

REFERENCES	Details
<b>The Commonwealth Constitution</b>	Is the highest law in the land. Where there is a conflict between a law of the State and a law of the Commonwealth, the latter must prevail. "It is impossible to obey both laws": 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."
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Section_109_of_the_Constitution_of_Australia">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Section_109_of_the_Constitution_of_Australia</a>
<b>Denial of Rights</b>	"Any assumed consent or agreements that a private individual is to be bound by State statutes that exist contrary to the Common Law right to travel freely around the Commonwealth of Australia, is fully and forever revoked and denied. You are challenged to reference any valid Law or Act that says "I am bound, or must consent, against MY WILL"
	As the paper trail evidences, your refusal to investigate below the surface and only produce pro-forma correspondence, amounts to a denial of rights
	"Common expressions such as: 'The Courts have declared a statute invalid'," says Chief Justice Latham, "sometime lead to misunderstanding. A pretend law made in excess of power is not and never has been a law at all. Anybody in the country is entitled to disregard it. Naturally, he will feel safer if he has a decision of a court in his favour, but such a decision is not an element that produces invalidity in any law. The law is not valid until a court pronounces against it – and thereafter invalid. If it is beyond power it is void ab initio" - Uniform Tax Case HCA (High Court of Australia) 1942 (65 CLR 373 at 408).
<b>Corpus Delicti</b>	Supreme Court ruled: "In every prosecution for crime it is necessary to establish the "corpus delicti", i.e., the body or elements of the crime." <u>People v. Lopez</u> , 62 Ca.Rptr. 47, 254 C.A.2d 185. "Elements of "corpus delicti," injury or loss or harm and a criminal agency which causes such injury, loss or harm, need only be proven by a "reasonable probability," i.e., by slight or prima facie proof..." <u>People v. Ramirez</u> , 153 Ca.Rptr. 789, 791, 91 C.A. 132.
<b>Burden of Proof</b>	The burden of proof is on the prosecution to prove the 'accused's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt and why it is NOT up to the 'accused to prove their innocence.
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/criminal/onus_and_standard_of_proof.html/">http://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/criminal/onus_and_standard_of_proof.html/</a>
<b>Acting In Commerce</b>	Acting In Commerce: All correspondence for your offices and related departments so far have referenced 'money', 'outstanding balances' and 'associated costs' and you signed off your letter with the title of 'Director' that goes with your job, as per an entity was "acting in commerce"? Can you please confirm that in all matters cited, you have been "acting in commerce", rather than as one private individual to another?
<b>1 Imperial Acts Application Act</b>	Section 8, Sub-section 12 clearly states "That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction, are illegal and void." This Act is enshrined in the State Constitution of every state in Australia.
	Let it be known for all to rely upon, that if a matter has not yet been litigated, it cannot be pursued as an alleged debt until such time as the matter has been litigated and determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/iaaa1980240/s8.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/iaaa1980240/s8.html</a>
<b>2 "Fines are voluntary"</b>	- Public announcement made August 6th 2013, from the Office of the Premier of Victoria, clearly stating this as a lawful and legal fact
	"Fines are a voluntary tax", announces Police Minister Kim Wells on August 6th 2013
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/law-order/victoria-police-boost-anti-speeding-arsenal-with-new-handheld-laser-devices/story-fni0fee2-1226691696070">http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/law-order/victoria-police-boost-anti-speeding-arsenal-with-new-handheld-laser-devices/story-fni0fee2-1226691696070</a>
<b>3 Additional Penalties and Costs</b>	Article 15 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states that "... Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time when the criminal offence was committed" therefore court costs cannot be added to a so-called "criminal" traffic fine."

	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/num_act/hraeoca1986512/sch2.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/num_act/hraeoca1986512/sch2.html</a>
	Costs are not payable in criminal proceedings.
<b>4 Infringements/Magistrates Courts</b>	'Infringement courts' are not courts of competent jurisdiction: Pursuant to Chapter III of the Commonwealth Constitution Act of 1099 (UK). As upheld by the High Court ruling Forge v ASIC.
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.supremecourt.wa.gov.au/files/The%20Constitutional%20Position%20of%20the%20Courts%20of%20Western%20Australia%20Martin%20CJ%20Oct%202012.pdf">http://www.supremecourt.wa.gov.au/files/The%20Constitutional%20Position%20of%20the%20Courts%20of%20Western%20Australia%20Martin%20CJ%20Oct%202012.pdf</a>
	<b>See Attachment 4</b>
	<i>Please review the following cases regarding jurisdiction:</i>
	<b>Main v. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980)</b> , "The law provides that once State and Federal jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven."
	<b>Hagens v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 533</b> , - "Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven".
	<b>Standard v. Olsen, 74 S. Ct. 768</b> , - "No sanctions can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction."
	<b>Basso v. Utah Power &amp; Light Co., 495 2nd 906 at 910</b> , - "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, even on final determination."
	<b>Thompson v. Tolmie, 2 Pet. 157, 7 L.Ed. 381; Griffith v. Frazier, 8 Cr. 9, 3L. Ed. 471</b> . "Where there is absence of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity and confer no right, offer no protection, and afford no justification, and may be rejected upon direct collateral attack."
	You are also required to take notice of the statement by Chief Justice Murray Gleeson of the High Court of Australia in 2001 - "No citizen can be Judged by anything other than a court that complies with section 71 of the Commonwealth Constitution." You are reminded that Section 71 of the Commonwealth Constitution states that "The judicial power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in a Federal Supreme Court, to be called the High Court of Australia, and in such other federal courts as the Parliament creates, and in such other courts as it invests with federal jurisdiction. The High Court shall consist of a Chief Justice, and so many other Justices, not less than two, as the Parliament prescribes."
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/</a>
	Any alleged warrant based upon the "Infringements Courts Act 2006" must comply with section 71 of the Commonwealth Constitution, otherwise section 109 of the Commonwealth Constitution renders the Infringements Courts Act 2006 invalid and without any legal effect on a sovereign-subject. Also the alleged "Infringements Courts Act 2006" must comply with the Commonwealth Constitution pursuant to section 15A of the Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (Commonwealth) which is does not do so presently. Section 15A states: "Every Act shall be read and construed subject to the Constitution, and so as not to exceed the legislative power of the Commonwealth..."
	At law under section 71 of the Australian Constitution only a court of competent jurisdiction may issue a fine after a natural person has been convicted of an offence. Also under section 76 and 78 of the "Evidence Act 1958 (Vic.);" the fine must be accompanied by a valid court order bearing a proper public seal AND accompanied by a supporting affidavit.
	<b>Link</b> <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s71.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s71.html</a>
	"Common expressions such as: 'The Courts have declared a statute invalid'," says Chief Justice Latham, "sometime lead to misunderstanding. A pretend law made in excess of power is not and never has been a law at all. Anybody in the country is entitled to disregard it. Naturally, he will feel safer if he has a decision of a court in his favour, but such a decision is not an element that produces invalidity in any law. The law is not valid until a court pronounces against it – and thereafter invalid. If it is beyond power it is void ab initio" - Uniform Tax Case HCA (High Court of Australia) 1942 (65 CLR 373 at 408).

5 <b><i>Infringement Registrar's 'authority' is Invalid.</i></b>	Infringement Registrar's 'authority' is non-existent. Michael Mibbons, 'Infringements Registrar' and Glenn Rutter, 'Manager Infringements Court' are employees of a private corporation, both 'acting in commerce'
	See Attachment 5 & 15b
	Court orders' - Does the Registrar's court orders comply with sections 150 and 151 of the commonwealth Evidence Act, showing the royal identifier stamp/ seal, as evidenced in the Style manual 6th edition. A printout will not suffice. If not able to produce, the Registrar may be charged with section 42 of the commonwealth crimes act 1914 for perverting the course of justice.
6 <b><i>PRIVACY ACT 1988</i></b>	Toll, speed, 'registration' monitoring devices <i>invade the community's privacy and rights to travel anonymously</i> within and between States, contravene the privacy provisions the Privacy Act 1988, the <i>common law principles of natural justice</i> and many other laws concerning privacy, given to ALL in the community."
	Link <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/pa1988108/">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/pa1988108/</a>
	LEAP Database : <a href="http://www.afr.com/p/technology/report_slams_victoria_police_it_8BObbrmARC8WboYENIdLP">http://www.afr.com/p/technology/report_slams_victoria_police_it_8BObbrmARC8WboYENIdLP</a>
	Link <a href="http://www.ibac.vic.gov.au/docs/default-source/opi-other-documents-and-papers/investigation-into-victoria-police-management-of-leap.pdf?sfvrsn=4">http://www.ibac.vic.gov.au/docs/default-source/opi-other-documents-and-papers/investigation-into-victoria-police-management-of-leap.pdf?sfvrsn=4</a>
	<b>Victoria POLICE - INFORMATION PRIVACY STATEMENT: PRINCIPLE 7 Page 6 - UNIQUE IDENTIFIERS - Unique identifiers, usually a number, are utilised by Victoria Police to enable the organisation to carry out its functions efficiently.</b>
7 <b><i>Council's as Corporate 'government'</i></b>	Abbott Government kills off local government referendum - A CONTROVERSIAL referendum to change the Constitution to recognise local government is dead. But taxpayers will still pick up a \$3.5 million bill for advertising and campaigning for the change.
	Link <a href="http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/abbott-government-kills-off-local-government-referendum/story-fni0fiyv-1226750784515">http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/abbott-government-kills-off-local-government-referendum/story-fni0fiyv-1226750784515</a>
	The Commonwealth Constitution clearly states there are to be only two levels of government - Federal and State. There is and NEVER WAS any 3rd tier of 'government' - The 1988 Referendum clearly decided that there was NO allowance for the establishment or continuance of local government in Australia. With no lawful or legal Local Council Recognition, they maintain their status as business entities as evidenced by their ABN's. i. Therefore no local government or council has ANY right to issue ANY fine to me Attachment 7
	Link Referendums were held in both 1974 and 1988 to recognise local councils as a tier of government. Both times the Australian people said "No". In 1989 the Victorian 'parliament' unlawfully and without the power to do so, purportedly enacted various 'Local Government Acts' and the 'authority' to issue fines. the most recent referendum of 2013 failed again, and as a result fo the legal 'three strikes and you're out' rule, can never be brought before Australians again.
	See Attachment 7 - Attorney General says No.
8 <b><i>The Road Safety Act 1986</i></b>	Road Safety Act 1986 is invalid as the Act has never been Proclaimed
	Link <a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/rsa1986125/s2.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/rsa1986125/s2.html</a>

9 <b><u>Harassment, Intimidation &amp; Extortion</u></b>	Use of third party interlopers like Mendelson Lawyers, Probe Collections and Sheriff's employees as Debt Collectors
	i. Debt Collection Guideline Part 2, Sections 4(i), 12, 19(e), 21(c) and 22; ii. Trade Practices Act 1974 - Parts IVA and V - Sections 60, 51(1) and 51AB; iii. Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001 (ASIC Act). Part 2, Division 2 - Section 12DJ; iv. ACCC vs. Maritime Union of Aust (2001)
Link	<a href="http://www.asic.gov.au/asic/pdflib.nsf/LookupByFileName/ACCC-ASIC_Debt_Collection_Guideline.pdf">www.asic.gov.au/asic/pdflib.nsf/LookupByFileName/ACCC-ASIC_Debt_Collection_Guideline.pdf</a>
Dept of Justice - Process	"If you don't take action"
Link	<a href="http://online.fines.vic.gov.au/fines/Content.aspx?page=107&amp;s=1">http://online.fines.vic.gov.au/fines/Content.aspx?page=107&amp;s=1</a>
	<a href="http://online.fines.vic.gov.au/fines/Content.aspx?page=46&amp;s=1&amp;l=107-46">http://online.fines.vic.gov.au/fines/Content.aspx?page=46&amp;s=1&amp;l=107-46</a>
Signed under duress	Signed under duress - Renders a 'contract' invalid - See attachment 9b
Link	<a href="http://www.australiancontractlaw.com/law/avoidance-duress.html">http://www.australiancontractlaw.com/law/avoidance-duress.html</a>
	Extortion - Definition: extortion - noun: the practice of obtaining something, especially money, through force or threats. "he used bribery and extortion to build himself a huge, art-stuffed mansion" synonyms: demanding money with menaces, exaction, extraction, blackmail;
Pro-Forma Letters	Quote from pro-forma letter dated 18th February 2014, signed by 'sheriff', Brendan Facey - : "...the sheriff may execute a warrant by enforcing a range of sanctions, including the seizure and sale of assets. If you have no assets, you may be arrested and brought before a magistrate in an open court... Please contact CCV directly".
Link	<a href="http://thelawdictionary.org/extortion/">http://thelawdictionary.org/extortion/</a>
	Demands for Money means an entity is "acting in commerce" and may be personally liable for their actions
10 <b>Police CANNOT stop motorists</b>	21st July 2013 - Magistrate Duncan Reynolds in line with Supreme Court Justice Stephen Kaye: "Police cannot pull over vehicles without a reason". In late 2012 Supreme Court Justice Stephen Kaye, in the matter of the DPP v Andrew Hamilton, stated that "a person who is not under arrest is entitled to do a runner from police seeking to question them." He further went on to state that Mr Hamilton, like any other person, "was under no obligation to stop and speak to police when they approached him." The judge went on to say that "it was an ancient principle of the common law that no-one has to stop and speak to police or answer their questions and there was no legislation in Victoria (or any other State) that alters that right".
	These cases confirm the police have absolutely NO power to pull a traveller over, do a random licence check, make someone stop for a Sheriff to clamp their car for outstanding warrants or issue any on-the-spot fines
Link	<a href="http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/police-power-to-stop-cars-under-threat-20130620-2oluv.html">http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/police-power-to-stop-cars-under-threat-20130620-2oluv.html</a>
Link	<a href="http://www.news.com.au/national-news/supreme-court-rules-person-is-entitled-to-do-runner-if-not-under-arrest/story-e6frfkvr-1226205953554">http://www.news.com.au/national-news/supreme-court-rules-person-is-entitled-to-do-runner-if-not-under-arrest/story-e6frfkvr-1226205953554</a>
11 <b>Police Oath and Contract:</b>	See attachment 11
Police Responsibility	What is the Role of Police? - <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IOsN-P5abVg">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IOsN-P5abVg</a>
Link	<a href="http://www.caradvice.com.au/11828/police-agree-speed-cameras-are-for-revenue-raising/">http://www.caradvice.com.au/11828/police-agree-speed-cameras-are-for-revenue-raising/</a>
	Police agree cameras are for revenue raising:

	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/law-order/veteran-police-officer-phil-wild-will-not-face-inquiry-despite-publicly-raising-concerns-over-victoria-police-speed-crackdown/story-fni0fee2-1226849669421">http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/law-order/veteran-police-officer-phil-wild-will-not-face-inquiry-despite-publicly-raising-concerns-over-victoria-police-speed-crackdown/story-fni0fee2-1226849669421</a>
	<b>NUREMBERG TRIALS</b>	Under the NUREMBERG TRIALS verdicts: One of the results of the Nuremburg trials, that have been adopted world-wide, stated "that even if you are obeying orders when committing a crime, you are personally guilty of that crime." This is confirmed by any Commonwealth or State laws regarding Aid 'N' Abet offences.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg_principles">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg_principles</a>
	<b>Unconscionable Conduct by VIC Police</b>	Victoria Police has a legal contract and is in service of the multi-national weapons manufacturer, Lockheed Martin. This is an unconscionable conflict of interest for Victoria Police and the State to be involved in corporate profiteering with a multi-national weapons manufacturer.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://au.linkedin.com/pub/david-ralph/1a/a11/399">http://au.linkedin.com/pub/david-ralph/1a/a11/399</a>
	<b>When are the 'police' NOT the 'police'?</b>	"Sheriff's officers are responsible for actioning warrants in Victoria. Sheriff's Operations employs sheriff's officers who enforce sanctions against those who do not comply with court orders. In respect of non-payment of fines there are a range of options to compel people to comply. Depending on the type of warrant these include the seizure and sale of assets, licence or registration suspension or, as a final option, arrest and imprisonment. The Sheriff is responsible for warrants for non-payment of fines, including failure to pay infringement notices for on-the-spot fines registered as Infringement Court Orders, and failure to pay fines imposed by a magistrate following an appearance in court. <b>The Victorian office was the first in Australia where the Sheriff took over from the police force, the responsibility for enforcing criminal fines". (Also see Dept of Justice Org Chart below)</b>
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.justice.vic.gov.au/utility/contact+us/sheriffs+operations.shtml#sthash.WGUmCQIJ.dpuf">http://www.justice.vic.gov.au/utility/contact+us/sheriffs+operations.shtml#sthash.WGUmCQIJ.dpuf</a>
	<b>12 Redflex' Traffic Systems</b>	Bribery Investigation - See attachment 12
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.afr.com/p/technology/redflex_scandal_widens_in_us_7ndbgLo6Fz1vW877Kfh0DJ">http://www.afr.com/p/technology/redflex_scandal_widens_in_us_7ndbgLo6Fz1vW877Kfh0DJ</a>
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.afr.com/p/technology/redflex_scandal_in_afp_sights_wssYAJdORg7L81FNQhSnFM">http://www.afr.com/p/technology/redflex_scandal_in_afp_sights_wssYAJdORg7L81FNQhSnFM</a>
		Cincinnati judge orders all speed cameras confiscated, manufacturer held in contempt - "In a recent court hearing, Judge Robert Ruehlman ordered them not only to be shut off but to be impounded - taken off the streets for good. The ruling comes as a result of a contentious legal battle over the speed cameras. Both sides of the case were back before Ruehlman during a contempt hearing June 27, "where the judge ruled that Elmwood Place and the speed camera contractor Optotraffic were in contempt of court," WLWT reported. Contempt of court Ruehlman found in March that the speed cameras were unconstitutional, essentially then ordering them shut down, along with the speed ticket program. He also ruled that outstanding tickets issued as a result of the system did not have to be paid."
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/ct-met-chicago-red-light-scandal-0303-20130303,0,3857195.story?page=">http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/ct-met-chicago-red-light-scandal-0303-20130303,0,3857195.story?page=</a>
		Ted Baillieu says there's been a cover-up on the accuracy of speed cameras which the Auditor-General should investigate. Ted Baillieu says there's been a cover-up on the accuracy of speed cameras which the Auditor-General should investigate. The Opposition leader says there have been legitimate concerns from motorists vindicated by government documents showing cameras on EastLink had been detected malfunctioning.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.3aw.com.au/blogs/3aw-generic-blog/blog-eastlink-speed-camera/20081202-6pc4.html?page=0">http://www.3aw.com.au/blogs/3aw-generic-blog/blog-eastlink-speed-camera/20081202-6pc4.html?page=0</a>
		The Opposition leader says there have been legitimate concerns from motorists vindicated by government documents showing cameras on EastLink had been detected malfunctioning.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.naturalnews.com/041084_speed_cameras_surveillance_speeding_tickets.html#">http://www.naturalnews.com/041084_speed_cameras_surveillance_speeding_tickets.html#</a>
	<b>Eastlink Coverup</b>	SEPTEMBER 13, 2010: Ted Baillieu says there's been a cover-up on the accuracy of speed cameras which the Auditor-General should investigate. SEPTEMBER 13, 2010: Ted Baillieu says there's been a cover-up on the accuracy of speed cameras which the Auditor-General should investigate. The Opposition leader says there have been legitimate concerns from motorists vindicated by government documents showing cameras on EastLink had been detected malfunctioning.

	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.3aw.com.au/blogs/3aw-generic-blog/blog-eastlink-speed-camera/20081202-6pc4.html?page=0">http://www.3aw.com.au/blogs/3aw-generic-blog/blog-eastlink-speed-camera/20081202-6pc4.html?page=0</a>
		Product Disclosure Statement (PDS) - ConnectEast - - Tolling breaches enforcement risk: there is a risk that contracted or casual customers will not pay their tolls, and these tolls will not be collected. Although the non-payers are referred to the State, the State is not obliged to take enforcement action under the legislation. If they do not take action this may mean that this toll revenue would not be collected.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.connecteast.com.au/downloadFile.aspx?file_id=177">http://www.connecteast.com.au/downloadFile.aspx?file_id=177</a>
<b>13</b>	<b>Currency Act 1965</b>	Sections 9, 11, 16 & 22 It is impossible to legally discharge a debt over the value of \$20 in Australia, as there is no valuable consideration in circulation in Australia with which to legally discharge any alleged fines, penalties or 'court' costs.
		Section 115 of the Commonwealth Constitution – “The States shall not coin nor make anything but gold and silver as payment of debt”
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s115.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s115.html</a>
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/C2004C00340">http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/C2004C00340</a>
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca1965120/s9.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca1965120/s9.html</a>
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca1965120/s11.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca1965120/s11.html</a>
<b>14</b>	<b>Travel ... "Shall be absolutely free"</b>	Travel within the Commonwealth "...shall be absolutely free." Pursuant to Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. i. All traffic infringement laws are in direct contradiction of, and therefore contravene, our fundamental Constitutional rights to travel freely on our roads. This constitutional right ensures that no government or corporate body can force any type of payment for travelling freely on commonwealth roads.
		Under lawful interpretation by Quick & Garran this means: 1. "... and the right to travel unburdened by State restrictions, regulations or obstructions" 2. Also, under the section 'Other State fees and charges allowable', tolling roads are not mentioned, therefore it are NOT allowable under the Australian Constitution
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Section_109_of_the_Constitution_of_Australia">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Section_109_of_the_Constitution_of_Australia</a>
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s92.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s92.html</a>
	<b>License to Travel</b>	Vic Roads lack of authority see Attachment 14. Note the question in relation to a “certified copy of any alleged statutory declaration/ document/ contract/ deed that contractually binds Vicroads to ....” Most people consider that their Driver’s Licence is this article, but the reply from Vicroads clearly states, it is NOT. In fact, there is NO such article and NO-ONE is in any way bound by the rules of any company, unless you work for them and AGREE to their rules BEFOREHAND. VicRoads is a privately owned company that has a contract with the Victorian Government to provide certain services for them, like keeping track of eveyones' licence details. No COMPANY like VicRoads actually evers suspends a licence – they simply keep track of demerit points and are the record keeping arm of the various state governments.
		Road Rules Victoria - is not a Law or an Act or anything even resembling something LEGAL. VicRoads refers to it as “The following document entitled “Road Rules – Victoria” is published by the Roads Corporation (VicRoads) to ENABLE the contents to be ADOPTED as law in Victoria.”
		‘Car’ is clearly noted on Vic Roads database as a Passenger Vehicle, NOT a commercial vehicle engaged in an act of commerce. Anything you can do legally with a license, you can also lawfully do without one.
		See Chap 5 Sect 109 of the Commonwealth Of Australian Constitution.

		Designation as a 'traveller' in your personal conveyance of the day, under no act of commerce, real or assumed, as opposed to designation as a "driver". Black's Law dictionary defines a "Driver" as one who is engaged in commerce on the highways". The traveller you refer to in your correspondence was in a 'motorised vessel' and was NOT engaged in any act of commerce and so is not confined by any statute such as the Road Safety Act. Therefore there is NO requirement for the traveller to be forced to pay to obtain a 'license', insurance or registration in any form.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.veriegn.freesevers.com/bulletin.htm">http://www.veriegn.freesevers.com/bulletin.htm</a>
	<b>Fee Simple/Toll Roads</b>	Toll roads discriminate against the poor and unfairly target particular persons, communities and businesses who live along or must use toll roads.
		See above - Section 92 of our Federal Constitution clearly states: "On the imposition of uniform duties of customs, trade, commerce, and intercourse between the States, whether by means of internal carriage or ocean navigation, shall be absolutely free." Under lawful interpretation by Quick & Garran this means: Under lawful interpretation by Quick & Garran this means: "... and the right to travel unburdened by State restrictions, regulations or obstructions" Also, under the section 'Other State fees and charges allowable', tolling roads are not mentioned, therefore it are NOT allowable under the Australian Constitution. Section 117 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1990 says: "A subject of the Queen, resident in any State, shall not be subject in any State to any disability or discrimination which would not be equally applicable to him if he were a subject of the Queen, resident in any other State." Therefore the tolling of roads is NOT allowable under the Australian Constitution.
	<b>Vehicle 'registration'</b>	Once registered, a vehicle is registered for life, as per the database the vehicle is 'registered on'. If the vehicle wasn't 'registered' it would not be on the database. The database belongs to a private company, managing the database on your behalf. Please also refer to Point 6 Privacy Act 1988
		Vehicle Type* Private use is defined as a vehicle that is used exclusively for social, domestic or pleasure purposes.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/Home/Registration/FeesFormsAndFAQs/Fees/VehicleRegistrationFees.htm">http://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/Home/Registration/FeesFormsAndFAQs/Fees/VehicleRegistrationFees.htm</a>
		Passenger cars:
		<a href="http://www.sro.vic.gov.au/SRO/sronav.nsf/childdocs/-3A87315B22BC23FFCA2575A100441F59-CD1B48B2849A0120CA2575C1008058E7-5F29315D2F1C052FCA2575A100442012-CD8682C3C6B8839CCA2575B700267FE9?open">http://www.sro.vic.gov.au/SRO/sronav.nsf/childdocs/-3A87315B22BC23FFCA2575A100441F59-CD1B48B2849A0120CA2575C1008058E7-5F29315D2F1C052FCA2575A100442012-CD8682C3C6B8839CCA2575B700267FE9?open</a>
		Police could stop fining unregistered cars
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://au.news.yahoo.com/sa/video/watch/20654433/police-could-stop-fining-unregistered-cars/">http://au.news.yahoo.com/sa/video/watch/20654433/police-could-stop-fining-unregistered-cars/</a>
<b>15</b>	<b>Corporate Govt &amp; Associates</b>	Various registered Corporation entities, acting in commerce, are operating as 'government' departments and bodies, even though they are NOT recognized by the Commonwealth Constitution. As such, any demand requires them to prove their authority or jurisdiction over you and a valid contract between them and you in which you agreed to pay the alleged unproven debt.
		Therefore no government department, council or police has a constitutional power to impose fines. They can only make an accusation and allegation which they must prove in court! If the Sheriff's office attempts to demand payment for a fine without a valid court order containing a proper public seal, supporting affidavit and warrant then they are engaging in illegal fraud, extortion and blackmail.
		Demands for Money mean an entity is "acting in commerce".
	<b>DOJ - Vic - Org Chart</b>	"Corporate Divisions and Business Areas" - Titles for each position, within each business unit
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://assets.justice.vic.gov.au/justice/resources/9a0dbcc0-8c64-44fa-8ab8-09095de9d473/organisationalchart-justice-web.pdf">http://assets.justice.vic.gov.au/justice/resources/9a0dbcc0-8c64-44fa-8ab8-09095de9d473/organisationalchart-justice-web.pdf</a>
	<b>CCV</b>	Not a 'government dept' and not a business - About Civic Compliance Victoria® CIVIC COMPLIANCE VICTORIA®, CCV® and the graphic below:are registered trade marks owned by the State of Victoria. The trade marks are used under licence from the State of Victoria in the provision of the Victorian Government's infringement management and enforcement services.
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://online.fines.vic.gov.au/fines/Content.aspx?page=87">http://online.fines.vic.gov.au/fines/Content.aspx?page=87</a>
	<b>OLBIA Pty Ltd</b>	Owned by the Salteri family, who won the licence to use CCV et al. Salteris also own other businesses involve in the 'infringements' business

		<a href="http://www.exfacie.com/images/tenix/tenix-20110809-ccv_letter.png">http://www.exfacie.com/images/tenix/tenix-20110809-ccv_letter.png</a>
		<a href="http://www.exfacie.com/images/tenix/tenix-20110628-ccv_letter.png">http://www.exfacie.com/images/tenix/tenix-20110628-ccv_letter.png</a>
		<a href="http://exfacie.com/?q=civic_compliance_victoria_explained">http://exfacie.com/?q=civic_compliance_victoria_explained</a>
		<a href="http://www.smh.com.au/business/executive-faced-gunpoint-extortion-20120928-26qn5.html">http://www.smh.com.au/business/executive-faced-gunpoint-extortion-20120928-26qn5.html</a>
		<a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tenix">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tenix</a>
<b>16</b>	<b>National Measurement Act 1960.</b>	<i>Under the National Measurement Regulations 1999 Statutory Rules 1999 - No. 110 persons are entitled, by law, to request a 'certificate of verification' from Vic Roads (or other authority) to prove that the camera in question is accurate.</i>
		Speed cameras, laser and radar devices do NOT comply with Section 10 of the National Measurement Act.
<b>17</b>	<b>'Criminal' matters</b>	Your offer of the option to 'elect' to go to court for these alleged 'criminal offences'. This is odd, because if you were accused of rape or murder, you would not have to 'elect' to go to court. <i>Also, as you would know 'costs' are not payable in criminal proceedings. Costs for criminal matters are paid by the taxpayer, not 'the accused', therefore adding costs on a 'criminal' matter is illegal. So, if you believe that 'crimes' have been committed then you are welcome to issue a summons to a Court of Competent Jurisdiction, pursuant to Chapter III of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK) so that your baseless charges can be defended, at your cost.</i>
<b>18</b>	<b>'Behind the back' judgements</b>	Annotation 206 "Service", of the Australian Constitution Act 1900 (UK) – That “no man can be legally bound by a judgement given behind his back and without his having had an opportunity of being heard.”
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="https://archive.org/details/annotatedconstit00quicuoft">https://archive.org/details/annotatedconstit00quicuoft</a>
<b>19</b>	<b>MELBOURNE CITYLINK ACT 1995</b>	No Royal Assent = invalid
	<b>Link</b>	<a href="http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/mcla1995212/s2.html">http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/mcla1995212/s2.html</a>