IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

CO No. 588 of 2020

HELD AT LONDON, UNITED KINGDOM.

BETWEEN:

Rodney N Culleton Claimant

AND

Peter Damien Quinlan, DBS Chief Justice SCWA and Ors First Defendant(s)

NOTICE FOR INTERVENTION

Intervener: Rural Australia Intervention Directive (RAID)

List of current members is attached

Date of document: 22 April 2020

Filed on behalf of: The Intervener

Date of filing: April 2020

Prepared by:

Neil Piccinin

Litigation Friend for Intervener

Email: napping2@netscape.net

Address for Service:

C/- 69a Harefield Road BROCKLEY SE4 1LU London, United Kingdom

- 1. The application for Judicial Review, CO/588/2020, filed in London by Rodney Norman Culleton, for review of a decision of the named person acting as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Western Australia, presents the opportunity for the intervening party to raise its voice for concern of corrupt practices engaged by the Supreme Court of Western Australia (WASC) and elsewhere.
- 2. This practice has occurred by a departure to the constitutional norms, and the Supreme Court Act 1935 itself, for which departure, in carrying no judicial authority, has harmed the intervener directly, or indirectly, for which address by the High Court of Justice is warranted as no court in Australia may address the application without the same bias, corruption, pretence and usurpation of power that the current Chief Justice for the Supreme Court is alleged to have shown.
- 3. The intervener enjoys the constitutional norms as one of the Australian people, the Commonwealth of Australia, for which body must include the Queen and Crown of the United Kingdom in application to the foundation law that establishes, and administers, the Commonwealth of Australia.
- 4. The intervener has cause, being a Crown subject and land holder, or having been a land holder as the case may be, held under her Majesty's authority in fee simple in accordance with Challis Real Property 3rd edition.
- 5. The intervener believes that practice of the Supreme Court for Western Australia, WASC, has removed those rights under fee simple and granted unlawful rights under an adopted authority, Queen of Australia, being found by the Government through a Constitutional Report in 1988, to be a legal

fiction and hold no constitutional authority recognised in law to take control of and dispose of our farming land that has been held for generations and cause a damage and violation of a right.

- 6. The intervener relies on the submitted evidence and contentions that the WASC is not operating pursuant to ss 16, 3, and 23 Supreme Court Act 1935 and the authority holders are not sitting Corum Judice to make orders to dispossess the rightful owners of their land and assets, pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth.
- 7. The intervener believes that the answer to the question of jurisdiction practiced by the Supreme Court of Western Australia ought to be examined for compliance to the said foundation law for which the constitution of Western Australia relies upon and for which urgency for review is drawn from the First Defendant's failure to reveal his oath where the West Australian gazettes show the publishing an authority, for West Australian appointments, that is not known to the law and the evidence demonstrates the title for adoption by the Queen as pretended and without authority.
- 8. The intervener believes damage arises for the removal of the practice of law without the Crown and Queen.
- 9. The intervener believes damage arises against the government of the United Kingdom for failing in their oversight commitments enshrined in the Commonwealth Constitution, as protected by the last provision, referendum, and for which the electors for the Commonwealth have not released that obligation.


- 10. The intervener understands that the High Court of Justice bears the responsibility to review the cause within the application as the bias, against the proper regard to the constitutions of the federal and state constitutions, is endemic in all the courts within Australia which have failed over three decades to correct itself and instead persist the practice without accountability.
- 11. The intervener prays for examination of the issues, with attention to the evidence, so that the law for the Commonwealth be restored and that the Queen may not be denied Her Rightful title for which application Her Majesty made promise at Coronation in 1953.
- 12. The intervener supports the Applicant's application, for judicial review, in the public interest that the law be known and declared for certainty and the unjust and unlawful practices be denied further application.


God Save The Queen.


Rural Australia Intervention Directive (RAID)

LIST OF INTERVENERS IN MATTER NO. CO/588/2020 IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, LONDON, UNITED KINGDOM [Rodney Culleton v Quinlan & Ors]

April 22 2020







NB:

Additional list of properties added ## Change of current residential address ### New addition(s)