

COURT TRANSCRIPT STATE VS HICKEY PAGE 1 - 26

20210112/D1/BMC/MAG/17/Coates, Magistrate

BENCH: So just hang on. For the purpose of this matter in view of the fact that the order made by Brother Simpson at the Richlands Magistrates Court will – that will be exhibit number 1, because it's not contested.

5

EXHIBIT #1 ADMITTED AND MARKED

10 BENCH: In relation to this matter – well, this says that the registrant contact is a person called LANSА Trust?---That's a bank account.

Well, where's the search of LANSА Trust?

15 MR RAUT: Did you conduct any search about LANSА?---No.

No?---No, not for that one.

20 BENCH: Smerff Electrical registrant is – the registrant is a contact called LANSА Trust. And the technical contract – contact is Bluehost Inc?---Yes.

MR RAUT: Your Honour – for the purpose of this proceeding, your Honour, I rely on the evidence that the post box contact details were linked with SmerffElectrical.com. Because Mr Hickey had - - -

25 BENCH: Well, Mr Hickey has conceded that it's his website.

MR RAUT: Yes. Yes, your Honour.

30 BENCH: But this search doesn't assist the Prosecution's case at all. It's SmerffElectrical.com. He says that that's his, but the resident contact is a person called LANSА Trust according to the search.

MR RAUT: Your Honour, I withdraw that document, your Honour, in terms of - - -

35 BENCH: Right. That doesn't assist at all. Was that your point, Mr Hickey? I mean, you say that it is your website.

40 DEFENDANT: Well, if it assists the court I accept that it is – the website is owned by my business and LANSА Trust was set up by the accountant to – to do the – whatever they have to do for the tax. So I accept that.

BENCH: All right. Okay. All right, thank you.

45 DEFENDANT: Thank you.

MR RAUT: Now, in terms of this business, did you make any inquiry or investigation how many people are involved and – instead of – in addition to Mr

COURT TRANSCRIPT STATE VS HICKEY PAGE 1 -51

20210112/D1/BMC/MAG/17/Coates, Magistrate

BENCH: Yes. That's the problem?---I don't accept that objection, because the – the invoices from SiteGround - - -

Well, let me just have a look at them so I can determine - - -

5

MR RAUT: Yeah. Yes.

WITNESS: Well, there's' the – a copy for the court there.

10 BENCH: - - - whether they're admissible or not. I just need you to – you've got them there with you?---There's three copies. So that's the copy for the court.

Okay. Okay. Well - - -?---I would like to say that the invoices - - -

15 No. No. No. Just let me have a look - - -?---Okay.

- - - at them?---Yep. Yep.

20 No, they're not admissible in their current form, because they don't comply with the rules of evidence?---That might be the case for - - -

No. No. Just – these are the two I've got. I've just looked at - - -?---No, there's eight pages there, or 10 pages.

25 Yes. Yes. Yes. I've had a look at this?---Well, the invoices are admissible, because they were made during the course of someone's employment, and they form – they form – if we check the Evidence Act, they form part – part of a record that was made - - -

30 Yes. But it would have to be the person who employed them. That means you'd have to call the person, and unless you're in a position to do that they're - - -?---That's not – that's not true. They're – they're - - -

35 They're not admissible as of right in accordance with the Evidence Act?---I don't accept that. As standalone evidence - - -

40 Well, that's my ruling on these documents. So I can understand how a person might feel that they would be, but under the rules they're not?---I'd – I'd like to repeat that they were made during the course of someone's employment as a regular record of – of what was done during the day, and as such they should be admitted under the Evidence Act.

No. They can't be. You'd have to call the person who made the record, and they'd have to confirm that?---Nevertheless, Gillespie - - -

45

You didn't - - -?---Gillespie hasn't – I'd like to give – evidence as to the origins of the documents that I've downloaded.

ANYTHING IN RED IS ADDED BY AUTHOR TO HIGHLIGHT INCONSISTENCY

Notice how the structure changes when Hickey is Arguing with Coates about the admissibility of evidence? Who is saying what? Why would it change? The document structure changes to deliberately obfuscate the interaction. Hickey is right. His evidence by law was admissible. The judge refused, and broke the law by doing so
Even the court record keepers are involved. They intentionally conceal misconduct in our courts.