Ronald Medlicott
[redacted]
11th January 2024

Dear Commissioners,

Re: COVID-19 Pandemic Governance:

At 1.01 p.m. on the 8th January 2024 and Australia Post trackable letter, serial number [redacted], was lodged at the Elizaeth South post office. According to the auspost.com.au website the letter was delivered at 10:58 a.m. on the 9th January 2024. The letter was addressed to [redacted] and contained a detailed report on a number of serious criminal activities that are also being drawn to the attention of criminal trial lawyers who can use the information on behalf of clients being prosecuted for a broad range of very serious charges, e.g., multiple homicides. With this in mind the sending of this submission is being screen-capture video recorded and the video and the text will be made available to the police and criminal trial lawyers. [SO: DON'T DELETE & DON'T IGNORE]

The most serious of the allegations made to [redacted], is the fact of law that exposing people to the COVID-19 is a major crime that has unlawfully infected almost 12 million people and resulted in the serial murder of approximately 24,000 people. If I am correct, then the issue of law that you must clarify is the possibility that, in law, you may have no jurisdiction to conduct the COVID-19 inquiry and all information that has been provided to the COVID-19 inquiry must be immediately forwarded to the Australian Federal Police for investigation. It is imperative that that point of law be addressed and with that in mind, I draw your attention to the following legal issues pertaining to the issue of jurisdiction.

NO JURISDICTION
As you may be aware, the former President of the United States of America (USA), Donald Trump, has appealed insurrection charges in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit with the claim that as the former President of the United States of America he has "absolute immunity" for any crimes committed whilst in office, i.e., The president's 'unique position in the constitutional scheme,' set forth in the Executive Vesting Clause, guarantees him immunity from trial." This remarkable claim has been vigorously challenged by the US Department of [redacted]. It has also resulted in two amicus curiae submissions , one which was from American Oversight, a nonprofit legal watchdog group. In the amicus brief filed by this high-profile legal watchdog group, they argue that the D.C. Circuit appeals court lacks the jurisdiction to take up Trump's appeal, and should therefore send the matter back to Justice Chutkan and allow the trial of Donald Trump to resume.

Because of the credibility of experts who submitted the two amicus curiae briefs, the 3 Federal Justices hearing the appeal have accepted these submissions and have required both Donald Trump and the Special Prosecutor to respond to the points of law set out in these amicus curiae briefs. A decision by this court on Donald Trump's appeal and the amicus curiae submissions may be handed down by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit sometime next week.

Donald Trump's claim of immunity may soon be paralleled by similar claims by Scott Morrison and Anthony Albanese in regard to the serious and fatal harms caused by their decisions to unlawfully allow the COVID-19 virus into Australia in violation of the terrorist activity law at Section 101.1 of the Commonwealth Criminal Code Act (1995), as defined under Section 100.1(2)(a - e) of this criminal code.

Casualties under Section 268.4 of this criminal code may be Genocide whilst individual deaths may be may be murders under Section 268.8 of the code. Since Anthony Albanese was sworn in as Prime Minister, the COVID-19 death toll has risen from 8,110 to 23,871, i.e., there have been 15,761 deaths, one of whom was [redacted].

In an upcoming submission to DCI Lyons and criminal trial lawyers, I shall be pointing out the following constitutional provision, which are found in Clause 5 of the Preamble of the Constitution:

"This Act, and all laws made by the Parliament of the Commonwealth under the Constitution, shall be binding on the courts, judges, and people of every State and of every part of the Commonwealth, notwithstanding anything in the laws of any State; and the laws of the Commonwealth shall be in force on all British ships, the Queen's ships of war excepted, whose first port of clearance and whose port of destination are in the Commonwealth. "

What is clearly very evident is that in Australia, valid federal laws are "binding" upon everyone, including all members of every parliament, and also every COVID 19 tribunal member The viewpoint that we are all subject to the Constitution and valid laws of the Commonwealth has been repeatedly expressed over a period of more than a century in a number of binding High Court decisions that the Tribunal needs to give serious consideration to at this time.

Citation #1:
Amalgamated Society of Engineers v Adelaide Steamship Co Ltd ("Engineers' case") [1920] HCA 54; (1920) 28 CLR 129 (31 August 1920)

[Majority at 3] The question presented is of the highest importance to the people of Australia, grouped nationally or sectionally, and it has necessitated a survey, not merely of the Constitution itself, but also of many of the decisions of this Court on various points more or less closely related to the question we have directly to determine. The more the decisions are examined, and compared with each other and with the Constitution itself, the more evident it becomes that no clear principle can account for them. They are sometimes at variance with the natural meaning of the text of the Constitution; some are irreconcilable with others, and some are individually rested on reasons not founded on the words of the Constitution or on any recognized principle of the common law underlying the expressed terms of the Constitution, but on implication drawn from what is called the principle of "necessity," that being itself referable to no more definite standard than the personal opinion of the Judge who declares it. The attempt to deduce any consistent rule from them has not only failed, but has disclosed an increasing entanglement and uncertainty, and a conflict both with the text of the Constitution and with distinct and clear declarations of law by the Privy Council.

[Majority at 4] It is therefore, in the circumstances, the manifest duty of this Court to turn its earnest attention to the provisions of the Constitution itself. That instrument is the political compact of the whole of the people of Australia, enacted into binding law by the Imperial Parliament, and it is the chief and special duty of this Court faithfully to expound and give effect to it according to its own terms, finding the intention from the words of the compact, and upholding it throughout precisely as framed. In doing this, we follow, not merely previous instances in this Court and other Courts in Australia, but also the precedent of the Privy Council in Read v. Bishop of Lincoln, where the Lord Chancellor, speaking for the Judicial Committee in relation to reviewing its own prior decisions, said: "Whilst fully sensible of the weight to be attached to such decisions, their Lordships are at the same time bound to examine the reasons upon which the decisions rest, and to give effect to their own view of the law." The grounds upon which the Privy Council came to that conclusion we refer to, but need not repeat, adding, however, that as the Commonwealth and State Parliaments and Executives are themselves bound by the declarations of this Court as to their powers inter se, our responsibility is so much the

greater to give the true effect to the relevant constitutional provisions. In doing this, to use the language of Lord Macnaghten in Vacher & Sons Ltd. v. London Society of Compositors, "a judicial tribunal has nothing to do with the policy of any Act which it may be called upon to interpret.

[Majority at 8] In the words of a distinguished lawyer and statesman. Lord Haldane, when a member of the House of Commons, delivered on the motion for leave to introduce the bill for the Act which we are considering:—"The difference between the Constitution which this bill proposes to set up and the Constitution of the United States is enormous and fundamental. This bill is permeated through and through with the spirit of the greatest institution which exists in the Empire, and which pertains to every Constitution established within the Empire—I mean the institution of responsible government, a government under which the Executive is directly responsible to—nay, is almost the creature of—the Legislature.

In his concurring findings, Justice Higgins summed up the above Majority findings.

[Higgins J. at 9] In connection with this subject, much argument has been addressed to sec. V. of the Constitution Act—what we call the "covering sections" of the Constitution. It provides that that Act and all laws made under the Constitution "shall be binding on the Courts, Judges, and people of every State ... notwithstanding anything in the laws of any State." I take sec. 51 of the Constitution as defining subject matters for legislation, and covering sec. V. as defining the persons who are to obey the legislation. Once we find a valid Federal law—say, a law as to trade and commerce with other countries—the Courts and Judges and people of every State must obey it, whatever the State laws may say to the contrary. Organized bodies of persons, such as incorporated companies or municipal corporations or States, are not mentioned: for they always act through "people"—human beings: and these human beings have to obey the valid Federal Act, whatever the State law says. The State law is to have no efficacy for them as against the valid Federal law: they must obey the Federal law as if the State law did not exist, and whether they act for State or for corporation or company. Here, the Minister for Trading Concerns is, by the Trading Concerns Act W.A., constituted a corporation. The successive Ministers have the rights and duties conferred by the Act, and must obey the Act except so far as it is inconsistent with a valid Federal Act; but to the extent of the inconsistency the Minister has to obey the Federal Act, not the State Act (sec. 109 of Constitution).

Citation #2: Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Commission. (HCA 25; 8th July 1997)
77 years after the Amalgamated Engineers decision in Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Commission, the High Court reviewed the constitutional provisions in order to ascertain the rights and responsibilities of government, administrators and individuals. The following citation from Lange is essentially re-statement of the views expressed in Amalgamated Engineers and again, the Court cited the fact that clause 5 of the Constitution renders the Constitution "binding on the courts, judges, and people of every State and of every part of the Commonwealth, notwithstanding anything in the laws of any State". Note also the statement that “The Constitution displaced, or rendered inapplicable, the English common law doctrine of the general competence and unqualified supremacy of the legislature.” Although every parliament is subject to the Constitution , on the 12th September 2023, Peter Dutton asked the following question; “Minister, can this parliament override the constitution?” Although the answer is a simple “No”, Attorney-General Mark Dreyfus leapt to his feet and launched into an angry diatribe that left the House of Representatives in a state of uproar and chaos. As a consequence, the question was answered by the Indigenous Service Minister, Linda Burney. However, as the following High Court citation makes very clear, this is a question that you cannot ignore because the federal, state and territory parliaments DID override the Constitution and as a direct consequence, almost 24,000 people are now dead.

Here, "[w]e act every day on the unexpressed assumption that the one common law surrounds us and applies where it has not been superseded by statute". Moreover, that one common law operates in the federal system established by the Constitution. The Constitution displaced, or rendered inapplicable, the English common law doctrine of the general competence and unqualified supremacy of the legislature. It placed upon the federal judicature the responsibility of deciding the limits of the respective powers of State and Commonwealth governments. The Constitution, the federal, State and territorial laws, and the common law in Australia together constitute the law of this country and form "one system of jurisprudence". Covering cl 5 of the Constitution renders the Constitution "binding on the courts, judges, and people of every State and of every part of the Commonwealth, notwithstanding anything in the laws of any State". Within that single system of jurisprudence, the basic law of the Constitution provides the authority for the enactment of valid statute law and may have effect on the content of the common law.

Conversely, the Constitution itself is informed by the common law. This was explained extra-judicially by Sir Owen Dixon[60]:

"We do not of course treat the common law as a transcendental body of legal doctrine, but we do treat it as antecedent in operation to the constitutional instruments which first divided Australia into separate colonies and then united her in a federal Commonwealth. We therefore regard Australian law as a unit. Its content comprises besides legislation the general common law which it is the duty of the courts to ascertain as best they may. ... The anterior operation of the common law in Australia is not just a dogma of our legal system, an abstraction of our constitutional reasoning. It is a fact of legal history."

MY COMMENT:
There are at least four significant issues of relevance in these High Court findings:

First, the Constitution and the laws of the Commonwealth are binding upon all of the parliaments, which includes all of the people within each parliament within the Commonwealth of Australia.

Second, the Constitution and the laws of the Commonwealth are binding upon the Courts and all officers of the Court, and also officers of the law.

Third, the findings of the High Court are binding upon the parliaments, lower courts, e.g., the Federal court and State Supreme Courts. It is axiomatic that the High Court's decisions are also binding upon all Royal commissions and other commissions of inquiry.

Fourth, the Executive Members of a Parliament are all accountable to all of the non-executive members, i.e., any 'Backbench' member can query the legality and rationality of executive decisions. However, one of the issues for [redacted] to investigate is why members of the South Australians Parliament who knew that exposing the State's population to COVID-19 refused to query this unlawful activity or to refer the issue to the police for their consideration of the facts of the matter.

Note this statement: by Justice Higgins: "these human beings have to obey the valid Federal Act, whatever the State law says. The State law is to have no efficacy for them as against the valid Federal law: they must obey the Federal law as if the State law did not exist, and whether they act for State or for corporation or company."

No matter what the policy of the Federal Government or any State Government may be, federal laws such as the Criminal Code Act, the Biosecurity Act and the Work Health & Safety Act all took precedence over political policy decisions. The principle of "safety first" is not a cliché`. It is binding statute law and the role Commonwealth and State Solicitor-Generals in providing legal advice on the

legal issues pertaining to the handling of the COVID-19 virus were perhaps even more important than the views of the Chief Health Officers, the Australian High Performance Protection Committee (AHPPC) as allowing the virus into Australia for economic reasons was a major crime and, in law, COVID-19 deaths may be murders for financial gain. A critical issue therefore is what role did the Commonwealth, State, and Territory Solicitor-Generals have in providing legal advice concerning the decisions being made by politicians, health officers, and emergency services coordinators.? As I point out in some of the following citations, the failure to adequately consider the legality of some of decisions that were made are now most definitely a matter for the courts to determine and as such, are far beyond the legal jurisdiction of the COVID-19 Inquiry.

Citation #3: Kioa v West. HCA 61; 18th December 1985
In and independent finding at paragraph 35 of his findings, Justice Brennan stated:

"When the question for the court is whether the condition is satisfied, the court must place itself in the shoes of the repository of the power to determine whether the procedure adopted was reasonable and fair. A different approach is called for when the question is whether a jurisdictional fact existed at the relevant time: jurisdiction may depend not on the circumstances perceived by the repository of the power but on the objective existence of the fact at the relevant time."

The power of politicians or public officials to make decisions has constraints, but the borderline of jurisdiction may be either ill-defined or unknown. In Amalgamated Engineers, Justice Higgins stated "human beings have to obey the valid Federal Act, whatever the State law says." The first criteria, which may require a High Court ruling as to whether-or-not legislation is legally valid or is a "statutory fiction" as per the retrospective legislation that the High Court overturned in Commonwealth DPP v. Keating, (HCA 20; 8th May 2013). The determination of the manner of death for COVID-19 fatalities is, in law, the jurisdiction of State or Territory Coroners' Courts and those decisions are outside the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, which means that any commission of inquiry that may be set up by the Albanese Government has no jurisdiction to make any rulings concerning deaths arising from any decisions made by the Albanese Government. This opens the door the legality of any determinations that may be made by federal government commissions of inquiry, e.g., claims that the Robodebt Debt Royal Commission (RRC) did not make any determination that Robodebt killed people are correct, but this is **because** [redacted] would have almost certainly been aware that she had no jurisdiction to do so.

The following two High Court citations were cited in my RRC submissions and they are equally valid in this submission when it comes to 'boundary fence-line' of valid legal jurisdiction.

Citation #3: *Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs v Bhardwaj* HCA 11; *14 March 2002*

[At 51]

Decisions involving jurisdictional error: the general law

There is, in our view, no reason in principle why the general law should treat administrative decisions involving jurisdictional error as binding or having legal effect unless and until set aside. A decision that involves jurisdictional error is a decision that lacks legal foundation and is properly regarded, in law, as no decision at all. Further, there is a certain illogicality in the notion that, although a decision involves jurisdictional error, the law requires that, until the decision is set aside, the rights of the individual to whom the decision relates are or, perhaps, are deemed to be other than as recognised by the law that will be applied if and when the decision is challenged. A fortiori in a case in which the decision in question exceeds constitutional power or infringes a constitutional prohibition.

[At 53] "In our view, logic and legal principle both direct the conclusion that the approach of the Supreme Court of Canada is correct. As already pointed out, a decision involving jurisdictional error has no legal foundation and is properly to be regarded, in law, as no decision at all. Once that is accepted, it follows that, if the duty of the decision-maker is to make a decision with respect to a person's rights but, because of jurisdictional error, he or she proceeds to make what is, in law, no decision at all, then, in law, the duty to make a decision remains unperformed. Thus, not only is there no legal impediment under the general law to a decision-maker making such a decision but, as a matter of strict legal principle, he or she is required to do so. And that is so, regardless of s 33(1) of the Acts Interpretation Act. "

Note the statement at 51 that is repeated in 53, i.e., "A decision that involves jurisdictional error is a decision that lacks legal foundation and is properly regarded, in law, as no decision at all."

In addition, note this statement: "A fortiori in a case in which the decision in question exceeds constitutional power or infringes a constitutional prohibition." No member of the Australian Federal Parliament, or any other member of any other State or Territory Parliament, had the legal right to endanger the entire population by allowing the illegal introduction of the COVID-19 virus into the Commonwealth of Australia. Whilst Scott Morrison had the power to make decisions concerning the introduction of the COVID-19 virus into Australia, under Section 429.3 of the Biosecurity Act (2015) he was not authorized to do so.

[429] Biosecurity officer may give direction to biosecurity industry participant to manage biosecurity risks

(3) However, a direction under subsection (1) must not require the biosecurity industry participant to carry out an activity that the biosecurity industry participant is not qualified, or does not have the expertise or resources, to carry out.

Note the statutory constraints upon politicians and other decision-makers who made decisions that placed the entire nation in deadly peril.

1. "not qualified"
2. "does not have the expertise"
3. does not have the (required) "resources."

COVID-19 is a Category virus that the WHO had explicitly made very clear was a serious threat to the public on a global scale. At the time that Scott Morrison began making decisions as to how to cope with

the threat to the Australian public, he was not qualified to make such decisions, and had no expertise in regard to the decisions that needed to be made. In his submissions to the UK COVID 10 Inquiry, Sir Patrick Vallance, Britain's former Chief Science Officer, pointed out that the former Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, had experienced difficulty in comprehending the information that he was being provided with. Sir Partick also cited a phone call with some of his European Union counter-parts in which it was pointed out that a national leader had difficulty in comprehending exponential curves. This had resulted in laughter by all other Science Officers participating in the phone conversation as they were experiencing similar problems.

Serious questions need to asked as to the qualifications of the members of the AHPPC in regard to their qualifications and expertise for dealing with the COVID-19 threat, e.g., South Australia's Chief health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier is a paediatrician, not an expert in viral epidemiology, and therefore her suitability to provide advice is open to question. In testimony given under Oath at the Victoria inquiry into the Hotel quarantine disaster, which resulted in 768 reported deaths, statements were made that Scott Morrison overrode the advice of the AHPPC, and if this is correct.

The third criteria, adequate resources, were not present, e.g., Category A quarantine and treatment facilities that could be used to isolate individuals, as per the requirements of the International Health regulations (2005) did not exist and the decision to quarantine infected families in hotels was a commercial decision, not a medical decision. Similarly, in the absence of adequate Category A quarantine facilities resulted in a decision to "quarantine" infected or contaminated people in their domestic residences. This decision was a criminal act of reckless endangerment that was totally at odds with the meaning of "isolation" as defined in the IHR (2005):

"isolation" means separation of ill or contaminated persons or affected baggage, containers, conveyances, goods or postal parcels from others in such a manner as to prevent the spread of infection or contamination;"

The IATA's 'Dangerous Goods Regulations (DGR) cost Au$513.60 at the time of writing this statement and can be purchased from this URL:

https://www.iata.org/en/publications/dgr/

For the record, Airliner passengers are either suspected of being infected or contaminated with COVID-19 are 'dangerous goods and in order to meet the DGR, must meet the following requirements:

1. Weigh less than 100 grammes. (NOT Kilo-grammes)
2. Be secured in airtight, shock resistant, leakproof packaging.
3. Be appropriately labelled as a bio-hazard.

Since only a small foetus may weight 100 grammes or less, no adult or child who may be contaminated or infected with COVID-19 may board a commercial airliner. Australian tourists should have been repatriated to Australia on registered Medivac flights in aircraft that were equipped to cope with the transport of one or more persons who may be contaminated with COVID-19. The question as to who in Australia had the legal jurisdiction to override these supposedly binding international DGRs is very simple, i.e., no-person in Australia could legally override these regulations, but that is precisely what has been happening for almost 4-years and the consequence of exceeding jurisdictional authority is almost 12 million conformed cases of COVID-19, nearly 24,000 confirmed homicides, and hundreds of billions of dollars in damages to the national economy and to millions of individuals.

Consistent with the High Court's decisions at 51 and 53 in Bhardwaj, decisions were made about the management of the COVID-19 crisis that were not legally valid, i.e., in law, they were 'no decision at all." I would point out that this is equally valid with the decision to try and mediate the impact of the COVID-19 using known-to-be-lethal experimental mRNA-based vaccines that were inadequately and incorrectly tested. All claims by politicians and other public officials that these exceedingly dangerous substances were "proven safe and effective" violate federal and state dishonesty laws, e.g., Section 142(2) of the South Australian criminal code:

142—Dishonest exploitation of position of advantage
(1) This section applies to the following advantages:
(2) A person is guilty of an offence if the person dishonestly exploits an advantage to which this section applies in order to—
(a) benefit him/herself or another; or
(b) cause a detriment to another.
Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 10 years.

In South Australia, public officials who falsely claimed that the Pfizer vaccine was "proven safe and effective" face imprisonment for up to 10 years, PLUS more substantial penalties where the Pfizer vaccine caused serious or fatal harm, e.g., imprisonment for life for Pfizer triggered fatalities.

A recently released scientific report titled "N^1-methylpseudouridylation of mRNA causes +1 ribosomal frameshifting " has identified previously unexpected and unknown genetic 'frameshifting' in Pfizer's mRNA-based vaccine and this may be causing unknown health consequences that may not present for an unknown period of time. The broad range of proven-to-be-lethal side effects associated with the inadequately tested COVID-19 calls into question the jurisdictional limits of Chief health Officers, and politicians who, knowing that the standard 3 phase – five years testing protocols had not occurred, falsely claimed that the mRNA-based vaccines were "proven safe and effective.

The following statement is from a CDC Selected COVID-19 Adverse Events Safety Reported dated

A review of vaccine safety data in VAERS from December 2020–August 2021 found a small but increased risk of myocarditis after mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. Over 350 million mRNA vaccines were given during the study period and CDC scientists found that rates of myocarditis were highest following the second dose of an mRNA vaccine among males in the following age groups:

- 12–15 years (70.7 cases per one million doses of Pfizer-BioNTech)
- 16–17 years (105.9 cases per one million doses of Pfizer-BioNTech)
- 18–24 years (52.4 cases and 56.3 cases per million doses of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna, respectively)

This report further stated:

See below for counts of verified reports of myocarditis by age group.

- 5-11 years: 23 verified reports of myocarditis after 23,178,311 doses administered
- 12-15 years: 371 verified reports of myocarditis after 25,791,756 doses administered
- 16-17 years: 316 verified reports of myocarditis after 14,117,149 doses administered

More than 668 million doses of COVID-19 vaccines were administered in the United States from December 14, 2020, through January 26, 2023. During this time, VAERS received 18,977 preliminary reports of death (0.0028%) among people who received a COVID-19 vaccine.

Two months later, the death toll linked to the COVID-19 vaccines had risen to 19,476.

What is manifestly apparent is that in both government funded advertising campaigns and in the deadly mandated vaccination terrorist attacks, the public was denied the whole truth and therefore were denied the ability to make an informed decision about whether-or-not they should be vaccinated with these deadly substances, which are now linked to the Excess Deaths Pandemic. One of the unknown consequences of these vaccines, which governments around the world are stiving to keep unknown, is the long-term possibility that the death toll from the vaccines may exceed the death toll from the COVID-19 virus.

Citation #4: ASIC v Hellicar & Ors. (HCA 17, 3rd May 2012)
When it comes to the issue of jurisdiction concerning the facts and issues surrounding the illegal entry of the COVID-19 virus into Australia, and the serious and fatal harms caused by both the virus and the COVID-19 vaccines, as was the case with the illegal Robodebt claims, deciding the facts of the matter is the jurisdiction of the courts. The following citations are from paragraphs 141 – 143 of Hellicar:

[At 141] And insofar as the duty was said to stem from a proposition "that the public interest can only be served if the case advanced on behalf of [a] regulatory agency does in fact represent the truth, in the sense that the facts relied upon as primary facts actually occurred", that premise is false for at least two reasons.

142. First, the proposition ignores that even a criminal trial "is not, and does not purport to be, an examination and assessment of all the information and evidence that exists, bearing upon the question of guilt or innocence" Each side in a criminal trial "is free to decide the ground on which it or he will contest the issue, the evidence which it or he will call, and what questions whether in chief or in cross-examination shall be asked; always, of course, subject to the rules of evidence, fairness and admissibility". Proceedings for declaration of contravention or pecuniary penalty order engage no more stringent requirements.

143. Second, the proposition that the public interest requires that the facts upon which a regulatory agency relies must be facts that "actually occurred" appears to require the regulatory agency to make some final judgment about what "actually occurred" before it adduces evidence. Deciding the facts of the case is a court's task, not a task for the regulatory authority.

The above decision was known to the [then] Finance Minister, Senator Penny Wong, who cited it during a Radio National 'AM' broadcast on the morning of the 11th may 2012. However, when it came to Centrelink's automated 'alleged debt' claims, which were introduced by the Hawke Government circa 1990, Senator Wong, and the Gillard Government, along with the Coalition and the Australian Greens, studiously ignored the above Hellicar decision. This may explain the current quasi-secret federal police investigation into the serious and lethal harms caused by this traumatic, randomly deadly fraud; once a welfare recipient disputed Centrelink's claim, as can be clearly comprehended from the above Hellicar citation, jurisdiction for determining the facts of matter was ceded to the courts. However, at an average cost of $25,000 per court claim, and with at least one contested claim costing almost $600,000, the 'solution' was to 'skip the courts and simply defraud welfare recipients. As Attorney-General Brandis made quite clear in the short 3-minute documentary video that can be viewed at the following URL, any deaths caused by Centrelink's 'mistakes' were simply ignored and

dismissed because of the need for what Attorney-General Brandis described as “appropriate compliance measures.”

https://studio.youtube.com/video/UT_E7kefSew/edit

The problem with what Attorney-General Brandis had described as “appropriate compliance measures” was that on the 27th November 2019, in Amato v. the Commonwealth of Australia, (VID611/2019, Justice Jennifer Davies dismissed the automated alleged debt process, a.k.a. ‘Robodebt’ as “not lawful.”

NOT LAWFUL
Just as robodebt was “not lawful” and the deaths caused by this illegal abuse of public office were also not lawful, in the context of the following terrorist activity laws in Section 101.1 of the Commonwealth criminal code as defined under Section 100.1(2) (a – e), the death toll caused by the deliberate violation of these supposedly binding laws are also “not lawful”, which is why one of these deaths has been referred the South Australin police for investigation.

THE DOMINO EFFECT
A criminal investigation into just of the COVID-GATE homicides will almost certainly trigger a ‘domino effect’ chain reaction as every death in Australia will need to be investigated. In citing a statement made by Scott Morrison on the 18th may 2022, the day that [redacted] and I became infected with COVID-19, I would point out the current efforts by Donald Trump to persuade the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in Washington DC that in his (former) capacity as the President of the United States of America, he can kill with impunity because he (believes) that he has immunity from prosecution by the criminal justice system.

It would appear from the statement below that Scott Morrison, the State Premiers, and the Territory Chief Ministers were also like-minded in their belief that [redacted] anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia. Please consider the following statement very carefully, keeping in mind the adage that when you grab a tiger by the tail, you need an extremely cohesive and effect plan to deal with the tiger’s teeth and claws.

“Well, there's been 7,853 deaths where people have died with COVID in this country, there's been 200 - 2,376 in aged care since the pandemic started. There've been 65 deaths in the last 24 hours of people who died with COVID and 15 of those were in aged care. And every single one of these deaths, from the outset of this pandemic is a terrible loss for the families of those who have been lost. Now, you will also know that as the number of case numbers has risen, and that's what was always going to happen, as part of the national plan that we put together with the states and territories, the case numbers would rise, and there was some 53,000 case numbers yesterday.”
The Hon. Scott Morrison MP - Media conference: Armstrong Creek, Victoria 18th May 2022
[Source: Hansard media release.]

As pointed out previously, more than 15,700 people have died since Anthony Albanese was sworn in as the Prime Minister and since the deaths may be culpable homicides for which Anthony Albanese and his government may be legally liable, it is entirely inappropriate that he should have any involvement in any official inquiry into the serious and lethal harms caused by illegally exposing the entire population to what the World Health Organization had initially described classified as “the outbreak to be a public health emergency of international concern.”
[Source] WHO COVID-19 Situation Report #11: paragraph 1.

Since the laws of the Commonwealth are binding upon every person within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia, the question of law is what "clear words" in the binding laws of the Commonwealth validate the massive death toll that Scott Morrison spoke about and openly admitted to being partly responsible for causing? Likewise, what binding laws of the Commonwealth justify the massive death toll that has been caused by the government of Anthony Albanese failing to comply with the supposedly binding DGR and IHR (2005) obligations?

On the 6th March 2020, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the WHO issued a joint statement, a.k.a. the Montreal Directive, in which all member nations were directed to obey their "binding" obligations under the International Air Transport Association (ITAO) regulations and the International Health Regulations (IHR 2005). Since this would have immediately shut down international airlines around the world, most member nations, either totally ignored the directives, or made only a feeble, token response. Just 5 days later, on the 11th May 2020, the WHO issued Situation Report #51, which contained the following statement:

"WHO Director-General in his regular media briefing today stated that WHO has been assessing this outbreak around the clock and we are deeply concerned both by the alarming levels of spread and severity, and by the alarming levels of inaction. WHO therefore have made the assessment that COVID-19 can be characterized as a pandemic."

Note the criteria for this decision:

[1] "the alarming levels of spread and severity, "
[2] "the alarming levels of inaction."

A 15-minute video documentary that raises serious questions of law, both within Australia and internationally, provides insight into the earlier mismanagement of the COVID-19 pandemic and the emerging death toll caused by the known-and-admitted-to-be-lethal mRNA-based vaccines.

The Synthetic Pandemic
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3IK_4Q-E5k

Note that as of the 6th March 2020, globally, there were 98,192 confirmed COVID-19 deaths. However, just 5 days later, on the 11th March, when the CDC declared COVID-19 to be a global pandemic, the death toll had risen to 118,319, i.e., an increase of 20,127 deaths in just 5 days. At that rate, over a period of 1-year that extrapolated out to almost 1,470,000 probable deaths. It is therefore no surprise that the WHO promptly declared COVID-19 to be a global pandemic and also did not hesitate to point the finger of responsibility for this exploding, tourist induced synthetic pandemic, i.e., the national government that had, to use Boris Johnson's terminology, "Let it rip."

Note also that according to the CDC 's COVID-19 vaccine 'safety' report of 11th March 2021, there were 'just 1,913 deaths linked to the COVID-19 vaccines, which was well below the 19.476 that were reported in March 2023.

THE WUHAN FACTOR
On the 20th March 2020, [redacted] presented a webinar for post-doctorate students concerning recent research analyzing the 26,000 lab-confirmed COVID-19 cases in Wuhan until February 18, 2020. Titled Learning from 26,000 COVID-19 cases in Wuhan, the webinar provided expert insights into control measures that stabilized and reduced the spread of COVID-19. The data presented also made it very clear just how dangerous was for elderly members of the community and how relatively unaffected children were.

The webinar outlined a new research paper, "*Evolving Epidemiology and Impact of Non-pharmaceutical Interventions on the Outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China*" that had been written by researcher that [redacted] greatly respected, i.e., it had been researched and written by experts who welcomed this review by Professor Lin and her post-doctorate student.

Although the content was aided a people with somewhat higher professional qualifications in a field where I have little knowledge or expertise, [redacted] conduct of the webinar and her presentation of the data made the video suitable for viewing by senior secondary high school students studying maths, biology, human studies and agriculture, i.e., the information as presented did not require an advanced science degree in order to understand the key issues concerning control of the COVID-19 pandemic. Any administrative review or criminal investigation of the mismanagement of the COVID-19 in Australia should pay careful attention to the content of [redacted] webinar.

https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/china-health-partnership/2020/03/20/covid-wuhan-prof-lin-xihong/

This webinar also provides politically unpopular insight into how to effectively manage a future pandemic outbreak that involves a highly infectious disease, e.g., the need to totally isolate infected or potentially infected people and how to effectively triage very large numbers of suspected and confirmed cases.

OUTBREAK: HOW AUSTRALIA LOST CONTROL:
Conversely, for insight into how to totally and thoroughly mismanage a pandemic in as criminally negligent a way as is humanly possible, the following Australian Broadcasting Commission documentary video , 'OUTBREAK', should be forensically reviewed. Law professors, business management lecturers and human resource management lecturers may all find this video to be a first-rate learning tool that graphically demonstrates 'The Peter Principle.' A qualified teacher for 50-years with 35-years as a qualified animal husbandry teacher, what is manifestly evident in this video is that far too many of the top-level decision-makers lacked even the most basic insight, experience, competence and understanding of how to control a zoonotic outbreak in a 'herd' of people.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M9MPXCpyCnY&t=1587s

The decision-makers in this video also appeared to have zero comprehension of the profound legal consequences of the decisions that they were making. Consider for example, these statement from the OUTBREAK video in the context of reckless conduct and criminal negligence laws, and civil tort actions for reckless endangerment and unlawful homicide:

[redacted] "We know transmission is going through households, from household to household."

[redacted] "What we have seen during the outbreaks with Delta is that if one member of a household becomes infected with Covid-19 of the Delta variant, usually, all members of that household are being infected., so this was different with what we had been dealing with before."

[redacted] "It is increasingly unrealistic to just want zero Covid, because zero Covid means, you know, isolation for Australia and, and, and constant risks of outbreaks with importation. You know, we would be living with that for ever."

These 'experts' knew the risks posed by ignoring supposedly binding DGR and IHR (2005) obligations, and they also knew the potentially lethal risks of very high infection and death rates if infected people were not properly quarantined in Category A, level 4 containment and treatment facilities. Their

solutions involved destroying families in order to prop up the national economy, which was already being hammered as a consequence of the original unlawful decision to allow tourists and returning travellers to import the pandemic in Australia.

[redacted] clearly stated the correct solution to the problem, but in the same breath, revealed why the decision-makers would avoid doing what needed to be done.

"It is increasingly unrealistic to just want zero Covid, because zero Covid means, you know, isolation for Australia."

[redacted]

"it's actual going to be of benefit to us to have these outbreaks. They need to be better contained of course. we need to see the numbers coming down in New South Wales, but ultimately, of course, this going to teach us how to live with Covid in the health care system."

“Learn to live with Covid.”

[redacted]

[redacted] underpinning the mismanagement of the COVID-19 pandemic, please watch this documentary video:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eTGDJYA-qos

Please note:
I was alerted to the COVID-19 inquiry by an email from an independent member of the Federal parliament late yesterday afternoon and this is a kludged up, on-the-fly response that is primarily intended to alert you to the fact that, like the Robodebt inquiry, the COVID-19 inquiry will almost certainly be followed by a criminal investigation; indeed, that may be many such investigations once the legal profession comes to grips with the ramifications and scope of this criminal abuse of public office.

APPENDED DOCUMENTS (If they total less than 10 MB)

[1] [redacted] bizarre ‘Mathematical Modelling’ bioterrorist mass murder plot.
[2] WHO SITREP #51
[3] THE MONTREAL DIRECTIVES
[4] This report

Ronald Medlicott. Dip T., GDA. Cert IV FLM., Cert IV WPT (II)