

From: **Rob Elliott** <robelliott@live.com.au>
Date: 15 March 2013 13:39
Subject: Claim for accrued entitlements
To: kathy Jackson <hsunatsec@gmail.com>
Kathy -

You'll be getting a letter of demand from my lawyers shortly regarding my unpaid accrued entitlements.

These were claimed from the union at the time of the repudiation of the agreement with me last year. There's been plenty of time for the union to sort itself out since the elections; it's clear to me that they are simply ignoring this matter, not even responding to my lawyers.

I think I've been pretty patient to date.

I've attached here a document I'm preparing for my lawyers - part general history, part draft statement, part *aide memoire* - can you have a look at it? I haven't put in all the relevant dates yet - don't have access to my records here and at any rate I wanted to compare notes to make sure I get them right. I'm showing it to you to make sure that there's nothing in it that compromises you especially re your undertakings to police.

Again I think you should have used information from police much earlier before/during Brown and Shorten were doing a number on you. But I do want to make it very clear KJ that I will not sit back and have Brown/Shorten/Simonds attempt a number on me without response. That ain't goin' to happen. The statement is me on scapolamine-lite, my preference re these crooks is to down a full dose but I'll respect your wishes up to a point. Your wish not to be the one seen as damaging Labor in an election year is all very well but your first priority is to yourself? When it comes to Labor, frankly my dear, / don't give a damn.

I understand too that Blackburn's have given Langers the flick. I'm telling you again Kathy that this cements in my view that they've been working both sides of the street. Marco's case was so piss-poor - real issues not argued - that wasn't an accident. If Feeney gets Wills or Gellibrand we'll know the circle is complete. Stroking Gerard and advising Marco at the same time? That's laying off the bets - nice work if you can get it. Not quite sure of the ethical position there. I'm told that Hayes agreed to have Langers continue working his agreement so who do you think might have changed his mind?

I've tried to contact Feeney to let him know that he's mentioned in the attached statement but he's off the radar - if you want to give it to him, feel free. I'll send a copy to Langers as he's also mentioned. You'll see that the statement characterises the type of work I was actually doing during relevant times and under whose direction, background to agreement etc. This is the type of information that the Administrator demanded of you under the NSW Act re certain contracts (tho' not Glen's) and Simonds was demanding of me. If the union wants to ask me again, let them knock themselves out.

Btw I see the ACTU report into union governance found that the HSU is the only bad apple and that everyone else is peeeerfect in the union movement. *J'en suis bouche bee*; who would have thunk! No need for further regulation then - nothing to see here. Not sure the Libs will be so charitable? Maybe we could get a new ACTU executive in on 457 visas since we clearly have nobody qualified in Australia? They'd have to be all-white though; Labor doesn't like brown or yellow people anymore (except for branch-stacking).

Whistle, whistle, here boy! From the people who brought you "two wongs don't make a white" normal service is resumed.

Keep your chin up, talk soon

Rob