

30th May 2017

Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee
Parliament House
George Street
Brisbane, QLD 4000

Dear Sir/Madam,

HONOURABLE ANEGLO VASTA (REVERSAL OF REMOVAL) BILL 2017

I am writing in support of the above. The Supreme Court of Queensland on the 7th June 1989 lost a brilliant legal mind with no substance to the removal.

The Honourable Angelo Vasta should never have been removed as a Judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland as there were no grounds or legal basis for his removal.

It is incomprehensible that the basis for the removal was founded on allegations of Honourable Angelo Vasta's **private affairs**. Private affairs which have absolutely nothing to do with removing a Judge as they are NOT based on Honourable Angelo Vasta's discharge of his judicial duties, which I understand could be such a basis to remove a Judge.

Further, when addressing these non-judicial duty related private affair accusations:

- The ATO upon investigation found that the Honourable Angelo Vasta's tax affairs were legitimate.
- Other fictitious, unfounded accusations into Honourable Angelo Vasta's private affairs have since been dismissed or proven to be untrue.

To have allowed the above allegations into someone's private affairs be publicly aired is defamation. To have allowed them to be heard in court as a basis to illegally remove someone from office is unjust (not to mention unnecessarily wasting court time and taxpayers money).

Notwithstanding that this very public attack slurs the good name and reputation of an outstanding Legal Mind, but that this unlawful removal was done with 'numerous deficiencies in the legislation' with the most serious I quote:



Disclaimer: Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation



- a) the terms of reference were too wide and examined all aspects of the Judge's life;
- b) the legislation prevented any decisions of the Commission to be made the subject of review in a court of law;
- c) there was no provision for the Judge to appeal any adverse findings of the Commission;
- d) if the Parliament sought to have the Commission make findings of fact to assist the Legislative Assembly, any provision that gave the Inquiry the authority to submit an opinion as to whether the Judge should be removed was wrong and possibly unconstitutional, since that power belongs to the Parliament and to the Parliament alone and cannot be delegated.

I would also like to know why the following was allowed to happen:

During the process, members of parliament wished to adjourn this for seven days, however the Government declined and pushed with a motion to a vote of the house without adjournment. They also denied a concerted effort for a conscience vote for all members of parliament. None of these actions were fair or executed in the spirit of the law, no division was called and there was intense disapproval from the opposition and other parties. The vote was determined only by voting on the voices.

The Honourable Angelo Vasta **should never** have been removed as there were no grounds to do so. Further when such unfounded accusations into his private life, which bear nothing on his judicial function were dismissed or proved to be untrue, the Honourable Angelo Vasta should have been reinstated straight away.

It is now 2017 and this wrong doing hasn't been corrected. I note that the Honourable Angelo Vasta is of an age whereby he cannot be reinstated, however this wrong needs to be made right by this reversal of removal bill 2017 being approved.

In closing, I must say that is not only a classic case of gross miscarriage of justice but it is also an important case of denial of natural justice in that even convicted criminals have a right of appeal against heinous crimes. Honourable Angelo Vasta was denied any right of appeal against these allegations into his private affairs, allegations which were dismissed or proved to be untrue, that were used to unlawfully remove his appointment from the Supreme Court in 1989.

It is of critical importance that the very parliament that dismissed him is now under a moral and legal obligation to correct this injustice by passing the reversal of removal bill 2017.

Kind Regards

Danielle George, CA, B.Comm, C.Dec
DG Accounting & Taxation



Disclaimer: Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation

PO Box 1933, Toowong, QLD 4066

Phone: (07) 3168 2995

www.dgaccountingtax.com.au