

From: Shane Dowling [mailto:shanedowling@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 8 August 2014 12:31 PM
To: ghambly@fairfaxmedia.com.au; fwestgarth@fairfaxmedia.com.au;
ghywood@fairfaxmedia.com.au
Subject: Joe Hockey v Fairfax Media

Dear Ms Hambly

I publish a website and I have some questions regarding the Joe Hockey defamation matter which is obviously of public interest. The barrister you have retained, Sandy Dawson, has recently been criticised to the extreme by Justice Ian Harrison of the Supreme Court of NSW in another defamation matter. One example is Justice Harrison said "*I reject entirely any suggestion or submission*" by Sandy Dawson in relation to the lies that Mr Dawson was saying in court from the Bar Table.

As you would know this is a breach of the barristers rules. For starters it breaches Section 63 of the Barrister Rules which says:

63. A barrister must not allege any matter of fact in: (a) any court document settled by the barrister; (b) any submission during any hearing; (c) the course of an opening address; or (d) the course of a closing address or submission on the evidence; unless the barrister believes on reasonable grounds that the factual material already available provides a proper basis to do so.

I detail Mr Dawson's corrupt conduct further on my website in a post titled "*Sandy Dawson Barrister-at-law. He's not even a private of the court let alone an officer of the court*".

Given Sandy Dawson has been caught out lying and deceiving in court which I know for a fact that your external lawyer Leanne Norman from Banki Haddock Fiora Lawyers is fully aware can you please answer the following questions.

The questions:

1. The matter covers alleged corrupt conduct by Joe Hockey which concerns all Australians and goes to Mr Hockey's suitability to be Treasurer and a MP, so why have you retained a barrister whose honesty is so severely tainted given the judgment of Justice Harrison?
2. One might assume that Fairfax Media are planning on lying and deceiving in court in their defence in the defamation matter given you have retained Mr Dawson. Is this true? And if not why would Fairfax Media put themselves in a position where the public might think that?
3. Who was the person who made the decision to retain Sandy Dawson to represent Fairfax Media?
4. If you look at Justice Harrison's judgement which was handed down on the 24th of April 2014 you will see that Mr Dawson was beaten by a self-

represented blogger. Why would Fairfax Media retain and pay big dollars to someone like Mr Dawson who cannot even beat a layman in court?

Can you please answer the questions ASAP as I publish soon and I might have follow-up questions.

Regards

Shane Dowling
[Kangaroo Court of Australia](#)
Ph 0411 238 704