

To the,
Information and Evidence Unit
Office of the Prosecutors
Post Office Box 19519
2500 CM The Hague
The Netherlands

19 September 2023

By email: otp.informationdesk@icc-cpi.int

Dear Prosecutors for the International Criminal Court,

This urgent official communication with the *International Criminal Court* is pursuant to the provisions set within *the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*. The stated *Crimes Against Humanity* (as defined in the *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*) outlined in this official communication are against officials acting in their official capacity as Australian Nationals.

We, Sandra, Michelle and Jessica Lazarus have suffered systematic and intentional abuse from the accused mentioned in this official communication, since May 2010.

Background

In 1988 the government of New South Wales, Australia introduced and implemented a permanent *Special Commission of Inquiry*, the *Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC)*. Since the inception, the *ICAC* legislation has been subjected to numerous legislative amendments. The *ICAC* was established to investigate corruption by public officials within the public sector of the government. The *ICAC* was originally a non-prosecutorial commission and as stated in the *ICAC* legislation, evidence collected by *ICAC* Officers must be provided to a “relevant authority” with prosecutorial authority, to determine prosecution, by observing and enacting the *Rule of Law* and the *Rule of Evidence*. Unlike other *Commission(s)* and *Grand Jury* proceedings, courtroom rules of evidence do not operate during *ICAC* investigations and/or inquiries. Similarly, unlike other *Commission(s)* and

Grand Jury proceedings, which are conducted under strict confidence, NSW *ICAC* investigations and inquiries are concluded in the public domain.

On 28 May 2010, the *ICAC* Officers executed a search warrant on our family residents, where Sandra and Jessica resided with their parents. Upon the execution of the search warrant the *ICAC* Officers collected, original authorised and signed invoices; computers; electronic storages devices such as, hard drives and universal storage bus; personal documents; personal correspondence, such as personal letters; university testamurs; and other personal documents unrelated to the *ICAC* investigation were seized.

On 12 July 2010, the *ICAC* pursuant to its legislation conducted a private inquiry, by issuing “*ICAC Summons*” for Sandra, Michelle and Jessica stating the three as, “person(s) of interests” and/or “affected parties”. On 15 December 2010, *ICAC* pursuant to its legislation conducted a second private inquiry, by issuing “*ICAC Summons*” for Sandra, stating her as a, “person(s) of interests” and/or “affected parties”. On 14 February 2011, the *ICAC* pursuant to its legislation conducted a public inquiry, by issuing “*ICAC Summons*” for Sandra, Michelle and Jessica stating the three as, “person(s) of interests” and/or “affected parties”. During the public inquiry *ICAC* Officials provided written correspondence to Jessica’s legal representative stating that she will not be referred to as a “person(s) of interests”. However, in the official *ICAC* investigation report, Sandra, Michelle and Jessica were referred to as, “person(s) of interests” and/or “affected parties”.

As stated in the *ICAC* legislation the *Rule of Evidence* does not apply, nor operate during *ICAC* investigations and/or inquiries (private and public). As such there is no accountability of evidence or documents collected by *ICAC* Officers, and intimidating, bullying methods of questioning are practiced during inquiries by *ICAC* Officials. This abusive practice of questioning and bullying of witnesses was pertained to “pulling wings of butterfly”, by a former *ICAC* Commissioner and retired *Supreme Court* Judge.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/ICAC-commissioner-megan-latham-defends-watchdog-inquiry-into-margaret-cunneen-at-heated-public-hearing-20150806-gitf1x.html>

and

<https://www.michaelsmithnews.com/2015/10/video-ICACs-megan-latham-on-investigative-free-kicks-and-pulling-the-wings-off-butterflies.html>

Recently, a new permanent *Special Commission of Inquiry* at the Federal level of government was introduced in 2022, similarly, the South Australian government also introduced a permanent *Special Commission of Inquiry*, however, legislation specifications differ from the NSW *ICAC*. An example, the two recently introduced commissions do not conduct private and public inquiries within the one investigation, rather, the need for public inquiries is removed from the legislation, and only private inquiries are conducted. The public inquiry is a repeat of the private inquiry, and most legal academics view the public inquiry in conjunction with the private inquiry as an abuse of process, implemented only to publicly humiliate an individual without legal process in accordance with the *Rule of Law*. The following was stated by the former *Supreme Court* Judge on 15 October 2014, in regards to the practice of conducting private and public inquiries within the one investigation:

“I do not see the merit in examinations being held in public – The evidence that is obtained at a private examination or a public hearing by an integrity agency under coercion will not be admissible at that person’s trial if that person is subsequently charged with a corruption offence – That is because it has been obtained in contravention of the right to silence which is a fundamental pillar of our criminal justice system. The New South Wales procedure allows for the public to become aware of evidence that both Parliament and the Courts consider unfair to be led against that person of interest at that person’s trial. And in NSW a person may be found to have acted corruptly on that same evidence – The Commissioner may have heard the evidence in private before she [or he] decides to hear the evidence again in public. For what purpose one asks would the Commissioner hear the same evidence again, upon which she can already make her decision, in public – It is somewhat unusual to hold a hearing to obtain evidence which the agency has. That raises other issues. A person who has been subject to a public hearing and a public statement that he or she has been guilty of corruption is likely to argue if charged with an offence that he or she cannot get a fair trial – Recently the High Court decided that a person’s conviction should be set aside because the prosecutor in that case had obtained a copy of the transcript of evidence in which the accused had been examined using the coercive powers to which I have referred that required the appellant to answer

questions. The evidence had not been used at the trial. It was simply that the prosecution was aware of the evidence. The High Court said that the prosecutor, in obtaining that evidence, obtained a forensic advantage in that he knew what the accused's defence was ahead of the trial. The appeal was allowed and the conviction was set aside and a new trial ordered. That result can be avoided by not providing the prosecutor with the evidence given by the accused. But, how can that be avoided if the examination is public?"

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<http://sapressclub.com.au/project/bruce-lander-qc/>

Since 1988, the NSW Judiciary has lacked judicial independence, this is due to the introduction of the *ICAC legislation*, particularly, the operation of certain components of section 8 of the legislation. The following was stated in an article on 18 December 2018 by the then President of the NSW Bar Association and President of the Law Council of Australia:

“The separation of powers is in and of itself a critical safeguard against corruption. A model where the executive oversees the investigation of allegations against judicial officers risks undermining judicial independence, or at least creates the appearance that judicial independence is undermined.”

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.lawcouncil.asn.au/media/speeches/opinion-piece-rule-of-law-is-key-to-integrity>

More recently, during the *ICAC* investigation and inquiries, relating to members of the business sector, it was noted by the *United Nations* that the *ICAC* legislation as it appears, is in breach of Article 14 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, and stated the following in its official report:

“Coupled with the lack of an exoneration protocol, investigated person are left in a unique position: their lives are substantially affected as if they were guilty of a crimes but they are left without the fundamental mechanisms of the presumption of

innocence, the right to appeal, and the protection provided through procedural and evidentiary burdens otherwise found within the criminal justice system – practically unchallengeable under the law due to the extraordinary breadth of the *ICAC*'s jurisdiction”

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fnat

An individual investigated by the *ICAC*, once again without jurisdictional authority, was Ms Sophia Tilley, the following is her official account of what the *ICAC* Officers said to her and how abusively they treated her:

“Investigators from NSW corruption watchdog *ICAC* told Sophia Tilley they were “above the police” when they unexpectedly arrived at her home and demanded she hand over her mobile phone. “There were these guys in suits. They were really solemn and they knew our names. They said, ‘We’re going to need to take your phones’,” Ms Tilley told The Australian in her first interview. “We said, ‘We need our phones for work, who are you, why would we give you our phones?’ “They said, ‘We’re *ICAC*.’ “I said, ‘You’re not the police, I don’t know what *ICAC* is or who you are, we’re not going to give you our phones, why would we?’ “They said, ‘We’re above the police.’ They said ‘if you don’t you’ll face five years in prison’. They said, ‘Trust me, this is in your best interest to do what we say, we’re the guys who got Eddie Obeid.’ That’s how they tried to identify themselves. “I don’t watch the news so I didn’t know who Eddie Obeid was.” Initially thinking the ordeal was a practical joke, Ms Tilley asked the officers if the visit was to do with a friend who lived nearby. “But they said, ‘No, it’s you’,” she said. “We said, ‘Why? What have we done?’ and they said, ‘You’ll find out soon enough.’” She continued to ask what she was in trouble for. Page 101 of 233 “I said, ‘Is this nearly over?’ and was told: ‘No, this is just the beginning.’ It was really odd.” It was only later that Ms Tilley discovered *ICAC* was claiming. Ms Tilley said Mr Grainger and another *ICAC* officer repeatedly turned up to the real estate agency where she is a receptionist and scolded her for telling colleagues they were from *ICAC*. The officers indicated to her she was under surveillance, but refused to explain what she had done wrong or why she was

under investigation. “They came right into reception and then had a go at me for talking to people about it, stressing that if I told anyone I could face five years in prison. I said you came into my work. It was pretty inconsistent,” she said. The fear of constant surveillance — and not knowing why she was being scrutinised — was the most frightening aspect for Ms Tilley. “They insinuated plenty of times that they were conducting surveillance and the concierge inferred it as well that they had been around,” she said. Ms Tilley’s treatment by *ICAC* comes as *ICAC* inspector David Levine indicated the corruption watchdog projected “breathtaking arrogance” in relation to its own powers and the people with whom it was dealing. When she left court, there were media waiting outside to photograph her. “I didn’t realise that they (*ICAC*) were in cahoots with the media,” Ms Tilley said. “I didn’t realise they were so immature and childlike. They were the ones who said they were above the police, so I wouldn’t have thought they were going to go to the media.” *ICAC* returned Ms Tilley’s phone after a week, but kept Mr Wyllie’s for a month. “This is a role reversal of what I would have expected to happen,” Ms Tilley said. “Normally, isn’t it the person who runs you off the road who gets in trouble? It was all about getting us in trouble for nothing.”

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fbusiness%2Fmedia%2Fday-ICAC-men-came-knocking-were-above-police%2Fnews-story%2Fed5be05c072f795a2fc99229d96d930b&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupa-test-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

Commission Investigation and Inquiries

On 12 July 2010, we were questioned about the work we completed and the people we met. We three provided supporting documents outlining the work completed, and provided information regarding meetings with people we met. However, when we were asked to identify people, we were never shown photographs of the individuals in question, nor were the individuals present at the time of questioning for identification, and since the *Rule of Evidence* do not operate at the *ICAC* inquiries, a single question contained the names of

multiple individuals, e.g. Did you meet, name of individual one, name of individual two and name of individual three? One question contained the names of three individuals, and if you have not meet all three individuals, it is impossible to know how to answer the question asked, especially when we were told on numerous occasion to answer questions asked, with a “yes” or “on” answer.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_YP5_B66ohc

Following the first private inquiry on 12 July 2010, ICAC Officers engaged a Forensic Analyst to determine the authenticity of documents in questions, related to work completed, and invoices issued and paid for work completed over two and half years at two hospitals in NSW. On 15 December 2010, Sandra was summoned to a second private inquiry, during which questions asked were repeated. Following the second private inquiry, ICAC Officer terminated forensic analysis, by providing false and misleading statements.

The details and evidence of false and misleading statements provided by the ICAC Officer as a witness in a *Court of Law* can be viewed at the following website links –

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1Mflp0HoMM>

and

https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fbusiness%2Fopinion%2Fchris-merritt-prejudice%2FICACs-procedures-challenged-in-lazarus-sisters-case%2Fnews-story%2F2af5d9f980abc70412b86fe6b82fcf81&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupa-test-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

During the ICAC investigation and inquiries the question of forensic analysis was raised, the ICAC commission provided written communication dated 5 April 2011, the following was stated by the ICAC’s Principal Lawyer as the reason why the forensic analysis was terminated. The reason for termination provided by the ICAC’s Principal Lawyer differed from the ICAC Officer in email communication.

“that the Commission did approach Ms Novotny last year but did not engage her to conduct any forensic examination of signatures due to the cost of so doing.”

Additionally, during the *ICAC* public inquiry Sandra’s legal representative raised the question regarding forensic analysis, the following was discussed during the *ICAC* inquiry, and forms part of the official *ICAC* records:

“MR STITT: Well, Your Honour, I don’t know whether there’s going to be handwriting experts or not in this- - -

THE COMMISSIONER: No, as far as I know, no.”

According to the original *ICAC* legislation, the Commission did not have the required legislative jurisdiction to investigate and/or conduct inquiries in relation to Sandra, Michelle and Jessica. This was confirmed by a Parliamentary report:

“Operation Charity (report 31 August 2011) concerned an investigation into alleged fraud on two Sydney hospitals. Two persons were alleged to have submitted requisitions and invoices and thereby misled public officials associated with the hospitals and the management of hospital funds. No impropriety on the part of any public official appears to have been in contemplation as a possibility in the inquiry. (If there had been, that would have been a basis for jurisdiction to investigate).”

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.oicac.nsw.gov.au/assets/oicac/reports/other-reports/Independent-Panel-Review-of-the-jurisdiction-of-ICAC-2015-Report.pdf>

Following the judgment of *High Court of Australia* judicial proceeding *ICAC v Cunneen [2015] HCA 14*, during which the *ICAC*’s legislative jurisdiction was defined, the NSW Parliament introduced a retroactive law increasing the *ICAC*’s legislative jurisdiction, to include the Lazarus *ICAC* investigation and inquiry (Operation Charity). The retroactive *ICAC* legislative amendment was implemented while judicial appeal proceedings for Sandra and Michelle were afoot in a *Court of Law*, on the grounds of jurisdictional issues and others.

Crimes Against Humanity

Mr Michael Barnes

Prior to presiding over the judicial proceedings in a *Court of Law* for Sandra and Michelle in 2013, Mr Barnes was a Coroner for Queensland, and presided over the ‘Death in Custody’ case in Palm Island, Queensland, Australia. During the Coroner’s judicial proceeding in a *Court of Law* Mr Barnes was seen publicly drinking with members of the Solicitors for the Defendant involved with the judicial proceeding. This resulted in Mr Barnes, “stand[ing] down on grounds of apprehended bias”.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2005-03-03/new-inquest-into-palm-is-death/1528952>
and

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2005-03-04/police-union-continues-to-criticise-coroner/1529166>

The events and details of the ‘Death in Custody’ case was discussed in the book titled “The Tall Man: Death and Life on Palm Island”, authored by Chloe Hooper.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.booktopia.com.au/the-tall-man-chloe-hooper/book/9780143010661.html>

The evidence before Mr Barnes as a Judicial Officer presiding over judicial proceedings for Sandra and Michelle in a ‘*Court of Law*’, clearly stated that, the ICAC as a commission and ICAC Officers, do not have the legislative jurisdiction to commence criminal judicial proceedings in a *Court of Law*, acting in the capacity of prosecutors and/or prosecuting organisations. Also, the evidence before Mr Barnes as a Judicial Officer presiding over judicial proceedings for Sandra and Michelle in a ‘*Court of Law*’, clearly stated that the ICAC did not have the legislative jurisdiction to investigate and/or conduct inquiries in relation to Sandra, Michelle and Jessica. Mr Barnes dismissed these presentations and evidence before him, and continued with the judicial proceedings. Following this ruling, Mr Barnes was promoted to the NSW *Coroner’s Court*, and continued to preside over Michelle’s judicial proceedings, and adjourned Sandra’s judicial proceedings relisting and moving the

proceeding to the pre-trial stage. Mr Barnes stated the following in his official judgment in a *Court of Law*, dated 23 May 2014:

“it is difficult to see how fraud of that nature could be within the investigation jurisdiction of the *ICAC*”.

During the judicial proceedings in a *Court of Law* for *DPP v Ian McDonald and DPP v John Maitland*, it was determined that the *ICAC* as a commission does not have the legislative jurisdiction to commence judicial proceeding in a *Court of Law* as a “prosecuting organisation”, it was further determined, that *ICAC* Officers do not have the legislative jurisdiction to commence judicial proceeding in a *Court of Law* as “prosecutor”. As a result of the official judgment in a *Court of Law*, the *Department of Public Prosecution*, recommenced judicial proceedings stating the *Department of Public Prosecution* as the valid prosecutor, with the required legislative jurisdiction.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/court-rules-ICAC-invalidly-commenced-prosecutions-against-ian-macdonald-and-john-maitland-over-coal-exploration-licence-to-doyles-creek-mining-20150522-gh7czv.html>

Following the judgment of *DPP v Ian McDonald and DPP v John Maitland*, the NSW Parliament amended legislation to provide the *ICAC* commission and its Officers with prosecutorial jurisdiction, however, this particular legalisation does not have retroactive operation, and therefore, the judicial proceedings in a *Court of Law*, for Sandra and Michelle commenced by *ICAC* Officer stating himself as the “prosecutor” and the *ICAC* commission as the “prosecuting organisation” remains invalid.

Mr Barnes continued as the judicial presider for Michelle’s judicial proceeding in a *Court of Law*. During the private *ICAC* inquiry on 12 July 2010, Michelle was a first time mother breastfeeding her child, and during the public inquiry which commenced on 14 February 2011 Michelle was pregnant with her second child. The abusive questioning method exercised during *ICAC* inquiries caused extreme harm to Michelle and her unborn child. Additionally, *ICAC* Commissioner, *ICAC* Counsel Assisting and *ICAC* Officers, provided false and misleading information to Michelle in questions asked. The evidence of this was

before Mr Barnes, the following was stated in his official judgment 23 May 2014 in a *Court of Law*:

“ [ICAC] Counsel Assisting put things to the defendant [Michelle Lazarus] 20 that were not accurate , he was clearly mistaken – the [ICAC] Commissioner too, one occasion, appear to have been confused”.

It is evident from the official judgment of 23 May 2014 in a *Court of Law*, that Mr Barnes was aware of *ICAC* legislative operations, and had a definite awareness of the misleading and inaccurate information contained in the questions asked during *ICAC* inquiries. Mr Barnes knowingly and with full knowledge of the evidence before him, wrongly and purposefully convicted Michelle *Beyond Reasonable Doubt* in a *Court of Law*, within the provisions of section 87 of the *ICAC Act 1988*, by dismissing the factual evidence before him, for providing misleading answers to questions asked by the *ICAC* Commissioner and the *ICAC* Counsel Assisting which contained inaccurate, false and misleading information.

Ms Joanna Keogh

Following Mr Barnes’ return of Sandra’s judicial proceeding to the pre-trial status, the judicial proceeding was before a newly appointed Magistrate of the *NSW Local Court*, Ms Joanna Keogh. During the judicial proceeding, forensic analysis was completed, a renowned Forensic Analyst provided expert evidence during the judicial proceeding as an expert witness, and submitted an official exhibit forensic analysis report. However, Ms Keogh disregarded the expert evidence and convicted Sandra *Beyond Reasonable Doubt* in a *Court of Law* and placed her in custody, on 27 November 2014.

Due to the abuse inflicted upon Sandra while she was in custody on 27 November 2014, she filed an appeal to the *Supreme Court* of NSW. On 6 February 2015 the following was entered into record in a *Court of Law (Supreme Court of NSW)* by the presiding Judicial Officer:

“Ms Lazarus indicated today that her concern nevertheless is that she could be sentenced next week. Indeed, as I understand it, the sentence is set for Monday, 9 February – Ms Lazarus also explained from the Bar table that her other concerns are that, whilst in custody at one stage, she was, she asserts, improperly approached by

someone in authority, and she would wish to have a subpoena issued in due course to see whether that was recorded on CCTV – Ms Lazarus’s concern is perhaps there was some connection between being wrongly placed in custody and also being improperly approached once she was there”.

Sandra completed the necessary requirements and the following was communicated in a letter dated 26 March 2015 by the NSW *Office of the Sheriff* in relation the CCTV footage request:

“I advise that CCTV footage across NSW courts (including at the Downing Centre) is only retained for a period of around 4-8 weeks on average, before being recorded over.”

On 6 April 2015 the judicial proceedings in *Supreme Court* of NSW were returned to the lower court and on 20 April 2015 Sandra was once again in a *Court of Law* before Ms Keogh. On 20 April 2015 Ms Keogh adjourned the proceeding and relisted on 27 April 2015 to finalise Sandra’s custodial sentence. Though Ms Keogh had seven days to determine Sandra’s custodial sentence, on 27 April 2015 Ms Keogh ordered and inflicted such extreme physical abuse that Sandra was taken from the court building in an ambulance and was hospitalised, undergoing approximately nine months on rehabilitation. Ms Keogh’s torturous abuse on 27 April 2015 began at approximately 10:00am and continued to 5:00pm, during this period Ms Keogh change the perimeters of the custodial sentence on four occasions, and on each occasion she placed Sandra in custody and removed her from custody, depriving Sandra of her medication, and on each occasion a new appeal application had to be filed with the NSW *Local Court* Registry. At the commencement of the judicial proceeding Ms Keogh was provided with documentary evidence in relation to Sandra’s medical conditions and limitations, with full knowledge and evidence before her in *Court of Law*, Ms Keogh abused her judicial power and authority on 27 November 2014 and 27 April 2015, which led to extreme physical and emotional harm to Sandra.

Mr Michael Kane

Mr Michael Kane is an Officer of the *ICAC*, in 2010 held the title of *ICAC* Senior Investigator, he led the execution of the search warrant. During the *ICAC* private inquiries, Mr Kane communicated with the Forensic Document Examiner, Mr Kane’s email

communication with the Forensic Document Examiner was obtained with the issuing of a Court Subpoena. The email communication outlined the willingness of the Forensic Document Examiner to provide analysis and to do so, at a reduced service cost. It is also evident from the emails that Mr Kane provided original documents in question to the Forensic Document Examiner, according to the email communication the Forensic Document Examiner utilised the document to determine cost, time and the need for additional information. In the email dated 11 January 2011, Mr Kane communicated false and misleading information to the Forensic Document Examiner to justify the termination of her analytical services. During Sandra's judicial proceeding in a *Court of Law* commenced by Mr Kane as the prosecutor, he presented himself as a witness and submitted documents to the court which were never seen before, and never appeared during the *ICAC* investigation and/or inquiries.

The details and evidence of false and misleading statements provided by the *ICAC* Officer as a witness in a *Court of Law* can be viewed at the following website links –

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1Mflp0HoMM>

and

https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fbusiness%2Fopinion%2Fchris-merritt-prejudice%2FICACs-procedures-challenged-in-lazarus-sisters-case%2Fnews-story%2F2af5d9f980abc70412b86fe6b82fcf81&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupa-test-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

For this reason no forensic analysis was completed and no forensic report was submitted during the *ICAC* inquiries, as a result, false and misleading information was provided to the local media outlets, which led to extensive and permanent damage to Sandra, Michelle and Jessica's personal and professional reputation.

Following the conclusion of the *ICAC* investigation and inquiries, Mr Kane, without legislative jurisdiction commenced criminal judicial proceedings against Sandra and Michelle in a *Court of Law*, stating himself as the "Prosecutor" and the *ICAC* as the "Prosecuting Organisation". In other similar judicial proceedings (*DPP v Ian McDonald and DPP v John Maitland*), commenced by *ICAC* Officers, judicial precedent was set and it was concluded

that ICAC Officer do not have the legislative jurisdiction to commence criminal judicial proceedings in a *Court of Law*. The following was stated by a retired *Supreme Court* Judge in regards to amending legislation to provide ICAC Officer with the legislative jurisdiction commenced criminal judicial proceedings, in a *Court of Law*:

“highlights the tension which can exist between an investigatory body, such as the ICAC which has vested interest in seeing the matter run its full course through to a successful prosecution”.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/icac-inspector-david-levine-slams-watchdog-and-urges-baird-government-not-to-change-act-20150420-1mp06z.html>

Personal gain is a contributing factor for Mr Kane’s abusive conduct which hindered the investigation and perverted the course of justice.

Abuse and Threats

Due to the extensive abuse subjected since 2010, and permanent damage to our reputation, we have been unable to obtain permanent employment, as a result, we are reliant on *Commonwealth* support programs. In January of 2018 we, the Mss Lazarus, commenced judicial proceeding in the *High Court of Australia*, requesting a review of section 8 of the *ICAC Act 1988*, which presently impedes judicial independence in the state of New South Wales. Following the commencement of the *High Court* judicial proceeding, we were visited, at our residence by individuals referring to themselves as “State Officers”, they threatened the safety of our children (at the time, all Lazarus children were aged 10 and younger), and demanded that we discontinue the *High Court* judicial. Succumbing to such threats, we discontinued the judicial proceeding in the *High Court of Australia*. These events and threats were placed on record in judicial proceeding. During judicial proceeding Sandra was informed that she “will be just another death in custody” for this reason she made the recording with her sisters Michelle and Jessica.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eK9WKkVqYuA>

More recently, the government is preventing our children, those with diagnosed learning disabilities from receiving the required special aid in school, the youngest child is aged six. Innocent children are now suffering, this denial of special aid in school is harming and limiting their ability to learn and obtain an education. Additionally, we are being denied adequate housing and living conditions, in the same manner, we are being denied the opportunity to complete and/or further our education. Our living conditions are being utilised to threaten and limit us, and to ensure that justice is never obtained. Soon, a number of us will have no place to reside nor will we have the ability to purchase food and daily necessities. The aforementioned abuse and contravention of national and international human rights legislations by the accused, was enabled by officials acting in their official capacity, who continued justifying abuse with the introduction of legislative amendments allowing and legalising abusive actions.

The details can be viewed at the following website link –

www.lazarussisterscases.com

We kindly request your help and wait for your response.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra, Michelle and Jessica Lazarus.