

keywords: fraud by Brisbane City Council [BCC]; fraud by police; police lies adopted by Beattie Government; Snr Const Henri Elias Rantala, dumb or corrupt; Rorting Rantala has broken the law, stolen and destroyed property of another, then charged him to try to cover his corruption, ; question of judicial propriety; Beattie shepherding Spence in Media conference; Coles Myer Ltd with much to hide; Coles knew of illegal discrimination of disabled by their staff, vicarious responsibility, yet did nothing to intervene; highly immoral of Coles; BCC police bully disabled guy named Haig; breach of Cth DDA; Magistrate bullies disabled guy, also breach of DDA;

Beattie Govt:




Illustration 1: Pensive Premier Beattie with much to ponder.

CRIMINAL LIES & COVER UP

The Beattie Government has adopted the lies and corruption of the Queensland Police and the

Brisbane City Council [BCC] as their very own. As evidenced in the letters below, from the Beattie Minister for Police Judy Spence, she has, as Minister of the Beattie Government, made the lie of the Police and Brisbane City Council [BCC] also now a lie of the Beattie Government. As detailed in ACLJ Issue #200701, the BCC with the aid of the dumb or corrupt [then] Snr Constable Henri Elias Rantala, broke and entered the home and property of a disabled guy, and stole his property over a three day period. This case is of a disabled guy in St Lucia. Call him Haig. We have investigated this case and found it to be a classic example of fraud and theft by BCC and the Police. We have assumed to prosecute Haig's case in the media as we have complete documented evidence showing the corruption in the BCC and police.

Now, with Spence's letters below, the Beattie government has become embroiled in this corruption. We have the proof to refute all allegations. No-one was found guilty of public nuisance. No evidence was heard and no plea required. It was simply dismissed. As for "public Interest", the Police knew that Haig could prove his innocence, and concurrently show that Coles Myer Ltd had much to hide. The fact that corruption is endemic in our society including the courts, lawyers, public service and government commissions and much of the mainline media, does not mean that we will accept it. We have all the documented evidence to prove the corruption. We will not relent, regardless of what any authority may say. Most of the Australian community realizes the degree of public corruption, but decide to keep their heads down to be able to best enjoy a peaceful life. However, maybe there is much truth to the comments of Sheikh Taj Din al-Hilali that, "The Western people are the biggest liars and oppressors ...". Dishonesty is endemic in our society, governments, courts, lawyers and barristers, and the mainline media.



Illustration 2: Judy Spence



*Illustration 3:
Merri Rose:
Beattie ex-Minister.*

Judy Spence is one of Beattie's quota of female Ministers, just as Merri Rose was, and Desley Boyle is. [**That must inspire confidence.**] Beattie shepherds Spence through press conferences, where the world would be able to see her stuff up. We wonder just how "hands on" Spence really is, in the ministerial office where the world cannot see. Of course, she has "staff". Does her being "hands on" refer to her actually signing the letters. Judy Spence treats the Police Ministry like her very own dolls house. She can be humoured all day as she "plays" in her "dolls' house". We can imagine the scene in Spence's office. "Now Judy, we are going to have some big excitement now. Bring your big biro over here and we will sign these big grown- up letters. Oh weeeeeee, you are a good girl to sign those. Now you can go back to your dolls." As can be seen from her letter of 23 January, 2007, that response was farmed out to the Police Department. Clearly, neither she, nor anyone else, has scrutinized the response.

Our "emails" to which she refers were actually OPEN LETTERS to her published on our <http://haigreport.com> website. Clearly, the Police lies were the work of Rantala, referenced above, as he was soon onto our webhost complaining about being called a dummy or corrupt. Since he did the wrong thing, he either did know, [so corrupt] or did not know that what he was doing was wrong, so a dummy. His subsequent conduct suggests he did know, so meaning that he was/is corrupt. "His" letter of 23 January, 2007, masquerading as Spence's, is resplendent with lies, but then what could we expect

from Rorting Rantala.

We have delayed publishing this episode, as we have been awaiting FOI release from Spence as to the documents and information with which this letter was prepared. We sought FOI from Spence on 30 January, 2007. We emailed her at both her email addresses of police@ministerial.qld.gov.au and at <mailto:police@qld.gov.au>. The 45 day period in which that FOI application should have been fulfilled ended on 16 March, 2007. We wonder how many people are surprised to find that Spence ignored her legal obligation. We have now lodged a “deemed refusal” application for Review with the Information Commissioner. We will report developments in our [Australian FOI Law Journal](#).

We will consider the lies in Rorting Rantala's letter. While the disabled guy Haig was charged by Rorting Rantala with five charges, Haig was convicted of none. On the day, the disabled guy did nothing wrong. So that Rantala the Rort did not have to stay at the property all day so that BCC could ransack his home, the Rort arrested the disabled guy on the charge of “breach of the peace”. His idea was to have the disabled guy bailed but with a condition on his bail that he not return home, so then if he did, the police could arrest him on breach of a bail condition and keep him in jail. The disabled guy was smart enough to work that out before they arrived at the watch-house. When Rort arrived with the disabled guy at the



watch-house, Rort had been too dumb to know that a condition, that have been adopted by the Beattie Government as their very the disabled guy not return to his own.

home all day, could not be placed

on a bail for that charge. So, Rort the dummy had to lie and say the disabled guy was arrested for “Public Nuisance”, as such a condition could be placed on a bail for that charge. The Rort further lied in his sworn statement that he changed his mind in the car while transporting the disabled guy to the watch-house. The Rort also concocted further lies in his sworn statement to substantiate a charge of Public Nuisance, but not the same reason that he said was the reason that the Rort changed his mind, from “breach of the peace” to “public Nuisance”, in the car. That dumb cop is tying himself up in his lies.

In Court, the disabled guy appeared and had subpoenaed a number of witnesses. The Magistrate was named Ehrich. He did not wish to hear the matter. He could tell that there was no substance to the charge. The disabled guy was not given an opportunity to be heard. In fact, when he attempted to comment, he was loudly and abruptly told to be quiet by the magistrate. That was bullying of the disabled guy. That amounts to discrimination on the basis of the disabled guy's disability. An illegal act by Magistrate Ehrich, pursuant to Commonwealth Legislation.

It could be argued that Magistrate Ehrich knew the disabled guy/defendant was innocent, and importantly, that he was likely to prove it overwhelmingly.. There would have been on the court file that Ehrich had, the court copies of all the subpoenas that the disabled guy had served, and the documents that were subpoenaed. It spelt out that the Police and BCC were acting **CRIMINALLY**. Importantly, the BCC needed a court order but had none. They were subpoenaed to bring to court their authority to enter Haig's home. They had none. The BCC were corrupt and had acted corruptly. They did not want it heard. Experience suggests that the BCC has some illegal sway over the Courts.

The disabled guy's defence was in the main, that the BCC and Police were illegally in his yard and home. The magistrate would have then been required to advise the Crime and Misconduct Commission of the Illegal Acts by the BCC and police. Their corruption is all documented.

The charge was dismissed absolutely. The Magistrate made the order, he stated, under Sect 19 of the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992. At Australian Law Publishers Pty Ltd [AuLP], we are of the view that a magistrate cannot dismiss/discharge a charge/defendant, under this section, without having heard the matter, and guilt being found, or alternatively, a guilty plea being received. There was no guilty plea, and the matter was not heard. We will investigate this aspect of this matter further. We suspect that the magistrate was in error. We wonder if the Magistrate knew he was in error, but thought this was the best way of denying the disabled guy his right to be heard. This could be the evil spectre of corruption arising again in Queensland. Maybe, Magistrate Ehrich wished to do his part to conceal criminal corruption by police and BCC.

We will be publicizing this “error”. It is not a matter of no substance. The Beattie Government has adopted this element which we intend to prove is Judicial Corruption. We at AuLP, will set out to prove that this was a corrupt way for the magistrate to prevent the Police and BCC corruption being made public. Rorting Rantala did not want the DPP to abandon the case. The disabled guy had subpoenaed persons from the Brisbane City Council [BCC] since the BCC and police illegally entered his yard and home. The BCC did not want all the evidence being heard.

As for “tainted Property”: that shows just how desperate Rorting Rantala really is. The concept of “tainted property” arises in relation to property purchased with the proceeds of major crime where the direct link from the major crime to the property cannot be proven. We will need to explain some background to this matter..

Well, it happened that the disabled guy had 14 mainly completely wrecked and junked Coles shopping trolleys in his yard. They were all unusable by Coles, but he had repaired four to meet his purposes. A previous Manager of the local Coles store, one Linda Maree Wease, had tried to con the eccentric looking disabled guy, to take all of Coles' junked shopping trolleys to “do her a favour” as she said, [to save her the job of having to organize their disposal]. He agreed to take them as he could fix some for his needs, and the rest could be used, he says, at worst, as reinforcing of concrete. Wease the weasel even helped him to move them up to his home; right up to his front gate. She then told the disabled guy, information about the trolleys that he would not have known, if he had stolen them. That was so very important and probably cost Wease her job with Coles. Apparently, “giving” them away like this was in breach of her job specifications. Hence, she was telling the managers of Coles who replaced her that the disabled guy had stolen them. [They were all junk so who would believe her, and why did they?] Over the following few weeks she left three or four trolleys right across his front gate such that he could not exit his home. All of these were twisted such that all four wheels would not touch a flat floor at the same time. The day after the

first one was left across his gate, the weasel asked Haig if he had found it, and told him it was for him.

The disabled guy appears quite eccentric but is really quite smart. He is worm farming. He has shown us his worm farm and how to calculate the approximate number of worms he has. We have seen, [he has shown us and we confirmed with Bunnings], the selling price of compost worms, [which he says his are and we believe]. They are very expensive. The price for live worms, when calculated as a cost of worm “meal” is about \$150/kg; or \$38/1,000. He looks a little freakish. He realizes this. He has a very long beard. He has shown us at AuLP, photos of himself without the beard, and an MRI of his skull. The MRI does show that he does have a greatly deformed skull, confirmed by the photos of him without the beard. When it was pointed out to us, we could see it, even with his beard. His beard does cover a lot so we believe it is realistic to believe the deformity in the shape of his skull is more obvious without his beard. He jokes that his face is not on the front of his head, and that is correct as the MRI shows it is around to the right of his head by between 5 and 10 degrees. He says that even without his beard, he invariably attracted negative and bullying reactions from others. He says, he now realises the reason, and, since he has become used to that, and importantly, understands the reason for it, he is freed from having to worry about what other people may think of him. He does appear quite eccentric.

He says he has developed a “low cost” operation for his worm farm. He has arrangements with many local restaurants and food stores to collect from them, organic food byproduct of their operation, before it becomes scrap. He uses this to feed his worms. At one stage, he was collecting four trolley loads per evening, of unsold bread from a local Hot Bread Kitchen, five evenings every fortnight. He was composting this and feeding his worms. With the yeast and fermentation, it was remarked that passing his home was like passing the Four X [XXXX] brewery at Milton.

So when Rorting Rantala approached Coles about the junk trolleys in the disabled guy's yard, the local manager told him that the trolleys were stolen. So Rorting Rantala charged the disabled guy with stealing 14 [junk] shopping trolleys.

The police officers associated with Rorting must think he is a moron. He had another two officers accompany him with a warrant, to the disabled guy's home, to impound [seize as he says] the rusting derelict trolleys. As they were “seizing” the junk, the disabled guy [call him Haig] phoned Linda Maree Wease [wease the weasel] at her new store. She was abusive; how did Haig know her new store? [Staff in the local store told him the day after she left.] She reckoned that Haig should not be talking to her, and was most abusive. Haig reckons that he then quickly realized that she was responsible for the lies.

Haig then emailed Coles Myer Ltd head office and told them the situation and related facts that the weasel had conveyed to him, that they could check and that Haig would not have known if he had in fact stolen the trolleys. Haig asked them not to release the email to the weasel, as that may be deemed to be “intimidating a witness”. They clearly did, because in the weasel's perjuring affidavit, she tried to address some of the specific points that Haig made in his email to them. We have compared all documents. Within a few months Haig discovered that the Weasel was no longer employed by Coles. We suspect that they gave her the option of resigning. Clearly, Coles knew the illegality that was afoot, and importantly, that they, vicariously for their staff, were responsible for it. Yet, Coles did nothing to put matter right. In fact, they did whatever they could to conceal the fact of what they knew. This is reprehensible for a Publicly listed company. Coles are vicariously liable for the actions of their staff. Their staff discriminated against Haig the disabled guy yet, they did nothing to prevent the on going mistreatment of Haig for the start of which they

are responsible. SHAME COLES.

The reality is that Coles has so much sensitive information within their files. We suspect that they will have destroyed as much as they can.

When it came to Rorting's charge of stealing the trolleys, Haig pointed out to the Magistrate, that nowhere in the DPP's case, did they have a claim from Coles of ownership of the trolleys. [In fact, the only claim of ownership that they had was from Haig.] The magistrates gave the prosecution the chance to obtain that claim from Coles. There were a few more mentions of the charge in court to which Haig had to attend, when the prosecution were still hoping to obtain a claim from Coles. Coles knew the reality so refused. Hence, the charge was dismissed. All the DPP had was a perjuring affidavit from the weasel denigrating Haig.

That was when Rorting the dummy, decided to try charging Haig, the disabled guy with the charge of, possession of "tainted Property" suspected of being stolen. In documents, Rorting had admitted that Haig had claimed the trolleys as his own. In the stealing charge, Rorting had calculated a figure to claim for restitution of \$142 for each of the junk trolleys so the total at \$1,988 was less than \$2,000 so it could be heard summarily, but still the maximum sum for that event, as he clearly wanted to hurt the disabled guy as much as possible: more disability discrimination. This is clearly discrimination on the basis of the disability of Haig. . [Haig says that if it had proceeded, it was Haig's option, so he would have demanded the hearing in the district court. Rorting the dummy had given Haig the option.] Pursuant to the Police Statute, Rorting was required to ensure the trolleys were retained, because Haig had claimed them as his. No doubt, the police superintendent of the police station did not wish to store 14 junk shopping trolleys in his security room, so Rorting dumped them. Rorting was getting himself in deeper and deeper just so he could bully and discriminate against the disabled guy. Since Rorting had dumped them, he had to ensure the charge was found in his favour. He was desperate to have Haig convicted as he had destroyed the trolleys which were claimed by Haig. This is the reason he preferred the second charge of tainted property, since Coles would not claim them. Coles HQ wanted nothing to do with it. Coles would not have been pleased to have been subpoenaed by Haig for the Tainted Property charge.

When the tainted property charge was to be heard, Haig had subpoenaed from Coles, all the relevant documents re this matter. Coles appointed a solicitor to produce the documents. That solicitor was desperate to talk to the DPP. Clearly, he told them that the documents they had, showed the Haig had not stolen them and that the weasel had lied. It was political dynamite, and, suggests the Publisher and Editor, **COMMERCIAL** dynamite for Coles. Coles' solicitor ensured that that the DPP was in no doubt that Haig would win, as Coles did not want the matter to proceed so as to prevent them from having to release documents showing the improper conduct of Coles. [What are they going to do when they see this. It is likely they may destroy documents and suggest that they never existed. If they wish to sue it will be a high profile case for Coles and the Publisher.]

We have claimed that sum of \$1,988 for Haig, in lieu of the actual trolleys, which he says he could still use, although Spence's staff apparently could not read, going by her letter of 13 December, 2006 as below.


All these Rantala Lies have been adopted by the Beattie Government. These are now all lies of the Beattie Government. At AuLP, we believe these are only a small proportion of the Beattie Government Lies.

At Australian Law Publishers Pty Ltd [AuLP], we have publishing interests in many areas including

Tertiary Education in Australia. Apparently, the reason Rorting is being promoted quite quickly in the Queensland Police Service is that he has commenced studying Law at one of the inferior Dawkin Universities. It may transpire that our assessment of his university is very poor. Rorting may have a bit of a distraction, when he inevitably does fail one or more subjects and blames the University for cheating him because he feels that are reacting to our assessment of that university as being of low standing. Accepting Rorting Rantala as a student, does not get it off to a good start. We live in interesting times.



Judy Spence MP
Member for Mount Gravatt



**Queensland
Government**

Office of the
**Minister for Police and
Corrective Services**

Ref: 1438 F11 LB

13 DEC 2006

Mr Russell Mathews
254 Hawken Drive
ST LUCIA QLD 4067

Dear Mr Mathews

Thank you for your emails of 16 and 17 November 2006 making allegations that a police officer stole a sum of money from

This matter is receiving attention and you will be advised further as soon as possible.


Yours sincerely

Judy Spence MP
Minister for Police and Corrective Services



Judy Spence MP

Member for Mount Gravatt



**Queensland
Government**

Ref: 1438 F11 F12 LB

Office of the
**Minister for Police and
Corrective Services**

23 JAN 2007

Mr Russell Mathews
254 Hawken Drive
ST LUCIA QLD 4067

Dear Mr Mathews

Thank you for your emails of 16 and 17 November 2006 regarding allegations of corruption against Queensland police officers.

This matter was referred to the Queensland Police Service. I am advised your allegations relate to offences with [redacted] charged and which have already been finalised.

The police advise in that regard [redacted] found guilty on a 'Public Nuisance' charge and discharged absolutely with no conviction recorded. I am advised no adverse comments were made by the magistrate in relation to the actions of police. Further, in relation to a charge of 'Tainted Property', no evidence was offered [redacted] as police considered it was not in the public interest to proceed.

I am advised there are current matters involving you which are before the courts. In the circumstances, it would not be appropriate for me to make any further comment.

I can advise, however, that I have no authority as Minister for Police to intervene in any police misconduct investigation. Should you have any concerns about the way in which your complaints have been handled, you may wish to consider writing to the Crime and Misconduct Commission at the following address:

Director
Complaints Services
Crime and Misconduct Commission
GPO Box 3123
BRISBANE QLD 4001

I trust this information is of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Judy Spence MP

Minister for Police and Corrective Services

Level 24 State Law Building
50 Ann Street Brisbane
PO Box 15195 City East
Queensland 4002 Australia
Telephone +61 7 3239 0199
Facsimile +61 7 3221 9985