

AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LTD

ABN 72 110 028 825

Level 16 Santos Place, 32 Turbot Street, Brisbane QLD 4000

PO Box 13038 George St Post Shop, Brisbane QLD 4003

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

F: 1300 739 037

E: [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

W: [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)



## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N 138069

**FEDERAL MAGISTRATES COURT OF AUSTRALIA**

**PARRAMATTA REGISTRY**

**DUNKLEY FM**

**No. PAC 6601 of 2007**

**NOLAN**

**and**

**NOLAN FAMILY LAW FINAL HEARING**

**PARRAMATTA**

**10.08 AM, THURSDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 2009**

*Pleases note the discrimination and 'appeal to motherhood'. I am merely referred to as MR. P. NOLAN and 'appears in person' which is a lie. And Jennier is 'the respondent mother'. She is a 'mother' but I am NOT referred to as a father. This 'mother worship' is endless.*

**MR P. NOLAN appears in person**

**MS S. BEVAN appears for the respondent mother**

Copyright in Transcript is owned by the Commonwealth of Australia. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968 you are not permitted to reproduce, adapt, re-transmit or distribute the Transcript material in any form or by any means without seeking prior written approval from the Family Court of Australia.

*Note: These people keep claiming 'copyright'. Yet when I ask them to produce the paperwork that shows they have a copyright under common law they refuse to do so. Hence they are in default and no copyright exists for the purpose of common law. They are trying to say that they can copyright the words spoken by human beings as a corporation. Since human beings are superior in law to corporations it is necessary for the human being to agree to the copyright. I didn't. Indeed, I have my OWN copyright notice which was served to David Dunkley and Louise Henderson. The lies of these people are quite endless.*

Note: More lies. This first part here never happened. I did not address david dunkley until I had my video recorder going. At that time Jennifer and sarah bevan were already sitting in their seats. Nice of the courts to say you can not have a recording device and then they will tell lies in their transcripts. I have signed an affidavit as to what happened outside the court room and I spoke to no-one on entering into the room and standing at the back of the room. By standing in the public gallery area and NOT entering between the rails (signifying stepping onto davids 'ship') I retained all my inalienable rights. Hence my refusal to board davids ship until he agreed to the contract that I may do so with all my inalienable rights intact. In particular, my property rights. This section is lies.

HIS HONOUR: Mr Nolan. Mr Nolan, just come in, sir. Have a seat.

MR NOLAN: I will do so if I can enter with all my inalienable rights intact, sir.

5 HIS HONOUR: No, you can just come in and have a seat, or you can not participate at all. It's a matter for yourself.

MR NOLAN: I'll do so if you agree that all my inalienable rights are intact, sir.

10 HIS HONOUR: No, I don't agree.

MR NOLAN: You don't agree that I have my inalienable rights intact, sir?

15 HIS HONOUR: No, I don't. It's a matter for you as to whether you want to participate or not, so if you do want to participate, come and have a seat at the bar table.

MR NOLAN: I will do so, sir, if you agree that I have all my inalienable rights intact.

20

HIS HONOUR: No.

MR NOLAN: Are you denying me my inalienable rights, sir?

25 HIS HONOUR: I am.

MR NOLAN: So let me just record this then.

30 HIS HONOUR: Call Mrs Nolan. It's all recorded, sir. You don't need to. You can get copies of the transcript. It's all on record. Mrs Nolan, is she coming in?

MR NOLAN: I haven't seen her, David.

35 HIS HONOUR: I didn't talk to you, sir.

MR NOLAN: There's no one outside – she's just arrived.

40 HIS HONOUR: Good, thank you. Ms Bevan, are you appearing for the respondent today?

MS BEVAN: I am, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: All right.

45 MS BEVAN: The respondent is before the court.

HIS HONOUR: Thank you.

This is where the truth is starting to be told. As you can see from the video evidence. I made this opening statement. I was nervous and confused as to what, exactly, was happening as I had never been in this situation before. I had only been to court twice before. Once to challenge a speeding fine from a lying police officer and once to have my wife advise a magistrate that she had lied to the police in order to 'frighten me' and that ended in me being arrested. Going to court like this was a stressful and difficult experience. I was also very jet lagged. When the trial of David Dunkley comes up the jury will be asked to remember the circumstances under which I was taking on this criminal cartel and that any/all mistakes were honest mistakes. In the early part I didn't realise that the court 'room' was not the court. The court is beyond the ballustrades. And I never entered the 'court' at any stage. David gave this away during the meeting.

MR NOLAN: Sir, my name is Peter Nolan – my calling is Peter Andrew Nolan. I have asked David Dunkley – I have told David Dunkley that I will enter this courtroom if I have all my inalienable rights intact. David Dunkley has said that I do not have all my inalienable rights intact. I will not enter this courtroom until such  
5 time as I have all my inalienable rights intact and your agreement, Mr Dunkley, to that.

David makes many attempts to talk me into taking a seat and therefore 'boarding his ship' while all the while refusing to agree to the contract that I may do so with my property rights intact. Stepping into the court signifying 'boarding his ship' and he is a pirate captain on the high seas. That is THEIR interpretation of it.

HIS HONOUR: Just have a seat, sir.

10 MR NOLAN: No, sir. I will have a seat when you agree I have all my inalienable rights intact.

HIS HONOUR: Ms Bevan, do you rely on the amended response filed 21 April 2008?

15

MS BEVAN: Your Honour, I have a minute of order to hand up - - -

HIS HONOUR: Thank you.

20 MS BEVAN: - - - which varies that. I'm not sure whether you received my case outline?

HIS HONOUR: I did.

25 MS BEVAN: There is one additional order on this minute of order in relation to an account in Jersey.

HIS HONOUR: All right. Thank you. Can I have that? Now, the Jersey account, where do I find about that?

30

MS BEVAN: Sorry, your Honour?

HIS HONOUR: You mentioned an account in Jersey.

35 MS BEVAN: It is point number - - -

HIS HONOUR: That's five, is it?

MS BEVAN: It is, yes, your Honour.

40

HIS HONOUR: Yes, okay. What's in that account?

MS BEVAN: In Australian dollars, your Honour, \$A1458 using a conversion rate of 1.6 euro.

45

HIS HONOUR: Fourteen hundred?

MS BEVAN: Yes.

HIS HONOUR: All right. So she relies on the minute of order, the affidavit sworn the 10<sup>th</sup> of - - -

MS BEVAN: November.

5

HIS HONOUR: November, and a financial statement which was sworn on 20 November.

MS BEVAN: That's correct, your Honour.

10

HIS HONOUR: Is that the documents?

MS BEVAN: They are, your Honour.

15 HIS HONOUR: Now, Mr Nolan, there was filed for you an application for final orders on 3 December 2007 and there was also filed on that day an affidavit that you swore on 13 June 2008 and a financial statement that you swore on 28 November 2007, and there don't appear to be any updating documents since then. Are you relying on any other documents?

20

MR NOLAN: I am not relying on any other documents to do with the Australian Federal Magistrates Court. *The court is a private company run for profit and control of the people. If you agree to use THEIR documents you agree to be a slave. I had my docs delivered to David.*

HIS HONOUR: You are relying on those, or not on those?

25

MR NOLAN: I am not relying on those documents to deal with the situation today, and the question I have is may I take a seat with my inalienable rights intact?

HIS HONOUR: You can take a seat whenever you like. *Here he is again offering for me to waive my property rights. When you know what he is saying it makes sense why he keeps offering.*

30

MR NOLAN: When you agree that my inalienable rights are intact, I will take a seat, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: It's a matter for you as to whether you keep standing. So those documents aren't relied on by you. If that's the case, then you won't have any documentation before the court. *I had documents to put before a common law court. But this court was operating in UCC commerce and I had reused the jurisdiction of that commercial court.*

35

MR NOLAN: I have documentation to present before a common law court, your Honour, but I am not going to answer until such time as you agree to the contract that my inalienable rights are intact.

40

HIS HONOUR: Well, it's a matter that you either give me the documents now or the case would proceed on an undefended basis. *'Undefended'? Who says I am accused of anything and need to 'defend' myself from anything? Thing about that.*

45 MR NOLAN: You have no right to proceed with the case on an undefended basis, David. I have submitted my claim of right to the Queen, the Prime Minister, the Attorney-General and the Governor-General, and they have consented by

*Here I point out how david has no right to proceed in this meeting on an 'undefended basis' since the queen (at al) have already agreed that these courts and their statutes have no authority over me. And if david is to claim authority over my property he needs the queen to explain why she did not rebutt my affidavit and default judgement. Since he has a sworn allegience to the crown he is beneath the crown and must do as the crown has agreed to. This statement is my clear rebuttal of the jurisdiction of davids private little court to force adjudication services over me and my property. In his 'order' issued on 2010-02-19 david makes the claim that I, at no time rebutted or challenged the jurisdiction of the court. Well? Here it is in THEIR transcript that I did this. And it is on the video evidence. This PROVES BEYOND DOUBT that david lied on his order as to the basis for his 'judgement'. If men put up with such blatant lying by magistrates they deserve their slavery.*

Please note the clear denial of right to provide adjudication services. I got it wrong in the first speaking and said 'judicial'. Realising my mistake I corrected myself to 'adjudication' services. These courts offer to the public domain 'adjudication services' just like McDonalds offers hamburgers. And if you avail of their 'adjudication services' then you agree to their fees, which are astronomical by the way, and you agree to their decisions. Why should any man agree to this? These magistrates are there to apply common law, not this la-la-land UCC shit they dish up.

acquiescence that you do not have a right to provide judicial – adjudication services to me unless I consent.

5 HIS HONOUR: Yes. Well, sir, you are an intelligent man and you know that that's a nonsense. Here david calls my defense of my inalienable rights and my claims 'a nonsense'. So I make him the offer of putting his words onto an affidavit. Notice he refuses that offer meaning he knows it is perjury.

10 MR NOLAN: Well, if that is a nonsense, David, you are going to have to sign an affidavit under full penalty of perjury, full commercial liability, to say that it is a nonsense. Are you willing to sign such an affidavit?

HIS HONOUR: No. I have just said that it is a nonsense. Now - - -  
Here he is making the claim that all he needs to do is 'say something' and it can be made to 'stick'. This is a lie and I know it.

15 MR NOLAN: Well, what you say doesn't matter. What matters is what you are prepared to put on an affidavit, David. Knowing he has just lied I point out that what he says is not relevant. It only matters what he is willing to put into an affidavit.

HIS HONOUR: All right. So there is no documents on which you seek to rely?

20 MR NOLAN: I have documents on which I seek to rely, but you have not agreed to the contract that I can enter the courtroom with my inalienable rights intact.

HIS HONOUR: Sir, you either hand me the documents now or the matter proceeds on an undefended basis. Notice the threat. He has no right to do this and he knows it. So he tries to threaten me and frighten me. But I stick to my guns because I know he is a scumbag criminal.

25 MR NOLAN: Well, if you proceed with the matter on an undefended basis, David, I will charge you one million ounces of gold for enforcing an adjudication process on me that I have not consented to as a sovereign.

HIS HONOUR: Thank you. Feeling far more confident and far better understanding what is happening by this stage I decide to offer david a contract for a million ounces of gold to retain me in the room defending my rights.

30 MR NOLAN: I stand here before you as a sovereign of the nation – of the land known as Australia, and I do not consent to your adjudication services in any way, shape or form and I have plenty of witnesses who know this.

And here is another clear rebuttal of the offer of 'adjudication services' again exposing the lies on the 'order' of 2010-02-19.

35 HIS HONOUR: All right. Thank you. Then the matter proceeds undefended.

MR NOLAN: Well, you will be charged one million ounces of gold for doing this, David. Do you agree to that charge? And here I make it very explicit. That if he continues he will be charged one million ounces of gold. And he is asked to enter into that contract.

40 HIS HONOUR: Charge whatever you like. I distinctly remember he said 'Yes, charge whatever you like'. The transcript service seems to have dropped the 'yes'.

MR NOLAN: Thank you for agreeing to the bill, David. Your audience here may wish to know why is it that a man cannot enter the courtroom with his inalienable rights intact? I was so astonished at the 'yes' that I immediately wanted to make sure the video recorded the fact he has agreed and give him a chance to object if he did not mean it. So I said 'thank you for agreeing'.

45 HIS HONOUR: The audience here observes that you are already within the courtroom, sir. All right. Then, Ms Bevan, you better address me in respect of how

Now. Here is an important distinction which I had not 'gotten' until david said this. He could not know I was still confused on this point at this point in time. I was standing just inside the door. I had been maneuvered there covertly by only having one door open. I had intended to stand in the doorway. But while standing in the doorway these criminal scumbags brought a 'crowd' of students in to watch the circus. Wonder what THEY made of it! LOL!! Anyway, as they were all standing behind me I moved into the court ROOM to allow the students in. This was NO accident. They were maneuvering me into the room and then, in this sentence, david tries to present 'in the court room' as the same as 'in the court'. But it is not. The back area of the room is the public gallery which is still 'on land'. The ballistrade represented the edge of the 'ship'. When david said this I noticed that I was only in the court ROOM and not 'in the court'. This was a major victory for me and a major mistake by david to point this out. My confidence swelled as I realised what he had told me.

we would get to a set of circumstances that would mean that your client gets the totality of the asset pool.

5 MS BEVAN: In order to do that, your Honour, I must tender a reasonably significant amount of documentation.

HIS HONOUR: All right.

10 MS BEVAN: In relation to the *Black & Kellner* and *Weir & Weir* principles, my case is that the husband, by failing to disclose his assets, has left the court in a situation where, as those cases say, you should not be unduly cautious in making an adverse – finding in favour of the innocent party.

15 HIS HONOUR: Yes. *Gents. Notice the woman is the 'innocent' party despite the crimes she has committed. What does that make you? That makes you the 'guilty' party. What are you 'guilty' of? Well you are 'guilty' of being a man of course. And that means you must be arse raped of your assets. It's called 'eekwality'.*

20 MS BEVAN: In addition, your Honour, the husband himself in various emails has made reference to his own income earning ability, in reference to his, in effect, destruction of the company of the parties, Instant Business Intelligence. There are other factors to take into account with regard to the Irish proceedings. My client's evidence is those Irish proceedings are now concluded and cannot be reinstated.

*Scumabg sarah bevan lies claiming I destroyed the company. The company was destroyed by Jennifer freezing the company account. Period.*

HIS HONOUR: Well, they can't be because, I mean, this is the venue for the hearing, isn't it?

25 MS BEVAN: It is, and this is the appropriate jurisdiction, in my submission, your Honour. Your Honour, there is also emails from the husband in which he makes reference to having removed certain amounts of money, such as 7000 and 10,000 euro out of the jurisdiction, that being the jurisdiction of Ireland.

30 HIS HONOUR: All right. Well, you had better tender that material.

35 MS BEVAN: Thank you, your Honour. I have on the front of it a list of those documents. I estimate that it will take approximately an hour to read. However, I can indicate that in relation to the husband's emails, although it is certainly outside of the usual practice, those emails are quite lengthy and I have put highlights around the relevant sections. I don't ask you to read the whole of the emails, but simply those highlighted sections.

40 HIS HONOUR: So the material that is produced in the ringback folder, you are seeking to tender that? Is that - - -

MS BEVAN: I am, your Honour.

45 HIS HONOUR: All right. Mr Nolan, there is sought to be tendered before me some material in a binder. Do you wish to be heard in respect to the tender?

Another offer to step onto his ship with my inalienable rights intact which he refuses to respond to. Are you men starting to get the picture now? He is the pirate captain of a pirate ship operating under Uniform Commercial Code. He is doing all he can to persuade and to trick me into stepping onto his pirate ship. That is why there is a 'dock'. That is why there is a 'bar'. These are all nautical terms. This is why he insists people 'bow to him' because not only is he the captain of a pirate ship he is a satanic 'priest' as well dressed in his black robes. This is why these priests insist that 'all rise' and 'all be seated'. Who else does this? A priest in a church. That's who. Because they too are satanic priests calling themselves 'christian'.

MR NOLAN: I do wish to be heard, sir, and I wish you to agree that I can approach the court with all my inalienable rights intact.

HIS HONOUR: So do you consent to the tender of the documents?

Here is my clear non-consent to the tender of the documents by Sarah Bevan. There can be no mistake about this.

MR NOLAN: No, I do not consent to the tender of the documents, David.

HIS HONOUR: All right. On what basis don't you consent to the tender of the documents?

10

MR NOLAN: I don't consent to the tender of the documents on the basis that I have not been given the opportunity to enter the court with all my inalienable rights intact.

HIS HONOUR: That's not a legal basis for the tender not to proceed, sir.

Now david tries to fool me on 'legalese'. He claims this is not a legal basis which is true. But I am not subject to their 'legal' system. ;-)

MR NOLAN: That's the lawful basis for the tender not to proceed, David.

And I point out to david that my objection is the LAWFUL basis, which is higher than 'legal', basis not to proceed. What does he do?

HIS HONOUR: All right. Then - - - He simply ignores this lawful basis and continues with the pantomime he is playing with Sarah Bevan.

20 MR NOLAN: We are in common law jurisdiction, David.

By now I was feeling really good so I noted to him that we are in common law jurisdiction and awaited his reply. I was laughing inside now. ;-)

HIS HONOUR: And on the basis that there is no objection that is sustainable at law, I mark as exhibit A the material in a ringback folder.

Having been soundly beaten in the above exchange david simply ignores his defeat and keeps going. He uses 'at law' but what he means by this is 'at statutes' which I have made clear I am not subject to. 'at law' does not mean AT COMMON LAW. It means 'at statutes and legislation'.

#### **EXHIBIT #A MATERIAL IN RINGBACK FOLDER**

By this time I knew I had won. I had david by the 'short and curlies' and there was now nothing he could do to regain the upper hand. He was vanquished and defeated. I had the video and the transcript coming. My confidence was soaring by this time. I had played and won. I was elated.

HIS HONOUR: Yes. Anything further, Ms Bevan?

30

MS BEVAN: Would you prefer to have my submissions now or after you have read

- - -

HIS HONOUR: No, I had better read all that material.

35

MS BEVAN: Thank you, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: All right. We will adjourn while I go off and read.

40

**ADJOURNED**

**[10.20 am]**

**RESUMED**

**[10.59 am]**

45



In the break I had spent time talking to the two Australian federal police officers who said their callings were Christopher and Andrew. Amazing because my middle name is Andrew and my oldest brother is Christopher. I took that as a good sign. Anyway, I explained to them that this was all a lie and the courts were corrupt. I told them that in the second half I would challenge the magistrate as to whether he was under oath. One of the two, I forget which one by name, but it was the dark-haired one, said that the magistrates were always under oath on the bench. I told him to watch what happened. I told him that the magistrate would refuse to talk about whether he was under oath because he wasn't. I told them he was nothing but the captain of a pirate ship intent on plundering my property. He joked that they were just the hired hands there to do what the captain told them. These guys obviously understood I was no 'threat of violence' and that I was there as a patriot. Though they thought I was crazy too.

HIS HONOUR: Ms Bevan, I have read the documents in exhibit A. Mr Nolan, there is a notice to produce. Do you produce any documents in answer to that notice? The 'notice' is a notice to produce which is THEIR notice in THEIR jurisdiction. Hence I was not responding to their la-la-land notices. I had documents under common law to present. And I offer them again at this point in time.

5 MR NOLAN: Not in answer to that notice, David. I have plenty of documents that I wish to provide to you.

HIS HONOUR: All right. Do you want to do that now, thank you.

10 MR NOLAN: I would love to do that now, David, as long as you will agree that I can enter between these two gates with all my inalienable rights intact. In particular, my property rights. I make another offer to 'board his ship' with my rights intact. And point out that I am particularly concerned about my property rights. By now I was having real fun!

HIS HONOUR: Yes, all right. So if you are going to produce, produce them now,  
15 please. David gets even more slimy here. He says 'yes, all right' but he is not clear what he has said 'yes' to. So I make sure I ask him what he has said 'yes' to.

MR NOLAN: When you said, "Yes, all right," do you mean that I may enter with my property rights and my inalienable rights intact, please, David?

20 HIS HONOUR: No, I don't mean that.

And here is sliminess is exposed. He meant 'yes' to something else and would not elaborate. Are you men getting the picture yet?

MR NOLAN: May I ask you a question then, David?

This was a great little exchange. I ask my SERVANT if I may ask him a question as his MASTER and he says flat out 'NO'. LOL!!

HIS HONOUR: No. Are you going to produce some documents in answer to the  
25 notice to produce?

MR NOLAN: So I want it recorded that I asked politely may I ask David a question and he said, "No."

HIS HONOUR: Are you going to produce the documents?  
30 The fact that David refuses to respond to the question of whether his oath is in the court is strong evidence, some would call it proof, that his oath is not in the court room. In order to hold his 'office' his 'oath of office' must be prominently displayed in the room. That is the LAW.

MR NOLAN: Is your oath in the courtroom today, David?

So I ask him if his oath is in the courtroom today. By common law, it must be there.

HIS HONOUR: All right. I take it that means that you are not producing.

I said nothing of the sort. David now knows he has lost and so he is going to 'tough it out' as best he can by ignoring me as much as possible!

MR NOLAN: And I note for the audience that David has refused to answer the question is his oath in the courtroom today.

HIS HONOUR: So there is no documents in answer to the notice to produce, Ms  
40 Bevan. Now David is fighting a lost battle hard. He tries to make the blatantly false claim that there are no documents in answer to the notice to produce when he has copies of my documents and I have another copy in my bag.

MR NOLAN: There are documents in answer to that notice, David. However, I will only present those documents in the case that my inalienable rights are intact.

45 HIS HONOUR: Yes, Ms Bevan.

Now I know I have David nailed to the wall I decide it's about time to enjoy myself and enjoy the experience. So I make it explicit on the record that there are documents I can produce and I will do so in the case my inalienable rights, right to life, liberty and enjoyment of my property, are intact. The whole scene devolves into a ludicrous pantomime from here on you. You will kill yourself laughing. David and Sarah know all is lost. That they will be exposed as a couple of petty criminals. But they bravely 'solidify on'.

What you will read next is nothing but a 'pantomime'. Remember. David and Sarah are both members of the same closed society called 'the law society'. They have both taken an oath to the 'law society' to work in the best interests of the 'law society'. One of those interests is to make the sheeple believe that there is something called 'justice' happening in the courts. Well? Read this cow-shit and tell me it's 'justice'. Nope. They call it the 'criminal just-us system' because THEY are the criminals and the system is just for them!! They use this lie and this pantomime to control the 'sheeple' and keep the rest of you 'in your place'. Read on. You will find it fascinating stuff.



MS BEVAN: Thank you, your Honour. Your Honour, in the documents produced – tendered, there wasn't a reference to the 10,000 euro, I believe.

HIS HONOUR: Yes.

5

MS BEVAN: I have one email and one letter to tender in addition in relation to that.

HIS HONOUR: All right, thank you.

10 MS BEVAN: It's only the upper part of that email I ask you to read, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: Mr Nolan, there is produced, or sought to be tendered, an email from Sarah Bevan to SBA Mail dated 25 November 2009. Do you want to be heard about that being marked as an exhibit?

15

MR NOLAN: David, I would like to participate in a friendly and peaceful way in this conversation. However, I will only participate in this conversation with my inalienable rights intact. By the way, I wish to declare that Mr Peter Andrew Nolan is a corporate straw man fiction and I am the primary creditor and secured party for this corporate fiction. You may call me Peter, David.

20

I had forgotten to make it clear I was the primary creditor an secured party for this strawman so I added it in here.

HIS HONOUR: Thank you. Then I mark as exhibit B the email from Sarah Bevan dated 25 November 2009 to SBA Mail.

25

**EXHIBIT #B EMAIL FROM SARAH BEVAN TO SBA MAIL DATED 25/11/2009**

30 HIS HONOUR: Mr Nolan, there is a letter from the Royal Bank of Canada to Mrs J. Nolan dated 20 March 2008 that is sought to be tendered. Do you want to be heard about that?

35 MR NOLAN: David, I have asked you to please call me Peter. Mr Nolan is a corporate straw man; it's a dead entity. I will speak as Peter Andrew of the Nolan family, the primary creditor and the secured party for the corporate straw man Mr Peter Andrew Nolan. And david keeps calling me by the ficticious strawman name after I hace asked him to call me peter. This is, of course, dis-respectful of his master and a sovereign.

40 HIS HONOUR: Then there being no objection, I mark as exhibit C the letter from the Royal Bank of Canada dated 20 March 2008 to Mrs J. Nolan.

45

**EXHIBIT #C LETTER FROM THE ROYAL BANK OF CANADA TO MRS J. NOLAN DATED 20/03/2008**

HIS HONOUR: Ms Bevan, in reading the material - - -

MS BEVAN: Yes, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: - - - there is an email called Dublinolans@gmail.com. I presume that's your client's email address.

5

MS BEVAN: It is, your Honour, yes.

HIS HONOUR: And then there is some emails to a Bruce@gSCO.ie. Who is that person?

10

MS BEVAN: There was an email to Bruce and that's the accountant, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: The accountant for what?

15

MS BEVAN: For Instant Business Intelligence.

HIS HONOUR: And there were some emails directed to a Bill Toal, T-o-a-l.

MS BEVAN: My client's father.

20

HIS HONOUR: I see.

MS BEVAN: The others which is Jarred Backworths Robertson is my client's son.

25

HIS HONOUR: Son. Fair enough, I gathered as much. All right. Yes, all right, then your submissions.

MS BEVAN: Thank you, your Honour. The orders my client seeks effects - when one takes into account the add backs included, and in that regard, your Honour, I should have an amended case outline which I should have handed up earlier. There are only some minor amendments on it which I have underlined - - -

30

HIS HONOUR: Yes, all right.

35

MS BEVAN: - - - is to add in one add back of \$7000.

HIS HONOUR: That's the money that was transferred when the - - -

MS BEVAN: 7000 euro - yes, it was.

40

HIS HONOUR: When - - -

MS BEVAN: And the net is underlined on the two last pages, your Honour.

45

HIS HONOUR: All right. Yes?

MS BEVAN: Your Honour, the effect of the orders sought by my client, if the add backs are taken into account, and I will address you on those shortly, effects a split to my client of the assets of 83 per cent, 83.3 to be precise. My submissions take an alternative – two alternative approaches, or, indeed, a combination of both, that is,  
5 that these orders are warranted on the basis of a *Black & Kellner* or *Weir & Weir* type approach, as I highlighted earlier, that being that the court should not be unduly cautious in making findings in favour of my client, the innocent party. The alternative is that there should be a significant adjustment pursuant to section 75(2) specifically in relation to subsection (b).

10 Your Honour, in relation to the assets, the Australian assets and the relatively minor assets in Ireland are easy to identify. There is also, the husband asserts in emails, a loan from his brother. The wife has given evidence that that loan was, in fact, a gift and the husband's own emails, as contained in the tender documents, refers to that  
15 amount not needing to be paid back. *It was a loan. Not a gift. This is just more lies. My mother is in full time care and an extra \$A50,000 would be real handy to my father right about now.*

HIS HONOUR: Still have to plead it as a contribution that comes in on his side of the - - -

20 MS BEVAN: You do, your Honour, and I will address you on contributions in that respect when I get to it, but given that the husband has not put any evidence with regard to the amount of the loan or the interest on the loan or the terms of repayment, and also given the nature of his emails as contained in the tendered exhibit A, my submission is that this is not a loan and should not be treated as a loan of the parties.  
25 In fact, it's just simply a contribution issue that I will come back to.

HIS HONOUR: Yes. *Note that david has a sworn affidavit duely notarised that this was a loan and he has a default judgment and order from me to pay it back. All the evidence needed. Sarah Bevan is lying in this paragraph and she knows it. Scumbag.*

MS BEVAN: Your Honour, in relation to the *Black & Kellner* considerations, you  
30 have before you emails from the husband where he refers to removing 7000 euro out of the jurisdiction. He also refers to paying that amount to a colleague in Germany, as he says. You also have the email, exhibit B, which refers to him removing 10,000 euro, he says to apply it for the sake of the family. My client's evidence says different and, in fact, my client's evidence is the only sworn evidence you have  
35 before you, your Honour. *The money was moved by accident and it was applied to the family costs. Jennifer is lying and so is sarah scumbag bevan. And they both know they are lying.*

In addition, your Honour, there was also what I would submit was a very significant asset, that being the company Instant Business Intelligence. My client's evidence is clear that that business traded well, afforded them a very decent income.

*'The business traded well'? LOL!! No. Peter worked his ARSE off and made money for the family. 'the business' did nothing. It's inanimate.*

HIS HONOUR: Yes, but I don't have any figures about it, do I? Don't have any.

MS BEVAN: You don't.

45 HIS HONOUR: And there is no profit and loss statements; there is no taxation returns.

*LOL! This is because Jennifer is too incompetent to even know how to get a copy of a P&L let alone read one!! LOL!!*

Yes. The company is 'dissolved' because the criminal scumbag calling himself Judge Griffin of the 'Family Court' in Ireland froze the company bank account in December 07 at the behest of Jennifer. So clearly the responsibility for the destruction of the company rests with Jennifer. However, there is no lie to blatant for Jennifer and Sarah to present to a 'court' and they lie to make the claim that the destruction of the company was somehow my responsibility. Sarah and Jennifer could not 'lie straight in bed'. And you men had better get used to the idea that women lie like this in the courts all the time with complete impunity. Are you going to tolerate that in the future like you do today? Or are you going to form your own courts, which are held with public viewing and scrutiny not like the close and secret family court and are you going to hold women accountable for their perjury? If you do not you deserve your slavery. Time to fight back gentlemen.

MS BEVAN: You have nothing in that regard, your Honour. My submission in that respect is that you cannot know anything about the company and, in fact, the company is now dissolved.

5 HIS HONOUR: Dissolved, I saw that.

MS BEVAN: But in any event, there is no means by which that this court can say, "I consider it had at some stage a value of X." That - - -

10 HIS HONOUR: I mean, it could have – it could simply just be a trading company that they conducted a business out of. It had no other intrinsic value of its own.

MS BEVAN: As in just a simply income-earning vehicle?

15 HIS HONOUR: Yes.

MS BEVAN: It could, your Honour, but it also could have been a significant asset itself. Tied in with the company is a reference the husband makes in various emails, to the software.

20

HIS HONOUR: Yes.

MS BEVAN: That he has software and in one of his emails refers to, "No court can force me to sell my software."

25

HIS HONOUR: Sure.

MS BEVAN: My submission in that regard, your Honour, is that he is making a concession that there is an asset. Again, you have absolutely no means of knowing what that asset is worth and that is because of the husband's complete failure to disclose any relevant material in this case, your Honour. Your Honour, in circumstances where you have no knowledge of what the asset pool is, this is a case, in my submission, that falls clearly within the guidelines set out in *Weir & Weir* and, in my submission, should give you or should lead you to not be cautious at all in making findings in favour of my client. When I referred earlier to my client receiving 83 per cent of the property pool, that is of what we know there is and the easily identifiable add backs.

30

35

Your Honour, in respect of the add backs, it is my submission that where you have in effect concessions by the husband that those amounts have been removed for his own purpose, have not been expended, on my client's evidence, for the sake of the family, but presumably have been used for his own personal purposes or simply, as he says, paid to someone else, that being a colleague in Germany, then the appropriate course is to treat those as add backs rather than as some sort of wastage consideration under Kabaly. Your Honour, in relation to – actually I will come back to the Kabaly issue later, your Honour. In relation to those add backs, there is then the consideration of whether they are to be treated as an asset rather than – under section 75(2)(o).

40

45

Gents, on this page is something you should take note of. In Australia the wimminz claim that 7 years is a 'lengthy marriage' and is the point where the wife should get half of the mans pre-marital assets...indeed, more like 70%. Now, I had jennifers two children from a previous marriage in my house from the time they were 7 and 6 until they were 18. That is about 10 years each. Sure, I actually provided the money to take her ex to court to provide a little child support for the children as he made no argument that they were not his children. I did not realise that Jennifer was a liar at the time. It was accepted she told the truth about 'abuse'. Jennifer did not work for 16 years of an 18 year marriage and I paid the majority of the costs of the two children as well as doing my best to play the role of step-father. Scumbag sarah calls this a 'limited part of the marriage'. And she tries to minimise what I did. Well? You men have now been told how you will be treated if you take on a single mother. Leave them to their fate is my advice to men now.

In that regard, given that the amounts are clearly identifiable and my client's financial statement sets out the means by which she has converted the amounts to Australian dollars, that being 1.616, I believe, it is appropriate and, in fact, is really the only course open to the court in respect of how to treat those factors. Your Honour, in relation to the contributions, my submission is that this is a case where there should be a 55/45 per cent split in my client's favour. Your Honour, the husband, if he was to present a case, might have two factors that he could argue in relation to contributions, that being that he provide a support to the wife's two older children from a previous relationship. 55/45? Based on what exactly? Oh that's right, she pulled those numbers out of her considerably sized arse.

HIS HONOUR: A *Robb & Robb* type argument. I love her minimisation of the loan my brother gave me. It was \$A25,000 across 88/89. This was when interest rates were 17% down to 15%. There were many days I went hungry because I didn't have enough money to buy food for myself. My brother generously offered me money to put to the mortgage to help me feed myself. The kids never went hungry but I sure did. Sure. Minimise that bitch!

MS BEVAN: Sorry? Brainless woman! LOL!!

HIS HONOUR: A *Robb & Robb* type argument.

MS BEVAN: Yes. However, that is mitigated by the fact, your Honour, that my client received child support from the children's father and they were only resident with the parties for a limited part of the marriage. The other factor, your Honour, is the gift from his brother. He said it's a loan, but as my submissions – as submissions made earlier, it's appropriate to be treated as a gift. My client's evidence is that it's an amount of \$15,000 that was advanced very early in the relationship. On the basis of it being a relatively limited amount and the amount of time and the nature of the contributions that have flowed since that time, my submission is it would really have little, if any, weight pursuant to *Pierce & Pierce* type considerations, your Honour.

On the contrary, your Honour, my client has made significant post-separation contributions and I should add, when I am jumping to post-separation, apart from those two factors that I have just mentioned, I would say that the contributions during the marriage would generally be considered 50/50. The husband was the bread winner; my client was the carer of the children and the domestic duties. She did that and that is how the parties organised their lives. It's a clear case where, apart from these other factors, it would otherwise be a 50/50 case, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: Yes. 50/50 is LAUGHABLE. My ex had a good job at IBM on \$A40K in 1993 when she quit and refused to ever work again. Besides raising and paying for her two children? My uncle was a builder and from learning from him I renovated two houses while princess sat on her arse.

MS BEVAN: Since separation, my client has continued to care for the children and has continued to make all payments for the care of the children. She has given evidence that in caring for the children she must pay private school fees and she is now also supporting Josephine, the older child, who is now at university.

HIS HONOUR: Yes, she is over 18. Really? How many kids in Ireland (or Austraila for that matter) MUST attend private schools? None. Private schools are a luxury, a privilege. They are not 'a right' or to be taken for granted. A child MUST attend AT LEAST a government school. But there is no MUST about attending expensive private schools. You men should take note of the 'entitlement' attitude of princess.

MS BEVAN: Sorry?

HIS HONOUR: She is over 18.

Now gents. Read this bit carefully to realise just how much women hate you. Jennifer had stolen EUR18K from my company. Frozen my personal and company bank accounts throwing me into poverty and into begging from my friends. My health failed me and I was severely ill. She kidnapped my children and relocated them to places unknown. And, as a result of my dis-owning my former children and severing my relationship with them I was suicidal for a month. It was a long road to get my health back on track and an even longer road to recover my business dealings. ALL of these were achieved through perjury which is a crime. So. Due to her specific efforts my health was severely affect and I was suicidal. What do we see here? Oh, I am the 'bad guy' and my behaviour has had a 'significantly negative effect on my client'. I could not make this cow-shit up. My 'crime'? Oh. Yes. I copied her on emails to her father asking him to intervene and keeping him up to date. nitially they claim 'thousands' but it turns out to be 550 over two years. LOL! Apparently poor princess does not know where the 'delete' button is or can not set a delete rule. Yet she was an IT expert for IBM for 5 years?? It's all cow-shit. And this is how YOU TOO will be treated if you tolerate it.

HIS HONOUR: She is not a special needs child.

5 MS BEVAN: She is not a special needs child, no.

HIS HONOUR: No.

10 MS BEVAN: I will come back to her in relation to section 75(2) though, your Honour. In addition, the contributions that my client has made post separation, in my submission, have been made more onerous by the conduct of the husband. The husband has embarked on a course of conduct which was designed – I withdraw that. The husband has embarked on a course of conduct which has had a significantly negative effect on my client. She says in her affidavit that she has received an  
15 extraordinary amount of emails from the husband and on that point, your Honour, I must correct one point in my client's affidavit. She says she has received what numbers in the thousands. Since swearing the affidavit, she has taken the arduous task of actually counting those that she still has, not knowing if any were deleted when the husband accessed her account, and she has counted 550.

20

That doesn't include the emails sent by the husband to various friends and colleagues and family members. Whatever the number, whether it's 550 or in the thousands, it is an extraordinary number of emails all taking a very particular approach and all – the combined effect must have an effect on my client. Your Honour, you don't have  
25 it in evidence, but my client instructs me today that she has been in counselling for 18 months – she has now concluded that counselling – in order to deal with the treatment she has had at the hands of the husband. Your Honour, as you will be aware, *Kennon & Kennon* gives authority to where – in circumstances where there has been domestic violence, but not only domestic violence, also other conduct  
30 which is not limited by description, the factors such as those should warrant a consideration of weighting the contributions in favour of the – essentially the victim, your Honour. Of course, we have to have some 'victimhood'. Poor princess has 'been in counselling'. Um? She was REAL HAPPY when she was married and 'needs counselling' when she destroys that marriage. What does that tell you?

35 If ever a case fell into the category of conduct which is designed to, or which has led to making the innocent party have a more onerous job in doing their day-to-day life, this is the case. Your Honour, the number of those emails, the nature of those emails, the widespread nature of those emails, can only have an effect on my client. Admittedly, you don't have expert evidence before you, but, in my submission, it is a very clear-cut case that by simple commonsense the effect of those must have had on  
40 my client. Your Honour, in relation to the section 75(2) factors, my submission is that there would be a very weighty adjustment in my client's favour. If we started from a proposition of a 55/45 contribution, my submission would be that it would be appropriate to adjust perhaps even up to 40 per cent in my client's favour.

45 HIS HONOUR: Why?

And here is scumbag sarah again talking about 'the innocent party' when the innocent party is guilty of the crimes of perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft while I, the REAL innocent party have not committed any crimes, have not broken ANY laws and have offered the hand of love and peace during the entire two year episode. Indeed, her father considered my 66/33 in her favour offer right up front 'more than generous' and 'more than jennifer has a right to expect'. I consistently offered the proposal that the two fathers sit down and work out the split of assets in order to keep the entire situation amicable and not to allow the scumbag liars/lawyers to drum up conflict to line their own pockets with the proceeds of the marriage which we ALL KNOW is one of the main motivating factors of the scumbag liars/lawyers. They offer the women stupid dreams of how much they can get to get the women to then create conflict and in the conflict the liars/lawyers and magistrates clean up on the carcass of the family. These people profit from the destruction of families and child abuse associated with it. They are the scum of the earth. No question.

And what is scumbag sarahs 'argument' as to why the weight should be up to 40%? Well she does not have an argument so she says 'simple common sense'. Really? It's common sense to rob a man now? Only a woman could say that.



MS BEVAN: Your Honour, subsection (b) refers to the income and earning capacity of the parties. The husband, throughout his emails, has referred to his income earning capacity. In one of his more recent emails, he has referred to the ability to earn 200,000 euro. That, in rough figures, equates to – I am doing the  
5 figures in my head – about \$A320,000 a year. He has referred to his consulting fee of 1000 euro a day, which is 1600, approximately, Australian dollars a day. If you don't consider that the property – that the business is indeed property and instead was an income-earning vehicle, the fact of the husband's income earning during the relationship suggests that he now has that earning capacity. Now, whether he  
10 chooses to exercise that or not as a result of other conduct that he chooses to take is a matter for him. However, he has that capacity. Um. What if I fall ill? What if I have an accident and can no longer work? Oh..that doesn't matter. Riiiiight....got it.

Your Honour, in addition my client has the care of the younger child of the marriage, who is under 16. As her evidence says, she is required to pay private school fees for  
15 him and also maintain him in the usual way. In addition, subsection (d) refers to the commitment to support others, as does subsection (e). She has given evidence that she is paying Josephine's university fees. As someone on a student permit, she has limited work rights and therefore limited ability to support herself. In addition, your Honour, subsection (k) refers to the effect of marriage on the earning capacity of a  
20 party. My client gives evidence that throughout the marriage, from very shortly after the younger child's birth, by agreement she was the one looking after the children.

By agreement? No. Jennifer unilaterally decided to quit work and never work again. All members of the family know I never agreed to this.

She was the one who stayed home and devoted herself to the care of the children in the house and effectively enabled the husband to go out and earn the amounts of  
25 money that he did, which then puts him in good stead to earn similar amounts of money now. Womens logic = Man has worked his arse off for 26 years to rise to the top of his profession in the world therefore you should steal his money off him because he can earn more. Riiiiight. Got it.

HIS HONOUR: I just don't have any evidence as to what he earned.

30 MS BEVAN: What he earned. In my client's affidavit, your Honour, there is some evidence. Jennifer is so feckless that even though she drew the salary checks and checked every check that came into the company and had copies of the companies bank statements she can't 'find evidence' of earnings! LOL!!

HIS HONOUR: It's a statement.

35 MS BEVAN: There is a bit of limited evidence, but you have it before you in paragraphs 55 and 56. It's within her knowledge to make those statements and therefore, as the only evidence you have in this matter, my submission is that it's strong evidence that you are able to rely on, your Honour. She says that the company paid the husband between six and 8000 euro a month and that the company  
40 earned 220-odd thousand dollars in consulting fees and an additional amount in software sales. Coming back to the effect of the marriage on my client's earning capacity, the absence for her from the workforce for such a length of time can only have a negative effect on her earning capacity. Nope. The numbers are wrong. She couldn't even get this right. LOL!!

45 Subsequent to separation, she obtained work as a carer which is a relatively unskilled position, and now works in office administration. She has detailed what her income is and it's certainly not anywhere near what she says the husband's income was.

Gents. Take careful. After having gotten herself deliberately pregnant to get away from a 'domineering mother' (her words not mine) and then lying to the boy it was accidental she manipulated him into marriage. Then she claims abuse, and with her track record of lying we can see how credible THAT claim is. I help her get a degree in IT and by the time she is 32 she has a degree in IT, 2 years as a programmer at National Mutual and 5 years in a job at IBM on a good career path. A job that she ONLY got because of the circumstance that I was already there. So I helped her every step of the way into her career even paying her uni fees and writing many of her programming assignments for her to get her to a position where she could have a good career in the worlds largest IT company. She quits without my agreement, indeed, over my very hostile non-consent as I would become the sole income earner for a family of 6 in sydney and we ALL know how hard THAT is. She sits on her arse for 16 years refusing to even work in her OWN HUSBANDS company. She refused to even spell check my manuals!! And because she refused to work her skills go off. And now her skills are off and she can't make as much money as she used to it is somehow up to the HUSBAND to PAY FOR HER. THAT is 'eekwality' gents.



In Australia child support is contingent on a paternity test. No child support is payable prior to a paternity test according to THEIR rules. Jennifer was asked for a paternity test and refused it. Hence, no child support was payable. Scumbag sarah knows this but she trots out the 'victim cow-shit' anyway. And we have seen in Australia how women who commit the crime of paternity fraud are 'punished'. They are given payment scheduled reaching out 200 years into the future. And don't you men forget it!

Notice again scumbag sarah tries to blame me for the failure of the company despite the fact that the company bank account was closed by a court order requested by jennifer. No lie can be too blatant for scumbag sarah. Also, the company account was not a 'controlled account'. When the court order for the freeze was lifted the money in the company was then subject to normal banking conditions. And I took the EUR7K left in it to pay debts.

Your Honour, another consideration under section 75(2) is the child support paid for the children. Josephine is now over 18, but she was under 18 at the time of separation; Joshua is still under 18. My client's evidence is that apart from three payments in November 2007, she has received no money whatsoever for the children. She has had to maintain the children since separation and I think it's very clear and my submission is there is no hope that the wife will ever receive any child support for Joshua. Your Honour, turning lastly to section 75(2)(o), I mentioned before the Kabaly principles in respect of wastage.

10 HIS HONOUR: Yes.

MS BEVAN: Your Honour, the husband has engaged in conduct that I would submit falls within the Kabaly principles in relation to two items: that being the company. If your Honour accepts or is willing to make a finding that it may well have had a value, then the husband's actions since separation have led it to now be dissolved and for it to have no value, one would assume, at all. In addition, your Honour has evidence about the actions the husband took in relation to the controlled moneys account. The sale proceeds from the sale of the Pennant Hills property were, pursuant to orders of 16 June 2008, to be placed into controlled moneys account.

20 HIS HONOUR: Well, the best that they can get for that would be something like about two or three per cent, isn't it?

MS BEVAN: In a cash management account – it now has gone up, but previously which relates to most of the period – would be about three per cent. By my calculations, being that it's approximately six months, it would be around about four and a half thousand dollars. Your Honour, there is very clear evidence from the husband's emails in respect of the controlled moneys. I can say that there was an attempt by my client to have the registrar sign the required documents pursuant to section 106A. There was a difficulty in that regard as a result of the notation made by Judicial Registrar Johnston that the agreement that Watts McCray would keep it - the husband's former lawyers - was a notation only. That was therefore unsuccessful, your Honour.

35 HIS HONOUR: That probably brings it to an end then.

MS BEVAN: Sorry?

HIS HONOUR: That probably puts it to an end. If it's a notation only – I mean, I will have to look at that.

MS BEVAN: It's unfortunate that in what happened, it was only a notation.

45 HIS HONOUR: Yes.

MS BEVAN: There was certainly no issue at the time and it wasn't – that particular part wasn't drafted as consent orders. It was added by Judicial Registrar Johnston. Your Honour, turning lastly to justice and equity in respect of the property issues,

Notice the blatant lie 'the husband has chosen not to give evidence today'. I was laughing on the inside at this time. I have, on the record, offered about SIX times to step into the court and here is scumbag sarah saying I have chosen not to give evidence. You can't make this up! And I love 'contemptuous attitude towards the court'. Nope. The 'court' is an inanimate object. Essentially, a piece of paper. I had a contemptuous attitude to scumbag sarah and scumbag david. And, in my opinion, justifiably so. You, dear reader, and read for yourself the lies they are telling? Would you also not have a contemptuous attitude to people who are trying to steal from you lying to each other in a little pantomime like this? And if you didn't? What kind of pussy are you? And note. Sarah says that the court should not be concered in 'failing hte husband in terms of providing him justice and equity'. You want to read that part clearly. Apparently courts are only for men who will submit to being slaves! LOL!! I was laughing so hard inside hearing this cow-shit knowing it would be published.

5 while my client's application for effectively 83 per cent of the assets is under what I have suggested might be the appropriate percentage for her, it is all that she can get. There is absolutely no point in making an order for the husband to pay her any money because I think we can all accept that that simply will not happen based on the conduct of the husband to date. Your Honour, the husband has chosen not to give evidence today. It can be as a result of what can only be described his contemptuous attitude towards this court.

10 That the husband has presented with that attitude should leave the court no concerns as to failing the husband in terms of providing him justice and equity. Your Honour, there are two additional orders sought that have only lately been sought in respect of parenting. Your Honour, that is sole parental responsibility and an issue about the passport. While sole parental responsibility should cover a passport, it is certainly my experience in the past with other clients that the passport office doesn't  
15 necessarily accept a sole parental responsibility order.

HIS HONOUR: When does the child's passport expire?

20 MS BEVAN: The child's passport expires in January, your Honour.

HIS HONOUR: He travels on an Australian passport?

25 MS BEVAN: He does, your Honour. Your Honour, there has been no section 60I certificate. My submission is that this is a matter where mediation is – that the requirement for mediation should be waived because of the simple impracticality of it. Your Honour, the husband – the only evidence I am relying on to support the sole parental responsibility is the husband's own emails where he refers to the children as his former children and also makes a comment of "the leeches called wife and children." The husband himself has disowned the children. I can say to your Honour  
30 that those two emails that I provided are not the only emails in that regard; there are numerous emails. I didn't see any point in tendering all of those relevant emails, your Honour. Your Honour, those are my submissions. I do have an application in respect of costs, though.

35 HIS HONOUR: Well, I am going to reserve so you will have to come back in respect of that. Mr Nolan, are there any submissions that you want to make?

40 MR NOLAN: David, I have asked you to call me Peter. Mr Nolan is a corporate straw man of which I am the primary creditor and secured party. For the record – are we on the record? I believe you have been recording. I believe you have been recording?

45 HIS HONOUR: No, no. What happens here, Mr Nolan, is that all proceedings in this court are recorded.

MR NOLAN: Okay. So for and on the record, David, are you operating under your oath today?

I had been waiting for this...time to play my little 'bomb-shell-end-game' and get david refusing to answer the question as to whether he has been sitting there for the last 40 minutes as a private employee of a private company and NOT in his 'public office' as a magistrate doing his sworn duty under his sworn oath. I knew perfectly well at this point he would refuse to reply because her had no-where else to go. He was defeated, he knew it, and he knew I knew it too. I've got to hand it to him. He soldiered on well but he was beaten. In all honesty, he had no chance of winning against me on this day unless I made a really bad mistake. And I rarely do that. I had prepped so hard for so long that he simply came up against a man who knew too much for him to be successful on the day. This is why I thought I might be killed that night. So. Dear reader, watch what he says....nothing. The two AFP guys were shocked to the core to see this. You should have seen the looks on their faces. It was priceless! LOL!!

PAC6601/2007/29/11/09 P.17  
©Commonwealth of Australia Transcript in Confidence

HIS HONOUR: Mr Nolan, do you have any submissions that you wish to make?

MR NOLAN: For and on the record, David, are you operating under your oath today?

5

HIS HONOUR: I take it that therefore you have no submissions that you wish to make. Nope. His is NOT going to answer. And just by the way. If he WAS operating under oath he had a lawful obligation to say so when asked. That is why I read into the record what is next.

10 MR NOLAN: So let the record show that a sovereign, Peter Andrew Nolan, has asked David twice is he operating under his oath today, and David has refused to answer is he operating under oath, and it's my contention that he is operating as a private employee and therefore has no jurisdiction over my common law property rights. All though the 'meeting' david was acting as a private employee of a private company with no jurisdiction at all. And so I read that into the record just to make damn sure that there was no-where for this scumbag to run in the future.

15 HIS HONOUR: There being no submissions, then I reserve my decision. I will deliver written judgment on a date to be advised.

Now david threatens to deliver a 'judgement'. Based on what exactly? And under what authority exactly?

MR NOLAN: Well, David, should you choose to violate my property rights, let me hereby notice you that I will address those rights in a common law jurisdiction court.  
20 You may be charged with theft. You may be charged with violation of common laws. I have with me documentation to demonstrate that I am the primary creditor of the corporate straw man Mr Peter Andrew Nolan, and I have the highest claim. I have not been able to present this documentation because the judge is acting – the magistrate is acting as a private employee of a private company, not as a common  
25 law judge. He is, in fact, impersonating a public servant.

HIS HONOUR: Thank you. We are adjourned.

### 30 **MATTER ADJOURNED at 11.28 am INDEFINITELY**

So I make damn sure that I tell him exactly what will happen to him if he tries to violate my property rights, which he subsequently did. So now the onus is on me to bring this man to justice. Since our SERVANTS in the 'legal community' are so clearly a bunch of criminal scumbags and are NOT performing their duties according to their oath of office. And don't even bother to have their oath with them and don't operate under their oath anyway? It is up to the HIGHER AUTHORITY which is 'the australian people' to put this man on trial and to issue a remedy statement against him. There is also the issue of the bill he accepted for a million ounces of gold.

I have already determined how this will be done. When I was 17 I made a great speech in my school auditorium as the vice captain of my high school. This was a traditional speech. My brother had tried to make a similar speech 4 years earlier. Alas, he was not a skilled public speaker, and though his words were the right words, he had trouble delivering them. Children, being as heartless as they can be, laughed at my brother in that day. In that moment, as my brother tried to get his message across with many students of the 1,000 or so gathered laughing at him, I took a vow that I would deliver that speech in 4 years time. I did. And it was acknowledged by all teachers to have been the best such speech of it's kind made to that date that any of them had seen. Indeed, I do not think there was a female in 500 or so present who was not in tears such was the power and effectiveness of that speech. I have had something of a career in public speaking in my life. Particularly in 'sales'.

So. I have determined that the trial and remedy statement for Louise Henderson and David Dunkley will be held in my old school auditorium that seats 1,000 people below a stage on which the court will be called to order. The people of Wagga Wagga will be invited to watch this trial. It will be fully public and fully transparent. 1,000 lucky people will get seats. The rest will have to listen outside. The young lad, launched off that stage nigh on 30 years ago, is going to conduct the single most important trial in Australian history on that same platform. You are invited to come along and witness the event.

Keep your eye on my homepage. That is where the date will be announced.

Gents? If you read all this and still do nothing? You are a willing slave and you deserve your slavery. It's that simple. Remember, the video of this transcript was sent to Kevin Rudd and Robert McClelland in December 09. This corruption goes to the PM. No-one else is going to 'save you'. This is something men have to do for themselves.