

SUPREME COURT OF QUEENSLAND

CITATION: *Re Harris* [2017] QSC 334

PARTIES: **KAREN HARRIS**
(applicant)

FILE NO: BS13419 of 2017

DIVISION: Trial Division

PROCEEDING: Application for leave to institute a proceeding

DELIVERED ON: 22 December 2017 (ex tempore)

DELIVERED AT: Brisbane

HEARING DATE: 22 December 2017

JUDGE: Mullins J

ORDER: **Leave to bring the proceeding is refused.**

CATCHWORDS: PROCEDURE – STATE AND TERRITORY COURTS:
JURISDICTION, POWERS AND GENERALLY –
VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS, PROCEEDINGS AND
RELATED MATTERS – where the applicant seeks leave
under section 11 of the *Vexatious Proceedings Act* 2005
(Qld) to institute a proceeding – where the application was
similar to a prior application made by a vexatious litigant that
was dismissed – whether the applicant was acting in concert
with the vexatious litigant – whether the applicant should be
granted leave to institute the proceeding

Vexatious Proceedings Act 2005 (Qld), s 11

COUNSEL: The applicant appeared on her own behalf

SOLICITORS: The applicant appeared on her own behalf

HER HONOUR: The application for leave by Ms Harris is refused on the ground that I infer she is acting in concert with Mr Skyring to bring a proceeding that is in virtually identical terms to the proceeding that Mr Skyring proposed in an application for leave in file number 13275 of 2017. That was dismissed by me on 18 December 2017. That application had been dismissed by 1 pm on that date. Ms Harris then appeared in the registry that afternoon seeking to file an application in the Court of Disputed Returns that was recognised by a registrar as being identical to the application that Mr Skyring had first attempted to file on 12 December 2017.

Ms Harris' attention was drawn by the registrar to the *Vexatious Proceedings Act* 2005. She returned on 19 December 2017 and filed this application seeking leave to bring an application

in the Court of Disputed Returns to challenge the entirety of the general election for all the representatives in the Queensland Parliament on constitutional grounds. The affidavit that Ms Harris has filed in support of the application does not make sense. Her submission that she has filed today as her outline of argument regurgitates arguments that Mr Skyring is notorious for in relation to challenging the legal tender of this country as being anything other than gold coins.

Ms Harris has her own litigation and was keen to assure me that she has her own reasons for bringing this challenge, if it is going to assist her in getting done what will be of use in her own proceedings. She did concede that she has had the assistance in formulating some of the content of her documents from various people, including Mr Skyring, and she acknowledged that she takes guidance from Mr Skyring. I infer that the guidance and assistance that she has taken from Mr Skyring that is reflected in the contents of her documents which have remarkable similarity to documents that were filed in this Court by Mr Skyring is sufficient degree to enable me to conclude that she is acting in concert with Mr Skyring who is a vexatious litigant and that she therefore requires the leave of the Court before she brings the challenge to the election of all of the elected members of Parliament that is on identical grounds to that which Mr Skyring wished to bring.

When I dismissed Mr Skyring's application in file 13275 of 2017 on 18 December 2017, I noted that to give Mr Skyring leave to bring his application in the Court of Disputed Returns would be to promote a vexatious proceeding as Mr Skyring wished to ventilate the currency argument that was at the nub of the arguments that had resulted in his being declared a vexatious litigant. Ms Harris wishes to ventilate the same arguments. It is not appropriate to give her leave to challenge the recent state election to ventilate those arguments, as it would be to promote a vexatious proceeding. That is why I make the order that I indicated at the outset of these reasons that leave to bring the proceeding is refused. Thank you. We will adjourn. There is one other thing that I will add to my reasons. I should have noted in my reasons, although Ms Harris had a McKenzie friend who was not Mr Skyring, Mr Skyring sat in the back of the courtroom for the entire proceeding.