

CHALLENGE TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

COURT DETAILS

Court: District Court of New South Wales
Division: Criminal
Registry: Parramatta
Case numbers: 2009/59226.

TITLE OF PROCEEDINGS.....

Prosecutor: THE QUEEN
Defendant: John Wilson

FILING DETAILS/ADDRESS FOR SERVICE

Filed for: John Wilson
Address for service: 19 Elm Place,
North Rocks, NSW 2151.

CHALLENGE DETAILS

This Challenge to the Jurisdiction of the Court is to be filed at the District Court of New South Wales at Parramatta on 20th August 2010 at 9:30am and is to be determined by a Special Jury.

RELIEF CLAIMED.....

The Plaintiff claims RELIEF that:

- (1) a Special Jury adjudge that the District Court of New South Wales, Parramatta, has no Jurisdiction to proceed summarily, ie: without Trial by Jury, in this action;

(2) the Special Jury adjudge this Trial to be a Mistrial;

(3) the Special Jury order a new Trial on the same Indictment and arraignment of the 25th of February 2010.

CHALLENGE GROUNDS

This Challenge to the Jurisdiction of the Court is made on all grounds, including Subject Matter, Relationship and Competency.

In any action, both parties must give their clear and unequivocal consent to be without a Jury. Without that consent, the Court has no Jurisdiction to proceed summarily and the Jurisdiction of the Court must be challenged. This Challenge can only be judged by a Special Jury. Should a Judge or Magistrate disregard or dismiss this Challenge, then he or she is liable to imprisonment for 5 years. Should a Judge or Magistrate disregard or dismiss this Challenge, that is a violation of Due Process and the Rule of Law.

Due Process is a course of legal proceedings according to rules and principles that have been established in a system for jurisprudence for the enforcement and protection of private rights. Due Process derives from early English Common Law. The first concrete expression of the Due Process idea embraced by Anglo-American law appeared in the 39th Article of Magna Carta 1215. (*Encyc. Brit.*)

“Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven.” (*Jagens v. Lavine, 415 S.Ct.768*). “Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, even on final determination.” (*Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co., 495 2nd 906 at 910*). “Where there is an absence of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity and confer no right, offer no protection, and afford no justification, and may be rejected upon direct collateral attack.” (*Thompson v. Tolmie, 2 Pet. 157, 7 L.Ed. 382; Griffith v. Frazier, 8 Cr. 9, 3L. Ed. 471*).

I do not consent to be without a Jury. The Court has not obtained my consent to be without a Jury which is clear and unequivocal. I have not signed a Memorandum of Consent to be without a Jury and allow this Court to proceed summarily.

I am a flesh and blood human being and “have liberty in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 2: 4).

The Right to Trial by Jury is an inalienable Right of all Freemen (Part 1 - Constitutional Enactments listed in the NSW Imperial Acts Application Act 1969 No. 30, Second Schedule).

It is the Rule of Law that is (1.) The supremacy of law. and (2) a feature attributed to the UK constitution by Professor Dicey (*Law of the Constitution*, 1885). It embodied three concepts: the absolute predominance of regular law, so that the government has no arbitrary authority over the citizen; the equal subjection of all (including officials) to the ordinary law administered by the ordinary courts; and the fact that the citizen’s personal freedoms are formulated and protected by the ordinary law rather than by abstract constitutional declarations. (Oxford Reference, A Dictionary of Law, Oxford University Press)

I am not a bonded slave and not a legal fiction.

I am a Freeman, the equal of any other Freeman, and have the Right to the lawful Judgment of a congregation of twelve other Freemen gathered together as a Jury, with each Juror asking “So help me God”, in order that they can administer Justice.

I am a sovereign human being created by God.

A Legal Maxim says, “Rights never die”.

The words of the Royal Coat of Arms say, “Honi soit qui mal y pense” and “Dieu et mon droit”.

I am of the People and Australia is a Democracy, which translates from the Greek to “People Rule”. We the People exercise our Sovereignty, ie: our ultimate authority to make and impose laws, through the unanimous Judgments from Trials by Juries. These Judgments are the Common Law.

“Common law doth control Acts of Parliament and adjudge them when against common right to be void” (Lord Edward Coke).

No Act of Parliament can take away my Right to Trial by Jury.

No “evil counsellors, judges and ministers” can be allowed to subvert and/or extirpate the laws and liberties of the People (see: Bill of Rights 1688).

To deny Trial by Jury is to deny Democracyand to deny Democracy is Treason, ie: a violation of allegiance.

MAGNA CARTA 1215, CAP XXXIX: *"No freeman shall be taken indeed imprisoned, either dispossessed, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, nor pass over him, nor send over him, except by means of the legal judgment of his own equals indeed the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay, Right or Justice."*

The CONFIRMATION OF THE CHARTERS, 1297 says: *"...that the Great Charters of Liberties and the Charter of the Forest, which were made by common assent of all the realm, in the time of King Henry our father, shall be kept in every point without breach....we have granted that they shall be observed in all points, and that our justices, sheriffs, mayors, and other officials which under us have to administer the laws of our land, shall allow the said charters in pleas before them and in judgments in all their points....And we will that if any judgment be given from henceforth, contrary to the points of the charters aforesaid, by the justices or by any other ministers that hold plea before them against the points of the charters, it shall be undone and holden for naught."*

The PETITION OF RIGHT, 1627 says: in section 3. *"And where also by the statute called, The Great Charter of the Liberties of England, it is declared and enacted, That no freeman may be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold or liberties or his free customs, or to be outlawed or exiled, or in manner destroyed, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."* and in section 8. *"That the awards, doings and proceedings, to the prejudice of your people in any of the premises, shall not be drawn hereafter into consequence or example."*

The SUPREME COURT PROCEDURE ACT No. 49, 1900 says under section 3. *"(1) In any action by consent of both parties the whole or any one or more of the issues of fact in question may be tried, or the amount of any damages or compensation may be assessed by a Judge without a jury."*

The COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACT No: 21, 1899 are relevant to the conduct of proceedings in this or any matter before the Supreme Court of New South Wales: ***“s.256. Upon the hearing of any motion or summons, the Court or Judge may, upon such terms as the Court of Judge thinks reasonable, order any document to be produced, and any witness to appear and be examined viva voce, either before the Court or a Judge or before a commissioner for affidavits; and upon hearing such evidence or reading the deposition may make such rule or order as may be just”***.

and

“s.257. (1) The Court or Judge may by such rule or order, or by any subsequent rule or order, command the attendance of the witnesses named therein for the purpose of being examined or the production of any document mentioned therein”.

and

“s.259. The Court or judge may amend any notice of motion, rule nisi, writ, pleading, affidavit, jurat or title of affidavit, record, praecipe, or other proceeding used before the Court or Judge not likely to mislead the opposite party on any point essential to the merits of the case, and may award such reasonable costs of such amendment as to the Court or Judge seem fit.”

The INTERPRETATION ACT No. 15, 1987 says under section 30. ***“(1) The amendment or repeal of an Act or statutory rule does not: ... (c) affect any right, privilege, obligation or liability acquired, accrued or incurred under the Act or statutory rule.”***

Every person is entitled to NATURAL JUSTICE which is described as the ***“Rules of fair play, originally developed by the court of equity to control the decisions of inferior courts and then gradually extended (particularly in the 20th century) to apply equally to the decisions of administrative and domestic tribunals and any authority exercising an administrative power that affects a person’s status, rights and liabilities. Any decision reached in contravention of natural justice is void as ultra vires. There are 2 principal rules: (1) The first is the rule against bias (ie: against departure from the standard of even-handed justice required of those who occupy judicial office) - nemo iudex in causa sua (or in propria causa). This means that any decision, however fair it may seem, is invalid if made by a person with any financial or other interest in the outcome or any known bias that might have affected his impartiality. The second rule is known as audi alteram partem (hear the other side). It states that a decision cannot stand unless the person directly affected by it was given a fair opportunity both to state his case***

and to know and answer the other side's case.”(Oxford Reference A Dictionary of Law, Oxford University Press, Third Edition).

HALSBURY'S LAWS OF AUSTRALIA says under (130-13460):
“Consent to summary jurisdiction The consent to be tried summarily must be clear and unequivocal and a failure to carry out the procedures for obtaining the consent will deprive the court of jurisdiction to determine the matters summarily.”

Thomas Jefferson said in 1821: *“The germ of destruction of our nation is in the power of the judiciary, an irresponsible body - working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall render powerless the checks of one branch over the other and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.”*

No Statutory Laws no Rules nor Regulations can take away my Right to Trial by Jury.

Lord Edward Coke once said, “Common law doth control Acts of Parliament and adjudges them when against common right to be void.”.

Common Law is the Law of the People, by the People and for the People.

Acts of Parliament (ie: mere Statute Law) endeavouring to take away the Right to trial by Jury are *ultra vires*.

People are not subject to Statute Law, which is inferior to Common Law, and are only accountable to Common Law that is made and imposed by their equals, ie: accountable only to Juries.

Judges have sworn to “well and truly serve” the Crown, as has the Sheriff of New South Wales. The Defendants to this action are the Sheriff of New South Wales and the State of New South Wales (ie: the Crown). No man, and certainly no Judge, can judge in his own cause.

It is the duty of a Sheriff “to ensure that people can exercise their rights in court in safety”. Sheriffs who enforce the denial of the Right to Trial by Jury are as culpable as the Judge or Magistrate committing that treasonous offence.

“A man who exercises his rights harms no one”...a Legal Maxim.

“Trial by Jury is the Palladium of Liberty” (anon).

The denial of my Right to Trial by Jury is sinister, vile and reprehensible.

All Acts of Parliament in Australia since 1919, with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, have not been lawfully enacted due to the fact that there have been no Orders in the Privy Council, ie: the Queen-in-Council, for the Appointments of any Vice Regal executive representatives of the Crown of the United Kingdom to grant the “Royal Assent” to enact Statute Laws, which was the procedure when the Commonwealth of Australia was “under the Crown of the United Kingdom” as per the Act of the UK Parliament to Constitute the Commonwealth of Australia (Victoria 63 & 64, Chapter 12, 9th July 1900). It follows that all the Appointments of Judges and Magistrates are also fraudulent.

“A Judge without jurisdiction is to be disobeyed with impunity” ...a Legal Maxim.

Australia is a Democracy which literally means that the PEOPLE RULE, ie: Sovereignty lies with the People who exercise that “ultimate authority to make and impose laws” by way of the unanimous Judgments of 12 Free Men empanelled as Jurors who ask, :”So help me God”, in order that they can administer Justice

I, therefore, Challenge the Jurisdiction of the Court. This Challenge can only be determined by a Special Jury.

All law hangs on loving God and loving one’s neighbour as oneself (Matthew 22: 40) and legislation which endeavours to take away the Rights of the People are no law, at all.

PLEADINGS AND PARTICULARS

The Defendant relies on the following facts and assertions:

1. Between the dates of Monday 24th May 2010 and Wednesday 9th June 2010, in the District Court of New South Wales at Parramatta, the trial of the Indictment, that read, “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON, was conducted.

2. On Wednesday 9th June 2010, Christopher John Armitage dismissed the Jury after they had returned “Guilty” verdicts to all three charges on the Indictment. Christopher John Armitage then adjourned proceedings to Friday 20th August 2010 when he intends to pass “Sentence” on me, John: Wilson.
3. The entire proceedings from the commencement of the trial have been and are unlawful and the Court has NO JURISDICTION.
4. “Jurisdiction” is “the right, power, or authority to administer justice by hearing and determining controversies.”
5. The prefix of the word, “Jurisdiction”, is “Juris” and is from the Latin word, “iuris” meaning “law, right, oath”.
6. The suffix of the word, “Jurisdiction” is “diction” and is from the “stem of dicere "speak, tell, say," related to dicare "proclaim, dedicate," from PIE base *deik- "to point out"
7. A “Juror” is “one that performs” “the law”, with “-or” being “a suffix occurring in loanwords from Latin, directly or through Anglo-French, usually denoting a condition or property of things or persons.”
8. Therefore, a JURY IS THE LAW and, because I am a living, flesh and blood, sovereign human being and a Freeman-on-the-Land ... and, because Australia is a Common Law Jurisdiction I, John: Wilson, am only under the Jurisdiction of a Jury of twelve Jurors who are my equals, as sovereign human beings, and who, by being empanelled as Jurors, make and impose Common Law.
9. Lysander Spooner in his 1852 “Essay on trial by Jury”, wrote:
“FOR more than six hundred years - that is, since Magna Carta, in 1215 - there has been no clearer principle of English or American constitutional law, than that, in criminal cases, it is not only the right and duty of juries to judge what are the facts, what is the law, and what was the moral intent of the accused; *but that it is also their right, and their primary and paramount duty, to judge of the justice of the law, and to hold all laws invalid, that are, in their opinion, unjust or oppressive, and all persons guiltless in violating, or resisting the execution of, such laws.*

Unless such be the right and duty of jurors, it is plain that, instead of juries being a "palladium of liberty" - a barrier against the tyranny and oppression of the government - they are really mere tools in its hands, for carrying into execution any injustice and oppression it may desire to have executed.

But for their right to judge of the law, *and the justice of the law*, juries would be no protection to an accused person, *even as to matters of fact*; for, if the government can dictate to a jury any law whatever, in a criminal case, it can certainly dictate to them the laws of evidence. That is, it can dictate what evidence is admissible, and what inadmissible, *and also what force or weight is to be given to the evidence admitted*. And if the government can thus dictate to a jury the laws of evidence, it can not only make it necessary for them to convict on a partial exhibition of the evidence rightfully pertaining to the case, but it can even require them to convict on any evidence whatever that it pleases to offer them."

10. A Jury CANNOT be the LAW unless they know the Law and can exercise their Right to judge and administer the Law.
11. A Jury CANNOT be the RIGHT unless they can DO RIGHT to all manner of People without fear or favour, affection or ill-will.
12. A Jury CANNOT be the OATH unless they swear the Oath and ask "SO HELP ME GOD" .
13. Empanelling of the Jury took place on Tuesday 25th May 2010 but no Juror's Oath was sworn by any Juror and no Juror asked "So help me God" in order that they may administer Justice according to the principles and ethics of a Court Christian, for it is Biblical Law that no one may judge any one (Matthew 7: 1-2) but rather have an assembly, ie; a Jury, in God's name (Matthew 18: 20) so that the

consciences of the Juror can be guided in the way of “Law and Justice with Mercy” in the execution of their Judgment. This obligation to “do right” is found in the Coronation Oath and, underpins the Judicial Oath.

14. The Jury, as empanelled for this trial, were totally lacking in any knowledge as to their responsibilities and duties as Jurors and were forbidden by Christopher John Armitage from educating themselves as to their true purpose. A Legal Maxim says: “One who does not understand is not present”. This Jury had NO UNDERSTANDING of their rights and responsibilities and their true authority to administer Justice.
15. Another Legal Maxim says: “A trial ought to be when the jury have the best knowledge”. Christopher John Armitage made sure the Jury had no knowledge essential for their proper task.
16. Throughout the entire proceedings, Christopher John Armitage ensured that the Jury remained INCOMPETENT.
17. Christopher John Armitage made sure that there was NO JURY SELECTION that would allow me to have a Jury of MY EQUALS, as required by the LAW OF THE LAND.
18. The Bible say: “People are destroyed for the lack of knowledge”.
19. Thomas Jefferson said: “The germ of destruction of our nation is in the power of the judiciary, an irresponsible body - working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall render powerless the checks of one branch over the other and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.”.
20. The Jury for “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON” was NO JURY.
21. The trial of “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON” was NO TRIAL, but a MISTRIAL.

22. The “SUMMING UP” to the Jury by Christopher John Armitage consisted of lies and flagrant misdirections to PERVERT THE COURSE OF JUSTICE.
23. Justice is the protection of rights and the punishment of wrongs.
24. Christopher John Armitage’s repeated insistence that 331 North Rocks Road, North Rocks was “the dwelling house of Kamal Issa” is Christopher John Armitage’s Judgment against my Defence that 331 North Rocks Road, North Rocks on the grounds that there NO CONTRACT created between First Mortgage Company Home Loans Pty Ltd CAN 194 268 448, either lawfully (ie: variable interest rates rendering a contract void for uncertainty) or as a properly formatted document (ie: the documents produced by the Crown Prosecutor being correctly compiled, signed and witnessed).
25. Christopher John Armitage’s repeated insistence that the Jury could not and must not judge the Law, and that only he had that power, was a unmitigated act to sabotage the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia which is founded on the principles of English Common Law and the Rule of Law for the protection of the People’s laws, freedoms and property.
26. Christopher John Armitage’s statement of: “Parliament has sovereignty to determine that certain matters will or will not be tried by jury” is TREASON against the Will of the People which was demonstrated in the National Referendum of 1988 when the Parliament tried to alter section 80 of the Australian Constitution to exclude Trial by Jury from actions for Contempt of Court and Courts Martial and it was the Will of the People that the Right to Trial by Jury must not be diminished.
27. In a DEMOCRACY, the PEOPLE HAVE SOVEREIGNTY, ie: the ultimate authority to make and impose laws. That SOVEREIGNTY is exercised by the PEOPLE by way of the unanimous Judgments of JURIES. Christopher John Armitage’s tyrannical misdirections to the Jury render him liable to “Imprisonment for Life”, which is the penalty in section 24AA of the Crimes Act (Cth.) 1914.
28. On Wednesday 9th June 2010, Christopher John Armitage dismissed the Jury without the Jury pronouncing any sentence upon me. Instead, Christopher John Armitage adjourned proceedings to

Friday 20th August 2010 when he said he would pronounce sentence.

29. Australia is a Common Law Jurisdiction where “No free man shall be taken indeed imprisoned, either dispossessed, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, nor pass over him, nor send over him, except by means of the legal judgment of his own equals indeed the law of the land.” and “To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay Right or Justice” (Magna Carta 1215, which is entrenched Constitutional and Common Law in Australia).
30. I, John: Wilson, am a Freeman-on-the Land and only under such Common Law.
31. I have NO CONTRACT with Christopher John Armitage and DO NOT CONSENT to his having any Jurisdiction over me.
32. I do NOT CONSENT to any SENTENCING which Christopher John Armitage may attempt to impose on me.
33. Christopher John Armitage has ASSUMED JURISDICTION which he DOES NOT HAVE. He has proceeded SUMMARILY without the Court obtaining the clear and unequivocal CONSENT from both parties, ie: THE QUEEN and myself, to be without a Jury. Therefore, the Court has no Jurisdiction to proceed summarily and any awards, doings and proceedings are illegal and void, and not to be drawn into consequence or example and, by disregarding legal rights and legal procedures, Christopher John Armitage has conducted a KANGAROO COURT..
34. I am a FREEMAN-ON-THE-LAND and NOT IN BONDAGE to Christopher John Armitage or to any Corporation whatsoever, including one known as the “DISTRICT COURT OF NSW. A.B.N. 33 673 621 537”.
35. A Judge or Magistrate is an OFFICER OF THE COURT and that OFFICE is created by an Act of Parliament, such as the District Court Act 1973 No 9.
36. Section 11 of the District Court Act 1973 No 9 says: “All civil and criminal proceedings in the court, and all business arising out of any such proceedings, shall, subject to this act and the *Jury Act 1977*, be heard and disposed of before a judge, who shall continue

the Court” is against the Common Right of every Freeman-on-the-Land to “the lawful judgment of his equals”, ie” to TRIAL BY JURY, and is, therefore, void because, as Lord Edward Coke wrote: “Common Law doth control Acts of Parliament and adjudges them when against Common Right to be void”.

37. No Freeman-on-the-Land is under the Jurisdiction of any Officer of any Court or any Statutory Body, Person or Entity.
38. Unless a Court obtains the clear and unequivocal consent of both parties to any action, the Court has no Jurisdiction to proceed summarily.
39. During the course of the trial between 24th May 2010 and 9th June 2010, exceeded even the Jurisdiction of a genuine “CORAM JUDGE” because, in an action where “THE QUEEN” is the Prosecutor and a Judge is a sworn servant of “THE QUEEN”, “coram” means “in the presence of someone who has no jurisdiction” because no one can “judge in his own cause” (an essential Rule of Natural Justice).
40. Christopher John Armitage’s actions to Interfere with the Administration of Justice, by setting aside the subpoenas I had issued to key witnesses in the case, ie: Andrew Scipione and Joanna Ruth Harrison, and forbidding the Jury from seeing my most important piece of evidence, ie: my website of <http://www.rightsandwrong.com.au> , were intolerable and flew in the face of concept of there being a “fair trial”.
41. Christopher John Armitage’s Summing Up to the Jury took place on Monday 7th June 2010. The Directions he made to the Jury violated the very foundations of TRIAL BY JURY which is, itself, the foundation of DEMOCRACY and the RULE OF LAW.
42. Christopher John Armitage’s Commission to be a Judge is FRAUDULENT because there are NO ORDERS for the Appointments of Governor-Generals of the Commonwealth of Australia nor for any State Governors issued by the QUEEN-IN-COUNCIL, ie: the PRIVY COUNCIL. Therefore, any “Appointments” made by the Governors-General of the Commonwealth of Australia and the State Governors purporting to induct “Judges” are equally FALSE.

43. On the 14th of August 2003, I sent the following email and received the email appearing below that:-

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

From: John Wilson [mailto:jhwilson@acay.com.au]

Sent: 14 August 2003 23:59

To: PCOSecretariat@pco.x.gsi.gov.uk

Subject: Appointment of the Governor-General of Australia

Dear Sirs,

I would like to view the Order Approved at the Council appointing the new Governor-General of Australia, Major-General Michael Jeffrey.

Please send me internet directions/instructions on how I can see the relevant documents.

Yours sincerely,
John Wilson.

I am sorry but there is no Order for this appointment.

Privy Council Office
2 Carlton Gardens
London SW1Y 5AA

Tel 7210 1030

Fax 7210 1071

<http://www.privycouncil.gov.uk> <<http://www.privycouncil.gov.uk/>>

44. Sir William Blackstone (1723 – 1780) wrote: “UPON these accounts the trial by jury even has been, and I trust ever will be, looked upon as the glory of the English law. And, if it has so great an advantage over others in regulating civil property, how much must that advantage be heightened, when it is applied to criminal cases! But this we must refer to the ensuing book of these commentaries: only observing for the present, that it is the most transcendent privilege which any subject can enjoy, or with for, that he cannot be affected either in his property, his liberty, or his person, but by the unanimous consent of twelve of his neighbours and equals. A constitution, that I may venture to affirm has, under providence, secured the just liberties of this nation for a long succession of ages. And therefore a celebrated French writer ⁴, who concludes, that because Rome, Sparta, and Carthage have lost their liberties, therefore those of England in time must perish, should

have recollected that Rome, Sparta, and Carthage, were strangers to the trial by jury.”

45. Proceedings in the District Court of New South Wales at Parramatta as to the Indictment of “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON” are wholly unlawful and the Court had NO JURISDICTION.

SIGNATURE

Signature:
Name: John Wilson
Capacity: Plaintiff and Sui Juris
Date: 12th July 2010.

PARTY DETAILS

PROSECUTOR

Name: THE QUEEN,
Address; C/- Crown Solicitor’s Office,
60 – 70 Elizabeth street,
Sydney, NSW 2000.NSW POLICE

DEFENDANT

Family name: Wilson
Christian name: John
Address: 19 Elm Place,
North Rocks, NSW 2151.

HOW TO RESPOND.....

You can respond by your solicitor or barrister, your representative or you attending court at the time and place for hearing.

If you have not already filed an originating process, appearance or defence, you must enter an appearance before your solicitor or barrister, your representative or you can appear before the court.

You can get further information about the documents that need to be filed to respond to the notice of motion from:

- The registry at the place of hearing
- A legal practitioner
- LawAccess NSW on 1300 888 529 or at www.lawaccess.nsw.gov.au.

NOTICE TO DEFENDANTS

If your solicitor, barrister, an authorised person or you do not attend, the court may give judgment or make orders against you. The court may also make orders for the payment of costs.

REGISTRY ADDRESS

Street address: Parramatta District Court,
8 George Street,
Parramatta, NSW 2150.
Sydney, NSW 2000.
Telephone: (02) 9895 4333.