

Submissions to the Authority By Grace Haden in response to Vivienne Holms submission 28/2/2018

1. This entire matter appears to be spiralling out of control and appears to have been commenced with an ulterior motive, that of gathering evidence for other court matters and pure intimidation
2. I am 65 next month have had 12 years of crap because I have stumbled on corruption which Holm appears to be very keen to conceal
3. I never have just one court action there are always more than one thing on the menue and this again has been timed to work in with my appeal of the declinature of my COA
4. This week I filed the high court submissions and came across a very important aspect that of Translegal
5. Translegal prepared affidavits which were sworn and were totally false the Authority at the time Mr Gill did not have a "disciplinary" hearing for translegal he decided straight off that their explanation that document service was not part of a PI licence ws sufficient.
6. There are many parallels. For Gary Swan , public interest in filing false affidavits in court was not even considered and when their PI coa's and Licences went through it was apparently smooth.
7. But telling a lawyer that he has obligations to the rule o f law now that is something worth losing your COA over.
8. Holm has made serious allegations against me and Verisure being
 - Passing off;
 - Harassment;
 - Knowingly publishing false and defamatory information about me online; and,
 - Threats and blackmail.
9. We have responded and She has failed to address the response but states
 - b. In relation to paragraph 10(b), I am currently preparing a Statement of Claim against Mrs Haden under the Defamation Act, which I plan to file in March; and,
10. In view of the disclosure that a statement of claim is being prepared The authority should refrain dealing with this ,r until all the allegations have been proved in a court of law .
 - a. There is legislation for passing off... and what have I passed myself off ? this needs to be proved in court
 - b. Harassment there is a harassment act and very strict rules as to what constitutes harassment , this needs to be proved in court

- c. There is an entire act devoted to defamation and the requirements are first to let someone know that something is not right give an opportunity for correction
 - d. Threats and blackmail when how ? these are serious claims and the only evidence I have of blackmail is then Holm threatened my PI licence if I as a trustee of a legally formed trust did not change our name
11. I wonder if I am the only one to notice the connection that since I exposed the corruption there has been a plethora of complaints court actions and lawyers letters claiming Harassment, defamation and Blackmail
 12. The back ground coordination is evident and because I saw the connection between many of the player I was labelled a conspiracy theorist , this even made the head lines <https://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/92032059/private-investigator-labelled-a-conspiracy-theorist-fights-loss-of-licence>
 13. Mr Holm would do well to refer to the definition of private investigator as set out in section 5 in particular “ for valuable consideration” speaking on fraud prevention is not a crime it is a community service
 14. Ms Holm communicated with me directly and sent a submission which contained a threat of legal action it appears that by doing he decent thing and to attempt to resolve it resulted in her childish response of “Can you please alert the Authority to this latest breach of the directions made on 26 January 2018 (final bullet of paragraph 6).”
 15. The email to Luke will become evidence in any defamation hearing .
 16. The response was to protect rights and try to resolve something which is upsetting Holm, but I have to question why did she get upset in 2016 for an article published in 2011 and why did she wait another year to respond and again make threats against my licence .
 17. Many things in Holms actions warrant closer look e.g why did two barristers instruct a resource management law clerk working from home to try to resolve a trust issue
 18. Why did she ring late at night, why not just hang up and why follow up with the threatening email at 11 pm at night

----- Original Message -----

From: [Vivienne Parre](mailto:Vivienne.Parre)
To: info@awinz.co.nz
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2006 11:07 PM
Subject: Registration as Private Investigator

Further to my previous email and our telephone conversation, could you also please supply details of your registration as a private investigator as I intend discussing the the ethics of your activities with the Registrar next week.

I have already contacted the Ministry of Economic Development to arrange for "AWINZ" to be removed from the registry pursuant to s15 of the Charitable Trusts Act.

Should you wish to discuss these matters please advise of a suitable time to contact you.

Yours faithfully,

Vivienne Wright.

19. Her former husband Nick Wright a partner at Brookfield's, at the time took on the SOC, the only way they could win was by denying me the right to a defence and it would appear that Holm then, as now, specialises in dirty tactics as opposed to clean law.
20. Nick Wright has since then left law and has been through the legal process himself, Time delivers all sorts of things including a decision dated November 2017 where it shows that Wright during the court proceedings resulting from Holms SOC became a committed patient [WRIGHT v ATTORNEY-GENERAL \(NEW ZEALAND POLICE\) \[2017\] NZHC 2865 \[22 November 2017\]](#)

[4] The incident on 22 November 2009 when he was detained by the Police resulted in the Auckland District Health Board treating him as a compulsory patient under the Mental Health (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992 from 23 November 2009 to 9 December 2009. Mr Wright says that the Auckland District Health Board also
21. Despite the SOC being taken on behalf of Wyn Hoadley, Neil Wells and Graeme Coutts as trustees of an unincorporated trust calling themselves the animal welfare institute of New Zealand and having no proof that they together were trustees of any trust. Holm threatened me the trustee of a legitimate trust to change our name or there would be consequences. the clue to their status and that of AWINZ was in their name they had no legal right to call themselves AWINZ but needed the name to conceal the corruption.
22. I welcome any court action by Holm as this would open the correct forum for the AWINZ matter to be addressed.
23. The platform of the PSPLA is not the correct forum, not one of these incidents relate to any work carried out under a licence or COA and many date back before the current act, as does the case law which holm has relied on.
24. In view of the impending legal action for which a statement of claim is being prepared it would be unsafe for me to have any part in this "disciplinary hearing" as it would appear that Ms Holm is using it as a stepping stone to other proceedings and any information for these proceedings are going to be used by her to sue me and who ever else for matters which have not even been brought to out attention... lets go straight for the jugular.
25. Since she is contemplating legal action it would be in line with the bill of rights for the authority to set this matter to one side until Holm has proved these allegations to the legal standard required in a court of law
26. If the authority does not wish to do this and continues with the "disciplinary hearing" then I will attend but will rely on the "He who asserts must prove rule"
27. Ms Holm has not even replied in an acceptable manner and has not signed her submission. I consider that she has proved the vicariousness and ulterior motive of her complaint and ask the authority to note this

28. My crime has been to be a whistle blower on serious corruption. It has nothing to do with being inept it has everything to do with having damaging evidence against the likes of HOLM and her desire to discredit me and put the final boot in so that this does not come back to haunt her.
29. Life must be difficult when you have something to conceal, times are changing and corruption is coming to the fore , with or without a COA I will not give up the battle for justice
30. No one should have to go through what I have had to endure just because you stumble on corruption and each and every person who stands by and allows this corruption to remain concealed could well become a party to the concealment.
31. Further Holm is colluding with Malcolm North both worked for the ministry of social development, Malcolm North is still sending offensive emails this is an excerpt from one of his latest where he takes credit for making me lose my COA

From: malcolm north [mailto:malcolm@muserestaurant.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 6 February 2018 7:53 p.m.
To: 'Grace Haden' <grace@verisure.co.nz>
Subject: RE:

You have got to be the biggest joke out .You should also put up the annulment .The idiot needs to get off your titty. and you need to stop sticking your nose in peoples business as it has cost you your license thanks to my help.

No convictions for me the pair of you and the convicted fraudster Haines have got to be the biggest losers New Zealand have ever come across. Had a discussion with the losers employer today.

Send this off to the police they probably need a laugh today.

Talking about bullying I can send you some emails from your tenants. I will keep referring people to Google people can easily see you are a complete idiot

32. This is a total set up stitch up , by following the proper rules and respecting BORA my rights will be protected.



Grace Haden

1.3.2018

This is a case of the pot calling the kettle black

What ever decision the authority makes will be used by Holm in legal action against me.

This is her MO the defamation proceedings in 2006 denied me a defence of truth and honest opinion. 12 years later it is still being used to DEFAME me except judgements are not defamatory