SUPREME COURT OF QUEENSLAND

CITATION:	*Bradley v The Queen* [2021] QCA 101
PARTIES:	**BRADLEY, Ross James** (applicant) **v** **THE QUEEN** (respondent) **ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF QUEENSLAND** (not a party to the application)
FILE NO/S:	CA No 133 of 2020 DC No 3989 of 2018
DIVISION:	Court of Appeal
PROCEEDING:	Application for Leave s 118 DCA (Criminal)
ORIGINATING COURT:	District Court at Brisbane – Unreported, 1 July 2020 (Sheridan DCJ)
DELIVERED ON:	11 May 2021
DELIVERED AT:	Brisbane
HEARING DATE:	8 April 2021
JUDGES:	Sofronoff P
ORDERS:	**1. Notice of appeal struck out.** ***2.*** **Applicant is prohibited from instituting proceedings in Queensland.**
CATCHWORDS:	APPEAL AND NEW TRIAL – APPEAL – GENERAL PRINCIPLES – RIGHT OF APPEAL – WHO MAY EXERCISE RIGHT – UNSUCCESSFUL PARTY – where the notice of appeal filed failed to make out any grounds for leave to appeal – where the applicant in previous proceedings filed multiple notices of appeal that were struck out as an abuse of process – whether the notice of appeal should be struck out for want of prosecution – whether the applicant should be declared a vexatious litigant *Vexatious Proceedings Act* 2005 (Qld), s 6
COUNSEL:	The applicant appeared on his own behalf R Berry for the Attorney-General of Queensland
SOLICITORS:	The applicant appeared on his own behalf Crown Law for the Attorney-General of Queensland

[1] **SOFRONOFF P:** Mr Bradley has filed yet another appeal. He has previously filed notices of appeal that have been struck out as an abuse of process: [2018] QCA 163;

[2017] QCA 66; [2016] QCA 53. I struck out a similar notice of appeal in November last year. Proceedings have also been struck out for the same reason in the trial division: 11427 of 2017; 13 November 2017; [2017] QSC 275.

[2] The notice of appeal in this case continues these precedents. It is a confused hodgepodge of confusion. One paragraph is enough to illustrate the content that fills the document:

> "That the supreme Ecclesiastical Law **is ONE**, under the CROWN. (The '**Ecclesia**'.) And this means that all ecclesiastical entities including Queensland as a state can (equally) sue and or be sued in the one **Ecclesiastical jurisdiction.** Men and women within court-house Registries (as 'public officials' under the state) have a **disregard for** and are continually disregarding the fact that Australia and it's [*sic*] state **were "created**" at and remain under this supreme Christian Law. Clear contempt of the Law."

[3] The notice of appeal should be struck out as an abuse of process.

[4] Mr Bradley has been incorrigible in his attempts to vex the parties he chooses to name as respondents to his applications. This case is an example. It arose from a document filed by Mr Bradley in the Magistrates Court which purported to sue "The Queen" and was entitled "Common Law to Govern the Court". Mr Bradley then pressed for a committal hearing at which he wanted to air his complaints. Like the notice of appeal before me, the document in the Magistrates Court was a confused heap of nonsense. An example is the following:

> "The common law (**as per the First Charter of Justice, 1787** and as **proclaimed under the Crown** and that still remains valid today) says that this is so. (Also, See attachment One)
>
> This document (as filed) involves a matter that went before the District Court of Appeal on 11/10/2018. (See **DCA 31/18**)
>
> The honourable court is asked to determine if this **my allegation** that a **public official**/s or, person/s of Queensland (see **Exhibit # THREE – DCA 31/18**) has or have **knowingly** or **unknowingly** committed a common law offence to pervert the course of justice. (Attach. Two)
>
> That as a man, and born with unalienable inherent Rights and Duties and through my person (**BRADLEY**), my matter as **Filed by me** and as was **incorrectly listed by registry staff of the Beenleigh court-house**, had subsequently **resulted in an 'obstruction'** of the course of justice that then became (resulted in) an unfair hearing, when conducted before a Coram."

[5] The learned magistrate rightly struck out the proceeding. Mr Bradley then appealed to the District Court, under the *aegis* of yet another senseless piece of paper, which was struck out, and he now seeks leave to agitate his concerns in the Court of Appeal.

[6] The time has come to stop this kind of behaviour from being repeated.

[7] At the hearing of this matter, I invited Mr Bradley to submit why his proceeding should not be struck out. Mr Bradley could not formulate a ground but, instead, persisted in making oral statements that were consistent with the incomprehensibility of his written statements.

[8] I also invited Mr Bradley to make submissions as to why he should not be declared a vexatious litigant. He made submissions of the same disordered kind, which merely demonstrated further the need for an order to be made to prevent any further abuse of the judicial process by him.

[9] I am satisfied that Mr Bradley has frequently instituted vexatious proceedings in Queensland. I am also satisfied that unless an order is made under the *Vexatious Proceedings Act* 2005 Mr Bradley will continue to waste the time and money of the people he chooses to sue and waste the time and resources of the Courts. I am satisfied that an order should be made to stop Mr Bradley from continuing to do this.

[10] The notice of appeal in this matter is struck out. Mr Bradley is prohibited from instituting proceedings in Queensland.