**PUBLIC PROSECUTION OPEN COURT PROGRESS REPORT BY THE ACCUSED**

**IN THE CRIMINAL SERIOUS CRIMES DIVISION OF THE SYDNEY LOCAL COURT**

**COMMONWEALTH DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS DIVISION**

**May 3rd, 2020**

**Background to the Alleged Criminal Offence**

**The Defendant has been caught allegedly paying the debts of others which are not his to pay.**

**In June 1966, $7,931 was paid, pursuant to a Supreme Court Order, on my behalf, into a Supreme Court bank account.**

**The moneys were never spent.**

**Two in evidence rates of interest have since been applied to my moneys, one after the other, from June 1966, right up to the present day.**

**My moneys, to this day, still, have never been spent.**

**Defendant’s Confession: “To get rid of some of the moneys I admit that I have been paying other people’s debts which are not mine to pay”.**

**Verdict: Defendant found Guilty !**

**Sentence: Defendant to buy other people’s debts first and then pay them.**

1. The Prosecution currently, as of April 26th and May 3rd 2022, has no case as it has thus far and despite its best efforts, not been unable to overcome my handed up Bankruptcy Annulment Extract of 1999, which very fundamental and central piece of evidence Anjali did not even bother or see the need to obtain a copy to hand up or put in her affidavit, as any lawyer doing due diligence should, (evidencing that there was no need as the final verdict is already predetermined, and hence void) so that renders all the ever appreciating moneys to continue to be in existence from June 1966 to the present day and justifies the setting aside of the consequential baseless mischarges made under sections 192E and 192G of the Crimes Act 1900 and also likewise defeats the mischarges made under sections 1041E and 1041G of the Corporations Act (which does not apply to contempted out-of-Court settlement beneficiaries as is mistakenly being asserted) and so all the loans and debts are rendered as paid, including those of Mr Henry Fay, who thus has implicit title, yet for some unexplained reason the Prosecution elected to not withdraw the charges last week in the face of the indisputable extract evidence.
2. The Prosecution has no standing as Ms Nathalie Pietsch has not disclosed, that I am aware, for which instructing corporate interests or clients or instructing principals both she and ASIC are acting. She is currently, by way of another document, just sent, been asked to disclose to the Court and the defendant who her corporate instructing principals are and I await her disclosure of that information, that she and ASIC have fair standing and until she and ASIC do they do they not have arguable fair standing.
3. With the bankruptcy annulment extract having been handed up, the prosecution has no witnesses as all their debts are now implicitly rendered as having been paid as the moneys have been clarified, by way of the extract, as having been in existence at all material times.
4. The Prosecution was served with full details of the fraud and, as far as I am aware, has not laid charges in relation to the fraud I reported to it which was filed in the Federal Court on June 15th  2021 and which the Prosecution would have had by since, say, the end of June last year and presumably have commenced investigating the fraud since that time. If that were not the case, which would be unlikely, it would, perhaps, attract a section 316 indictment of seeking to conceal a crime that could be laid against the prosecutor if he does commence prosecuting the fraud that I have reported to him and proven for the prosecution, for no apparent reason, since it has all been laid bare for him.
5. After 19 years: a breakthough has occurred in the alleged arson murder of the ‘next friend’, my late father, Mr Neville Murphy through whom I sued in 1443/64, and the willful destruction of vital evidence so as to frustrate due process, as someone greatly disturbed and distressed and upset by my murder details lead generation investigation site, which gives full undenied and unchallenged, incontrovertible thus far, details and background facts to the alleged arson murder, in the context of the history and follow on of 1443/64. That information is the only information on the site that anyone could ever possibly stress or be upset or disturbed about and so contact ASIC, of all people?, and demand that the site, which they cannot refute, as they were unable to do that, be taken down, because it was all true and so disturbed them greatly. And so hence they, incriminatingly, rang ASIC (why ASIC?) so no one else, invidiously, could nominate as an arson murder suspect, as they knew there was no further need, and they knew everything there was spot on, which was why the house was burnt down and they were disturbed and most upset. So now, by way of my site doing what it was partially intended to do, we have our voluntary candidate, someone who has nominated themselves as the prime, number one, murder suspect, or most certainly knows who it is, as that was a purpose of the site, to get public reaction and responses to the arson murder crime allegations. This nominating suspect is to be promptly referred by ASIC to the police for questioning based on their incriminating giveaway reaction to the site and inability to contradict.
6. Anjali discloses that ASIC is aware of the still new “400% ASIC Imaginative Innovation and Initiative” system which I s.witch.ed over to to avoid apparent confusion, by doing something which no business can possibly do and proving, once and for all time that abused but imaginative settlement beneficiaries are not businesses, as, after the May 6th 2021 ASIC consultation, the following September 18th, the 125th quarterly rest anniversary, where, thanks to ASIC, debts and mortgages, especially now with the annulment and the fortifying section 74, paragraph 6 provision, found to be in application and operation, are now, logically, again able to be paid out this time around, ultimately for nothing. Yet this is regarded as a crime in some twisted quarters for some purported reason of ASIC’s instructing domestic and foreign corporate principals – which would call for some sort of public written explanation.
7. Anjali, who is not a doctor, does not claim in her affidavit to have any other tertiary qualifications than a law degree. She works as a lawyer in the Financial Services Enforcement division but disclosed in response to my asking, that, although she works in financial services as a lawyer, she does not know how to use a spreadsheet program. However, notably, she was the only one at the consultation perspicacious enough to have noticed in her investigations that my ‘facility’, if we may call it that, as it is more a composition currently of some fifteen reserves, 14 of which are true perpetuities, perhaps the only true perpetuities in the entire world, a ‘facility’ which seems to keep evolving and developing as if having a life of its own and on a trajectory to who knows where???, which suggests Anjali may have suspected a major further advance might come out of our consultation. If so, she was right, and the only one who might have picked that it to be coming, which it did on September 18th, the anniversary date of the 125th quarterly rest (see 125th QR document, elsewhere attached). The complete makeover on September 18th was the first time I had actually worked out a system of my own as the previous systems: ‘0%’, ‘10%’, ‘15%’, ‘25%’ and ‘35%’ were all add-on accretions and patches that had been suggestions of others, a lawyer, then an accountant and then two others, Kewa and Marina. Apart from that Anjali came away from the May 6th four hour consultation, seemingly, with different ideas and impressions than I did. The current criminal proceedings are based on the old accretions as the entire system quantum-leapt last September 18th and these proceedings are inappropriately based on the old ‘other people’s ideas’ system and so have little operational application as the system completely changed after the due process ASIC consultation. However the prosecution is not being honest and telling the Court that tha tis the case. If these criminal proceedings were to be based on the post-ASIC consultation inspired new system they would probably not even get off the ground, most definitely now with the annulment that only came to light because the CDPP finally, at long last, answered my five year old somewhat immobilizing question as to what event allegedly made the moneys to cease to exist? To which the CDPP answered in its Crown Case Statement, for the first time ever, that it was found to be my obscure, never mentioned, long ago, accidental 1997 bankruptcy, though the CDPP incorrectly said I was “declared bankrupt”, which I never was, which told me straightaway that they had not bothered to go and check to have it documented - because the outcome of the matter was predetermined, so proper due diligence could go out the window because it didn’t matter as it was all in the bag, and also because, rather than being ‘declared bankrupt’, I had ‘declared bankruptcy’, because mine was a debtor’s petition and not a creditor’s petition, as appears to have been assumed due to not knowing that AGC’s September 1st 1997 creditor’s petition had, unbeknowns to me, been turfed out of the Federal Court just three days before. If they had checked by way of doing their due diligence, which did no tsemt ot matter, and obtaining an extract they would have immediately seen that my debtor’s petition had been annulled eighteen months into the bankruptcy, thus activating Section 74, paragraph 6 and that they had no case, which I said last week upon my handing up of the extract, which has not been denied, and then we might really start to really make progress as we get pass the impass of no one having known the vexxed answer. The current proceedings are not apt to the current situation and only apply to the pre-ASIC consultation, which seems very odd and not apt and suggests areas in ASIC do not communicate with other areas within ASIC and different areas are off doing different things without telling each other. Hence, we have a consultation which leads to profound change and at the same time get charged with fraud as if an entire division had never been told that there had been a consultation seven months before which led to a major overhaul. Anyway, either ASIC or the CDPP could have simply rung me up and I could have told them all this but they never rang. Instead other people were sent to collect money with no intention of ever providing any benefit to later fool the Court that I was in business with all of these impostors at once who had no idea what a business is as they did not know how to provide a proper accountable net benefit.
8. In Anjali’s affidavit at paragraph 17, Anjali commences an instructed collateral and precautionary strategic assault on behalf of and on the instructions of one or all of her undeclared thus far instructing principals, seeking to challenge my five doctoral degrees that were specifically put into evidence, unlike the extract, for this assault. But Anjali has not sought copies of my five theses in order for her to rebut the theses herself and undermine my doctorates and thus my five-doctorates charge-out general attendance rate for nuisance and invoicings etc stands. Today, the two newly indebted debtors can settle for just a $1 each as the first step today of a ‘cascade of Calderbank offers’ offer, or may opt for higher or choose full liability amounts and be in default to me within a week, which may adversely affect their current already above-mentioned non-existent standing and elsewhere mentioned defect in the November 10th 2020 filing by Ms Nathalie Pietsch. Currently, as of yesterday (May 2nd), he and the ASIC ‘filent’ (new word!) are debtors to the defendant who can each prudently settle for $1 each.
9. I claim my entitlements to exemptions on the ASIC site under points 2 and 4, being an incidental component of another facility, which mine is, and also one off’s, and not standing arrangements, both of which apply to me as I am being proactive and making the entitled public aware of the public prosecutions. The site aussiedebtbailout.org is incidental to my recovery of my Supreme Court settlement moneys and the lead gathering investigation into the “next friend” alleged arson murder to find leads, of which we have one who wanted to close off the number of suspects at just themselves only, and so thereby admit, by a process of ‘elimination’, that they are either the murderer or closely associated and don’t want any publicity and have not been able to challenge or fault even one of the facts on the site.
10. The CDPP case seems to be knowingly based upon an ASIC case filed by ASIC in which, it is alleged, to have been filed by way of swearing and filing a false instrument, which everyone seems to know about but doesn’t care, much the same as not getting extracts, so as to commence a case that is proving not to exist. The allegation has been put to the deponent for response and to withdraw the case from the Federal Court, hand up the details of the letter currently being sent to the deponent and await a reply.
11. A Resolution offer is being put to the prosecutor in regard to the documented 65 alleged frauds advised to the Court last week, but not by number, and to set off the alleged remaining (0) amounts allegedly owing by the defendant in phase 1 of the case, which concluded with the handing up of my annulment notice concluding phase one and rendering all the payments as having been made with evidenced to still be in existence since 1999, Australian legal tender moneys for which the above exceptions 2 and 4 apply and no licence needed as the defendant does not ultimately now charge debtors anything, as ASIC knows, and a licence is not needed per the exemptions, so as to not give people advice as to what to do with my money once I have paid them, against their figures so that a set off figure be arrived at.
12. I am entitled to tell my friends about the alleged criminal aspects of the matters alleged as the public has an interest and right to know about crimes and their defences and I am entitled to print out my filed documents to show to them and to show them to other friends by other means, that my reputation not be sullied, as is my right as one who is innocent until proven guilty for the allegedly heinous crime of paying debts and loans with moneys that exists as per the annulment document so that I may finally access a portion of my money in a way that the law provides and the law allows.
13. In the matter, Anjali has strategically or consequentially linked the matter to 1443/64 by otherwise, needlessly, involving my father, the late Mr Neville Murphy (“Mr Murphy”) into the proceedings, as can be done so as to score points, who was the ‘next friend’ whom I sued through in that matter. I am his son and I am Dr Murphy, Mr Murphy in our family always refers to my father as he was not a doctor but rather a businessman, which I am not, and the two should not be confused, particularly in affidavits, as I am more of an academic and studious and quietly theological type. No charges have ever been laid against Mr Murphy as he is deceased as he was allegedly arson murdered in 2003, as ASIC or some of its instructing corporate principals would very well know, as detailed in the taken down aussiedebtbailout.org so as to ‘section 316’ (conceal) a crime site complained about by the one elicited prime suspect, and he deceased in 2003. Mr Murphy, who was allegedly murdered by way of arson crime does not use a telephone, not that I am aware. For Anjali to get up on this she would have to rebut all five of my theses and she has not yet asked for copies of any of them but I am happy to email them to her for her to read and “go her hardest” to rebut. Saying that references to my name are references to my father who is deceased is irrational and would confuse the court and may invalidate any outcome. In paragraph 22 Anjali puts herself at the site of the fire at about 4 or 5 am on the morning of July 8th, 2003, so she must have been much younger then (22), as that is the only time she may have appeared to my father there, as I have been given to understand my father had been shot first before the fire allegedly began. By a perhaps unforeseen process of deduction, Anjali puts herself at the very site of the murder on the morning of the fire by her affidavit and so she may know the person who made the complaint. Paragraph 23 is scarcely credible from this deponent as Mr Murphy died in 2003 and she has just deposed under oath that she was there on the morning of the fire to interpose herself into our family. (Whoever helped Anjali with this affidavit seems to know exactly where they are going with this and what they are leading up to and is not doing her any favours). To paragraphs 26 and 27, Mr Murphy died by arson on the morning of July 8th 2003 so Anjali must be hearing voices, according to her affidavit, and so is evidencing that she has a mental illness of psychosis and schizophrenia as she hears voices of dead people and perhaps should be put on medication, although I am a proponent of treatment alternatives in mental health, being the founding president of Staag. As per paragraph 28, Anjali has substituted the charges, ineffectively I point out, nice try, onto my deceased father and so relieved me of any charge in crime with the handing up of my annulment document on April 26th, 2022. I suggest the deponent withdraw her entire affidavit whilst she still has the chance before some terrible and unexpected things start to befall her such as getting herself entered into the NSW mental health system where only 3% of psychiatrists have been found, over a 25 year lengthy study, the most accurate one known, to be able to accurately diagnose. I think someone such as a supervisor with a hidden agenda has set Anjali up to do this highly destructive ‘double edged sword ’ that is set up to backfire and be intended to destroy her career and future by way of an arcane and recondite, very cunningly conceived secret affidavit ‘boomeranging’ technique that will do more than come back and bite her in the bum but rather put her into a trap that may forever be used as a means of control, or the like, against her, if matters come undone and fall into the wrong hands, for her being too nice and trusting, and bring about her instant dismissal from ASIC, and someone grab her job, maybe the person who helped her with it, and she be put on a DSP. Hence, malice aforethought or the like is clearly in evidence and charges of malice or the like should be laid and be most definitely be seen to be laid (watch this space) as a part of this matter with its many interconnected parts and attempts to destroy the credibility of this manipulated witness. As for the affidavit of Mr Fay, the annulment renders it to be the case that he does indeed have title, and has all along as Betty said, after her having sought advice and texting me that he does, and that settles the matter as it all hinges on whether the money has continued to exist at either of the two being applied interest rates which the extract evidences, in association with section 74, paragraph 6. Henry may have been overcharged and should seek any extorting be settled by way of set off with government departments.
14. In her affidavit Anjali has knowingly sworn a mistruth and lied on oath about a matter she knows quite well about, or should, in that the October 2020 Orders are no longer in place as a seemingly over enthusiastic operative of either ASIC or the CDPP or one their instructing corporate, domestic or foreign, principals or clients, Fin Hub Solutions of Bankstown, vicariously and impatiently breached both Orders on November 9th 2021, the intended very next day after I withdrew a matter from Burwood Local Court so as to transfer to a higher jurisdiction. The matter had been against one of the operatives who never had any intention of providing any genuine, let alone net, benefit, one of the 65 documented protected frauds, evidencing a clear communication link between both Fin Hub Solutions and Adline, who interestingly has now gone back to using its earlier name, as two of the so called ‘Bankstown gang’. The breaches were documented, and arguably, with the double breach backfire, the Federal Court proceedings automatically concluded on November 9th 2021 with the double breach being upon ASIC and its many instructing foreign and domestic corporate principals that had been organized (for a second time in my matter) to intentionally, and for no other reason, evidence and engineer once again a breach of both Court orders purportedly by me the next day, being November 10th, so as to commemorate the misfiling of the above Concise Orders when no date had been known, as explained above and the filing thus of nil effect. However, constructively, the double breach was the day before, on the 9th, when the operative, Fin Hub Solutions, rang out of the blue, as they all seem to do, they all seem to come through the phone, to set up the illicit meeting so as to arrange for the simultaneous breaching of the two Federal Court Orders and quiz me about a number of my residential investment (?) properties in Millers Point that no one who had not studied my Affidavit of Truth Affidavit of Assets filed in the Federal Court on November 13th, 2020, could have possibly known anything about. In this way, with the revealing of the link the next day on the 10th the operative breached both orders collectively on behalf of its instructing corporate principal so the Federal Court matter is no more, irrespective of whether it ever legally began due to the alleged and never to this day denied misfiling. Anjali would, of course, know all about this and has not deposed that she knows that the Court Orders were breached by Fin Hub Solutions planning a set up double breach of the Court Orders the day before, which I curiously attended to see what exactly was going on, as every time a finance company approaches me it is nothing but a scam, and worked it out a few weeks later, which was all confirmed by Fin Hub Solutions gleefully sending me images by email of the two breached Court Orders, as apparently and surprizingly they had had them all along and all the time and knew exactly what they were doing and why they had them. It would have been hard to keep the lid on that one and the word must have gotten all around in the ASIC camp that it was I who breached the two Court Orders, or had I? as when I had worked out what had been attempted I wrote to Fin Hub Solutions twice and got the last word and it all went quiet and I foiled the second such attempt. The first one had been by AGC to attempt to have me breach my 1966 Terms of Settlement in 1990, which failed and backfired.
15. I seek an Order that the Prosecution, now that we are at the doorstep of the Resolution process, both email me its weekly progress reports each Monday morning for response by way of my progress reports on the prosecuting of the many crimes to be handed up on the Tuesday Court sessions.
16. It seems everyone, last week, but me with the two handups, i.e. the sudden death annulment doc and the new beginning at last upon the original ancient but continually in use fraud, stuffed up big time all the way around because I’m the only one who knows what the case is all about and have lived it since the age of 9, and so am regarded in some quarters as fair game, and the case always ‘returns to itself’ - because the Supreme Court case exists - and always will – until every last cent is paid and the common law jurisdiction is at last at an end.
17. Hopefully in the near future someone will develop an app so the ever accruing moneys can start to be used on mobile phones and the like. The delivery system is still very clunky and primitive at the moment and can be much further refined.
18. Invoices served for forced labour work done by the defendant at his professional doctorate rates, were served overnight and are again in person today.
19. Class dismissed.

1. Hours spent: 12 x $5,000 at my five doctorates rate = $60,000, as things must be done, and be seen to be done, perfectly. Terms, please pay within seven days lest there be default.

E. & O. E.

Dr David Murphy

Law Therapist and Defendant and Funds Owner and Public Prosecutions Reporter

0419 605 365