

To The Crown Law Office

To the Solicitor-General Una Jagose QC

20/5/2020

Dear Ms Jagose,

It is now almost a year since I first wrote to you outlining the judicial fraud committed by Shonagh Kenderdine where she falsely claimed in full public view to be a warranted judge for a staggering 13 months, breaking a slew of New Zealand laws and corruptly pocketing tax payer monies. To date you have not replied.

This fraud was fully verified by an arm of the government itself, The Judicial Conduct Commissioner, Sir David Gascoigne. Gascoigne took almost a year to answer John Adams' complaint. This deliberate delay was an obstruction of justice.

I am disturbed by the correspondence from your office, shared with me and where I am mentioned by name, where your office is gas-lighting those who are following up on this corruption. Instead of answering the fundamental question as to whether a member of the public [Kenderdine] can issue a legal decision, red herrings are thrown around about her qualification to chair the Call-In. The day Kenderdine permanently lost her warrant was the day the Call-In had no legal standing or authority to issue a consent for the Turitea wind farm. Her subsequent lies and forgeries of official documents signed off as retired judge and Environment Court Judge do not equate to validation of the Final Decision but simply pile on the fraud.

Your office cites the following in correspondence dated 6 May 2020 to Ms Mildon.

(b) 1 member as the chairperson who must be a current, former, or retired Environment Court or a retired High Court Judge.

*and*

(5) The minister must appoint a current, former or retired Environment Judge as the chairperson.

In both instances the adjective "*current*," itself modified by "*must*," modifies all subsequent categories of eligible persons, i.e. they must be eligible to hold a warrant throughout the duration of the Call-In. All other Call-Ins have had a warranted judge as chairperson through to their Final Decision.

Your office has I believe, deliberately and incorrectly inserted the word "either" into correspondence to Ms Mildon, a key word which is not in the legislation cited and which would fundamentally change its entire meaning.

This is a misrepresentation of the clear and unequivocal statements regarding eligibility for appointment.

I ask you to promptly cite for me NZ legislation which shows an elderly woman without a warrant and ineligible for one by virtue of age, as per her appointment under the District Courts Act 1947, can dupe the public and issue a corrupt binding legal decision.

Yours sincerely

Paul Stichbury