

Dear Senators, Committee Secretary, Sir, Madam,

I became aware of this inquiry from seeing a segment on the 7.30 report. From what I saw the practices at the Post seem to be every bit as bad as I experienced when I first work there in 1988. I will try to give brief summary of what happened. I was injured in 1988 and the Post dismissed me in 1990 for being medically unfit. I was under the Rehabilitation Act of 1988. That started a long struggle for compensation.

I first submitted my claim at Australia Post and was told that my claim would not be paid even before it was assessed. I was then sent to a Doctor [REDACTED], who gave me a very unfair examination, his report was full of innuendo and misrepresentations. This doctor is well known in insurance field for these types of reports and it was quite clear that the post knew this.

I was also sent for another examination by this doctor in 1996, I was injured during the examination and attended the emergency rooms of the [REDACTED] Hospital. The exacerbation of my injury by the doctor caused me to miss my tertiary exams and I had to spend another 6 months to re-sit the exams.

I was then sent for reconsideration and much the same happened, my then solicitor requested the Post review the medical evidence by my treating doctors, the answer was we will only consider our doctor's opinions. This is much the same practice as the FNDs that are currently used by the Post.

It took 18 months to get a hearing date with the AAT and then the second hearing day was 6 months later. That appeal was lost. I was fortunate to get a second chance due to a review of the legality of the Act in my case. I was allowed to submit my case to be heard in the District Court.

During the litigation process we requested pertinent documents that we believed would show the Post's negligence in the matter. The post repeatedly refused to answer the subpoenas and denied the documents existed. My solicitor had to take the stand himself and gave evidence to the effect that the Post was concealing relevant documents that the court had ordered to be discovered. The representative from the Post was also cross examined as to the existence of the documents. If I recall correctly he was warned against perjuring himself.

The judge made the order that if the Post did not produce the documents that we said existed he would strike out their defense, well they managed to find those documents that they said didn't exist or they couldn't find, they didn't produce them until the day of the hearing and huge quantity of documents required an adjournment to properly process these injury reports. In the end there was around 400 relevant injury reports that were similar to the injuries I sustained with 18 months of my injury occurring.

Had my solicitors not pursued the Post over these injury reports we would never had been able to prove the negligence of the Post's work processes. In the [REDACTED] court of Appeal this evidence was crucial in the finding of negligence against the Post. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The incriminating evidence of course was the reason they said the documents couldn't be found or didn't exist. I regard this as essentially contempt of

court and corruption. It shows that the Post cannot be trusted and only when placed under very heavy scrutiny which is not available to most Australia Post employees especially given the extensive powers granted to the Post under the Rehabilitation act of 1988.

I would be willing to supply the documents I have from the court process and the conduct of the doctors employed by the Post and the way the Post conducted themselves when dealing with myself as an injured employee. I believe all employees should be treated with respect and the Post an Australian government organization should not use these extensive powers anymore as they have clearly showed time and time again they have abused them.

I met many injured Australia Post workers during the time of my court hearings and I had much sympathy for their position as it is a very difficult situation when you are injured and need support and yet the exact opposite happens if you work at the Post. The mental aspects of the corruption happening at the Post on the injured worker should not be under estimated, the effects are also transferred in the injured workers personal life and can have great effect on relationships.

When the Post lost in the Court of Appeal unanimously they briefed [REDACTED] QC a constitutional law specialist to see if they could appeal the judgment in the High Court, he couldn't find a error in law, it then was sent back to the District Court.

My case was eventually won, it took 13 years from the time I was injured and cost many hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees. The case manager on the side of Australia Post behaved extremely badly in court and actually threw the brief at the Australian Government Solicitor, my counsel described his behaviour in general as the worst he had ever seen in a court room. I believe this person is still in a senior position in Australia Post.

I also don't believe the Post should have an advantage over other companies in being able to administer their own worker's compensation scheme, that is not a level playing field. I also believe that the cash reward for the Post's managers is a very bad idea, it reminds me of aspects of the Stanford Prison Experiment and the Melbourne experiment where the extensive powers granted to one side was exploited and sadistic behaviour was exhibited.

I do not believe Australians want to sanction such deceptive, rogue, corrupt and bullying behaviour at an Australian Government corporation. Practices at Australia Post needs to change, despite my protests to members of Parliament at the time of my case, nothing happened as it "was before the courts". It is time for change. Thank you for taking the time to read my submission.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]