

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. ST. (C.1)	2. ND. (C.2)	3. RD. (C.3)	PAROLE MAX 10. YRS. (D.1)	PAROLE MAX LIFE, (D.2)
1947.	1.						
1948.	2.	NPP START AS FROM	3-6-1994				
1949.	3.	CCA [212.]					
1950.	4.	START OF [46.]					
1951.	5.	FULL COURT [74.]					
1952.	6.	EARLIEST DATE TO APPLY FOR PAROLE					
1953.	7.	NPP END DATE (3RD)					
1954.	8.	NPP END DATE (1.ST)					
1955.	9.	STATUTE CHANGE LIFE ON PAROLE.					
1956.	10.	NPP END DATE (DCS)					
1957.	11.	END OF WHOLE SENTENCE (3RD)					
1958.	12.	NPP END DATE (2ND)					
1959.	13.	END OF WHOLE SENTENCE (1.ST)					
1960.	14.	END OF WHOLE SENTENCE (DCS)					
1961.	15.	END OF WHOLE SENTENCE (2ND)					

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' 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, 1964. 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 ABOGATION 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.", 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 RECALCULATION EFFECT WHICH WAS ARBITRARY, PER STATUTORY MANDATE (AS IT DID NOT BURDEN RESPECTIVE LIFERS' 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 / NULLIFIED / CANCELLED', OR EVEN 'SET ASIDE'. ONLY THE 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD' HAS BEEN ALTERED DURING THE 2ND. ([212.I]), OR 3RD. ([74.I]), 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) I).
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
1982. RATHER THAN 2016'. THE INTENTION WAS TO RECEIVE RECOGNITION FROM PCS THAT MY TRUE 'NPP OF TIME', PER [74.I], 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.I], MEANT THAT FROM APPROXIMATELY 3-12-2008 ONWARDS, I WAS STATUTE PERMITTED TO
1983. 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 [74.] 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 [74.] 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 ~~THE~~ 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 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 MARRY 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 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 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

2015. ENFORCEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS 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],
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 [REDACTED] ORDER' [74.],
2023. WHICH,
SINCE APPROXIMATELY EARLY 2016, IS NOW CLAIMED, AND, OPERATIONALLY ACTING [REDACTED]
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].
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
2025. 2018. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], 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], 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]. 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' (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,

2045. BY INTRINSICATING THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS WITHIN THE 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 CAME 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 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', 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, 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
 2052. 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), 1531. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2053. 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.




2054. ALL 'NPP' SENTENCING ORDERS MUST EXIST WITHIN THE
 ENVELOPING AND ENCOMPASSING 'HEAD-SENTENCE'
 SENTENCING ORDER.

2055. [SEE TEXT AT 2033. IBID]

2056. [SEE TEXT AT 2032. IBID]

2057. (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/THEREBY 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/ACCURED RIGHT (TO IMMUNITY), BUT, MY FIRST DATE FROM WHICH TO INVOKE AND EXERCISE MY 'SENTENCING SUBSTANTIVE/ACCURED 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 TELEFORD ([196.]), REFERENCE IS VALID TO SHOW ^{THAT} ~~THE~~ 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
2086. LIFE PRISONERS' ([85.]), HAS NO "RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION" [196.], THEREFORE, OF ANY RELEVANT AUTHORITY 'IT' CLAIMS TO HOLD REGARDING MY 'SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT', [74.],
2087. FIRST, IT CANNOT AFFECT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER IMPOSED AGAINST ME, WHICH WAS ALREADY ACTIVATED, BEFORE RESPECTIVE AMENDMENTS ^{WERE} ~~THE~~ ASSENTED [15.], INCLUDING MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, CCA APPEAL ([212.]), AND PETITION APPEAL ([74.]), OR TRY TO ~~THE~~, OR EVEN OPERATES AS IF ^{ALREADY} ~~THE~~ DONE SO, TO DISREGARD 'SUBSTANTIVE/ACCURED 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", ~~THE~~ '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.], ~~THE~~ 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, ~~THE~~ 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' (C SEE TEXT AT 2089,
 2092. 2090. IBID J). 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.J), THE FACT IS THAT THE 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT' HAS NO
CONSTITUTIONAL COMPETENCE (C1. AND 3.J), TO CREATE A MORE 'PUNITIVE' AND/OR
'BURDENSOME' EFFECT TO MY LIBERTY, AND, TO THE ACTUAL IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDERS
(AND THEIR RESPECTIVELY ATTRIBUTABLE PENALTIES, C SEE TEXT AT 2032, 2033, 2066,
 2094. 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J), 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 J, 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"), THE STATE OF SOUTH
AUSTRALIA, VIA ACTIONS OF THEIR STATE PARLIAMENT (CH. I [3.J), AND STATE GOVERNMENT
(CH. II [3.J), OPERATED THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, S.A. ([85.J), 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.J 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.J), C SEE TEXT
 2098. AT 1537. TO 1570. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J), 'WHICH SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIRS THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY OF
MY ORIGINAL ■ SENTENCING COURT (HEAD-SENTENCE), AND, NPP SENTENCING COURT C SEE
 2099. TEXT AT 2032, 2033. IBID J), 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 ([85.J), 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 ~~██████~~ '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 ██████, [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 ~~IN~~ 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 ^{MY} ~~THE~~ 2002 IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS' (ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE TRUE

2108. JUDICIAL MEANING OF [78. AND 80.]), ⁶ 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 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)))⁹,
[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)]⁹), '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. 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' 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 (C1.), UNAUTHORISED, INCOMPETENT, ULTRA
VIRE 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 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

NOTHING TO CONTRADICT THE MINIMUM TERM THAT WAS FIXED BY HIS SENTENCING COURT
 2128. ([PARA. 29.]), AND ALSO DOES NOT MAKE THE SENTENCE OF LIFE IMPRISONMENT "MORE
 2129. PUNITIVE OR BUADENSOME TO LIBERTY" ([PARA. 29.]), AND THE SECTION OF STATUTE
(RESPECTIVE AMENDMENTS TO IT), DID NOT REPLACE A JUDICIAL JUDGMENT WITH A LEGISLATIVE
 2130. JUDGMENT ([PARA. 29.]), AND THE SECTION OF STATUTE (RESPECTIVE AMENDMENTS TO IT),
DOES NOT INTERSECT AT ALL WITH THE EXERCISE OF JUDICIAL POWER THAT HAS OCCURRED
([PARA. 29.])?

2131. BECAUSE,
 IN KNIGHT'S CASE FOR COMPLAINT, THE HCA EFFECTIVELY QUALIFIED AN OPEN
 JURISDICTION AND OPEN AUTHORITY (WITHIN SUCH OPEN JURISDICTION), WITHIN WHICH
 THE STATE OF VICTORIA, THROUGH 'ACTIONS OF ITS PARLIAMENT (CH. I [3.])', AND 'ACTIONS
 OF ITS STATE GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.])', TOOK THE OPEN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE IT
 2132. A LOT MORE DIFFICULT FOR KNIGHT TO RECEIVE PAROLE, BUT, AND THIS IS THE
 CRITICAL PREREQUISITE, IT WAS CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], 'OPEN' TO THE STATE OF
 VICTORIA TO EFFECT SUCH LEGISLATED CHANGES TO 'KNIGHT'S ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR
 2133. PAROLE, ONLY BECAUSE OF THE 'VAGUENESS OF THE SENTENCING ORDER/S IMPOSED
 UPON HIM', IN THAT THOSE SENTENCING ORDERS LEFT 'OPEN' MEANS TO EFFECT THOSE STATUTE AMENDMENTS.

2134. HOWEVER, UPON DELIVERY OF MY TWO CURRENT SENTENCES [SEE TEXT AT 2032.
 TO 2039. (INCLUSIVE), 2063, 2065, 2066, 2067, IBID], AND UNLIKE WITH KNIGHT, IT
 WAS NEVER 'OPEN' TO THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, TO CREATE A STATUTORY
 PROVISION WHICH IN ITS OPERATION, EFFECTIVELY CREATED AND THEN ^{ACTIONED} ~~WAS~~ A 'LEGISLATED
 RE-SENTENCING OF MY EXISTING ~~EXISTING~~ JUDICIAL SENTENCING ORDERS', AS I
 HAVE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED IN THIS DOCUMENT, MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT [74.],
^{WORDED} ~~WAS~~ FUNDAMENTAL ABSOLUTENESS IN 'ITS' PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS,

2135. THEREBY HAMMERING SHUT THE DOOR ON 'ANY FUTURE INCREASES TO THE PENALTY/
 BURDEN OF SENTENCE IMPOSED UPON ME, WHICH THE S.A. GOVERNMENT MIGHT TRY TO
 2136. IMPRESS/INFLECT UPON MY IMPOSED SENTENCES, AND ~~WAS~~ THEREBY UPON ME'. REGARDLESS
 OF SAID 'HAMMERING SHUT THE DOOR', THE S.A. GOVERNMENT DID ACT OUTSIDE WHAT WAS
 2137. ACTUALLY 'OPEN' TO IT JURISDICTIONALLY, THEREBY INFLICTING UPON ME A GREATER
AND MORE PENALISING AND BURDENSOME PUNISHMENT AGAINST MY LIBERTY, THAN

WAS EVER 'OPEN' (PERMISSIBLE), TO EFFECTATION BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA,
[SEE TEXT AT 1943. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE) IBID],⁶ HENCE, JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD [82. AND 83.]⁷,

2138. BECAUSE OF, AND, CONSEQUENTIAL TO,

2139. THE VERY CLEARLY WORDED ORDERING OF AND BY THE FULL COURT, IN THEIR
DELIVERY (AND THEREBY IMPOSING), OF MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], AND ITS
INTRINSIC AND UNBREAKABLE MARRIAGE TO ITS PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS

2140. PROPER (EFFECTING THEREIN, THE CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]), PROTECTED FUNDAMENTAL
ABSOLUTENESS IN ITS PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2134. IBID],
IN PARTICULAR [80.], WHICH THEN MANDATES OPERATIONAL CALCULATIONS WHICH ANCHOR
SPECIFIC ACTIONS, TO SPECIFIC DATES, THEN FURTHER ACTIONS CONSEQUENTIAL FROM SUCH
SPECIFIC DATES, INCLUDING 'END OF WHOLE SENTENCE' [SEE TEXT AT 1619. TO 1627. (INCLUSIVE)

2141. IBID], EXPLAINED MORE AT [TEXT 1609. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND, TO BE
ABSOLUTELY SURE THAT 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT' SENTENCING STANDARDS WERE NEVER
APPLIED ([46.] SENTENCING STANDARDS WERE OPERATIONAL IN 2002, BUT WERE
VOIDED FROM EFFECT BY THE FULL COURT⁹), TO ANY PART OR ASPECT OF MY 2002
IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS, THE FULL COURT ORDERED A
'FUNDAMENTAL ABSOLUTENESS' IN THEIR STATEMENT SENTENCING ORDER [78.], AND,

2142. BY 'IMPRESSING AND INTRINSICATING' THE "IF" ([78.]), DISCRIMINATOR AS A CLEAR
AND DISTINCTIVE 'ABROGATOR OF RELEVANCE', THE FULL COURT 'QUALIFIED' EXACTLY
WHAT 'SENTENCING STANDARDS "MUST" ([80.]), BE APPLIED/ENFORCED AGAINST
ME PER [74.], BEING THE 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS', AND,

2143. WHAT 'SENTENCING STANDARDS 'MUST NOT' ([78. ("IF TODAY'S STANDARDS WERE APPLIED,
THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD WOULD BE LONGER.", PARAGRAPH 14. OF JUDGMENT [74.])⁹), BE
APPLIED/ENFORCED AGAINST ME PER [74.], MEANING THE 2002 OPERATIONAL
VERSION OF [46.], MUST NOT BE 'APPLIED TO' OR EVEN 'BE A CONTRIBUTOR TO' MY
SENTENCING ORDERS PERFECTED BY THAT COURT').

2144. BY EXAMPLE FROM KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2084. IBID], AND [TEXT AT 2120. TO
2130. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], ^{IT SHOULD} ~~IT SHOULD~~ BE EASIER TO APPRECIATE⁶ MY 2002 JUDGMENT
[74.], WITH ANCHORED, SPECIFIC POINTS IN TIME AND ACTIONS BY STATE (CH. II
[3.]), WHICH MUST¹⁵ BE DONE, THEREBY FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENTIATING ME,

AND CONTRASTING ME AND MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS,

2145. FROM,

KNIGHT, HIS IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDERS, AND WHAT 'CHARACTERISTICS' OF HIS IMPOSED SENTENCE, WERE ACTUALLY 'OPEN' TO LEGISLATIVE CHANGE [SEE TEXT AT 2121. IBID],
AS FOLLOWS:

2146. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2123. IBID],

2147. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE ORDERED NON-PAROLE PERIOD, UNDER STATUTORY APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.], CLOSED AMBIGUITY/UNCERTAINTY FROM SENTENCE COMPONENTS INCLUDING ACTUAL NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE, WHEN I WAS PERMITTED TO RECEIVE PAROLE, WHO HAD JURISDICTION OVER SAME, HOW LONG ON PAROLE FOR, AND ONLY LEFT OPEN FOR ENFORCEABLE ACTION (BY CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER), OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT [SEE TEXT AT 1609. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2148. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2124. IBID],

2149. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER, PER AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT [80.], DID NOT SAY NOTHING ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT I WOULD BE PAROLE-RELEASED AT EXPIRATION OF NON-PAROLE PERIOD, AS THE MAJOR FEATURE OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT IS AS THE TITLE STATES, HENCE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' ([126.]), BEING A STATUTORY COMPLIANCE OBLIGATION TO AUTOMATICALLY RELEASE ME ON PAROLE [SEE TEXT AT 1609, TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2150. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2125. IBID],

2151. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE RE-IMPOSING OF PERFECTED SENTENCING STANDARDS EXISTING IN 1992 [78. AND 80.], AS THE 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, FORCED THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF SAID 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.], AS FUNDAMENTALLY AND

2152.

2153. INTRINSICALLY INSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EXERCISE OF JUDICIAL POWER CONSTITUTED BY IMPOSITION OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE), 2063, 2065. TO 2067. (INCLUSIVE) IBID],
2154. AND, MANDATING PAROLE-RELEASE PROCEDURAL PROCESSES PER. AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT STATUTORY OBLIGATION [80.], [SEE TEXT AT 1609. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], WAS THEREFORE AND THEREBY A SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT TO WHICH I WAS CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], ENTITLED AND RIGHTED TO RECEIVE AS AN ABSOLUTE ([80. ("THIS COURT MUST..." ([30. ('MUST' IS A TERM QUALIFIABLY EQUAL TO "SHALL")]))]), RIGHT, BOTH IN LAW, AND AT LAW. [SEE TEXT AT 1703. TO 1725. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].
2155. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2126. IBID],
2156. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER [78.], INTRINSICALLY MARRIED 'SENTENCING STANDARDS OF 1992 [80.], BEING THE '1992 OPERATIONAL VERSION OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT', WHICH DID (PER. STATUTORY OBLIGATION), SPEAK AND ORDER ACCORDINGLY, OF MY ACCRUED RIGHT TO BE 'AUTOMATICALLY RELEASED ON PAROLE AT THE EXPIRATION OF MY COURT DETERMINED NON-PAROLE PERIOD', IN COMPETENT COMPLIANCE WITH THE 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS'. [SEE TEXT AT 2149, 2151. TO 2154. (INCLUSIVE)].
- 2157.
2158. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2127. IBID],
2159. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE PERFECTED ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, AND PERFECTED NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCING ORDER [SEE TEXT AT 2032. TO 2039. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], ATTRACTED TO THEM
2160. THE OPERATIONAL APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT, OF 1992 VERSION OF THE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT', WHICH SPECIFICALLY THEREIN IDENTIFIED THE ABSOLUTE MAXIMUM TERM OF

- 2161, ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE, BY STATUTORY MANDATE,
 AND SO, EVEN THOUGH THE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' WAS A SOUTH
 AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENTARY CONSTRUCT (CH. I [3.]), THEN
 OPERATIONALLY APPLIED TO RESPECTIVE LIFER SUCH AS ME, BY
 STATE GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.]), PER. CORRECTIONAL
 2162, SERVICES ACT ([85.]), (SEE ANDREWS [207. (THEREIN AT
 2163, PARAGRAPH 15, AND PARAGRAPH 20.)]), ONCE MY 2002
RE-SENTENCING COURT PERFECTED 'ITS' SENTENCING
ORDERS [74.], WITHIN WHICH ALSO ORDERED [80.], THE
OPERATIONAL FEATURES OF 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS,
 DESCRIBED AT [TEXT 1609. TO 1632. (INCLUSIVE), TEXT AT
 938. TO 941. (INCLUSIVE), TEXT AT 2066, 2067. IBID],
 2164, THEREAFTER CARRIED WITH THEM, AND WERE CONSTITUTIONALLY
([1.]), PROTECTED AS, CH. III COURT SENTENCING [3.],
ORDERS ([SEE TEXT AT 1521. TO 1544. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]),
 AND WERE UNTOUCHABLE EXCEPT TO ENFORCE 'LESS
 2165, BURDEN UPON ME THAN WAS SO ORDERED', ~~████~~ BUT, CH. II
([3.]), SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ACTIONS DO NOT
HOLD ANY JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE TO CREATE ANY
BARRIER (BY EFFECT), WHICH PREVENTS/PROHIBITS ME
FROM RECEIVING PAROLE-~~████~~ RELEASE AT THE TIME I
 2166, WAS PERMITTED TO (PER [74.], WHICH IS JUDICIALLY
PROTECTED AS YEAR 2009 [SEE TEXT AT 2063, 2065,
 2167, 2066, 2067. IBID]), AND, BY DENYING ME PAROLE FOR
ANY REASON, AND/OR DENYING/PREVENTING ME PAROLE-RELEASE
ACCORDING TO SAID CALCULATED DATE OF 2009, THEN EFFECTS
 2168, AN INCREASE TO PENALTY OF IMPOSED SENTENCE,
WHICH WAS NOT JURISDICTIONALLY OPEN TO THE SOUTH
AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WITHIN MY SENTENCING ORDERS
 2169, [74.]⁹, BEING, MAXIMUM TERM OF IMPOSED SENTENCE, AS

2170. CALCULATED BY STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF MY PERFECTED
2171. SENTENCING ORDERS, RE. [80.], THEREFORE, CONTRARY TO
CLAIMS BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (ABOUT WHAT
CH. II [3.], OPERATIONAL POWER, JURISDICTION AND
AUTHORITY 'THEY' THINK 'THEY' HOLD, IN RELATION TO
SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT AGAINST ME [74.]), MY ENTIRE
LENGTH OF IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCE ORDERS, IS
SUBSTANTIVELY PROTECTED FROM INCREASE OF COURT'S
ORDERED PENALTY, BY [80.], AND THE JUDICIAL
2172. INTERPRETATION OF [74.], SO THAT START DATE AND END
DATE, OF MY ACTUAL, AND THEREIN NUMERICALLY
DEFINED AND ANCHORED TO SPECIFIC CALENDER
DATES, SENTENCE, IS A KNOWN DATE [SEE TEXT AT
2173. 1964. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]. 'ANY INCREASE TO THE
PERIOD OF TIME I AM STILL ~~IN PRISON~~, WITHOUT
PAROLE-RELEASE, HAS AN AUTOMATIC CONSEQUENCE, MORE
PENALISING AND BURDENSOME THAN 'ORDER' OF MY
2174. SENTENCING COURT PERMITTED, AS IT TRANSLATES TO AN
ACTUAL CALENDER DATE, AT WHICH MY WHOLE SENTENCE IS
CALCULATED TO END [SEE TEXT AT 1964. TO 1982.
(INCLUSIVE) IBID.], 'EXCEPT THAT IT IS EXTENDED BY
JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT DECISIONS AND ACTIONS BY
S.A. GOVERNMENT (ULTRA VIRES, [82. AND 83.])'.
2175. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2128. IBID.],
2176. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE RE-IMPOSING OF PERFECTED SENTENCING
STANDARDS EXISTING IN 1992 [78. AND 80.], AS THE
2177. 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, FORCED THE OPERATIONAL
EFFECT OF SAID 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.], WHICH
ENFORCEABLY GUARANTEED NOT ONLY AUTOMATIC
PAROLE-RELEASE (PER RESPECTIVE STATUTORY CONDITIONS

2178.

[SEE TEXT AT 2152, 2153, 2154, 2156, 2157, 2159, TO 2174. (INCLUSIVE). IBID ⁹], BUT ALSO (AND INDEPENDANTLY OF AUTOMATICALLY PAROLE-RELEASED, ⁶ AS TO ~~██████~~ THEN DISTINCTLY

2179.

IDENTIFY ANOTHER SUBSTANTIVE/ACCURED RIGHT TO WHICH I AM ENTITLED UNDER 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS', WHICH IS THE 'FIRST CALENDER DATE' ON WHICH I OWN (ABSOLUTE RIGHT), THE STATUTORY RIGHT [80.], TO START DAY ONE OF

2180.

PAROLE-RELEASE (WHICH THEN MARRIES DAY ONE TO THE MAXIMUM PAROLE LENGTH OF 10. YEARS, AT WHICH TIME THEN MARRIES TO STATUTORY SATISFACTION OF ENTIRE IMPOSED 'LIFE' SENTENCE), [SEE TEXT AT 1611. TO 1618.

2181.

(INCLUSIVE) IBID ⁷], SO THAT ANCHORING SAID 'FIRST CALENDER DATE', THEN INTRINSICALLY MARRIES TO 'MAXIMUM LAST ^{CALENDER} ~~██████~~ DATE' AS AN ANCHORING POINT TO

2182.

THEN INITIATE/EXERCISE (AS AN ENFORCEABLY GUARANTEED SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT, ACKNOWLEDGED AND ABSORBED INTO THE 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS PERFECTED AS MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER [80.], [SEE TEXT AT 1707. TO 1725. (INCLUSIVE), 1727. TO 1729. (INCLUSIVE), 1733. TO 1741. (INCLUSIVE), 1750. TO 1752. (INCLUSIVE), 1755. TO 1766. (INCLUSIVE), 1793. TO 1815. (INCLUSIVE) IBID ⁹],

2183.

THE NEXT DISTINCTLY IDENTIFIABLE SUBSTANTIVE/ACCURED RIGHT TO WHICH I AM ENTITLED, UNDER 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS', WHICH IS THE 'FULL SATISFACTION OF ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE' [SEE TEXT AT 1616, 1617, 1618, 1904. TO 1907. (INCLUSIVE), ~~██~~ 1964, 1977, 1980.

2184.

IBID ⁷], SO THAT, 'IF THERE IS ANY INCREASE TO THE 'MAXIMUM PERMITTED IDENTIFIABLE LAST CALENDER DATES' (PURSUANT TO [74. AND 80.], '1992 AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS'), I AM (BY SUCH

2185.

2186.

2187.

2188.

2189.

2190.

2191.

2192.

‘INCREASE TO CALENDER DATES’, CONSEQUENTIAL TO AN EVENT OR ACTION/DECISION OF ‘CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER’ (CH. II [3.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AND ITS DELEGATED REPRESENTATIVES)), THE ‘VICTIM OF AN INCREASE TO THE TOTAL PERMISSIBLE PENALTY OF IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER’ (WHICH, THROUGH COMPETENT DETERMINATION, DELIVERY, IMPOSITION OF, AND THEN PERFECTING OF SUCH ORDER [74.], ‘ANCHORS FIRST AND MAXIMUM LAST DATES’ (WITHIN WHICH ARE THE TOTAL MAXIMUM NUMBER OF CALENDER DAYS, THAT CAN LAWFULLY, BY CONSTITUTIONAL ([1.]), JURISDICTIONALLY COMPETENT SENTENCING COURT, BE ORDERED/IMPOSED UPON ME IN THE PERMISSIBLY COMPLIANT MANNER, WITHIN PERFECTED RESTRICTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS [74. AND 80.], ([77. (22½ YEARS)], [80. (22½ YEARS MINUS ⅓ OF, EQUALS 15. YEARS)]), OPERATIONALLY APPLY [126. (SO THAT A “DAY NO LATER THAN THIRTY DAYS AFTER THE DAY WHEN THE PERIOD THE PRISONER HAS SERVED IN PRISON DURING THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD AND THE TOTAL ████████ NUMBER OF DAYS OF REMISSION CREDITED TO HIM DURING THAT PERIOD..., TOGETHER EQUAL THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD.”)), SO THAT 15 YEARS PLUS ONE DAY (TO A MAXIMUM OF “THIRTY DAYS AFTER”, THEREFORE ‘15. YEARS PLUS THIRTY DAYS’, IS LEGISLATIVELY (PER. 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.]), THE LAST DAY UPON WHICH ‘I MUST THEN BE PAROLE-RELEASED’, AT WHICH POINT ‘PAROLE DAY ONE STARTS’ AND PAROLE MAXIMUM TERM IS TEN YEARS, PER [128.], [SEE TEXT AT 1615, 1616, 1617. IBID], THEREBY ALSO DATING ‘PAROLE LAST DAY’ (AS AN ACTUAL CALENDER DATE), AS ‘15. YEARS, PLUS THIRTY DAYS, PLUS TEN YEARS, EQUATING TO A VERY

2193.

SPECIFIC AND IDENTIFIABLE PERIOD OF TIME, WHICH IS THE 'TOTAL PERMISSIBLE LENGTH OF IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER, THAT IS 'OPEN TO ENFORCEMENT' (BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AS THE 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER'), CALCULATING TO 'TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AND THIRTY DAYS'⁹⁹, IS THE SUBSTANTIVELY ~~RIGHTED~~ RIGHTED LENGTH OF SENTENCE WHICH PERMITS ME THE ACCRUED RIGHT [80.], OF PAROLE-RELEASE IN ACCORDANCE WITH MY STRICTLY CHARACTERISED SENTENCING ORDER [74.], [RETURN TO 2188.]

2194.

2195.

THEN, UPON COMMENCEMENT OF 'PAROLE DAY ONE' IS THE OPERATIONAL APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF [128. (UNTIL THE CALENDER DATE, WHICH CALCULATES FROM SAID 'START DAY ONE OF PAROLE-RELEASE [SEE TEXT AT 2179, 2180, 2181, 2190, IBID], TO TEN YEARS LATER, WHICH THEN QUALIFIES THE 'MAXIMUM LAST DATE' [SEE TEXT AT 2185, IBID], WHICH SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IS LAWFULLY (PER. PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER [74.]), PERMITTED TO ENFORCE RESPECTIVE IMPOSED SENTENCE ~~ORDER~~ ORDER AGAINST ME [SEE TEXT AT 1616, 1617, IBID]],

2196.

THEN, UPON COMPLETION OF SAID MAXIMUM PAROLE TERM OF TEN YEARS, WHICH QUALIFIES AS SAID 'MAXIMUM LAST DATE', IS MY SUBSTANTIVELY RIGHTED 'ANCHORING POINT OF ABSOLUTE MAXIMUM TERM OF ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE', AT WHICH POINT MY SENTENCE MUST BE "WHOLLY SATISFIED", IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH [74.], [SEE TEXT AT 1844, 1845, 1924, 1977, IBID], [RETURN TO 2187.]

2197.

AND, CONSEQUENTIAL TO BEING A PERFECTED SENTENCING, SO QUALIFIABLY SPECIFIC [78. AND 80.], IN ITS

JUDICIAL ORDERING ([74.]), THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA HAD NO LEGISLATIVE ROOM 'OPEN' TO IT, TO LEGISLATIVELY CREATE OR EFFECT ANY ACT/EVENT WHICH DENIED ME PAROLE-RELEASE, PAROLE AND/OR FULL SATISFACTION OF ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER (ON A SPECIFICALLY CALCULATED CALENDER DATE, WHICH WAS KNOWN AND ACKNOWLEDGED ON THE DAY OF SENTENCE DELIVERY (2002, [74.]), BY THE SENTENCING COURT ■ ITSELF, BY WAY OF THE INTRINSIC WORDING OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER (SUCH WORDING INCLUDING [78. AND 80.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1334. TO 1337. (INCLUSIVE), 1582, 1625. TO 1644. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), [RETURN TO 2186.] OF MY SENTENCE MAP, WHICH THE 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER' (CH. II [3.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), IS CONSTITUTIONALLY PERMITTED, ■ AND OBLIGATED [1. AND 3.], TO COMPLY WITH ([74.], [SEE TEXT AT 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE) IBID])), [RETURN TO 2185.] WHICH IS CONTRARY TO PERMISSIBLE ACTIONS/EVENTS THAT COULD EVER BE 'OPEN' TO SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CONCERNING ENFORCEMENT OF [74.], AS THE WORDING OF MY SENTENCING ORDER [74. ■ AND 80.], AND OPERATIONAL APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF SUCH WORDING THEREIN, PROHIBITS ANY PERIODS OF TIME ■ INCREASES WHICH ARE MORE THAN THOSE DESCRIBED AT [TEXT 2187. TO 2192. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], NOTING ALSO, WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN HIGHLIGHTED AS SAID 'TOTAL PERMISSIBLE PENALTY OF SENTENCE WHICH 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER' (CH. II [3.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), IS COURT ORDERED [74.], TO COMPLY WITH' [SEE TEXT AT 1968, 1969, 1970,

2198.

2199.

2200.

2201.

1971. TO 1980. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2007. (INCLUSIVE)
IBID]), [RETURN TO 2178.]

2202.

THE OPERATIONAL ENFORCEMENT (BY 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE
ENFORCER', CH. II [3.], STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH
AUSTRALIA), OF AND APPLICATION OF, 'UNTIL ENTIRE
IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER IS WHOLLY SATISFIED',
ONLY THE PENALTY AND BURDEN OF IMPOSED
SENTENCING ORDER [74.], AS PERFECTED, AND
THEREFORE COMPLIANT WITH, IN ACCORDANCE WITH, AND
PURSUANT TO THE '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS' ([78. AND
80.], [SEE TEXT AT ¶ 938. TO 941. (INCLUSIVE), 1609. TO
1652. (INCLUSIVE), 1964. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]).

2203.

EVEN THOUGH I WAS SENTENCED BY THE SENTENCING COURTS
[SEE TEXT AT 2024. TO 2039. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND
CONSEQUENTIALLY I MUST ACCEPT AND ABIDE BY SAID
PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS,

2204.

SO TOO, MUST THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA
(THROUGH ACTIONS OF ITS CH. II [3.], STATE
GOVERNMENT WHICH FUNCTIONS AS THE 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE
ENFORCER'), ACCEPT AND ABIDE BY SAID PERFECTED
SENTENCING ORDERS,

2205.

BECAUSE, SAID SENTENCING COURTS DID NOT ONLY
PERFECT THEIR RESPECTIVE SENTENCING ORDERS AGAINST
MY LIBERTY (AS THE 'BURDEN OF PENALTY UPON ME'), THE

2206.

SENTENCING COURTS ALSO IMPOSED THEIR RESPECTIVE
PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS, AS A COURT'S
ORDER OF/FOR COMPLIANCE, UPON THE 'FREE WILL'
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, THEREBY RESTRICTING
HOW THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COULD, AND,
COULD NOT 'ACT' TOWARDS/AGAINST ME WHILE IT

2207. ADMINISTRATIVELY ENFORCED MY IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER
2208. [74.], IN ACCORDANCE WITH HOW 'IT' WAS 'ORDERED BY
MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT ([74., 78. AND 80.]), TO
ADMINISTER MY IMPOSED SENTENCE ORDER'. THE
PRIMARY RECIPIENT OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER [74.],
2209. IS ME, BUT, SUCH ORDER, BY ITS EXISTENCE, BURDENS
UPON THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, A 'COMPLIANCE
ORDER, CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], PROHIBITING THE STATE
OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA FROM [REDACTED] 'BURDENING ME WITH
ANY SENTENCE PENALTY EXCEEDING WHAT WAS
PERFECTED AS MY SENTENCING ORDER, AND THEREFORE IN
ACCORDANCE WITH AND PURSUANT TO '1992 SENTENCING
STANDARDS AND THEIR RESPECTIVELY CHARACTERISED OPERATIONAL
EFFECTS', [SEE TEXT AT 1249. TO 1269. (INCLUSIVE),
1603. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE), 1703. TO 1752. (INCLUSIVE),
1965. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2006. (INCLUSIVE)
IBID].
2210. MY 2002 PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER [74.], WAS IN
FACT A FINITE SENTENCE EFFECT, THAT WAS NOT OPEN-
ENDED, THEREFORE, UNLIKE KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2084,
2128. IBID], THERE WAS NO MEANS BY WHICH THE STATE
OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COULD LEGISLATIVELY CAUSE ME 'ANY
MORE TIME IN PRISON (RE NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME)',
'ANY MORE TIME IN PRISON (RE JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE TO
REFUSE ME PAROLE-RELEASE AFTER I APPLY FOR PAROLE,
IF I'VE SATISFIED RELEVANT PRE-REQUISITES, SUCH AS AN
APPROVED ADDRESS FOR PAROLE RELEASE)', 'ANY MORE [REDACTED] TIME
ON PAROLE (RE MAXIMUM PAROLE TERM OF 10 YEARS)', 'ANY
INCREASED TERM OF MAXIMUM SENTENCE LENGTH ([SEE
TEXT AT 2188. TO 2196. (INCLUSIVE) IBID])'.

2218. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2129. IBID],
2219. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE RE-IMPOSING OF PERFECTED
SENTENCING STANDARDS EXISTING IN 1992. [78. AND
80.], AS MY PERFECTED 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, FORCED
 THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF SAID 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS
2220. [80.], WHICH ~~WAS~~ ENFORCEABLY GUARANTEED NOT
ONLY THE 'FINITE' EFFECT (STRICT START POINT AND END
 POINT OF ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE, CALCULATED AND ALSO
 KNOWN ABOUT BY THE IMPOSING COURT ALSO [78. AND
 80.], THEREBY ANCHORING TO THE INTRINSIC FEATURES OF
 OPERATIONAL EFFECT, WHICH BECAME THE PERFECTED
 SENTENCING ORDERS OF MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], OF
2221. MY IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDERS (MEANING THAT THE
 IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER ENSURED A STRICT PERIOD OF
 TIME, OF APPROXIMATELY 25 YEARS AND THIRTY DAYS, WAS
 THE FULL TERM OF SENTENCE ORDER WHICH COULD LAWFULLY
 BE ENFORCED AGAINST ME, BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT
 WHO WOULD ACT AS 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER'), [SEE
 TEXT AT 2212. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], IT ALSO
2222. 'FORTRESSED AND FORTIFIED MY SUBSTANTIVE/ACCRUED
SENTENCING RIGHTS EMBODIED THEREIN' ([74.]), AS CH. III
[3.], CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], PROTECTED JUDICIAL
ORDERS (WHICH ALSO, CONSEQUENTIAL TO SPECIFIC 'WORDING' OF
 MY 2002 JUDGMENT, INCLUDING [78. AND 80.], CREATED
ADDITIONAL SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS TO ENSURE ONLY THE TOTAL
IMPOSEABLE SENTENCE BURDEN/PENALTY [74.], WAS
 ACTUALLY ALLOWED TO BE ENFORCED AGAINST ME BY THE
2224. 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER', ~~WAS~~ ALSO, SUCH 'WORDING'
DENIED ENCROACHMENT UPON THE BURDEN/PENALTY
OF MY ENTIRE SENTENCE LENGTH, FROM STATE OF

SOUTH AUSTRALIA STATUTE AMENDMENTS, WHICH MIGHT, BY THEIR OPERATION, GIVE CHARACTERISTIC RISE TO 'STATE ADMINISTRATIVE RE-SENTENCING', THEREBY 'REPLACING MY JUDICIAL SENTENCING ORDER WITH A FRAUDULENT LEGISLATIVE SENTENCING ORDER' [SEE TEXT AT 2197, 2198. IBID], WHICH THEN EQUATES TO A 'FAKE SENTENCE' WHICH THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TRIES TO ENFORCE AGAINST ME, BY ULTRA VIRES/ JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT MEANS [40, 45, 82. AND 83.], [SEE TEXT AT 2202. TO 2211. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND, BY JUDICIALLY ORDERING [78. AND 80.], THAT '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS "MUST" [80.], BE APPLIED TO MY 2002 IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDER', THEREBY FORCED STATE GOVERNMENT COMPLIANCE WITH SUCH JUDICIAL ORDER [SEE TEXT AT 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND DID NOT PERMIT/ENABLE THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA TO REFUSE TO COMPLY WITH SAID COURT'S ORDERS (IN ACCORDANCE WITH [74.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1249. TO 1269. (INCLUSIVE), 1646. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE), 1716. TO 1725. (INCLUSIVE), 1904. TO 1907. (INCLUSIVE), 2028. TO 2031. (INCLUSIVE), 2194. TO 2198. (INCLUSIVE), IBID].

2225.

EVEN THOUGH MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDER PARTICULARS DID NOT EMPOWER/PERMIT ANY 'PENALTY/BURDEN' INCREASE UPON ME OTHER THAN BY NEW JUDICIAL RE-SENTENCING (TO VACATE/SET ASIDE MY CURRENT SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), I WAS STILL ILLEGALLY AND UNCONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], DENIED ENFORCEMENT OF WHAT WAS MY ONLY IMPOSED SENTENCE ORDERS, AS

2226.

2227.

2228. STRICTLY ORDERED BY MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT
 [74.], WHICH EFFECTIVELY BECOMES AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL
 (1.), STATE LEGISLATIVE-RE-SENTENCING BY A
JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT AND INCOMPETENT STATE
GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA [82. AND 83.], [SEE
 TEXT AT 2212. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], IN SIMPLER
TERMS, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT REPLACED
MY JUDICIAL JUDGMENT [74.], WITH A LEGISLATIVE
JUDGMENT [SEE TEXT AT 2112. TO 2120. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].
2229. KNIGHT [SEE TEXT AT 2130. IBID],
2230. COMPARED TO ME [74.], WHEREBY THE RE-IMPOSING OF PERFECTED
SENTENCING STANDARDS EXISTING IN 1992. [78. AND
 2231. 80.], AS MY PERFECTED 2002 SENTENCING ORDER, ALSO
FORCED THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF 1992 SENTENCING
STANDARDS, AS AN ABSOLUTE AND MANDATORY ORDER OF
A CH. III ([3.]), COURT, UPON THE ENFORCER OF MY
IMPOSED SENTENCE (THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA,
 2232. CH. II [3.]), AND IN SO MANDATING [80.], QUALIFIED
THE ONLY PERMISSIBLE SENTENCING STANDARDS WHICH
COULD LAWFULLY BE 'BURDENED UPON ME BY THE ENFORCER
OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCE (THE CH. II [3.], STATE
 2233. GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA)', QUALIFIED THE ONLY
PERMISSIBLE SENTENCING STANDARDS WHICH COULD LAWFULLY
BE 'ACTIONED AGAINST ME/ENFORCED AGAINST ME BY THE
ENFORCER OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCE (THE CH. II [3.],
 2234. STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA)', QUALIFIED THE
ONLY PERMISSIBLE SENTENCING STANDARDS WHICH COULD
LAWFULLY BE 'OPERATIONALLY APPLIED TO THE OBSERVANCE
OF MY SENTENCING ORDER, BY THE ENFORCER OF MY IMPOSED
SENTENCE (THE CH. II [3.], STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH

Australia)',

2235.

AND BY SUCH QUALIFICATION [78. AND 80.], LEFT NO AMBIGUITY OR ROOM FOR MISINTERPRETATION, OF EXACTLY WHAT THE SENTENCING COURT (WHO DELIVERED MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.]), WAS JUDICIALLY ORDERING THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TO COMPLY WITH, AND THEREBY ENFORCE AGAINST ME AS MY ORDERED SENTENCE.

2236.

DUE TO SUCH STRICT QUALIFYING ORDERS (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, '22 ½ YEARS AS A NON-PAROLE PERIOD', 'COMPLIANT OBSERVANCE OF APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF ONLY THE 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS'), MANDATED AND QUALIFIED IN THEIR WORDED CLARITY, THEREBY ALSO CARRIED ABSOLUTE PERIODS OF TIME WHICH ANCHORED SENTENCE EVENTS TO SAID 'TIME POINTS', WHICH MARRIED TO 'THE ONLY LAWFULLY PERMISSIBLE WAY THAT MY SENTENCE IS ~~PERMITTED~~ PERMITTED TO BE CARRIED-OUT AGAINST ME BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT' ([SEE TEXT AT 2186. TO 2199. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]).

2237.

MY IMPOSED SENTENCE WAS TIME-PERIOD LOCKED, SO THAT UNDER '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS' [80.], ~~WHICH~~ SPECIFIC SENTENCE EVENTS WERE ENFORCEMENT OBLIGATIONS UPON SENTENCE ENFORCER, RIGHT UP TO WHOLE SATISFACTION OF IMPOSED SENTENCE [74.].

2238.

BY EXTENDING SAID 'TIME POINTS' FOR ANY REASON (WHERE SUCH REASON IS DUE TO AN ACTION/DECISION BY 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER'), EQUATES TO AN ACT BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA WHICH IS NOT WITHIN COMPETENT JURISDICTION OR AUTHORITY OPEN TO 'IT', ACCORDING TO SAID STRICT QUALIFICATIONS OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER, SIMPLY PUT, MY

2239.

SENTENCING ORDER [74.], WHICH LAYS OUT AT [TEXT AT 1966. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE), 2065, 2066, 2067. IBID], THEREBY ANCHORING MY SENTENCE MAP LINE (ACCORDING TO PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER), CLEARLY IDENTIFIES WHAT MUST BE DONE BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, TO ENSURE 'THEY' ENFORCE ONLY MY IMPOSED SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2219. TO 2228. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], HOWEVER, 'THEY' HAVE REFUSED TO COMPLY WITH MY SENTENCE MAP LINE, EFFECTIVELY NOW INTERSECTING, IMPEDING AND VIOLATING MY ACTUAL SENTENCE MAP LINE, LEGISLATED (ULTRA VIRES, WITHOUT JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE), TO CREATE FRAUDULENT DIFFICULTIES TOWARDS ME RECEIVING PAROLE, WHICH THEREFORE 'INTERSECTS WITH THE EXERCISE OF JUDICIAL POWER WHICH CREATED THE [REDACTED] SENTENCING ORDER', [SEE TEXT AT 935. TO 941. (INCLUSIVE), 2212. TO 2217 (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2240. AS I HAVE REPEATEDLY HIGHLIGHTED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT, ⁶ IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, AND ITS STATE GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.], ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION), ⁶ BELIEVE IT IS JURISDICTIONALLY OPEN TO CREATE/EFFECT, IN RELATION TO ENFORCEMENT OF MY 2002 PERFECTED
2242. SENTENCING ORDERS [74.], ⁶ IT HELD NO [REDACTED] SUCH JURISDICTION TO 'REFUSE' SAID JUDICIAL ORDERS', AND YET ⁶ TREATED SAID JUDICIAL ORDERS AS
2243. PERFUNCTORY AND THEREFORE WITHOUT RELEVANCE', SO THEN, IF THE STRICT ABSOLUTENESS OF SAID JUDICIAL OBLIGATIONS (SO IMPOSED UPON THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA [74., 80. AND 77.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1898. TO 1903. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], CAN'T BE RECEIVED BY ME EVEN THOUGH SUCH SENTENCING ORDERS ([74.]) ARE THE ONLY CONSTITUTIONALLY GOVERNING ([1.]), AUTHORITY WHICH ENABLE MY INCARCERATION LAWFULLY BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, AND, BY SUCH NON-COMPLIANCE BY/FROM THE SOUTH

2244. AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, HAS CONSEQUENTIALLY 'BURDENED/PENALISED ME
(INCARCERATIVELY/CUSTODIALLY), MORE SEVERELY THAN WAS EVER ALLOWABLE OR
PERMISSIBLE WITHIN THE STRICTLY WORDED DIRECTIVES OF MY 2002 PERFECTED
SENTENCING ORDERS [74., 78. AND 80.]',

2245. THEN, AND DUE TO SUCH ILLEGAL NON-COMPLIANCE [SEE TEXT AT 1537. TO 1570.
 (INCLUSIVE), 870. TO 884. (INCLUSIVE), 1249. TO 1269. (INCLUSIVE), 1646. TO 1652.
 (INCLUSIVE), IBID],

2246. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.]), IS CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.],
UNFIT AND INCOMPETENT TO HOLD GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA,

2247. UNTIL 'IT' (THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), LAWFULLY COMPLIES WITH ONLY
WHAT 'IT' WAS LAWFULLY PERMITTED TO ENFORCE AGAINST ME AS MY PERFECTED
SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 1898. TO 1903. (INCLUSIVE), 1965. TO 2007 (INCLUSIVE)
IBID],

2248. AS 'ITS' RIGHT TO 'INCARCERATE ME', 'AND FOR WHAT REASON' (AFTER SENTENCE IS 'ORDER TO
SERVE PRISON TIME/INCARCERATED')', 'AND FOR WHAT MINIMUM PERIOD INCARCERATED (THE
NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME AS ORDERED BY RESPECTIVE SENTENCING COURT)', 'AND FOR WHAT
MAXIMUM PERIOD OF TIME (THE TOTAL LENGTH OF IMPOSED SENTENCE LENGTH/ORDER)',
'AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES AND CONDITIONS (LOGISTICALLY)', 'AND PURSUANT TO
AND COMPLIANT WITH WHAT LAWS, RULES, GUIDELINES, PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES (WHICH THE
STATE GOVERNMENT LAWFULLY, AND ONLY WHEN 'IT' HOLDS JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY AND
COMPETENCE TO 'APPLY', 'OBSERVE', 'ENFORCE', 'OVERSEE OPERATIONAL APPLICATION OF',
USES TO ADMINISTER ENFORCEMENT OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCING ORDERS [74.]',

2249. IS ALL BORNE FROM, AND CONSEQUENTIAL TO, THE SPECIFIC AND DISTINCTIVE
AND DISCRIMINATING WORDS OF MY PERFECTED CH. III COURT ([3.]),
SENTENCING ORDERS (IN SUCH MANNER AND FORM THAT MY SENTENCING ORDERS
ONLY APPLY TO ME, AND CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], THEY ([74.]), CANNOT EVER BE
LAWFULLY APPLIED TO ANY OTHER PERSON OTHER THAN ME).

2250. WHAT IS ALSO IMPORTANT BY THE FACT THAT 'MY SENTENCING ORDER CAN ONLY
EVER BE APPLIED TO ME' (BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), IS THAT IT ALSO
EMPOWERS THE SENTENCING COURT TO 'INCORPORATE INDIVIDUAL AND DISTINCTIVE

FEATURES WITHIN MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS, WHICH MAY BE OUTSIDE THE STANDARD SENTENCING REGIME OPERATING AT THE TIME OF SENTENCING', WHICH WAS ACTUALLY DONE BY MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING COURT [74.], AS INDICATED AT [78.], THEN REPLACED PER [80.].

2251. SUCH A CIRCUMSTANCE OF 'DEPARTATION FROM THE (AT THAT TIME IN 2002), STANDARD SENTENCING REGIME, BY MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT ([74.])', GAINS REINFORCEMENT FROM THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FULL COURT IN JUDGMENT R. v. SELLECK [2000]

2252. SASC 190, THEREIN "HELD: (3) (PER OLSSON J) THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT CONSTITUTES AN EXCLUSIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK RELATED TO THE POWERS OF ALL COURTS IN SENTENCING OFFENDERS. (5) (PER GRAY J) THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT IS NOT A COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE LAW AND DOES NOT INCORPORATE ALL RELEVANT ASPECTS OF THE COMMON LAW. THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT IS NOT A CODE.", AND AT PARAGRAPH 23, THEREIN "... (PER OLSSON J) HE EXPRESSED THE CATEGORIC VIEW THAT HE DID NOT CONSIDER THAT S. 18 OF THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT CONSTITUTED A COMPLETE CODE ON THE POWERS OF A SENTENCING

2253. JUDGE.", AND AT PARAGRAPH 26, THEREIN "... (PER OLSSON J) BUT A GLANCE AT THE PROVISIONS OF THAT STATUTE RENDER IT APPARENT THAT THE LEGISLATURE INTENDED IT, INTER ALIA, TO CONSTITUTE AN EXCLUSIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK RELATED TO THE POWERS OF ALL COURTS IN SENTENCING OFFENDERS. THIS IS APPARENT BOTH FROM THE TERMS OF THE STATUTE ITSELF AND FROM THE TITLE OF IT. IT IS EXPRESSED TO BE AN ACT TO CONSOLIDATE AND AMEND THE

2254. LAW RELATING TO SENTENCING AND THE ENFORCEMENT OF SENTENCES.", AND AT PARA. 101, THEREIN "... (PER GRAY J) A NUMBER OF ASPECTS OF THE SENTENCING ACT CONFIRM THAT THE ACT IS NOT A CODE. IT IS NOT EXPRESSED TO BE A CODE. I REFER TO MY EARLIER OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING S 4. SECTION 10 SPECIFICALLY REQUIRES THE COURT TO HAVE REGARD TO OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS. THIS LEAVES THE COURT

2255. TO ASCERTAIN THOSE MATTERS BY REFERENCE TO GENERAL PRINCIPLES. WHEN DEALING WITH THE FIXING OF NON-PAROLE PERIODS, S 10 GIVES NO GUIDANCE TO THE COURT AND LEAVES THE COMMON LAW TO FILL THE GAP." [SEE [64.] ALSO]

2257. WHAT WAS CLEARLY AND ARBITRARILY ORDERED IN MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, WAS THE STATUTORY HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE" [SEE TEXT AT 2004, TO 2009 (INCLUSIVE), 2028, TO 2038 (INCLUSIVE), AND, SAID ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER WAS ANCHORED PURSUANT TO ONLY THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS, AND WAS ALSO CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND PERFECTED AS SUCH BY THE CLEARLY DEFINING WORDS OF MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, AS FOLLOWS:

2258. "R v DAVID PETER JARRETT
FRIDAY, 3 JUNE 1994
No 819/92
BEFORE JUSTICE MULLIGHAN

2259. THERE IS OF COURSE ONLY ONE HEAD SENTENCE WHICH THE LAW ALLOWS TO BE IMPOSED. THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT IS THAT YOU BE IMPRISONED FOR LIFE.

2260. ... I MUST FIX A NON-PAROLE PERIOD.

2261. ... AT PRESENT THE LAW PROVIDES THAT A PRISONER IS TO BE RELEASED ON PAROLE AT THE END OF THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD WHICH IS REDUCED BY REMISSIONS FOR GOOD BEHAVIOUR.

2262. I AM INFORMED THAT PARLIAMENT HAS RECENTLY ENACTED LEGISLATION, NOT YET IN FORCE...

2263. ... DESPITE THESE IMPENDING CHANGES TO THE LAW, YOU HAVE ASKED ME TO FIX A NON-PAROLE PERIOD ON THE BASIS OF THE LAW AS IT IS AND NOT AS IT IS LIKELY TO BE.

2264. AFTER DUE CONSIDERATION I THINK THAT IS THE PROPER COURSE TO TAKE...

2265.

UNDER THE LAW, AS IT STANDS AT PRESENT, I MUST ALSO
HAVE REGARD TO THE LIKELIHOOD THAT YOU WILL RESPOND
FAVOURABLY TO PAROLE AND TO YOUR PROSPECTS OF
REHABILITATION BY MEANS OF PAROLE AND TO YOUR LEADING
A GOOD AND USEFUL LIFE ONCE RELEASED FROM PRISON ON PAROLE.”

2266.

AS MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER FOR HEAD-SENTENCE (“LIFE”), RECOGNISED,
 PER STATUTORY OBLIGATION WHICH CONSEQUENTED IMPOSITION OF THE TERM “LIFE”
 [SEE TEXT AT 1257. TO 1261. (INCLUSIVE), 1604. TO 1632. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], THE

2267.

SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTING WHICH WAS PERFECTED AND IMPOSED AND DELIVERED INTO
COURT’S RECORDS, WAS THE MANDATORY OPERATIONAL APPLICATION AND
ENFORCEMENT OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, AGAINST THE HEAD-SENTENCE

2268.

OF “LIFE”, THEREBY ANCHORING MY IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE ^{UNDER} ~~THE~~ THE
AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, TO MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD, AS AN ABSOLUTE JUDICIAL
DIRECTIVE BY A CH. III COURT ([3.]), UPON MY ‘CUSTODIAL SENTENCE
ENFORCER’ (STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, CH. II [3.]),

2269. THEREBY,

UPON IMPOSITION OF MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD [SEE TEXT AT 2004. TO 2006. (INCLUSIVE),
2007. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE), 2017. IBID], THE END DATE OF MY ENTIRE
SENTENCING ORDERS (HEAD-SENTENCE PLUS NON-PAROLE PERIOD), IS AN
IDENTIFIABLE DATE AT WHICH I STILL OWN THE SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT, PER
PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS, TO HAVE MY IMPOSED “LIFE” SENTENCE FULLY AND
WHOLLY SATISFIED [SEE TEXT AT 1257. TO 1261. (INCLUSIVE), 1889. TO 1923.
(INCLUSIVE), 1987. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2270.

EFFECTIVELY, THE STATUTE BORNE MANDATORY HEAD-SENTENCE OF “LIFE” (UPON
CONVICTION FOR ‘MURDER’), IS RE-DEFINED BY AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT (OPERATIONAL
APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF [123., 124. AND 125.], [SEE TEXT AT 1924. TO 1932.
(INCLUSIVE), 1772. TO 1779. (INCLUSIVE), 1713. TO 1725. (INCLUSIVE), 1755. TO 1756.
(INCLUSIVE) IBID]. [SEE TEXT AT 1604. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE), 1704. TO 1706. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]

2271.

MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING ORDER, OF “LIFE”, WAS PERFECTED, DELIVERED AND

PLACED INTO COURT'S RECORDS AS SUCH [SEE TEXT AT 1257. TO 1261. (INCLUSIVE), 1604. TO 1632. (INCLUSIVE), 1733 TO 1741. (INCLUSIVE), 2007. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AS DESCRIBED BY GRAPHIC IMAGE AT [TEXT 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2063, 2065. TO 2067. (INCLUSIVE) IBID],

2272. AND SO,

NO MATTER HOW MANY 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD RE-SENTENCING HEARINGS' I RECEIVE [SEE TEXT AT 2004. TO 2006. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], MY PERFECTED HEAD-SENTENCE SENTENCING ORDER IS ONLY CERTIFIED AS A STANDING RECORD OF THE CH. III [3.], COURTS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH AND PURSUANT TO 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' SENTENCING STANDARDS, THEREBY MARRYING 'IMPOSED "LIFE" HEAD-SENTENCE TO SENTENCE BEING WHOLLY SATISFIED', AS INSTRUCTED BY THE ORIGINAL ~~SENTENCING~~ SENTENCING COURT, AND LATER, QUALIFIABLY RE-IMPOSED BY MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT ([74. AND 80.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1965. TO 1983. (INCLUSIVE), 1987. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2274. IT IS THEREFORE FRAUDULENT OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (CH. II E 3.]), ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CH. I AND CH. II [3.],

2275. AT STATE JURISDICTION), FOR 'THEM' TO CLAIM THAT THEY CAN 'WILLY-NILLY' CHANGE/AMEND 'PAROLE LAWS FOR LIFERS', AT THEIR OWN STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT DISCRETION, INCLUDING BY REMOVING/EXTRACTING SUBSTANTIVE SENTENCING RIGHTS (FROM RESPECTIVE LIFERS, INCLUDING ME),

2276. WITHOUT EVER TAKING SUCH LIFERS (INCLUDING ME), BACK TO A CHAPTER III SENTENCING COURT ([3.]), FOR THE COMPETENT COURT, THE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION SENTENCING COURT ([44. ("SENTENCING COURT"), 45.]), TO DECIDE AND JUDICIALLY ORDER AS PART OF SUCH A JUDICIAL

2277. SENTENCING HEARING (WHICH, SUCH AS WITH REGARD TO MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING HEARING 'FOR IMPOSITION OF MY HEAD-SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2259, 2261, 2262, 2263, IBID], AND MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD RE-SENTENCING HEARING [74.]', WOULD REQUIRE SUCH A SENTENCING COURT TO ORDER THAT MY HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE"

2278. MUST BE NULLIFIED/VOIDED/VACATED/SET ASIDE (FUNDAMENTALLY THAT WOULD ALSO INVALIDATE THE INTRINSIC, INCORPORATED 'NPP' [SEE TEXT AT 2034. TO 2038. ~~IBID~~]

(INCLUSIVE), 2039, 2054, IBID], AS A 'NPP' CANNOT EXIST UNTIL A HEAD-SENTENCE IS ESTABLISHED AND FORMALLY IMPOSED, AS THE 'NPP' IS A TERM WHICH IS REDUCED 'FROM' A HEAD-SENTENCE), SO THAT I LITERALLY HAVE NO IMPOSED SENTENCE, THAT WAY THE SENTENCING COURT (THE RE-SENTENCING COURT, UTILISING [45.], AND [40.], ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTS), IS FREE TO IMPOSE A NEW 'HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE" PURSUANT TO DIFFERENT SENTENCING STANDARDS', WHICH THEN WOULD ATTRACT AND INCORPORATE THE DIFFERENT SENTENCING STANDARDS INTO A NEWLY IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE, WITHIN WHICH MAY ALSO INCLUDE SUCH PERMISSIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS FROM WITHIN THE OPERATIONAL COMPETENCE OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT [85.], 'THE EFFECT OF CREATING AND ADMINISTERING AND ENFORCING' AN 'EXTENDED NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME', CONSEQUENTIAL 'ONLY VIA DECISIONS OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT', THROUGH THE 'GENERAL OPERATIONS' OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT (AN EXAMPLE OF SUCH 'GENERAL OPERATIONS' IS DESCRIBED AT [TEXT AT ■ 2023, 2068. TO 2077 (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [151. AND 171.]), 'WITHOUT NEED OF CURRENT STATUTORY APPROACH SUCH AS THAT OF [38., 40., 44. AND 45.], WHICH CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]), REQUIRES THE RESPECTIVE AND COMPETENT COURT (CH. III [3.], COURT, SITING AS AN APPEAL COURT), TO JUDICIALLY RULE OVER SUCH AN APPLICATION', IF IT WILL PERMIT THE NEW STATUTORY AMENDMENTS (ENACTED SINCE ORIGINAL SENTENCING HEARING, OR EVEN, AFTER 'NPP' RE-~~SENTENCING~~ SENTENCING HEARING, SUCH AS MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.]), WHICH THE EXISTING SENTENCING ORDER OF THE RESPECTIVE LIFER (SUCH AS MY 'ORIGINAL' AND 'NPP' SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2032, 2033, 2034. TO 2038, (INCLUSIVE) IBID], WHICH DO NOT PERMIT ANY 'PERIOD OF TIME INCREASE' TO MY COURT ORDERED 'NPP OF TIME', OTHER THAN BY SENTENCING COURT (CH. III [3.]), REPLACING MY EXISTING 'NPP' ORDER, PER [80.], WITH A NEW 'NPP' ORDER, PER [38., 40. AND 45.]), DOES NOT ALLOW, DUE TO EXISTING SENTENCING ORDER RESTRICTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS [80.], WHICH EFFECTIVELY ACT AS 'BOUNDARIES AND DIRECTIVES' AGAINST SUCH ACTIONS BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (A CLEAR AND OBVIOUS ~~EXAMPLE~~ EXAMPLE IS THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES AND OBLIGATIONS AND BOUNDARIES (OF JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE AND AUTHORITY [82. AND 83.]),

OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT UPON THE 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER' (WHICH I

HAVE DETAILED ABOVE IN THIS DOCUMENT), [SEE TEXT AT 1603. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]

WHEREIN THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT THROUGH ITS OPERATION AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTS, IS

BURDENED AS A COURT ORDER IMPOSITION (THE SENTENCING ORDER IMPOSED ON RESPECTIVE

LIFER, ALSO FORCES STATE GOVERNMENT TO ENFORCE SUCH SENTENCING ORDER, BY WAY

OF COMPLIANCE BY ITSELF, WITH THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES, OPERATIONAL

OBLIGATIONS AND OPERATIONAL BOUNDARIES OF SUCH PERFECTED SENTENCING COURT

ORDERS), JUST AS I WAS ORIGINALLY SENTENCED TO IN 1994 [SEE TEXT AT 2258. TO

2265. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.] AND NON-PAROLE PERIOD RE-SENTENCED TO IN 2002 [74.

AND 80.] [SEE TEXT AT 979. TO 1030. (INCLUSIVE), 1043. TO 1103. (INCLUSIVE),

1257. TO 1261. (INCLUSIVE), 1603. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.] ASSOCIATED WITH

ENFORCEMENT OF MY SENTENCE ORDER, AND THEREFORE IS BURDENED AGAINST THE

ENFORCER OF SENTENCE AS WELL AS RESPECTIVE LIFER (WHICH, IN MY SPECIFIC

CASE, MEANS ME, MY 2002 SENTENCING ORDERS [74.] AND THE ABSOLUTE DIRECTIVE

AGAINST/UPON SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AT [80.] WITH REINFORCEMENT OF

INTENTIONAL ABROGATION AT [78.]).

IRONICALLY, I CAN ONLY HAVE ONE 'NPP' SENTENCING ORDER IMPOSED UPON ME (FOR

THE MURDER CONVICTION VERDICT OF 1994), AT ANY ONE TIME, WHICH CURRENTLY

IS [74.] EXCEPT THAT, THE ENFORCER OF THE 2002 PERFECTED SENTENCING

ORDER ([74.]), IS ALSO THE PROTECTOR OF THE DIRECTIVES OF SAID

ORDER ([74.]), ESPECIALLY OF [78.] AND [80.], BUT WHO REFUSES TO

ENFORCE [74.] OBLIGATIONS, AND INSTEAD CREATED ITS OWN SENTENCE

ORDER WHICH IT ENFORCES AGAINST ME [SEE TEXT AT 2063. TO 2077. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.],

HOWEVER,

BOTH CAN'T LAWFULLY EXIST [SEE TEXT AT 2112. TO 2120. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]. WHY

DOESN'T THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA TAKE THEIR CLAIM, OF JURISDICTIONAL

COMPETENCE, OVER MY PERFECTED SENTENCE ORDERS [74.], TO A

CH. III [3.] COURT FOR COMPETENCE ASSESSMENT? WHAT HAVE THEY GOT TO

LOSE CONSIDERING THEY CLAIM, AND OPERATE, AS IF THEY HAVE 'ABSOLUTE

POWER, JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY OVER MY ENTIRE SENTENCE ORDERS,

2298. INCLUDING 'THE POWER TO REPLACE THE FULL TERM OF MY FINITE SENTENCE ORDERS ([74. AND 80.]); WITH A FAKE-SENTENCE 'INTERPRETATION' THAT ENDS WHEN I DIE (OR, OTHERWISE, CONVICTION IS VOIDED BY APPEAL COURT), [SEE TEXT AT 2219. TO 2228. (INCLUSIVE), 2230. TO 2240. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J, [SEE TEXT AT 2068. TO 2083. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J. [ALSO SEE TEXT AT 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J.

2299. AT THE POINT THAT MY HEAD-SENTENCE WAS IMPOSED [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2266. TO 2273. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J, MY JUDICIALLY PROTECTED RIGHT TO RECEIVE NO MORE BURDEN OR PENALTY, THAN MY PERFECTED SENTENCE ORDERS PERMITTED, INCLUDING BY WAY OF WHAT WAS PERMISSIBLY OPEN TO ENFORCEMENT AGAINST ME, DAY ONE OF MY ENTIRE SENTENCE STARTED ITS FINITE TERM OF SENTENCE LENGTH, AS FROM 3-6-1994 [74.]. THEREFORE, IN ORDER TO SATISFY NOT ONLY MY HEAD-SENTENCE SENTENCING ORDERS, AS PERFECTED, AND, MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCING ORDERS, AS PERFECTED, I MUST BE ADMINISTRATIVELY ENABLED WITH THE REQUISITE DUE PROCESS EVENTS TO WHICH MY SENTENCING ORDERS ARE ANCHORED, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER OR NOT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WANTS TO EFFECT/UNDERTAKE/PARTICIPATE IN SUCH DUE PROCESS EVENTS,

2302. IT DOES NOT HAVE ANY JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE OPEN TO IT TO REFUSE MY RIGHT OF SUBSTANTIVE ENFORCEMENT (BY STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS [74.], INCLUDING TO APPLY FOR PAROLE PER ORDERED FIRST DATE ONWARDS [SEE TEXT AT 1991. TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J,

2304. AND, TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY ENTITLED, PER PERFECTED COURTS SENTENCING ORDERS [74.], TO RECEIVE PAROLE-RELEASE PER ORDERED FIRST DATE ONWARDS [SEE TEXT AT 1987. TO 1990. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J,

2305. AND, TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY ENTITLED, PER PERFECTED COURTS SENTENCING ORDERS [74.], TO RECEIVE FULL-SATISFACTION OF MY ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE (SO AS TO WHOLLY SATISFY IMPOSED SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 1257. TO 1261. (INCLUSIVE) IBID J), AS AT THE FIRST INSTANCE, CALCULATED FORWARD FROM DAY ONE OF SENTENCE START, TO THE LAST DATE CALCULATED AS PERMISSIBLY ENFORCEABLE AS MY IMPOSED SENTENCE

2306. (WHICH JUDICIALLY AUTHORIZES SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TO ENFORCE [74.], AGAINST ME,