

**From:** Simon McArley [mailto:Simon.McArley@sfo.govt.nz]  
**Sent:** Friday, 17 May 2013 11:27 a.m.  
**To:** Grace Haden <grace@verisure.co.nz>  
**Cc:** Nick Paterson <nick.paterson@sfo.govt.nz>; Graham Gill <Graham.Gill@sfo.govt.nz>  
**Subject:** RE: too serious for plice ot serious enough for SFO .. who deals with corruption ?

Dear Grace

Thank you for your e-mail. I have reviewed the history of your complaint, and the various correspondence between yourself and the office over the last 3 years. I am afraid I can add nothing more to what has been said in that correspondence, most recently by Graham Gill on the 13<sup>th</sup> May this year. I do not believe the complaint discloses evidence of a serious or complex financial crime, and accordingly support the earlier decisions not to commence an investigation.

While I expect you will not agree with that decision, I hope you can accept that the question of SFO's involvement with this matter is closed.

Regards

Simon McArley | Acting Chief Executive | Serious Fraud Office | PO Box 7124, Wellesley Street, Auckland | Level 6, 21 Queen Street, Auckland 1010 | DDI: 09 301 0111 | M: 021 308 953 | F: + 64 9 303 0142 |

**From:** Grace Haden [mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 16 May 2013 2:42 p.m.  
**To:** Nick Paterson; Simon McArley  
**Cc:** SCOTT, Bruce  
**Subject:** too serious for plice ot serious enough for SFO .. who deals with corruption ?

Good afternoon Nick and Simon.

I refer to the news item <http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/8657607/Whistleblowers-welcome-at-SFO>

On Sunday I made a complaint through the SFO web site this was in response to the article and also because I had been told by DI Bruce Scott to contact the SFO in about a week, which it was.

On Monday I attended the fraud conference and was delighted to see the subject of corruption come up and Heard Nick say that the SFO deal with corruption .

in a full conference room I put a question to Nick who acknowledged that it was common for people to write Legislation for their own purpose but said that he would consider looking at the aspect of a law enforcement authority which did not have any legal existence. ... 'State capture' obtains when a small number of firms (or such entities as the military) is able to shape the rules of the game to its advantage through massive illicit, and non-transparent provision of private benefits to officials and politicians.

Read more: <http://www.answers.com/topic/state-capture#ixzz2TQ0nxn5j>

You may also find that in studying state capture you will see other examples of it .. that which we call common is actually corruption on the world scale.

On Thursday I received a letter from the SFO as per attached.

It appears to me that this perfect fraud has become even more perfect in that it is too serious for the police and not serious enough for the SFO

As it transpires I do have new evidence which conclusively proves that MAF gave coercive law enforcement powers to a fictional organisation, an organisation which was in reality nothing more than the man who wrote the bill and was the "independent advisor to the select committee and this is supported by evidence which proves that Mr Wells intentionally misled the minister of the crown. A kindergarten teacher gets 8 months home detention for faking a diploma a barrister gets away with faking an organisation which has coercive statutory powers .

MAF documents which were deliberately withheld at the request of Wells were obtained through the ombudsmen , in these documents Maf independent state that they could not differentiate between the AWINZ and Waitakere

He then ran the operation from council premises using the council resources staff etc to derive a personal income.. Public office for private pecuniary gain. ( he had the equivalent of the RNZSPCA except he used council officers vehicles infrastructure to run it but banking the proceeds of prosecution – section 171 of the animal welfare act into an account he operated in a pseudonym )

He has gone on to use charitable funds to derive a personal income ( money laundering ) being an award made to him from the court when he successfully played the rules and prevented me from putting a defence of truth and honest opinion.

In terms of the UN convention against corruption two forms of corruption are easily identified .. state capture .. of which this is a prime example and public office for private pecuniary gain and money laundering

Add charity fraud to this and perverting the course of justice using the court .

The word I came away from the conference with was "obfuscate " this case is a prime example of it and proves that by making things difficult confusing and complicated you can commit serious crime in New Zealand- this case is a prime example and it is not of my doing it is what the offender did.. except he is not an offender as his actions are apparently sanctioned.

The Australian speaker who used that word said it was a red flag, in new Zealand it is an invitation to write the matter off.

Everyone wants it simple I have simplified it so much that I am then told that there is no offence disclosed.. You simply can't simplify complicated matters and have all the ingredients there, I was a prosecutor I was in the police for 15 years I am involved with fraud and corruption I am not some house wife who has read a book on the subject.

As for \$ value, I suspect that there is not a huge sum involved due to the spot light I threw on to the activities. For this I have paid a price which is disproportionately high.

The reality is that it is a case study for state capture and I am sure that the OECD would agree with me that it is not OK to write legislation for your own business plan advise on it and implement it using falsehood.

I have been “ done like a dogs dinner “ for asking Waitakere council why a manager was contracting to himself using s pseudonym for services which were not those that council provided. And for asking MAF “ why they gave law enforcement powers to an organisation which did not exist beyond an undefined trading name.

Whistle-blowers get absolutely no support in new Zealand.

I do hope that someone will take this seriously , those who I have spoken to have all had the “ That too hard lets write it off “ reaction. In reality all the work is done, my documents were obtained from local and central government and the evidence is collated.

If the police refer it to the SFO and the SFO refer it to the police then we are on right royal merry go round and it makes me suspect that the reality of this matter is that it is a hot potato .

I have copied members of the press into this email in the BCC as they are monitoring the matter , I am also in communication with the OECD and will keep them in the loop.

If you do not deal with corruption please let me know who I should be taking this matter to or if no action is taken than I can only assume that such action is condoned in NZ hence the corruption free status.

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)