

FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA

Skyring v Ramsey [2003] FCA 745

**ALAN GEORGE SKYRING v GRAHAM KINGSLEY RAMSEY AS DISTRICT
REGISTRAR OF THE FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA, QUEENSLAND
DISTRICT REGISTRY
Q101 OF 2003**

**COOPER J
BRISBANE
16 JULY 2003**

**IN THE FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA
QUEENSLAND DISTRICT REGISTRY**

Q101 OF 2003

**BETWEEN: ALAN GEORGE SKYRING
 APPLICANT**

**AND: GRAHAM KINGSLEY RAMSEY AS DISTRICT REGISTRAR
 OF THE FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA,
 QUEENSLAND DISTRICT REGISTRY
 RESPONDENT**

JUDGE: COOPER J

DATE OF ORDER: 16 JULY 2003

WHERE MADE: BRISBANE

THE COURT ORDERS THAT:

1. The application is dismissed.

**IN THE FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA
QUEENSLAND DISTRICT REGISTRY**

Q101 OF 2003

**BETWEEN: ALAN GEORGE SKYRING
 APPLICANT**

**AND: GRAHAM KINGSLEY RAMSEY AS DISTRICT REGISTRAR
 OF THE FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA,
 QUEENSLAND DISTRICT REGISTRY
 RESPONDENT**

JUDGE: COOPER J

DATE: 16 JULY 2003

PLACE: BRISBANE

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

1 This is an application by Alan George Skyring for leave to re-open certain proceedings which he has filed in this Court. The applicant requires leave as he was declared a vexatious litigant in this Court on 6 July 1999 by order of Sackville J, who ordered that he was not to institute or continue proceedings in this Court without leave. The order of Sackville J was appealed to a Full Court of this Court, which dismissed the appeal on 9 June 2000 (*Skyring v Ramsey* [2000] FCA 774).

2 The applicant now seeks to re-open previous litigation in this Court which he contends was, and remains, unresolved. In relation to those proceedings, he wishes to re-litigate the issues which led to the making of the orders by Sackville J in July 1999. He finds his application, as appears from written submissions accompanying it and from oral submissions made to the Court, on the basis of new information which he contends demonstrates the error of the previous decisions of the High Court, the Supreme Court of Queensland and this Court in relation to what has been termed 'the currency issue'.

3 The alleged new material relates to the legitimacy of Australian Parliaments for many decades. The applicant's thesis is that the members of Parliament are not properly elected because they failed, in accordance with the requirements of the electoral legislation, to lodge

deposits in terms of proper currency. Accordingly, the submission is that Acts of the Australian Parliament, including the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* (Cth), are invalid and of no force and effect; that the creation of this Court is of no force and effect; and that the orders of this Court made in purported exercise of its jurisdiction are also of no force and effect, including the order of Sackville J and the orders of the Full Court dismissing the applicant's appeal.

4 The applicant's thesis formed the basis of proceedings on an electoral petition numbered Q55 of 2002, entitled *Gunter v Hollingworth and Others* [2002] FCA 943. The thesis was rejected by me in a judgment given on 30 July 2002.

5 The position is that the applicant does not wish to litigate issues, other than those the subject of previous proceedings, to enforce new rights unrelated to them, or, to take steps to protect himself from any action unrelated to them. In reality, what he wishes to do is to re-litigate the matters which the Court has previously ordered he is not to do because they are utterly hopeless in the view of the several Courts which have considered them and ruled on them over the years.

6 Accordingly, there is no basis upon which leave should be granted to further litigate those issues. The application is dismissed.

I certify that the preceding six (6) numbered paragraphs are a true copy of the Reasons for Judgment herein of the Honourable Justice Cooper.

Associate:

Dated: 16 July 2003

Counsel for the Applicant: The Applicant appeared in person

Counsel for the Respondent: No appearance

Date of Hearing: 16 July 2003

Date of Judgment: 16 July 2003