

keywords: HREOC;corruption;incompetence;cheating bullying DISABLED complainant; statutory interpretation; *Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (Cth)*; singular v plural;legal humbug;DDA;

HREOC uses legal rot to bully disabled

The irony is that Australia's Human Rights and Equal Opportunity commission [HREOC] are required to protect disabled Australians from bullying and discrimination, using the (Cth) Disability Discrimination Act 1992 [DDA]. The reality is that HREOC is incompetently using legal humbug to attempt to thwart a disabled man's attempt to be saved from illegal discrimination.



Illustration 1: The Boys. HAIGPHOTO



Illustration 2: Assist dog Pyosik HAIGPHOTO

The HREOC is corrupt and has a secret agenda to protect a secret coterie which has established itself in positions of influence across our society, including courts and government commissions. We will address here the incompetent method attempted by HREOC to deny the disabled man the justice

This direction by the Senior Deputy Registrar does not appear to fall within the ambit of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* ("the DDA") as section 9 of the DDA refers to a person with a disability being accompanied by an "assistance animal" (singular) not "assistance animal(s)" (plural). I note that Ms Karen Toohey, the Delegate of the President, wrote to you on 14 October 2005 to explain why your complaint against Queensland Rail had been terminated. In that letter Ms Toohey advised that she was satisfied that section 9 referred to a single assistance animal, not multiple assistance animals. The Commission's view on this has not changed. It follows that the Commission does not agree with the interpretation of section 9 that you offered to the Supreme Court. I note, also, that you have made available to the Commission a medical report dated 23 September 2004 which confirms that you have a disability, but does not specify that the dogs are trained to alleviate the effects of the disability.

Illustration 3: Section of HREOC letter to Haig with legal humbug that plural excluded.

he deserves.

The Supreme Court of Queensland [SCQ], refused to permit Haig to enter court to defend a matter on the grounds that he was accompanied by his assistance dogs. The DDA makes such conduct by SCQ illegal as discrimination [or bullying in reality] because of disability. As shown in the except from their letter, the HREOC tried to cheat Haig by stating that the legislation mentions Animal, singular, not animals, plural. They admit that they had used the same invalid reason to refuse to accept a claim of his previously. We advised Haig of the import of the *Cth Acts Interpretation Act 1901 [AIA]* as detailed below: that unless the alternative is clear from the statute, *singular includes plural and plural includes singular*.



*Illustration 4:
Assistance dog Pookh.*

HAIGPHOTO

The HREOC had refused to accept the complaint from Haig. After our advice, Haig advised the HREOC of *Section 23 AIA*. They have now accepted his complaint. We will keep ourselves informed of the developments. We are trained as lawyers, and we can advise Haig that all the legal requirements of the DDA have been met, [despite what the HREOC incompetent states at the bottom of that section exhibited].

Section 23 Acts Interpretation Act 1901

23 Rules as to gender and number

In any Act, unless the contrary intention appears:

(a) words importing a gender include every other gender; and

(b) *words in the singular number include the plural and words in the plural number include the singular.*