

7-4-2019

14/

I WAS NOT QUESTIONED BY THE BOARD, IN 'THAT SAME MANNER', IN RELATION TO THE ARSON CONVICTION APPEAL, HOWEVER, IF THE BOARD WANTS TO KNOW "EXACTLY" WHAT I AM COMPLAINING ABOUT IN RELATION TO ARSON CONVICTION, I AM PREPARED TO PROVIDE A COPY OF 'THAT' RECENT SUBMISSION TO THE GOVERNOR (PRIMARY DOCUMENT CONSISTING OF 275 PAGES, PLUS ATTACHMENTS), WHICH INCLUDES THE GOVERNMENT PRODUCED DOCUMENTS AS MATERIAL EVIDENCE THEREIN. THE BOARD IS WELCOME TO REQUEST COPY OF SAID ARSON PETITION FROM MY REPRESENTING LAWYER, ROCKY PERROTTA.

SOC, THE BOARD, THE DCS, ARE ALL CLAIMING THAT MY 'REFUSAL TO ADMIT GUILT OF ARSON, IS PARTLY THE REASON FOR NOT BEING RECOMMENDED FOR PAROLE. I THEREFORE INVITE THE BOARD TO REQUEST COPY OF SAID ARSON PETITION, PLUS, REVIEW 'THE VIDEO RECORD OF MY NON-INDEX (ARSON) OFFENCE PRESENTATION DURING VPP (AND THE IMPACT THAT MATTER HAS ON ME)'.

AS FAR AS THE MURDER CONVICTION APPEAL IS CONCERNED, THE PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING WAS NOT THE FORUM FOR REVEALING 'DANGEROUS AND SENSITIVE DETAILS ASSOCIATED WITH PART OF THE CONVICTION CHALLENGE', PARTICULARLY AS IT ALSO CONCERNS A FORMER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE WHO HAS ALREADY ~~SEE~~ SUFFERED A GREAT DEAL BECAUSE OF SA GOVERNMENT CRIMINAL ACTIONS AGAINST HIM, CONSEQUENTIAL TO THE FACT THAT HE COULD NOT BE BOUGHT-OFF BY HIS THEN EMPLOYER, THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE.

ONLY WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS, HAS THE 'REASON' FOR THE CRIMES OF AND BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT, AGAINST ME, PRIOR TO AND DURING MY 1994 MURDER TRIAL, BECOME KNOWN TO ME,

THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, THROUGH THE HARASSING QUESTIONING OF ME BY THE BOARD, WANTS TO KNOW 'HOW MUCH I DO KNOW', ABOUT 'WHY THEY DID IT', AND 'WHAT THEY DID AFTER TRIAL', AND, BECAUSE IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THIS BE PAPERTRAILED FROM ME NOW... I WILL FILL IN SOME OF THE BLANK SPACES...

7-4-2019

15/

\*\*

MY MURDER TRIAL WAS IN 1994. DR. HARRY HARDING (EMPLOYED AT SAFSC), WAS 'OUTSOURCED' BY THE SAFSC (AS PART OF THE ADDITIONAL BUSINESS OF THE SAFSC, THEIR EMPLOYEES MAY BE 'HIRED OUT'), TO MY TRIAL DEFENCE TEAM, TO 'REVIEW AND THEN WRITE REPORT OF HIS FINDINGS, IN REGARD TO DR A, VAN DAAL TESTS AND REPORTS' WHICH WAS PROSECUTION EVIDENCE DISCLOSED TO ~~THE~~ DEFENDANT BY THE CROWN. DR H. HARDING PREPARED HIS REPORT, DATED APPROXIMATELY 23-3-1994, THEN HIS EMPLOYER (SAFSC, MORE DIRECTLY, BILL TILSTONE), BECAME AWARE OF SPECIFIC CONTENTS OF SAID HARDING REPORT (FOR MY DEFENCE), THEN HIS EMPLOYER (STATE GOVERNMENT), CRIMINALLY ABUSED THEIR PRIOR KNOWLEDGE OF SAID REPORT BY HARDING, AND CRIMINALLY INTIMIDATED AND ILLEGALLY (CLCA REFERENCE), THREATENED DR HARRY HARDING 'NOT TO ACT AS A ~~DEF~~ DEFENCE WITNESS, NOT TO GIVE ANY TRIAL TESTIMONY, NOT TO HAND OVER HIS REPORT TO MY DEFENCE LAWYER, NOT TO REVEAL THE CONTENTS OF HIS REPORT AND TO RETRACT SAID COMPLETED REPORT'. THE INTEGRITY OF DR HARRY HARDING WAS SUCH THAT HE WOULD DO AS HE WAS HIRED TO DO BY MY DEFENCE LAWYER (GORDON BARRETT). DR HARRY HARDING WAS FURTHER CRIMINALLY THREATENED THAT 'IF HARDING DID GIVE EVIDENCE AT TRIAL, THEN HIS JOB WOULD BE ON THE LINE'.

HARDING'S REPORT EFFECTIVELY DESTROYED THE DPP PURPORTED RELIABILITY AND CREDIBILITY OF A VAN DAAL'S DNA TEST RESULTS, AND, SOME OF THE RESULTS OBTAINED BY VAN DAAL, INDICATING HARDING 'WOULD NOT HAVE COME TO THE SAME DETERMINATION OR READING OF RESULTS'.

ON THE MORNING DR HARRY HARDING WAS TO START HIS TRIAL TESTIMONY AS DEFENCE WITNESS, MY TRIAL LAWYER, GORDON BARRETT (NOW IN 2019 IS A DISTRICT COURT JUDGE), TOLD ME TO MY FACE, THAT 'HARRY HARDING HAD INFORMED BARRETT, THAT HE HAD BEEN THREATENED BY HIS EMPLOYER NOT TO ACT AS DEFENCE WITNESS IN MY TRIAL, AND THAT IF ~~HARDING~~ <sup>HARDING</sup> DID, THEN

HARDING'S JOB WOULD BE ON THE LINE, 'BUT DON'T WORRY BECAUSE HARDING HAS ASSURED ME THAT HE IS STILL GOING TO GIVE EVIDENCE IN THE BOX'. I WAS NOT TOLD BY BARRETT WHAT MY LEGAL RIGHTS WERE AT THAT TIME, OTHERWISE, I WOULD HAVE INITIATED STATUTORY DECLARATIONS AND AFFIDAVITS AT THAT TIME, FROM BARRETT, AND DR HARDING, AND, ASKED HARDING AND BARRETT TO MAKE FORMAL STATEMENTS TO POLICE, 'ABOUT WHAT BARRETT HAD REVEALED TO ME, RE THE THREATS TO HARDING, FROM AND BY WHOM, ETC.'. DURING THE TESTIMONY OF DR HARRY HARDING, IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT PROSECUTOR WENDY ABRAHAM WAS AWARE OF GOVERNMENT INTIMIDATION AND THREATS TO DR HARRY HARDING, AND, EVEN THE 'FORM AND MANNER OF PROSECUTORIAL ATTACK', WAS SUCH THAT TRIAL PROSECUTOR WAS EFFECTIVELY ACCUSING DR HARRY HARDING OF BEING 'MENTALLY IMPAIRED, PROFESSIONALLY INCOMPETENT RESULTING FROM MENTAL IMPAIRMENT SO THAT HARDING'S REPORT SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN ANY CREDIBILITY OR VALUE BY THE COURT', PLUS, IT APPEARED THAT PROSECUTOR ABRAHAM WAS ILLEGALLY USING (USE OF SUCH EMPLOYEE INFORMATION, ABOUT DR HARRY HARDING, THAT WOULD NOT HAVE <sup>BEEN</sup> OTHERWISE KNOWN TO OR EVEN AVAILABLE TO SA DPP, SPECIFICALLY, WENDY ABRAHAM, BUT FOR THE FACT THAT DR HARRY HARDING WAS A STATE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE, OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE, WHICH HAD ALREADY CRIMINALLY <sup>THREATENED</sup> ~~THREATENED~~ HARDING 'NOT TO TESTIFY ABOUT HIS REPORT FINDINGS, ETC.', AND WAS NOW ACTIVELY WORKING WITH DPP PAUL ROPPE AND TRIAL PROSECUTOR WENDY ABRAHAM TO PUBLICLY DESTROY DR HARDING'S PROFESSIONAL CREDIBILITY AND LABEL DR HARDING AS MENTALLY UNFIT TO 'WRITE AND REPORT IN ANY PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY', SO THAT THE 'VOIR DIRE RULING WOULD DISMISS DR HARDING'S ATTACK OF PROSECUTION DNA EVIDENCE OF AND BY ANGELA VAN DAAL, WHICH WOULD THEN 'ADMIT VAN DAAL'S DNA EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY INTO MY MURDER TRIAL AS PROSECUTION EVIDENCE', PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION OF HARDING'S PERSONAL AFFAIRS TO DISCREDIT DR HARDING'S MENTAL COMPETENCE (THE MANNER AND REASON AND PURPOSE OF ABRAHAM'S

7-4-2019

17/

PROSECUTORIAL ATTACK AGAINST HARDING HIMSELF, RATHER THAN THE 'FINDINGS IN HARDING'S REPORT AND HARDING'S TESTIMONY ABOUT HIS FINDINGS', ALSO MADE THE ACTIONS/CONDUCT OF PROSECUTOR WENDY ABRAHAM 'FRAUDULENT AND PROSECUTORIALLY IMPROPER'), AS PART OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT COLLUSION BETWEEN BILL TILSTONE (SAFSC), PAUL ROFFE (DPP DIRECTOR), WENDY ABRAHAM (DPP, MY TRIAL PROSECUTOR), AND AT LEAST ONE OTHER SENIOR PERSON FROM THE SAFSC DIRECTORSHIP, TO UNLAWFULLY ACT SO AS TO ENSURE VAN PAAL'S DNA EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY IS ADMITTED INTO TRIAL EVIDENCE. UNTIL A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, I DID NOT KNOW WHY THOSE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WENT TO SUCH CRIMINAL EXTREMES IN ORDER TO STOP DR HARDING'S REPORT AND ASSOCIATED FINDINGS BEING VALIDATED IN MY 1994 TRIAL VOIR DIRE (WHICH WOULD HAVE THEN 'EXCLUDED ALL VAN PAAL'S ~~AND~~ AND ALL SAFSC DNA EVIDENCE, REPORTS AND TESTIMONY, FROM MURDER TRIAL PROSECUTION EVIDENCE'), BECAUSE, I DID NOT ACCEPT THAT THEY ALL WENT TO SUCH OBVIOUS ILLEGAL EXTENTS 'JUST SO I WOULD GET CONVICTED' (I AM A NOBODY, IT DID NOT MAKE SENSE TO ME WHY THEY ALL WERE PLAYING THEIR RESPECTIVE ILLEGAL ROLES, JUST TO STOP HARDING'S REPORT, STOP HARDING'S TESTIMONY, GET THE SAFSC DNA PROSECUTION EVIDENCE ADMITTED INTO MY MURDER TRIAL, AND, GET ME CONVICTED USING SAME SAFSC DNA PROSECUTION EVIDENCE), BUT I KNOW NOW...! THERE WAS A LOT MORE AT STAKE THAN 'JUST A PROSECUTION OF ME'..... IT WAS THE ENTIRE DNA DATABASE ITSELF, WHICH WAS CREATED BY THE SAFSC IN 1991.

THIS IS SOME OF WHAT I NOW KNOW:

- 1991, SAFSC CREATED A DNA DATABASE.
- THAT DNA DATABASE INCLUDED 'TYPINGS/READINGS' FROM CRIME SCENE DNA EVIDENCE.
- WHICH MEANS IT WAS THE 'PROSECUTION FILE' OF CASES SINCE 1991, AND, AS MY TRIAL WAS 1994, HOW <sup>MANY</sup> ~~THE~~ CONVICTIONS, PATERNITY TESTS, ETC, HAD BEEN DETERMINED WITHIN THOSE



COUPLE OF YEARS WHICH USED RESULTS FROM SAID 1991 DATABASE?

- IN LATE 1992, SAFSC DNA SPECIALIST ANGELA VAN DAAL, WHO WAS ACTING AS A PROSECUTION WITNESS (A 2ND OPINION FOR THE PROSECUTION), IN THE MATTER R v SEYGARISTOS, VICTORIA COUNTY COURT, JUDGE RAVECH 17-11-1992, UNREPORTED

DURING THE VOIR DIRE TESTIMONY OF A. VAN DAAL, ADMITTED THAT HER 'TESTING', 'RESULTS', 'FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CORRECT PROCEDURES', ETC, MADE HER RESULTS 'UNRELIABLE' AND THEREFORE COULD NOT BE ACCEPTED AS ACCURATE OR VALID, WHICH ALSO MEANT THAT THE 1991 DNA DATABASE ALREADY CONTAINED STATISTICAL RESULTS WHICH COULD NOT BE ACCEPTED AS ACCURATE OR TRUE, IN EFFECT... A FALSE DATABASE.

- THAT TESTIMONY WAS KNOWN BY SAFSC DIRECTORSHIP, THE SA ATTORNEY-GENERAL, THE SA DPP DIRECTOR, AND OTHERS.
- THE RULING IN SEYGARISTOS MATTER (VOIR DIRE), WAS THAT ALL VAN DAAL EVIDENCE, REPORTS, ETC, WAS DISALLOWED AT THE TRIAL IN VICTORIA.
- THE RAMIFICATIONS SHOULD HAVE RESULTED IN A NEW DATABASE FROM THAT TIME ONWARDS, BUT IT DIDN'T.
- THE SAFSC AND SA GOVERNMENT FRAUDULENTLY CONTINUED TO USE THAT 'SAME' TAINTED/FLAWED DNA DATABASE.
- DNA DATABASE STARTED IN 1991, DATE OF MURDER I WAS ARRESTED FOR WAS 4-1-1992, TESTIMONY OF VAN DAAL IN SEYGARISTOS WAS LATE 1992, MY MURDER TRIAL STARTED MARCH 1994, DR HARRY HARDING REPORT WAS DATED MARCH 1994, THE DNA CRIME SCENE EVIDENCE USED BY PROSECUTION AT MY MURDER TRIAL (STATISTICAL RECORDS, ETC), WAS THE SAME DATABASE WHICH VIC. COUNTY COURT JUDGE RULED AS DISALLOWED DUE TO ADMITTED ERRORS BY VAN DAAL.
- BY MID 1993, THE SAFSC (DR BILL TILSTONE), AND SA DPP HAD

7-4-2019 19/

ACKNOWLEDGED THAT 'ALL FUTURE SA USE OF DNA IN A FORENSIC ENVIRONMENT WILL LARGELY REVOLVE AROUND THE FINDINGS AND RULINGS IN THE TRIAL PROSECUTION OF JARRETT'.

- UNLIKE WITH THE SEYGHARISTOS RULING AGAINST VAN DAAL, IF THE VOIR DIRE RULING IN MY 1994 MURDER TRIAL, WAS TO 'ACKNOWLEDGE' UNRELIABILITY IN VAN DAAL'S RESULTS, STATISTICAL ERRORS IN THE SAFSC DNA DATABASE, THE RAMIFICATIONS WOULD INCLUDE 'NUMEROUS CONVICTIONS BEING OVERTURNED, THE SAFSC NOT HAVING ANY APPROVAL TO OPERATE FOR PROSECUTION DNA DATABASE ~~WORK~~ WORK, ETC.

- DURING MY VOIR DIRE, PROSECUTOR ABRAHAM WAS DIRECTLY ASKED BY JUSTICE MULLIGHAN, 'IF THE PROSECUTION'S DNA EVIDENCE WAS NOT ADMITTED INTO TRIAL EVIDENCE, WOULD THE PROSECUTION STILL HAVE SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO CONTINUE TO TRIAL?', ABRAHAM'S ANSWER WAS 'NO, THERE IS NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE TO CONTINUE'.

\* THEY (ABOVE), RELATE TO PRIOR TO AND DURING MY 1994 MURDER TRIAL.

- APPROXIMATELY 1997, AS I STEPPED INTO KITCHEN FOYER AT YATALA PRISON KITCHEN, STARTING MORNING SHIFT, PRISON KITCHEN SUPERVISOR DCS EMPLOYEE IAN SANDELL APPROACHED ME AND SAID "MY MOTHER HATES YOU.". BAFELED BY HIS STATEMENT, PLUS, THE FACT THAT I LITERALLY HAD JUST ENTERED THE KITCHEN TO GO TO MY JOB THERE, I SAID "WHAT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?" TO OFFICER IAN SANDELL. SANDELL RESPONDED "MY MOTHER HATES YOU." I SAID 'I DON'T EVEN KNOW HER, "WHY DOES SHE HATE ME?"' SANDELL ANSWERED, "BECAUSE YOU GOT HER FRIEND SACKED." I ASKED "WHAT THE FUCK ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?" SANDELL SAID "HER FRIEND GOT THE SACK BECAUSE OF YOU." I THEN ASKED "WHERE DOES SHE WORK?" SANDELL SAID "STATE FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE."

7-4-2019

20/

I THEN SAID, 'YOUR HUM MUST BE REFERRING TO HARRY HARDING THEN.'

NOW, I ALSO HAD CONFIRMATION, FROM SANDELL, THAT OTHER SAFSC EMPLOYEES HAD DIRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE CRIMINAL ACTS BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT AGAINST DR HARRY HARDING, AND THAT THIS PARTICULAR PERSON WAS A FRIEND OF HARDING, AND THAT SHE WAS IAN SANDELL'S MOTHER, SO THAT AT SOME TIME IN THE FUTURE I COULD PROVIDE THOSE DETAILS TO LAWYER FOR THEM TO INVESTIGATE FOR THEMSELVES, ALSO, IN RELATION TO CORRUPTION COMPLAINT.

- AFTER I WAS MOVED FROM YATALA PRISON, TO PORT AUGUSTA PRISON, APPROXIMATELY 2002/2003, I STARTED SEEING SOCIAL WORKER THERE ~~WHEN~~ (MENTAL HEALTH I NEEDED HELP WITH). SW MIRIUM LEFT THE JOB SO THEN I WAS SEEN BY SW HAMISH. AS PART OF ME DISCLOSING THE THINGS THAT WERE MESSING WITH MY HEADSPACE, I REVEALED MATTERS RELATING TO ARSON CHARGE AND TRIAL, AND, MURDER CHARGE AND TRIAL, WHICH INCLUDED THE ABOVE DETAILS RE HARDING. I ALSO REVEALED TO HAMISH THAT I FEARED BROADCASTING WHAT I KNEW, BECAUSE 'THE STATE GOVERNMENT WENT TO THOSE LENGTHS ~~IN~~ TO ENSURE VAN DRAAL'S EVIDENCE WAS PERMITTED IN MY 1994 MURDER TRIAL, AND I STILL HAD NO IDEA 'WHY', BUT THAT IT WAS SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH THAT IT INVOLVED SAFSC DIRECTORS, DPP PAUL ROFFE, AND TRIAL PROSECUTOR WENDY ABRAHAM... THEY CRIMINALLY THREATENED A GOVERNMENT SCIENTIST NOT TO SPEAK, OR ELSE... SO I DID NOT KNOW HOW FAR ~~THE~~ THE GOVERNMENT WOULD GO TO SHUT ME DOWN, EVEN NOW, <sup>AND</sup> ~~THE~~, WHAT ELSE THEY WOULD DO TO OTHER PEOPLE WHO ~~WERE~~ KNEW WHAT HAPPENED, TO ENSURE 'THOSE PEOPLE' CONTINUE TO NOT SAY ANYTHING NOW'. SOME TIME AFTER I STARTED SEEING SW HAMISH, HAMISH SAID THAT HE

7-4-2019

21/

WAS 'ASSOCIATED WITH, OR ~~BE~~ PART OF, OR SOMETHING TO THAT EFFECT, A GROUP'. HAMISH THEN DESCRIBED THAT 'GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO GET TOGETHER, OR MEET UP, OR SOMETHING, AND DISCUSS A RANGE OF ISSUES, INCLUDING COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL MATTERS, THAT THERE ARE A WHOLE RANGE OF PEOPLE WHO ARE PART OF THAT GROUP, INCLUDING SCIENTISTS, LAWYERS, CONCERNED CITIZENS, ETC'. HAMISH ~~HE~~ THEN ASKED ME IF 'I MIND IF HE SPOKE TO SOME PEOPLE HE KNEW IN THAT GROUP, SCIENTISTS AND PEOPLE WHO UNDERSTAND DNA TESTING, BECAUSE SOME OF THE THINGS I WAS DESCRIBING ABOUT ALL THE DNA TESTING EVENTS IN ~~THE~~ MY MATTER (MURDER TRIAL), WERE QUITE ALARMING IN A GENERAL SENSE, AND HE WAS CURIOUS TO UNDERSTAND IT ALL'. HAMISH SAID 'HE WOULD NOT BE MENTIONING MY NAME, BUT WOULD ONLY USE GENERAL REFERENCES'. I SAID TO HAMISH, THAT, 'I WASN'T TELLING HIM ALL THOSE THINGS SO HE WOULD INVESTIGATE IT FOR ME, I WAS DISCLOSING THEM SO THAT HE HAD AN UNDERSTANDING OF SOME OF THE CRAP THAT WAS IN MY HEAD, THAT I WAS STRUGGLING WITH, THAT DIRECTLY RELATED TO ME BEING IN PRISON, AND, I DIDN'T WANT HIM TO GET INTO TROUBLE IF HE STARTED INVESTIGATING WHAT I HAD DISCLOSED, AND I DEFINATELY DID NOT WANT HAMISH TO LOSE HIS JOB, SO THEN, IF THAT'S WHAT HE WANTED TO DO AND IT WOULD NOT GET HAMISH INTO ANY TROUBLE WITH HIS JOB, THEN HE HAD MY CONSENT TO TALK ABOUT WHAT I REVEALED (RE HARDING, SANDEL, VAN PAAL, ETC), BECAUSE I TRUSTED HAMISH TO BE GENUINE IN HIS INTENTIONS. I THEN EMPHASISED TO HAMISH TO, 'PLEASE BE CAREFUL WHO YOU TALK TO BECAUSE 'THEY' WENT AFTER HARRY HARDING USING HIGH-RANKING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (SAFSC, DPP



PAUL ROFFE, PPP WENDY ABRAHAM), AND ITS NOT THE FIRST TIME THEY'VE DONE STUFF LIKE THAT. THERE WAS A PRISONER AT YATALA, ~~WHO~~ MID-LATE 1990'S, MARK MARSHALL, WHO WAS REVEALING TO HIS SOCIAL WORKER (MALE, APPROX. 35-40, ROUNDISH FACE, STOCKY BUILD), ABOUT A LOT OF CHILD SEX CRIMES THAT ADULTS WERE INVOLVED IN WHEN MARK WAS A CHILD, BUT WHEN THAT SOCIAL WORKER STARTED REPORTING TO OFFICIALS ABOUT THOSE THINGS, WE FOUND OUT ABOUT THREE YEARS LATER THAT 'PEOPLE IN BALACLAVAS WOKE HIM ONE NIGHT AND SUGGESTED HE STOP ASKING PEOPLE QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT MARSHALL', THAT 'THOSE' PEOPLE WHO WERE IN HIS BEDROOM WHEN THEY WOKE HIM HAS SCARED HIM ENOUGH THAT HE QUIT HIS JOB AND MOVED'. I TOLD HAMISH THAT 'HE HAD MY CONSENT TO USE MY NAME IF HE WANTED TO, BUT TO PLEASE BE CAREFUL'.

SEVERAL MONTHS LATER, DURING A SESSION WITH HAMISH, HE SAID TO ME THAT 'HE HAD RECENTLY SPOKEN TO ONE OF THE SCIENTIST PEOPLE HE KNEW, IN THE GROUP HAMISH WAS PART OF, AND HE WAS DESCRIBING SPECIFIC THINGS THAT I HAD ~~REVEALED~~ REVEALED, THAT THE SCIENTIST PERSON THEN SAID TO HAMISH THAT THE THINGS THAT HAMISH WAS DESCRIBING SOUNDED VERY FAMILIAR TO THE SCIENTIST WHO THEN ASKED HAMISH IF HAMISH HAD CONSENT TO REVEAL THE PRISONER'S NAME, WHICH HAMISH DID THEN REVEAL, 'DAVID JARRET', THE SCIENTIST THEN SAID TO HAMISH, 'THAT IS WHY IT SOUNDS FAMILIAR TO ME BECAUSE THE SCIENTIST YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT WHO WAS THREATENED, WAS IN FACT HIMSELF'. HAMISH THEN SAID TO ME THAT THE SCIENTIST FRIEND OF HIS WAS HARRY HARDING, AND THAT HARRY HARDING HAD REVEALED MORE THINGS TO HIM ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED. HAMISH CONTINUED, 'AFTER TELLING HARDING MY

7-9-2019

23/

NAME, HARDING REVEALED TO HAMISH THAT 'THERE WAS A LOT MORE THAT HAPPENED (TO HARDING) AFTER THE TRIAL'. HAMISH THEN SAID TO ME THAT 'HE IS RELUCTANT TO SAY MUCH ABOUT WHAT ELSE HARDING REVEALED TO HIM, BECAUSE OF HOW SERIOUS IT WAS, BUT "I CAN TELL YOU THAT DR HARDING TOLD ME IT STARTED THE DAY AFTER HE FINISHED ON THE WITNESS STAND IN YOUR CASE, WHEN HE NEXT WENT TO WORK, 'SOMEONE' WALKED UP TO HIM, HANDED HIM A BROOMSTOCK AND SAID "THIS IS YOUR JOB FROM NOW ON, SAME OFFICE, SAME PAY, BUT THIS IS ALL YOU'RE GOOD FOR NOW'".

- COUPLE OF YEARS LATER, I WATCHED ON TELEVISION, ABC 'AUSTRALIAN STORY' ABOUT MR QUIGLEY IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA, ABOUT THE THINGS THE STATE, AND, UNIDENTIFIED MASKED PERSONS DID TO QUIGLEY TO TRY AND STOP QUIGLEY FROM EXPOSING THE STATE CORRUPTION RELATING TO MALLARD TRIAL AND CONVICTION. MY 'FEARS' RELATING TO ME EXPOSING WHAT THIS STATE DID RE MY PROSECUTION TO CONVICTION, WERE INCREASED AFTER REALISING THAT, IF 'THAT COULD BE DONE BY THE WA GOV AGAINST QUIGLEY, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING WHO HE WAS, WHAT ELSE WOULD 'THEY' (SA GOV) DO TO SHUT ME DOWN, CONSIDERING HOW THAT WENT AFTER HARDING?

- APPROX. 2016 I WROTE TO DPP DIRECTOR, EFFECTIVELY HIGHLIGHTING THAT I 'KNEW CERTAIN STATE IMPROPRIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH CROWN CONDUCT BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER MY TRIAL'. ~~THAT LETTER WAS~~

FOLLOWING DPP REPLY, I REVEALED MY INFORMATION TO MY LAWYER, ABOUT THE HARDING ISSUES.

- LATE 2016/EARLY 2017, MY LAWYER COLD-CALLED DR HARRY HARDING, ASKING ABOUT MATTERS I REVEALED REGARDING THREATS TO HARDING ETC, ASSOCIATED WITH HARDING'S WORK FOR MY

7-4-2019 24/

1994 MURDER TRIAL.

- WITHIN A WEEK OF MY LAWYER SPEAKING WITH HARRY HARDING, I HAD A CALL WITH MY LAWYER, WHO INFORMED ME THAT HE HAD ACTUALLY SPOKE TO DR HARRY HARDING, AND, THAT DR HARDING HAD EFFECTIVELY CONFIRMED ALL THE THINGS THAT I HAD CLAIMED HAD BEEN DONE TO HARDING. \* \*

WHEN I SAID TO THE BOARD AT THE PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING, THAT THERE WERE SERIOUS MATTERS RELATING TO MY MURDER CONVICTION APPEAL WHICH I DID NOT WANT THE STATE GOVERNMENT TO KNOW ABOUT BECAUSE ~~IT WAS~~ ~~I DID NOT WANT THE GO~~ THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT RAMIFICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INFORMATION, I DID NOT LIE, I DID NOT EMBELISH WHAT IS FACT, PLUS, I WAS NOT AWARE THAT A PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING ALSO DOUBLES AS A CHALLENGE HEARING AGAINST MY JURIDICAL RIGHT TO APPEAL AGAINST STATE GOVERNMENT CRIMINAL ABUSE OF POSITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT SO AS TO EFFECT ARSON CONVICTION, AND, STATE GOVERNMENT CRIMINAL ABUSE OF POSITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT SO AS TO EFFECT MURDER CONVICTION. IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO THINK OTHERWISE CONSIDERING THE BOARD REPEATEDLY HARASSED ME TO REVEAL "EXACTLY" WHAT IT WAS ABOUT THE MURDER CONVICTION, I WAS TARGETING FOR APPEAL. I HAVE DELIBERATELY NOT REVEALED SPECIFIC MATTERS RELATING TO THE DNA EVIDENCE, WHICH ARE INTENDED TO BE STATED IN APPEAL POINTS, BUT I CAN DISCLOSE THAT THE 'HARDING' MATTERS AND 'SPECIFIC DNA' MATTERS, WILL NOT BE THE ONLY MATTERS IN THE APPEAL PAPERS.

THE STATE GOVERNMENT, BOARD, DCS, SOC, SMU, RPB, SAPOL, ETC, WILL ALL SAY 'I HAVE NO COURT RULING OR POLICE INVESTIGATION TO SUPPORT MY CLAIMS RE THREATS TO HARDING, CRIMINAL ACTS BY STATE (ARSON, MURDER CONVICTIONS)', AND THAT IS AN ACCURATE CLAIM, IN PART, BUT THAT

7-4-2019 25/

DOES NOT MEAN THEY ARE NOT TRUE. I AM NOT TRYING TO IMPLY THAT 'I AM THE POOR VICTIM', I DID NOT SAY THAT, NOR HAVE I TRIED TO CARRY THAT LEAF.... WHAT I HAVE DONE IS DESCRIBE THINGS THAT ARE TRUE.

IN THE BOARD'S PAROLE REFUSAL LETTER, IS A POINT OF TIME 'IN 12 MONTHS', BEFORE I AM ALLOWED TO APPLY FOR PAROLE AGAIN. CAN THE BOARD PLEASE CLARIFY FOR ME, BECAUSE, I AM FAMILIAR WITH THE PART OF THE DCS ACT WHICH STATES THAT LIFE APPLICANT APPLYING FOR PAROLE, CANNOT RECEIVE PAROLE RELEASE PRIOR TO THEIR NON-PAROLE PERIOD DATE, HOWEVER, THEY CAN SUBMIT THEIR PAROLE APPLICATION 'UP TO 6 MONTHS PRIOR TO NPP DATE', SO THEN, IS THE BOARD DIRECTING THAT THEY HAVE NOW CREATED A NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD LENGTH OF TIME 'FOR ME' OF 18 MONTHS, SO THAT 6 MONTHS EARLIER (12 MONTHS), THAN THE 18 MONTHS, IS WHEN I CAN SUBMIT MY NEW PAROLE ~~REF~~ RELEASE APPLICATION, OR, IS THE BOARD DIRECTING THAT THEY HAVE NOW CREATED A NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD LENGTH OF TIME 'FOR ME' OF 12 MONTHS, SO THAT 6 MONTHS EARLIER (WHICH IS 6 MONTHS AFTER DATE OF PAROLE REFUSAL) ~~WHICH IS 6 MONTHS~~, THAN THE '12 MONTHS', IS WHEN I CAN SUBMIT MY NEW PAROLE RELEASE APPLICATION? HAS THE BOARD CREATED FOR ME A NEW NON-PAROLE PERIOD OF TIME OF 12 MONTHS OR 18 MONTHS?

THE STATE AND THE BOARD DON'T LIKE THAT I HAVE MADE SO MANY COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE STATE (WITHIN THE LAST 19 YEARS), AND TELL ME TO EXPLAIN 'WHY'. THEN, MAY I ANSWER BY ASKING 'WHAT DOES THE BOARD EXPECT ME TO DO WHEN I SEE SOMETHING THAT IS NOT RIGHT, AM I TO TURN MY HEAD AWAY AND SAY NOTHING, AM I TO DISREGARD WHO I THINK MIGHT BE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF BY THE THING THAT IS NOT RIGHT AND ME JUST KEEP ON WALKING, AM I TO BEND AT THE KNEES AND FOLD UNDER PRESSURE WHEN A BULLY ENTERS THE ROOM.... IS THAT THE TYPE OF PERSON THE BOARD WANTS ME TO BE? IT IS NOT DIFFERENT, IT IS THE SAME PART OF THE BRAIN




7-4-2019 26/

BEING UTILISED, WHEN A PERSON DECIDES TO STAND UP AND PROJECT... 'THAT IS ENOUGH... WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS NOT RIGHT'. WITHIN THE VPP, WE ARE DIRECTED TO 'FIND THE STRENGTH AND COURAGE WITHIN OURSELF, TO BE 'THAT PERSON' WHO STANDS-UP AND CALLS 'THAT OTHER PERSON' OUT, AND IT DOES NOT MATTER IF THE BULLY IS 'A MAN HITTING HIS PARTNER OR CHILD', 'DOMESTIC ABUSE', 'ROAD RAGE', 'DRINK DRIVER', ETC, OR AS I HAVE RELUCTANTLY DONE WITHIN THE LAST 18 YEARS, I TRIED TO STAND-UP. I HAD NOT BEEN ABLE <sup>TO</sup> 'STAND-UP' IN OTHER AREAS EVEN THOUGH I WANTED TO AND NEEDED TO, BUT, THAT DID NOT MEAN THAT I WAS NOT GENUINE IN WHAT SPECIFICALLY I WAS COMPLAINING ABOUT, IRRESPECTIVE OF IT BEING TO DCS MINISTER, ATTORNEY-GENERAL, DCS CEO, AHPRA, OPI, OMBUDSMAN, SAPOL, OR WHOMEVER THE COMPLAINT WAS TO. THERE WERE SOME PERIODS WHEN LANGUAGE USED BY ME WAS NOT 'DIPLOMATIC', CONSEQUENTIAL TO MENTAL HEALTH DIFFICULTIES I WAS EXPERIENCING, RESULTING IN INAPPROPRIATE USE OF SOME WORDS, WHICH WAS ALSO RESULTING FROM SIGNIFICANT FRUSTRATION OVER MATTERS BEING COMPLAINED ABOUT.

COULD THE BOARD PLEASE NOTIFY MY LAWYER, ROCKY PERROTTA (WHO REPRESENTED ME AT MY PAROLE APPLICATION HEARING), OF THE BOARD'S RECEIPT OF THIS ANNUAL REVIEW SUBMISSION BY ME.

THANK YOU.

 D. JARRETT