

NOTICE OF FILING AND HEARING

Filing and Hearing Details

Document Lodged: Originating Application for Judicial Review - Form 66 - Rule 31.01(1)
Court of Filing: FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA (FCA)
Date of Lodgment: 13/03/2026 4:13:17 PM AEDT
Date Accepted for Filing: 13/03/2026 4:54:41 PM AEDT
File Number: VID1357/2025
File Title: FRIENDS OF AUSTRALIAN ROCK ART INC v MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER & ANOR
Registry: VICTORIA REGISTRY - FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA
Reason for Listing: To Be Advised
Time and date for hearing: To Be Advised
Place: To Be Advised



Sia Lagos

Registrar

Important Information

This Notice has been inserted as the first page of the document which has been accepted for electronic filing. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties.

The date of the filing of the document is determined pursuant to the Court's Rules.



Amended Originating application for judicial review

No. VID 1357 of 2025

Federal Court of Australia
District Registry: Victoria
Division: General

Friends of Australian Rock Art Inc

Applicant

Minister for the Environment and Water and another named in the schedule

Respondents

To the Respondents

The Applicant applies for the relief set out in this application.

The Court will hear this application, or make orders for the conduct of the proceeding, at the time and place stated below. If you or your lawyer do not attend, then the Court may make orders in your absence.

You must file a notice of address for service (Form 10) in the Registry before attending Court or taking any other steps in the proceeding.

Time and date for hearing:

Place:

The Court ordered that the time for serving this application be abridged to

Date: ~~10 October 2025~~ 13 March 2026

.....
Signed by an officer acting with the authority
of the District Registrar

.....
Filed on behalf of (name & role of party) Friends of Australian Rock Art Inc
Prepared by (name of person/lawyer) Anita O'Hart
Law firm (if applicable) Johnson Legal Pty Ltd
Tel 02 8043 9996 Fax

.....
Email anita@johnsonlegal.au / asha@johnsonlegal.au
Address for service Level 21, 8 Chifley Square, Sydney NSW 2000
(include state and postcode)



The Applicant applies to the Court to review the decision of the First Respondent (**Minister**) dated 12 September 2025 made ~~under s~~ pursuant to ss 130(1), 133(1) and s 134 of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cth) (**EPBC Act**) that approved the action of the Second Respondent (**Woodside**), subject to 48 conditions, to continue and extend the operating life of the North West Shelf (**NWS**) Project (**NWSx Project**) through the long-term processing of third-party gas and fluids and NWS Joint Venture field resources through the NWS Project facilities (the **Decision**). The approval has effect until 31 December 2070.

The ~~First Respondent attached 48 conditions to the Decision (the Final Conditions). The First Respondent~~ **Minister** provided a Statement of Reasons for the Decision on 12 September 2025 (**Statement of Reasons**)

The application for judicial review is made pursuant to s 5(1) of the *Administrative Decision (Judicial Review) Act 1977* (Cth) (**ADJR Act**) and s 39B of the *Judiciary Act 1903* (Cth).

Details of claim

The Applicant is taken to be a person aggrieved by the Decision pursuant to s 487(3) of the *EPBC Act* because:

1. The Applicant is an association incorporated in Australia; and
2. In the two years prior to the Decision, the Applicant has engaged in a series of activities in Australia for protection or conservation of, or research into, the environment, including:
 - a. activities associated with the decision-making processes relating to the approval of the NWSx Project; and
3. An object of the Applicant's association under its Rules is (and was at the time of the Decision, ~~pending approval by the Department of Consumer Protection WA~~) to:
 - a. promote, lobby and campaign for conservation and protection of the natural environment; ~~including in relation to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.~~

Grounds of application

The Decision was and is invalid or otherwise beyond power, on the grounds set out in paragraphs 1-7 ~~1, 2, 3 and/or 4~~ below.



Section 136(1)(b): economic matters

1. In deciding whether to make the Decision, the Minister:
 - a. was required by s 136(1)(b), to consider economic matters that include adverse economic consequences that may or would arise from or be caused by the Decision; and
 - b. failed to consider any such consequences.

Particulars

- (a) There were documents before the Minister identifying adverse economic consequences of the approval of the NWSx Project, including documents that questioned, contradicted, or qualified the purported economic benefits of the NWSx Project as described by Woodside. Those documents addressed the following matters relevant to the Minister's consideration of s 136(1)(b):
 - (i) economic risks and impacts of the NWSx Project to the Western Australian and national economies;
 - (ii) economic risks and impacts to the value of gas from changes to energy markets during the period of the NWSx Project;
 - (iii) economic impacts, risks and liabilities (direct and indirect) to Australia associated with emissions of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere from the NWSx Project;
 - (iv) economic risks and impacts associated with damage to the rock art from air emissions from the NWSx Project;
 - (v) economic impacts from lost tourism; and
 - (vi) questions, contrary information and/or concerns regarding the economic assumptions and conclusions put forward by Woodside.
- (b) The Court should find that the Minister did not consider any of the matters listed in particular (a) to Ground 1 above in his consideration of s 136(1)(b) because:
 - (i) he did not refer to any of these matters in the applicable part of his Statement of Reasons for the Decision [Statement of Reasons [248]-[252]];
 - (ii) the Legal Considerations Report upon which the Minister relied did not refer to these matters in the applicable section [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [210]-[216]];



- (iii) the matters listed in particular (a) to Ground 1 were sufficiently significant that it would be expected that the Statement of Reasons would refer to them had they been considered by the Minister; and
- (iv) there is no other evidence that the Minister considered any of those matters.

(c) In the premises, the Minister, in considering s 136(1)(b) and deciding to approve the NWSx Project and attaching the conditions to the approval, failed to have any regard to adverse economic consequences of the NWSx Project and that error was material.

1. ~~The First Respondent failed to exercise his jurisdiction under ss 130(1) and 133(1) when purportedly making the Decision because he failed to comply with s 136(1)(b) of the EPBC Act.~~

Particulars

- a. ~~The First Respondent's power to decide whether or not to approve the taking of the action under ss 130(1) and 133(1) and power to decide what conditions to attach to an approval under s 134 are conditioned by s 136(1)(b) of the EPBC Act.~~
- b. ~~In considering the mandatory considerations in s 136(1)(b), the First Respondent must take account of the applicable factors in s 136(2) of the EPBC Act.~~
- c. ~~The First Respondent accepted that the conditions (**WA Conditions**) under the decision of the Western Australian Minister for Environment, Climate Action published in Ministerial Statement 1233 are insufficient to manage the likely impacts to the Dampier Archipelago (including the Burrup Peninsula) national heritage place (**NHP**) resulting from the NWSx Project. Statement of Reasons at [234].~~
- d. ~~The First Respondent accepted that the taking of the action, in conjunction with the WA Conditions and the Final Conditions, is likely to result in residual impacts to the values of the NHP. Statement of Reasons at [235].~~
- e. ~~The Applicant provided information to the First Respondent relating to the adverse economic and social consequences of the NWSx Project.~~
- f. ~~The First Respondent, in considering s 136(1)(b), and deciding whether to approve the NWSx Project and what conditions to attach to an approval:~~



- ~~i. failed to have any, or sufficient regard to the adverse social consequences of the NWSx Project; and/or~~
- ~~ii. failed to have any, or sufficient regard to the adverse economic consequences of the NWSx Project; and/or~~
- ~~iii. failed to take sufficient account of s 136(2)(a).~~
- ~~g. By reason of paragraphs (a) (f) above, the First Respondent failed to comply with s 136(1)(b) and, therefore, failed to exercise his jurisdiction under ss 130(1) and 133(1).~~

2. In considering economic matters under s 136(1)(b), the Minister made findings:

- a. that the “proposed action would result in significant economic benefits to the regional, State and National communities” at Statement of Reasons [250]; and
- b. in each of the Reasons given at Statement of Reasons [250(a)-(c)]; and
- c. in the final sentence of Statement of Reasons [251],
which were irrational, illogical and/or unreasonable (either in isolation or in any combination) because, in making those findings, the Minister:
- d. took into account the purported economic benefits of a separate proposed action under the EPBC Act (the Browse Development), which is yet to be and may never be approved; and/or
- e. considered an irrelevant matter and/or a matter he was not required or permitted to consider being the purported economic benefits of the Browse Development; and/or
- f. failed to consider any adverse economic consequences that may or would arise from, or be caused by, the Decision.

Particulars

- (a) The Applicant refers to and repeats particular (a) to Ground 1 above.
- (b) The Department requested information from Woodside on economic matters, and noted that the matters may be positive and negative economic impacts. In response, Woodside provided information on purported economic benefits [Attachment F114 and F115 to the Decision Brief].



- (c) The Minister considered and relied upon the purported economic benefits of the approval of the NSWx Project as described in the information provided by Woodside [Statement of Reasons [249]-[251], [310]].
- (d) The Minister's findings identified in Ground 2 combined the purported economic benefits of the approval of the NWSx Project with the Browse Development to the regional, Western Australian, and Australian communities.
- (e) The Browse Development is a separate proposed action under the EPBC Act, for which Woodside is the proponent, and which has not been, and may never be, approved [Statement of Reasons at [17]].
- (f) In the premises, by combining the purported economic benefits from the NWSx Project with the proposed Browse Development that is unapproved and may never be approved; and/or considering an irrelevant matter and/or a matter he was not required or permitted to consider being the purported economic benefits of the Browse Development; and/or failing to consider any adverse economic consequences (identified at particular (a) to Ground 1 above) that may, or would arise from, or be caused by the Decision the Minister made illogical, irrational and/or unreasonable findings that were material to the Decision.

~~2. The First Respondent made a legal error, misunderstood the applicable law and/or asked himself the wrong question, by failing to have any, or sufficient regard to the adverse economic and social consequences of the NWSx Project under s 136(1).~~

Particulars

- ~~a. By reason of the allegations at paragraphs (a) (f) in the particulars to Ground 1 above.~~

~~3. The First Respondent's Decision was unreasonable because he failed to have sufficient regard to the adverse economic and social consequences of the NWSx Project pursuant to s 136(1) of the EPBC Act.~~

Particulars

- ~~a. In considering s 136(1)(b), having regard to the subject matter of the decision, the decision-making process taken under the EPBC Act, and the information before him, the First Respondent was obliged to act in a manner that was legally reasonable by having regard to all the considerations which the law required in~~



~~order to decide whether to approve the NWSx Project and what conditions to attach to the approval.~~

~~b. In making the Decision, the First Respondent:~~

~~i. made the findings alleged in paragraphs (c)-(d) in the particulars to Ground 1 above;~~

~~ii. failed to have sufficient regard to:~~

~~1. the adverse economic consequences of the NWSx Project; and/or~~

~~2. the adverse social consequences of the NWSx Project; and/or~~

~~iii. failed to take sufficient account of the principles of ecologically sustainable development pursuant to s 136(2)(a) of the EPBC Act.~~

~~4. The First Respondent failed to consider a mandatory consideration under s 136(1)(b) of the EPBC Act, being the adverse economic and social consequences of the NWSx Project.~~

Particulars

~~a. In considering s 136(1)(b), having regard to the text, object and purpose of the EPBC Act, the First Respondent was required to consider the adverse economic and social consequences of the NWSx Project.~~

~~b. In making the Decision, the First Respondent:~~

~~i. failed to have regard to the adverse social consequences of the NWSx Project; and/or~~

~~ii. failed to have regard to the adverse economic consequences of the NWSx Project.~~

Attachment of Conditions to the Decision

3. Before making the Decision pursuant to ss 130, 133(1) and 134 of the EPBC Act, the Minister was required to:

a. identify the impacts of the proposed NWSx Project on matters of national environmental significance under Pt 3 of the EPBC Act (namely the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place), if the proposed NWSx Project was to be approved with all of the final proposed conditions; and



b. assess whether those impacts are acceptable in light of the benefits that the proposed action may bring.

and failed to undertake the task in paragraph (a) and/or (b).

Particulars

- (a) As the Minister chose to approve the action with conditions, at the time of making the Decision the Minister had to be satisfied on a rational basis that each condition attached to the approval met the criteria in s 134(1) on a proper understanding of the applicable law; namely, whether the impacts to the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place from the final conditions attached to the approval of the NWSx Project were acceptable (by limiting or reducing those impacts) in light of the benefits they may bring, having regard to the objects of the *EPBC Act* and the operation of ss 130, 133(1), 134 and 136 of the *EPBC Act*.
- (b) On 28 May 2025, the Minister proposed to approve the action with attached conditions (**the proposed decision**) and provided the proposed decision to Woodside.
- (c) The First Respondent and Woodside consulted on the proposed decision between 28 May 2025 and 12 September 2025, the date of the Decision.
- (d) The conditions attached to the proposed decision (**proposed conditions**) were more stringent than the conditions attached to the Decision in that the conditions attached to the Decision will allow for more air emissions from the NWSx Project than allowed under the proposed conditions.
- (e) When making the Decision, the Minister considered and accepted the Department's advice on the body of scientific evidence of the impacts and risks to the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place was:
- (i) as described in the Legal Considerations Report prepared before, and addressed to, the proposed decision; and
 - (ii) based on new scientific evidence (including research undertaken as part of a PhD dissertation and information provided by the Applicant received following the proposed decision) that impacts to the rock art of the National Heritage Place can occur at the current level of air emissions pollution from the NWS [Statement of Reasons at [48], [49], [52], [102], [104], [118]-[120], [132], [151], [166], [167]; Decision Brief – 'Final Decision Package –



Northwest Shelf Project Extension, Carnarvon Basin, WA (EPBC 2018/8335) at [33], [34], [54]-[55]].

(f) The Legal Considerations Report:

- (i) recommended that the proposed NWSx Project be approved subject to the proposed conditions included in Attachment A to the proposed decision brief dated 28 May 2025 [Attachment F to the Decision Brief at [1]];
- (ii) considered the likely scope and severity of the potential impacts of the NWSx Project on the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place on the scientific evidence available at that time it was prepared [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [151]-155]]; considered the adequacy of the mitigation measures and conditions under the Western Australian approval (Ministerial Statement 1233 (MS 1233)) [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [175]-[180]]; and, made recommendations concerning the proposed conditions having regard to the likely “risk of serious and irreversible damage to the petroglyphs as a result of emissions from [the NWSx Project]” [Attachment F to the Decision Brief at [183]] and the lack of knowledge of “what the safe levels of emissions for the [NWSx Project] will be” [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [185](a), see also [189]-[196]]. Those recommendations relied, in part, on the Department’s technical advice provided 21 February 2025 [Attachment F83 to the Decision Brief];
- (iii) concluded that the proposed conditions and MS1233 conditions will “result in residual impacts to the values of the Dampier Archipelago (including the Burrup Peninsula) National Heritage Place” [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [197]] and, therefore, considered the “acceptability” of those impacts having regard to the following matters (considered at [199] of Report):
 - (A) the current (as at the time of preparing the Report) state of the environment and level of scientific uncertainty;
 - (B) the nature of the potential impacts on the values of the National Heritage Place;
 - (C) the potential extent of the impacts to the National Heritage Place;



- (D) the standards of what constitutes a “significant impact” for the National Heritage Place in the Conservation Agreement between the Commonwealth and Woodside and the Department’s ‘Matters of National Environmental Significance – Significant impact guidelines 1.1 Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conversation Act 1999’; and
- (E) the duration of impact and the existing Commonwealth approvals for the processing gas in the NWS joint venture;
- (iv) for the reasons outlined at particular (c)(ii) and (iii) of Ground 3 above, concluded that the Department’s view “is that the conditions proposed to be attached to the [proposed decision] are necessary or convenient to protect the” National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [201]]; and
- (v) was not updated between the proposed decision and the Decision.
- (g) In the Decision Brief, the Department advised the Minister that the Legal Considerations Report identified:
- (iii) “the matters which you must and may consider in making your proposed decision on whether or not to approve the proposed action, including the likely impacts of the proposed action for the purpose of each controlling provision, principles of ecologically sustainable development, economic and social matters, and matters relevant to listed threatened species and communities” [Attachment F1 to the Decision Brief at [31]]; and
- (iv) the Department’s “analysis and conclusions in respect of these matters and the recommended proposed decision” [Attachment F1 to the Decision Brief at [32]].
- (h) The documents before the Minister at the time of making the Decision did not identify and assess whether the impacts of approving the NWSx Project with the attached final conditions were acceptable in light of the benefits that the proposed action may bring as required by the applicable law governing the Minister’s powers to approve the NWSx Project with the attached final conditions.



- (i) The Minister had no rational basis for the conclusion that the impacts on the rock art from the Air Emissions Conditions were acceptable on the information before him.
 - (j) The error was material and invalidates the Decision.
4. Before making the Decision, which included attaching each of Conditions 4 to 8 (the Emissions Conditions) to the approval of the proposed action, the Minister:
- a. was required by s 134(1) to be satisfied that each of the proposed Emissions Conditions was “necessary or convenient for protecting a matter protected by a provision of Part 3 for which the approval has effect”, namely, the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place, having regard to the impacts of the proposed action on the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place and every other final proposed condition; and
 - b. failed to undertake that task, or proceeded on a misunderstanding of the law, in relation to each of the Emissions Conditions.

Particulars

- (a) The Applicant refers to and repeats particulars (a), (e)-(g) to Ground 3 above.
- (b) The documents before the Minister at the time of making the Decision did not consider, or alternatively, did not adequately consider, whether each of proposed Emissions Conditions were “necessary or convenient for protecting” the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place, having regard to the impacts of the NWSx Project with the attached final conditions on the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place.
- (c) The Minister failed to independently be satisfied that each of the Emissions Conditions satisfied the criteria in s 134(1) for protecting the National Heritage Place.
- (d) Further or alternatively, the Minister proceeded on a misunderstanding of the law about his statutory task under s 134 when attaching the Emissions Conditions to the approval of the NWSx Project.
- (e) The Minister’s errors, however characterised, are material and invalidate the Decision; or alternatively, if the Minister’s error of law concerns any or all of Conditions 4-8 the Decision cannot stand as the Minister’s approval of the NWSx Project depended upon those conditions attaching.



5. In making the Decision, the Minister imposed the Emissions Conditions by reference to whether they were feasible for Woodside to comply with, so as to ensure that their attachment would not prevent the proposed action from occurring, and thereby:
- a. failed to comply with the task required under s 134(1), as specified in Ground 4(a), or proceeded on a misunderstanding of the law; or
 - b. otherwise reasoned unreasonably, irrationally and/or illogically.

Particulars

- (a) The Applicant refers to and repeats particulars (e) to Ground 3 above.
- (b) The Minister accepted that the conditions in MS 1233 are insufficient to manage the likely impacts to the National Heritage Place resulting from the proposed action [Statement of Reasons at [234] and [299]].
- (c) The Minister rejected Woodside’s understanding of the adequacy of the MS 1233 conditions and the scientific evidence that “there has been no impact to the rock art and that there is no current risk of damage” to the rock art from the current operations of the NWS [Statement of Reasons at [162], [164]-[166]].
- (d) The Minister considered Woodside’s comments on the proposed condition relating to air emissions reductions in the proposed decision (**Proposed Condition 3**), including that it “would amount to a refusal of the [NWSx Project] as it is not technically feasible to reduce air emissions from the [NWSx Project] to comply with this limit” [Statement of Reasons at [171] and [162]].
- (e) The Minister considered information provided by Woodside that it considered “relevant to the proposed action and how [it] intended to achieve the reductions required by MS 1233” and accepted that “achieving Proposed Condition 3 was not feasible, as set out in the proponent’s response” and accepted the Department’s alternative recommendation on the Air Emissions Conditions that was fashioned around Woodside’s stated feasibility limitations with Proposed Condition 3 [Statement of Reasons at [172]-[175]].
- (f) Having regard to the matters outlined at particulars (a)-(e) of Ground 5 above, the Minister reasoned that the Emissions Conditions attaching to the approval of the NWSx Project “should impose the lowest volume of emissions that can feasibly be set while still allowing the action to occur and without permitting an unacceptable impact on the NHP to occur” [Statement of Reasons at [176]].



- (g) In the premises, the Minister did not ask himself the correct legal question required under s 134(1) in relation to the Emissions Conditions; and/or reasoned unreasonably, irrationally and/or illogically.
- (h) The error, however characterised, is material and invalidates the Decision; or alternatively, the Decision cannot stand as the Minister's approval of the NWSx Project depended upon the Emissions Conditions attaching.

Section 137A(a): National Heritage Management principles

6. The Minister's Decision is inconsistent with the National Heritage Management principles contrary to s 137A(a) of the EPBC Act.

Particulars

- (a) Section 137A prohibited the Minister from acting inconsistently with the National Heritage Management principles in approving the NWSx Project with the attached conditions.
- (b) The EPBC Act requires regulations to prescribe principles for managing National Heritage places (s 324Y(1)). The prescribed National Heritage Management principles are contained in the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000 (Cth), Schedule 5B.
 - (i) The objective in managing National Heritage places is to identify, protect, conserve, present and transmit, to all generations, their National Heritage values (Objective 1).
- (c) The degradation of the petroglyphs from the impacts of the NWSx Project will impact all five National Heritage values of the Dampier Archipelago (including the Burrup Peninsula) National Heritage Place.
- (d) The Minister's Decision is not consistent with Objective 1 as the Decision will not protect, conserve, present and transmit the petroglyphs of the National Heritage Place to all generations.
- (e) Compliance with the National Heritage Management principles is a matter for the Court to determine based on the admissible evidence before the Court. Section 137A is not dependent upon the Minister's satisfaction that his Decision is compliant with those principles.



(f) The Minister's failure to comply with s 137A is a material error that invalidates the Decision.

7. Alternatively to Ground 6, in making the Decision, if the Minister was required by s 137A(a) to form a state of mind that he would not be acting inconsistently with the National Heritage Management principles, he formed a state of mind that the Decision was not inconsistent with the National Heritage Management principles unreasonably, irrationally and/or illogically.

Particulars

- (a) The Minister accepted the Department's advice that "the taking of the proposed action, despite the proposed avoidance and mitigation measures, in conjunction with the conditions described in MS 1233" and the final conditions the Minister intended to impose, is "likely to result in residual impacts to the values of the National Heritage Place" [Statement of Reasons at [230] and [235]].
- (b) The Minister stated that he "agree[d] with the department that the proposed action is consistent with the National Heritage Management objectives since the conditions of approval for the action will be to protect the petroglyphs for future generations" [Statement of Reasons at [294]]. On that basis, he said he was "satisfied that approving the action, subject to the recommended conditions, would not be inconsistent with the National Heritage Management Principles or the Murujuga National Park Management Plan" [Statement of Reasons at [295]].
- (c) The documents before the Minister did not identify whether and/or how the decision to approve the NWSx Project attaching the final conditions will protect the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place for future generations and was not inconsistent with s 137A.
- (d) The Decision did not satisfy the requirement in s 137A because there was no rational basis that attaching the Emissions Conditions to the NWSx Project would protect, conserve, present and transmit, to all generations, the National Heritage values of the National Heritage Place for the purpose of Objective 1 of the National Heritage Management principles.
- (e) Further or alternatively, the Minister unreasonably, irrationally and/or illogically relied upon the Department advice in the Legal Considerations Report in considering the s 137A requirement and forming the state of mind that the s 137A



requirement was met [Statement of Reasons at [294], Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [273]-[275]] as:

- (i) the Legal Considerations Report advice that “the proposed action is consistent with the National Heritage Management objective since the conditions of approval will be to protect the petroglyphs for future generations” for the purposes of s 137A concerned the proposed conditions [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [274]].
 - (ii) that recommendation relied upon the Department being satisfied that the impacts of the NWSx Project “will be appropriately managed by the WA conditions, and the proposed conditions” [Attachment F9 to the Decision Brief at [273], [274], [275]].
 - (iii) the Department did not consider or advise the Minister whether the decision to approve the NWSx Project attaching the final conditions was not inconsistent with the National Heritage Management Principles pursuant to s 137A (and refers to and repeats particular (f)(v) of Ground 3 above).
- (f) The Minister’s failure to comply with s 137A is material and invalidates the Decision.

Orders sought

1. An order declaring that the Decision made by the Minister ~~First Respondent~~ for Woodside ~~the Second Respondent~~ to continue and extend the operating life of the North West Shelf (NWS) Project through the long-term processing of third-party gas and fluids and NWS Joint Venture field resources through the NWS Project facilities, is invalid.
2. Further, pursuant to s 16(1) of the *ADJR Act*, an order to quash the Decision from the date it was made and an order referring Woodside’s ~~the Second Respondent’s~~ application for approval to take an action to the Minister ~~First Respondent~~ to reconsider according to law.
3. In the alternative to order 2, pursuant to s 39B of the *Judiciary Act*, an order in the nature of certiorari quashing the Decision and an order in the nature of mandamus directing the Minister ~~First Respondent~~ to reconsider Woodside’s ~~the Second Respondent’s~~ application for approval to take an action according to law.
4. Costs.



Applicant's address

The Applicant's address for service is:

Place: Level 21, 8 Chifley Square, Sydney NSW 2000

Email: anita@johnsonlegal.au

The Applicant's address is 1 / 2nd Floor, 143 Barrack St, Perth WA 6000.

Service on the Respondent

It is intended to serve this application on all Respondents.

Date: ~~10 October 2025~~ 13 March 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A O'Hart'.

.....
Signed by Anita O'Hart
Lawyer for the Applicant



Schedule

No. VID 1357 of 2025

Federal Court of Australia
District Registry: Victoria
Division: General

Respondent

Second Respondent: Woodside Energy Ltd (ACN: 005 482 986)

Date: ~~10 October 2025~~ 13 March 2026