

(LEGAL MATERIAL) BREACH OF JURISDICTION - SENTENCING STANDARDS 1.

AUTHOR: DAVID P. JARRETT

PART. 1.

1. THIS BRIEF RELATES TO CONDUCT BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WHICH IS, BY ALL RELEVANT JUDICIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITIES, PROHIBITED, YET CONTINUES TO BE PERPETRATED AGAINST LIFERS, REGARDLESS OF PROTECTED RIGHTS BEING VIOLATED.
2. THE STATE HAS STOLEN FROM ME, AND OTHER LIFERS TOO, CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS, AS WELL AS MY RIGHT TO RECEIVE SUCH PROTECTED RIGHTS, FOR MANY YEARS, AND STOLEN MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO FAIR AND HONEST ADMINISTRATION OF LAW RELATING TO SAME PROTECTED RIGHTS, AND FRAUDULENTLY STOLEN FROM ME MY LIBERTY FROM A CORRECTIONAL (PRISON), FACILITY.
3. I AM A DANGER TO THE GOVERNMENT BECAUSE I WILL NOT BE SILENCED BY THE STATE, NOR ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT'S CRIMES/CONDUCT DONE TO ME, AND CONTINUES TO PERPETRATE, WHICH FOR REASONS OF FULL AND PROPER AND HONEST INVESTIGATION OF SAME, SHOULD INCUR ROYAL COMMISSION. ONLY A ROYAL COMMISSION, OUT OF THE HANDS OF THE POLITICIANS, WOULD ENABLE FULL EXTENT OF GOVERNMENT'S IMPROPRIETIES TO BE IDENTIFIED AND MEASURED.
4. THE STATE GOVERNMENT ABUSES ~~IS~~ ^{ITS} AUTHORITY AND ACTS WITHOUT JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY, TO 'RE-SENTENCE' LIFERS AND TO 'EXTEND' THEIR ~~NON-PAROLE~~ NON-PAROLE PERIODS (NOT ALL LIFERS, BUT CERTAINLY MANY), WHO ARE ALSO A SPECIAL CLASS, A "PRESCRIBED CLASS" OF PRISONER [93.], AND 'SPECIAL CLASS OF PERSON' WHICH IS 'A PRISONER IN STATE CUSTODY' (WARD OF THE STATE IN STATE PRISON). THE GOVERNMENT EFFECTIVELY RE-SENTENCES LIFERS TO A NEW NPP (THEREBY AFFECTING PENALTY OF THEIR SENTENCE WHICH WAS COURT IMPOSED, AND INCREASING THEIR TIME IN PRISON), BUT DOES SO WITHOUT THE USE OF ANY CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT, WHICH IN FACT IS THE ONLY CONSTITUTIONALLY AUTHORISED STATE INSTRUMENTALITY WITH JURISDICTION TO LAWFULLY

CHANGE THE SENTENCE OF A LIFER. [39. AND 40.]

5. I AM THE VICTIM OF A TYRANT, THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA. THE TYRANT GOVERNMENT CARES NOT FOR THE LIFERS' PROTECTED RIGHTS WHICH IT VIOLATES AND STEALS, IT CARES NOT FOR ITS UNLAWFUL USE OF ITS AUTHORITY, AS THE STATE GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING ACTS DONE BY THE BOARD (PAROLE BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), THE GOVERNOR AND THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, IT CARES NOT FOR THE CLAIMED LEGITIMACY AND CLAIMED LEGAL COMPETENCE IN ITS ACTIONS, EVEN AFTER FORMAL WRITTEN CHALLENGE AGAINST AN ACT PERFORMED BY IT, BECAUSE IT HAS NO PROFESSIONAL REGARD FOR COMPLAINTS BY PRISONERS SUCH AS MYSELF, UNTIL FOR EXAMPLE AN ANTI-CORRUPTION ENTITY SUPPORTS AND DETERMINES IN FAVOUR OF SUCH PRISONERS. THE TYRANT STATE GOVERNMENT HAS ACTED OUTSIDE ITS LAWFUL JURISDICTION, AGAINST LIFERS, FOR FAR TOO LONG AND THE STATE GOVERNMENT MUST STOP DOING WHAT IT HAS DONE, IN ERROR, OUTSIDE ITS ACTUAL JURISDICTION, AND IT MUST REPAIR THE DAMAGE IT HAS DONE TO SO MANY LIFERS. IT MUST APOLOGISE TO SUCH LIFERS, VICTIMS OF STATE GOVERNMENT UNLAWFUL ACTS, AND RESTITUTE US AS QUICKLY AS CAN BE PROFESSIONALLY DONE.

6. AN ACT WHICH IS DONE, OUTSIDE LAWFUL RIGHT AND LAWFUL JURISDICTION, IS STILL AN UNLAWFUL ACT, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER OR NOT THE GOVERNMENT WORKER KNEW THEIR ACTION WAS UNLAWFUL. THE VICTIM-LIFER OF SUCH AN UNLAWFUL ACT, IS STILL THE VICTIM OF AN UNLAWFUL ACT AND MUST BE GRANTED RELIEF, FROM UNLAWFUL CONDUCT AND/OR ACTIONS WHICH THE STATE GOVERNMENT HAS PERPETRATED AGAINST US, WITHOUT DELAY.

7. IF A THIEF STEALS TWO DOLLARS FROM ME, THEN GIVES MY STOLEN TWO DOLLARS TO ANOTHER PERSON, WHO DID NOT KNOW THE TWO DOLLARS WAS STOLEN FROM ME, THEN NOT ONLY AM I STILL THE VICTIM OF TWO DOLLARS BEING STOLEN FROM ME, BUT I ALSO HAVE LEGAL CAUSE AND CLAIM TO RECOVER MY STOLEN TWO DOLLARS,

NO MATTER WHO CURRENTLY HAS MY STOLEN TWO DOLLARS.

8. IF THE STATE GOVERNMENT TAKES SOMETHING FROM ME WITHOUT HAVING LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR LEGAL JURISDICTION TO DO SO, THEN I AM THE VICTIM OF THEFT. IF THE ACT OF THEFT (STEALING), FROM ME IS PERPETRATED BY ANY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHO DID NOT REALISE THEY WERE IN FACT STEALING FROM ME, THEY ONLY THOUGHT THEY WERE 'DOING THEIR JOB' ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT, THEN THEY ARE NOT DELIBERATELY STEALING FROM ME AND THEIR ACTIONS ARE NOT INTENTIONAL TO CAUSE ME HARM. HOWEVER, IF THE GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS AGAINST ME, WHICH EQUATE TO THEFT (ACCORDING TO MY DESCRIPTION ABOVE), CONTINUE TO BE PERPETRATED AGAINST ME EVEN AFTER I INFORM THE GOVERNMENT OF ITS UNLAWFUL/IMPROPER ACTIONS AGAINST ME, THEN THE GOVERNMENT HAS NO EXCUSE OR DEFENCE FOR THEIR CONTINUING UNLAWFUL/IMPROPER CONDUCT WHICH I AM THE VICTIM OF.

9. THE GOVERNMENT'S BLATENT REFUSAL TO ENFORCE THE PROTECTED RIGHTS OF LIFERS, INCLUDING MINE, WITH SUCH A DEGREE IN LACK CARE FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM WHICH THEY INFLICT UPON US, AS A RESULT OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL THEFT OF OUR CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS, SCREAMS THE QUESTION OF 'WHY ARE THEY SO CORRUPT AND WHY HAVEN'T THEY STOPPED?'

10. I AM NOT A LANYER, I AM JUST A PRISONER, BUT I CAN READ AND I CAN WRITE. AND NO MATTER HOW HARD THE TYRANT STATE GOVERNMENT TRIES TO BULLY ME, I WILL NOT BE SILENCED AND THEY MUST STOP STEALING MY PROTECTED RIGHTS, THEY MUST STOP ACTING OUTSIDE THEIR ACTUAL JURISDICTION (ULTRA VIRES), AND THE MANY VICTIMS (LIFERS), OF THEIR PROHIBITED ACTS WHICH THEY COMMITTED AGAINST US, MUST BE GRANTED RELIEF FROM SUCH IMPROPER ACTS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. [82. AND 83.]

11. IN REALISING THE TRUTH SUPPORTING MY ACCUSATIONS HEREIN, AND THE FOUNDATION LEGALITIES INTRINSIC TO MY RIGHTS WHICH THE STATE GOVERNMENT STOLE FROM ME, AND OTHER LIFERS, IT IS RELEVANT TO NOTE THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN AN 'ABSOLUTE

RIGHT' (THAT WHICH MUST BE APPLIED AND EFFECTED), AND A 'DISCRETIONARY RIGHT' (THAT WHICH MAY BE GRANTED BUT AT THE DISCRETION OF THE AUTHORISED AND JURISDICTIONALLY COMPETENT PARTY), A 'PRISONER OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT WHO DOES NOT RESIDE WITHIN A GOVERNMENT CORRECTIONAL FACILITY' (SUCH AS A PAROLEE), AND A 'PRISONER OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT WHO IS INCARCERATED WITHIN A GOVERNMENT CORRECTIONAL FACILITY' (SUCH AS A PRISON), A 'STANDARD PRISONER' (WHO IS A PRISONER IN STATE GOVERNMENT CUSTODY, INCARCERATED BY A COMPETENT CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT), AND A 'POLITICAL PRISONER' (NOT INCARCERATED BY A COMPETENT CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT, BUT BY THE UNAUTHORISED/IMPROPER USE OF LEGISLATED AUTHORITY OF A STATE INSTRUMENTALITY, THIS ALSO MEANS PRISONERS WHO REMAIN INCARCERATED DUE TO ERRONEOUS/IMPROPER USE OF LEGISLATED AUTHORITY OF A STATE INSTRUMENTALITY).

PART. 2.

BRIEF BACKGROUND

12. IN 1994 I WAS CONVICTED OF MURDER BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPREME COURT, FOR A CRIME WHICH HAPPENED IN EARLY 1992, THEN SENTENCED FOR THAT CONVICTION. THE CROWN APPEALED SENTENCE SHORTLY THEREAFTER, THEN IN JULY 1994 THE CRIMINAL COURT OF APPEAL INCREASED MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD FROM 28½ YEARS TO 39 YEARS (R V. JARRETT (NO. 3) DELIVERED 29-7-1994; R V. JARRETT (1994) 177 L.S.J.S. 488), WHICH AFTER CORRECT APPLICATION OF OPERATIONAL SENTENCING STANDARDS IN EFFECT AT THAT TIME, INCLUDING CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT 1988, S.A., CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT 1982, S.A., AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT ACT 1984, S.A., NO. 94 [125.], AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 2) 1990, S.A., NO. 76 [129. AND 130.], EQUATES TO 19 YEARS FROM 28½ YEARS AND 26 YEARS FROM 39 YEARS RESPECTIVELY.
13. IN 2002 THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COURT (FULL COURT), RE-SENTENCED ME FOR THE SAME 1994 CONVICTION (R V. JARRETT [2002] SASC 289 DELIVERED 9-9-2002), IN DOING SO VOIDING THE 1994 CCA JUDGMENT (DELIVERED 29-7-1994), WHICH HAD INCREASED MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD UP TO 39 YEARS (EFFECTIVELY CALCULATED TO 26 YEARS), FROM MY ORIGINAL TRIAL SENTENCE. THE 2002 JUDGMENT

ALSO CARRIED WITH IT SEVERAL 'ABSOLUTE RIGHTS' OWED TO ME BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, AS WELL AS ABSOLUTE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS WHICH MUST BE DONE.

14. THE FULL COURT IN 2002, WHEN DELIVERING MY JUDGMENT, WAS VERY SPECIFIC AND PRECISE IN ITS CHOSEN WORDS, AND DID NOT LEAVE ANY ROOM FOR MISINTERPRETATION OF ITS MEANING AND INTENTIONS.

15. SINCE DELIVERY OF MY 2002 JUDGMENT BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CRIMINAL COURT, WHICH EFFECTIVELY SAT AS A CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT [35. AND 45.], THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, THROUGH ACTIONS OF THE PAROLE BOARD, MINISTERS FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, ATTORNEY-GENERAL, CROWN SOLICITOR DEPARTMENT AND PREMIER, HAS ILLEGALLY 'RE-SENTENCED' ME AND EXTENDED MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD FROM APPROXIMATELY 15 YEARS, UP TO 22½ YEARS. THE STATE GOVERNMENT HAS REFUSED TO COMPLY WITH THE VERY SPECIFICALLY WORDED JUDGMENT OF THE COURT IN 2002, INSTEAD SUBSTITUTING THE 2002 COURT'S JUDGMENT WITH THEIR OWN INTERPRETATION OF SAID 2002 JUDGMENT. I ACCEPT THAT THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND ITS EMPLOYEES, DID NOT NECESSARILY KNOW THAT THEY WERE PERFORMING ILLEGAL ACTS AGAINST ME. ~~REGARD MY~~ REGARDING MY SENTENCE CHANGE BY THEM, HOWEVER, AFTER I FORMALLY CHALLENGED THE MINISTER FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND PAROLE BOARD FOR THEIR WRONG ACTIONS, I WAS BASICALLY TOLD TO GO AWAY BECAUSE THEY MADE A DECISION AND WILL NOT VARY FROM THAT DECISION. IT ALSO MEANT THAT THEY COULD HAVE EASILY INVESTIGATED MY FORMAL WRITTEN CHALLENGE, TO A PROFESSIONAL STANDARD, BUT THEY CHOSE NOT TO, AS IT WAS EASIER FOR THEM TO SPEW OUT THE STANDARD LINE OF 'WE'VE SOUGHT CROWN SOLICITOR ADVICE'. INEPT INVESTIGATION OF MY SAID FORMAL CHALLENGE, TO WHAT THE STATE GOVERNMENT DECLARES MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD TO BE, WHICH THEY STATE IS 22½ YEARS EFFECTIVE SENTENCE WITH YEAR OF NON-PAROLE PERIOD BEING 2016 (1994 + 22½ YEARS), IN MY ACCUSATION AGAINST THEM I ALSO ACCUSE THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE AND PROFESSIONAL INCOMPETENCE, FOR FAILING TO AND REFUSING TO ABIDE BY THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT IN MY 2002 JUDGMENT.

16. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, NOT IN FACT BEING A CRIMINAL SENTENCING

COURT [35, 44. AND 45.], BUT RATHER EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT OPERATING UNDER A PROFESSIONALLY FALSE BELIEF, HAS REPEATEDLY PERPETRATED PROHIBITED ACTS AGAINST ME, NOT ONLY BY REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH MY 2002 JUDGMENT OF THE COMPETENT COURT (R v. JARRETT [2002] SASC 289), BUT ALSO BY ADMINISTRATIVELY INCREASING MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD, WITHOUT ANY CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY TO DO SO, AND IN FACT CONSTITUTIONALLY PROHIBITED FROM DOING SO.

17. AT THE FLICK OF A PEN AND WITHOUT ANY JURISDICTIONAL (LEGAL) AUTHORITY TO DO SO, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT INCREASED MY CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT DETERMINED SENTENCE [45.], OF 2002 BY APPROXIMATELY 7½ YEARS.
18. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAD (AND CONTINUES TO HAVE), NO JUSTIFIABLE LEGAL RIGHT, ABSOLUTELY NO JUSTIFIABLE LEGAL AUTHORITY OR LEGAL JURISDICTION, TO SUBSTITUTE THE ACTUAL COURT'S JUDGMENT OF 2002 (R v. JARRETT [2002] SASC 289), WITH ITS OWN (CLAIMED), INTERPRETATION OF SAID JUDGMENT, WHICH NEGATIVELY AFFECTS ME BY ADDING 7½ YEARS TO MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD.
19. TWO OF THE MOST SERIOUS EFFECTS, RESULTING FROM THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT REFUSING TO PROPERLY COMPLY WITH AND ADHERE TO THE COURT'S 2002 JUDGMENT (R v. JARRETT [2002] SASC 289), ARE THAT I AM NOW A 'POLITICAL PRISONER' (PROHIBITED IN AUSTRALIAN CRIMINAL LAW), AND AS AT MAY 2015, I HAVE BEEN UNLAWFULLY INCARCERATED IN STATE PRISON APPROXIMATELY 6 YEARS (SINCE 2009 WHEN THE STATE GOVERNMENT WAS OBLIGATED, UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY, TO RELEASE ME FROM STATE PRISON ON PAROLE).
20. WHILST INVESTIGATING THE FOUNDATION LEGALITIES OF MY SITUATION, I REALISED THAT I AM NOT THE ONLY LIFER (LIFE-SENTENCED PRISONER WITH SENTENCING COURT DETERMINED NON-PAROLE PERIOD), WHO IS A VICTIM OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IMPROPRIETIES RELATING TO NON-PAROLE PERIODS, SENTENCING COURT SENTENCES COMPARED TO ACTUAL SENTENCE SERVED BY LIFER, PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESSES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSAULT (NON-PHYSICAL TORTURE).
21. IT IS IMPORTANT TO REALISE AND RECOGNISE THAT JUST BECAUSE A STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE (OR ENTITY), PERFORMS AN ACT OR DOES A THING (WHICH INCLUDES PRODUCING A DOCUMENT OR EVEN JUST MAKING AN OFFICIAL AND ~~FOR~~ FORMAL DECISION), DOES NOT

MAKE THE ACT LAWFULLY PERFORMED JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE A GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE, OR BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT THEY HAD LAWFUL AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION TO DO SO. AN 'IMPROPER ACT/UNLAWFUL ACT' IS STILL AN IMPROPER/UNLAWFUL ACT. I PROVED THAT VERY POINT EARLY IN 2015, AFTER MORE THAN A YEAR OF DEALING WITH THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S CRIMINALLY IMPROPER ACT AGAINST ME, PERPETRATED BY STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES OPERATING UNDER THE DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES PORTFOLIO, I WAS PROVEN CORRECT. THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION ACT, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, PROHIBITS ME FROM REVEALING CERTAIN DETAILS, HOWEVER, WITHIN WEEKS OF ME FORMALLY SUBMITTING 'CRIMINAL CORRUPTION COMPLAINT, RELATING TO ILLEGAL ACTS THE STATE GOVERNMENT PERPETRATED AGAINST ME', ~~FROM~~ CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES REVERSED A PREVIOUS OFFICIAL DECISION MADE BY THEM, EVEN THOUGH THEIR ORIGINAL DECISION THEY CLAIMED PROTECTION UNDER CROWN LAW ADVICE, BUT I PROVED THAT ADVICE WAS FALSE, AND I CAUGHT THEM OUT ON THEIR IMPROPER ACTS. JUST BECAUSE THE STATE GOVERNMENT CLAIMS 'LAWFUL RIGHT TO DO SOMETHING', DOES NOT MAKE IT SO!

22. AS LIFERS WITH NON-PAROLE PERIODS WE ARE A "PRESCRIBED CLASS" OF PRISONER [93.], AND FOLLOWING OUR SENTENCING BY CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURTS, WE ALSO HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATE LEGISLATED RIGHTS OWED TO US BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ~~GOVT~~ GOVERNMENT.

23. I HAVE BROADLY GROUPED THREE TYPES OF LIFERS UNDER ~~THE~~ THE FOLLOWING CIRCUMSTANCES:

PRISONER A.

- CRIME EVENT BETWEEN 1989 AND 31-7-1994
- CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT, 1988, S.A. OPERATIONAL.
- REMISSION LAWS APPLIED
- AUTOMATIC PAROLE-MANDATORY APPLICATION OF

PRISONER B.

- CRIME EVENT BETWEEN 1-8-1994 AND 30-8-2012

- CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) Act 1988., S.A. OPERATIONAL.
- STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRUTH IN SENTENCING) ACT., 1994., S.A. OPERATIONAL.
- REMISSION LAWS REPEALED
- AUTOMATIC PAROLE RELEASE REPEALED (AGAINST LIFERS)
- PRIOR TO INSERTION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES Act 1982., S.A.

SECTIONS 67. (7A) [103.]

67. (7B) [104.]

67. (7C) [105.]

PRISONER C.

- CRIME EVENT BETWEEN 31-8-2012 AND 1-6-2015
- CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) Act 1988., S.A. OPERATIONAL
- STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRUTH IN SENTENCING) ACT., 1994., S.A. OPERATIONAL.
- REMISSION LAWS REPEALED
- AUTOMATIC PAROLE RELEASE REPEALED (AGAINST LIFERS)
- AFTER INSERTION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES Act 1982., S.A.

SECTIONS 67. (7A) [103.]

67. (7B) [104.]

67. (7C) [105.]

24. I WOULD BE IN THE SAME GROUP AS 'PRISONER A.' ABOVE, AS THE TIME OF THE CRIME WHICH I WAS CONVICTED OF HAPPENED IN 1992, THEREFORE 'SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLICABLE IN 1992 MUST BE APPLIED TO MY 2002 JUDGMENT'. [80.]

25. THE CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT DELIVERED ITS JUDGMENT IN 2002 [74.], NOW THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS NO CHOICE, NO DISCRETION, IT MUST ACCEPT THAT 2002 JUDGMENT AND IT MUST ABIDE BY THAT JUDGMENT, WITHOUT DELAY.

26. BELOW I WILL MAP OUT WHAT RIGHTS OF MINE WERE STOLEN AND VIOLATED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, AND IDENTIFY WHY THEY ARE PROTECTED RIGHTS, AND WHY THE STATE GOVERNMENT UNLAWFULLY STOLE ACCRUED RIGHTS FROM ME.

ARGUMENT FOUNDATION

27. A LEGAL RIGHT OWED TO ME, ESPECIALLY AN ACCRUED RIGHT, HAS ITS CREATION FUNDAMENTALLY AUTHORISED, PARTICULARLY WHEN DEALING IN THE FIELD OF AUSTRALIAN CRIMINAL LAW, THROUGH THE AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION [3., 4., 5., 7., 9., 10. AND 12.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LEGISLATION INCLUDING ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT 1915 [13.], CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT 1935 [31.], CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT 1988 [34.], CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT 1982 [86.], CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT ACT 1984 [123.], CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT AMENDMENT ACT 1990 [129.], AND CRIMINAL CASE JUDGMENTS INCLUDING TELFORD V. SEVERIN [131.], AND R.V. JARRETT [75.].
28. JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE, THE LEGAL RIGHT AND AUTHORITY TO ACT, IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO THIS ISSUE OF MY ACCRUED RIGHTS, MY ABSOLUTE RIGHTS, MY STOLEN RIGHTS AND MY VIOLATED RIGHTS.
29. AS ABOVE DESCRIBED, IN 1994 I WAS SENTENCED UNDER THE SAME SENTENCING STANDARDS AS 'PRISONER A'. [75.], BY THE TRIAL JUDGE AND BY THE CCA.
30. IN 2002 I WAS AGAIN SENTENCED ("AFRESH"), TO THE EXACT SAME SENTENCING STANDARDS THAT EXISTED IN "1992" [80.], NOT THE SENTENCING STANDARDS THAT EXISTED AND WERE OPERATIONAL IN 2002, ONLY THE SENTENCING STANDARDS WHICH EXISTED AND WERE OPERATIONAL IN "1992" [74.]. THE 2002 JUDGMENT INCLUDED VERY CLEAR AND EASILY UNDERSTOOD WORDS [37.], SO THERE COULD BE NO MISINTERPRETATION OF THE INTENTION OF THE COURT IN 2002 [75.]. THERE WAS NO WORRING IN MY 2002 JUDGMENT, WHICH IN ANY WAY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE OR POSITIVE FORM, SUGGESTED, IMPLIED OR DIRECTED THAT ANY OF THE 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS 'SHOULD NOT' OR 'WILL NOT' BE AWARDED TO ME, AND THEREFORE, WITH THE FULL CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED WEIGHT OF THE CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT IN THAT 2002 JUDGMENT [131., 3., 35., 45., 77., 80. AND 4.], CHAPTER III OF THE CONSTITUTION [1.], EMPOWERED THE CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT TO DETERMINE AND IMPOSE UPON ME A SENTENCE WITHIN THE CRIMINAL LAW JURISDICTION [35., 44. AND 45.].