FOR  
THE ESTATE OF ANWAR SALEM Plaintiff

- v -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED (4849283) First Defendant

UBER INTERNATIONAL HOLDING B.V. (RSIN 851 929 357) Second Defendant

UBER B.V. (RSIN 852 071 589) Third Defendant

UBER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD (ACN 160 299 865) Fourth Defendant

RASIER OPERATIONS B.V. (RSIN 853 682 318) Fifth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS B.V. (RSIN 855 779 330) Sixth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS PTY LTD (ACN 609 590 463) Seventh Defendant

PETER STEWART

Plaintiff

- v -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED (4849283) First Defendant

UBER INTERNATIONAL HOLDING B.V. (RSIN 851 929 357) Second Defendant

UBER B.V. (RSIN 852 071 589) Third Defendant

UBER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD (ACN 160 299 865) Fourth Defendant

RASIER OPERATIONS B.V. (RSIN 853 682 318) Fifth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS B.V. (RSIN 855 779 330) Sixth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS PTY LTD (ACN 609 590 463) Seventh Defendant

H.D. ANDREE & M. ANDREE (a partnership)

Plaintiff

- v -

UBER TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED (4849283) First Defendant

UBER INTERNATIONAL HOLDING B.V. (RSIN 851 929 357) Second Defendant

UBER B.V. (RSIN 852 071 589) Third Defendant

UBER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD (ACN 160 299 865) Fourth Defendant

RASIER OPERATIONS B.V. (RSIN 853 682 318) Fifth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS B.V. (RSIN 855 779 330) Sixth Defendant

UBER PACIFIC HOLDINGS PTY LTD (ACN 609 590 463) Seventh Defendant