Carole Lymburn
82 Moa Road
Point Chevalier
Auckland 1002

24th March, 1991

Snr Sgt Morris/Snr Sgt Dearlove
Ponsonby Police Dept
Jervois Road
Ponsonby, Auckland 1002

Dear Sirs:

During the time I have lived at Moa Road, about ten years, I have on too many occasions needed to call on the police because of efforts by my neighbours to deliberately make my life unbearable eg:

1. threaten to cut my throat
2. threaten to rape me
3. threaten to blow my house up with dynamite
4. threaten to hit me over the head with a rock
5. threaten to rob me
6. threaten to gouge my eyes out and put me in the ground
7. accuse me of being sexually involved with one of my sons, and for us both to have Aids

... just to name a few.

While efforts are being made through the Member of Parliament, Helen Clark, to deal with the problem of my immediate neighbour, I am being harrassed on a stepped-up scale.

On the 4th December, 1990, my son and I consulted with Constable Brent Mathieson because we found that together we could not fight all these people in the area, and needed police help, it being as 'they' described it, Maori against Pakeha.

Constable Mathieson, my son Anthony, and myself debated at length, and in conclusion Constable Mathieson plainly stated he 'could take no action' as he did not have any law giving authority to deal with them and I would have to keep suffering this kind of treatment.

During the course of the conversation, he expressed the opinion he had thought me to be 'unstable'.

When a person endures this sort of treatment by a gang, as I have, they are naturally bound to become upset. However, I shall defend my state of mind on a later occasion.
On Wednesday, March 20th, 1991, I decided to seek advice again by phone from the Ponsonby Care Centre, 13 Maidstone Street, Grey Lynn, as I felt that they played a great part in housing Oakley patients, and drug rehabilitation people, and they may be able to identify the Maori woman living with my neighbour, Mrs. Kaka, the one who continually abuses me, threatens to disfigure me and ultimately kill me. eg. "I will gouge your eyes out and put you in the ground, you white maggot" (incident at home on 17th March, 1991).

I spoke with a staff member calling himself 'Phillip' who straight away found my complaints about my neighbours objectionable, taking their point of view.

He then told me he would make me an appointment with one of the resident doctors.

I asked him on what authority was he allowed to do such things and he explained he was a psychiatric nurse and that I needed to consult with a psychiatrist, and that Constable Mathieson had told him to make an appointment for me.

I am extremely concerned that the question now is directed at my mental 'stability' and I will expect that Constable Mathieson explain in proper terms why he thinks I need to see a psychiatrist.

I am waiting for your most urgent reply in this matter, as this factor now reflects in my credibility and ultimate safety.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. Carole Lyburn
82 Moa Road,
Pt Chevalier,
AUCKLAND.

21st May 1991,

Senior Sgt Morris,
Ponsonby Police Department,
Jervois Road,
Ponsonby,
AUCKLAND.

Dear Sir,

I refer to my letter of 24th March 1991 which was posted to your office by registered mail on 3rd April 1991.

May I remind you that it is now approaching six weeks since I dispatched this letter to you and so far I have not received either acknowledgement or a satisfactory reply.

Would you please give this matter your immediate attention.

Yours faithfully,

Carol Lymphburn

Mrs Carole Lymphburn.
July 19th, 1991

Ponsonby Police Department
Jervois Road
Ponsonby, Auckland

Attn: Senior Sgt Morris

Dear Sir,

I again refer to my letter of March 24th, 1991, and also my letter of May 21st, 1991, both of which you have completely ignored.

I am still not prepared to let this matter drop and again demand an explanation from Constable Mathieson regarding his actions.

Please advise immediately.

Mrs. Carole Lymburn
23 August 1991

Mrs C. Lymburn
82 Moa Road
PT CHEVALIER

Dear Mrs Lymburn,

On 4 July 1991 I forwarded a letter advising you of the outcome of your enquiries into comments made by Constable Mathieson. I understand that that letter has gone astray. I shall again explain the outcome of the enquiries.

Present at the meeting were you, your son, Constable Mathieson and a Civilian Office Attendant. The Civilian Attendant made notes during the meeting. Those notes indicate that you would not listen to reasoned explanations offered by Constable Mathieson. Your conduct towards Constable Mathieson became such that the Office Attendant found it necessary to intervene and defend Constable Mathieson. The notes recorded at the meeting satisfy me that Constable Mathieson did not act improperly.

During the meeting your son asked Constable Mathieson if he thought that you were unstable. The term was not defined. Constable Mathieson reports that he replied in the affirmative. He now regrets having done so. I do not consider that Constable Mathieson’s honest reply to your son’s question was improper.

Constable Mathieson did not contact the Ponsonby Care Centre after the meeting to discuss you. He advises me that he was contacted by a staff member from the Ponsonby Care Centre as a result of telephone calls which you had made to the Centre. Constable Mathieson did not make an appointment for you to see a psychiatrist or suggest that such an appointment should be made.

You will recall that I visited your property to discuss this matter with you in an attempt to act as an intermediary between yourself and Constable Mathieson. Unfortunately, you ordered me from your property. I again offer to meet with you and Constable Mathieson in an endeavour to reconcile any differences between you.

Yours faithfully,

M.A. FIBBES
Area Controller
AVONDALE
CAROLE LYMBURN
82 Moa Road
Point Chevalier, Auckland 1002

18 November, 1991

New Zealand Police Station
P.O. Box 19-190
Avondale, Auckland

Attn: M.A. Fibbes
Area Controller

Dear Mr. Fibbes,

With reference to your letter of 23rd August,1991, I wish to challenge various points you are making.

You allege that you sent me a letter dated 4th July, 1991. I have received no such letter. Perhaps you would like to forward me a photocopy, as I doubt a reply was even prepared or sent.

After I had sent yet another reminder to Ponsonby Station about my original letter, dated 24th March, 1991, I received a phone call from Sgt Morris who said they had never received any such letter.

I had anticipated this type of response, so I had all my letters registered. New Zealand Post conducted an investigation and told me that Sgt Ross Palmer had signed for registered article 433. I phoned Sgt Morris with this information and he offered the excuse it had been 'misfiled'. I was told by him he would look into it. I indicated that I was not prepared to drop the matter and required a reply in writing.

Many weeks went by and I had still not had any reply to my first letter.

On July 19th, I sent yet another letter to bring the matter to the attention of Sgt Morris and still he ignored me.

To recall your visit to my home:
In the morning, as I was preparing to go out, I received a phone call. No one spoke when I answered. I concluded that someone was establishing whether I was home or not.
A short time later, you were knocking on my door. I had just taken a bath and as I explained to you through the window, I was not fully dressed and that I still preferred a written reply to my letter and would not settle for anything less. (Not the usual Police procedure of avoiding the issue by briefly discussing it and then refusing to do any more). As far as being 'ordered' from the property, you have an unusual interpretation of being declined an interview. I never 'ordered' you anywhere, just simply refused to open my door as I was in my dressing gown and as I told Sgt Morris twice before, wanted the matter settled in writing.

Our interview with Constable Mathieson deteriorated because he again refused to take any action against the ones who were threatening me.

My son did not ask him if he thought I was unstable.

I personally challenged him on this point because he had made insinuations against my mentality on a previous occasion and I believed him to be freely voicing his opinion to others. He admits in writing he holds this view of me.

I therefore challenge him now to prove it.

I reacted to him by stating I considered him to be a coward and I believed it was easier for him to call me unstable than to face the vicious gang that was tormenting me and threatening my life.

I had on a previous phone conversation to the Central Station been told by a constable that Mathieson must have been 'frightened' to deal with these people and I was merely endorsing his observation. The specific household I was complaining about was defended by Mathieson as 'a nice family'. This 'nice family' on December 5th, 1990 accused my son and me of being sexually involved and that both of us had the aids infection.

On 30th October, 1991, the woman from this house blocked my way on the street, criticising me, abusing me and threatening me, and she spat over me saying, "I hope you catch aids" and "I wish you would die, you fucking old bitch".

She used filth and vicious abuse at me all the way down the street to my gate. She said that she could do anything she liked "because the police said you are mental". Phillip from the Ponsonby Care Centre accused Constable Mathieson of trying to procure the appointment for me to see a psychiatrist whether he denies it or not. Mathieson instructed him to call on me. This is nowproved. I do not wish to meet with you and a reconciliation with Mathieson is out of the question. Mathieson is responsible for the trouble I am suffering along with my family.
I have very strong reasons to believe he was instrumental in my being insulted and banned from 3 Guys Supermarket, Point Chevalier. He knows Mr. Kerr, the manager, and when I was complaining about the rude way I was being treated by the staff, Kerr ordered me from the store saying, "We are sick of you", "We are going to get rid of you", "You have been in Carrington", "If you come in here again, I will throw you out", "The Police won't take any notice of you".

He was right. When I rang for help from the Citizens Advice Office, the police refused to come down straight away. They arrived hours later.

My son interviewed Sgt Burgoyne and she told him the staff in the store had said to her, "The woman couldn't have come from Carrington, she was too well dressed." Kerr had told them I was from Carrington. Kerr taunted me in the store by saying, "You've got nothing", and "Why don't you live it up". Why would a supermarket manager make such a personal attack on a customer when she wanted a receipt for goods purchased before leaving the store?

On Tuesday 5th November, 1991, my son arrived to take me shopping and to attend the dentist.

He walked up the street to observe a car parked in the drive of the woman who spat over me, three houses up the street. He intended to check for the name of the owner, as we still don't know who she is.

My son was abused as he walked up the street by Mr. Stevens from his kitchen window, straight across the road. Then two women ran out of the house further up and screamed and yelled in a frenzy, "Why are you taking the number"? We endeavoured to get in the car and drive away, but they ran down the road and pulled the driver's door open, and continued to threaten my son. He stood up and grabbed the car lock bar for protection.

I moved around the car to be in support of my son and as I walked around this woman attempted to push me over. My son intervened and pushed her away and she fell on the ground. Then the Maori woman attacked him and two more came running from the opposite house, and they bashed and punched my son to the ground. He swung the bar around to protect himself. I was nearly knocked over in the skirmish and ran in to phone the police. They left it 5 minutes and rang back from the Ponsonby Police Station to ask if they had any 'knives or guns', treating it like a real joke. They did not arrive for at least half an hour. They would not take a record of the event.
My son's glasses were taken by the Maori who spat on me and the police called my son a liar. This Constable Mitchell said he was issuing my son with an official warning. My son asked for it in writing and he refused.

Wednesday 6th November, I was disturbed with knocking on my door. I refused to open it to someone saying they were the Police and they wanted to talk about my son. It was the one who said we had aids and he screamed at me "You slut", "You prostitute", "You whore", and "Last night five men came around here and raped you". He was crazed and smashed my plants. The Maori woman held the glasses up to me at my window and said, "Come out and get them or I'll smash them". I refused. She smashed them out at my gate, I found a piece of the lens. My son said it was from his glasses.

Detective Inspector Davies promised us on November 5th, 1991 to look into the matter. He says now he has given it to Ponsonby. Ponsonby Station told my son he was a liar and told him to 'get going'. They would not give him a complaint form for insurance purposes when he called on 6th November, 1991. How long are they going to try and pretend all this is not happening?

Ponsonby Police may laugh and think it is a big joke. Not one person of the dozens of intelligent people we have interviewed, professional people included, think it is a joke.

It is your responsibility to do something and take action against these people.

Please advise urgently.

-Carole Lymburn

(Mrs.) Carole Lymburn
September 12th, 1991

The Doctor-in-Charge
Ponsonby Care Centre
13 Maidstone Street
Grey Lynn, Auckland 1002

Dear Sir:

On Wednesday, March 20th, 1991, I had occasion to ring the Ponsonby Care Centre to discuss a matter that I felt could be explained by your staff. I was having some serious problems with my surrounding neighbours threatening me with violence and being obscenely abusive every time they saw me. I had discussed this with my son and he had suggested I phone your centre because we both felt that the people may be having treatment for psychiatric problems or drug abuse.

I had laid complaints to the police regarding these incidents of aggression towards me and was wondering why these people had not been subdued.

When I spoke to your staff member, identifying himself as "Phillip", I was explaining my situation and found he took immediate exception to my complaint. He adopted a "smart" attitude and asked if I wanted to see a psychiatrist. I declined, and he insisted I should because he had been in discussion with Constable Mathieson about my problems and Mathieson had told him to get me to come and see a psychiatrist. This person Phillip continued to be extremely cheeky and, in a very taunting voice, said,

"Did you ring to make an appointment ?"

I asked, "What for ?" and he replied, "To see one of our doctors."

I asked, "What doctor ?" He replied, "A psychiatrist."

I was shocked and said, "What right do you have to speak to me like that ?"

He said that Constable Mathieson asked him to make an appointment for me and they often discussed things and he was very acquainted with him.

He kept saying, "I think you should come here. Both of us do." and "Do you want me to make an appointment ? That is what you rang me for, or you wouldn't have rung."
I have sought an explanation from Constable Mathieson and he has taken five months to reply to my letter. He denies being responsible for the suggestion I need psychiatric treatment and states that at no time did he discuss my case with your organisation.

I would like now to have an explanation covering your staff member's actions. Some person, or persons, are responsible for my good character and mental stability being taken away from me by slander, and this explains why I am being singled out and treated with contempt in this district.

My family and I are extremely concerned that this is allowed to take place and consider it a serious indictment against my human rights and personal safety.

We therefore demand an investigation as to the disgusting performance by a member of your so-called professional staff.

Please advise urgently.

Yours faithfully,

Carole Lymburn

(Mrs. Carole Lymburn)
18 September 1991

Mrs Carole Lymburn
82 Moa Road
Point Chevalier
AUCKLAND 1002

Dear Mrs Lymburn

Your complaint regarding this Centre's involvement as a consequence of difficulties you were experiencing with neighbours has been investigated.

Staff have been informed and I am able to advise you that all staff at the Centre are aware of the professional standard of practice required of them.

The offer for an appointment was meant as a means of offering support during a period of distress. This offer is common practice and offered to people distressed by situations they find themselves having to deal with. It is not necessarily an indication that psychiatric treatment is indicated. It is hoped this will help to resolve your concern.

I am sorry about your difficulties and hope that in future the Police can assist in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Coral Pearson
LOCALITY MANAGER
September 25th, 1991

Ms. Coral Pearson  
Locality Manager  
Ponsonby Community Mental Health Centre  
13 Maidstone Street  
Ponsonby, Auckland 1002

Dear Ms. Pearson:

I received your reply today, dated September 18th, 1991. However, you have failed to answer adequately the questions I had raised with my initial enquiry.

I did not seek from you a job description on how you run your centre.

Please refer again to my letter of September 12th and the detailed conversation between myself and your staff person calling himself Phillip.

I challenge in particular his unethical behaviour towards me and his demands to me to see a consulting psychiatrist. I am extremely concerned that it is the opinion of both he and Constable Mathieson that I am in need of psychiatric help and they both feel at liberty to spread this opinion to anyone they like.

I again demand an investigation, preferably you interviewing your colleague and relating back to me why he and Mathieson have the right to destroy my character.

Please advise urgently.

Yours faithfully,

Carole Lymburn

(Mrs.) Carole Lymburn
CAROLE LYMBOURN
82 Moa Road
Point Chevalier, Auckland 1002

4th November, 1991

Ponsonby Community Mental Health Centre
13 Maidstone Street
Ponsonby
Auckland 1002

Attn: Ms. Coral Pearson
Locality Manager

Dear Ms. Pearson,

May I refer you to my letter of 25th September, 1991 to which I have received no reply.

Constable Mathison and your staff member, Phillip, are responsible for my being denied police protection because of what they are saying about me.

On Sunday 27th October, 1991 my life was again threatened by a vicious woman from the flat of my neighbour, Mrs. Kaka, and on Wednesday 30th October, 1991, I was accosted on my way home from the shop, criticised, abused, threatened with violence and spat over by another woman in the street, Constable Mathison said belonged to a 'nice family.' She said the Police had said that I was a 'mental'.

Please give this matter your immediate attention. Both my son and I seriously believe they will carry out these violent threats to assault and disfigure me.

I hold your organisation partly responsible.

Yours faithfully,

Carole Lymburn
19 November 1991

Mrs Carole Lymburn
82 Moa Road
Point Chevalier
AUCKLAND 1002

Dear Mrs Lymburn


I have recently replaced Coral Pearson as Acting Manager at Ponsonby Community Mental Health Centre and your letter was filed in error rather than being immediately responded to.

Further to Ms Pearson’s letter I once again apologise for Mr Philip Bielby’s behaviour and assure you that you will not have any further contact with him. Mr Bielby assures me that he has not discussed his contact with you outside of this unit and that he is aware of the issues of confidentiality. Mr Bielby’s behaviour has been thoroughly investigated by both Ms Pearson and myself and appropriate action has been taken.

In reference to Constable Mathison, I have no authority to investigate his actions or the response of the Police and suggest you contact the Avondale Police Station.

Once again Mrs Lymburn, I apologise for this unfortunate incident.

Yours sincerely

D.M.D. Sorensen
ACTING LOCALITY MANAGER
26 November 1993

Housing New Zealand
2 Mt Albert Road
MT ALBERT

Attention: Mr Graeme Ogle

Dear Mr Ogle

re: Carole Lymburn, 82 Moa Road, Point Chevalier

I visited Mrs Lymburn on 25/11/93 with Alan Barker (Social Worker). At present there is no action that can be taken by our service.

Yours sincerely

Chris Perkins
Psychogeriatrician
PSYCH S.E.W.
3 December 1993

Mrs Lymburn
82 Moa Road
PT CHEVALIER

Dear Mrs Lymburn

Having seen you and thought about your case I feel that it is possible that you may have a mental illness which causes you to be suspicious of others and to feel persecuted by them. Obviously I would need to investigate further to prove or disprove the reality of your beliefs about your neighbours and I don't feel able to do this without your permission.

Medication is sometimes helpful to reduce the strength of false beliefs (should they prove to be so) and the anxiety surrounding the beliefs.

If you feel that you could accept my help in any way I would be pleased to see you again.

My apologies for all the upset you have felt surrounding my visit.

Yours sincerely

Chris Perkins
Psychogeriatrician
PSYCH S.E.W.
Senior Sergeant
PONSONBY

On 8.4.91 I spoke with Phil BEILBY, Charge Nurse at Ponsoby Care Centre.

He has had discussions with Mrs LYMBURN since December 1990. Mrs LYMBURN has been reluctant to accept help.

Mr BEILBY offered her the opportunity for support to deal with the distress she is suffering (apparently due to a problem she has with neighbours).

On 20 March 1991 Mrs LYMBURN phoned Mr BEILBY demanding to know what he had done about her complaints. She accused the Care Centre for being responsible for releasing psychiatric patients into her neighbourhood. Mr BEILBY offered her support again but became agitated and accused him of casting innuendos about her.

Any Police response to Mrs LYMBURN's letter will only give her more opportunity to select, exaggerate, twist and distort what is said. She will only become more upset.

I therefore suggest that no response be made and the letter attached be filed.

Constable Brent MATHIESON may wish to note the contents of the letter first.

S.R. PALMER
CONSTABLE 6905
10.4.91

Note file: Han submit for filing.

8/Sgt Ponsoby.
I have noted the contents and have kept a copy for my own records. - For filing please.

26/4/91
Application for reconsideration under Legal Aid Application Number 06W038808 in
the Matters of Civil vs Plaintiff

**IT IS ANNOUNCED IN THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD TODAY
THE 28TH JULY 06 THAT “ZAQUI BILL $2.4M AND
CLIMBING” Legal aid is $483,744**

**This man is not even a New Zealand Citizen.**

The prospects of success should not be treated lightly in this case and are indeed very
strong taking into account the witnesses and nearly 700 pieces of evidence including
many from the Police’s own records.
There is unsurmountable evidence to prove the Plaintiff’s claims of mistreatment.
Here is a very brief discussion of some of the documentation which is in evidence:

The Defendant has admitted to the Plaintiff in writing, that their actions have caused
her distress over a period over 10 years or more. *These actions are still continuing to
cause very serious distress to the Plaintiff.*
The evidence proves that in origin, the written statement made by Police Constable
(Brent Mathieson) who recorded in his report to his Superior that the Plaintiff’s
doctor was saying she was insane, to have been manufactured and this is backed in
written evidence by the Plaintiff’s Doctor (Barbara Morris) subsequently denying in
writing to the Medical Council that she has ever said such a thing in a signed letter
proving this malicious comment about the Plaintiff to have been totally untrue.

*The evidence also shows continued actions of malice by the defendants:*

1. The evidence shows Defamatory statements to members of the public about the
   Plaintiff.
2. The evidence shows a refusal to protect the plaintiff from a person who was
   threatening to kill her, and known to the Police and officially recorded by the Police
   to be a Drug Criminal, a Drug Dealer and someone who has had convictions of
   violent assaults upon other innocent persons in society.
3. The Evidence shows that the Defendants set about a tactical plan to evict the
   Plaintiff from her Housing New Zealand home and try to render the Plaintiff helpless.

4. The Evidence shows that the Defendants made threats that if the plaintiff attempted
   to report any further criminal incident to them they would “take her to Court.”

5. The Evidence shows that the Defendant made a malicious phone call from the 111
   Control room of the Auckland Central Police Station intimidating the Plaintiff when
   she had prowlers at her home and as was frightened.
6. The Evidence shows that the Defendants cut the Plaintiff loose from support and protection and she was at the mercy of her neighbours who had threatened consistently that they would commit bodily harm against her and/or destruction.

Costs versus benefit is understood by the Plaintiff and her lawyer, and they have taken very serious consideration when deciding to take the next step which is to proceed with the action to court, and they acknowledge that this action is costly, however the benefit to the Plaintiff’s well being and restoration of her adequacy in having this claim judged before the court is immeasurable to her, as she has been treated horrendously by the Police and by their actions of malice in declaring her to be a person who mentally insane. They have rendered her life to be null and void.

The fact that the Legal Aid has been declined before, should now not have any bearing on the current application.  
The Plaintiff and her Lawyer have fought hard to satisfy the law and have now reached the point where all the evidence is ready to be presented to the court and there are nearly 700 documents in total.

Copies of The Police files were released to the Plaintiff before they were destroyed.

The Evidence is still intact.

The fact that the Plaintiff is a model citizen and has no criminal history should not be grounds for her to be refused Legal Aid and an opportunity to pursue a claim under the Breach of her Human Rights Bill.  
This Bill of Rights surely is not confined to criminals.

Cruel and degrading treatment is well proved in the evidence particularly the way they referred to the client and wrote cruel and sexually degrading memo’s to other departments about her.  
“Why don’t you go and lock her up for incest” written and signed in his own handwriting Sgt Jones Central Station.

The Police Officers are named  
Constable Brent Mathieson  
Sgt Snaith  
Sgt Dixon  
Snr Sgt Mildenhall  
Constable Palmer  
Sgt Wayne Jones  
............................ and their signed memos and reports are ready to be produced, showing the cruel and degrading treatment using their authority as Public servants to hurt and destroy the Plaintiff.  
An Affidavit from the Plaintiff’s Solicitor, at the time, confirms the fact that the Defendants were discrediting the Plaintiff to her solicitor and Official members of the Public without her knowledge.
This level of treatment amounts to the highest level of mental cruelty anyone can ever inflict on another human being, and is a grave event to have taken place in a civilised and sophisticated society such as New Zealand which is presumed to protect its citizens from this type of harm.

The Legal Services Agency would be seriously remiss if they failed to allow this case to proceed particularly as it is in protection of one of its good citizens.

The serious events in this case should be provocation enough for the Legal Services Agency to demand that the law needs to supervise the outcome of these events.

The Legal Services Agency needs to provide the Plaintiff and New Zealand Society, with the Right to have this now Judged. Plaintiff and the Public need to know what is deemed to be decent and respectful treatment by the New Zealand Police as this is clearly not.

The court needs to take Jurisdiction.

The long standing grievance will not disappear unless there is justice.
The claims are all able to be proved. The evidence is there and it is contained in nearly 700 pieces of evidence.
It is unfortunate that it will be expensive but this is not the Plaintiff's fault, she has not broken the law and should be entitled to have Justice. She has spent every last cent she has had on fighting for Justice for herself.
The claim is not being brought against the neighbours it is being brought against the Police who have unfairly defamed the Plaintiff and sided with the neighbours against the Plaintiff by being malicious about the Plaintiff.
The Plaintiff if self funded would show no hesitation in pursuing this cause.
The majority of New Zealanders would support the Plaintiff's actions to clear her reputation and good name.
The Plaintiff has fought hard and long through every avenue available to her in the Justice system and other legal avenues as a decent citizen and has spent every spare cent she has had to her own detriment to fight the Police who have done nothing but stonewall her from obtaining rightful justice.

The Plaintiff's case is not “far-fetched”.

The Plaintiff has a very serious claim going on here and the only thing that is preventing her from obtaining real justice in front of the Court is that Legal Services refuse to grant her costs which will be redeemed when this case is won.

It is now officially noted that the Crown have conceded that there is a case to answer so why would you now refuse this application?
19 May 2008

The Registrar
Auckland High Court
Civil Section
AUCKLAND

BY HAND

CIV 2005-404-640 - LYMBOURN v ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Please find attached a further affidavit of Carole Lymburn for this proceeding.
A copy of the affidavit has been served on the Crown Law Office.

Yours faithfully

Philip J Wright

CC Sarah MacLean
Crown Law Office
PO Box 2858
WELLINGTON

By Facsimile: (04) 473 3482