

# TO THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## SUPPLEMENT TO THE PETITION TO THE HOUSE 15<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2010 AND 24<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2010

This petition of Antal Bittmann and fellow citizens that have been aggrieved by an administrative decision of a member of the *Judiciary* or an *Officer* of the Commonwealth as set out in Section 75(v) of the Constitution.

A writ of mandamus to show cause is based on a **presumption** of misbehaviour. Four writs were served and heard in the High Court in 2008.

Officers of the Commonwealth, appointed by the Governor-General made or sought orders to liquidate and/or freeze assets of companies and/or depositors on a **presumption** of insolvency.

These Officers (judicators) tendered their submission to the High Court.

The High Court failed to set aside orders that were obtained on a **presumption**.

Where a cause is pending involving interpretations of the Constitution, it is the duty of the Court not to proceed without advising Parliament.

This is a matter that must be given to the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth (as per Section 78A – Intervention by the Attorney-General. This is a provision relating to the constitutional matters. *Judiciary Act 1903.*) and, **for the House to resolve**.

We the aggrieved citizens, with the right of petitioning the Parliament (a long established fundamental right), we request both Houses to use their exclusive powers to terminate appointments that breach the rules of natural justice.

We ask the House to address matters where only Parliament has jurisdiction.

**This is not a matter for a working group by the standing committee of the Attorney-General to resolve.**