

TO - THE GOVERNOR OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA  
GOVERNMENT HOUSE, ADELAIDE  
c/ - GPO BOX 2373  
ADELAIDE SA 5001

YOUR REF:

01/03/039

FROM - DAVID P JARRETT  
(DGS No. 69405)  
MT GAMBIER PRISON

1.11.2024

c/ - P.O. BOX 1498  
MT GAMBIER SA 5290

RE - FORMAL COMPLAINT AGAINST Sth. Aust. ATTORNEY-GENERAL,  
- PROFESSIONAL AND CRIMINAL DECEPTION BY SAME ATTORNEY-GENERAL,  
- PROFESSIONAL INCOMPETENCE AND NEGLIGENCE BY SAME ATTORNEY-GENERAL,  
- CRIMINAL ACCESSORY TO STATE CRIMES ('AFTER THE FACT'), BY SAME  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL, BY PROFESSIONALLY ASSISTING TO MAINTAIN  
COVERUP OF SPECIFIC STATE CRIMES,

GOVERNOR

THIS COMPLAINT PERTAINS TO THE OFFICIAL ACTIONS OF THE Sth. Aust. ATTORNEY-GENERAL, WITHIN THE STATUTORY PROCESSES OF A 'PETITION TO THE GOVERNOR', SPECIFICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH TWO SUCH PETITIONS FROM ME:

PETITION (A)

MY 2019 SUBMITTED 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR', AGAINST CONVICTION FOR  
'1993 CRIMINAL CONVICTION FOR ARSON', AND, ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S  
OFFICIAL DETERMINATION AND DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT'.

## PETITION ②

MY 2022 SUBMITTED 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR', FOR 'RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION', AND, ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICIAL DETERMINATION AND DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT'.

THE STH. AUST. GOVERNMENT HAS AGAIN SHOWN ITS WILLINGNESS TO ADOPT, ENABLE, AND PARTICIPATE IN POLITICAL CORRUPTION, RATHER THAN LET A PRISONER (SUCH AS ME), RECEIVE JUDICIAL HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF RESPECTIVE PETITION APPLICATION.

I REQUEST JUDICIAL HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF BOTH RESPECTIVE PETITIONS, CONSEQUENTIAL TO DUE PROCESS AND PROCEDURAL NON-COMPLIANCE, AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES COMMITTED BY RESPECTIVE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, IN THEIR METHOD AND MEANS BY WHICH ATTORNEY-GENERAL CONSTRUCTED THEIR DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT', SPECIFICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH PETITIONER'S '2019 PETITION AGAINST 1993 ARSON CONVICTION', AND, PETITIONER'S '2022 PETITION FOR RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION'.

ADDITIONALLY, I REQUEST COMPETENT AND PUBLIC INVESTIGATION, SUCH AS BY ROYAL COMMISSION OR PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY, OF SAID ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S MOTIVATION AND REASONING UNDERPINNING THEIR RESPECTIVE 'NO MERIT' DECISIONS.

IT IS NOT THE FIRST TIME THIS CENTURY, THAT POLITICAL IMPROPRIETY, INTERFERENCE AND COVERUP, HAVE VIOLATED 'PETITIONER'S STATUTORY RIGHTS INTRINSICALLY ANCHORED TO SUCH PETITION TO GOVERNOR PROCESS', IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

THE HENRY KEOGH PETITION OF APPROXIMATELY 2005, WAS SUBJECT TO DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF PETITIONER'S PROTECTED STATUTORY RIGHTS, WHICH WAS MADE PUBLIC WITHIN KEOGH'S JUDICIAL HEARINGS, APPROXIMATELY 2012/2013.



THE STH. AUST. GOVERNMENT IS STILL CRIMINALLY VIOLATING 'PETITIONER'S STATUTORY RIGHTS, OF HONEST AND COMPETENT PETITION MERIT ASSESSMENT', AND THEY HIDE THEIR PROFESSIONAL AND CRIMINAL POLITICAL IMPROPRIETIES IN THE SHADOWS. I WILL NOT BE SILENT ABOUT ANY SUCH POLITICAL/CRIMINAL IMPROPRIETIES COMMITTED AGAINST ME, NOR SHOULD I HAVE TO! I WILL SHINE THE LIGHT IN THE SHADOWS, TO LIGHT UP AND NAME THE OFFENDERS OF STATE CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST ME.... THAT IS THE PURPOSE OF BOTH SAID PETITIONS, AND, MY OPI COMPLAINT REF. NO. 2022/004071.

LACKING REQUISITE QUALIFICATION FROM LEGITIMATE AND COMPETENT INVESTIGATIONS, OF THE LEGAL/JUSTIFIABLE MERIT OF BOTH PETITION (A) AND PETITION (B), HAS GIVEN RISE TO THE RESPECTIVE ATTORNEY-GENERAL MAKING A FUNDAMENTALLY IMPROPER PERSONAL DETERMINATION AND DECLARATION (WITH THE APPEARANCE OF UNLAWFUL PERSONAL/POLITICAL AGENDA), RATHER THAN MAKING A LEGALLY-PERMISSIBLE AND FUNDAMENTALLY PROFESSIONAL DETERMINATION AND DECLARATION (BORNE FROM CRITICAL AND PROPER ASSESSMENT/INVESTIGATION OF THE RESPECTIVE PETITION, SUCH AS AGAINST THE RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODES AND PROFESSIONAL CODES OF CONDUCT).

THE STATUTORY PROCESSES AND PROPER PROCEDURES OF SUCH A 'PETITION TO THE GOVERNOR', REQUIRE THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL TO (IN SHORT):

- 1.) LAWFULLY AND COMPETENTLY ASSESS THE 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT' OF RESPECTIVE PETITION, THEN,
- 2.) PRODUCE FORMAL DECLARATION (OFFICIAL DOCUMENT), AS TO THE 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT' OF RESPECTIVE PETITION, AND,
- 3.) FORMALLY NOTIFY THE PETITIONER AND THE GOVERNOR, OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECISION/DETERMINATION OF 'MERIT' OR 'NO MERIT'.

IT IS A FUNDAMENTAL IMPERATIVE (A MANDATORY OBLIGATION), THAT THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL MUST FORMULATE AND DETERMINE, ONLY THE LEGITIMATE/LEGAL.



MERIT OF RESPECTIVE PETITION (SUCH AS WITH REFERENCE AND REGARD TO COMMON AND STATUTORY LAW), AND, MUST NOT FORMULATE AND DETERMINE AN OTHERWISE POLITICALLY OR PERSONALLY MOTIVATED DECISION AS TO MERIT OF RESPECTIVE PETITION (IF SUCH POLITICALLY/PERSONALLY CONSTRUCTED DECISION CONFLICTS WITH PETITIONER'S APPLICATION FOR PETITION RELIEF).

THE 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR PROCESS', DOES NOT PERMIT ANY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT 'EMPLOYEE', TO ASSIST IN THE ONGOING PROTECTION AND COVERUP, OF ANY 'STATE CRIME COMMITTED AGAINST ME'. ADDITIONALLY, IF SUCH 'STATE CRIMES' IDENTIFIED BY PETITIONER, ARE NOT REMEDIED BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S MERIT ASSESSMENT DECISION, BY 'REFERRING RESPECTIVE PETITION TO THE COURT FOR JUDICIAL CONSIDERATION AND JUDICIAL DETERMINATION', THEN, THE ONLY PROPER AND LOGICAL CONCLUSION, IS THAT THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S SAID DECISION OF 'NO MERIT' (PETITION'S MERIT ASSESSMENT), IS IMPROPERLY AND ILLEGALLY ENABLING AND ASSISTING SUCH 'STATE CRIMES' TO REMAIN HIDDEN IN GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION AND POLITICAL COVERUP.

THE OFFICE OF CROWN SOLICITOR AND THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, HAVE ALREADY PROVEN THEIR WILLINGNESS TO ACTIVELY ASSIST IN SUCH 'PROTECTION AND ~~SE~~ COVERUP OF STATE CRIMES AGAINST ME'. MY OPI COMPLAINT REF. 2022/004071, REVEALS EVIDENCE OF NOT ONLY STATE CRIMES AGAINST ME, BUT ALSO, IDENTIFIED PERSONS WHO HAVE/ARE ACTIVELY ASSISTING IN THE ONGOING COVERUP OF THOSE STATE GOVERNMENT CRIMES AGAINST ME.

WHERE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PETITION DECISION OF 'NO MERIT', CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODES, AND, PARTICULARLY WHERE PETITION SUBMISSION FROM PETITIONER INCLUDES MATERIAL EVIDENCE THEREIN, SUFFICIENT FOR A COMPETENT LAW COURT TO RECOGNISE AND QUALIFY AS 'GOVERNMENT PRODUCED MATERIAL EVIDENCE, SUPPORTING PETITIONER'S CLAIM', IT IS IMPROPER AND ABUSIVE FOR SUCH ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECISION OF 'NO MERIT', TO CONTINUE UNCHALLENGED, SUCH AS BY JUDICIAL INVESTIGATION/REVIEW, NOT ONLY OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECISION



OF 'NO MERIT', BUT ALSO, THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION OF THE PETITION ITSELF, ... IS THERE ANY 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT' WITHIN PETITIONER'S CLAIM AND/OR COMPLAINT?

PETITION (A) RELATES TO AND INCLUDES A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AGAINST AN ILLEGAL PROSECUTION, RESULTING IN AN ILLEGALLY OBTAINED CONVICTION (FOR ARSON, IN 1993).

IT IS NOT OPEN TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, WHEN DETERMINING 'IF THERE IS ANY LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT IN RESPECTIVE PETITION', TO DECLARE THAT THERE IS 'NO MERIT', IF IN FACT 'LEGAL MERIT' DOES EXIST. EVEN IF ONLY A SINGLE POINT OF 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT' EXISTS WITHIN RESPECTIVE PETITION, THERE IS NO DISCRETION OPEN TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL TO THEN DECLARE THAT THE RESPECTIVE PETITION HAS 'NO MERIT'. THE QUESTION OF 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT', OF THE RESPECTIVE PETITION, SHOULD THEREFORE INCLUDE A FUNDAMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE 'LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE PETITIONER, BEING PROPERLY AND LAWFULLY ADMINISTERED AND ADHERED TO AT ALL RELEVANT TIMES'.

IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE 'PETITIONER'S LEGAL RIGHTS AT ALL RELEVANT TIMES', TO THEREFORE INCLUDE FROM JAN. 1991 (DATE OF ALLEGED ARSON), UP TO THE PRESENT DATE (AS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO IMPOSE A PENALTY AND DETRIMENT UPON PETITIONER, CONSEQUENTIAL TO SAID 1993 ARSON CONVICTION, LINKING DIRECTLY TO THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S ONGOING REFUSAL TO RELEASE PETITIONER FROM INCARCERATION). [SEE ALSO OPI REF. 2022/004071]

IRRESPECTIVE OF THE MEANS BY WHICH THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL CONSTRUCTED THEIR FORMAL DECISION OF 'NO MERIT' IN SAID PETITION (PRIOR TO THEIR OFFICIAL DECLARATION TO PETITIONER AND THE GOVERNOR, THAT RESPECTIVE PETITION HAD 'NO MERIT'), THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL IS A MINISTER OF STATE WHO:

CRIMINALLY MISREPRESENTED THE SUBSTANTIVE AND QUALIFIABLE LEGAL MERIT OF SAID PETITION (TO JUDICIAL STANDARDS);

CRIMINALLY DECEIVED THE GOVERNOR (AND PETITIONER), WHEN NOTIFYING THE



GOVERNOR THAT SAID PETITION HAD 'NO MERIT' (AND THEREFORE 'NO LEGAL MERIT'); MADE CRIMINALLY FALSE DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT' (WHEN YOU COMPARE PETITION PARTICULARS AGAINST RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODES AND PROFESSIONAL CODES OF CONDUCT).

ADDITIONALLY, AS A MINISTER OF STATE WHO WAS ENGAGED IN AN OFFICIAL STATUTORY PROCESS ('PETITION TO GOVERNOR'), THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL UNLAWFULLY AND ILLEGALLY DENIED PETITIONER AN HONEST AND FAIR CONSIDERATION, INVESTIGATION AND DECISION AS TO THE ACTUAL 'LEGAL MERIT' OF RESPECTIVE PETITION, AND, IMPROPERLY DENIED REMEDY BEING SOUGHT BY PETITIONER, WHICH FUNDAMENTALLY INCLUDES JUDICIAL HEARING AND COURT'S JUDGEMENT.

IF ANY RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODES OR CODES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, DESCRIBES AN 'ACTION', 'EVENT' OR 'CIRCUMSTANCE' AS A PROHIBITED 'ACTION', 'EVENT' OR 'CIRCUMSTANCE', AND, SUCH AN 'ACTION', 'EVENT' OR 'CIRCUMSTANCE' IS IDENTIFIED, DESCRIBED/PARTICULARISED WITHIN RESPECTIVE PETITION SUBMISSION, EVEN MORESO WHERE QUALIFIABLE 'GOVERNMENT PRODUCED/CREATED MATERIAL EVIDENCE' (JUSTIFYING AND SUPPORTING SUCH ACCUSATION BY PETITIONER), FORMS PART OF THE RESPECTIVE PETITION DOCUMENT, BUT, ATTORNEY-GENERAL DECLARES THAT 'NO MERIT' EXISTS IN RESPECTIVE PETITION, IT IS THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF THE PETITIONER TO HAVE SAID DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT' (BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL), CRIMINALLY INVESTIGATED.

ADDITIONALLY, WHERE RESPECTIVE 'NO MERIT DECLARATION' BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL, EFFECTED A PREVENTION OF THE PETITION FROM BEING JUDICIALLY HEARD, CONSIDERED AND DETERMINED, IT IS A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE TO CONTINUE TO DENY PETITIONER A PROPER JUDICIAL INVESTIGATION OF RESPECTIVE PETITION.

THEREFORE, TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER IMPROPER POLITICAL INTERFERENCE IN THE PROCESSING OF PETITIONER'S RESPECTIVE PETITION SUBMISSION, IT WOULD BE ADMINISTRATIVELY PROPER AND JUSTIFIED FOR RESPECTIVE PETITION TO BE REFERRED TO



THE COMPETENT CH. III COURT, FOR THE COURT TO THEN INVESTIGATE SAID PETITION ITSELF.

IT APPEARS THAT THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT', WAS MOTIVATED BY INTENTIONS OF PROTECTING CRIMES OF STATE (WHICH PETITIONER WAS COMPLAINING ABOUT), THEREBY ANCHORING ATTORNEY-GENERAL TO CRIMINAL IMPROPRIETIES INCLUDING AS 'AN ACCESSARY AFTER THE FACT' (TO PROTECT THE STATE CRIMES BY HELPING TO COVER THEM UP, AND USING THE PETITION PROCESS TO ACHIEVE SUCH ILLEGAL COVERUP).

THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S ADMINISTRATION OF PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES ASSOCIATED WITH MY SAID 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR', MUST AT ALL TIMES BE LAWFUL AND PROFESSIONAL. THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL IS LEGALLY LIABLE AND ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR OFFICIAL DETERMINATION, ASSOCIATED WITH SAID 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR'.

THE 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR' INCORPORATES A JUDICIAL PROCESS, WITH A CH. III COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION, THEREFORE, A FALSE/ERRONEOUS DETERMINATION AND DECISION BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL (OF 'NO MERIT'), WOULD EFFECTIVELY EQUATE TO 'AN IMPROPER/CRIMINAL INTERFERENCE IN A JUDICIAL PROCESS', 'DISHONEST DEALINGS WITH DOCUMENTS', 'ABUSE OF OFFICE/AUTHORITY', 'PROFESSIONAL INCOMPETENCE AND/OR NEGLIGENCE', AND, 'PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT' (WHERE EVIDENCE OF IMPROPRIETY EXISTS, TO THE JUDICIAL STANDARD).

MY 'ARSON CONVICTION PETITION' WAS PREPARED BY ME, WRITTEN IN SUCH A WAY THAT A HIGHSCHOOL STUDENT COULD EASILY UNDERSTAND IT, AND CLEARLY IDENTIFIES SOME OF THE 'RELEVANT AND KNOWN MATERIAL EVIDENCE DOCUMENTS' TO SUPPORT PETITIONER'S COMPLAINT (INCLUDING TEXT FROM POLICE WITNESS STATEMENTS, SAPOL FIRE REPORT, TRIAL TRANSCRIPT AND SAPOL CRIMESCENE PHOTOS).

EVEN IF YOU ASSESS ONLY THE SPECIFIC OFFENCES PARTICULARISED IN MY 'ARSON CONVICTION PETITION', AGAINST POLICE CONSTABLE A. CAUNCE AND THE



TRIAL PROSECUTOR P. RICE, THAT ALONE PROVES QUALIFIABLE 'LEGAL MERIT' EXISTS, AND YET, THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL OPTED TO DISREGARD CROWN-CREATED AND 'DISCLOSED' MATERIAL EVIDENCE, BY FORMALLY DECIDING 'NO MERIT' IN SAID PETITION, ....!

### BRIEF OVERVIEW OF SOME OF THE CAUNCE AND RICE CRIMINAL IMPROPRIETIES

THE 'CENTRAL PILLAR' AND 'CRITICAL' DETAIL, INTRINSIC TO EXCULPATORY INVESTIGATION, IS THE 'SINGLE QUESTION' FROM CONSTABLE CAUNCE, TO JARRETT ON 10-1-1992, ASKING JARRETT WHY JARRETT WENT TO THE TRAIN CARRIAGE?

THE ONLY PERSON TO ASK JARRETT 'THAT SPECIFIC QUESTION', ON THAT DATE AND AT THAT TIME WAS CAUNCE, AND IT WAS ONLY ASKED ONCE, SO THEN, IT IS FUNDAMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT TO FOLLOW THE MOVEMENT OF THAT SPECIFIC QUESTION (BY CAUNCE), AND SPECIFIC ANSWER (BY JARRETT).

IT IS A SINGLE EVENT, ON A SPECIFIC DATE, AT A SPECIFIC TIME, AND, AS MATERIALLY EVIDENCED, POLICE OFFICER CAUNCE PROVIDED THREE CONFLICTING VERSIONS OF THAT SPECIFIC CONVERSATION BETWEEN CAUNCE AND JARRETT, TO DIFFERENT PEOPLE AND AT DIFFERENT TIMES.

THEREFORE, PHYSICAL PROOF (SUCH AS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE PRODUCED DOCUMENTS), INCLUDING SAPOL FIRE REPORT, SAPOL WITNESS STATEMENTS, CRIMINAL TRIAL TRANSCRIPT OF WITNESS TESTIMONY BY POLICE OFFICER CAUNCE, AS WELL AS PROSECUTOR'S 'WORDS' (DURING XN AND XXN AND CLOSING ARGUMENT), BY PROSECUTOR RICE, IS PART OF THE MATERIAL EVIDENCE WHICH SUPPORTS ACCUSATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL AND CRIMINAL IMPROPRIETIES, BY CAUNCE AND BY RICE, AND QUALIFIABLY SUSTAIN PETITIONER'S COMPLAINT OF A CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PROSECUTION OF THE TRIAL BY PROSECUTOR PAUL RICE, AND, EQUATES TO 'A "FUNDAMENTAL" FLAW IN THE CHARACTER OF THE TRIAL', PLUS, 'A GUILTY VERDICT MUST BE UNSAFE IF PROSECUTION USES AND THEREFORE RELIES UPON FALSE TESTIMONY' (CITE WILDE v THE QUEEN [1988] HCA 6; (1988) 164 CLR 365).



VERSION 1. BY CAUNCE.

SAPOL FIRE REPORT, 'OBSERVED LIGHT IN TRAIN'

VERSION 2. BY CAUNCE.

SAPOL WITNESS STATEMENT 'TO INVESTIGATE A FIRE'

VERSION 3. BY CAUNCE.

TRIAL XN TESTIMONY 'TO CLEAN IT'

SAPOL FIRE REPORT (10-1-1991), DETAILS SIGNED BY CONSTABLE A. CAUNCE,  
STATING 'JARRETT SAID SAW LIGHT IN REAR TRAIN, WENT TO INVESTIGATE THE  
LIGHT'.

SAPOL CONSTABLE KITTO... ATTENDED WITH CAUNCE... DID NOT TALK TO JARRETT.

SAPOL CONSTABLE CAUNCE... ATTENDED WITH KITO... DID TALK TO JARRETT.

SAPOL DETECTIVE K. MODRA... ATTENDED SCENE 10-1-1991... DID NOT TALK TO JARRETT

... DID NOT TALK TO CAUNCE ... DID TALK TO KITTO.

FIRE REPORT DATED 10-1-1991 (RELEVANT DETAILS SOURCED DIRECT FROM CAUNCE),  
'OBSERVED LIGHT IN TRAIN'.

PD166 STATEMENT BY CAUNCE DATED 7-8-1992,  
'TO INVESTIGATE A FIRE'.

PD166 STATEMENT BY KITTO DATED 7-8-1992,

\* NO MENTION OF JARRETT'S 'REASON FOR GOING TO TRAIN'.

PD166 STATEMENT BY K. MODRA DATED 7-8-1992,

"ADVISED HE HAD SEEN LIGHT IN TRAIN".

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT R v JARRETT DISTRICT COURT 1993

XN CAUNCE (BY PROSECUTOR RICE) 'TO CLEAN IT'.

XXN CAUNCE (BY BARNETT) 'ADMITS HIS STATEMENT IS CORRECT VERSION'.

10-1-1991 SAPOL FIRE REPORT, CAUNCE DESCRIBES JARRETT'S ANSWER AS  
'OBSERVED A LIGHT IN THE TRAIN' (AS REASON FOR GOING INTO TRAIN).

7-8-1992 signed PD166 by CAUNCE, CAUNCE DESCRIBES JARRETT'S ANSWER AS 'TO INVESTIGATE A FIRE IN THE TRAIN' (AS REASON FOR GOING INTO TRAIN).

7-8-1992 signed PD166 by MODRA, MODRA DESCRIBES JARRETT'S ANSWER AS 'ADVISED HE HAD SEEN LIGHT IN TRAIN' (AS REASON FOR GOING INTO TRAIN).

\* MODRA WAS SOURCING FROM OWN INVESTIGATION NOTES CREATED ON 10-1-1991, MODRA GOT 'THAT INFO' FROM KITTO, WHO GOT IT FROM CAUNCE DIRECTLY (NOT FROM JARRETT).

\* MODRA'S ONLY SOURCE FOR JARRETT'S REASON (ORIGINALLY), WAS KITTO, ON 10-1-1991.

\* KITTO'S ONLY SOURCE FOR JARRETT'S REASON, WAS CAUNCE, ON 10-1-1991.

\* CAUNCE'S ONLY SOURCE FOR JARRETT'S REASON, WAS JARRETT, ON 10-1-1991.

DAY PRIOR TO 1993 ARSON TRIAL, CAUNCE HAD ALREADY PROVIDED 2 X CONFLICTING VERSIONS OF 'JARRETT'S REASON FOR GOING INTO TRAIN', BEING THE SAPOL FIRE REPORT (ALSO SAME AS CAUNCE TOLD KITTO ON 10-1-1991), AND SAPOL PD166 WITNESS STATEMENT.

DURING 1993 ARSON TRIAL XN TESTIMONY BY CAUNCE, CAUNCE PROVIDED HIS 3RD CONFLICTING VERSION OF 'JARRETT'S REASON FOR GOING INTO TRAIN'.

DURING 1993 ARSON TRIAL XXN TESTIMONY BY CAUNCE, CAUNCE 'QUALIFIED HIS PD166 WITNESS STATEMENT AS THE ACCURATE VERSION' [EXCEPT THAT CAUNCE WAS ILLEGALLY 'QUALIFYING A CRIMINALLY FALSE DOCUMENT', AS CAUNCE'S VERSION 2 DETAIL 'TO INVESTIGATE A FIRE', WAS ALREADY ESTABLISHED AS A CRIMINALLY FALSE SAPOL PD166 WITNESS STATEMENT].

PROSECUTOR RICE ILLEGALLY RELIED UPON CRIMINALLY FALSE PD166 WITNESS

STATEMENT BY CAUNCE, CRIMINALLY FALSE XN TESTIMONY BY CAUNCE, CRIMINALLY FALSE XXN TESTIMONY BY CAUNCE, AND, CRIMINALLY DECEIVED TRIAL COURT AND JURY BY NOT INFORMING TRIAL COURT AND JURY OF CAUNCE'S ORIGINAL VERSION (AS SIGNED-OFF ON SAPOL FIRE REPORT BY CAUNCE ON 10-1-1991), OR, THAT DETECTIVE MODRA'S SAPOL PD166 WITNESS STATEMENT (DATED 7-8-1992), ALSO CONTAINS PROOF OF



1.11.2024

11.

CAUNCE'S ORIGINAL VERSION TOO, OR, THAT CAUNCE HAD MISLED THE TRIAL COURT AND JURY WHEN CAUNCE (DURING XXN), 'QUALIFIED CAUNCE'S OWN PD166 STATEMENT AS THE ACCURATE VERSION, BEING 'TO INVESTIGATE A FIRE''. PROSECUTOR RICE MALICIOUSLY CONTINUED TO PROSECUTE THE CASE FOR THE CROWN, AND WILLINGLY COMMITTED CRIMES FOR THE STATE, AGAINST ME, TO ENSURE CONVICTED OF THE CHARGE OF ARSON.

THAT IS ALL VERY EASY AND SIMPLE TO UNDERSTAND, TO READ, TO FOLLOW AND VERIFY AS MATERIALLY EVIDENCED .... THE FULL PETITION DESCRIBES MUCH MORE DETAIL, AND POINTS OF CONTENTION, AGAINST SAID 1993 ARSON CONVICTION.

I DO NOT UNDERSTAND 'WHY' AN ATTORNEY-GENERAL, WHO CLAIMS TO BE ACTING HONESTLY AND LAWFULLY, AND WITH INTEGRITY, WOULD WANT TO DIRECTLY ASSOCIATE THEMSELF WITH THE DELIBERATE AND ONGOING COVERUP OF STATE CRIMES (AS DESCRIBED IN MY 2019 PETITION AGAINST SAID 1993 ARSON CONVICTION), BY OFFICIALLY DECLARING THAT SAID ARSON PETITION HAS 'NO MERIT' .... UNLESS THE RESPECTIVE ATTORNEY-GENERAL IS A PROFESSIONALLY CORRUPT CROWN REPRESENTATIVE, MORE CONCERNED WITH PROTECTING STATE CRIMES, RATHER THAN 'REFER MY SAID ARSON PETITION TO THE COURT AND LET THE COURT INVESTIGATE THE PETITION JUDICIALLY'!

PETITION (B), ORIGINAL SUBMISSION DATED 14-6-2022, AND, PETITION CLARIFICATION LETTER DATED 18-9-2022. PETITION (B) IS DIVIDED INTO TWO DISTINCT ISSUES, BOTH OF WHICH ARE LINKED TO EACH OTHER.

ISSUE No. 1. (PAGES 2 TO 3), RELATES TO AND INCLUDES A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AGAINST 'A FRAUDULENT AND MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, RESULTING IN AN ILLEGALLY OBTAINED CONVICTION FOR MURDER (IN 1994)',

ISSUE No. 2. (PAGES 4 TO 7), RELATES TO AND INCLUDES A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AGAINST 'THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT'S JURISDICTIONALLY

FRAUDULENT CONTINUING ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF PETITIONERS'  
SENTENCING ORDER.

IT IS NOT OPEN TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, WHEN DETERMINING 'IF THERE IS ANY LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT IN RESPECTIVE PETITION', TO DECLARE THAT THERE IS 'NO MERIT', IF IN FACT 'LEGAL MERIT' DOES EXIST. EVEN IF ONLY A SINGLE POINT OF 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT' EXISTS WITHIN RESPECTIVE PETITION, THERE IS NO DISCRETION OPEN TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL TO THEN DECLARE THAT THE RESPECTIVE PETITION HAS 'NO MERIT'. THE QUESTION OF 'LEGITIMATE/LEGAL MERIT', OF THE RESPECTIVE PETITION, SHOULD THEREFORE INCLUDE A FUNDAMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE 'LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE PETITIONER, BEING PROPERLY AND LAWFULLY ADMINISTERED AND ADHERED TO AT ALL RELEVANT TIMES'.

IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE 'PETITIONER'S LEGAL RIGHTS AT ALL RELEVANT TIMES', TO THEREFORE INCLUDE FROM JAN. 1992 (DATE OF ALLEGED MURDER), UP TO THE PRESENT DATE (AS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO IMPOSE PENALTY OF INCARCERATION UPON PETITIONER, CONSEQUENTIAL TO SAID 1994 MURDER CONVICTION).  
[SEE ALSO OPI REF. 2022/004071]

IRRESPECTIVE OF THE MEANS BY WHICH THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL CONSTRUCTED THEIR FORMAL DECISION OF 'NO MERIT' IN SAID PETITION (PRIOR TO THEIR OFFICIAL DECLARATION TO PETITIONER AND THE GOVERNOR, THAT RESPECTIVE PETITION HAD 'NO MERIT'), THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL IS A MINISTER OF STATE WHO :

CRIMINALLY MISREPRESENTED THE SUBSTANTIVE AND QUALIFIABLE LEGAL MERIT OF SAID PETITION (TO JUDICIAL STANDARDS) ;

CRIMINALLY DECEIVED THE GOVERNOR (AND PETITIONER), WHEN NOTIFYING THE GOVERNOR THAT SAID PETITION HAD 'NO MERIT' (AND THEREFORE NO LEGAL MERIT) ;

MADE CRIMINALLY FALSE DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT' (WHEN YOU COMPARE PETITION PARTICULARS AGAINST RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODES AND PROFESSIONAL CODES OF CONDUCT).



ADDITIONALLY, AS A MINISTER OF STATE WHO WAS ENGAGED IN AN OFFICIAL STATUTORY PROCESS ('PETITION TO GOVERNOR'), THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL UNLAWFULLY AND ILLEGALLY DENIED PETITIONER AN HONEST AND FAIR CONSIDERATION, INVESTIGATION AND DECISION AS TO THE ACTUAL 'LEGAL MERIT' OF RESPECTIVE PETITION, AND, IMPROPERLY DENIED REMEDY BEING SOUGHT BY PETITIONER, WHICH FUNDAMENTALLY INCLUDES JUDICIAL HEARING AND COURT'S JUDGEMENT DIRECTLY ASSOCIATED WITH SENTENCE INTERPRETATION OF R v JARRETT (2002) SASC 289, WHICH ONLY A CH. III COURT HAS COMPETENT JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO 'DEFINE'.

IF ANY RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODES OR CODES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, DESCRIBES AN 'ACTION', 'EVENT' OR 'CIRCUMSTANCE' AS A PROHIBITED 'ACTION', 'EVENT' OR 'CIRCUMSTANCE', AND, SUCH AN 'ACTION', 'EVENT' OR 'CIRCUMSTANCE' IS IDENTIFIED, DESCRIBED/PARTICULARISED WITHIN RESPECTIVE PETITION SUBMISSION, EVEN MORESO WHERE GOVERNMENT CREATED/PRODUCED MATERIAL EVIDENCE (QUALIFIABLY JUSTIFYING AND SUPPORTING SUCH ACCUSATION BY PETITIONER), FORMS PART OF RESPECTIVE PETITION DOCUMENT, BUT, ATTORNEY-GENERAL DECLARES THAT 'NO MERIT' EXISTS IN RESPECTIVE PETITION, IT IS THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF THE PETITIONER TO HAVE SAID DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT' (BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL), CRIMINALLY INVESTIGATED.

ADDITIONALLY, WHERE RESPECTIVE 'NO MERIT DECLARATION' BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL, EFFECTED A PREVENTION OF THE PETITION FROM BEING JUDICIALLY HEARD, CONSIDERED, AND DETERMINED, IT IS A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE TO CONTINUE TO DENY PETITIONER A PROPER JUDICIAL INVESTIGATION OF RESPECTIVE PETITION.

THEREFORE, TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER IMPROPER POLITICAL INTERFERENCE IN THE PROCESSING OF PETITIONER'S RESPECTIVE PETITION SUBMISSION, IT WOULD BE ADMINISTRATIVELY PROPER AND JUSTIFIED FOR RESPECTIVE PETITION TO BE REFERRED TO THE COMPETENT CH. III COURT, FOR THE COURT TO THEN INVESTIGATE SAID PETITION ITSELF.

IT APPEARS THAT THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECLARATION OF 'NO MERIT', WAS



MOTIVATED BY INTENTIONS OF PROTECTING CRIMES OF STATE (WHICH PETITIONER WAS COMPLAINING ABOUT), THEREBY ANCHORING ATTORNEY-GENERAL TO CRIMINAL IMPROPRIETIES INCLUDING AS 'AN ACCESSARY AFTER THE FACT' (TO PROTECT THE STATE CRIMES BY HELPING TO COVER THEM UP, AND USING THE PETITION PROCESS TO ACHIEVE SUCH ILLEGAL COVERUP).

THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S ADMINISTRATION OF PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES ASSOCIATED WITH MY SAID 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR', MUST AT ALL TIMES BE LAWFUL AND PROFESSIONAL. THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL IS LEGALLY LIABLE AND ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR OFFICIAL DETERMINATION (THE 'MERIT/NO MERIT DECISION'), ASSOCIATED WITH SAID 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR'.

THE ~~PETITION~~ 'PETITION TO GOVERNOR' INCORPORATES A JUDICIAL PROCESS, WITH A CH. III COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION, THEREFORE, A FALSE/ERRONEOUS DETERMINATION AND DECISION BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL (OF 'NO MERIT'), WOULD EFFECTIVELY EQUATE TO 'AN IMPROPER/CRIMINAL INTERFERENCE IN A JUDICIAL PROCESS', 'DISHONEST DEALINGS WITH DOCUMENTS', 'ABUSE OF OFFICE/AUTHORITY', 'PROFESSIONAL INCOMPETENCE AND/OR NEGLIGENCE', AND, 'PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT' (WHERE EVIDENCE OF IMPROPRIETY EXISTS, TO THE 'JUDICIAL STANDARD').

MY 'RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION PETITION' WAS PREPARED BY ME, WRITTEN IN SUCH A WAY THAT A HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT COULD EASILY UNDERSTAND IT, AND CLEARLY IDENTIFIES SOME OF THE 'RELEVANT AND KNOWN MATERIAL EVIDENCE DOCUMENTS' TO SUPPORT PETITIONER'S COMPLAINT (INCLUDING OPI COMPLAINT REF. NO. 2022/004071, AND, 2002 SENTENCING ORDER R v JARRETT [2002] SASC 289).

THE 'PETITION TO BE RELEASED FROM INCARCERATION', WAS NOT SIMPLY 'A REQUEST TO BE RELEASED FROM STATE GOVERNMENT'S PRISON INCARCERATION', IT WAS ALSO AN 'OFFICIAL COMPLAINT AGAINST THE REASON I AM INCARCERATED (1994

1.11.2024

15.

MURDER PROSECUTION), AND THE REASON I CONTINUE TO BE INCARCERATED BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (INCLUDES REFERENCE TO 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, MY DEALINGS WITH PAROLE BOARD, THE CRIMINALLY VINDICTIVE AND MALICIOUS CONDUCT OF A PRISON COURSE FACILITATOR, AND OTHER MATTERS)?

FOLLOWING ORIGINAL PETITION SUBMISSION TO GOVERNOR (DATED 14-6-2022), I RECEIVED THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECISION (LETTER REF. 22AGO2471, DATED 19-9-2022), TO 'NOT INITIATE OR PROGRESS ANY TYPE OF LEGITIMATE OR COMPETENT INVESTIGATION INTO ANY OF THE MATTERS I RAISED IN MY COMPLAINT', IN WHAT APPEARED TO BE A MINISTERIAL BRUSH-OFF... "FOR COMPLETENESS, I CONFIRM I HAVE ALSO REVIEWED YOUR LETTER TO THE GOVERNOR DATED 14 JUNE 2022... I WILL NOT BE PROGRESSING THE MATTERS YOU HAVE RAISED AT THIS TIME."

IT APPEARED, FROM THE WORDING OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S LETTER (REF. 22AGO2471, DATED 19-9-2022), THAT MY PETITION (DATED 14-6-2022), RECEIVED NO MORE THAN A PERFUNCTORY READ BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, IF IN FACT THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL PERSONALLY READ ANY OF SAID DOCUMENT, OR MERELY RELIED UPON SOMEONE ELSE TO 'READ' AND 'RELAY' AN 'OVERVIEW TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'!

INTERESTINGLY, WITHIN THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S LETTER OF 19-9-2022, THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL STATED "FROM WHAT I ASCERTAIN, THE CRUX OF YOUR COMPLAINT IS YOUR CONTINUED DETAINMENT WHICH YOU ASSERT EXTENDS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE SENTENCING ORDER MADE BY THE SUPREME COURT IN R v JARRETT 2002 [SASC] 289.", YET, MADE NO REFERENCE TO "ISSUE ONE" (MY PETITION DATED 14-6-2022), AT ALL!

IT IS SIGNIFICANTLY DISTURBING, THAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AND THEIR CROWN <sup>✓</sup>COLLABORATORS, CONTINUE TO VIOLATE THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL SOLICITOR



JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY, WHEN 'DETERMINING' THEIR REPLY AND RESPONSE TO MY CONTINUED COMPLAINT AGAINST SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT'S 'ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATION OF MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER OBLIGATIONS, WHICH THE STATE GOVERNMENT 'MUST' COMPLY WITH, PURSUANT TO SAID SENTENCING ORDER', AND, 'THEIR JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT DECISION, TO NOT ONLY CLAIM COMPETENT AUTHORITY TO ACT, BUT ALSO, TO ACT IN A FIELD NOT JURISDICTIONALLY OPEN TO ANY PERSON OR STATUTORY OPERATION, ANYWHERE WITHIN SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, CONSTITUTION CH. II STATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SPECIFICALLY CONCERNING THE 'CORRECT AND JUDICIALLY ACCURATE INTERPRETATION OF SPECIFIC FEATURES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OBLIGATIONS IN R v JARRETT [2002], AS ORDERED BY THE CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPETENT CH. III COURT'.

ONLY THE COURT (CONST. CH. III), HAS JURISDICTIONALLY COMPETENT AUTHORITY, TO LAWFULLY ACT TO CREATE A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCE, IMPOSE A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCE, THEN INFORM RESPECTIVE PARTIES (THE CROWN, THE SENTENCED PERSON), ON THE ACCURATE MEANING/INTERPRETATION OF SUCH SENTENCING ORDER, INCLUDING ANY SPECIFIC/SPECIAL FEATURES THEREIN, WHICH MUST BE ADMINISTRATIVELY OBSERVED AND ENFORCED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT. THE STATE GOVERNMENT HAS NO JURISDICTION TO ACT ON ITS 'OWN INTERPRETATION' OF MY SAID 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, IT IS HOWEVER, OBLIGATED BY CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE, TO SEEK JUDICIAL CLARIFICATION OF SENTENCING ORDER PARTICULARS I HAVE REPEATEDLY HIGHLIGHTED, YET, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO REFUSE TO SEEK JUDICIAL CLARIFICATION OF SAME, RESULTING IN CONTINUED 'UNLAWFUL INCARCERATION OF ME' (OUTSIDE PERMISSIBLE OPERATION OF SAID SENTENCING ORDER OF 2002), AND, FUNDAMENTALLY RECLASSIFIES ME AS AN ILLEGALLY INCARCERATED 'POLITICAL PRISONER'.

AFTER RECEIVING AND REVIEWING THE GOVERNOR'S LETTER DATED 15-7-2022 (REF. 01/03/039), CONFIRMING RECEIPT OF MY LETTER DATED 14-6-2022, I NOTED THE 'ABSENCE' OF ANY USE OR REFERENCE TO THE WORDS "MERIT" AND



1.11.2024

17,

"PETITION", WITHIN THE GOVERNOR'S LETTER. I THEN FORWARDED A 'PETITION CLARIFICATION LETTER' TO THE GOVERNOR (DATED 18-9-2022), AND SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED 'KNOWN DOCUMENTS OF MINE, THAT I REGARDED AS SIGNIFICANT FEATURE DOCUMENTS FOR PETITION CONSIDERATION, AS 'RELEVANT MATERIAL TOWARDS MY PETITION'S MERIT ASSESSMENT'.

IT IS SUSPICIOUS ALSO, THAT WHEN MY LAWYER (MR R. PERROTTA, PRINCIPAL OF PERROTTA LEGAL, ST HELENA CHAMBERS, 32 ST. HELENA PLACE, ADELAIDE S.A. 5000, MOB. 0413 805 389), WAS A FEDERAL PROSECUTOR, HIS INTEGRITY, CREDIBILITY AND PROFESSIONALISM WERE GIVEN HIGH REGARD BY THE CROWN, BUT, AND EVEN THOUGH I HAVE MADE SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO MY LAWYER'S AVAILABILITY, WITHIN MY SAID PETITION, FOR ANY INTERVIEW RELATING TO MY SAID PETITION AND ITS CONTENTS, NOT A SINGLE GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE HAS EVER BOTHERED TO COMMUNICATE WITH MR PERROTTA, IN ANY ATTEMPT TO VERIFY ANY 'DETAIL' I HAVE DESCRIBED WITHIN MY PETITION. IT IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND WHY THAT IS TOO.... IF IN FACT THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (REPRESENTING THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), LEGITIMATELY INTENDED TO 'INVESTIGATE/RESOLVE MY SAID PETITION (CRIMINAL COMPLAINT PARTICULARS, AND, RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION)', WHY WOULD THEY NOT WANT TO QUESTION/INTERVIEW MY LAWYER...? THE SIMPLE ANSWER IS BECAUSE MR PERROTTA WILL NOT LIE ABOUT 'WHAT HE KNOWS', 'HAS BECOME AWARE OF', OR, 'HAS PROFESSIONALLY DETERMINED' AS MY LAWYER, INCLUDING IN RELATION TO THE '1994 MURDER PROSECUTION OF ME', AND, THE 'CORRECT INTERPRETATION OF MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER', AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS.

IT HAS THEREFORE BECOME ANOTHER ACTION BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, TO IMPROPERLY INTERFERE WITH ME RECEIVING/OBTAINING A LEGITIMATE, HONEST AND COMPETENT INVESTIGATION OF THE VERY SERIOUS AND SPECIFIC ACCUSATIONS OF IMPROPRIETY, WHICH ARE INDICATED WITHIN MY SAID PETITION, AND THEREFORE FORM PART OF MY PETITION FOR RELEASE ~~THE~~ FROM INCARCERATION.

ALL THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL HAD TO DO WHEN ASSESSING MY PETITION'S LEGITIMATE



'MERIT', WAS TO ACT WITH PROPRIETY, INTEGRITY AND PROFESSIONALISM, BUT INSTEAD, AND IN A WAY THAT APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN EASILY AND SUBVERSIVELY ACHIEVED BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, CHOSE TO MISREPRESENT NOT ONLY THE 'SERIOUSNESS OF THE CRIMINAL/PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES' RELATING TO THE 1994 MURDER PROSECUTION, AND THE 2002 SENTENCING ORDER INTERPRETATION, AND THE PRISON COURSE FACILITATOR'S CONDUCT AND ACTIONS', BUT ALSO, THE 'VALUE AND VOLUMES OF SPECIFIC AND RELEVANT EVIDENCE' (BOTH SUPPORTING AND SUSTAINING RESPECTIVE COMPLAINT PARTICULARS), WHICH WAS ALL EASILY ACCESSIBLE BY, AND AVAILABLE TO, THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S PETITION 'MERIT' ASSESSMENT (BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL).

THE STATUTORY PETITION IS TO THE GOVERNOR, AND THEREFORE, HAS FAR REACHING JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY (WITHIN PETITION INVESTIGATION PROCESSES), TO COMPETENTLY AND PROPERLY INVESTIGATE THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR 'RELEASE FROM INCARCERATION'. FORMING PART OF THE RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS FROM PETITIONER, WAS SPECIFIC ACCUSATIONS OF CRIMINAL/PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES, AND, THAT WHAT PETITIONER HAD ALREADY TRIED TO MAKE TO POLICE AS A WITNESS/VICTIM STATEMENT (BUT SAPOL REFUSED TO ACCEPT/RECEIVE MY VICTIM AND WITNESS STATEMENT, THEREBY PREVENTING OFFICIAL RECORD OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT WITNESS/VICTIM STATEMENT FROM EVEN EXISTING), WHICH WOULD ALSO THEN HAVE BEEN AN EASILY OBTAINABLE OFFICIAL POLICE RECORD, WAS THEN FORMALLY WRITTEN BY PETITIONER AS A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AND WITNESS/VICTIM STATEMENT (ALL-IN-ONE), TO THE OFFICE FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY [ICAC ACT, S.A.], OPI REF. No. 2022/004071.

IT WAS UNKNOWN TO ME UNTIL EARLY 2024 (VIA RECORDED PHONE CALL TO OPI), THAT THE ICAC ACT WAS CHANGED APPROXIMATELY 2021, AND THE ICAC COMMISSIONER NO LONGER HAD VITO AUTHORITY OVER OPI MANAGER DECISIONS (SUCH AS TO 'SHUT DOWN' AN OPI COMPLAINT, OR TO 'PROGRESS IT' TO ICAC INVESTIGATION).

THEREFORE, WHEN SUBMITTING SAID 2022 OPI COMPLAINT, I WAS OF THE BELIEF THAT ~~NOT~~ NOT ONLY WOULD THE ICAC COMMISSIONER (A FORMER SUPREME COURT



JUDGE AND THEREFORE COMPETENT TO UNDERSTAND ALL THE RELEVANT CRIMINAL CODE STIPULATIONS DESCRIBED WITHIN SAID OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071), GET TO SEE WHAT MY CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS WERE, BUT ALSO, WOULD HAVE PROPER AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN ALL THE SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS I DESCRIBED THEREIN, AS RELEVANT GOVERNMENT CREATED AND PRODUCED DOCUMENTS, BECAUSE, 'AS A PRISONER I WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO OBTAIN SUCH DOCUMENTS, IN ORDER TO THEN SUBMIT THEM' WITH SAID OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071'.

CONSEQUENTIAL TO ICAC ACT CHANGES APPROXIMATELY 2021, IT ENABLED THE OPI TO IMPROPERLY QUARANTINE MY OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071, AND THEN FUNDAMENTALLY ORCHESTRATING ANOTHER GOVERNMENT BRUSH-OFF AND COVERUP, RATHER THAN ONFORWARD TO A STATUTORY BODY THAT CAN ACTUALLY INVESTIGATE A CRIME (IF ICAC ACT 'NOW' PREVENTS SUCH COMPETENT AND HONEST INVESTIGATIONS FROM HAPPENING 'INTERNALLY'), SUCH AS SAPOL ANTI-CORRUPTION BRANCH OR EVEN AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE, OR WHOEVER! .... THE OPI SIMPLY 'SHUT IT DOWN' AND THEIR EXCUSES INCLUDED 'IF IT HAPPENED PRIOR TO 2012 THEN ICAC ACT DOES NOT PERMIT IT TO BE INVESTIGATED', AND, 'THE OPI HAS NO AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN OR TO INVESTIGATE (CANNOT OBTAIN DOCUMENTS OR INVESTIGATE MY COMPLAINT), AND THEREFORE, BASED ON THE INFORMATION WE RECEIVED FROM YOU', WE HAVE INSUFFICIENT TO PROCEED AND MUST THEREFORE CLOSE THE FILE'.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION SENTENCING COURT, TO CREATE AND TO DEFINE ITS '2002 SENTENCING ORDER' (R v JARRETT [2002] SASC 289), IS ABSOLUTE, AND ITS SENTENCING ORDERS MUST BE COMPLIED WITH BY STATE GOVERNMENT 'SENTENCE ENFORCERS'. LIKEWISE, THE JURISDICTION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT, TO DESCRIBE ANY FUNDAMENTAL, CRITICAL, INTRINSIC FEATURES OF ITS SAID '2002 SENTENCING ORDER', IS ALSO ABSOLUTE, AND THEREFORE CANNOT BE LAWFULLY REDEFINED, OTHER THAN BY A HIGHER CH. III COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION. THE 'COURT' IS THEREFORE



~~IS~~ THE ONLY AUTHORITY, WHICH IS JURISDICTIONALLY COMPETENT TO PROPERLY AND LAWFULLY INTERPRET ITS OWN SUCH SENTENCING ORDER, WITH THE PURPOSE OF SUCH JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION, BEING TO ACT AS THE SOLE AUTHORITY TO DESCRIBE AND EXPLAIN ANY SPECIFIC SENTENCING ORDERS, TO WHICH THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES MUST ABIDE. SO THEN, WHY IS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT STILL REFUSING TO OBTAIN PROPER JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION, OF 'SPECIFIC FEATURES' OF MY SAID 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, WHICH I HAVE REPEATELY IDENTIFIED, INCLUDING WITHIN MY OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071?

I AM THE VICTIM OF CONTINUED ILLEGAL INCARCERATION (NO LONGER WITHIN THE 2002 SENTENCING ORDER AUTHORITY), UNLAWFULLY CONTINUED BY THE JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT ACTIONS AND DECISIONS OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ~~THE~~, AND NOW ALSO, BY AN IMPROPERLY DETERMINED DECISION BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (PETITION DECISION OF 'NO MERIT'), WHICH WAS PRESENTED AS A FORMAL DECLARATION BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, THAT 'PROPER AND LAWFUL MERIT ASSESSMENT WAS UNDERTAKEN, OF MY SENTENCING ORDER INTERPRETATION COMPLAINT, BUT WAS BASELESS AND THEREFORE HAD NO MERIT'.

INTERESTING.... THAT A PROFESSIONALLY CORRUPT SOUTH-AUSTRALIAN ATTORNEY-GENERAL, WOULD NOT EVEN BOTHER TO EFFECT THE REQUIRED JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION HEARING (SO AS TO CAUSE THE COURT TO DECIDE THE ~~ACCURE~~ ACCURATE INTERPRETATION, OF ITS OWN SAID 2002 SENTENCING ORDER ADMINISTRATIVE OBLIGATIONS), INSTEAD, THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FORMALLY DECLARED 'NO MERIT' (IN SAID PETITION REQUEST), WITHOUT THE COURT EVER HEARING OR CONSIDERING THAT WHICH ONLY A COURT CAN LEGITIMATELY DETERMINE, AS 'HAVING' OR 'NOT HAVING' MERIT. IT IS A DEFECTIVE USE OF OFFICE BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, AND AN ABUSE OF AUTHORITY BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL, TO ACT 'TO FORMALLY DECLARE NO MERIT' UPON 'FALSE AUTHORITY BEING WHATEVER SOURCE THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL CLAIMS AS THEIR ADVICE' (FROM WHICH THEY ARE ACTING), ABOUT A QUESTION OF INTERPRETATION



'WHICH THE COURT HAS STILL NOT HEARD OR JUDICIALLY RULED ON SINCE ACTUAL DELIVERY OF SUBJECT SENTENCE IN 2002'.

WHY IS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT STILL PROTECTING STATE CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST ME, INSTEAD OF PROFESSIONALLY AND LEGITIMATELY INVESTIGATING THEM? WHY IS THE ICAC ACT (S.A.), BEING IMPROPERLY USED BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, TO IMPEDE COMPETENT AND LEGITIMATE INVESTIGATIONS INTO CRIMINAL/PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES DESCRIBED BY ME, WITHIN MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT, REF. 2022/004071, INCLUDING '1993 ARSON TRIAL PROSECUTION', '1994 MURDER TRIAL PROSECUTION', '2002 RE SENTENCING (ACCURATE SENTENCE INTERPRETATION DESCRIBING MANDATORY ADMINISTRATIVE OBLIGATIONS)', 'PRISON COURSE FACILITATOR'S CRIMINAL/PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES (THE 'HARM' MALICIOUSLY INFLICTED AND THEIR 'MOTIVES' FOR DOING SO)', AND OTHER 'MATTERS' THEREIN PARTICULARISED? THE SAID OPI COMPLAINT (2022/004071), WOULD HAVE ACTUALLY BEEN A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT TO SAPOL, BUT FOR THE FACT THAT SAPOL REFUSED TO ACCEPT ANY OFFICIAL WITNESS/VICTIM STATEMENT FROM ME, WHEN THEY EVENTUALLY ATTENDED ME AT THE PRISON (AFTER SEVERAL PHONE REQUESTS FROM ME).

MY PETITION CLARIFICATION LETTER (DATED 18-9-2022), MADE IT CLEAR THAT I SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED MY OPI COMPLAINT DOCUMENT (REF. 2022/004071), ALSO BE REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED AS PART OF MY PETITION SUBMISSION. GOVERNOR'S LETTER TO ME, DATED 10-10-2022 (REF. 01/03/039), ACKNOWLEDGED THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MY OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071, AS PART OF THEIR CONSIDERATION OF MY SAID PETITION, HOWEVER:

"BEFORE CONTINUING TO CONSIDER THE PETITION, I SHOULD BE GRATEFUL IF YOU WOULD EITHER PROVIDE ME WITH A COPY OF THAT CORRESPONDENCE OR INDICATE THAT YOU ARE CONTENT THAT YOUR PETITION TO BE DETERMINED WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF THAT CORRESPONDENCE.

SHOULD YOU WISH TO PROVIDE COPIES OF THAT CORRESPONDENCE TO ME, YOU MAY WISH



FIRST TO LIAISE WITH THE OFFICE FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY TO ENSURE THAT THE CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT 2012 ARE NOT BREACHED."

IT IS RELEVANT TO NOTE THAT AT THE TIME OF RECEIVING SAID GOVERNOR'S LETTER OF 10-10-2022, THE OPI STILL HAD THE BULK OF MY OPI COMPLAINT DOCUMENTS (2022/004071), SO IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO SEND MY 'OWN COPY' TO THE GOVERNOR, WHICH I WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE ALREADY DONE.

MAJORITY OF THE DOCUMENTS SENT TO THE OPI, INCLUDING THOSE FORWARDED VIA MY LAWYER, WERE 'ORIGINALS' (I HAD NO COPIES OF AT THAT TIME).

THE OPI 'ORIGINALLY CONSENTED' (VIA RECORDED PHONECALL), TO ME FORWARDING 'COPY OF MY OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071, TO THE GOVERNOR, RE MY PETITION REQUEST', DETAILS OF WHICH WERE RELAYED IN MY LETTER TO GOVERNOR DATED 15-10-2022.

CURIOUSLY, GOVERNOR'S SAID LETTER OF 10-10-2024 (ABOVE QUOTE "BEFORE CONTINUING ... IF YOU WOULD EITHER PROVIDE ME WITH A COPY ... OR INDICATE ... YOU ARE CONTENT THAT YOUR PETITION TO BE DETERMINED WITHOUT ~~CONSIDER~~ CONSIDERATION OF THAT CORRESPONDENCE." ), NOTES THE SIGNIFICANCE (TO ME), OF MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT PARTICULARS (2022/004071), BUT THEN OFFERS A 'CONSIDERATION OF PETITION WITH NO CONSIDERATION TOWARDS ANY OF THE CONTENTS PARTICULARISED WITHIN SAID OPI COMPLAINT (2022/004071)'?

SUSPICIOUSLY, AFTER OPI 'ORIGINALLY APPROVED ME (VIA PHONE), TO SEND GOVERNOR A COPY OF MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT (2022/004071), FOR THE PURPOSE OF PETITION CONSIDERATION', THE OPI LATER CHANGED THEIR ORIGINAL DECISION AND REFUSED APPROVAL (NO LONGER PERMITTED TO SEND GOVERNOR MY OWN CRIMINAL COMPLAINT SUBMISSION, 2022/004071)!

1.11.2024

23.

FOLLOWING OPI'S 'REFUSAL', APPROXIMATELY LATE 2022 TO EARLY 2023, I INFORMED GOVERNOR THAT I WAS IMPROPERLY PLACED INTO POSITION OF PETITION CONSIDERATION, WITHOUT THE MOST SIGNIFICANT DOCUMENTS EVEN BEING READ AND CONSIDERED, AS PART OF THEIR PETITION ASSESSMENT !!!

AS PETITIONER, I WAS UNFAIRLY DISADVANTAGED, WHEN PLACED IN A 'CIRCUMSTANCE OF DURESS', WHEN INFORMING GOVERNOR THAT I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO PRESENT MY OWN PETITION SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS, IN FULL, WHICH I HAD ALREADY WRITTEN, AND THAT 'DURESS CIRCUMSTANCE' WAS DUE TO THE DECISION OF A GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE REPRESENTING OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY OF THE ICAC ACT (S.A.).

THIS SAID 'CIRCUMSTANCE OF DURESS', WAS DIRECTLY CONSEQUENTIAL TO THE OPI MANAGER REFUSING ME PERMISSION, TO PROVIDE GOVERNOR WITH A COPY OF MY OWN DOCUMENTS (OPI 2022/004071), WHICH ONLY BECAME OPI COMPLAINT BECAUSE SAPOL REFUSED TO RECEIVE OR EVEN ACKNOWLEDGE MY RESPECTIVE WITNESS/VICTIM STATEMENT.

AS A PRISONER 'IN CUSTODY', THERE ARE MANY 'RELEVANT STATE GOVERNMENT CREATED AND PRODUCED DOCUMENTS', WHICH I CANNOT EVER 'OBTAIN', IN ORDER TO 'SUBMIT' SAME TO THE GOVERNOR AS PART OF MY PETITION SUBMISSION, OR, IN ORDER TO 'SUBMIT' SAME TO THE OFFICE FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY AS PART OF MY OPI COMPLAINT SUBMISSION (2022/004071), AND THAT SERVES A CORRUPT STATE GOVERNMENT REGIME PERFECTLY .... IT ENABLED A CROWN REPRESENTATIVE TO EASILY SHUT DOWN/BLOCK, A LEGITIMATE INVESTIGATION INTO STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE CRIMINAL/PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES, WHICH I SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED (IN WRITING), AND THEN ALL 'THEY' HAD TO DO WAS 'DECLARE NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT PETITIONER'S ACCUSATIONS', THEREFORE, 'PETITION HAS NO MERIT'.

THE ICAC ACT HAS NO JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO PERMIT ANY OPI/ICAC REPRESENTATIVE (OPI MANAGER, ICAC COMMISSIONER), TO 'REFUSE ME PERMISSION TO



RELEASE TO THE GOVERNOR, COPY OF MY OWN CREATED DOCUMENTS', WHICH I SUBMITTED TO THE OPI AS AN OFFICIAL COMPLAINT (REF. 2022/004071), WITHIN THE SCOPE OF MY SAID STATUTORY PETITIONS TO GOVERNOR. SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CASE LAW DESCRIBES SUCH PETITIONS TO GOVERNOR, AS HAVING 'SUFFICIENT JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY THEREIN, SO AS TO ENABLE AND PERMIT A PROPER, COMPETENT AND PROFESSIONAL MERIT ASSESSMENT OF PETITIONER'S REQUEST'.

FUNDAMENTALLY, MY PETITION SUBMISSION, WHICH I SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED TO INCLUDE MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT DOCUMENTS (OPI 2022/004071), WAS CONSIDERED, 'ASSESSED' AND DECLARED BY THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL TO HAVE NO LEGITIMATE MERIT.... WITHOUT EVER HAVING CONSIDERED THE DOCUMENTS CONSTITUTING MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT (2022/004071).

IT WAS WITHIN THE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF CONDUCTING PETITION MERIT ASSESSMENT, 'TO OBTAIN COPY OF MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT 2022/004071', SUCH AS BY 'FORMALLY DIRECTING ICAC COMMISSIONER TO RELEASE COPY OF SAID DOCUMENTS TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL' (PURSUANT TO DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY THE GOVERNOR, WITHIN THE STATUTORY PROCESSES OF SUCH PETITION TO GOVERNOR).

FOLLOWING MY NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNOR (IN WRITING), THAT MY RESPECTIVE PETITION WAS DENIED INCLUSION OF MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT DOCUMENTS (2022/004071), THE SAID PETITION WAS SUBSEQUENTLY PROCESSED BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND FORMALLY DECLARED BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ATTORNEY-GENERAL, AS HAVING 'NO MERIT'. THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DECISION OF 'NO MERIT', IS QUALIFIED DOCUMENT EVIDENCE, THAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IS PREPARED TO CRIMINALLY DECEIVE THE GOVERNOR AND ME (THE PETITIONER), ABOUT THE CRIMINALITY OF STATE GOVERNMENT 'ACTIONS' AND 'DECISIONS' ASSOCIATED WITH, AND INTRINSIC TO, MY ONGOING ILLEGAL INCARCERATION, AND, HOW THE STATE GOVERNMENT ILLEGALLY ADMINISTERED A FALSE NON-PAROLE PERIOD TERM OF 22½ YEARS AGAINST ME, WHEN THE SENTENCING COURT ONLY ORDERED A 15 YEAR NON-



PAROLE PERIOD (DIRECTLY CONSEQUENTIAL TO THE NUMERICAL CALCULATION ORDERED, PURSUANT TO "... SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLICABLE IN 1992", R v JARRETT (2002) 83 SASR 583, AT PARAGRAPH 14). [REFER OPI COMPLAINT REF. 2022/004071]

IT IS ALSO TROUBLING, THAT THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S REASONS FOR ITS 'ONGOING INCARCERATION OF ME' (PAROLE BOARD REFUSE PAROLE RELEASE), IS STILL LARGELY DERIVED FROM THE POST COURSE REPORT BY A 'PARTICULAR FACILITATOR', OF THE VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM WHICH I PARTICIPATED IN DURING 2017/2018, WHO WAS ALSO ONE OF THE TWO FACILITATORS SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED BY ME, WITHIN MY CRIMINAL COMPLAINT TO THE OPI (OPI REF. 2022/004071), AND WAS ALSO IDENTIFIED BY ME WITHIN MY WRITTEN COMMUNICATION TO PAROLE BOARD, REHABILITATION AND PROGRAMS BRANCH, THE GOVERNOR, AND, ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

THAT SAME SPECIFIC 'PROGRAM FACILITATOR', WAS THE SAME PERSON RPB ALSO ARRANGED TO REPRESENT RPB, DURING AN OFFICIAL RECORDED INTERVIEW WITH ME, EARLY 2021, THOUGH I ACTUALLY REQUESTED THE 'RECORDED INTERVIEW' BE WITH A SENIOR RPB MANAGER.

RPB REPRESENTATIVE AND STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE, JODIE FEAST, DURING SAID 2021 RECORDED INTERVIEW, **EMPHATICALLY DECLARED** (ON BEHALF OF RPB, CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT, AND THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), THAT **I WAS NOT WELCOME ON ANY RPB COURSES IF I DO NOT ADMIT GUILT OF CRIMES CONVICTED OF**. SUCH DECLARATION BY JODIE FEAST, WAS NOT AN ACCURATE REPRESENTATION OF 'COURSE PARTICIPATION CRITERIA', IT WAS HOWEVER A 'REPRESENTATIVE EXTENSION OF FEAST'S MALICIOUS AND VINDICTIVE PERSONAL AGENDA, WHICH FEAST ILLEGALLY PURSUED AGAINST ME DURING MY VPP PARTICIPATION IN 2017/2018'. THE 'PARTICULARISED EVENTS' DESCRIBING 'CRIMINAL AND PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES', PURSUED AND COMMITTED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE JODIE FEAST, AND THE 'PROFESSIONAL IMPROPRIETIES' NEGLIGENTLY COMMITTED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE BEN (VPP



FACILITATOR, PSYCHOLOGIST), ARE ALSO SPECIFIC ITEMISED FEATURES WITHIN MY CRIMINAL COMPLAINT TO THE OPI, REF. No. 2022/004071.

THE FACT THAT VPP FACILITATOR J. FEAST WAS ABLE TO CRIMINALLY HARASS ME, CRIMINALLY INTIMIDATE ME, AND CRIMINALLY THREATEN ME, AS A PRISONER PARTICIPANT IN SAID VPP (2017/18), AS PART OF FEAST'S UNPROFESSIONAL AND ILLEGAL CONDUCT AGAINST ME SPECIFICALLY, WITH FEAST'S PRIMARY INTENTION BEING TO FORCE ME OFF THAT COURSE, SIMPLY BECAUSE 'JODIE FEAST DID NOT WANT ME ON THAT COURSE' (FEAST DIRECTLY INFORMED ME FEBRUARY 2018 THAT 'SHE DID NOT WANT ME ON THE VPP COURSE'), IS AN INDICATION OF HOW CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT AND PROFESSIONALLY INCOMPETENT RPB MANAGEMENT WAS, AT THAT TIME, IN 'FAILING TO PROTECT ME', NOT ONLY FROM THE 'PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM MALICIOUSLY INFLICTED' UPON ME BY SAID VPP FACILITATOR JODIE FEAST, BUT ALSO THE 'CONSEQUENTIAL EFFECT OF THAT INTENTIONAL PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE', WHICH I CONTINUE TO SUFFER FROM, BORNE FROM THE DELIBERATE AND INDEFENSIBLE ACTIONS WHICH JODIE FEAST SPITEFULLY AND ABUSIVELY ENGAGED IN, AGAINST ME SPECIFICALLY, DURING MY SAID VPP PARTICIPATION (2017/18).

AS IF IT WASN'T ENOUGH TO BE 'THE VICTIM OF', AND TO BE FORCED TO ENDURE AND SUFFER THE 'SPITEFUL AND MALICIOUS INTENTIONS OF', VPP FACILITATOR JODIE FEAST, WHILST I REMAINED AS A VPP PARTICIPANT (2017/18), FEAST'S CRIMINALLY VINDICTIVE PURSUITS (AGAINST ME SPECIFICALLY), LATER INCLUDED PRODUCING A FRAUDULENT POST COURSE REPORT (ABOUT ME, AS A VPP PARTICIPANT), THEREBY ENSURING THAT FEAST'S INDEFENSIBLE AND VINDICTIVE INTENTIONS TOWARDS ME, WOULD BE ANCHORED TO ME WHILST I REMAINED INCARCERATED. VPP FACILITATOR JODIE FEAST KNEW THE POST COURSE REPORT (PCR), WOULD BE FUNDAMENTALLY RELIED UPON BY REHABILITATION AND PROGRAM BRANCH (RPB), SERIOUS OFFENDER COMMITTEE (SOC), AND THE PAROLE BOARD, TO 'ASSESS AND GAUGE MY SUITABILITY FOR RELEASE FROM PRISON (PAROLE)'.

THOUGH JODIE FEAST'S ATTEMPTS TO ILLEGALLY INTIMIDATE, HARASS AND THREATEN ME,



'IN ORDER TO STOP ME FROM ATTENDING THE SAID 2017/18 VPP', WERE NOT SUCCESSFUL, FEAST WAS STILL ABLE TO IMPROPERLY AND SUBVERSIVELY MANIPULATE THE PCR, SO AS TO ENSURE THE PCR DID NOT READ IN ANY VIEW FAVOURABLE TOWARDS ME, IRRESPECTIVE OF ITS ACCURACY OR LACK OF, WHICH INCLUDED 'SUITABILITY FOR RELEASE FROM PRISON' .... A CONTAMINATED PCR, TAINTED BY THE SPITEFUL AND CRIMINALLY VINDICTIVE PERSONAL AGENDA OF JODIE FEAST, AND WHICH IS NOT AN ACCURATE, OR LEGITIMATE, OR PROFESSIONALLY HONEST REPRESENTATION OF ME AS A PRISONER, OR AS A PERSON. THAT 'SAME' PCR CONTINUES TO BE RELIED UPON BY THE PAROLE BOARD AND OTHER SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES .... 6 YEARS AFTER IT WAS CREATED .... IT WAS A TAINTED PCR WHEN IT WAS WRITTEN, AND IT IS STILL TAINTED !

STATE GOVERNMENT SOCIAL WORKER JODIE FEAST, WAS ONE OF FIVE VPP FACILITATORS OF THE 2017/18 VPP I WAS A PARTICIPANT IN, AND WAS THE ONLY FACILITATOR WHO DELIBERATELY AND CRIMINALLY PURSUED, A VINDICTIVE AND SPITEFUL PERSONAL AGENDA AGAINST ME. FEAST'S CRIMINAL INTENTIONS TOWARDS ME, 'ADMISSIONS' FEAST MADE TO ME, INCLUDING 'REASONS' FOR FEAST'S VINDICTIVE AND MALICIOUS ACTIONS TOWARDS ME, AND FEAST'S ILLEGAL ACTIONS WELL OUTSIDE LEGITIMATE OR PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, ARE EXTENSIVELY DESCRIBED WITHIN MY SAID OPI CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AND WITNESS/VICTIM STATEMENT, OPI REF. 2022/004071.

THE FACT THAT VPP FACILITATOR JODIE FEAST, WAS ABLE TO SO EASILY PURSUE FEAST'S ILLEGAL PERSONAL AGENDA AGAINST ME SPECIFICALLY, AND WITH SUCH 'CRIMINAL LACK OF REGARD, TOWARDS ANY DEGREE OF FORESEEABLE PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM FEAST WAS DELIBERATELY INFLECTING ON ME', IS EVIDENCE OF THE LEVEL OF UNPROFESSIONAL AND PROHIBITED CRIMINAL MANIPULATION FEAST WAS WILLING TO, AND DID EMPLOY.

WITHIN THE SAID POST COURSE REPORT, ITS AUTHOR INCLUDED STATEMENTS AND



DECLARATIONS AGAINST MY 'MENTAL COMPETENCE AND SENSE OF REALITY' ('COGNITIVE DISTORTIONS'), AND AGAINST 'ABILITY TO SOCIALISE AND ENGAGE NEW SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS', MY 'ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE WITH OTHERS', MY 'PURPORTED HESITANCE TO DISCUSS SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES', AND MY PURPORTED 'PORTRAYAL OF MYSELF ~~AS~~ AS THE VICTIM OF INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE'. IT IS CURIOUS THAT 'ALLEGED STATEMENTS OF FACT' (BY PCR AUTHOR), SEEM TO CONFLICT WITH 'J.I.S. RECORDS AND VPP DIGITAL CAMERA VIDEO MATERIAL EVIDENCE', AND IN SOME 'CASES/AREAS OF EXPERTISE', FALL WELL OUTSIDE THE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION OF REPORT'S AUTHOR. MORE COMPREHENSIVE DETAILS (ON THIS ISSUE), ARE RECORDED WITHIN MY SAID OPI COMPLAINT (2022/004071), ~~THE~~ HOWEVER, A BRIEF REBUTAL AND CLARIFICATION IS APPROPRIATE.

- 'MENTAL COMPETENCE AND SENSE OF REALITY': BY SAYING 'NOT GUILTY' DURING VPP PARTICIPATION, I AM ACCUSED OF BEING 'COGNITIVELY DISTORTED'. CURIOUS HOW MY LAWYER (R PERBOMA), PROFESSIONALLY REPRESENTS ME FOR 1993 ARSON CONVICTION (APPEAL), 1994 MURDER CONVICTION (APPEAL), AND MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING INTERPRETATION (CHALLENGING SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT'S ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATION OF MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER). [REFER OPI REF. 2022/004071].
- 'ABILITY TO SOCIALISE AND ENGAGE NEW SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS': PCR DECLARES THAT I 'WILL HAVE DIFFICULTY SOCIALLY INTERACTING AND CREATING NEW SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS', HOWEVER, J.I.S. FILE ENTRIES SINCE MY INCARCERATION (1992), PROVIDES DECADES OF REGULAR AND ACCURATE CASE NOTE ENTRIES, REPRESENTING ME 'MIXING WELL WITH OTHERS', 'RESPECTFUL TO STAFF AND OTHER PRISONERS', 'PROVIDES ASSISTANCE TO OTHER PRISONERS WHEN ASKED (BY STAFF AND BY OTHER PRISONERS)'. WHY IS THE PCR THE PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT RELIED UPON, STILL, BY DCS, EVEN THOUGH IT CONTINUES TO CONFLICT WITH CASE FILE ENTRIES, GENERATED BY PRISON STAFF WHO CONSTANTLY HAVE DIRECT OBSERVATIONS OF ME (DAILY), SINCE 1992 INCARCERATION? CURIOUS HOW THE SAME PROFESSIONALLY CORRUPT FACILITATOR, WHO CRIMINALLY HARASSED ME, CRIMINALLY INTIMIDATED ME, AND CRIMINALLY THREATENED ME DURING MY 2017/18 VPP PARTICIPATION, GETS TO ALSO DECLARE THAT 'I WILL



STRUGGLE TO ENGAGE SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE COMMUNITY, RESULTING IN INCREASED RISK OF OFFENDING'!! [REFER OPI REF. 2022/004071]

- 'ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE WITH OTHERS (PARTICULARLY COMMUNITY SOCIALISING)':

LACK OF WILLINGNESS BY SAID VPP FACILITATOR JODIE FEAST, TO PROFESSIONALLY INTERACT WITH ME AS A PRISONER PARTICIPANT, DURING MY VPP PARTICIPATION (2017/18), SIGNIFICANTLY INTERFERED WITH AND CLOUDED FACILITATOR FEAST'S ABILITY TO 'COMPETENTLY' OR 'ACCURATELY' 'ASSESS ME', ESPECIALLY DUE TO FEAST'S FUNDAMENTAL PREOCCUPATION WITH PURSUING FACILITATOR FEAST'S ILLEGAL PERSONAL AGENDA (TOWARDS ME), AND FEAST'S UNLAWFUL AND FORSEEABLY HARMFUL METHODS EMPLOYED TO ACHIEVE FEAST'S UNAUTHORISED GOAL. [REFER OPI REF. 2022/004071]

- 'HESITANCE TO DISCUSS SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES': FALSELY STATED THAT I WAS 'HESITANT...', WHICH IS ALSO MATERIALLY EVIDENCED ON DIGITAL CAMERA RECORDINGS OF RESPECTIVE ONE-ON-ONE SESSIONS OF MY VPP PARTICIPATION (2017/18). FACILITATOR DID NOT UNDERTAKE 'OPEN-STYLE QUESTIONING' OF ME IN RELATION TO 'SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES', OTHER THAN 'DO YOU INTEND HAVING ANY PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AFTER LEAVING PRISON?', MY REPLY INCLUDED 'I DON'T KNOW.... I GUESS I'D LIKE TO BUT I DON'T REALLY THINK ABOUT THAT STUFF, THERE ARE OTHER PARTS OF MY LIFE THAT ARE A LOT MORE IMPORTANT THAN STUFF LIKE THAT'. WHENEVER FACILITATOR ASKED 'TARGET QUESTIONS RELATING TO SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR', THE 'QUESTIONS' WERE NOT OPEN-STYLE, THEY WERE 'LOADED QUESTIONS' THAT WERE IMPOSSIBLE TO ANSWER IF PERSON STATES 'THEY ARE NOT GUILTY'. I DID ANSWER EVERY SUCH LOADED QUESTION, HOWEVER, MY ANSWERS INCLUDED 'I AM NOT GUILTY SO HOW CAN I POSSIBLY ANSWER THAT?', WHICH IS STILL AN ANSWER! FACILITATOR HAD NO INTENTION OF 'WORKING WITH ME', SO AS TO PROGRESS THROUGH SUCH 'SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES INVESTIGATION', AND MADE IT ABUSIVELY CLEAR THAT THEY DID NOT WANT ME ON THAT COURSE IF I WAS 'NOT GOING TO ADMIT GUILT OF CRIME'.  
EXAMPLE OF LOADED QUESTIONS INCLUDED 'WHAT WERE YOU THINKING DURING THE OFFENCE PRIOR TO, OR AFTER, COMMITTING THE RAPE?'. THE FACILITATOR FALSELY ACCUSED ME OF RELUCTANCE AND HESITANCE TO DISCUSS 'MY SEXUAL



PROCLIVITIES'. IT WAS VERY EASY TO GENUINELY INVESTIGATE MY SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES (DURING SAID VPP PARTICIPATION 2017/18), AND IT STILL IS ~~AND~~ HAD I ACTUALLY BEEN ASKED AN OPEN-STYLE QUESTION BY FACILITATOR, THEN I WOULD HAVE BEEN OPEN TO FREELY ANSWER SUCH 'QUESTION', EXCEPT THAT THAT WAS NOT THE INTENTION OF SAID FACILITATOR, WHO INSTEAD CHOSE TO ANCHOR THEMSELVE TO LOADED QUESTIONS, SPECIFIC TO THE CONVICTION, RATHER THAN MORE GENERALISED QUESTIONS (ABOUT 'MY SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES'), AROUND 'THAT' TIME AND EVEN 'SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES QUESTIONS AROUND THE TIME OF THE VPP' (AFTER BEING INCARCERATED 1992 TO 2018, 26 YEARS). THE FACILITATOR REFUSED TO 'PROGRESS' OR, 'MOVE FORWARD' AS FAR AS SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES INTERROGATION, AND ACTED MORE LIKE AN ARROGANT TRIAL PROSECUTOR, THAN A PROFESSIONAL COURSE FACILITATOR. THE FACILITATOR'S INABILITY TO ACT PROFESSIONALLY TOWARDS, UNWILLING TO COMPLY WITH DIRECTIVE FROM FEAST'S SENIOR, BEING THAT 'JARRETT WAS GOING TO BE ON THAT COURSE, AND THAT FEAST HAD FIND A WAY TO WORK WITH JARRETT', AND, FAILURE TO STOP ILLEGALLY PURSUING AND ENGAGING IN FEAST'S PERSONAL AGENDA (AGAINST ME), IS CAUSE TO WARRANT CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION INTO 'WHAT FEAST DID (TOWARDS ME), WHY FEAST DID IT, AND HOW FEAST ACHIEVED IT'... MY CRIMINAL COMPLAINT/WITNESS STATEMENT EXISTS AS OPI REF. NO. 2022/004071.

IF I AM ASKED A 'LOADED QUESTION', I WILL STILL PROVIDE AN ANSWER TO THE LOADED QUESTION, BUT TO <sup>BE</sup> MISLEADINGLY ACCUSED OF 'HESITANCE AND RELUCTANCE TO ANSWER SEXUAL PROCLIVITIES QUESTIONS', SAYS MORE ABOUT THE WILLINGNESS OF PCR AUTHOR TO MISREPRESENT KNOWN FACTS (AS MATERIALLY EVIDENCED ON THE DIGITAL CAMERA VIDEO FOOTAGE OF MY VPP PARTICIPATION 2017/18). SEVERAL TIMES THE FACILITATOR PROCLAIMED THEIR SIGNIFICANT RELUCTANCE TO 'WORK WITH ME', OR EVEN TO 'COMMUNICATE WITH ME' (INCLUDING DURING SOME GROUP SESSIONS), AS MATERIALLY EVIDENCED ON SAID DIGITAL CAMERA VPP FOOTAGE. [REFER OPI REF. 2022/004071]

- 'PORTRAYAL OF MYSELF AS VICTIM OF INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE': DURING VPP PARTICIPATION 2017/18, AT NO TIME DID I EVER 'CLAIM TO BE THE VICTIM'. WHEN



ASKED RESPECTIVE QUESTION BY FACILITATOR, I RESPONDED WITH 'RELEVANT DETAILS AND FACTS OF EVENTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES', WHICH THE FACILITATOR WAS REFUSING TO ACKNOWLEDGE AS RELEVANT OR APPROPRIATE, BECAUSE, IF A LOADED QUESTION WAS ASKED OF ME, AND MY ANSWER, THOUGH FACTUAL AND LEGALLY ACCURATE, BUT DID NOT INCLUDE OR EQUATE TO AN 'ADMISSION OF GUILT', THEN, FACILITATOR FEAST WOULD ACCUSE ME OF 'WASTING EVERYONE'S TIME', 'REFUSING TO ADMIT GUILT', 'BEING A BURDEN TO EVERYONE ELSE ON THE COURSE INCLUDING THE FACILITATORS', AND, INCLUDED AN AGGRESSIVE ACCUSATION BY FEAST (ON CAMERA), TO "STOP PLAYING THE VICTIM, YOU ARE NOT THE VICTIM OF ANYTHING". MY REPLY TO FEAST'S METHOD OF VERBAL ATTACK, INCLUDED 'I NEVER SAID I WAS A VICTIM AND I NEVER CLAIMED TO BE THE VICTIM...!'

INTERESTINGLY, THE 'FACTS OF EVENTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES', DIRECTLY PERTAIN TO '1993 ARSON PROSECUTION', '1994 MURDER PROSECUTION', '2002 SENTENCING CLARIFICATION', AND ALL THREE MATTERS (DURING 2017/18), WERE ALSO BEING PROFESSIONALLY REPRESENTED BY MY LAWYER (R. PERROTTA), AS THEY STILL ARE TODAY, AND, ALL THREE MATTERS ARE FEATURE 'MATTERS' WITHIN OPI REF. 2022/004071.

IF FACILITATOR ASKED ME A PARTICULAR QUESTION, THE ANSWER TO WHICH WAS A FACTUAL AND ACCURATE REPRESENTATION OF AN EVENT, THEN, JUST BECAUSE FEAST DID NOT RESPECT THE TRUTH IN SAID ANSWER, I AM THEN 'FRAUDULENTLY ACCUSED BY FEAST AS SYSTEM BASHING'. A VPP FACILITATOR'S JOB WAS TO 'FACILITATE THE PROVISION OF COURSE-SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE TO COURSE PARTICIPANTS'.... IT WAS NOT TO CRIMINALLY THREATEN, HARASS OR INTIMIDATE ME TO THE EXTENT OF CRIMINAL PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE, SO THEN, HOW EXACTLY IS ENGAGING IN SUCH CRIMINALLY ABUSIVE BEHAVIOURS TOWARDS ME, ACTUALLY EQUATING TO 'PROVISION OF COURSE-SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE'? [REFER OPI REF. 2022/004071]

WHEN I EVENTUALLY CONVERSED WITH JORIE FEAST, ABOUT 'FEAST'S CONDUCT TOWARDS ME' (WHILE I WAS A VPP PARTICIPANT), FEAST'S RESPONSES INCLUDED "DON'T TAKE IT SO PERSONALLY, THAT WAS A VERY DIFFICULT TIME FOR ME IN MY



PERSONAL LIFE THAT YEAR", AND, "I AM A GOVERNMENT SOCIAL WORKER AND I HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS HOW COURSE FUNDING IS SPENT ON PRISONERS WILLING TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR CRIMES, AND NOT WASTED ON PRISONERS LIKE YOU WHO REFUSE TO ADMIT THEIR GUILT".

IT IS ALREADY 'PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE', AND, 'JUDICIAL RECORD', THAT A PRISONER CAN BE PAROLE-RELEASED FROM PRISON, AFTER SUCCESSFULLY PARTICIPATING IN AND COMPLETING RPB PROGRAMS, SUCH AS VPP AND SBC (VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM, SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR CLINIC), EVEN AFTER MAINTAINING 'NOT GUILTY OF CRIME CONVICTED OF'... 2017 PRISONER A. AGIUS'S. POST COURSE REPORT 'THOUGH MAINTAINING NOT GUILTY POSITION, AGIUS ACKNOWLEDGES CIRCUMSTANCES ~~THAT~~ THAT MAY PLACE HIM AT RISK OF OFFENDING', THEN 'RECEIVED PAROLE RELEASE' [JUDICIAL RECORD AS MATERIAL EVIDENCE]... 2024 PRISONER D. BROMLEY, A LIFER CONVICTED OF MURDER, 'RECOMMENDED FOR PAROLE BY PAROLE BOARD', THEN 'RELEASED ON PAROLE', EVEN THOUGH HE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED RPB PROGRAM WHILE 'MAINTAINING NOT GUILTY POSITION' [PUBLIC MEDIA RECORD AS MATERIAL EVIDENCE]

OBVIOUSLY THOSE TWO PRISONERS (AGIUS AND BROMLEY), HAD THE BENEFIT AND ADVANTAGE OF COURSE FACILITATORS WHO WERE PREPARED AND WILLING TO 'WORK WITH' RESPECTIVE PRISONER (AGIUS, BROMLEY), RATHER THAN 'BATTLING AGAINST' RESPECTIVE PRISONER. THE FEATURE QUESTION HERE IS 'WHY WAS VPP FACILITATOR JODIE FEAST PERMITTED (BY RPB, DCS, SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), TO REPEATEDLY 'BATTLING AGAINST ME' DURING MY SAID VPP PARTICIPATION (2017/18), IN DIRECT BREACH OF FORMAL DIRECTION FROM FEAST'S SENIOR, BEING THAT 'JARRETT WAS GOING TO REMAIN ON THE VPP, AND FACILITATOR FEAST WAS 'DIRECTED' TO 'WORK WITH' JARRETT, IRRESPECTIVE OF JARRETT'S 'NOT GUILTY POSITION'' (THIS INFORMATION WAS REVEALED TO ME DIRECTLY, DURING A VPP ONE-ON-ONE SESSION LATE FEBRUARY 2018, BY FACILITATOR FEAST, DURING FEAST'S TYRANT OF CRIMINAL INTIMIDATION AND CRIMINAL THREATS, WITH DELIBERATE, VICIOUS AND VINDICTIVE INTENTION OF CAUSING ME HARM... AND SUCCEEDED, TO THE EXTENT OF 'PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSASSINATION')? KEY 'CIRCUMSTANCES', 'EVENTS' AND



SPECIFIC 'RELEVANT CONVERSATIONS', ARE PARTICULARISED FEATURES OF MY SAID CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AND WITNESS STATEMENT OPI REF. 2022/004071.

THE 'FRAUDULENT' AND 'DECEPTIVELY MISLEADING' ELEMENTS OF MY SAID VPP PCR (DATED 2018), CONTINUE TO BE RELIED UPON BY STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, RESULTING IN 'PAROLE BOARD'S ASSESSMENT OF ME' (PER PCR), WHICH IS CONTAMINATED BY 'FALSE PARTICULARS' (SPECIFIC CLAIMS BY PCR AUTHOR).

THE STATE GOVERNMENT (THROUGH PAROLE BOARD DECISIONS), ALSO 'REASONS' THAT 'I CANNOT BE TRUSTED TO BE RELEASED FROM PRISON BECAUSE I HAVE STATED THAT I DO NOT TRUST STATE GOVERNMENT OR DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONS', AND YET, I DO NOT RECALL EVER BEING ASKED BY PAROLE BOARD, DCS STAFF, OR ANYONE REPRESENTING PRISON SERVICES, 'FOR WHAT REASON DO I NOT TRUST STATE GOVERNMENT OR DCS?'. FUNDAMENTALLY ALSO, I STILL ENGAGE IN CONTACT/COMMUNICATION WITH SAME STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES (REPRESENTATIVES OF), WHICH 'I DO NOT TRUST' .... I DO NOT NEED TO TRUST THEM IN ORDER TO CONTINUE ENGAGEMENT WITH THEM EITHER!

IN 2023 I WILLINGLY PARTICIPATED IN 'PSYCHIATRIST'S ASSESSMENT' OF ME (FOLLOWING PAROLE BOARD'S REQUEST TO ASSESS MY MENTAL HEALTH AND COMPETENCE). SUSPICIOUSLY THOUGH, MY 'CONTINUED REQUEST THROUGH INTERVENTION UNIT STAFF (THE MOST RECENT BEING DURING MID 2024 CASE REVIEW), FOR SOME KIND OF UPDATED PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF ME, BECAUSE, DCS CONTINUES TO FALL BACK TO AND RELY UPON THE TAINTED 2018 VPP PCR, AND THERE IS NOTHING MORE RECENT' (OF THAT TYPE, EXCLUDING SAID 2023 PSYCHIATRIST'S ASSESSMENT), HAS AGAIN RECEIVED NO PROGRESSIVE REPLY FROM ANYONE REPRESENTING DCS .... WHAT A SURPRISE!



I CAN UNDERSTAND, AND APPRECIATE, HOW AFRAID THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IS, OF THE PUBLIC EVER 'FINDING OUT' THE FULL CONTENTS OF MY SAID CRIMINAL COMPLAINT TO THE OPI, REF. No. 2022/004071, AS THE DOCUMENTS CONSTITUTING SAID COMPLAINT (TO THE OPI), CLEARLY REVEAL VERY SERIOUS OFFENCES OF PUBLIC SIGNIFICANCE, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE CROWN AND STATE GOVERNMENT, INVOLVED IN 'THE OFFENCES', AND, INVOLVED IN 'THE COVERUP OF THE OFFENCES', AND IT IS NO SURPRISE THE CROWN DOES NOT EVER WANT ME TO APPEAR IN COURT, IN RELATION TO ANY 'MATTER' I DESCRIBED/IDENTIFIED IN OPI REF. No. 2022/004071.

I CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN DIPLOMATICALLY RESPECTFUL CONTACT WITH PRISON STAFF I INTERACT WITH, REGARDLESS OF THEIR EMPLOYMENT POSITION.

I AM STILL WAITING TO RECEIVE ANY REPLY FROM MINISTER FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, FOLLOWING MY 'COGNITIVE DISTORTIONS' LETTER TO THE MINISTER, DATED 27-3-2024 (MY LAWYER POSTED SAID LETTER TO THE MINISTER, EARLY APRIL 2024). NO REPLY FROM MINISTER, RE 'COGNITIVE DISTORTIONS' LETTER, WITHIN REASONABLE TIME, SO MY LAWYER EMAILED SAME 'ORIGINAL LETTER OF 27-3-2024', TO THE SAME MINISTER, IN JUNE 2024, RECEIVING GENERIC 'CONFORMATION OF RECEIPT OF EMAIL FROM MY LAWYER'. AS AT EARLY NOVEMBER 2024, I AM STILL WAITING TO RECEIVE ANY REPLY FROM MINISTER, TO MY SAID LETTER RE 'COGNITIVE DISTORTION ACCUSATIONS' !!

I WILL NOT ASSIST THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TO HIDE/COVER-UP ANY STATE CRIMES 'IT' HAS COMMITTED AGAINST ME, INCLUDING BEING SILENT ABOUT THOSE CRIMES.... NOR SHOULD I HAVE TO !! THE PAROLE BOARD, DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, AND VPP FACILITATOR, HAVE ALL 'THREATENED ME ABOUT CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS THAT I HAVE MADE TO THE OFFICE FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY (OPI)'. EVERY ONE OF THOSE THREATS WAS ILLEGAL, BUT THAT DID NOT STOP 'THEM' FROM



THREATENING ME ANYWAY!

THE COURT IS THE ONLY APPROPRIATE ARENA, FOR PROPERLY INVESTIGATING AND DETERMINING THE TRUE MERIT OF MY RESPECTIVE PETITIONS, AS IS THE COURT'S ROLE IN THE SAID PETITION TO GOVERNOR PROCESS.

REMEDY TO MY COMPLAINT RELATING TO PETITION A (HEREIN DESCRIBED), CAN BE ACHIEVED TO MY SATISFACTION, BY REFERRING MY SAID 2019 PETITION TO GOVERNOR (AGAINST 1993 ARSON CONVICTION), TO THE COURT, FOR THE COURT TO DETERMINE MERIT OF SAID PETITION.

REMEDY TO MY COMPLAINT RELATING TO PETITION B (HEREIN DESCRIBED), AS AN INITIAL UNDERTAKING OF COMMITMENT, BY REFERRING 'ISSUE No. 2' OF MY SAID 2022 PETITION TO GOVERNOR, SPECIFICALLY THE '2002 SENTENCING CLARIFICATION', TO THE COURT, FOR THE COURT TO PROPERLY DEFINE SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS AND FEATURES PREVIOUSLY HIGHLIGHTED BY ME, WHICH I ARGUE HAVE NOT BEEN COMPLIED WITH BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT (SENTENCE INTERPRETATION), AND TO EXPEDITE SAID 'SENTENCE CLARIFICATION HEARING'.

PLEASE NOTIFY ME IN WRITING, AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE, OF YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS COMPLAINT, AND, OF THE GOVERNOR'S INTENTIONS IN RESPONSE TO THIS COMPLAINT.

I HAVE REQUESTED R. PERROTTA OF PERROTTA LEGAL (ST. HELENA CHAMBERS), TO FORMALLY REPRESENT ME AND MY LEGAL INTERESTS, IN RELATION TO 'THE CONTENTS OF THIS DOCUMENT', ONLY AFTER ITS RECEIPT BY THE GOVERNOR.



1.11.2024

36.

YOU ARE INVITED TO LIAISE WITH MR PERROTTA, AT YOUR DISCRETION,  
ABOUT ANY MATTER I HAVE INDICATED IN THIS DOCUMENT.

RESPECTFULLY



D. P. JARRETT 1ST. NOVEMBER 2024