


Attention MEDIA BUYING AGENTS: Discover the cost-benefit imperative of advertising in our journals. <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishAdvertising.html>

Should ACCC be wary of Telstra's culture of CRIME and CRIMINAL FRAUD?



The Face of Telstra in the current broadband debate: Dr Phil Burgess, MD Public Policy & Communications, Telstra. HAIGPHOTO

By Alex Gordon LLB

Our journalising of the Telstra culture of crime and fraud is, this month, spread over six of our journals, with each handling a different aspect or

emphasis. **This is topical as Telstra is attempting to strangle future competition in Broadband in Australia.** People should now know what the culture is at Telstra. These are print journals and are held in various libraries. Additionally, all of our journals are archived on our websites. The National Library of Australia and the State Library of Australia have online catalogues with links to our archived versions. A part of our strategy is enabling the journals to be linked from both the print and archived copies. Of course Google is an essential part of our strategy.

[Attention MEDIA BUYING AGENTS: Discover the cost-benefit imperative of advertising in our journals.](http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishAdvertising.html) <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishAdvertising.html>

The links to our other journals covering aspects of this FRAUD, including hyperlinks for this journal when archived online, are detailed at the end of this article. [Google indexes/notes them regardless of where they appear.]

Telstra persists with its attempts to mislead and deceive with arguments that may seem to the uneducated majority to be plausible. On 22 May, 2007, [Whirlpool broadband news](http://www.whirlpool.net.au/) at <http://www.whirlpool.net.au/> carried the news that Telstra had lost yet another appeal to the Australian Competition Tribunal. It added that the tribunal had “disputed the validity of Telstra's pricing models”.

Different aspects of this matter are discussed in a number of our journals this month. See the paragraph last page linking to each of the journals carrying an aspect. In particular, note the two *Dossier of:* journals.

Our Informant Haig had a extremely valuable business n

Townsville but FRAUD by Telstra wrecked the business. It involved deceit, dishonesty and others matters which are currently before the courts so mention of them is subjudice.

So what can we tell you? So, what got in the way? Well, Haig was defrauded by Telstra with the aid [wittingly or unwittingly –

we will consider that aspect later], of their

Corporate Solicitor Ian Robert Arthur Row, [See our '[Dossier of:](#)' on him], and



Telstra's Corporate Solicitor, Ian Robert Arthur Row, wittingly or unwittingly involved in criminal FRAUD of business owner. Aspects are subject to subjudice considerations in the courts' Criminal Jurisdiction.

other criminals, which, sub-judice considerations prevent our detailing at this time. In the future we will be able to details all of the matter now sub-judice.

The “Value of Telstra's FRAUD!!”

The initial loss of revenue cause by the admitted fault of Telstra was of the order of \$90,000. A payment of \$90,000 in November 1996, would NOT have fully compensated for the loss. The later the instance at which compensation would have been paid, the greater would be the amount of the losses caused. Because Mel Ward had assured Haig that the loss would be “fixed up”, Haig had delayed restructuring his business to take account of the Telstra fraud. This caused him to lose his business and be declared bankrupt. This is all due to the Telstra Fraud.

Just as we said, Haig had a nascent employment agency in 1986, three years before Therese Rein began her employment agency. Haig had many advantages over Rein. Her business is today worth in the order of \$170 million. Haig's would have been worth more. Haig had many other aspects to his business including Computing, ICT, Tax, Accounting, Staff Training [Haig had been a full-time Secondary School teacher and a full-time Tutor in Commerce at James Cook University in Townsville], Superannuation and a Licenced Corporate Dealer in Securities, under which many Dealer's Reps could be appointed. The value of the Loss today would greatly exceed, \$1,000 million dollars.

In a year or so the “sub judice blank” should be able to be published. If the Government assists Telstra to gain the Broadband advantage over G9, [we will ensure the Government, including the Minister Senator Helen Coonan, all know the details of the “Telstra CRIMINAL ACTIONS AND FRAUD”, alerting them to the “subjudice blank”, as we can do, as it is not publishing it], regardless of who wins this year's election, those people centrally involved in giving Telstra the nod would be widely publicized. That would be

a fraud on the whole Australian community.

We, at Australian Law Publishers, believe that once G9 know of the Criminal fraud by Telstra, using criminal means, including the “SUB JUDICE BLANK”, they will be able to hammer that to the government. Telstra will not be able to argue in the face of that. We can show G9, the whereabouts of PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, IN COURT FILES, EVIDENCING ALL THESE MATTERS.

The links connecting our journals on the different aspects and emphases of this TELSTRA FRAUD matter are:

The more extensive narrative is covered in [HaigReport Issue200702 dated 18 June, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_HaigReport_journal_issue200702.pdf) at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_HaigReport_journal_issue200702.pdf /. The related journals on the Telstra culture of Crime and fraud are included [in these journals and these archive URLs](#): **Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN: 1321-6562** with the actual copy at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_Australian_Criminal_Law_Journal_issue200706.pdf **Australian Telecommunications Law Journal ISSN 1321-4470** with the archived copy at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_Australian_Telecommunications_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf /. We have [Dossiers of:](#) [URL = <http://austlawpublish.com/austlawpublishDossierof.html> /] for the two person centrally involved [not subject to the sub-judice consideration] viz: [Mel Ward](#) at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618dossierof.mel_vin.ward.pdf and [Ian Robert Arthur Row, then Corporate Solicitor at Telstra](#) at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618dossierof.ian_row.pdf /. Because the Commonwealth Ombudsman [not the TIO] was also involved, we have included that aspect in [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal issue200701](#) at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_Australian_Parliamentary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf /.