

# QUT Alumni Journal:

Journal of the Alumni of Queensland University of Technology

ISSN 1835-050X

13 August, 2007.

Issue #: 200701

Publisher: **Australian Law Publishers** Pty Ltd[ACN 010 615 933][AuLP][Email:AustLawPublish.com/eml.html](mailto:AustLawPublish.com/eml.html)

<http://austlawpublish.com> 254 Hawken Drive, St Lucia, Qld. 4067.

Skype: russellmathews

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

**keywords:** documented evidence; 1975 file from State Archives; Spender instrumental in defrauding client; for labor mates in Qld Govt. Railways;



*Disabled gate at Spender's home at 41 Gray Road, West End, Brisbane: mobility disability. Looks abused, but not a child. DON'T LAUGH, well not until IT does, then it is laughing with ...*

*HAIGPHOTO*

## Spender, Federal Court, & Laughing at/with the Disabled

**We possess evidence, extremely valuable to QUT.**

*By Alex Gordon LLB*

In the Federal Court, Brisbane, on 12 July, 2007, an unusual exchange occurred between Spender J. and Sofronoff QC, for QUT. It seemed that Spender wished to place an “expression of (his) attitude” to the disabled and paedophiles, on the record. Spender chose this forum [an inappropriate forum we believe], to enter this debate with us and respond to our salvo, [in the [Australian Judiciary Law Journal \[AJLJ\] ISSN 1321-4497, Issue #200701, published 21 May, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521) and archived at [http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Judiciary Law Journal issue200701.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521)] about his corruption in 1974 when, as a barrister, he

appeared before the Railway Appeals Tribunal [RAT], instructed by the disgraced, deceitful and dishonest perjurer, the now ex-Solicitor, Terence Joseph Mellifont [aka Terry Mellifont – people google on that two 'r' spelling; we usually spell his name in full so those pages are not returned, and we have only one page returned – of the six- albeit the first]. Spender's client on that occasion was our disabled photographer, Haig.

**Was there an Ulterior Reason for Spender's “comments”?**

Counsel for QUT, Walter Sofronoff QC, was amazed and shocked that Spender should comment as he did in the Federal Court on 12 July, 2007. Sofronoff said, “This is an interlocutory hearing and your Honour knows very little about the case at this stage”, and that Spender was unjustified in making “adverse comments about our case in the way that your Honour is doing.”

This was a “last ditch effort” by Spender to attempt to give himself some “disability cred”; to shore up his disability anti-discrimination credentials. Spender has been stung by our first salvo, the revelation/question in our journal [Australian Judiciary law Journal, Issue 200701 published 21 May, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf) archived at [http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Judiciary Law Journal issue200701.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521_Australian_Judiciary_Law_Journal_issue200701.pdf) /, as to his involvement in the fraud of the disabled fellow named Haig, whom Spender was instructed as barrister to represent in Haig's appeal against Haig's sacking by the Queensland Government Railways [QGR]. We continue our revelations about Spender in that fraud of which Spender must be greatly ashamed, in our concurrently published Australian Criminal law Journal Issue200708 published 13 August, 2007 archived online at

To Sofronoff QC, Spender agreed that he was not fully informed on the case, but what rationale did he give, for making his “unjustified” comments? Unfortunately for QUT, Spender was using this occasion to try to corrupt the record: the public record of “an impression of his attitude” and of his “concerns”. Read the exchange in the box at the top of page 2. It was inappropriate of Spender to comment on the case when, as he admitted, he was far from conversant with the facts of the matter. We have a very persuasive suggestion. All parties to the proceeding, as well as Spender, should consider whether he should disqualify himself.

**Spender has been so stung by our first attack that he has become irrational and going off half-cocked. He has an ulterior motive. He has “lost the plot”. He wishes to use the QUT case to discount his earlier conduct defrauding the disabled client who was expecting Spender, as a barrister, to represent him properly. That was prior to the DDA but Spender had a Fiduciary Duty [FD] to that disabled guy, Haig. That FD was doubly born. Spender owed it as Haig's legal representative, and also because Haig was, and still is, disabled.**

**Instead, as we explain in more depth in our concurrently published [Australian Criminal law Journal Issue200708 published 13 August, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf) archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf>**

**In 1974, Spender thought he was bullet proof, and he has been, for 33 years. Now we are on the scene to help Haig. It's time to go, Jeff!!**

**Spender should be sacked from the Federal Court. We are pursuing Spender's scalp. Mixing metaphors, we will be happy if he “falls on his sword”. We will still claim credit for Spender's demise. After all, this is all on the public record, being held in many libraries around Australia. We expect that he will wish to save the embarrassment of an address from both houses of Commonwealth Parliament, to enable his sacking, per Sect 72 of the Australian Constitution..**

**Spender can no longer act effectively as a Federal Court judge. After his unjustified comments, and this recognition for them, counsel for QUT would not risk failing his client, QUT, by not requesting that Spender disqualifies himself. If Spender hears this case, which, he has indicated, is his intention, he will most likely continue with his irrationality to thicken the record of how he pretends the “political correct” stance of abhorring discrimination due to disability. We believe Spenders continuation on the Federal Court is untenable and accordingly we call for his sacking, in our concurrent publication [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal Issue 200702](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf) archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf> /.**

**Excerpt from the Spender-Sofronoff exchange in the Federal Court 12 July, 2007:**

**Spender** noted that Michael Noonan had said MacLennan's statement "made him feel like a paedophile."

**Sofronoff:** Yes.

**Spender:** I would have thought that - at least in the real world - there's not a very great deal of difference between laughing at the disabled and abusing children.

**Sofronoff:** Your Honour, I wouldn't disagree with what you've just said. The question is, at the end of the day, whether Hookham and MacLennan have been dealt with rightly or not and your Honour is simply in no position this morning to make adverse comments about our case in the way that your Honour is doing.

**Spender:** Well, I am saying this because I want to convey to all the parties that I regard this as a very, very important case dealing with the nature of a university and what a university is - or ought to be - all about, and that there seems to me to be a terrible inherent tension between the claim that Noonan and his supervisors are entitled - consistently with the idea of a university - to embark upon a thesis of this kind and of this nature and that that task is not in breach of one of the five cardinal ethical principles that is to be derived from the Public Affairs Act, or whatever it is in section eight of the university's code of conduct - respect for persons.

**Sofronoff:** But why does your Honour address me upon the assumption that anything Noonan did involved disrespect for any person?

**Spender:** Because that is what the exception taken by these two gentlemen was.

**Sofronoff:** I know, your Honour, but I have seen the subject film clips and your Honour hasn't. And your Honour is, with all due respect, not in a position to be making criticisms of the kind that your Honour is making now about either Noonan's work or about the attitude of the university. This is an interlocutory hearing and your Honour knows very little about the case at this stage.

**Spender:** Yes. As I said when I started speaking, I'm making these statements to give some impression of my attitude and what I regard as the important issues in this case to the parties in the hope that there might at least be a sensible resolution of this dispute before the final hearing. If that falls on infertile ground, so be it. But I don't want my concerns, uninformed as they are in the fullest, to be not conveyed to the parties.

**In our AJLJ 200701 we asked the question in our headline, "Did Federal Court Judge Jeffery Spender cheat disabled client?" We are pleased that Spender has entered this debate. No doubt, Spender believed that our journal was merely the fading memories of an unhappy client.**

**We are please to advise Sofronoff and QUT, that we are in possession of a 1975 file from State Archives strongly supporting Haig's contention. In our concurrently published [Australian Criminal Law Journal \[ACLJ\] ISSN 1321-6561 Issue 200708 published 13 August, 2007](#) archived at**

<http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf> we detail some of this evidence without actually showing it. [State archives claims copyright.]

This, plus Haig's commentary, plus Spender's "expressions of (his) attitude" and "concerns", would clearly give a reasonably informed bystander a reasonable apprehension that Spender would be biased, against one or other of the two parties/sides, but certainly that he would not be unbiased. Surely, a biased decision maker is not what our "Justice System" needs. Haig advises that he will be happy to consult with Sofronoff and provide evidence to the court in any application by Sofronoff/QUT for Spender to disqualify himself for apprehended bias; [or by John Hookham and Gary MacLennan – after all who could tell, in advance, which way Spender would actually be biased; we suggest he could be a "loose cannon"; he has gone off "half-cocked" with his response entering this debate; he has been badly stung by our previous salvo in our May journals].

**WANTED: Contract PRINTERS in Asia.**

Print/copy shop owners or operators anywhere in South East Asia including China, Singapore, India, Malaysia, Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, Hong Kong, Macau, South Korea, Philippines, Indonesia, Japan, Taiwan, New Zealand, and Sri Lanka. [Google loves a list], we invite your expression of interest in offering your printing services.

Please read the accompanying article. Our initial small print run is black monochrome A4. We expect to direct much more print business to Asian firms as the Australian Print/copy businesses are overcharging and giving poor service. See our accompanying advertisements for people wanting printing done and for the Graphic Designers of print copy to produce print ready copy in .pdf format for those customers.

We are happy to pay in your currency or any currency you choose. The payment would be electronically, immediately the work is done and posted. Contact us on our PHP email at <http://AustLawPublish.com/eml.html>

This evidence, going to the very basis of Spender's honesty, has to be a concern to at least one of the parties in all future matters before him. We, and Haig will be happy to consult with any party who has an appearance before Spender in any court. Spender may find he has a light court schedule in future. Since this would in effect incapacitate him, as well as

for his “proved misbehaviour”, we believe Spender should be removed from the Bench in all courts where he sits. Section 72 of The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia provides the procedure for such Removal. Spender's role as a Judicial officer is untenable. We anticipate that Spender may resign and try to go quietly, or he may choose to fight. If he wants to fight this out, such will give us great publicity, and we will win.

This Journal is part of the Mellifont/Spender/Heffernan/Reiman/Queensland Rail fraud topic. On this August, 2007 occasion, this FRAUD TOPIC in spread across four journals. They are archived at [Australian Parliamentary Law Journal Issue 200702](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianParliamentaryLawJournalissue200702.pdf> /, [Australian Criminal Law Journal Issue 200708 \[Justice.Jeffrey.Spender\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200708.justice.jeffrey.spender.pdf> /, [QUT Alumni Journal Issue 200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813QUTAJissue200701.pdf) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813QUTAJissue200701.pdf> /, [The Allstralian Journal Issue 200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070813TheAllstralianJournalissue200701.pdf) <http://austlawpublish.com/20070813TheAllstralianJournalissue200701.pdf> /.

In July 2007, we had four journals addressing this topic. They are archived at <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200707.judge.julie.dick.pdf> , <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716dossierof.judge.julie.maree.dick.pdf> , <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716dossierof.terence.mellifont.pdf> , <http://AustLawpublish.com/20070716QBAissue200702.pdf> /. These are in addition to seven of our previous journals. In April, we published [HaigReport \[ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf) (we held it over for a month)]/. It is also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /. That gave the factual setting from which this umbrella topic has arisen. In May, 2007, we publishing a further six journals which are relevant to this topic/matter. Our then newest Law Journal, very topical in Australia in the lead up to the 2007 Federal Election, was the [Australian Industrial Relations Law Journal ISSN 1834-8378 \[AIRLJ\] Issue #200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianIndustrialRelationsLawJournalissue200701.pdf) which is archived at [\[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Industrial Relations Law Journal issue200701.pdf\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianIndustrialRelationsLawJournalissue200701.pdf). Although the [Australian Judiciary Law Journal ISSN 1321-4497 Issue #200701](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianJudiciaryLawJournalissue200701.pdf) [\[http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Judiciary Law Journal issue200701.pdf\]](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianJudiciaryLawJournalissue200701.pdf), is included as part of the [Australian Criminal Law Journal ISSN 1321-6562 Issue200705](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200705.pdf) [archived at [http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Criminal Law Journal issue200705.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianCriminalLawJournalissue200705.pdf)], we also reference its separate publication as [http://austlawpublish.com/20070521 Australian Judiciary Law Journal issue200701.pdf](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521AustralianJudiciaryLawJournalissue200701.pdf), and the Dossiers of: three people involved are [Dossier of: Walter Norman Reiman](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.walter.reiman.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.walter.reiman.pdf> , [Dossier of: Jeffery Ernest John Spender](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.jeffery.spender.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.jeffery.spender.pdf> and [Dossier of: Frank Thomas Heffernan](http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.heffernan.pdf) archived at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070521dossierof.frank.heffernan.pdf> and for background [HaigReport \[ISSN 1834-6294 #200701 26 March, 2007](http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf), also archived online at <http://austlawpublish.com/20070314%20HaigReport%20journal%20issue200701.pdf> /.

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