

keywords: concurrent **Australian Judiciary law Journal** ISSN 1321-4497; report herein to Qld police of possible fraud by Jeffery Ernest John SPENDER, Justice of the Federal Court of Australia; by Frank Thomas Heffernan and Walter Norman Reiman, both now retired from Qld Rail [QR], and possible fraud by previously struck-off solicitor Terry (TJ) Mellifont; report herein to Chief Justice of Supreme Court of Queensland [SCQ] of possible breach of Profession Standards, Fiduciary Duty and his Duty to the Court, by JEJ Spender when a barrister in 1974, and by Mellifont; police corrupt; SCQ fails to discipline proven illegal acts by solicitors and barristers;

Proceeds of CRIME?



House at 41 Gray Road, the address on the electoral roll for JEJ Spender, Justice of the Federal Court of Australia. HAIGPHOTO

In our concurrently published [Australian Judiciary Law Journal](http://austlawpublish.com/20070228_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf) ISSN 1321-4497 [AJLJ] Issue#200701

http://austlawpublish.com/20070228_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf, we

make serious allegations of the facts of possible omissions, and breaches of professional Standards of Lawyers, by Jeffery Ernest John SPENDER, presently a Justice of the Federal Court of Australia, his

instructing solicitor at the time, the previously disgraced and permanently struck-off solicitor, Terry (TJ) Mellifont, both highly prominent Labor/Union Lawyers at the time in 1974. We have taken the unusual step of re-publishing that AJLJ #200701 as part of this journal.

We are using the opportunity of this ACLJ to report these matters FORMALLY to the relevant

authorities. By this PUBLIC journal, we notify the Queensland Police [QP], and the Supreme Court of Queensland [SCQ], of the Fraud of Haig by the Queensland Rail and the lies and perjury of QR personnel. We shall also separately notify the Police and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Queensland [SCQ], by means of notifying the present responsible Government Ministers, directing them to these, our journals that are also held in the Queensland Parliamentary Library.

We are concurrently publishing six journals which are relevant to this matter. Our latest Law Journal, very topical in Australia in the lead up to the 2007 Federal Election, is the [Australian Industrial Relations Law Journal](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.jeffery.spender.pdf) ISSN 1834-8378 [AIRLJ] Issue #200701 which is archived at [\[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australianindustrialrelationslawjournalissue200701.pdf\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australianindustrialrelationslawjournalissue200701.pdf). Although the [Australian Judiciary Law Journal](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australianjudiciarylawjournalissue200701.pdf) ISSN 1321-4497 Issue #200701 [<http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australianjudiciarylawjournalissue200701.pdf>], is included as part of the [Australian Criminal Law Journal](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australiancriminallawjournalissue200705.pdf) ISSN 1321-6562 Issue200705 [archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australiancriminallawjournalissue200705.pdf>], we also reference its separate publication as <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521australianjudiciarylawjournalissue200701.pdf>, and the Dossiers of: three people involved are [Dossier of: Walter Norman Reiman](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.walter.reiman.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.walter.reiman.pdf>, [Dossier of: Jeffery Ernest John Spender](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.jeffery.spender.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.jeffery.spender.pdf> and [Dossier of: Frank Thomas Heffernan](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.thomas.heffernan.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.thomas.heffernan.pdf> and for background [HaigReport](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.thomas.heffernan.pdf) [ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007, also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /.

Many people in our community believe the police to be corrupt. We all, at AuLP, and Haig are legally trained to be lawyers with LLB, and have the professional ability and evidence to know that the Queensland Police are corrupt. They are corrupt.

The SCQ is responsible for admitting Spender to practice Law prior to his being a Federal Court judge. He had made Oath to the SCQ, and thus has/had a Duty to the Court, which duty takes precedence over all other duties and interests he has, to conduct himself in accord with Professional Standards. As we relate in the following re-published AJLJ 200701, these Professional Standards include that Spender should never engage in a Conflict of Interest and Duty: a situation where his interest was at odds with his client's interests which it was Spender's Fiduciary Duty to pursue for his client. That is the nature of a

Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN: 1321-6562 Issue #200705 2

Fiduciary Duty. We allege to the QP and the SCQ that, not only has Spender breached that duty, when he acted for Haig, he pursued his interest of promoting the Labor/Union cause, at the expense of his duty to his client, and as a result, our informant Haig was defrauded by the labor/union inspired Queensland Rail [QR] and perjuring officers of QR, as related in the AJLJ 200701 [concurrent]. Spender and Mellifont were/are both prominent labor/union Lawyers. We already have much evidence that the QP are corrupt. If they fail to act here, then that will be more evidence of QP corruption.

Since the SCQ admits lawyers to practice law in Queensland, we believe it is incumbent upon SCQ, for the purpose of “keeping its house in order”, that it discipline Solicitors who have breached professional standards, set by SCQ.

The SCQ has Inherent Jurisdiction to “discipline” members of its court who it has admitted to practice law, if they breach those professional standards.

We would not expect SCQ to act properly. We have previously provided SCQ with irrefutable evidence that officers of its court, who SCQ has admitted to practice law as solicitors, had repeatedly breached professional standard by engaging in Conflicts of Duty and

Duty, [acting for two groups of clients who have competing interests while still owing a Fiduciary Duty to both: an impossibility to do]. Apart from doing absolutely nothing, the SCQ has admitted it is not the least bit interested in knowing such information.

As disclosed in our [Australian Human Rights Journal ISSN 1321-4446 Issue#200701 published 23 April, 2007,](http://austlawpublish.com/20070423%20Australian%20Human%20Rights%20Law%20Journal%20issue200701.pdf)

[\[http://austlawpublish.com/20070423%20Australian%20Human%20Rights%20Law%20Journal%20issue200701.pdf\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070423%20Australian%20Human%20Rights%20Law%20Journal%20issue200701.pdf) our recent prime informant Haig, is disabled and has two small assistance dogs. The SCQ has illegally banned Haig from SCQ premises. Haig made complaint to the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [HREOC]. They refused to accept his complaint using legal rot, until we advised Haig how they were in error. Upon his advice of that basic error, [we have evidence that hreoc is also corrupt], they accepted his complaint. We expect that they are now trying to determine a way of again rejecting his complaint. Thankfully, our journals are gaining an increasing readership.

Since we expect that this matter will end up in court, we advise QR that they should not destroy any documents that may be required to be discovered, by US or Haig.

Australian **Judiciary** Law Journal

ISSN

21 May, 2007.

Issue #: 200701

Publisher: **Australian Law Publishers Pty Ltd**_[ACN 010 615 933] [AuLP]

E: info@AustLawPublish.com

<http://AustLawPublish.com> 254 Hawken Drive, St Lucia, Qld. 4067.

Skype: russellmathews

Editor-in-Chief: **Russell G H Mathews BCom BSc LLB BA**

keywords: Editorial; Federal Court judge; Jeffery Ernest John SPENDER; prominent labor lawyers; permanently struck off disgraced solicitor Terry (TJ) Mellifont; Spender, Hawke government appointment; prior barrister; advocate's immunity; breach of professional conduct; conflict of Interest and Duty; corrupt Qld Law Society Inc; QldRail [QR]; Unionized; labor/union cheats; labor/union bludgers; Frank Heffernan; Wally Reiman; perjury; criminals; judicial immunity for judges; Patsy Mary Wolfe; Quentin Alice Louise Bryce; Margaret White; Dr Michael White; Australia's Human Rights Commission [HREOC] corrupt; barrister cheats disabled client?;

Did **Federal Court Judge** **Jeffery Spender** **cheat** **disabled client?**

The disabled client was cheated; was in fact defrauded. It amounts to Criminal Fraud. The Fraud was ALP Labor/Union inspired. The question remains, what role, if any, did Spender have in the Criminal Fraud.

This dates back 33 years to a case in 1974, when Spender was a barrister in Brisbane. He was a prominent Labor/Union lawyer, as



41 Gray Road, West End, the address on the electoral roll for Jeffery Ernest John SPENDER. [We do not have copyright on a photo of Spender.] This is hardly confidential information. The electoral roll is public, and the view of this address is also very public.

We have copyright here. HAIGPHOTO was the disgraced and permanently struck-off solicitor Terry (TJ) Mellifont. Last Month we published [HaigReport \[ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007\]](#) (we held it over for a month)./ It is also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /.

We are concurrently publishing six journals which are relevant to this matter. Our latest Law Journal, very topical in Australia in the lead up to the 2007 Federal Election, is the [Australian Industrial Relations Law Journal ISSN 1834-8378 \[AIRLJ\] Issue #200701](#) which is archived at [\[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Industrial_Relations_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Industrial_Relations_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf). Although the [Australian Judiciary Law Journal ISSN 1321-4497 Issue #200701](#) [\[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf), is included as part of the [Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN 1321-6562 Issue200705](#) [archived at http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Criminal_Law_Journal_issue200705.pdf], we also reference its separate publication as http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf, and the Dossiers of: three people involved are [Dossier of: Walter Norman Reiman](#) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.walter.reiman.pdf>, [Dossier of: Jeffery Ernest John Spender](#) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.jeffery.spender.pdf> and [Dossier of: Frank Thomas Heffernan](#) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.heffernan.pdf> and for background [HaigReport \[ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007\]](#), also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /.

The purpose of publishing that Journal, was to set the background for this most important expose going to the very basis of our legal system, in Australia, and hence to the very basis of our civilization. If Spender would do as he did when a barrister, what would he do as a Judge of the Federal Court?

As a barrister, Spender had advocates'

immunity which means that he cannot be sued by his client for anything he, the barrister does as an advocate. That does not mean just while he is in court, or in a tribunal, but also anything remotely associated with that appearance in that court/tribunal. Of course, the fiction of "Professional Standards" and the barrister's purported "Duty to the Court" with which we are doused and conned by the legal profession and its political and judicial cabal, has little import, as those who "enforce" such are answerable to no-one.



Derelict gate at far end of front fence of 41 Gray Road. Not much movement there for a while.

HAIGPHOTO

Of course, there is the legal/judicial fiction that when barristers are admitted to the Supreme Court so that they may practice law, they sign a declaration thus imposing upon them an "overriding duty to the court". This takes many forms but one is that if the opposing party is unrepresented or represented by a barrister buffoon, the barrister appearing for the opposing party should inform the court, the judge, of points of law, and the relevant case law, that are raised by the evidence, even if the case law supports the opposing party. This is because the Duty to the Court requires that they advise the court so that the court will make the correct decision. Now, that sounds magnanimous doesn't it? If he or she fails to do this, then he/she is said to have "breached

his/her duty to the court”.

What is “discipline” of the Legal Profession.

When we hear of a barrister being “disciplined” that invariably means he has upset someone in the hierarchy of the “club”, and not known his place.

As a judge of the Federal Court, Spender has Judicial Immunity. He cannot be sued for anything he does as a judge. The “reason” given for this immunity is to protect the “independence” of the judiciary. All judges in Australia are invariably appointed by either of the two major political parties. The parties will appoint “independent” types? Of course, and the Police service has an Air Wing. Spender was a high profile “labor lawyer”. He was well known in the labor/Union movement. We doubt anyone can be surprised that it was not a Liberal government that appointed Spender to the Federal Court. So, then, how did Spender “prove” himself “worthy” of Labor elevation?

Lawyer's “Conflict of Interest and Duty”.

Since anyone passively observing, will realise that if a barrister has a personal interest in a matter, that is at odds with his client's, then if the barrister helps his client prevail, the barrister will be hurting himself. If the client knew of the barrister's opposing interest, the client would not expect the barrister to harm himself, so a client would steer clear. A barrister in that situation, could do much to make the outcome to his desire. Hence, the legal profession, to seem to the populace that it is an honourable profession, prohibits such a position by barristers terming the situation, a “Conflict of Interest and Duty”, [the Duty is to the client]. In one possibility, Spender's interest 33 years ago in 1974, [we date this, as we are sure this article will be read for many years hence – as it will become part of the “literary stock” of this country being held in the National Library of Australia in Canberra; in fact in the Australian Collection of the Main Reading Room], was to support

and assist the Labor party and Union movement and to improve his “popularity” within the labor party and Union movement; to maybe “prove himself worthy” of “elevation”? We wonder how else he improved his chances of elevation, if in fact he did..

It is not necessary for Haig [our disabled informant who believes he was cheated by Spender] to prove that Spender did actually cheat him. It is enough that Spender did not disqualify himself on the prohibited grounds of “Conflict of Interest and Duty”. Haig can prove clearly the charges by Queensland Rail [QR] were trumped up, and Spender deliberately acted such that Haig was not discharged as innocent. Haig was defrauded by QR. QR knew Haig was disabled and accordingly owed Haig a Fiduciary Duty [FD]. A FD is far more onerous for the person owing it that is the Duty of Care. QR would be required to show how it discharged that obligation or duty. Since it did not discharge it, it cannot show that it did.

How the Criminal Fraud by QR arose.

Two people from QR who are Criminals are [See [their Dossiers by us on our Dossiers of: page at http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishDossierof.html](http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishDossierof.html)] Frank Thomas Heffernan, now of 2 Rawle Crt, Broadbeach Waters [he retired from QR in August 1990], and Walter Norman [Wally] Reiman now of 22 Deniven St, Corinda, [he retired from QR in April 1992]. Heffernan was, at that relevant time, Assistant to the General Manger, CJ [Joe] Kelso. Kelso was then a member of the Ipswich Branch of the Labor Party.

The Chief Claims Clerk in February, 1974, was, Haig believes, one Harry Smythe. That Claims Clerk was responsible for the working of the Claims Office. He saw the big backlog that was building up on Reiman's part of the Claims. He realised that Haig worked very effectively. For that reason, the Claim's Clerk allocated Haig to the job of attaching for Reiman. As detailed later in this journal

in the narrative, since Haig was doing a very effective job, he had almost organized all of the backlog into order within three weeks. In doing so, Haig had attached all documents for the same file together to enable Haig to attach all for each respective file to that file at the one time. Haig was working in a very systematic manner while ensuring Reiman had work on which to operate at all times. As also detailed, Reiman was displaying the panic as he was anticipating being overwhelmed and shown to have been bludging for years. This spurred Reiman's perjured testimony and complaints to Heffernan, and in the process, major fraud of Haig.. It is a serious indictment of Smythe that he did not make public the reality that Haig had done a fine job of attacking the backlog. [After all, that is what Smythe wanted, unless he had been involved in setting Haig up to be defrauded]. Maybe he did advise Heffernan, but maybe then Heffernan had told him to forget it or Heffernan had just ignored it. Heffernan's criminality springs from his assisting in the fraud of Haig when he had all the evidence to the contrary. Further criminality arises from his destruction of the evidence which evidence was inconvenient for the QR. The quantum of the fraud of Haig was at least, the three months' loss of pay plus his legal costs.

When Heffernan came in to "catch Haig", the office was deserted of all the females, [they were in their special set aside "Rest Room/Lounge"], and many males. Does anyone really think that the clerical bludgers in QR worked worked right to the dot of 5pm. This was the Claims Office of QR. So, if a claim for lost parcels or goods was delayed for years, who in QR, especially in the clerical bludge pit, would lose sleep?

Heffernan had access to all the documents that Haig had processed and placed in order such that all documents for the same file were together, and pinned together. As well, all the documents were dated, and by far the majority of dates predated the period in which Haig had been allocated that job.

Heffernan had access to all the evidence to

show that Haig was innocent. He had carriage of the matter and decided that the evidence should be destroyed, and it was destroyed under his stewardship. The number of unattached documents were used to "prove" that Haig had been "idling his time" instead of working. It was Spender's job to put all that in perspective, but then, he would have displeased his labor/union mates.

Haig blitzed the Commonwealth Public Service Exam.

Upon reading our published Journal HaigReport as referenced above, Haig did want us to add another important point he had told us previously, to clarify that far from being inept and incompetent which QR personnel perjured themselves to allege, Haig was highly intelligent and capable. Just after Haig transferred to Brisbane with QR in December, 1971, he sat the Commonwealth Public Service Exam in January/February, 1972; [he says he reckoned that the Commonwealth Public Service would be better than the Queensland "public service", and the pay was better]. Haig was in the first call up. Much to the shame of the Commonwealth Public Service, Haig was rejected because of his disability. Haig says he is very angry at the Commonwealth's actions to him and that his life may have been very different and much better since, had the Commonwealth of Australia not discriminated against him. Although this was prior to the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 [DDA], the Commonwealth still owed Haig a Fiduciary Duty. Haig says he intends to make much in the future of his being "Cheated by Australia".

By Spender's actions during the QR hearing, it is obvious that he knew the QR was a Labor/Union stronghold of Labor parasites. As a luminary of the labor/union movement, it is clear that Spender knew the QR was a labor/union stronghold. We agree with Haig, it is widely known in our community, and has been for decades, as long as the railways have existed, that QR is and has always been a labor/union stronghold. Spender actions

ensured that his labor/union mates prevailed at the expense of his client Haig. It is hard to believe that Spender did not realize what the QR were doing.

Haig forced to Join the Railway Salaried Officers Union.

In fact, Haig had been cajoled and pressured to join the Railway Salaried Officers Union [RSOU]. Most of the Claims office staff were members of the RSO union. Haig believes that Reiman, the lying perjuring criminal fraudster was also a member of the RSOU. That and their refusal to defend Haig, makes the RSO union a **CRIMINAL ORGANISATION**. They were involved in the fraud of Haig. Given the IR laws debate on the Federal scene, and Federal labor, and Dudd Rudd [typical for a Nambour product], wanting to support unions, this is a particularly topical matter.



41 Gray Road, West End including incandescent bulb. HAIGPHOTO

At what time did QR discover that Haig had foolishly “instructed” the other labor/union “heroes”, Mellifont and Spender? [Mellifont should have disqualified himself too for Conflict of Interest and duty.]

The QR parasites must have thought all their Christmases had come at once. Here they were lying to cheat Haig, and Haig turns up with one of their own labor “heroes” to “defend” him.

That is presuming that they did not already know the identity of Haig's “legal” team. It is probable, since in most cases, solicitors for both sides communicated before the hearing, that Mellifont had already been in contact with the Railway to “break the good news” to them: that Mellifont would ensure that Haig was defrauded, as did happen. The actions of Mellifont helped produce that result. Although, since both sides in a judicial matter make “discovery” to other side, Mellifont should have known the “evidence” upon which the QR would rely, and Mellifont should have made that known to Haig and obtained Haig's advice on that. Mellifont did not. Mellifont's omission there seriously implicates him in the fraud.

However, Spender's actions in the Tribunal room, in his always absenting himself from the presence of Haig when Haig could have instructed him on the evidence, indicts Spender. In fact, the fact that Spender did not object to the evidence of just the statement of the “number of unattached documents”, when the actual documents were not available, because criminal Heffernan ensured the evidence was destroyed, [which evidence would have shown that by far the majority of documents predated Haig's being allocated to that job], is another indictment of Spender.

They all knew that Haig was a member of the Liberal Party. [We think Haig must have been very naive, but then people in the Liberal Party knew what was happening to Haig but did nothing to help or even offer him advice.]

At the Railway Appeals Tribunal, [RAT], the QR introduced NEW evidence, totally unknown to Haig.

Haig tells us that at the hearing in the Railway Appeals Tribunal, [RAT], the QR introduced evidence of which he had not been informed.

Spender's conduct in the tribunal room.

Spender deliberately absented himself from Haig at every opportunity during recesses or adjournments, so Haig could not discuss the evidence and put it in perspective. Spender would jump up at every opportunity during a recess and go to the other end of the “bar” table to talk to Heffernan, Reiman and the QR “personnel” and hold a Labor/Union “informal”. Clearly, Spender did not want to engage Haig in discussion as Haig may have put him on the spot. Invariably a whole throng of all the QR perjuring witnesses and other QR bludgers who were having a “day off” to see Haig “go down”, would congregate around Spender. Haig now realises that Spender was such a big name in the Labor party/Union cancer, they all thought it was “wonderful” just to be in his presence.

Would Spender's breaching his Duty to the Court, being the “Professional Standard”, of not representing a client when he had a personal interest in conflict with his client's interest, as Haig suggests he did, in this case, to “help his labor mates”, be viewed as “proof” of his being a “worthy labor/union man”? Haig says he will not mind if he can get a fight out of this.

Haig has been very eager for us to publish this article. He went with his two assistance dogs to the Australian Electoral Office on Monday 30 April, 2007 to scrutinize the Electoral roll. He knew Spender's full name and there it was, he says, with the address of 41 Gray Road, West End. [Haig commented that Gray Road may be appropriate for a “lawyer like Spender”, rather than a White or

Black Road.] Haig also discovered that there was another Spender with that electoral address. That was a ***GLENICE ETHEL SPENDER***.

We like to illustrate our journals. We did not have copyright on a photo of JEJ Spender, and we did not think he would be too amicable to our taking his photo in court. Haig described Spender for us. In 1974 he was a young slim man, aged about 35 with short back and sides. Haig remembers him in a pastel shirt with tie. Spender's appearance has changed over the years. He has increased his weight. He has less hair, his face has



Ford vehicle Reg. # 843DEC, in front yard of 41 Gray Road.

become rounder and his nose redder. One could picture his photo on the cover of Christmas Cards. [Depending upon how many lawyers who appear in Spender's court read this or parts of this, will be the prevalence of the sounds of “HO, HO, HO” around his court.]

Haig was eager to obtain a photo of the “electoral address”. It is ironic that as Spender is/was a prominent Labor lawyer, Haig walked with his two assistance dogs from St Lucia, across the new bridge and along Gladstone Road and Dornoch Terrace to West End, to take some photos of 41 Gray Road, and return, on Labor Day, 7 May, 2007. Haig tells us he had sore legs, feet and blisters on his feet. We think Spender should be concerned that someone is prepared to go to such lengths to make Spender accountable.

Haig took quite a few photos.

So, what will those named decide to do?

Well, it is not anticipated that this will please them. Heffernan, and Reiman, may just cause Spender more problems as they may act in a way that Spender does not want. They could act [go off] like “loose cannons”, and no one could know what the outcome will be. Of course, thoughts of a claim of defamation and an application for an ex parte interim Injunction, followed by an interlocutory injunction restraining Haig and us, may be their initial response. The revelations that will inevitably flow may not please many, but will not displease Haig. Much can be “discovered” from QR records, Old staff can be found and although their memories will most certainly be “foggy”, they may think, what they say will be evidence and they can exclude many possible facts, which then permits logical conclusions to be drawn.

As people trained to be lawyers, we know that courts are corrupt, and we are qualified to decide that. Unlike most people similarly trained in law, we do not need the courts for our living. We “practice” law in a different way. At that stage, [applications for injunctions], the court should decide whether there is a *prima facie* case. Let us consider that. Anyone applying for an ex parte injunction will be in breach of their “Duty to the Court” [no doubt merely an academic point], if they do not bring this consideration of the *prima facie* case to the courts attention.

Definitely, Spender has labor leanings as previously a labor lawyer and appointment to the Federal Court by the Hawke Government.

Does anyone think that QR is a bastion of conservative politics of highly skilled and competent persons, or is it a stronghold of incompetent bludgers and petty thieves of goods and parcels, giving rise to an avalanche of claims, and who vote labor so as to be given what they have not earned.

Queensland Courts now have judges predominately appointed by a labor state government, in the same way Spender was. As well, they see another judge as themselves.

I am sure they would resort to something like, “all people including barristers, vote in elections so have a political inclination, so of course Spender's interest for the labor/union movement should not disqualify him”. The point is that we have secret political ballots. Were a barrister to keep his political interests secret, that would be a different matter. Spender was a hero of the Labor/union cancer. He spent all his time during RAT recesses and adjournments chatting to ALL the QR witnesses, legal team and hangers-on, including Heffernan and Reiman just as a labor/union cancer hero would be expected to do.

Does it seem like Haig is an incompetent person, given that he has numerous University degrees including an LLB? The year after Heffernan the criminal sacked Haig, Haig did first year full time of a Commerce Degree, passing well while working 20 hours per week for a Chartered Accountant. We wonder how many other QR clerk parasites could have done the same. The prime charge was that Haig was “idling time” at 4:45pm. Does anyone really think that clerical bludgers in QR worked worked right to the dot of 5pm. This was the Claims Office of QR. So, if a claim was delayed for years, who in QR, especially in the clerical bludge pit, would lose sleep.

If this goes to court, it will not be dispensed in quick time. An amazing amount of evidence may be discovered. It will be a Pandora's box. This will be all while Dudd Rudd is trying to become PM. What will Spender do? We think his initial reaction will be to fly into a rage a la the Maths Department of The University of Queensland when he was a maths student there circa 1960. Even though Mellifont, another Labor lawyer instructed him, we, while trained as lawyers and fully qualified at AuLP, believe Spender should have done what we believe was the proper thing and disqualified himself instead of seeming to shepherd through a conviction of his client. Did he think that there was no chance of it returning to bite him?

Involvement of Queensland Law

Society Inc. [QLS]

Haig had been told he had the right of appeal to the Railway Appeals Tribunal. Haig knew little about law at that time. Haig saw on TV that the Queensland Law Society Incorporated [QLSI] was offering a “free legal advice” one night per week from a hall, in Fortitude Valley, Brisbane. Haig thinks it was a church hall. Haig decided to attend and did on the one evening per week when it was offered.

When Haig arrived, there were no other “clients” there. Haig cannot remember the name of the fellow but there was no waiting. Haig told him his predicament: Labor railway cheats, and Haig's being in the Liberal Party, Haig being set up and cheated by the QR parasites, and that Haig had a right of appeal to the Railway Tribunal. Haig tells us he wanted to discuss the legal situation. Since the QLSI is like a trade union of solicitors, they were not about to do that. It was just deceptive advertising by solicitors to gain more clients. The Law Society cheat then looked quickly in a list and told Haig a name as if that person was a specialist in this facet of law. A few seconds later, he asked, “Now, have you got that name”, as if he thought Haig would not remember it. He must not have seen Haig write it down. Clearly, going by Haig's appearance, he thought Haig was a dim wit.

Haig did not realize until recently, that he did and does look odd. He says he is in no doubt now when he has seen that MRI showing just how deformed is his skull. About that time in his life, a counselor, not to “take the mickey” with Haig, but to assist him, told Haig that he looked like a “nerd”. The counselor further suggested that if he could not [ha ha] put a bag over his head, [ha ha], he should wear a hat and grow his beard long and thick. Haig says that Haig thought that the counselor was just talking of an “image” thing, when likening Haig's appearance to that of Bill Gates', as having the typical nerd appearance, with the counselor commenting that Haig should not bother trying to “style” his hair.

QLS referral Haig to Labor/Union

Lawyer Crook TJ Mellifont.

It seemed that it was important to the Law Society fellow, that Haig saw that particular solicitor. [Haig can remember that aspect very clearly. Haig does not know who the fellow was: whether he worked for the QLSI as an employee or whether he was a solicitor or an employee of a solicitor; probably the latter, Haig thinks.] Haig repeated the name. It was T J Mellifont. This was in March/April, 1974.

Mellifont struck off the roll of Solicitors permanently.

A few years later Haig heard how Mellifont had been permanently struck off the roll of solicitors. While studying Haig's LLB, Haig learned more. Prior to that time of Haig's referral to him, Mellifont had been “disciplined” by QLSI, [Haig thinks it was in 1972]. We can confirm all of this to Haig.

Haig had no other idea of where to go or where to obtain advice, so Haig did go to see Mellifont. Haig was very innocent and naive at the time. [Just think of how Haig had spent the previous seven years.] Haig must have been so naive, because Haig showed Mellifont Haig's bank book, when Haig first saw him, to show Mellifont that Haig could afford to pay him. Mellifont did not see Haig for long but referred Haig to one of his staff. Haig received very poor service. Whenever Haig tried to phone Mellifont, he would always be “in conference”. Haig would leave his phone number and wait for Mellifont's call but he NEVER phoned. Of course, when Haig complained to QLSI about Mellifont, the Queensland Law Society impeded Haig in every way they could, yet they knew Mellifont was a crook. Haig has far more evidence, not related to this matter and not complimentary to QLSI. We will divulge that for Haig, in time.

Many reading this will already know of Mellifont as one of the high profile LABOR LAWYERS. Of course, Haig did not know this. There could be many reasons this Law Society parasite referred Haig to Mellifont. One could be because he thought it would be “funny” in an ironic way to send someone who was set up by

Labor parasites to a Labor lawyer, who may also be a parasite. Another reason could be that he took an instant dislike to Haig because of Haig's freakish appearance with the deformed skull and his naive and gauche behaviour borne from his previous seven years of hellish experiences. Yet another could be that the Law Society parasite was just another corrupt labor lawyer.

Jeffery Ernest John SPENDER enters the scene.

Imagine who Mellifont “instructed” as barrister. None other than another high profile LABOR LAWYER. Haig can remember Mellifont saying that this barrister was being spoken of as a foundation judge for the new court being introduced by the then Commonwealth's Attorney-General Lionel Murphy. By the time the Federal Court was formed, Labor was out of office and so this barrister did not become a judge of the Federal Court until 1982 when Hawke became PM. The barrister was Jeffery Ernest John SPENDER. SPENDER was protected from any action against him for wrong doing as a barrister by ADVOCATES IMMUNITY. As a judge of the Federal Court, he is protected by JUDICIAL IMMUNITY. [Of course, that judicial immunity would come into play, only if Spender acted improperly as a judge, and how likely is that, eh?]

The QLSI is responsible for sending Haig to a most inappropriate lawyer. In fact, they sent Haig to a corrupt lawyer, and especially, a SOLICITOR THAT THE LAW SOCIETY KNEW TO BE CORRUPT. They no doubt thought that this was funny. Now that Haig has been trained as a lawyer, and since Haig has much evidence that is less than complimentary, [EXCEEDINGLY SO], to the QLSI, Haig is sure the QLSI will wish they had acted properly towards Haig.

Mellifont must have thought Haig was such a dummy; being a member of the Liberal Party yet going to him, a Labor lawyer. The parasites from Queensland Rail cannot have believed their luck. They must have thought Haig was so stupid: to get one of their “Labor mates” to “represent” him. Mellifont must have thought it so pleasing

to himself, that he could seem like a “big labor mate”, cheat Haig and charge Haig into the bargain.

Spender studied Maths in the Maths Department at The University of Queensland.

Surely, this reality of these unfolding facts was not lost on Spender. After all, prior to studying Law at UQ, Spender obtained a Science Degree at UQ with a major [or double major even], in mathematics, plus a Master's Degree in Mathematics. He has a degree of intelligence. There is still folklore around the Maths Department at UQ of the occasion when Spender went into a furious rage on one occasion. That would have been circa 1960.

The Liberal party deserted Haig.

Haig now realises that Haig was treated abysmally by people in the Liberal Party, and the Liberal Party itself, in not assisting him. Haig was disabled, alone in Brisbane without any support network. Haig did not make a big deal of it at the time that Haig was disabled. Although this predated the DDA, Haig was still owed a Fiduciary Duty by Mellifont, and Spender.

Spender surprised to see Haig in his court in 1990

Haig warrants that Spender was surprised to see Haig in his court as an Accountant with a BCom from UQ, in the early 1990's. Haig wonders if Spender ever thought Haig would come after him when Haig has an LLB and more. Haig cannot sue Spender as he is protected, both when a barrister, by “Advocates Immunity” and when a judge by “judicial Immunity”. Haig will just tell the truth about Spender. Let us see who will try to censor the truth.

Brisbane's Judiciary and Legal Profession closely but secretly followed Haig's progress through Law School at UQ although the Law School had tried illegally to exclude Haig.

Haig has been surprised to discover that without

exception, every judge of any court in Brisbane, and apparently all of the legal profession, knows of Haig.

Gundelach enters the narrative.

One Saturday evening a few years ago, Haig was out walking his dogs, and Haig was stopped near a local restaurant, by a fellow who had been so obviously enjoying himself dining in that local establishment, and he asked Haig about Haig's law studies. Haig did not know him. Haig discovered his name was, [and still is, Haig guesses] Gundelach, a barrister in Brisbane, and sometime special commissioner/prosecutor. Gundelach then volunteered that "Jeff Spender likes you." Haig tells us he thought, "oh yes."

Justice Connolly of SCQ increased Mellifont's suspension from practice from six years to permanent.

Mellifont was a simple unabashed crook and con-man. He later [after this incident in 1974], appealed a decision of the Solicitors' Complaints Tribunal of the QLSI to strike him off the roll of solicitors for a period of six years. Mellifont was a dumb incompetent crook. He had improperly kept his Solicitor's Trust Account. He had improperly withdrawn funds. He told lies and actually wrote out a cash cheque from his office account and had it cashed and then put that cash into his trust account. The bank kept a record of the audit trail of funds. Mellifont was caught telling a pack of lies. Justice Connolly of the Supreme Court of Queensland, was totally disgusted with Mellifont and struck him off as a solicitor, permanently.

It could be suggested that Mellifont, while a high profile Labor lawyer, should have declined to act for Haig, since the Railway was such a Labor stronghold. In legalese, Mellifont [and Spender too] had a "**Conflict of Interest and Duty**". Mellifont was such a crook and stupid into the bargain, that he would not do the proper and correct act.

HAIG, a NOBODY.

Haig has no doubt that at that time, in 1974,

Haig must have seemed like a no-body who would never amount to anything. Haig was disabled, looked feakish and disfigured, due to the gross asymmetry of Haig's skull. Haig tells us that because he has seen the MRI, he can now have no illusions. Circumstances would suggest that Mellifont and Spender could have clearly thought they could cheat Haig with immunity. [This is now nearly 33 years later. Haig would have put it behind him, he says, but it is relevant to more recent events. As well, this is far too good an opportunity for us, as Publishers not to use it to its ultimate benefit.]

Spender was stupid to not disqualify himself. Spender should have disqualified himself. Spender had a conflict of Interest and Duty too. [Spender may now be wishing that Mellifont had not referred Haig to him.]

Haig is sure circumstances would suggest that Spender, like Mellifont, could have thought Haig had no comeback if they cheated him, and that that would be the end of it; that they would never hear of Haig again. We, as publishers are very happy to be responsible for Haig being heard, right across this country. In fact, we are extremely grateful for all the information that can be sourced from Haig.

Haig reckons that Spender would have been surprised to see Haig in his court, in 1990.

The nature of the QR charges.

We will now detail what the charges were, the "evidence" produced by QR, and what Spender should have done, but failed to do, such that a rogue may suggest, was for the purpose of pleasing his labor/union mates.

Basically, the charges related to two aspects. The first was that at 4:45 pm, 15 minutes before finishing time, Haig was reading his copy of the Australian Financial Review. The second aspect related to the amount of work yet to be done by Haig; effectively that Haig was incompetent, so he must have been reading the paper the whole time instead of working.

Haig had been doing that job for about three to four weeks. That job had not been done properly

for at least a year. Prior to Haig's being given the task of attaching documents to files for Wally Reiman's [that is Walter Norman Reiman's], attention, another young fellow did it, it seemed, on a part-time basis. Haig can remember how this other fellow used to sit down, pick the documents that would be easy to attach, [the ones that already had the reference numbers on them], attach those few to files and put them on Reiman's desk, then go off and waste his time doing who knows what. Reiman was happy with that as it meant he did not have much work to do. Reiman would spend his day just chatting to other staff about all manner of non-work related topics. The result was that the number of unattached documents yet to be attached continued to increase. Additionally, they were not the easy documents to attach.

Huge backlog of work for Reiman.

There was a great bundle of old document still to attach when Haig was given the task of attaching them. Haig was told to attach them. Haig had been attaching documents for another clerk handling claims for a different geographical area of the State of Queensland. He had been doing this well without complaint from the clerk. It was because he was doing this job well, that the Chief Claims Clerk, [Haig thinks his name was Harry Smythe], allocated Haig to the job of attaching for Reiman.

Reiman was a bludger.

Apparently, Reiman did not want Haig to do that, because it meant work for Reiman, and work was his antithesis; [and of all clerks in the QR].

Haig approached the huge task, systematically, using his undoubted intelligence.

Most of those documents left for Haig to attach, did not have a file reference upon them. Haig was required to search through cards in a box to try to find the matter and its reference number. It was a slow soul destroying job. The documents which clearly follow up an existing case should have had a reference in the card file, but did not. Invariable, the originating document for many files was buried in the files.

There a massive number of document yet to attach when Haig was given the task. Haig had to continue attaching files to ensure that Reiman, had work to do. Haig did attach documents to files as they arrived, but still Haig had to attack the backlog. Because there were regularly many documents in the backlog, for a particular file, and the work on it could not be properly done unless all the documents for it were attached, or else, requests could be sent again for the documents which were in the backlog. Haig decided, after Haig had attached a whole bundle of documents to files, [but only a minor proportion of what was there], that he should not attach any more of the backlog to files until, Haig had all documents needing attachment in order and so all documents for the same file would be attached concurrently. Of course, haig insured that there was always sufficient files on which Reiman could work, so that he would not be hampered through not having files for his attention.

Because there were multiple documents in the massive backlog, for the same file, Haig realized, after he had attached a whole bundle of documents, but only a minor proportion of the documents needing to be attached, the most efficient way for Haig to perform the job was to do them all in the one final attachment.

Reiman displayed his panic, fear and loathing, of the work about to be presented for him to do.

Of course, Haig had to ensure that Reiman had work to do along the way. Haig can remember, that when Reiman was about to need more files, Haig had attached so many documents, that Haig had a bundle of files 40cm high in each of the seven in-trays at the front of Reiman's desk. The piles were so high they were almost toppling over. Haig can remember Reiman's looking at Haig with a dead-pan face of dread, as Haig placed them on Reiman's desk. More worrying for Reiman, Haig now realizes, was that this was just scratching the surface of the backlog pile of documents to attach. This would keep Reiman busy while Haig could sort the remaining documents and attach them all. Haig was finding that as Haig sorted more, there were many separate documents for the same file. Had

Haig attached not all the relevant documents, the claim could not be processed. Haig was doing the job in the best way it could be done.

Reiman's fear of work made him a perjuring criminal lying under oath.

Reiman PERJURED himself. He lied under oath. HE IS A CRIMINAL. QR is liable for his criminal acts. If Reiman wishes to “chance his arm” he can decide to sue Haig, [and us]. It will be like a loose cannon for Spender, as so much could become public. So much of the “evidence” will be now unavailable. There are so many people involved and they will all be implicated if it ever comes to court. Some will not wish for that. [In fact, the fact that they, QR, had attached all the documents, means there was insufficient evidence to convict Haig at that time. That Haig was convicted, means that Spender was more than merely incompetent. Spender was protected by advocates immunity. Hspender had a Duty to the Court and Tribunal. Spender had a conflict of Interest and Duty. Reiman was fearing the “major attachment” process for which Haig was clearly building. This was his motivation to lie and cheat, to have Haig sacked.

Defective performance of Mellifont and Spender, and maybe also failure by QR.

Prior to the Railway Appeals Tribunal hearing, Haig was not told of what evidence the railway would present. If the Railway had not provided it to Mellifont/Spender, that would have been grounds for an adjournment. If it had been provided to Spender et al, then Mellifont/Spender were in error in not addressing it with Haig.

Anyway, the evidence that the Railway [QR] produced was that they had put a number of staff onto “Haig's” job to “clean it up” and advised the Tribunal the number of documents that they counted. They did not have the actual documents as “by their nature, they had to be attached” they reckoned. That means the evidence was destroyed. Spender must have known that but failed to note it. Additionally, because of the extra work this put on Reiman, he had to be given assistance, as, said QR, Haig had

caused all this extra work.

The other evidence was that Haig was reading a paper at fifteen minutes before “work” finished for the day, when Haig still had work to do. They were trying to say that the whole backlog was due to Haig reading the paper the whole day. Much was made of the fact that it was the Financial Review and not the Telegraph that the Railway bludgers would read. Somehow, QR and the RSOU paraistes and perjurers were suggesting that it was okay for staff to be reading the Telegraph as they had just bought it and wanted to see the “news”. [Can anyone remember the Telegraph? News?]

QR Admin established the Culture at QR of bludging and ceasing work well before knock-off to permit preparation for leaving “work”.

That was the culture of the Railway [QR]. All staff ceased even trying to give the impression that they were “working” at about thirty minutes before the job was scheduled to finish for the day. That was the case with all staff including the senior staff of the railway. All the females of the office would move out in unison at 4:30 to the women's “lounge/rest room”, and cease work for the day, the guys in the office would buy and read the “Telegraph” newspaper, that a paper boy who would come through the office, had sold them. That was all accepted by the Railway, being all the Railway representatives. No-one was ever chatted, because that was teht established culture of QR.. That happened every day. Senior QR staff would walk through the office. Senior QR staff would also buy and read the Telegraph It was never suggested that Haig should be the only one who should be still working. It was as if the QR acted as “agent provocateur”. Haig merely followed the “Railway practice”, set by all including Senior QR staff.

Spender's “performance” in the Tribunal.

Before we highlight the proper argument that Spender should have put, we will detail the interesting scene that unfolded in the tribunal that day. There was a “bar table” of sorts. Haig did not have an opportunity during that day to

address any matters re the evidence with Spender. At all breaks in the hearing, Spender would move to the other end of the “bar table” and talk to the Heffernan, Reiman [and have a animated and social discussion], QR representatives, and invariably a whole throng of other QR staff, including all the QR “witnesses” and other hangers-on., would gravitate to the grouping surrounding Spender. Clearly, he was not talking about Haig's case. He would not be able to talk about Haig's case in front of all the “hangers-on”. Haig was a bit upset at the time, as Haig wanted to address some of the evidence and put it into perspective for Spender, but Haig now realizes the real significance of that time. At that time, Spender was a leading light of the Labor/union circus. He was “holding court” so to speak with all of these labor hangers-on.

When it came time to present Haig's defence, Spender put Haig in the witness box. He asked Haig a couple of insignificant questions, about insignificant matters and then said there was no more evidence. Haig was dismayed. Haig was convicted as charged, reinstated, but told he would lose the three months pay for the time Haig had been suspended. Whether Haig will receive true “compensation” from Spender and the QR is one matter, [with the 33 years since, it has greatly appreciated]. Haig may have to content himself with just telling the truth, the REAL truth. Clearly, the labor/union cancer does “reward” labor miscreants, even if they have “immunity” from legal charge. Haig was cheated by lies and corruption in Queensland Railways, and not just on the “shop floor” but all the way to the top of the Railway. Haig believes he was also cheated by Spender and that proven crook, MELLIFONT. Haig suggest that all judges appointed by labor have a potential to have been crooks to receive the elevation, and have a potential to be crooks as judges.

Haig was firstly cheated by the Queensland Railway, and secondly, Haig states he believes, he was cheated by Spender. Of course, Spender would have known [as that is the fact] that Haig would have no comeback in the law, as Spender had “advocates immunity”. No-one would have a claim against a barrister who was incompetent or dishonest by deliberately failing to put his client's case, due to political allegiances. He, Spender would now know that no-one will have any comeback against him legally for anything he would do as a judge to cheat people, due to “judicial immunity”. It is as if labor governments appoint labor lawyers who have

“proven” themselves as worthy for labor largess because they have supported labor ideology and labor lackeys, as in QR. Maybe it remains to be seen, if Spender has done likewise when a Judge of the Federal Court, and if any other labor “lights” who have been appointed by labor governments, anywhere in Australia, did likewise, as barristers before a labor levitation or after their appointment as judges. A labor “light” could be in a position of influence in other ways. It could be as a Commissioner in a government commission. Haig states it as a hypothetical possibility only, at this time, that Quentin Bryce was Sex Discrimination Commissioner in the Human Rights Commission [HRC], before the Beattie labor government, “elevated” her to be governor of Queensland. She was appointed to that HRC position by the Federal labor government. In 1991 Haig sued Quentin Bryce AND the HRC in the Federal Court. It was heard in 1992, just after Easter. The HRC was represented by the then barrister Patsy Mary Wolfe. The hearing was before Spender, who had treated Haig as mentioned above, in 1974 in the Railway Appeals Tribunal when Spender was a barrister. Wolfe was at pains to inform Spender, that Wolfe represented the HRC and a number of other representatives of the HRC, but specifically NOT QUENTIN BRYCE. Spender seemed incredulous and Wolfe reiterated. Wolfe had been involved in the case in Directions Hearings, since its inception in 1991, and had never raised the point that she was not representing Bryce. Could it be that Bryce wished to distance herself from Wolfe because or in case Wolfe did, or would do, something illegal? There is substantial evidence that Wolfe had caucused with Spender, in his private chambers, some time before the hearing in 1992. We wonder what was discussed and how the discussion went.

In 2005, Margaret White [MaW], a judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland appointed by the Beattie labor government, claimed both Wolfe and Bryce, as her “close personal friends”, in open court. It is not believed that Wolfe and Bryce are unacquainted with each other but rather, just as MaW claims them both as “close personal friends” [cpf] of hers, they are in turn, cpf of each other.

Soon after the Federal Court hearing before Spender, a Hawke Government labor appointment to the Federal Court, Wolfe became a labor appointment to the Queensland District Court. A few years later she was appointed to be Chief Judge of the District court, over the heads of her more senior DC judges by a Beattie labor decision.