

Karl Roe

Address withheld due to concern for safety
Auckland
karl.andrew.roe@gmail.com

16 November 2016

Chief District Court Judge

Jan-Marie Doogue
marie.mcnicholas@justice.govt.nz

District Court Judge Hinton

c/o Northshore District Court

Principal Family Court Judge

Laurence Ryan
marie.mcnicholas@justice.govt.nz

General Manager District Courts

Att: Tony Fisher
tony.fisher@justice.govt.nz

North Shore District Courts Civil Registry

Att: Craig Walker
Craig.walker@justice.govt.nz

The Supreme Court of New Zealand

Att: Sian Elias
supremecourt@justice.govt.nz

Noel Anderson J

supremecourt@justice.govt.nz

Klaus Hufner

Berlin
Germany
Human Rights Violations
German United Nations Association/ German Commission for UNESCO
secretariat@unesco.de
info@dgvn.de

Office of the High Commissioner

Human Rights

United Nations

Subject: Judicial and Courts Corruption [see Bangalore Principles and the ICCPR – New Zealand conference state]

Dear Sirs/Madams

Re: Judge Hinton breaching my rights under;

*** the NZBORA, and**

*** the ICCPR,**

*** the Bangalore Principles as enshrined in our common law, and breaching those same principles as recorded in the annexed "Guidelines For Judicial Conduct".**

Such inappropriate, subjugating, inimical, behaviour, amounting to Judicial Misconduct of a magnitude necessitating a complaint to the Judicial Conduct Commissioner in order that action be considered relating to the removal, or significant remedial training, of Judge Hinton.

1. My previous letter was headed "*Inexplicable and incontrovertible corrupt and/or illegal behaviour's at the registry of the North Shore, and Auckland, District Courts*".
2. Having received Judge Hinton's threatening, biased, and incomprehensible, minute [annexed as document "**A**"], which does not;
 - 2.1 Apply the law that was before him in writing; and;
 - 2.2 Apply the facts to the case, which were before him in admissible evidence in sworn testimony, which facts proved that the applicant's affidavit was perjurious, and the application for orders fraudulent.
 - 2.3 Record why he made his decision in the manner that he did granting suppression of my affidavit and notice of defence in that those documents "be placed in a sealed box and not to be accessed without leave of a judge", and that the proven perjurious affidavit and fraudulent application of Olivia Baker remain searchable.
 - 2.4 Apply the statute law found in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 protecting my rights to a fair hearing, or abide by the guidelines found in the "Guidelines For Judicial Conduct" that directly reflect this country's undertakings and obligations being a consenting country to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Bangalore Principles.
 - 2.5 Deal with my applications to have the court hold the applicant in contempt for perjury, and conspiring to defeat and pervert the course of justice, and to direct that the police be advised as to the clear perjury, and other offending made out on the documents before the Court.
3. In clear and purposefully designed affect, the judges behaviour, without reasonable excuse [which would have been recorded in the decision if one existed], was to ignore the perjury and attempt to defeat the course of justice, and to conceal the evidence from the prying eyes of the media or indeed others interested in exposing the criminal behaviour of the applicant, Matthew Blomfield, and the applicants husband relating to pedophilia.

4. It would seem the Judge believes himself above the law of New Zealand, and the common law of the Commonwealth, and indeed [most worryingly], the judiciaries obligation to abide by International law that this countries legislature is a signatory to.
5. For the record this is a formal complaint to the Judicial Conduct Commissioner about Judge Hinton being incompetent to continue to adjudicate in the District Courts of New Zealand due to an unfathomable lack of knowledge of the most fundamental rules, guidelines, and principles, that impact on all fact finders that decide the competing rights of those before them. In effect, I am alleging judicial misconduct against Judge Hinton, and that he may be one of the Judges that Mr Blomfield inferred he had "in his pocket".
6. I have decided to copy in Judge Hinton so that hopefully he takes note of what I have to say, [about his inexplicable inadequate performance], into account when he is next on the bench. For ease of reference the Judge could use Google to "get up to speed". I will start with the "Guidelines For Judicial Conduct". I assume that Judge Hinton is not aware of this documents contents. In the "Preface" the guidelines state;

*This publication is intended to provide practical guidance to members of the judiciary in New Zealand. The general principles it identifies underpin the legitimacy of judicial function which is essential to any society organised by law. **As such, the general principles can readily be accepted as standards all judges agree to live by when accepting appointment. The public of New Zealand is entitled to expect judges to follow the principles identified.....** In the end, the legitimacy of judicial function and the independence of the judiciary depend upon public confidence. Stripping away the mystique attached to what judges do and making explicit the process by which ethical dilemmas are confronted respects the community's vital interest in judicial standards and their maintenance.*

7. At paragraph 7 of the Guidelines the Bangalore Principles are related in the following manner;

The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct were initiated by the United Nations in 2001 and, after wide consultation, were endorsed at the of the United Nations Human Rights Commission at Geneva in 2003.

Their stated intention is:

*"To establish standards for ethical conduct of judges. They are designed to provide guidance to judges and to afford the judiciary a framework for regulating judicial conduct. **They are also intended to assist members of the Executive and Legislature, and lawyers and the public in general, to better understand and support the judiciary**".*

8. At 9, in summary the principles are recorded as being;

- (i) **Judicial independence is a prerequisite to the rule of law and a fundamental guarantee of a fair trial. A judge shall therefore uphold and exemplify judicial independence in both its individual and institutional aspects.**

- (ii) **Impartiality is essential** to the proper discharge of the judicial office. It applies not only to the decision itself but also the process by which the decision is made.
- (iii) **Integrity** is essential to the proper discharge of the judicial office.
- (iv) **Propriety, and the appearance of propriety**, are essential to the performance of all of the activities of the judge.
- (v) **Ensuring equality of treatment** to all before the **courts is essential** to the due performance of the judicial office.
- (vi) **Competence and diligence are prerequisites** to the due performance of judicial office.

These guiding principles overlap to some degree but are designed to enhance public confidence in the independence and impartiality of the judiciary.

9. The following statements are recorded in the guidelines that underpin the principles, and which I believe Judge Hinton is somewhat confused about relating to his use of his powers as granted by statute, and to thankfully a much lesser extent, the common law as to inherent powers [not that such powers are significant at the bottom of the Judicial ladder]. I feel that Judge Hinton considers himself above the law and beyond criticism, in which he is thankfully as mistaken as his other apparent beliefs;

11. **Judicial independence is sometimes mistakenly perceived as a privilege enjoyed by judges. In fact, it is a cornerstone of our system of government in a democratic society and a safeguard of the freedom and rights of the citizen under the rule of law.**
18. Judges should always take care that their conduct, official or private, does not undermine their institutional or individual independence, or the public appearance of independence.
46. **The primary obligation of a judge is to determine the case before him or her according to law**
47. **The judge must hear a case in accordance with the principles of natural justice and on the evidence in the case. Communication between the judge and any party in the absence of the other party to the case is not permissible, except in proceedings properly heard ex parte.**
48. **It is important for judges to maintain a standard of behaviour in court that is consistent with the status of judicial office and does not diminish the confidence of litigants in particular, and the public in general, in the ability, integrity, impartiality and independence of the judge.**
51. A judge must be firm in maintaining proper conduct during a hearing. Intervention is appropriate but should be moderate. It is important a judge does not appear from interventions to have reached a conclusion prematurely or, in the case of criminal trials before a jury, to have reached a view of guilt or innocence.
52. A judge should remember that informal exchanges between the judge and counsel **may convey an impression that the judge and counsel are treating the proceedings as if they were an activity of an exclusive group. This should be kept in mind, particularly in the case where there is an unrepresented litigant,** but the caution extends to all cases.

10. The judge's decision ignores perjury and indicates that he wishes to hide the evidence that proved perjury and pedophilia which could involve New Zealand's international obligations relating to the Mutual Assistance In Criminal Matters Act 1992, and the various declarations of the United Nations relating to the protection of children from sexual exploitation. This is not part of his behaviour that is strictly appealable as it could be alleged to be scandalous as I am saying that Judge Hinton should face inquiries as being a facilitator of suppressing evidence of a paedophilia ring involving judges, lawyers, and local businessmen.
11. The judge then rules that the perjurious applicant can apply ex parte for further publication suppression orders, when the only reason for discontinuance was, as a result of the clear perjury, and the judges only reason for stating that the applicant could make an ex-parte application for name suppression was to threaten me about making the perjury and the pedophilia public through the media, and what had occurred as a result of the perjury.
12. What I cannot accept is that a judge of any level of competence, and one that is not corrupt would seek to, when I could not attend due to further death threats from Mr Blomfield, as a result of Mr Blomfield's homosexual relationship with the applicant's husband, take the fraudulent applicants side, to the extent that he;
 - 12.1 Grants a discontinuance without;
 - 12.1.1 Giving reasons for the acceptance of the filed discontinuance without addressing;
 - 12.1.1.1 The need for an affidavit in support, and insuring that the respondent had copies of the application and the affidavit in support to enable a fair hearing, irrelevant of a fair determination of the application.
 - 12.1.1.2 The need to address my application that the applicant address my allegations and annexures which proved the pedophilia and perjury, and sought to have the applicant, and her lawyer, and others involved, held accountable for perjury.
13. I have more allegations to make against the District Court Judge and the staff at Auckland which include serious allegations against court staff interfering with the

course of justice, but that is for another time, other than to say that they directly relate to interfering with filed documents changing jurisdiction from the Family Court back to the District Court, and changing the status from ex parte to inter partes, so that the offenders that have been victimizing me, are made aware of the allegations against them, and the evidence that I hold in support of those allegations. These changes were so significant that they must amount to a conspiracy likely involving Judge Hinton wanting to deal with my separate proceedings.

14. To protect myself I have sent this correspondence to numerous media outlets.
15. I have a significant amount of evidence that has been secreted which I want to provide to an honest judge, or panel of judges, but am deeply concerned that what I seek in being before an honest judge does not actually exist. I rely on and maintain my protection from such criminality from the judiciary pursuant to the NZBORA 1990 and the ICCPR.
16. I am concerned as to the possibility that I may be killed to keep secret what has occurred. Judge Hinton has also denied me access to the court file, and his notes made allegedly during the hearing, and the audio and transcript of the alleged hearing. I have doubts that there was even a hearing. But the audio will be very interesting if one actually exists. If one does not exist that will prove the conspiracy.
17. This case is probably a case that will redefine corruption as cited in the Taito Phillip Fields case. I'm thankful for the Internet and its search engines every day as they make lawyers an irrelevancy. Given my experience of corruption of Judicial Officers and staff, I feel strongly that there needs to be a high level investigation into the current state of this countries judiciary.
18. I seek that you look at the file, inquire as to why the orders were made in my absence, when the judge was aware of the threats against me, and why the Judge did not detail my allegations and my applications relating to perjury and contempt before allowing the applicant to discontinue proceedings without the issue of costs being dealt with by memorandum.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Karl Roe', written over a horizontal line.

Karl Roe