



*Because truth matters*

Request 8. To Doug McKay

My email dated 23 November 2012 as below

This email was addressed to the Mayor, Please advise if the Mayor stated that he had never heard about my matter ever received this email. If not why not.

If Wendy Brandon diverted it could you please under privacy act provide the request from the Mayor to Wendy asking her to block or divert my email.

If this was diverted from the mayor please ask him to meet and discuss this with me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Grace Haden'.

Grace Haden

Licensed Private Investigator

**From:** [Grace Haden](#)  
**To:** [len.brown@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:len.brown@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)  
**Cc:** ["info@ombudsman.parliament.nz"](mailto:info@ombudsman.parliament.nz); ["d.carter@ministers.govt.nz"](mailto:d.carter@ministers.govt.nz); ["charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz"](mailto:charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz); ["Catriona McDougal"](#); ["kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz"](mailto:kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz); ["Rob Stock \(SUN\)"](#); ["Councillor Sharon Stewart"](#)  
**Subject:** request for urgent meeting with mayor  
**Date:** Friday, 23 November 2012 11:14:00 a.m.  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[5\\_mou\\_waitakere.pdf.pdf.pdf](#)

---

Good morning Mr Brown

As can be seen below it appears that counsel for Council is condoning and covering up gross corruption within council that of use of public office for private pecuniary Gain.

I believe that it is important that residents can report corruption to council without losing 7 years of their lives and be in danger of losing their home.

As a former lawyer you will understand the implications of a council manager contracting council services to himself under a pseudonym. The Mou attached is between a council manager tom Didovich and Mr Wells . Mr Wells went on to take the position of Mr Didovich and there by contracted to himself- Without declaring the conflict of interest in the application for the position.

He also re branded the council facilities so that the logos of the council pound and AWINZ were identical.



this was not in colour it was printed on a donation flyer along with the council Logo



these Logo's are still on the council premises and vehicles.

MAF commented [final draft audit 2008](#) "it was at times difficult during the audit to distinguish where the structure of AWINZ finished and where WCC began hence it was at times difficult to separate the AWINZ organisation from that of WCC. For example AWINZ inspectors are not employed by AWINZ but are all employees of WCC page 9 all personnel ( including the AWINZ inspectors ) based at the WCC animal accommodation facility (48 the concourse ) are employees of WCC It must be noted that AWINZ does not have any employees as such , apart from when they contract to the film industry to monitor AW issues, this did lead to some confusion regarding the demarcation between the two organisations"

The council employees were required to prioritise their duties to the fictional AWINZ, which in reality was the council manager Neil Wells , any Animal welfare prosecutions which came about was prosecuted By Mr Wells in his capacity as Barrister and the proceeds of prosecution went into a bank account he administered in the name animal welfare Institute of New Zealand and only he had control over.

It is unbelievable that this kind of action is condoned by you counsel Wendy Brandon .

These were public resources being used, public money used for set up and private pecuniary gain for an employee who was contracting to himself for the use of council property and staff. There was no benefit to council and this had never formally gone through council

Why is this being condoned. Why do ordinary citizens think this is wrong and why the does the United Nations call this corruption when Auckland council condones it?

Could I please have an urgent meeting with you so that this practice can be exposed. I have evidence that there are other ventures within council which likewise are corrupt.

Regards  
Grace Haden  
Licenced Private Investigator

**VeriSure**

*Because truth matters*

Phone (09) 520 1815  
mobile 027 286 8239  
visit us at [www.verisure.co.nz](http://www.verisure.co.nz)

---

**From:** Grace Haden [mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz]  
**Sent:** Friday, 23 November 2012 10:08 a.m.  
**To:** 'Wendy Brandon'  
**Cc:** 'info@ombudsman.parliament.nz'; 'd.carter@ministers.govt.nz'; 'charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz'; 'Catriona McDougall'; 'kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz'; 'Mayor Len Brown'; 'Rob Stock (SUN)'; 'Councillor Sharon Stewart'  
**Subject:** RE: request for urgent investigation by council

Wendy

You would not be re litigating anything. There is a huge difference between a defamation

claim and the claim of corruption. Why does it take 7 years to bring corruption to the attention of council ?

The court has been used to pervert the course of justice and as I have told you there is a proceeding currently before the court for obtaining a judgement by fraud.

You appear to have a very back to front way of dealing with corruption .

I would presume that you have assessed the information which I have sent you and that you are now actively condoning the use of council premises for private pecuniary gain by council employees and that you are condoning council managers contracting to themselves. You are now allowing your office to be used for the concealment of crime and I will be making a complaint to the law society accordingly.

You are making me out to be vexatious based on the uncorroborated evidence of Mr Wells who was compelled to deceive the court because of the implications the truth had on his career.

You are condoning the use of council facilities fraudulently and you are not acting in the interest of the administration of justice .

Questioning corruption has cost me an obscene amount of money. Do you honestly think that any one in their right mind will ever question corruption in council again.

Those who are employed are quietly disposed of by confidentiality clauses , those who are not employed like myself are hammered into the ground and totally annihilated through persons like yourself who will not even look at the most basic of documents and asses that there is something terribly wrong.

Wendy attack has always been the best form of defence and by you attacking my character and reputation using judgements which are before the court for having been obtained by fraud are denigrating me You are attacking me because you cannot attack the issue . the issue is that council resources have been used fraudulently and you are ignoring it.

You are doing everything in your power to get me out of the picture. You know that through your actions Corruption will flourish in Auckland city because you are condoning it. Just let the rate payers pay more so more people can gain privately.

This is a well-documented and researched example of corruption it is under your nose and you don't even want to learn from it.. that is not just ignorance it goes to negligence.

A lawyer with integrity would look at the documents I have brought to your attention and would act to ensure that councillors are briefed on the perpetration of corruption in council learning from the past prevents expensive mistakes in the future.

How much more is going on and how much more are you condoning? What is in it for You Wendy? Surely your objective should be to protect the councils assets and resources and ensure that they are being used for a proper purpose. You are not doing that Wendy and it

appears to me that you are failing the people of Auckland.

I do have to wonder who is paying your wages, strangely enough I thought it was the rate payers not employees within council who have your loyalty to ensure that corruption is concealed.

Regards  
Grace Haden

**VeriSure**

*Because truth matters*

Phone (09) 520 1815  
mobile 027 286 8239  
visit us at [www.verisure.co.nz](http://www.verisure.co.nz)

---

**From:** Wendy Brandon [<mailto:Wendy.Brandon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>]  
**Sent:** Friday, 23 November 2012 9:10 a.m.  
**To:** 'Grace Haden'  
**Cc:** [info@ombudsman.parliament.nz](mailto:info@ombudsman.parliament.nz); [d.carter@ministers.govt.nz](mailto:d.carter@ministers.govt.nz); [charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz); Catriona McDougall; [kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz); Mayor Len Brown; 'Rob Stock (SUN)'; Councillor Sharon Stewart  
**Subject:** RE: request for urgent investigation by council

Dear Ms Haden

I refer to my email correspondence of yesterday and confirm that if you wish to complain about the responses you have received to your various LGOIMA requests of the past weeks, you have the right to complain to the Ombudsman. I have read both of the High Court and District Court judgments (attached) and it would be inappropriate for me to engage in any re-litigation of matters that have been heard and determined by the courts.

As per below, I am satisfied that over the past several years you have received all of the information held by the former WCC in relation to AWINZ. No new information relating to AWINZ has come into existence in Auckland Council. Given the very strong findings in both the District Court and High Court judgments, your continued requests are vexatious and are accordingly, declined.

Yours faithfully

Wendy Brandon  
General Counsel

22/11/12

Dear Ms Haden

For the record:

1. I did not respond to a LGOIMA request from you within an hour. You made the request in question on 24 October 2012, and I responded on 2 November. On 5 November I confirmed that response. My response was made in good faith and I am satisfied that the WCC documents (dating back to 2000 and 2008) cannot now be located and possibly never existed. In one of your emails and/or your request you alleged that the information was "actively concealed" from Waitakere City Councillors and Council officers at the time so its not surprising that it cannot now be located, or its existence confirmed.

2. My response was given in good faith.

3. The information you have listed below is not the same information that you requested on 24 October. Accordingly, it has been treated and considered as a fresh request and it is refused pursuant to section 17(h) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, because it is vexatious.

4. This response to your most recent request is similarly made in good faith and because I am satisfied on the basis of my inquiries that all of the information held by the former Waitakere City Council in relation to AWINZ has been provided to you in response to the many, many requests for information you have made to both Auckland Council and Waitakere City Council since approximately 2006. I am also mindful of the Decisions of the District Court and High Court (attached) and the findings and orders made in those judgments, and your apparent refusal to observe due process either in the context of the court orders or the LGOIMA process.

5. As always, you have the right by way of a complaint to an Ombudsman under section 27(3) of the LGOIMA to seek an investigation and review of this refusal.

Yours faithfully

Wendy Brandon

---

**From:** Grace Haden [<mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 22 November 2012 5:10 PM  
**To:** Wendy Brandon  
**Cc:** [info@ombudsman.parliament.nz](mailto:info@ombudsman.parliament.nz); [d.carter@ministers.govt.nz](mailto:d.carter@ministers.govt.nz); [charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz); Catriona McDougall; [kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz); Mayor Len Brown; 'Rob Stock (SUN)'; Councillor Sharon Stewart  
**Subject:** RE: request for urgent investigation by council

Wendy

Are you aware that the decision which you are referring to was obtained by fraud. It is currently before the court to set aside the judgement .

Whistle-blowers have historically been targets for defamation claims.

In any case it has nothing to do with the complaint that the council premises , staff and infrastructure were being used by the fictional organisation AWINZ which was in reality a private enterprise run by the manager of dog control . a form of corruption called public office for private pecuniary advantage.

As a lawyer you would be shocked at how the defamation matter was won.

It is extremely difficult to win if they use false claim to create costs against you, strike out your defence of truth and honest opinion, skip the formal proof hearing, use your affidavit in mitigation of damages against you and then they commit perjury in their uncorroborated evidence.

I was in the LCRO with regards to the conduct of the lawyers concerned on Tuesday. They were exonerated by the law society when Neil Wells provided the law society with fabricated evidence- relying on a council employee to manufacture a minute dated 2006 in 2011 when overwhelming independent evidence exists that the 2006 minute had been lost in a computer crash.

In the meantime all this would have been averted if the council lawyer at the time Denis Sheard had actually gone and spoken to the dog control officers and questioned why Mr Wells did not declare his conflict of interests in his application for the position of manager animal welfare. Instead three council employees were dismissed because they were seen as a threat to exposing this venture.

AS council lawyer you need only look at one document to see the red flags that document is the attached or available at

<http://anticorruptionnz.files.wordpress.com/2010/01/mou-waitakere.pdf>

1. Animal welfare institute did not exist it is not a legal entity in its own right, council did not have a copy of any evidence of its existence.
2. Wells and Didovich sign the MOU Didovich for council wells for the fictional organisation
3. Wells later took over Didovich's role and became both parties to this agreement he never declared the conflict of interest in his application  
<http://www.transparency.net.nz/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/4-oct-2005-job-application.pdf>

If that doesn't have alarms ringing then I don't know what will, if you can condone such evidence without investigation then I have serious concerns about your integrity.

Didovich is intrinsically entwined in this whole matter, he paid for legal opinions to facilitate the setting up of AWINZ, he paid Wells to set up AWINZ and later became a trustee of a trust which was used to cover the whole thing up. Yet you continue to attack me!

Mr Wells re-branded the council facilities so that the logos of the council pound and AWINZ were identical.



this was not in colour it was printed on

a donation flyer along with the council Logo



these Logo's are still on the council premises and vehicles.

Maf commented [final draft audit 2008](#) "it was at times difficult during the audit to distinguish where the structure of AWINZ finished and where WCC began hence it was at times difficult to separate the AWINZ organisation from that of WCC. For example AWINZ inspectors are not employed by AWINZ but are all employees of WCC page 9 all personnel ( including the AWINZ inspectors ) based at the WCC animal accommodation facility (48 the concourse ) are employees of WCC It must be noted that AWINZ does not have any employees as such , apart from when they contract to the film industry to monitor AW issues, this did lead to some confusion regarding the demarcation between the two organisations"

Wendy if you can in all fairness ignore all the evidence that I have put before you then you are either incompetent or corrupt yourself.

You are all that stands between the public's money being misappropriated

If you do not act then I take it then that you condone

1. managers contracting to themselves
2. changing the logos of a council facility so that they are almost identical to those of their fictitious entity
3. making money from the work of council staff as a side line

and that such action then does not warrant investigation . You simply prefer to shoot the messenger.

Wendy as an in house solicitor I am advising you that your obligations are to the rule of law and the administration of justice You have a legal obligation not to use your office for fraud. Section 66 Of the crimes act parties to the offence must strike close to the heart. If you actively cover up the corruption and the fraud then you are not only in breach of your rules of ethical conduct you will also become an accessory after the fact.



I look forward to an invitation from you to meet with you so that I can place all the evidence I have before you . Ordinary people get it they understand they are appalled.

The reasons I have asked for more information is that under the public records act your records should be available and archived. The fact that the records are missing on such a contentious matter is another red flag which you should be noting.

The council has not once investigated this matter had the council acted properly in the beginning I could have been spared many years of character assassination and a lot of expense.

I am able to come in and see you tomorrow or next week and I will personally place the documents in front of you which will illustrate that there was a serious issue in Waitakere dog and stock control.

**Please let me know what time suits you and I will be there.**

**The council cannot condone corruption - If this corruption occurred and you have allowed a blind eye to be turned then what else is being ignored?**

Regards  
Grace Haden

**VeriSure**

*Because truth matters*

Phone (09) 520 1815  
mobile 027 286 8239  
visit us at [www.verisure.co.nz](http://www.verisure.co.nz)

---

**From:** Wendy Brandon [<mailto:Wendy.Brandon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 22 November 2012 3:29 p.m.  
**To:** 'Grace Haden'  
**Subject:** RE: request for urgent investigation by council

Dear Ms Haden

For the record:

1. I did not respond to a LGOIMA request from you within an hour. You made the request in question on 24 October 2012, and I responded on 2 November. On 5 November I confirmed that response. My response was made in good faith and I am satisfied that the WCC documents (dating back to 2000 and 2008) cannot now be located and possibly never existed. In one of your emails and/or your request you alleged that the information was "actively concealed" from Waitakere City Councillors and Council officers at the time so its not surprising that it cannot now

be located, or its existence confirmed.

2. My response was given in good faith.

3. The information you have listed below is not the same information that you requested on 24 October. Accordingly, it has been treated and considered as a fresh request and it is refused pursuant to section 17(h) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, because it is vexatious.

4. This response to your most recent request is similarly made in good faith and because I am satisfied on the basis of my inquiries that all of the information held by the former Waitakere City Council in relation to AWINZ has been provided to you in response to the many, many requests for information you have made to both Auckland Council and Waitakere City Council since approximately 2006. I am also mindful of the Decisions of the District Court and High Court (attached) and the findings and orders made in those judgments, and your apparent refusal to observe due process either in the context of the court orders or the LGOIMA process.

5. As always, you have the right by way of a complaint to an Ombudsman under section 27(3) of the LGOIMA to seek an investigation and review of this refusal.

Yours faithfully

Wendy Brandon

---

**From:** Grace Haden [<mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 8 November 2012 4:25 PM  
**To:** Doug McKay  
**Cc:** [info@ombudsman.parliament.nz](mailto:info@ombudsman.parliament.nz); Wendy Brandon; Mayor Len Brown; [d.carter@ministers.govt.nz](mailto:d.carter@ministers.govt.nz); Catriona McDougall; [charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:charles.chauvel@parliament.govt.nz); [kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz); Councillor Sharon Stewart  
**Subject:** request for urgent investigation by council

Good afternoon Doug

I made a LGOIMA request from Your solicitor Wendy Brandon.

I admire her efficiency as within an hour she had ascertained that the documents I requested were not available she stated "I confirm that the information you requested cannot be located and/or does not exist."

As I cannot doubt the integrity of your lawyer, who is after all an officer of the court and expected to uphold the rule of law, and being a council employee she is bound by the provisions of the local government act with regards to transparency, I have to accept her response and apply the implications of this response to my LGOIMA request

It is not for the counsel for council to conceal corruption. She has a duty to ensure transparency and accountability and as a lawyer her honesty and therefore her word can be assured.

What transpires in applying her response to the following request brings about serious issues of concern and I ask the council to immediately investigate this in the interest of the public.

The LGOIMA request was as follows I have added under each paragraph what the logical interpretation must be given the reply of Wendy Brandon ... I requested

1. documents which show that council has investigated the use of the council facilities , staff and resources by AWINZ.
  - a. If the information does not exist this means that the council has never investigated, this is appalling as it proves that the council is being negligent with contracts, conflicts of interest and allowing the public resources to be used for private pecuniary gain
2. Documents and policies which allow the managers of divisions such as dog and stock control to independently contract / [sign agreements](#) to third parties and the processes which need to be followed. E.g. Mr Didovich [writes on behalf of Waitakere city council](#) , what authority did he have to give these assurances on behalf of council?
  - a. If the information does not exist this means that the council has not got any policies for council managers and it appears to be a free for all , it must be of concern then that a council manager signed an agreement which allowed a third party to use the councils facilities, staff and vehicles for free. This would not be a wise use of councils funds.
3. Mr Wells in the guise of AWINZ also told MAF that AWINZ was going to take over the animal welfare services please provide any documentation discussion papers etc which would have given Mr Wells foundation for this statement. , see [application](#)
  - a. If the information does not exist this means that Mr Wells misled the minister , The council now being aware of this has a duty to ensure that the minister becomes aware that the council had no knowledge with regards to the AWINZ matter and that the parties who corresponded with him in th guise of council had no mandate to do so.
4. Invoices for the payment of Kensington swan for all legal opinions requested by council or by Dog and stock control for the legal opinions in 2000 which persuaded the Minister to give approval to AWINZ as an approved Organisation links to the legal opinion are here [initial opinion](#)  
[Draft](#) [final](#)

- a. If the information does not exist this means that the council manager involved engaged Kensington swan in his professional capacity and the council should make urgent enquiries as to who did pay for the services.
5. Why council continued to push for AWINZ to be approved when [crown law](#) said that it was ultra Vires and any minutes of any council meetings which gave a mandate for this use of council funds.- plus any documentation which considered the cost benefit analysis of this action.
  - a. If the information does not exist this means that the council was not involved in the animal welfare aspects of the dog control section and that tis now calls for an urgent investigation in view of the statements from MAF which recorded that AWINZ did operate from council premises.
6. What was Lesley Wears position with council and was the question raised [in the fax located here](#) addressed please provide a copy of the response
  - a. It therefore appears that Lesley Wear never received a response , I would however have thought that council might have known who she was since she was employed by council, perhaps this was overlooked by Ms Brandon, after all it was a lot of information that she got through in one hour.
7. In [an email Neil Wells](#) states "*while that could have been answered immediately by the council legal section , council decided to obtain independent legal opinion from Kensington Swann that opinion has now come to hand this week and confirms the previous legal opinion sent to MAF policy in past years "* Please provide all council documents which supports this statement and who in Waitakere city was waiting for directions as to where the Kensington swan letter should be sent to .
  - a. If the information does not exist this means that the council lawyer was circumvented and that the legal opinion which was obtained was not one which the council had requested or authorised , but had instead been requested by Mr Wells for his own purposes and apparently paid for by council. The legal opinion swayed the minister as he believed that the legal opinion came at the request of council. If this is not the case then it is important and the minister should be advised immediately that he has been misled.
8. All documents after 2000 relating to animal welfare were not made available to me, I request that these be made available for my perusal and copies as required arising from that.

- a. If these documents are still missing then Council should be asking questions as to why all documents relating to the dog and stock control division are missing, MR Wells the manager appears to have an issue with losing vital documents, the governance documents for AWINZ were missing, the trust deed was lost more than once despite there being two copies and now it transpires that he somehow lost/ misplaced all the animal welfare documents for council, I would have thought that losing all the documents for an entire department would have been a matter of concern. I now of three persons who were sacked by council for a lot less .

Corruption is a serious matter Doug. This matter has been swept under the carpet for the past 6 ½ years , Your counsel in looking for this information and discovering that it is all missing must be seeing the red flags of fraud. May I suggest that the council calls in the police or serious fraud office.

I can assist I have a chronology of documents to simplify the matter, I am a licenced private investigator and can tell you that those documents disclose the fact that council premises were being used by a fictitious organisation called Animal welfare institute of New Zealand and that Mr Didovich and Mr Wells colluded together to use the council resources for private pecuniary gain.

My summary is below, the hyperlinks open the documents shown .

This letter will also be on Transparency.net.nz so that those who are following this matter can be kept in the loop.

I would imagine that in view of the information which Ms Brandon has given me that it would be negligent of council not to investigate.

I am certain that this is the tip of the ice berg in council corruption and you will no doubt uncover more and thereby save rate payers millions.

As ever I am happy to assist.

Regards  
Grace Haden

**VeriSure**

*Because truth matters*

Phone (09) 520 1815  
mobile 027 286 8239  
visit us at [www.verisure.co.nz](http://www.verisure.co.nz)

---

**From:** Wendy Brandon  
[<mailto:Wendy.Brandon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 7 November 2012 2:53 p.m.  
**To:** 'Grace Haden'; Mayor Len Brown  
**Cc:** Councillor Penny Hulse; Councillor Cathy Casey; Councillor Richard Northey; Councillor Sandra Coney; Councillor Penny Webster; Councillor Mike Lee; Councillor John Walker; Councillor Sharon Stewart; Councillor Michael Goudie; Councillor Ann Hartley; Councillor Cameron Brewer; Councillor Christine Fletcher; Catriona McDougall; Councillor Alf Filipaina; Councillor George Wood; Councillor Des Morrison; Councillor Calum Penrose; Councillor Noelene Raffills; Wayne Walker - [wayne@waynewalker.co.nz](mailto:wayne@waynewalker.co.nz) (External); 'Dick Quax'; Councillor Arthur Anae; 'Bernard.Orsman@nzherald.co.nz'; [brian.rudman@nzherald.co.nz](mailto:brian.rudman@nzherald.co.nz)  
**Subject:** RE: Councillors kept in the dark with regards to corruption

Dear Ms Haden

As advised in my reply to your most recent requests for information, if you wish to make a complaint about Council's response, you must direct that complaint to the Office of the Ombudsman.

However, I confirm that the information you requested cannot be located and/or does not exist.

As to the remaining allegations, Council must obey the law. There is currently an injunction in place prohibiting you from making any statements or allegations "reviling or denigrating Mr Wells". This latest round of emails and other correspondence contain statements that clearly fall within the terms of the orders being the same or similar to those that gave rise to the granting of injunctive relief. Unless or until the injunction is dismissed, I am unable to take any further action.

Kind regards  
Wendy

---

**From:** Grace Haden [<mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 7 November 2012 2:08 PM  
**To:** Mayor Len Brown  
**Cc:** Councillor Penny Hulse; Councillor Cathy Casey; Councillor Richard Northey; Councillor Sandra Coney; Councillor Penny Webster; Councillor Mike Lee; Councillor John Walker; Councillor Sharon Stewart; Councillor Michael Goudie; Councillor Ann Hartley; Councillor Cameron Brewer; Councillor Christine Fletcher; Catriona McDougall; Councillor Alf Filipaina; Councillor George Wood; Councillor Des Morrison; Councillor Calum Penrose; Councillor Noelene Raffills; Wayne Walker - [wayne@waynewalker.co.nz](mailto:wayne@waynewalker.co.nz) (External); 'Dick Quax'; Councillor Arthur Anae; 'Bernard.Orsman@nzherald.co.nz'; [brian.rudman@nzherald.co.nz](mailto:brian.rudman@nzherald.co.nz); Wendy Brandon  
**Subject:** Councillors kept in the dark with regards to corruption

**Open letter and LGOIMA to Mayor Brown with regards to Corruption apparently being condoned by counsel**

**for Council .**

Sir, please find here with a most condescending reply from your [general counsel Wendy Brandon](#)

I originally [requested speaking rights](#) with regards to serious corruption which occurred within Waitakere city council, it involved public office for private pecuniary Gain and my assertion is backed with solid evidence. I followed this up with [LGOIMA requests](#) and [second LGOIMA](#) seeking the ability to discuss the matter with a councillor

Instead of solutions I receive a put down by Brandon who is severely neglectful of both her duties as an officer of the law and as a counsel to council

The [fundamental obligations of a lawyer are to the rule of law](#) and as such she is employed in a public capacity and is all that stands between the exposure and concealment of corruption.

AWINZ is an "organisation" run by the then dog and stock control manager and existed on council premises used the council staff and vehicles emblazoned with identical logos as used by AWINZ the "organisation" .

While council denied its existence MAF at a [time of an audit recorded](#) *"it was at times difficult during the audit to distinguish where the structure of AWINZ finished and where WCC began hence it was at times difficult to separate the AWINZ organisation from that of WCC. For example AWINZ inspectors are not employed by AWINZ but are all employees of WCC"*

Effectively this independently proves my allegations of Public office for private pecuniary gain .

Counsel has responded to me and attacked me( if you can't attack the issue it appears that you attack the person ) , she does not get the point that the issue I am raising has nothing to do with any court action but has everything to do with corruption within council.

Previous counsel for Waitakere Denis Sheard denied emphatically that AWINZ existed on the premises. The independent evidence which I have provided to council on the 21<sup>st</sup> October shows that this was the case.

Wendy Brandon should be asking questions with regards to

the MOU attached and be asking

1. Why was the council lawyer was not involved in the drafting and supervision of the [signing of the MOU with AWINZ](#) .
2. Why was Animal welfare services able to enter into an agreement with a trading name( AWINZ does not exist as a legal person ) and be questioning the research if any which was done to establish who represented the name the animal welfare institute of New Zealand. The document concerned is the [MOU attached and available here](#)
3. Why was Mr Wells employed by council without consideration to the conflict of interest this posed ,which by the way was [not declared on his application](#) ,
4. Further Counsel and Council should be aware that the manager whom [Mr Wells signed this MOU with](#) became a member of the so called trust which was set up as a [cover up on 5 December 2006](#)
5. And was the council aware that Mr Didovich had used [council funds to pay Mr Wells](#) to set up the trust ( this is one of many invoices .
6. And that [Mr Didovich collected and witnessed the signatures](#) of the alleged trustees of the 2000 AWINZ trust [while he was on leave](#) .
7. Mr Didovich also wrote to the minister approving of the use of staff, he did this on the letter heads of [North shore](#) and [Waitakere city council](#) . MAF were looking for assurances from council but only got these assurances from an accomplice a council manager without consultation through the proper avenues in council .” ***[MAF would appreciate a written assurance from the Waitakere and North Shore City Councils that they have the legal power to spend money derived from rating on animal welfare \(by paying inspectors when they undertake animal welfare work\).](#)***
  - a. It should be noted that [Lesley Wear asked for an explanation](#), and questioned what the risks were for council it would be good to see if this was ever addressed
8. Mr Didovich [also sought a legal opinion](#) , which circumvented the councils solicitors and obtained the Kensington swan opinion. When crown law opposed the involvement of council in the animal welfare work due to it being ultra vires a second legal opinion was sought. A draft was sent back to Didovich and then the final version came back which was a



decision the minister relied upon... this final document had information which indicates significant input from Mr Wells with his personal knowledge of the event on the select committee.

- a. Council should be asking why was the council lawyer left out of the loop ?
- b. What was the costing estimate how much did the legal opinion cost? And how was it paid, who authorised it.

I sincerely believe that Council is keeping the lid on this matter because by exposing it - it would open a can of worms.

By Way of LGOIMA I request

1. documents which show that council has investigated the use of the council facilities , staff and resources by AWINZ.
2. Documents and policies which allow the managers of divisions such as dog and stock control to independently contract / sign agreements to third parties and the processes which need to be followed. E.g. Mr Didovich [writes on behalf of Waitakere city council](#) , what authority did he have to give these assurances on behalf of council?
3. Mr Wells in the guise of AWINZ also told MAF that AWINZ was going to take over the animal welfare services please provide any documentation discussion papers etc which would have given Mr Wells foundation for this statement. , see [application](#)
4. Invoices for the payment of Kensington swan for all legal opinions requested by council or by Dog and stock control for the legal opinions in 2000 which persuaded the Minister to give approval to AWINZ as an approved Organisation links to the legal opinion are here [initial opinion](#) [Draft](#) [final](#)
5. Why council continued to push for AWINZ to be approved when [crown law](#) said that it was ultra Vires and any minutes of any council meetings which gave a mandate for this use of council funds.- plus any documentation which considered the cost benefit analysis of this action.
6. What was Lesley Wears position with council and was the question raised [in the fax located here](#) addressed please provide a copy of the response
7. In [an email Neil Wells](#) states "*while that could have been answered immediately by the council legal section*

, council decided to obtain independent legal opinion from Kensington Swann that opinion has now come to hand this week and confirms the previous legal opinion sent to MAF policy in past years " Please provide all council documents which supports this statement and who in Waitakere city was waiting for directions as to where the Kensington swan letter should be sent to .

8. All documents after 2000 relating to animal welfare were not made available to me, I request that these be made available for my perusal and copies as required arising from that.

I wish to add that the Ms Brandon is not employed to conceal corruption and she has an obligation to facilitate transparency and accountability, documents which I have obtained in the past show that as much as 40% of the work for animal welfare services in Waitakere was being Animal welfare work which according to the documents I have was ultra Vires for council .

Mr Wells appears to have been able to control and influence council and derive a personal income from animal welfare prosecutions undertaken as a result the involvement of council officers working in council vehicles paid by the public. [the evidence is shown in the chronology](#) this is Public office for private pecuniary income a recognised form of corruption .

He effectively ran an SPCA type organisation using council staff resources and vehicles. All income and no expense. And it appears that Wendy Brandon is condoning this .



No wonder our rates are sky high.

A full chronology is available at  
<http://www.transparency.net.nz/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/full-chronology-AWINZ.pdf>

**Truth is never defamatory** I am not denigrating Mr wells I am stating fact supported by the 5000 or so documents on my chronology .

I have paid well over \$300,000 because I did some pro bono work for a council officer who questioned why she was volunteering her council paid time to AWINZ. Council responded by sacking her and then taking her back to the ERA on allegations of breach of confidentiality. Others have been sacked and silenced as well , No wonder council staff do not speak up speak up and you lose your job.

Council should have investigated. It's not too late they can still investigate I have done the hard work not just for free but at a personal cost which is far too high.

It is through the neglect of council that I have had to endure 6 ½ years of litigation .

Is Council so irresponsible that it cannot see corruption even when it is pointed out to them? Is placing gagging orders over staff who speak out in concern a responsible thing to do ? How does that fit in with transparency????

By doing nothing Auckland council is proving that it condones corruption, this is a well-researched matter which proves how corruption occurs in council .

Auckland council by ignoring this shows that it prefers to attack the messenger rather than look out for the interest of the public. we pay the rates we should have accountability .

I look forward to a civil response and the information I have requested supplied.

Regards  
Grace Haden

**VeriSure**  
*Because truth matters*

Phone (09) 520 1815  
mobile 027 286 8239

visit us at [www.verisure.co.nz](http://www.verisure.co.nz)



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.