

FAMILY LAW ACT 1975

FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA
AT PARRAMATTA

No.NCC 3620 of 2007

BETWEEN

[PARTINGTON]
[RICKY]
Applicant Father

AND

[STEWART]
[SUZANNE KAY]
Respondent Mother

The 18th day of November 2010.

UPON APPLICATION TO THE COURT THIS DAY
THE COURT ORDERED:

- (1) That all previous orders in relation to the child, Michael Partington, born 19 March 2004, be, and are hereby discharged.
- (2) That the child live with the mother.
- (3) That the mother have sole parental responsibility for the child.
- (4) That the father spend no time with the child.
Notice that the 'order' is that the father have NO TIME with the child. This is obviously ludicrous.
- (5) That the father be declared a person with a disability, for the purpose of Pt 6.3, r 6.08 of the *Family Law Rules* (Cth). **Yep. A man who stands up for his rights and won't just bend over and take it up the arse has a 'disability'.**
- (6) That in the event the father wishes to seek further orders in this Court or any Court exercising jurisdiction under the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth), then he shall obtain an order for the appointment of a case guardian. In the event of such case guardian being appointed, that case guardian should be required to obtain leave of the Court on behalf of the father prior to filing any application for parenting orders in relation to the child.
Yes. They even say that if he wants to do anything else he should have someone else tell him what he should be doing.
- (7) That the case guardian, upon the making of any application, serve the mother with any such application for parenting orders in relation to the child, give at least fourteen days notice of any hearing date appointed in relation to the matter at the question of leave.
And they are even trying to claim that the 'guardian' of Ricky has conditions under which documents can be served! LOL!!
- (8) That the father is hereby restrained from approaching the child, any school at which the child attends from time to time, and the child's residence, either in person or in writing or by electronic communication. **The judge CLAIMS he has a right to tell Ricky that he is restrained from seeing his son...blah, blah, blah. Lets see this claim on an affidavit, eh?**
- (9) That the father is hereby restrained from approaching the mother or any place at which the mother may reside or be employed from time to time, and is hereby restrained from communicating with the mother by any means whatsoever including in writing or by electronic communication. **And here is the claim that Ricky is restrained from approaching the mother or anywhere the mother may reside or be employed. Apparently Ricky has no right to liberty, eh? Again? I'd like to see that on an affidavit.**