



Maritime Rights Organisation WA <maritimerightsorgwa@gmail.com>

ABROLHOS ISLANDS AND MID WEST TRAWL FISHERY PAXTON ISSUE

2 messages

Maritime Rights Organisation WA <maritimerightsorgwa@gmail.com>
To: minister.punch@dpc.wa.gov.au

Wed, Jul 26, 2023 at 5:48 PM

Further to my email 25.7.23 regarding the transfer referred to in paragraph 2 of your email to me dated 24.4.23, i would like to add further relevant information and evidence relating to my proof of beneficial ownership, prior to the transfer 3.5.91, the LFBL licensees fraud, Peter Rogers legislated obligations, and his comments relating to the transfer, request for clarification of ownership, by the LFBL licensees, and the licencing system.

I am also requesting a meeting with you to discuss this issue.

On 17.11.89 i signed an offer and acceptance to buy G249 on 30.11.90. see Attachment pg 7pgs 1 2 +3

The Contract is to buy G249 having ONE trawl unit attached and an Onslow Prawn Licence. The contract was conditional on the licences being transferable, as the Onslow Licence wasn't. Fisheries had a meeting late 1990 and decided to leave the Onslow Licences non-transferable. This frustrated the contract.

On 15.5.90 i had my AIMWTF licence No 1921 being ONE trawl unit transferred to G249 so i could fish TWO trawl units.

NB: no receipt of stamp duty accompanied this transfer. There was no change of Beneficial Ownership. See attachments pages 51, 52, 53, previous email, Peter Millington as Director of Licensing confirming this.

At the end of the contract, now frustrated, i owed \$3000.00 on the lease payments, Fred Blenkinsop independent of his partners sold my ONE trawl unit licence, telling me when i found out "i'll teach you a thing or two about business". He committed Fraud.

I approached Fred Blenkinsop's lawyers, who realising their client had committed Fraud, attempted to get the licence back. See Attachment pg 31 Our clients are agreeable in principle to the "Paxton endorsement" being returned to him. The new licence holder refused to return the licence, then i was offered the sale price less the \$3000 outstanding. I did not accept.

See also letter from LFBL Licensees partners JF & KA Fay. Attachment pg 32. receiving proceeds of sale less outstanding lease debt.

So that's how i lost my licence, stolen because i owed \$3000.

See Also Attachments pages 23, 26 pg 2, Endorsement was Paxton's, signed Fred Blenkinsop.

Attachment pg 49 K FAY Stat Dec 29.12.93, confirming Mark Paxton's beneficial Ownership, and Fred Blenkinsop's fraudulent sale of the unit.

Attachment pg 58, 59, 60 J Fay 22.3.94, signed statement also confirming Mark Paxton's ownership and Fred Blenkinsop's crime.

Then everything changed, Fred Blenkinsop realised he was as LFBL holder the "CONSIDERED OWNER" of my licence.

See Attachment pg 34, 13.11.92 Final position will be determined by the advice we receive from the Department.

See Attachment pg 35, 35 pg 2. This is the request to Peter Rogers seeking the Department to clarify the ownership of a single rig licence.

It then refers to both Fred Blenkinsop and Mark Paxton having had contact with Peter Millington, re both claiming ownership of the Twin Rig licence. I never claimed ownership of the Twin rig lic just my single unit being half the Twin. You should note that Peter Millington in Attachments 51, 52, 53 confirms my beneficial ownership of the single unit. It also refers to the contract to buy G249 with ONE unit attached as a contract to buy a Twin rig licence which it isn't. And concludes with a request to clarify ownership of the twin endorsement.

Attachment 40 is the reply, it is a licence history of my single unit including its transfer to G249 and the statement "The licensees of the "Panama were JF & KA Faye and Blenkinsop Nominees P/L.

This is the problem, Peter Rogers' dogged refusal to recognise beneficial ownership only "CONSIDERED OWNERSHIP" and his refusal to recognise the Department's Duty of Care to beneficial owners.

NB: as mentioned in the previous email CONSIDERED OWNERS but not beneficial owners Jim Mace and Andre Hoskins were sentenced to 4 years goal for the same offence perpetrated by Fred Blenkinsop. Creating a precedent that the licencing system did not protect beneficial ownership and could be easily used to commit Fraud. As Peter Rogers had already been informed of in our meeting 17.2.93.

Under the then WA Public Sector Code of Ethics Peter Rogers failed,

[A] Report Fraud

[B] Act openly and promptly to help resolve issues

[C] Inform others about decisions and actions that affect them

[D] Minimise risk and harm, and

[E] Be conscientious and scrupulous in the performance of public duty.

These breaches were for the purpose of concealing the Department's Failure of Duty of Care and affectively aiding and abetting a FRAUD.

See Attachment pg 185 being pg 3 of my letter to Peter Rogers' 14.2.94 that was accepted by Peter Rogers as the basis of the investigation held in 2004 and 2005, listing 5 points establishing the above PSSC of Ethics.