

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

**AND COURT OF APPEAL OF NEW ZEALAND
AND HIGH COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
AUCKLAND REGISTRY**



CASEBOOK FOR:

- **CA 507/09**
- **CA 515/09**
- **CIV 2009-404-0856**
- **CIV 2009-404-1521**
- **CA412/09 Submission
before Supreme Court**
- **Publication of NZ,
Law and Justice.
[http://RateNZjudges.com/
Injustice/Home/](http://RateNZjudges.com/Injustice/Home/)
and /Injustice/Archive/**

Publishing Details

ISBN 978-0-473-15805-7
Author: R. Prasad
Publisher: R. Prasad
Date Published: 31/10/09

© Copyright Law and Justice, R. Prasad

INDEX

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1	Introduction	003 - 006
2	Service of Documents	007 - 010
3	Proceedings List	011 - 012
4	Defendants Involved	013 - 014
5	Judges Involved	015 - 016
6	Court Officials	017 - 018
7	Lawyers	019 - 020
8	Formal Complaints	021 - 023
9	Proceedings Described	024 - 024
	⇒ <i>CIV 2003-092-1518 Part A</i>	<i>025 - 026</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2003-092-4034 Part B</i>	<i>027 - 035</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2005-404-5424 Part C</i>	<i>036 - 037</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2006-404-1022 Part D</i>	<i>038 - 039</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2006-404-4389 Part E</i>	<i>040 - 041</i>
	⇒ <i>CA 652/07, NZCA 70 Part F</i>	<i>042 - 043</i>
	⇒ <i>CRI 2007-004-20246 Part G</i>	<i>044 - 046</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2009-404-0001 Part H</i>	<i>047 - 048</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2008-092-2719 Part I</i>	<i>049 - 051</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2009-404-0856 Part J</i>	<i>052 - 057</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2009-404-1521 Part K</i>	<i>058 - 060</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2009-404-2312 Part L</i>	<i>061 - 062</i>
	⇒ <i>CA 412/09 Part M</i>	<i>063 - 064</i>
	⇒ <i>CA 507/09 Part N</i>	<i>065 - 066</i>
	⇒ <i>CA 515/09 Part O</i>	<i>067 - 068</i>
	⇒ <i>CIV 2009-404-000 Part P</i>	<i>069 - 070</i>
	⇒ <i>SC 2009/0000 Part Q</i>	<i>071 - 077</i>
10	Documents in Support	078 - 079
	⇒ Fraud Upon the Court	080 - 080

SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Complaint in this matter involves bribery, fraud, corruption, conspiracy in the matters listed, that started from one Proceedings in CIV 2003-0692-4034 by Judge Blackie of Manukau District Court, Gary Harrison, Jag Lal and Ravin Lal in year 2005 which led to the start of sixteen other Proceedings and is still going like cancer:

- This led to liquidation and striking off of an innocent company World Commerce NZ Limited, with fraud of Defendants, its Lawyers and Ministry of Justice of New Zealand.
- Judge Field of Auckland District Court, to protect and in defence of the interest of two Court Judges to conceal corruption, entered conviction on the innocent director who was seeking justice in New Zealand's court.
- Ministry of Justice did not allow filing of documents, refused leave, awarded illegal costs against me for seeking correction of the defects of serious breaches of Law and consequences by ten Court Judges in inferior, High and Court of Appeal, instead told me to **live with the fraud:**
 - ⇒ Ministry of Justice has given me gross injustice by blocking all my legal rights, as a coloured person to seek justice in the New Zealand's Court of Law,
 - ⇒ Court of Appeal and Supreme Court are not giving Leave to conceal the corruption of this magnitude, the documents does not go past the Registrar Gordon Thatcher.
- Ministry of Justice has blocked my operative e-mail mails@nzicom.co.nz from seeking justice, with Rule 550, whilst it deals with this matter on this e-mail.
- Defendants are involved in unorthodox method of defence with bribery, fraud, corruption, false documents, lies cheat and deceit and Ministry of Justice has no problem with that.

Whole matter is documented in this book form, filed in National Library under ISBN No: 978-0-473-15805-7, served on the named dignitaries and filed on the Internet to seek international attention against Ministry of Justice of New Zealand for justice.

COURT OF APPEAL

- [1] Whole aspect is attributed to the President of Court of Appeal (*W.P. Young*), who knowingly refused Leave in CA 652/07 and CA 412/09 to hear this matter with such intentional serious breaches of law by nine Court Judges.

On one hand he dismissed my Appeal, awarded costs against me on two occasions CA 652/07 and CA 412/09 to seek corrections of serious breach of Law and Rules of Court caused by Defence Counsel Gary Harrison, on the other hand he allowed illegal Appeal from CA 652/07 and CA 412/09 to the same Defendants from the same serious defects and even reduced the Security for Costs without my consultation, (*Full details provided in formal complaint against him to Judicial, Human Rights Commissioners, Attorney General*).

JUDGES

- [2] The named Judges denied me a right to justice (*violation of Civil and Legal Rights*) they only heard the Defendants non-sense with Gary Harrison.

Ten Judges ignored the Facts and Law that protects my legal rights, completely ignored me from Justice, fraudulently liquidated my company, convicted and putting me in prison for not paying Blackie's family holiday.

Ten Judges involved in these matters dealt with me in accordance with colour, creed, ethnicity and inferiority in favour of the Defendants rather than on the principles of Law and Justice by Ministry of Justice of New Zealand.

The Judges made decision in all these Proceedings based on one man's (*Gary Harrison's*) lies, cheat corruption and deceit of Fact and Law and on his failure in these unorthodox methods of defence for the Defendants, he requires special treatment for his non-sense and from "fraud upon the court".

Treatment given to me as a coloured person in this way for seeking justice is illegal in New Zealand and in most civilized countries, it is breach of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and treason upon the Constitution of New Zealand by 10 named Judges, Court Officials and Gary Harrison.

DEFENDANTS

- [3] The Defendants are under some fraud scheme in this matter protected by certain district and high Judges and are of the belief that they could succeed in Proceedings based on unorthodox methods of their counsel by filing false, out of time and documents by non-party, paying benefits in Court System, corruption, ignoring Law of the Land and Rules of Court and may also of the belief that their criminal habits from their originating country will work in this country as well and no one is watching them.

COURT OFFICIALS

- [4] These Court Officials have gone out of jurisdiction of Court and breached the Law and Rules of Court to provide defence/protection to the Defendants and as the saying goes no one does anything for free.

LAWYERS

- [5] The named Lawyers went to the extent of setting up Kangaroo Court and compiling their own Judgment for the Defendants in Manukau District Court.

SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

- [6] It is established fact that the Registrar of Supreme Court will once again not put this document before Supreme Court so these documents are served on the appropriate named Officials for action and filed on Internet as follows:
- a) Document is posted to Her Majesty the Queen in Buckingham Palace in London with a copy served on His Excellency the Governor General (*Hon. Sir Satya Nand*),
 - b) Copy is served on the Supreme Court of New Zealand, by serving a copy on the Chief Justice (*Hon. Sian Elias*) and on the Attorney General of New Zealand,
 - c) Other Documents as per Listing.
-

SECTION 2
SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

[1] **HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**

Queen Elizabeth the II, Her Highness Elizabeth Rogina
Buckingham Palace,
London SW1 A 11 AA

Served on:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*Hon. Sir Satya Nand*)

Government House, Private Bag, **Wellington**

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW ZEALAND

Parliament Building, **Wellington**

SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND /

Served on: CHIEF JUSTICE OF NEW ZEALAND (*Sian Elias*)

Supreme Court of New Zealand, P O Box 61, **Wellington**

Key Issue in this matter is:

If one Party, the Court Judge and the Registrar's office is one party, then what will the other party do ?

If the Judge is part of one Party regardless of whether it is right or wrong, what will the other party do ?

If Justice is delivered with fraud and corruption on one side, what will the other party do with Law ?

If fraud and corruption is entered against one Party and the Party is not allowed to file documents, no leave is granted, Court of Appeal does not give leave what will this Party do ?

Ministry of Justice has to do better than that to deliver justice.

SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

- [2] **HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR** (*Hon. Sir Satya Nand*)
Government House, Private Bag, Wellington
- [3] **ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW ZEALAND**
Parliament Building, Wellington
- [4] **HON. MINISTER FOR JUSTICE**
HON. MINISTER FOR COURTS
Parliament Building, Wellington
- [5] **HON. MINISTER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
Parliament Building, Wellington
- [6] **MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** (*Registrar of Companies*)
Private Bag 92-513 Wellesley Street, Auckland
NATIONAL ENFORCEMENT UNIT (*P.J. Visser, David Harte, Kelly Oxborrow, Ruth Fearnley*)
Private Bag 92-513 Wellesley Street, Auckland
- [7] **SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND / CHIEF JUSTICE OF NEW ZEALAND** (*Sian Elias*)
Supreme Court of New Zealand, P O Box 61, Wellington
- [8] **PRESIDENT OF COURT OF APPEAL** (*William Young*)
P O Box 1606, Wellington, Cnr of Molesworth Street and Aitkin Ave,
Wellington
-

SERVICE OF DOCUMENTS

- [9] **CHIEF JUDGE, HIGH COURT** (*A.P. Randerson*)
P.O. Box 60, **Auckland**
- [10] **MANUKAU DISTRICT COURT** (*Head of the Bench*)
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, **Manukau**
- [11] **AUCKLAND DISTRICT COURT** (*Head of the Bench*)
Cnr of Albert Street and Kingston Ave, **Auckland**
- [12] **MINISTRY OF JUSTICE HEAD OFFICE** (*Higher/Lower Courts, Tony Fisher and Andrew Hampton*),
P. O. Box 180, **Wellington**
- [13] **JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSIONER** (*David Gasgoin*)
P. O. Box 2661, **Wellington**
- [14] **COMMISSIONER OF POLICE** (*Howard Broad*)
P. O. Box 3017, **Wellington**
- [15] **HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONER**
Level 10 Tower Centre, 45 Queens Street, **Auckland 1140**
P O Box 6751, Wellesley Street, **Auckland 1140**
- [16] **NEW ZEALAND LAW SOCIETY** (*National Secretary*)
P O Box 4417, Shortland Street, **Auckland 1140**
-

SECTION 3
PROCEEDINGS INVOLVED

PROCEEDINGS INVOLVED

- [1] **CIV 2003-092-1518** (*Breach of Database Rights*)
 - [2] **CIV 2003-092-4034** (*Breach of Database Rights*) + *Costs Order*
 - [3] **CIV 2005-404-5424** (*Appeal in Breach of Copyright*)+*Costs Order*
 - [4] **CIV 2006-404-1022** (*Termination of Liquidation*)
 - [5] **CIV 2006-404-4389** (*Termination of Liquidation*) + *Costs Order*
 - [6] **CA652/07, NZCA70** (*Appeal in Breach of Copyright*) + *Costs Order*
 - [7] **CRI 2007-004-20246** CRI 7004503486 (*Company's Act 261(6) a*)
 - [8] **CRI 2009-404-0001** CRI 2007-004-20246 *Appeal,(Company's Act 261(6) a*)
 - [9] **CIV 2008-092-2719** (*Breach of Copyright, Inferior Court*)
 - [10] **CIV 2009-404-0856** (*Breach of Copyright, High Court*)
 - [11] **CIV 2009-404-1521** CIV 2008-092-2719 *Appeal (Breach of Res-judicata)*
 - [12] **CIV 2009-404-2312** (*Bankruptcy Proceedings by Defendants*)
 - [13] **CA 412/09** (*Review of Associate Judge Robinson's Direction/Decision*)
 - [14] **CA 507/09** (*Criminal Appeal in Court of Appeal*)
 - [15] **CA 515/09** (*Appeal by Defendants of Associate Judge Dooge's Decision*)
 - [16] **CIV 2009-404-xxxx** (*Proceedings against Official Assignee/Liquidators*)
 - [17] **SC xxxx** (*Appeal of CA412/09 in Supreme Court*)
-

SECTION 4
DEFENDANTS INVOLVED

DEFENDANTS INVOLVED

[1] **INDIANA PUBLICATIONS (NZ) LTD**

36 Santa Ana Drive, Howick,

Occupation: Company of Alleged Works

[2] **RAVIN LAL (DIRECTOR)**

36 Santa Ana Drive, Howick,

Occupation: Director of Alleged Company

[3] **ARIN LAL**

36 Santa Ana Drive, Howick,

Occupation: Distributor of Alleged Works

[4] **VENKAT RAM**

36 Santa Ana Drive, Howick,

Occupation: Editor of Alleged Works

[5] **MAHESH PARERA**

36 Santa Ana Drive, Howick,

Occupation: Graphic Designer of Alleged Works

[6] **CHENCHU NAGULU**

36 Santa Ana Drive, Howick,

Occupation: Production of Alleged Works

SECTION 5
JUDGES INVOLVED

JUDGES INVOLVED

- [1] **JUDGE C.S.BLACKIE**
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, Manukau
- [2] **JUDGE ANDREE WILTENS**
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, Manukau
- [3] **JUDGE CHRISTOPHER FIELD**
Auckland District Court, Chr Kingston Street and Albert Street
- [4] **ASSOCIATE JUDGE ROBINSON**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [5] **JUSTICE ASHER**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [6] **JUSTICE ALLAN**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [7] **JUSTICE WYLIE**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [8] **JUSTICE HARRISON**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [9] **JUSTICE O' REGAN**
Court of Appeal, P O Box 1606, Wellington
- [10] **JUSTICE WILLIAM P. YOUNG** (*President*)
Court of Appeal, P O Box 1606, Wellington
-

SECTION 6
COURT OFFICIALS INVOLVED

COURT OFFICIALS INVOLVED

- [1] **KELVIN SIMILIE** (*Registrar*)
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, Manukau
- [2] **LINDA BIDDLE** (*Registrar during these period in 2005*)
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, Manukau
- [3] **JULIE VAIFALI**
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, Manukau
- [4] **CHARLES NUMBER**
Private Bag 94-030, South Auckland Mail Centre, Manukau
- [5] **TENUSHA EIYANGA**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [6] **GORDON SULLIMAN**
Auckland High Court, P.O.Box 60, Auckland
- [7] **CLAIRE BROWN** (*Registrar*)
Court of Appeal, P O Box 1606, Wellington
- [8] **GORDON THATCHER** (*Registrar*)
Supreme Court, P O Box 61, Wellington
-

SECTION 7
LAWYERS INVOLVED

LAWYERS INVOLVED

[1] **GARY HARRISON**

P. O. Box 4338 , Auckland

[2] **JAG LAL OF JAGLAL LAWYERS**

P. O. Box 109-059, New Market, Auckland

[3] **BHARAT PARSHOTAM OF PARSHOTAM & CO**

P. O. Box 27-079, Mt Roskill, Auckland

[4] **TOM MALLOY**

Level 18, ASB Building, Albert Street, P O Box 92-513, Auckland

SECTION 8
FORMAL JUDICIAL COMPLAINT

IN THE OFFICES OF THE NAMED OFFICIALS

Ministry of Justice had been giving me the runaround since last five years in the observance of principles of Law and natural justice, based on ethnic minority, colour, creed and from experience it suddenly had right to deny justice based on these features.

It had come to my attention at very early stages of these Proceedings that Ravin Lal had connections in Manukau District Court at bench level and therefore was getting illegal decisions in his favour by the Judges.

[1] That some kind of scheme may be operating in that Court in which some ethnic Judge (*I do not know the name, presumably an Indian*) in Manukau District Court takes a large sum of money and fixes criminally inclined cases of Indian people in that and High Court:

a) One case was referred to me as Crown v an Indian person for a name suppression and home detention for serious criminal matter.

[2] A High Court Justice (*I do not know the name,*) is believed to be running a similar fraud business in which that person is believed to have several corrupt Lawyers as his clients:

a) It is also believed that this person may have taken a large sum of money and stuffed up a large Medical company's Case (*Medlab*),

b) The treatment of my Proceedings against the defendants is similar to that Case and Defendants may also be his clients indirectly.

[3] My struggle with this countries justice system is the Defendants having that access in the judiciary and being given illegal benefits against the Law.

[4] It was also suggested that there may be a ring made up of several people including a Police officer (*Kicked out of the Force for corruption*), a Lawyer (*Known for Immigration Scams*) a District Court Judge and others, one of the Defendants is believed to be one of them.

[5] I did not take any notice of that at that time these details came to me as it did not concern me neither I believed it at the time.

IN THE OFFICES OF THE NAMED OFFICIALS

- [6] It was believed that under this scheme one gets to suggest the custom made judgment intended and also get their money back by way of an illegal Order against the other party (*a cashback for the party paying benefits to Court Judges*).
- [7] The main issues in this matter is that the Defendants with the inferior Court Manukau District Court, managed to acquire an illegal Judgment with fraud and serious defects of Law and Court Rules from this scheme:
- a) The Judgment that is described fully in the ensuing sections as being a “fraud upon the Court”.
- [8] With that illegal Judgment and an illegal Order for Costs they caused massive damages to me, they illegally liquidated my company Sage Group Limited.
- [9] They brought Bankruptcy Proceedings on me from the illegal Order for Costs to them by inferior Court Judge Blackie, High Court Justice Asher and President of Court of Appeal W.P. Young.
- [10] High Court Justice is believed to be at this end, who conceals these frauds of inferior Courts at a cost, fixes up cases of these people and blocks these cases to Appellate Courts or be able to acquire Leave in appellate Courts by the President.
- [11] Judge Blackie’s Judgment could well be described not only wrong, but more fraud, illegal and criminal, falling under Crimes Act 1961, Administration of Law and Justice, conspiring to defeat Justice in a New Zealand Court of Law.
- [12] It began to occur to me that, that information may be correct when I found out that illegal activities were happening to me in my case against these bunch of Defendants.
- [13] The matter started to come to light when I refused to pay the family holiday package of Judge in inferior Court of around May 2005 and 1st June 2005, similar benefits in the High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court to conceal the originating Judgment and Cost Order of 2nd June 2005 of Blackie.
-

SECTION 9
PROCEEDINGS DESCRIBED

PART A
CIV 2003-092-1518

CIV 2003-092-1518

This is a Dispute Proceedings filed in Manukau District Court in year 2003:

- [1] This Proceedings was filed in March 2003.
 - [2] Period of breach related to year 1998 to 7th March 2002.
 - [3] Breach related to, that the Defendant Ravin Lal copied the whole Database from the Plaintiff's Publication Indian Bizz in the year 1999/2000 when he came to live in this country.
 - [4] He created his own Database from that and started a Newspaper business Indian Newslink.
 - [5] Breach of unauthorised use of Database is not covered under Copyright Act 1994.
 - [6] He refused to pay compensation for that unauthorised use of Database for the three years 1999 - 7th March 2002 at \$ 5, 000 per annum \$ 15, 000.
 - [7] For lack of jurisdiction of the Disputes Tribunal in Copyright and Company's matter, it was transferred to Manukau District Court in civil section in the same year.
-

PART B
CIV 2003-092-4034

CIV 2003-092-4034

This is the Dispute Proceedings transferred to this Civil section of Manukau District Court in year 2003:

Masterminded By: Gary Harrison

Compiled By: Instructing Solicitor and Second Defendant

Signed By: Judge Blackie

- [1] Reference to [*CIV 2003-092-1518, Page 26, Para 1 - 7*].
 - [2] Issues in this matter are that I (*Mr Prasad*) have established a legal Copyright with my money, time and labour in New Zealand, which is my personal intellectual property, protected by Ministry of Economic Development under Copyright Act 1994 and the works is binding on the Crown Reference to [*Doc No # 3 , Page 79, Para # 3 (Copyright Owner)*].
 - [3] Issues related to breach of Copyright matter and period of event related to year 8th March 2002 onwards.
 - [4] On legal advice that my case was not so strong on the grounds that there was no public records established of the Defendant (*Ravin Lal's*) publication under the legal requirement for publications in New Zealand under National Library Act 1965 s 30a amended 1994 and now 2003 s 31 requires every published works to be deposited in Legal Deposit of New Zealand, which also marks the date on which they were published and for admissibility in Courts, Reference to [*Doc No # 3 , Page 79, Para # 3 (Copyright Owner (Plaintiff's Works)) and Doc No # 4 , Page 79, Para # 4 (Defendants Works)*].
 - [5] After the Matter had been before Civil section for about a year, I joined my company Sage Group Limited now (*World Commerce NZ Limited*) as a Licensee under Copyright Act 1994 s 124 as not taking part in the Proceedings and not liable for costs.
 - [6] Issues related were to cover for breach of Database rights and period of breach related to year 1999 to 7th March 2002.
-

CIV 2003-092-4034

- [7] In order not to jeopardize my chances of bringing a proper breach of Copyright Proceedings on the Defendants at a later time when these public records were available in the National Library Database, it was appropriate for me to depose myself and the Copyright matter under Copyright Act 1994.
- [8] The proper cause of action remained in the Proceedings as breach of Database rights not covered under Copyright Act 1994 since no public records of the Defendants were established under National Library Act 2003 s 31.
- [9] On 20th July 2004, the matter was called before Judge Simpson who substituted me with the company Sage Group Limited as main Plaintiff.
- [10] I was legally considered no longer a Plaintiff as Copyright owner, the Copyright matter also deposited with me under s 120 of Copyright Act 1994 on 20th July 2004.
- [11] The company became sole main Plaintiff and the issues became breach of Database rights covered under Intellectual Property Law Reference to [**Doc No # 1 , Page 79, Para # 1 (Simpsons Orders)**].
- [12] The company Sage Group Limited was represented separately by Solicitors (*Thomas & Co*) and they were also on Court record on 2nd June 2005 and 20th July 2005.
- [13] Company was given firm fixture Notice by the Court for firm hearing on 20th July 2005, on which the company relied upon for hearing with its solicitors Reference to [**Doc No # 2, Page 79, Para # 2 (Firm Fixture)**].
- [14] On 1st June 2005, one month prior to the actual fixture of company, Judge Blackie returned from an overseas trip and on 2nd June 2005, he gave verbal Orders to me (*deposed Plaintiff Copyright Owner*) through the deputy Registrar to come to the Court.
- [15] Although it was not a necessity for me but I had to go to the Court on the Orders of Judge Blackie, to avoid any contempt of Court charges.
-

CIV 2003-092-4034

[16] 2nd June 2005 was not a date fixed by the Court and no formal Court Notice was given to the company Sage Group Limited, where there was already a formal Court Notice for firm hearing on 20th July 2005 in place Reference to [*Doc No # 1, Page 79, Para # 1 (Simpson's Order)*] and [*Doc No # 2, Page 79, Para # 2(Fixture)*].

[17] In the Court, Judge Blackie told me virtually by putting a gun to my head to present the case to him, I declined as it had become the company's matter with its solicitors and it was not a hearing date.

[18] Judge Blackie forced me against my will that the matter be decided on that day and he gave me no choice to either transfer the company's matter to North Shore District Court or adjourn, since there was another firm fixture date 20th July 2005 in place with company's solicitors Reference to [*Doc No # 5, Page 79, Para # 5 (Court Transcript)*].

[19] I had no jurisdiction to give evidence on behalf of the company Sage Group Limited unless the company's solicitors were present also on the hearing date of 20th July 2005.

[20] Manukau District Court did not carryout the hearing of the company Sage Group Limited for which it had given a firm fixture Notice under Company's Act 1993 s 387 for firm hearing on 20th July 2005 Reference to [*Doc No # 2, Page 79, Para # 2 (Firm Fixture)*].

[21] The evidence given by me on 2nd June 2005 is on the basis of Indian Bizz (*Original Copyright version*) as Copyright Owner as a witness:

a) It legally constitutes an evidence of a witness under Copyright Act 1994 s 133a as an interim hearing to adduce evidence, since the Copyright matter and I as the Copyright owner were deposed on 20th July 2004,

b) My evidence did not constitute an evidence of company Sage Group Limited as it had separate issues of breach of Database rights not covered under Copyright Act 1994,

CIV 2003-092-4034

- c) Company's solicitors were not given any Notice for hearing of 2nd June 2005 and were not present,
- d) No Judgment and Cost Order in relation to Copyright could legally be entered upon the company from that evidence upon these further grounds:
- 1) CIV 2005-404-5424 Justice Asher's ruling at [3] of 6th November 2007, that the Judgment in CIV 2003-092-4034 was made from non-party's evidence,
 - 2) CA 652/07 NZCA 70 Court of Appeal's ruling of 19th March 2008, that the evidence of the person in Judgment had no legal status "Want of Jurisdiction",
 - 3) There was no legal public record established of Defendants works under National Library Act 2003 s 31 prior to July 2007, to substantiate the legal existence of defendants works at that time when Judge Blackie entered Judgment on the company from non-party's evidence Reference to [*Doc No # 4, Page 79, Para # 4 (Defendants Works)*].

LAW

- [22] In every breach of Copyright matter of the nature of literary works, a Court Judge must first establish a public record for all publications in question before the Court under National Library Act 1965 s 30a amended 1994 and now 2003 s 31 requires every published works to be deposited in Legal Deposit of New Zealand, which also marks the date on which they were published and for admissibility in Court, Reference to [*Doc No # 3, Page 79, Para # 3 (Copyright Owner (Plaintiff's Works))*]
-

CIV 2003-092-4034

- a) Court (*Judge Blackie*) did not have any legal jurisdiction to look at anything of the Defendants that did not have a public record above,
- b) There is nothing to substantiate as to what Defendants made, which period it related to and what Judge Blackie held from where and for what purpose (*Full details later*),
- c) Defendants works were infringing copies of my legal Copyright works to rip off people described under Passing Off and breach of Fair Trading Act 1986 s 9 from year 2003 until July 2007.

[23] Section 16 of the Copyright Act 1994 provides that where the Copyright has not expired, the Copyright owner (*Mr Prasad*) has exclusive rights and for others a Copyright License applies.

[24] Through community involvement, it came to the attention that the overseas trip of Judge Blackie was paid by Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal in around May 2005 which may be via a Credit Card:

- a) This was to enter the Judgment in their favour to avoid the actual firm fixture hearing of 20th July 2005 of the company,
 - b) The Judgment itself was understood to be a ready made one on 2nd June 2005 and also there were reasons to believe that it was masterminded and compiled by Defendants lawyers, Gary Harrison, Jag Lal and Ravin Lal (*Second Defendant*),
 - c) The purpose being to illegally gain legal Copyright through defects of Court Rules and Law to bypass Copyright License, with their connections in Manukau District and High Court,
 - d) Copyright has current Copyright protection and is subject to Copyright License, which I have not given to the Defendants: Telecom Corp of NZ v Color Pages Limited (High Court, Auckland, 14 August 1997 (CP142/97), McGechan T) held.
-

CIV 2003-092-4034

- [25] Judge Blackie's Judgment judicial fraud defined as "Fraud upon the Court":
- a) The Case was filed in the year March 2003 in Disputes Tribunal,
 - b) Issues related to breach of Database rights and the period of breach related to year 1999 to 7th March 2002, Reference to [*Doc No # 3, Page 79, Para # 3 (Plaintiff's Works)*].
 - c) It was also proven in Judge Blackie's Judgment Para [14], that the works was a compilation of data.,
 - d) Data relates to Database rights and is not covered under Copyright Act 1994, therefore the company's matter was never a Copyright matter after 20th July 2004 when company became main Plaintiff Reference to [*Doc No # 1 , Page 79, Para # 1 (Simpsons Orders)*],
 - e) Evidence was taken on a date (2/06/05) not fixed by Court, of the person being non-party and having no legal status in the matter ruled by High and Court of Appeal, Reference to [*Pages 31, Para # 21d (1 - 2) (above)*],
 - f) Company was represented by Solicitors, it never set the matter down, it never pre-paid any hearing Fees, no hearing happened Reference to [*Doc No # 5, Page 79, Para # 5 (Court Transcript)*] and [*Doc No # 2, Page 79, Para # 2 (Firm Fixture)*],
 - g) Running public record of the Plaintiff's work from year 1998 to year 2008 were established in National Library Database, confirming Copyright ownership details of Mr Prasad under ISBN No: **0-473-08478-3** Reference to [*Doc No # 3, Page 79, Para # 3 (Copyright Owner (Plaintiff's Works)*],
 - h) Although this Proceedings was no longer Copyright matter after 20th July 2004, it was established that Copyright existed, it has not expired and only Mr Prasad has right of action Reference to [*Doc No # 9, Para # 1 - 7 and 11 - 26 (Judge Blackie's Judgment)*],
-

CIV 2003-092-4034

- i) No public record of the Defendants work prior to July 2007 were found in National Library Database to give admissibility of Defendants works in Court to Judge Blackie, the only record came to light was in July 2007 Reference to [*Doc No # 4 , Page 79, Para # 4 (Defendants Works)*],

FRAUD No: 1

- j) Judge Blackie accepted a family holiday package in around May 2005 and 1st June 2005 from the Defendants Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal, to sign and enter Judgment on Sage Group Limited without a hearing, the Judgment being compiled by Defendants lawyers (*Gary Harrison, Jag Lal and Ravin Lal*), entered on 29th August 2005, sent in company's mailbox,
- k) A fraudulent Cost Order was signed by Judge Blackie to cover Blackie's family holiday package and lawyers costs,
- l) So what is Judge Blackie's Judgment, where did it come from, Proceedings was filed in year 2003, issues and period of breach related to breach of Database and period related to year 1999 - 7th March 2002, that came before him in year 2005, and the public record appeared in National Library Database two years later in 2007, so where did he held no breach for Defendants for so serious breach ?.

[26] Judge Blackie to file sworn Affidavit sworn before the Chief Justice and serve that he compiled this Judgment from the Court Transcript and explain why it is not a judicial fraud defined as "Fraud upon the Court".

[27] To the Ministry of Justice: Supreme Court of New Zealand, Why does a Law abiding citizen of this country have to live with the:

- a) Fraud of a court judge, Defendant's Judgment,
 - b) Give his company's records to have his company liquidated and assets sold, or else go to prison for not paying family holiday package, defined as "Fraud upon the Court".
-

CIV 2003-092-4034

[28] Judge Blackie's Judgment constitutes a Judicial Fraud by a Court Judge, defined as "Fraud Upon the Court" described in the attached Case Law: Reference to [*Document Page 80*].

- a) A fraud has no legal status and every decision and Orders of the Court where fraud happens becomes null and void and have no legal force or effect of any sort what-so-ever, ten named Judges are accessory to that criminal act filed before the dignitaries.

[29] Ten Court Judges Reference to [*Judges Involved List, Page 16, Para 1 - 10*] across the board, Manukau District Court, Auckland District Court, High Court and Court of Appeal are accessory to the criminal act by Judge Blackie:

- a) Described under Administration of Law and Justice s 100, s 116 (*Conspiracy to defeat Justice in the New Zealand Court of Law to defraud Copyright*) still under the monarchy Her Majesty the Queen Elizabeth Rogina II.

[30] Court of Appeal and Supreme Court did not give me Leave to Appeal to this serious breach of Law and injustice given by ten Court Judges to me, my company Sage Group Limited now World Commerce NZ Limited (*Struck Off*) CA 652/07 and my business is stuck:

- a) My company was struck off and I was convicted for no reason for refusing to reimburse to Defendants Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal, a Court Judge's family holiday package of \$ 14, 190 for entering fraud Court Judgment and Cost Order in their favour prior to actual firm fixture in CIV 2003-092-4034,
 - b) I am a man of principle, I believe in my own hard work, effort, truth, fairness and equal justice for everyone, Law is the same whether it came from lawyer's, a professional layman's or the horses mouth,
 - c) My message is clear to whole universe, I will never pay any bribe to any Court Judge of New Zealand, regardless whether I get justice of Ministry of Justice of New Zealand or not.
-

PART C
CIV 2005-404-5424

CIV 2005-404-5424

This is an Appeal from Civil section of Manukau District Court in CIV 2003-092-4034 to High Court:

- [1] Reference to [*CIV 2003-092-4034, Page 28 - 35, Para 1 - 30*].
- [2] The matter was Appealed in High Court, which was called before Justice Asher on 12th April 2006.
- [3] Justice Asher ruled that Judge Blackie's Judgment was correct in spite of all the serious breach of law, breach of rules of Court and he dismissed the company's Appeal on 13th April 2006.

FRAUD No: 2

- [4] I challenged Judge Blackie's and Justice Asher's decision and sought Leave of High Court to Appeal to Court of Appeal CA 652/07 NZCA70, which was called before Justice Asher again on 6th November 2007.
- [5] Justice Asher Ruled at [3] that I was not a party to the proceedings and I had no legal status in the the matter CIV 2003-092-4034,
- [6] I argued that the company never had a hearing in inferior Court, I am the director of the company and my sole evidence as Copyright owner is in this judgment so how did a Judgment came about ?
- [7] Justice Asher told me he should not even be looking or talking to me and it was out of courtesy that he talked to me, referring to me of my colour, creed and ethnicity, why is it my fault that I am a coloured person, it is natural.
- [8] He ordered costs against me in the sum of \$ 2, 440 in favour of Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and Ravin Lal for breaching my legal Copyright.
- [9] It came to my understanding later that Defendants paid \$ 2, 500 to have the Leave refused to Court of Appeal to have Judge Blackie's Judgment set aside.
-

PART D
CIV 2006-404-1022

CIV 2006-404-1022

This Proceedings was started by Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal:

[1] Reference to [*CIV 2005-404-5424, Page 37, Para 1 - 9*].

FRAUD No: 3

[2] Whilst an Appeal process was pending hearing in High Court in CIV 2005-404-5424 and prior to the hearing, Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited, its director Ravin Lal, Jag Lal and Gary Harrison started advertising my company in the Gazette and News Paper that my company was unable to pay its debts, Judge Blackie's family holiday package.

[3] Company never owed any penny to anyone Reference to [*Doc No # 6, Page 79, Para # 6 (Accountants Report)*].

[4] I raised this matter with the Chief Judge Hon. A.P. Randerson, he told me not to communicate with him.

[5] With some strong arguments with the High Court Officials, High Court backed down and a hearing of the Appeal in CIV 2005-404-5424 was followed by this event.

[6] Defendants abandoned the liquidation after advertising and making Statuary Demand for the reimbursement of Judge Blackie's family holiday package of \$ 14, 190.

[7] I made it very clear to everyone that came in contact with me in this regards that I will not pay Judge Blackie's family holiday package to Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal.

PART E
CIV 2006-404-4389

CIV 2006-404-4389

This Proceedings was started by Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal after Justice Asher dismissed the Appeal of the company:

FRAUD No: 4

- [1] Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-1022, Page 39, Para 1 - 7*].
 - [2] After the hearing and dismissal of the Appeal, Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited, its director Ravin Lal, Dawsons Lawyers and Gary Harrison started advertising my company in the Gazette and News Paper and made Statutory Demand again for Judge Blackie's family holiday package, that my company was unable to pay its debts.
 - [3] I refused to pay as there was no section of any enactment (*Company's Act 1993*) which allows a Court Judges family holiday package to be paid by a director, for entering a fraud Court Judgment upon his company.
 - [4] I presented this argument to the Chief Judge Hon. A.P. Randerson of High Court in around August 2006, he told me not to communicate with him.
 - [5] I referred the matter to several Government Agencies, but it fell in deaf ears.
 - [6] Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited manage to liquidate my company on 2nd November 2006 in the hope of getting their money back for Judge Blackie's family holiday package from assets of my company.
 - [7] David Harte (*Official Assignee*) and Kelly Oxborrow (*Liquidator*) were appointed to liquidate company Sage Group Limited to pay Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited for re-imbusement of that holiday package.
 - [8] This is a free country and Judge Blackie is free to do whatever he wishes with the abuse of his judicial powers and Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal are free to pay whoever they want to pay holiday package as its their money, but the Question of Law and Justice is, why should my company Sage Group Limited re-imburse them ?
-

PART F
CA652/07, NZCA70

CA652/07, NZCA70

This is an Appeal to Court of Appeal to Appeal in the company's matter, after Justice Asher refused Leave:

- [1] First Reference to [*CIV 2005-404-5424, Page 37, Para 1 - 9*].
- [2] Second Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-4389, Page 41, Para 1 - 8*].
- [3] Following the refusal of Justice Asher's Leave of High Court, I sought Leave of Court of Appeal to Appeal in Sage Group Limited's matter in respect of Judge Blackie's Judgment in CIV 2003-092-4034 and Justice Asher's decision in CIV 2005-404-5424.

FRAUD No: 5

- [4] President never even looked at the documents filed by me, he came with only one piece of paper, the non-sense filed by Gary Harrison.
 - [5] President W.P. Young over ruled the other two Judges refused Leave and put cost on me in the sum of \$ 2, 572 in favour of the Defendants Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited for Gary Harrison.
 - [6] On title page of the Judgment, it starts with cost of \$ 1, 500, which leads me to believe the amount ended up in some Court Official's (*his*) pocket for dismissal of Leave and the further \$ 1,000 to make Application go out of time.
 - [7] Company Sage Group Limited was illegally liquidated, got struck off the Companies Register and I got conviction entered against me CA 507/09, because this man W.P. Young never gave Leave to Appeal against refusal of re-imburement of Court Judges family holiday package to Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal.
 - [8] If Leave to Appeal was given, 16 other Proceedings would be avoided, this man is the cause of my ruins, because he supported criminal act rather than Law and Justice: Reference to [*Proceedings, Page 12, Para 1 - 17*].
-

PART G
CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486

CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486

This Proceedings was started by Official Assignee (*David Harte*) and Liquidator (*Kelly Oxborrow*) on the advice of Investigator (*P.J. Visser*):

- [1] First Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-4389, Page 41, Para 1 - 8*].
- [2] Second Reference to [*CA 652/07, NZCA70, Page 43, Para 1 - 8*].
- [3] The Official Assignee demanded the records of the company Sage Group Limited to liquidate my company and pay Indiana Publication (NZ) Limited for the re-imbursement of Judge Blackie's family holiday package.
- [4] I refused to supply the records on grounds listed in above paragraphs [1 - 2].
- [5] The matter was called before Judge Field on 21st August 2008 and details of paragraphs [1 - 2] were heard before him.
- [6] I told Judge Field to make Order on Official Assignee and Liquidator to give consent to my company so I could put the company's matter before High Court for setting aside Judge Blackie's Judgment and Cost order.
- [7] Two Application for such request were earlier declined by Liquidators Reference to [*Doc No # 7 & 8, Page 79, Para # 7 & 8 (Assignee's Letter)*].
- [8] Judge Field declined and told me to give the records or else he would lock me up, or give home detention or community service.
- [9] Having no option available to me in this predicament, I declined to give the records, which I considered to be:
 - a) An illegal Order from a criminal act from which there was no way out, and for which there was valid legal reasons presented to the Court.
 - b) In exercise of my powers under Company's Act 1993 s 131.

Duty of directors to act in good faith and in best interests of company

CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486

Subject to this section, a director of a company, when exercising powers or performing duties, must act in good faith and in what the director believes to be the best interests of the company.

PERVERSION OF COURSE OF JUSTICE

[10] If Official Assignee and Liquidator had given consent to put the matter before High Court, this event would not have arisen.

[11] Actions of Official Assignee (*David Harte*) and Liquidator (*Kelly Oxborrow*) is defined under Crimes Act 1961, Administration of Law and Justice s 116 Perversion of Course of Justice:

- a) If the Director were to be convicted for not giving the records of the company, then
- b) Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal be convicted first to defraud a legal Copyright with fraud and corruption in the Court system,
- c) Then Judge Blackie, Justice Asher and President W.P. Young are to be convicted next for allowing that to happen in the system, then
- d) Official Assignee and Liquidator to be convicted next for helping conceal the criminal act of above and not giving consent, perversion.

[12] Official Assignee and Liquidator failed to serve a copy of Final Report on me as the director within the specified time for filing objection, report were received after the company was struck off.

[13] Judge Field's Order against me is, accessory to criminal act of Judge Blackie and Justice Asher, therefore illegal under Summary Proceedings Act 1957, Judge Field to face Judicial Panel.

PART H
CRI 2009-404-0001

CRI 2009-004-0001

This was an Appeal from Auckland District Court in CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486 into High Court:

[1] Reference to [*CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486, Page 45 - 46, Para 1 - 13*].

CORRUPTION

[2] The matter was called before Justice Harrison, who told me before I spoke a word, that if I spoke one word of above paragraphs [1 - 6] of the fraud and corruption, he would lock me up, he gagged me from talking with the abuse of his Judicial powers to protect the interest of Judge Blackie and Justice Asher.

[3] Justice Harrison's actions are violation of my Civil Rights under Bill of Rights Act 1990 Part II, s 27, Right to Justice.

[4] Tom Malloy told him, that I withdrew my Appeal on conviction, I do not know how he knew that and I did not.

[5] The whole matter be heard in accordance with above paragraphs [1 - 6] and all convictions be quashed.

[6] Justice Harrison is to face Judicial Panel with Judge Field and others.

[7] Matter is before Court of Appeal under CA 507/09.

PART I
CIV 2008-092-2719

CIV 2008-092-2719

This Proceedings is a breach of Copyright matter of Copyright Owner Mr Prasad, commenced on 17th June 2008 which was abandoned on 20th July 2004.

- [1] Reference to [*CIV 2003-092-4034, Page 29, Para 7 - 10*].
- [2] The matter was re-commenced against five Defendants for breach of s 29 - s 31, s 16, s 111 of Copyright Act 1994, that was abandoned on 20th July 2004 by Copyright owner for lack of public records under:
- a) National Library Act 1965 s 30a amended 1994 and now 2003, s 31 requires every published works to be deposited in Legal Deposit of New Zealand which also marks the date on which they were published, shows the only records of the Defendants works commenced in July 2007, that would give jurisdiction and admissibility in Court, Reference to [*Doc No # 4, Page 79, Para # 4 (Defendants Works)*].
- [3] The public records shows that Defendants made INDIAN BUSINESS DIRECTORY and so does Plaintiff makes INDIAN BUSINESS DIRECTORY and for which he has not given a Copyright License to Defendants to re-produce.
- [4] Period of breach relates to 8th March 2002 onwards Reference to [*Doc No # 3, Page 79, Para # 3 (Plaintiff's Works)*].
- [5] Manukau District Court placed the Case on Standard Track but did not start the matter in nine months, Court breached the Court protocol, Rules of Court for Standard Track.

FRAUD No: 6

- [6] Defendants filed a Summary Judgment for res-judicata.
- [7] Defendants, their lawyers Gary Harrison, Bharat Parshotam, Registrar Kelvin Similie and Case Officer Julie Vaifali made several attempts to enter the Defendants fraud Summary Judgment on: 17/09/08, 19/11/08, 19/01/09.
-

CIV 2008-092-2719

- [8] All the hearings were cancelled because I was present in court on all the dates and if I was present on this date as well, they would have cancelled as well.
- [9] In view of the fact that Defendants, their lawyers Gary Harrison, Bharat Parshotam, Registrar Kelvin Similie and Case Officer Julie Vaifali were involved in corruption in Manukau District, on 19th February 2009 as Plaintiff I discontinued the matter and filed in High Court under CIV 2009-404-0856 before 10:00am.
- [10] I effectively discontinued the Proceedings on 19th February 2009, which remained on discontinuance basis until 10:00am on 20th February 2009.
- [11] On 20th February 2009, Judge Andree Wiltens terminated the discontinuance and entered a Judgment and Cost Order for Summary Judgment for res-judicata.
- [12] Matter was Appealed under CIV 2009-404-1521 in High Court.
-

PART J
CIV 2009-404-0856

CIV 2009-404-0856

This Proceedings was removed from Manukau District Court and was filed in High Court on 20th February 2009 before 10:00am, because of corruption.

- [1] Reference to [*CIV 2008-092-2719, Page 50 - 51, Para 1 - 12*].
- [2] The matter was re-commenced against five Defendants for breach of s 29 - s 31, s 16, s 111 of Copyright Act 1994, removed from Manukau District Court on 20th February 2009, that was abandoned on 20th July 2004 for lack of public records, by the Copyright owner Mr Prasad under:
- a) National Library Act 1965 s 30a amended 1994 and now 2003, s 31 requires every published works to be deposited in Legal Deposit of New Zealand which also marks the date on which they were published, shows the only records of the Defendants works commenced in July 2007, that would give jurisdiction and admissibility in Court, Reference to [*Doc No # 4, Page 79, Para # 4 (Defendants Works)*].
- [3] The public records shows that Defendants made INDIAN BUSINESS DIRECTORY and so does Plaintiff makes INDIAN BUSINESS DIRECTORY and for which he has not given a Copyright License to Defendants to re-produce.
- [4] Period of breach relates to 8th March 2002 onwards Reference to [*Doc No # 3, Page 79, Para # 3 (Plaintiff's Works)*].
- [5] High Court placed the Case on Standard Track scheduled for first tele-conference on 7th April 2009.
- [6] Standard direction of Plaintiff's Notice on Defendants required them to file and serve defence by 27th March 2009.
- [7] Defendants did not file nor served any documents until 7th April 2009, when they sneaked an out of time bundle of Memorandum pre-dated to 31st March 2009 and part of it was filed by non-party (*Ravin Lal*), which were received on 13th April 2009.
-

CIV 2009-404-0856

FRAUD No: 7

- [8] As Plaintiff I did not have a copy before me on 7th April 2009 for tele-conference.
- [9] High Court Registry accepted the out of time, bundle of documents filed by non-party from the Defendants, from which Associate Judge Robinson made the directions, instead of Statement of Claim and Standard direction of Court:
- a) Defendants sought Security for Costs of \$ 20, 000 from the Plaintiff,
 - b) Defendants sought the filling of second Summary Judgment for res-judicata.
- [10] Associate Judge Robinson granted it to the Defendants, I asked the Judge as to what you doing as it is res-judicata allowing a second Summary Judgment in my Proceedings, he told me he did not care.

FRAUD No: 8

- [11] I filed for a review of Associate Judge Robinson's direction/decision for a review as it affected me and my Proceedings.
- [12] Matter was called before Justice Allan on 21st August 2009, he refused to review on the basis that my Application was filed out of time:
- a) I argued that the review is about the Defendants filing and the Registry accepting out of time and out of jurisdiction documents by non-party,
 - b) Justice Allan were to strike out Defendants defective documents also, but he told me its ok that the Defendants filed defective documents and it is not ok for me to seek a review of that,
 - c) It came to my understanding that for so doing he may have accepted in the form of costs that he made on me \$ 1, 200.
- [13] I Appealed review of Robinson's decision, Justice Allan's Cost and removal of matter to Court of Appeal for corruption in High Court under CA 412/09.
-

CIV 2009-404-0856

FRAUD No: 9

[14] Defendants pre-planned to enter a fraud Summary Judgment with the influence of \$ 20 k in my Proceedings, Reference to [*CIV 2003-092-4034, Page 28 - 35, Para 1 - 30*] (*Judge Blackie's Judgment*).

[15] I took the matter with the former Judicial Commissioner.

[16] Matter was called before Associate Judge Robinson on 26th June 2009, he backed out and refused the Security Deposit.

a) I seek Solicitors Costs in the sum of \$ 2, 700.

FRAUD No: 10

[17] Matter was set down for hearing of their second Summary Judgment for res-judicata on 17th July 2009 called before Associate Judge Doogue.

[18] Defendants second Summary Judgment is res-judicata itself Reference to [*CIV 2008-092-2719, Page 50 - 51, Para 1 - 12*] and [*CIV 2003-092-4034, Page 28 - 35, Para 1 - 30*] and [*CIV 2009-404-0856, Page 54, Para 9 - 13*].

[19] Defendants could not prove any res-judicata and their Summary Judgment failed.

[20] Defendants Appealed Associate Judges decision in Court of Appeal under CA 515/09.

FRAUD No: 11

[21] Plaintiff's own Summary Judgment was not heard, because the matter would have ended.

[22] In tele-conference on 24/09/09, Gary Harrison did not appear.

a) I seek Solicitors Costs \$2,700 Doogue's and \$950 for no appearance.

CIV 2009-404-0856

FRAUD No: 12

[23] Matter was set down for further tele-conference on 8th October 2009, for stay of proceedings for Appeal filed by Defendants from Associate Judge Doogue's decision:

- a) Stay is opposed on the basis that the Defendants may have been eligible to Appeal the first Summary Judgment for res-judicata entered by Judge Andree Wiltens in Manukau District Court in CIV 2008-092-2719, Appeal is from res-judicata itself.
- b) Security for Costs is opposed,
- c) Associate Judge Doogue's decision of Summary Judgment for res-judicata is second one in the same Copyright matter with only the change of venue, therefore being res-judicata itself, from the directions from false documents and is not Appealable unless without my consent which I have not given.

FRAUD No: 13

[24] Gary Harrison proposes to prolong the matter to year 2011 which is opposed on the basis that the matter is before the Courts since year 2005 and grown into a monster fraud because of Ministry of Justice of New Zealand, 10 Judges and Gary Harrison, reference to this Case Book.

[25] All the Fact and Law clearly came out before the Court in Associate Judge Doogue's Judgment of 17th July 2009 and clearly documented in this Case Book filed in High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court.

[26] There is no further hearing required, but the hearing of this Case Book and Judgment of High Court, Court of Appeal or Supreme Court.

[27] In accordance with my Court Notice of 20th February 2009 and Standard directions of the Court, my Case is due to be heard at this time for which I paid \$1, 100 Court Fees.

CIV 2009-404-0856

[28] There is nothing further left in this matter, other than Judgment of Court:

- a) My Copyright binds the Crown under s 13 of Copyright Act 1994:
 - 1) I played a fair game since year 2003 in accordance with honesty, fairness, Rules of Court, Principles of Law and Justice of New Zealand,
 - 2) I am highly educated, have respect in my community, have several high powered trade and am highly experienced in Administration, IT (*Hardware/ Software/ Systems/ Design, Programming*), Accounting, Corporate Systems, Author, Publisher, Printing, and others, I studied Law and specialise in several sections, one being (*Copyright Law/ Copyright Act 994*),
- b) Defendants, Gary Harrison and Ministry of Justice have breached my Copyright under Copyright Act 1994:
 - 1) Played a very dirty game since year 2003 in accordance with dishonesty, unfairness, breach of Rules of Court, breach of Principles of Law and Justice of New Zealand, bribery, fraud, corruption and conspiracy.

[29] I cannot wait any longer, the matter be decided, as all the directions have been made from false documents and non-party, I am not responsible:

- a) All their claim failed in High Court and there is no further jurisdiction,
- b)

This is no fair justice and Ministry of Justice, cannot go on hearing Gary Harrison's non-sense for ever.

[30] I have business commitments, therefore my Case be set down for hearing and be allocated half day, otherwise Leave be granted for hearing before Court of Appeal in accordance with this Case Book for hearing and Judgment from:

- a) Statement of Claim,
 - b) Default Judgment,
 - c) Summary Judgment.
-

PART K
CIV 2009-404-1521

CIV 2009-404-1521

This is an Appeal from Manukau District Court from Proceedings CIV 2003-092-2719 in the decision of Judge Andree Wiltens on the res-judicata basis.

[1] Reference to [*CIV 2008-092-2719, Page 50 - 51, Para 1 - 12*].

FRAUD No: 14

[2] In view of the fact that Defendants, their lawyers Gary Harrison, Bharat Parshotam, Registrar Kelvin Similie and Case Officer Julie Vaifali were involved in corruption in Manukau District, on 19th February 2009 as Plaintiff I discontinued the matter and filed in High Court under CIV 2009-404-0856 before 10:00am.

[3] I effectively discontinued the Proceedings on 19th February 2009, which remained on discontinuance basis until 10:00am on 20th February 2009.

[4] On 20th February 2009, Defendants, their lawyers Gary Harrison, Bharat Parshotam, Registrar Kelvin Similie, Case Officer Julie Vaifali and Judge Andree Wiltens:

- a) Terminated the discontinuance, in spite of having the knowledge of discontinuance,
- b) Proceeded to a hearing and entered a Summary Judgment for res-judicata and Cost order was produced with the influence of money for entering fraud Judgment in Defendant's favour.

[5] The Proceedings became alive and normal again, discontinuance ended and the matter became a decision of res-judicata basis on 20th February 2009 after 10:00am in Manukau District Court.

[6] Normal procedures of Court were applied for Appeal and Defendants were no longer qualified for costs under discontinuance basis and no further discontinuance was filed after termination on 20th February 2009 and Defendants were required to Appeal/Cross Appeal this Judgment in High Court.

CIV 2009-404-1521

FRAUD No: 15

[7] On 20th February 2009, Defendants, their lawyers Gary Harrison, Bharat Parshotam, Registrar Kelvin Similie, Case Officer Julie Vaifali and Judge Andree Wiltens committed criminal Act:

- a) Defined under Crimes Act 1961 s 116, Administration of Law and Justice, Conspiracy to defeat justice,
- b) Breached District Court Act 1947 s 57 (*Right of Audience of Plaintiff*):
 - 1) Discontinuance was to remain intact, Judge terminated it,
 - 2) Judge Proceeded to hearing and entered a decision, Judgment and Cost Order.

[8] On 20th February 2009, after 10:00am the Proceedings CIV 2008-092-2719 became alive on the res-judicata basis that came before Justice Wylie:

- a) It was clearly determined by Justice Wylie that the discontinuance was effectively made, but was terminated by Judge Andree Wiltens,
 - b) The issue of discontinuance and costs finished on the entry of a decision in the matter after 10:00am on 20th February 2009,
 - c) If no Appeal was made by Plaintiff, decision would remain as a decision of Summary Judgment for res-judicata,
 - d) Justice Wylie's power was only to the extent of setting aside what was written on Judge Andree Wiltens decision of Summary Judgment for res-judicata, since the discontinuance was terminated, unless Defendants filed an Appeal or cross Appeal for discontinuance, that would give jurisdiction to Justice Wylie to deal in that aspects,
 - e) Justice Wylie's Costs is illegal and to be reversed onto the Defendants, by Court of Appeal, therefore Leave be granted,
 - f) How much did the Defendants promised to pay here also?.
-

PART L
CIV 2009-404-2312

CIV 2009-404-2312

This Proceedings was filed by Gary Harrison for the Defendants to recover the loot that they paid in High Court and Court of Appeal.

[1] First Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-5424, Page 37, Para 8 - 9*].

[2] Second Reference to [*CA 652/07, NZCA 70, Page 43, Para 6 - 7*].

FRAUD No: 16

[3] I was nearly made bankrupt by Defendants Indiana Publications (NZ) Limited and its director Ravin Lal for not reimbursing benefits paid by them to High Court Justice Asher for refusing leave to Court of Appeal and Court of Appeal President W.P. Young for dismissing the Appeal and Registrar Claire Brown \$ 5, 700 CIV 2005-404-5424, CA 652/07, NZCA 70.

[4] This excludes the sum of \$1, 100 to the solicitors costs to set aside bankruptcy.

PART M
CA 412/09

CA 412/09

This Appeal was made to Court of Appeal for the refusal of review of Associate Judge Robinson's direction/decision in CIV 2009-404-0856.

[1] Reference to [*CIV 2009-404-0856, Page 53 - 55, Para 1 - 16*].

FRAUD No: 17

[2] This Appeal arose as a result of fraud by High Court Registry, Gordon Sulliman, Tenusha Aiyanga and Gary Harrison:

- a) High Court Registry accepted for filing a bundle of out of time Memorandum after the time for filing the documents were expired and I was affected by the documents,
- b) Associate Judge Robinson made directions/decision from these false documents rather than the legal documents that were filed before the Court: Statement of Claim and Notice of proceedings.

[3] I have a right to Appeal a fraud or fraudulent activity, High Court refused that instead allowed illegal directions from that.

[4] I Appealed the matter to Court of Appeal and once again this man W.P. Young refused Leave as it adversely affected me and for the benefit of the Defendants.

[5] I am being Ordered to re-imburse to the Defendants \$ for some activity that was illegally caused by them.

[6] These costs are believed to be for benefits by way of illegal costs to Court of Appeal for dismissal of Leave and right of Appeal, awarded by President of Court of Appeal W.P. Young, Justice O' Regan and the Registrar for reducing the Security for Costs in CA 515/09. Justice O'Regan told me if you are affected by this so what ?.

PART N
CA 507/09

CA 507/09

This Appeal was made to Court of Appeal for the refusal by Justice Harrison for the hearing of conviction in CRI 2009-404-0001.

[1] Reference to [*CRI 2009-404-0001, Page 48, Para 1 - 7*].

FRAUD No: 18

[2] I am of the opinion that the president W.P. Young will dismiss this Appeal as well.

[3] That does not deter me from seeking justice in Ministry of Justice of New Zealand in New Zealand Courts.

a) I am a man of principle, I believe in my own hard work, effort, truth, fairness and equal justice for everyone, Law is the same whether it came from lawyer's, a professional layman's or the horses mouth,

b) My message is clear to whole universe, I will never pay any bribe to any Court Judge of New Zealand, regardless whether I get justice of Ministry of Justice of New Zealand or not.

[4] This also leads to believe that how many other genuine and innocent people may have suffered injustice of Ministry of Justice of New Zealand by Court Judges, that is why there is no faith in the justice of this country.

[5] This also goes to show as to why New Zealand be still rated the 3rd highest corrupt free country in the world, the rest of the world needs to know.

PART O
CA 515/09

CA 515/09

This Appeal was made to Court of Appeal by the Defendants from Associate Judge Doogue's decision for refusal of entry of Garry Harrison;s fraud Summary Judgment in my Copyright matter in CIV 2009-404-0856.

- [1] First Reference to [CA 412/09, Page 64, Para 1 - 6].
- [2] Second Reference to [CIV 2009-404-0856, Page 55, Para 17 - 20].
- [3] Third Reference to [CIV 2003-092-4034, Page 28 - 35, Para 1 - 30].

FRAUD No: 19

- [4] Defendants first Summary Judgment from Manukau District Court failed in High Court in CIV 2009-404-1521 and that would be considered the valid Summary Judgment for Appeal.
 - [5] Associate Judge Doogue's decision is second Summary Judgment in the same Copyright matter of a coloured Plaintiff and so two Summary Judgment is allowed by Ministry of Justice of New Zealand.
 - [6] The big question is how much is promised this time to Court of Appeal to enter another fraud Summary Judgment in CA 515/09 to discredit Associate Judge Doogue's decision.?
 - [7] Court of Appeal has set up this \$ 20, 000 fraud against me and my Proceedings for fraud decision from a res-judicata itself in favour of the Defendants and fraud costs to the Judges.
-

PART P
CIV 2009-404-0000

COMPANY'S MATTER

This Proceedings relates to Sage Group Limited, several Applications were made before High Court (*Gordon Sulliman*) made it impossible to file documents in this matter in CIV 2006-404-4389.

[1] Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-4389, Page 41, Para 1 - 8*]

FRAUD No: 20

[2] Gordon Sulliman made it impossible to file documents and serve on the Registrar of Companies for re-instatement of company Sage Group Limited.

[3] Tenusha Eiyenga chased me from the front counter on several occasions humiliating me in front of Court staff, she told me on several occasions, go away and no one will take your documents, that was in defence of the Defendants as they are believed to be her family/friends.

[4] I had been unable to file documents before the High Court because of corruption.

[5] Supreme Court to re-instate my company and award all the damages, costs and compensation caused by Defendants, Gary Harrison and Ministry of Justice.

PART Q
SC 2009/0000

RELIEF SOUGHT

The whole matter involves bribery, fraud, corruption, conspiracy in the matters listed, that started from one Proceedings in CIV 2003-0692-4034 by Judge Blackie of Manukau District Court, Gary Harrison, Jag Lal and Ravin Lal in year 2005 and now also Bharat Parshotam which led to the start of sixteen other Proceedings to defraud a legal Copyright.

It is still going like cancer in all parts of Ministry of Justice.

This matter now can only be dealt with by Supreme Court of New Zealand with which, I seek the following relief:

[1] **CIV 2003-092-4034:**

Setting aside of Judge Blackie's Judgment and Cost Order in CIV 2003-092-4034, upon the grounds that the Judgment is made from non-party's evidence (*High Court CIV 2005-404-5424 of 6th November 2007 at [3] and Court of Appeal rulings CA 652/07, NZCA 70 of 19th March 2008*). Company's Solicitors and Court Costs be awarded against the Defendants Appx \$ 25, 000 plus the compensation of \$ 15, 000 that was sought and further compensation for company unable to trade since 2nd November 2006 be awarded Reference to [*CIV 2003-092-4034, Page 28 - 35, Para 1 - 30*].

[2] **CIV 2005-404-5424:**

Accordingly Costs Order of \$2,440 made by Justice Asher (*High Court CIV 2005-404-5424 of 6th November 2007 at [3]*) be reversed that is related to CIV 2003-092-4034, and re-paid Reference to [*CIV 2005-404-5424, Page 37, Para 1 - 9*].

[3] **CIV 2007-404-1022:**

Accordingly the company was advertised in Gazette and News papers for no reasons and was abandoned, therefore compensation be granted by the Court that is related to CIV 2003-092-4034, approximately \$ 75, 000 Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-1022, Page 39, Para 1 - 7*].

RELIEF SOUGHT

[4] **CIV 2007-404-4389:**

Accordingly the company was advertised in Gazette and News papers for no reasons and the was Liquidated on 2nd November 2006 therefore company be re-instated on the Company's Register and compensation be granted by the Court that is related to CIV 2003-092-4034, Court to decide since the company never traded from 2nd November 2006, plus all the Court Costs in High Court appx \$ 5, 000 Reference to [*CIV 2006-404-4389, Page 41, Para 1 - 8*].

[5] **CA 652/07, NZCA 70:**

Accordingly the company's defects were not corrected by Justice Asher, no Leave was given and Court of Appeal did not give Leave for serious breach of Law, therefore compensation be granted by the Court that is related to CIV 2003-092-4034, therefore Plaintiff's Costs be awarded \$3, 200 Reference to [*CA 652/07, NZCA70, Page 43, Para 1 - 8*].

[6] **CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486:**

Accordingly the Official Assignee did not give consent to have the matter filed before High Court, the director was not legally obliged to give the records of the company for fraud, therefore compensation be granted by the Court that is related to CIV 2003-092-4034, Solicitors Costs \$ 4, 750, and \$ 2, 700 be awarded Reference to [*CRI 2007-004-20246, 7004503486, Page 45 - 46, Para 1 - 13*].

[7] **CRI 2009-404-0001:**

Accordingly the High Court did not hear the matter filed before High Court, the director was legally entitled to be heard, therefore compensation be granted by the Court that is related to CIV 2003-092-4034, Solicitors Costs \$ 2, 700 be awarded Reference to [*CRI 2009-404-0001, Page 48, Para 1 - 7*].

RELIEF SOUGHT

[8] CIV 2003-092-2719:

This Proceedings was started on the rulings of (*High Court CIV 2005-404-5424 of 6th November 2007 at [3] and Court of Appeal rulings CA 652/07, NZCA 70 of 19th March 2008*) and upon the grounds that the Copyright aspects of the Proceedings and the Copyright owner were deposed on 20th July 2004.

The matter was discontinued on 19th February 2009, for the reasons of fraud and corruption by the defence, lawyers and court officials.

On 20th February 2009, the defence, lawyers, court and court officials terminated the discontinuance and entered a decision of Summary Judgment for res-judicata and Cost Order (*causing a criminal act under Crimes Act 1961 s 116*), therefore Plaintiff's Costs of \$ 5, 045 be awarded Reference to [*CIV 2008-092-2719, Page 50 - 51, Para 1 - 12*].

[9] CIV 2009-404-0856:

Plaintiff commenced Copyright Proceedings on the Defendants on 20th February 2009, Defendants Summary Judgment for res-judicata was decided in Manukau District Court CIV 2008-092-2719 and in High Court CIV 2009-404-1521.

According to the Plaintiff's Notice, Defendants were required to file defence by 27th March 2009, which they have not done so until this date.

Defendants have no defence but are engaged in bribery of Court judges, fraud, conspiracy and corruption in High Court, this is not the method of justice in New Zealand.

Defendants filed a bundle of false, illegal and out of time document from which Associate Judge Robinson made wrong direction in the matter without jurisdiction.

RELIEF SOUGHT

Plaintiff filed for a review of that, Justice Allan refused to review and awarded Costs on Plaintiff, the Costs are illegal (*destined to be in the Judges pocket*) therefore be reversed and Plaintiff's Costs \$2, 700 be awarded.

Defendants Security for Costs failed in High Court on 26th June 2009 and Plaintiff's Costs \$2, 700 be awarded.

Defendants Summary Judgment for res-judicata failed in High Court on 17th July 2009 and Plaintiff's Costs \$2, 700 be awarded.

Gary Harrison failed to appear in tele-conference of 24th September 2009 Plaintiff's Costs be awarded \$ 950 be awarded.

Plaintiff's matter be decided before Friday on 23rd October 2009 as it is due for hearing by now in accordance with the Court Notice of 20th February 2009, High Court is involved in corruption Reference to [*CIV 2009-404-0856, Page 53 - 57, Para 1 - 30*].

[10] **CIV 2009-404-1521:**

On 20th February 2009, the defence, lawyers, court and court officials terminated the discontinuance and entered a decision of Summary Judgment for res-judicata and Cost Order (*causing a criminal act under Crimes Act 1961 s 116*).

The Proceedings became alive and normal, High Court illegally imposed Costs on the Plaintiff on which it had no jurisdiction (*destined to end up in judges pocket*), the Costs be reversed and Plaintiff's Costs of \$ 7, 500 be awarded Reference to [*CIV 2009-404-1521, Page 59 - 60, Para 1 - 8*].

[11] **CIV 2009-404-2312:**

Defendants brought Bankruptcy Proceedings on me from the loot in High Court CIV 2005-404-5424 and Court of Appeal CA 652/07, NZ CA70 (*causing a criminal act under Crimes Act 1961 s 116*).

RELIEF SOUGHT

These amounts be paid back by the Defendants: \$ 2, 440 (*High Court*), \$ 2, 572 (*Court of Appeal*) Solicitors Costs \$ 1, 200 be awarded Reference to [*CIV 2009-404-2312, Page 62, Para 1 - 4*].

[12] **CA 412/09:**

Court of Appeal refused Leave for genuine course and from the same defects granted Appeal to the Defendants.

It was all caused by the Defendants and its lawyers, therefore Plaintiff's Costs of \$ 3, 200 be awarded Reference to [*CA 412/09 Page 64, Para 1 - 6*].

[13] **CA 507/09:**

High Court refused to hear this matter for which there was legal rights.

It was all caused by the Defendants, Ministry of Economic Development and its lawyers of illegally liquidating the company, therefore Appellant's Costs of \$ 3, 200, plus Costs in Auckland District Court \$ 4, 750, with compensation of \$ 75, 000 for illegal Proceedings be awarded Reference to [*CA 507/09 Page 66, Para 1 - 5*].

[14] **CA 515/09:**

Court of Appeal has set up this \$ 20, 000 fraud against me and my Proceedings for fraud decision from a res-judicata itself in favour of the Defendants.

It was all caused by the Defendants and its lawyers, therefore Plaintiff's Costs of \$ 3, 200 be awarded, the fraud Appeal of the Defendants be dismissed Reference to [*CA 515/09 Page 68, Para 1 - 4*].

[15] **COMPANY'S MATTER**

It was all caused by the Defendants and its lawyers, therefore Court to award damages Reference to [*Company's matter, Page 70, Para 1 - 3*].

THIS APPLICATION is made under Supreme Court Act 2003 as right of Appeal from Court of Appeal in CA 412/09 s 7 and s 13(2)b Substantial Miscarriage of Justice.

Applicant is not legally aided.

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

APPLICANTS

Applicant's address for service is:
3 Mono Place, Ellerslie, Auckland,
P O Box 14-637, Panmure, or P.O. Box 101-630 NSMC, Auckland, New Zealand,
Mobile: 021 525-730, Email: mails@nzicom.co.nz.

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURTS

THIS NOTICE IS SERVED ON FOLLOWING RESPONDENTS:

As Per Listing Reference to [*Service Listing, Page 8 - 10, Para 1 - 16*]

Note:

Cheque for Fees of \$ 900 is attached.

Dated at **Auckland** this **Thursday** the **15th** day of **October 2009**

SECTION 10
DOCUMENTS IN SUPPOT

DOCUMENTS LISTING

No	Date	Description of Document	Possession
001	20/07/04	Judge Simpson's Order describing the amendments to Plaintiff	Attached
002	30/05/05	Firm Fixture Notice given by Court for firm hearing on this date 20 th July 2005	Attached
003	08/03/02	National Library Certificate, a legal document that describes the ownership of Copyright, the Publisher, Author and the Publication date	Attached
004	07/07/07	National Library details of Defendants document filed as at July 2007	Attached
005	02/06/05	Court Transcript describing Judge Blackie was aware that 2 nd June 2005 was not a hearing date, Mr Prasad was a non-party, it was Database matter and there were Solicitors on Record (<i>Partial Court Transcript</i>)	Attached
006	31/10/08	Accountants Letter describing the company's financial position as at two days prior to the liquidation	Attached
007	20/06/08	First Letter of Official Assignee describing the refusal of consent to commencement of proceedings of the company to correct defects of judicial issues	Attached
008	11/07/08	Second Letter of Official Assignee describing the refusal of consent to commencement of proceedings of the company to correct defects of judicial issues	Attached
009	29/08/05	Judge Blackie's Judgment	Attached
010	06/11/07	Justice Asher's Judgment	Attached
011	19/03/08	Court of Appeal's Judgment	Attached

"Fraud On The Court By An Officer Of The Court ~ State and Federal"

Who is an "officer of the court"?

A judge is an officer of the court, as well as are all attorneys. A state judge is a state judicial officer, paid by the State to act impartially and lawfully. A federal judge is a federal judicial officer, paid by the federal government to act impartially and lawfully. State and federal attorneys fall into the same general category and must meet the same requirements. A judge is not the court. People v. Zajic, 88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626 (1980).

What is "fraud on the court"?

Whenever any officer of the court commits fraud during a proceeding in the court, he/she is engaged in "fraud upon the court". In Bulloch v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his judicial function — thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."

"Fraud upon the court" has been defined by the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals to "embrace that species of fraud which does, or attempts to, defile the court itself, or is a fraud perpetrated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery can not perform in the usual manner its impartial task of adjudging cases that are presented for adjudication." Kenner v. C.I.R., 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, 60.23. The 7th Circuit further stated "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final."

What effect does an act of "fraud upon the court" have upon the court proceeding?

"Fraud upon the court" makes void the orders and judgments of that court.

It is also clear and well-settled Illinois law that any attempt to commit "fraud upon the court" vitiates the entire proceeding. The People of the State of Illinois v. Fred E. Sterling, 357 Ill. 354; 192 N.E. 229 (1934) ("The maxim that fraud vitiates every transaction into which it enters applies to judgments as well as to contracts and other transactions."); Allen F. Moore v. Stanley F. Sievers, 336 Ill. 316; 168 N.E. 259 (1929) ("The maxim that fraud vitiates every transaction into which it enters ..."); In re Village of Willowbrook, 37 Ill.App.2d 393 (1962) ("It is axiomatic that fraud vitiates everything."); Dunham v. Dunham, 57 Ill.App. 475 (1894), affirmed 162 Ill. 589 (1896); Skelly Oil Co. v. Universal Oil Products Co., 338 Ill.App. 79, 86 N.E.2d 875, 883-4 (1949); Thomas Stasel v. The American Home Security Corporation, 362 Ill. 350; 199 N.E. 798 (1935).

Under Illinois and Federal law, when any officer of the court has committed "fraud upon the court", the orders and judgment of that court are void, of no legal force or effect.

Under New Zealand Law it is punishable under Crimes Act 1961, "Administration of Law and Justice" and the Supreme Court has the power to overturn every such decision and Orders and enter correct decision and Orders.
