Telephone: (07) 3248 1100
Facsimile: (07) 3248 1260 (General)
(07) 3248 1240 (Approved for Document Filing)
Email: qldreg@fedcourt.gov.au

FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA
QUEENSLAND DISTRICT REGISTRY

Your Ref:
Our Ref:

HARRY GIBBS COMMONWEALTH LAW COURTS
119 NORTH QUAY
BRISBANE QLD 4000

PO BOX 13084
GEORGE STREET
BRISBANE QLD 4003

12 March 2018

Mr Andrew Garrett
10/15 Hunter Street
HOBART TAS 7000

By email: [redacted]

Dear Mr Garrett

Requests under Freedom of Information Act

I refer to your emails of 25 November 2017 and 30 December 2017 to the Federal Court of Australia in which you have sought access to a range of documents under the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (Cth) (FOI Act).

On 25 November 2017 you made the following request:

> *I ask you to consider this communique as an application to the Federal Court of Australia under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (Cth) for a copy of any document or thing of an administrative character;*
>
> 1. *related to me in the period 2005 until today's date, and*
> 2. *any document or thing of an administrative character relating to complaints against the Judiciary and or Administrative Arms of the Federal Court of Australia.*

On 6 December 2017 the Court acknowledged receipt of your FOI request of 25 November 2017 and identified that due to the scope of your request it may give rise to a practical refusal reason as defined under s 24AA of the FOI Act. The Court enquired as to whether you were able to narrow the scope of your request to more precisely identify a relevant period and/or the type of documents that you were seeking.

On 21 December 2017 the Court acknowledged receipt of your further FOI request of 16 December 2017 and advised that due to the scope of your FOI requests an application was made to the Australian Information Commissioner for an extension of time for the processing of those requests.

On 21 December 2017 the Australian Information Commissioner granted the court an extension of time under s 15AB(2) of the FOI Act in respect of both FOI requests to close of business on 26 February 2018.

In your email of 30 December 2017 addressed to John Mathieson, Deputy Principal Registrar you narrowed your FOI request of 25 November 2017 as follows:

> *I note that in respect of my application dated 25th November 2017;*
>
> 1. *I wish to narrow part 1 of my application to be read for the period 1st January 2005 until 31 December 2015;*
> 2. *I wish to narrow part 2 of my request and confirm that the Court does not need to include copies of complaints made by me or your responses to those complaints and further if there is an administrative document or thing that is already in existence that summarises the number of complaints and the Court's responses to those complaints then I will not require copies of the actual complaints at this Juncture.*

Further you state:

> *I ask you to accept this communique as a Notice of Actual and Apprehended Bias that you and indeed any officer of the Crown is hopelessly conflicted in making:*
>
> 1. *any FOI decision to applications made by me;*
> 2. *any decision to delegate the Courts administrative powers*
>
> *I request the administrative powers of the Court and its officer to make the FOI decision is delegated to a person who is not an officer of the Crown being the Supreme Court of Hong Kong as a court with Common Law jurisdiction.*

On 23 February 2018 the Court provided you with a written request consultation notice under s 24AB(2) of the FOI Act. The Court also informed you of its intention to refuse access to any documents within your request to the extent that you request relates to complaints against the 'Administrative Arms' of the Court. The basis for this refusal being that a practical refusal reason existed pursuant to paragraph 24AA(1)(a)(i) of the FOI Act in that the work involved in processing the request would substantially and unreasonably divert the resources of the agency from its other operations.

On 26 February 2018 you responded to that request for consultation by offering to narrow your request as follows:

> *In order to further assist the Supreme Court of Hong Kong and the Federal Court of Australia in its support role I wish to further narrow my request to apply to only complaints against members of the Judiciary and the Registrars of the Court who have been involved in proceedings related to me which limits time frames significantly to 2005-2011 in the South Australia Registry and 2008 in the WA Registry and 2014-2017 in the Victoria Registry.*

On 28 February 2018 the Court attempted to further clarify the nature of your request by asking whether it would be correct to assume that the complaints you were interested in are complaints against the relevant Registrars in the performance of their functions, be they as directed under s 35A(1) of the Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 or the range of other legislative regimes for which they have powers and duties. The Court received no response.

The decision that follows is a decision in respect of your FOI request of 25 November 2017 as narrowed on 30 December 2017 and 26 February 2018.

Authorised decision-maker

I am authorised under section 23(1) of the FOI Act to make a decision on behalf of the Federal Court in relation to your request.

You requested that the powers of the Court and its principal officer to make the FOI decision be delegated to a person who is not an officer of the Crown, but the Supreme Court of Hong Kong.

As relevant, subsection 23(2) of the FOI Act provides that a decision in respect of a request made to a court may be made on behalf of that court by the principal officer of that court or, subject to regulations, by an officer of that court acting within the scope of authority exercisable by him or her in accordance with the arrangements approved by the principal officer of that court.

I am lawfully able to make a decision in respect of your request. I have had no other dealings with you, save for my FOI decision dated 26 February 2018 in response to your FOI request of 16 December 2017. There is no evidence to suggest that I have an actual bias. In addition, there is nothing to suggest that a fair-minded lay observer might reasonably apprehend that I might not bring an impartial mind to the making of a decision in response to your FOI request.[1]

In circumstances where an officer of the Court, authorised by the principal officer, is available and lawfully able to make the decision, there is no necessity to consider entering into an arrangement for that decision to be made by a person outside the Court. Of course, the Supreme Court of Hong Kong was abolished on 1 July 1997 and has since existed as the High Court of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

Decision

I have decided to refuse access to documents falling within the scope of your request within the following categories:

- documents directly related or associated with Court proceedings or in the custody or possession of Judicial Officers;
- originating applications not accepted for filing and associated documents;
- judicial complaints;
- complaints against Registrars involved in proceedings related to you; and
- associated with certain dealings on the Personal Property Security Register.

I have decided to grant access to documents falling within the scope of your request within the following categories pursuant to the relevant Schedules:

- FOI requests, Schedule A;
- application for compensation, Schedule B;
- application for Test Case Funding; Schedule C; and

[1] see Burgess v Minister for Immigration and Border Protection [2018] FCA 69 at [34]; Ebner v Official Trustee in Bankruptcy (2000) 205 CLR 337 at [6]

- application to OAIC for Vexatious Applicant Declaration; Schedule D;

In making my decision I have had regard to:

a. the terms of your requests;
b. the content of the documents within the scope of your request;
c. the relevant provisions of the FOI Act and case law considering those provisions; and
d. the FOI Guidelines issued by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner.

Reasons for Decision

Searches undertaken and documents identified

Searches undertaken

The searches undertaken by the Court to identify documents within the scope of your FOI request have been extensive and exhaustive, involving a search of the electronic and hard copy files of every District Registry and the Principal Registry of the Federal Court. The search has encompassed 32 litigation files related to you and associated companies as well as files associated with rejected originating applications, applications for fee waiver, complaints and FOI requests. The search also included the open email accounts of all current and recent Federal Court staff, with approximately 8 GB of data and 4000 emails being recovered.

Documents identified

The documents identified relating to you and/or the various companies for which you have been associated or otherwise falling within your FOI requests fit within the following categories:

- documents directly related or associated with Court proceedings or in the custody or possession of Judicial Officers;
- originating applications not accepted for filing and associated documents;
- judicial complaints;
- complaints against Registrars involved in proceedings related to you;
- FOI requests;
- application for compensation;
- application for Test Case Funding;
- application to OAIC for vexatious applicant declaration; and
- associated with certain dealings on the Personal Property Security Register (PPSR)

Documents directly related or associated with Court proceedings or in the custody or possession of Judicial Officers

The majority of documents identified were documents directly related or associated with Court proceedings or in the possession of Judicial Officers. It also included considerable correspondence from you either addressed to the Court, or to the parties in various Court proceedings to which you, or entities to which you were associated, were a party. This correspondence either contained commentary from you in respect of those proceedings and/or

flagged further actions or rights arising from those proceedings that you would exercise or had exercised.

Section 15(1) of the FOI Act provides:

> *Subject to section 15A, a person who wishes to obtain access to a document of an agency or an official document of a Minister may request access to the document.*

Section 5(1) of the Act provides:

> *For the purposes of this Act:*
> *(a) a court (other than a court of Norfolk Island) shall be deemed to be a prescribed authority;*
> *(b) the holder of a judicial office (other than a judicial office in a court of Norfolk Island) or other office pertaining to a court (other than a court of Norfolk Island) in his or her capacity as the holder of that office, being an office established by the legislation establishing the court, shall be deemed not to be a prescribed authority and shall not be included in a Department; and*
> *(c) a registry or other office of a court (other than a court of Norfolk Island), and the staff of such a registry or other office when acting in a capacity as members of that staff, shall be taken as a part of the court;*
> *but this Act does not apply to any request for access to a document of the court unless the document relates to matters of an administrative nature.*

The High Court of Australia considered the operation of s 5 of the FOI Act and the meaning of the phrase "matters of an administrative nature" in *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor* (2013) 249 CLR 645; [2013] HCA 52. In the joint judgment dismissing the appeal the Chief Justice and Justices Crennan, Kiefel and Bell acknowledged that:

> *The FOI Act does not apply to any request for access to a document of either a court or a specified tribunal, authority or body "unless the document relates to matters of an administrative nature".*[2]

Further, the High Court held:

> *...the exception of a class of document which relates to "matters of an administrative nature" connotes documents which concern the management and administration of office resources, examples of which were given above. This is a common enough connotation of the epithet "administrative".*[3]

The examples referred to by the Court were a second category of assistance and support provided to the Governor-General by the Office of the Official Secretary. That category of support was the management and administration of office resources, such as financial and human resources and information technology.[4] The first category, which was thereby excluded from the management and administration of office resources, including assisting and supporting the Governor-General's discharge of substantive powers and functions.

As relevant, the High Court then held that:

> *Accordingly, the only documents which courts and specified tribunals, authorities and bodies are obliged to open to increased public scrutiny are those documents relating to the management and administration of registry and office resources.*[5]

---

[2] at [19]
[3] at [41]
[4] at 13]
[5] at [47]

The High Court, in considering the decision of *Bienstein v Family Court of Australia*[6], held that decision to be erroneous in suggesting that even documents held by a court which related to individual cases might be characterised as documents relating to matters of an administrative nature, or that since some powers and functions of a judicial officer were administrative in nature, those administrative powers and functions which were not closely related to judicial independence would not need protection from the operation of the FOI Act.[7]

The High Court held that the reasoning in *Bienstein* accorded no weight to the circumstance that a judicial officer is not subject to the operation of the FOI Act, only a registry or office of a court or specified tribunal is subject to the operation of the FOI Act, and then only in respect of documents relating to administrative matters.[8]

In a separate judgment, Justice Gageler also dismissed the appeal. His Honour held that:

> *The distinction sought to be drawn by the appellant between documents which "relate to administrative tasks ... to support or assist the exercise of ... powers or the [performance] of .... functions", on the one hand, and documents which answer that description but which would "disclose the decision-making process involved in the exercise of those powers or performance of those functions in a particular matter or context", on the other, is too fine to be sustained. The true distinction is more robust and more practical.*
>
> *Matters which do not relate to the provision of logistical support do not become "administrative" merely because they are in some way preparatory to an exercise of a substantive power or to the performance of a substantive function.*[9]

Pursuant to s 5(1) of the FOI Act and following the decision of the High Court in *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor*, I am satisfied that any documents directly related or associated to Court proceedings are not documents to which the FOI Act applies, as they are not documents which concern the management and administration of registry or office resources. I am also satisfied that the FOI Act does also not apply to any document that is in the control or possession of a Judicial Officer. To the extent that your FOI request sought to access these documents your request is refused.

Originating applications not accepted for filing and associated documents

A number of documents were identified that were not applications directly related to proceedings within the Court, but originating applications and associated documents that were not accepted for filing for a variety of reasons. These reasons included that you were prohibited from instituting proceedings in any registry of the Court without the leave of the Court by order of Justice Pagone on 26 February 2015 in proceeding VID600/2014.

These are documents that were all lodged, received or created in connection with proceedings which you sought to commence. These documents are not, following *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor,* documents relating to the management and administration of registry and office resources.

---

[6] (2008) 170 FCR 382
[7] at [51]
[8] at [51]
[9] at [75] and [76]

I am satisfied that these documents, which include, but are not limited to, the originating applications that were sought to be filed, any accompanying material such as affidavits or statements of claim, applications for fee waiver and correspondence regarding the refusal to file are not matters of an administrative nature pursuant to s 5(1) of the FOI Act. They are not accessible under the FOI Act and to the extent your FOI request seeks access to them they are refused.

Judicial Complaints

Your FOI request specifically included any document or thing of an administrative character relating to complaints against the Judiciary of the Federal Court of Australia.

Section 5(1A) of the FOI Act provides:

> *This Act does not apply to any request for access to a document of a court (other than a court of Norfolk Island) that relates to a complaint handler (or a body consisting of complaint handlers):*
>
> *(a) exercising powers or performing functions under paragraph 15(1AA)(c) and subsection 15(1AAA) of the Federal Court of Australia Act 1976; or*
> *(b) assisting in exercising those powers or performing those functions.*

As relevant paragraph 15(1AA)(c) provides:

> *(1AA) In discharging his or her responsibility under subsection (1) (and without limiting the generality of that subsection) the Chief Justice:*
>
> *(c) may deal, as set out in subsection (1AAA), with a complaint about the performance by another Judge or his or her judicial or official duties;*

Section (1AAA) provides:

> *The Chief Justice may, if a complaint is made about another Judge, deal with the complaint by doing either or both of the following in respect of the complaint:*
>
> *(a) deciding whether or not to handle the complaint and then doing one of the following:*
> *(i) dismissing the complaint;*
> *(ii) handling the complaint if the Chief Justice has a relevant belief in relation to the complaint about the other Judge;*
> *(iii) arranging for any other complaint handlers to assist the Chief Justice to handle the complaint if the Chief Justice has a relevant belief in relation to the complaint about the other Judge;*
> *(b) arranging for any other complaint handlers to decide whether or not to handle the complaint and then to do one of the following:*
> *(i) dismiss the complaint;*
> *(ii) handle the complaint if each of the complaint handlers has a relevant belief in relation to the complaint about the other Judge.*

Section 15(1AAB) provides:

> *The Chief Justice may authorise, in writing, a person or a body to do one or more of the following:*
> *(a) assist the Chief Justice to handle complaints or a specified complaint;*
> *(b) decide whether or not to handle complaints or a specified complaint;*
> *(c) dismiss complaints or a specified complaint;*
> *(d) handle complaints or a specified complaint.*

Pursuant to s 5(1A) of the FOI Act, the FOI Act does not apply to any documents relating to the handling of complaints about Judges of the Federal Court. I am therefore satisfied that

these documents are not accessible under the FOI Act and to the extent that your FOI request seeks access to these documents your FOI request is refused.

Complaints against Registrars involved in proceedings related to you

Your FOI request of 25 November 2017 included a request for any document or thing of an administrative character relating to complaints against the "Administrative Arms" of the Federal Court of Australia. On 30 December 2017 you narrowed the scope of this request to exclude copies of any complaints made by you or the responses to those complaints. Further, you stated that if an administrative document or thing that was already in existence summarised those complaints and the Court's responses to those complaints then you would not require copies of the actual complaints.

On 23 February 2018, the Court provided you with a written request consultation notice under s 24AB(2) of the FOI Act. The Court also informed you of its intention to refuse access to any documents within your request to the extent that you request relates to complaints against the 'Administrative Arms' of the Court. The basis for this refusal being that a practical refusal reason existed pursuant to paragraph 24AA(1)(a)(i) of the FOI Act in that the work involved in processing the request would substantially and unreasonably divert the resources of the agency from its other operations.

On 26 February 2018 you responded to that request for consultation by offering to narrow your request as follows:

> *In order to further assist the Supreme Court of Hong Kong and the Federal Court of Australia in its support role I wish to further narrow my request to apply to only complaints against members of the Judiciary and the Registrars of the Court who have been involved in proceedings related to me which limits time frames significantly to 2005-2011 in the South Australia Registry and 2008 in the WA Registry and 2014-2017 in the Victoria Registry.*

On 28 February 2018 the Court attempted to further clarify the nature of your request by asking whether it would be correct to assume that the complaints you were interested in are complaints against the relevant Registrars in the performance of their functions, be they as directed under s 35A(1) of the Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 or the range of other legislative regimes for which they have powers and duties. The Court received no response.

Complaints directly related or associated with Court proceedings

As already identified in my reasons above, the FOI Act has a very limited application to the Federal Court.[10] The only request that can validly be made to it under the FOI Act is to access a "document of an administrative nature".[11] These are documents relating to the management and administration of registry and office resources.[12]

To the extent that your FOI request seeks access to complaints about Registrars of the Court in the performance of their functions and duties, where those duties are directly related or associated to Court proceedings, I am satisfied that these are not documents which concern

---

[10] see paragraphs 1.6 – 2.8 of the FOI Guidelines

[11] section 5 FOI Act

[12] *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor* (2013) 249 CLR 645; [2013] HCA 52 at [47]

the management and administration of registry or office resources. I am satisfied, pursuant to s 5(1) of the FOI Act and following the decision of the High Court in *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor,* that these are not documents to which the FOI Act applies.

Complaints not directly related or associated with Court proceedings

As no response was provided to the Court's query of 28 February 2018, it is not clear whether you may have an interest in accessing complaints, if any exist, about Registrars that do not relate to the performance of Registrar functions related or associated with Court proceedings. On the assumption that you are, I am satisfied that a practical refusal reason exists pursuant to paragraph 24AA(1)(a)(i) of the FOI Act in that the work involved in processing the request would substantially and unreasonably divert the resources of the agency from its other operations.

To avoid any confusion, I make this decision based on the narrower scope of your request proposed in your email of 26 February 2018. I would have reached a similar conclusion based on your original request of 25 November 2017 and narrowed on 30 December 2017.

Whilst, your email of 26 February 2018 purports to limit timeframes significantly, it still seeks access to any complaint ever made in respect of any Registrar who was involved in proceedings related to you. In order to meets the requirement that all reasonable steps be undertaken to identify all relevant documents, the Court would need to conduct a search over all electronic and hard copy files in any area of the Court in which one of those Registrars worked.

Such a search would firstly include all the litigation files in relevant registries covering the span of years of employment for any relevant Registrar. As Duty Registrar responsibilities are rotated between Registrars, it would not be possible to limit the search to a specific category of litigation files or relating to particular Judges for which those Registrars may have provided assistance. In Victoria alone there were 1420 relevant litigation files in just one of those years, 2017. On an extremely conservative estimate of 15 minutes per litigation file, this would take an estimated 355 hours to review.

An effective search would also require a review of all Court email accounts for the relevant years. A recent review of existing email accounts undertaken in respect of one specific litigant across a single year, following the identification of relevant emails by the Court's Infrastructure Solutions Unit using precise search criteria, took 10 minutes on average for each email account. This would need to be undertaken for each existing or previously existing Federal Court Registry employee across more than a decade. However, once an employee leaves the Court their email account is closed. These accounts can only be accessed by way of back-up systems where these exist. Retrieval of data from back-up systems is time intensive. Complicating matters further, any search run on existing email accounts or back-up email accounts could not use the word 'complaint' as a precise search criteria due to its regular use in respect of Federal Court litigation. It is simply not possible to quantify with any confidence the time required to conduct such a search.

Once documents were identified there would still be resource ramifications on the Court in examining any documents, consulting with parties, deciding whether to grant, refuse or defer access and where necessary redact information.[13]

In making my decision I have also had regard to the fact that the Federal Court is a small organisation with limited resources available for FOI processing. All work undertaken in responding to FOI requests in the Court is undertaken by staff who have competing responsibilities. In order to meet this request those competing responsibilities would not be met for an extended period of time.[14]

FOI Requests

Included within the scope of your FOI request is a range of documents related to previous FOI requests you have made. Most of the documents within this category have previously been made available to you pursuant to your previous FOI requests.

In *Federal Court of Australia and Garrett* [2015] AICmr 4 at [43] the Information Commissioner stated:

The documents that were released relate largely to Mr Garrett's FOI requests. The Federal Court's approach of releasing any document that does not relate to Mr Garrett's legal proceedings would appear to be a generous interpretation of s 5(1) and the 'management and administration of registry and office resources', in Mr Garrett's favour.

This statement would appear to cast doubt upon whether documents related to FOI requests can properly be said to be within the management and administration of registry and office resources, following *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor* and for the purposes of s 5(1) of the FOI Act.

I am nonetheless satisfied that it would be appropriate, consistent with previous Court practice, to grant access to the documents listed in Schedule A in response to your FOI requests. To the extent that the FOI Act does not apply to the documents listed in Schedule A, I provide access to those documents outside the FOI Act.

Application for Compensation

On 27 June 2015 by email marked for the attention of the Chief Justice and others you requested compensation under the Compensation for Detriment Caused by Defective Administration Scheme (CDDA Scheme) and the Legal Services Directions 2005.

On 17 August 2015 the Federal Court received from you an FOI request seeking access to any document or thing in the possession of the Federal Court which related to your claim for compensation under the CDDA Scheme, Legal Service Directions and the *Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Act 1986* (Cth).

On 14 September 2015 the Court granted access in full to 11 documents or clusters of documents and 8 attachments in another cluster of documents and to grant access to edited

---

[13] see paragraph 3.116 FOI Guidelines

[14] see paragraph 3.117 FOI Guidelines

copies of another 10 documents or clusters of documents. Access to a number of documents was also refused.

I have had the opportunity to review the reasons provided by Deputy Principal Registrar Mathieson dated 14 September 2015 and the documents referred to in those reasons. I have no disagreement with those reasons and adopt them for the purposes of your current FOI request. To the extent that your FOI request seeks access to the documents identified by the Court in response to your FOI request of 17 August 2015, access is granted to the extent and for the same reasons as provided to you on 14 September 2015.

A number of documents have been identified within this category of documents that were created subsequent to the decision of 14 September 2015. These documents, together with the documents previously identified in the decision of 14 September 2015, are set out in Schedule B.

I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant access in full to these additional documents in response to your FOI request.

Application for Test Case Funding

A number of documents were identified relating to a request made by you to the Court on 25 September 2015 for a grant of Financial Assistance under the Public Interest Test Case Funding Scheme. Those documents are set out in Schedule C. On 15 October 2015 the Court, in its response to your request, stated that no funding for public interest test cases is available or could lawfully be provided by the Federal Court to any person or entity.

I am satisfied that it would be appropriate to grant access in full to these documents pursuant to your FOI request.

Application to OAIC for Vexatious Applicant Declaration

A number of documents were identified relating to an application made by the Court to the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner pursuant to s 89K of the FOI Act.

Pursuant to s 5(1) of the FOI Act and following the decision of the High Court in *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor*, I am satisfied that these documents are not documents which concern the management and administration of registry or office resources.

As a number of these documents have already been provided to you as part of those proceedings before the OAIC, I am satisfied that it would be appropriate to provide those documents to you outside the parameters of the FOI Act. The relevant documents are identified in Schedule D.

Associated with certain dealings on the Personal Property Security Register (PPSR)

A number of documents identified are associated with certain dealings by you on the PPSR.

Pursuant to s 5(1) of the FOI Act and following the decision of the High Court in *Kline v Official Secretary to the Governor General of Australia & Anor*, I am satisfied that these

documents are not documents which concern the management and administration of registry or office resources.

To the extent that your FOI request sought to access these documents your request for access is refused.

Charges

You have not been charged for the processing of your request

Release of Documents

I have decided that the documents which I have decided to release to you should be provided in an electronic format. As the total size of these documents is well beyond the limits generally imposed by internet service providers, the documents have been copied onto a USB thumb drive, which is enclosed with this letter.

Your Review Rights

If you are dissatisfied with my decision, you may apply for internal review or to the Information Commissioner for review of those decisions. I encourage you to seek internal review as a first step as it may provide a more rapid resolution of your concerns.

Internal review

Under section 54 of the FOI Act, you may apply in writing to the Federal Court for an internal review of my decision. The internal review application must be made within 30 days of the date of this letter.

Where possible please attach reasons why you believe review of the decision is necessary. The internal review will be carried out by another officer within 30 days.

Information Commissioner review

Under section 54L of the FOI Act, you may apply to the Australia Information Commissioner to review my decision. An application for review by the Information Commissioner must be made in writing within 60 days of the date of this letter and be lodged in one of the following ways:

online: https://forms.business.gov.au/aba/oaic/foi-review-/
email: enquiries@oaic.gov.au
post: GPO Box 2999, Canberra ACT 2601
in person: Level 3, 175 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW

More information about the Information Commissioner review is available on the Officer of the Australian Information Commissioner website. Go to www.oaic.gov.au/freedom-of-information/foi-reviews.

Yours sincerely

Scott Tredwell
Deputy District Registrar

Schedule A

No.	Date	Description
1.	06.03.2015	Email attaching FOI request Andrew Garrett to Justice Pagone
2.	06.03.2015	Email attaching FOI request Andrew Garrett to Victorian Registry
3.	06.03.2015	Email attaching FOI request Andrew Garrett to Chief Justice Allsop
4.	10.03.2015	Email attaching FOI request Andrew Garrett to Justice Davies
5.	12.03.2015	Email attaching FOI request Andrew Garrett to Justice Beach
6.	12.03.2015	Email attaching FOI request Andrew Garrett to Justice Mortimer
7.	16.03.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
8.	21.05.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to Federal Court External FOI Account
9.	26.05.2015	Email John Mathieson to Murray Belcher
10.	03.06.2015	Letter Murray Belcher to Andrew Garrett
11.	03.06.2015	Email Murray Belcher to John Mathieson
12.	19.06.2015	Letter Tim Luxton to Andrew Garrett
13.	30.06.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
14.	13.07.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
15.	14.07.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
16.	21.07.2015	Letter Tim Luxton to Andrew Garrett
17.	27.07.2015	Letter Tim Luxton to Andrew Garrett
18.	12.08.2015	Email John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
19.	12.08.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
20.	17.08.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
21.	25.08.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
22.	14.09.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
23.	25.09.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
24.	04.10.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
25.	14.10.2015	Email John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
26.	15.10.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
27.	21.10.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett

Schedule B

No.	Date	Description
1.	19.08.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett
2.	25.08.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
3.	14.09.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett*
4.	04.10.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
5.	14.10.2015	Email John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett

* The documents released pursuant to the decision of John Mathieson in his letter of 14 September 2015 are included on the USB thumb drive enclosed with this response.

Schedule C

No.	Date	Description
1.	25.09.2015	Email Andrew Garrett to John Mathieson
2.	15.10.2015	Email John Mathieson to Andrew Garrett

Schedule D

No.	Date	Description
1.	12.10.2015	Letter John Mathieson and Adele Byrne to Office of the Australian Information Commissioner, sent 14 October 2015.
2.	21.10.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Office of the Australian Information Commissioner
3.	09.11.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Office of the Australian Information Commissioner
4.	10.11.2015	Letter John Mathieson to Office of the Australian Information Commissioner