

**COURT OF APPEAL
SUPREME COURT OF QUEENSLAND**

CA NUMBER: 9591/13
NUMBER : 4516/13

Appellant: **Peter Markan**
AND
Respondent: **Crime and Misconduct Commission**

REPLY TO RESPONDENT ARGUMENTS

The Respondent lawyers 'arguments' confirm Queensland lawyers appalling attitude towards respect for the laws in this country, including the lack of respect for the Australian Constitution as very ironically noted in paragraph 44 of their response. It also shows the need to place those people in re-education facilities to enable them developing the respect for laws and other people in the society.

1. The order made by Mr Boddice was in total disregard of my arguments before the court and the facts formally before the court. 'Discretionary' power of the judge was used to protect unlawful, criminal conduct of his mates in lawyers mafia outfits (CMC and LSC) and to deprive me of my human rights privileges and the right to be protected by the law.
2. **The Affidavit of Sidonie Loreece Wood from 11 September 2013 was before the court and it contains all the evidence of my struggle against lawyers mafia and the evidence of wrongdoing of both CMC and LSC.**
3. Very strange claim was made in Respondent Arguments that CMC has 'no power' to investigate lawyers mafia as they do not belong to 'public administration'(par 13).
Such statement actually shows the idiocy of the person making that assertion as Queensland educated lawyer and 'legal professional'.
4. Commonly known facts are that eg CMC is pursuing so called 'bikies gangs' and big importers, manufactures and distributors of substances known as 'drugs' - which, to the knowledge of even average primary school 5th grader, are not belonging to 'public administration'.
5. Is that henchman of depravity implying that 'bikies gangs' are organized by Queensland Government and drugs pushers are in Queensland Health, and drug importers are in Queensland Transport ???
6. The evidence of the existence of 'lawyers mafia' can be seen in everyday's events, workings of courts and public administration.
In this case it was provided so clearly eg. in the form of the copy of the letter from LSC from 11.04.2011, referred to in my Statement of Claim (in par 18) known to CMC and also clearly before the Court.

Reply to Respondent Arguments

Name: Peter Markan

Peter Markan v Crime and Misconduct Commission Address:

CA NUMBER: 9591/13

Phone :

Email : justiceaction@gmx.com

7. Par 50, 55, 63, 69 of the Respondent Arguments are implying that Queensland lawyers are sacred cows who cannot be pursued for their crimes against the society. That is also the indication of the confidence of a person belonging himself to 'lawyers mafia' - certain of being protected from legal punishment by existing arrangements within the public administration and courts.
8. Par 18 is so characteristic of the bulldust promoted by lawyers about themselves. Here, a moron is claiming to possess the ability to read other people minds and knowing precisely what thoughts were in person mind at a given time. Truly amazing, isn't it?
9. Re par 67 of me being a 'shareholder' in 'State of Queensland' as the corporation - as pointed out in par 20 of my Outline of Arguments. I would like to refer in this case to quite important Authority - the International Military Tribunal for the Nuremberg Trials - which in article 21 of its charter says- 'The Tribunal shall not require **proof of facts of common knowledge** but shall take judicial notice thereof ...'. It has to be quite important 'authority' because several people were hanged as the result of its operation.
10. **The fact of common knowledge**, which I am asking the court to take 'judicial notice', is that 'State of Queensland' is the formally registered corporation (US Securities and Exchange Commissions under No. 0001244818) and I, as the shareholder of that corporation, **have voting rights to select its management and have a say in its operation** with the legal consequences which have to be noted in the case against CMC.
(ref: <http://www.sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar?action=getcompany&CIK=0001244818&owner=exclude&count=40>)
11. Mr Boddice through his attitude during the court hearing showed himself as the person disrespecting laws of this country, including Australian Constitution, and also to be the abuser of human rights of other people.
How can a judge expect other people to respect the law if he himself is a law breaker ???
12. Such appalling attitude is shared by Queensland lawyers - represented here by the person making statements (saturated with references to 'authorities') as the lawyer and the representative of CMC in the Respondent Arguments.
13. Lawyers 'overriding duty to the court' is shown in sleazy arse licking in par 31 - 'a Court should approach applications by a Defendant for summary judgment cautiously' attempting to 'defend' judges conduct as law breaker and abuser of human rights by hinting at certain 'authorities'.
14. This is hideous attempt to bypass the law, as established by Acts of Parliament on behalf of **all people** in Australia, by an opinion of an individual who happens to be a lawyer !
(A suggestion to potential bank robbers - you are not breaking the law you are 'acting cautiously'.)

Reply to Respondent Arguments

Name: Peter Markan

Peter Markan v Crime and Misconduct Commission Address:

CA NUMBER: 9591/13

Phone :

Email : justiceaction@gmx.com

15. **I am asking this Court to determine** - are we living in democracy or under dictatorship?
 What is more important - **the laws**, as created by parliament representing all people in Australia/Queensland or **an opinion/statement** by an individual representing nobody except himself?
16. Par 30 (and others) of the Respondent Arguments provides the evidence of that shared attitude of disrespect by judiciary and lawyers - in spite of the fact that a lawyer should be expected to be aware of the laws in the given jurisdiction and show (even superficially) respect for the laws.
17. The provision of **Article 14 of The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** -
 “All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, **everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law.**”
 are valid law in this jurisdiction and it gives me the right to stand up to depravity, rottenness and wickedness so characteristic in Queensland ‘legal’ arrangements.
18. Mr Boddice is not doing me any favour by formally showing that he is who he claims he is. All publically available information show him merely as having some schooling and ‘experience’ as THE LAWYER and NOT AS JUDGE.
THERE IS NOWHERE TO BE FOUND ANY EVIDENCE OF HIS COMPETENCE AS THE JUDGE.
19. Mr Boddice, by his failure to provide the evidence of his judicial competence, deprived me not only the human rights privilege but also deprived me of the protection by law. The question I am asking THIS COURT - **is this happening because I am not a lawyer and not of anglo origin !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**

Signed:

Applicant *PETER MARKAN*

Dated: 04.12.2013