

Dossier of:

ISSN: 1834-805X

18 June, 2007.

Issue 200702.melvin.ward

Publisher: **Australian Law Publishers** Pty Ltd[ACN 010 615 933] [AuLP] [E: info@AustLawPublish.com](mailto:info@AustLawPublish.com)
<http://austlawpublish.com> 254 Hawken Drive, St Lucia, Qld. 4067. Skype: russellmathews

Editor-in-Chief: **Russell G H Mathews BCom BSc LLB BA**

keywords: undertaking; to compensate for Telstra's caused fault; appointed Corporate Solicitor Ian Row to implement his undertaking; Ward knowingly or unknowingly invoked CRIMINAL MEANS

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

Melvin K. Ward



Undertaking DISHONOURED, INSTEAD, CRIMINAL FRAUD

By Alex Gordon LLB

Mel Ward AO, Managing Director of Telecom/Telstra in 1987 when he gave his undertaking to compensate customer for Telstra's admitted fault. HAIGPHOTO

00702.melvin.ward

1

Mel Ward was the Managing Director of Telstra in 1987, when he appeared one Sunday evening on Channel 9's "60 Minutes". His message was that he was intending to make big advances at Telstra. Our regular informant, Haig, had been cost a great amount of lost business from his Tax and Accounting Business in Townsville, by a Telstra caused fault. He had been given the run around for 12 months by the parasites in Telecom in Townsville, from the time the fault that had persisted for five months was discovered by Haig. Haig 'phoned Ward the following day. Ward's stated view to Haig was that the loss should have been remedied, and that it should have been remedied "long ago". He undertook to ensure that was done and to that purpose, he would have "someone up there within a fortnight".

WARD appointed **Ian Row**, Corporate Solicitor, to implement his undertaking. Knowingly, or unknowingly to Row, Row implemented a criminal and fraudulent procedure to ensure Haig was denied compensation. Consideration the many statements by Row at the time suggests Row was well aware of the Criminal fraud occurring. Since Haig had already made complaint to the Commonwealth Ombudsman [CO], Row decided it was easier to involve the CO in this "procedure" that was a fraud. The CO accepted that Telstra should not compensate Haig for his lost business. We will be holding the CO to account. We are sure they will rely upon a statement that they were unaware of the fraud occurring.

Ward is one step further removed from the fraud. All other things being equal, this would suggest that there is a greater probability to be attached to a Ward Statement, that he was unaware of the fraud. This will need to be investigated. It is not just a matter of history either. Ward will hear of this/these journals. He will make decisions. What he decides will have a bearing on how he emerges from any scrutiny of him. There is also the interplay that is likely between Ward and Row. Consider, just hypothetically of course, that each may have evidence on each other that is not the most favourable.

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 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.

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.]

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 of Maths 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.

Haig does not think that he will receive that due compensation from Telstra. We had considered withholding Row's name, but we suspected that Row or others [of which there are many] who wish an ill wind blowing on Haig, may try to allege that Haig was attempting to extort money from Row. Row is reported on the web ["Revision" Issue 2 May, 2002] as at May 2002 as working at Visionstream, a subsidiary of Leighton Holdings Ltd. He sounded a real crawler: "The opportunity to be part of the Visionstream Team, under Chris Forsterling's leadership, at this stage of my career, provides me with both excitement and difficulty." He continues: "The difficulty is that I keep putting off my retirement because of my enjoyment with work!" Well, if Row has not retired already, this publication may seal it for him. Haig says that Row not only cheated him, but also was a "smart arse" into the bargain. Haig says, "Let Row sue. I'm ready for him now." Haig says that if Row decides to sue us, the Publisher, Haig will apply to the court to be joined in the action. The "sub judice blank" can be detailed in court.

It does appear, [thankfully], that Row is no longer with the Leightons' subsidiary. The web shows Row as "Media Contact: Ian Row, 0408

126 396" for "Media release – Same sex relationship register welcome ..." for Victorian Equal

Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, or maybe that was not his job but just an interest.

We see on the web that Row is rabbiting on about South Gippsland Shire Council approving a rabbit farm in the area and so will be hopping off to Melbourne to take an appeal to the VCAT in Melbourne on 9 and 10 July, 2007.

We see him listed Consumer Affairs Victoria contact for Delegate queries: Ian Row
Telephone: 03 9627 7220
Email: cav.communications@justice.vic.gov.au

There is no other Ian Row on the Electoral roll for Victoria.

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_AustralianCriminalLawJournal_issue200706.pdf **[Australian Telecommunications Law Journal ISSN 1321-4470](#)** with the archived copy at http://austlawpublish.com/20070618_AustralianTelecommunicationsLawJournal_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.melvin.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_AustralianParliamentaryLawJournal_issue200701.pdf /.

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