

6 February 2024

Christopher Dean Pecotic/Binse 43517
C/o- Melaleuca Unit (1) H. M. P. Barwon Lara, Victoria 3212

Attention 'Director Integrity Policy and Performance'. **Petitions of Mercy** C/o-
First Law Officer and Policy Team. Department of Justice and Community Safety.
Level 17/ 121 Exhibition Street. Melbourne 3000. Victoria.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Ref no. 23086630, previous complaints lodged with your offices **19 September 2023
and 20 October 2023.**

*This P.O.M is NOW prepared in the proper structure intended for Supreme Courts of
Victoria to Receive once referred to them by your offices in successful considerations.*

*Found within this legal CD Current updated amended Petition of Mercy submission
are. - Affidavit, Written Case, Exhibit cover, Index Exhibit CDB-01, Exhibit CDB-01,
List of authorities. Petition of Mercy correspondence folder*

I do not accept this ruse of an explanation for the delay in considering my case, in that
ALL my previous CD's have been misplaced, as you suggested in your mail dated 3
January 2024. If you wish to view them, either find them or go to the 2 social media
platforms I refer to at bottom of this page, to view personally as have gone GLOBAL!

***I did indicate that 'I would release the following collection of incontrovertible video
slide submissions materials to social media'.***

(True to my word, I honour this pledge & guarantee).

With it becoming crystalized, clear & indefensible in rebutting EVIDENCE proven!

LET THE WORLD & EVERYBODY IN BETWEEN GAUGE YOUR CONDUCT!

NOT TO MENTION, ASSESS FOR THEMSELVES THE FACTS & EVIDENCE.

1. Petition of Mercy Rejected!
2. Charge 1. Indictment C11434997.4, Necessity- P.T.S.D both negated.
3. Charge 1. Indictment C11434997.4, Verdins P.T.S.D.
4. Charge 1. Indictment C11434997.4, Malicious - Perjury (2).
5. Charge 1. Indictment C11434997.4, No gun's link.
6. Charges 1 & 2. Indictment C11434997.4, Malicious -Perjury.
7. Charges 1-4. Indictment C11434997.4, Miscarriage.
8. Charge 2. Indictment C11434997.4, Flashbangs used Siege.
9. Charge 2. Indictment C11434997.4, Self-defence denied!
10. Charge 3. Indictment C11434997.4, Indictment C11434997.4,
11. Charge 4. Indictment C11434997.4, Atak charges.

***The above compilation of legal video slides can be found at either
chrisbinse@iexpress.com.au (or) at YOU TUBE, with all updates to follow case.***

You have 'UNDERESTIMATED MY DRIVE & DETERMINATION TO EXPOSE'

I am submitting as an 'unrepresented inmate', 'notice of applying to you', for a 'Petition of Mercy review', in seeking your offices to assess & consider the vast comprehensive legal arguments in respect to the defective conviction(s) born in

R v Binse [2014] V S C 253. T. Forrest, J. Indictment C11434997. 4, Charge(s) 1-4.

The Petitioner was convicted in the above Tribunal/Proceedings in the categories of a miscarriage of justice- pursuant to s. 327 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2009.

That the 'whole of the case be considered' in it being referred to the Supreme Court of Victoria's Appeal, for deciding whether on the 'whole of the case' the 'possibility of error is so substantial', as to 'make the conviction(s) alluded to above as unsafe'. 'Defective and a substantial miscarriage found', in this matter.

Where new evidence is tendered, the Court must determine its credibility and relevance to the issue of guilt and it must then weigh its cogency, it may see and hear witnesses of new evidence, and it is entitled to receive evidence that tends. -

Referring to the following legal decisions & findings:

Mickelberg v the Queen (1989)167 CLR 259, found at p -. '273, 288, & 301'.

R v Ratten (1974) 131 CLR 510, found at p '516', '526'.

R v Knowles [1984] VR 751, found at '767'.

Lawless v Queen_1979_142_CLR_659, found at p '670'.

I have NO legal representation at this point in time, my case speaks & will sell itself. I respectfully ask, that you submit 'my whole case' to the Victoria Supreme Court of Appeals, to consider & review, the 'travesty of justice clearly found', crystalized!!

I remind you again of Law on: In the Course of or connected to Their Public Office.

R v Quach (2010) 27 VR 310, 321 at [38].

In Quach. Redlich JA observed '[t]he official's conduct will be linked to their office when doing the impugned act, the official did something he or she was duty bound to refrain from going, according to the responsibilities of the office".

Further, A 'Public Official'.

HKSAR v Wong Lin-Kay [2012] HKCFA 33, at [44].

'Such persons may or may not be employed by the government; they may or may not be paid. They may be a high officer of state or lowly employees; the offence may be committed as well by police or a customs officer as by a GOVERNMENT MINISTER. The common element is that the accused must have abused some power, duty or responsibility entrusted to or invested in him or HER and exercisable in the public interest'.

Sincere Regards Christopher Dean Pecotic/Binse 43517.

Chris