

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a courtesy and out of respect, I write to you to be helpful in clearing up this matter.

Simply, I don't understand.

In relation to this claim upon me by you, I say:

Enough money was placed in the meter for the time away.

Therefore, by your rules no offence was committed as there was no failure to pay breach.

Nor was there any intent to commit an offence or cause harm.

A receipt was never issued from the meter to evidence payment was made. Why?

Also, I am not in receipt of evidence clearly proving that meter H77 was accurately working on that day and at that time. Would you kindly provide a meter expert report to me as soon as practicable?

The meter next to mine was also not working and suspect there may be some connection, although I am not a meter expert.

Simply, I object to this claim and seek to have it revoked forthwith.

Thus far, this claim has caused me some level of stress, and under duress I might add.

At present, without hard evidence for rebuttal, it appears it is my word against your discretion and how you are feeling this day. By the way, how are you feeling?

The Rule of Law

There is one simple law on Earth applicable to man, and that is DO NO HARM.

Hence, your claim must evidence how the City of Melbourne has been harmed, which it does not. Would you kindly provide such evidence of this harm?

As an indication to you, this claim upon me is causing me harm every moment I have to deal with it.

So the main question arising is, why would the City of Melbourne wish to cause me harm?

Further Law

According to legislation in the Imperial Acts Application Act 1980 – SECT 8 referred to below, one can only be fined after a valid court conviction.

[1688] I William and Mary Sess. II (Bill of Rights) c. II

12. That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction, are illegal and void.

Also, courts must comply with Chapter 3 of Australia's Constitution (plurality of judges and a jury of your peers, for the indictment of any offence).

Please note that the Infringements Court is not a constitutionally recognised court. Hence, the legislation upon which you rely upon to give validity to your infringements is a pretend law.

In 1942, Chief Justice Latham of the High Court of Australia stated:

"A pretended law made in excess of power is not and never has been a law at all. Anybody in the country is entitled to disregard it."

Furthermore, the City of Melbourne (ABN: 55 370 219 287) is a fiction and as a Sovereign and natural man of the Earth it has no jurisdiction over me, with this claim or at any time, save upon providing evidence that it does have the divine power and authority of Almighty God or greater.

Hardship

However, if you feel it appropriate to continue to foist such a claim upon me to which I clearly object, kindly consider the following:

My financial situation is well below the poverty line, long term unemployed, in receipt of Centrelink assistance and Healthcare Card;

Recently, I was also admitted to the Royal Melbourne Hospital Trauma Department in December 2013 for severe physical and psychological injuries sustained from falling off a 10 foot balcony onto concrete;

Currently, I remain on a Medical Certificate from the fall and in conjunction with a history of suffering severe depression and anxiety.

Whilst residing in an unfortunate financial position the quantum claimed would cause me harm and be grossly disproportionate to the harm, if any, caused to the City of Melbourne in relation to any alleged offence.

However, under the cover of my objection being a fair, reasonable and honourable man and as a proposed remedy in lieu of the quantum, I am willing to offer my services toward community work, appropriate and subject to my health condition, to expunge any perceived debt owed to the City of Melbourne.

Regards
Michael