

1937. SO THAT, WHEN ATTACHING 'ACTIONS', 'EVENTS' AND 'POINTS IN TIME', TO THE SUBJECT ANCHORS DESCRIBED IN ABOVE TEXT [SEE TEXT AT 1934. IBID], 'ENGAGES', 'EFFECTS', 'CIRCUMSTANCE', 'CONDITION', AND 'SERVED', TOGETHER WITH THE SUBJECT ANCHORS DESCRIBED IN ABOVE TEXT [SEE TEXT AT 1936. IBID], 'CAUSES', AND 'DETERMINES',
1938. IT IS QUALIFIABLY EVIDENCED, THAT, IN ORDER FOR THE SA GOVERNMENT TO LAWFULLY ENFORCE AND APPLY MY 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74., 77., 78., 79. AND 80.], 'IT' MUST KNOW THE CRITERIA RELEVANT AND INTRINSIC TO EACH RESPECTIVE SUBJECT ANCHOR,
1939. CONSIDERING THAT ALL SAID SUBJECT ANCHORS MARRY TO A SINGLE ACT, WHICH MUST BE PERFORMED BY 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER' (AND WITHOUT ANY JURISDICTION OR AUTHORITY TO MAKE ANY RULING/DECISION, WHICH CLAIMS COMPETENCE TO REFUSE TO CARRY-OUT THE 'SENTENCING ORDER'), AS THEY DO NOT HOLD ANY LEGALLY VIABLE JURISDICTION, OR AUTHORITY (WITHIN ANY FIELD OF ^{COMPETENT} JURISDICTION),
1940. UNDER ABOVE DESCRIBED CONDITIONS (WHEREBY PRISONER HAS SATISFIED ALL 'ADMINISTRATIVE EVENTS/CRITERIA' LINKED TO THEIR SAID APPLICATION (FOR 'PAROLE-RELEASE', OR, FOR '10. YEAR MAXIMUM PAROLE ACHIEVED AND AWAITING CONFIRMATION' OF "WHOLLY SATISFIED"
1941. SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 1616, 1617. IBID]), TO IN ANY WAY PERMIT OR ENTITLE 'THEM' ('CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER'), TO OVER-STEP/VETO 'THEIR' STATUTORY OBLIGATION OF SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT [SEE TEXT AT 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND,
1942. WITH REGARD TO MY RE-SENTENCING ORDER [74.], OF 2002, WITH THE SPECIAL CONDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS FORMING AND CONSTITUTING 'SENTENCING ORDER PROPER', THE JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE OF 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER' WAS INTRINSICALLY MAPPED AND DETERMINED, WITHIN SAID JUDGMENT [74.], BY THE CAREFULLY DELIVERED WORDS OF SAID JUDGMENT,
1943. TO WHICH WERE ATTRACTED SAID SUBJECT ANCHORS [REFER TO TEXT AT 1937, 1938,
1944. 1939. IBID], THEREBY ENSURING THAT 'ALL RELEVANT EVENT PARTICULARS ASSOCIATED WITH MY COURT ORDERED SENTENCE [74.], WERE EASILY IDENTIFIABLE AND UNDERSTOOD BY ALL
1945. PARTIES INVOLVED IN MY SAID RE-SENTENCING HEARING', AND, 'MY SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, IS CARRIED-OUT WITH ONLY THE CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 3.]), PERMITTED ACTIONS/PROCEDURES/PROCESSES WHICH ARE OPEN FOR USE BY

1946. **TABLE OF SUBJECT ANCHORS (Non-Parole Period Related)**

Row No.	(A) EVENT (SUBJECT ANCHOR)	(B) DATE OF ANCHORING POINT	(C) JUDGMENT			(D) DCS / STATE GOV. INTERPRETATION	
1.			1. ST. (C.1.)	2. ND. (C.2.)	3. RD. (C.3.)	PAROLE MAX 10. YRS. (D.1.)	PAROLE MAX LIFE. (D.2.)
1947.							
1948.	2. NPP START AS FROM	3-6-1994	+19	+26	+15	+22½	+22½
1949.	3. CCA [212.]	29-7-1994					
1950.	4. START OF [46.]	1-8-1994					
1951.	5. FULL COURT [74.]	9-9-2002			○		○
1952.	6. EARLIEST DATE TO APPLY FOR PAROLE	3-12-2008			□		
1953.	7. NPP END DATE (3RD)	3-6-2009			● +10		
1954.	8. NPP END DATE (1. ST)	3-6-2013	● +10				
1955.	9. STATUTE CHANGE LIFE ON PAROLE.	EARLY 2016					← □
1956.	10. NPP END DATE (DCS)	16-11-2016				+10	+ LIFE
1957.	11. WHOLE SENTENCE (3RD)	3-6-2019					
1958.	12. NPP END DATE (2ND)	3-6-2020		● +10			
1959.	13. WHOLE SENTENCE (1. ST)	3-6-2023					
1960.	14. WHOLE SENTENCE (DCS)	16-11-2026					
1961.	15. WHOLE SENTENCE (2ND)	3-6-2030					

1962. (ROW NUMBER FIRST, THEN COLUMN POSITION) [EXAMPLE 'R2, C1', 'R14, D1']

1963. FROM ABOVE TABLE, ROW 1, = COLUMN HEADINGS

COLUMN (A) = RELEVANT EVENT.

COLUMN (B) = KEY DATE ASSOCIATED WITH RELEVANT EVENT.

COLUMN (C) = MY THREE COURT SENTENCING JUDGMENTS,

'1. ST' = ORIGINAL SENTENCING (TRIAL JUDGE).

'2. ND' = CCA RE-SENTENCING [212.].

'3. RD' = FULL COURT RE-SENTENCING [74.].

COLUMN (D) = DCS / STATE GOV. 'CLAIMED' ~~RE~~ SENTENCE CALCULATION.

(1945.) 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER', IN ACCORDANCE WITH VERY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, WHICH INTRINSICALLY FORM AND ANCHOR TO FUNDAMENTAL PARTICULARS AND FEATURES OF SAID SINGLE ACT [SEE TEXT AT 1939, *IBID*], BEING, MY SENTENCE (LENGTH) IN TOTAL, FROM THE OFFICIAL START DATE OF 3-6-1994 [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, C.3.), 1962, 1963. *IBID*], TO THE OFFICIAL END DATE OF PAROLE RELEASE DATE PLUS MAXIMUM 10 YEARS PAROLE [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. *IBID*].

1965. THE PERIODS OF TIME DEFINING AND CHARACTERISING THE FUNDAMENTAL AND FOUNDATION ANCHORS FORMING MY 'SENTENCE MAP', ARE INTRINSICALLY MARRIED TO:

1966. 1. MANDATORY APPLICATION OF '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS' ('AUTOMATIC PAROLE Act'), [74. (PARAGRAPH 14. THEREIN, "THIS COURT MUST APPLY THE SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLICABLE IN 1992.")].

1967. 2. MANDATORY ABROGATION OF CURRENT (AS AT SEPTEMBER 2002), AND ALL OTHER SENTENCING STANDARDS, EXCEPT THOSE OPERATIONAL IN AND DURING 1992 [74. (PARAGRAPH 14. THEREIN, "HOWEVER, APPLYING THOSE STANDARDS AS BEST THEY CAN BE APPLIED IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES", AND, "IF TODAY'S STANDARDS WERE APPLIED, THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD WOULD BE LONGER.")].

1968. 3. DATE IMPOSED 'SENTENCE MUST START AS FROM' [74. (PARAGRAPH 16. THEREIN, "FOR THESE REASONS, IN MY OPINION THE APPEAL CONSTITUTED BY REFERENCE SHOULD BE ALLOWED AND THE ORDER OF THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL SET ASIDE, I WOULD FIX A NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 22 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS TO DATE FROM 3 JUNE 1994.")], [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.2, B. AND R.2, C.3.), 1962, 1963. *IBID*].

1969. 4. PERIOD OF TIME 'COURT IMPOSED AS NPP OF TIME' [74. (PARAGRAPH 16. THEREIN, "I WOULD FIX A NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 22 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS TO DATE FROM 3 JUNE 1994.")], 78. AND 80.], [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.2, C.3. AND R.7, B. AND R.7, C.3.), 1962, 1963. *IBID*].

1970. 5. ENFORCEMENT AND OPERATIONAL APPLICATION OF THE APPLICABLE ([74., 77., 78. AND 80.]), 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS AND SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHTS THEREIN ENVELOPED AND ENCOMPASSED ACCORDINGLY, AND RESPECTFULLY, PER. SENTENCING

1971. ORDER, RELATING TO SPECIFIC CALCULATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH AND INCLUDING CALCULATION OF 'NPP OF TIME', 'MAXIMUM PAROLE PERIOD' (REFER ANDREWS JUDGMENT PROPER
1972. [207. (PARAGRAPH 20., THEREIN, FULL TEXT.)], EFFECTIVELY CAUSING MY IMPOSED 22 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS [77.], TO BE ~~RE-CONFIGURED~~ AND RECALCULATED TO
1973. '15 YEARS ACTUAL TIME' [53., 126., 137. AND 139.] (REFER ANDREWS JUDGMENT PROPER
1974. [207. (PARAGRAPH 15. THEREIN, "ON 19 NOVEMBER 1991... CONVICTED OF MURDER AND WAS SENTENCED TO IMPRISONMENT FOR LIFE. ON SENTENCING... COX J FIXED A NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 23 YEARS... PURSUANT TO THAT SECTION, THE PLAINTIFF HAD THE RIGHT TO REMISSIONS AND TO BE AUTOMATICALLY RELEASED ON PAROLE, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, AT THE EXPIRATION OF THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD SET BY THE COURT.",
1975. AND, PARAGRAPH 17. THEREIN, "THERE IS NO DISPUTE THAT ON THE RECALCULATION IMPLEMENTING S 20 OF THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT, THE PLAINTIFF'S NON-PAROLE PERIOD WAS REDUCED TO BE 14 YEARS 11 MONTHS AND 20 DAYS."], AS AN EXAMPLE OF
1976. RECALCULATION EFFECT WHICH WAS ARBITRARY, PER STATUTORY MANDATE (AS IT DID NOT BURDEN RESPECTIVE LIFE'S COURT IMPOSED SENTENCE WITH AN EFFECT, ADMINISTRATIVELY, THAT WAS OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE OF STATE PARLIAMENT (CH. I [3.]), OR STATE GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.]), AND, A FLOW-ON FROM 'REMISSION CALCULATIONS' WHICH WERE ALREADY BEING EMPLOYED (WITHIN OPERATION OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, 'GOOD BEHAVIOUR REWARD SYSTEM'), [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.2, C.3. AND R.7, B. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, B. AND R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID.].
1977. 6. DATE IMPOSED 'SENTENCE MUST END' [74. AND 80.], SO THAT, IN ORDER TO PROPERLY AND COMPLIANTLY ENFORCE MY 2002 COURT IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER [74.], ~~VALID~~ VALID SATISFACTION AND OBSERVANCE OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER [74.], MUST BE COMPLIED WITH BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, IN THE MANNER SO ORDERED ([REFER TO TEXT AT 1603. TO 1652 (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, C.3.)], 1962, 1963. IBID.].
1978. 7. AT NO TIME, SINCE MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING, WHEN "LIFE" AS MANDATORY HEAD SENTENCE WAS IMPOSED UPON ME, HAS MY HEAD-SENTENCE EVER BEEN RULED BY

1979. ANY OTHER SENTENCING COURT AS 'VOIDED/NULIFIED/CANCELLED', OR EVEN 'SET ASIDE'. ONLY THE 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD' HAS BEEN ALTERED DURING THE 2ND. ([212.1]), OR 3RD. ([74.1]), RE-SENTENCING HEARING (REFER MY 2002 JUDGMENT PROPER [74. (PARAGRAPH 3. AND 5. THEREIN, INDICATING THAT SAID APPEALS WERE ONLY RELATING TO NON-PAROLE ~~PERIODS~~ PERIODS) 1).

1980. 8. THE 'SENTENCING ORDER' MUST BE CARRIED-OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL STIPULATED RESTRICTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS SO 'ORDERED' [SEE TEXT AT 846, 847, 870 TO 884 (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.2, C.3. AND R.6, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID].

1981. 9. IT SHOULD ALSO BE KNOWN, AS AN ESTABLISHED FACT, THAT PRIOR TO 1-1-2009, I WAS ACTIVELY WRITING TO SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, COMPLAINING THAT 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT WAS ERRONEOUSLY CALCULATING MY SENTENCE ORDER IMPOSED NPP, THAT IT WAS IN FACT 2009 RATHER THAN 2016'. THE INTENTION WAS TO RECEIVE RECOGNITION FROM DCS

1982. THAT MY TRUE 'NPP OF TIME', PER [74.1], WAS APPROXIMATELY 2009, THEN, WITH SUCH 'CORRECT CONFIRMATION', RECOGNISED ACTUAL NPP DATE OF APPROX, 2009, I INTENDED TO APPLY FOR PAROLE RELEASE, WHICH, PER [74.1], MEANT THAT FROM APPROXIMATELY 3-12-2008 ONWARDS, I WAS STATUTE PERMITTED TO SUBMIT A 'PAROLE- RELEASE SUBMISSION TO THE PAROLE BOARD'. THE STATE GOVERNMENT (CORRECTIONAL SERVICES MINISTERS), PAROLE BOARD, CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT, AND THEIR AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES, ALL FAILED TO ACCEPT 'THEIR ERROR RELATING TO MY TRUE, IMPOSED SENTENCE, CALCULATION PROPER,

1984. OF MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE OF EARLIEST RELEASE ON PAROLE, INSTEAD, BRUSHING ME OFF AND SUGGESTING THAT 'I SHOULD GO AND COMPLAIN TO A LAWYER ABOUT SAID ISSUE', AND, 'THEY WILL NOT RESPOND TO ME ABOUT THIS SUBJECT MATTER ANY FURTHER BECAUSE THEY HAVE BEEN DOING SO FOR SEVERAL YEARS, FROM THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES MINISTER, CORRECTIONAL SERVICES' CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, SENTENCE MANAGEMENT UNIT, SERIOUS OFFENDER COMMITTEE, PRISON MANAGER, PRISON SUPERVISOR, PRISON PSYCHOLOGIST AND PRISON SOCIAL WORKER'.

1985. THE PURPOSE OF SAID SUBJECT ANCHORS [SEE TEXT AT 1943, IBID], IS TO FIRST IDENTIFY RELEVANT CRITERIA [SEE TEXT AT 1938, IBID], TO ATTACH VERY SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF MY 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], FROM WHICH OTHER ACTIONS/EVENTS BRANCH.

1986. A SUBJECT ANCHOR FOR MY 'SENTENCE START AS FROM', WOULD THEREFORE IDENTIFY AS '3-6-1994' [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.2, B. AND R.2, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID], FROM WHICH SUBJECT ANCHOR 'LENGTH OF IMPOSED 'NPP OF TIME' MUST BRANCH,

1987. A SUBJECT ANCHOR FOR 'DATE ON WHICH SAID IMPOSED 'NPP OF TIME' ([74.]), MUST BE CALCULATED TO END,

1988. WOULD THEREFORE IDENTIFY AS, 3-6-1994, PLUS 22 1/2 YEARS ("MUST" APPLY [80.]), PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS EXISTING IN 1992, CALCULATING TO AN 'EARLIEST RELEASE DATE NPP OF TIME', OF 22 1/2 YEARS MINUS 1/3 OF 22 1/2 YEARS

1989. [(22 1/2 ÷ 3 = 7 1/2 YEARS), (22 1/2 - 7 1/2 = 15 YEARS), (3-6-1994 + 15 YEARS = 3-6-2009), (3-6-1994 TO 3-6-2009 = 15 YEARS), (15 YEARS IS THE TRUE AND ABSOLUTE 'NPP OF TIME' ORDERED AND IMPOSED BY MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT [74., 77, 78. AND 80.]), ('1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS' [80.], BEING THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS OF 1992 ([207. (PARAGRAPHS 15, 20, THEREIN)]), WERE A MANDATORY ENFORCEMENT ORDER IMPOSED BY SAID COURT [74.]), (MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, INCORPORATED 'REASONS' OF THE COURT, FORMING THE [REDACTED] JUDGMENT PROPER [74.], AND SO ORDERED THEREIN, NOT ONLY 'ME' TO SERVE SAID IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER, BUT ALSO, 'THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA' TO CARRY-OUT AND ENFORCE SAID IMPOSED ORDER, AS FUNDAMENTAL AND INTRINSIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SAID 2002 [REDACTED] JUDGMENT [74.], WERE QUALIFIABLY EXPLAINED TO SUCH A SPECIFIC EXTENT THAT NO AMBIGUITY REMAINED, THEREBY FORCEABLY (IN DIRECT, AFFIRMATIVE AND POSITIVE WORDING), ENSURING AS AN INTRINSIC PART OF MY SAID SENTENCING ORDER, THAT MY SENTENCE MAP WAS MARRIED DELIBERATELY TO RELEVANT SUBJECT ANCHORS [REFER TEXT AT 1942 TO 1945. (INCLUSIVE), 1964. IBID]],

1990. WHICH IS 15 YEARS AFTER 3-6-1994, SO THAT '3-6-1994 + 15 YEARS IS 3-6-2009' ([126.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.7, B. AND R.7, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID].

1991. A SUBJECT ANCHOR FOR 'DATE ON WHICH/AFTER WHICH, I AM LAWFULLY PERMITTED TO APPLY (VIA FORMAL WRITTEN APPLICATION), FOR RELEASE ON PAROLE', IN ACCORDANCE WITH STATUTORY DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENTS, WRITTEN WITHIN 'RELEVANT VERSION' OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT ([85.]), AS PROCEDURAL OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATIONS,
1992. AND, WITHIN SUCH PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OBLIGATIONS OPEN FOR USE BY ME, IN ACCORDANCE WITH/IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE 'SENTENCING ORDER' IMPOSED UPON ME IN
1993. 2002 ([74., 78. AND 80.]), 'WHICH ALSO THEREIN IMPOSED UPON THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, THE STRICT PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OBLIGATIONS WHICH MUST BE ACCEPTED, APPLIED AND ENFORCED BY STATE GOVERNMENT, ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR PROCEDURAL DEALINGS
1994. WITH MY PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATION, WHICH THEREFORE AND THEREBY ALSO DOES NOT BURDEN ME WITH ANY SENTENCE 'IMPACT/EFFECT', THAT IS GREATER THAN WHAT WAS COURT IMPOSED AGAINST ME' [74.],
1995. WOULD THEREFORE IDENTIFY AS, A PERIOD OF TIME (THEREIN INTRINSICING TWO SPECIFIC DATES, THE PRIMARY DATE BEING DATE ANCHORED TO THE END OF THE 'NPP OF TIME', THE SECONDARY DATE BEING SIX MONTHS PRIOR TO PRIMARY DATE), NO LONGER THAN SIX MONTHS PRIOR TO THE DATE ON WHICH SAID COURT DETERMINED AND IMPOSED 'NPP OF TIME' ([74.]), WAS CALCULATED TO END (WHICH IS ~~IS~~ THEN ANCHORED AS THE 'NPP DATE'), [97.]
1996. 'NPP DATE' MUST ONLY BE CALCULATED IN ACCORDANCE/COMPLIANCE WITH 'SENTENCING ORDER' IMPOSED SENTENCING STANDARDS [74. AND 80.], ANCHORING TO 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.], THEREBY ASSOCIATING AND MARRYING TO 'SENTENCE START DATE' (3-6-1994), 'NPP OF TIME' (15 YEARS), 'NPP DATE' (3-6-1994 + 15 YEARS = 3-6-2009), 'NPP DATE MINUS 6. MONTHS' ([97.], 3-6-2009 - 6 MONTHS = 3-12-2008.)],
1997. WHICH IS 6 MONTHS EARLIER THAN 3-6-2009, SO THAT '3-6-2009 MINUS 6. MONTHS IS 3-12-2008 AS THE EARLIEST DATE THAT I WAS PERMITTED TO FORMALLY APPLY FOR PAROLE-RELEASE' [REFER TEXT AT 1987. TO 1990. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.2, B. AND R.2, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.6, B. AND R.6, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID].

1998. A SUBJECT ANCHOR INTRINSIC TO STATUTORY PROCEDURES, IN RELATION TO HOW AND WHEN THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA MUST PROCEDURALLY COMPLY WITH [80.] OF [74.], WHILE DEALING WITH/MANAGING, ^{MY} PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATION (AND PAROLE-RELEASE, ACCORDINGLY),

1999. WOULD THEREFORE IDENTIFY AS, 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], 'KEY FEATURES THEREIN INCLUDING [78. AND 80.], [77.], AND [207. (PARAGRAPH 20. THEREIN, FULL TEXT)]', THE 'CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA' [1., 3., 35. ("COURT", "SENTENCE"), 38., 40., 44. ("SENTENCING COURT"), AND 45.], 'TO ONLY ENFORCE AN IMPOSED SENTENCE AGAINST ME', 'TO NEVER CREATE AND CARRY-OUT ANY SENTENCE AGAINST ME WHICH IS NOT DELEGATED DOWN TO 'IT' FROM/BY THE CH. III ([3.]), SENTENCING COURT [SEE TEXT AT 846, 847, 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AS MY ACTUAL 'SENTENCING ORDER', THE FACT IN POINT THAT 'NOT ONLY IS MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], JUDICIALLY UNCHALLENGED AND UN-CONTRADICTED BY ANY VOICE OF STATE GOVERNMENT (S.A.), IT IS ALSO THE ONLY STANDING 'SENTENCING ORDER' JUDICIALLY IMPOSED UPON ME/AGAINST ME, BY AND/OR BORNE FROM MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING HEARING [74.], [SEE TEXT AT ¹⁹⁴⁶ (TABLE POSITION R.5, A. AND ^{R.5} B. AND R.5, C.3. AND R.2, C.3. AND R.6, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, C.3.), ¹⁹⁶² 1963. IBID], [80. ("THIS COURT MUST APPLY THE SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLICABLE IN 1992.")], [77.].
2001. A SUBJECT ANCHOR INTRINSIC TO THE ONLY PERMISSIBLE SENTENCING STANDARDS THAT "MUST" ([80.]), BE ENFORCEABLY APPLIED FROM MY 'SENTENCING ORDER' ([74.]), AGAINST ME (THE SUBJECT PERSON UPON WHOM SUCH ORDER IS IMPOSED), BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (AS 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER'), ESPECIALLY REGARDING AND IN RELATION TO 'CALCULATED PERIODS OF TIME', 'MY PAROLE APPLICATION', 'MY ACTUAL RELEASE ON PAROLE', 'MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM DURATION OF MY RELEASE ON PAROLE', 'ANY PARTICULARISATION AND PARTICULARISATION WHICH BY ANY MANNER AND/OR FORM, WITHIN 1992 ORDERED SENTENCING STANDARDS ([80.]), PERTAINS TO SATISFACTION OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCE',
2002. WOULD THEREFORE IDENTIFY AS, 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], ESPECIALLY (THEREIN), [78.
2003. AND 80.], AND, ARE ADDITIONALLY GOVERNED, GUARANTEED AND JUDICIALLY PROTECTED BY [38., 40., 44. AND 45.], AS CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]), UNBREAKABLE QUALIFIERS OF JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE AND AUTHORITY, EMBEDDED WITHIN AND THEREBY FORM OF ABSOLUTE OUTCOME, OF THE PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER OF THE SENTENCING COURT IN 2002 ([74.]), UNTIL SATISFACTION OF IMPOSED 'SENTENCING ORDER' IS ACHIEVED [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963.].

2004. WHAT IS ALSO SIGNIFICANT ABOUT ALL THREE OF MY SENTENCING HEARINGS, THE ORIGINAL [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, A. AND R.2, B. AND R.2, C.1. DOWN TO R.13, C.1.), 1962, 1963. IBID], THE SECOND (CCA [212.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, A. AND R.2, B. AND R.2, C.2. DOWN TO R.15, C.2.), 1962, 1963. IBID], AND THE THIRD (FULL COURT [74.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, A. AND R.2, B. AND R.2, C.3. DOWN TO R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID], IS THAT ONCE MY HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE" WAS IMPOSED UPON ME BY THE TRIAL SENTENCING JUSTICE (ORIGINAL SENTENCE), IT HAS NEVER
2005. BEEN REMOVED, VACATED, SET ASIDE, VOIDED, NULLIFIED, ETC. 'IT' HAS NEVER BEEN JUDICIALLY QUESTIONED, ATTACKED OR CHALLENGED IN ANY WAY ASSOCIATED WITH MY SENTENCE APPEAL HEARINGS ([212.], [74.]), AND THEREFORE CONTINUES TO STAND AS THE ORIGINAL, AND, ONLY HEAD-SENTENCE COURT IMPOSED UPON/AGAINST ME FOR
2006. MURDER CONVICTION (1994 TRIAL, ADELAIDE SUPREME COURT), AND, 'WAS IMPOSED UPON/AGAINST ME PURSUANT TO PROPER PERMISSIBLE APPLICATION OF THE ONLY APPLICABLE SENTENCING STANDARDS, WHICH NOT ONLY EXISTED AT THAT TIME ('AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT'), BUT ALSO WERE THE ONLY COMPETENTLY PERMITTED TO BE IMPOSED UPON ME, AND RELIED UPON BY SAID SENTENCING COURT, TO CONSIDER, DETERMINE AND DELIVER, THE 'IMPOSED SENTENCE', AS THE STATED SENTENCING STANDARDS ('AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT'), WERE EFFECTIVELY AND OPERATIONALLY SAME AS THOSE EXISTING IN 1992, AT THE TIME CRIME COMMITTED ([79. AND 80.]), [REFER TO TEXT IN [207.], PARAGRAPHS 15. ('AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT REFERENCE'), AND 20. ('FULL TEXT')].
2007. THE IMPOSED 'HEAD-SENTENCE' (AS ABOVE DESCRIBED), MUST THEREFORE HARRY TO THE ORIGINAL SENTENCING STANDARDS WHEREIN THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, SO IMPOSED, MANDATES, UNTIL SATISFACTION OR REMOVAL OF SAID "LIFE" SENTENCE (IMPOSED PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT), FUNDAMENTAL APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF SPECIFIC SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED SENTENCING RIGHTS, INTRINSIC TO THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS, WHICH ARE OUTSIDE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY HELD BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, TO TAKE AWAY, INVALIDATE, VOID, FROM APPLICATIONAL EFFECT UPON THE OWNER OF SUCH SENTENCING RIGHTS, BEING ME, THE RESPECTIVELY SENTENCED PERSON,
2008. THE 'ONLY' ALTERATION TO MY COURT IMPOSED SENTENCES, HAS OFFICIALLY (AND JUDICIALLY), BEEN TO THE 'NPP OF TIME', AND 'NPP DATE', WHICH ARE ADMINISTRATIVELY

MANAGED AND GOVERNED BY STATUTORY INSTRUMENT [14.], THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT ([85.]), VIA ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY (COMPETENTLY OPEN TO USE THEREIN AND THEREUNDER, AND, COMPLIANTLY WITH MY 'SENTENCING ORDER' BY MY SENTENCING COURT [74. AND 80.]), THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (AND ANY DELEGATED DOWN RESPONSIBILITY/ACTIONS).

2009. IT IS PARAMOUNT TO THE PERMISSIBLE ENFORCEMENT OF MY COURT IMPOSED SENTENCE, THAT SAID 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], IS NOT MISUSED BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (INADVERTANTLY OR DELIBERATELY, BY WAY OF ACTION AND/OR EFFECT OF A DECISION AND/OR OUTCOME OF AN ACTION), TO 'BURDEN ME WITH ANY GREATER PENALTY OF IMPOSED AND DELIVERED SENTENCE, THAN WAS PERMISSIBLE AND THEREFORE ALLOWABLE ACCORDING TO ALL INTRINSIC RESTRICTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS FORMING AND CONSTITUTING MY IMPOSED 'SENTENCING ORDER PROPER'.

2010. NOTING IN [53.], THE TEXT, "IT WILL BE NOTED THAT THE AMENDMENTS ABOLISH REMISSIONS AS FROM THE DAY THE AMENDMENTS COME INTO OPERATION.". AS INDICATED HEREIN, [46.] CAME INTO OPERATION ON 1-8-1994, WHICH WAS AFTER MY HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE" WAS COURT IMPOSED UPON ME, BY MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING COURT (CCA. [212.], WAS ALSO DELIVERED PRIOR TO 1-8-1994, (THEREFORE ALSO COMPETENTLY IMPOSED PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS [207. (PARAGRAPH 20. ('FULL TEXT'))]).

2012. IN PINDER [208.], AS DETAILED FURTHER THROUGHOUT THIS DOCUMENT, IT WAS RELEVANT TO 'IDENTIFY' THE FIRST DATE FROM WHICH TO ~~EXERCISE~~ EXERCISE SPECIFIC (AND
2013. RESPECTIVE), 'SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED' SENTENCING STANDARDS 'RIGHTS', THOUGH, IN PINDER [208.], THE 'ISSUE IN HAND' WAS MORESO 'A SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHT' OF 'IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION', AND THEREFORE THE FIRST DATE ON WHICH SUCH RIGHT CAN IN FACT AND LAW BE EXERCISED, IS A CRITICAL AND INTRINSIC FEATURE OF SAID
2014. 'SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHT', WHEREAS, WITH ~~THE~~ PINDER ([208.]), PROVIDING NOT JUST A 'RELEVANCE', BUT IN FACT AN 'AUTHORITY' TOO, REGARDING THE 2002 [74.], 'SENTENCING ORDER' IMPOSED UPON ME (INCLUDING MANDATORY APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS
2015. OPERATING IN 1992 [80.]), BUT ALSO, THE METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING THE POINT AT WHICH IS THE FIRST TIME/DATE/EVENT FOR ANCHORING TO, MY ABSOLUTE

2016. RIGHT FROM SUCH POINT AND THEREAFTER, TO EXERCISE MY IMPOSED SENTENCE 'SENTENCING RIGHTS', INCLUDING SUCH INTRINSIC AND FUNDAMENTAL 'SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED AND DUE PROCESS' RIGHTS WHICH ACTIVELY INCORPORATE AND ENCOMPASS THE 'JUDGMENT PROPER' [74.], AS A FORM OF WARRANT OF APPLICATIONAL OBSERVATION AND ENFORCEMENT, IN SATISFACTION OF THE IMPOSED 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.].

2017. EXCEPT FOR THE EVENT OF A HIGHER CH. III [3.], SENTENCING COURT 'SETTING ASIDE, VACATING, OR BY SOME OTHER JUDICIAL MEANS CHANGING MY CURRENT SENTENCING ORDER ([74.])', THEN, MY ONLY SENTENCING ORDER [74.], REMAINS, WITH ABSOLUTE CONSTITUTIONAL [1.], PROTECTION, AS ORDERED [74.], [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, C.3. AND R.6, C.3. AND R.7, C.3. AND R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID.].

2018. WITH REFERENCE AUTHORITY TO THE HCA JUDGMENT [210.], IDENTIFYING TOWARDS THE ANCHORING POINT OF A "PERFECTED" "ORDER" BY THE SITTING COURT, IT IS BY SUCH AUTHORITY, THAT WHEN THE FULL COURT "PERFECTED" ITS DELIVERED 'SENTENCING ORDER' UPON ME ([74.]), SUCH 'SENTENCING ORDER' WAS CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 3.]), UNTOUCHABLE BY ANY STATUTORY MEANS OTHER THAN

2019. BY A HIGHER SENTENCING COURT (AS DESCRIBED ABOVE). ALL DECISIONS BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CH. II [3.], GOVERNMENT BODIES, PERSONS, REPRESENTATIVES, WHICH HAVE REFUSED, FAILED, NEGLECTED, FORGOTTEN TO ONLY ENFORCE AN IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER ([74.]), AGAINST ME [SEE TEXT AT 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.], AND INSTEAD THEY HAVE CREATED THEIR OWN INTERPRETATION (UNCONSTITUTIONALLY [1. AND 3.]), USING THEIR OWN CREATION OF CLAIMED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY AND

2020. COMPETENCE TO SO ACT ([46.]), WHICH, 'CONSEQUENTIAL TO DELIVERY OF MY 2002 FULL COURT JUDGMENT [74.], ON SUCH DATE OF DELIVERY (9-9-2002), THEY DISREGARDED STRICT AND 'ABSOLUTE WORDING THEREIN [78., 79. AND 80.], WHICH ACTUALLY CONVERT TO SENTENCING ANCHOR POINTS' [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, C.3. DOWN TO R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID.],

2021. INSTEAD, 'CLAIMING, AND, OPERATIONALLY ACTING THEIR OWN CREATED INTERPRETATION, WHICH ATTACHES TO FALSE AND CRIMINALLY DECEPTIVE 'ANCHORING POINTS' [SEE TEXT AT 1946

- (TABLE POSITION R.2, D.1. DOWN TO R.10, D.1. DOWN TO R.14, D.1.), 1962, 1963. IBID J,
2022. BUT THEN,
CONSEQUENTIAL TO ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE TO S.A. CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT,
THE S.A. GOVERNMENT HAS AGAIN CRIMINALLY EXCEEDED THE JURISDICTIONAL
AUTHORITY AND COMPETENCE (ULTRA VIRES, JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD), GIVEN TO IT UNDER
[1.], IT HAS LITERALLY DISSOLVED THE ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY INTRINSIC TO THE
CREATION OF MY 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], AND RE-WRITTEN, AGAIN, THE
CLAIMED MEANING AND INTERPRETATION OF MY ACTUAL 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.],
2023. WHICH,
SINCE APPROXIMATELY EARLY 2016, IS NOW CLAIMED, AND, OPERATIONALLY ACTING
THEIR NEWLY CREATED INTERPRETATION OF MY 'SENTENCING ORDER' ([74.]), WHICH ATTACHES TO
NEW FALSE AND CRIMINALLY DECEPTIVE 'ANCHORING POINTS' [SEE TEXT AT 1946
(TABLE POSITION R.9, A. AND R.9, B. AND R.9, D.2. AND R.2, D.2. DOWN TO R.10, D.2.
AND PAROLE UNTIL I DIE), 1962, 1963. IBID J.
2024. BY ESTABLISHING THE INTRINSIC AND FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENT OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCE IN 2002,
WHICH 'QUALIFIES A PERFECTED ORDER OF SAID SENTENCING COURT ([74.]), AS AN
ANCHORING POINT FROM WHICH I OWN THE ABSOLUTE 'SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHT',
TO EXERCISE MY IMPOSED SENTENCING STANDARDS RIGHTS', ATTACHED CONSTITUTIONALLY
([1.]), TO MY IMPOSED 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], [SEE TEXT AT 870. TO 884, 2012. TO
2018. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J], ALSO CEMENTS THE ONLY PERMISSIBLE WAY THAT ANY CH.II [3.],
S.A. GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE (PERSON/AGENCY), IS ABLE TO LAWFULLY OBTAIN ANY
'INCREASE TO BURDEN OF PENALTY ALREADY IMPOSED UPON ME' BY MY EXISTING IMPOSED
2026. SENTENCE ([74.]). THE FIRST POINT I COULD EXERCISE ANY 'SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS'
BORNE DIRECTLY FROM MY IMPOSED SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2015, 2016. IBID J], WAS ON DATE
2027. OF DELIVERY OF IMPOSED SENTENCE, 9-9-2002 [74.]. PERFECTION OF SAID DELIVERED
'SENTENCING ORDER', THEREBY EMPLOYED ABSOLUTE JUDICIAL COMPETENCE AND
JURISDICTIONAL PROTECTION OF SAID 'PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], [SEE TEXT
2028. AT 2018. IBID J]. AT THE MOMENT OF SAID 'PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER', I WAS ALREADY
SERVING MY IMPOSED SENTENCE ('TO DATE FROM 3-6-1994'), AND HAD THEREBY
ACCRUED SENTENCING STANDARDS RIGHTS IMPOSED AND PERFECTED ON 9-9-2002, WHICH

2029. NOT ONLY ADDED TO THE IMPOSED SENTENCE I WAS ALREADY SERVING (MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, 1994, WHEREIN THE HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE" WAS IMPOSED AND SAID ORDER, RE 'HEAD-SENTENCE', WAS THEN PERFECTED, THEREBY ALSO ESTABLISHING THE ONLY SENTENCING STANDARDS PERMITTED TO BE OPERATIONALLY APPLIED TO SAID HEAD-SENTENCE, BEING, THE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS', AND, AS ALREADY RECOGNISED BY THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA, IN WATSON [194. (PARAGRAPH 11.)], ALSO THEREIN CITING PNJ V. THE QUEEN [2009] HCA 6, "THE FACT THAT THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS PART OF THE SENTENCE IS IMPLICIT IN ~~THE~~ THE OBSERVATIONS OF THE HIGH COURT...",], [SEE TEXT AT ²⁰¹⁰ ~~2010~~, 2011. IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 2004. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND SO, THE 'PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER' IN 1994, WHICH ANCHORED "LIFE" AS MY HEAD-SENTENCE, ALSO ANCHORED THE IMPOSED SENTENCING STANDARDS TO SAID 'PERFECTED HEAD-SENTENCE SENTENCING ORDER'), MY 'HEAD-SENTENCE SENTENCING ORDER',

2030. IT IN FACT CEMENTED THE 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING STANDARDS' (INTRINSIC TO MY IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE), TO THE 'NEWLY PERFECTED SENTENCING ~~ORDER~~ ORDER' (DELIVERED ON 9-9-2002 [74.]), AND UNDER THE UNTOUCHABLE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY AND COMPETENCE IT HOLDS, THE FULL COURT SO ORDERED (AS A PERFECTED ORDER), THAT '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS "MUST" BE APPLIED TO THEIR PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER' [78., 79. AND 80.], [74.], WHICH IT DELIVERED ON THAT DATE ([1. AND 3.]),

2031. AS, SAID NEWLY IMPOSED 'SENTENCING ORDER' [74.], WAS ONLY AN ORDER AGAINST MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD, AND DOES NOT TOUCH THE IMPOSED 'HEAD-SENTENCE SENTENCING STANDARDS' IN ANY MANNER OR FORM (WHICH STILL, THEREFORE, ~~EXIST~~ PERFECTED EXIST PURSUANT TO THEIR INTRINSIC ~~PERFECTED~~ SENTENCING STANDARDS, THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT), [SEE TEXT AT 2004. TO 2007. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 2001. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2032. MY IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE (ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER), INCLUDED INTRINSIC USE OF SPECIFIC SENTENCING STANDARDS, EMBODIED WITHIN THE PERFECTION OF MY ORIGINAL 'SENTENCING ORDER', IDENTIFIED AS THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT ([74. AND 75.]).

2033. MY IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD (FULL COURT, DELIVERED 9-9-2002 [74.]), INCLUDED INTRINSIC USE OF SPECIFIC SENTENCING STANDARDS, EMBODIED WITHIN THE PERFECTION OF MY NEWLY DETERMINED 'SENTENCING ORDER', IDENTIFIED AS THE

AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT [74. AND 80.], [SEE TEXT AT 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, IBID].

2034. ALTHOUGH MY 'IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE' ("LIFE"), IS A DISTINCTLY DIFFERENT FORM OF SENTENCE TO MY NEWLY 'IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD' ([74.]), IT IS FUNDAMENTAL TO THE
2035. EXISTENCE OF BOTH, THAT THEY CAN ONLY BE CREATED IN A CH. III COMPETENT COURT [3.],
2036. 'THEY MUST ONLY BE DETERMINED AND IMPOSED PURSUANT TO 'RELEVANT' SENTENCING STANDARDS, THAT THE RESPECTIVE COURT ITSELF MUST CLEARLY IDENTIFY (AND THEREBY ANCHOR TO THE IMPOSED AND DELIVERED SENTENCE)', THE RELEVANT AND SPECIFIC SENTENCING STANDARDS WHICH MUST BE OPERATIONALLY APPLIED, OBSERVED AND ENFORCED ACCORDINGLY,
2037. AND, EVEN THOUGH IT IS POSSIBLE FOR ME TO HAVE AN 'IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE BUT NOT HAVE ANY NPP IMPOSED', IT IS HOWEVER IMPOSSIBLE TO HAVE AN 'IMPOSED NPP BUT NOT
2038. HAVE ANY HEAD-SENTENCE IMPOSED'. AN IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE INCORPORATES ANY IMPOSED NPP.

2039. AS HIGHLIGHTED THROUGHOUT THIS DOCUMENT, MY 'HEAD-SENTENCE' WAS IMPOSED AND PERFECTED PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS ([75.]), AND, MY IMPOSED 'NPP' 'SENTENCING ORDER' WAS ALSO PERFECTED PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS ([74. AND 80.]), PLUS, THE 'SENTENCING ORDER', WHICH INTRINSICALLY RELIES ON TEXT OF THE JUDGMENT PROPER [74.], SO ORDERED, THAT, 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS "MUST" NOT BE APPLIED TO MY IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER' [74., 78. AND 80.].

2040. I HAVE DESCRIBED IN THIS DOCUMENT (ABOVE), THE POWERFULLY CHARACTERISED
2041. KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 'LIFE, AS AN IMPOSED SENTENCE (WITH IMPOSED 'NPP'), PRIOR TO OPERATION OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT',
2042. 'LIFE, AS AN IMPOSED SENTENCE (WITH IMPOSED 'NPP'), DURING OPERATION OF, AND SIGNIFICANTLY ALSO, PURSUANT TO OPERATION OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS, IRRESPECTIVE OF ACTUAL DATE OF DELIVERY OF IMPOSED SENTENCE',
2043. AND,
- 'LIFE, AS AN IMPOSED SENTENCE (WITH IMPOSED 'NPP'), PURSUANT TO OPERATION OF THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS'.

2044. THE RADICAL KEY FEATURES OF MY 'IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE' (ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER [SEE TEXT AT 2032. IBID]), AS I HAVE DESCRIBED FURTHER IN ~~THIS~~ THIS DOCUMENT,

BY INTRINSICATING THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS WITHIN THE
 2045. PERFECTION OF SAID 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER', COMPETENTLY MANDATED THE
 OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF THE SUBSTANTIVE APPLICATION, AND ENFORCEMENT,
 OF SUCH MATTERS INCLUDING, 'NUMERICAL CALCULATION OF ALL IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIODS
 WHICH MAY COME UPON ME FROM A COMPETENT SENTENCING COURT' (WHICH DID IN FACT HAPPEN
 WITH THE DELIVERY AND IMPOSITION OF [212.], AND THEN [74.]), 'PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS
 METHODS AND JURISDICTIONAL PERMISSIONS LINKING TO SAID NPP DATE/S', 'ENFORCEABLE ACTIONS
 OPEN TO USE BY S.A. GOVERNMENT WHEN AND WHILE ADMINISTERING MY IMPOSED SENTENCES
 (HEAD-SENTENCE AND NPP-SENTENCE)', 'MAXIMUM PERIOD OF LENGTH OF PAROLE PERMITTED TO BE
 ADMINISTRATIVELY ORDERED AGAINST ME, BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT', 'IDENTIFIABLE
 DATE AT WHICH MY ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE MUST BE WHOLLY SATISFIED (MAXIMUM OF TEN
 2046. YEARS AFTER PAROLE RELEASE STARTS)', AND THESE ARE ONLY SOME OF SUCH INCLUDED MATTERS
 MANDATED WITHIN MY IMPOSED 'PERFECTED HEAD-SENTENCE ORDER' ([SEE TEXT AT
 1612. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE), 1844, 1845, 2028, 2029, 2030, IBID.]).


2047. THE RADICAL KEY FEATURES OF MY 'IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD' (NEWLY IMPOSED
 SENTENCING ORDER [74.], [80.]), AS I HAVE DESCRIBED THROUGHOUT THIS DOCUMENT,
 BY INTRINSICATING THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS WITHIN THE
 PERFECTION OF SAID 'NEW AND CURRENTLY ONLY COMPETENT SENTENCING ORDER',
 2048. RELATING TO 'NPP DATE' AND 'NPP OF TIME', COMPETENTLY MANDATED THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT
 OF THE SUBSTANTIVE APPLICATION, AND ENFORCEMENT, OF SUCH MATTERS INCLUDING,
 THOSE INDICATED IN ABOVE [TEXT AT 2045, 2046. IBID.].

2049. BOTH FORMS OF IMPOSED SENTENCE, 'HEAD-SENTENCE' AND 'NPP', INDEPENDENTLY CARRY
 THE SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHT OF OPERATIONAL APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT,
 2050. OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, EVEN THOUGH ACCORDING TO THE 'STATE GOVERNMENT OF
 SOUTH AUSTRALIA, MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], IN "NO WAY ENTITLED ME TO "ANY
 PROVISIONS" OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT (BY OFFICIAL MINISTERIAL LETTER FROM JENIFER
 RANKINE MP, MINISTER FOR POLICE AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, 2012), AND THEREFORE MY
 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], AND THEREIN DESCRIBED NON-PAROLE PERIOD, WERE CALCULATED AND
 DETERMINED ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT ([46.])".

2051. NOT ONLY IS THE MINISTER (ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA),

FUNDAMENTALLY IN ERROR WITH SUCH FALSE CLAIM OF INTERPRETATION, OF THE JUDICIAL MEANING OF THE WORDS OF MY JUDGMENT PROPER [74.], BUT IS ALSO EFFECTING JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD, AGAINST THE JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE OF MY CH. III [3.], SENTENCING COURT, WHICH IS CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]), PROHIBITED, [SEE TEXT AT 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE), 1537. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

TO FURTHER ILLUSTRATE THIS POINT, I PROVIDE A 'GRAPHIC IMAGE', SHOWING MY 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER' OF "LIFE" [SEE TEXT AT 2032, IBID], WHICH IS THE 'HEAD-SENTENCE', PERFECTED PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS [SEE TEXT AT 1611. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 2037, 2038. IBID], AND 'POINTER' REFERENCES.




ALL 'NPP' SENTENCING ORDERS MUST EXIST WITHIN THE ENVELOPING AND ENCOMPASSING 'HEAD-SENTENCE' SENTENCING ORDER.

[SEE TEXT AT 2033. IBID]

[SEE TEXT AT 2032, IBID]

(AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, SEE ANDREWS [207, (THEREIN PARAGRAPHS 15, 19, 20.)]).



2061. THE COMBINED REPRESENTATIONS OF 'GRAPHIC IMAGES', 'POINTER' REFERENCES AND OTHER DETAILS
 WITHIN [TEXT AT 2053. TO 2060. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND [TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE) TO
 1963. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], TOGETHER WITH OTHER RELEVANT SUPPORTING DETAILS THROUGHOUT THIS
 DOCUMENT, SHOW THAT I HAVE ACCURATELY EXPRESSED IN WRITTEN WORD AND IMAGE/TABLE FORM, HOW
 EASY IT IS TO UNDERSTAND 'WHAT MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER ACTUALLY MEANS AND MANDATES',
 COMPARED TO, 'WHAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FALSELY CLAIM AND IMPROPERLY ACTION
 AGAINST ME, FROM THEIR FALSE, FRAUDULENT CLAIMS OF INTERPRETATION CORRECTNESS' ([74.]):

2062. [TEXT AT 2057.] DRAWS LINE (A) AND LINE (H) TO THEIR RESPECTIVE CIRCLES,
 THE CIRCLES ARE MY ACTUAL IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2032, IBID].

2063. LINE (A) GOES TO MY TRUE SENTENCE ORDERS, AS INDICATED WITHIN TABLE
 COLUMN C. [TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, C.1. TO R.13, C.1. AND R.2,
 C.2. TO R.15, C.2. AND R.2, C.3. TO R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID].

2064. LINE (H) GOES TO MY FALSELY CLAIMED SENTENCE ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2050,
 2051, 2052, 2058. IBID], AS INDICATED WITHIN TABLE COLUMN D. [SEE TEXT
 AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.2, D.1. TO R.14, D.1. AND R.2, D.2. TO
 LIFE ~~AND~~ ON PAROLE/SENTENCE ENDS WHEN I DIE), 1962, 1963. IBID].

2065. LINE (C) [TEXT AT 2056.], POINTS TO REPRESENT WHERE MY IMPOSED HEAD-
 SENTENCE WAS ORDERED, WHICH WAS ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER (LINE (B)),
 [SEE TEXT AT 2004. TO 2007. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2066. LINE (D) [TEXT AT 2055.], POINTS TO REPRESENT WHERE AND WHEN MY
 IMPOSED 2002 JUDGMENT WAS ORDERED ([74.]), [SEE TEXT AT 2008,
 2028. TO 2031. (INCLUSIVE), 2033. TO 2039. (INCLUSIVE), 2042, 2047, 2048.
 IBID].

2067. LINE (E), POINTS TO REPRESENT 'MANDATORY END OF SENTENCE', PER
 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER PERFECTED ORDER', WHICH THEREFORE MUST
 ANCHOR TO PERFECTED ~~HEAD-SENTENCE~~ HEAD-SENTENCE SENTENCING STANDARDS, WHICH
 THEREIN IDENTIFY THE ONLY AUTHORISED WAY TO 'CONCLUDE/SATISFY' MY IMPOSED
 'HEAD-SENTENCE/NON-PAROLE PERIOD', WHICH IS IN FACT AND LAW AT THE
 END OF A MAXIMUM 10 YEARS PAROLE, AS ORDERED [74.], [SEE TEXT AT
 1611. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE), 2044. TO 2048. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT

AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.11, C.3.), 1962, 1963. IBID].

2068.

[TEXT AT 2058.] REPRESENTS THE 'FAKE SENTENCES' WHICH THE S.A. GOVERNMENT CLAIMS TO BE COMPETENTLY ENFORCEABLE AGAINST ME [SEE TEXT AT 2050. TO 2052. (INCLUSIVE), 2019. TO 2023. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2069.

LINE (F) [TEXT AT 2059.], POINTS TO REPRESENT 'MANDATORY END OF SENTENCE', PER STATUTORY MANDATE (CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, SA ([85.])), WHICH WAS AT THE END OF MAXIMUM 10. YEARS PAROLE (WHICH EFFECTIVELY MEANT THAT WHOLE IMPOSED SENTENCE COULD, BY STATUTE MANDATE, BE "WHOLLY SATISFIED" [SEE TEXT AT 1616, 1617. IBID]), [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, D.1. AND R.10, A. AND R.10, B. AND R.10, D.1. AND R.14, A. AND R.14, B. AND R.14, D.1.), 1962, 1963.

2070.

IBID]. POINT (F) AND POINT (G) ARE CLAIMED BY S.A. GOVERNMENT TO BE THE SAME IMPOSED SENTENCE ORDER, DELIVERED 9-9-2002, EXCEPT THOUGH, POINT (G) ([151.], "LIFE" ON PAROLE WHICH MEANS 'PAROLE UNTIL YOU DIE', CANNOT EXIST WITHIN ANY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER, WHICH IS ALREADY A PERFECTED SENTENCING STANDARDS SENTENCING ORDER WHICH MANDATES A MAXIMUM PAROLE LENGTH OF 10. YEARS, AT WHICH POINT HEAD-SENTENCE BECOMES "WHOLLY SATISFIED" [SEE TEXT AT 1716. TO 1720. (INCLUSIVE), 1884. TO 1907. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), WAS STATE-LEGISLATIVELY CONSEQUENTED, THEREBY DEFACTO RE-SENTENCING ME (AND OTHER RESPECTIVE LIFERS), WITHOUT A COURT ROOM IN SIGHT, TO A 'NEWLY BURDENING FAKE SENTENCE'.

2071.

LINE (G) [TEXT AT 2060.], POINTS TO REPRESENT 'SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S NEWLY LEGISLATED (CH. I [3.]), GOVERNMENT ACTIONED (CH. II [3.]), PENALTY INCREASING TO AN ALREADY JUDICIALLY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER, WITHOUT COMPETENCE OR JURISDICTION TO SO CREATE OR IMPOSE AGAINST ME', BUT HAVE DONE SO ANYWAY, WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL INVOLVEMENT OR MANDATORY STATUTE COMPLIANCE [38., 40., 44., 45., 82., 83. AND 131.], [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R.5, D.2. AND R.9, D.2. AND R.10, D.2., LIFE PAROLE.), 1962, 1963. IBID]. IT CAME INTO OPERATION AFTER

2072.

'SENTENCED LIFERS' WERE AGAIN USED FOR POLITICAL GAIN, BY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PAROLE) AMENDMENT ACT' [140, 162, 179, AND 187.], AND INCORPORATED THE DECEPTIVE RESTRUCTURING OF STATE GOVERNMENT SECRET MEETING/DISCUSSIONS/RELEVANT PARTICULARS, ETC. FROM THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, INTO THE NEW SECRET MEETINGS FORMAT ([148.]), [161.], ONCE AGAIN IN CONTRAVENTION OF [113.] (A PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATION IS A 'MATTER BEFORE THE BOARD FROM START TO FINISH', NO MATTER WHOSE DESK 'IT' IS ON, OR OFFICE IT IS IN, OR AGENCY (P.A.R.C.), IT IS BEING REVIEWED BY), NOW CALLED THE 'PAROLE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMISSION', COMMENCING APPROXIMATELY EARLY 2016 [SEE TEXT AT 1946 (TABLE POSITION R. 9, A. AND R. 9, B. AND R. 9, D. 2.), 1962, 1963, IBID.].

2073.

[TEXT AT 2059.] IDENTIFIES THAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WERE STILL RECOGNISING THE STATUTORY MAXIMUM PAROLE-PERIOD, PERMITTED TO BE ADMINISTRATIVELY ORDERED AGAINST ME, AS 10 YEARS, ALSO, THAT SAME 'MAXIMUM PAROLE LENGTH' FORMED PART OF ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, AND THE 2002 SENTENCING ORDER [74.], AS JUDICIAL ORDERS,

2074.

HOWEVER, THE S.A. GOVERNMENT FRAUDULENTLY DISREGARDED THE 'TRUE CALCULATION OF MY NPP START DATE' [SEE (TABLE POSITION R. 7, C. 3.), 1962, 1963.], THEN APPLIED THEIR OWN FALSE CALCULATION AS

2075.

[SEE (TABLE POSITION R. 10, D. 1.), 1962, 1963.], BUT ALSO, IMPROPERLY GAVE PAROLE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL PURPORTED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OVER WHETHER OR NOT I WOULD EVER BE PAROLE-RELEASED (CONTRARY TO MY IMPOSED 'HEAD-SENTENCE' AND 'NPP' SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2054. IBID.]), [74, 78, AND 80.].

2076.

[TEXT AT 2060.] IDENTIFIES THAT, FOLLOWING STATUTE CHANGE [SEE (TABLE POSITION R. 9, D. 2.), 1962, 1963. IBID.], THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT INVALIDATED MY 'HEAD-SENTENCE' SENTENCING ORDER [SEE TEXT AT 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057. IBID.], AND MY 'NPP'

2077. SENTENCING ORDER [74.], NO LONGER OFFICIALLY RECOGNISED MY 'NPP' 'MAXIMUM DURATION AS 10. YEARS', AND INSTITUTED A RADICALLY NEW PENALTY AGAINST ME, THEY CLASSIFIED IT AS 'MY CURRENT SENTENCE WHICH INCLUDED PAROLE ^{UNTIL} I DIE AS THE ONLY LENGTH OF APPLICABLE PAROLE DURATION' ([151.]), [SEE (TABLE POSITION R.9, D.2. AND R.10, D.2. AND LIFE ON PAROLE UNTIL I DIE), 1962, 1963.].

2078. IT IS APPROPRIATE TO HIGHLIGHT THE SUBSTANTIVE QUALIFICATION BORNE OUT IN PINDER [208.], AND RELEVANCE TO MY IMPOSED SENTENCES [SEE TEXT AT 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE)

2079. IBID]. PINDER ([208.]), ARGUED TO DEFEND HIS 'SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT' TO BE IMMUNE FROM JUDICIAL PROCESSES (CRIMINAL PROCESSES), WHEREAS, I WAS ALREADY INVOLVED IN JUDICIAL PROCESSES WHEN 'ORIGINALLY SENTENCED TO "LIFE"', 1994, AND STILL INVOLVED IN THE SAME 'ORIGINAL SENTENCE' ("LIFE"), WHEN CROWN APPEAL RE-SENTENCED ([212.]), AND STILL INVOLVED IN THE SAME 'ORIGINAL SENTENCE' ("LIFE"), WHEN PETITION APPEAL

2080. RE-SENTENCED ([74. AND 75.]), AND, INTRINSIC TO SAID 'ORIGINAL AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER' OF "LIFE", WAS THE STATUTORY INTERPRETATION OF THE JUDICIAL ORDER SO PERFECTED, PURSUANT TO THE FOUNDATION SENTENCING STANDARDS THEREIN/THERE TO APPLICABLE, BEING THE '1992 VERSION OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' [74.], THE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' [212.], THE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING' ('HEAD-SENTENCE' AND 'NPP'), [SEE TEXT AT 2053,

2081. 2054. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]. PINDER ([208.]), HAD NOT ^{REACHED} HIS FIRST DATE FROM WHICH TO INVOKE HIS ~~SENTENCE~~ SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHT (TO IMMUNITY), BUT, MY FIRST DATE FROM WHICH TO INVOKE AND EXERCISE MY 'SENTENCING SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED RIGHTS', WAS AT THE VERY LATEST POINT WHEN RESPECTIVE SENTENCING ORDERS WERE

2082. PERFECTED (ON THAT DATE). THIS POINT IS RELEVANT ALSO WHEN LOOKING AT THE CROWN-SOLICITOR'S STATEMENT TO THE HCA, IN TELFORD [196.], "WE SAY THIS ACT

2083. HAS NO RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION." THAT STATEMENT BY THE CROWN-SOLICITOR, IN 2007, WAS EFFECTIVELY 'A LIE' (A FRAUD COMMITTED AGAINST THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA), WHEN LOOKING AT WHAT THE S.A. GOVERNMENT CLAIMED AGAINST THE JUDICIAL ORDER OF MY 2002 SENTENCE [74.], AND ALSO, 'FAKE RE-SENTENCED' ME AGAIN APPROXIMATELY EARLY 2016 [SEE TEXT AT 2058, 2059, 2060, 2068. TO 2077.

2084. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]. IT IS AGAINST SUCH A CIRCUMSTANCE THAT I INVITE ATTENTION TO THE KNIGHT JUDGMENT (KNIGHT V VICTORIA [2017] HCA 29, 17 AUGUST 2017, M 251/2015).

2085. THE TELFORD ([196.]), REFERENCE IS VALID TO SHOW ^{THAT} EVEN TO THE HCA, THE S.A. CROWN-SOLICITOR WAS STATING THE FACT THAT THE 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT' (THE ACT WHICH ENABLES CUSTODIAL MANAGEMENT OF PRISONERS, INCLUDING IN RELATION TO 'PAROLE FOR LIFE PRISONERS' ([85.]), HAS NO "RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION" [196.], THEREFORE, OF ANY RELEVANT AUTHORITY 'IT' CLAIMS TO HOLD REGARDING MY 'SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT', [74.],
 2086. FIRST, IT CANNOT AFFECT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER IMPOSED AGAINST ME, WHICH WAS ALREADY ACTIVATED BEFORE RESPECTIVE AMENDMENTS ^{WERE} ASSENTED [15.], INCLUDING MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, CCA APPEAL ([212.]), AND PETITION APPEAL ([74.]),
 2087. OR TRY TO , OR EVEN OPERATES AS IF ^{ALREADY} DONE SO, TO DISREGARD 'SUBSTANTIVE/ACCURSED RIGHTS' SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO 'SENTENCE LENGTH, PAROLE APPLICATION, PAROLE RELEASE, PAROLE TERM, WHO/WHAT HAS RIGHT TO DENY ME PAROLE (IF ANYONE

2088. AT ALL)', WHICH, THEN DENIES ME SUCH PERFECTED SENTENCING RIGHTS, AND CONSEQUENCES A MORE PENALISING IMPACT OF SENTENCE THAN WAS PERMITTED ACCORDING TO MY CURRENT AND ACTIVE SENTENCING ORDERS (ORIGINAL SENTENCE, "LIFE", 'NPP' RE-SENTENCING, [74.]), [SEE TEXT AT 2032, 2033. (INCLUSIVE)],

2089. AND, IT MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY FORM OR MANNER, TO INTERFERE WITH THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY OF MY CH.III [3.], SENTENCING COURT WHO PERFECTED MY COMPETENT 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, "LIFE" (PER. AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING
 2090. STANDARDS [SEE TEXT AT 2042, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2053, 2063, 2065. IBID]), OR, THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY OF MY CH.III [3.], SENTENCING COURT WHO PERFECTED MY COMPETENT AND CURRENT 'NPP SENTENCING ORDER, [74.] (PER. AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS [SEE TEXT AT 2044. TO 2049. (INCLUSIVE), 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2063, 2065, 2066, 2067. IBID]).

2091. EVEN THOUGH THE 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT' "HAS NO RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION" [SEE TEXT AT 2081, 2082, 2083, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088. IBID], IT HAS BEEN FRAUDULENTLY AND UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 3.]), USED BY THE S.A. GOVERNMENT TO VIOLATE THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY OF THE JUDICATURE ([1. AND 3.]), BEING THE SOURCE

OF MY 'ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER', AND 'NPP SENTENCING ORDER' (I SEE TEXT AT 2089,
 2092. 2090. IBID I). IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER OR NOT SUCH JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD (BY THE
S.A. GOVERNMENT / S.A. PARLIAMENT), WAS BELIEVED BY THE STATE OF SOUTH
AUSTRALIA, IN ITS USE/OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF SUCH 'ACT', TO BE LAWFULLY DONE OR
 2093. NOT (C1. AND 3.I), THE FACT IS THAT THE 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT' HAS NO
CONSTITUTIONAL COMPETENCE (C1. AND 3.I), TO CREATE A MORE 'PUNITIVE' AND/OR
'BURDEN SOME' EFFECT TO MY LIBERTY, AND, TO THE ACTUAL IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDERS
(AND THEIR RESPECTIVELY ATTRIBUTABLE PENALTIES, I SEE TEXT AT 2032, 2033, 2066,
 2094. 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID I), AND YET, EVEN WITHOUT JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OR
COMPETENCE TO 'INTERFERE WITH THE COURT'S SENTENCING BURDEN/PENALTY IMPOSED UPON
 2095. ME (SEE KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2084. IBID I], JUDGMENT, PARAGRAPH 26. THEREIN, "THERE ARE
CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE PARTY-SPECIFIC NATURE OF LEGISLATION CAN BE INDICATIVE OF THE TENDENCY
 2096. OF THAT LEGISLATION TO INTERFERE WITH AN EXERCISE OF JUDICIAL POWER³⁵, "I), THE STATE OF SOUTH
AUSTRALIA, VIA ACTIONS OF THEIR STATE PARLIAMENT (CH.I [3.I], AND STATE GOVERNMENT
(CH.II [3.I], OPERATED THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, S.A. (C85.I), IN SUCH
 2097. A 'PRACTICAL' WAY' (APPLICATION OF 'ACT', ARBITRARILY (AGAINST ME), AND IN DOING SO VIOLATED/
BREACHED THE JURISDICTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (CH.II [3.I] ONLY), WHICH EXISTS ONLY
AS ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT OF MY CRIMINAL LAW IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDERS
(■ SO IMPOSED, PERFECTED AND ORDERED, IN A CH.III SENTENCING ■ COURT [3.I]), I SEE TEXT
 2098. AT 1537. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE) IBID I), 'WHICH SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIRS THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY OF
MY ORIGINAL ■ SENTENCING COURT (HEAD-SENTENCE), AND, NPP SENTENCING COURT I SEE
 2099. TEXT AT 2032, 2033. IBID I], AND, 'THE IMPAIRMENT/INTERFERENCE IS ARGUED TO LIE IN THE
 2100. PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE 'ACT', AND, SUCH PRACTICAL OPERATION IS SAID TO EFFECTIVELY (AND IN
REAL TERMS AND IMPACT UPON ME), REPLACE A PARTY-SPECIFIC 'JUDICIAL JUDGMENT' ABOUT 'MY'
 2101. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAROLE AT A PARTICULAR POINT IN TIME (WHEN I'M SUBSTANTIVELY PERMITTED TO APPLY
FOR PAROLE, RECEIVE PAROLE, WHO HAS JURISDICTION TO DECIDE OVER SAME, WHAT CONSIDERATION
MATTERS RE. ■ SAME, ARE ACTUALLY OPEN TO CONSIDERATION WITHIN OPERATION OF CORRECTIONAL
 2102. SERVICES ACT (C85.I), AND WHAT MATTERS ARE NOT OPEN TO CONSIDERATION), AND, LENGTH OF
ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE (INCORPORATING NPP DATE, MAXIMUM PERMITTED DURATION OF PAROLE,
THAT, AT END OF MAXIMUM PAROLE DURATION SAID IMPOSED SENTENCE MUST BE WHOLLY SERVED), MY ACTUAL

SENTENCING ORDERS AS THEY WERE PERFECTED BY THEIR RESPECTIVE COURTS ([74, AND 75.], [SEE TEXT AT 2053, 2054, 2056, 2057, 2067. IBID.]),

2103. WITH, [RE CLAIM AT TEXT 2100. IBID.]

2104. AN ARBITRARY-SPECIFIC (LEGISLATED AGAINST 'LIFERS' ONLY, HENCE 'SPECIFIC', AND AGAINST 'ALL LIFERS', HENCE 'ARBITRARY', 'LIFERS AS ALREADY CONVICTED AND SENTENCED' (CONTRARY TO CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 45.]), OBLIGATED STATUTORY COMPLIANCE ASSOCIATED WITH ENFORCEMENT OF AN IMPOSED SENTENCE UPON A LIFER, AND CLCA APPLICATION ([31.]), FOR INCREASING PENALTY OF IMPOSED SENTENCES UPON LIFERS, VIA JUDICIAL DUE PROCESS, AFTER SENTENCING ORDER IS PERFECTED), AND, 'PERSONS WHO ARE NOT YET SENTENCED AS A [REDACTED] 'LIFER', ARE TREATED UNDER THE SAME 'SENTENCING STANDARDS BANNER' (TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT, [46.], WHICHEVER VERSION OF [46.], IS ACTIVELY OPERATING AT THAT TIME, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHEN 'LIFER WAS ACTUALLY SENTENCED', AND, 'IRRESPECTIVE OF PERSON-SPECIFIC INTRINSIC FEATURES OF, FOR EXAMPLE, MY, POSSIBLY PRECEDENTIAL ORDERS BY MY SENTENCING COURT, INCLUDING [REDACTED] [78., 79. AND 80.]), WITHOUT EXCEPTION,

2105. THEREBY NOT ONLY NEGATING/VOIDING ^{ANY} ~~AND~~ INTRINSIC INDIVIDUALITY IN A SENTENCING AUTHORITY

2106. OF A CH. III [3.] COURT, BUT ALSO, AS THERE ARE NO STATUTORY PROVISIONS MADE ~~ON~~ AVAILABLE WITHIN [46.], TO ENABLE THE 'SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT' ('CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER' [SEE TEXT AT 1537. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]), ~~IT THEREFORE AND~~ ~~THEREBY BECOMES IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, TO 'LAWFULLY ENFORCE~~ TO COMPETENTLY AND COMPLIANTLY ENFORCE MY 'PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS'

2107. [SEE TEXT AT 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2065, 2066. IBID.], AS THEY ARROGANTLY CONTINUE TO ARBITRARILY APPLY ONLY [46.] STYLE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY TO ~~THE~~ ^{MY} 2002 IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS' (ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE TRUE

2108. JUDICIAL MEANING OF [78. AND 80.]), IT THEREFORE AND THEREBY BECOMES LITERALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA TO LAWFULLY ENFORCE, PURSUANT TO

2109. THEIR COMPLIANCE-COMPETENCE-SENTENCING-ORDER-JURISDICTIONAL-AUTHORITY (TO ENFORCE THAT WHICH IS IMPOSED, AND NO GREATER PENALTY SHALL FALL UPON THE ACCUSED THAN WAS IMPOSED ONLY BY THE COMPETENT COURT [SEE TEXT AT 846, 847, 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.], [SEE TEXT AT 1946. (TABLE POSITION R.2, C.3. TO R.11, C.3.), COMPARED TO (TABLE POSITION R.2, D.2. TO R.9, D.2. TO R.10, LIFE ON PAROLE), 1962,

1963, IBID]), MY 2002 PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER [74. AND 80.]⁹,
[RETURNING TO 2104.]

2110. LEGISLATIVE JUDGMENT ABOUT THE SAME MATTER (WHEREBY THE 'ACT' ITSELF [46.], AND
2111. SUBSEQUENT AMENDMENTS TO 'IT', IN 'THEIR' OPERATION, HAVE ACTUALLY CREATED AN ENTIRELY
NEW (ALTHOUGH CONSTITUTIONALLY [1. AND 3.], WITHOUT JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OR
COMPETENCE), 'CLAIMED' (BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, CROWN-SOLICITOR'S
OFFICE, AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENTS), SENTENCING EFFECT (AND IN
DOING SO HAVE VIOLATED [45.], EFFECTIVELY DISSOLVED THE ~~THE~~ ABSOLUTE AND UNTOUCHABLE
JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE OF MY CRIMINAL LAW, CH. III ([3.]), SENTENCING COURT,
USING (ULTRA VIRES), AN ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OF/BY A CH. II ([3.]), STATUTORY
INSTRUMENT (CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT [85.]), STATE INSTRUMENTALITY (CORRECTIONAL
SERVICES DEPARTMENT), MINISTERS OF THE CROWN (PREMIER, ATTORNEY-GENERAL,
CORRECTIONAL SERVICES MINISTER)))

[SEE TEXT AT 2084. (KNIGHT JUDGMENT, PARAGRAPHS 23, 26. THEREIN), IBID]

2112. SO THAT, PER COMPETENT ACTION, OR, PER ILLEGAL/FRAUDULENT ACTION,

2113. EITHER, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ENFORCES (PER. CONSTITUTIONAL [1.],
OBLIGATION), MY COURT'S PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS AGAINST ME ([74.]),
[SEE TEXT AT 2109. IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 2065, 2066, 2067. IBID],

2114. OR, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO ILLEGALLY/FRAUDULENTLY
ACTION AGAINST ME, ^{AND ALSO} SIGNIFICANTLY MORE PENALISING AND BURDENSOME UPON ME (THAN
WAS EVER PERMITTED BY EITHER OF MY CURRENTLY VALID AND PERFECTED SENTENCING
ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE)]), 'ITS' OWN CREATION OF WHAT 'THEY'
NOW REGARD AS MY ACTUAL SENTENCE, EVEN THOUGH IT IS IN FACT A 'FAKE SENTENCE'
[SEE TEXT AT 2109. ~~THE~~ IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 2068. TO 2077. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]⁹.

2115. THERE CANNOT LAWFULLY EXIST AT THE SAME TIME, MY 'JUDICIAL SENTENCING ORDER' [SEE TEXT
AT 2113. IBID], AND, THE 'LEGISLATIVE PSEUDO-SENTENCING ORDER' [SEE TEXT AT 2114.

2116. IBID], YET, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, FOR MORE THAN TEN YEARS, HAS REFUSED
TO JUDICIALLY QUALIFY 'THEIR' CLAIMED CORRECTNESS, IN 'THEIR' FRAUDULENT CALCULATION
OF WHAT ~~THEY~~ 'THEY' ALLEGE TO BE 'THE MEANING OF MY SENTENCING ORDER [74.]',
2117. WHICH 'THEY' CLAIM TO BE PURSUANT TO 'THEIR' 'LEGISLATIVELY RESTRUCTURED SENTENCING

ORDER' [SEE TEXT AT 2109, 2114. IBID], EXCEPT, THEIR INTERPRETATION CLAIM IS ERRONEOUS.

2118. THAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN, 'WHAT I STATE IS THE ONLY PERMISSIBLE CONDUCT, ACTIONED BY S.A. GOVERNMENT, AS THE ENFORCER OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCES [SEE TEXT AT 1537. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE), 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE), 2113. IBID]',

2119. AND,

'WHAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IS ACTUALLY ACTIONING AGAINST ME (AS I HAVE ABOVE DESCRIBED AS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL (C.I.), UNAUTHORISED, INCOMPETENT, ULTRA VIRES LEGISLATIVE (CH.I [3.]), ATTACK BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AND ~~██████████~~ ITS SUBORDINATE AGENTS (EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), AGAINST ME (CH. II [3.]), AND MY CH. III [3.], COURT IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS ([74.]), WHICH STAND AS JUDICIAL ORDERS OF AND BY ~~██████████~~ THE IMPOSER OF SAID SENTENCING ORDERS [74.], [SEE TEXT AT 1537. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE), 2068. TO 2077. (INCLUSIVE), 2114. IBID]')',

2120. IS,

VISUALLY QUANTIFIED IN THE TABLE OF SUBJECT ANCHORS [SEE TEXT AT 1946. (TABLE POSITIONS R.2, C.3. TO R.11, C.3. AND R.2, D.2. TO 'SENTENCE ENDS WHEN I DIE'), 1962, 1963. IBID].

2121. VERY DIFFERENT TO THE JUDICIALLY CHARACTERISED CIRCUMSTANCE OF SENTENCED PERSON, MR KNIGHT, IN PARAGRAPHS 26, 27, 28, 29. OF HIS 2017 HCA JUDGMENT

2122. [SEE TEXT AT 2084. IBID], WHEREIN THAT COURT (HCA), CLEARLY SEATED KNIGHT'S

2123. IMPOSED SENTENCE AS ⁶ BEING A MINIMUM TERM OF INCARCERATION, AND DID NO MORE THAN TO SET A PERIOD DURING WHICH HE WAS NOT TO BE ELIGIBLE TO BE RELEASED ON PAROLE

2124. ([PARA. 27.]), AND ^{THE} ~~██████████~~ FIXING OF THAT MINIMUM TERM SAID NOTHING ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT HE WOULD BE RELEASED ON PAROLE AT THE EXPIRATION OF THAT MINIMUM

2125. TERM ([PARA. 27.]), AND WHETHER OR NOT HE WOULD BE RELEASED ON PAROLE AT THE EXPIRATION OF THE MINIMUM TERM WAS SIMPLY OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EXERCISE OF

2126. JUDICIAL POWER CONSTITUTED BY IMPOSITION OF THE SENTENCES ([PARA. 28.]), AND OF THOSE IMPOSED SENTENCES SUCH A 'MATTER' COULD NOT, AND DID NOT, SPEAK TO THAT

2127. QUESTION ([PARA. 28.]), AND BY MAKING IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR HIM TO OBTAIN PAROLE AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF SAID MINIMUM TERM OF INCARCERATION, THE STATUTE AMENDMENTS DO