Submission Template —Enabling corporate legal practitioners to support related entities of their employer

Please complete all relevant sections. Use plain language and provide evidence or examples where possible. You may attach supporting documents.

A. Submitter details

- **Organisation (if applicable):** University of Queensland ("UQ")
- **Primary contact name and role/title:** [redacted]
- **Email:** [redacted]
- **Phone:** [redacted]
- **Jurisdiction(s):** Queensland

B. Confidentiality and publication

- **Do you request that your submission (in full) be treated as confidential?**

  No, UQ does not request that this submission be treated as confidential.

- **If 'No', may the Council publish your submission on its website, including your name/organisation?**

  Yes, although UQ requests that the name and contact details of the primary contact not be published.

C. Detailed responses to consultation questions

Question 1 — Practical operation of the current framework

Does the current definition of "related entity" present practical difficulties for corporate legal practitioners employed by entities that are not a company within the meaning of the Corporations Act?

1. **Position:**

   Yes.

2. **Please provide details of any practical difficulties experienced:**

   UQ's in-house legal practitioners are regulated under a different legislative framework. However, UQ supports the proposed reform because the issue identified by affected universities is a real and foreseeable consequence of applying a company-based definition of "related entity" to non-company employers.

   Universities commonly operate through controlled entities that support their teaching, research, commercialisation, philanthropy, residential accommodation, health care and sporting activities. Where an employed legal practitioner's entitlement to provide legal services depends on whether the relevant entity fits within a Corporations Act concept designed for companies, non-company employers may face uncertainty or unnecessary restriction.

In practical terms, that uncertainty may require controlled entities to obtain external legal advice even where the issue is routine, low risk, closely connected with the university's operations, and capable of being efficiently managed by the university's in-house legal team. That can increase cost, delay, fragmentation of advice and inconsistency in legal risk management across the broader university group.

UQ therefore supports the concern raised by universities in affected jurisdictions. A regulatory framework that allows in-house university legal practitioners to advise controlled entities of their employer, subject to ordinary professional obligations including conflict management and independence, would better reflect how universities are structured and governed in practice.

3. **Additional comments (optional):**

   University governance is under increased focus. Removing technical barriers to coherent legal support across university groups would promote more effective governance, risk management and accountability.

Question 2 —Reliance on the concept of "control" under section 50AA of the Corporations Act

If this issue is addressed by an amendment to the Uniform General Rules, do you support relying on the definition of "control" in section 50AA of the Corporations Act to capture related entities of entities that are not a company?

1. **Position:**

   Yes.

   UQ supports the proposed reliance on section 50AA because it provides a familiar and functional concept of control that is not limited to formal corporate ownership. That is useful for universities, where relationships with controlled or sufficiently related entities may arise through governance rights, appointment powers or practical influence over decision-making.

2. **Are there any alternative approaches the Council should consider?**

   No further comments.

3. **Rationale:**

   No further comments.

4. **Additional comments (optional):**

   No further comments.

Question 3 —Potential implications and unintended consequences

If the potential reforms outlined at Q2 are progressed, could this cause any unintended consequences, and if so how should these be addressed?

1. **Position:**

   UQ is not aware of any unintended consequences that would outweigh the benefits of reform.

2. **Please identify any potential implications or unintended consequences:**

   No further comments.

3. **Are there any safeguards, limitations or clarifications the Council should consider?**

   UQ also considers that existing professional obligations provide appropriate safeguards. In-house legal practitioners remain subject to duties concerning client identification, independence, confidentiality and conflicts of interest.

4. **Additional comments (optional):**

   No further comments.

D. Attachments (optional)

No attachments are provided.

Lodgement and deadline

- **Submit by email: submissions@legalservicescouncil.org.au**
  (If you require an alternative lodgement method or accessibility adjustments, please contact the Council.)
- **Closing date:** *22 July 2026*
- **General enquiries: lsc@legalservicescouncil.org.au**