

Office of the Crown

Lady Crown
Ngati Rangihou Corrangie Hapu
Rangihou, New Zealand Street, Paremata
C/O PO Box 9144
Harris Park NSW 2150



25th June 2019

Tim Castle
Sparke Helmore Lawyers
Level 29, MLC Centre, 19 Martin Place
Sydney NSW 2000



Sent via Email tim.castle@sparke.com.au
Hand delivered to Sparke Helmore Lawyers at Federal Court

Lady Crown & Anor ats Parramatta City Council Federal Court of Australia Proceedings No NSD711/2019 Our Ref: SHL19624

Dear Tim,

We refer to the Originating Process filed 8 May 2019 (the Originating Process) being an application to wind up 'Parramatta City Council' (amongst other prayers for relief and remedy) in the Federal Court of Australia.

We acknowledge your letter dated 19th June 2019, disrespectfully giving our party only 5 working days to respond (which is not in accordance with law), after seven years of solid correspondence, to and from the Parramatta City Council, and your plans to try to dismiss the originating process prior to the court hearing on the 26th June, 2019.

From the outset, we strongly urge you seek remedy and negotiation with us concerning the proceedings. We are aware that you are planning to seek summary judgment against Lady Crown (live sovereign de jure) and Office of the Crown (entity), therefore following is our rebuttal to your letter and plans to subpoena the Commissioner of Taxation and the Attorney General, to validate the '*local government entity*' status of the Parramatta City Council, trading name and company ABN 49 907 174 773.

1. The Debtor 'Parramatta City Council'

1.1 We understand that you are referring to the Parramatta City Council as the City of Parramatta however a recent check of the trading name via ASIC and the Australian Business Register (ATO) clearly lists the 'City of Parramatta Council' with the ABN, trading as Parramatta City Council, entity type 'Local Government Entity', GST

- registered.
- 1.2 We draw your attention to the Letter from Attorney General to Mr Thompson dated 8th July 2010 which states “The constitution does not currently recognise local government”. That means that the City of Parramatta Council and the Parramatta City Council is not recognized in the constitution and invalid. Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.3 We draw your attention to a Letter from Attorney General to Mr Thompson 8th July 2010 regarding 1988 Referendum to amend section 128 constitution “119A. Each state shall provide for the establishment & continuance of a system of local government with local government bodies elected in accordance with the laws of the State & empowered to administer, and to make by laws, for their respective areas in accordance with the laws of the State.” 87% of voters, voted NO to giving recognition to local government. Therefore it is clear that no system of local government exists in law within the commonwealth of Australia, therefore INVALID. Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.4 Therefore Parramatta City Council is a private trading company masquerading as a local government entity with an ABN 49 907 174 773 which has in fact no authority. 1988 decision was “All councils now operate with no Head of Power” hence why they have a CEO. No Legal standing under the constitution, therefore INVALID. Refer to https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1011/11RP10#_Toc284229067 and annexure v.
 - 1.5 The Australian Government Corporate Seal for the Australian Business Register where Parramatta City Council is registered bares the seal of a private company (implies ownership). The Great Seal of Australia is used by the COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA private corporation registered with the Securities Exchange Commission in Washington DC ABN: 122104616 masquerading as government, therefore INVALID. Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.6 The Australian Business Registration classification for Parramatta City Council states it is registered as a ‘Local Government Entity’, however no local government exists under the constitution, therefore invalid. Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.7 The COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA has No Authority. High Court Decision: Re Wakin 1999. Ramifications of the court's decision “every decision made by a federal court exercising state jurisdiction was INVALID.” Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.8 Parliament of Australia is a private corporation ABN:52 997 141 147, subsidiary company and the COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA – No Authority – High Court Decision: Re Wakin 1999, therefore INVALID. Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.9 The **Government in the Constitution of 1900** is named ‘**Government of the Commonwealth**’. It was not amended in the 1988 Referendum therefore the *Australian Government, Parliament of Australia and Commonwealth of Australia* are all invalid entities. Refer to annexure v.
 - 1.10 Section 9, Chapter 1 Para 1 Paragraph 4 “The provision of this Constitution relating to the Governor-General extend and apply to the Governor-General...to administer the **Government of the Commonwealth.**”
 - 1.10.1 Therefore the Administrator of the **Government of the Commonwealth** is the Governor-General, and

- 1.10.2 Therefore the Governor-General was commissioned by the Queen of Australia who doesn't exist, is not living and is an artificial creation/persona, therefore invalid, and
- 1.10.3 Therefore the Governor-General is reliant upon the Office of Governor-General, and
- 1.10.4 Therefore the Office of the Governor-General is reliant upon Letters Patent passed under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, constituting the Office of Governor-General and Commander in Chief of the Commonwealth of Australia dated 29 Oct 1900, and
- 1.10.5 NO LETTERS PATENT exists dated 29 Oct 1900, and
- 1.10.6 Therefore the Office of the Governor-General is invalid, and
- 1.10.7 Therefore an Unlawful & Illegitimate Government exists with no basis in law. Refer to Attachment E.
- 1.10.8 In summary 1919 sovereignty was transferred from the British people and parliament to the Australia People. Australia became a Sovereign Nation. 1999 High Court of Australia ruled that the United Kingdom was a foreign power for the purpose of Section 44 of the Commonwealth Constitution when the Constitution is the legislation of the Parliament of the United Kingdom alone. Hence the legal reference for the Australian Courts as 'Alice in Wonderland'.
- 1.11 With respect to us being the true guardians of the land, unrebutted and validated, and the Parramatta City Council being the tenant, be advised that we have received letters from the Parramatta City Council on:
 - 1.11.1 20th March 2013, and
 - 1.11.2 22th April 2013, and
 - 1.11.3 29th May 2013, and
 - 1.11.4 30th May 2013, and
 - 1.11.5 3rd June 2013, and
 - 1.11.6 5th July 2013, and
 - 1.11.7 3rd March 2014, and
 - 1.11.8 5th March 2014, and
 - 1.11.9 17th October 2013, and
 - 1.11.10 10th October 2014, and
 - 1.11.11 13th November 2014, and
 - 1.11.12 22nd July 2015.
 - 1.11.13 Only recently did we receive a letter with the change of entity to 'City of Parramatta' dated the 14th January 2019
- 1.12 The fact that the council has only recently decided to change their name on the letters to us, makes no difference, as the burden of proof lies in the many letters from Parramatta City Council previously, acknowledging our existence, the asbestos issue, the ownership to the land and the originating process in question.
- 1.13 Be advised that we will confidently ask the registrar of the Federal Court if your client is a Trading Company or not.
- 1.14 Be advised that we have confidently asked the ATO if your client is a Trading Company – ATO response was Yes, they are a local government entity, registered for

GST with the ATO on the Australian Business Register which is managed by the ATO, also stating that the City of Parramatta Council is only an entity name.

- 1.15 Be advised that we are confident that if we subpoena the Commissioner of the ATO he will support the findings on the Australia Business Register, supported by financial audits. Please see annexure a attached.
- 1.16 Thereafter Chris Drury from Sparke Helmore Lawyers then presented in court on behalf of and representing the Parramatta City Council. If he was not representing the Parramatta City Council, then why did he turn up and lodge in court that he was representing the Parramatta City Council on his Notice of Adjournment and Notice of Appearance dated 5th June 2019? We draw your attention to *Mirvac Homes Pty Ltd v Parramatta City Council* [1999] NSWLEC 239 41 as a case that proves they exist in law.
- 1.17 With regards to Rik Hart, he too is a corp-oration (dead man speaking) that Chris Drury from Sparke Helmore Lawyers represented in court and again lodged his name again into court on the Notice of Adjournment and Notice of Appearance dated 5th June 2019. Fact is Rik Hart the birth certificate means person, dead, still born, deceased. Births, Deaths, Marriages, and Relationships Registration Act 1995, sections 63(2)(c), 64(1)(c), 65(3), and 66(1)(b). The interpretation of name, is specified by the registered person as a trading name in the person's application for registration under the Act. We are unsure if this was to get the corporation Rik Hart on the court record so as to charge his birth certificate or simply a mistake on Chris Drury's behalf. However we raise the question as to why Chris Drury pointed out to the registrar in court that Rik Hart was not a corporation on three occasions, then filed a two notices in court with Rik Hart as a debtor/respondent, which validates that Rik Hart is a corporation as per the lawyers notices and the Births Deaths and Marriages Act.
- 1.18 We assume that the recent change of name to the City of Parramatta, is to divert the matter to an entity which is an artificial entity, without assets, also known as a dead, artificial entity.
- 1.18.1 If the Parramatta City Council is now claiming to be a dead entity that owns land, then that cannot be. We will be calling on the registrar of the federal court to identify the true sovereign that is standing on the land, that claims to OWN the land, as stated in the letters from the Parramatta City Council dated 5th March 2014, 10th October 2014 and 13th November 2014. The 'Parramatta City Council' makes the claim that they own the land, not the 'City of Parramatta'.. A dead or artificial entity cannot own land. *"Will the true Crown please stand"*.
- 1.19 We are aware that the council is holding strong with the Local Government Act 1993 (NSW) (the Local Government Act) in their hand. If this is their legal standing, we draw your attention to the three Referendums 1974, 1988 and 1999.
- 1.19.1 The Referendums in 1974 and 1988 specifically asked the people to say 'Yes or No'to Local Governments (Councils) being continued and whether new Councils could be formed - the continuance of and establishment of. The people voted an overwhelming NO, thus all Councils that may have existed, became unlawful. They are not a part of Government and are nothing more

than Private ABN companies. They pretend to be Government when clearly they are not.

- 1.19.2 By not recognizing the peoples decision is contempt by politicians and councils. A Federal Referendum of the people is an explicitly binding Act on all Governments. By not listening to the voice of the people via Federal Referendums they have enacted treason upon themselves.
- 1.19.3 City of Parramatta trading as Parramatta city council (abn 49 907 474 773) and CEO, with their by-laws have no basis in law, no head of power and no authority (the rule of law in Australia) (see hume doors & timber v logan shire council – case: questions head of power).
- 1.19.4 HCA 11. 2015 states that, “If the council has an ABN and provides services for money, they are a Trading Company”. That cannot be changed or over-ruled by any Statute or Act.
- 1.19.5 Local Government, ABN companies, “If the council has an ABN and they employ people, they are a Company”. Companies require a written contract with full disclosure to do business with anyone. “Fair Work Act Sec 35. Parramatta city council employs staff and has never given full disclosure.
- 1.19.6 Under section 44 it states that a person may be disqualified if they are :(is) under any acknowledgment of allegiance, obedience, or adherence to a foreign power, or is a subject entitled to the rights or privileges of a subject of a foreign power. This includes the HM Queen Elizabeth who is a constitutional monarch, foreign to Australia and the Queen of Australia who is an invalid entity, not a person, artificial entity.
- 1.19.7 Prior to 1900, there were no States, they were known as Colonies and were all independent under British military law. Those independent Colonies had agreements for trade, etc under the Federal Councils of Australasia Act 1855. As free settlers began to grow in number, the People decided to unite under one form of government. Years of conventions and referendums were held and in 1898–1900 culminated in the Draft Constitution of the People which went to England for ratification. On July 9, 1900, Queen Victoria signed the amended draft Constitution and returned it to Australia. It was approved by the people and **The Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK)** was brought into Australian law on 1st January 1901 to become the Founding and Primary law for all now named States and Governments, Courts, Police and People, over and above anything in previous State or Colony laws.
- 1.19.8 The states did not have and currently do not have authority or power to make acts or laws that are not mentioned within the Commonwealth of the Australia Constitution Act, PERIOD.... Sections 106, 107, 108, and 109 created the states. Read them, they are all bound by Clause 5, Operation of the Constitution and Laws states ***“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."

- 1.19.9 The Parliament has no powers except for those given by us, the people of the **Commonwealth of Australia**. Parliament cannot add new laws nor give any powers to States or any private company without a Referendum and then it must be proclaimed and gazetted showing the dates of such.
- 1.19.10 Furthermore, Section 109 also nullifies every new "law" since 1900 in any State contrived "Local Government Acts," (none of which have been lawfully proclaimed, nor gazetted, nor approved by Referendum, including the notorious Australia Act 1986.) It states "***When a law of a State is inconsistent with a law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid***". This is spelled out clearly in – Sec 9A of the Acts interpretation Act 1954 which is still current.
- 1.19.11 Local councils are registered on the Stock Exchange as private companies and thus as private companies have no authority under the constitution or legislation to act in any capacity, or enforce any legislation or other functions whatsoever, including no authority to impose taxes disguised as fines for anything, including parking, licenses for animals, or Land Tax Rates.
- 1.19.12 Treasurer Peter Howard Costello & Commissioner for Taxation Michael Joseph Carmody all stated before the introduction of the infamous GST "Goods and Services Tax", Quote: "Local government Council Rates will attract no GST because Council Rates are a tax and we can't tax a tax".
- 1.19.13 Therefore, the council falsely claiming to be a government body does not have authority to collect taxes. Clearly in sections 51 and 52 of the Constitution and from the Constitutional Commission (1985 – 1988) Report that "The power of taxation is held exclusively by the Federal Parliament.", and therefore no states have authority under the constitution to impose a tax.
- 1.19.14 Thus, Local Government does not have the power to impose taxes in the form of fines or land tax rates. All taxes imposed by Local Councils are unlawful and repugnant.
- 1.19.15 The High Court of Australia ruled that "State Governments could not raise ANY TAX", and because of this the 'State Excise on Fuel, Tobacco & Alcohol' was removed.
- 1.19.16 The Australia Acts 1985 and 1986 (request Acts only) created the unlawful Local Governments. The real Queen Elizabeth the Second signed on the top of the front page of those "Acts", which means she acknowledged, but she did not sign the bottom. She told Hawke and the Australian Government – "you must ask the people." So, we then had a Referendum in 1999, where those two Acts and everything in them were overwhelmingly rejected. ***Thus, the inclusion of Local Government – (Local Councils) as a third tier of Government was rejected and they remain unlawful today.*** They are nothing more than ABN private companies. Confirmation is the Parramatta City Council have a CEO named Rik Hart, who was not elected

and obviously is not answerable to no one, except their United Nation bosses, yet they control and manipulate the elected local Councillors.

- 1.19.17 The 1999 Referendum totally invalidates all Local Government Acts to this day. No new legislation can alter the fact that Councils in the form of Constitutional Government cannot lawfully exist. We the people said, NO, three times.
- 1.19.18 Thus, State Governments have no authority to create any laws which contravene anything in the true Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901. Nor do they have powers to give to ABN companies any powers the State does not have. Section 109 removes the “anything” and everything whatsoever in any previous Acts regarding Local Councils being any part of government. They remain to this day as private ABN companies – nothing more.
- 1.19.19 HCA 1942 (uniform tax case) chief justice latham: “the words “under the constitution” are words of limitation and qualification, not all enactments purporting to be laws made by the parliament are binding; but laws made under, in pursuance of, and within the authority conferred by the constitution, and those only, are binding on the courts, judges, and the people. A law in excess of the authority conferred by the constitution is no law; it is wholly void and inoperative; it confers no rights, it imposes no duties; it affords no protection.
- 1.19.20 The act itself is binding without limitation or qualification because it is passed by the sovereign parliament (UK), but the laws passed by the parliament of the commonwealth, a subordinate parliament, must be within the limits of the delegation of powers or they will be null and void”.
- 1.19.21 Sir Harry Gibbs, high court judge and chief justice, quoted: “i therefore have come to the conclusion that the current legal and political system in use in Australia and its states and territories has no basis in law”.
- 1.19.22 Claiming a “Commission from the Government” is an admission of Treason. The 1999 Referendum removed the Australia Act 1985 and 1986 and all Acts regarding Local Government, and the attempt to establish a Republic. All Council Staff, CEOs and Councillors are accessories to the Crime and guilty of misprision of treason. Three referendums means there cannot be another local government referendum. That is a fact of unequivocal law.
- 1.19.23 The result of three referendums 1974, 1988, 1999, therefore quoting any Local Government Acts, which have no basis or authority under the laws of the land, is rejected and unlawful. Therefore the council is continuing to operate and perpetuate any and all private money systems, issuing, collection, legal enforcement systems and, any and all slavery systems of and against any and all peoples.
- 1.19.24 An act of wilful treason is the New South Wales Anglican Church of Australia Act 1976 No.21
- 1.20 If the Local Government Act is unlawful and illegal as a result to the referendums 1974, 1988 and 1999, we refute your suggestion to draw our attention

to sections and acts thereafter that are unlawful and illegal, period.

- 1.21** All the above was deliberately done to remove all RIGHTS from the people of the Commonwealth of Australia as established UNDER the **Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901**.
- 1.22 Every State created a Local Government Act by joining the Commonwealth of Australia as a sovereign, independent and federal nation enforced in the Australia Act 1986 Commonwealth. **Local Government Act 1993 No 30 New South Wales**
- 1.23 All State Governments by joining the Commonwealth as a sovereign, independent and federal nation took ownership of all land.
- 1.24 Lands Acquisition Act 1973, No. 208 (C'lth) of 19th December 1973 which created their own "Australian Land".
- 1.25 4 (1) Section 7 of the Principal Act is amended** – by omitting from sub-section (1) the words "The Governor-General" and substituting the words "The Minister" = **treason**.
- 1.26 In the 1999 Referendum, we the people also voted to remain a Constitutional Monarchy – We are not a democracy (mobocracy). A lynch mob is a democracy – the majority wants to hang the minority. WE, the People of the Commonwealth of Australia remain a Constitutional Monarchy under English Common Law. **But above all is God's law in the KJV 1611**.
- 1.27 The Political Parties have had their 3 attempts at having City and Regional Councils recognized as legitimate Local Governments through Federal Referendum but, they failed. However, like wolves in sheep clothing they still want it and have used many forms of veiled sophistry at their disposal to try and fool the people of Australia and through stealth rob them of their inalienable rights and freedoms as guaranteed by the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901. This shows the utter contempt these Politicians and Lawyers have, as they don't really recognize us, the people.
- 1.28 A Federal Referendum of the people is an explicitly binding Act on all Governments.**
- 1.29 This also proves that these Australian Governments don't represent the people of the Commonwealth of Australia as established UNDER the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901, as Proclaimed and Gazetted. When Governments don't listen to the voice of the people via Federal Referendums they enact **Treason** upon themselves.
- 1.30 Section 128 of the Constitution provides that any proposed law to alter the Constitution *must* be passed by an absolute majority in both Houses of the Commonwealth Parliament. If passed by both Houses it is submitted to a referendum at least two months, but less than six months, after it has been passed by Parliament.
- 1.31 Under the superior Imperial Law – Transfer of Land Act ... transfers land from the Crown to you in Fee Simple. Only a Jury of 12 can order removal of ownership: **Clause 39 Magna Carta**.
- 1.32 In Referendums 74 and 88 we said no continuance – no establishment – no empowerment – Councils have no lawful right to exist as Local Government.

- 1.33 Further demand under Sect 42 CRIMES ACT 1914 – SECT 42. Conspiracy to defeat justice (1) A person commits an offence if: (a) the person conspires with another person to obstruct, to prevent, to pervert or to defeat the course of justice in relation to a judicial power; and (b) the judicial power is the judicial power of the Commonwealth.
- 1.34 Crimes Act Sec 80 1.AA Life Imprisonment – deprived of assets.
- 1.35 Three Referendums = cannot have another Local Government Referendum. That is a Fact of Unequivocal Law: As a member and others as a British (British = a Hebrew word meaning “Covenant Man” or “Man of the Covenant”) Subject with one share in the Company of the Commonwealth of Australia, that all Judges, Magistrates, Lawyers, Police, Governor Generals, Attorney Generals, and Politicians, have at Law a requirement to take the **Oath of Office for Allegiance to the Crown**, (King David’s Crown) of the covenant to **maintain the Laws of God** found in the first five books of the King James Bible 1611 from this all man-made legislation is strictly prohibited. This is the **Law of Oath to the B.A.R. “British Accreditation Registry”** All above must report to the British Monarch who is the Head of the B.A.R. which clearly orders all the above to **obey the “Laws of God” This is the Law**, and why the King James Bible 1611 is the only instrument at Law for a Court to Sit in competent jurisdiction.
- 1.36 We draw your attention to the Lady Crown’s Affidavit dated 27th May 2019 which clearly outlines her disciple-ship of Ambassador of the lord, Jesus Christ and God. She walks all lands as a servant of God for she is anointed.
- 1.37 Truth is truth, Fact is fact. God’s laws and the law’s of the land are one. Anything else are only man made laws.

2. The Creditor ‘Lady Crown’

- 2.1 We draw your attention to the Criminal Code Act 1995 Aust 9.5 regarding the Claim of Right. Lady Crown’s Affidavit clearly outlines the Claim of Right for Lady Crown aka Crown, referencing the annexure m dated 4th February 2019 which is in accordance with law. Unrebutted by the Council and Prime Minister of Australia.
- 2.2 We confirm that Lady Crown is the legal and lawful name for the Creditor. ‘Lady’ referring to the ‘sovereign de jure woman’ and ‘Crown’ as recorded with births deaths and marriages. *The true living Crown in Right.*
- 2.3 We confirm that Lady Crown and the Hapu refers to the *live and living sovereign de jure woman* and her family group.
- 2.4 We suggest that should any third party bring charges, fines or fees against Lady Crown the ‘*live sovereign de jure*’ that they be deposited and charged to the Registrar General NZ on behalf of the dead name, accepted for value to the order of the Birth Certificate 699/70, in accord and satisfaction, by accommodation with the cestui que trust, whereby the guarantee or indemnity is \$10,000,000. Administration Act 1969, 68 Bondsmen and sureties deemed to be trustees.
- 2.5 We confirm that Lady Crown owns nothing.
- 2.6 We confirm that the Office of the Crown and Ngati Rangihou Corrangie Hapu owns

nothing.

- 2.7 With respect to the creditors address, the federal court accepted the PO Box and has not requested anything in writing. If required, we will present the information to the court.

3. Originating Process

- 3.1 You state that the originating process is defective, frivolous and vexatious. With that in mind, it should be easy for you, as a lawyer, to rebut the affidavits immediately and without further ado.

- 3.1.1 Therefore we request the true bill of sale for Rangihou. This should be easy to obtain from your client, which would then, without doubt, absolutely make our reclamation defective, frivolous or vexatious. However if your client is unable to produce a true bill of sale for Rangihou, then our reclamation would be true, validated and affirmed.
- 3.1.2 Furthermore we have requested many rebuttals from the council for seven years in writing. To date your client has not produced a rebuttal in writing. The only rebuttal has been in 21st March 2019 whereby the council utilised the services and bullying tactics of the police **force** to illegally force us off our sacred and holy consecrated lands, and thereafter a verbal and intimidating rebuttal from Chris Drury in the federal court hallway on 5th June 2019.
- 3.1.3 Furthermore we request that you rebut the fact that this ***'first true gifting of land'*** from one First Nations People to another First Nation's People in Australia's history didn't happen. (Original invoice).
- 3.1.4 Furthermore we request that you rebut the dumping of asbestos on Rangihou. (Original invoice).
- 3.1.5 Whereas it is not acceptable that the council are guilty of seven years of ignorance, tacit admission and no rebuttal to all notices, invoices defaults, commercial liens and statutory demands.
- 3.1.6 Whereas it is not acceptable that the council are guilty of seven years of disrespecting, ignoring, falsifying claims that the children are not buried at Rangihou and statements that our reclamation is erroneous and not legitimate, without a written rebuttal.
- 3.1.7 Whereas it is not acceptable that the council are guilty of economic, cultural and land damages pursuant to: diminution, impairment, desecration of our rangihou sacred and holy consecrated land, burial sites and land marks without our approval - diminution of connection and traditional attachment to land and intangible disadvantages of damages to standing on the land - to living on the land - to building on the land - gaining spiritual and material sustenance from the land - worshipping on the land - attending to our burials and memorials on the lands - travelling over and across our sacred consecrated lands - foraging

on our lands - gathering on our lands - using gods natural gifts of food on our lands - living peacefully in our domicile in our dwellings and structures - undertaking cultural activities on our lands - undertaking ceremonies on our lands - holding meetings and protecting our sacred sites, holy and tapu (spiritual restrictions/prohibited) land marks and sharing our lands with the public for humanitarian purposes.

- 3.1.8 Therefore it is reasonable that damages be claimed for being forced off, severed from our rangihou lands on the 21st march 2019 which were possessed, declared sacred and holy in a consecration ceremony on Sunday 17th march 2019 in the eyes of God.
- 3.1.9 Therefore it is reasonable that damages be claimed and responsible persons be charged, in accordance with law, for forcing, intimidating, and trespassing the true guardians of the lands, by council managers, illegally impersonating government agents on the 21st march 2019 without lawful documents, standard of proof, true bill of sale, notice of rebuttal or a warrant.
- 3.1.10 Therefore it is reasonable that damages be claimed for land stolen from the Burramattagal people and true guardians, the Mauri people.
- 3.1.11 Therefore it is reasonable that damages be claimed for significant deaths of the Burramattagal people due to stolen lands.
- 3.1.12 If our reclamation is defective, frivolous, vexatious, erroneous and not legitimate, then God will make the final judgement upon all who continue to conspire with another person to obstruct, to prevent, to pervert or to defeat the course of justice in relation to a judicial power, against a 'live sovereign de jure woman' and against sacred and holy consecrated lands which were placed into the hands of another guardian, being King Te Ruki Kawiti 1811.
- 3.2 Regarding the **section 459E** of the Corporations Act, the originating process has been served on the company that states it **owns the land**, which is the 'Parramatta City Council.'
- 3.3 Regarding the **debt**, we the true guardians of the land invoiced the Parramatta City Council for the illegal dumping of asbestos and theft of stolen land. This is due to No True Bill of Sale. The council's actions thereafter included covering up the asbestos with a blanket and plants, which again confirms that the Parramatta City Council acknowledged the letters and tried to cover up their illegal dumping. They responded in writing to their actions.
- 3.4 If the Council is not a company, then why have they been acting and writing as a company with an ABN and with various CEO's being Robert Lang, Greg Dyer and now Rik Hart.
- 3.5 Section 2.3 of your letter states that our basis for relief is without merit. Seizing the council's assets or demanding payment is not outside the scope of the law for reasonable repayment to the true guardians of the lands, due to damages, theft, stolen lands, being forced off our lands and being repugnant.

3.6 Be advised that we are privy, and will present in court, recent correspondence (May 2019) from the City of Parramatta, to an owner (individual) in the Parramatta region, that threatens a maximum penalty of \$5 million dollars for non-compliance for an offence under the Act, for a Tier 1 offence and compliance costs. Our method of recovery for stolen lands and asbestos dumping is the exact same process of recovery for an offence and compliance costs (fees and interest) as the council. Therefore we confirm that our debt recovery method, is in accordance with law and in fact, \$60 Million is under charged for this type of offence. The Parramatta City Council CEO also got away with 7 years imprisonment for this offence. And it is for this very reason that they think they are above the law, gathering partners in crime such as yourselves. We draw your attention to ICAC corruption enquiries whereby Jerrold Cripps says “no one is above the law”.

<https://www.abc.net.au/am/content/2013/s3815576.htm>

3.6.1 We draw your attention to the website <https://www.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/living-community/clean-up/illegal-dumping> whereby the City of Parramatta states: Illegal dumping is the unlawful. Those found guilty of illegal dumping face fines or fees in excess of \$500 and up to \$250,000. Asbestos dumping Fine \$5,000,000 or 7 years Imprisonment.

3.6.2 We draw your attention to <https://rangihousacredburialsite.wordpress.com/illegal-dumping-of-asbestos-at-rangihou-1a-morton-street-by-parramatta-city-council/>. We received an email from Riding Darren JP, Investigator, Regional Illegal Dumping Squad Western Sydney, regarding the Asbestos Dumping whereby he states that the Parramatta City Council informed him that works on the site have been initiated (arranged). Here is confirmation and validation that Parramatta City Council accepted responsibility as they covered up the area with a fibre blanket and plants, hoping we would go away. Fact is, we the true guardians of the lands fined them in accordance with law, \$60 million for damages. Written in Fact and Unrebutted.

3.7 Section 2.4 of your letter states that we are not open to relief. Fact is that we have always offered relief and remedy in all letters, notices, invoices, commercial liens, defaults and statutory demands from Lady Crown and parties. Your statement of relief is incorrect.

3.8 Our reclamation of land is clear. Chris Drury stated in person in the court hallway that we are in the wrong jurisdiction and that we need to make a claim. Fact is, we are not making a new claim to the land, as the land was given to Mauri King Te Ruki Kawiti in 1811. We are reclaiming the land from the Parramatta City Council and any other party that chooses to be added to the list of corporation bodies such as the City of Parramatta Council. Our originating process is in the correct jurisdiction.

4. Not Engaging and Irrelevant material

- 4.1 Section 3.1 of your letter relates to not engaging. Fact is that the council have not engaged at any point to rebut any affidavits, notices, invoices, commercial liens, defaults or statutory demands. All letters of reply have been short and irrelevant to the content of the notices of rebuttal.
- 4.2 To go onto say that the affidavits are replete with irrelevant material, are almost entirely inadmissible and objectionable and do not serve to bring about any reasonable prospect of success, is laughing in the face of God. To turn a blind eye to Lady Crown and her sworn affidavits, then swear on the bible in a court room, we remind you that Jesus 'Yeshua' is her suretiship. Therefore because she is anointed as his Ambassador in perpetuity, he will not leave anyone unpunished who misuse his name in vain. Deut 5:11. *"Do not touch his anointed, the one walking with God psalms 34:17-22 For Yeshua comes after her"*
- 4.3 Lady Crown's affidavit is my solemn expression of her truth in the eye's of Our Heavenly Father God.
- 4.4 If her affidavit is unrebutted, it stands as truth in law.
- 4.5 If her reclamation of land, to the sovereign lands of Rangihou, Australia, Rangihoua and Aotearoa (ground, soil, earth, fields, meadows, pastures, woods, moors, waters, marshes, furies and heath) is unrebutted, it stands as truth in law.
- 4.6 If her affidavit is unrebutted, it becomes a judgment in law.
- 4.7 In commerce for this matter to be resolved, it must be expressed.
- 4.8 He who does not deny, admits.
- 4.9 He who fails to assert his rights has none.
- 4.10 Lien is a claim which can be satisfied by: 1. someone rebutting it, 2. another affidavit of his own and 3. A rebuttal point by point.
- 4.11 *"No man can serve two masters. You will like one more than the other or be more loyal to one than the other." You cannot serve both God and Money.*
- 4.12 You either stand with God and the Natural Laws of our God, or under man made Laws.
- 4.13 We will each be judged according to the words of Jesus, and so it is or each of us to make our own decisions and choices in relation to his words. *"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12:48*
- 4.14 *"For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matthew 12:50*
- 4.15 We draw your attention to the annexure n and Exhibit LC6.

5 Dismissal

- 5.1 The council's reasons for dismissal are not in alignment with our originating process application. In fact it is highly disrespectful towards Lady Crown, our Ambassador for the Lord Jesus 'Yeshua'.

6 Settlement Offer

- 6.1 In the circumstances and to avoid the costs of having to seek summary judgement, Lady Crown and on behalf of Ngati Rangihou Corrangie Hapu makes the following open offer of settlement without any admission:

6.1.1 Recognition and Acknowledgement

- 6.1.1.1 **Lady Crown & Ngati Rangihou Corrangie Hapu** be formally recognised and acknowledged in writing as the true guardians of Rangihou with the Barramattagul people as the traditional custodians of these lands.

- 6.1.1.2 **Rangihou Lands** be recognised as the first true gifting of land in Australia's History, and only gifting, from One First Nations People to another being the Originee Barramuttagul Chief Corrangie to the Mauri Nation, Mauri King Te Ruki Kawiti (Ngati Manu). Also recognised and acknowledged as a significant historical and sacred site of cultural significance, national significance to the Mauri Nation. Land originally gifted from Paramount Barramuttagul Chief Corrangie, adopted son of the Rev Samuel Marsden. Also significant because of the connection between the Rev Samuel Marsden, Mauri King Hongi Hika, Mauri King Te Pahi, Mauri Chief Ruatara and Mauri Chief Korokoro.

- 6.1.1.3 **Rangihou Burials** acknowledgement and memorials.

- 6.1.1.4 **Rodd Island Burials** acknowledgement and memorials.

- 6.1.1.5 **Ratana Carvings** at Callan Park to be recognised and acknowledged as a significant historical and sacred site of cultural significance, national significance to the Mauri Nation and Ratana faith in Aotearoa

6.1.2 Land Settlement

- 6.1.2.1 **Return Rangihou Lands 112 Acres** – Caveat over private properties. Buy back properties from private owners (tenants on the land) and return to creditors.

- 6.1.2.1.1 **Plus another 112 acres** of uninhabited land on the river for development to creditors in allodial title - *Includes Baludarri Land (Est 20 acres), James Ruse Reserve (Est 5 Acres), Rodd Island, Balmain (Est 6 Acres), 45 Asquith Street, Silverwater (620sqm), 116 Macquarie Street (Est 600sqm), Deakin Park Silverwater (Est 1 Acre), Callan Park Ratana Rock Carvings, Rozelle (Est 20 Acres), Plus 4 levels or 4,000sqm of office space plus 80 car spaces, Plus Events and*

Sports venues made available free of charge.

- 6.1.2.1.2 **'Land' to be held in allodial title or equivalent** - *No encumbrances, no hindrances, no duties, no jurisdiction, no notices, no leases, no land locked, not cut off from the road system or essential services water, power, gas, waste. Land includes 6 Foot below the land. No Parking collections on our streets. No Council or Aust Government Jurisdiction on this land. Tax exempt from all land taxes and rates. Council to pay for all costs to legally transfer lands as proposed. No toxic lands and Asbestos to be removed from Rangihou.*

7 Compensation Settlement Offer

- 7.1 Compensation Payment - 0.5% of Statutory Demand.
7.2 Immediate payment of \$208 million as part payment of statutory demand.
7.3 Yearly payment of \$208 million for every year that the council delays returning Rangihou to Lady Crown.

8 Adjournment and Remedy

- 8.1 The creditors consent to an order that the proceedings will be adjourned with no order as to costs, such that each party will agree to bear their own legal costs on the 26th June 2019.
8.2 This offer is an offer of remedy and will remain open for acceptance until **Wednesday 21st August 2019 11am.**

9 Legal Representation, Costs & Charges

- 9.1 Be advised that we currently have several options available to us for legal representation and at this stage, time is required for us to inform them accordingly about the originating process. We will supply you with our legal counsel details prior to the August 2019 court hearing.
9.2 Lady Crown will rely upon this letter in support of an application for costs on an indemnity basis. Should the council make a claim for legal costs against Lady Crown, refer to points 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 of this letter.

10 Lady Crown Authority

- 10.1 Herein remains the woman, Lady Crown, standing on the Land, Crown Land with divine right and authority, above and below, having received no objection or court action, to all notices of rebuttal and land occupancy intentions, sent to the Australian & New Zealand Governments and Councils.
10.2 Therefore be it known that any and all courts of Australia and New Zealand will refuse any action or charges brought against Lady Crown since by

acquiescence, all parties tacitly honoured the divine right and authority of Lady Crown through her Claim of Right.

10.3 Fact remains that the permanent estoppels by acquiescence now stands in perpetuity. Thus barring any and all officers and/or prosecutors from bringing charges against Lady Crown, under any Act or Statutes as all notices and claims were not responded to in the stated fashion; in the time stated; or as requested.

10.4 Therefore Lady Crown will assert her full powers, rights, authority, privileges, traditions, laws, lores, customs, values and protections as she sees fits, in accordance with God's Law's (which are above all manmade laws). At times Lady Crown may point an officer or agent to the following laws, as she sees fit, to remind them of their legal obligations and responsibilities in their role, as follows:

10.4.1 *Magna Carta, Halsbury Rules, Crown Act March 1823, The House of Lords 1837 Royal Command Vol VIII Accounts and Papers 1838 statement from His Majesty stating that he would avail himself of all the aid, information and experience of the government that could be afforded, when the sovereign rise enlightened virtuous; superior in knowledge; enlightened in wisdom; and capable of high standing functions with divine right and authority, The Select Committee of the House of Lords, Rev Samuel Hinds 1838; the Power is in the Body with the Consent of the Crown and the delegation of Power is also subject to the Control of the Crown, 1839 Standing Orders Lord Normanby 1839, Mortuary Law Authority, Treaty for the Protection of Rangihou and Baludarri Sacred Burial Sites and Lands, 1919 The Treaty of Versailles and Covenant of the League of Nations, He Wakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni [The Declaration of Independence 1835], Te Tiriti O Waitangi 1840 [Treaty of Waitangi 1840], Te Ture Whenua Maori Maori Land Act 1993, PIP Act 1872 & 1875 section 6 & 7 prohibits parliaments, judicatures from exercising foreign UK statutes against or in respect of Ancient Clans and their lands, Housing Act 1955 - all land is vested in and on behalf of the Crown, Notice of International Jurisdiction over Rangihou and Baludarri Lands 8th September 2014, UCC Financing Statement Commercial Lien Claim Affidavit of Notice of Default. Total of Damages and Obligation \$1,184,845,000,000 11.11.13, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Criminal Code Act 1995 Aust, Crimes Act 1961 NZ, Maxim in Law; she who fails to assert her rights has none and God's Laws, the Holy Bible - Be it known that Lady Crown with divine right and authority only complies with God's Law on the land in perpetuity. Lady Crown has no corporate status within the government system. Lady Crown has sworn an oath to be faithful to God, bare true allegiance and abide by God's Laws as Ambassador of the Lord Jesus. There is no law higher than that of the creator. The only jurisdiction to which Lady Crown wilfully and completely consents to that of God.*

Should you wish to discuss further, please do so in writing addressed to the attention of the writer.

Be advised that our recent correspondence with you will be put on court record for the registrar prior to the court hearing 26th June 2019.

Nothing in this letter should be taken to be an exhaustive statement of Lady Crown or Ngati Rangihou Corrangie Hapu's position, nor taken to constitute any admission or waiver. We reserve all of our rights.

Kind regards

All rights reserved.

Chief Advisor
Spider Ward

Attachment: See Annexure A (1 page)

Current details for ABN 49 907 174 773

ABN details

Entity name:	CITY OF PARRAMATTA COUNCIL
ABN status:	Active from 01 Nov 1999
Entity type:	Local Government Entity
Goods & Services Tax (GST):	Registered from 01 Jul 2000
Main business location:	NSW 2150

Business name(s)

Business name	From
RIVERSIDE THEATRE 	11 Apr 2019
THE POWER OF THE DOCUMENTARY 	11 Apr 2019
BEYOND ABBA 	25 Jun 2015
BEYOND THE SQUARE RIVERSIDE 	25 Jun 2015
NATIONAL THEATRE OF PARRAMATTA 	25 Jun 2015
SHARP SHORT DANCE 	25 Jun 2015
SHARP SHORT THEATRE 	25 Jun 2015
DISCOVER PARRAMATTA 	09 May 2008
BIG LAUGH COMEDY PRODUCTIONS 	25 Nov 2005
RIVERSIDE PRODUCTIONS 	14 Nov 2005
THE BIG LAUGH COMEDY FESTIVAL 	06 Jan 2005
CONNECTION ARCADE 	07 Jun 2002

Trading name(s)

From 1 November 2023, ABN Lookup will not display trading names and will only display registered business names. For more information, click [help](#).

Trading name	From
PARRAMATTA CITY COUNCIL	01 Nov 1999

Deductible gift recipient status

Not entitled to receive tax deductible gifts

ABN last updated: 11 Apr 2019

Record extracted: 13 Jun 2019