

keywords: Telstra fraud; **Telstra CANNOT BE TRUSTED WITH BROADBAND**; Mel Ward; Ian Row; ex Corporate Solicitor for Telstra; criminal action by Telstra; subjudice matter in criminal jurisdiction; G9 not Telstra can be trusted with new **BROADBAND ROLLOUT**; **SUBJUDICE MATTER cannot be published but can be related in private meeting with G9** and its members, and Fed Govt Helen Coonan;

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

Commonwealth Ombudsman knew how much about the **TELSTRA FRAUD?** **G9** and **BROADBAND**

By Alex Gordon LLB

The Australian Parliamentary Law Journal continues this month's AuLP

feature on the Telstra Fraud that has not yet been reconciled, and the criminal procedures that were followed to ensure that the fraud persisted.

The Commonwealth Ombudsman [CO] is an officer of the Commonwealth Parliament. He reports directly to parliament. His role is to scrutinize the Commonwealth Executive [CE][the Commonwealth Public Service- CPS], and so is not a part of the CPS. Although CO staff are not Public servants, they are part of the Public Sector and have the undoubted psyche that accompanies their being part of the Public Sector. This fraud by Telstra, then called Telecom occurred when Telstra was 100% government owned. Accordingly, consideration of the CO rightly falls in this journal.

Telstra's then [in 1987], MD, Mel Ward had given our informant Haig, an undertaking that the losses caused to his business, by Telstra's [then called Telecom] fault, for which they admitted they were solely and totally responsible, would be compensated. Ward appointed Telstra's Corporate Solicitor, Ian Row [that is Ian Robert Arthur Row of [55 or 65] Riley Rd Outtrim 3951 (03) 5657 3226], to implement his undertaking. Soon after Row had concluded implementing the fraud, he began with the VisionStream Pty Ltd subsidiary of Leighton Holdings Ltd. [Whether Row knew of it being a fraud, or not can be discussed PUBLICLY when a currently sub judice matter in the criminal jurisdiction is no longer before the courts.] Of course, it can be discussed privately to, for instance, Leightons or the Broadband G9 or G9 members, [or any court if it wishes to risk itself]. There are copious quantities of irrefutable documentary evidence. That this fraud occurred and the steps that

Telstra took to ensure the Fraud persisted, do, this publisher suggests, have a huge bearing on whether Telstra is a fit and proper organization to undertake the BROADBAND ROLLOUT across Australia. We suggest Telstra is NOT a FIT and PROPER organization to undertake the BROADBAND ROLLOUT. When we advise G9 members of the details of the Telstra fraud and the present subjudice particulars, they will know this too.

The “Value of Telstra's FRAUD!!”

The initial loss of revenue cause by the admitted fault of Telstra was of the order of \$90,000. A payment of \$90,000 in November 1996, would NOT have fully compensated for the loss. The later the instance at which compensation would have been paid, the greater would be the amount of the losses caused. Because Mel Ward had assured Haig that the loss would be “fixed up”, Haig had delayed restructuring his business to take account of the Telstra fraud. This caused him to lose his business and be declared bankrupt. This is all due to the Telstra Fraud.

Just as we said, Haig had a nascent employment agency in 1986, three years before Therese Rein began her employment agency. Haig had many advantages over Rein. Her business is today worth in the order of \$170 million. Haig's

would have been worth more. Haig had many other aspects to his business including Computing, ICT, Tax, Accounting, Staff Training [Haig had been a full-time Secondary School teacher and a full-time Tutor in Commerce at James Cook University in Townsville], Superannuation and a Licenced Corporate Dealer in Securities, under which many Dealer's Reps could be appointed. The value of the Loss today would greatly exceed, \$1,000 million dollars.

In a year or so the "sub judice blank" should be able to be published. If the Government assists Telstra to gain the Broadband advantage over G9, [we will ensure the Government, including the Minister Senator Helen Coonan, all know the details of the "Telstra CRIMINAL ACTIONS AND FRAUD", alerting them to the "subjudice blank", as we can do, as it is not publishing it], regardless of who wins this year's election, those people centrally involved in giving Telstra the nod would be widely publicized. That would be a fraud on the whole Australian community.

We, at Australian Law Publishers, believe that once G9 know of the Criminal fraud by Telstra, using criminal means, including the "SUB JUDICE BLANK", they will be able to hammer that to the government. Telstra will not be able to argue in the face of that. We can show G9, the whereabouts of PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, IN COURT FILES, EVIDENCING ALL THESE MATTERS.

The links connecting our journals on the different aspects and emphases of this TELSTRA FRAUD matter are:

The more extensive narrative is covered in [HaigReport Issue200702 dated 18 June, 2007 at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_HaigReport_journal_issue200702.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_HaigReport_journal_issue200702.pdf) /. The related journals on the Telstra culture of Crime and fraud are included [in these journals and these archive URLs](#): [Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN: 1321-6562](#) with the actual copy at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_AustralianCriminalLawJournal_issue200706.pdf [Australian Telecommunications Law Journal ISSN 1321-4470](#) with the archived copy at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_AustralianTelecommunicationsLawJournal_issue200701.pdf /. We have [Dossiers of](#): [URL = <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishDossierof.html> /] for the two person centrally involved [not subject to the sub-judice consideration] viz: [Mel Ward](#) at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070618dossierof.melvin.ward.pdf> and [Ian Robert Arthur Row, then Corporate Solicitor at Telstra](#) at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070618dossierof.ianrow.pdf> /. Because the Commonwealth Ombudsman [not the TIO] was also involved, we have included that aspect in [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal issue200701](#) at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_AustralianParliamentaryLawJournal_issue200701.pdf /.

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