

Dear Minister Catley,

I write in response to your correspondence dated 29 December 2025 regarding my identity theft allegations. I must respectfully but urgently inform you that **the information provided to your office by NSW Police Force contains material falsehoods** that I can now prove through Government Information (Public Access) Act releases and interstate government records.

Your response contains three statements that are demonstrably false. I address each below with documentary evidence.

FALSE STATEMENT 1: "Police have engaged with Mr Smith over a period of time"

Your Statement:

"Police have also engaged with Mr Smith over a period of time in relation to his concerns..."

The Reality:

Communication was formally terminated by Kings Cross PAC, not maintained.

Evidence A: Commander's Formal Ban (21 February 2025)

Commander David El-Badawi issued a written directive (Ref: **D/2025/201535**) stating:

"We have decided that we will not be addressing any further correspondence from you on this matter."

Evidence B: Inspector Winch's Directive (16 February 2025)

Five days earlier, Inspector Martha Winch sent an email with subject line "FW: Your emails to Police..." containing the directive:

"Do not contact any Staff or Officer attached to Kings Cross Police."

Evidence C: Email Blocking Confirmed

The Customer Assistance Unit (Ref: **CAS-2168176-L7G9**) subsequently confirmed that Kings Cross PAC **blocked my email address entirely**, preventing any contact.

The GIPA Cover-Up:

GIPA Application GIPAA-2025-0834706 requested records justifying this communication ban. The result: **"Not Held"**

This means:

- The ban is being enforced
- But no official records document the ban's authorization or justification
- This "off-the-books" ban enabled police to tell your office the exact opposite of the truth

Minister, you were told police "engaged" with me. The truth: they

banned me from contact while refusing to document that ban in official records.

FALSE STATEMENT 2: "Allegations have been fully investigated"

Your Statement:

"I am advised that the allegations raised by Mr Smith have been fully investigated by the NSW Police Force (NSWPF) on a number of occasions."

The Reality:

Investigations were explicitly declined, not conducted.

Evidence A: Inspector Winch's Refusal (20 September 2024)

Inspector Martha Winch wrote (released via **GIPAA-2025-0943218**, Pages 1-3):

"The complaint does not amount to misconduct and will be declined to be investigated."

Not "investigated and found unsubstantiated" – **DECLINED TO BE INVESTIGATED.**

Evidence B: Missing Investigation Records

GIPA Application GIPAA-2025-0943218 requested six categories of Inspector Winch's assessment records:

1. Complaint Assessment (20-22 Sept 2024) - **NOT PROVIDED**
2. Refusal to Investigate Misconduct (1 Oct 2024) - **NOT PROVIDED**
3. Response to DVLO Request (27 Oct 2024) - **NOT PROVIDED**
4. LECC Referral Decision (8 Nov 2024) - **NOT PROVIDED**
5. Decision to End Communication (8-9 Dec 2024) - **NOT PROVIDED**
6. Communication Ban Directive (16 Feb 2025) - **RELEASED**
(proving ban exists)

Result: Despite the Schedule claiming these records were "located," the actual released pages contain **none of the requested assessment records.**

Evidence C: Admitted Evidence Destruction

GIPA Internal Review REV-2025-0858525 contains this admission:

"Constable Dellenty advised that upon finalisation of the local court matter **some information she had received that was not saved on ViewIMS had been deleted.**"

The Officer in Charge deleted the evidence after my prosecution

collapsed.

This is a breach of the **State Records Act 1998, Section 21** (unauthorized disposal of State records).

Evidence D: Missing Outcome Reports

GIPA Application GIPAA-2025-0834706 requested the Outcome Report for investigation **E102735735**.

Result: "Not Held"

GIPA Application GIPAA-2025-0909690 requested reasons for marking **Event E99602333** as "Non-Enquiry."

Result: "Not Held"

The Pattern:

- Complaints **declined** rather than investigated
- Assessment records claimed "located" but not released
- Evidence **deleted** by investigating officer
- Outcome reports **missing** from official records

Minister, you were told allegations were "fully investigated." The truth: complaints were declined without investigation, critical evidence was deleted, and outcome reports don't exist.

ADDITIONAL FALSEHOOD: "Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate Claims"

Your Statement:

"...he has been informed that there is insufficient evidence to substantiate claims of identity theft."

The Reality:

Professional forensic evidence was provided and ignored.

The Cybertrace Report (Ref: 2025-4663)

On **10 June 2025**, I provided a comprehensive forensic investigation report to police at Day Street Station, witnessed by Thomas Mellor.

This report identified:

- Suspect's IP address: **103.53.118.254**
- ISP: Anycast Holdings / Swoop
- Digital aliases linked to suspect: @frost_rich, @The_real_Tony_smith
- Evidence of drug trafficking using my name

GIPA Application GIPAA-2025-0925592 requested this report and related investigative records.

Result: Police claimed "**nil evidence**" and characterized the matter as a "civil dispute"

The Queensland Police Acknowledgment

Sergeant Jake Lacy (Redcliffe Station, QLD) sent an email on **29**

January 2025 (referenced in my GIPA background) stating: References Cybercrime report **CIRS-20241121-242**; confirms QPS inability to investigate NSW-based offences.

This proves:

1. Interstate police recognized this as a **criminal matter**, not "civil"
2. They attempted to cooperate with Kings Cross PAC
3. Kings Cross PAC **failed to respond or cooperate** (per Sgt Lacy)

Senior Constable De Angeli's Dismissal (29 November 2024)

When I reported the Telegram account "**@The_real_Tony_smith**" advertising drug sales, S/Con Joseph De Angeli responded:

"Using aliases is **not against the law.**"

This is false. Crimes Act 1900, Section 192I explicitly criminalizes possessing identification information (including "usernames") with intent to commit an indictable offence.

GIPA Application GIPAA-2025-0943236 requested S/Con De Angeli's statutory assessment records applying Crimes Act s192I/J/K.

Result: "Not Held" – No assessment was ever conducted.

The Pattern:

- Forensic report provided → Claimed "nil evidence"
- Interstate police cooperation attempted → No response from Kings Cross PAC
- Criminal statute directly applicable → Officer claimed "not against the law"
- Statutory assessment requested via GIPA → "Not Held"

Minister, you were told there was "insufficient evidence." The truth: professional forensic evidence was provided, acknowledged by interstate police as criminal, but dismissed by Kings Cross PAC without conducting the statutory assessments required by the Crimes Act.

THE INTERSTATE EVIDENCE: NSW POLICE LIED ABOUT THEIR OWN ACTIONS

The "Not Held" Lie Proven False

GIPA Internal Review REV-2025-0858528 (decided **8 August 2025**) contains this finding:

"Agency does not hold the information... searches [of COPS/CAD] did not locate any Events."

This was regarding the **26 June 2025 welfare check** incident where I alleged NSW Police made a false referral to Queensland Health

claiming I made "000 calls expressing suicidal thoughts."

The Queensland Health Records Prove the Lie:

I obtained records from **Queensland Health** under Right to Information laws (Ref: **JIAU25/13749**).

These records contain an email from NSW Police officer "Brendan" (@police.nsw.gov.au) sent to Queensland Health Acute Care Team stating:

1. That I made "000 calls" (false – NSW Police own GIPA confirms no such calls exist)
2. That I expressed "suicidal thoughts about jumping in front of a train" (false)
3. That a 2021 hospital visit was for "mental health issues" (false – it was a colonoscopy)

Most damning, on 27 June 2025, "Brendan" sent a follow-up email stating:

"The reason why I ask... is **the gentleman... has made further complaints to a Federal Ministers Office and I need to respond to them.**"

What This Proves:

1. **NSW Police DID make the interstate referral** (contrary to their "Not Held" GIPA finding)
2. **The referral contained fabricated information** (false 000 call, false medical history)
3. **The motive was retaliation for Ministerial complaints**, not genuine welfare concern
4. **NSW Police then denied the referral existed** when I requested records via GIPA

Minister, NSW Police told you I was provided with "additional information on the outcome of the investigation." The truth: they fabricated a mental health crisis to retaliate against my Ministerial complaints, then denied the entire incident existed when I requested records.

THE REGULATORY TRAP: YOU DIRECTED ME TO CONTACT A BANNED COMMAND

Your Advice:

"Should Mr Smith have further concerns, please encourage him to contact Kings Cross PAC on (02) 8356 0099."

The Problem:

This advice is impossible to follow because:

1. Inspector Winch banned me from contacting "any Staff or

- Officer attached to Kings Cross Police" (16 Feb 2025)
2. Commander El-Badawi confirmed they will not address further correspondence (21 Feb 2025)
 3. My email address has been blocked by the Command
 4. These bans were deliberately kept "off the books" (GIPA: "Not Held")

Your office was not informed of these bans when preparing your response.

This creates a "regulatory trap":

- I am legally prohibited from contacting Kings Cross PAC
- Your office directs me to contact Kings Cross PAC
- If I attempt contact, I violate the Inspector's directive
- If I don't attempt contact, I appear uncooperative

This is Administrative Entrapment Based on False Information Provided to Executive Government.

DATABASE CORRUPTION ADMITTED BY POLICE STAFF Evidence from Third-Party Witness (Lita Bennett, Safer Pathway):

A Domestic Violence Liaison Officer at Kings Cross PAC admitted to independent witness Lita Bennett that:

"There had been **duplication and error** in how incidents were recorded... **confusion arising from [my] name being listed under multiple identities.**"

What This Means:

1. The perpetrator's use of "Tony Smith" as a criminal alias has **corrupted the police database**
2. My victim reports are being conflated with the offender's criminal aliases
3. Police staff **acknowledge the corruption** but refuse to facilitate corrections
4. This corrupted database is then used to conduct "reasonable searches" for GIPA requests

Minister, when police told you allegations were "fully investigated," they used a database they know is corrupted by the very identity theft I reported.

FABRICATED RECORDS: PHYSICAL IMPOSSIBILITIES

The charge involving the allegation that I called Issac Rushton from the number **0433 813 180** was **"Use carriage service to menace/harass/offend"** (Ref: **H 81615839**), brought under Section 474.17(1)

of the Criminal Code

The Allegation

The core of this charge rested on a sworn statement provided by **Issac Rushton** to the NSW Police Force (NSWPF) on December 1, 2023.

- **The Incident:** Rushton claimed that while he was asleep on **4 September 2023**, he received a missed call at **2:17 AM**.
- **Identification:** He alleged that he recognized the number **0433 813 180** as my phone number, which he had saved in his phone under my name.
- **Legal Context:** This call was alleged to be a criminal breach of a then-active **Apprehended Violence Order (AVO)** granted on 15 August 2022.

The Evidence Contradicting the Charge

The "fact" is this missed call was a technical impossibility based on independent telecommunications records:

- **Prior Cancellation:** I provided documentary proof, including Optus billing services, demonstrating that the phone number **0433 813 180** had been cancelled on **25 August 2023**—ten days before the alleged call.
- **Zero Communication Records:** Police-obtained **Telstra records** (CSP Ref: 2617668) for the period of 1 September to 7 September 2023 showed a **"Total Result Count: 0"** for that number.
- **Police Awareness:** The Officer in Charge (OIC), **Constable Claudine Dellenty**, possessed these exculpatory phone records **99 days before** laying the charge but proceeded with the prosecution regardless

The Incident: Case Report C 78394809 regarding the phone call to mobile number **0433 813 180** was recorded on **7 June 2024**.

entry was created by **Constable Claudine Dellenty** as part of an update to the case narrative for Case Report C 78394809.

- A mobile call was placed to the POI (Tony Smith), who reportedly "picked up then hung up" once he realized the call was from the Kings Cross Police Station (KXPS). Following the hang-up, an SMS was sent to the same mobile number (0433 813 180)

The Problem:

This phone call is physically impossible.

I provided Optus invoices proving this service was **cancelled and disconnected on 25 August 2023 – 287 days** before the alleged call.

Police Response:

Privacy Internal Review MF/2025/2287 (Para 10.9-10.11) **refused to**

correct this false entry, claiming it must be preserved as a "historical snapshot" under Retention Authority DA221.

The Contradiction:

- **False data** (impossible phone call) → Protected as "historical snapshot," must be retained 5 years
- **Exculpatory data** (OIC's notebooks/emails) → Deleted by officer, claimed "not saved on ViewIMS"

Minister, police told you there was "insufficient evidence." The truth: they fabricated evidence (impossible phone calls), preserved false records, and deleted evidence that would prove my innocence.

CRITICAL ADDITION: THE BRIEF OF EVIDENCE LIE AND SUPPRESSION OF CRIME REPORTING

FALSE STATEMENT: "The Brief of Evidence Has Been Served on You"

On 16 February 2025, Inspector Martha Winch wrote to me: "The brief of evidence has been served on you. Provide this to your solicitor who can assist you with any questions you may have regarding the matter before the court."

On 8 December 2024, Inspector Winch wrote: "The brief of evidence would have been served and will contain the documents related to the matter."

The Truth:

As of 16 February 2025, I had NOT been served the Brief of Evidence.

I stated this explicitly in my response to Inspector Winch (included in the GIPA-released correspondence, though conveniently ignored):

"I have not been served the brief."

Why This False Statement Matters:

Inspector Winch used the false claim that I had been served the brief to:

1. Justify blocking my email address:

"Cst Dellenty will be blocking your email address as she continues to be harassed by your contact after you were asked several times in writing not to contact her."

2. Justify the total communication ban:

"Do not contact any Staff or Officer attached to Kings Cross Police, unless in CASE OF EMERGENCY."

3. Deflect my evidence of innocence:

- Told me to "provide this [brief] to your solicitor"
- When I didn't have the brief to provide
- While simultaneously blocking my ability to communicate exculpatory evidence

The Circular Trap:

What I Needed	What Police Did	The Result
Access to Brief of Evidence to prepare defense	Falsely claimed it was served; refused to provide it	Cannot prepare defense
Ability to present exculpatory evidence (carrier records, Meta logs, Cybertrace report)	Blocked email; banned all contact; told to "raise it in court with solicitor"	Evidence cannot reach investigators
Legal representation	Psychologist report: "unlikely Mr. Smith would be able to verbally express any coherent directive to potential lawyers"	Cannot instruct lawyers without written communication
Written communication channel (due to PTSD/disability)	Email blocked; in-person contact required; phone contact mandated	Accommodation denied

Minister, Inspector Winch created an administrative prison:

- Falsely claimed brief was served → Blocked communication → Banned contact → Told me to use a brief I didn't have → With a lawyer I couldn't instruct → While preventing me from providing evidence of innocence

THE "BANALITY OF EVIL": ACCEPTING FALSE ACCUSATIONS WITHOUT INVESTIGATION

My Warning to Inspector Winch (22 September 2024):

In correspondence released via GIPAA-2025-0943218 (Pages 1-3), I wrote:

"To know that facts being presented to court is false is misconduct. It's abuse. It's false accusations."

"Accepting false accusations without investigating the evidence that would exonerate me is a form of banality of evil. I believe it is abusive, malicious and illegal and by agreeing with this conduct are complicit."

What I Was Specifically Warning About:

1. False Phone Call Evidence: The Facts Sheet claims I made a phone call on **4 September 2023** from number **0433 813 180**.

I provided Optus invoices proving this service was cancelled on 25 August 2023 - ten days before the alleged call.

Inspector Winch's response: "This is a matter to be raised with your solicitor."

2. False Instagram Timeline: The sworn police statement claims the Instagram account @bjow_ett was discovered in **November 2023**.

I provided Meta business records proving the account was discovered in July 2023 - showing a 4-month discrepancy in sworn testimony.

Inspector Winch's response: "This can be raised in your defence at Court."

3. Prospect of Conviction: I cited the **DPP Prosecution Guidelines** regarding prospect of conviction, specifically noting:

"It is clear that there is no reasonable prospect of conviction... I am being singled out and denied my right to present evidence."

Inspector Winch's response: Declined to investigate as "does not amount to misconduct."

The Acknowledgment of No Investigation:

In my 22 September 2024 email (GIPA Pages 1-3), I stated:

"I note that you have concluded that there has been no misconduct and that you have decided this without investigation."

Inspector Winch never disputed this characterization. She confirmed the approach:

"The complaint does not amount to misconduct and will be declined to be investigated." (20 September 2024)

PROHIBITED FROM REPORTING ONGOING CRIMES

The Drug Sales Account in My Name

Throughout late 2024, I repeatedly reported to Inspector Winch that Issac Rushton was:

1. Operating a Telegram account: **@The_real_Tony_smith** (ID: 7515693902)
2. Advertising drug sales under my name

3. Impersonating me on MS Teams for criminal purposes
4. Using my identity as a criminal alias

I explicitly stated (9 December 2024):

"Assurance that the impersonation has been formally investigated and that I am not being wrongfully implicated in his alleged criminal activities. Attached is his continuing drug sales account in my name. Which based on my previous and current eight charges and threats by Issac for reporting his illegal operation, I expect to be charged at some point in the future."

Inspector Winch's Response (9 December 2024):

"Once again, I will not be providing information about another person to you. The matters you have raised do not amount to misconduct of a Police Officer and as such, my communication with you will be ending."

Then, on 8 December 2024, Inspector Winch Directed:

"I would ask that unless you have a new matter to report to Police, you do not contact NSW Police regarding the matter before the Court and your ex partner Issac Rushton."

The Impossible Directive:

Minister, I was told:

1. **Don't report Issac Rushton's ongoing crimes** (drug sales, impersonation)
2. **Don't contact police** about the drug account using my name
3. **Do contact Crime Stoppers** (which I had done repeatedly with no action)
4. **Attend police station in person** (despite PTSD, interstate residence, and documented inability)

Meanwhile:

- Rushton's drug sales account remained active
- My name continued to be used for criminal activity
- I faced 8 charges (later increased) for "harassing" him by reporting his crimes

THE IDENTITY CORRUPTION: "I WAS TO FIND OUT LATER"

The Revelation of Database Contamination

I stated in my correspondence:

"I was to find out later that my name was already being attributed to Issac Rushton's crimes."

This is confirmed by the Lita Bennett evidence (Safer Pathway advocacy records):

A Domestic Violence Liaison Officer admitted to independent witness Lita Bennett:

"There had been **duplication and error** in how incidents were recorded... **confusion arising from [Tony Smith's] name being listed under multiple identities.**"

What This Means:

While Inspector Winch was:

- Blocking my email
- Banning my contact
- Refusing to investigate impersonation
- Telling me not to report Rushton's crimes
- Claiming insufficient evidence of identity theft

The police database had ALREADY:

- Merged my victim reports with Rushton's criminal aliases
- Listed my name under "multiple identities"
- Created "duplication and error" acknowledged by police staff
- Been corrupted by the very identity theft I was reporting

Minister, This Creates a Logical Impossibility:

How can police claim "insufficient evidence" of identity theft when their own database proves the identity theft occurred?

The DVLO admission to Lita Bennett proves:

1. Police knew the database was corrupted
2. They acknowledged my name was conflated with Rushton's aliases
3. They refused to investigate the cause (Rushton's criminal impersonation)
4. They used the corrupted database to tell your office allegations were "fully investigated"

THE SYSTEMATIC DENIAL OF THE RIGHT TO PRESENT EVIDENCE

Constitutional and Statutory Rights Violated:

In my correspondence to Inspector Winch, I specifically cited:

"**Why am I being singled out for this treatment**, with policies and procedures clearly not being followed in my case?"

"**It is my legal right to present evidence that contradicts the police charges laid against me**, especially when that evidence demonstrates misconduct or significant errors in the investigation.

Why is this right being denied to me?"

The Evidence I Was Prohibited From Presenting:

1. Telecommunications Evidence:

- Optus invoices proving phone service cancellation
- Telstra records showing "Total Result Count: 0" for alleged call date
- **Inspector Winch's response:** "Raise it with your solicitor"

2. Meta Business Records:

- Discovery dates of Instagram accounts
- Account activity logs showing entrapment
- **Inspector Winch's response:** "Raise it in your defence at Court"

3. Cybertrace Forensic Report:

- IP address 103.53.118.254 linking Rushton to impersonation
- Digital evidence of drug trafficking
- **Inspector Winch's response:** Communication ending; don't contact us

4. Crime Stoppers Reports:

- Reference numbers: 996961, 999823, 1002693, 1012217, 1015185
- Years of drug trafficking intelligence
- **Inspector Winch's response:** Not investigated; doesn't amount to misconduct

The Disability Discrimination:

I provided a **psychologist's report** stating:

"It is unlikely that Mr. Smith would be able to verbally express any coherent directive to potential lawyers."

Inspector Winch's response was to:

1. **Block written communication** (email)
2. **Require in-person attendance** (despite PTSD from police stations)
3. **Mandate phone communication** (despite documented inability)
4. **Claim brief was served** (when it wasn't)
5. **Tell me to instruct a solicitor** (which the psychologist said I couldn't do verbally)

Minister, this is systematic exclusion of a disabled person from accessing justice.

SUMMARY: THE THREE LIES THAT ENABLED THE FOURTH

Minister, your office was provided with FALSE STATEMENT #2:

"An officer from Kings Cross PAC recently spoke with Mr Smith"

This lie was only possible because of three prior lies:

LIE #1: "The Brief of Evidence Has Been Served"

- **Claimed:** 16 February 2025
- **Truth:** I had not been served; I stated this explicitly
- **Purpose:** Justify blocking communication and banning contact

LIE #2: "Allegations Have Been Fully Investigated"

- **Claimed:** To your office (F/2025/55291)
- **Truth:** Inspector Winch explicitly "declined to be investigated" (20 Sept 2024)
- **Purpose:** Conceal refusal to examine exculpatory evidence

LIE #3: "Insufficient Evidence of Identity Theft"

- **Claimed:** To your office (F/2025/55291)
- **Truth:** Police database corruption admitted; Cybertrace report ignored
- **Purpose:** Dismiss professional forensic evidence and interstate police cooperation

THESE THREE LIES ENABLED LIE #4:

"An officer recently spoke with Mr Smith"

Because:

- If brief was served → No need to speak to me
- If fully investigated → Nothing to discuss
- If insufficient evidence → No action to report
- If contact was banned → Speaking to me was prohibited

Minister, someone at Kings Cross PAC constructed a false narrative for your office that was internally contradictory and externally disproven by their own GIPA releases.

THE FINAL DIRECTIVE: "DO NOT CONTACT NSW POLICE REGARDING ISSAC RUSHTON"

Inspector Winch's Instruction (8 December 2024):

"I would ask that unless you have a new matter to report to Police, you do not contact NSW Police regarding the matter before the Court and your ex partner Issac Rushton. The brief of evidence would have been served and will contain the documents related to the matter."

The Impossibility of Compliance:

How can I NOT report Issac Rushton when:

1. He operates a drug sales account in my name (@The_real_Tony_smith)
2. He impersonates me on MS Teams for fraud
3. He violates bail conditions (if on bail, which police won't

confirm)

4. Every instance of his criminal activity using my name creates risk of **future false charges against me**
5. I have already faced 8 charges, with threats of more to come

The Catch-22:

If I Report Rushton's Crimes	If I Don't Report Rushton's Crimes
Violate Inspector Winch's directive	Fail to establish contemporaneous record
Risk additional harassment charges	Risk being charged for crimes he commits in my name
Demonstrate "non-compliance" with police	Have no defense when drugs sold under @The_real_Tony_smith are traced
Provide basis for further contact restrictions	Appear complicit in criminal activity

Minister, I was ordered to choose between:

- **Option A:** Report ongoing crimes and be punished for "contacting police about Rushton"
- **Option B:** Don't report crimes and be blamed when Rushton's actions (in my name) result in charges against me

Evidence This Is Already Occurring:

I explicitly warned Inspector Winch (9 December 2024):

"Which based on my previous and current eight charges and threats by Issac for reporting his illegal operation, I expect to be charged at some point in the future."

This is not paranoia. This is pattern recognition.

Every time I report Rushton's crimes:

1. He makes false accusations against me
2. Police charge me based on his statements
3. My evidence of innocence is deemed "inadmissible" or "raise it in court"
4. Charges proceed despite no reasonable prospect of conviction
5. Rushton's crimes remain uninvestigated

Inspector Winch's directive to "not contact NSW Police regarding Issac Rushton" guaranteed this cycle would continue unchecked.

SUMMARY: MATERIAL FALSEHOODS PROVIDED TO

YOUR OFFICE

What Your Office Was Told	The Documented Truth	Evidence
1. "Police engaged with Mr Smith over a period of time"	Communication banned since February 2025; email blocked	Commander letter D/2025/201535; GIPA release page 20
2. "Allegations fully investigated"	Complaints declined without investigation; evidence deleted	Inspector Winch refusal (GIPA pp.1-3); Deletion admission (REV-2025-085852 5)
3. "Insufficient evidence"	Forensic report provided; interstate police confirmed criminal matter	Cybertrace Report 2025-4663; QPS email CIRS-20241121-24 2
4. Implied: No recent police contact	False welfare check weaponizing Mental Health Act after Ministerial complaint	QLD Health RTI JIAU25/13749 proving "Brendan" email
5. Implied: Brief served; proper process followed	Brief NOT served; false claim used to block communication	Inspector Winch: "brief has been served" (16 Feb 2025); My response: "I have not been served the brief"
6. Implied: Could report crimes via normal channels	Explicitly told NOT to report Rushton's ongoing crimes; banned from contact	Inspector Winch: "do not contact NSW Police regarding... Issac Rushton" (8 Dec 2024)

7. Implied: Fair treatment; right to present evidence	Systematically denied right to present exculpatory evidence; called "harassment"	Multiple refusals: "raise it with solicitor," "raise it in court," "communication ending"
8. Implied: No disability discrimination	Email blocked despite psychologist report stating inability to instruct lawyers verbally	Psychologist: "unlikely Mr. Smith would be able to verbally express coherent directive to potential lawyers"

REQUESTED ACTIONS

1. Immediate Inquiry into False Briefings

I request your office initiate an inquiry into how Kings Cross PAC provided materially false information to the Minister for Police, specifically:

- Why your office was not informed of the February 2025 communication ban
- Who falsely reported that an officer "recently spoke" with me
- Why the "Brendan" welfare check retaliation was not disclosed to your office

2. Correct the Ministerial Record

The correspondence F/2025/55291 should be formally corrected to reflect:

- No "recent contact" occurred
- Communication was **banned**, not maintained
- Complaints were **declined**, not investigated
- Forensic evidence was **ignored**, not assessed
- Interstate retaliation occurred after Ministerial complaint

3. Independent Review of Kings Cross PAC Record-Keeping

I request a formal review of Kings Cross PAC's compliance with:

- **State Records Act 1998** (unauthorized destruction by Constable Dellenty)
- **GIPA Act 2009** (false "Not Held" findings contradicted by QLD records)
- **NSW Police Force Code of Conduct** (fabricating welfare check to retaliate for complaints)

4. Protection from Further Retaliation

The "Brendan" email explicitly states the welfare check was triggered by complaints to "a Federal Ministers Office." I now make complaints to your office (State Minister).

I request assurance that:

- No further retaliatory welfare checks will be initiated
- No further false mental health referrals will be made to interstate agencies
- My contact with your office will not trigger police retaliation

5. Investigation into False "Brief Served" Claim

The false statement that the brief of evidence was served on me was used to:

- Justify blocking my email address
- Legitimize the total communication ban
- Deflect my attempts to present exculpatory evidence
- Create the appearance that I had access to legal process I didn't have

I request:

- Formal investigation into who authorized this false statement
- Disclosure of actual brief service date (if ever served)
- Review of whether prosecution can proceed when defendant has been denied access to brief

6. Review of Prohibition Against Crime Reporting

I was explicitly directed to **NOT contact NSW Police regarding Issac Rushton**, even as he:

- Operated drug sales accounts in my name
- Impersonated me for criminal purposes
- Potentially violated bail conditions
- Created ongoing risk of false charges against me

I request:

- Clarification: Is it NSW Police policy to prohibit victims from reporting ongoing crimes?
- Review: On what legal basis can police order a victim NOT to report criminal activity?
- Protection: How am I to protect myself from false charges when prohibited from establishing a contemporaneous record of the perpetrator's crimes?

7. Disability Accommodation Review

I provided medical evidence of:

- PTSD preventing in-person police station attendance
- Cognitive/communication disability requiring written communication

- Psychologist assessment stating inability to instruct lawyers verbally

Police response was to:

- Block written communication (email)
- Mandate in-person or phone contact
- Require me to instruct a solicitor (which medical evidence said I couldn't do)

I request:

- Review of disability discrimination in this matter
- Investigation of whether NSW Police violated Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)
- Establishment of proper accommodation protocols for future interactions

CONCLUSION

Minister Catley, I do not believe you personally intended to provide false information in your response to Mr Greenwich. However, the evidence I have provided demonstrates that **Kings Cross PAC systematically misrepresented the facts to your office.**

The Core Deception:

Kings Cross PAC created an "off-the-books" communication ban (GIPA: "Not Held") that enabled them to:

1. Enforce a total communication blackout against me
2. Falsely report to your office that they were "engaging" with me
3. Recommend you direct me to contact them (knowing I am banned from doing so)
4. Retaliate against Ministerial complaints using false mental health referrals
5. Deny all of the above when I requested records via GIPA

This is not administrative error. This is systematic deception of Executive Government.

The Evidence Standard:

Everything I have stated above can be verified through:

- GIPA releases from NSW Police (including admission of evidence destruction)
- RTI releases from Queensland Health (proving false referral)
- Dated correspondence from Commander and Inspector (proving communication ban)
- Independent witness statements (proving database corruption acknowledgment)

- Telecommunications records (disproving fabricated phone calls)

I am not asking you to take my word. I am asking you to review the government's own records.

Final Request:

Minister, you have been provided false information by an agency you oversee. The integrity of your office's responses depends on the integrity of the information provided by NSW Police.

Kings Cross PAC has compromised that integrity.

I respectfully request:

1. A formal inquiry into how this false information reached your office
2. Correction of the ministerial record
3. Independent oversight of Kings Cross PAC record-keeping practices
4. Protection from retaliation for making this disclosure

I am available to provide any of the referenced documents to your office for verification.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Smith

Phone: 0493 998 501

Email: als1969@me.com