

keywords: **see extensive keywords** at the top of page 2

Attention MEDIA BUYING AGENTS: Discover the cost-benefit imperative of advertising in our journals. <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishAdvertising.html>



It seems some consider Spender's court has some value as a TV backdrop. HAIGPHOTO

Corrupt labor judge

SPENDER defrauds disabled

By Alex Gordon LLB

“I would have thought that - at least in the real world - there's not a very great deal of difference between laughing at the disabled and abusing children.” Spender J. Federal Court, QUT/Laughing at/with the disabled; 12 July, 2007.

Well Jeff, where does DEFRAUDING THE DISABLED fit in your philosophy?

Keywords: Jeffrey Ernest John Spender; [Jeffrey Spender](#) defrauded disabled; in 1974; disabled named Haig; Laughing at the disabled; laughing with the disabled; QUT; Queensland University of Technology; free speech; John Hookham and Gary MacLennan; PhD reality TV-style project; Michael Noonan; academic comment; personal attacks; made him feel like a paedophile; Sofronoff; Walter Sofronoff QC; campaign against Noonan; rules of civil academic debate; disciplinary charges; withering remarks; devil's advocate; contemporary humour; trial 22 October, 2007; is Spender changing his colours; public persona; Spender Mellifont Cabal; Spender realised eventual day of reckoning potential circa 1989; Quentin Alice Louie Bryce; HREOC; Judge Julie Dick; CMC; PCMC; LSC; FOI; information Commissioner; Patsy Mary Wolfe; Margaret Jean White; Dr Michael White; labor appointments; Spender labor judge; The University of Queensland; UQ; Law School; Dean of Law; Professor Geoffery deQ. Walker; Haig defrauded again; difference between laughing at the disabled and abusing children; what about defrauding the disabled; taking candy from a child; disabled unprotected; abused child unprotected; fraud; crime; corruption; a very, very important case; Spender Mellifont fraud of disabled now on the record; this QUT disability case gives Spender public opportunity to show such bias favouring the disabled, so he can claim he could never defraud disabled; hence important for Spender; big risk for QUT; big risk for all universities in Australia, academia; Spender intends to pontificate: dealing with the nature of a university and what a university is; grounds for all universities and academics in Australia to seek joinder; five cardinal ethical principles; Spender's uniformed concerns; will Spender disqualify himself; or will QUT demand, or other University/academic seek joinder then demand Spender disqualify himself for bias; Haig advises us he is prepared to give evidence of his disability and fraud by Spender, Mellifont, Frank Heffernan, QGR; Spender is St Laurence Old Boy [SLOB] 1952 to 1959; Spender recounts Bill Heffernan SLOB 1953 Captain First XV; Frank Thomas Heffernan [FTH]; is FTH SLOB? Or related to Bill Heffernan; FTH corrupt; sacked Haig from Queensland Government Railways [QGR]; bogus grounds; detained without charge over foiled UK bomb plots; Mohammed Haneef; Indian doctor Mohammed Haneef; Gold Coast doctor; Haneef visa cancellation; federal police; barrister; Spender; Jeffrey Ernest John Spender; Jeff Spender; Terry Mellifont; TJ Mellifont; Terence Joseph Mellifont; District Court Judge Julie Maree Dick; fraud; cheating; Queensland Government Railways; QGR; Queensland Rail; QR; perjurers; [Walter Norman "Wally" Reiman](#); [Frank Thomas Heffernan](#); destroyed evidence; Spender did not object to any improper introduction of "evidence"; labor appointed judges; corrupt judge; defrauded disabled; Mellifont incompetent again; this time incompetence in perpetrating the fraud, not to cover it up; unlike Mellifont's strike off incompetence and fraud;

Well Jeff, where does DEFRAUDING THE DISABLED fit in your philosophy?

This record of Spender's prior conduct of defrauding a disabled man, casts great doubt on whether he should hear the QUT, Laughing at/with the Disabled case.

At a "pre-hearing conference" on 14th June, 1974, in the office of barrister [Jeffrey Spender](#), and in front of [Jeffrey Spender](#), only one whole day before the Railway Appeals Tribunal [appropriately – RAT] hearing, [and more than eight weeks after Haig first consulted and retained Mellifont], [Mellifont](#) interrupts his client Haig while Haig was speaking to [Jeffrey Spender](#) who was appearing perplexed while looking at Mellifont, with Mellifont saying rhetorically, **"I haven't got a statement from you yet, have I?"** At that date, 14 June, 1974, Mellifont was aged about 31 and [Jeffrey Spender](#) 32. Mellifont did not know what he had done for his client, Haig, as that was not Mellifont's interest. What Mellifont intended is discussed later. When Haig told Mellifont

there was no statement, Mellifont said, “We'll get a statement from you and then we'll see the barrister.” That did not happen and there was no pre-hearing conference, [although [Mellifont](#) tried to charge for it, in his itemised Bill of Costs, but abandoned it – more on that later]. That is just part of it. This is incompetence. There is much more, and that was the blatant fraud.

[Jeffrey Ernest John Spender](#), now, in July/August, 2007, the longest serving Justice of the Federal Court of Australia, cannot escape his central involvement in the criminal fraud of Haig, when Spender and [Mellifont](#) conspired with labor mates, Heffernan and Reiman in the Queensland Government Railways [QGR], between the dates of 17 April, 1974 and the 19 June, 1974, to defraud the disabled person named Haig. Spender had a guilty mind, Spender chose not to



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

bother to even try to be briefed on the subject matter, and in fact actively behaved to ensure he was not briefed. He failed to utilize any one of the very many opportunities to show that the Queensland Government Railways [QGR] were wrong to dismiss Haig.

It was the appointment of [Jeffrey Spender](#) to the Federal Court in May 1984, as an act, that brought the judicial system of Australia into disrepute, not our now relating Spender's corruption. We expect that there will be a “shoot the messenger” sentiment. Our wish is to sanitize the judicial system of Australia. From his

lofty position as Federal Court Judge, Spender has overseen a criminal culture with the proven prejuror Terry Mellifont, [Terence Joseph Mellifont] as his criminal lieutenant. When Mellifont was suspended from the roll of solicitors for his corruption, it was Spender who attempted to have Mellifont's term of suspension reduced but Mellifont was struck off for good and the good of all, bar his corrupt mates.

[Jeffrey Spender](#) played a central part in ensuring that Haig was defrauded in 1974. Spender was then corrupt and still is. He was the labor appointment to the Federal Court, in 1984 by the Hawke labor government. Many LABOR JUDGES ARE CORRUPT. Let Spender sue us or Haig. Coming up to a Federal Election, a case like this will make the news nationwide on a daily

basis, and draw attention to all labor appointments to the judiciary, and to all of our journals. There have been so many corrupt judicial appointments by the Beattie labor government in Queensland. We can show corrupt acts by labor appointments to each of the three levels of the Queensland judiciary.

All your printing needs in one spot.

If you find Australian printing too expensive and poor quality, contact us on our PHP email at <http://AustLawPublish.com/eml.html> /. We are in the process of developing a business plan to provide to you, printing services by a variety of printers in South East Asia. Those printers will be provided with print/photo ready copy. We will arrange businesses and individual Graphic Designers in Australia , New Zealand or a country where the language of the Print job is the first language of that country, so they can produce that copy to your satisfaction prior to its going to the Asian printer. Contact us on our PHP email at <http://AustLawPublish.com/eml.html>

Australians have to consider how much reliance can be placed upon the findings and decisions of Jeffrey Ernest John Spender [Jeff Spender – spelt a little differently so Google will index it in more variations], and, because of other information we know, of findings and decisions emanating from the whole Federal Court.

Spender has been ruling, in the Federal Court, on the matter of Indian doctor Mohammed Haneef, the Gold Coast doctor detained without charge over foiled UK bomb plots; re the Haneef visa cancellation involving federal police and terrorism matters. [That should ensure many more hits from much google indexing of the archived copies of this journal.]

Much more relevant to circumstances is his foreshadowed hearing on 22 October, 2007 of the QUT, Laughing at the Disabled case. There is so much clandestine “background” to Spender, his “decision” can hardly be reliable precedent.

Haig was/is disabled and was an employee of Queensland Government Railways [QGR]. The central QGR criminals were [Walter Norman “Wally” Reiman](#) and [Frank Thomas Heffernan](#). They set Haig up to be the scapegoat for Reiman's bludging and incompetence. They were Labor parasite supporters. Spender and Mellifont were high profile Labor Lawyers. The majority of Mellifont's scheming was with Heffernan as lieutenant for Kelso. Mellifont represented Spender and himself in his corrupt conspiring with QGR's Heffernan.

Reiman perjured himself in a major way, and Heffernan, as assistant to the CJ (Joe) Kelso, the General Manager and Chief of Operations, of the South East Division, QGR, a clandestine member of the Ipswich Branch of the Labor Party, destroyed the evidence and Spender permitted him, without objection, to introduce false Statements about the “evidence” which Heffernan had destroyed.

Haig was a member of the Liberal Party. [He says he resigned in early 1976, after the election of Fraser to the PM, and says he is now disgusted with all political parties.] The Queensland Law Society Incorporated [QLSI] was advertising that it was offering “free legal advice” from a church hall in Fortitude Valley, Brisbane, one night per week. That was false advertising. All it was, in fact, was a means of referring more people to solicitors. Knowing Haig was a member of the Liberal party and had been sacked by the Labor parasite populated QGR, the QLSI rep referred Haig to labor lawyer Mellifont. Haig was not aware that Mellifont was a labor lawyer. We are in possession of much more information critical of QLSI.

Haig duly saw Mellifont on 17 April, 1974. Mellifont thought all his Christmases had come at once, when Haig appeared in his office. Mellifont realised this was an opportunity to corruptly further the corrupt “Labor cause”. This was his real interest; not his client, Haig.

At that meeting, Haig was obviously disabled. Haig showed Mellifont all the documentation he had from the QGR re their sacking him. He also showed Mellifont a certificate from his doctor showing the nature of his disabilities. As well, Haig's disabilities were quite obvious. He appeared as if he was in a world of his own. He tended to not take cues from others but just state his case. He was gauche and seemed very intense. Haig even showed Mellifont his bankbook to show he had “substance” and the money to pay Mellifont. Mellifont thought he had a real sitting duck just right for the plucking, and to big-note himself in the “corrupt labor cause”.

Mellifont quickly had a Notice of Appeal drafted. Rather than post it for a cost of seven cents, [the postage in 1974], Mellifont personally delivered the Notice to his Labor mates at the QGR, so he could feel free to conspire with his labor mates to shaft his client and have his client lose the appeal. Mellifont was so concentrated on scheming with his labor parasite mates, that he forgot to even make an appearance of doing a proper job of representing his client, Haig. This

was the reason he forgot the basic task of even obtaining a statement from his client Haig. Mellifont was not even interested in discussing the circumstances of Haig's dilemma. **Now, we think Spender has the dilemma.**

Mellifont was not only corrupt, he was also incompetent. The incompetence of [Mellifont](#) can be gauged from his performance in this case. [Mellifont](#) organised for Haig to go with [Mellifont](#) to a “pre-hearing conference” with Spender, just two working days before the Railway Appeals Tribunal [appropriately – RAT]. The Hearing was on Monday 18 June, 1974.

We believe Spender was not the instigator of the fraud, but Spender could have been. Mellifont conspired with the QGR fraudsters to ensure that Haig lost his appeal. Spender, by his actions was happy to go along with the fraud of Haig and play his part in defrauding Haig. [Heffernan even arranged for the hearing to be padded out to go a second day so Spender could defraud Haig a second day “refresher” fee.] Spender's complicity makes Spender guilty of the fraud along with Mellifont, Reiman, Frank Heffernan, Queensland Government Railways and the Queensland Government. We intend to ensure that Haig is compensated, with his losses, adjusted to current value, interest on those adjusted losses and damages, together with many fold that total as punitive damages from the Queensland Government.

"I haven't got a statement form you yet, have I?" asked Mellifont in front of Spender, just two days before the Railway hearing. The following day, the Friday 15 June, 1974, Mellifont had a girl clerk take a “statement”. It was a bare skeleton and did not mention the relevant matters. It was merely just bare details, and was solely to appear as though a “Statement” had been prepared. The statement did not address the substantive aspects of the matter. The girl was writing the “statement” in long hand. The factual matters and any evidence or the nature of any evidence were never discussed with Mellifont or Spender, before, or even during the hearing. For Spender, it was a social occasion as he would chat with the railway personnel and all the railway hangers on. There was no conference with the barrister Spender. Mellifont attempted to charge for it on his Bill of Costs. Mellifont knew that was a fraud too, and abandoned it at taxing. Spender knew Mellifont had been incompetent and derelict. Had Spender been genuine and wished to represent his client Haig properly, he would have been very angry with Mellifont, as he would have had to work harder to make up for Mellifont's deficiency, but Mellifont was his Labor mate, and Haig was just a disabled guy. Had Spender been genuine, he would have at least tried to compensate for Mellifont's neglect by discussing the

evidence [“conferencing”] with Haig at the hearing and at every opportunity. In contrast, Spender barely spoke to Haig. It seems the only facts that fit the evidence is that Spender knew Haig was being defrauded and Spender was happy to defraud Haig as well, and he would receive an extra day's “refresher” fee.

On every occasion where he could have discussed the evidence, Spender deliberately absented himself, so he could not be “compromised” with Haig's assessment of the evidence. Spender was already compromised in a major way.

In 1974, Spender was a willing partner with Mellifont in the fraud of the disabled guy, Haig. If Spender had not intended that Haig was defrauded, Spender could have acted differently to give Haig's case a fair airing. He did not. At all breaks in the hearing, Spender would move across to talk with Heffernan [were Heffernan and Spender both St Laurence Old Boys [slob] and was that what they found to talk about during the breaks in the hearing], and the other Railway labor criminal fraudsters. It seems to us that Spender, as a “leading labor light”, was enjoying his bathing in the obsequious gush of the railway labor sycophants, and ensuring that those sycophants remained happy.

At the RAT hearing, Mellifont did appear on one occasion. It was like a major social event as Mellifont chatted with the Railway personnel, like long lost friend. On the 18 April, 1974, Mellifont went to the Railways premises to ostensibly file the Notice of Appeal, and chatted with his labor mate, Heffernan. Why did Mellifont choose Spender? Was it that Heffernan noted to Mellifont that he, Heffernan, or was it his relative Bill Heffernan the captian of the St Laurence's 1953 First XV, was an Old Boy of St Laurence College, and that Spender was also an Old Boy of St Laurence's College in South Brisbane? Spender is on recent record of reminiscing about Bill Heffernan, the 1953 captain of St Laurence's First XV.

Haig had provided Mellifont with a certificate from his Doctor disclosing the nature of his disability at his first appearance with Mellifont. This was copied to Spender's brief so Spender also knew. As well, it was quite obvious that Haig was disabled after just a short time speaking with him. Spender and Mellifont

knew Haig would be a push-over. **What other skeletons are there in Spender's cupboard?**

We will explain the extent of Mellifont's incompetence. We have a few more clues now than Haig had at the time, to be able to understand how Haig was defrauded by Spender and his lieutenant Mellifont. Spender is really implicated in the quagmire, because two days before the Railway's Appeal Tribunal [RAT] hearing Mellifont organised for Haig to conference with Spender while Mellifont was present. Haig met Mellifont at Mellifont's office in the now Mercure Motel on the corner of North Quay and Ann Street [his office was right on the corner], then went to Spender's office in Turbot street, backing onto Ann Street, between George Street and North Quay. Haig remembers how they went via a laneway, that no longer exists, between Ann and Turbot Streets that came out beside the building housing Spender's office. Spender was there and then, when Haig was given the cue, Haig started talking to Spender about the facts of the matter. That is when Mellifont interrupts, because Spender is saying nothing and looking perplexed, at Mellifont. **"I haven't got a statement form you yet, have I?" said Mellifont.**

Mellifont had not taken a statement. Haig had repeatedly tried to phone Mellifont between the time he first saw him on the 17 April, 1974, and that date, June 15, 1974. Every time, his receptionist said Mellifont was "in conference". Haig always left a message for Mellifont to phone him, but Mellifont never did. Haig tells us he was not up to taking on anyone at that time. Spender should not have proceeded since he was not properly briefed. Mellifont tried to claim for a conference of one hour with Spender on the morning of the hearing, 18 June, 1974, but there was none. Mellifont later abandoned that claim. In fact there was NO CONFERENCE of Haig with Spender. During the hearing, Spender ensured that there was no opportunity for Haig to discuss the evidence or any matter re the case. It was clear to Spender the nature of what was "going down". Haig was set up, and Spender did his part in it. Haig was a 24yo disabled guy who was being set up by the QR, with perjurers aplenty amongst the QR parasites. Spender must have thought Haig a no-body, who could be shafted with out a second thought. We warrant that Spender would never have thought that Haig would return to bite him, as is happening and will continue while Spender remains a Federal Court judge. Spender is the longest serving Federal Court judge. He would be about 65 yo now, completing matriculation in 1959. We believe he has mandatory

retirement at age 70. Mellifont would turn 64 sometime this year, 2007, having matriculated (?) in 1960.

The Railway made the RAT hearing last longer, to a second day, but not long on the second day, so that Spender would receive a “refresher” which he did receive, but not have his day interrupted for too long. A half way decent barrister would have had that case dismissed well within the first day, if the barrister had genuinely wished to assist his client as his Fiduciary Duty requires. Spender clearly breached his fiduciary duty. A halfway decent barrister could have had QR admit they had nothing, simply by a consideration of “the evidence”. We know what Mellifont should have done, and there would be enough evidence about still, if anyone wants to take us to court, to be able to show how Spender should have been able to show that Haig was wrongly sacked.

Spender was happy to proceed, even though he knew he had not been properly briefed, or briefed at all.

The real highlight was that Mellifont thought he was onto a winner and it was all about him and the Railway being matey and agreeing to not defend Haig properly. That is what actually happened. It was because Mellifont was thinking only about how he could improve the lot for himself and his corrupt “boss” Spender, and his labor parasite mates, that he forgot to to keep up the appearance that he was "defending" Haig. This was obvious to Spender. We believe that Spender's actions suggest he was extremely happy to go along with what Mellifont had organised for him to defraud Haig, especially since the Railway made it go a second day so Spender could demand and receive a “refresher” fee. This is “proved misbehaviour”. Spender should be removed from the Federal Court and all commonwealth Courts of which he is a judge.

The contact between Mellifont and the QR was very matey. Mellifont personally delivered the Notice of appeal to QR. He clearly big-noted himself and they conspired the plan to screw Haig for the good of the laborite parasites in QGR. His labor mates in QGR phoned Mellifont to tell him the date of the appeal hearing, and confirmed in writing. That would not be usual. Usually, the date would be just notified.

We bet Spender would never have thought this will be back to bite him after 33 years. At that time in 1974, Mellifont would have been about 31 years old, and Spender about 32 years old.

We see a lot of interest in our site about material already published about Jeffrey Spender. In fact we have seen one googling <jeffrey spender queensland corrupt> and there has been quite a bit of interest in Spender of late, by google and just the internet accessing Spender's part of our site, where the journals re Spender are archived.

This Journal is part of the Mellifont/Spender/Heffernan/Reiman/Queensland Rail fraud topic. On this August, 2007 occasion, this FRAUD TOPIC in spread across four journals. They are archived at [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal Issue 200702](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf) [http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf /, Australian Criminal Law Journal Issue 200708 \[Justice.Jeffrey.Spender\] http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf /, QUT Alumni Journal Issue 200701 http://austlawpublish.com/20070813QUTAJissue200701.pdf /, The Allstralian Journal Issue 200701 http://austlawpublish.com/20070813TheAllstralianJournalissue200701.pdf /.](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf)

In July 2007, we had four journals addressing this topic. They are archived at <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200707.judge.julie.dick.pdf> , <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716dossierof.judge.julie.maree.dick.pdf> , <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716dossierof.terence.mellifont.pdf> , <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716QBAissue200702.pdf> /. These are in addition to seven of our previous journals. In April, we published [HaigReport \[ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf) (we held it over for a month)]/. It is also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /. That gave the factual setting from which this umbrella topic has arisen. In May, 2007, we publishing a further six journals which are relevant to this topic/matter. Our then newest Law Journal, very topical in Australia in the lead up to the 2007 Federal Election, was the [Australian Industrial Relations Law Journal ISSN 1834-8378 \[AIRLJ\] Issue #200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianIndustrialRelationsLawJournalissue200701.pdf) which is archived at [[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Industrial Relations Law Journal issue200701.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianIndustrialRelationsLawJournalissue200701.pdf)]. Although the [Australian Judiciary Law Journal ISSN 1321-4497 Issue #200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianJudiciaryLawJournalissue200701.pdf) [[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Judiciary Law Journal issue200701.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianJudiciaryLawJournalissue200701.pdf)], is included as part of the [Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN 1321-6562 Issue200705](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200705.pdf) [archived at [http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Criminal Law Journal issue200705.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200705.pdf)], we also reference its separate publication as [http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Judiciary Law Journal issue200701.pdf](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.heffernan.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.heffernan.pdf> and for background [HaigReport \[ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf), also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /.

Attention MEDIA BUYING AGENTS: Discover the cost-benefit imperative of advertising in our journals. <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishAdvertising.html>