I found LexisNexis Case Summaries – Employment Law to be a very concise yet broad ranging update on recent and significant cases in Australian employment law.

Employment law is by its nature vast in providing for the inevitable difficulties when individuals or groups of individuals fail to reach agreement with other individuals or groups of individuals when trying to earn some money. This book gives the reader a feel for how some of the unusual and obscure areas of the law play out in front of the Fair Work Commission or higher tribunals. It also provides generous coverage of the more predictable areas like unfair dismissal, but I found the novel cases to be its appeal and should prove to be a useful resource when encountering problems with no obvious solution.

An example was *Aiezza v Victorian WorkCover Authority* [2011] VMC 30. For various reasons the employer decided to begin enforcing a policy, included in its employment contracts, to allow company vehicles to be used for personal use but only so long as work use made up at least 65% of the overall usage. The decision was in favour of the employee, the reason being that the employer was estopped by convention from insisting that the policy be enforced because there had been widespread non-compliance. In fact, the employee was awarded $30,000 for being without the use of the company vehicle for a period of time.

This was an interesting result and shows that employers need to take a consistent approach to their policies. They cannot be generous for periods of time then when the relationship sours begin taking a strict view on elements of the relationship they thought had some flexibility. In effect, the employer has completely lost access to the policy and along the way spent significantly more money on benefits to employees by failing to audit logbooks. It would be interesting to know if the motor vehicle expenditure being paid for with government funds had any bearing on the decision.

Others include:
- Facebook posts falling within the bullying regime where posts are made at home and outside of work hours because they would still be accessible during work time;
- an employee successful in an unfair dismissal claim after working for a competitor when on annual leave;
- a Tasmanian decision where a state-wide restraint of trade was upheld and not too broad;
- an offer of alternative employment in the redundancy process needing to be of comparable seniority to be genuine;
- an employee of three weeks standing having a workplace right to complain or make inquiry and therefore suffering adverse action when dismissed for questioning the practices of his employer;
- employee taking daily Milo allocation home to add to drinking chocolate, coffee and raw sugar before consuming the next day at work not grounds for dismissal; and
the High Court rejecting the existence of an implied term of trust and confidence but leaving open the possibility of a duty of good faith while stating the wider implications for the employment relationship and public policy make these more appropriate questions for legislative action and not judicial intervention.

Overall, a useful addition to the employment toolkit.