**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF SYDNEY**

**In the Matter of**

**David Gregory Murphy v The Council of the Municipality of Strathfield**

**1443/64 aka 2011/327194**

**The overriding Common Law Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court continues until every last cent owing and "outstanding" and to which I am entitled is paid**

Frivolous and Vexatious, Extraneous, Ex-Jurisdictional Matter

In the Local Court Commonwealth Criminal Division

Case name: R v David Gregory MURPHY  
Case number: 2022/78429

Prosecutor’s reference number: 2021PR01733t

**Dr David Murphy**

**Funds Owner**

**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.**

To Ms Nathalie Pietsch

ASIC

*"However, the fund which Mr Murphy purported to rely upon to pay the customer's debt or loan does not exist." - Pietsch*

*“Nor does he control a pool of “reserves”* ***that is available*** *to pay off loans and debts” (Davies at [42]-[43]).*

*not, notably and admissively enough as intended for future revisitation, reinterpretation and reliance,*

*“Nor does he control any purported/alleged pool of “reserves” that is allegedly available to pay off loans and debts”.*

***A Proof:***

*So thus, when you read what Davies says very carefully, compared to what he could have said if he really wanted to make a point, he does admit, quite adequately enough, that my moneys do indeed exist, especially in the light of what was going to evaluatively occur on the very next day, but he does not have any idea who is controlling them, because, if he did, he would simply say who it is and prove it all to us, but he does not know and tellingly, never has since.*

*So, until he can say who does, or disprove my interpretation of what he has written when compared to what I suggest above that he could have written, if wanting, at all, to be seen to be agreeing with Pietsch, which he appears not to be, seemingly to perhaps revisit his open to interpretation wording, which I am doing, and use it later on and say who the new owner is, then, it is the case, is it not, I ask under section 17.3 of the UCPR, that I am, until he names someone who otherwise is, and tells us when they got to own all fifteen reserves and how they pulled it off.*

*Quite clearly, he was pre-empting the unmistakeable next day, in evidence, evaluative email (attached) takeover attempt of October 3rd 2020, from Deutschebank, the chief guarantor, acting out a role, which failed.*

*Naming anyone else who controls all fifteen reserves, that are admitted to be available to pay off loans and debts, has not been done at any time since he wrote his words on October 2nd, 2020, just the day before the very evaluative take over attempt by an ASIC client/instructing principal the very next day on October 3rd 2020.*

*So the default situation since 1966 is that the owner of the growing number of reserves must, of course, be me, as I own the whole admitted pool of the fifteen reserves, which he admits adequately enough, are, in point of fact, available to pay off debts and loans, i.e. including from Reserves 1, 10 and 12.*

Now back to Ms Pietsch who was paid very well to say what she wrote, meaning I should also be paid for what I have to write in reply: so let’s get started in the true style of a prosecutor letting rip.

1. On November 10th 2020, you wrote me a whole lot of garbage and shit, the majority of which, but perhaps for some dates and some amounts you knew not to be true and designed to engage a great deal of my extremely valuable time as you should have known I would be able to bill you at my published five doctorate rates for your being tortious and seeking to trick the Court mischievously in writing rubbish to people about their Court matters, that are none of your fucking business to muscle in on, whose names you have from found from suppressed court records or going over old insurance claims to see if they are goers or picked out of the phone book or found on the internet or have been passed on to you by your other criminal buddies, mates and pals, who have been doing the same thing, as they have found it a good way to make money out of civil court settlement beneficiaries who have no idea what is going on and never quite got their moneys because it was earmarked from the beginning for future recovery with 1,665% interest over 30 years.
2. In your pack of lies Concise Statement attached to the Notice of Filing of November 10th 2020, designed to window dress a now reported in court crime (26.4.22), in paragraph 15, you claim that one, and only one in particular, of my Court Order originating legal tender money reserves currently does not exist (the so called “fund”) but notably, and very intentionally, you elected to not claim that that particular one reserve (Reserve 1), not being concerned at all about any of the other fourteen of my Court Order originating etc derivative, moneys, which Davies concedes do exist, none of which are any of your fucking business (as you don’t have a business as you are a criminal and criminals don’t know what a business is or what a business isn’t ‘cause they are fucking criminals, as you mostly all are), ever did exist, considering that my moneys have never ever been spent.
3. You refer to the moneys as “the fund” so we shall assume that you are referring to Reserve 1 and, as said, not to the other fourteen reserves, which may also be similarly commandeered and drawn upon, especially Reserve 12, in regard to which you have no issue, but not so for Reserve 10, in regard to which you have no issue or dispute as to how it lawfully came into existence. With these, say, thirteen other reserves, which were disclosed by way of my Federal Court ‘Affidavit of Truth’ Affidavit of Assets, which were not rebutted in the requisite 28 days and so undisputed and thus stand as incontrovertible truth in any Court in Australia, you have no issue. Your concerns are only with Reserve 1, and Reserve 1 alone. Davies , above admits to there being others.
4. Hence, with regard to Reserve 1 only and not to the other 13, you allow for the Court Order originating moneys to have been in existence, as you elected to not plead that they never did exist in the past but only that they did not exist on November 10th 2020, but at some point of time in the past, and by some means, which you have not explained, you implicitly concede that one day they all ceased to exist, (see the problem?) (this is excluding the other 14 reserves which you are arguing as having disappeared), considering that they (i.e. Reserve 1, but also applicable to the other 14 reserves) have never been spent and have never been abandoned.

**What event are your talking about?**

1. Please disclose what was the event as at November 10th 2020 to which you were referring to, being at some time in the past back to June 6th 1966, that caused my, Reserve 1 only, Court order originating moneys to cease to exist, considering that my moneys have never been spent.
2. It was not until the consultation of May 6th 2021 that ASIC first heard me make mention of there having been a 1997 bankruptcy. As at November 10th 2020 you, yourself, did not know of that bankruptcy, but however, as at November 10th 2020, you swore that my moneys (i.e. Reserve 1 only) on that day did not exist, but did not appear to know why: and so could not legally swear and file, considering that my moneys have never been spent.
3. As the event you were referring to that made all my Court Order originating, guaranteed moneys cease to exist at some point, and it was not the 1997 bankruptcy, as neither you or anyone in ASIC knew of the bankruptcy until the following May 6th 2021, please tell me as to what event you were referring to that made all my (Reserve 1 only, but not the others) Court Order originating moneys that had been accruing consecutively at the two rates of interest, to cease to exist on whatever date you are referring to, such that, since they allegedly do not exist now they cannot be tapped into now to pay a debt which is not mine, at a totally unbusinesslike 75% loss each and every time, purely because they all ceased to exist at some point in the past, given that you are not referring to my 1997 bankruptcy and considering that they had never been spent, because I believe you have no fucking idea (there are only three other dates available to you, each of which are totally absurd) as to what event over the past 56 years you can possibly be referring to and you must disclose a credible date and credible event to advance your cause.
4. If you did not know upon what date since June 6th 1966 and by what means my negotiable, guaranteed, accruing, highly desirable, equitable entitlement moneys allegedly ceased to exist and how that came to be then: at no particular time on the ledger do you know if the moneys were in existence or not, you did not know, you did not care, you did not make enquiries, were acting criminally, you did not have a clue and you have no right to deny or interfere in an abused Supreme Court settlement beneficiary doggedly accessing his entitled moneys and saying he is a business for doing so.
5. If you did not know whether the moneys paid to settle loans or debts on any particular day were in existence or not then you do not know whether a debtor’s loan has been paid or not.

1. If you did not know whether any of the debts or loans had been paid or not then you do not know whether there has been any fraud or not, although you would know there cannot be as there is are guarantors in the mix.

1. Since you do not know whether there has been any fraud or not then you do not have a cause of action and cannot assert that anything criminal has taken place as you do not know upon what date and by what means the moneys in existence and appreciating since 1966 onwards and due to an annulment enjoy the benefits of section 74 paragraph 6 of the Bankruptcy Act 1966 allegedly ceased to exist.
2. Since you do not know if you have any cause of action then your swearing and filing of a false instrument which you did not know to be true or not, as you did not know whether there had been any alleged fraud or not, because you did not know upon what day, if any, and by what means, my Court Order originating moneys had allegedly ceased to exist was allegedly fraudulent and allegedly designed to incur actionable loss and was allegedly vexatious and an alleged criminal act calling for a discretionary sentence.
3. Please enlighten me.
4. Lack of attention to detail and the neglect of proper due process generally indicates that people's minds are on something else more profitable and that a matter is predetermined as an instructing principal's interests must be kept in mind, and everyone else is none the wiser.
5. I demand your immediate notification as to the date and event of which you speak immediately by return email.
6. If you cannot immediately give me a date and event then I direct that you, or the Associate of Farrell J, should you fail to do so, immediately withdraw your Notice of Filing and Concise Statement from the Federal Court Register as criminally you knew of no such event or date which you had been referring to on November 10th 2020, which was well before May 6th the following year, when you illegally swore and filed your Concise Statement not knowing whether the moneys did exist or did not because you did not know how and when they allegedly ceased to exist.

**For whom do you act?**

1. My matter has been given to you because you are the ASIC / CDPP authoritarian and totalitarian trained specialists who bring proceedings against all the Supreme Court settlement beneficiaries of any state who have either been induced to breach their Terms of Settlement some 24 years later, about which you are fully informed from my handed up complaint (attached), and have unknowingly breached or have not breached, but have worked out a legal way to access their hitherto elusive and made virtually inaccessible moneys, as alleged business people for you to gain false jurisdiction and you stand guard at your corporate instructing principal’s door to see they never can get their moneys so as to protect the arcane and recondite and abstruse secret art of recovering court settlements with 1,665% interest, as in my case, in utter contempt of the Court that provided the original Court Order, perhaps because the money went somewhere else long ago. I am one of the ones who did not breach my 1966 Terms of Settlement when approached to do so so I have been given to you and ASIC as a Supreme Court settlement beneficiary from the 1960’s to prosecute on criminal charges of seeking to access my thus far inaccessible and kept far out of reach, hard to get at, equitable entitlement moneys in a very special and unique way that the law provides and the law allows and which the law ensures that brings up any fight up to the doorstep of one of your many instructing corporate principals for whom you act whenever this point is reached, 58 years later in the original proceedings which have not completed the accessing of settlement moneys stage and the final cent is yet to be paid and so the original jurisdiction still applies and the matter has entered the criminal jurisdiction, as perhaps usually intended.
2. Please advise the Court as to for whom you act as you have no standing before the Court if you do not have a party or parties for whom you act and who is or are instructing you, unless that party is, of course, me, as I have proven in my unrebutted letter to Mr Earl of January 20th, 2021, attached. So please advise who is retaining you, and for whom you act as you have no standing to come before the Court, unless, of course, it is me, as I evidenced in that letter beyond all reasonable doubt. If it is not so then please, if you can, rebut, point by point, my attached letter to Mr Earl which he was unable to rebut due to your having another instructing corporate principal. I am herewith, by attaching it, presenting the Earl letter to the Court (as I am also doing now to put the Court on notice to make the appropriate orders) to assert to the Court that, arguably and by default, you can only be acting for me, if you do not disclose any other corporate or individual parties for whom you are acting by your having filed the above such process.
3. I note that as of April 26th when I filed the attached 1997 – 1999 bankruptcy annulment document in the Court, of which I now make you aware, you ceased to have any apparent case and the four witnesses remaining who might have given evidence that their debts were not paid due to the money, allegedly, not having been in existence, then since, due to the annulment, were implicitly, and in fact, paid many years later. The document that I handed up and filed in court evidenced that indeed the moneys did continue to exist after the bankruptcy annulment as the moneys were not affected by any adverse pleaded events (which was only ever, at least, pleaded in a document served upon me dated February 28th alleging it was the bankruptcy which made all fifteen of the reserves (seven did not exist until after the bankruptcy) to cease to exist (which, really!, even a bankruptcy cannot do, as the moneys do not cease to exist, they just go somewhere else) and so exist, today, unaffected. Hence, the debts were indeed paid, and as the attached document attests, all debts were paid as all debts were paid some 18 to 23 years after the 1999 annulment, is it not the case I now ask under my herewith invoked section 17.3 of the UCPR?
4. You may have written what you ignorantly wrote perhaps under the watchful eye of your supervisor and manager and all the way up the chain of commend to the top who were supervising the supervisors all the way down to you as perhaps you may only have been trained to learn how to write some unresearched tripe to other people whose names you picked out of old phone books and from ads in the papers and whose names friends gave you as referrals – or perhaps you are being sacrificed and thrown to the lions because you were not told any background and nobody else would touch it. If so who do you hold accountable? If you do not answer then the answer is that you are solely accountable.
5. What are the names of all your superiors all the way up the chain and onto all their instructing principals who helped you make up all this rubbish about people who have settled out of court and have not breached their terms and have had a degree of difficulty, which out of your contempt for the Supreme Court could you intend for them to never get and set a precedent that can be used against all Supreme Court beneficiaries so as to gain a degree of domination over the civil court system that all Supreme Court beneficiaries require an ASIC licence to access their moneys and then so that ASIC will not come along and fetch it back. If you do not give the names of the other fabricators I will assume you dreamed the whole idea up in your lunchtime against a person you had never met and do the same to many others.

**Your Operatives’ Frauds**

1. Also note that I am of the view that it is quite evident and arguable that my former idepaige lien of March 22nd 2020 is pertinent here. That lien was foreclosed at law on March 28th 2020 and that foreclosure at law elicited your swift reply to me in response to gain my attention, exactly one month later to the day so as to evidence a relationship to be in existence, on April 28th advising of your purported concerns over Shop-a-Docket advertising arranged by your, or one of your instructing principal’s, agents called Zac Adams, (real name Gurdon), to whom you gave my number.

1. The operative Mr ‘Adams’ never had any intention of providing any benefit to me, let alone a net benefit, but just sought to strategically set me up, as now in retrospect becomes quite obvious, for your long in the planning eventual approach. Hence his, and thus vicariously, your deceitful approach through the instructed agency of Mr Zac ‘Adams’, was fraudulent and intended to get as much money, as ‘evidence of the proceeds of crime’, which now fails due to my 1999 bankruptcy annulment having vested all the moneys back in me as per section 74, paragraph 6, of the Bankruptcy Act 1966, meaning that you and ASIC have no case, and never did, but at the time of filing you did not know whether you did or did not so your filing was void as you did not know whether or why you had a case or not and it turns out you never did.

1. These ‘jail bait’ moneys, which you thought you were legally defrauding me of, were obtained off me solely in order to set me up with no intention at all to provide any settlement-access financial benefit by your operative Zac ‘Adams’, that would later be produced to the Court to fool the Court. It is most incriminating that you write of the allegation of the Shop a Docket approach to me by your agent, so as to fool the Court, as if I approached Zac or Shop a Docket, or any of your operatives in your instructing principal’s operatives, in that what piqued my interest was the opportunity to do in depth, detailed response analysis, to determine whether I would have received a net benefit or not, as was to be the case with Adline who followed soon after. You do not mention Zac’s agency as part of your fraud so as to deceive the Court as if I approached him when it was you through him who was approaching me to defraud me of my ‘jail bait’ money, with no intention to ever provide a benefit, hence an intended fraud, with the enticement being that I would be able to do spreadsheet response analysis, which I love doing and have done so for decades, as I did in my business from 1988 to 1997, and survived through the then financial ‘storm’ that way, to determine if Shop A Docket actually works, which I have proven that it does not. It is a sham you use to approach people to get their money as, like Adline has been proven by me, not to work and so only survives as a scam that is useful to get at people in court.
2. The same goes with Adline whom you had deceitfully approach me in order to unknowingly collect ‘jail bait’ moneys which would later be alleged to be ‘evidence of the proceeds of crime’, so that I could again do analysis on results, which I love doing, in order to determine if there was ever a benefit. With Adline, there certainly was not as no one ever rang except for one operative who has sworn a false affidavit, on your behalf, alleging he saw copious quantities of roadside billboard advertising when the written admission by Adline in Burwood Local Court was that no advertising services were ever provided, as your, or one of your instructing corporate principal’s’ operative, Adline, never had any cause and never did (and as Federally commissioned agents why would they) ever pay any GST, as they believed, as they had been told, that I was a fraud, so your operatives conducting a sting never had any intention of providing any benefit, net or gross, and so held on to my $27,500, but returned one eighth, through the operative, Murray, who swore a false affidavit on oath to fool the Court. No other enquirers ever rang over 18 months over 14 sites each with a footfall of some 5,000 per week xxx. Hence, you defrauded me so to build an artificial case and trick the Court, oblivious to the Section 74.6 effect of the 1999 annulment, as you had not been informed and had the effect that all the loans and debts were implicitly paid when I compliantly paid them, as that was some 18 to 23 years after the annulment of the bankruptcy, which bankruptcy the CDPP is now alleging is the reason why my either one or fifteen reserves of moneys have ceased to exist, (which is an impossibility anyway as money never ceases to exist, it just goes somewhere). Consequently, you and the CDPP have no case as I challenged on Tuesday in Court and which was not denied.
3. Zac ‘Adams’ and also Shop a Docket, who clearly were in on it, continued to ring me on your behalf, when no net benefits were ever being received, and none ever intended, to help you construct an artificial case to fool the Court. Zak and Shop a Docket were also oblivious of section 74.6 being in force, and kept begging for more alleged ‘evidence of the proceeds of crime ‘jail bait’ moneys’ to either pay for your, or one of your instructing principal’s legals and operational costs, on the pretext that the alleged advertising, where there was no real proof that it ever took place as I never saw any of the dockets. Again, since Shop a Docket has turned up in this matter, the argument is, of course, that the alleged advertising was being paid for with the ‘proceeds of crime’ and so right across the 65 of your ASIC sponsored frauds, there was never any benefit intended as your golden rule is to never provide a benefit to an (alleged) fraudster, as to provide a benefit is fraud due to it being complicient in the fraud, and so hence there was never any benefit intended in any of the 65 frauds conducted and run by ASIC or its various (I think there are six) instructing corporate principals on its behalf, so as to get all my money for your instructing corporate principals.

1. It is these 65 frauds by your or their instructed operatives which I advised to the Court on Tuesday, that the CDPP is obliged by law to prosecute to see if any of your operatives are genuine or not, when all the money I paid was ‘jail bait’ money as this is what I do to catch out crooks and I have caught you all out and so there must be obligatory prosecutions, which are not set up so as to fool the Court, as yours are. Is all the foregoing not the case?, I ask under section 17.3 of the UCPR - and if not then why not?, if you have any answer.
2. Hence, as it is all the same case, which has just s.witch.ed, I direct that all my ‘jail bait’ moneys alleged to have been paid by me to your operatives as ‘evidence of the proceeds of crime’, which you, ASIC, or the CDPP have all brought together in the one place in a trust account, ready to whitewash and money launder in your own special District Court, by way of the ‘production’ of each of the amounts simply printed as a list on a piece of paper to hand up to the Court, and so then be divvied up and all the now, all of a sudden, criminal (due to my citing the annulment) operatives finally be further paid, as they were probably only paid $200 each by the promoters of the illegal and fraudulent criminal jury fixing racketeering and extortion scams at the time for their efforts, be instead all, every single one, be paid into a Court bank account, or the like, before you have standing to proceed in, what is, this reserve takeover matter, or show cause as to why my ‘jail bait’ monies from the 65 frauds now all, each and everyone one, be paid into the Court, rather than just being listed on a piece of paper.
3. I submit that you and ASIC and the CDPP are acting for perhaps the same foreign instructing corporate client that Kewa brought her solicitor along to a meeting in December 2019 for the sole purpose of ‘locking in’ my moneys for their, and perhaps your, (yours may be different) foreign corporate client (for if the moneys did not exist, as was that learned solicitor’s legal opinion that they did, he would not have done so) and you are now running a lie to fool the Court that I am currently, even to this day, in business with Kewa, or ever was, so as to assist your foreign corporate client in the takeover of my appreciating settlement moneys by saying that I am in business with business partners, so as to fool the Court. You would not know what a business is as you have never been in business as you are a criminals and criminals do not know what a business is and what a business is not so your tendentious opinions does not account for anything as everything you say and write is a lie, and so all the moneys you have stolen for ASIC and any of your previous employers should be disgorged from you and given back with interest. If you have never stolen from them then all past employers are implicated too and should be investigated and closed down as you are the master criminals who implicate all the others. By if not paying them back for your thefts of monies while with them unless they were thus admittedly by your admissive actions and scamming too.

1. Hence what you are knowingly doing, is to knowingly and unlawfully carry out a belated ‘set up’ intended to catch a person who had not breached his Terms of Settlement, when called upon to do so by an instructed operative in 1990, and consequently, for that reason, precisely 56 (2x28) days afterwards, put to him the Deed of Engagement and Provision with its undetected provision and guarantee and ASIC’s and the CDPP’s client/s is/are upset and wanting all my money and to jail me, when all the time, they did not ever bother to pay the $15 to obtain the extract or do any research at all so as to know about the annulment of my bankruptcy, which causative and probative event the CDPP has committed itself to in its Crown Case Statement, as the focal point and causative event, which annulment, together with section 74, paragraph 6 of the Bankruptcy Act, allegedly proves, beyond reasonable doubt, that my appreciating, guaranteed, negotiable, unbreached-by-me, Supreme Court Court Order originating settlement moneys, which implicitly by the election of the date of September 4th 1997, are committedly admitted to all be in existence as of the previous day, September 3rd 1997, as the bankruptcy, brought about by parties related to or being your corporate clients, did not commence until the next day, September 4th, and so do exist today and so, therefore, can be used to pay out debts which are not mine, so the ledger lights up like a Christmas tree saying paid, paid, paid, paid, at a definitively and decidedly unbusinesslike loss of 75% or more, each and every time, as laughably and eternally invidiously, annulled, mistaken, needless, unjustified and illogical debtor’s petition bankruptcy, based upon a misunderstanding, and caused by AGC seeking to recover childhood settlement moneys, which it regarded as fair game, to make an obscene profit of 1,665%, when I had not been the party who had actually breached my Terms of Settlement when AGC called upon me in 1990 to do so, which purported breach allegedly made all my above mentioned Court Order originating moneys to cease to exist (which is an impossibility) at some particular and precise hour and minute and second of the day when the all-in-order and done-by-the-book stickler-for-detail annulment was actually taking place.
2. I presume ASIC and the CDPP are doing this exact same thing and variants of it to many other Civil Court beneficiaries, and maybe even judgment creditors, who have settled out of court on Terms not to be disclosed, or obtained favourable judgments, in contempt of the civil courts system, by way of skillfully promoting and profiting from illegal and fraudulent criminal jury fixing racketeering and extortion scams, run by criminals for the financial etc benefit only of criminals, which have not been lawful since the precedent of June 17th 2019, and arguably retrospectively as they always have, as you all are proving to be very practiced in performing your assigned roles when it comes to this point so as to convict and obtain jail sentences for civil court beneficiaries and judgment creditors (or you are working on a way to do it) at this point.

1. Why don’t you come clean and save time and costs and just get your instructing corporate principal or client, on whose doorstep, somewhere in the world, presumably overseas, all this is piling up?, because the banks have by now perhaps worked out who the culprit/s are who are to blame and are sheeting everything back to them and causing delay and that or those instructing corporate principal client/s are reacting and starting to respond through channels available to them, such as the seemingly impregnable and formidable ASIC and the CDPP, and are retaining you, amongst others, to act for them. Please have your client/s, save time and come out and say they own my money, considering that they never put any money into it, or did they?, or ever done any work, and are instead trying to steal it with your assistance and skills to execute a very profitable robbery for all concerned. This would be the second or third such documented or recorded attempt to takeover attempt of my moneys.
2. So who am I reeling in with my ‘jail bait’ moneys? Who have I got at the end of the line? I have landed me a whale, maybe a few. It is your illegal and fraudulent criminal jury fixing racketeering extortion scam, as opposed to the former Self Litigants Association demonstrated ‘Panel’ alternative, that you all run through consenting courts with complicient judges so as to all make profits from the proceeds of crime which you commit.
3. ASIC is a danger to the general public and we have to come down as hard as possible on these very dangerous organizations which hunt Supreme Court beneficiaries to stop them legally getting their moneys.
4. I advise as to my costs in the preparation of this entire letter by way of invoice for twenty hours work. I put a lot of work into my necessitated letters and am entitled to charge at my [published](http://scwl.org/attendance.html) five doctorates rate for general attendance of $5,000 per hour. Hence, the amount now due and owing that has been willingly incurred by you for your having willingly engaged me by way of the sending of your vexatious and unjustified document of November 10th 2020 is $100,000.
5. However I make the following very fair cascading Calderbank offer:
6. If the moneys are paid within 24 hours (1 day) by way of couriered bank cheque then the amount will be reduced to $1 only.
7. If the moneys are otherwise paid within 48 hours (2 days) by way of couriered bank cheque then the amount outstanding will be satisfied for an amount of $20 only.
8. If the moneys are otherwise paid within 72 hours (3 days) by way of couriered bank cheque then the amount outstanding will be satisfied for an amount of $200 only.
9. If the moneys are otherwise paid within 96 hours (4 days) by way of couriered bank cheque then amount outstanding will be satisfied for an amount of $2,000 only.
10. If the moneys are otherwise paid within 120 hours (5 days) by way of couriered bank cheque then amount outstanding will be satisfied for an amount of $20,000 only.
11. If the moneys are otherwise paid within 144 hours (6 days) by way of couriered bank cheque then amount outstanding will be satisfied for an amount of $50,000 only.
12. If the moneys are otherwise paid within 168 hours (7 days) by way of couriered bank cheque then amount outstanding will be satisfied for an amount of $75,000.
13. Thereafter the full amount of $100,000 will apply at your election as you threw away an exceptional opportunity to settle for $1 but instead have elected to vexatiously deny me my right to access my Court ordered settlement moneys at a loss where, as you are aware from the documents attached, ultimately no one has to pay me anything to have their debts and loans paid out under the 400% ‘ASIC Inspired Innovation Initiative’ system that came about from the May 6th 2021 consultation with ASIC and was instituted on the anniversary of the 125th Quarterly Rest on September 18th 2021. Upon your payment of the $100,000, if that is the figure you finally elect, I will withdraw the charge of your allegedly knowingly having sworn and filed a false instrument as a lawyer to cause very significant financial loss and damage to my reputation and to cause needless distress, putting me to forced labour causing me to have to write this very detailed, thorough and comprehensive letter for your response, which would never have come about had you not committed an alleged crime which the public has an interest and right to know, as the public has an interest in crime and defences to crime, by way of public prosecution means.

1. You have been given an exceptional opportunity to settle your debt at a great discount for the work you have needlessly obliged me to do when you have no case and no standing and I have done nothing wrong in accessing my moneys in the only way which the law provides and the law allows, which brings any fight up to the doorstep of your instructing principal or client and you are exposing yourself to liability for the debts of others to yourself pursuant to Detention Application 3 (d) when you are aware that as a Supreme Court settlement beneficiary with a protracted settlement, through no fault of my own, I am not a business as you allege, but nevertheless, since, as an act so as to deny others an opportunity to which they are entitled, you would deny innocent individuals and innocent businesses the lawful opportunity to have their debts paid for free with my negotiable, guaranteed, equitable entitlement, moneys that do continue to exist due to my undisputed and unassailable annulment you and the Commonwealth may become liable for their full debt and “all moneys outstanding” as per the anticipatory Deed which makes provision for all moneys outstanding.

1. Terms: full amount must be paid in seven days, i.e., lest there be default.
2. Please pay me by way of a bankcheque or otherwise it will be viewed that you may be inviting a lien.
3. If you have any questions you are actually welcome to ring me and ask on 0419 605 365.
4. This document will be handed up to the Court for the Court to make any Orders.

Dr David Murphy

Frauds Victim and Survivor

Founding President of the former Sydney Self Litigants Association.

Accredited and Recognized Law Therapist

0419 605 365