



14 February 2011

Grace Haden
Verisure Investigations Ltd
P O Box 17463
Greenlane
Auckland 1546

Dear Grace Haden

OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT REQUESTS

I refer to your official information requests:

- (i) To the Prime Minister dated 13 December 2010 which was transferred to the Minister of Agriculture on 18 January and transferred to MAF on 26 January 2011.
- (ii) To Minister Carter dated 10 January and transferred to MAF on 25 January 2011.
- (iii) To Minister Carter and David Bayvel dated 22 January and transferred to MAF on 26 January 2011.

In your request to the Prime Minister you have requested "all documents which consider this form of corruption (including using the name in the pretence that (the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand) exists (and) (has the legal ability (and has done so) to prosecute citizens and keep the proceeds (under) section 171 (of the) Animal Welfare Act) and methods we have employed to combat this!!

This request is refused under section 18(e) in that the information does not exist.

Your request to Minister Carter dated 10 January 2011 seeks "... Advice what "if anything the government is doing about this fraudulent application for approved status the consequences of which is that even still today we have persons working in Waitakere dog pound who call themselves animal welfare inspectors."

At the request of the Trustees, the Minister has revoked the approval of AWINZ to be an approved organisation and inspectors operating for AWINZ have had their appointments cancelled.

In your request to Minister Carter and David Bayvel dated 22nd January 2011 you ask "And what evidence the minister has that would indicate to the public who at any time



during the existence of the approved organisation, were the persons or person who used that trading name”

This request is refused under section 18(e) in that the information does not exist.

You also ask “Could you also please provide a copy of the criteria the government used for contracting to a trading name [AWINZ] and by which means was accountability to the public addressed given no one knew who was using this trading name at any given time.”

MAF did not contract with AWINZ and consequently there is no criteria. Your request is refused under section 18(e). Accountability to the public was addressed by regular audits of the animal welfare inspector performance.

You ask for “...[provision of] any discussion papers and documentation which considered the implication of providing a trading name with law enforcement powers.”

No consideration was given to dealing with a “trading name”, consequently your request is refused under section 18(e) in that the information does not exist.

You may request the Ombudsman to review these decisions under section 28 of the Official Information Act 1984. The Ombudsman is contactable at

Office of the Ombudsman
P O Box 10-152
The Terrace
Wellington

Yours sincerely



A C David Bayvel
Director Animal Welfare

From: Grace Haden [mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 13 December 2010 3:59 p.m.
To: 'j.key@ministers.govt.nz'
Cc: 's.power@ministers.govt.nz'; 'j.collins@ministers.govt.nz'; 'research@worldbank.org'; 'jhellman@worldbank.org'; 'gjones@mit.edu'; 'dkaufmann@brookings.edu'
Subject: state capture

"Seize the state, seize the day": state capture, corruption, and influence in transition [refer source](#)

Mr Key

I wrote to you this morning regarding the animal welfare institute of New Zealand (AWINZ) a law enforcement authority which is fictional in structure and although it has legal powers is no more than a trading name for one man who wrote the legislation to facilitate it.

Because of the lack of substance of AWINZ there are no binding contracts but despite this those using the name in the pretence that it exists have the legal ability (and has done so) to prosecute citizens and keep the proceeds section 171 animal welfare act.

AWINZ came into being when a citizen who had [drafted a business plan](#) for his own business venture, wrote the major part of the animal welfare act, he then became an employee of the select committee and was their independent advisor, he was also advisor to MAF.

When the act he had contributed to and advised on became law he told the minister that an organisation existed and applied in the name of that organisation for approved status under the act to give himself the same rights as the RNZSPCA of which he had been a former director.

The statements in the application was false and in 2006 there was no evidence of any organisation and an alleged trustee stated that the proposed trustees had not met since late 1998. The deed which was supplied had expired in 2003 and he contracts with local and central government was signed without the deed or any evidence of trustees being provided.

Despite claims that AWINZ no longer exists it is still a registered charity and has never been removed from the list of approved organisation.

I have been informed that this is a good example of state capture which is a form of corrupt practice. The article whose title has been used was published in 2000.

I again emphasise that I questioned this corrupt practice some 4 ½ years ago and have been held in the court without right of trial having been arbitrarily found guilty of defamation on the basis of my own affidavit which was submitted in mitigation of damages as the act allows for.

I have been unsuccessful in finding any government department which deals with this aspect of corruption and therefore seek your assistance.

Could you please advise to whom one makes a complaint with regards to state capture and By way of OIA please supply all documents which consider this form of corruption and methods we have employed to combat this .

[Reply](#)

To the Prime Minister dated 13 December 2010 which was transferred to the Minister of Agriculture on 18 January and transferred to MAF on 26 January 2011.

In your request to the Prime Minister you have requested “all documents which consider this form of corruption (including using the name in the pretence that (the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand) exists (and) (has the legal ability (and has done so) to prosecute citizens and keep the proceeds (under) section 171 (of the) Animal Welfare Act) and methods we have employed to combat this!!

This request is refused under section 18(e) in that the information does not exist.

More information with regards to AWINZ can be found on my blog site
<http://anticorruptionnz.wordpress.com/>

Regards
Grace Haden



Phone (09) 520 1815
mobile 027 286 8239
visit us at www.verisure.co.nz

From: Grace Haden [mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 10 January 2011 2:41 p.m.
To: 'd.carter@ministers.govt.nz'
Cc: 'Joanna Tuckwell'; 'Catriona McDougall'; 'PREECE, Peter'
Subject: revocation of approved organisation AWINZ

Sir,

I note that a notice has been placed in the Gazette 16 December 2010 revoking the approved status of the animal s welfare institute of New Zealand .

The notice refers to the approval gazetted 18 January 2001. The Notice is incorrect as it was amended by the notice below, Like wise this notice requires amending to remove the word inc .

It is not surprising that the words inc found their way into the because this has been an identity fraud since day ONE .

AWINZ is not and never was an incorporated society (only incorporated societies can use the word inc)

It is nothing more than a trading name for person and persons unknown.. Most probably the trading name for the only person who has ever been visible with that name prior to 2006 Neil wells .. who wrote the legislation which facilitated “ approved organisation” It may have been a trust (of which

the trustees never met) from 1.3.200 to 1.3.2003 and was re created by Mr Wells in December 2006 when a new deed was signed. There is however nothing more than the words in the 2006 deed that suggest continuity. Continuity is impossible when the previous “ trust” has not existed for 3 ½ years .

Background

Mr Wells who wrote the animal welfare act and inserted the ability for Organisations to become approved there by becoming like the SPCA and having wide powers and the ability to retain money from prosecutions . (section 171 Animal welfare act)

[The application](#) was made in the name of an organisation which did not exist at that time , If something does not exist it cannot apply for law enforcement ability least of all carry out the duties.

When the application was made for “ awinz” to become an approved organisation Wells supplied un signed trust deed. Wells subsequently gave repeated assurances of the trusts existence and misled the minister as to its status the incorporation of the trust . [Letter to the minister 25 March 2000](#) states” *A signed copy of the Deed of Trust will follow. The original is being submitted to the Ministry of Commerce for registration as a charitable trust in accordance with clause 20 (a) of the Deed.* ‘

1. Mr Wells had incorporated a number of trusts before and knew that only a certified copy is sent.(evidence of this exists on the societies web site of the MED)
2. If he could not send the a copy due to lack of the original then how come there were two originals in 2008
3. The trust deed purportedly signed 1.3.2000 (and not provided until 2006) did not have a clause 20(a) it only went to 19

It appears that the minister at the time believed that AWINZ was an incorporated as a society and therefore the words inc appeared. **NO ONE HAD SEEN SIGNED TRUST DOCUMENTS ,INSISTED ON DOCUMENTS BEING PRODUCED OR CHECKED IN ANY REGISTER IF THE ENTITY EXISTED PRIOR TO GIVING THE FICTITIOUS AWINZ LAW ENFORCEMENT POWERS.**

In [January 2001 Wells](#) wrote to MAF and drew the attention to the fact that the words Inc are only relevant for an incorporated society. He did not allude to the fact that despite the many assurances of incorporation , it had never been incorporated.

Incorporation would have given it perpetual existence and made it an entity in its own right.. i.e. legal person as it was it was no more than an un defined trading name for person or persons unknown

There was no trust in existence at the time the application was made and there is no indication that anyone except Mr Wells knew of or consented to AWINZ becoming an approved Organisation .

A trust was allegedly set up in allegedly March 2000 the date was inserted after the deed was signed.

The deed states that the trustees will retire after 3 years.

There is no evidence of continuation of the trust after 1.3.2003

Contracts with MAF and with Waitakere city (through the same person who had witnessed the trustees signatures) were signed after the term of this deed had expired. You would not be able

to get a loan with documentation such as this but it appears that you can get law enforcement powers.

Notice Number: 1534

Year: 2001

Publication Date: 08 March 2001

Page Number: 572

Title: Amendment to declaration of approval of Animal Welfare of New Zealand

Notice Text:

Amendment to Declaration of Approval of the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand as an Approved Organisation Under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 Notice No. 1187

I hereby give notice that the declaration of approval of the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand as an approved organisation under the Animal Welfare Act 1999, notified in Notice No. 1181, published in the New Zealand Gazette on 18 January 2001 (No. 6, page 116) is amended by deleting the word "(Inc)" from the name of the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand wherever it occurs.

Dated at Wellington this 2nd day of February 2001.

JIM SUTTON, Minister of Agriculture.

Could you also please advise what if anything the government is doing about this fraudulent application for approved status the consequences of which is that even still today we have persons working in Waitakere dog pound who call themselves animal welfare inspectors.

Reply To Minister Carter dated 10 January and transferred to MAF on 25 January 2011.

Your request to Minister Carter dated 10 January 2011 seeks "... Advice what "if anything the government is doing about this fraudulent application for approved status the consequences of which is that even still today we have persons working in Waitakere dog pound who call themselves animal welfare inspectors."

At the request of the Trustees, the Minister has revoked the approval of AWINZ to be an approved organisation and inspectors operating for AWINZ have had their appointments cancelled.

Could you also please ensure that this matter is placed before a lawyer or someone who knows about entities, probably someone from the Ministry of economic developments .. It would appear that too many people have been trusting and no one has read the documents and fully comprehended the legal aspects of them

Regards
Grace Haden

Verisure
Investigations Ltd.

Phone (09) 520 1815
mobile 027 286 8239
visit us at www.verisure.co.nz

From: Grace Haden [mailto:grace@verisure.co.nz]
Sent: Saturday, 22 January 2011 5:12 p.m.
To: 'd.carter@ministers.govt.nz'; 'david.bayvel@maf.govt.nz'; 'enquiry@oag.govt.nz'
Cc: 'Catriona McDougall'; 'info@winstonpeters.com'; 'j.key@ministers.govt.nz';
'r.hide@ministers.govt.nz'; 'Stephen.Walker@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'bethia.gibson@auditnz.govt.nz';
'chong.lim@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'robert.cox@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'stephen.lewis@auditnz.govt.nz';
'ann.kilpatrick@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'mark.maloney@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'john.merrin@auditnz.govt.nz';
'megan.wassilieff@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'robyn.wells@auditnz.govt.nz'; 'brett.story@auditnz.govt.nz';
'keith.locke@parliament.govt.nz'; 'sue.kedgley@parliament.govt.nz';
'catherine.delahunty@parliament.govt.nz'; 'kennedy.graham@parliament.govt.nz';
'phil.goff@parliament.govt.nz'; 'david.cunliffe@parliament.govt.nz';
'lianne.dalziel@parliament.govt.nz'; 'rick.barker@parliament.govt.nz'
Subject: Trading name Animal welfare institute of New Zealand

Official information act request **MAF** and **minister** and **office of the auditor general** . Open letter

Animal welfare institute of New Zealand (AWINZ) has at all times been a trading name .

This trading name without proof of who it represented (that is the parties who were alleged trustees) was given approved status under the animal welfare act 1999.

The approved “ organisation “ has never been an Organisation under any enactment which provides it with the ability to act in its own name, ie independent existence from those using that trading name.

The trading name Animal welfare Institute of New Zealand has been used by various groups

1. Neil Wells personally .. in 1999 when he made an application for approved status, and for funds falsely claiming that a trust existed.
2. An unincorporated trust consisting of Nuala Grove, Sarah Giltrap and Graeme Coutts this trust was formed allegedly 1-3-2000 ,
 - a. these trustees never applied for or consented to the application for approved status ,
 - b. or appointed or approved any person to sign on the individual trustees behalf in such an application . the deed specifically states that powers of the trustees can be delegated in writing. If such a document had existed then this would have had to have been produced, and kept on record , before one could sign for and on behalf of the others.
 - c. This trust has a common seal , this common seal has not been appended to any formal document to show that it is this trusts trading name that is being used. According to the deed , and without further evidence this trust ceased to exist 1.3.2003
3. Neil Wells personally Dec 2003 when he signed the Mou with Maf and Mou with Waitakere city council
 - a. Opened a bank account that only had access to
 - b. Applied for IRD status
4. The name of a subsequently formed trust 5.12.2006 who without evidence claim that they are the same trust as the trust which ceased to exist in 2003. These persons became a

Charity and subsequently asked for the revocation of the approved status. These persons were Wyn Hoadley, Neil Wells, Tom Didovich and Graeme Coutts. There is no record with MAF of these people having entered into a contract with MAF for animal welfare services, They could therefore not request the relinquishment of the approved status

In December 2009 the minister accepted the application to revoke the approved status from the last group listed above, Could the minister please advise what checks were carried out and what evidence was presented to him to satisfy him that these people were the one and the same "organisation using the trading name Animal welfare institute of New Zealand.

And what evidence the minister has that would indicate to the public who at any time during the existence of the approved organisation, were the persons or person who used that trading name.

Reply

In your request to Minister Carter and David Bayvel dated 22nd January 2011 you ask "And what evidence the minister has that would indicate to the public who at any time

during the existence of the approved organisation, were the persons or person who used that trading name"

This request is refused under section 18(e) in that the information does not exist.

Could you also please provide a copy of the criteria the government used for contracting to a trading name and by which means was accountability to the public addressed given that no one knew who was using this trading name at any given time.

Reply

You also ask "Could you also please provide a copy of the criteria the government used for contracting to a trading name [AWINZ] and by which means was accountability to the public addressed given no one knew who was using this trading name at any given time."

MAF did not contract with AWINZ and consequently there is no criteria. Your request is refused under section 18(e). Accountability to the public was addressed by regular audits of the animal welfare inspector performance.

Could you please also provide any discussion papers and documentation which considered the implication of providing a trading name with law enforcement powers.

Reply

You ask for "...[provision of] any discussion papers and documentation which considered the implication of providing a trading name with law enforcement powers."

No consideration was given to dealing with a "trading name", consequently your request is refused under section 18(e) in that the information does not exist.

Regards
Grace Haden



Phone (09) 520 1815
mobile 027 286 8239
visit us at www.verisure.co.nz