Motions Kam 25th by - The is lawn



Filed: 18 June 2018 5:12 PM



Form 3A/B Rule 6.2

# AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM

COURT DETAILS
Court

Supreme Court of NSW

Division Common Law

Common Law General List Supreme Court Sydney Registry

2017/00131194 Case number

FILING DETAILS

Plaintiff[s] Filed for

Brendan Pendergast Legal representative

Legal representative reference

Telephone (03) 5560 2000

Your reference 170191

ATTACHMENT DETAILS In accordance with Part 3 of the UCPR, this coversheet confirms that both the Amended Statement of Claim (e-Services), along with any other documents listed below, were filed by the Court.

Amended Statement of Claim (Further Amended Statement of Claim.pdf)

[attach.]

bpender001 Page 1 of 1 Filed: 18/06/2018 17:12 PM

Form 3A (version 7) UCPR 6.2

# FURTHER AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM

#### **COURT DETAILS**

Court Supreme Court of New South Wales

Division Common Law

List General Registry Sydney

Case number 2017/131194

TITLE OF PROCEEDINGS

First plaintiff Manfred Kuhn

Second plaintiff Elizabeth Kaye Stewart

Defendant Infigen Energy Limited

ABN 39 105 051 616

**FILING DETAILS** 

Filed for Manfred Kuhn and Elizabeth Kaye Stewart, the plaintiffs

Legal representative Brendan Pendergast, Maddens Lawyers

219 Koroit Street,

Warrnambool, Victoria, 3280

DX:28001

Tel: (03) 5560 2000

Legal representative 170191

reference

Contact name and Brendan Pendergast, (03)55602000

telephone <u>bfp@maddenslawyers.com.au</u>

Contact email

# **TYPE OF CLAIM**

Torts - Negligence - Personal Injury - Property Damage

#### **RELIEF CLAIMED**

The plaintiffs claim on their own behalf and on behalf of each of the Group Members:

- A. Damages.
- B. Costs.
- C. Interest on damages and costs pursuant to sections 100 and 101 of the Civil Procedure Act 2005 (NSW).
- **D.** Such further order as the Court deems fit.

# **PLEADINGS AND PARTICULARS**

### A. INTRODUCTION

# A.1. The plaintiffs

- 1 The first and second plaintiffs (plaintiffs):
  - a. owned personal and real property in New South Wales at 783 Mount Fairy Rd,
     Mount Fairy (Land);
  - suffered loss and damage by reason of the bushfire which commenced on 17 January 2017 in the vicinity of Tarago (Currandooley Bushfire) and burnt the area depicted in Annexure 1;
  - c. commence this proceeding as a representative proceeding pursuant to section 157 of the *Civil Procedure Act 2005* (NSW) (Civil Procedure Act) on behalf of all persons (Group Members), who or which:
    - suffered loss or damage to property (Group Member Land) as a result of the Currandooley Bushfire;
    - ii. suffered personal injury (whether physical injury, or psychiatric injury as defined below) as a result of:
      - A. the Currandooley Bushfire; and, or alternatively
      - B. an injury to another person as a result of the Currandooley Bushfire.

(where psychiatric injury in this group definition means nervous shock or another psychiatric or psychological injury, disturbance, disorder or condition which has been diagnosed by a medical practitioner prior to the commencement of this proceeding);

- iii. are the legal personal representatives of the estates of any person who would be a Group Member but for their death after the date of the fire;
- iv. are not any of the following:

- a related party (as defined by section 228 of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) (Corporations Act) of Infigen Energy Limited (Infigen);
- B. a related body corporate (as defined by section 50 of the Corporations Act) of Infigen;
- C. an associated entity (as defined by section 50AAA of the Corporations Act) of Infigen;
- D. an officer or a close associate (as defined by section 9 of the Corporations Act) of Infigen; or
- E. the Commonwealth or a State or any body corporate, Minister or officer acting in the capacity of an officer of the Commonwealth or a State.
- Immediately prior to the commencement of this proceeding, seven or more persons have claims against Infigen within the meaning of section 157 of the Civil Procedure Act.
- The plaintiffs and Group Members have the same interest in this proceeding, by reason of the fact that the plaintiffs and each Group Member claim the same type of relief against Infigen in negligence and require a resolution of at least the common issues of law or fact identified in Section D of this amended statement of claim.

# A.2. Infigen Energy Limited (Infigen)

- 4 Infigen is and at all material times was:
  - a. incorporated pursuant to the Corporations Act and capable of being sued;
  - the owner and operator of the Capital Renewable Energy Precinct located near Bungendore in New South Wales, Australia incorporating the Capital Windfarm comprising 67 wind turbines and the Woodlawn Windfarm comprising 23 wind turbines;
  - c. the owner of and had under its care, control and management the electricity power lines and associated equipment or electricity structures that formed the distribution system used to convey and control the conveyance of electricity within and from the Capital Windfarm and the Woodlawn Windfarm (Electricity Works); and

4

d. to the extent that the Capital Windfarm, Woodlawn Windfarm or Electricity Works were built on land that Infigen did not own or lease in whole, was licenced to keep in place and maintain the Capital Windfarm or Electricity Works on the land on which they were situated.

#### B. CURRANDOOLEY BUSHFIRE

5 Shortly before 10:00 AM on 17 January 2017, the Currandooley Bushfire commenced in grass adjacent to the Electricity Works.

#### **Particulars**

The Currandooley Bushfire commenced in the vicinity of pole #25 of the WOO 33 kV transmission powerline ("pole #25") which passes from Woodlawn Windfarm to a substation on the Capital Windfarm owned and operated by Infigen.

- The Currandooley Bushfire spread from its point of ignition to surrounding areas and caused extensive damage before being brought under control.
- 7 The Currandooley Bushfire was caused by a bird coming into contact with the Electricity Works.

# **Particulars**

The Currandooley Bushfire was caused by an interaction between a bird and the Electricity Works, which involved, alternatively:

- a. a bird coming into contact with two phases or a phase and ground, causing the bird to be electrocuted, catch on fire and fall into dry grass at the base of pole #25, causing a fire to commence;
- b. a bird coming into contact with two phases or a phase and ground, causing the Electrical Works to ignite and eject burning or heated material, causing a fire to commence in the vicinity of the base of pole #25;
- a bird perched on the Electrical Works ejecting a streamer onto or near an insulator or conductor forming part of the Electricity Works, causing a flashover and an ignition by either of the sub-particulars a. or b. above; or
- d. a bird otherwise configuring the Electricity Works so as to cause the Currandooley Bushfire (Expert Report of Paul de Mar, [82] and Figures 10 and 11; Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn pp 15-19).

# C. NEGLIGENCE

# C.1. Duty of Care

8 At the material times, Infigen caused or allowed electricity to be transmitted via the Electricity Works.

At the material times, Infigen knew or ought to have known that the activity of transmitting electricity via the Electricity Works created a risk of fire (Risk of Fire).

#### **Particulars**

Infigen as a producer and transmitter of electricity knew or ought to have known that the activity of transmitting electricity carried a risk that electricity might escape from the Electricity Works and cause fire on or around the Electricity Works.

- At the material times, Infigen knew or ought to have known that the Risk of Fire created a risk of:
  - a. loss or damage to the property of the plaintiffs and Group Members; and, or alternatively
  - personal injury (whether physical injury, or psychiatric injury as defined in paragraph 1c.ii of this amended statement of claim) to the persons of the plaintiffs and Group Members,

(together, Risk of Harm).

# **Particulars**

The Risk of Harm arose because:

- a. if ignition by the Risk of Fire occurred in a bushfire prone area in bushfire season there was a risk of a bushfire; and
- b. if a bushfire occurred in the vicinity of the Electricity Works there was a risk that a class of persons including the plaintiffs and Group Members would suffer loss and damage to their property and person.
- 11 At the material times, the plaintiffs and Group Members:
  - a. had no or no practicable ability to prevent or minimise the risk of a fire starting in connection with the Electricity Works by the Risk of Fire;
  - b. were vulnerable to the impact or effects of such fire; and consequently
  - c. were dependent, for the protection of their persons, property and interests, upon Infigen taking precautions against the Risk of Harm.
- As a result of the matters pleaded in paragraphs 8 to 11 above (separately or in combination) Infigen, at the material times, owed a duty of care to the plaintiffs and Group Members to exercise reasonable care and to take reasonable precautions against the possibility of the materialisation of the Risk of Harm (**Duty of Care**).

# C.2. Breach

- At the material times, the Risk of Harm was:
  - a. foreseeable to Infigen; and
  - b. not insignificant.

#### **Particulars**

- a. Infigen was aware of the Risk of Fire and the Risk of Harm.
- b. Infigen was aware that, on 4 January 2017, a fire broke out at a property known as "Pylara", which spread over 20ha and that the fire was caused by a crow landing on or near pole #67 of the WOO 33 kV transmission powerline, being electrocuted and falling alight to the ground.
- <u>b1. Infigen was aware that on 11 February 2014, a fire broke out at its Lake Bonnev</u>
  <u>Wind Farm which was caused by a crow shorting out its overhead 33kV line</u>
  connecting Lake Bonnev 3 to the substation at pole # 35.
- Infigen was aware that it was not uncommon for bird strikes to occur on powerlines and that a bird strike could cause a fire.
   (http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/flaming-crows-bird-on-wire-sparks-bushfire/ne ws-story/22148adfcc 118eae 0ca015ab426392ce)
- d. Following the Currandooley Fire, Infigen conducted environmental improvements including laying gravel around the base of power poles and slashing/spraying long grass. (http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/flaming-crows-bird-on-wire-sparks-bushfire/news-story/22148adfcc 118eae0ca015ab426392ce)
- e. Infigen was aware that the Capital Windfarm and Electricity Works were located in an area designated by the Rural Fire Service as bushfire prone.
- f.—Infigen was aware-that a Total Fire Ban was in place on 17 January 2017.
- g. Infigen was aware that the foreseeable local conditions for the land upon which the Electricity Works were located and its surrounds included:
  - dry environmental conditions;
  - low atmospheric humidity;
  - high ambient temperature; and
  - strongwinds.: and
  - an average of six bird attributed outages on its Electricity Works each year between 2012 and 2017 (IFN.001.118.0003 and IFN.001.095.0002).
- h. <u>Infigen</u> as a producer and transmitter of electricity knew or ought to have known that the risk of animal or bird contact with its Electricity Works causing ground fire was foreseeable and significant:
  - I. Western Power Bushfire Management Implementation Plan 2010:
  - //. TasNetworks Bushfire Risk Mitigation Plan 2017:

- iii. Essential Energy Bushfire Risk Management Plan 2017;
- iv. "it is widely known in the electricity supply industry that bird flashover faults on high voltage power lines can cause bushfires when fuel conditions beneath the fault location are conducive to fire ignition and spread" (Expert Report of Paul de Mar at [43], see further at [61]-[68]):
- v. Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, pp 31-32: and
- vi. Expert Report of Dr Trevor Blackburn, p 14.
- i. Further, Infigen knew or ought to have known that the risk of animal or bird contact with its Electricity Works causing ground fire was foreseeable and significant by reason of the fault data it collected from 2012 together with its awareness of the local conditions identified in particular (g) above and the general risk identified at particular (h) above (Expert Report of Paul de Mar, [39]-[60]; Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, pp 19 21).
- 14 As a result of the matters pleaded and particularised in paragraphs 9 to 13 above:
  - a. there was a significant risk of harm if reasonable precautions were not taken against the Risk of Harm;
  - b. the harm that could occur in the event that the Risk of Harm eventuated was serious in that it could involve destruction of property and danger to life;
  - c. the burden of taking reasonable precautions against the Risk of Harm was low or moderate or, in the alternative, was not unreasonable having regard to the probability that the Risk of Harm would eventuate and potential seriousness of the harm if that occurred; and

# Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, pp 40-41.

- d. the social utility of Infigen operating the Electricity Works was not so great as to have impeded it from taking reasonable precautions against the Risk of Harm.
- As a result of the matters pleaded and particularised in paragraphs 9 to 14 above, a reasonable person in the position of Infigen at the material times would have taken the following precautions against the materialisation of the Risk of Harm:
  - a. reducing fuel load in the vicinity of the Electricity Works, and in particular near the parts of the Electricity Works comprising high-voltage transmission lines, including near the WOO 33 kV transmission powerline;

#### **Particulars**

Fuel load should have been managed by:

- a. regular scheduled slashing and maintenance operations in the vicinity of the Electricity Works supplemented by additional slashing as necessary when inter alia weather conditions led to greater and higher grass in the vicinity (Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, pp 27-28): or alternatively
- cultivation or tilling of the soil within any easement area of the Electricity Works.
- installing safety features on those parts of the Electricity Works comprising high-voltage transmission lines to minimise dangerous interaction of animals or objects;

The following safety features should have been installed:

- a. beds of gravel or other non-flammable material around the pylons supporting the Electricity Works (Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, p 27): and, or alternatively
- b. —an-appropriately designed auto-reclose system; and, or alternatively
- c. adequate separation and/or insulation of active conductors to minimise flashover from external causes.
- modifying or designing the Electricity Works to deter bird strikes or other unsafe animal contact, including the emission of streamers over high-risk areas; and, or alternatively

#### **Particulars**

The following modification or design features should have been adopted:

- a. bird deterrents and/or diverters, including perch deterrents and safe perches to lure birds away from energised conductors and nearby hardware (Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, pp 25 26):
- b. insulating sleeves, including:
  - i. placing insulation over the grounded metal cross-arm (Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, p 36; Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, p 24-26): or
  - <u>ii.</u> placing low density polyethylene pipe over live aluminium conductor steel-reinforced cables (in particular the centre phase and where used as a jumper on auxiliary structures) (<u>Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, p 37)</u>.

to prevent birds or animals contacting two phases or a phase and ground; and-or-alternatively

- c. covered or gapped ground conductors to prevent phase to ground contact by birds or animals.;
- <u>d.</u> <u>installing hanging insulators so as to prevent a bird making contact between</u> <u>the grounded metal cross-arm and a conductor (Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, pp 34 35):</u>

- e. designing the Electricity Works having regard to local conditions with sufficient clearance between the conductors and earthed structures to avoid the electrocution of birds perched on the metal cross-arms (Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, pp 34 35): and, or alternatively
- <u>e</u>. designing the Electricity Works to be carried underground (Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, p 33).
- d. -immediate-reporting-of-actual-or-suspected-ignitions-to-emergency-services-in bushfire-season-and/or-Total-Fire-Ban-days developing and implementing a bushfire risk mitigation plan.

A bushfire risk mitigation plan should have been adopted including:

- a. a bushfire mitigation policy:
- <u>b.</u> <u>a formal process by which sources of bushfire risk (including the risk of bushfire starting from bird-caused faults) are identified and reviewed, and trend analysis undertaken for fault types which have the potential to cause bushfires:</u>
- a process for programming and tracking that bushfire preventative actions are complete before each bushfire season and reported to management and Board: and
- d. <u>a process for investigating fire starts, reporting issues to management.</u>
  reviewing procedural strengths, weakness and opportunities for improvement and acting on those (Expert Report of Paul de Mar. \171-\251 and [38]).

(together and separately, Bushfire Risk Precautions).

- Infigen failed to take reasonable care in relation to the Risk of Harm by reason of it, prior to 17 January 2017:
  - a. failing to reduce fuel load in the vicinity of the WOO 33 kV transmission powerline in bushfire season;

# **Particulars**

# Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, p 28.

- failing to lay gravel beds (or other non-flammable material) under the WOO 33
   kV transmission powerline poles and/or pylons;
- G. —failing-to-install-an-appropriate-auto-reclose-system-on-the-Electricity-Works;
- d. failing to adequately separate or insulate the conductors;

# **Particulars**

- a. Expert Report of DrTrevor Blackburn, pp 9-12.
- b. Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, pp 38-39 and 42.

e. failing to modify or design the WOO 33 kV transmission powerlines and auxiliary infrastructure so as to minimise the risk of unsafe bird contact with the Electricity Works;

# **Particulars**

Expert Report of Laurence McKinnon, pp 38-39 and 42.

f. <u>failing to develop and implement a bushfire risk mitigation plan</u> contact emergency—services—as—soon as—the—ignition—which resulted in—the Currandooley-Bushfire-became-apparent; and, or alternatively

## **Particulars**

### Expert Report of Paul de Mar, [79]-[81]

 g. otherwise failing to carry out or carry out with reasonable care any of the Bushfire Risk Precautions particularised in paragraph 15 above,

(together and separately, Bushfire Risk Failures).

By reason of one or more of the Bushfire Risk Failures, Infigen breached its Duty of Care (Bushfire Risk Breach).

# C.3. Causation

- Had the Bushfire Risk Breach not occurred, the Currandooley Bushfire:
  - a. would not have occurred; and
  - b. would not have caused loss and damage to the plaintiff and Group Members.

# **Particulars**

- a. Expert Report of Dr Trevor Blackburn, pp 3 and 29-30.
- b. Expert Report of Paul de Mar, [81].

# C.4. Loss and damage of plaintiffs

The plaintiffs have suffered loss and damage as a result of the Bushfire Risk Breach.

#### **Particulars**

The loss suffered by the plaintiffs is \$529,569, being:

a. Property loss and damage: \$407,044 (Expert Report of Joe Lane, GHD, Annexure B): and

- <u>b. Loss of commercial tree plantation: \$122,525 (Expert Report of Damian\_Walsh, Margules Groom).</u>
- a. the cost of repair of property;
- b. anydiminution in the value of property; and, or alternatively
- c. anyconsequential losses being the necessity to pay interest and other expenses resulting from the damage to property.

Further particulars of further loss and damage will be provided in due course and prior to the hearing.

## C.5. Loss and damage of Group Members

Group Members have suffered loss and damage as a result of the Bushfire Risk Breach.

#### **Particulars**

.The gross Quantum of loss suffered by all registered group members but for the plaintiffs in relation to property damage is \$4,368,938 being:

- a. Property loss and damage: \$4,775,982 (Expert Reports of Joe Lane, GHD).
- <u>b.</u> <u>Loss of the oak plantation at Merigan: \$130.110 (Expert Report of Alan Mann, Canopy Tree Experts)</u>

The <u>Further</u> loss suffered by Group Members will be particularised following the initial trial of the plaintiffs' claim and prior to the determination of Group Members' claims but with the plaintiffs' current state of knowledge will likely consist of:

- a. the cost of repair of property plus any diminution in the value of property post any repairs;
- the-cost of replacement of property less any salvage value of the damaged property;
- c. any consequential losses being the loss to income and profits resulting from the damage to property;
- d. any consequential losses being the necessity to pay interest and other expenses resulting from the damage to property; and, or alternatively
- e. personal injury (if relevant to a particular Group Member).

### C1. NUISANCE

20A. The activity of allowing electricity to be transmitted via the Electricity Works and the Currandooley Bushfire has caused a substantial interference with the use and enjoyment of the Land by the plaintiffs and Group Members as owners and occupiers of the Land and Group Member Land.

# The plaintiffs repeat paragraph 19 and 20 above.

20B. The substantial interference with the use and enjoyment of the Land and Group

Member Land by Infigen's activities is unreasonable in that Infigen knew at all

material times that there was a foreseeable risk that fire may occur on the Capital

Windfarm, Woodlawn Windfarm, or otherwise on or in connection with the Electricity

Works and spread to the Land and Group Member Land and.

# <u>Particulars</u>

The plaintiffs repeat paragraphs 13 to 16 above and say:

- <u>a. a reasonable person in the position of Infigen would have taken the Bushfire Risk Precautions: and</u>
- b. Infigen committed the Bushfire Risk Failures.
- 20C. The plaintiffs and Group Members have suffered damage as result of the substantial and unreasonable interference with their use and enjoyment of the Land and Group Member Land.

#### <u>Particulars</u>

The plaintiffs repeat paragraph 19 and 20 above.

#### D. COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW OR FACT

- The questions of law or fact common to the claims of the plaintiffs and each Group Member are:
  - a. whether the Risk of Fire and Risk of Harm existed;
  - b. whether Infigen owed the Duty of Care to the plaintiffs and Group Members;
  - c. the nature, scope and content of the Duty of Care;
  - d. whether the Risk of Harm was foreseeable;
  - e. whether a reasonable person in the position of Infigen at the material times would carry out the Bushfire Risk Precautions;
  - f. whether and to what extent the Bushfire Risk Failures were breaches of the Duty of Care;

- g. whether the Bushfire Risk Breach caused or contributed to the Currandooley Bushfire;
- h. whether Infigen has caused a nuisance to plaintiffs and Group Members by unreasonably interfering with their enjoyment of the Land and Group Member Land; and
- i. the principles for identifying and measuring compensable loss suffered by the claimants resulting from the breaches of duty or negligence or nuisance alleged herein.

# SIGNATURE OF LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I certify under clause 4 of Schedule 2 to the Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Act 2014 that there are reasonable grounds for believing on the basis of provable facts and a reasonably arguable view of the law that the claim for damages in these proceedings has reasonable prospects of success.

I have advised the plaintiffs that court fees may be payable during these proceedings. These fees may include a hearing allocation fee.

Signature -

Capacity

Date of signature 18.06.18

KATHRYN AMY EMENY of Maddens Lawyers 219 Korolt Street Warmambool An Australian legal practitioner within the meaning of the Legal Profession Uniform Law (Victoria)

#### NOTICE TO DEFENDANT

If you do not file a defence within 28 days of being served with this statement of claim:

- You will be in default in these proceedings.
- The court may enter judgment against you without any further notice to you.

The judgment may be for the relief claimed in the statement of claim and for the plaintiffs' costs of bringing these proceedings. The court may provide third parties with details of any default judgment entered against you.

### **HOW TO RESPOND**

Please read this statement of claim very carefully. If you have any trouble understanding it or require assistance on how to respond to the claim you should get legal advice as soon as possible.

You can get further information about what you need to do to respond to the claim from:

- A legal practitioner.
- LawAccess NSW on 1300 888 529 or at www.lawaccess.nsw.gov.au.
- The court registry for limited procedural information.

You can respond in one of the following ways:

- 1 If you intend to dispute the claim or part of the claim, by filing a defence and/or making a cross-claim.
- 2 If money is claimed, and you believe you owe the money claimed, by:
  - Paying the plaintiff all of the money and interest claimed. If you file a notice
    of payment under UCPR 6.17 further proceedings against you will be
    stayed unless the court otherwise orders.
  - Filing an acknowledgement of the claim.
  - Applying to the court for further time to pay the claim.
- If money is claimed, and you believe you owe part of the money claimed, by:
  - Paying the plaintiffs that part of the money that is claimed.
  - Filing a defence in relation to the part that you do not believe is owed.

Court forms are available on the UCPR website at www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/ucpr or at any NSW court registry.

# **REGISTRY ADDRESS**

Street address Supreme Court of New South Wales

Law Courts Building, Queens Square 184 Phillip Street, Sydney NSW 2000

Australia

Postal address Supreme Court of New South Wales

GPO Box 3 Sydney NSW 2001

Australia

DX: 829 Sydney

Telephone (02) 9230 8111

### **AFFIDAVIT VERIFYING**

Name Kathryn Amy Emeny

Address 219 Koroit Street, Warrnambool Victoria, 3280

Occupation Lawyer

Date **\%** June 2018.

I, Kathryn Amy Emeny, of 219 Koroit Street, Warrnambool, Victoria, Solicitor, make oath and say as follows:

- 1 I am a Principal of Maddens Lawyers of 219 Koroit Street, Warrnambool (my firm).
- The Plaintiffs are joint proprietors of property at 783 Mount Fairy Rd, Mount Fairy, NSW which was damaged in the 17 January 2017 Currandooley fire described in the Further Amended Statement of Claim (Fire).
- The Plaintiffs' knowledge of the allegations of fact in the pleading are limited by reason of the representative nature of these proceedings and accordingly I have been authorised to make this Affidavit on behalf of the Plaintiffs.
- 4 My firm has undertaken extensive investigations into the cause and circumstances of the Fire including attending at the fire field, conferring with witnesses and reviewing relevant documentation.
- I have received instructions from in excess of seven owners of property damaged in the Fire, including the Plaintiffs to pursue a claim against Infigen Energy seeking damages for losses suffered as a result of the Fire.
- As to any allegations of fact in the pleading, I believe that the allegations are true.

SWORN at

Warrnambool, Victoria

Signature of deponent

COURTNEY VICTORIA WINES

of Maddens Lawyers Name of witness

210 Koroit Straet Warrnambool.
219 Koroit Straet Warrnambool.
Uniform Law (Victoria)
Lawyer Address of witness **fictoria,** 3280.

Capacity of witness

And as a witness, I certify the following matters concerning the person who made this affidavit (the deponent):

1 I saw the face of the deponent.

2 I have known the deponent for at least 12 months.

Signature of witness

Note: The deponent and witness must sign each page of the affidavit. See UCPR 35.7B.

[\* The only "special justification" for not removing a face covering is a legitimate medical reason (at April 2012).]

[•(•"Identification documents" include current driver licence, proof of age card, Medicare card, credit card, Centrelink pension card, Veterans Affairs entitlement card, student identity card, citizenship certificate, birth certificate, passport or see Oaths Regulation 2011.]



