

Glenn

From: Glenn <glennt@cvcoupling.com>
Sent: Friday, 13 July 2018 10:40
To: 'ruth.shann@vicbar.com.au'
Subject: Judicial Corruption

Good morning.

My name is Glenn Alexander Thompson.

This email is copied to all 1956 Victorian barristers with a published email addresses.

The purpose of this email s to enable me to publicly fix each such barrister, including you personally, with knowledge of, or wilful ignorance of, ineluctable evidence of judicial and other corruption.

Further purpose is set out at the end of this email.

I will get straight to the first of the evidence.

- On 29th November 2006 Justice Robert Osborn published purported Reasons for Judgment in proceeding 6321 of 2006 ([Austlii link here](#))
- I was the plaintiff in that proceeding.
- Under the heading "Factual Background", at his paragraph 17 Osborn said that I had purchased certain land.
- Then at his paragraph 18 Osborn said;

Following such purchase a dispute arose as to withholding of reticulated water supply from the plaintiffs' land, by the subdivider. Such water was supplied by the Water Board to this subdivision in 1982.

- From a simple reading of that paragraph 18, any person possessed of a modicum of common sense and from a country where the citizens enjoy democratic property rights would immediately perceive;
 - Osborn's paragraph 18 preposterously represents that "the subdivider" withheld water supply from my freehold land and which water was supplied by the statutory authority being the Water Board and was supplied to the subdivision which included my freehold land.
 - That the things said in that paragraph could not possibly be true in either fact or law.
 - It is not possible in fact or law for any private entity to withhold a service or supply provided by statutory authority to another person.
 - It is not credible that Osborn held a judicial belief or any reasoned belief at all as to that paragraph.
 - That paragraph could not have been composed and published in error or accident.
 - The person possessed of a modicum of common sense and no knowledge of the proceeding would reasonably conclude the probability/possibility is that Osborn's paragraph 18 was purposefully composed and published for nefarious and/or ulterior purpose.

- At the time of composing and publishing that paragraph 18 Justice Robert Osborn knew well that it was in the face of fundamental public record facts known to him. In particular.
 - The subdivision referred to in Osborn's paragraph 18 is Victorian Rural Residential Cluster Subdivision registered number CS1134 which was registered by the Registrar of Titles on 9th August 1979. ([Registered Plan here](#))
 - The "the subdivider" referred to in Osborn's paragraph 18 was in fact the timeshare company which was incorporated pursuant to the Companies (Victoria) Code on 10th March 1981 and was not and could not be "the subdivider". ([Certificate of Incorporation](#))
 - The timeshare company was merely an owner of some freehold allotments and had identical status as myself as owner of my freehold allotments. We each also had an undivided share in the common property which included the water reticulation system.
 - The subdivision was "Rural Residential" and situated entirely outside the gazetted "Urban Water District" of the statutory water authority and no right or entitlement to water from the authority existed. Therefore water could not be "withheld" where no right or entitlement or expectation of that water existed and there could not be and was not a "dispute" in respect of non-existent "withholding" of water supply.
- By falsely referring to the timeshare company as "the subdivider" Osborn provided his otherwise overtly preposterous utterances with superficial verisimilitude which might deceive a casual and unthinking Australian reader or a reader from a despotic country into accepting that "the subdivider" could withhold statutory authority water from someone else's freehold land.
- Osborn's paragraph 18 was in the face of the fundamental public record facts known to him and was not and could not be founded on any factual evidence before him or on any factual submissions to him.
- Osborn's paragraph 18 was also in the face of plain common sense
- It must be that Osborn's paragraph 18 was crafted by him for nefarious and/or ulterior, possibly criminal, purpose.

Osborn's paragraph 18 exactly repeated the essence of fraudulent submissions by the then Major General Greg Garde QC.

- In the hearing before Osborn the Water Board was a defendant and Garde was senior council for that Water Board.
- In a previous hearing Garde was barrister for the in fact timeshare company referred to in Osborn's paragraph 18.
- In the hearing before Osborn I provided a copy of Garde's earlier signed written submission where he had made flagrantly false submissions while barrister for the timeshare company.
- Before Osborn I alleged that if Garde had not made his earlier false submissions then my losses would not have occurred and the hearing before Osborn would not be occurring.
- Then at pages 185 to 213 of the transcript of 1st November 2006 Garde made a series of submissions which Osborn and Garde both knew to be both false and preposterous and knew to be new material not previously raised in or relevant to the proceeding.
- Then at page 213 of the transcript Osborn refused my right of reply and immediately adjourned sine die.

- Osborn then published his Reasons on 29th November 2006.
- Osborn's paragraph 18 exactly repeats the essence of what Osborn and Garde knew to be the purposefully fabricated and flagrantly false submissions of Garde at pages 193, 197 and 198 of the transcript. (I detail and evince those flagrantly false submissions further below.)
 - In turn Garde's fabricated submissions exactly repeat the essence of the overtly false submissions and fabricated documents in the earlier proceeding where Garde made false submissions . (I detail and evince those flagrantly false submissions and fabricated documents further below.)

One instance of judicial corruption does not make a systemic and culturally corrupt justice system, the following material does.

- Because I was absent from court on 29th November Osborn adjourned until 7th December for Orders.
- In that intervening period I prepared substantial document which alleged and evinced that Osborn had fabricated his purported reasons.
- I told Osborn that i would appeal and that because I would be an appellant in person practice note 2 of 1995 required Garde to compile a summary of facts and that the summary of facts would necessarily be at odds with Osborn's reasons and would expose him.
- On 7th December 2006 Osborn made his orders against me and ordered that I pay punishing indemnity costs to the defendants.
- Each of the barristers and solicitors present knew well that Osborn had fabricated his reasons to conceal corrupt conduct. Those barristers were Greg Garde QC, Sharron Burchell, Jim Delany QC and Greg Ahern.
- Osborn and each of the barristers were aware that Osborn's costs orders constituted court ordered extortion.
- I filed notice of Appeal the last possible day after 7th December 2006. The Notice of Appeal alleged that Osborn fabricated his reasons and that each of the barristers knew it.

Osborn conspires with at least Garde's instructing solicitor to fabricate and utter fraudulent "Authenticated Order" document under the seal of the Supreme Court.

- By letter dated 7th May 2007 Garde's instructing solicitor, Steven Mark Edward served me with a fraudulently fabricated "Authenticated Order" document. ([letter here](#))
 - That letter falsely represented that my appeal had been filed out of time from orders made on 29th November 2006.
 - The enclosed "Authenticated Order" document fraudulently represented that Osborn had made orders against me on 29th November 2006. ([Fraudulent authenticated order](#))
 - The fact known to Osborn and Garde's instructing solicitor was that no orders other than adjournment were made on 29th November and all of Osborn's substantive orders were made on 7th December 2006. ([Last page 7th December transcript here](#)) ([Complete 7th December transcript here](#))
 - Also included with Edward's letter was a further fraudulently fabricated order document which purported to set out the orders made on 7th December but in fact omitted the first

order made on 7th December and only set out the second and third order made on 7th December. ([Further fraudulent Authenticated Order here](#))

- The first fraudulent authenticated order document was dependant on the omission made in the second and vice versa.
- I overcame that fabricated order by pointing out the palpable fact that no such order had been made. It may well have succeeded against a self represented litigant other than myself.

Garde, Delany, Burchell and Ahern bald faced lie to the Court of Appeal and the Court of Appeal knew it.

- Garde, Delany, Burchell and Ahern made application that I file security for their costs in my appeal.
- In that application each of those barristers bald faced lied and represented that Osborn's purported Reasons were legitimately concluded.
- In opposition I set out the self evident facts;
 - that Osborn's reasons were fabricated
 - that Osborn and at least Garde's instructing solicitor had conspired to fabricate and utter fraudulent "authenticated order" documents
- In knowledge of ineluctable evidence that Osborn had fabricated his reason and fabricated "authenticated orders" justices Buchanan and Redlich ordered that I file \$60,000 security for costs.
- I filed that \$60,000 in cash. Buchanan and Redlich were well aware that most self represented litigants could not file such security and the corruption they were fixed with ineluctable evidence of would be authoritatively concealed.

Further conduct of the Court of Appeal contrived to conceal the corrupt conduct known to it.

- At a directions hearing Garde, Delany and the rest sought orders that I prepare an Appeal Book consisting of in excess of 33,000 pages.
- In apposition I set out the palpable fact that the statement of facts required by practice note 2 of 1995 would expose that Osborn's reasons were fabricated and I sought order that Garde, Delany and the rest comply with that practice note and that the Appeal Book then be limited to relevant documents. ([Practice note 2 of 1995 here](#))
- In reply Garde. Delany and the rest sought orders that they not be required to prepare such statement of facts.
- In sufficient knowledge that the statement of fact would expose the corrupt conduct of Osborn and Garde and the now Associate Justice Lansdowne ordered that Garde, Delany and the rest not compile the summary of facts.
- Associate Justice Lansdowne's reasons and orders are contrived to give verisimilitude to her order.
 - Associate Justice Lansdowne was well aware that Garde, Delany and Co could not agree with me as to the facts without exposing Osborn and themselves.
 - Associate Justice Lansdowne was sell aware that practice note no 2 required Garde, Delany and the rest to compile a summary of facts, full stop. (presumably because self represented litigants are too stupid.)

- Associate Justice Lansdowne's reasons and orders misrepresent practice note no 2 by representing that an "**agreed** summary of facts" was required.
- Associate Justice Lansdowne ordered that an "agreed summary of facts" be dispensed with. ([First Authenticated Order here](#)) ([Second Authenticated Order here](#))
- Associate Justice Lansdowne was well aware that she was assisting to conceal corruption which she had ineluctable evidence of.

Barristers Ian Waller and Louie Hawas refuse to expose corruption known to them.

- It had become apparent that Garde, Delany and the rest simply bald faced lied with impunity and the court knew it and repeatedly made orders against me and which concealed the corruption known to all.
- I formed that view that my only hope was if I could retain a senior barrister with courage and integrity to stand against the corruption.
- Barristers Ian Waller and Louie Hawas were retained by me for that specific purpose.
- They refused to mention let alone discuss and acknowledge the corruption which they were well aware of.
- They refused to act for me to expose the corruption known to them.
- Their specific advice was "the court will find a way to find against me and I should save my money and abandon the appeal."
- At that time it became apparent that corruption was systemic, cultural and endemic.
- They charged me \$40,000 for nothing. I refused to pay. They did nothing except deceive me into believing that that would act to expose the corruption. From the first minute they knew they would not.

Further overt corrupt conduct in the Court of Appeal.

- I decided to embark on a campaign to expose the flagrant judicial and general corruption.
- I reserved the web domain name "Courtsontrial.com"
- I abandoned my appeal and filed a submission setting out that any court where barristers of the ilk of Garde could lie with impunity was not a place to seek justice and that I had abandoned by appeal in favour of a campaign to expose the corruption and that I had reserved the website Courtsontrial.com for that purpose.
- Garde and Burchell and their instructing solicitor who had served the fabricated authenticated order documents immediately made application that I pay punishing indemnity costs for having vilified Osborn and themselves and because my appeal was hopeless.
- In full knowledge of the foregoing Justices Neave and Mandy;
 - ordered that I pay punishing indemnity costs.
 - said that my allegations against Osborn, Garde etc were "assertions only and must be regarded as both unfounded and scandalous"
- **Neave and Mandie lied, they were well aware of the foregoing and much more.**

- Then Delany and Ahern and their instructing solicitor made application for indemnity costs on the grounds that my appeal was hopeless.
- In full knowledge of the foregoing and much more Justices Redlich and Beach ordered that I pay ordinary costs.
 - In their reasons Redlich and Beach noted that I had retained Ian Waller and Louie Hawas and they said that as a self represented litigant I would not be aware that my appeal was hopeless and that I had abandoned my appeal after seeking legal advice.
 - My submission to them in fact said that I could not find barristers with the courage and integrity to stand against the corruption.
- In their reasons Redlich and Beach noted my allegations against Osborn and Garde and then they said;
 - "While it appears that Mr. Thompson genuinely holds to these beliefs, they involve a serious misunderstanding of the evidence and the legal implications. No material has been advanced in written or oral submissions which might on any view support these allegations.
- **Redlich and Beach lied, they were well aware of the foregoing and much more.**

Supreme Court Judges seek to maliciously and criminally intimidate my "Internet Content Host" and conceal their corruption.

- I published my website and made you tube videos which set out some of the corrupt conduct.
- My "Internet Content Host" was a small family business located in Bathurst New South Wales.
- By email dated 13th January 2014 the Supreme Court doorman and extreme underling, Mr. Gary Ryan wrote to my "Internet Content Host" and represented that he had been engaged by a number of Supreme Court Justices.
 - In that email Gary Ryan implied/represented that my "Internet Content Host" could be charged with contempt of court if he did not remove my website from the web. ([Copy emails here](#))
- My "Internet Content Host" was intimidated but courageously said to the effect; "They are judges, they can get a court order, I will not remove the website without a court order."
- Notably Justice Osborn fearlessly fabricated his Reasons knowing full well that they could be appealed to the Chief Justice herself. One of the judges who engaged Gary Ryan may have been the then Chief Justice, Marilyn Warren wishing to conceal corruption known to her.
- That is utter corruption.

Attorney General Robert Clark conspires with the Assistant Government Solicitor, Ian Lee, to maliciously and criminally intimidate my "Internet Content Host" and conceal the corruption known to them.

- When the overtly corrupt attempt of a number of judges and Gary Ryan failed to illegally censor the web and conceal the corruption the Victorian Attorney General, Robert Clark, conspired to do so.
- The Attorney General misrepresented case law and the provisions of the [Broadcasting Services ACT 1962 - Schedule 5](#) and wrongfully and successfully intimidated my Australian based "Internet Content Host" by falsely representing that he was an "internet platform provider" responsible for the

"Internet Content" of the website owned and authored by me and that he could be charged with contempt of court if he did not take my website, "Courtsontrial.com" down. ([Letter Here](#))

- When my "Internet content host", though intimidated and worried, refused to take down my website in the absence of a court order Attorney General Clark wrote to the hardware lessor of my "Internet content host" and made identical misrepresentations and threat as he had made to my "Internet content host". That hardware lessor was intimidated and threatened my "Internet content host" that if he did not comply then the hardware lessor would suspend my "Internet content host's" access to the whole of his hardware and thereby shut down his entire business. ([letter to lessor here](#)) ([Lessors email to my content host here](#))
- Concurrently, in knowledge that I was the author of and I proudly admitted responsibility for the "Internet Content" the Attorney General failed and refused to respond to my written invitation that he specify any "internet content" which was factually false and/or specify any imputation not reasonably founded on fact. ([My letter to Robert Clarke here.](#))
- Significantly Clark's letter to the hardware lessor was sent two months after my letter to him.
- I simply moved my "Internet content" to an American "Internet content host".
- They never did write to me as proud author of my website, they knew better.
- Significantly Attorney General Clark appointed Garde as a Justice of the Supreme Court and President of the successor to the Tribunal which he conspired to deceive in 1988.

It appears to me that the conduct of the Judges and Ryan and Attorney General Clark constitute criminal intimidation for the purpose of illegally censoring the web and thereby concealing judicial corruption known to them.

Garde's originating overtly corrupt and criminal conduct.

- Rural Residential Cluster Subdivision CS1134 was registered on 9th August 1979. ([Registered Plan here](#))
- I purchased my residential land by contract dated 1st November 1979 ([Contract here](#))
- On 16th December 1981 the timeshare company purchased 10 allotments. ([Transfer of Land](#))
- That timeshare company wished to acquire the whole of the subdivision for timeshare purposes having a then estimated sales revenue of \$150,000,000 in today's dollars.
- On 1st January 1982 the Water Board entered into a palpably fraudulent water supply agreement with the timeshare company. That agreement fraudulently represented that the timeshare company owned or occupied the whole of the land comprising the cluster subdivision. ([Water Agreement](#))
- In the Victorian Parliament, on 21st November 1985 Max McDonald MLA described a conspiracy where the then Kyneton Council and Kyneton Water Board gave effect to the threat of the timeshare company that if I tried to sell my land to anyone other than the timeshare company then water supply and water dependent building permits would be denied to my land and my land would be rendered worthless and unsaleable. ([Hansard here](#)).
- The palpably fraudulent representation of the Council and Water Board included that pursuant to the Water Agreement the timeshare company owned and controlled the (in fact common property) water supply and reticulation system within the cluster subdivision and water was not available to my land except with the agreement of the timeshare company. ([Letter to Minister for water](#))

- Unbeknown to me the Water Board falsely represented that the timeshare company was "the developer". That false representation provided identical verisimilitude as Osborn's representation that the timeshare company was "the subdivider". The minister was carelessly deceived. ([Water Department memo here.](#))
- In the period 1984 to 1988 that conspiracy prevented me and my mortgagee from selling my land on the open market.
- In 1987 John Norman Price was solicitor for my mortgagee, Mercantile Credits Limited ("MCL").
- In 1987, in knowledge of irreconcilable conflict of interest, MCL conspired with Price and the timeshare company to deceive the then Victorian Administrative Appeals Tribunal and to corruptly lead/cause it to wrongly/mistakenly believe that the Water Supply Agreement was a lawful and enforceable agreement and to thereby conceal the conspiracy described in Parliament.
- While I was not party to that Tribunal Hearing I gave notice that I intended to make the self evident submission that the Water Supply Agreement was unlawful, inter alia because it purported to give the private company control of the water supply and common property reticulation system.
- Price engaged the then junior barrister, Lieutenant Colonel Greg Garde.
- Price and Garde then conspired with the three conspirators named in Parliament for the purpose of falsifying my proposed submission and deceiving the tribunal and concealing the conspiracy described in Parliament.
- At page 4, paragraph 4 of his written and purposefully fabricated submissions Garde said;
 - The Water Supply Agreement was lawful and enforceable.
 - That the agreement was for supply to "the estate" ([Garde's Page 4 here](#)) ([Complete submission here](#))
- Manifestly Garde's representations were palpably preposterous and false in the circumstances known to him and Price and the three conspirators named in Parliament. Namely;
 - that the timeshare company was merely my newly incorporated neighbour who merely owned a few allotments and had identical status as myself.
 - That the agreement was not an agreement to supply water to "the estate", it was in fact an agreement to supply the timeshare company which fraudulently represented that it owned or occupied the whole of the subdivision.
- At that time the Council and Water Authority made fraudulent written submissions and exhibited a fraudulently fabricated schedule of Planning Permits and represented that the timeshare company had been the subdivider since 1976. ([Submission and exhibit here](#))
- At that time I understood the palpably false fabrications of Garde to be quite disparate from the fabrications of the Council and Water Board.
- The fact known to Garde and Price and the three conspirators named in Parliament was that Garde's otherwise overtly false and preposterous submissions were provided essential but superficial verisimilitude by the palpably false representations of the Council and Water Authority.
- The Tribunal disregarded my written submissions and carelessly accepted the false submissions of Garde and the Council and Water Authority. ([My written submission here](#))

- If the Tribunal had not been deceived the conspiracy described in Parliament would have been at an end.
- By their fraudulent representations Garde and the Council and Water Board represented;
 - That timeshare company was the subdivider.
 - That the Water Supply Agreement was for supply of water to "the estate" which included my land.
 - That the water supply agreement was lawful and enforceable.
- By their fraudulent representations they concealed the in fact ongoing conspiracy which had been described in Parliament.

In fearless full view of Jim Delany, Sharon Burchell and Greg Ahern, Justice Robert Osborn and Greg Garde conspired with one another in open court to pervert the course of justice and authoritatively conceal Garde's corrupt conduct.

- Having deceived the tribunal MCL/Esanda sold my land in the circumstances of the in fact ongoing conspiracy. That sale caused losses and damage to my family and me which now exceed some \$20,000,000.
- My 2005 proceeding before Osborn alleged the fact that Esanda sold my land in the circumstances of the conspiracy described in Parliament.
- At that time I was unaware of the essential connexion between the fraudulent representations of Garde and the seemingly disparate fabrications of the Council and Water Board to the Tribunal.
- In a written submission to Osborn I exhibited Garde's submission to the Tribunal and I said that if Garde had not deceived the tribunal then my losses may not have occurred and the hearing before Osborn would not be occurring.
- Then at pages 185 to 213 of the transcript of 1st November 2006 Garde made a series of submissions which Osborn and Garde both knew to be both false and preposterous and knew to be new material not previously raised in or relevant to the proceeding.
- Then at page 213 of the transcript Osborn refused my right of reply and immediately adjourned sine die.
- Osborn then published his Reasons on 29th November 2006.
- Osborn's paragraph 18 exactly repeats the essence of what Osborn and Garde knew to be the purposefully fabricated and flagrantly false submissions of Garde at pages 193, 197 and 198 of the transcript.
- At [page 193](#) Garde said;

"that the development company that was controlled by the Buchanans denied any access to the water which that company had procured through the supply agreement to the Thompsons,

so the consequence of that was that although, as Your Honour has had discussed earlier, an agreement was made on the first day of January 1982 between the Water Works Trust and Woodleigh Heights Resort Development for the supply of water suitable for domestic purposes by the Water Works Trust, which was the first supply of that water to this land, that

supply agreement was made with the development company, and it was as a consequence up to the development company as to whether or not other lot owners gained access to the water that that company was now receiving from the Water Works Trust."

- At [page 197](#) Garde said;

"So in other words, unless you go and talk to the development company and get their consent then you can't access the system which is controlled by the development company."

- At [page 198](#) Garde said;

"And if one interpolates here Your Honour, the trust had in place a water agreement as Your Honour has looked at which took the water supplied by the trust to a location from which the development company and its assets took responsibility for the ongoing supply of water and the problem that gave rise to is that if there was a disagreement between the development company and individual lot owners then individual lot owners might not gain that access" ([complete transcript here](#))

- By those fabricated submissions Garde fraudulently represented/conveyed;
 - That the timeshare company was development company/subdivider.
 - That the agreement was for the supply of water to "this land", the estate, the subdivision.
 - That the water supply agreement was legitimate/lawful.
 - That the developer/subdivider could deny water authority water to me/my land.
- At the time that Garde made those submission each of Osborn, Garde, Delany, Burchell and Ahern knew them to be false and not possible in fact or law.
- Osborn's paragraph 18 exactly repeats the fraudulent representation of Garde and the Council and Water Board to the Tribunal and exactly repeats the essence of Garde's fraudulent submissions to Osborn.
 - That the timeshare company was "the subdivider"
 - That the supply of water was to "this subdivision", "this land", "the estate"
- Significantly Osborn's paragraph 166 fraudulently represents that the water supply agreement was an agreement for the supply of water to the whole of the subdivision.

The entire balance of Osborn's purported Reasons are crassly and flagrantly contrived to provide exceedingly tenuous verisimilitude to his opening flagrant fabrications at his paragraph 18.

Each of Court of Appeal Justices Buchanan, Beach, Redlich, Neave and Mandie and associate Justice Lansdowne were well aware that Osborn had fabricated his Reasons and were aware that Osborn had conspired to fabricate and utter fraudulent "Authenticated Order" documents.

Each of Garde, Delany, Burchell, Ahern, Waller and Hawas were similarly aware.

Attorney General Robert Clark was similarly aware.

When caught with their pants down the Victorian bar and bench really are a dirty little bunch of crooks.

My family and me will not be sacrificed to maintain the reputation of an in fact overtly corrupt justice system

The fact of this email to all present addressees will be well publicised.

Any addressee with the courage and integrity to stand against endemic and systemic corruption may contact me by return email or by mobile on 040 88 67 885.

My intention is to ensure that at least Justice Robert Osborn and Major General Justice Greg Garde are removed from office and incarcerated and bankrupted. (Osborn remains a Reserve Judge and remains liable to removal from office.)

In time I will succeed and also expose each complicit silent bystander.

Regards

Glenn Thompson.