

2024-05-03 Graham and John speak with Julian Gillespie about current issues in Australian courts

Well, G'day everyone and welcome to another episode of Club Grubbery. It's great to have you here and great to have you back on, Johnny. Oh, thanks Hooty. Yeah. Great to be here. And, uh, yeah, another great episode. Another one. We've got one of our regulars, uh, will we say former lawyer, Julian Gillespie.

That'll do. Thank you Hooty. Yes. And hello, John. Yeah, we've got to be careful how we tread and how we, uh, how we, you know, describe people and, uh, and give them title and whatever. But anyway, such is the nature of the new Australia that we live in. Everyone's on a knife's edge. And, uh, Julian, we want to get straight into it because, um, you have been at the forefront of some legal actions in this country in the last couple of years or more that have really been pivotal.

And it seems like in so many other cases that we're seeing, not only those that you're involved in, but others as well, there seems to be a brick wall. Uh, in your case, it's always been, seemed to have been about standing and all that, all those other legal issues, legal issues rather, but somewhere something's got to give.

Now, in the AVN case, in the Australian babies case, had similar issues, now the GMO case that you brought against Pfizer and Moderna, I think, because of genetically modified organisms that weren't licensed, that seemed like it had to go gangbusters. What happened Julian? Okay. Yes. So this is like the trilogy or the Lord of the Rings.

We'll see where this all goes. Um, yeah, just to recap quickly, because this is where, you know, the journey started with the AVN case. And I think that's probably close to near the time we all first met. And that was trying to, uh, stop the rollout of the Pfizer drug to young kids. And we were blocked in the federal court with one of our applicants, particularly Mark Neugebauer.

Uh, he was trying to protect his foster kids from mandated vaccines. Uh, he was told that he didn't have standing, that he wasn't properly aggrieved and that he, his argument really was with, with the uh, the Minister in South Australia and not with Brendan Murphy. Who was the guy approving the vaccines, which is absurd.

It's like, well, there wouldn't be a problem in South Australia if the guy approving the vaccines wasn't illegally approving them. That's what the nub of the case was there. Yeah. So we had to surrender that case, uh, the way it rolled out and we were just flabbergasted that, Standing was being used to block us when we had walked in laboring, you know, in one hand, under one hand, we had this huge pile of evidence, uh, which only showed unprecedented deaths and injuries, which were all preventable.

And moreover, COVID is no threat to kids, so why the hell are you giving them an experimental drug? And by the way, it's illegally approved. It wasn't, it didn't follow the checklist of, of, of criteria that the secretary had to follow. Anyway, we got rolled there. Um, and then it, then we saw on the, on the near horizon that they're going to roll it out to babies.

Uh, the Moderna vaccine was going to be first out of the gate there. And so that's. Well, we created the Australian babies case, recognizing the problem with standing being abused by the federal court. We immediately went to the high court and, and where we had labored under a great deal of evidence for the AVN case.

By the time we got to the high court, we had a wheelbarrow of evidence, which included global evidence of these things, just killing, killing. In the millions and injuring in the hundreds, if not in millions, several millions around the globe, wherever these things have been rolled out. And this is all coming from government databases.

So it was very irrefutable evidence. And so we roll in the wheelbarrow and we tell the high court, this is all about preventable deaths and injuries. We're here just to stop a drug going to babies who don't need it because there's no medical evidence. that COVID is a threat to them whatsoever when the medium age of death from COVID is 83 years old.

We're quite at the other end of the spectrum. And instead of being blocked by standing in that, in that matter, we had the, he's now the chief justice gaglia, but he was justice gaglia at the time. Uh, he sent us a note without even an opportunity to appear in person before him. And the crux of it was, listening to your case would be quote, would unduly divert the court from its principal functions would unduly divert the court from its principal functions.

Now, I would have thought saving the life of an Australian baby is a paramount function, but His honor fought that would unduly divert the court from its principal function. I don't, what is that? Is that commercial, commercial decisions? Only corporates get any attention from the high court. And then, and if it involves preventable deaths and injuries, uh, sorry, we haven't got time for you.

So they tried to flick us back to the federal court. Which quite frankly is a clown act after what we saw on the AVN case. And they would have been spurred on by the now chief justice of the high court saying we haven't got time to listen to these preventable deaths and injuries, the federal court would have just turned around and run the whole standing gig grip trick on us once more.

So we, we pulled, we pulled up, we stopped. We said, we're not going to waste our time, money, and resources going to the federal court again. But in the In that Australian baby's case, that was the first time that we identified because it took quite some time to unravel the legislation, but we realized that the Gene Technology Act 2000 applied to these vaccines and it's like, holy crap, these things are actually GMOs, genetically modified organisms, tick every box perfectly under the legal definitions.

And so we said to all of our major funders, because there's a lot, thousands of people who have donated and we've raised what, over 1.5 million. So it's not just one applicant or two applicants who have been approaching the court. That the court's been trying to hold out. It's actually thousands of people are behind these cases.

This is effectively, you know, thousands of applicants are here trying to get justice out of the Australian judicial system. We said to our chief funders, we said, look, let's just stop this rubbish trying to get justice against the Secretary of Health because the court is looking after him by every device possible.

They've seen this massive multi billion dollar rollout national campaign, and they're not going to allow that to be stopped because that obviously would speak enormous financial and legal liability. It's like what, what the court just stopped it. People would ask questions. And so having identified that these things were GMOs, well, then, you know, That was a different kettle of fish.

The responsibility was on Fajr and Moderna to go to what's called the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator before going to the TGA, before speaking to Brendan Murphy, put in an application seeking to obtain a GMO license. GMO licenses don't issue just like that. They have to go through a stringent risk assessment.

Some of those issues are like, are there genotoxicity issues? Can these things integrate with natural human DNA? Could the offspring of those who receive these drugs uh, be affected subsequently, altered, their genome being altered and so forth. Now AstraZeneca, they did apply for one of those and were granted a GMO license.

Uh, obviously a pretty shoddy risk assessment, uh, process was performed there because AstraZeneca started killing people. Very shortly after it was rolled out in this country. And then they had to restrict it for some reason, only to older people. So any older people would die on that occasion. Um, but Pfizer, Moderna didn't go through the same process.

So yes, we got the funders to agree to roll their donations towards bringing the action against Pfizer and Moderna. Now, all of that. documents, all the papers and everything were filed last year. Pfizer and Moderna came to court and they started banging on the table and say, Oh no, no. Before this goes to a substantive hearing, um, we think that, that we've got grounds for a summary dismissal application.

So that's an interlocutory application. And we were just scratching our heads because summary dismissal, usually you have to show the court one thing. Basically, that the merits of our case, the applicant's case, there's no merits there. It's never really going to get, go through a proper hearing and get to a victory.

You can see it. Other words in, in big lights, they've got a weak case. And we looked at them and said, are you joking? A weak case? We only have to show you that they're GMOs. One thing. And then secondly, that they both knew that their products were GMOs. Um, now, yeah, so scratching our head, we thought, what's the real argument here?

Pfizer steps up and says, Oh, well, we're going to say that it's got to be summarily dismissed because your applicant, Dr. Julian Fitch hasn't got standing. Boom. The old chestnut was back in the room standing once more. We had never heard of standing being used as a basis for a summary dismissal application.

Now it's quite ridiculous. It was ridiculous on the face of it. immediately because he's a doctor who subsequently discovered these things are GMOs after having A, administered them to himself, B, to his children, C, to his wife, and then thousands of bloody patients. Then he learns that the Australian government didn't make sure these things were properly, uh, risk assessed and go through the office of the gene technology regulator first and what he didn't, he wasn't told that these products were GMOs.

And so he was prevented. Um, from absorbing that information and presenting it to his patients, let alone for his kid's sake and for, for his wife and for himself, had he known, he said, I wouldn't have touched the damn things. We already knew that they are experimental, but to find out that they're the genetically modified organisms as well.

So you think that he's a properly agreed person. He's actually really quite angry because now he doesn't know what's going to happen to his patients. The genome of his children, let alone all of his patients who he started to see all of the injuries occurring in. Um, and he's also a pharmacist, right? So the guy's not silly.

He's got plenty of credentials on the board. The summary dismissal application was run. Council for Fires from Moderna just brought out weird law, weird, weird, weird, weird submissions and arguments. But, you know, put them up as submissions to, uh, Her Honor Helen Roth. That's R O F E. And she took them all in consideration.

We came back with our exceptionally talented barrister who just slammed all these submissions down. It's like, well, they're ridiculous. They're ridiculous, Your Honor. This is the nub of it. And how can he not be an aggrieved person? That was the basis that they were saying that, uh, he had no standing, that he wasn't properly aggrieved.

He wasn't properly upset. He was, there was nothing individually important about his circumstances. Um, so that was all put on and. So Katie Ashby Coppins, who's the, the, uh, on record, the instructing solicitor, she and I sort of sat back and it's like, well, it should go only one way in a, in a sensible world, but we've been living in a COVID world, haven't we, since 2020.

And so there was unfortunately behind the scenes, a real expectation that something weird was going to occur. And indeed, true to form, the judiciary. stepped up on the 1st of March and Justice Roth handed down a decision, walked onto the bench for a few moments, could not look the camera in the eye and just said, uh, summary dismissal application is granted.

Uh, Dr. Fitch is not an agreed party. And then she bolted from the bench. Here we go. A rerun all over again, all over again, standing being abused in this country. When we've got evidence to show that That over 20 million

Australians have received substances. They're not vaccines. We've said that millions of times on this show and we all know the truth of that.

Millions of Australians have received not once but twice or up to three times. Some people up to four times genetically modified organisms and they were never informed. Never informed. We can tell you. That during, you know, you get this shuffle of paperwork between the parties when you're preparing a case.

We got a document from Pfizer admitting that they attended the office of the gene technology regulator in late 2020. We tried to ask further, what was the substance of that conversation? And through a technical rule, they were able to say, Oh, we don't have to show you anything else. But they, this is Pfizer, went there.

So they clearly knew, they clearly knew that there was a very real likelihood that their substance satisfied the GMO definitions in this country. For some reason, something was said at that meeting where the then Gene Technology Regulator, the head of the OGTR, Gene Technology Regulator, Raj Bhullar, who is still the Gene Technology Regulator, just said, boys, just walk on through.

You don't have to stop you. If, if, if your circumstances change, come back to me. Okay. But she basically gave them a pass. AstraZeneca didn't get the pass. No one's legally entitled to get a pass. These things have to be submitted to protect the health and the genetic integrity of Australians, the genetic integrity of Australians.

So here we are, we've got another situation of incredible evidence speaking to the proof of Over 20 million. Let's put it up around 24, 25 million Australians having received on multiple occasions, gene altering substances. And we've got a judge bending over backwards so far that she, I'm surprised she didn't break her bloody back.

Saying, Oh no, standing, standing, standing. He's not a grave standing. That's the most important thing here. You see how ridiculous that is. It's like the AVN case and the baby's case standing, standing. So important. Forget about the dying people standing. So important, right? As pathetic as I looked in, in that little theater is how pathetic it looks to us as Australians.

When we go to the court seeking justice and we get this rubbish. Sir, back at us after Australians pony up over 1.5 million to get some justice. And we get this theater of standing all the time. Yet now we've got a situation of the DNA well in this country having been poisoned for ever. This isn't reversible.

It's not that you walk down to your local GP and say, Oh, I've just suffered some genetic integration by a synthetic DNA doctor. Can you please reverse that integration event? Once it's in our natural DNA, it's there forever to produce God knows which one of the genetic disorders, and there's thousands of them, or what it's going to do to offspring, if they even make it to life.

So part of me, I'm a little bit frustrated that Justice Roth has to join the same show as her fellow members of the federal court and the high court, holding us out with this ridiculous chant. And mantra of standing being the most important principle that the judiciary must follow in this country. More important than human life.

Over the lives of Australians. Yeah. Okay. Back in the AVN case, when we first brought that pile of evidence, then when we went to the high court and now with this ridiculous judgment by justice, Helen Roth, what you do as a justice to look after the health and welfare. of millions of Australians, you break the bloody law.

You say, I don't give a damn about any arguments on standing. I want to hear the evidence about what's really going on in the ground here. And if I'm wrong, just say it was Brendan Murphy in the ABN case. Brendan, you appeal my decision and take it to the high court. But I want to hear if people are dying and I can stop it.

That's what a justice of Australia does. When you get to the high court, when you're Gaglia, who's now the chief justice. And he sees pleading saying preventable deaths and injuries of Australian babies. You don't boot it back to the federal court after you know that the same party went for a circus act there.

You say, this is a matter of national priority that I listened to this case immediately expedite the hearing and open all the documents in that wheelbarrow of evidence of yours. We need to get to the bottom of this. That's what a justice to the high court of Australia does.

The precedent was set, wasn't it? In the AVN case, and then Gaglia up in the High Court, and so there's Justice Helen Roth. I'm gonna do exactly what I've seen my fellow justices do. I'm gonna screw these litigants. I'm gonna forget that 24 million people I've had this gene altering substance and I'm going to do the old standing song and dance.

I have to get that off my chest because that's exactly what everybody has been thinking and feeling and getting upset about since we started these very legitimate proceedings. This is the third attempt now at justice in this country. The federal court and high court have lost their bearing. They do not represent Australian people.

Or seek to present, protect Australian people, let alone preserve the lives of Australian people. They've lost their credibility. They've lost their credibility. They're not fit to serve. It's just that simple. Someone has to call a spade a spade. If Justice Gaglia, Chief Justice Gaglia wants to say, well, the fellow's a little bit upset.

He's been denied on several occasions. If that's his bloody explanation for the fit that I just threw then. He wasn't listening. And that's exactly why I said what I did. Now, just returning to that one March decision, it's an atrocious decision. In the normal course, we'd have to go for the same goddamn circus that we experienced with the AVN case.

And in a different respect, the Australian babies case to take it to a full federal court appeal to show how absolutely absurd it is, but then be dealing with three members on a full federal court going, You're all the same people in the same court. And you've just watched, watched the chief justice of the high court not give a crap about preventable deaths and injuries.

So you can sort of see what we would expect to be the outcome there. And then they have to go and appeal to the high court and then to have the high court say, no standing, 24 million poisoned Australians, right? So anyway, We've sort of been saved that theater, that absurdity for the time being, because days after that one March decision was handed down, I was, I was pointed in the direction by somebody and I conducted some research.

And a couple of days later, I, I surfaced and lo and behold, it's like justice Helen Roth represented Pfizer as a barrister before she became a judge. On five significant massive cases, five massive cases, so important and so incredible were those FISA cases that when she was welcomed, there's these ceremonies when you are elevated to become a judge of the federal court, they call it a welcoming ceremony.

Many, many justices turn up from the federal court. From the high court, you get attorney generals turning up and very privileged guests. And in va and they all give various speeches welcoming the a new justice and they talk about their achievements, you know, prior to becoming a judge and typically the achievements when they're a barrister.

And it was mentioned many times during that welcoming ceremony. She's the she's the pharmaceutical queen of Australia in terms of barristers. And the Pfizer cases, the Pfizer cases, that was came out again and again. So we've got this entire judiciary and legal system like the, like the big cheese and they're all going yes, it's Helen Roth She's the pharmaceutical queen and her Pfizer cases weren't they just cracking weren't they cracking now We're not required to know the history of every single judge that we appear before right?

We've got other things to do like prepare a bloody case where we want to stop people from Suffering fervor poisoning to their DNA. She hands down the one March decision. Something doesn't smell right. Do that research. Holy crap. She appeared five times for Pfizer. And then we find out she, she really was indeed the pharmaceutical point.

We found another in like 20 other cases where she represented all the big farmer interests. All the big farmer interests. So she's a, she's a big farmer girl. Let's put it that way. But I don't mean just as a barrister. She also holds a degree in science with a specialty in guess what? Genetics genetics, which is exactly what our case is about.

Genetically modified organisms. Like she is really interested. She's pro genetics and pro all the genetic sciences. And her family relations, holy hell. They are what's part of a, what's called a pharmaceutical fortune. Like this, we know about the big ones overseas, Pfizer, Merck, Lilly, and all the rest of them.

Like they're just standalone, huge global conglomerates, multi billions of dollars, if not trillions after the latest scam. Well, we've had domestic homegrown pharmaceutical families, you know, come into being from early last century. And she's related to one of the biggest and all of their friends and family and into all the research science institutes, and she's been on the boards that allocate funding to scientific research.

You're kidding me. And the connections here with all of her family interests and all these research organizations, they've received multi millions in COVID funding. And fortunes for the development of these mod RNA LMP complexes, which were just shot into the arms of millions of Australians. In other words, she comes from a crew, you know, high society, high science society and all the rest of it, which were all like, come on, Moderna, come on Pfizer and bring your money with us, you know, bring it to our research institute.

So it's like, you're conflicted to hell woman. You're conflicted to hell. You're pro all of these goddamn things, but the big trip for her judicially is that it's within minutes of us all first meeting. Now you come together for what's called a case management hearing, and you meet each other for the first time.

And it's where you tell the judge, the nub of the case, how long you think it's going to take on a hearing. If anyone's got any objections to anything, um, and you schedule it. Okay. And that's when, when we first met at our first case management hearing, that's when Pfizer indicated they want to bring, they, they wanted to file a summary dismissal application.

That's all well and good, but what Justice Helen Roff was meant to do before any real dialogue started at that case management hearing, within the first five minutes, she was required, required, obligated to say, well, Hold on, everyone. I just want to inform all the parties present in the court here that when I was at the bar, when I was working as a barrister, I represented the first respondent here, FISA, on five separate occasions in the following cases.

I just bring this to your attention because I considered the matter. I don't believe that my prior representations, representing Pfizer, um, I don't believe I should need to disqualify myself, but I'm alerting you as I'm obliged to do in case you have any submissions as to why I should recuse or disqualify myself.

That's the proper way to go about it. It's full disclosure. It's not a bit of disclosure, it's full disclosure. Now we got none of that and that was, it went for half an hour, that case management hearing. And then there was a great stretch of days, it might have been 60 or 70 days until we actually reconvened in front of each other to run that, that summary dismissal application for a full day.

Now she'd already lost her opportunity, but when that summary dismissal application came back on, like she, she had those like 60 or 70 days, she could have informed us like, Oh, I forgot to tell you at the case management hearing, I once appeared for Pfizer. We never got a note from him. And then we get to the, the summary dismissal hearing.

She takes her to the bench. It doesn't say anything. So you might've seen my sub stack articles on this, um, early March, when I started to peel this onion open and reveal the facts to the watching public, because as I mentioned from the outset, there are literally tens of thousands of people watching these proceedings, tens of thousands, thousands of people have put their hands in their pocket for this as well.

And I started laying it out. It's like, she didn't tell us anything at any, any single, uh, one of those occasions. And now we've got a situation where she knew exactly what she was meant to do. But she chose not to share that information. That was an intention to conceal her past from the parties. Like, why she even got allocated the brief is also a question.

It's like, if you're the Chief Justice of the Federal Court, and that's Deborah Mortimer, and you know you've got this star pharmaceutical, you know, lawyer, who's one of your judges, who appeared. for fires on multiple occasions. And indeed it was lauded during her welcoming ceremony. And you see another COVID brief come in.

Right. You know, when a COVID brief comes in, like the registrar has to call, it has to call up the Chief Justice and say, well, we've got a hot one here, Chief Justice, this one's going after fires from Moderna. How Helen Roth got allocated that is just beyond me because we've, as you'll see in a coming article, I think it's going to be released in the Spectator very shortly, in the next few days.

Um, a couple of, um, uh, of Australia's, Law professors have weighed in on this whole controversy and they looked at it, the facts, and they said she should never have received the brief. She should never have received the brief and if it had been inadvertently handed to her, she should have said, Oh, I can't touch that.

Exactly. Conflict of interest. Well, you know, it's just the appearance. That's all it requires at a, at a really basic threshold level. Just the appearance, the appearance to the puncher in the trait. When you hear about the backstory, if you're a punter in the street, and that's the test, the reasonable person in the street, if it's, if, if it's the appearance that she could possibly be biased, well then you give the brief back.

Right. Um, um, so she ended up getting the brief and holding onto the brief. So there's a backstory there somehow, but how, how she could take to the bench and then not disclose it is just another thing. Because if I was, I'm just sort of spit balling here, but if I receive a hot brief, that's naming Fijian Moderna for having introduced GMOs into this country unlicensed, and let's be clear, a license may never have issued because this stuff is so toxic.

It didn't go through the approval process. So we don't know if a license was ever going to be issued. Maybe that's why Ari avoided that step. Um, but if you're the judge who gets this hot brief, I'd be talking about it with my other judges. Now it's true. I was a former barrister and there's a style about the whole existence.

What occurs in barristers, all working from one chambers, it's sort of one, one office, for instance, and then you And you discuss matters amongst yourself, you just do, and when you get elevated from being a barrister up into a court, whichever court, it's a very similar working environment, that you've got, instead of another barrister friend down the hall, you've got just a judge who was a former barrister, and they're usually just a few meters away, officers, they're not kilometers apart, they're just meters apart, and they're in the same building on the same floor.

And they have, have their own tea room and they eat lunch together. Right. It's like life is normal. And you sit down and you go, and I'm just spit balling here again. You sit down, you go, I'm Helen Roth, right? Guess what? I just got, I've got a brief alleging GMOs, Pfizer, Moderna. Apparently their stuff's GMOs and I've got to, I've got to rule on it at some stage.

That's pretty hot news. And the other judges that, you know, having the tea break. We'd go, Holy crap, Helen. That's a pretty, that's a hot potato. That one. Didn't you work for Pfizer once when you're at the barrister, when you're at the bar, Helen would have gone. Yeah, yeah, I did. What should I do right up your alley?

Yeah. And Helen would have been going, I'll have to recuse myself. There's no way that I'm going to look like I'm not biased here. You know, I made thousands, tens of hundreds of thousands of dollars out of Pfizer, but I think I'll take it on. I think I'll keep, stay on the bench and I'll inform, you know, the And I should inform the parties and all the other judges said, yeah, you've got to, if you're going to hold onto it, you've got to at least disclose that.

Make sure you do it in minutes when you get to take to the bench for this one. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. I'll do that. What stopped her? What, what other conversation occurred that when she talked to the bench, instead of disclosing that she was obliged, I mean, there's basically a judge's handbook, which spells all this stuff out.

When you go to, when you first go to the bench, you read that handbook. Like it's all obvious, but you've got to read it again. You know, it's like, it's like a work health, work health, you know, safety manual, if you don't want to be kicked out of the judiciary, make sure you follow these basic rules. What changed her mind from disclosing to concealing?

And so that's where we're up to. We've got a judge who concealed vital information from Dr. Julian Fitch, which prevented him being provided the opportunity to raise objections, to seek that she be dismissed because she's got clear conflicts of interest is to put it, to put it. Mildly, but it's worse than that.

Now it's worse than that now, because we've got a situation where the disclosure was concealed knowingly with intention, and that's effectively in my book, and I think for a lot of punters out there as well, that's an act of deception and that really amounts to an act of goddamn dishonesty. That's all it can be said in my view.

Everyone's got a personal view on this, but in my view, that's dishonesty. That's dishonesty. And then you go on and you hand down a judgment by a tortured decision on standing, which allows your former client to get out the side door. Now, does that pass the pub test with anyone watching this? It doesn't.

How do you say this, John? Yeah. I mean, you've been through the court system. You've seen this play out several times in the last four years. Hmm. Well, unfortunately, uh, I think they were given a, a different handbook at some stage. Uh, look at Beach Jones, uh, in the Kassam matter that ultimately, uh, led the pathway for my matter because, um, Judge Adamson, uh, in, in our case, uh, was certainly not going to trample on the feet of, uh, Beach Jones as the, uh, Chief of Common Law in the Supreme Court.

Uh, now he, he's, he's now gone on to become a high court judge on the back of the Casam case. And he's giving lectures or keynote speeches at the University of New South Wales and forwards in books on the virtues of mRNA vaccines. Yeah. Yeah. And, and he's also affiliated with some eugenics scholars as well, who liked the idea of, you know, Weeding out the weakest amongst us.

And I mean, overnight, you've got, uh, Professor, uh, Dolores, uh, Cahill. Yeah. Now saying that anyone that's, uh, been jabbed, uh, with even one dose of, of these mRNA vaccines is likely to die within three to five years. That's, that's a call. Um, and we, we actually made that call with internal discussions, uh, from the science that we were receiving, a flood of it from the network.

You know, that network we have in the background of just eminent, you know, associate professors, professors and PhDs in this area. A lot of them have to continue to keep their heads below the parapets, of course. Um, but they came running to us and said, Holy hell, people don't realize what they've been asked to take.

And one of them, one of the, one of the emerging areas that we're seeing is a cancers. If you really want to see a confirmation, like this is no longer just anecdotal. If it is, uh, Sonia Elijah, okay. Um, Tremendous. I'll just screen share so people can. You can see that's her latest sub stack there. True horrors of COVID vaccine harm data now.

So that's in sub stack. That's a go to. It was only released yesterday or the day before. That's where an incredibly skillful data, uh, expert, Walter, I can't pronounce his name correctly, Akumen, Akumen, uh, A U K E M A. We've got the Danes adverse event.

reporting system in Australia that, that, uh, TGA publishes for the vaccine injuries and the deaths, which we believe is a completely corrupted, purposely corrupted, uh, uh, system. There's the equivalent in Europe and it's called the Eurovigilance adverse event data system. And it's a goddamn nightmare to try and navigate.

It is really difficult. I've spent days trying to just get some really simple information, but it's this clunky. Delay process. It's like, we always knew that there was just a goldmine of not just signal data here, but just damning data. But they had this old system. Well, this, this fellow here, Walter, being a true hacker, they're able to finally extract all of that data.

Um, so we see these extraordinary deaths, extraordinary injuries from the vaccines, but more importantly, they extracted all the data for every other medication, every other form of medication. Um, and so you can track in real time. These huge spikes and reports for the covid vaccines. But coming, going into the end of 2022 and into, sorry, 2023.

This is this. Getting back to it, John, this three to five year, uh, uh, timeframe that you mentioned before, there's this, this explosion in the Euro vigilant database in cancer drugs, demand for cancer, drugs, and anti-inflammatory drugs. Okay. Of such, it's, it's a huge, what's called a huge sigma, multiple sigma, so this is like, this is not a chance event, this is directly caused by something, and the only other predominant, um, uh, theme affecting that population is the mass inoculation with these COVID drugs, and so now the delayed effect of the type of disease, That we said back in 2022, we said, this is really going to start manifesting after the first initial wave of injuries and deaths as full blown long term or medium to long term illnesses and people three to five years from now.

And we can see it because of the, of the medicine uptakes that are occurring in Europe. Well, it'll be the same in Australia, but we can't see the daughters transparently, but we passed that same video. Over to an Australian crew. I don't know if you've seen the open Danes system, which Sharon cousins, uh, and a few others, you know, they only got that off the ground in, in the last few months.

And there's still tweaking and tuning that thing up, um, when they can incorporate this Euro vigilance data, for instance, as a comparison, it's going to be further explosive icing on the cake. Um, and so, yeah, getting back to it. Well, Professor Dalgleish has said that on our program previously, uh, and the cancer drug uptake in, I think Singapore has gone through the roof.

Um, and recently we we've had, um, uh, arguably, uh, Japan's most senior oncologist, Professor Fukushima, uh, come out saying that the, uh, MRNA vaccines, uh, evil practices of science. Yeah. But, but John, they're conspiracy theorists, anti vaxxers, who no one should listen to because they don't have sufficient qualifications worthy of anyone taking any notice of them.

And so I don't know why you raise it here. It only makes this show look like it's, it's, it's populated by fear mongers. And those people you spoke about would never be respected in a court of law because they lack any credentials, right? Look, I've got to tell you a grassroots conversation that I had yesterday.

I've been having, I've been having issues with the internet service provider that I use. So I called and they're expecting to get a call center in the Philippines and a lot of you identified herself and said that she was You know, from a capital city in Australia. I won't, I'm going to try and de identify.

And I asked her what the weather was like where she was and she said, Oh, it's been a lovely day. She said, I've got the fire going. I said, Oh, are you working from home? She said, yeah. I said, how does that work? She said, Oh, it's amazing. And I said, Oh really? How so? She said, well, I'm raising a couple of kids and my husband's not quite well and he's at home and I need to look after him.

And I said, what's wrong with him? She said, he's got stage four cancer diagnosed just before Christmas. I said, were you expecting it? She said, no, it just came out of the blue. We couldn't believe it. And I said, um, so what's the prognosis? She said, well, it's shrinking, um, because he's doing chemo. But, um, the prognosis isn't good.

We're just getting a little bit of life extension. And I said, I said, have you noticed a lot of people in your circle who are getting cancer? She said, yeah, everybody's talking about people getting cancer. And then I told her

what we do and I gave her the web address and she'd never heard of us. And I told her, you realize this might be caused by the vaccine.

She said, Oh, really? I said, yeah. And then I talked about Angostel Gleash's testimony on our program. And she was horrified. She said, Oh my God, we've had four shots. There you go. I'll have a look at it. And she took the web address and she, uh, we engaged for half an hour. It was heartbreaking. But everybody's on, uh, nothing to say.

I saw these virtual reality goggles on, you know, there you have, you've seen one. We get people like Gerard Renick in Senate estimates when he gets the TGA in front of him and he will cite people like, you know, the Japanese professor, you mentioned John Dalglish and all the rest of it. And the, and they, they won't pay any respect.

Like, no, it's only, it's only our message. The TGA message. And that, that professor's a nutcase. Oh, you know, he's been respected for the last 50 years as a, as a global authority on his subject. But as soon as he, this authority can connect these cancers to the drugs that you illegally approved, all of a sudden he's a goddamn nutcase.

I mean, that's just criminal and it's properly criminal. That's, I'm not just saying that as a throwaway line, that's just properly criminal. That's, that's ignoring scientific evidence right in front of your bloody face in preference. Willful blindness. Yep. It's it's criminal, willful blindness in order to keep your \$1 million a year a job.

Which is all about ushering in the latest crap from Big Pharma. That's all it is, the latest crap from Big Pharma. And, heh, these, they set these drugs up to make people sick. They knew. We've been looking at the science behind these things and it goes back over two decades. They weren't a new novel vaccine, a new novel technology platform.

They've been tinkering with this crap for decades. For decades and decades and decades, and particularly the LMP dash mod RNA structure platform that Moderna and Pfizer rolled out. That was on darpa, the US Defense Research Group that was on their whiteboard in 2010. It was their mission to have a pandemic to announce a pandemic and roll out this stuff as an as in the us.

In any race as a medical countermeasure, that was just something that they wanted to get some cheap frills about. And it was about exactly the same time that Bill Gates, you know, his photograph shaking Fauci's hand saying, we're going to have the decade of, of vaccines. We're going to do something big here.

So, I mean, the whole thing was set up to get these things in no matter what. And you might've seen, of course, when we're talking about cancers, they're exploding inflammatory diseases. And also prion like diseases, and they're the things that go after people's minds and turn them into mush and vegetables, right?

And prion disease science is, it's well established, but it's also difficult. It's very, very difficult work. And we're entering this new phase of just emerging still scientific studies to show the pathways back from these synthetic drugs to being the cause of prion disease, right? So that's mad cow disease, Alzheimer's disease, all these other.

Inflammatory diseases and these cancers. So the focus has to be able to, to shift for these labs. But who's, who's going to fund a lab? Who's going to establish the causal link, right? No, no one's going to give money to a lab that's going to establish the causal link with these cancers and these inflammatory diseases and prion diseases at this point, because it only leads to liability in this Australian government.

Let's be clear. Now this Australian government. And Pfizer and Moderna and AstraZeneca, right? That's the only reason why they're so despicable and won't listen to the Dalglishies, because it's all about protecting their arse. It's all about protecting their reputations and their latest, you know, award from the Queen or the King.

You know, Brendan Murphy got an award from the goddamn Queen for illegally introducing these genetically altering substances into this country. And Australia's TGA, I'm the scarett. 95 percent funded by Big Pharma. Of course. 95%. Now, you know, we referred to this in the Senate, John, when we went to the committee and Julian, you participated extremely well in that, in those hearings as well about the Royal Commission and your team.

Um, I talked about human factors disasters. Now, if there was a mid air collision over Sydney of two jumbo jets, the investigation would be incredibly lengthy. It would go on for ages. It would go on for years. It would be a mediate and lengthy. That's right. Now that all the players would be called in.

People like air traffic controllers, uh, engineers, refuelers, uh, the baggage handlers who loaded the cargo, the, uh, administrators who rostered and did the scheduling, uh, of the pilots who made the mistakes or whatever that led to this. There'd be a massive investigation of all the players. Now in this situation now, I called it in the Senate.

We are presiding, this government is presiding over the biggest human factors, failure in world history. Who are the players? Well, the media, the bureaucracies, the corporate, uh, big pharmaceutical companies, the health departments, the, the politicians, the elected representatives, the law enforcement and the judiciary.

And the judiciary and the judiciary. They are all in the gamut of the human factor disaster that's happening right now. And they are literally watching two aircraft approach each other on a collision course and they're not doing anything about it other than looking for something like standing on which to base their argument.

Yep. Your last life preserver, you know, even after those jets have collided and gone down and there's some people still left in the water who can be saved. You go to the judiciary and say, look, it took us a while to accumulate the facts and the evidence, but now we can tell you the true story and you can bring justice to everyone and stop this

disaster continuing to unfold and to prevent a similar disaster in the future. And in this country, this judiciary, I'll pantomime it out here a little bit. They're having internal discussions and saying, you know, We can't let any of these dudes win because all of those other human factors that you mentioned, Graham, they'd be all undone.

They'd be all revealed for the bad acts and roles that they played. The complicity, the not looking at science, not looking at any safety risk assessments whatsoever, not caring as it was the statutory duty of the TTA and the office of the gene technology regulator. To prevent any harm to any human or ill health effects, any ill health effects.

All of that was ignored very, very consciously and intentionally. And if the judiciary was to do the right thing, all of that would be revealed. And so you'd have a situation. It was like, well, okay, that court case has revealed the truth. Pretty much everyone in the TGA right now needs to be set. And that, that department needs to be completely reformed and rejigged.

Everyone over there in the health department needs to go. That political party needs to be outlawed and that political party needs to be outlawed because they profited directly from this deception on the Australian people. Part of the WHO's pantomime after getting orders from God knows who. It was more than just Bill Gates.

He never needed the money. This was some of a larger covert operation that was here. I mentioned DARPA before. We're aligned with those guys, part of the five eyes intelligence community. And that's, they're all the civilizations that were impacted the most. The UK, Australia, New Zealand, America, Canada, and every other just about Commonwealth country as well.

That's what the target was here. This was a targeted exercise. And I'll say the judiciary is helping to cover up the fact it was a targeted exercise. Now we're not here in the GMO proceedings to try and uncover the perpetrators

of this global crime. We're just trying to stop the supply of Of substances that are altering the natural GM genome of Australians, right?

We had Raj Buhler, the gene technology regulator, 20, 24 October. It was last year when Senator Gerard Rennick had her in the crosshairs before Senate Estimates Committee and she admitted, it's in my substack. She admitted it's on the Hansard video record that they're GMOs. She admitted it, but then she put this bullshit.

She I'll call it out here. Come and sue me. Raj Bheela, you lied directly to the Australian public when you admitted that they were GMOs, but you did not have to regulate them. Her reasoning was all manufactured wholly overseas. And so therefore we don't have to regulate them. No, of course you don't have to slap, make, uh, require them to obtain a GMO license with respect to the manufacturing step.

But as soon as you seek to import them into this country and then transport them within this country, store them in this country and then dispose of them. Each one of those is called a dealing. Each GMO license. If you go to the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator's website, you can see every single GMO license that has been issued.

And there are countless instances where the product is manufactured wholly overseas, but the importer into Australia needs to get a GMO license. That's why they went to the OGTR's office. And so she admits in one breath that they're GMOs, but then she lies to everyone saying, Oh, but we weren't responsible thereafter.

Okay. That was out and out. Liar. She's the fall guy here. She's the fall guy. She's the one that was going to go into potentially block the quick provisional approval process through the TJ where Brendan Murphy's there, like, I mean, we'll get you out the back real quick with an approval. That's what Brendan Murphy was there for.

He'd received the call from overseas and God knows who else just passed these guys, no matter what, that's exactly what he did illegally. Right. Greg Hunt. Um, yes, as part of the WEF fellowship, for Christ's sake, who does he really work for? Um, who did he really work for? But they knew, they knew these GMO laws applied to Pfizer and Moderna.

And so they must have done a sit down with Raj Bhula, look, she's not stupid. She's got a PhD. She understands enough of the science. And really knowing the science. And it's pretty straightforward legislation. When you get your head around it, it becomes really quite simple afterwards. They must've sat it down and say, look, Raj, we need you not to raise any stink.

Right. We know what your statutory duties are. If they have to stop off at your office before they come to the TGA, that means that it's going to get caught up in a lengthy risk assessment process. And it means that we have to inform the public. That these things are GMOs, and we have to allow the public an opportunity to provide submissions, even science submissions, if they object.

Now remember, the Pfizer product was provisionally approved very, very speedily by the TGA in February of 2021. Had the proper legal steps been taken, and they had gone to the OGTR first, that would have held up matters minimum eight months. Minimum eight months. And by that stage, all Australian media would have learned that these new drugs that the TGA wants to approve once they're finished talking to the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, these new drugs, which they're telling everyone is going to save everyone from SARS CoV 2, um, they're GMOs, everyone.

They're GMOs. Do you really want to take a GMO that's never been used in a vaccine? Uh, and it would have created it. We're going to get, and I said this in an interview with Dr. John Campbell, uh, from last week, someone in this country, no doubt it's going to say, oh, we wanted to avoid vaccine hesitancy, right?

Now, whoever says that to you needs to be marched out the back and kicked in the ass for lying directly to your face again, because A, they're not vaccines and B, they're GMOs. And every Australian is entitled to have GMO hesitancy about something that can alter their DNA and affect the offspring for the rest of eternity.

That's what they want to hide from the Australian public because people would naturally recoil. Remember when we freaked out? You guys would remember this 30, 40 years ago about the prospect of genetically modified strawberries or tomatoes. Right. They wanted to bring in new strawberries that wouldn't, wouldn't die from frostbite.

And everyone was worried about eating these things. Is it going to change my DNA? Valid questions. That was just for eating them. These substances went straight in to the FDA. The FDA in America has just approved a company to, uh, genetically modify soybeans with a pig protein. Yeah. To increase the attack level.

They've been dumbing down Americans for decades. Americans have been shoveling GMO crops in their mouths for decades. I've got to ask you, Julian, because, um, you know, people will be wondering, oh, that's a nice backdrop. Julian Scott, and I'm not going to go too far down that road. You're living in a tent.

You're living in a tent in somebody's backyard. And you have been for quite a while. I know your circumstance. You are so, you have devoted your entire life to this. Everything you've trained and studied for and everything you participated in, um, and the legal system that at one time you would have loved, because most jurists do.

By doing what you're doing now, and by naming this justice Roth, and by going after her the way that you have, what risk have you put yourself personally under? Oh, the Law Society of New South Wales, uh, sent me a letter, uh, this week, um, suggesting mildly summary, uh, criminal charges, apparently we're representing, creating the appearance that I'm representing myself as a registered lawyer.

Um, and I, I think that's, it could be just procedural, uh, because, you know, I have been involved in a number of interviews and, um, uh, and articles. And some people have, have addressed me differently as the lawyer. So it could, could have just naturally. I've never put a shingle out saying I am for hire, because indeed I've always sought to be introduced as the former barrister, which really should indicate that I'm, that I'm not a practitioner of the law.

I provide my legal views for free. And when it came to the AVN, I provided my legal views for free to the AVN to assist them. with the instructions they needed to provide to the lawyers representing them. Likewise, in the baby's case, I came up with a case theory, which I offered to some practitioners. And, uh, thereafter, when that was adopted, I provided for free some legal views, which happened to have been, uh, adopted by practitioners and have not been remunerated.

Now there's no way that a professional Practitioner of the law on this country can speak up about these matters. Otherwise they will be silenced. We've seen that with doctors in this country, trying to raise their concerns about these, these diabolical substances, where all of a sudden there's a complaint that materializes out of, out of the ether from an unnamed complainant.

And then Africa comes swooping in and, and suspends immediately, immediately you're suspended and you are gagged doctors all across. We know that the blood. The carnage everywhere to the medical profession to the most conscientious, most professional of Australian doctors who voice concerns are out of a job still in this country and are suffering, are suffering, right?

The rest of those who are still in the jobs, they're the cowards who followed the orders, you know, um, now it's the same in the legal profession. And so there was a decision made, uh, several years ago, not to for me to, to be re registered. Because I wouldn't be able to speak as honestly as I can hear about the failure of the Australian judicial system to protect Australians from genetic poisons, which have already altered the DNA of Australians in the millions.

To be able to tell those facts. If I was a practicing lawyer, could get me bounced in the subject to disciplinary proceedings. It's just absurd. It's absurd. If you're registered, you can't tell the truth. If you're unregistered, you

can express your personal opinions. I just happen to have a couple of law degrees behind me and some experience as a practitioner.

So I don't come to your show with shallow opinions. They are indeed informed opinions. So, um, it's, it's. The 10 is, you know, I couldn't go and earn an income over this. It's just the way it is. Uh, but seeking to get some results, proper results, we've only ever been trying to stop the flow of these poisons to Australians, that's all I've been here trying to do and to be able to get at least one win, even after most of this stuff's gone in arms on multiple occasions, to stop them at any stage is a good thing.

Because there's still, uh, naive and ignorant people out there who've been not informed. Right? We will get a, a new viewer of your show this week, who's never stumbled upon grubbery before. And they'll hear this and they'll go, what? What? And then I'll at least tell their wife or their husband, but then also their, their family.

And if it, if it stops one parent giving this stuff to their kid to save their DNA, Well, then it's a win. It's a payment. So let's not get too caught up about my background here. At least I've got a tent over my room, over my head. Um, so, um, but no, let's get back to it. The, cause it's, I noticed the time justice Rob has done, has done a bad thing.

That's my view. And people are entitled to their view here. Now, when a justice in this country does a bad thing, then. There's very limited recourse for being able to deal with it. This, as I mentioned, has gone beyond, beyond a typical case where an applicant like us could set, find out some information, say, oh, we think the decision was affected by some bias, right?

Because of some historical interaction between the judge and one of the other parties or whatever, some business dealings. This is worse than that. Yeah, we know about the Pfizer stuff, which is pretty bad and she should recuse herself. It's the fact of the intentional concealment. Which amounts in my view and, and, and in the minds of many other people, it's like, well, that was an act of dishonesty.

Now that's, that's conduct in itself. That's separate from that, from her Pfizer history. It's like, she's currently appearing to be not biased, John, but dishonest. Dishonest is like out of the ballpark, baby. You just, you just went. One round and how many more with Lionel Murphy from, you know, back in 1984, that controversy, uh, seeking to pervert the course of justice with the criminal charges brought against Lionel Murphy, uh, federal charges.

They were heard, um, in the old Banco court in Sydney. He was found guilty. Uh, there, there was mistrial, second trial found guilty, and then a subsequent appeal court, dismissed the verdict, but then Here's where our constitution comes into play. Section 72 sub 2 entitles both Houses of Parliament, the Senate and the House of Representatives to inquire into the conduct of a judicial officer if there's prima facie evidence that the judicial officer has, quote, misbehaved.

That's all it is. It's not badly misbehaved or grossly misbehaved or excessively misbehaved. It's just misbehaved. And indeed, every Senator and MP in this country has a constitutional duty to ensure that our federal court and high court has clean judges in there, clean and honest judges. They're paid millions.

They're given entitlements. They're given chauffeur driven cars, secured premises, security guards. First class travel, like the list goes on and on and on. They are one of the most protected and entitled work groups in this country. Extraordinary superannuation, like you name it, they get given it. And you only get given that if you are absolutely squeaky clean.

Now I mentioned what happened in the AVN case. Then we got what happened in the Baby's case. Three times in a row, it gets beyond chance and coincidence here. But the difference here with Justice Raul. So she went on to intentionally conceal her prior involvement with Pfizer for Christ's sake. That's just gone on a global mass poisoning rampage and she intentionally concealed it.

That amounts to misbehavior in my view, but it just so you know, for section 72, when an MP or a Senator is looking at somebody accused, a judicial officer, a judge accused of. Misbehavior. It's not some obscure, difficult legal test that needs to be applied. Here's the test. What are the contemporary social value views of that conduct?

The contemporary social value views. In other words, what does the person in the street think? It's not even that reasonable test fiction, the reasonable person fiction that you hear lawyers talk about so much. It's contemporary social values. of what society thinks amounts to misbehavior or misconduct or bad behavior.

Okay. Your senator and your MP is meant to represent contemporary social values and they're meant to represent your voice. Now, the only way that we're going to, cause we know that we've, we've had these politicians in the pockets of these big pharma companies. For the past several years, there must be some back end payoff somewhere because they've not listened to any of their constituents saying, um, I'm massively vaccine injured or my uncle has died two days after like they're just how hard was it for Babette to get the excess deaths inquiry up.

We had shamelessly to earlier votes on that. And it was voted down, voted down, but finally that excess deaths inquiry is going ahead. And I can tell you, knowing all the data specialists who are submitting to that inquiry, it's the vaccines. When I say vaccines, I spell it V A X X I N E, vaccines. The double X means poison and death.

Okay. Now. We've got a judicial officer involved in yet another COVID theater holding out justice in the reality of what's going on in the ground. This is more than just deaths and injuries. This is showing how they're receiving synthetic GMOs. People are receiving synthetic GMOs and it's going into the nucleus.

We've had the science papers. We put them at the feet of Brendan Murphy during the AVN proceedings in early 2022. Brendan, stop telling the public on your, on your website that it doesn't go into the nucleus. Here's the science papers mate, and let's, let's not forget, uh, how they, uh, treated, uh, the Deputy Commissioner, Lindel Dean in discussing, uh, you know, you've, you've got a, uh, a justice here who has not declared a, a, uh, what, what, what appears to be a massive conflict of interest, yet on the other hand, you've got.

Lindel Dean, who made a very reasonable dissenting judgment in a vaccine case and was sent for re education. Re education. Was hum, uh, was made out to be a complete cooker, uh, was, was treated grossly unfairly by, by her, uh, by her peers. Uh, and you know, that is astounding, uh, when you can compare. What's happened to her and what hasn't happened in these other cases.

Let's just go back to this, this term re education. We only ever hear that or ever heard about that historically, out of just the most hardcore communist countries. Yep. Yep. Communist countries. Now if people in Australia can't see, we're living in a totalitarian culture in this country. It's no longer, it was long lost, the, the, the title of the lucky country, we're living in just legally, I'll say, the disgusting country.

It's disgusting, because our last vestige of hope to the judiciary is in on the game of this totalitarian bullshit. Yeah, that's going down. Mandated vaccines, judiciary who speaks up, gets pushed down and re educated. Christ, deputy president, deputy president, not, she's one below the president, means one of the smartest people in the bloody country and she gets sent off to re education.

Now, what about Justice Ropp in this case? What are the ramifications? People have to take their contemporary social values about this conduct. of Justice Rolfe concealing this information, this massive conflict of interest, intentionally concealing it. They have to inform their MPs and their senators. No way, mate, this is no good.

As my elected representative, this conduct, no way, it's not allowed. You can't have any hint of any dishonesty or misconduct in these privileged judges responsible for, as we've been discussing. Life and death. And they've just blown that responsibility for the last few years. That's just not their business model anymore.

We don't do life and death. That's what now chief justice Gaglia had the hide to say. I have to say it again. It would unduly divert the court from its principle functions. They, uh, that sentence will go down. In legal jurisprudence, infamy is probably the most disgusting line ever uttered by a justice of the high court of this country in the context of acknowledged preventable deaths and injuries.

Preventable. He didn't care about preventing deaths and injuries. Now, nor it seems does the government of this country who is perpetuating it. Yep. It's a club. We've heard it before, but it's on full blown display on this occasion. We're watching it in real time. We're watching it repeat one case to the next.

And let's not forget it started very early. The former chief justice of the Supreme court, uh, Tom Bathurst, uh, my understanding, mandated vaccines in the courts three or four days before the commencement of the Cassam matter. Yeah, if you wanted entry into the courtroom, you had to be vaxxed. That's right.

But, but judicial offices were exempted from any vaccine mandates. You know, they didn't have to take, take the poison, but they could say who walked in their door or not. If, if they hadn't had it or not, we saw that in the appeal for the ABN medal. I'm just as rare as, oh my God, what a, it was just as disgusting animal show circus that, that appeal.

And there was a member of the public in the back who didn't have their mask on correctly. And he went ballistic, started screaming at an individual at the other end of the room who was apparently going to poison him with his breath. Wow. I mean, it was just. You know, listen, we know that you've got a lot to think about and you've got to work so hard in your chambers and there's this detachment from, you know, the people in the street and normal society, but don't be a tosser.

Don't be just a fool. And we saw that on display. The person was not a reasonable individual. They weren't acting rationally. I'm talking about a justice of the federal court. Their behavior was just off, off all charts. Now, I need to return to the constitutional obligations of our MPs and Senators. Your viewers need to contact their MP and Senators.

You've got every viewer here has one MP, federal MP, and several Senators for their state or territory. You have to contact them and say, I've heard all about what's going on in these GMO proceedings. Where the truth of the GMO nature of these drugs is apparently being sought to be held out once again on a ridiculous, a number of ridiculous charade standing, uh, decision.

But we found that this judge has committed misconduct and I'm not happy with it. I don't want to see a judge that looks more than biased to me sitting in this court. I want them investigated. Your viewers have to inform their elected representatives. Now how do they do that? Okay. All right. Mike. It's not easy, even with the internet these days, it's not easy to do, to locate exactly who are all your senators and who's your, your MP.

We made it easy. Now, as a director of children's health defense, we've been working away in the last few weeks to put together a website, which makes it easy for everyone. I'll just share the screen here so everyone knows where to go. And here it is, the name of the website. If you can see in the URL at the top is.

Section 72 dot a you section 72 dot a you super simple section 72 that's for the Australian constitution. It's your constitution viewers, your constitution, your senators and MPs are there to uphold your constitution. The constitution is the people's constitution. This judge works for you. Get it very clear.

This judge works for you. And if you think That a judge of the high court of the federal court is bent. You have a constitutional right under section 72 to inform your member or senators that you're not happy and that you want them investigated. Okay. Your Senator and members have to listen to you. That is their job.

They're your employees as well. Now, if you scroll through this page, we provide The essential elements of this discussion about these GMO proceedings and the conduct of Justice Helen Roff and how, in our view, it doesn't pass the pub test. If you believe that it doesn't pass the pub test, that is, this conduct is not kosher.

It's not okay. It's not to be swept under the rug as something that, oh, it was just a simple mistake. No, this involved intentional concealment, which in my view, and others who I've worked with to create this, amounts to probably dishonesty pretty squarely falls under section 72 misbehavior. So if you're unhappy about that, what you think looks like misbehavior, go to the website.

It's on the same page. We help you write a letter. We help you make a phone call. We help you MPs and senators are, or we help you send an email. You click on. That button, put in your postcode, I'll put in 2481 for Northern Rivers, and then boom! Hello, that's the local MP for the Northern Rivers, happens to be the Honourable Justine Elliott.

When you click on through the continue, it helps you write a letter, an email to send to Justine Elliott. It will also be sent to all of your relevant New South Wales Senators. informing them of the same issues and your concerns about the conduct of Justice Roth and your desire for your elected representatives to call for an inquiry into that conduct under section 72 as occurred with Justice Lionel Murphy back in the early to mid 80s for his apparently seeking to pervert the course of justice.

And so anyone's postcode in Australia, you enter your postcode, And then just follow the prompts to continue to continue, continue. Couldn't be easier. Couldn't be easier. It's a lay down, misere as they say. When the politicians hear about it, they will act. We've already spoken to a number of them. Malcolm Roberts, Gerard Rennick, Ralph Bebek, Alex Antic, Russell Broadbent.

They're all very concerned. They're all very concerned about what Justice Helen Roth has done. And they said to us directly. This is a section 72 matter. This requires parliament to take over and control. Once it's a section 72 matter, no court can seek to intervene and try and protect justice role. It's for the Australian people to judge this judge when a section 72 matter comes up because it's effectively the constitution protecting the Australian people from what could be, what could be a bad judiciary.

So they take the power away from. Other judges and they say, Oh no, you only need one, one bad apple and you could have a whole lot of them. We don't know the safest ways for the people to make the final decision. So it becomes an Australian white jury, if you like, it's appropriate. So we get to protect our constitution from bad judges because bad judges have the power to take people entirely in the wrong direction.

And as we've been discussing here today. They can take cases away from saving people's lives. Julian, is it, is it a long bow to draw by saying that it would appear that the Australian judiciary has gone rogue? On matters of COVID, I've got no problem with saying that. I have absolutely no problem with saying that.

And it was a very, very clear submission in the terms of reference that we lodged. under the people's terms of reference for the legal and constitutional affairs committee. Now the legal and constitutional affairs committee returned its report on the 19th of last month, broad terms of reference, which is classic for royal commission proposed terms of reference, but there's facility.

there to look at the role of the judiciary because there's been our cases you know about but then the many fair work commission cases too many too many where those commissioners have been taking what's called judicial notice of recommendations coming from a target about you know these people should take this drug like this cohort six uh babies should take this drug on this this quantity when you take judicial notice that means if you're the applicant and You come to court trying to save your job, and you say the Atargi advice is bad, and the judge says, no, I'm going to take judicial notice of it, that means you don't get to cross examine the Atargi, so called Atargi experts about how did you arrive at that decision?

Where was your scientific evidence for making that recommendation? Judicial notice. Makes them off balance. You can't cross examine them. You don't get to see if the, if the, if the conclusions they arrived at is credible. And so they've been protected like Brendan Murphy was protected. They've just been this whole moving face to judiciary, like a scrum.

When the people come at the judiciary, trying to get justice, the judicial scrum moves to block. To block any proper, and I'm talking about proper, proper, uh, legal attacks on the validity of these Atargi recommendations or the validity, the legal validity of Brendan Murphy's approvals. And then you come, you know, we, we shift focus like in any rugby match and say, okay, well, they're holding us out there.

They're holding us out there. Oh, look, they're GMOs. Let's go in that direction and try and get the ball down the justice. Field a few yards and then they come and block us again. Standing, standing, standing. It's like, oh, you're not allowed to hold the ball. You're not meant to be on the field. That's the analogy.

You're not meant to be on the field challenging this legally. Where here is the legal judiciary to block you? Our guys, Dr. Julian Fitch saying, Mate, I'm the one who administered this rubbish, and I've poisoned the GMO, sorry, the DNA of my, my patient, and you say I haven't got a right to be on the field?

That's what the analogy is that clear. Sorry, John. And I was just going to say, Julian, the flow on is correct. It's not just the fair work commission, but also the industrial relations commissions, uh, around the States. Uh, the police have not had one successful outcome in New South Wales. Uh, returning to work, uh, teachers were the same paramedics, nurses, that poor officer Falconer over in WA a few days, a few days ago, Once again, we've got a court saying the sovereignty of parliament, right?

That's a legal doctrine. Let's be clear about that. They're saying the sovereignty of parliament on the, under the WA constitution, um, they were allowed to make this far reaching law to impose these sorts of mandates. That's the law on its head. The sovereignty of parliament theory is wrong. It's wrong. It actually offends the common law.

That we brought to this country from a place called England, which had this document, which made England what it is today called Magna Carta, which ensures certain common law rights. Now, if legislation by any or powerful parliament in this country, particularly the state parliaments who have incredibly powerful constitutions, if a piece of legislation offends the common law rights of the people of Australia.

The courts are meant to strike that legislation down and invalidate it. But it was sometime mid last century. I'm still doing research on this and talking to some very, very old and learned barristers retired now as well, um, who ran cases decades before me. And they've been sharing. This with me showing me how this, this idea crept into the courts, the jurisprudence of this country saying the sovereignty of parliament, whatever parliament rights, we can strike down wrong.

You're meant to, as a court, protect the people from any legislation, which treads and tramples on our common law rights as they were brought into Australia, which was recognized in all of our legal decisions in the 1800s in this country. Okay. And then there was this, I don't, it was almost, it was almost like there was a collusion to try and again, take away those common law rights.

Now, if you brought in a piece of legislation, which just wholesale said, Australians have no more common law rights in this country, clearly the courts would then say, Oh no, no, no, I've got to strike down that legislation. But it's all these piecemeal legislations, like we saw, which enabled these various mandates under which you suffered and under which you suffered, Hootie.

Which still did the same thing. It took away your common law rights, bodily integrity, your right to, uh, uh, to continue, um, employment and all the rest of it to cross the border from one country, one state into the other. Um, and we've got all these justices effectively going, Oh, parliamentary sovereignty, parliamentary sovereignty, that's wrong law.

So the whole judiciary is suffering from that legal defect as well. And it needs to be reeducated. I mean, properly wholesale re educated to get them back following the law, the common law in this country, as well as, which is,

which is added to by complementary legislation from time to time. Now, let's say, uh, we'll be discussing this and many other issues.

We've got to actually bring this to a close. Yes. Yes. But next Augusto Zimmerman. On just such matters. And he is a very passionate defender of the Australian constitution and, and the rule of law in this country. And I cannot wait to get him on where he'll be on with Tim Dwyer as well. Uh, Julian, we've got to bring this to a close sadly, mate, but, um, we want to get you back on and we will, we have before, and we will again.

But please go to that website. Section seventy two dot AU. That's the one. It even rhymes. Look at it. Section seventy two dot AU. Um and just follow those beautifully laid out prompts and get in touch with your legal representatives whose taxes are be who your taxes are being paid to keep them in a job.

So put them to work for goodness sake. Um I wanna bring this one to to a close with a prayer very quickly. Dear Lord, Father in heaven, we thank you so much for the opportunity we have to share and shed the light of truth. We pray that justice will prevail and that justice will be swift, merciful, but direct.

We ask this in Jesus holy name. Amen. Julian, thanks for coming on, mate. We really appreciate that. Uh, we'll get this out tonight. Johnny, you've often been heard to say. You just couldn't make this stuff up. You just couldn't. Stay under the trees, everyone. If you love somebody. For goodness sake, give him a call and let him know.

You may just save their life. Julian, you've been, you've articulated your frustration in a manner that would have to uh, enrage a great many Australians and it's time to get angry everybody. It's time to get angry because this has gone on far enough. Um, the elites are spreading their tentacles right the way through the system of this country and they're destroying it and they have to have a wake up call and it's time that we gave it to them.

You've been given the link, use it and give the judge. And the judiciary and the parliamentarians a wake up call. God bless you all. Thanks for being on. Thanks again, Julian. And we look forward to seeing you next week on Club Grubbery with, uh, professor Augusto Zimmerman and Tim Dwyer. Bye for now.