

7-4-2019. 1/

TO SECRETARY OF THE PAROLE BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

VIA PRISON INTERVENTION UNIT STAFF

FROM DAVID P. JARRETT

69405

c/ MOUNT GAMBLER PRISON

P.O. Box 1498

MOUNT GAMBLER SA 5240

RE - ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT, SUBMISSION BY PRISONER,
IN COMBINATION WITH LETTER TO THE BOARD (REASONS FOR REFUSAL, BY BOARD).
- REQUEST THIS ENTIRE DOCUMENT BE FORWARDED TO DCS MINISTER AS PART OF
ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT TO THE MINISTER (FROM THE BOARD)

I REQUEST OF THE BOARD THAT YOU PLEASE DO NOT REQUEST ME TO ATTEND THE ANNUAL
REVIEW HEARING IN PERSON. IF THE BOARD WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO ME FOR THE ANNUAL
REVIEW, COULD YOU PLEASE APPROVE AN AVL.

IT HAS BEEN MORE THAN A WEEK SINCE PRISON MANAGEMENT ARRANGED TO 'SHOW ME' THE
BOARD'S 'REASONS FOR REFUSAL OF PAROLE RECOMMENDATION', WHICH I WAS ALLOWED TO READ
WITH INTERVENTION UNIT STAFF PRESENT, WHICH WAS HELPEFUL TO SOME EXTENT AS I
DID HAVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING SOME OF WHAT THE BOARD WROTE.

AS SOCIAL WORKER MARIAH (WHO WAS IN THE ROOM WHILE I READ THE BOARD'S REFUSAL
LETTER), WAS NOT ABLE TO ANSWER SOME OF MY QUESTIONS, OR EXPLAIN CERTAIN 'REASONING'
OF THE BOARD REGARDING PARTICULAR QUESTIONS I HAD ABOUT SOME OF THE THINGS
WRITTEN BY THE BOARD, IT WAS SUGGESTED TO ME TO 'WRITE TO THE BOARD AND ASK
THE BOARD ABOUT WHAT THEY MEANT'.

PLEASE BE AWARE THAT I HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY MAIL FROM THE BOARD, AND,
DURING MY CALL TO ^{MY} ~~THE~~ LAWYER ON THURSDAY 4-4-2019 (11 AM), I WAS TOLD
BY MR R PERROTTA THAT HE TOO, HAD NOT RECEIVED ANY SUCH DOCUMENT FROM
THE BOARD (BOARD'S REASONS FOR REFUSAL), SO THAT MY REFERENCE TO THE
SAID DOCUMENT, IS FROM WHAT I REMEMBER READING MORE THAN A WEEK AGO.

7-4-2019

2/

THE MAIN QUESTION (TO SW MARIAH, AFTER READING 'BOARD'S REASONS FOR REFUSAL'), WAS, 'WHAT EXACTLY IS THE BOARD ASKING OF ME, AND, WHAT IS THE BOARD SUGGESTING THAT I DO?'. I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND WHAT THE BOARD WAS DIRECTING TO ME TO DO, BECAUSE I COULDN'T INTERPRET A 'CLEAR PATH', OR, 'NEXT STEP', OR, SOMETHING TO PINPOINT AND IDENTIFY AS WHAT IT IS THAT I'M BEING TOLD TO DO (BY THE BOARD)? I APPRECIATE I MAY HAVE MISSED SOMETHING BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT IS THAT THE BOARD IS TELLING ME TO DO? I UNDERSTOOD THE PART ABOUT 'REFUSED PAROLE', 'GO AWAY FOR 12 MONTHS THEN REAPPLY', BUT, AS I SAID TO SW MARIAH, 'I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS THAT THE BOARD IS TELLING ME OR EXPECTING ME TO DO... I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT MY NEXT STEP, OR, THING, OR, EVENT, OR, PROCESS IS THAT I'M BEING TOLD TO DO, AND REALISTICALLY, WHAT IS GOING TO OR ABLE TO CHANGE IN 12 MONTHS THAT IS GOING TO SATISFY WHATEVER IT IS THAT THE BOARD IS EXPECTING ME TO DO?... EVEN DOING ANY COURSE, NO MATTER WHAT THE COURSE IS, THERE IS A 'PRE-REQUISITE' WHICH IS EFFECTIVELY BEEN FORCED UPON ME NOW, BY THE STATE, WHICH IS WHAT I INTERPRETED FROM THE SOC REPORT HIGHLIGHTED BY THE BOARD DURING MY PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING, THAT, IF I DO NOT ADMIT GUILT OF CRIMES CONVICTED OF THEN I WILL NEVER GET PAROLE RECOMMENDATION FROM SOC, AND, ADDITIONALLY, I WILL NEVER BE ABLE TO 'PASS' A COURSE (E.G. VPP), IF I DON'T 'ADMIT GUILT, PROVIDE REASONS FOR COMMITTING ARSON AND MURDER' (THE CRIMES CONVICTED OF)?

IS THE BOARD PREPARED TO 'RECOMMEND ME TO THE PARC' (IRRESPECTIVE OF ANY OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE OR CONDITION), IF I HAVE NOT ADMITTED ~~GUILT~~ GUILT OF MURDER (WHICH IS THE ONLY SENTENCE IMPOSED UPON ME IN 2002 FULL COURT SENTENCE HEARING)? I ASK THIS DIRECT QUESTION BECAUSE IT GIVES ME AT LEAST AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE STATE WILL IMPRESS UPON ME, EITHER, 'ADMIT GUILT OR REMAIN IN PRISON UNTIL I DIE' (IF THERE IS A PRE-REQUISITE THAT I MUST FIRST ADMIT GUILT PRIOR TO ANY PAROLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE PARC), OR, 'PAROLE MAY STILL BE RECEIVED EVEN THOUGH I HAVE NOT ADMITTED TO GUILT OF MURDER CONVICTION AGAINST ME'.

7-4-2019

3/

IF THE BOARD IS EFFECTING SUCH A PRE-REQUISITE ('ADMIT GUILT OF MURDER OTHERWISE THE BOARD/STATE GOVERNMENT WILL NEVER RECOMMEND FOR PAROLE'), THEN IT WOULD SEEM POINTLESS ME EVER APPLYING FOR PAROLE AGAIN AND WASTING THE BOARD'S TIME (AS THE BOARD WOULD AUTOMATICALLY REFUSE PAROLE BECAUSE I HAD NOT ADMITED TO GUILT OF MURDER). I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE PAROLE, AND, IT WOULD BE NICE TO AT LEAST BE ABLE TO RECEIVE (WITHOUT SAID PRE-REQUISITE BEING APPLIED), PAROLE, BASED ON WHO I AM TODAY, RATHER THAN, WHOEVER I WAS MORE THAN 25⁺ YEARS AGO. I DID NOT BREEZE THROUGH 2 1/2 DECADES IN PRISON, AND, THE EFFECT OF NOT ONLY ALL THAT TIME IN CUSTODY, BUT ALSO, THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT OF 'EVERYTHING', FROM DAY OF ARREST IN 1992, TILL NOW, IS NOT INSIGNIFICANT TO WHO I AM TODAY. I KNOW TOO WELL WHAT EFFECT THAT TIME AND EXPERIENCES HAS HAD UPON ME... BUT I ALSO APPRECIATE THE PARTS OF ME THAT CANNOT BE BROKEN BY PRISON, I STILL TRY TO TREAT PEOPLE FAIRLY AND KINDLY (IRRESPECTIVE OF OFFICER OR PRISONER), I STILL TRY TO SEE TOMORROW AS A BETTER DAY THAN TODAY, NOT EASY FOR ME SOMETIMES BUT AT LEAST I STILL TRY, I STILL TRY TO SEE THE POSITIVE INFLUENCES AROUND ME (WHETHER ITS CERTAIN PEOPLE I HAVE CONTACT WITH OR EVEN CIRCUMSTANCES I AM PART OF), AND THESE PARTS OF ME ARE WHO I AM, NOT, WHAT I AM (WHAT I AM IS A PERSON CONVICTED OF MURDER).

IN THE BOARD'S REASONS FOR REFUSAL, THERE WAS A CLAIM THAT, AS PART OF MY 'WRITTEN APPLICATION' FOR PAROLE, ~~THAT~~ THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT PREPARATION BY ME TOWARDS 'EMPLOYMENT ONCE ON PAROLE'. I STRESS THAT THIS WAS 'MY INTERPRETATION' FROM WHAT I READ, AND THAT MY CONFUSION ON THAT POINT WAS RELAYED TO SW MARIAH, WITH A QUESTION OF 'WHAT IS THE BOARD EXPECTING ME TO DO ABOUT POSSIBLE EMPLOYMENT WHEN ON PAROLE, AM I TO WRITE TO A BUNCH OF PLACES SAYING "I AM CONVICTED OF MURDER, BEEN IN PRISON SINCE 1992, I MAY RECEIVE PAROLE SOME TIME AFTER 6 MONTHS FROM NOW... WILL YOU EMPLOY ME?". I WAS NOT BEING SARCASTIC TO SW MARIAH BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO, LITERALLY... AND I CERTAINLY CANNOT AFFORD \$1. PER STAMP/LETTER TO WRITE TO POSSIBLE

7-4-2019

4/

EMPLOYERS, PLUS, WHERE AM I SUPPOSED TO GET JOB OPPORTUNITIES FROM OTHER THAN A PRISON NEWSPAPER? I DO NOT UNDERSTAND HOW I AM MEANT TO PUT DOWN ANY SUCH EMPLOYMENT POSSIBILITIES WHEN PAROLED, IF I 'DON'T KNOW WHAT JOBS THE BOARD WILL EVEN LET ME DO (NO-ONE HAS TOLD ME), WHAT JOBS ARE EVEN AVAILABLE (I HAVE NO ACCESS TO JOB SITE/EMPLOYMENT LISTS ON THE INTERNET), AND AFTER 'EVERYTHING THAT HAS AFFECTED MY MENTAL HEALTH' SINCE 1992 INCARCERATION, OF WHATEVER JOB OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE LISTED AND THAT I AM PERMITTED TO APPLY FOR, I MUST THEN DETERMINE IF I THINK I COULD COPE WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF WHATEVER THE JOB IS...!!!

AS I ALSO SAID TO SW MARIAH, 'WHEN I FIRST STARTED TO PREPARE PAROLE APPLICATION LATE 2018, I ASKED CMC A LOT OF QUESTIONS, PLUS, ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION ABOUT THINGS I HAD HEARD FROM OTHER LIFERS WHO HAD BEEN TO APC AND BEEN BACK TO PRISON RECENTLY, SUCH AS I, MCKENZIE AND M. WEBB, WHOM I HAVE KNOWN FOR MANY YEARS, INCLUDING, ABOUT WHAT EXACTLY WAS DEPARTMENTALLY OFFERED AT APC RE JOB SEARCHING, ETC?, AND, THAT I WAS TOLD BY CMC THAT THERE WAS A 'JOB CLUB/EMPLOYMENT CLUB' AT APC DESIGNED TO ASSIST PRISONERS TO FIND WORK, THAT, FOR THE FIRST FEW MONTHS AT APC I WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO GO OUT FREELY DUE TO SOME ASSESSMENT BY APC STAFF (RE-INTEGRATION ASSESSMENT), PLUS, DUE TO THE SYSTEM IN PLACE AT APC TO ASSIST LIFERS (SOCIAL WORKERS, LIAISONS, ETC), THERE WOULD ALWAYS BE STAFF AROUND TO ASSIST IF I WAS HAVING DIFFICULTIES ~~REINTEGRATING~~ REINTEGRATING TO SOCIETY, AND, AS THE CMC CONFIRMED WITH ME ABOUT MY REQUEST TO SEEK SPECIALIST HELP THROUGH 'YARROW HOUSE' WHILST AT APC, THE APC STAFF WOULD BE AWARE OF MY CIRCUMSTANCES AND I COULD SPEAK WITH THEM AT SUITABLE TIMES ABOUT MATTERS INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT SUITABILITY'. FROM WHAT I UNDERSTOOD FROM THE BOARD'S REFUSAL LETTER, IT IMPLIED THAT I DID NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT WORK/JOB PLAN FOR PAROLE. SW MARIAH SUGGESTED I WRITE TO THE BOARD AND ASK WHAT MORE, RE EMPLOYMENT ON PAROLE, THE BOARD WANTS

7-4-2019

5/

ME TO WRITE/INCLUDE IN PAROLE APPLICATION NEXT TIME. IF I DON'T HAVE ACCESS TO APC JOB PROCESS/LIAISONS, ETC, BECAUSE DCS CHANGED THEIR PROCESS OF 'LIFER CAN'T NOW GO TO APC UNTIL AFTER PARC GRANTS PAROLE' (WHICH WAS TOLD TO ME BY CMC WHEN I WAS PREPARING PAROLE APPLICATION), AND SO I DON'T EVEN KNOW WHAT JOBS ARE EVEN ON OFFER, THEN HOW AM I EVER TO SATISFY SUCH REQUIREMENT FROM THE BOARD ABOUT POSSIBLE EMPLOYMENT OF ME? CAN THE BOARD OFFER ME ANY REALISTIC WAYS THAT I CAN ACHIEVE SUCH REQUIREMENT, IF I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING MORE THAN A NEWSPAPER JOB LIST TO WORK FROM? I WAS ALREADY SIGNED TO SYC TOO.

THE PLAN FOR ME AT THE APC, ~~IS~~ AS I DID INFORM OF IN THE PAROLE APPLICATION, WAS ~~THE~~ FOR ME TO START WITH 'MENTAL HEALTH', TO THEN PROGRESS TO EMPLOYMENT (OF SOMETHING SUITABLE TO MY COPING PROGRESS). MY FEAR OF PEOPLE, FEAR OF FAILING/NOT COMPLETING JOB PROPERLY, FEAR OF LOUD/ANGRY/VIOLENT VOICES, ALL THINGS THAT MESS WITH MY ANXIETY, WERE PART OF ME GETTING THE PARTICULAR HELP SUGGESTED TO ME 10 YEARS AGO, AND LATE 2018, BY INTERVENTION UNIT STAFF. (IRONICALLY (FROM MY POSITION), THE ENVIRONMENT OF PRISON ITSELF IS WHAT IS CONTINUING THOSE ISSUES FOR ME. WHATEVER MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES I HAD PRIOR TO 1992 (STEP-FATHER MATTERS), COMPOUNDED TO THINGS THAT HAPPENED WHILE INCARCERATED. THE PERSON I AM TODAY, IS THE AFTER EFFECT OF MORE THAN A COUPLE OF BAD EVENTS OVER ALL THOSE YEARS IN PRISON, AND I AM CERTAINLY NOT THE PERSON I WAS IN 1992, SO WHEN DCS LOOKS AT ME AND IMPLIES THAT 'I AM THE PERSON WHO WAS INCARCERATED' (WHICH WAS ME ALMOST 27 YEARS AGO), RATHER THAN, 'THE PERSON I AM TODAY' (ALMOST 27 YEARS LATER), ~~THAT I~~, AND THAT 26 1/2 YEARS OF BEING WATCHED EVERY DAY IS STILL NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE FOR DCS/THE BOARD, TO BELIEVE THAT I AM ABLE TO COMPLY WITH SUPERVISION IN THE COMMUNITY (PAROLE), WHICH ALSO ASSOCIATES WITH PAROLE EMPLOYMENT, BECAUSE, IT SUGGESTS TO ME THAT THE BOARD IS OF THE OPINION/BELIEF THAT I CAN'T BE TRUSTED TO BE IN THE COMMUNITY, THAT I ALSO HAVE INTENTIONS OF UNLAWFUL

7-4-2019

6/

ACTS, OR POSSIBLY, THAT THE DCS/THE BOARD BELIEVES I WILL EXPERIENCE A MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS AND CONSEQUENTIALLY COMMIT CRIMINAL ACTS DUE TO LACK OF CONTROL OF SELF, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE BOARD IS SUGGESTING I DO TO ALLEVIATE SUCH CONCERNS? WILL I RECEIVE SIMILAR SUGGESTIONS FROM SOC/THE BOARD IN ANOTHER YEAR, TO THEN BE TOLD AGAIN THAT I HAVE NOT DONE ENOUGH TIME IN PRISON?

IS THE BOARD SUGGESTING THAT IT DOES NOT TRUST 'MY INTENTIONS UPON RELEASE FROM PRISON'? OR, THAT I AM CONCEALING 'MY TRUE INTENTIONS' UPON RELEASE ON PAROLE?

I DID NOT START ASKING FOR 'HELP' RECENTLY (EXAMPLE, VPP LATE 2017 TO LATE 2018), I STARTING TRYING TO GET 'HELP' FROM 'SOMEONE ELSE' IN 2003. I THINK IT WAS (MIRIAM, SW AT PORT AUGUSTA). I GOT TO THE POINT WHERE 'I COULD NOT MANAGE BY MYSELF ANY LONGER' AND I NEEDED TO FIND SOMEONE TO TALK TO. THE BOARD MADE REFERENCE, IN ITS REFUSAL LETTER, TO 'HE ONLY RECENTLY ENGAGING'. I DIDN'T QUITE UNDERSTAND WHAT THAT WAS A DIRECT REFERENCE TO. WAS IT TO ME PARTICIPATING IN VPP, OR, WANTING TO CONTINUE 'SPEAKING' WITH SOMEONE AFTER THE COURSE FINISHED? ...OR SOMETHING ELSE?

THE BOARD RIGHTLY SAID, DURING PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING, THAT 'IT' MUST REGARD ME AS CONVICTED PERSON, CONVICTED OF MURDER, AND I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IS HOW THE BOARD, DCS, AND COURSE FACILITATORS MUST SEE, 'CONVICTED AND THEREFORE GUILTY' OF CRIME CONVICTED OF (IN THIS REGARD I WAS CONVICTED OF MURDER AND SO MUST BE SEEN AS GUILTY OF SUCH CRIME). I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THE BOARD HAS DCS REPORTS THAT CONSIDER ME 'CONVICTED OF MURDER (AND THEREFORE MUST ACTUALLY BE GUILTY OF THE CRIME)', AND YET CLAIMING NOT GUILTY, SO THEREFORE I AM EITHER 'IN DENIAL, AND SO, ARE A HIGH RISK OF COMMITTING CRIMES IF OUT ON PAROLE', OR, 'I AM JUST A LIAR, AND SO, ARE A HIGH RISK OF COMMITTING CRIMES IF OUT ON PAROLE'. DURING SESSION WITH VPP FACILITATOR, ONE-ON-ONE, I WAS ASKED 'WHY DID I EVEN BOTHER TO DO 'THAT' COURSE IF I WASN'T WILLING TO, OR PREPARED TO,

7-4-2019

7/

TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CRIMES I COMMITTED, ADMIT TO MY GUILT AND ALLOW THE FACILITATORS TO PROVIDE THE HELP I NEEDED SO THAT I DON'T COMMIT ANY MORE CRIMES?', AND, ALSO TOLD, 'IT WAS UNFAIR OF ME TO TAKE UP FACILITATORS TIME WHICH IS BEING WASTED ON ME BECAUSE I REFUSE TO ADMIT TO MY GUILT, WHEN THERE ARE GENUINE PRISONERS WHO THE FACILITATORS COULD BE HELPING AND WHO REALLY WANTED TO BE ON THAT COURSE, BUT I WAS SELFISHLY TAKING UP A POSITION ON THE COURSE INSTEAD OF THEM', AND, 'WHAT RIGHT DID I HAVE TO EVER BE ON THAT COURSE IF I WAS NOT PREPARED TO BE HONEST AND ADMIT TO WHAT I DID?', AND, 'WHY DO YOU EVEN BOTHER ATTENDING AND WASTING EVERYONES TIME WHEN YOU KNOW YOU ARE GUILTY BUT CONTINUE TO DENY WHAT YOU DID... YOU KNOW YOU DID IT, THE EVIDENCE AGAINST YOU IN BOTH CASES WAS VERY STRONG, AND I'VE READ OTHER JUDGMENTS ON THE INTERNET FROM YOUR MURDER TRIAL AND ITS OBVIOUS YOU DID, SO WHY DON'T I JUST BE HONEST AND ADMIT WHAT I DID SO THEN WE CAN GIVE YOU THE HELP YOU NEED?', AND, 'I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN EVEN HELP YOU IF YOU CONTINUE TO DENY YOUR GUILT BECAUSE YOU ARE GIVING US NOTHING TO WORK WITH, AND YOUR CONTINUING DENIAL MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR THE FACILITATORS TO WORK WITH YOU'. THERE WAS MORE SAID BUT ^{THAT} WAS THE JIST OF IT.

By the end of that one-on-one session I had no doubt that I was 'EXPECTED TO ADMIT GUILT' OF CRIME CONVICTED OF, AS A PRE-REQUISITE TO SUCCESSFUL COURSE PARTICIPATION, BUT, IT WAS ALSO A CONFIRMATION THAT I WAS ~~GOING~~ NOT GOING TO BE BELIEVED FOR THE GENUINE REASONS OF WHY I WANTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THAT ~~COURSE~~ COURSE. THAT SESSION WAS A COUPLE OF MONTHS INTO COURSE, AND, AT A POINT WHERE I ^{HAD} ~~HAVE~~ ALREADY LOWERED SIGNIFICANT PSYCHOLOGICAL PROTECTIVE BARICADES, WHICH 'ENABLED A GREATER EFFECT TO ME EMOTIONALLY, THAN WOULD HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED PRIOR TO ME STARTING THAT COURSE' IN LATE 2017. By GOING AFTER MY INTEGRITY (THE GENUINE REASONS FOR ME WANTING TO PARTICIPATE IN THAT COURSE), AND SUGGESTING MY ACTIONS WERE WASTING

7-4-2019

8/

THEIR EFFORTS ON ME, AS IF I WASN'T GENUINELY APPRECIATIVE OF THEIR HELP AND THE TIME THEY WERE SPENDING WITH ME, AND, SUGGESTING OR EVEN IMPLYING THAT THEIR TIME AND CONTACT WITH ME WAS NOT VERY SIGNIFICANT TO ME (WHEN IN FACT THE OPPOSITE WAS TRUE), I HAD A LOT OF DIFFICULTY LATER THAT NIGHT, TRYING TO CONTAIN/MANAGE THE EMOTIONAL EFFECT THAT CONVERSATION WAS HAVING ON ME, WHICH INCLUDED ME THINKING THAT 'I WAS IN THE WAY', 'CAUSING THEM TO BE ANGRY WITH ME', 'SEEN AS A PRISONER WHO WAS WASTING EVERYONE'S TIME', 'SEEN AS A PRISONER WHO WAS PRETENDING TO BE APPRECIATIVE OF THEM AND WHAT THEY WERE DOING FOR ME', AND THAT 'IT WOULD BE BETTER IF I GOT OUT OF EVERYONE'S WAY SO THEY WOULDN'T BE ANGRY WITH ME ANYMORE'. I WANTED TO BE DEAD THAT NIGHT AND MY INTENTION WAS TO KILL MYSELF THAT NIGHT. THE EMOTIONAL PAIN ASSOCIATED WITH BELIEVING I HAD UPSET THE FACILITATORS 'TO THAT ~~EXTENT~~ EXTENT', IN EFFECT, 'CAUSING HARM TO THEM', I DIDN'T WANT THEM TO BE ANGRY WITH ME ANYMORE. I DELIBERATELY STAYED IN THE ROOM I WAS IN BECAUSE 'IF' I HAD MADE THE 'INTENT' DECISION (TO KILL MYSELF), I WOULD NOT RETRACT, SO, EVEN THOUGH I REALLY WANTED TO BE DEAD, THAT NIGHT, I KEPT TRYING TO REASON-OUT WHERE MY HEAD WAS AT, A WAR BETWEEN ME REALLY WANTING TO BE DEAD (KILLING MYSELF THAT NIGHT), AND ME TRYING TO STOP MYSELF (CORE BELIEF, DON'T CAUSE HARM), BY 'THINKING MYSELF OUT OF THAT SITUATION'. THE 'THOUGHT' THAT WON THE BATTLE WAS THIS:

'IF I KILLED MYSELF THAT NIGHT, THE FACILITATOR MIGHT GET 'UPSET' IF THEY THOUGHT I HAD KILLED MYSELF BECAUSE OF SOMETHING 'THEY' SAID TO ME, AND THEN MAYBE QUESTION ~~THEMSELVES~~ THEIR THOUGHTS TOWARDS WANTING TO HELP PEOPLE, LEADING TO THEM QUITTING THEIR JOB, AND THEY HAD THEIR OWN FAMILY WHO MIGHT THEN BE AFFECTED BY 'THEM' QUITTING A JOB 'THEY' ENJOYED DOING, AND, I REMEMBERED SOMETHING THEY REVEALED IN GROUP ABOUT HOW 'THEM' HAD ATTEMPTED SUICIDE, AND, I DID NOT WANT TO CAUSE ANY OF THAT HARM TO 'THEM', THEY ARE WERE GENUINE IN WHAT THEY SAID TO ME AND THEY CERTAINLY DID NOT

7-4-2019

9/

INTEND HARM UPON ME.

I CONTINUED TO COMMUNICATE RESPECTFULLY WITH THAT PERSON, AND I STILL RESPECT THEM FOR WHO THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY DO, AND STILL TRUST IN THEIR HONEST INTENTIONS TOWARDS ME. MY REACTION TO WHAT THEY SAID, WAS MY ISSUE, ~~NOT~~ BECAUSE OF HOW 'SELF-DESTRUCTIVELY' I WAS THINKING ABOUT WHAT WAS SAID TO ME.

I HAVE REVEALED THIS TO DCS/THE BOARD, BECAUSE IT IS RELEVANT TO WHAT I REALISED DURING VPP, YET CONTINUED TO PARTICIPATE, AND CONTINUED TO REVEAL MORE OF WHAT WAS ~~THE~~ SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTING ME (EVERY DAY), AND I STILL WANTED TO BE A PART OF SOMETHING THAT WAS GIVING MY LIFE POSITIVE VALUE, EVEN ~~THOUGH~~ THOUGH I EXPERIENCED A LOT OF HIGH RISK THOUGHTS AGAINST MY LIFE, DUE TO THE MEMORY KICKS FROM PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AND THE IMPACT OR WRITING ABOUT THEM/DISCUSSING THEM. DCS/BOARD DOUBTS 'IF I GOT ANY BENEFIT FROM COURSE AT ALL?'. THAT ~~IS~~ WAS SAID TO ME BY THE BOARD DURING MY PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING. IT APPEARS FROM BOARD'S PAROLE REFUSAL LETTER THAT THE BOARD STILL DOES NOT BELIEVE ~~ME~~ ME WHEN 'I' SAY THAT I DID BENEFIT FROM VPP. FOR YEARS I 'KEPT SILENT' BECAUSE I WAS TIRED OF BEING LIED TO/MISREPRESENTED BY DCS, THEN, I MADE THE DECISION TO TRUST IN SOMEONE (FACILITATORS), THEN, I PROGRESSED TO REVEALING MORE OF MYSELF, SO IF THAT IS NOT PROOF IN QUALIFICATION OF ME EXPERIENCING PSYCHOLOGICAL APPRECIATION FROM PARTICIPATION IN THE VPP, THEN, I AM CONFUSED AS TO WHAT CRITERIA I AM REQUIRED TO SATISFY IN ORDER FOR THE DCS/BOARD TO BELIEVE MY ANSWER ABOUT 'BENEFITING FROM THE VPP'? THE CONSTANT DAILY WAR WITHIN MY OWN HEAD, BECAUSE I OPENED THE GATE AND 'LET THE FACILITATORS IN' AT THE SAME TIME AS 'LETTING ME OUT' (DISCLOSING PERSONAL MATTERS/DETAILS), THAT, IN EFFECT, ~~COULD~~ AND I KNEW FROM VERY EARLY IN THE COURSE THAT MY TRUST IN THEM WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS TOO IMPORTANT TO ME TO LET GO OF, AND DUE TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ME AND ALL FIVE COURSE FACILITATORS, WHICH WAS FUNDAMENTAL TO ME NOT QUITTING THE COURSE (THE PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT FROM COURSE PARTICIPATION, WHAT WAS BEING

7-4-2019 10/

SPOKEN ABOUT, WRITTEN ABOUT, PLUS THE EFFECT OF ^{ME} REMOVING CERTAIN PROTECTIVE BARRIERS WHICH THEN LEFT ME VULNERABLE TO MY OWN 'THOUGHT MISMANAGEMENT'), BECAUSE, IF I DIDN'T QUIT THEN I WOULD CONTINUE TO APPRECIATE THE PROFOUND POSITIVE AND PROGRESSIVE IMPACT MY ENGAGEMENT WAS HAVING ON ME, BUT, IF I DID QUIT THEN I WOULD HAVE SHUT MYSELF DOWN COMPLETELY (BEEN DIRTY ON MYSELF FOR THROWING AWAY SOMETHING THAT MEANT SO MUCH TO ME, ALL BECAUSE I DIDN'T WANT TO EXPERIENCE ANYMORE OF THE PAINFUL THOUGHTS/EMOTIONS BEING DRAWN-OUT THROUGH ACTIVE COURSE PARTICIPATION), I FOUGHT TO KEEP MYSELF ON TRACK, EVERY DAY, EVERY WEEK, KNOWING WHERE I REALLY NEEDED TO GET TO BEFORE COURSE FINISHED, AND, WHICH I WAS ONLY ABLE TO DO BECAUSE OF THE BELIEF THAT I HAD ABOUT WHAT 'MY ENGAGEMENT IN VPP WAS DOING FOR ME, RATHER THAN TO ME'.

I DON'T HAVE THE WORDS TO DESCRIBE HOW IMPORTANT THE ~~BENEFIT~~ BENEFIT OF THE VPP WAS TO ME, THERE WAS A LOT OF SELF-DESTRUCTIVE EMOTIONAL REACTIONS (PROBLEM THINKING), BUT, THAT WAS OUTWEIGHED BY THAT WHICH I DON'T HAVE WORDS TO DESCRIBE.

'WILL I PERMIT MYSELF TO GO THROUGH THAT MUCH MENTAL PAIN AGAIN, JUST SO DCS CAN AGAIN CALL ME A LIAR AND AGAIN SAY THAT I FAILED A COURSE BECAUSE I DID NOT ADMIT GUILT OF CRIMES CONVICTED OF, ARSON AND MURDER (RE SOC REPORT HIGHLIGHTED BY BOARD ~~HEARING~~ DURING PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING)?' I DON'T KNOW! IF THAT IS THE PRE-REQUISITE FOR BEING ALLOWED TO PASS A COURSE, THEN IT MEANS THE OUTCOME WILL ^{ALREADY} ~~ALREADY~~ BE KNOWN BEFORE COURSE PARTICIPATION COMMENCES.

I DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHY I WAS BEING CHALLENGED BY THE BOARD, DURING PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING, ABOUT MY FORMAL COMPLAINT AGAINST 'SPECIFIC TEXT CONTAINED WITHIN THE DR NAMBIER REPORT'. THAT FORMAL COMPLAINT WAS I THINK 16 OR 17 YEARS AGO, AND, I HAVE NOT READ MY SAID COMPLAINT WITHIN THE LAST 10 YEARS (AT LEAST), YET I WAS FELT THAT THE BOARD EXPECTED ME TO 'APOLOGISE' FOR MAKING THAT FORMAL COMPLAINT, AS ^{IF} I HAD NO RIGHT TO MAKE THAT COMPLAINT,

7-4-2019

11/

OR EVEN ANY COMPLAINTS, ABOUT SOMETHING WHICH I PERCEIVED/BELIEVED TO BE 'FALSE, OR MISLEADING, OR MISREPRESENTATIVE, ETC'. I WAS FELT AS IF I WAS BEING 'REPRIMANDED' FOR EVEN MAKING THAT FORMAL COMPLAINT, AND ~~WAS~~ EXPECTED TO 'APOLOGISE AND RETRACT' IT. I WAS ASKED TO 'EXPLAIN MYSELF' FOR EVEN MAKING THAT COMPLAINT!!! WAS THE BOARD ACTUALLY TRYING TO SEE HOW I WOULD REACT/RESPOND TO 'ME BEING CHALLENGED'? I CAN UNDERSTAND IF THAT IS WHAT THE BOARD WAS TRYING TO ASSESS FROM ME, THOUGH I FELT THAT IT WAS MORE A CLAIM THAT 'I HAD NO RIGHT TO MAKE SUCH A COMPLAINT AND I'M EXPECTED TO APOLOGISE FOR DOING SO'. SAID COMPLAINT CLEARLY DEFINED RESPECTIVE SPECIFIC TEXT, FROM WITHIN THE NAMBIER REPORT WHICH WAS RELEASED TO ME THROUGH FOI, YET NO SPECIFIC TEXT REFERENCE WAS CITED, ^{BY THE BOARD} ONLY THE 'OVERALL REPRESENTATION TEXT FROM MY COMPLAINT', SO I ~~DON'T~~ DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW I CAN BE EXPECTED TO ^{RESPOND} ~~FOR~~ FOR MAKING A FORMAL COMPLAINT, WHEN I HAD THE RIGHT TO COMPLAIN ABOUT SOMETHING ~~IF~~ I DID NOT THINK WAS ACCURATE. THE BOARD ALSO MADE REFERENCE, IN ITS PAROLE REFUSAL LETTER, TO AN AHPRA COMPLAINT (AUSTRALIAN HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION AGENCY), MADE BY ME, YET MADE NO REFERENCE TO THAT SUBJECT MATTER DURING PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING. I AM CURIOUS TO KNOW ~~WHY~~ WHY THE BOARD HAS INCLUDED THAT MATTER? THE AHPRA COMPLAINTS WERE AGAINST 'SPECIFIC TEXT IN SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS', 'SPECIFIC ACTS OF IMPROPRIETY ASSOCIATED WITH SAME', 'SPECIFIC ATTEMPTS TO UNLAWFULLY PROTECT THAT WHICH WAS FALSE/MISREPRESENTATIVE, ETC', AS WAS ITS ~~SIBLING~~ SIBLING FORMAL COMPLAINTS TO THE SA OMBUDSMAN, AS WAS ITS SIBLING FORMAL COMPLAINTS TO THE OFFICE FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY (ICAC), I WILL NOT APOLOGISE OR RETRACT ANY OF THOSE COMPLAINTS, ESPECIALLY WHEN SUPPORTING MATERIAL EVIDENCE INCLUDED DCS PRODUCED DOCUMENTS WITHIN ~~THE~~ GOVERNMENT MASTER FILE WHICH THE DCS CREATED. EVERY ACCUSATION THEREIN IS JUDICIALLY QUALIFIABLE. THE BOARD IS WELCOME TO OBTAIN A COPY OF ALL THOSE COMPLAINT DOCUMENTS.

7-9-2019 12/

FROM AHPRA, OMBUDSMAN AND OPI, IF THE BOARD WISHES TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT I ACCUSED THOSE ~~IS~~ PERSONS OF, AND WHY.

AS I SAID TO THE BOARD, 'I DO NOT MAKE FALSE ACCUSATIONS', IN OTHER WORDS, I WILL NOT LIE IN ANY COMPLAINT MADE BY ME, AND, ALL FORMAL COMPLAINTS BY ME, SINCE 1992, HAVE ONLY BEEN ABOUT SPECIFIC MATTERS WHICH I LEGITIMATELY BELIEVE ARE TRUE IN FORM BECAUSE I WILL NOT MAKE A FALSE COMPLAINT AGAINST ANYONE.

WAS THE BOARD SUGGESTING/IMPLYING, THAT I AM A FRAUDULENT COMPLAINER? I DON'T KNOW IF THE BOARD DOES OR NOT, THAT IS WHY I AM ASKING.

IN BOARD'S PAROLE REFUSAL LETTER, THE BOARD ACCUSED ME OF BEING "GRANDIOSE", BUT I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE REFERENCE. IS THE BOARD SUGGESTING THAT I AM 'BUILDING-UP PARTICULARS RELATING TO ARSON CONVICTION APPEAL OR MURDER CONVICTION APPEAL, TO MORE THAN WHAT THEY ACTUALLY ARE?', OR SOMETHING ELSE RELATING TO POSSIBLY 'WHAT BENEFIT I RECEIVED FROM VPP'? CAN THE BOARD PLEASE EXPLAIN TO ME ITS REFERENCE, SO THAT I UNDERSTAND WHY THE BOARD WROTE IT, IS THE BOARD IMPLYING OR ACCUSING ME OF 'PRESENTING MYSELF AS BETTER THAN THE NEXT PRISONER, OR, IN DENIAL ABOUT MY OWN STATUS'?

I AM CRISPPLY AWARE OF WHAT I AM AND WHAT I AM REGARDED AS, ~~BEING~~ I AM ACCUSED OF MURDER, CONVICTED OF MURDER, SENTENCED AS A MURDERER, AND INCARCERATED AS A MURDERER. I REGARD MYSELF AS A PRISONER SERVING SENTENCE UNDER 'THAT' STATUS.... THAT IS WHAT I CARRY UPON MYSELF. THE FACT THAT I SAID 'NOT GUILTY' OF ARSON, 'NOT GUILTY' OF MURDER, PRIOR TO TRIALS, AND DURING BOTH TRIALS, IS THE SAME REASON NOW, AFTER MORE THAN 25 YEARS IN PRISON, EXCEPT THAT 'NOW', IT SEEMS LIKE I AM AGAIN BEING PUNISHED, AND RE-SENTENCED TO MORE TIME IN PRISON AS A CONSEQUENCE OF NOT ACCEPTING BOTH VERDICTS AS ACCURATE/LAWFULLY ACQUIRED/TRUE VERDICTS'. I KNOW THERE IS MORE TO IT THAN JUST MY CONTINUED STANCE OF 'NOT GUILTY', BUT, IN

7-4-2019

13/

SIMPLE FORM ITS FOUNDATION IS ME SAYING 'NOT GUILTY'. DURING VPP
AND DURING PAROLE APPLICATION PROCESS, I OPENLY INFORMED OF INTENTION
TO CHALLENGE BOTH CONVICTIONS. DURING PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING,
I WAS ACTIVELY HARASSED, REPEATEDLY, BY THE BOARD, TO REVEAL
"EXACTLY" WHAT IT WAS ABOUT THE MURDER CONVICTION THAT 'I WAS
COMPLAINING ABOUT AND INTENDING TO CHALLENGE'. EVEN AFTER CLEARLY
DECLARING I DID NOT WANT THE STATE TO BE AWARE OF SPECIFICS OF
MURDER CONVICTION CHALLENGE, AS THE INFORMATION WAS PROTECTED BY
LAWYER-CLIENT CONFIDENTIALITY, 'NOT ~~WAS~~ TILL THE MATTER WAS SUBMITTED
TO THE COURTS', THE BOARD CONTINUED TO HARASS ME TO REVEAL MORE
SPECIFIC ~~THE~~ INDICATION OF WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR APPEALING MURDER
CONVICTION, TO THE POINT WHERE, UNDER DURESS I REVEALED THAT IT
'RELATED TO THE DNA EVIDENCE'. THAT WAS STILL ~~NOW~~ NOT ENOUGH
SPECIFICS FOR THE BOARD AND I WAS AGAIN HARASSED BY THE BOARD TO
TELL THE BOARD "EXACTLY" WHAT IT WAS ABOUT THE DNA EVIDENCE THAT
I INTENDED TO COMPLAIN ABOUT, WHICH CLEARLY, BY MY PRIOR ANSWERS, I
DID NOT WANT TO ~~RE~~ REVEAL TO THE STATE GOVERNMENT UNTIL IT WAS
SUBMITTED TO THE COURTS, BUT WAS, BY MY 'APPARENT INSUFFICIENT
DISCLOSURE', ANGERING AND FRUSTRATING THE BOARD. THE BOARD
IS AWARE OF "INVOLUNTARY STATEMENTS", 'STATEMENTS MADE UNDER DURESS',
'BEING FORCED TO SPEAK, AGAINST AND/OR CONTRARY TO FREE WILL'....
THAT IS THE PRESSURE I FELT FROM THE BOARD; WHO REPEATEDLY
TOLD ME TO REVEAL "EXACTLY" WHAT I WAS COMPLAINING
ABOUT FROM MY MURDER CONVICTION.

WAS THAT PART OF WHY THE BOARD REGARDED ME AS ARROGANT AND
GRANDIOSE... BECAUSE I EVENTUALLY SAID TO THE BOARD THAT I DID
NOT WANT TO SAY ANYMORE ABOUT IT BECAUSE OF HOW SERIOUS IT WAS
AND THE RAMIFICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH IT?