

1. A vexatious malicious and defamatory complaint has been filed by Vivienne Holm under section 73 (4) (d).
2. The complaint is not subject to the oaths and declarations act but if it was it would be a great starting point for perjury
3. Holm complained against the licence of Verisure and a "licence" for myself The authority has also applied this to my COE under section 74 (4) (d)
4. The authority has given leave and has come to the conclusion that the complaint has been made in good faith despite the disparaging comments and the defamatory statements in the complaint and a total lack of evidence of any allegation which shows that
 - a. Any officer of the company, has been guilty of misconduct or gross negligence in the course of the business to which the licence relates or
 - b. that the certificate holder has been guilty of misconduct or gross negligence in the course of being a responsible employee:
5. Under section 73(6) and 74 (6) there is also a requirement for the complainant to serve the complaint within 7 days, this was not done. The PSPLA forwarded the evidence on to me and this was received outside the statutory 7 day period.
6. Before that time frame was up it appears that I have already been found guilty and a disciplinary hearing was scheduled for 21 march
7. Had the complainant, a former lawyer looked up the companies register she would have found the address for service. It appears unbelievable that a senior Policy analyst for Land Information New Zealand cannot find the address for a registered company or its director or understand that Ownership details of properties, including hers are in the public domain, and I therefore question the secret squirrel in withholding her details
8. It is of significance that the very first contact I had with Holm was when she approached me in my capacity as trustee of a legally unincorporated trust and attempted to blackmail me, by threatening my Pi Licence and having our trust web site removed if we did not change the name of our trust .
9. I heard nothing from her until December last year when she wrote anonymously and again threatened my Pi licence , the gap was 11 ½ years . I know it was her because she has used this same email address to complain to the authority
10. The complaint is a mud slinging exercise , makes manifestly false allegations , is unsupported with any evidence of her serious claims summarised as "Mrs Haden and Verisure Investigations have been harassing, defaming, blackmailing and threatening me for over ten years. "
 - a. Harassment has criteria set under the act if I or the company had harassed her she could have taken legal action, she cannot however because two contacts initiated by her and responding to her threats would be laughed out of court. However this complaint and her threats in December are grounds for me to take harassment proceedings against her .

- b. Defaming, the defamation act allows a person who believes they have been defamed to serve notice under section 25 of the defamation act, I have never heard from Holm with regards to any concerns in any publication on Transparency.Net.nz which is a site owned by Transparency New Zealand Ltd a company which I am the director of.
- c. Blackmailing ; It is she who has been blackmailing me see annexure D provided by Holm and annexure E, if you view E on the web you will be able to open the links to the evidence which she has left off
- d. Threatening, her email in December 2017 .. she threatened my Pi licence as she is doing now see annexure J, , it would appear that by getting net safe involved things were lost in translation but it is clear that netsafe advised her that her complaint did not reach the threshold, an important point they missed was that the publication was in 2011 which falls outside the scope of the 2015 act in any case.
 - i. If the publication was incorrect or an issue you would think that holm would have approached Transparency New Zealand Ltd well before then

11. The sections under which the complaint has been brought require section 4 d to be complied with, that is "in the course of the business to which the licence relates or in the course of being a responsible employee:

- a. 13 Meaning of private investigator employee- In this Act, private investigator employee means an individual who in the course of his or her employment, or engagement as a contractor, by a private investigator seeks, or obtains for any person or supplies to any person, any information specified in section 5(2).

12. The current legislation under which the complaint is made commenced on 1 April 2011

- a. Verisure's licence very first licence under this act was issued on 24-Aug-2011
- b. My own COE was first issued 16 August 2011

13. It follows then that only events which fall into the time frame of Licence or COE can be considered

14. A further criteria is that anything in that time frame has to be connected to the course of the business to which the licence relates or as a responsible employee .

15. The easiest way to deal with this complaint is to look at the evidence and its validity as assessed on the dates of the legislation the Licence and the COE

A	18-Jul-06	Not relevant does not pertain to the current legislation
B	30-Jul-08	Not relevant does not pertain to the current legislation
C	18-Jul-06	Not relevant does not pertain to the current legislation
D	Jun-06	Not relevant does not pertain to the current legislation
E	29-Apr-11	Not relevant does not pertain to a time frame in which the current licence or COE existed

F	Dec-17	Copy of see Annexure J see it for details
G	18/04/2011	Not relevant does not pertain to a time frame in which the current licence or COE existed
H	19-Sep-16	This document is irrelevant it is not in affidavit form and is hearsay and is immaterial and not associated to my work as a PI or to verisure
I	8-Dec-16	Not relevant as this does not relate to the business of Verisure or to any actions by a responsible employee the post was in capacity as Director of transparency New Zealand Limited in response to a phone call from Net safe regarding a post on the web site owned by the company
J	10-Dec-17	Not relevant post was in capacity as Director of transparency New Zealand Limited in response to threats by Vivienne Holm
K	9-Dec-16	relevant as proof of vexatiousness of Holm's claims , she was advise by net safe that her complaint did not meet the threshold
L	9-Dec-16	No relevance

16. The authority has already scheduled a disciplinary hearing without considering the evidence, this is a breach of natural justice under section 27 Bill of rights.
17. The reality is that there is nothing in this complaint which falls in the time frame and relates to the business of verisure or the actions of Grace Haden in her capacity as a holder of a COE.
18. The authority therefore appears not to have any grounds to hold a hearing as there is no evidence and can be no evidence to support compliance with section 73 and 74 .
19. The entire complaint is a mudslinging exercise intent on discrediting me as Vivien Holm knows that if the fraud is investigated she will be an accessory to the crime. She even states her purpose in the penultimate paragraph , I have been saying for years that all these complaints have been thrown at me in an attempt to discredit me , I hope that this complaint can be seen as proof, there does appear to be a degree of orchestration if seen from my view point .
20. I can disprove her allegations set out in the text and will do so if the authority is going to step outside the legislation and use this malicious falsehood to decide that I am not a suitable person to hold a PI licence based on this slanderous un sworn rubbish
21. In short I am a whistle blower on serious government corruption , use of public office for private gain .
22. Holm is up to her neck in concealing this corruption and for some reason has panicked hence the complaint
23. By way of back ground

- a. Mr Wells wrote the no 1 bill for the current animal welfare act
- b. He advised on it as independent adviser to the select committee
- c. He made a fraudulent application to the minister claiming that the animal welfare institute of New Zealand existed as a legal person in its own right when in reality it had no legal existence.
- d. In 2006 I with others incorporated a trust to conclusively prove that no other legal entity existed by that name
- e. There is much evidence that Wells AWINZ did not exist , even the statement of claim annexure A shows that it was an unincorporated trust and our trust was incorporated, even more incredibly the unincorporated trust had no trust deed and had only ever had one alleged meeting since its alleged formation 1.3.2000 some three months after it made an application for coercive law enforcement powers .
- f. Holm , a law clerk at the time , according to a pile of evidence collated at that time , was apparently instructed by two barristers . She saw it fit to ring me and harass me late at night , if she did not expect the phone to be answered she could have said sorry wrong number.
- g. She followed up her verbal threats to attack my Pi licence with emails as produced by her (downloaded from Transparency.net.nz)annexure D. Note that the correspondence with me is to info @ awinz.co.nz . she did follow up with the registrar he advised them

David Josland



10056885783

From: David Josland
Sent: Wednesday, 21 June 2006 2:05 p.m.
To: 'neil.wells@waitakere.govt.nz'
Subject: Companies Office - Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand - 1809454

Dear Mr Wells,

I have received on behalf of the Registrar of Incorporated Societies ("the Registrar") your facsimile concerning the registration of the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand - 1809454 ("the trust").

I have considered your submission that the trust's application was in breach of section 15 of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 ("the Act") because Ms Haden used "a name that is identical with that of...a body [corporate] established in New Zealand".

Although your organisation (also called the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand) is an "approved organisation" under section 121 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 the Registrar is of the opinion that this has not conferred "body corporate" status on your organisation for the purposes of section 15 of the Charitable Trusts Act. Even if your organisation was a body corporate the Act does not give the Registrar the power to direct a trust to change its name.

You have invited the Registrar to use his powers under section 26 of the Act to dissolve the Board of the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand. The Registrar is not of the opinion that the trust has been registered by reason of a mistake of fact or law and therefore is not prepared to dissolve the Board. The application to incorporate the trust was accepted in good faith by the Registrar and finding that the application was in registrable form he duly registered the trust.

I note that your organisation is in the process of issuing proceedings in the High Court for an interim injunction restraining Haden and another party from passing off and publishing defamatory statements on their Internet site.

You may also wish to consider section 25 of the Charitable Trusts Act which states that "a Board may be wound up by the Court if the Court is satisfied that it is just and equitable that the Board should be wound up". Under section 25(2)(f) an application to wind up the Board may be made by "any...person who adduces proof of circumstances which in the opinion of the Court make it proper that he should make the application". The circumstances that you have outlined to the Registrar in your facsimile may bring your organisation within this section of the Act.

I am happy to accept documents on behalf of the Registrar if you wish to bring anything further concerning this matter to the Registrar's attention.

My postal address is:

David Josland
Solicitor
Companies Office
Private Bag 92061
Auckland Mail Centre

- h. Yet despite this Holm claims that we were the fake AWINZ when the reality was that Neil Wells application for statutory powers was fraudulent and we had exposed them by proving that they had no legal existence or trust deed .
- i. More documents were to come out over the years, Wells having actively suppressed the release of them under OIA the most significant of these was the audit report which was released after the law society had dismissed the complaints.
- j. Wells himself was proved to be corrupt when he was charged by the law society for unscrupulous dealings with a ladies money and filing false accounts .
- k. Wells died in August the charities commission are now investigating the misappropriation of charitable funds .

- I. In 12 years I have not given up exposing this corruption which has cost me my family , marriage , earnings and well over 300,000. I thank Ms Holm for putting gin this complaint as she has contradicted enough matters which will now enable it to be reopened.
24. If you look at the complaints against me in the past you will see a pattern, claims of harassment , blackmail, defamation , now that Hols has surfaced is see the possibility that she had connections with many of these complaints and may have been party to orchestrating the events and her position in the public service and contacts have more than likely interfered with any investigation of AWINZ.
25. I am now accused of speaking to Holms children, that was in 2006 the day after she phoned me and threatened me, we all have a right to go to any house, I knocked on the door and the girls came out, I spoke to them as you would and said words to the effect of Can I see mummy please or is mummy home . Somehow Holm makes this sound sinister.
26. I only went to the house once , that was on the day after she intimidated me at 9.45 pm , Holm conveniently mixes time frames when the emails prove different.
27. I am guilty of exposing corruption, this may be inconvenient for the corrupt , and if the authority does not accept that I uncovered corruption I ask that she gets the DIA to independently investigate this matter to prove my veracity .
28. I have a ton of evidence I welcome someone to look at it but it is not relevant for me to provide it to the authority as it will simply waste time. The police say its too serious , the SFO say its not serious enough , I had an inept lawyer defending me (Evgeny orlov) he scalped me for what it was worth and I really wonder who he was working for
29. I have been blackmailed in my capacity as a trustee of the trust by Holm , she has harassed and threatened me as director of Transparency NZ. If I was miss informed by Netsafe then she could have advised in a civilised way, Transparency NZ has now made changes .
30. Section 14 Freedom of expression Everyone has the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions of any kind in any form. If Holm has any issues with any publication then she should raise it with the correct entity , making a complaint against my licence is vexatious to the extreme .
31. I request that the authority asses the need for the hearing in accordance with section 77 as there is no evidence at all to support a complaint under sections 73(4) (d) and 74 (4) (d) as there is nothing in this alleged complaint which is relevant to Verisure Licence or my COA .
32. I make this request in accordance with section 27 (1) Bill of rights
(1)Every person has the right to the observance of the principles of natural justice by any tribunal or other public authority which has the power to make a determination in respect of that person's rights, obligations, or interests protected or recognised by law.



Grace Haden

“transparency.net.nz” (Active)

Query Date Time	1 February 2018 9:51 pm
Domain Name	transparency.net.nz
Query Status	Active
Domain Date Registered	9 March 2010 3:13 pm
Domain Date Billed Until	9 March 2018 3:13 pm
Domain Date Last Modified	8 February 2017 7:11 am
Domain Delegate Requested	yes
Domain Signed	no
Registrar Name	Umbrellar Limited t/a DiscountDomains
Registrar Address	PO Box 302829
Registrar Address	North Harbour
Registrar City	Auckland
Registrar Postal Code	0751
Registrar Country	NZ (NEW ZEALAND)
Registrar Phone	+64 3 9619550
Registrar Fax	+64 3 3516705
Registrar Email	support@umbrellar.com
Registrant Contact Name	Transparency New Zealand Limited

« BACK TO SEARCH RESULTS

MY TOOLS

REQUEST AUTHORITY

TRANSPARENCY NEW ZEALAND LIMITED (2433711) Registered

Last updated on 01 Nov 2017

To maintain this company [log on here](#)

[View as Single Page](#) [Certificate of Incorporation](#) [Company Extract](#)



Company Summary	Addresses	Directors (1)	Shareholdings (1)	Documents (15)	PPSR Search
Company number:	2433711				
NZBN:	9429031627801				
Incorporation Date:	09 Mar 2010				
Company Status:	Registered				
Entity type:	NZ Limited Company				
Constitution filed:	No				
AR filing month:	November , last filed on 01 Nov 2017				
.....					
Ultimate holding company	No				
Company addresses:	Registered Office 5 Somes Place, Poraiti, Napier, 4112 , New Zealand Address for service 5 Somes Place, Poraiti, Napier, 4112 , New Zealand View all addresses				
Directors	Showing 1 of 1 directors Grace HADEN 5 Somes Place, Poraiti, Napier, 4112 , New Zealand				
Company record link:	http://app.companiesoffice.govt.nz/co/2433711				

Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand

Charitable Trust Deed

DEED made this 12th day of April 2006

PARTIES

Helen Wenley of Auckland, Property Manager (referred to as "the Settlor")

AND

Robert Frittmann, of Auckland, Security Guard

AND

Grace Haden, of Auckland, Private Investigator

(Collectively referred to as the "the Founding Trustees").

BACKGROUND

- A. The Settlor wishes to establish a trust for charitable purposes by creating the trust provided for in this Deed.
- B. The Settlor has accordingly paid or caused to be paid into the joint names of the Founding Trustees the sum of ten dollars (\$10.00) (the receipt of which is acknowledged by the Trustees) to be held by the Founding Trustees together with any further sums or other assets acquired or vested in the Founding Trustees upon the trusts and with and subject to the powers and discretions set out or implied in this Deed



CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

ANIMAL OWNERS SUPPORT TRUST 1809454

This is to certify that ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE OF NEW ZEALAND was incorporated under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 on the 27th day of April 2006 and changed its name to ANIMAL OWNERS SUPPORT TRUST on the 20th day of June 2007.