

OPEN LETTER to:

ISSN: 1834-9099

30 August, 2007.

Issue #: 200702.philip.ruddock

Publisher: **Australian Law Publishers** Pty Ltd[ACN 010 615 933] [AuLP] **Email:** AustLawPublish.com/eml.html

<http://austlawpublish.com> 254 Hawken Drive, St Lucia, Qld. 4067.

Skype: russellmathews

Editor-in-Chief: **Russell G H Mathews BCom BSc LLB BA**

keywords: Federal Court; judge non-convicted criminal; Jeffrey Ernest John Spender; Labor lawyer barrister Spender defrauded disabled client in 1974; defrauded disabled client only because he was disabled; gutless labor; conspired with criminal and perjurer labor lawyer, Terence Joseph Mellifont; Terry Mellifont; TJ Mellifont; Frank Thomas Heffernan, Assistant to GM &CofO Qld Govt. Railways, CJ (Joe) Kelso clandestine member Ipswich Branch ALP;

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

The Hon Philip Maxwell Ruddock Australian Attorney General

by Alex Gordon LLB

We are not attacking you. We wish to bring to the attention of yourself as Prime Law Officer of the Commonwealth, a most serious matter regarding Justice in Australia. We are in fact attacking Spender J. of the Federal Court [and numerous other Commonwealth Courts].

In 1974, while a barrister in Brisbane, Jeffrey Ernest John Spender, conspired with others to cheat and defraud a disabled client. This makes Spender a criminal. Having a criminal as a judge in a Federal court, cannot engender confidence in our justice system. Consider the sentiments of those against whom Spender has made adverse decisions over the 23 plus years that he has been there. As discussed in our concurrent [Open Letter to: your colleague Hon Julie Bishop, Minister for Education, Science and Training](#) [archived at <http://AustLawPublish.com/20070830openlettersissue200702.julie.bishop.pdf>], Spender's position cannot engender confidence in International Students give the lawlessness of DIMIA displayed in the Meguma Ogawa episode of false imprisonment at Villawood for 70 days, as discussed below.

This is such a serious potentially harmful situation, to Australia. Australia is very much on the International stage. This would be just another nail in the coffin, after the situation where DIMIA (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs) CONSPIRED IN CONCERT WITH Kevin Rudd's mate, [Prof. Glynn Davis, VC of The University of Melbourne \[UM\] to imprison Megumi Ogawa in Villawood](#) [archived at <http://AustLawPublish.com/20070821MelbAJissue200702.pdf>] for 70 days, with the aim of beating Megumi, an International Student, into

submission, when UM was in the wrong. This would not sit well with knowledge internationally, that Australia's Court System is so debauched. **A recall of parliament to permit a Sect 72 procedure could be justified.** To determine this, I suggest that your office should meet with us, including Haig who was defrauded, and for us to show you the evidence we possess. When Spender knows this is underway, he may resign to save further embarrassment and to prevent the evidence seeing the light of day.

We believe he should be removed from Courts of the Commonwealth. We have addressed the prospect of his removal by Sect 72 of the Constitution in [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal Issue 200702](#)

<http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf/>.

He knows we are attacking him. Our first salvo was May, 2007, with the [Australian Judiciary Law Journal ISSN 1321-4497 Issue #200701](#)

[<http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianJudiciaryLawJournalissue200701.pdf/>], is

included as part of the [Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN 1321-6562 Issue200705](#)

[archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200705.pdf/>].

Spender chose to respond to our attack on 12 July, 2007. The forum of choice for Spender was his court in a directions hearing of the “QUT, Laughing at/with the disabled” case. We have covered that in our August [and august] [QUT Alumni Journal Issue 200701](#) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813QUTAJissue200701.pdf/>,

While much more disabled then than now, this disabled person is our part-time photographer Haig. Spender's reasons for doing as he did, are a matter of conjecture, but probably related to his banal labor politics and his assessment that they, all labor parasites, would get away with it, [and have so far, for 33 years]. Spender's associates in Crime on that occasion were the CRIMINAL PERJURER and ex-solicitor [struck off the roll in 1980], Terence Joseph Mellifont [Terry Mellifont of TJ Mellifont infamy], Frank Thomas Heffernan, [now retired to the Gold Coast], the Assistant to the then General Manager and Chief of Operations of the Queensland Government Railways, CJ “:Joe” Kelso, who happened to be a clandestine member of the Ipswich Branch of the Australian Labor Party [ALP].

We, Australian Law Publishers Pty Ltd, have made the running on this. The details of this labor fraud on Haig is detailed in many of our journals beginning 21 May, 2007. The links to the archived copies of ALL these journals is at the end of this OPEN LETTER to: you, Mr Ruddock. We believe you should be well informed on these matters.

There are a number of possibilities. Spender cannot feel too secure. We have much evidence of Spender's involvement in the conspiracy. Spender's part involved not presenting Haig's case properly to the tribunal. This was more than mere negligence for which he had Advocates Immunity. He was aware the Mellifont had conspired with Heffernan to defraud Haig. He was aware just one full day before the hearing, that Mellifont had not even obtained a statement from Haig. Spender did not have details of the matter from Mellifont and did not discuss any evidence with Haig, but instead at all opportunities during breaks in the hearing, discussed old school times with Heffernan. The Railway Appeals Tribunal [RAT] found the charge “proved”, and Haig lost approximately four months Salary, including two days barristers fees to Spender; nearly a month's salary for Haig. With the evidence we have, and any other evidence which can still come to light, 33+years later, we can prove, what Spender chose not to even attempt. We can still show today, that the charge had no merit.

All your printing needs in one spot.

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

Spender is boxed into a corner. He cannot make this “go away” by merely resigning. That may be the preferable option for Spender, [we do not expect it though] as then we will target the Queensland Government Railway and Queensland Government for adjusted compensation of Haig. Another benefit for Spender in that, ie resigning, is that the evidence we have will not have had the public airing, for which we earnestly wish, that it may well have if he chooses to fight. If he sues us, [we are ready for that], much evidence, condemning Spender will become public, and very public at that. It will be very good publicity for us, our publishing and our journals. We have irrefutable documented evidence. In the event of Spender, [or anyone else] suing, the Commonwealth may also wish to join the action.

We thank you for [your letter to our Editor Russell Mathews](#), regarding the harassment to which he had been subjected, on the basis of his disability, by the Deputy Registrar of the AAT in Brisbane, one Peter David Stirk. Your letter is online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070725letterRuddockDisability.PDF> /.

We are not in contempt of court as we are not attacking the Federal Court. Spender, as a non-convicted criminal, [he defrauded Haig and conspired with others to do so], greatly diminishes the stature of the Federal Court, by his being a Federal Court Judge. We

are merely the messenger.

Of course, the purpose of this message [rather than our conveying any other], is to attack Spender. This is well known and will become better known. Spender variant Google searches are by far the majority of Google searches that come to our site. This has included established old media. [We class ourselves as 'NEW MEDIA'.] SPENDER'S PERFORMANCE in the QUT CASE on 12 JULY, 2007 SHOWS HE IS FEELING THIS. He must have certainly upset many people over the past 45 years. People who wish to attack another see the best time to do so being when that person is under attack. This is called 'shark attack'. This will increase pressure on him. Regardless of what happens, and maybe anticipating the worst, his ALP mates could see this as potentially very damaging for the ALP and Rudd in the forthcoming election.

We intend to forward an alert email, to you alerting you to this Open Letter to: archived online. We intend to send it also, by bcc, to many members of Federal Parliament and Queensland Parliament. Regardless of what transpires with this matter, it can only hurt the ALP coming up to the Federal Election. The only uncertainty is the extent. Spender can choose to give this much publicity, and in so doing hurt his political party of choice, the ALP. As Spender's criminal past gains greater publicity, it will increase the damage to the ALP and Rudd

This Journal is part of the Mellifont/Spender/Heffernan/Reiman/Queensland Rail fraud topic. On the occasion of the 13 August, 2007 publications, this FRAUD TOPIC was spread across four journals. They are archived at [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal Issue 200702](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf> /, [QUT Alumni Journal Issue 200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813QUTAJournalIssue200701.pdf) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813TheAllstralianJournalissue200701.pdf> /.

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

Attention MEDIA BUYING AGENTS: Discover the cost-benefit

imperative of advertising in our journals. <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishAdvertising.html>