

- UP TO SUCH CALCULATED LAST DATE, BUT NO FURTHER THAN THAT CALCULATED LAST DATE, WHICH IS ALSO AN INTRINSIC FEATURE OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS OF '1992' [80.] WHICH WAS THE ONLY SENTENCE ORDER PERFECTED AGAINST ME IN 2002 [74.] ADDITIONAL TO WHAT WAS ALREADY ORDERED AGAINST ME IN 1994 [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2032, 2033, 2028-2031 (INCLUSIVE) IBID.] [SEE TEXT AT 2159, TO 2174. (INCLUSIVE), 2176, TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]
2307. ONCE MY SENTENCING ORDERS ARE PERFECTED BY THE SENTENCING COURT [SEE TEXT AT 2258, TO 2261. (INCLUSIVE), 2032, 1987, TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE), 2033, 2031, 2186, TO 2196. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.] [74.] THE CH. III COURT (C3.3), MUST HAND-OVER ENFORCEMENT OF THE PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS TO THE CH. II STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (C3.3), WHO THEN MUST ENFORCE SAID ORDERS AGAINST ME. THE INTRINSIC FEATURE OF EITHER OF MY SENTENCING ORDERS (THE HEAD-SENTENCE, THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCE), WHICH DEFINES VERY SIGNIFICANT TIME PERIODS ANCHORED TO VERY SPECIFIC DUE PROCESS ADMINISTRATIVE EVENTS, WHICH COMBINE TO FORM MY ENTIRE SENTENCE MAP [SEE TEXT AT 1965, TO 1980. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.] AND WHICH SHOW MY SENTENCE LENGTH AS IT WAS JUDICIALLY ORDERED AND PERFECTED, AND WHICH JUDICIALLY PROHIBITS ANY ADDITIONAL PERIODS OF TIME BEING ADDED TO THE SENTENCE ORDERED TIME PERIODS WHICH THEMSELVES WERE [SEE TEXT AT 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2219, TO 2225. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.] AND OF TIME OF 15 YEARS, PLACING BAR AGAINST ANY ADMINISTRATIVE INCREASE TO SUCH SET PERIOD, OTHER THAN THE STATUTORY '30. DAY ADMINISTRATIVE WINDOW' [126.] THEN 'PAROLE MAXIMUM TERM' OF 10. YEARS, PLACING BAR AGAINST ANY ADMINISTRATIVE / STATE LEGISLATIVE INCREASE TO SUCH SET PERIOD. [128. AND 100.] THEN 'IMPOSED SENTENCE MUST BE WHOLLY SATISFIED' WHICH WAS AND STILL IS (UNTIL MY IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS ARE ENFORCED BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AS THEY WERE SO ORDERED TO ENFORCE, BY MY SENTENCING COURT), A STATUTORY OBLIGATION UPON THE S.A. GOVERNMENT, WHICH MY SENTENCING COURT PROTECTED WITHIN MY COURT'S SENTENCING ORDERS [74. AND 80.] [SEE TEXT AT 1257, TO 1261.

(INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND AS SUCH IT THEREFORE IS A CRITICAL AND FUNDAMENTAL COMPONENT OF BOTH PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS [SEE TEXT AT 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE)]

2315. IBID], AND WHICH JUDICIALLY CHARACTERISES AND QUALIFIES IT AS A SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT (I OWN AS PART OF MY ORDERED SENTENCE, AND, THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA IS ORDERED TO ENFORCE AGAINST ME WITHIN ITS OBLIGATION AS 'CUSTODIAL SENTENCE ENFORCER'), EFFECTIVELY AS WEIGHTED TO MY SENTENCING ORDERS AS MUCH AS 'MY IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD', AND MY DATE ORDERED TO START MY SENTENCE AS FROM, BEING, 3-6-1994, AND WHICH IN NO WAY LIMITS IT TO ~~BEING~~ MERELY BEING 'PROCEDURAL IN NATURE AND FORM' (THE DUE PROCESS ACTION OF APPLYING TO THE STATE GOVERNMENT IN WRITING, FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF 'SENTENCE COMPLETION/SATISFACTION', [SEE TEXT AT 1260, 1261. IBID]), BECAUSE THE STATUTORY FEATURE OF THE END DATE OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING COURT ORDER, IS MARKED TO THE START DATE OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING COURT ORDER, WHICH ARE BOTH MARKED TO STATUTORY ADMINISTRATIVE MEANS (HOW SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT MUST ADMINISTER MY SENTENCING ORDERS AGAINST/UPON ME [SEE TEXT AT 1611. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), IN ADDITION TO THE INDIVIDUALITY OF MY SENTENCING COURT ORDERS IMPOSED ONLY ON ME (AND CH. II [3.], STATE GOVERNMENT HAS NO JURISDICTION TO ABROGATE [80.], OR EVEN [78.], JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES FROM MY JUDGMENT 2321. PROPER [74.]), THEREBY MANDATING OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF [80.], AS AN ACCRUED RIGHT FOR ME TO RECEIVE ENFORCEMENT OF, AND, AN ACCRUED OBLIGATION WHICH SENTENCE ENFORCER MUST OBSERVE AND SATISFY ADMINISTRATIVELY),

2322. IS, THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT (1992 OPERATIONAL VERSION, AS ORDERED AND PERFECTED IN [74.], QUALIFIED AT [80.]), [SEE TEXT AT 1604. TO 1608. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 1755. TO 1771. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [123., 124., 125., 126., 127. AND 128.], [SEE TEXT AT 1043, 1044, 1115, 1124. TO 1135. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2323. BY ABROGATING AT [78.], IN 2002, THEN MANDATING AT [80.], AND THERE NOT BEING ANY POSITIVE OR AFFIRMATIVE WORKING WITHIN [74.], TO ENABLE ANY ADMINISTRATIVE, OPERATIONAL, DUE PROCESS PROCEDURE (OR EFFECT OF), OF OR FROM THE

- EXISTING SENTENCING STANDARDS OF 2002 (Truth in Sentencing Act [46.J], PROVIDED NO LEAVE OF THE COURT, WITHIN THE TWO [74.J, FOR THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TO VETO/INVALIDATE SENTENCING COURT DIRECTIVES AT [78, AND 80.J, WHICH WERE FUNDAMENTAL AND INTRINSIC TO THE PROPERLY PERFECTED ORDERS AND JUDGMENT OF THAT COURT. THEREFORE, SAID PRIME SENTENCING DIRECTIVE OF MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT [74.J, REMAINS AS AN ABSOLUTE ORDER [80.J, TO WHICH AND UNDER WHICH THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 22 1/2 YEARS IS ANCHORED, AND ALL OTHER ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT TRUE CALCULATION OF SAID SENTENCE, SUCH AS 'THE COURT DID THIS, OR THAT, EVEN THOUGH IT IS NOT STATED IN WORDS, I AM NOT ENTITLED TO ANY PROVISIONS OF SENTENCING STATUTE EXISTING PRIOR TO [46.J, AND SIMILAR CLAIMS BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT AND ITS DELEGATES, OTHER THAN WHAT I HAVE DESCRIBED AT [TEXT AT 2176, TO 2217, (INCLUSIVE) IBID.J, (WITH ASSISTANCE FROM TEXT [AT 1611, TO 1618, (INCLUSIVE) IBID.J, TEXT [AT 1965 TO 1980, (INCLUSIVE), 1985, TO 2003 (INCLUSIVE), 2062, TO 2077, (INCLUSIVE), 2091, TO 2120, (INCLUSIVE) IBID.J), MUST BE IRRELEVANT.
2329. A SENTENCING JUDGMENT AND ASSOCIATED SENTENCING ORDERS, MUST BE ACTUAL WORDS ON A PAGE, AS IS THE RULE OF LAW IN AUSTRALIA. THERE IS NO INCLUSION IN A SENTENCING JUDGMENT, OR ITS ORDERS, UNTIL IT IS THE ACTUAL WORDS ON A PAGE, AS SPOKEN BY MY SENTENCING JUSTICE [SEE TEXT AT 2258, IBID.J, AND SPOKEN BY MY NPP RE-SENTENCING JUSTICES [74.J, WHICH IS ALSO CONFIRMED AS A QUALIFICATION BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA IN 2012 [SEE TEXT AT 1103, IBID.J, WHO STATED "... THE SENTENCING REMARKS AND JUDGMENTS GIVEN IN THE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST YOU ACCURATELY RECORD THE ORDERS OF THE COURT. THE RECORDS OF THE COURT INCLUDE THE SENTENCING REMARKS AND JUDGMENTS. [37, AND 45.J.
2333. IT IS RELEVANT TO NOTE ALSO, FURTHER TO WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN HIGHLIGHTED BY HE WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT, THAT, AT THE INITIAL JUDICIAL PROCESSES RELATING TO ME BEING CHARGED ON INFORMATION WHICH RESULTED IN A CRIMINAL TRIAL, THEN CONVICTION, 2334. THEN SENTENCING, IS THAT, AT THE FIRST INSTANCE OF ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

RELEVANT TO ME BEING IN PRISON, THE 'DPP FILED CHARGES AGAINST ME, IN THE COURTS RECORDS, IN THE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION', THEREBY ENABLING TWO STANDARD JURISDICTIONS UPON WHICH SAID FILED CHARGES IN THE COURT'S RECORDS, COULD JUDICIALLY PROGRESS, AFTER MY TRIAL CONVICTION AND SENTENCING IN 1994 WERE OFFICIALLY ENTERED IN THE COURT'S RECORDS (SEE [210. (PARAGRAPH 61. IN JUDGMENT PROPER)]), BEING, THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION AND THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION ([74.]), WHICH BOTH OPERATE WITHIN CH. III COURTS ONLY [3.], AND ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], PROHIBITED FROM BEING INVALIDATED FROM OPERATIONAL INTENTIONS / ENFORCEMENT, AS FAR AS ANY JUDICIAL ORDERS BORNE FROM SUCH JUDICIAL PROGRESS HEARINGS, EXCEPT BY A COURT OF SIMILAR JURISDICTION OR A HIGHER CH. III [3.] COURT. [45.]

2336. IRONICALLY, MY 2002 ~~■■■~~ JUDGMENT IS AN OUTCOME HEARD IN THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION, THE FULL COURT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ([74.]), YET, THE ACTIONS OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, RE [46.], AND LATER AMENDMENTS TO [46.], EFFECTIVELY VIOLATE (FROM WITHIN CH. II [3.], STATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS), THE JURISDICTION OF THE CH. III COURT [3.], AND JUDICIAL ORDERS THEREIN MADE AND PERFECTED AND ENTERED INTO THE COURT'S RECORDS (PARTICULARLY THE JUDGMENT DIRECTIVES OF ~~■■■~~ [78. AND 80.]).
2337. THE ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATION OF [46.], AGAINST LIFERS IN GENERAL IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, AS AN ARBITRARY ATTACK AGAINST IMPOSED SENTENCES OF RESPECTIVE LIFERS (WHO WERE ORIGINALLY SENTENCED PURSUANT TO THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, WHICH WAS REPEALED AS OF 1-8-1994 [46.]), WHICH
2338. ADMINISTRATIVELY DENIES A FUNDAMENTAL CONSTRUCTION COMPONENT OF A 'JUDICIALLY ORDERED FINITE SENTENCE LENGTH' (SENTENCED AS A LIFER, WITH A NON-PAROLE ~~■■■~~ PERIOD, PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING
2339. STANDARDS), AND FRAUDULENTLY DOES SO WITHOUT COMPETENT JURISDICTION TO
2340. SO ACT [82. AND 83.] (THE 'FINITE SENTENCING FEATURE' IS DESCRIBED IN COMPARATIVE DETAILS, RELATING TO MY SENTENCING SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS, AT [TEXT AT 2159. TO 2174. (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE), 2219. TO 2228. (INCLUSIVE), 2230.
2341. TO 2240. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), AS THE OPERATION OF [46.] IS ONLY ADMINISTRATIVE

2342. JURISDICTION⁶, IT CANNOT BE EITHER CRIMINAL JURISDICTION OR
 APPELLATE JURISDICTION (WHICH CAN ONLY OPERATE WITHIN CH. III COURTS
 2343. [3.])⁹, SO [46.], HOLDS NO JURISDICTION (FROM CH. II [3.],
 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS), TO RE-OPEN, RECONSIDER OR ALTER THE
 SUBSTANCE OF THE RESULT OF MY PERFECTED SENTENCING COURT ORDERS
 (HEAD-SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT ~~2062~~ 2258, TO 2265. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND
 2344. NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCE [74.])⁹, YET, EFFECTIVELY DID 'RECONSIDER' THE
 OPERATIONAL AND ENFORCEMENT MEANING OF MY JUDGMENT DIRECTIVES [74.],
 AND DID SO IMPROPERLY, FRAUDULENTLY AND WITHOUT JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION⁹,
 2345. AND THEN,
 DID⁶ ALTER⁶ THE OPERATIONAL AND ENFORCEMENT MEANING OF MY JUDGMENT DIRECTIVES
 [74.], AND DID SO IMPROPERLY, FRAUDULENTLY [194. (PARA. 64. "FRAUD")], AND
 2346. WITHOUT JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION, JUDICIAL COMPETENCE, JUDICIAL AUTHORITY,
 2347. OR CONSTITUTIONAL ENTITLEMENT TO SO ACT ([1. AND 3.])⁹, THEREBY MAKING
 'THEIR' CHANGES TO MY SENTENCE INTERPRETATION [SEE TEXT AT 2062. TO 2081.
 (INCLUSIVE) IBID], ERRONEOUS, ILLEGAL, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL [1.].
 2348. IT IS WORTH NOTING IN [210.], AT:

2349. PARAGRAPH 71.

" THE INHERENT POWER TO CORRECT AN ORDER AFTER IT IS PERFECTED BY
 BEING DRAWN UP AS A RECORD OF THE COURT IS VERY LIMITED.

...

THAT ASPECT OF THE POWER IS CALLED THE "SLIP RULE".

2350. HOWEVER, IT DOES NOT PERMIT RECONSIDERATION OR ALTERATION OF THE
SUBSTANCE OF THE RESULT THAT WAS REACHED AND RECORDED ⁹²."

2351. PARAGRAPH 70.

" ... IT WAS COMMON GROUND THAT THE JUDGMENTS OF ACQUITTAL AND
CONVICTION WERE PERFECTED AT THE LATEST AFTER SENTENCING ~~2062~~
WHEN THE REPORTS ~~2062~~ OF PRISONERS WERE COMPLETED AND SIGNED."

2352.

PARAGRAPH 70.

“ THE INHERENT POWER IS LIMITED BY THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF FINALITY OF LITIGATION WHICH HAS REPEATEDLY BEEN AFFIRMED BY THIS COURT ⁸⁹ ;

2353.

“ A CENTRAL AND PERVAING TENET OF THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM IS THAT CONTROVERSIES, ONCE RESOLVED, ARE NOT TO BE REOPENED EXCEPT IN A FEW, NARROWLY DEFINED, CIRCUMSTANCES. ” ”

2354.

PARAGRAPH 61.

2355.

“ ... THE ONLY RELEVANT ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WAS THAT WHICH THE DPP HAD INVOKED WHEN FILING THE INFORMATION CHARGING THE APPELLANTS WHICH LED TO THEIR TRIAL AND THE VERDICTS AND ORDERS WHICH FOLLOWED.

2356.

ASSUMING, FOR THE SAKE OF ARGUMENT, THAT THAT JURISDICTION WAS NOT EXHAUSTED WHEN THE VERDICTS AND SENTENCES WERE FORMALLY RECORDED, THE REFERRAL OF QUESTIONS TO THE FULL COURT ON THE FIRST APPLICATION DID NOT CHANGE ITS NATURE.

2357.

AS APPEARS BELOW, THE “ INHERENT JURISDICTION ” RELIED UPON BY THE DPP AND THE FULL COURT TO AUTHORISE THE ORDERS MADE ON THE APPLICATIONS IS NOT AN ADDITIONAL HEAD OF JURISDICTION. IT IS A COLLECTION OF POWERS IN AID OF JURISDICTION. ”

2358.

PARAGRAPH 99.

2359.

“ ... ONCE JUDGMENT HAS BEEN ENTERED AND THUS PERFECTED, A DIFFERENT PRINCIPLE IS ENGAGED -

2360.

THE FINALITY OF PERFECTED JUDGMENTS ¹¹⁰ .

2361.

A PERFECTED JUDGMENT IS FINAL AND, SUBJECT TO ITS OWN LIMITED SET OF EXCEPTIONS, CANNOT BE SET ASIDE. ”

2362. MY REASON FOR REFERENCING THE KNIGHT JUDGMENT^{AND} [210.], [SEE TEXT AT 2084. *IBID*], IS THAT HE WAS ORIGINALLY SENTENCED PURSUANT TO SENTENCING STANDARDS WHICH, ALTHOUGH WITH SLIGHT DIFFERENCES, WERE OPERATIONALLY VERY SIMILAR TO THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' (SEE ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207. (PARAGRAPH 20. THEREIN, WITH FURTHER DESCRIPTION IN PARAGRAPHS 15. AND 19.)]),
2363. HOWEVER,

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO KNIGHT'S SENTENCE WERE PERMITTED, DUE TO SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIABLE CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH IN NO WAY COMPARES TO SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PAROLE BOARD OPERATIONS, JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OR COMPETENCE (OF PAROLE BOARD), WITH REGARD TO 'LIFERS WHO WERE SENTENCED PURSUANT TO THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, S.A. SENTENCING STANDARDS', AND ADDITIONALLY, REGARDING MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING [74.], AND THE JUDICIAL ORDERS WITHIN SAME, WHICH THEREIN JUDICIALLY ORDERED FORTIFYING JUDGMENT DIRECTIVES (PARTICULARLY [78. AND 80.]).

2365. ONCE MY 2002 SENTENCE JUDGMENT WAS PERFECTED (PERFECTED JUDGMENT ORDER IS ALSO CHARACTERISED AS AN ULTIMATE ~~JUDGMENT~~ ORDER), [74.], IT WAS BY ALL MEANS BEYOND 'CHANGE', 'ALTERATION', 'RECONSIDERATION' [SEE TEXT AT 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2359, 2360, 2361. *IBID*], EXCEPT IN ~~ACCORDANCE~~ ACCORDANCE WITH VERY STRICT AND NARROWLY DEFINED CIRCUMSTANCES, AND EVEN THEN, CAN ONLY BE

2366. ENGAGED THROUGH JUDICIAL PROCEDURAL APPLICATION. THE SUBSTANTIVE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], WAS THE 'SETTLED AND RESOLVED' EFFECT, OF THE 'CONTROVERSY' OF MY RE-SENTENCING COMPLAINT ([77.]), AS ARGUED BETWEEN 'ME' (THE APPLICANT), AND THE 'STATE PROSECUTOR' [SEE TEXT AT 2353. *IBID*], AND WAS CONSEQUENTIALLY FINALISED AS MY NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCING ORDER BY THE CH. III [3.] COMPETENT COURT. WITHIN SAID JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES ([74.]), WAS THE ABSOLUTE JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION [80.], IN ABROGATION OF EXISTING/CURRENT SENTENCING LAWS/STANDARDS [78.].

2368. AT NO TIME SINCE PERFECTING SAID JUDGMENT [74.], HAS ANY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN 'STATE' GOVERNMENT AND/OR 'STATE' PARLIAMENT, EVER 'HELD' ANY COMPETENT JURISDICTION, OR ANY POWER/AUTHORITY (WITHIN ANY COMPETENT JURISDICTION), TO 'RE-OPEN' [SEE TEXT AT 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353. *IBID*],

ANY 'ARGUMENT', 'RECONSIDERATION' OR 'RE-EVALUATION' OF THE 'SUBSTANCE', OR 'SUBSTANTIVE EFFECT' ^{OF} SAID ORDERS (PROPER), [74.], OR ~~TO~~ TO, IMPEDE THE APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF SAID ORDERS [74.], RE-DEFINE THE APPLICATIONAL CHARACTERISTIC, OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTIC OR ENFORCEMENT CHARACTERISTIC OF MY SAID JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES [74.],

2369.

YET,

IT IS WHAT THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACTUALLY DID ANYWAY (STATUTE CHANGE INCLUDED [46.], WITH LATER AMENDMENTS INCLUDING 'PAROLE FOR LIFE' RATHER THAN PAROLE MAXIMUM CAPPED AT '10 YEARS' [SEE TEXT AT 1604. TO 1626, 1257.

2370.

TO 1261. (INCLUSIVE) ⁹IBID ⁶]), WITHOUT EVER ENGAGING THE ONLY PROCEDURALLY PERMISSIBLE WAY TO 'CHALLENGE, APPEAL, RECONSIDER' THE SUBSTANCE (OR OPERATIONAL EFFECT/OBLIGATIONS OF), OF MY SAID JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES [74.], WHICH WAS BY FORMAL APPLICATION TO THE CH. III [3.] COURTS.

2371.

THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA HAS BY JUDICIAL STANDARDS, 'STOLEN MY SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT TO PROPER APPLICATION OF MY 2002 SENTENCE JUDGMENT

2372.

[74.], AND THEREIN INTRINSIC JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES [74., 78. AND 80.], WHICH PER CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPETENT MANDATE ([1. AND 3.]), OBLIGATE THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA TO ENFORCE ONLY THE ENFORCEABLE PENALTIES OF SENTENCE PERMITTED ~~WITHIN~~ WITHIN SAID JUDGMENT [74.], AND JUDICIAL

2373.

DIRECTIVES'. NOWHERE WITHIN MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], DOES THE COURT LEAVE ANY 'ABILITY OF STATE (CH. II [3.]), TO BY ANY MEANS INCREASE THE TRUE MAXIMUM TERM OF INCARCERATION PENALTY WHICH THE COURT IMPOSED UPON ME [74.], WHICH CAPPED AT 25 YEARS AND THIRTY DAYS [SEE TEXT AT

2374.

2219. TO 2225. (INCLUSIVE) ⁶IBID ⁶], AS QUALIFIED BY NON-PAROLE PERIOD, PAROLE PERIOD MAXIMUM PERMITTED TERM, THIRTY DAYS [126.], AND [80.], WHICH BY NUMERICAL FORM IS '22½ YEARS CALCULATED PER [80.], ~~SO THAT~~ SO THAT 22½ YEARS IS OPERATIONALLY 15 YEARS, PLUS 10 YEARS, PLUS 30 DAYS', AS FROM 3-6-1994 [74.].

2375.

IN FURTHER QUALIFICATION OF SUCH JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES, RELATING TO MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE TERM OF INCARCERATION, IS, ⁶~~THE~~ THE COURT'S JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE AT [80.], WHICH CONFLICTS OPERATIONALLY WITH 'THEN CURRENT SENTENCING

- STANDARDS' (WHICH IN 2002, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, WERE THE 2002 VERSION OF [46.], TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT), WHICH SAID COURT OBVIOUSLY REALISED AND SO CLEARLY
2377. ~~REDACTED~~ DISQUALIFIED SAID "CURRENT STANDARDS" FROM HAVING ANY
2378. INVOLVEMENT/EFFECT THEREIN [74. AND 78.]. THE 'DOOR' WAS JUDICIALLY 'SLAMMED SHUT' ON THE OPERATION OF 'CURRENT SENTENCING STANDARDS' ([78. AND 80.]), THE 'DOOR WAS WELDED SHUT, NAILED SHUT, CONCRETED SHUT', WITH NO WAY OF INCORPORATING THEIR OPERATIONAL EFFECT EITHER, AS THE COURT 'POSITIVELY AND AFFIRMATIVELY' DIRECTED [80.], AS THE ACTIVE ORDER OF THAT COURT [74.].
2379. IT WAS, AT THE TIME OF SENTENCING IN 2002 [74.], AND EVEN UP TO NOW, IN
2380. 2018 (16 YEARS LATER), OPERATIONALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO LAWFULLY OPERATE '22½ YEARS PURSUANT TO 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT, OPERATING VERSION OF 2002', AS A 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD' FOR MY TRUE CALCULATED SENTENCE INTERPRETATION (AS FROM 3-6-1994, THEREBY ATTACHING YEAR 2016 AS DESIGNATED END OF NON-PAROLE PERIOD)',
2381. AT THE SAME TIME, AS,
- '22½ YEARS PURSUANT TO 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, OPERATING VERSION OF 1992', AS A 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD' FOR MY TRUE CALCULATED SENTENCE INTERPRETATION (AS FROM 3-6-1994, THEREBY ATTACHING YEAR 2009 AS DESIGNATED END OF NON-PAROLE PERIOD)',
2382. FIRSTLY, AND FUNDAMENTALLY,
- THERE CAN ONLY BE ONE OPERATING VERSION OF SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLIED TO MY 1994 IMPOSED SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2258 TO 2260. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], WHICH WAS ALSO FORTIFIED INTO MY 2002 IMPOSED 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD' SENTENCE [74. AND 80.],
2383. SECONDLY,
- THERE WAS ONLY ONE OPERATING VERSION OF SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLIED TO MY
2384. ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE (HEAD-SENTENCE AND NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCE CAN NEVER COMBINE, IF EACH HAS A FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLIED TO IT, COMBATING RESPECTIVELY, MAKING IT JUDICIALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO 'DEFINE' AS A SINGLE SENTENCE WITH ~~REDACTED~~ ORDERED NON-PAROLE PERIOD), [SEE TEXT AT
2385. 2032. TO 2039. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], WHICH IN 1994 WAS 'THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT', THEN IN 2002 WAS MORE NARROWLY DEFINED BY [80.], BEING THE '1992'.

OPERATING VERSION OF THE 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT' (QUALIFICATION THAT NPP IS PART OF THE SENTENCE, AT [194. (PARA. 11.)]), ([80.]),

2386. THIRDLY, AND ALREADY HIGHLIGHTED HEREIN,

THE COURT'S POSITIVE AND AFFIRMATIVE DIRECTIVE, AS AN ORDER OF THE COURT, AT [80.], WAS TO STATE AS AN ABSOLUTE ORDER OF THE COURT, IN A WAY THAT LEFT NO ROOM FOR MISINTERPRETATION OR MISUNDERSTANDING, ~~THE~~ ONLY '1992

SENTENCING STANDARDS ARE APPLIED, AND THEREAFTER ENFORCED AGAINST ME, AS MY ONLY VALID SENTENCE (CONSEQUENTIAL TO MURDER CONVICTION IN 1994)', AND, THIS DIRECTIVE ([80.]), IS SUPPORTED BY THE NEGATIVE CONDITION [78.],

THEREBY LEAVING NO RIGHT IN LAW (COMMON OR STATUTE), TO APPLY ANY OTHER SENTENCING STANDARDS TO MY SENTENCES, EXCEPT THOSE JUDICIALLY ORDERED IN [74.], AT [80.].

2388. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW [80.], COULD BE VIOLATED BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, SO EASILY, WHICH CONSEQUENTED STATUTORY VIOLATION (THE STATUTE VIOLATED WAS AT [1. AND 3.]), OF ITS OBLIGATION TO LAWFULLY INFORM ME OF MY TRUE SENTENCE PARTICULARS, AFTER DELIVERY OF MY 2002

PERFECTED JUDGMENT (SO THAT MY TRUE NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME [SEE TEXT AT 2381. IBID]), CALCULATING 3-12-2008, OR THEREABOUTS, AS MY FIRST DATE TO APPLY FOR PAROLE, AND 3-6-2009, OR THEREABOUTS, AS THE STATUTORY ([80.], [74., 77. AND 78.], [126., 127. AND 128.], [135.], [137. AND 139.], [53.]) (SOME OF THE RELEVANT OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS), OUTCOME WHICH

2390. CALCULATES THE EXACT DATE OF MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD END, WHICH IS ALSO

DAY, 1. OF THE STATUTORY 'THIRTY DAY WINDOW' [126.], WITHIN WHICH MY ORDERED

SENTENCE [74.], SUBSTANTIVELY RIGHTS ME TO RECEIVE PAROLE-RELEASE [SEE TEXT AT 2187. TO 2196. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND, SUBSTANTIVELY RIGHTS ME STATUTORY

('1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS, [80.], [126.]'), PROTECTION AGAINST

2392. NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S COMPETENT JUDICIAL ORDERS (BY THE

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, IF THE STATE GOVERNMENT FAILED/REFUSED TO ENFORCE/CARRY-OUT ANY OF THE MANDATORY JUDICIAL ~~INSTRUCTIONS~~

DIRECTIVES OF MY JUDGMENT 'PROPER' [74.], ESPECIALLY [80.] ([77.]),

2393. ⁶ AS THE CH. III COURTS [3.], ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]), EMPOWERED AND AUTHORISED TO PROTECT THEIR JUDICIAL ORDERS FROM BEING OBSTUCTED
2394. BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AS WAS SUPPORTIVELY STATED IN [210.],
2395. THEREIN PARAGRAPH 69. "THE SPECIES OF THE GENUS OF THE INHERENT POWER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA WERE APTLY DESCRIBED BY THE LATE BRADLEY SELWAY, A FORMER SOLICITOR - GENERAL FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND JUSTICE OF THE FEDERAL COURT.... THEY INCLUDE THE POWERS TO PUNISH CONTEMPT, TO GRANT INJUNCTIONS, TO PROTECT THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE LITIGATION, TO CORRECT ACCIDENTAL SLIPS AND OMISSIONS IN COURT RECORDS, INCLUDING IN ORDERS OF THE COURT, AND TO STAY PROCEEDINGS IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE ABUSE OF THE PROCESSES OF THE COURT. THE LAST MENTIONED IS AN ASPECT OF THE INHERENT POWER DESCRIBED BY MASTER JACOB IN 1970, IN A MUCH CITED ARTICLE, AS THE POWER TO MAINTAIN THE AUTHORITY OF THE COURT AND TO PREVENT ITS PROCESSES FROM BEING OBSTRUCTED AND ABUSED ⁸⁸ "",
2396. AND YET, IRONICALLY, [RETURN TO 2389, 2390. AND RESTATE]
HAVE NEVER BEEN ACCURATELY STATED TO ME BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT,
WHICH BEGS THE 'OBVIOUS QUESTION' OF 'WHY DID THE CROWN PROSECUTOR, PRIOR TO PERFECTING ^{OF} FULL COURT'S JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES OF [74.], ESPECIALLY THE ORDER DESCRIBED AT [80.], AND THE QUALIFICATION AT [78.], NOT VERBALLY CHALLENGE SAME, IF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA 'NEVER' INTENDED TO CARRY-OUT AND ENFORCE MY IMPOSED SENTENCE [74.], AS DIRECTED BY SAID COMPETENT COURT',
2397. INSTEAD, AND WITH PERFUNCTORY INTENT (AGAINST [80.], AND [78.]), TOLD ME AND SENT PAROLE BOARD NOTICES, AND OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS TO ME, IDENTIFYING 2016 AS MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD ENDING TERM [SEE TEXT AT 2380. IBID]),
2398. IF, [RETURN TO 2388. AND RESTATE]
THE ONLY COMPETENT AND LAWFULLY PERMISSIBLE ACTIONS, WERE THOSE DEFINED BY THE SENTENCING JUDGMENT (PROPER), AND ASSOCIATED COURT'S ORDERS [74.], WHICH WAS NEVER ACTUALLY COMPLIED WITH BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AS FAR AS 'WHAT MUST BE DONE... AND NO MORE THAN THAT',

2399. WHICH, AS HAS BEEN CLEARLY CONTRASTED AND DIFFERENTIATED AND IDENTIFIED BY ME (WITHIN
 2400. THIS COMPLAINT DOCUMENT), AND SUPPORTED WITH COURT'S JUDGMENTS AS WELL, AS THE
 2401. MAIN AND FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ⁶ WHAT THE COURT QUALIFIABLY ORDERED
IN 2002, AS MY SENTENCING JUDGMENT AND ORDERS [74.], [SEE TEXT AT 2381,
1965. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE), 2007. TO 2008. (INCLUSIVE),
2065. TO 2067. (INCLUSIVE), 2151. TO 2154. (INCLUSIVE), 2156. TO 2157. (INCLUSIVE),
2159. TO 2174. (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE), 2219. TO 2228. (INCLUSIVE),
2230. TO 2240. (INCLUSIVE), 2248. TO 2292. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], THEREIN AND THEREBY
 2402. DIRECTING AND ORDERING A SENTENCE WITH A FINITE TERM AND KNOWN PERIOD OF
TIME, FROM START DATE TO END DATE ⁶ , PER '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS',
 2403. VERSUS,
WHAT THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (THROUGH OPERATIONAL - ADMINISTRATIVE
ACTIONS OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AND ITS REPRESENTATIVE AGENTS),
 2404. AS I ACCUSE THEM OF, FRAUDULENTLY CLAIMS TO BE ⁶ THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S
OPERATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INTERPRETATION AND UNDERSTANDING AS THEIR LAWFULLY
ENFORCEABLE RIGHT TO ACTION AGAINST ME, CONSEQUENTIAL TO THE 2002
RE-SENTENCING JUDGMENT [74.], [SEE TEXT AT ~~2380~~ 2380, 2021. TO
2023. (INCLUSIVE), 2050, 2064, 2068. TO 2077. (INCLUSIVE), 2122. TO 2130.
(INCLUSIVE), 1780. TO 1783. (INCLUSIVE), 1855. IBID], ~~2122. TO 2130.~~ THEREBY
 2405. OVERSEEING WHAT THEY CLASSIFY AS AN INFINITE TERM AND EFFECTIVELY, AN
 2406. 'UNKNOWN PERIOD OF TIME AS LENGTH OF ENTIRE SENTENCE (WHICH ENDS EITHER BY
CANCELLING SENTENCE, ORDINARILY DONE BY APPEAL COURT, AGAINST CONVICTION,
 2407. OR CANCELLING SENTENCE WHEN SENTENCED LIFER DIES), IF LIFER IS PAROLE-
RELEASED, IS DETERMINED AS SATISFIED WHEN LIFER DIES, HENCE 'PAROLE FOR LIFE'
[SEE TEXT AT 2076, 2077, IBID] ⁶ ???
 2408. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO DOUBT IN MY MIND, THAT THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, THROUGH
ACTIONS OF ITS STATE GOVERNMENT, HAS MADE DETERMINATIONS ABOUT WHAT THEY CLAIM IS MY
'ACTUAL NON-PAROLE PERIOD TERM (IN YEARS/MONTHS), FOLLOWING MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING
 2409. [74.], AND THEY HAVE ONLY CALCULATED MY "22 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS TO DATE FROM
3. JUNE 1994." [SEE TEXT AT 1006, 1007, 1008. IBID], [74.], IN ACCORDANCE

WITH 2002 TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT (C46.J), SENTENCING STANDARDS,
WHICH, ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA,
WAS QUALIFIABLY ADMITTED BY MINISTER OF STATE, HON. JENNIFER BANKINE MP,
IN HER LETTER TO ME, DATED 22-5-2012, LETTER REFERENCE NO. 12 MCS 0110,
THEREIN STATING ON MINISTER'S CLAIM OF COMPETENCE (ALBEIT ULTRA VIRES): -

2410. "DEAR MR JARRETT

I AM WRITING TO YOU IN RESPONSE TO YOUR LETTER DATED 5 MAY 2012 IN WHICH
YOU QUESTION THE LEGAL VALIDITY OF THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD YOU ARE CURRENTLY
SERVING.

I AM ADVISED THE PAROLE BOARD WROTE TO YOU ON 7 JUNE 2010 EXPLAINING IN
DETAIL HOW YOUR NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS CALCULATED
IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT LEGISLATION. THE BOARD ALSO SUGGESTED THAT
YOU SHOULD SEEK LEGAL ADVICE IF YOU REQUIRE FURTHER CLARIFICATION OF
YOUR SENTENCE.

2411. AS THE ISSUE YOU HAVE RAISED IS A LEGAL MATTER, I AM NOT IN A POSITION
TO ASSIST YOU FURTHER.

2412. ANY DISPUTE YOU MAY HAVE WITH THE INTERPRETATION OF
LEGISLATION AS IT RELATES TO YOUR NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS A
MATTER FOR THE COURTS TO RESOLVE..."

2413. ISSUED TO ME IN 2017, FOLLOWING MY OFFICIAL REQUEST FOR COPY OF
SAME, DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
REFERENCE NO. CEN/17/0510, LETTER FROM THEM DATED 7. JULY 2017.

2414. IT IS ALMOST 'COMICAL' THAT THE MINISTER OF STATE, 'ADMITS THAT THE COURTS ARE
THE ONLY COMPETENT JURISDICTION, AND COMPETENT AUTHORITY WITHIN SAME COMPETENT
JURISDICTION, TO DEAL WITH ANY DISPUTE RELATING TO MY SENTENCE

2415. INTERPRETATION', AND YET, NOT ONLY HAS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT REFUSED TO
REFER 'THEIR CLAIMED "INTERPRETATION" TO ANY COMPETENT COURT, EVER', 'THEY ARE
STILL TRYING TO DISGUISE THEIR "INTERPRETATION" RE MY 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD', AS A

2416. 'LEGISLATIVE JUDGMENT/LEGISLATIVE INTERPRETATION',⁶ RATHER THAN ALL THAT IT ACTUALLY IS, WHICH IS A 'JUDICIAL JUDGMENT AND THAT CARRIES ONLY A JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION' ([74.], THE FULL COURT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA IS NOT FILLED WITH MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, IT IS ONLY CHAIRED BY JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME AND SUPERIOR COURTS OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA)⁹ [SEE TEXT AT 2411, 2412 ("INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATION"), 2412, IBID].

2417. FOR THE MINISTER OF STATE [SEE TEXT AT 2409. IBID], TO SO OPENLY AND BLATENTLY
 2418. STATE THAT MY "NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS CALCULATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT LEGISLATION.",
 2419. [SEE TEXT AT 2410. IBID], INVITES AND EVOKES FORMAL CHALLENGE AND COMPLAINT AGAINST 'THE S.A. GOVERNMENT FOR REFUSING TO CALCULATE MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD, ONLY ACCORDING TO JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1002, 1003, 1026. TO 1030. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], PURSUANT TO 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.]. THE CH. II [3.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS NO JURISDICTION TO RECALCULATE AND RECONSIDER AND REDEFINE ANY SENTENCING STANDARDS, TOWARD MY 2002 SENTENCE [74.], BECAUSE ONLY MY SENTENCING COURT IN 2002 OWNED SUCH JURISDICTIONAL POWER [SEE TEXT AT 2393, 2394, 2395. IBID], TO MAKE SUCH OFFICIAL ORDERS. [82. AND 83.]

2421. I AM NOT AN IDIOT, I CAN READ SIMPLE WORDS ON A PAGE [74. AND 80.], [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1029, 1030. IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1003, 1008, 1004, 1026. IBID], SO THEN, IF I CAN UNDERSTAND SUCH WORDING, AND I AM AN AVERAGE EDUCATED PERSON WHO LEFT PUBLIC SCHOOLING SHORTLY AFTER MID-YEAR 11. EXAMS, AND INCARCERATED SINCE 1992 (AS AT MID 2018, EQUATES TO 26 YEARS IN PRISON), AND
 2423. (WHEN I STARTED READING THE WORDING IN [74.], 'AS IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN MEANING, SINCE DELIVERY AND PERFECTING OF, IN 2002', I COULD NOT BELIEVE HOW ABSOLUTE THE DIRECTIVES OF THE COURT WERE, AND YET NOT UNDERSTOOD BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IN THE TRUE MEANING OF THE JUDGMENT ([74.]), WORDING,
 2424. UNTIL I STARTED INVESTIGATING 'THINGS THAT WOULD HAPPEN, TO THE ADVANTAGE OF OTHER PRISONERS, IF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ENFORCED MY TRUE SENTENCE OF [74.], WHICH IS AS I HAVE CLAIMED HEREIN, RE '2009 AS END OF 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME' [SEE TEXT AT 2401, 2402. IBID]', OVER TEN YEARS OR

2435. REPRESENTATIVES AND THEIR STATE INSTRUMENTALITIES [33.], ABOUT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STATE GOVERNMENTS' CLAIMED INTERPRETATION OF MY 2002 NON-PAROLE PERIOD CALCULATION,
2426. BUT, EVEN THOUGH THE CH. II [3.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, HAS NO COMPETENT JURISDICTION TO RE-DEFINE THE ACTUAL MEANING OF MY 2002 JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES [74.], THEY DID SO ANYWAY, CLAIMING, THEY HAD CROWN LAW ADVICE ON SAID MATTER AND I SHOULD GO AWAY AND STOP COMPLAINING TO THEM?
2427. SERIOUSLY, HOW HARD IS IT TO UNDERSTAND E TEXT AT 1001, 1004, 1029, IBID.] ?
2428. WHY HAS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CONVERTED MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], AND UNDER WHAT CONSTITUTIONAL COMPETENCE [1.], CONSIDERING MY INTERPRETATION, WHICH MARKIES TO THE DESCRIPTION AT [77.], AND FURTHER SUPPORTED BY THE FACT IN LAW, DESCRIBED AT [61.]. ("... THE DEFENDANT HAS 'NOTHING TO LOSE' BY APPEALING HIS OR HER SENTENCE. THE COURT CANNOT INCREASE SENTENCE ON A DEFENCE APPEAL, NO MATTER HOW UNTENABLE THE APPEAL MAY BE."), WHICH I HAVE EXPLAINED AND ELABORATED ON HEREIN, AND WHICH EXPANDS IN DETAIL FOR CLOSER UNDERSTANDING AND APPRECIATION, OF HOW SPECIFIC AND ABSOLUTE THE COURT WERE IN 2002 ([74.]), TO VOID [212.], IN ALL ITS EFFECTS, ARGUMENTS, DECISIONS, CONSIDERATIONS AND OUTCOMES/RULINGS [see text at 1068. TO 1114. (inclusive) IBID.] ?
2431. OBVIOUSLY, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS NEVER APPLIED AND/OR ENFORCED 'ANY ASPECT OF 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS, TO MY 2002 DELIVERED AND PERFECTED SENTENCING JUDGMENT [74.], AS THEY ONLY APPLIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT LEGISLATION' [see text at 2410. IBID.], WHICH, AT THE TIME OF SENTENCE DELIVERY AND STILL REMAINS IN FORCE NOW, IS THE 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT' [46.], BUT, IT HAS NEVER BEEN THE COMPETENT AND CONSTITUTIONALLY (CL. AND 3.]), PERMISSIBLE RIGHT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, TO REPLACE THE JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE OF THE COURT [74.], AT [80.], AND THE SUBSTANTIVE ORDERS OF THE COURT WHICH MARRY TO '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS' (AS CLEARLY DESCRIBED THROUGHOUT THIS COMPLAINT DOCUMENT), WITH '2002 TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT

SENTENCING STANDARDS ([46.]), INCLUDING/INCORPORATING ONGOING VERSIONS OF TRUTH
IN SENTENCING ACT ALSO ([46.]), IN BLATENT VIOLATION OF [78.].

2434. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.]), IS TRUSTED BY MY 2002
SENTENCING COURT, FOLLOWING MY 2002 SENTENCE DELIVERY ([74.], 9. SEP. 2002),
TO LAWFULLY ENFORCE EVERY OPERATIONAL COMPONENT AND DIRECTIVE OF SAID
SENTENCING COURT, IN COMPLIANCE ⁶ NOT JUST ^{WITH} ~~THE~~ SAID COURT'S JUDICIAL
2435. ORDERS ([74.]), OF WHICH [80. AND 78.], ARE JUDICIAL ORDERS ⁹ (AS DIRECT
2436. ORDERS OF SAID COURT ON THAT DATE OF DELIVERY ([74.], 9. SEP. 2002), THEREFORE
A STANDING ORDER OF 'THAT' DAY, BUT ALSO, AS A CARRY-OVER ORDER INTO 'THE
NEXT DAY', AND THEN ON 'THE NEXT DAY' SAID CARRY-OVER ORDER 'EXTENDS' OVER
TO 'THE NEXT DAY AGAIN', AND SO ON UNTIL THE ORIGINAL STANDING ORDER
'ARRIVES AT ITS DESTINATION', WHICH IS THE 'FINAL DAY/DATE OF MY IMPOSED
2437. AND PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER OF THE CH. III [3.] COURT', AND THE
JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE WITHIN MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], WHICH QUALIFIES MY
IMPOSED SENTENCES [SEE TEXT AT 2004. TO 2008. (INCLUSIVE), 2028. TO 2038.
(INCLUSIVE) IBID], AS FINITE, IS GROUNDED IN PARAGRAPH 14. OF THE JUDGMENT
2438. [74.], WITH THE ABSOLUTE WORDING "THIS COURT MUST APPLY THE
SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLICABLE IN 1992." [80.],

2439. AND THEREFORE,
THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF 'SECTION 12. OF THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT,
2440. 1988.' (SEE JUDGMENT [212.], PARAGRAPH 23. THEREIN, "IT IS RELEVANT TO HAVE
REGARD ALSO TO THE PROSPECT OF REMISSIONS.... THE PRISONER WILL BE ENTITLED TO
2441. REMISSIONS.... WITH REMISSIONS, THE PRISONER WILL ~~BE~~ IN ALL LIKELIHOOD BE RELEASED
AFTER SERVING 20 OF THE 30 YEARS OF THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD. HE WILL THEN BE SOME
2442. 43 YEARS OLD."'), WHICH MANDATES THE ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATION OF 'REMISSIONS
SYSTEM', WHICH INTRINSICALLY INCLUDES, INCORPORATES AND MARRIES TO THE
'AUTOMATIC PAROLE, AUTOMATIC RELEASE, PAROLE MAXIMUM AND DURATION OF 10. YEARS
2443. AND SENTENCE SATISFACTION AT POINT OF END OF TENTH YEAR OF PAROLE', MUST ALSO
BE APPLIED TO THE 'NUMERICAL DURATION OF IMPOSED SENTENCE LENGTH' [SEE TEXT
AT 1001, 1003, 1004. TO 1008. (INCLUSIVE) IBID],

2444. ⁶ BUT ALSO,
 WITH THE CONSTITUTIONAL ([1.]), OBLIGATION OF THE CH. II STATE GOVERNMENT ([3.]),
 WHICH IS TO ENFORCE THE JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES AND JUDICIAL ORDERS OF
 THE CH. III SENTENCING COURT ([3.]), [74.], WITHOUT INFLATING
 THE COURT'S SENTENCE PENALTY (UPON ME), IN ANY MANNER OR FORM,
2445. IN SIMPLE TERMS, THE COURT IMPOSED SENTENCE [74.], INCLUDED THE
 ABSOLUTE COURT'S JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE 'AT' THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN
 GOVERNMENT, OF [80.], IT THEN ENSURED NO MISINTERPRETATION OF SAME
 WITH [78.], WHICH MEANS STATE GOVERNMENT HAS NO CHOICE, NO
2446. OPTION, NO DISCRETION OPEN TO IT TO REFUSE TO COMPLY, WHICH ALSO MEANS
2447. THAT THE CALCULATION EFFECT OF 'REMISSIONS REDUCTION AT MAXIMUM
 NUMBER OF DAYS OF REMISSIONS THEY COULD HAVE EARNED HAD
2448. REMISSIONS NOT BEEN ABOLISHED' [53.], MUST BE ADMINISTRATIVELY
2449. APPLIED (SEE [75.], INDICATING APPLICATION OF "TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS" TO "28 YEARS
 AND SIX MONTHS TO 19 YEARS", AND [77.], IDENTIFYING INTENTION OF THE COURT AT
 "AND A NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 24 YEARS, WITH A REDUCTION OF 18 MONTHS FOR TIME ALREADY
 HELD IN CUSTODY AT THE TIME OF ORIGINAL SENTENCING, SHOULD BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE
 NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 28 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS FIXED BY THE SENTENCING JUDGE,
2450. [16.])", TO THE 'NUMERICAL DURATION' ([SEE TEXT AT 1003, 1005, 1008. IBID]),
 OF THE IMPOSED SENTENCE LENGTH ([SEE TEXT AT 1987. TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE), 2159. TO 2174.
 (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 1044. TO 1062. (INCLUSIVE)
 IBID]).
2451. MY SENTENCING COURT IN 2002 ([74.]), WASN'T JUST 'BLABBERING', IN OTHER WORDS,
 WHAT SAID COURT JUSTICES SPOKE IN WORDS (WHICH WAS TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM),
2452. WAS THE COURT'S INTENTIONS ('WHAT' THE COURT IS ORDERING TO BE DONE), AND IN
 PARTNERSHIP WAS THE COURT'S JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES ('HOW' THE COURT EXPECTS ITS
 SENTENCE ORDERS TO BE ADMINISTRATIVELY APPLIED/CARRIED OUT), AND IN PARTNERSHIP
2453. WAS THE COURT'S DEFINED NUMERICAL DURATION IT IMPOSED ON ME (THE 'PERIOD
 OF TIME/NPP OF TIME', TO WHICH THE 'WHAT' AND 'HOW' IS OPERATIONALLY APPLIED/ENFORCED,
 FROM WHICH (AFTER 'NPP DATE' REACHED, PAROLE-RELEASED), 'PAROLE LENGTH' AND 'THE

SATISFACTION OF WHOLE SENTENCE, PER 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS, IS OPERATIONALLY ENFORCED
[SEE TEXT AT 1604, TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]),

2454. AND,

2455. THERE IS NOTHING PERFUNCTORY IN MY SAID 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], WHICH IN ANY WAY, MANNER OR FORM, EMPOWERS OR ENTITLES OR AUTHORISES OR PERMITS THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (INCLUDING ANY EMPLOYEE OR AGENT OF/ON BEHALF OF, THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), TO DISREGARD [80.], OR TO TREAT [80.], AS MERELY 'PERFUNCTORY', OR TO OUTRIGHT DISREGARD THE COURT'S ABSOLUTE JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE AND FORMAL INSTRUCTION OF SAID COURT UPON ITSELF,
2456. AT [80.], OR TO REFUSE TO OPERATIONALLY ENSURE (AND ENFORCE ACCORDINGLY), THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTS OF THE 1992 OPERATIONAL VERSION OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT [SEE TEXT AT 1987. TO 2003 (INCLUSIVE), 1604. TO 1618 (INCLUSIVE), 1740. TO 1741. (INCLUSIVE), 1755. TO 1779. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], ([123.] TO [128.] (INCLUSIVE)), ARE PROPERLY INCORPORATED, APPLIED AND ENFORCED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT WHILST IT OVERSEES THE CARRYING-OUT OF MY
2457. SAID PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDERS [74.] (WITH SAID 'ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTS OF 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS', BEING EXPLAINED IN MORE DETAIL AT [TEXT 1965. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE), 2063, 2065. TO 2067. (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]).

2458. I POSIT A VERY SIMPLE QUESTION FOR THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AS FOLLOWS:

2459. QUESTION 1. AS [80.] IS NOT PERFUNCTORY, THEN [80.] MUST EQUATE TO
2460. 'A COURT'S AUTHORITY TO ORDER ITSELF', SO THEN, HOW HAS [80.] BEEN APPLIED TO THE COURT'S DELIVERED NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF "22 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS" [SEE TEXT AT 2443. IBID], BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, WHERE IS THE TANGIBLE PROOF
2461. 'IN CALCULATED NUMBER OF DAYS' (22 1/2 YEARS PER [80.]), TO AT LEAST SHOW THAT THE 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE IS OPERATIONALLY CALCULATED ACCORDING TO 1992 SENTENCING
2462. STANDARDS', THEREBY EFFECTING AN ADMINISTRATIVELY TRUE DATE AS THE NPP DATE OF LAWFULLY OBTAINABLE PAROLE-RELEASE' [SEE TEXT AT 1986. TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]?

2463. THE POINT BEING MADE, IS THAT THE COURT, IN ITS' ORIGINAL JUDGMENT, CROWN'S
 APPEAL (1994), AND MY 2002 APPEAL [SEE TEXT AT 986. IBID], ALL DETERMINED AND
 DELIVERED AND IMPOSED 'THEIR' RESPECTIVE SENTENCING JUDGMENTS, PURSUANT TO AND IN
 ACCORDANCE WITH 'THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS' [SEE TEXT AT 2004,
 2464. IBID], WHEREBY MY FIRST AND SECOND 'SENTENCING HEARINGS' (DESCRIBED IN
 [75.]), WERE BOTH DELIVERED AT THE TIME WHEN THE OPERATIONAL SENTENCING
 STANDARDS (PRIOR TO 1-8-1994), OF THAT PERIOD, WERE THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE
 2465. ACT, BUT, MY THIRD 'SENTENCING HEARING' ([74.]), FORCED 'ITSELF' TO
 ABROGATE 2002 SENTENCING STANDARDS (WHICH BY SA STATUTE WERE THE 'TRUTH
 IN SENTENCING ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS' ([46.], 2002 VERSION)), WITH THE
 JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE [80.], [SEE TEXT AT 1001. IBID], AND THE JUDICIAL QUALIFIER
 2466. AT [78.], [SEE TEXT AT 1004. IBID], THAT WAY THE COURT WAS THEN ONLY PERMITTED
 TO APPLY THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT NON-PAROLE PERIOD CALCULATION FORMULA,
 THAT EXISTED, AND, WAS ACTUALLY OPERATIONAL IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA AT THE TIME, OF THE
 YEAR "1992" [80.], EFFECTIVELY, AND ALSO FROM THE 'GOVERNMENT'S ADMINISTRATIVE'
 2467. AND 'GOVERNMENT'S SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT' PERSPECTIVE, THE 2002 RE-SENTENCING
 2468. COURT JUDGMENT [74.], WAS THEN (IN 2002), AND IS STILL NOW (UNTIL FULL
 SATISFACTION OF ENTIRE IMPOSED SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1002, 1003, 1005,
 1008, 1986. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE), 1029. TO 1030. (INCLUSIVE), 1611. TO 1618.
 2469. (INCLUSIVE), 2188. TO 2196. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), JUDICIALLY ORDERED (PER. [80.]),
 TO APPLY THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT NON-PAROLE PERIOD CALCULATION FORMULA,
 2470. IN THE SAME WAY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT CORRECTLY 'APPLIED' (TO MY
 2471. ORIGINAL AND CCA RE-SENTENCING JUDGMENTS [SEE TEXT AT 2004. IBID]), THE
EFFECTIVE TERM OF NON-PAROLE PERIOD CALCULATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
 2472. (STATUTORY FORMULA FOR AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT EARLIEST RELEASE DATE, SEE
 2473. [126.] WORDING), AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT (SEE ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], THEREIN
 2474. PARAGRAPH 20.), SENTENCING STANDARDS, TO MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING [SEE TEXT AT 2004,
 987. TO 988. (INCLUSIVE), 995. TO 997. (INCLUSIVE), 2063, 2257. TO 2265.
 (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [75. AND 77.], AND, TO THE CROWN'S APPEAL RE-SENTENCING [SEE
TEXT AT 2004, 989. TO 990. (INCLUSIVE), 998. TO 1000. (INCLUSIVE), 2063, 984,

980. TO 983. (INCLUSIVE), 1011. TO 1016. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [75.]'.

2475. THERE IS LITERALLY NO PROOF/NO EVIDENCE, IN ANY ADMINISTRATIVE
 (GOVERNMENT CUSTODY RECORDS OF ME), OPERATIONAL (GOVERNMENT CUSTODY RECORDS OF ME),
 MATERIAL/SUBSTANTIVE (GOVERNMENT CUSTODY RECORDS OF ME), OR EFFECTIVE (GOVERNMENT
 CUSTODY RECORDS OF ME), FORM, TO VERIFY AND/OR QUALIFY, ON THIS DATE AND AT
 THIS TIME, BEING JULY 2018 (APPROXIMATELY 16 YEARS AFTER DELIVERY OF MY 2002
 2476. JUDGMENT), THAT THE JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE AT [80.], (PARAGRAPH 14. OF [74.]),
HAS EVER BEEN COMPLIED WITH, FOLLOWED THROUGH WITH, APPLIED, ENFORCED, EFFECTED
INTO NUMERICAL ~~████████~~ CALCULATION OF ACTUAL NUMBER OF YEARS AND DAYS BEING MY TRUE
 2477. NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME, WHICH IS INCREDIBLE CONSIDERING THE ABSOLUTE JURISDICTION
 OF THE CH. III COURT [3.], WHEN IT SAT AS A RE-SENTENCING COURT (IN CRIMINAL
 2478. JURISDICTION, [74.], IN 2002), BUT SOMEHOW, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT
HAS IN EVERY RESPECT, REFUSED TO RECOGNISE ANY OPERATIONAL OUTCOME WHICH
 2479. ACTUALLY SATISFIES THE SAID JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE [80.], AND WHEN CHALLENGED BY
 ME VIA LETTER, DIRECT TO THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES MINISTER, IN 2012, ONE OF THE
 2480. REPLY LETTERS FROM GOVERNMENT MINISTER J. RANKINE, INCLUDED THAT I AM NOT
ENTITLED TO ANY OF THE SENTENCING PROVISIONS THAT EXISTED
PRIOR TO THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT, AND THEREFORE,
IN ^{ACCORDANCE} ~~████████~~ WITH THE TRUTH IN ~~SENT~~ SENTENCING ACT, YOUR
NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 22½ YEARS IS CALCULATED TO END IN
NOVEMBER 2016'.

2481. AS ALREADY PROVEN IN THE WORDING ~~██~~ OF MINISTER'S LETTER TO ME IN 2012 [SEE TEXT
 AT 2408. TO 2413. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS NO
 INTENTION OF EVER APPLYING THE MATHEMATICAL FORMULA, OF THE '1992
 2482. AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS ([SEE TEXT AT 1604. TO 1652. (INCLUSIVE),
 1937. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE), 2004. TO 2011. (INCLUSIVE), 2018. TO
 2483. 2039. (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID])', TO MY DELIVERED SENTENCE [74.].
 2484. THE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIM BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, OVER MY 2002
 JUDGMENT [74.], IS CRIMINALLY FALSE AND FRAUDULENT, AND I AM THE VICTIM OF STATE
 GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION INTENDED TO DENY ME ONLY MY JUDICIAL SENTENCE (BE ENFORCED).

DISTINCTION FROM JULIAN KNIGHT APPEAL

2485. IN AUGUST 2017, THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA DELIVERED THEIR JUDGMENT, KNIGHT V. VICTORIA [2017] HCA 29, 17 AUGUST 2017, M251/2015 [SEE ALSO, TEXT AT ■ 2082. TO 2084. (INCLUSIVE) IBID].

2486. THE BASIS FOR THE KNIGHT APPEAL, IN SHORT, WAS:

2487. KNIGHT JUDGMENT, THEREIN PARAGRAPH 4.

"BY SPECIAL CASE IN A PROCEEDING BROUGHT BY MR KNIGHT AGAINST THE STATE OF VICTORIA AND THE ADULT PAROLE BOARD IN THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF THE HIGH COURT, A SINGLE SUBSTANTIVE QUESTION HAS BEEN STATED FOR THE OPINION OF THE FULL COURT. IS s 74AA INVALID ON THE GROUND THAT IT IS CONTRARY TO CH III OF THE CONSTITUTION?"

2488. KNIGHT JUDGMENT, THEREIN PARAGRAPH 5.

"IN SUPPORT OF AN AFFIRMATIVE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION, MR KNIGHT ADVANCES TWO DISCRETE ARGUMENTS. EACH SEEKS A DIFFERENT WAY TO INVOKE THE PRINCIPLE, ASSOCIATED WITH KABLE V DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS (NSW)¹, THAT A LAW WHICH SUBSTANTIALLY IMPAIRS THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY OF A COURT SO AS TO BE INCOMPATIBLE WITH ITS ROLE AS A REPOSITORY OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION UNDER CH III OF THE CONSTITUTION IS INVALID². THE FIRST ARGUMENT IS THAT THE SECTION INTERFERES WITH THE SENTENCES IMPOSED BY THE SUPREME COURT."

2489. KNIGHT HAS BEEN CHARACTERISED IN MORE DETAIL WITHIN PART 10. (IBID), BUT THERE ARE SOME FEATURES OF SAID ■ JUDGMENT [SEE TEXT AT 2485, IBID], WHICH I THINK DRAW ADDITIONAL ATTENTION.

2490. WHEN KNIGHT WAS SENTENCED, HAMPEL J "CORRECTLY CHARACTERISED A MINIMUM TERM

2491. NOT AS A PERIOD AT THE END OF WHICH THE PRISONER WAS TO BE RELEASED BUT RATHER AS "A PERIOD BEFORE THE EXPIRATION OF WHICH, ... HE CANNOT BE RELEASED"³, [SEE TEXT AT 2485 (KNIGHT JUDGMENT, PARAGRAPH 8.); IBID],

2492. WHEREAS,

IN MY ORIGINAL SENTENCING [SEE TEXT AT 2258. IBID], IN 1994, AND CROWN'S AREAL IN 1994 [212.], THE OPERATIONALLY ACTIVE AND RELEVANT SENTENCING STANDARDS (THE

AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, REFER ANDREWS [207.], PARAGRAPH 15, 19. AND 20. THEREIN),

2493. DID VERY CLEARLY IDENTIFY AND CHARACTERISE MY 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD', AS A NON-PAROLE

PERIOD OF TIME AT THE EXPIRATION OF WHICH I AM TO BE RELEASED ON PAROLE (PURSUANT TO

AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS), (ORIGINAL ON 3-6-1994, [212.] ON 29-7-1994),

2494. SEE ALSO,

[139.], [75.], [77.], [80.], [126.], [137.], [53.], [44.], [45.],

2495. SEE ALSO,

FROM ORIGINAL SENTENCING REMARKS [SEE TEXT AT 2258. IBID], [SEE TEXT AT 2263, 2264.

IBID], AND FOLLOWING ON FROM TEXT [AT 2264. IBID], "... COURSE TO TAKE,

BUT I DO BEAR IN MIND THAT YOU MAY NOT BE ENTITLED TO AUTOMATIC RELEASE

FROM PRISON AT THE END OF THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD AND ALSO THAT

THE PERIOD WHICH I FIX IS LIKELY TO BE REDUCED BY OPERATION OF LAW,"

2496. AND,

FROM ORIGINAL SENTENCING REMARKS [SEE TEXT AT 2258. IBID], "HAVING REGARD TO ALL

OF THESE MATERS AND TO THE SUBMISSIONS OF BOTH COUNSEL I CONSIDER THAT THE

APPROPRIATE NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS 30 YEARS.

2497. IN VIEW OF THE TIME YOU HAVE SPENT IN CUSTODY I REDUCE THAT PERIOD BY 18 MONTHS AS

THE NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS TO COMMENCE FROM TODAY.

2498. I FIX A NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 28 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS TO COMMENCE FROM THIS DAY,"

2499. AND,

FROM ORIGINAL SENTENCING REMARKS [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2261. IBID], THERE IS NO

AMBIGUITY IN THE CLEAR DESCRIPTION BY SENTENCING JUSTICE MULLIGHAN, WHEREIN THE

2500. SENTENCING JUSTICE, WITHIN THE FOUNDATION OF THE IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE OF "LIFE"

[SEE TEXT AT 2259, 1604. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], IDENTIFIED THAT THE EXISTING

SENTENCING STANDARDS RELEVANT TO THE CREATION, CONSIDERATION, CONSTRUCTION AND

2501. IMPOSITION OF (HEAD-SENTENCE, BEFORE 'NPP WAS DETERMINED, THEN, AFTER IMPOSING

THE HEAD-SENTENCE, SAME SENTENCING STANDARDS APPLIED TO DETERMINE AND IMPOSE THE

ORIGINAL NON-PAROLE PERIOD (OF TIME), [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2261, 2263, 2265,
 2502. 2496. TO 2498 (INCLUSIVE) IBID], [75.], MY IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE,
 WHICH OBLIGATED THE STATE GOVERNMENT TO RELEASE ME ON PAROLE AT THE END OF
 MY COURT DETERMINED NON-PAROLE PERIOD, WHICH, PER STATUTORY MANDATE (AUTOMATIC
 PAROLE ACT), THEREFORE AND THEREAFTER (UNTIL IMPOSED SENTENCE IS SATISFIED), INCLUDED
 ADMINISTRATIVE REDUCTION OF 'ACTUAL PERIOD OF TIME IN A PRISON/CORRECTIONAL FACILITY',
 PRIOR TO BEING PAROLE-RELEASED ("NON-PAROLE PERIOD WHICH IS REDUCED BY REMISSIONS FOR
 GOOD BEHAVIOUR." [SEE TEXT AT 2261. IBID]),
 2503. AND, [RETURN TO 2492. AND 2493 AND RESTATE], ALSO,
 IN MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING JUDGMENT [74.], THE OPERATIONALLY ACTIVE AND
 RELEVANT SENTENCING STANDARDS (THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, REFER ANDREWS [207.],
 2504. PARAGRAPHS 15, 19, AND 20. THEREIN), WHICH THAT SENTENCING COURT DID VERY CLEARLY AND
 QUALIFIABLY DEFINE AS 'THE ONLY RELEVANT SENTENCING STANDARDS FOR CREATION,
 CONSIDERATION, CONSTRUCTION AND IMPOSITION OF MY NEWLY IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF
 TIME', AND WITH POSITIVE AND CLARIFYING WORDING [80.], [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1002,
 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008. IBID], SO AS TO EASILY UNDERSTAND NOT JUST THE
 COURT'S INTENTIONS, BUT ALSO TO CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE COURT'S JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES,
 2505. ESPECIALLY AT [80.] AND [78.], DIDN'T JUST CHARACTERISE MY NEW NON-PAROLE
 PERIOD AS, 'A NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME AT THE EXPIRATION OF WHICH I AM TO BE
 RELEASED ON PAROLE (PURSUANT TO THE 1992 VERSION OF THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT
 2506. SENTENCING STANDARDS)', THAT COURT IN FACT JUDICIALLY ORDERED THAT 1992
 SENTENCING STANDARDS MUST APPLY, AND, BE APPLIED, TO THE
 NUMERICAL DURATION OF IMPOSED SENTENCE LENGTH WHICH 'IT'
 DELIVERS [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1003, 1004. TO 1008. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], JUST AS
 IF MY 2002 ([74.]), ORDERED SENTENCE LENGTH OF '22½ YEARS' [SEE TEXT
 AT 1001, 1008. IBID], HAD BEEN ACTUALLY SAID IN '1992', OR EVEN ON THE
 DATE OF ORIGINAL SENTENCING [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2259, 2261. IBID],
 2507. AND THEREFORE,
 JUDICIALLY ORDERING THAT 'ITS' DELIVERED TERM OF "22 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS" [SEE
 TEXT AT 1001, 1002, 1004, 1008. IBID], AS MY 'NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME', IS

ADMINISTRATIVELY OBSERVED AND ENFORCED AGAINST ME (BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, WHO IS OBLIGATED TO, AND RESPONSIBLE FOR, THE CARRYING-OUT ENFORCEMENT OF MY COURT IMPOSED SENTENCES, COMPLIANTLY WITH DIRECTED COURT SENTENCING ORDERS, CONSISTENT WITH INTENTIONS DEFINED WITHIN [74.]), STRICTLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE '1992 VERSION OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT NON-PAROLE PERIOD CALCULATION FORMULA',

2509. WITH THE '1992 VERSION OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT PAROLE PERIOD CALCULATION FORMULA',

2510. WITH THE '1992 VERSION OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCE SATISFACTION CALCULATION FORMULA',

2511. SO THAT,

MY 2002 ~~SENTENCE~~ / SENTENCE [74.], IS IN ALL PRACTICAL RESPECTS (PER AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS AS MY ONLY EXISTING SENTENCES), A COURT ORDERED AND IMPOSED FINITE/FIXED-TERM SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 1985, TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE), 1964. TO 1982. (INCLUSIVE), 2061, 2063, 2065. TO 2067. (INCLUSIVE), 2159. TO 2174. (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE), 2219. TO 2228. (INCLUSIVE), 2230. TO 2240. (INCLUSIVE). IBID].

REMAINING MATTERS

2512. A CRIMINAL JURISDICTION SENTENCING COURT, HAS, IN EVERY RELEVANT REGARD, AND WHEN IT IS "CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPETENT" (TO SO ACT), ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION WHEN ITS INTENTION AND PRACTICAL ACTION ARE TO SENTENCE/RE-SENTENCE
2513. ME, CONSEQUENTIAL TO MY CONVICTION FOR MURDER IN 1994. THE COMPETENT CH. III COURT ([3.]), AND NO OTHER KNOWN ENTITY/BODY (INCLUDING FROM ANYWHERE WITHIN CH. I OR CH. II [3.], WITHIN THE OPERATIONAL EXISTENCE OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND ITS THEREIN AND WITHIN INCORPORATED ENTITIES/AGENCIES), MUST IMPOSE A LEGALLY ENFORCEABLE SENTENCE UPON ME, WHICH, AT PRESENT, IS PERFECTED AS [74.].
2514. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS NEVER ACCEPTED THE JUDICIAL
2515. DIRECTIVE OF SAID SENTENCING COURT IN 2002, AT [80.], 'REALISING THAT IF THEY HAD ACCEPTED [80.], THEN ENFORCED MY IMPOSED SENTENCE ([74.]), ACCORDING TO
2516. "1992" SENTENCING FOUNDATION, THEN, NOT ONLY WOULD STATE GOVERNMENT HAVE TO PAROLE-RELEASE ME IN 2009, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS AND ENTITLEMENTS SO OWNED BY ME ([74. AND 80.]), IT WOULD MEAN THAT OTHER LIFERS WHO WERE RIGHTLY SENTENCED PER AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS, WOULD ALSO HAVE TO BE PAROLE-RELEASED UNDER ADMINISTRATIVE OBLIGATIONS LEGISLATED INTO THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE
2517. ACT (REFER ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPHS 15, 19. AND 20.)?. IT LOOKS LIKE THE STATE GOVERNMENT HAS THEREFORE CRIMINALLY MANIPULATED ITS ACTUAL JURISDICTION
2518. OVER ME, AS THE 'ENFORCER OF SENTENCE' (STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), TO WAIT UNTIL THE COURT HEARING WAS FINISHED, THE JUDGMENT AND ORDERS OF THE COURT PERFECTED AS
2519. [74.], AND THEN, AFTER THE COURT PROCESS WAS DONE AND MY LAWYER NO LONGER ACTIVELY NEEDED TO REPRESENT ME FOR THE COURT APPEAL (WHICH BASICALLY MEANT BY CLOSE
2520. OF BUSINESS ON THE DAY THE JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED, [74.], 9-9-2002), TO THEN FALSELY AND FRAUDULENTLY MISLEAD ME (THE PRISONER IN THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S CUSTODY), IN OTHER WORDS KNOWING WHAT THEY WERE TELLING ME WAS NOT LAWFULLY ACCURATE, BUT, SAYING IT TO ME AND PRESENTING (BY DOCUMENT), IT TO ME KNOWING IT ^{WAS} ERRONEOUS,

2521. THAT WAY THEY COULD ADMINISTRATIVELY (THROUGH ACTIONS, DETERMINATIONS, AND DOCUMENTS SENT TO ME, BY THE OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, RELATING TO ME BEING HELD IN PRISON UNDER SENTENCE, THE SOUTH
2522. AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AND ITS RELEVANT EMPLOYEES/AGENTS), STOP ME FROM REALISING THE TRUTH OF THEIR FRAUDULENT ACTIONS ABOUT MY TRUE NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE, WHICH WAS ACTUALLY 2009, PER [80.], CORRECTLY APPLIED TO 22½ YEARS (FROM [74.]), RATHER THAN THEIR CRIMINALLY DECEPTIVE AND JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT RE-INTERPRETATION TO '2016 NON-PAROLE PERIOD'.
2523. YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE TO GUESS ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT I AM ACCURATE IN MY ACCUSATION, ESPECIALLY WHEN QUALIFICATION PROOF ALREADY EXISTS, FROM THE COURT OF RE-SENTENCING (IT'S ALSO KNOWN AS MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], [SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1003, 1005, 1008, 1004. IBID]), AND FROM THE MINISTER OF STATE [SEE TEXT AT 2408. TO 2413 (INCLUSIVE), 2410 (EMPHASIS ADDED) IBID].
2524. ISN'T IT SERIOUSLY QUESTIONABLE, THAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT NEVER QUESTIONED THE JUSTICES OF THE FULL COURT, DURING MY ACTUAL RE-SENTENCING HEARING IN 2002, FOR CALENDER DATE CLARIFICATION OF 'EXACTLY WHAT THE COURT OPERATIONALLY AND ENFORCEABLY MEANT WITH THE WORDING AT [78.],
2525. AND [80.]', YET, EVEN IF THE STATE GOVERNMENT DID NOT REALISE THEIR POSSIBLE MISINTERPRETATION OF MY ACTUAL AND CALENDER TRUE DATE OF NON-PAROLE PERIOD END, UNTIL I ACTIVELY STARTED WRITING LETTERS TO SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PAROLE BOARD, AND OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS/AGENTS, APPROXIMATELY 2007 (OR
2526. THEREABOUTS), THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA WAS IN FACT CONSTITUTIONALLY OBLIGATED [1. AND 3.], TO APPLY TO THE COURT FOR SENTENCE CLARIFICATION, WHICH, PER STATUTORY RIGHT, I HAVE A JUDICIALLY PROTECTED RIGHT TO HAVE MY COMPLAINT HEARD BY A COMPETENT COURT, AND, THAT I AM NOT CHARGED MONEY, RE COURT FEES, FOR THE COURT TO HEAR MY COMPLAINT
2527. AGAINST THE STATE, RE THE STATE STOLE THE LAWFULLY ENFORCEABLE SENTENCE WHICH THE COURT IMPOSED, THEN ILLEGALLY REPLACED THE 'ENFORCEABLE SENTENCE' [74.], PER [80.], WITH ITS OWN VERSION, INCLUDING BEING AN ~~ILLEGAL~~

ADDITIONAL 7. YEARS WHICH THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ILLEGALLY ADDED TO MY JUDICIALLY ORDERED NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME [SEE TEXT AT 1965, TO 2006. (INCLUSIVE), 2053, TO 2077. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]'.

2528. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IS OBLIGATED TO ENFORCE ONLY MY SENTENCING COURT ORDERED SENTENCE, AGAINST ME, SO WHY THEN DID THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT NOT FOLLOW PROTOCOL AS JUDICIALLY OBLIGATED, PER INTENTIONS OF PARLIAMENT, IN THE STATUTORY GATEWAY FOR 'SENTENCE CLARIFICATION'?

2529. SEE [34.], 2006 VERSION : (THEREIN)

"DIVISION 1. - PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS

2530. 9A - RECTIFICATION OF SENTENCING ERRORS

2531. (1) A COURT THAT IMPOSES A SENTENCE ON A DEFENDANT, OR A COURT OF CO-ORDINATE JURISDICTION, MAY, ON APPLICATION BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS OR THE DEFENDANT, MAKE SUCH ORDERS AS THE COURT IS SATISFIED ARE REQUIRED TO RECTIFY AN ERROR OF A TECHNICAL NATURE MADE BY THE SENTENCING COURT IN IMPOSING THE SENTENCE, OR TO SUPPLY A DEFICIENCY OR REMOVE AN AMBIGUITY IN THE ~~SENTENCING~~ SENTENCING ORDER.

2532. (2) THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS AND THE DEFENDANT ARE BOTH PARTIES TO AN APPLICATION UNDER THIS SECTION.

2533. 9B - PRESENCE OF DEFENDANT DURING SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS

2534. (1) SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS, A DEFENDANT WHO IS TO BE SENTENCED FOR AN INDICTABLE OFFENCE MUST BE PRESENT WHEN THE SENTENCE IS IMPOSED AND THROUGHOUT ALL PROCEEDINGS RELEVANT TO THE DETERMINATION OF SENTENCE."

2535. AS I HAVE ALREADY HIGHLIGHTED MANY TIMES HEREIN, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT NEVER HELD JURISDICTION, TO THEN CLAIM OWNERSHIP OVER 'THE TRUE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TRUE OPERATIONALLY ENFORCEABLE MEANING/INTERPRETATION OF THE WORDING OF MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.]', AS THE STATE GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.]), MUST FOLLOW CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS [1.], AS CLEARLY STATED AT [TEXT AT 2531, 2534. IBID], AND ALWAYS ACT ACCORDING TO [45.], IN THAT THE COURT (CH. III [3.]), ALONE ACTUALLY OWNS THE POWER TO SENTENCE ME, AS WELL

2537. AS THE MEANING/INTERPRETATION OF AN IMPOSED SENTENCE,
IN OTHER WORDS,

AT NO TIME CAN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT EVER OWN OR HOLD JURISDICTION,
OVER THAT WHICH IS OWNED BY MY SENTENCING COURT, RELATING TO THE

2538. MEANING AND TRUE INTERPRETATION (WHERE INTERPRETATION IS THE UNDERSTANDING OF
THE LITERAL WORDS OF MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], AND HOW THEY LITERALLY

2539. AFFECT ME, AND WHERE AND WHAT MY RIGHTS ARE, ETC.), AND EFFECT OF MY 2002

SENTENCING JUDGMENT PROPER [74.], PLUS ALL JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES THEREIN

(INCLUDING [78. AND 80.]), AND ANY OTHER JUDICIAL/COURT REGISTRY STATED

2540. ORDERS BORNE FROM SAME JUDGMENT, AS THE COURT MUST OWN AND
EXPLAIN SUCH MEANING, INTERPRETATION, UNTIL BOTH SIDES (ME, THE SENTENCED
PRISONER, AND THEM, THE ENFORCER OF SENTENCE), UNDERSTAND SAID SENTENCING

2541. JUDGMENT/ORDERS IN FULL EFFECT, PER [34., 36., 37., 38., 44. AND 45.], AND IF
NOT SUFFICIENTLY EXPLAINED OR A LATER 'ISSUE' APPEARS (SUCH AS ME

WRITING COMPLAINT LETTERS TO STATE GOVERNMENT ABOUT HOW
GOVERNMENT MISINTERPRETED MY 2002 SENTENCE ORDERS [74.]⁸;

THEN PER. [TEXT AT 2529. TO 2534. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.], OR SIMILAR COURT APPROACH.

2542. HOW CURIOUS THAT THERE WAS NO AMBIGUITY OR LEGAL ERROR IN MY 2002

SENTENCE JUDGMENT [74.], YET STATE REFUSED TO ASK COURT [SEE TEXT AT

2531. IBID.], TO FURTHER EXPLAIN/SPECIFY (LITERALLY, TO THE CALENDAR DATE), THAT

WHICH THE FULL COURT HAD ALREADY SUFFICIENTLY PARTICULARISED, EXPLAINED⁹

IDENTIFIED, DIRECTED AND ORDERED, ESPECIALLY AT [78.], AND [80.]?!¹⁰!

2543. AS I HAVE EXPLAINED AND IDENTIFIED THROUGHOUT THIS DOCUMENT, MY ORIGINAL
SENTENCE (HEAD-SENTENCE), AND MY EXISTING NON-PAROLE PERIOD (PER. [74.]), ARE

2544. JUDICIALLY ORDERED FINITE/FIXED PERIOD ORDERS OF COMPETENT COURTS,
WITH A 'LIMITED/RESTRICTED DEGREE OF PERIOD INCREASE', DEPENDING ON MY⁶

SPECIFIC ACTIONS⁹, NOT BY ANY RIGHT OR DISCRETION HELD BY THE STATE (ACCORDING

2545. TO WHAT THE STATE THINKS IT OWNS), AND⁶, IT IS IN FACT ME LITERALLY SIGNING
(AS A FINAL NOTE OF AGREEMENT), MY PAROLE-RELEASE CONDITIONS⁹, AS INDICATED

2546. IN ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPH 20:

“66.(5) A PRISONER SHALL NOT BE RELEASED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION UNTIL -

AND

B) THE PRISONER HAS ACCEPTED THOSE CONDITIONS IN WRITING.

(7) IF, AFTER CARRYING OUT A REVIEW....,

THE BOARD MAY ORDER THE RELEASE OF THE PRISONER FROM PRISON ON PAROLE
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS ACT UPON THE WRITTEN ACCEPTANCE BY THE
PRISONER OF THOSE CONDITIONS.”

2547. EVEN THOUGH MY HEAD-SENTENCE AND NPP ([74. AND 80.]), ARE JUDICIALLY ORDERED
TO BE CARRIED-OUT PURSUANT TO AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS, I

2548. STILL HAD TO SIGN MY PAROLE CONDITIONS NOTICE BEFORE I COULD BE RELEASED. THAT
BECOMES IMPOSSIBLE TO DO THOUGH IF THE STATE GOVERNMENT LIES TO ME AND DENIES
ME, BY APPROXIMATELY 7½ YEARS, MY COURT ORDERED AND CALCULATED [77. AND
80.], NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE [SEE TEXT AT 1946. TO 1963. (INCLUSIVE), 1965.

2549. TO 1980. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]. DUE TO ME HAVING TO BATTLE
THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S THEFT OF MY COURT ORDERED NPP TRUE EFFECT ([74.]),
I CAN ONLY SUBMIT MY PAROLE APPLICATION [SEE TEXT AT 1982. TO 1984. (INCLUSIVE) IBID],
ONCE THIS DOCUMENT IS FINISHED.

2550. THE PRINCIPLE OF FINALITY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CRIMINAL LAW
SENTENCING, EFFECTIVELY MEANS NOT JUST COURT SENTENCING ACTIONS, BUT ALSO
THAT ONCE SETTLED, THE SENTENCE UPON ME STANDS UNTOUCHABLE

2551. UNLESS BY RESPECTIVE COMPETENT COURT'. THAT MEANS, MY ORDERED HEAD-
SENTENCE, PER AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, CANNOT MEAN 'PAROLE FOR LIFE',
AS PARLIAMENT AND STATE HAVE NO JURISDICTION TO VETO THE MAXIMUM
IMPACT OF MY SENTENCES TO MY LIBERTY, AS REINFORCED IN 2002
BY MY NEW NPP ORDERS [74.], [78.], [75., 77. AND 80.].

2552. UNLIKE IN ANDREWS [207.], WHO WAS REQUESTING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF HIS
SENTENCE (DELIVERED PRIOR TO 1-8-1994, [46.]), 'STATUS' UNDER CERTAIN

CIRCUMSTANCES, AND, IN MY OPINION, AN UNDER-DEVELOPED POINT OF ARGUMENT,
 2553. I, IN FACT HAD A NEW NPP FIX, AND CLEARLY REMOVING SPECIFIC STANDARDS,
 SO AS TO EMPHATICALLY RE-IMPOSE THE TRUE AND VALID STANDARDS OF
 SENTENCING FORMULA, AS MY ACTUAL SENTENCE, THEREBY MANDATING ENFORCEMENT
 OF SUCH FORMULA AND THERETO ANCHORED SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS OWNED BY ME.

2554. "THE FACT THAT PARLIAMENT TURNED ITS MIND TO, AND PRESERVED THOSE ASPECTS OF THE
AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT, IS A FURTHER INDICATION THAT IT DID NOT INTEND TO PRESERVE
ANY RIGHT OF AUTOMATIC RELEASE FOR THOSE SENTENCED WHEN THE AUTOMATIC PAROLE
 ACT WAS STILL IN OPERATION."

* IN ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPH 33.

2555. THE PREVIOUS QUOTE HIGHLIGHTS HOW, EVEN THOUGH A NPP IS ACTUALLY PART OF A SENTENCE,
 AND A SENTENCE ON A LIFER (CONVICTED OF MURDER), INCLUDING NPP DATE, NPP OF TIME,
 APPLICABLE SENTENCING STANDARDS, ARE ONLY IMPOSED BY A CH. III COURT ([3.]),

2556. IT WAS THE ABSOLUTE INTENTION OF PARLIAMENT AND STATE, TO TAKE AWAY THE COURT'S
 JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE FROM RESPECTIVELY SENTENCED LIFERS, THEIR ALREADY
 IMPOSED SENTENCES, OF 'LIFE', WHICH WERE QUALIFIED AND PERFECTED PURSUANT
 TO 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS' [SEE TEXT AT 1603. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE)

2557. IBID], WHICH, IN EFFECT BECAME A FINITE SENTENCE, AND RADICALLY EMPOWERED SUCH
 SENTENCED LIFERS, INCLUDING ME, WITH SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS NOT PREVIOUSLY HELD

2558. BY LIFERS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA. CURRENTLY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, STARTING IN
 APPROXIMATELY 2016, PAROLE DURATION CHANGED FROM 'MAXIMUM 10 YEARS', TO
 'PAROLE FOR REST OF LIFE', WHICH EQUATES TO A FUNDAMENTAL AND MASSIVE
 INCREASE, IN REAL TIME (LENGTH OF TIME), TO THE MAXIMUM PENALTY THAT WAS
 PERMITTED TO BE ENFORCED AGAINST ME BY 'SENTENCE ENFORCER' (STATE GOVERNMENT
 OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA), ACCORDING TO THE PERFECTED SENTENCING ORDER [74.].

2559. THE ARBITRARY EFFECT OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW CHANGES TO CORRECTIONAL
 SERVICES ACT, S.A., MEAN THAT THE STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT HAVE
 INVALIDATED MY ORIGINAL SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2258. TO 2259. (INCLUSIVE),

2560. 2261, 2032. TO 2039. (INCLUSIVE), 2001. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], NOT LAWFULLY

2561. THOUGH, BUT BY FRAUDULENT AND ULTRA VIRES MEANS [82. AND 83.], AND AT THE LEAST OF

SUCH ABUSES AGAINST RE-SENTENCING ME WITHOUT JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE, WAS THE
 FACT THAT I WAS DENIED INPUT REGARDING THE NEW EFFECT UPON MY
 SUBSTANTIVELY ORDERED, IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCE ([74.,
 2562. 77., 78., 80. AND 45.]), IRRESPECTIVE OF MY RIGHT TO BE PRESENT DURING "AND
 THROUGHOUT ALL PROCEEDINGS RELEVANT TO THE DETERMINATION OF SENTENCE" [SEE
 2563. TEXT AT 2533, 2534. IBID], AND THE REASON FOR ME NOT HAVING RIGHT OF INPUT
 AFFORDED, IS ^{THAT} A COMPETENT COURT WAS NOT USED TO CHANGE LEGITIMATE IMPACT
 AND PENALTY ^{OF} COURT'S SENTENCE [74.], INSTEAD IT WAS STATE PARLIAMENT AND
 STATE GOVERNMENT (CH. I AND CH. II [3.]), VIA STATUTE AMENDMENTS,
 2564. THEREFORE,
 I AM CURRENTLY SERVING A FALSE/FAKE SENTENCE, DETERMINED AND CREATED
 2565. AND ADMINISTERED BY ITS CREATOR, THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, RATHER
 THAN SERVING MY ONLY LAWFULLY DETERMINED AND DELIVERED AND IMPOSED AND PERFECTED
 SENTENCING ORDERS, SEALED AS SUCH BY ITS CREATOR, THE FULL COURT OF SOUTH
 2566. AUSTRALIA, SITTING AS MY RE-SENTENCING COURT IN 2002 [74.]. WHAT IS ALSO
 INCREDIBLE IS THAT MY SENTENCE IN CRIMINAL JURISDICTION ([74.]), CAN ONLY BE
 'PENALTY INCREASED' WITHIN CH. III [3.], COURTS, AND NEVER FROM WITHIN
 OPERATION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT OR ITS DEPARTMENTED AGENCIES, WHICH
 2567. EXIST ONLY AS ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, NEVER CRIMINAL LAW JURISDICTION, SO THAT,
 EVEN THOUGH THE STATE GOVERNMENT AMENDS CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, S.A., FOR
 "PROSPECTIVE OPERATION" (ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPH 27.), ONLY,
 SO AS TO "APPLY EQUALLY TO ALL PRISONERS, WHETHER SENTENCED BEFORE OR AFTER ITS
 COMMENCEMENT, AND IS, THEREFORE, ONLY MEANT TO OPERATE PROSPECTIVELY.... THAT EVEN
 IF THAT WERE NOT SO, THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT CLEARLY SHOWS AN INTENTION TO
 DISPLACE THE PRESUMPTION AGAINST RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION," (ANDREWS JUDGMENT
 2568. [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPH 26.), [131., 135. AND 196.],
 2569. IT LOOKS AS IF THE STATE GOVERNMENT IS 'OPERATIONALLY APPLYING THE ADMINISTRATIVE
 2570. JURISDICTION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, S.A. (INCORPORATING 2002 VERSION OF
 2571. 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT', AND 2016 AMENDMENTS [140., 151. AND 156.]), AS IF THE
CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT WAS AND IS A SENTENCING AND ADMINISTRATION OF SENTENCE

CODE, WITH ABSOLUTE VETO JURISDICTION ABOVE THE JURISDICTIONAL POWER AND COMPETENCE AND AUTHORITY OF MY CH. III ([3.]), CRIMINAL JURISDICTION SENTENCING COURT AND ITS PERFECTED JUDGMENT AND THEREIN INTRINSIC JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES, MOST FUNDAMENTAL OF WHICH IS PROBABLY [80.], ACCOMPANIED WITH A FORTIORI [78.]?

2572. THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF ENFORCEMENT OF MY JUDICIALLY ORDERED
2573. SENTENCE [74.], ONCE FINALLY DETERMINED AND PERFECTED BY THE COURT, IS THAT MY IMPOSED SENTENCE MUST THEN BE ENFORCED BY STATE, ACCORDING TO THE DIRECTIVES AND INTENTIONS OF MY SENTENCING COURT
2574. ([74.]), NOT THOUGH, AT THE CHANGING POSITION/STANCE/
2575. INTENTIONS OF THE STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT, WHICH, AS I HAVE HIGHLIGHTED ABOVE, IS NOW ENFORCEMENT OF MY SENTENCE (AGAINST ME BY THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT), HAS AND CONTINUES TO BE CRIMINALLY MANIPULATED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, TO 'ITS' UNLAWFULLY ACQUIRED BENEFIT, THROUGH JURISDICTION
2576. BREACH AND JURISDICTION VIOLATION, CONSEQUENTING AGAINST ME A THEFT OF SENTENCE RIGHTS, THEFT OF MY SENTENCE, AND THEFT OF MY RIGHT TO JUDICIALLY PROTECT MY SENTENCE ORDERS (ESPECIALLY AS I DON'T HAVE THE FUNDS TO INITIATE JUDICIAL INVESTIGATION AGAINST THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, FOR 'ITS' ILLEGAL REFUSAL TO ENFORCE MY ORDERED SENTENCE, INSTEAD ADMINISTERING 'ITS' OWN CREATED SENTENCE AGAINST ME).

2577. OF ALL THE JUDICIAL ACTIONS BY SENTENCED LIFERS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, ORIGINALLY SENTENCED PER AUTOMATIC PAROLE ACT SENTENCING STANDARDS, NONE, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, HAVE EVER PROPERLY ARGUED ABOUT THE EFFECT AGAINST THE COURT'S SENTENCE (NPP DATE, PAROLE-RELEASE RIGHTS, ETC), BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT USING 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT' TO, IN ACTUAL EFFECT, TAKE AWAY RESPECTIVE COURT'S SENTENCE AND REPLACE WITH PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT'S SENTENCE, THEREBY MAKING ME (AND THEM, RESPECTIVELY), 'POLITICAL PRISONERS' ([176.]), AND UNCONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], DISPLACING MY CORRECT STATUS OF A CH. III
2578. ([3.]), ORDERED JUDICIAL PRISONER. IT ISN'T OBVIOUS TO THE SIDE STANDING OBSERVER, OR EASILY RECOGNISED BY DIRECT VIEW, TO APPRECIATE IN LITERAL TERMS,

HOW JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT AND ERRONEOUS ARE THE ACTIONS OF STATE (TO USE
 2579. STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT), ~~TO~~ TO EFFECTIVELY NULLIFY MY TRUE
 ORIGINAL HEAD-SENTENCE SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS, OWNED BY ME ALONE AND JUDICIALLY
 2580. PROTECTED BY DUE PROCESS ACCORDING TO COMPETENT PROCEDURAL LAW, AND THEN
 IMPOSE (AS A REPLACEMENT), THE STATE'S UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]),
 RE-CONFIGURED AND RE-DEFINED 'MEANING/UNDERSTANDING/INTERPRETATION' OF
 WHAT 'THEY' THEN ALSO CLAIM IS MY SENTENCE, WHICH 'THEY' (STATE GOVERNMENT OF
 2581. SOUTH AUSTRALIA), THEN INTEND TO ADMINISTRATIVELY ENFORCE AGAINST ME, AND ALSO
 ATTACK MY 2002 NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCE [74.], BY SIMILAR MEANS,
 2582. UNTIL,
 YOU HAVE A GOOD, HARD LOOK BEHIND THE STATE'S SMOKE-AND-MIRRORS ACTIONS,
 2583. THAT BASICALLY MEANS TO STOP ACCEPTING WHAT THE S.A. PARLIAMENT AND S.A.
 GOVERNMENT, AND, S.A. CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT, SAY, JUST BECAUSE
 THEY 'SAY IT', OR, BELIEVING WHAT 'THEY' SAY, JUST BECAUSE 'THEY' SAY IT,
 2584. IN RELATION TO THEIR JURISDICTION AND/OR AUTHORITY AND/OR COMPETENCE, WHEN
 2585. 'THEY' HAVE DEALINGS WITH MY ORIGINAL HEAD-SENTENCE, ALSO, WHEN 'THEY' HAVE DEALINGS
 WITH MY 2002 NON-PAROLE PERIOD DETERMINATION ([74.]),
 2586. BECAUSE,
 IF PEOPLE DON'T ACTUALLY INVESTIGATE WHAT I CLAIM HAS BEEN DONE TO MY
 LIBERTY (COURT ORDERED ACTUAL SENTENCES, HEAD-SENTENCE PLUS [74.]), WITHOUT
 JURISDICTION TO DO SO, BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (AND PARLIAMENT), THEN
 'THEIR' ERRONEOUS ACTIONS CONTINUE AND MORE PRISONERS THEN BECOME POLITICAL
 2587. PRISONERS, DISPLACING THEIR CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 3.]), COMPETENT STATUS AS
 JUDICIALLY ORDERED PRISONERS, WITH THEIR NEW FRAUDULENT AND FALSE STATUS AS
 POLITICAL PRISONERS OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STATE (OF AUSTRALIA), AND ITS INCOMPETENT
 2588. SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT. IF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA DOES NOT RETAIN ME
 2589. IN A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY (PRISON), BY MEANS (BASED ON DECISIONS AND ACTIONS
 2590. WHICH ARE NOT JURISDICTIONALLY COMPETENT [82. AND 83.]), WHICH ARE
 CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], ALLOWABLE, AUTHORISED AND COMPETENT, THEN SAID
 STATE GOVERNMENT IS INCOMPETENT AND ITS RESPECTIVE DECISIONS AND ACTIONS, WHICH

EFFECTED AND CONTINUE TO EFFECT ITS ONGOING DETENTION OF ME, IN A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, ARE CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], INVALID, EQUATING TO UNLAWFULLY DETAINED/ INCARCERATED, RATHER THAN BEING A LAWFULLY IMPRISONED PERSON, WHICH, IF COMPETENTLY ASSESSING MY 2002 SENTENCE QUALIFICATION ([74.]), TRANSLATES TO MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD END DATE OF APPROXIMATELY MID 2009 [SEE TEXT AT 1965. TO 1980. (INCLUSIVE), 1985. TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND MY PAROLE-RELEASE BEING SHORTLY THEREAFTER.

WHAT IS ALSO A FACT IS THAT, IF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAD TRIED TO REFUSE ME PAROLE-RELEASE, EITHER 'BY PAROLE BOARD OR EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT', AFTER A PAROLE RELEASE APPLICATION WAS SUBMITTED BY ME (LATE 2008 TO MID 2009, [SEE TEXT AT 1969, 1977, 1980, 1987. TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], THAT IS IF THE S.A. GOVERNMENT DID, PRIOR TO DECEMBER 2008, ALREADY RECOGNISE AND ACCEPT MY TRUE NPP END DATE OF APPROXIMATELY MID 2009, AND I HAD THEREFORE SUBMITTED PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATION ACCORDINGLY), WHICH, WITHOUT PROPER JUDICIAL APPLICATION BY STATE (SUCH AS [45., 38., 40. AND 44.]), WOULD EQUATE TO JURISDICTIONALLY ERRONEOUS/ FRAUDULENT DECISIONS, TO WHICH MY DIRECTION WOULD THEN BE MY APPLICATION TO COURT, AGAINST ERRONEOUS AND INCOMPETENT DECISIONS BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA,

RATHER THAN WHAT I HAVE DONE FOR MORE THAN 10. YEARS, WHICH IS TO AT THE VERY LEAST, BE ALLOWED TO SERVE THE SENTENCE IMPOSED ON ME BY THE COURT IN 2002 [74.], AND THE TRUE SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS THERETO ATTACHED, WHICH INCLUDES NON-PAROLE PERIOD TRUE DATE, PER MY IMPOSED HEAD-SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2259, 2261, IBID], AND [74. AND 80.].

FURTHER EXPLAINED THROUGHOUT THIS DOCUMENT, ARE SOME OF THE SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THE S.A. PAROLE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT HAVE NEVER HELD, IN ANY CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.], COMPETENT MANNER OR FORM, ANY JURISDICTION OR AUTHORITY, TO REFUSE ME PAROLE-RELEASE FOLLOWING A SUBMISSION BY ME FOR RELEASE ON PAROLE. THE SAME CAN ALSO BE STATED AGAINST THE CURRENT GOVERNMENT ENTITIES/ BODIES, FORMING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSERS OF AND FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF ANY PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATION I SUBMIT AT THIS TIME (2018), WHICH,

2598. FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT (SOUTH AUSTRALIA), IN APPROXI-
2599. MATELY LATE 2015 TO EARLY 2016 [140, 162, 179, AND 187.], RATHER THAN THE PAROLE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT (IN CABINET [29.]), INVOLVED IN PAROLE RELEASE DECISIONS OF LIFERS ([100. AND 101.], PER OPERATION OF [46.], ACCORDING TO WHAT THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA TELLS 'ITSELF' ABOUT ITS OWN ALLEGED JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE),
2600. WHERE THE TERM 'DECISIONS' RELATES TO VARIABLES 'OPEN' TO MOVEMENT, SUCH AS THE MINIMUM 3 YEAR AND MAXIMUM 10 YEAR PAROLE TERM, AND ANY TERM THERE-BETWEEN,
2601. IT IS NOW,
- PAROLE BOARD AND PAROLE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMISSION (P.A.R.C.), WHICH, LIKE CABINET, HAS 'SECRET HEARINGS ABOUT LIFERS' PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATIONS', AND
2602. EFFECTIVELY EQUATES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL [1.], SECRET MEETING ABOUT A LIFER, SUCH AS ME, WHERE THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION VIOLATES MY CH. III [3.], CRIMINAL JURISDICTION SENTENCES' SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURAL
2603. RIGHTS, TO BE 'EITHER PRESENT IN PERSON OR BY MY LAWYER AGENT (REPRESENTING ME AND PROTECTING MY CONSTITUTIONAL [1.], RIGHTS [113.])', AS WELL AS MY
2604. RIGHT TO REPLY. THE PARC ALSO CLAIMS CH. III [3.], CRIMINAL LAW JURISDICTION, IF IT, REPRESENTING THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, WANTS
2605. TO REFUSE TO PAROLE-RELEASE ME, TO THEN 'CREATE A NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME FOR ME, TO THEN ADMINISTRATIVELY RE-SENTENCE ME TO THEIR (PARC), DETERMINED NPP OF TIME', AND DO SO IN ABSENCE OF [45, 38, AND 40.], A CH. III [3.], COURT, A PROSECUTOR, AND JUSTICES OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERIOR
2606. COURTS'. ADDITIONALLY, IF THE PAROLE BOARD MAKES DECISION TO 'RECOMMEND PAROLE OF ME' (OTHERWISE LAW REQUIRES [38, AND 40.]), AND BOARD INCLUDES A REPRESENTATIVE OF VICTIMS OF CRIME COMMISSION, SAPOL AND S.A. ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT (WHICH INCORPORATES THE PAROLE BOARD AS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN
2607. GOVERNMENT'S AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE), THEN, WHY IS THE VOCC AND ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT GIVEN A FREE HIT TO VETO THE DECISION ALREADY MADE BY THE BOARD, ON WHICH THEY SAT (OR AT LEAST WERE REPRESENTED WITHIN), IF NOT FOR REASON OF MALICE, IMPROPRIETY, FRAUD, AND/OR SOME

2608. SORT OF 'PERSONAL' BENEFIT, CONSIDERING, IF THEY OPT TO CHALLENGE PAROLE BOARD
 RECOMMENDATION TO PAROLE-RELEASE ME, THEN THEY WOULD BE CHALLENGING A DECISION OF
 2609. THE BOARD WHICH THEY HELPED TO PRODUCE ?! TO ME, THAT APPEARS TO BE AN ABUSE
 2610. OF PROCESS BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES/BODIES !!! HOW INCREDIBLE THAT
 CH. III [3.], COURTS DON'T EVEN PERMIT THAT TYPE OF ABUSIVE PROCESSING, BUT IN
 2611. SOUTH AUSTRALIA IT WAS ACTUALLY STATUTE WRITTEN... PROBLEM IS THOUGH, A NON-PAROLE
 PERIOD OF TIME, IS PART OF MY SENTENCE, WHICH ONLY A CH. III COURT
 ([3.]), CAN IMPOSE ON ME (A UFER, SENTENCED FOLLOWING 1994 MURDER CONVICTION),
 2612. SO THEN,
 ACCORDING TO CURRENT PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES IN SOUTH
 AUSTRALIA, THE PARC COMMISSIONER CAN RECEIVE ANY COMPLAINT/CHALLENGE FROM
 THE RESPECTIVE ENTITIES [145., 171. AND 172.], OR COMMISSIONER DECIDE ALONE TO
 REFUSE PAROLE-RELEASE THEN ILLEGALLY EFFECT A NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD
 2613. OF TIME AGAINST ME. WOW!! NOT A SINGLE COURT IN SIGHT, SO THAT MEANS
 I WOULD HAVE LESS KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE WORDS SPOKEN AGAINST ME, IN
 A PARC HEARING, THAN A PRISONER WHO WAS 'INDEFINATELY SENTENCED', BECAUSE
 THEY HAVE A HEARING IN THE STATE'S SUPERIOR COURTS WHEN THEY APPLY FOR RELEASE
 2614. FROM PRISON. HOW CAN I HOPE TO HAVE AN HONEST PARC HEARING IF THE
 PARC HEARINGS ARE HELD IN THE DARKNESS OF SECRECY?
 2615. HOW IS IT THAT MY HEAD-SENTENCE AND NPP MANDATE VERY STRICT PERIODS OF TIME
 BE ANCHORED TO OBLIGATIONS OF STATE, RE WHEN I AM PERMITTED TO BE PAROLE-
 2616. RELEASED (2009), BUT THEN S.A. GOVERNMENT ILLEGALLY RE-DEFINES MY IMPOSED
 SENTENCES, AND RE-SENTENCES ME TO 'GOVERNMENT'S PLEASURE',
 IN PRACTICAL TERMS, EVEN THOUGH MY ONLY SENTENCE TYPES WERE AS AUTOMATIC
 2617. PAROLE ACT SENTENCES? PLUS, THE S.A. GOVERNMENT WILL CLAIM THAT ~~THEY~~ THEY
 HAVE NOT ALTERED OR AFFECTED MORE PENALTY UPON ME, THAN WAS COURT ORDERED,
 AND TO THAT I SIMPLY SAY, LOOK AT WHAT THEY DID TO MY SENTENCE ORDERS [74.
 2618. AND 80.], AND TEXT [AT 2410. TO 2413. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]. THE "LEGISLATION"
 TO WHICH THE MINISTER REFERS AT [TEXT 2410. IBID], WAS, AND STILL IS, THE 'TRUTH
 2619. IN SENTENCING ACT', HOWEVER, IRONICALLY, THAT SPECIFIC ACT WAS VERY

CLEARLY, QUALIFIABLY AND EMPHATICALLY ABROGATED FROM ANY OPERATIONAL AND
 CREATION AND DETERMINATION INFLUENCE, UPON MY 2002 SENTENCING JUDGMENT
 2620. ([78.]), BECAUSE 'THAT SUPERIOR COURT' JUDICIALLY ORDERED/DIRECTED, THAT
 ONLY '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS MUST BE OPERATIONALLY APPLIED TO MY 2002
 DETERMINED AND IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD, OF 22½ YEARS' [SEE TEXT AT 1987. TO
 2621. 2003. (INCLUSIVE) IBID.]. IT IS NOT DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND THE CORRECT FORMULA
 TO APPLY TO MY 22½ YR NON-PAROLE PERIOD, WHEN [80.], IS PROPERLY READ,
 2622. UNDERSTOOD, APPLIED AND ENFORCED FROM [74.]. YOU ONLY NEED VIEW THE
 SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STATE REPORTS, ON THE RELEVANT PAGE (R v JARRETT (2002)
 83 SASR 583, [75.], [78., 79., 80. AND 77.], ESPECIALLY AT [77.]), TO
 SEE THAT THE WRITER OF SAID REFERENCE IN THE SASR, CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THE
 TRUE EFFECT IN NUMERICAL TERMS, OF HOW TO CALCULATE THE ACTUAL DATE
 2623. WHEN MY 22½ YR TERM OF NPP, PER [80.], MUST END. THE BIG
 QUESTION THEN BECOMES, WHY THEN, DOES THE S.A. PAROLE BOARD CONTINUE
 TO CLAIM THAT 'THEY GOT CROWN LAW ADVICE WHICH STATES THAT 22½ = 22½
 2624. YEARS FROM 3-6-1994 TO NOVEMBER 2016'? I HAVE A QUESTION THEN...
 SINCE WHEN HAS THE CH. II [3.], SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CROWN SOLICITOR, OR
 ANY S.A. GOVERNMENT LAWYERS, ACQUIRED THE CONSTITUTIONAL [1.]
 JURISDICTION/AUTHORITY/COMPETENCE, TO ACT AND/OR OPERATE, AND/OR FUNCTION
 AS A CH. III [3.], CRIMINAL JURISDICTION SUPERIOR COURT, TO THEN ACT TO
 DEFINE/INTERPRET THE TRUE OPERATIONAL MEANING, EFFECT AND CALCULATION
 2625. APPRECIATION AND UNDERSTANDING OF [74.], [77.], [78.], [80.]? I CALL
 THAT 'CRIMINAL MANIPULATION OF POSITION OF EMPLOYMENT', 'ABUSE OF POWER AND
 AUTHORITY', AND A 'FRAUDULENT ACTION BY PAROLE BOARD AND S.A.
 GOVERNMENT, TO AID EACH OTHER UNLAWFULLY TO COVER-UP THEFT OF MY COURT
 ORDERED SENTENCE [74.]', 'ULTRA VIRES REPEATED ACTIONS [82. AND 83.], TO
 CONTINUE TO DO WHAT THE LAW PROHIBITS THEM FROM DOING ([SEE TEXT
 AT 2531, 2534. IBID.]), WHICH IS TO 'INTERPRETATIVELY DEFINE MY 2002 SENTENCE
 ORDERS [74.], OUTSIDE COMPETENT JURISDICTION (IN OTHER WORDS, CREATE THEIR
 OWN 'INTERPRETATION' WITHOUT EVER DUE PROCESSING PER PROPER PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE,

WHICH COULD ONLY BE ACHIEVED IF THEY SOUGHT SPECIFIC COMPETENT COURT FORMAL CLARIFICATION, OF THE ENFORCEABLE EFFECT OF [74.]⁹'.

2626. A STATE GOVERNMENT LAWYER, THE S.A. PAROLE BOARD, THE S.A. ATTORNEY-GENERAL, ⁶HOLD NO RIGHT IN LAW TO DETERMINE THE TRUE MEANING AND EFFECT OF MY SENTENCES (HEAD-SENTENCE AND NON-PAROLE PERIOD), WHICH THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA IS OBLIGATED TO ENFORCE AGAINST ME, THEREFORE MUST ENFORCE AGAINST ME, AND, IS LAWFULLY PERMITTED TO ENFORCE AGAINST ME, AND, WHICH I MUST HAVE
2627. BURDENED UPON ME (AND NO MORE THAN THAT), AS ONLY A COMPETENT CH.III [3.], COURT COULD EVER HOLD SUCH RIGHT IN LAW, TO EXPLAIN THE TRUE EFFECT OF [74.], AND ABOUT THE RESPECTIVE MAXIMUM IMPACT MY SAID SENTENCES ARE PERMITTED TO AFFECT MY LIBERTY FROM CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, WHEN AND HOW SUCH LIBERTY SHALL OCCUR, AND, WHEN AND HOW MY IMPOSED SENTENCES ARE ~~TO BE~~ FULLY SATISFIED, AND OTHER RESPECTIVE AND RELATED CONDITIONS INTRINSIC TO SAID SENTENCES.

2628. IN 2002, AT DELIVERY AND PERFECTION OF MY NEW NPP [74.], PER 1992 STANDARDS [80.], PLUS, EVEN IF ANY 'TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS' OF [46.], WERE APPLIED TO [74.], NPP TERM, THE POINT IS THAT ALL PERIODS OF TIME WERE SET AND FIXED ON THAT DATE IN 2002 [SEE TEXT AT 2171. TO 2174. (INCLUSIVE), 2176. TO 2217. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], PLUS, WHEN I ARRIVED AT SUCH END OF NPP DATE, PLUS ONE DAY,
2629. AND I STILL WAS NOT NOTIFIED BY S.A. GOVERNMENT THAT I HAD ALREADY GONE OVER
2630. THE ⁶JUDICIALLY INSTRUCTED AND ORDERED NPP END DATE, THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA NO LONGER HELD RIGHT IN LAW COMPETENCE TO INCARCERATE ME IN A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, OR HAVE ANY SAY IN ANY (OTHERWISE LEGITIMATE), DECISION MAKING
2631. MATTERS PERTAINING TO ME REMAINING IN PRISON. IN EFFECT, THE S.A. GOVERNMENT WERE, THEREAFTER, A POISON TREE, AND EVERY DECISION THEN-AFTER IS POISONED BY ITS IMPROPRIETY AND FRAUD, UNTIL IT RELEASES ME FROM CUSTODY (AT THE VERY LEAST), PURSUANT TO AND IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH
2632. MY JUDICIALLY ORDERED SENTENCES (ORIGINAL SENTENCE, "LIFE" [SEE TEXT AT 2258, 2259, 1604. TO 1610. (INCLUSIVE), INTRINSICATING 1611. TO 1618. (INCLUSIVE) IBID],
2633. THEN, WITH THE ONGOING ENVELOPE OF ORIGINAL SENTENCE [SEE TEXT AT 2266.

TO 2269. (INCLUSIVE), 2032. TO 2038. (INCLUSIVE), 2260, 2261, 2004. TO 2009. (INCLUSIVE), 2063, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2054. IBID], IN 2002 A NEWLY CALCULATED NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME [74.], SO THAT 22½ YR NPP [SEE TEXT AT 1001. TO 1008. (INCLUSIVE), 1987. TO 1990. (INCLUSIVE), 2187. TO 2193. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], IS ^{QUANTIFIED} ~~REDEFINED~~ BY [80.],
 2634. TO BE APPROXIMATELY MID 2009⁹), WHICH IS ALREADY LONG AFTER THEIR SPECIFICLY
 2635. IDENTIFIABLE DATE, SO NOW THEN, I CONTINUE TO WAIT FOR PAROLE-RELEASE, FROM THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE THE CUSTORIANS WHO ERRONEOUSLY RE-DEFINED THE TRUE LENGTH OF MY COURT ORDERED SENTENCE IN 2002 [74.], AND CARRY-ON WITH THAT DECEPTIVE DETERMINATION (ULTRA VIRES [82. AND 83.]),
 2636. STILL.....

IF I DO NOT STAND UP AND CONTINUE TO THORN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, TO POINT OUT WHAT FRAUD THE STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTED AGAINST ME, RE STEALING MY JUDICIAL SENTENCE RIGHTS; PER [74.]', THEN ERRONEOUSLY MANIPULATE THE TRUE EFFECT OF [74.], INTO SIGNIFICANTLY MORE TERM IN PRISON THAN WAS COURT ORDERED ■ AND JUDICIALLY PERMITTED BY [74.], WHO ELSE WILL?

2637. A VERY SIMPLE POINT CONTINUES TO STAND OUT, WHEN INVESTIGATING MY TRUE SENTENCES, AS COURT ORDERED, WHICH IN BRIEF TERMS, IS THIS...

- 2638. • A COURT ORDERED MY SENTENCES, ORIGINAL AND [74.],
- 2639. • ONLY A COURT, BY STATUTE MANDATE [45.], CAN DEFINE/INTERPRET THE SENTENCES,
- 2640. • ONLY A COURT OWNS ■ JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE TO INCREASE PENALTY OF SAME,
- 2641. • COMPETENT COURT ONLY EXISTS WITHIN CH. III [3.], STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT DON'T EXIST IN CH. III [3.],
- 2642. • PENALTY OF IMPOSED SENTENCES MUST ONLY BE DETERMINED, DEFINED, INCREASED, WITHIN SAID CH. III [3.],
- 2643. • STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT CAN'T HOLD CONSTITUTIONAL [1.], RIGHT AT LAW/IN LAW, TO AUTHORISE ITSELF/THEMSELF TO 'RE-DEFINE/RE-DETERMINE THE 'IMPACT-BURDEN' OF MY COURT ORDERED SENTENCES', AND FOR THEM TO CLAIM OTHERWISE, IS JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT AND ERRONEOUS,
- 2644. • THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA CAN'T THEN SIMPLY 'WRITE-IN AMENDMENTS TO

2645. RELEVANT STATUTE, SUCH AS CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, TO SUDDENLY GIVE PAROLE BOARD, EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT, PAROLE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMISSIONER, VETO JURISDICTION TO EFFECTIVELY REFUSE TO PAROLE-RELEASE ME, IF THEY CHOOSE TO, AS THAT TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION DID NOT EXIST IN 1992 [80.], PLUS, THE COURT ABROGATED ALL BUT 1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.], FROM APPLICABILITY TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF MY 2002 SENTENCE ORDERS [74.],
2646. • IN PARLIAMENT AND GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CH. I AND CH. II, [3.]), THERE IS NO JURISDICTION TO INVALIDATE MY ORIGINAL SENTENCE ORDER (HEAD-SENTENCE, EFFECTED PER [TEXT AT 2258. TO 2261. (INCLUSIVE) 1B10]), OR TO INVALIDATE MY 2002 SENTENCE ORDER (NON-PAROLE PERIOD, EFFECTED PER [80.], EFFECTED WITHIN ORIGINAL SENTENCE ORDER), OR TO ENCROACH UPON OR TO IMPEDE ENFORCEMENT OBLIGATIONS OF MY SENTENCES UPON SENTENCE ENFORCER, SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, AS MY SENTENCE ORDERS CAN ONLY BE CHANGED BY COMPETENT COURT, BUT NOT BY STATE PARLIAMENT OR STATE GOVERNMENT,
2647. • JUST BECAUSE STATE PARLIAMENT CHANGED STATUTE (CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, AND OTHER LEGISLATION RELATING TO PAROLE FOR LIFERS), WHICH STATE GOVERNMENT THEN OPERATES, CLAIMING GOVERNMENT ENTITIES NOW HAVE FULL JURISDICTION TO VETO MY COURT SENTENCING ORDER [80.], DOES NOT EMPOWER
2648. STATE TO EXPUNGE MY SUBSTANTIVE RIGHT TO PAROLE-RELEASE RIGHTS AND ENTITLEMENTS, DIRECTED PER MY ABSOLUTE SENTENCE ORDERS, AT [74.], AND [80.]. MY SENTENCING COURTS (ORIGINAL, PLUS 2002 [74.]),
2649. DEFINED NOT JUST MY SENTENCES, BUT ALSO MY SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS AND ACCRUALS WHICH ARE FUNDAMENTALLY/INTRINSICALLY MARRIED TO MY TWO SENTENCING JUDGMENTS, WHICH ARE ALSO SUBSTANTIVELY RIGHTED TO ME AND BY ME UNTIL SAID SENTENCES ARE COMPLETED/SORTED TO THE JUDICIALLY DIRECTED SATISFACTION, IN ACCORDANCE AND COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR PERFECTED COURT ORDERING TO SPECIFIED SENTENCING STANDARDS [80.].
2650. THE STATE TRIES TO CLAIM JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE TO CHANGE STATUTE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES, 'RELATING TO PAROLE APPLICATIONS/DECISION', FOR 'ALL' LIFERS, EXCEPT THAT ACTION VIOLATES SUBSTANTIVE PROCESSES AND

PROCEDURES ALREADY JUDICIALLY EFFECTED UPON ME, PER MY SENTENCING DIRECTIVES, AGAINST WHICH ONLY COMPETENT COURT HAS REQUISITE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO RECONSIDER/REVIEW/RE-DEFINE OR EVEN INVALIDATE.

2651. THE ANDREWS APPLICATION ([207.]), WAS FOR A JUDICIAL REVIEW AGAINST THE
2652. DECISIONS OF PAROLE BOARD TO 'REFUSE PAROLE RELEASE'. WHEREAS, THIS COMPLAINT DOCUMENT DESCRIBES AND TARGETS, AMONGST OTHER POINTS, THE FACT OF WHY THE S.A. PAROLE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT, DID NOT EVEN HOLD COMPETENT JURISDICTION TO VETO/REFUSE/DENY PAROLE-RELEASE TO MR ANDREWS 'FOR THE REASONS THEY CLAIMED', OR, 'IN THE MANNER SUCH DECISIONS WERE CREATED', ALL OF WHICH IS RELEVANT SO AS TO HIGHLIGHT HOW MY 2002 SENTENCING JUDGMENT [74.], HAS IN PRACTICAL TERMS BEEN VOIDED ILLEGALLY [82. AND 83.], BY THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

2653. ON 9-9-2002, MY NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD SENTENCING ORDERS WERE
FORMALLY DELIVERED BY THE FULL COURT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, AND PERFECTED
2654. ACCORDINGLY. PURSUANT TO CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, S.A., AT THAT TIME, PARTICULARLY SECTION 21.A (I THINK IT IS), WHEN I ARRIVE AT THE PRISON IN THE VEHICLE TRANSPORTING ME FROM COURT, WITH MY NEW JUDGMENT [74.], WHAT MUST BE PRESENTED TO THE PRISON BY CUSTODIAL STAFF TRANSPORTING ME, IS PROPER DOCUMENTATION SO AS TO LAWFULLY PERMIT SUCH PRISON TO THEN RECEIVE ME AS A PRISONER INTO THEIR CUSTODY, AS FOLLOWS: [86.]

2655. " PART 4 - IMPRISONMENT

DIVISION I. - ADMISSION AND ASSIGNMENT OF PRISONERS

21 A - DOCUMENTATION TO BE PRESENTED UPON ADMISSION OF A PRISONER TO A CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION.

2656. A PERSON WHO IS TO BE DETAINED IN A CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION PURSUANT TO AN ORDER OF A COURT OR A WARRANT OF COMMITMENT CANNOT BE ADMITTED TO A CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION FOR DETENTION EXCEPT ON PRESENTATION OF -

2657. (A) A WRITTEN STATEMENT THAT CONTAINS PARTICULARS OF THE ORDER OF THE COURT; OR

2658. (B) THE WARRANT OF COMMITMENT, WHICH MUST CONTAIN PARTICULARS OF THE ORDER OF THE COURT ON WHICH IT IS FOUNDED,

2659. FURTHER TO THE [TEXT AT 2408. TO 2416. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], PLUS, OTHER LETTERS I RECEIVED FROM CORRECTIONAL SERVICES MINISTER, DATED 2012 (IN PARTICULAR), WITH ONE OF SAID LETTERS IN 2012, VERY CLEARLY STATING FROM THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S OPINION AND DETERMINATION, THAT I AM NOT ENTITLED TO ANY PROVISIONS OF ANY SENTENCING LAWS (SENTENCING STANDARDS, REMISSION SYSTEM, ETC), WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT, AND THEREFORE, MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF 22 1/2 YEARS, AS FROM 3-6-1994, IS CALCULATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT, TO END IN NOVEMBER 2016,

2661. IT IS ALSO RELEVANT TO INVESTIGATE,

2662. NOT ONLY WHO WAS THE FIRST GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE, COURT EMPLOYEE, ETC. WHO WRONGLY (ERRONEOUSLY), DETERMINED/CALCULATED MY NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD LENGTH IN YEARS AND DAYS,

2663. BUT ALSO,

2664. WHERE SAID 'NPP CALCULATION ERROR' CEMENTED DAMAGE TO MY PERMANENT PRISON RECORDS. ABOVE AT [TEXT AT 2653, 2654. IBID], IDENTIFIES AN EVENT WHICH FUNDAMENTALLY REQUIRES, AS A PRE-REQUISITE [REDACTED] QUALIFICATION OF LEGALLY ACCURATE (TO THE CH. III [3.], SENTENCING COURT'S STANDARD OF JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE SUBSTANTIVE ACCURACY, AS THE TRUE CALCULATED 'NPP LENGTH OF TIME' [SEE TEXT AT 1966. TO 1980. (INCLUSIVE), 1987. TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), DOCUMENTATION FOR PRESENTATION, PRIOR TO RESPECTIVE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ADMITTING ME INTO THEIR FACILITY AS A PRISONER, THE CRITERIA WHICH MUST EXIST IN ESTABLISHED FORM, TO EFFECT/SATISFY LAWFULLY PERMITTED ADMISSION (AS REQUIRED BY STATUTORY OBLIGATION [SEE TEXT AT 2654. TO 2658. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]).

2668. IN SUBSTANCE PROOF, SUCH DOCUMENTATION SO REQUIRED, MUST BE AN ACCURATE

REPRESENTATION OF A CURRENT AND OPERATIONALLY ACTIVE AND VALID JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE (COURT ORDER / COURT INSTRUCTION), SUCH AS MY 2002

2669. RE-SENTENCING JUDGMENT [74.]. IT SEEMS THOUGH, WHEN COMPARING SAID
 2670. 'SECTION 21 A [SEE TEXT AT 2654. TO 2658. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]', TO ALL THE WRITTEN
 REPLIES I HAVE RECEIVED FROM S.A. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SINCE FIRST STARTED
 CHALLENGING THEIR '2016 NPP DATE' DETERMINATION (RATHER THAN '2009 NPP DATE'),
 2670. WHEREBY 'THEIR' COLLECTIVE REPLIES/EXCUSES PRETTY MUCH ALLIGN TO [TEXT AT 2660.
 IBID]',

2671. THAT,
 NOT ONLY HAS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT REFUSED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE TRUE AND
 VALID OPERATIONAL EFFECT, OF MY 2002 JUDICIAL DIRECTIVE [80.], WITHIN [74.],
 AS MY VALID SENTENCING ORDERS (EQUATING TO [77.], NON-PAROLE PERIOD
 CALCULATION FORMULA),

2672. BUT ALSO,
 ON 9-9-2002, AFTER DELIVERY OF MY NEW SENTENCING JUDGMENT [74.], AT THE
 2673. ENTRY GATE OF YATALA PRISON (SOUTH AUSTRALIA), WHEN THE 'SECTION 21 A.
 DOCUMENTATION' ([SEE TEXT AT 2654. TO 2658. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), WAS BEING
 HANDED TO THE 'CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION EMPLOYEES REPRESENTING YATALA PRISON

2674. 'CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION' [SEE TEXT AT 2656. IBID], SAID DOCUMENTATION INCLUDED
 WHAT WAS THEREON 'IDENTIFIED AS MY NEWLY STATED NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE,
 BEING IN THE YEAR 2016' [SEE TEXT AT 2058, 2059, 2069, 2073. TO 2075.
 (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AS THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S INTERPRETATION OF
 THE OPERATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECT OF MY NEW SENTENCE ORDERS.

2675. HOWEVER, SAID DOCUMENTATION THEREFORE INCLUDED FALSE DETAILS/DATA,
 SPECIFICALLY, THE 'STATED NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE OF 2016', AND, CONSIDERING THE
 PURPOSE OF ME ATTENDING COURT ON THAT DATE WAS RELATING TO MY NON-PAROLE PERIOD

2676. (OF TIME), WHICH WAS JUDICIALLY CHANGED ON 9-9-2002, IT WAS THEREFORE A
 'STATUTORY PRE-REQUISITE THAT SAID 'SECTION 21 A DOCUMENTATION', MUST
 ACCURATELY REPRESENT THE COURT'S CURRENT AND VALID SENTENCE JUDGMENT
 [74.], AND JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES COMPRISING THE WHOLE COURT'S INTENTIONS',

2677. AND THAT MUST INTRINSICATE THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF ALL JUDICIAL INSTRUCTIONS AND JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES, WITHIN THE WORDING OF THE FULL JUDGMENT [74.], WHICH THEREFORE MUST ALSO INCLUDE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF [80.], AGAINST THE 'STATED PERIOD OF 22½ YEARS' ([SEE TEXT AT 1001, 1002, 1004, 1008, 2260, 2261, 1987. TO 1997. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]), WHICH THEN EFFECTS A FORMULA CALCULATION TO A TRUE PERIOD OF TIME BEING 15 YEARS (PURSUANT TO '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS', [80.]).

2678. DUE TO SAID DOCUMENTATION INCLUDING THE STATED FALSE NPP DATE OF '2016', IN PLACE OF '2009' [SEE TEXT AT 2675. IBID], SAID DOCUMENTATION THEREFORE IS FALSE AND INVALID, AS IT DOES NOT ACCURATELY REPRESENT THE TRUE INTENTIONS OF MY 2002 SENTENCING COURT, OR, SAID COURT'S JUDICIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

2679. IN EFFECT, YATALA PRISON RECEIVED ME [SEE ~~TEXT~~ TEXT AT 2653, 2654, 2672, 2673. IBID], AFTER DELIVERY OF MY NEW SENTENCE [74.], ON 9-9-2002, CONSEQUENTIAL TO A VOID/INVALID DECISION ABOUT THE PRE-REQUISITE SATISFACTION [SEE TEXT AT 2655. TO 2658. (INCLUSIVE) IBID], AND THEREFORE

2680. RECEIVED ME ILLEGALLY INTO THEIR CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION (SAID DOCUMENTATION MISREPRESENTED THE TRUE INTENTION/EFFECT OF MY NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE, INSTEAD INDICATING 7 YEARS AND SIX MONTHS LONGER NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE THAN THE COURT ORDERED AGAINST ME, EQUATING TO A JURISDICTIONALLY ERRONEOUS DECISION TO ADMIT ME AS A PRISONER, ON THAT DATE, PLUS EVERY TIME THENAFTER, WHEN I AM 'ADMITTED INTO ANY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION', IF SAME FALSE 'NPP DATE OF 2016' IS STILL PART OF SUCH DOCUMENTATION [SEE TEXT AT 2655. TO 2658. (INCLUSIVE) IBID]). [82. AND 83.]

2681. UNLIKE IN ANDREWS [207.], WHEREIN PRISONER ANDREWS SOUGHT JUDICIAL REMEDY/RELIEF RELATING TO HIS IMPOSED SENTENCE BEING 'RE-DEFINED', CONSEQUENTIAL TO [46.], BEING APPLIED TO HIS SENTENCE, IN A WAY WHICH ANDREWS

2682. DESCRIBED AS RETROSPECTIVE (ALTHOUGH, I THINK HE SHOULD HAVE ARGUED SUCH POINT DIFFERENTLY, SUCH AS 'JURISDICTIONAL ERROR TO DECIDE MATTERS NOT COMPETENTLY OPEN TO PAROLE BOARD OR EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT, ABOUT HIS PAROLE-RELEASE APPLICATION',

OR EVEN, 'REPLACING HIS JUDICIAL SENTENCE WITH A LEGISLATIVE SENTENCE WHICH A SENTENCING COURT HAD NO INVOLVEMENT IN' (WHICH IS ALSO A CONTRAVENTION OF [45.]),

2683. IT IS,

A SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT ARGUMENT WHICH I PUT, DUE TO THE FACT THAT, IN THE ANDREWS SENTENCING HEARING (SEE [207. (JUDGMENT PROPER, THEREIN PARAGRAPH 15.)]), IN 1991, THE 'TRUTH IN SENTENCING ACT' [46.], DID NOT EVEN EXIST,

2684. WHEREAS, IN 2002, AT MY RE-SENTENCING HEARING, MY COURT CLEARLY TOOK INTO ACCOUNT THE OPERATION OF [46.], THEN DETERMINED SAME MUST HAVE NO EFFECT IN DETERMINING MY 2002 NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME, AND THAT ONLY '1992

2685. STANDARDS MUST APPLY' [78., 79., 80. AND 77.], AND SO, THE ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], CANNOT HOLD GROUND OR PLACE AGAINST MY COMPLAINTS

2686. DESCRIBED THROUGHOUT THIS DOCUMENT (IN OTHER WORDS, THE FACT THAT MR ANDREWS LOST HIS APPEAL [207.], IS IRRELEVANT IN THAT 'IT' IS NOT SUBSTANTIVELY ARGUABLE ON PAR WITH MY 2002 RE-SENTENCING [74.], OR ORDERS/DIRECTIVES

2687. THEREIN (PARTICULARLY [78. AND 80.])). HOWEVER, THERE WERE SOME VALID POINTS IN ANDREWS [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPHS 15, 16, 17, 18. WHICH HIGHLIGHT THE SUBSTANTIVE EFFECT OF OPERATIONAL OBSERVANCE OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE, PARTICULARLY THE ACTION OF ~~THE~~ AUTOMATIC PAROLE, WHICH WAS THE WHOLE POINT OF THE SUBSTANTIVE STATUTORY RIGHT [126., 127. AND 128.], OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE -

2688. RELEASE ([80.], MEANT THAT MY SENTENCING RIGHTS ARE ANCHORED TO MY PAROLE RIGHTS AS THEY EXISTED IN 1992, AND ONLY A CH. III COURT [3.], HAS COMPETENT JURISDICTION TO DETERMINE OTHERWISE).

2689. THE PARLIAMENT NEVER REMEDIED THE THEFT OF AUTOMATIC PAROLE, FROM THE SENTENCED LIFERS WHO HAD SENTENCING ORDER RIGHT TO RECEIVE AUTOMATIC

2690. PAROLE [51.], (HANSARD IN FULL, TO VERIFY). PARLIAMENT ^{ADOPTED REMISSIONS} ~~THE~~ CALCULATION ([139., 137. AND ~~THE~~ 53.]), AS THEY WERE OBLIGATED TO OBSERVE, HOWEVER, WHAT HAS NEVER BEEN RECOGNISED IN THE OPERATION OF [46.], UNLIKE THE FORMULA

2691. 'ADJUSTMENT' FOR REMISSIONS ("... REDUCED BY THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DAYS OF REMISSION

A PERFUNCTORY TITLE GIVEN TO AN ACT, OR THE OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF THAT ACT, IT WAS APPLICABLE AS STATUTORY MANDATE, JUST AS ITS TITLE IMPLIES, SO THAT
 2701. MY JUDICIALLY ORDERED RIGHT TO PAROLE-RELEASE WITHIN [74.], IS
 SUBSTANTIVELY MANDATED BY [80.], WHICH IN NO WAY PERMITS PERFUNCTORY
 DISCRETION.

2702. I THINK IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO NOTE CERTAIN 'POSITION OF ARGUMENT PRESENTED BY
 THE DEFENDANT (THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA)', IN THE ANDREWS APPEAL
 (REFER ANDREWS JUDGMENT [207.], IN PARTICULAR, THEREIN PARAGRAPHS 34, 35, 36, 37.
 2703. AND 38.), IN 2008. IN ANDREWS [207.], THE DEFENDANT IS CLAIMING ADMINISTRATIVE
 COMPETENCE TO AFFECT 'SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS' OWNED BY RESPECTIVE LIFERS WHO WERE
 SENTENCED, 'PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF SAID "2008 AMENDING ACT" (PARA. 34. THEREIN)',
 2704. WHEREAS, IN TELFORD [196.], THE SAME DEFENDANT INFORMS THE HIGH COURT IN 2007,
 THAT THE ACT "SIMPLY HAS NO RETROSPECTIVE OPERATION." (IRRESPECTIVE OF THE 2008 ACT
 2705. BEING AN AMENDING ACT), AND RETURNING TO ANDREWS [207.], THE SAME DEFENDANT SAID
 THAT "IT WAS THE INTENTION OF PARLIAMENT THAT IF THESE PROCEEDINGS HAD BEEN CONCLUDED
 BEFORE ~~THE~~ THE AMENDMENT WAS ENACTED, THEN THE AMENDMENT WOULD NOT APPLY," (PARA.
 2706. 36. THEREIN). THE POINT I'M ENLIVENING IS THAT SAID DEFENDANT CLAIMS ON ONE
 DAY 'VERSION A', THEN ON ANOTHER DAY 'VERSION B', THEN ON ANOTHER DAY BACK TO
 'VERSION A', ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT CERTAIN 'AMENDMENTS' WILL AFFECT SENTENCING
 RIGHTS IMPOSED ON MR ANDREWS (OR ANY OTHER RESPECTIVELY SENTENCED LIFER).

2707. I WILL ADD A KICKER TO 'THAT CLAIM BY SAME DEFENDANT', RELATING TO SAID
 CLAUSE 2(3), PARTICULARLY, THE FULL TEXT OF CL. 2(3), AND FULL TEXT OF SAID
 PARA. 36 IN [207.],

2708. WHEREBY,
 MY OWN SENTENCING JUDGMENT IN 2002 [74.], WAS "HEARD AND FINALLY DETERMINED
 BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS CLAUSE." ([115., 116., 117., 118. AND 119.]), AND,
 2709. AS SUCH, THAT SAID CLAUSE 2(3), ENSURES THAT NO PART OF SAID CLAUSE IS PERMITTED
 IN ANY MANNER OR FORM, TO ENCROACH UPON ANY "RIGHTS" (OWNED BY ME), OR,
 2710. "LIABILITIES ARISING BETWEEN PARTIES" ('LIABILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS' OF STATE GOVERNMENT,

WHICH WERE FORCED UPON SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, BY MY 2002 SENTENCING

COURT [74.], THEREIN FORCING '1992 SENTENCING STANDARDS MUST APPLY'

TO SAID 2002 'NPP DATE DETERMINATION OF 22½ YEARS; PLUS, AUTOMATIC PAROLE REGIME MUST

ALSO BE OBSERVED AND ENFORCED BY S.A. GOVERNMENT TOWARDS ME CONSEQUENTIAL TO

[74. AND 80.], "TO PROCEEDINGS HEARD AND FINALLY DETERMINED" [118.] WHICH IS

THE PERFECTED SENTENCING JUDGMENT PROPER [74.], AND IS STILL MY STANDING SENTENCE

ORDERS, AND, CONSEQUENTIAL TO VERY SPECIFIC JUDICIAL DIRECTIVES THEREIN [80.], PLUS

'22½ YEARS; PLUS OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF [SEE TEXT AT 1966. TO 1980. (INCLUSIVE)], 1986.

TO 2003. (INCLUSIVE) AND [74.], COLLECTIVELY COMPRISE MY FINALLY DETERMINED SENTENCE

ORDERS [74.]. MY SENTENCE ORDERS WERE SET AND FIXED IN 2002 ([74.]),

AND EVEN THOUGH THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ILLEGALLY REFUSED TO

ENFORCE THE COURT'S SENTENCE (AGAINST ME), PER [80.], THE FACT STILL REMAINS

THAT MY SENTENCE, AND ITS INTRINSIC SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS INFUSED WITHIN AND

THROUGHOUT MY ENTIRE IMPOSED AND PERFECTED SENTENCE DETERMINATION,

WAS FINALLY DETERMINED ON 9-9-2002 [74.], AND THAT SAID FINAL

DETERMINATION OF ALL STATED PENALTIES OF MY IMPOSED SENTENCE WHICH [REDACTED] BY

ORDER OF THE FULL COURT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA [74.], FUNDAMENTALLY ALSO FIXED ALL

RELEVANT PERIODS OF TIME ASSOCIATED WITH KEY PROCESS AND KEY PROCEDURES

FORMING 'MY SENTENCE RIGHTS', 'MY PAROLE APPLICATION RIGHTS', 'MY PAROLE-RELEASE

RIGHTS', 'MY PAROLE DURATION RIGHTS', AND 'MY SENTENCE SATISFACTION RIGHTS', AND

FUNDAMENTALLY ALSO FIXED THE RELEVANT DUE PROCESS AND DUE PROCEDURES TO

SAID RESPECTIVE PERIODS OF TIME, THEREBY CONSTITUTING 'MY SENTENCE TIME ANCHORS

AND PROCEDURAL ANCHORS' ON THAT DATE IN 2002, TO WHICH I SUBSTANTIALLY OWN

CH. III [3.], COURT [REDACTED] PROTECTION AGAINST DISSOLUTION/DELETION OF MY FIXED

SENTENCE RIGHTS AND ENTITLEMENTS, SUCH AS FROM CH. I AND/OR CH. II [3.],

S.A. PARLIAMENTS/S.A. GOVERNMENT (RESPECTIVELY)).

IN ANDREWS [207.], THEREIN PARAGRAPH 38. (OF JUDGMENT PROPER), THE COURT

(JUSTICE DAVID), MAKES CLAIM THE 'PAROLE BOARD HAD, AND STILL HAS, THE DISCRETION TO

REFUSE THE PLAINTIFFS APPLICATIONS FOR RELEASE ON PAROLE, AND, THOUGH I AM NOT

ARGUING 'FOR MR ANDREWS', I DO HOWEVER NOT AGREE WITH THE COURT'S CLAIM ABOUT

THE PAROLE BOARD HAVING JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE/AUTHORITY TO 'REFUSE SAID PAROLE
 2721. RELEASE APPLICATIONS BY MR ANDREWS', FOR REASONS I HAVE EXPLAINED HEREIN. IT
 MUST ALSO NOT BE AN AUTHORITY DETERMINATION (ON BEHALF OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT),
 THROWN UP BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, AGAINST ME AND MY 2002 SENTENCE
 JUDGMENT [74.], AND MY CURRENT COMPLAINT AGAINST THIS STATE'S
 GOVERNMENT FOR CRIMINALLY REFUSING TO ABIDE BY THE JUDICIAL CONSTRAINTS
 OF SAID JUDGMENT [74.].

2722. IT WOULD BE NICE IF THIS STATE JUST LET ME SERVE MY COURT'S SENTENCE
 2723. [74.], RATHER THAN ARBITRARILY ADMINISTRATIVELY RE-SENTENCE ME. CERTAINLY,
 THE JUDGMENT [74.], IS STILL IN COURT'S RECORDS, BUT ADMINISTRATIVELY, THIS
 STATE ILLEGALLY RE-SENTENCED ME VIA STATE PARLIAMENT AND STATE GOVERNMENT.

2724. WHAT IS THE POINT OF HAVING A SENTENCING COURT, IF THE STATE DISREGARDS
 THE COURT'S ABSOLUTE SENTENCING JURISDICTION [82. AND 83.]?

2725. IS THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WAITING FOR ME TO DIE, IN ORDER TO PREVENT
 THIS MATTER EVER RECEIVING CH.III [3.], JUDICIAL HEARING, AND ASSOCIATED
 2726. JUDICIAL DETERMINATION? HAVE THEY FORGOTTEN ABOUT THE 'MABO JUDGMENT',
 2727. AND THE FACT OF MR MABO BEING DECEASED WHEN JUDGMENT DELIVERED? WHAT IS THE
 POINT OF HAVING CLEARLY DEFINED JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE, RELATING TO MY COURT
 IMPOSED SENTENCE, IF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT ~~AND~~ AND STATE
 GOVERNMENT, EFFECTIVELY DEFACATE ON THE COURT'S ABSOLUTE JURISDICTIONAL
 AUTHORITY AND COMPETENCE, BY ADMINISTRATIVELY RE-SENTENCING ME WITHOUT A
 COURT IN SIGHT? WHAT THE HELL....!

2728. THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION INVOLVED IN MY ARREST, CONVICTION, THEN
 SENTENCING (CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT, SOUTH AUSTRALIA), IS ALL UNDER
 CRIMINAL LAW JURISDICTION, NOT LIKE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
 2729. ACTS, WHICH ARE STRICTLY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JURISDICTION ONLY. THE COURT
 ALONE DEFINES MY SENTENCE 'PENALTY/BURDEN', NOT THE STATE GOVERNMENT. [45.]