

SUSPENDED RECOMMENDATION, AFTER WHICH BOARD AND GOVERNOR MUST VALIDATE AND QUALIFY GOVERNOR'S REASONS FOR NOT APPROVING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION;")

214.

s. 67(7A)(i) - AMENDMENT ('WHERE GOVERNOR'S REASON/S FOR NOT APPROVING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION IMPLIES FACTUAL ERROR, WHICH BOARD CONSIDERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CSA. S. 67(4), [EXAMPLE, BOARD BELIEVED PRISONER HAD ENGAGED/ PARTICIPATED IN PRISON EMPLOYMENT FOR 10 YEARS, BUT GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION (FOLLOWING CSA. S. 67(6)), RECEIVED CORRECTIONAL SERVICES EVIDENCE, IN DOCUMENT FORM, CLARIFYING PERIOD TO ONLY 2 YEARS, THEREBY SUGGESTING FACTUAL ERROR IN INFORMATION CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD (CSA. S. 67(4))], BOARD AND GOVERNOR MUST QUALIFY THE CONFLICTING INFORMATIONS, WITHIN 30 DAYS OF BOARD'S RECEIPT OF GOVERNOR'S REJECTION OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION, IN ORDER TO VALIDATE SUSPENDING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION;")

215.

s. 67(7A)(ii) - AMENDMENT ('WHERE GOVERNOR'S REASON/S FOR NOT APPROVING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION IMPLIES CRIMINAL LAW MATTERS WHICH, ACCORDING TO BOARD'S EVIDENCE PRESENTED TO GOVERNOR FOR REVIEW (FOLLOWING OPERATION OF CSA. S. 67(6)), INDICATES BOARD HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF AND/OR GAVE NO CONSIDERATION TO (PURSUANT TO CSA. S. 67(4)), BOARD AND GOVERNOR MUST QUALIFY THE CLAIMED CONFLICTING INFORMATIONS, INCLUDING POLICE RECORD/S ASSOCIATED WITH IMPLIED CRIMINAL LAW MATTER/S, WITHIN 30 DAYS OF BOARD'S RECEIPT OF GOVERNOR'S REJECTION OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION, IN ORDER TO VALIDATE SUSPENDING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION;")

216.

s. 67(7A)(iii) - AMENDMENT ('WHERE GOVERNOR'S REASON/S FOR NOT

APPROVING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION, EFFECTING AUTOMATIC SUSPENSION OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION, ARE NOT QUALIFIED BY THE BOARD AND GOVERNOR WITHIN 30 CALENDER DAYS FROM DATE OF SUSPENDED RECOMMENDATION, THE SUSPENSION OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION MUST AUTOMATICALLY BE VOIDED AND GOVERNOR'S REASON/S (ASSOCIATED WITH SUSPENSION), ARE ALSO VOIDED, EFFECTING GOVERNOR'S APPROVAL OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION;')

217.

s. 67(7A)(IV) - AMENDMENT ('WHERE GOVERNOR'S REASON/S FOR NOT APPROVING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION, EFFECTING AUTOMATIC SUSPENSION OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION, ARE QUALIFIED BY THE BOARD AND GOVERNOR WITHIN 30 CALENDER DAYS FROM DATE OF SUSPENDED RECOMMENDATION, THEREBY VALIDATING SUSPENSION, THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION (UNDER ACTIVE SUSPENSION), SHALL BE NULLIFIED OUTRIGHT, AND BOARD'S DETERMINATION IS THEREFORE STILL PENDING, EFFECTING RECONSIDERATION OF PRISONER'S PAROLE APPLICATION (CSA. s. 67(4)), WITH THE INCLUSION OF THE QUALIFIED NEW INFORMATION/S (AS DETERMINED DURING PERIOD OF SUSPENDED RECOMMENDATION);')

218.

s. 67(7A)(V) - AMENDMENT ('WHERE BOARD'S SUSPENDED RECOMMENDATION HAS BEEN NULLIFIED OUTRIGHT (CSA. s. 67(7A)(IV)), THE BOARD SHALL COMPLETE ITS RECONSIDERATION OF PRISONER'S PAROLE APPLICATION, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF THE NEW INFORMATION'S PURPORTED CREDIBILITY AND VALIDITY, WITHIN 60 CALENDER DAYS FROM DATE OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION BEING SUSPENDED (FOLLOWING CSA. s. 67(7A));')

219. s. 67(7A)(vi) - AMENDMENT ('UPON COMPLETION OF BOARD'S RECONSIDERATION, WHERE BOARD RECOMMENDS RELEASE ON PAROLE OF PRISONER SERVING LIFE SENTENCE, THE GOVERNOR SHALL NOT REJECT BOARD'S RECONSIDERED RECOMMENDATION, AND GOVERNOR SHALL ACCEPT AND APPROVE RELEASE ON PAROLE OF LIFER.')
220. 6.) CSA. s. 67(7B) - AMEND ('UPON DELIVERY OF SENTENCING COURT'S JUDGMENT, WHERE COURT REJECTS APPLICATIONS BY DPP/PAROLE BOARD AND/OR ATTORNEY-GENERAL (CSA. s. 67(4)(F)), THE GOVERNOR, FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION BY THE BOARD THAT THE PRISONER SERVING LIFE SENTENCE, BE RELEASED ON PAROLE, MUST NOT REJECT BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION FOR ANY REASON WHICH WAS CONSIDERED BY THE SENTENCING COURT;')
221. s. 67(7B)(i) - AMENDMENT ('IT SHALL BE ACCEPTED AND UNDERSTOOD THAT ALL KNOWN AND RELEVANT STATE'S EVIDENCE, WAS PRESENTED TO THE COURT BY THE APPLICANT/S FOLLOWING OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF CSA. ss. 67(4)(B)(i), 67(4)(C), AND 67(4)(L)(i);')
222. s. 67(7B)(ii) - AMENDMENT ('UPON DELIVERY OF SENTENCING COURT'S JUDGMENT, WHERE COURT REJECTS APPLICATIONS BY DPP/PAROLE BOARD AND/OR ATTORNEY-GENERAL (CSA. s. 67(4)(F)), IT SHALL BE ACCEPTED AND UNDERSTOOD THAT IT WAS THE DETERMINATION OF THE PAROLE BOARD TO REFUSE PAROLE TO LIFER (CSA. s. 67(4)), WHICH MUST BE AFFECTED FOLLOWING COURT'S JUDGMENT, IN FAVOUR OF PRISONER, THEREBY AUTOMATICALLY REVERSING BOARD'S PRIOR DETERMINATION, EFFECTING NEW DETERMINATION BY THE BOARD, WHICH MUST BE TO RECOMMEND RELEASE ON PAROLE OF PRISONER SERVING LIFE SENTENCE (CSA. s. 67(6));')
223. 7.) ^{CSA.} ~~6~~ s. 67(7C) - AMEND ('FOLLOWING NEW DETERMINATION BY THE BOARD, BEING CONSEQUENTIAL TO CSA. s. 67(7B)(ii), AND AFTER CSA. s. 67(6), ONLY IF GOVERNOR ACQUIRES NEW INFORMATION WHICH WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO, OR ABLE TO BE CONSIDERED

BY THE SENTENCING COURT, PAROLE BOARD (CSA. s. 67(7B)(ii)), OR STATE GOVERNMENT PRIOR TO GOVERNOR'S RECEIPT OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION (CSA. s. 67(6)), AND THE NEW INFORMATION, IF IT HAD BEEN AVAILABLE TO THE BOARD DURING CONSIDERATION PHASE (CSA. s. 67(4)), IS LIKELY TO HAVE RESULTED IN BOARD'S 'REFUSAL' TO GRANT/RECOMMEND PAROLE (CSA. s. 67(4)), THE GOVERNOR MAY EFFECT SUSPENSION OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION PURSUANT TO CSA. s. 67(7A).') [AS ABOVE AMENDED].

224. 8.) CSA. s. 67(7D) - AMENDMENT ('A PRISONER SERVING LIFE SENTENCE SHALL BE AFFORDED PRIORITY PROCESSING BY THE PAROLE BOARD, FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER PRISONER'S APPLICATION FOR RELEASE ON PAROLE, FOLLOWING BOARD'S RECEIPT OF THE PRISONER'S PAROLE APPLICATION (CSA. s. 67).')

225. 26. CSA s. 67. ([94.]), MAKES REFERENCE TO THE GOVERNOR AS THE PERSON WHO ALONE RECEIVES, THEN MAKES DETERMINATIONS IN RELATION TO PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS (SUCH AS [100., 101., 106., 127. AND 128.]), AND MAKES NO REFERENCE TO THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (EC.), OR CABINET AS HAVING ANY INVOLVEMENT IN ANY DECISION MADE, RELATING TO PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS ([94.]), THEREBY CREATING A FALSE BELIEF. IN FACT, THE GOVERNOR HAS NO OPERATIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE ACT CLAIMED TO BE PERFORMED BY THE 'GOVERNOR'. THE REALITY IS THAT POLITICIANS ALONE ARE THE PERSONS INVOLVED IN DETERMINING THE PARTICULAR DECISION, AND DO SO UNDER THE IMPROPER PROTECTION (WATSON [194. (PARA. 64. "FRAUD")]), OF CABINET CONFIDENTIALITY (WATSON [194. (PARA. 133.)]), WHICH BY THAT VERY ACTION VIOLATES A JUDICIALLY PROTECTED RIGHT (OWNED BY THE LIFER APPLICANT), OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION DURING EVERY ASPECT OF THE 'PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS' WHILST

226. CSA. s. 67. IS UNDER OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATION ([110. AND 113.]). I CONTEST THE CONSTITUTIONAL LEGALITY OF ASSENT OF ANY BILL INTO LEGISLATION, WHICH IN ITS OPERATION EMPOWERS CABINET (CH. II [3.]), TO HOLD SECRET HEARINGS, THEN USE A DECISION ARRIVED AT IN CABINET (BY POLITICAL PUPPETS WHO DON'T WISH TO LOSE

227. THEIR PORTFOLIO, SO BASICALLY ARRIVE AT THE DECISION WHICH THE PREMIER WANTS THEM TO ARRIVE AT, VIA FEAR OF JOB LOSS, AND LACKING FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN THEIR VOTING PROCESS TO ARRIVE AT SUCH DECISION), TO ILLEGALLY RE-SENTENCE LIFER TO AT LEAST ONE MORE YEAR IN PRISON ([24., 97. AND 108.]), BECAUSE SUCH A BILL IN FACT VIOLATES CONSTRUCTION PREREQUISITE [28.], WHICH MUST THEN INCUR REMEDY BY LEGISLATIVE OPERATION [16.]. CABINET HAS NO CONSTITUTIONAL ([1. AND 3.]), AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN SUCH ACTION OF PAROLE APPLICATION HEARINGS ([94.]), NOT ONLY BECAUSE ~~OF~~ OF CABINET CONFIDENTIALITY (VIOLATING [113.]), BUT ALSO AS SUCH OPERATIONAL EVENT IS NOT POSITIVELY OR AFFIRMATIVELY WORDED IN CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS WORDING, WITHIN LEGISLATION, STIPULATING SUCH EVENT (SELLECK [64. (PARAS. 93, 94, 117.)]). THERE IS NO CREATION IN PARLIAMENT, NOR HAS THERE EVER BEEN WITHIN THE AUTHORITY OF THE AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION [1.], DEFINED POSITIVELY AND AFFIRMATIVELY IN CLEAR AND UNMISTAKABLE WORDING, ANY RIGHT OR ENTITLEMENT VESTED IN THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, TO SENTENCE A LIFER TO INCARCERATION (INCLUDING EXTENDING PERIOD OF INCARCERATION), FOR REASONS OF POLITICAL GAIN/BENEFIT, DEFICIENT IN LEGAL FOUNDATION WHICH MEETS CRIMINAL LAW COURT JUSTIFICATION, AND TO ARRIVE AT SUCH SENTENCE IN CABINET (RATHER THAN CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT [45.]), AND DENY THE RELEVANT PRISONER ANY REPRESENTATION AT SAID CABINET HEARING, AND THEN TO GAIN ROYAL CERTIFICATION OF SUCH ACTIONS (BY CABINET), WHEN CLAIMING THAT IT WAS THE GOVERNOR'S DECISION, AND YET SUCH EVENTS HAVE BEEN FLIPPANTLY PERPETRATED IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA SINCE 1-8-1944 ([46.]). [16., 28., 29., 94., 97., 101., 103., 110., 112., 113., 124., 128., 131., 132., 174., 175., 176., 188. AND 194. (WATSON (PARAS. 31, 61, 64, 65, 102, 139.))]

228. IT IS SIGNIFICANTLY INTERESTING TO COMPARE THE INTENTION IN WORDING BETWEEN [124., 125., 126., 127. AND 128.] WHEREIN 'AUTOMATIC PAROLE' WAS ENFORCED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, AND [100., 101., 106., 107., 108. AND 109.] WHEREIN THE GOVERNOR'S ROLE (IN WORDS), ON THE FACE DID NOT SEEM MUCH DIFFERENT, BUT IN FACT THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND CABINET TOOK IMPROPER ADVANTAGE OF THE

USE OF THE GOVERNOR [29.], AFTER 1-8-94 ([46.]), WHEREBY POLITICIANS MADE DETERMINATIONS ABOUT PAROLE RELEASE OF LIFERS, NOT THE PAROLE BOARD. ~~■~~ AFTER 2012 AMENDMENTS TO CSA [102., 103., 104. AND 105.], THE STATE GOVERNMENT GAINED IMPROPER ADVANTAGE BY FRAUDULENTLY ASSENTED CHANGES TO THEIR PURPORTED JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY, RELATING TO PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS (CSA s. 67.), EXCEPT CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY DID NOT EXIST WITHIN SAID 2012 AMENDMENTS ([28. AND 16.]). THE STATE GOVERNMENT THOUGHT IT HAD CLOSED 'A DEFICIENCY IN THE CSA (WHERE THERE HAD BEEN NO NEGATIVE PROVISION TO OPPOSE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PAROLE RELEASE FOR LIFERS)', WHEREBY 2012 AMENDMENTS GAVE THE IMPRESSION TO MANY THAT AFFIRMATIVE WORDING, IN CLEAR AND UNMISTAKABLE INTENT (IN WORDS), PROVIDED LEAVE TO THE GOVERNMENT (IN CABINET), AND THE GOVERNOR, TO NOT ONLY 'REFUSE PAROLE RELEASE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PAROLE BOARD', BUT ALSO TO REFUSE TO GIVE REASONS TO THE LIFER APPLICANT AS TO WHY PAROLE RELEASE HAD BEEN REFUSED', AND TO PROTECT THAT CONDUCT THROUGH CABINET CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENT (CSA ss. 67(7A), 67(7B), 67(7C) [102., 103., 104. AND 105.]). EVEN THE COURT IN WATSON [194.], GAVE AN ERRONEOUS ASSESSMENT OF THE SCOPE OF JURISDICTION OF THE GOVERNOR, AND OF CABINET, ASSOCIATED WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECEIPT OF THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION FOR LIFER TO BE RELEASED ON PAROLE, DUE TO TWO FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS, BEING THAT 'THE COURT HAD NOT BEEN SHOWN THE PROPER CONSTITUTIONAL LINKS ACCURATELY IDENTIFYING THE TRUE AND ACCURATE SCOPE OF THE PAROLE BOARD, CABINET AND GOVERNOR (RE CSA s. 67, AND CSA s. 77, AND SENTENCING ACT s. 56 [94., 110., 113. AND 45.]), AND 'THE COURT THOUGHT WHAT IT HAD PREVIOUSLY THOUGHT WITHOUT PERFORMING COMPETENT INVESTIGATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL JUSTIFIABILITY AND JURISDICTION OF THE PAROLE BOARD, CABINET AND GOVERNOR (AND THEREFORE CHOSE TO BE COMPLACENT WITH SUCH THOUGHTS, RATHER THAN UNDERTAKE PROPER INDEPENDANT INVESTIGATION OF ASSUMED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY, EVEN IF WATSON OR CROWN SOLICITOR DID NOT ENCOURAGE SUCH AN UNDERTAKING).

IN THIS PART, OPERATIONAL SENTENCING STANDARDS BETWEEN 1988 AND 1-1-2016 WILL BE REFERENCED, WITH NO CONSIDERATION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL [140.], SOON TO BECOME OPERATIONAL, IN 2016.

231. EVERY LIFER APPLYING FOR PAROLE MUST APPLY IN THE LEGISLATIVELY "PRESCRIBED MANNER" [96.], WHICH IS TO "THE BOARD" [96.], NOT THE GOVERNOR, OR THE MINISTER, OR CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, OR EVEN THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT OR ANY OTHER STATE INSTRUMENTALITY [33.], ONLY IN THE "PRESCRIBED MANNER TO THE BOARD" [96.], IF THE LIFER ALREADY HAS A COURT IMPOSED NPP, REGARDLESS OF BEING A 'PRISONER A.' TYPE, 'PRISONER B.' TYPE, OR 'PRISONER C.' TYPE [SEE PARAGRAPH 23.1BIV].
232. EVEN THE TITLE OF THE RELEVANT SECTION, CSA. s. 67 [94.], CLEARLY DESCRIBES THE LEGISLATED INTENT FROM PARLIAMENT, OF THE REQUIRED DUE PROCESS FOR A LIFER TO APPLY FOR PAROLE, BEING "SECTION 67- RELEASE ON PAROLE BY APPLICATION TO THE BOARD" [94.], AND THE BOARD IS ONLY THE PAROLE BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA.
233. FURTHER REINFORCED LEGISLATED INTENT OF PARLIAMENT AT CSA s. 67(2)(a) [96.], THE CORRECT DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENT, "THE PRISONER MAY APPLY IN THE PRESCRIBED MANNER TO THE BOARD FOR THE PRISONER'S RELEASE ON PAROLE.". ADOPTING ARGUMENT FROM THE CROWN-SOLICITOR IN WATSON (BEING SOLICITOR-GENERAL ON BEHALF OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT [194. (PARA. 133.)]), BEING THAT 'THE ABSENCE OF EXPRESS WORDS IN THE CSA TO IMPART ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT, ROYAL (GOVERNOR), OR OTHER ENTITY WITH ANY JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION PROPER, FOR ANY ACTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION AND DETERMINATION (CSA. s. 67(4) [94.], MEANS THAT PARLIAMENT HAD NO INTENTION OF ENABLING ANY OTHER SUCH ENTITY WITH SAID AUTHORITY, THEREFORE IT REMAINS VESTED IN THE BOARD ONLY, UNTIL CHANGED BY CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPETENT BODY.
234. THEREFORE, ONLY THE "BOARD" HAS CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATE LEGISLATED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE A PAROLE APPLICATION FROM LIFER APPLICANT. NOT ONLY IS THERE NO AFFIRMATIVE AND UNAMBIGUOUS WORDING IN THE CSA, TO RECEIVE PAROLE APPLICATION FROM

LIFER APPLICANT, THERE IS ALSO NO AFFIRMATIVE AND UNAMBIGUOUS WORDING TO EMPOWER ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT ENTITY (CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MINISTER), OR ROYAL PARTY (GOVERNOR), TO CONSIDER SAID APPLICATION FROM LIFER, OR EVEN FROM PAROLE BOARD ITSELF (EVEN THOUGH GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN IMPROPERLY USING CABINET AND GOVERNOR, IN THAT VERY MANNER, SINCE 1-8-1994 [46.]), THEREFORE IT IS THE WORDED INTENTION OF PARLIAMENT, THAT ONLY THE BOARD IS VESTED WITH THE AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE AND CONSIDER THE LIFER'S APPLICATION PROPER. [99.]

235. WHEN THE BOARD RECEIVES A PAROLE APPLICATION FROM LIFER [96.], THE PAROLE BOARD NOW FUNCTIONS AND SITS AS A "JUDICIAL BODY" (CLCA, S. 237 [33.]), DURING THE PROCESSING PHASE OF THE PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS, BEING THE ENTIRE PERIOD AND EVERY PROCESS AND STEP WITHIN SUCH PERIOD, FROM BOARD'S RECEIPT OF SAID APPLICATION, UNTIL PRISONER'S RECEIPT OF BOARD'S DETERMINATION ([PARAGRAPH 167. IBID]), AND BOARD MUST PROCESS LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENTS OF THE CSA, SPECIFICALLY INCLUDING CSA, S. 77(3) [113.], WHEREIN IT IS CLEARLY THE INTENTION OF PARLIAMENT, THAT THE PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS IS A LEGAL PROCESS ([113.]), AND THE LIFER'S LEGAL RIGHTS AND ENTITLEMENTS MUST BE NOT ONLY PROTECTED, ~~BUT~~ BUT ALSO REPRESENTATIVELY GUARDED BY A PRACTITIONER OF LAW, IF PRISONER WISHES TO INVOKE SUCH
236. REPRESENTATION RIGHT. THE LIFER MAY NOT BE VERSED IN THE EXTENT OF THEIR LEGAL RIGHTS, BUT A LAWYER SHALL BE SO LEARNED TO KNOW THEM (ON BEHALF OF THE LIFER APPLICANT). IF THE DUE ~~PRO~~ PROCESS PREREQUISITE FEATURE OF THE PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS, IS NOT COMPLIED WITH PRIOR TO BOARD'S DETERMINATION BEING DELIVERED (WHERE SAID DETERMINATION IS 'THE ANSWER THE LIFER RECEIVES FROM THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S SOLE REPRESENTATIVE (THE PAROLE BOARD), FOLLOWING APPLICATION FOR PAROLE ([99.]), AND SUCH ANSWER IS THAT PAROLE WILL NOT BE GRANTED'), THEN THE ARRIVED AT DETERMINATION (OF THE BOARD, CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MINISTER OR GOVERNOR), IS NOT PROPERLY/LAWFULLY ACHIEVED, THEREFORE MUST CONSEQUENTIALLY BE
237. VOIDED. A FAILURE IN PROPER PROCESS, DUE PROCESS, VOIDS ~~BOARD'S~~ PAROLE BOARD'S REFUSAL (TO APPROVE PAROLE), IRRESPECTIVE OF THE BOARD'S REFUSAL BEING CSA, S. 67(9) ([107. AND 108.]), OR AFTER INITIALLY 'RECOMMENDING' PER. CSA, S. 67(6) AND 67(7) ([100. AND 101.]), BUT THEN REFUSED BY CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR

PER CSA. s. 67(TA) AND 67(TB) AND 67(TC) ([102., 103., 104., 105. AND 29.]), WHICH IS THEN
 238. REPORTED TO LIFER APPLICANT BY THE BOARD, WHERE THE BOARD RECOMMENDS PAROLE ([100.]),
 TO THEN BE VOIDED AND OVERTURNED BY CABINET AND GOVERNOR ([102., 103., 104., 105. AND
 29.]), IS TO CREATE A DECISION THROUGH FAILURE TO OBSERVE DUE PROCESS ACCORDING TO
 LAW, WHICH AT THE VERY LEAST INCLUDED GOVERNMENT'S REFUSAL TO ENFORCE OR EVEN PERMIT
 LIFER APPLICANTS' REPRESENTATION RIGHT CSA. s. 77(3) ([113.]), DESCRIBED FURTHER IN
 STAFFORD [65. (PARA. 149.)], AND THOUGH STAFFORD IS DESCRIBING TRIAL PROCESS, THE
 FOUNDATION ARGUMENT STILL EXISTS, PLUS, THE ACT OF CABINET 'CONSIDERING' LIFER'S PAROLE
 APPLICATION PROPER (RATHER THAN JUST THE LEGAL MERIT AND JUSTIFIABILITY OF THE BOARD'S
 RECOMMENDATION ([100.])), IS BASICALLY AN ADMINISTRATIVE TRIAL OF THE STRENGTH OF THE
 239. LIFER'S APPLICATION FOR PAROLE' ([65.]). SINCE 1-8-1944 ([46.]), AS DESCRIBED IN MORE
 DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT, THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNOR HAVE ACTIVELY
 NEGLECTED TO OBSERVE DUE PROCESS (ACCORDING TO LAW), REQUISITE FEATURES OF THE
 PROCESSING PHASE OF LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS, TO THEN CREATE A DECISION (TO
 REFUSE TO GRANT PAROLE TO LIFER APPLICANT), THROUGH IMPROPER EVENT (IN CABINET), AND A
 LACK OF DUE PROCESS. COMBINING THE ACT AND RESULT WHEREBY [65.] AND [83.]
 SHOW PROHIBITED ACT (AS DESCRIBED HEREIN, CABINET AND GOVERNOR 'CONSIDERING' PAROLE APPLICATION
 PROPER), AND FRAUDULENT/ERRONEOUS DETERMINATION (AS DESCRIBED HEREIN, 'DETERMINATION' OF
 SAME TO REFUSE TO GRANT PAROLE TO LIFER APPLICANT).

240. THE STATE GOVERNMENT, WHO IS EMPOWERED BY THE CONSTITUTION ([3.]), CONFINED UNDER
 OPERATION OF CHAPTER II (GOVERNMENT OF THE DAY), TO ENFORCE THE SENTENCE IMPOSED BY
 THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT, AND IMPOSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 56, OF
 THE SENTENCING ACT ([34., 45., 44. AND 84.]), AND FOR A LIFER WHO IS INCARCERATED THEN
 THE STATE GOVERNMENT SHALL INCLUDE, IN A LAWFULLY AND CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPLIANT
 MANNER (CHs. I, II, III [3.]), OPERATIONAL EFFECT OF CSA ([85.]), AS AN INCORPORATED
 241. ELEMENT OF STATE'S ENFORCEMENT OF SAID IMPOSED SENTENCE. HOWEVER, THE SOUTH
AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (SINCE 1-8-1944 [46.]), AND SUCCESSIVE GOVERNORS (SINCE 1-8-1944
 [46.]), WHERE GOVERNOR EXPRESSES CABINET'S POLITICAL AGENDA ([29., 175., 176. AND WATSON
 194. (PARA. 61.)]), HAVE MISREPRESENTED THEIR ACTUAL JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY (BORNE FROM
 CH. II [1. AND 3.] OPERATION), AND ACTED UNDER SAID FALSE AUTHORITY, IRRESPECTIVE OF

SUCH CONDUCT BEING ACTIVELY KNOWN TO THEM AS ULTRA VIRES, OR THROUGH THEIR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE AS TO THEIR TRUE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY ([1. AND 3.]), WITH REGARD TO THE PROCESSING PHASE OF THE LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION, TO THE BOARD (CSA. s. 67 [94.]), WHICH THEN BOARD 'CONSIDERS' AND MAKES OFFICIAL 'DETERMINATION' (CSA. s. 67(4) [94.]), AND WHERE 'DETERMINATION' IS TO RECOMMEND PAROLE FOR LIFER (CSA. s. 67(6) [100.]), AND SAID 'RECOMMENDATION' IS SENT FROM (AND BY), THE BOARD TO GOVERNOR (FOR APPROVAL (CSA. s. 67(7) [101.])), AND WHERE CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR ENGAGE IN AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT, WHERE NO AUTHORITY EXISTS FOR SUCH ACT TO BE PERFORMED, TO CONSIDER LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION PROPER (AS IF THEY WERE THE BOARD PERFORMING CSA. s. 67(4) [94.]), NOT IN FACT ONLY THE 'RECOMMENDATION' OF THE BOARD (CSA. s. 67(6) [100.]), WHICH IS AN UNAUTHORISED CONSIDERATION (PARTICULARLY AS LEGISLATION IN FACT ONLY PERMITS AN ADMINISTRATIVE JUDICIAL REVIEW, OF THE DETERMINATION OF THE BOARD, TO 'RECOMMEND PAROLE'), AND KNOWING THAT IF THEY 'REFUSE TO GRANT PAROLE APPROVAL', WHICH WOULD MEAN THEY HAD ^{REVERSED} ~~REVERSED~~ THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION (FOR PAROLE FOR THE LIFER), THE ARBITRARY CONSEQUENCE WOULD BE THE ADMINISTRATIVE RESENTENCING OF THE LIFER, ~~APPROPRIATE TO~~ TO INCREASE LIFER'S COURT IMPOSED NPP BY 6 TO 12 MONTHS (WHICH IS AN ACT EFFECTING CRIMINAL DERELICTION FOR THE REQUISITE OBSERVANCE OF DUE PROCESS, FOR THE CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPLIANT ACT OF EXTENDING NON-PAROLE PERIOD [65, 242. 83., 84., 45. AND 38.]). AS DESCRIBED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT, EXTENDING NPP IN SUCH WAY IS ILLEGAL, DEVALUING THE JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD WHO MADE THE 'RECOMMENDATION FOR PAROLE', BY 'REVERSING' ~~REJECTING~~ RATHER THAN 'REJECTING' (THEREBY PENDING A RE-DETERMINATION BY THE BOARD (AS ONLY THE BOARD IS LEGISLATIVELY COMPETENT/JURISDICTIONALLY AUTHORISED TO MAKE ^{DETERMINATION} ~~DETERMINATION~~, FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION ([94.]))), BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION IN SUCH WAY IS JURISDICTIONALLY FRAUDULENT AND CSA. LEGISLATIVELY PROHIBITED.

243. WITHOUT COMPETENT JURISDICTION (DEFINED BY [1., 3., 28., 45., 84., 65. AND 83.]), AS EXAMPLE FOUNDATION, WHERE TRUE AUTHORITY IS DEFINED AND ANCHORED), THE STATE GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNOR PARTICIPATED IN AN ACT RESULTING IN THEIR REFUSAL TO ACCEPT BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION (TO GRANT PAROLE FOR LIFER), THEN CONSEQUENTIALLY BECAME AN ACTIVE PARTICIPANT IN THE ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING OF THE RESPECTIVE LIFER, WHOSE PAROLE

- APPLICATION THEY HAD PRECURSIVELY 'REJECTED'. THE ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING EVENT, ARBITRARY IN ITS OPERATION (AND AGAINST SELICK [64. (PARA. 117.)]), RESULTING IN THE INCREASE TO LIFER'S COURT IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD. ABUSE OF OPERATION OF CSA (AND ILLEGAL ADMINISTRATIVE USE OF SAME), BY WAY OF AN ACT PERFORMED UNDER TAINTED CLOUD OF JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD BY SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (OPERATING UNDER CH. II AUTHORITY [3.]), TO ~~DO~~ PERFORM THE ACT OF RE-SENTENCING (WHERE COURTS' DEFINITION OF WHAT IS THE REQUISITE DUE PROCESS), THE RESPECTIVE LIFER (WHO IN FACT ONLY SUBMITTED APPLICATION FOR PAROLE, NOT AN APPLICATION FOR INCREASE OR DECREASE ~~TO~~ ^{TO} EXISTING COURT IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD), TO A NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD INCREASED FROM THE SENTENCING COURTS DETERMINED AND IMPOSED NPP, AND THE PRIOR ACTION OF STATE PARLIAMENT (TO CREATE LEGISLATION WHICH IS THEN IMPROPERLY EFFECTED INTO SAID ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING EVENT), BEING CONTRIBUTORY TO SUCH ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING BY STATE GOVERNMENT, OF SAID
244. LIFER. THE ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING, BY STATE GOVERNMENT, DID NOT INCLUDE USE OF ANY CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT IN THE ACT OF RE-SENTENCING, NOR DID IT INCLUDE, INVOLVE OR COMPLY WITH ANY REQUISITE SECTION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING ACT ([34., 38. AND 45.]), THEREBY CONSTITUTING UNAUTHORISED ACTION, INCLUDING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, AS THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT WHILST APPLYING THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT, IS THE ONLY CONSTITUTIONALLY EMPOWERED ASSIGNED (AND THEREFORE ALSO COMPETENT), AUTHORITY (PER. CH. III [3.]), TO "EXTEND" A LIFER'S NPP ([38.]), AS PART OF SENTENCE WHICH ONLY SAID COURT CAN LAWFULLY IMPOSE ON A LIFER ([34., 45., 84., 35., 36., 37. AND 38.]).
245. ONLY A SUPREME COURT, APPEALS COURT OR HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA. (SITTING AS A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT), JUDGE/JUDGES IS/ARE PERMITTED TO SENTENCE/RESENTENCING OF A LIFER TO A NEW NPP, NOT PARLIAMENT, NOT GOVERNOR, NOT MINISTER AND NOT CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, THEREFORE EVERY PARTICIPANT INVOLVED IN THE ACT OF RE-SENTENCING LIFER IN SAID DESCRIBED MANNER (RESULTING FROM CABINET/GOVERNOR REFUSING TO GRANT PAROLE TO LIFER), IRRESPECTIVE OF ~~WHETHER~~ WHETHER THE INDIVIDUALS ACTUALLY KNEW THEY WERE ENGAGING IN AN IMPROPER ACT, WAS A PARTY TO THE ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING. PARLIAMENT BEING THE CREATORS OF THE PARTICULAR LEGISLATION (OR AMENDMENTS INTO EXISTING ACT),

- EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT OPERATING UNDER CH. II AUTHORITY [1. AND 3.], INFORMING GOVERNOR THAT BILL IS READY AND APPROPRIATE FOR ASSENT ([15. AND 29.]), GOVERNOR WHO ASSENTS SUCH BILL ([15.]), GOVERNMENT WHO THEN MIS-APPROPRIATES THEIR CH. II [1. AND 3.] AUTHORITY TO UNLAWFULLY EFFECT OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, BEING CABINET-IN-SITING, TO UNLAWFULLY PERFORM A 'CONSIDERATION' OF A LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION, RATHER THAN ONLY A JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE DECISION OF THE PAROLE BOARD TO 'RECOMMEND PAROLE', AND BORNE FROM SAID 'CONSIDERATION' IS A DECISION WHICH NOT ONLY REVERSED BOARD'S DECISION, BUT THEN CHANGED TO AN ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING OF THE LIFER, AND THEN EFFECTED AN ILLEGAL INCREASE TO SAID LIFER'S COURT IMPOSED NPP OF 6 TO 12 MONTHS, THEREBY EFFECTING INCREASE TO THEIR TERM OF INCARCERATION OF AT LEAST ANOTHER 18 MONTHS (DUE TO REAPPLICATION FOR PAROLE
246. AND PROCEEDS ATTACHED TO SAME. ANY FRAUDULENT LEGISLATION (OR PART THEREIN), WHICH IS OPERATIONALLY AFFECTED INTO STATE GOVERNMENT'S BENEFIT, IN VIOLATION AND/OR BREACH OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY TO SO ACT, IS AN UNLAWFUL ACT, AND THAT IS THE WHAT TRANSPIRES CURRENTLY BETWEEN STATE GOVERNMENT, CSA, PAROLE BOARD AND LIFERS APPLYING FOR PAROLE (UP TO 1-1-2016). THESE MATTERS ARE DESCRIBED
247. IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT. FAILURE OF AND BY A GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE (INCLUDING MINISTERS), TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THEIR CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPLIANT AND AUTHORISED ([3.]), LEGAL AUTHORITY AND COMPETENT JURISDICTION ^{THEY} ACTUALLY IS, RELATIVE TO ANY ACT ^{THEY} INTEND TO PERFORM, EFFECT AND/OR CONTRIBUTE TO IN ANY WAY, IS PROFESSIONALLY NEGLIGENT AND INEPT, AND EVEN IF RELYING ON SOMEONE ELSE TO TELL ^{THEM} WHAT ~~THEIR~~ AUTHORITY THEY ACTUALLY HOLD, DOESN'T REMOVE OR DENY THE EVENTUAL ACTION WHICH IS IMPROPERLY ACHIEVED / EFFECTED, ESPECIALLY WHEN A LIFER IS THE REAL VICTIM OF SUCH IMPROPER ACT, AS DESCRIBED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT.
248. THE FACT THAT BOARD MEMBERS (AS INDIVIDUALS OF THE PAROLE BOARD), EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT MINISTERS (AS INDIVIDUALS OF CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL), AND OTHER RELATED EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT (AS INDIVIDUALS OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT), HAVE ON MANY OCCASIONS SINCE ENACTMENT OF THE STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRUTH IN SENTENCING) ACT 1994. S.A. [46.] ON 1-8-1994, IN RELATION TO LIFERS AND SENTENCING AND LIFERS

APPLYING FOR PAROLE, PERFORMED ACTS EXCEEDING THEIR LAWFUL AUTHORITY, BEING ABUSE OF AUTHORITY (ULTRA VIRES, A DEFECTIVE USE OF THE LAWFUL AUTHORITY ASSIGNED TO THEM TO EFFECT UNAUTHORISED ACT, REGARDLESS OF INTENTIONAL IMPROPRIETY, OR THROUGH INEPTITUDE, NEGLIGENCE AND/OR INCOMPETENCE), AS GENERALLY PARTICULARISED IN CRAIG [83.], ACTS OF JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD, ACTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE FRAUD, AND STOLEN THE PROTECTED RIGHTS AND APPLICATION OF SAME FROM MANY LIFERS SEEKING TO APPLY FOR PAROLE, ENGAGED IN ~~PAROLE~~ PAROLE PROCESSING PHASE AND/OR REAPPLICATION FOR PAROLE (AFTER PREVIOUS 'REFUSAL' TO GRANT PAROLE), DESCRIBED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT, AND CREATED VICTIMS OF SUCH IMPROPRIETIES (BEING THE LIFERS), DOES NOT MAKE THE IMPROPER ACTIONS ANY LESS UNLAWFUL. JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE PERFORMED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, WHO MAY NOT HAVE EVEN KNOWN THEIR CONDUCT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ([1.]).

249. ACTUALLY, IT SHOWS THAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT WILL USE ANY AND ALL MEANS AVAILABLE TO IT, IRRESPECTIVE OF BEING WITHIN OR OUTSIDE THEIR ASSIGNED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY (WITH THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S ILLEGAL ACTIONS TOWARDS ME ('PRISONER A.' TYPE), REGARDING MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74.], FURTHER EXPLAINED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT, BEING A PRIMARY EXAMPLE OF THEIR UNLAWFUL CONDUCT, ESPECIALLY AFTER I NOTIFIED THE STATE GOVERNMENT, IN WRITING, OF SPECIFICALLY WHY THEIR CONDUCT WAS NOT LAWFUL), SUCH AS THROUGH ACTIONS OF AND BY THE PAROLE BOARD, GOVERNOR AND CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, TO IMPROPERLY VIOLATE THE PROTECTED
250. RIGHTS (IN LAW), OF LIFERS ENGAGED IN THE PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS. SUCH PROTECTED RIGHTS OF THE RESPECTIVE LIFER, WHETHER THEY BE 'PRISONER A.' TYPE, 'PRISONER B.' TYPE OR 'PRISONER C.' TYPE [PARAGRAPH 23. IBID], ARE ACCRUED AND OWNED BY THE LIFER UPON SENTENCING BY THE SENTENCING COURT (AND HAVE BEEN FORMALLY DEFINED, CREATED IN WRITTEN WORDS AND OFFICIALLY SANCTIONED INTO AND PROTECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION [1.], JUDGMENTS OF THE HIGH COURT AND OF THE SUPREME COURT AND FULL COURT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT [31.], ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT [13.], CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT [34.], CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, S.A. 1982 (PRE 1-8-1994 AND POST 1-8-1994 VERSIONS), STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRUTH IN SENTENCING) ACT [46.]), ONCE SENTENCE IS IMPOSED.

251. ONE OF THE SIGNIFICANT CONSEQUENCES DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTED TO AND RESULTING FROM

SUCH ABUSE OF AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION, ADMINISTRATIVE AND JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD AND THE DEFECTIVE USE OF (THE ACTUAL) AUTHORITY OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT (OPERATING UNDER CH. II [3.] AUTHORITY), IS TO "CAUSE HARM" TO THE RESPECTIVE LIFERS (EXPLAINED AND DESCRIBED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT), PURSUANT TO CLCA

ss. 21. AND 24. [31.], IN A MANNER PROHIBITED IN LAW. THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT (REGARDING LIFERS APPLYING FOR PAROLE), ALSO ENGAGES IN "DISHONEST EXPLOITATION OF ADVANTAGE" (CLCA s. 142. [31.]), AND "DISHONEST DEALINGS WITH DOCUMENTS" (CLCA s. 140 [31.]), AND "DECEPTION" (CLCA s. 134. [31.]), AND "ABUSE OF PUBLIC OFFICE" (CLCA s. 251 [31.]), AND "ATTEMPT TO ~~PERVERT~~ OBSTRUCT OR PERVERT COURSE OF JUSTICE OR DUE ADMINISTRATION OF LAW" (CLCA s. 256 [31.]), SOMETIMES INTENTIONALLY, WHEREBY THEIR IMPROPER CONDUCT CONTINUES EVEN AFTER WRITTEN NOTIFICATION FROM LIFER OF THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS, AND SOMETIMES (BEING THE MAJORITY OF TIMES), THEIR IMPROPER CONDUCT IS DUE TO THEIR PROFESSIONAL INEPTITUDE, PROFESSIONAL INCOMPETENCE, PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE AND PROFESSIONAL ARROGANCE.

252. UNFORTUNATELY FOR THE AFFECTED LIFERS, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT PERMITS ITSELF, AND ASSISTS ITSELF TO UNLAWFULLY VIOLATE THE LIFERS' CONSTITUTIONALLY AND STATE LEGISLATIVELY PROTECTED AND ACCRUED RIGHTS, RELATING TO CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING OF MANY LIFERS (INCLUDING NPP WITHIN SUCH SENTENCES), WHEN THE STATE GOVERNMENT (OPERATING UNDER CH. II [3.] AUTHORITY ONLY), DISREGARDS THE REQUISITE MANDATORY USE AND INVOLVEMENT (AND ASSOCIATED DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS), OF THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT (WHICH IS THE ONLY CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.] EMPOWERED ENTITY WITH JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY ([3.] JUDICATURE), TO "EXTEND" A LIFER'S NPP ([45. AND 38.]), INSTEAD ONLY ADMINISTRATIVELY USING ACTIONS OF PAROLE BOARD, CABINET/EXECUTIVE ~~COUNCIL~~ COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR, AND APPLICATION OF FRAUDULENTLY ASSENTED ([15. AND 28.]) SENTENCING LEGISLATION, TO "EXTEND" INDIVIDUAL LIFERS' NPP, IN AN UNLAWFUL AND ILLEGAL MANNER, AS DESCRIBED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT. [REFER CSA ss. 67(3), 67(4), CLCA s. 237 "JUDICIAL BODY", CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING ACT s. 3. "COURT", ss. 6, 9, 32(3), 32(6), 32(6A), 32(7), 32(9), 32(10), 32(10)(xi), 32(10)(xii), AND 56.]

IN THIS PART, OPERATIONAL SENTENCING STANDARDS BETWEEN 1988 AND 1-1-2016 WILL BE REFERENCED, WITH NO CONSIDERATION OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL [140.], SOON TO BECOME OPERATIONAL, IN 2016.

253. THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT [86.] PERMITS A LIFER TO APPLY FOR PAROLE UP TO 6 MONTHS PRIOR TO THEIR NON-PAROLE PERIOD EXPIRY DATE ([47.]). THE LIFER APPLICANT IS ONLY PERMITTED TO SUBMIT ONE PAROLE APPLICATION AT ANY ONE TIME, THEREFORE ONLY A SINGLE PAROLE APPLICATION CAN BE SUBMITTED, AND SINGLE APPLICATION CAN BE PROCESSED ('PROCESSING PHASE'), FROM THE SAME LIFER APPLICANT AT ANY ONE TIME.
254. MANY LIFERS (APPLYING FOR PAROLE, THE PROCESSING PHASE), HAVE EXPERIENCED SIGNIFICANT DELAYS BY THE STATE GOVERNMENTS' JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY, EMPOWERED TO PROCESS SUCH PAROLE APPLICATIONS FROM LIFERS, THE PAROLE BOARD ([94., 96., 97., 98., 99., 100., 101., 103. ("RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOARD"), 106., 107., 108., 109., 110., 111., 112. AND 113.]), SOMETIMES UPWARDS OF 2 YEARS (IN THE 'PROCESSING PHASE'). THIS UNFAIR AND UNPROFESSIONAL AND DISCRIMINATORY REGIME OF 'SIGNIFICANT PERIODS', RELATING TO LIFERS' PAROLE APPLICATIONS IN THE 'PROCESSING PHASE', IS A SITUATION WHICH NON-LIFERS
255. NEVER EXPERIENCE/SUFFER. ONE REASON FOR ONLY LIFERS (AND NOT NON-LIFERS), HAVING THEIR PAROLE APPLICATIONS IN THE 'PROCESSING PHASE' FOR LONG PERIODS, IS DUE TO NON-LIFERS HAVING THEIR PAROLE APPLICATION DEALT WITH ENTIRELY BY THE BOARD, THERE IS NO FORWARDING ON (SUCH AS TO MINISTER, GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL), OF THEIR RESPECTIVE PAROLE APPLICATIONS, UNLIKE LIFERS WHOSE PAROLE APPLICATIONS ARE FORWARDED TO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL/GOVERNOR FOR THEIR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE 'PROCESSING PHASE'.
256. UPON SENTENCING OF A LIFER, THE COURT IS MANDATED TO INFORM THE LIFER, AND THEREFORE THE LIFER HAS THE OBLIGATORY RIGHT (IN LAW), TO RECEIVE AN 'EXPLANATION FROM THE COURT OF THE LEGAL EFFECT AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE SENTENCE' (CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT S.A. S. 9(1)(b) [37.]), IMPOSED UPON THEM ([45.]). THIS MEANS THE STATE GOVERNMENT, OPERATING UNDER CH. II AUTHORITY ([3.]), WHILE ENFORCING

THE SENTENCE IMPOSED BY THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT (PURSUANT TO SECTION 56 OF THE SENTENCING ACT ([45.]), WHILE IT OPERATED UNDER CH. III AUTHORITY ([3.]), HAS "OBLIGATIONS" ([37.]), TO THE DEFENDANT REGARDING PRISONERS' RIGHTS AND EXPECTATIONS, INCLUDING WHAT THE STATE GOVERNMENT IS OBLIGATED TO UNDERTAKE AND TO COMPLY WITH ([45.]).

257. ONLY A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT HAS LEGAL AUTHORITY AND COMPETENT JURISDICTION ([3, (CH. III JUDICATURE), EMPOWERS CLSC TO CONSIDER, DETERMINE AND THEN IMPOSE UPON RESPECTIVE LIFER, PURSUANT TO SECTION 56 OF CLSA, 45.]), SPOKEN BY A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT JUSTICE, WHEN STILL WITHIN SOUTH AUSTRALIA COURT JURISDICTION, PURSUANT TO CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT 1983 S.A., S. 56 ([34, AND 45.]), TO VARY / EXTEND A LIFER'S NON-PAROLE PERIOD ([38., 39., 45, AND 194. (PARAS. 11. AND 68.])). SUCH JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE HAS NOT BEEN VESTED IN THE GOVERNOR, CABINET / EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OR MINISTERS OR PARLIAMENT, ONLY THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT ([45. AND 38.]).

258. THAT ALSO MEANS THAT SAID COURT IS A "JUDICIAL ~~Body~~ BODY" WITH CRIMINAL LAW JURISDICTION, UNLIKE PAROLE BOARD, PRISON VISITING TRIBUNAL AND CABINET / EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (ENGAGING IN PAROLE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' REVIEW FOR LIFER'S PAROLE), WHICH STATE LEGISLATIVELY ([13., 31., 34., 85. AND 86.]), AND CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 3.]), ARE ONLY PERMITTED TO SIT AS A "JUDICIAL BODY" BUT LIMITED AND ~~CONTAINED~~ CONFINED TO ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION (REGARDING PAROLE APPLICATIONS).

259. THE PURPOSE OF A SPECIFIC SENTENCE (INCLUDING DETERMINED NPP), DETERMINED AND IMPOSED BY THE CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT, FOR A LIFER (WITH IMPOSED NPP), IS 'FINALITY' IN THE PENALTY OF SENTENCE CALCULATED BY THE SENTENCING COURT. THAT WAY ALL CONCERNED / RELEVANT PARTIES ARE FULLY INFORMED OF THE COURT'S IMPOSED SENTENCE (INCLUDING ALL CONSIDERATIONS WHICH COURT RELIED UPON ([36. AND 37.]), PRIOR TO DECIDING THEN IMPOSING SENTENCE), MAKING THE PROCESS AN OPEN BOOK REGIME WITH NO SECRET / HIDDEN COURT'S CONSIDERATIONS (WHICH CONVICTED LIFER IS NOT AWARE OF).

260. THEREFORE, THE LIFER (DEFENDANT), AND THE STATE (DPP), KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THE IMPOSED SENTENCE IS (FROM AND BY THE COURT ([45.]), PURSUANT TO DUE PROCESS

REQUIREMENTS OF SECTIONS 6, AND 9, OF THE SENTENCING ACT (L 36. AND 37.]), AS IS CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1. AND 3.] CH. III, JUDICATURE), REQUIRED BY, AND PROTECTED BY ALSO (AS A RIGHT IN LAW).

261. FOR A LIFER INCARCERATED IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHEN THE CRIME HAPPENED WHICH THEY WERE CONVICTED OF (AGAINST THE REQUIREMENT FORMING APPLICABLE SENTENCING STANDARDS ([72. AND 77.])), IRRESPECTIVE OF WHEN THEY WERE CONVICTED, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHEN THEY WERE SENTENCED, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHAT SENTENCING STANDARDS WERE APPLIED TO THE IMPOSED SENTENCE (REGARDLESS OF CORRECT SENTENCING STANDARDS BEING APPLIED OR NOT), AND IRRESPECTIVE OF AN ABROGATING SENTENCE BEING IMPOSED BY THE COMPETENT COURT (SUCH AS MY 2002 JUDGMENT [74., 80., 78., AND 77.]), CURRENT ACTIONS BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT (ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNMENT'S REASONING AND ~~OPERATIONAL~~ OPERATIONAL EFFECTS), EFFECTIVELY MEAN THAT A LIFER (WITH AN IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD), CAN BE HELD IN CUSTODY UNTIL THEY DIE (EVEN AFTER PAROLE BOARD 'RECOMMENDS' PAROLE RELEASE TO GOVERNOR ([100.])), REGARDLESS OF THE DATE OF THEIR CRIMINAL SENTENCING COURT DETERMINED (AND
262. IMPOSED), NON-PAROLE PERIOD. THE LIFERS CONTINUE TO BE HELD IN CUSTODY FOR YEARS AFTER THEIR COURT DETERMINED (AND IMPOSED), NON-PAROLE PERIODS ~~EXP~~ EXPIRE, ONLY BECAUSE THE POLITICALLY CORRUPT STATE GOVERNMENT (OF THE DAY), BEING THE CABINET (WHO ACTS IN AN IMPROPER WAY, AND FOR AN IMPROPER PURPOSE), AND INCLUDES INCOMPETENT/INEPT CONDUCT BY GOVERNOR ALSO, WHERE THEIR ACTION IS TO 'REFUSE TO APPROVE PAROLE TO A LIFER', EVEN THOUGH THE PAROLE BOARD HAS "RECOMMENDED" ([100.]), SOMETIMES EVEN REPEATEDLY 'RECOMMENDED' PAROLE RELEASE ONLY TO BE REFUSED BY CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AND GOVERNOR (AS AN INDIVIDUAL). [65. (DUE PROCESS DENIED), 83., 112., 113., 132., 131., 174., 175., 176., 188., 189., 194. (PARAS. 28, 68.)]
263. THE EFFECT OF GOVERNOR AND CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL 'REFUSING TO GRANT PAROLE TO A LIFER', EVEN THOUGH THE PAROLE BOARD MADE A LEGALLY SOUND 'RECOMMENDATION' TO GRANT ~~THEIR~~ PAROLE (SOMETIMES EVEN REPEATEDLY 'RECOMMENDED' PAROLE FOR RESPECTIVE LIFERS), MEANS THAT THE LIFER, IN REAL TERMS, IS GIVEN A SHIFTING SENTENCE, WHICH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ([1.]) IN ITS OPERATIONAL

EFFECT AND CONTRARY TO THE PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINAL COURT SENTENCING FINALITY, AND ALSO ILLEGALLY DENIES THE RESPECTIVE LIFER (DENIED PAROLE), THE MANDATORY OBSERVANCE OF THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT [34.], PARTICULAR (THEREIN),

264. SECTIONS 56, 6. AND 4. ([45., 36. AND 37.]). IT IS NOT EVEN THE SENTENCING COURT WHICH IMPOSED THE 'SHIFTING SENTENCE', IT IS ACHIEVED BY IMPROPER OPERATION OF (WHAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE PROPER USE OF CH. II [3.] AUTHORITY, EXCEPT FOR SAID UNLAWFUL CONDUCT), THE STATE GOVERNMENT'S ADMINISTRATION OF THE BUSINESS OF GOVERNING SOUTH AUSTRALIA. WHERE 'JURISDICTIONAL ERROR' IS THE FLAWED/ERRONEOUS BELIEF THAT ONE MAY BE EMPOWERED/~~VESTED~~ WITH CERTAIN JURISDICTION, TO PERFORM CERTAIN ACTS AND ARRIVE AT CERTAIN DECISIONS, AND THEN ACTING AS IF ONE HAD THAT AUTHORITY TO SO ACT, BUT THAT IS LESS IMPROPER THAN NEGLECTING/
 FAILING TO PROPERLY INVESTIGATE ONE'S ASSUMED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY, TO PERFORM CERTAIN ACTS (ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT), TO ~~ARRIVE~~ ^{ARRIVE} AT CERTAIN DECISIONS (ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT), AND TO EFFECT CERTAIN CONSEQUENTIAL ACTIONS RESULTING FROM SAME (AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GOVERNMENT), ESPECIALLY AFTER THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT IS NOTIFIED, INFORMED, CHALLENGED FORMALLY AND OFFICIALLY ABOUT SUCH ACTIONS DONE, PARTICULARLY WHERE THE 'CLAIMED ~~THE~~ JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY' RELIED UPON BY THE GOVERNMENT, AS THE STATE GOVERNMENT BELIEVED IT OWNED (AND WAS THEREFORE EMPOWERED WITH), IS THE VERY SUBJECT MATTER BEING CHALLENGED ([83. AND 82.]).

SUCH MATTERS ARE DESCRIBED AT GREATER DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT.

265. THERE ARE MANY LIFERS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRISONS WHO HAVE BEEN 'DENIED PAROLE', NOT BY THE PAROLE BOARD DIRECTLY, BUT CONSEQUENTIALLY AFTER CABINET (INCLUDING GOVERNOR-IN-CABINET), 'REFUSED TO APPROVE PAROLE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION'
 266. TO RELEASE A LIFER ON PAROLE'. THE PAROLE BOARD MERELY RELAYS TO THE LIFER THAT PAROLE WAS NOT APPROVED. THE MAJORITY OF TIMES PAROLE IS REFUSED BY CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, THE LIFER IS DENIED ANY OFFICIAL REASONING FOR SAID 'REFUSAL', BY THE PAROLE BOARD, THE STATE GOVERNMENT, CABINET/EXECUTIVE
 267. COUNCIL AND THE GOVERNOR (AS AN INDIVIDUAL). BEING DENIED ANY REASON/S AS TO WHY PAROLE RELEASE WAS REFUSED BY CABINET, NEGLECTS TO PROVIDE PAROLE APPLICANT

WITH TARGET DETAILS (POINTS OF CONTENTION), TO ATTACK THROUGH CRIMINAL COURT OR EVEN ADMINISTRATIVE COURT'S REVIEW, WHICH IN ~~THE~~ FACT IS THE INTENTION OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, TO IMPROPERLY STOP A LIFER PAROLE APPLICANT FROM CHALLENGING THE POLITICALLY CORRUPT CONDUCT BY STATE GOVERNMENT, AS A COURT CHALLENGE MUST INCLUDE 'NOT JUST THE DECISION BY CABINET TO REFUSE PAROLE TO RESPECTIVE LIFER', BUT ALSO THE 'REASONING FROM WHICH SAID DECISION WAS FORMULATED'. THIS MATTER IS DESCRIBED IN GREATER DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT, INCLUDING [28.] BREACH IN THE ASSENT OF [102., 103., 104. AND 105.], BEING FRAUDULENT ASSENT [144. (PARA. 64. "IMPROPER PURPOSE")], WHERE CLAIMED JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY (TO ACT), IN FACT DOES NOT EXIST CONSTITUTIONALLY ([1.]), AND IS PROHIBITED FROM BEING CREATED (IN THE WAY CLAIMED TO EXIST [82. AND 83.]), EFFECTING OPERATION OF [16.], AND FOR THE SIMILAR REASON VOID [46.], FURTHER EVOKING OPERATION OF [16.], CONSEQUENTIALLY REINSTATING THE CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT WHICH WAS OPERATIONAL, IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA IN 1994, IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO ENACTMENT OF [46.]. ADDITIONALLY, UPON GOVERNOR/CABINET RECEIPT OF BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION ([100.]), CABINET BREACHED (CH. II [3.]) JURISDICTION AND PERFORMED A SECOND CONSIDERATION (CSA s. 67(4) [99.]), YET ONLY HAD RIGHT ~~TO~~ (CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY [1.]), TO JUDICIALLY REVIEW [33. "JUDICIAL BODY, JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS"], THE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' TO DETERMINE IF ~~THE~~ THE 'RECOMMENDATION' ITSELF (WHICH WAS THE FORMAL JUDGMENT OF THE BOARD (WHO SAT AS A FORMAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, TO PERFORM CSA. s. 67(4) CONSIDERATION OF LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION CSA. s. 67), SITTING AS A JUDICIAL BODY, ENGAGING IN A JUDICIAL PROCEEDING, WITHIN WHICH RESPECTIVE LIFER HAS RIGHT OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION CSA. s. 77(3)), WAS LEGALLY SOUND. THE CHALLENGE IS AGAINST CABINET AND GOVERNOR'S CONDUCT IN TWO MAIN PARTS, THE FIRST BEING THEIR BELIEF THAT THEY ARE PERFORMING A DEFACTO CSA. s. 67(4) ([99.]) CONSIDERATION THEN SUBSEQUENT DECISION, SPECIFICALLY ENCOMPASSING PAROLE APPLICATION PROPER, WHICH IS A FALSE BELIEF ABOUT THEIR CLAIMED JURISDICTION RELATING TO 'WHAT THEY RECEIVE AND WHY'. THE SECOND, BEING THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ILLEGAL RE-SENTENCING, OF THE LIFERS WHOSE PAROLE APPLICATIONS CSA. s. 67 ([99.]), RECEIVED POSITIVE 'RECOMMENDATION' FROM THE

PAROLE BOARD CSA. S. 67(6) (E100.J), THAT THE RESPECTIVE LIFER SHOULD RECEIVE PAROLE RELEASE', BUT CONSEQUENTIAL TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDUCT OF CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR (INDEPENDENT FROM THEM), BEING THEIR FRAUDULENT (E194. (PARA. 64. "IMPROPER PURPOSE"), 82. AND 83.J), CONSIDERATION THEN SUBSEQUENT DECISION TO 'REFUSE PAROLE RELEASE' (WHICH GOES AGAINST BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION'), THE ARBITRARY RESULT OF SUCH CABINET/GOVERNOR 'REFUSAL', IS AN ILLEGALLY CREATED INCREASE TO LIFER'S COURT DETERMINED AND IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD, WITH SUCH INCREASE BEING APPROXIMATELY 12 MONTHS AFTER SAID CABINET/GOVERNOR 'REFUSAL', AND DUE TO CABINET AND GOVERNOR (AS AN INDIVIDUAL), HAVING FULL PRIOR KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONSEQUENCE TO LIFER'S TERM OF INCARCERATION INCREASE (ADMINISTRATIVELY), I ACCUSE CABINET (INCLUDING GOVERNOR-IN-CABINET), AND GOVERNOR (AS AN INDIVIDUAL), OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT, NEGLIGENCE, MALFEASANCE AND INEPTITUDE ~~IN~~ AS THEY WERE ALL PART TO THE ILLEGAL ACT OR RE-SENTENCING, FROM A SECONDARY PERSPECTIVE, AFTER ILLEGALLY AND UNLAWFULLY BREACHING THE CONFINED SCOPE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION', FOR LEGAL SOUNDNESS (OF THE 'RECOMMENDATION' ONLY).

272. FOR A GOVERNMENT AGENT TO NOT KNOW THEIR TRUE JURISDICTION, IS INEPT AND NEGLIGENT AND INCOMPETENT; RESULTING IN ILLEGAL IMPRISONMENT OF A LIFER.

273. WHERE CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR, THEN ALSO RESIST ALL REQUESTS FROM LIFER APPLICANT, AND FROM PAROLE BOARD ALSO, TO FURNISH REASONS FOR THEIR 'REFUSAL' (TO APPROVE PAROLE RELEASE, WHICH WAS BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION), FURTHER COMPOUNDS THEIR IMPROPER UNDERTAKINGS, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER OR NOT ~~THEY~~ THEY THOUGHT THEY ACTUALLY HAD THE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO DO WHAT THEY DID. THIS MATTER IS DESCRIBED IN GREATER DETAIL IN OTHER ~~IN~~ SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT.

274. BY REFUSING TO PROVIDE LIFER WITH PROOF OF THE OFFICIAL REASONING OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, BEING CABINET AND GOVERNOR, WHEN THEY DISREGARD BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION CSA. S. 67(6) (E100.J), DID NOT APPROVE SAID 'RECOMMENDATION', EFFECTING STATE GOVERNMENT DETERMINING THAT BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' IS PROFESSIONALLY INCOMPETENT AND NEGLIGENT, THEN THERE MUST BE LEGAL BASIS AND NOT POLITICAL CORRUPTION FOR MAKING SUCH A DECISION, WHICH LIFER, BY PARLIAMENTARY INTENTION CSA. S. 77(3) (E113.J), MUST BE INFORMED OF.

275. IN WATSON [194.], THE COURT WAS IN SIGNIFICANT ERROR WHEN STATING AS IF FACTUAL, THAT LIFER HAS NO RIGHT IN LAW TO ⁶KNOW WHAT IS DISCUSSED IN CABINET, AND THEREFORE NO RIGHT TO KNOW ON WHAT BASIS/FUNDAMENTAL LEGAL GROUND/S THE CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND THEN GOVERNOR (INDEPENDENT OF CABINET [29.]), DETERMINED THAT 'PAROLE BOARD WAS WRONG TO 'RECOMMEND PAROLE RELEASE' FOR A PARTICULAR LIFER'. THIS MATTER OF SIGNIFICANT ERRORS IN WATSON [194.], IS DESCRIBED IN MORE DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT.
276. IT IS IN FACT THE INTENTION OF PARLIAMENT, AND A CONSTITUTIONAL ([1.]), REQUIREMENT THAT THE LIFER APPLICANT MUST BE GIVEN 'STATE'S LEGAL ARGUMENT WHICH CLEARLY IDENTIFIES THE REASONING OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, FROM WHICH THE CONSIDERATION ([99.]) OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT ARRIVING AT A DETERMINATION ([100.]) OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, WAS THEN DISREGARDED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, ALBEIT IMPROPERLY (FURTHER DESCRIBED IN GREATER DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT), AND THEN VOIDED (IMPROPERLY USING FRAUDULENTLY ASSENTED [102.], WHICH VIOLATED [28., 107., 108. AND 112. AND 113.]), BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT'.
277. THE STATE GOVERNMENT IS AN AMALGAMATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHO WORK FOR, WITHIN AND ON BEHALF OF SPECIFIC DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES ETC. WHICH AS INDIVIDUALS THEY REPRESENT (IN THEIR PERSONAL WORK FOR SAME), AND ALL SUCH DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES ETC. COMBINE TO EFFECT THE OPERATIONAL BUSINESS OF THE GOVERNMENT. THE GOVERNMENT IS THEREFORE A THING, BEING THE STATE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, BUT ALSO THE INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEES (AND AGENTS), WHO PERFORM AND WHO REPRESENT (ON BEHALF OF), THE OPERATIONAL ACTIONS OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT. EACH SUCH EMPLOYEE, AS AN INDIVIDUAL BUT ALSO WITHIN DEDICATED DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES ETC. OF LIKE INDIVIDUALS, MUST CONFINE THEIR OPERATIONAL ACTIONS TO WITHIN THE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY ASSIGNED TO RESPECTIVE DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES ETC. THE PAROLE BOARD IS ONE SUCH OPERATIONAL ENTITY, WITH THEIR OPERATIONAL CONDUCT/ACTIONS BEING THE VESTED AUTHORITY TO UNDERTAKE CERTAIN ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING RECEIVING LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION ([94. AND 96.]), THEN CONSIDERING SAME ([94.]), THEN MAKING DETERMINATION FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION
278. ([94.]). THEREFORE, PURSUANT TO CSA. s. 67(4) [107. AND 108.], AND SAME IS ONLY

- AFTER ENGAGEMENT BY LIFER APPLICANT OF CSA. s. 67, THEN CSA. s. 67(2), WHICH ARE ONLY POSSIBLE AFTER OPERATION OF SENTENCING ACT [34.], IN ACCORDANCE WITH [45.], AND SUBSEQUENT TO [36., 37. AND 38.], WHICH ARE ONLY CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.] PERMITTED IF COMPLIANT WITH [28.], UNDER JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY AND COMPETENCE BORNE FROM CH. III ([3.] JUDICATURE) OF THE CONSTITUTION [1.], IT IS ONLY THE PAROLE BOARD WHO IS PERMITTED IN LAW, TO PERFORM, WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PROCESSING PHASE (OF LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION ("TO THE BOARD" [96.])), THE CONSIDERATION OF SAID LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION, CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUISITE ELEMENTS OF DUE PROCESS ASSOCIATED WITH SUCH APPLICATION ([94.]), AND THE OBSERVANCE OF SUCH DUE PROCESS, ACCORDING TO LAW (NOT ACCORDING TO WHAT THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN PERPETRATING SINCE 1-8-1994 ([46.]), WHICH HAS NOT BEEN CONSTITUTIONALLY ^{COMPLIANT} ~~CONSTITUTIONAL~~ ([1.]), AND IS THEREFORE ILLEGAL, AS EXPLAINED IN MORE ~~IN~~ DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT), AS HIGHLIGHTED IN
279. STAFFORD [65.]. THE COURT WAS IN ERROR IN WATSON [144.], TO STATE AS IF FACTUAL, THAT CSA. s. 67(9) [107.] WAS ONLY REQUIRED IF THE BOARD REFUSED LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION, BUT NOT IF CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OR GOVERNOR (AS AN INDIVIDUAL), REFUSED TO APPROVE THE PAROLE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' ([100.]), BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT 'THE PAROLE BOARD AND ONLY THE BOARD IS REQUIRED TO GIVE REASONS' PER CSA. s. 67(9) [107.], AS EXPRESSED IN PARAGRAPH 25 THEREIN [144. (PARA. 25.)].
280. THE COURT IN WATSON [144.], WAS IN ERROR MANY TIMES DUE TO ASSUMED BELIEFS (OF THE COURT), WHICH WERE LEGALLY FLAWED FOR SEVERAL REASONS, AS DESCRIBED
281. IN GREATER DETAILS IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT. DUE TO LACK OF PROPER AND COMPETENT EXPLANATION TO THE COURT (IN WATSON [144.]), THE COURT WAS DEPRIVED OF THE TRUE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ([1.]), ASSOCIATED WITH CSA. s. 67. ([44.]), PAROLE APPLICATION BY LIFER, ESPECIALLY THE CONFINED/NARROW JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR (AS AN INDIVIDUAL), REGARDING THEIR RECEIPT OF BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' TO RELEASE LIFER ON PAROLE, WHICH GAVE RISE TO THE COURT'S ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS IN RELATION TO 'GOVERNOR'S ROLE AND AUTHORITY', 'CABINET'S/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL'S ROLE AND AUTHORITY', AND 'BOARD'S ROLE AND AUTHORITY'.

282. THE DELIBERATE ACT OF REFUSING TO PROVE, BY WAY OF ISSUING PRISONER APPLICANT (LIFER APPLYING FOR PAROLE [94.], WHOSE APPLICATION SUBSEQUENT TO [94.], WAS ACCEPTED BY THE BOARD [100.], BUT WAS NOT APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR [29. AND 194. (PARA. 61.)], AND NO REASONS FOR 'NOT APPROVING'), WITH WRITTEN REASON/S FOR 'THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA' NOT ACCEPTING AND THEREBY NOT APPROVING, THE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' ([100.]), AND SO DENYING THE LIFER THAT WHICH MUST BE PROVIDED TO NON-LIFERS WHEN 'THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA' DOES NOT APPROVE THEIR APPLICATION FOR PAROLE RELEASE ([94. AND 107. AND 108.])], IS A SERIOUSLY DECEPTIVE AND DISCRIMINATORY ACT PERPETRATED
283. BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT ONLY AGAINST LIFERS. THERE IS NOTHING WRITTEN IN THE CSA, WHICH PERMITS (IN CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPLIANT [1. AND 28.] WORDING), SUCH AN ACT OF BLATENT DISCRIMINATION, AND IN FACT IS ACTUALLY ~~PROHIBITED~~ PROHIBITED IN LAW VIA OPERATIONAL INTENTION ASSOCIATED WITH [34., 45., 36., 37., 38., 84., 85., 94., 107., 108. AND 113.].
284. JUST BECAUSE 'THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA' HAVE PERPETRATED SUCH OFFENSIVE AND DISCRIMINATORY ACTS, SINCE 1-8-1944 ([46.]), DOES NOT MEAN IS SHOULD CONTINUE 'AS IT HAS DONE FOR SO LONG'. THE CONDUCT IS UNLAWFUL AND ILLEGAL AND MANY LIFERS HAVE BECOME VICTIMS OF SAID CRIMES, PERPETRATED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, WHICH ALSO MEANS THE PAROLE BOARD HAS BEEN COMPLICIT IN SAID IMPROPER ACTS.
285. A NON-LIFER WHO IS 'REFUSED PAROLE' RELEASE MAY COMPLETE THEIR ENTIRE SENTENCE, AT WHICH POINT THE STATE GOVERNMENT MUST RELEASE THEM FROM CUSTODY. WHEREAS, A LIFER WHO IS 'REFUSED PAROLE' RELEASE (BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, AFTER [100.], AND NO REASON/S PROVIDED TO LIFER AS TO 'WHY REFUSED PAROLE?'), AND WITHOUT EFFECTING CSA, s. 67(9) (SO LIFER HAS 'NO REASONING TO CHALLENGE IN A COURT APPEAL, AGAINST THAT DECISION OF AND BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, TO REFUSE PAROLE APPLICATION), 'HAS NO FINALITY IN THEIR SENTENCE' OTHER THAN WHEN THEY DIE, AT WHICH POINT THEY ARE GUARANTEED TO EXIT CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, AS A DEAD BODY.
286. I ARGUE THAT EVERY LIFER APPLICANT ([94.]), MUST BE FULLY INFORMED OF

- ALL KNOWN STATE'S EVIDENCE, RELATING TO SAID LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION BEING REJECTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, CONSISTENT WITH CSA. s. 67(4), WHICH IN FACT, AND IN LAW, SHOULD ONLY OCCUR IF CSA. s. 67(6) DOES NOT EXIST. ~~THERE~~ THERE MUST, PER CONSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE (L1.3), EXIST ONLY CSA. s. 67(4) [107.], OR CSA. s. 67(6) [100.], BECAUSE THEY ARE DICHOTOMIC EVENTS IN SUBSEQUENCE TO THE SAME ACTION (WHICH IS A PAROLE APPLICATION [94.]).
287. THE PROCESSING PHASE OF A PAROLE APPLICATION INCORPORATES ALL ACTIONS OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT, ASSOCIATED WITH PROCESSING SAID APPLICATION BY LIFER, IRRESPECTIVE OF WHICH GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE ACTUALLY PERFORMS AN ASSOCIATED
288. ACTION. THEREFORE, EVERY GOVERNMENT REJECTION OF EVERY RESPECTIVE LIFER APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR PAROLE RELEASE, PARTICULARLY AS IT IS ALSO ^{IN} ~~THE~~ THE PROCESSING PHASE [PARAGRAPHS 167, 169. AND 170. IBID], MUST BE REGARDED AND THEREFORE HANDLED, MANAGED AND PROCESSED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT BODY WITH LEGISLATIVELY VESTED AUTHORITY (THAT WHICH IS IDENTIFIED BY PARLIAMENTARY CREATION, BEING STATUTORY INSTRUMENT [14.]), IN THIS MATTER SUCH BODY IS THE PAROLE BOARD, AND MUST ABIDE BY THE POSITIVE AND AFFIRMATIVE WORDING ([64.]), OF CSA. s. 77(3) [113.] (IF LAWYER NOT PERMITTED IN CABINET TO "REPRESENT" LIFER APPLICANT, THEN ALL USE OF CABINET, WHICH IN ANY WAY INFLUENCES ANY EVENT RELATING TO ANY LIFER'S RESPECTIVE PAROLE APPLICATION, MUST BE PROHIBITED (AS IT CANNOT EXIST DUE TO VIOLATION OF [28.]), MUST NOT BE PERMITTED, AND IN FACT, SINCE 1-8-1994 ([46.]), HAVE NOT EXISTED IN LAW
289. (INCLUDING STATUTE), BUT SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT HAVE ILLEGALLY ACTED DURING PROCESSING PHASE, AFTER [100.], AS IF IT HAD JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY VIA [29.], AND ALLOWED CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL HEARINGS TO VOID CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF CSA. s. 77(3) ([113.]), WHICH VIOLATES (IN ITS EFFECT), [28.], WHICH IN FACT IS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY (PRIOR TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ASSENT (L1.) OF [102., 103., 104. AND 105.], DUE TO VIOLATION OF [28.], EQUATING TO IMPROPER ASSENT OF [102.], WHICH MUST
290. BE EXPUNGED [16.], DUE TO [28.]), THE CSA. [94.], DID NOT MAKE ANY MENTION IN LEGISLATION BETWEEN CSA. ss. 67(6), 67(7), 67(8), 67(9) OR

67(10), OF ANY USE OF CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL TO 'DENY/REFUSE A LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION', AS SUCH AN OPERATIONAL ACTION IS STILL CONSTITUTIONALLY (CH. I [3.]), VESTED IN THE PAROLE BOARD (AS THE AUTHORISED GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENT, STATUTORY INSTRUMENT, PER SPECIFIC WORDING THEREIN [64.]), [14.], WITH JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE TO SO ACT, EVEN THOUGH SINCE 1-8-1944 [46.], THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT UNLAWFULLY (DUE TO LACK OF CONSTITUTIONAL [1.] PROTECTION AND AUTHORITY TO SO ACT), SHIFTED THE CONSTITUTIONALLY [1.] ANCHORED JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE (RELATING TO [100. AND 101.]), OF THE PAROLE BOARD ONLY (PER AFFIRMATIVE WORDING [64.]), TO THE UNLAWFULLY EMPOWERED CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR (THIS MATTER IS DESCRIBED IN GREATER DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT), AS IDENTIFIED CLEARLY AT CSA. s. 67(9) [107. AND 108.]), DURING EVERY ASPECT OF THE PROCESSING PHASE WHICH HAS BEARING ON 'CONSIDERATION' (CSA. s. 67(4) [99.]), 'DETERMINATION' (CSA. s. 67(4) AND CSA. s. 67(6), OR, CSA. s. 67(4) AND CSA. s. 67(4) [99., 100., 101., 106., 107. AND 108.]), AND 'OUTCOME' (PER "DUE PROCESS" ACCORDING TO LAW [65.]), EITHER CSA. s. 67(6) [100.], OR, CSA. s. 67(9) [107. AND 108.].

291. CONSEQUENTIAL TO (AND ARBITRARILY, AGAINST SELLECK [64. (PARA. 117.)]), THE CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR REFUSING TO ACCEPT THE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION TO GRANT PAROLE TO A SPECIFIC LIFER' ([100.]), ACCORDING TO THE UNLAWFUL CONDUCT PERPETRATED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT (COMPLICITLY INCLUDING ACTIONS OF THE PAROLE BOARD), THE RESPECTIVE LIFER CAN'T SUBMIT ANOTHER PAROLE APPLICATION ([99.]), FOR AT LEAST ANOTHER 6 MONTHS (CSA. s. 67(3) [97.], CSA. ss. 67(4), 67(4)(c), 67(10) [107., 108. AND 109.]), DUE TO THE CRIMINALLY ABUSIVE ACT, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL [1.] ACT ^{OF} RE-SENTENCING THE LIFER TO AN INCREASED NON-PAROLE PERIOD. THIS MATTER IS DESCRIBED IN GREATER
292. DETAIL IN OTHER SECTIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT. ONLY A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT IS CONSTITUTIONALLY PERMITTED (CH. III [3.]), TO VARY A COURT IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD (WATSON [194. (PARAS. 11, 39.)], (PARA. 68. "UNDER THE STATUTORY SCHEME... COURT WILL DECIDE THESE MATTERS.")]), NOT PARLIAMENT (CH. I [3.]), AND NOT EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENT (CH. II [3.]), ONLY THE

SENTENCING COURT (PURSUANT TO [34., 35., 36., 45. AND 38.]), JURISDICTIONALLY AUTHORIZED WITH CONSTITUTIONAL COMPETENCE (CH. III [3.]).

293. IF A NON-PAROLE PERIOD IS NOT CREATED IN, CREATED BY AND IMPOSED BY A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT (IF STILL WITHIN SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JUDICIAL PRECINCTS), THEN 'IT' IS NOT A COURT IMPOSED NON-PAROLE PERIOD, THEREFORE CAN'T BE WHAT THE STATE GOVERNMENT CLAIMS IT TO BE (A NON-PAROLE PERIOD), AND DOES NOT COMPLY WITH [45.].
294. IT ALSO MEANS, TECHNICALLY, THAT THE LIFER'S COURT IMPOSED NPP HAS BEEN EXTENDED BY ANOTHER 12 MONTHS, BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, WHICH IS NOT JUST UNLAWFUL (WHERE NO CONSTITUTION AUTHORITY EXISTS ([1.])), IT IS ALSO ILLEGAL (AS SUCH ACTS ARE PROHIBITED IN LEGISLATION ~~§~~ [45., 84., 36., 38., 40., 41., 42., 43., 44. AND 194. (PARA. 39.)]).
295. ONLY A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT (BEING A "JUDICIAL BODY" (CLCA. s. 237 [33.]), WITH CRIMINAL LAW JURISDICTION), IS CONSTITUTIONALLY PERMITTED (CH. III [3.]), WITH ASSOCIATED JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE AND AUTHORITY, TO "VARY" AND/OR "EXTEND" ([34., 35., 45. AND 38.]), A LIFER'S COURT IMPOSED NPP. THE CONSTITUTION [1. AND 3.], AND STATE LEGISLATION DO NOT PERMIT ANY "JUDICIAL BODY" (CLCA. s. 237 [33.]), WITH ONLY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JURISDICTION TO "VARY" AND/OR "EXTEND" A LIFER'S COURT IMPOSED NPP, WHICH INCLUDES (AS PROHIBITED BODIES), THE PAROLE BOARD, CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR.
296. BY REFUSING TO APPROVE PAROLE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' CSA. s. 67(6) [100.], KNOWING SUCH ACTION ARBITRARILY RESULTS IN EXTENDING OF LIFER'S TERM OF INCARCERATION, MEANS CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND GOVERNOR HAVE BEEN A PARTY TO RE-SENTENCING OF RESPECTIVE LIFER APPLICANT, TO A MINIMUM OF 12 MONTHS MORE INCARCERATION, WITHOUT USE OF A CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT, THEREBY CONSTITUTING DEFECTIVE USE OF ASSIGNED AUTHORITY (ULTRA VIRES).
297. THE PAROLE BOARD DOES NOT HAVE 'CONSTITUTIONAL CONSENT' ([1.]), OR 'CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT CONSENT' ([34.]), OR 'SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPREME COURT RULES CONSENT', OR 'CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT' CONSENT' ([86.]), TO ON-FORWARD A LIFER'S PAROLE APPLICATION CSA. s. 67 [94.], TO ANY OTHER

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITY/JUDICIAL BODY, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAROLE SUITABILITY 'CONSIDERATION' CSA. s. 67(4) [99.], OR SUBSEQUENT 'DETERMINATION' CSA. s. 67(6) [100.] OR CSA. s. 67(4) [107. AND 108.], AFTER PAROLE BOARD HAS ALREADY MADE ITS OFFICIAL DETERMINATION, WHERE SUCH DETERMINATION IS TO 'RECOMMEND PAROLE RELEASE' CSA. s. 67(6) [100.]. THEREFORE, WHEN THE BOARD ON-FORWARDS A LIFER'S 'RECOMMENDED PAROLE RELEASE DETERMINATION' CSA. s. 67(6) [100.], TO ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT ENTITY (SUCH AS GOVERNOR, CABINET/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MINISTERS), KNOWING THAT SUCH PARTIES HAVE PREVIOUSLY (SINCE 1-8-1994 [46.], WITH RESPECT TO OTHER LIFER APPLICANTS ([99., 100., 109, AND 97.]), AND MAY INCLUDE SAME RESPECTIVE APPLICANT WITH A RE-APPLICATION ([109.]), CONSEQUENTED (WHEN THEY REFUSE TO ACCEPT BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' ([100.]), INCREASE TO LIFER'S TERM OF INCARCERATION (ADMINISTRATIVELY, AND WITH NO OPERATIONAL USE OF ANY CRIMINAL LAW SENTENCING COURT, OR CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) ACT, OR CH. III ([3.]) OF THE CONSTITUTION [1.]), SO ACTING WITHOUT CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY ([1.]), THE BOARD ACTS WITHOUT ANY COMPETENT JURISDICTION ([82. AND 83.]), BY ON-FORWARDING KNOWING THAT SUCH GOVERNMENT ENTITY IS IN FACT GOING TO PERFORM A 'CONSIDERATION' OF APPLICATION FOR PAROLE ([99.]), NOT A JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE LEGAL SOUNDNESS OF THE BOARD'S 'RECOMMENDATION' [100.]