

---

SIXTH COMPLAINT AGAINST MLAMBO JP  
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE JUDICIAL SERVICE COMMISSION ACT

---

I, Anthony Brink, affirm:

1. I am an advocate of the High Court of South Africa, residing at 25 Balcomb Avenue, Zini River Estate, Mtunzini, KwaZulu-Natal. My email address is anthonybrink.sa@gmail.com and my cellphone number is 0837794174. I am the complainant.
2. This is a complaint made under section 14 of the Judicial Service Commission Act 9 of 1994 against Dunstan Mlambo JP, head of the Gauteng Division of the High Court, and chairperson of the Board of Directors of Legal Aid South Africa ('LASA'), hereinafter 'the respondent'.
3. I charge the respondent with 'gross misconduct, as envisaged in section 177(1)(a) of the Constitution', per section 14(4)(a) of the said Act, in lying to the Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development (as he was then named; hereafter 'the Minister') in a 'confidential' report, submitted under a covering letter quoting a dishonest and disparaging email he'd sent me, to pervert the Minister's enquiry into my complaint repeated in my third petition to the respondent and his Board, which I'd copied to the Minister, that LASA CEO and information officer Vidhu Vedalankar had persistently and repeatedly illegally refused to comply with my requests made in August and December 2010 under the Promotion of Access to Information Act 2 of 2000 ('PAIA') for access to specified LASA records, and that she'd thereby violated my fundamental right to public body information entrenched by section 32(1)(a) of the Bill of Rights in Chapter 2 of the Constitution.

4. For concision, I'll refer to parts of my previous Complaints against the respondent, and I request that they be read as incorporated in this Sixth Complaint. So as to avoid interrupting the central narrative, I'll provide explanatory notes and traverse some collateral matters in an Endnote.
5. Paragraphs 4–13 of my Second Complaint establish the Judicial Service Commission's jurisdiction to decide this Sixth Complaint.
6. As said in my Fifth Complaint, I petitioned the respondent and the Board for the third time on 25 February 2011 about information officer Vedalankar's repeated, persistent illegal total refusal to comply with my PAIA requests of August and December 2010. And, as anticipated by my ultimatum to the respondent in my second petition that should he fail to act on this grave unconstitutional illegality I'd petition the Minister and Parliament next, I copied my third petition to LASA's Executive Authority, the Minister; to his Special Advisor; to the Deputy Minister; and to the chairperson of the Justice Portfolio Committee of the National Assembly, charged with oversight over LASA by section 55(2) of the Constitution.
7. In contradistinction to the respondent, who ignored it as he said he would, the Minister and the chairperson of the Portfolio Committee immediately recognised the enormity and the gravity of my fundamental rights violation complaints repeated in my third petition, and initiated separate, independent enquiries into them.
8. Certainly, the chairperson of the Portfolio Committee did so, because I have a copy of his demand that the respondent report to him; but in the case of the Minister, I'm surmising he also demanded a report from the fact that the respondent made a report to him. Other possible reasons the respondent reported to the Minister are canvassed in my Endnote, Part One.

9. I'm unable to furnish the Judicial Service Commission with a copy of the Minister's demand, presuming he made it, for the reason stated in my Endnote, Part Five.
10. At all events, the respondent reported to the Minister on 9 March 2011. A copy of his 'Report to the Honourable Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development Re: Adv Anthony Brink' ('the report'), which he signed on that date, is annexed marked 'A'.
11. The report was ghost-written by LASA National Operations Executive Brian Nair. I treat this further in my Endnote, Part Two.
12. I'm similarly unable to furnish the Judicial Service Commission with a copy of the letter the respondent wrote the Minister covering his report, for the reason stated in my Endnote, Parts Three and Five.
13. Whereas the report contains no 'Confidential' information of any description, let alone as any law defines it, the header of every page strangely urged on the Minister this furtive classification for the concealment of the information it contained from anyone else. Like from me.
14. The respondent didn't copy his report to me, and it was only by chance that I learned of its existence from the chairperson of the Portfolio Committee some months later, in June 2011. How LASA then unlawfully withheld and concealed the report from me for years, despite my repeatedly made requests for it during pre-trial document discovery process in the Labour Court, and how I eventually fortuitously found it and obtained a copy, is recounted in my Endnote, Part Four.
15. Concerning my complaint in my third petition made yet again about Vedalankar's outrageous repeated illegal total refusals of my PAIA requests, and her persistent violation of my fundamental civil right to information held

by the state in the democratic era, the report stated unctuously and dishonestly:

He is currently pursuing his requests for further information with the Human Rights Commission and has threatened litigation. We are satisfied that we have been open and transparent with Adv Brink in terms of the provision of information as it relates to his core complaint. We are in the process of ensuring that any outstanding requests for information are attended to in terms of PAIA, notwithstanding the fact that many of his requests do not relate to his complaint regarding non appointment. Whilst Adv Brink has threatened legal action in his correspondence to us, we remain confident that we have acted properly in this matter and that we have complied with the provisions of PAIA. ... Notwithstanding the insulting and malicious tone of most of Adv Brink's correspondence with us on this matter, we have tried to convince him, by the provision of relevant documentary evidence, that the basis of his conspiracy theory is unfounded. It is however clear that Adv Brink believes otherwise. ... As a result of Mr Brink's invasive conduct, the Chairperson of the Board wrote to him specifically requesting him to cease contacting Board members as the attached email attests. Despite the Board Chairperson's request Mr Brink has continued with his tirade.

16. The respondent's report to the Minister was self-evidently calculated to pervert his enquiry by misleading him and inducing him to believe incorrectly that:

16.1. my three complaints to the respondent in November 2010 and January and February 2011 about Vedalankar's illegal refusals of my PAIA requests were baseless;

- 16.2. she'd duly complied with my PAIA requests and had refused me nothing;
- 16.3. a few outstanding records that she'd agreed to provide me were still being gathered for delivery;
- 16.4. she'd duly furnished me with all the documents I needed to see for myself that the financial explanation she'd given for the abortion of my appointment was true;
- 16.5. I was mentally perturbed for not accepting her budgetary insufficiency explanation for the abortion of my appointment, and for complaining that the documents that she'd put up, and others I'd sourced, did not support and actually contradicted her claim that LASA's three remaining vacant critical Senior Litigator posts had been frozen indefinitely for want of sufficient budget from the Department to fill them;
- 16.6. I'd asked for and was wasting her time in seeking access to irrelevant documents that had no bearing on the abortion of my appointment;
- 16.7. my 'requests for further information' (in fact the same illegally refused information) that I was 'currently pursuing ... with the Human Rights Commission' were an equal waste of time;
- 16.8. my 'threatened litigation' to compel her compliance with my PAIA requests was meritless and bound to fail;
- 16.9. my correspondence with LASA's executive management and Board was 'insulting and malicious' and my 'conduct ... invasive' – which is to say, in repeatedly entreating the respondent and the Board to see to Vedalankar's compliance with my PAIA requests, and thereby respect my fundamental right to information held by the state guaranteed by

section 32(1)(a) in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, I'd grievously misconducted myself and was continuing to do so; and,

16.10. in my communications with LASA's officers, as I was pursuing entirely misconceived claims and complaints, I was raving like a demented person.

17. All the respondent's claims and clear implications to the Minister in his report about my complaint, repeated again in my third petition, that Vedalankar had illegally and unconstitutionally refused to comply with my PAIA requests, were lies.
18. The respondent knew full well they were lies, because he'd received, had read, had well understood, and had very deliberately spurned my three petitions to him inter alia about Vedalankar's persistent, repeated illegal refusals of my PAIA requests and her ongoing violation of my fundamental right to information.
19. My first petition (annexure 'A' to my Second Complaint) had closely and precisely detailed the unlawfulness and dishonesty of her first refusal in October 2010. My second petition repeated my complaint about this. And my third petition (a) reiterated my complaint; (b) added another about Vedalankar's rejection of my second PAIA request in December 2010 on the false basis that it was a mere repetition of my first request in August; and (c) complained of her ongoing repeated illegal and unconstitutional refusal of my August request for a fresh bunch of plainly spurious, unlawful reasons.
20. That is, the respondent signed and submitted the report to the Minister well knowing – because I'd spelt it out to him in fine detail, which as a top, former appellate judge he well understood – that Vedalankar's repeated absolute refusal to open LASA's books to me was incontestably illegal and unconstitutional.

21. Besides the respondent's lies and false implications to dishonestly discredit and put down my complaint about Vedalankar's persistent illegal total refusal of my PAIA requests made in August and December 2010, the respondent's report contained a multitude of other lies, chiefly concerning (a) the strange, silent, long, unexplained delay in my appointment to the Pietermaritzburg Senior Litigator post for which I'd been selected and recommended, and then (b) when I pressed Vedalankar to finalise it eight months after my successful interview, the wholly off-the-record, unauthorised, illegal abortion of my recruitment to the post (still vacant, still funded to this day). My Eighth Complaint to follow will again expose and refute the respondent's lies in this regard. (After exposing and refuting these lies in my unusually detailed original statement of claim in the Labour Court in July 2011, the respondent's first lie to the Minister was recanted and retracted as a mere mistake in an affidavit made on his behalf, and his second lie was dropped and replaced with other totally different lies told in a 'Report to Board'.)
22. With the corrupt intention of prejudicing the Minister against me and my complaint, the better to pervert his enquiry into Vedalankar's persistent illegal and unconstitutional total refusals of my requests for access to LASA's public records, about which I'd repeatedly complained to him in my three petitions, the respondent defamed me in a letter covering his report by putting up or quoting his false and insulting late-night email sent me on 24 January 2010 (annexure 'C' to my First Complaint).
23. The 'attached email' mentioned in the last sentence of the penultimate paragraph of the report is undoubtedly this outrageous email, because the same sentence appears in the subsequent report to the Justice Portfolio Committee (to be annexed to and the subject of my Seventh Complaint to follow); and in his covering letter to the Committee (which I have) it pleased

the respondent to quote his dishonest and insulting email to me to the same corrupt end. (As said, I can't provide a copy for the reason stated in my Endnote, Part Five.)

24. Since the lies told in the respondent's report and covering letter were subscribed by a senior judge, the Minister naturally believed them to be true; concluded that my PAIA complaints were devoid of merit and that I was a personal and professional reprobate as the respondent alleged, even a bit of a nutcase not worth responding to; and closed the matter – as is evident from the fact that I got no reply from him.
25. The respondent thus succeeded in corruptly misleading the Minister, and thereby perverting his enquiry inter alia into my complaint – reiterated in my third petition to the respondent on 25 February 2011, copied to the Minister – that LASA CEO and information officer Vidhu Vedalankar had repeatedly and persistently illegally refused my duly made requests for access to LASA records and was thereby violating my fundamental right to public body information entrenched by section 32(1)(a) of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution.
26. By deceiving LASA's Executive Authority in this manner, the respondent again:
  - 26.1. breached multiple relevant provisions of LASA's Code of Ethics and Conduct, as enumerated in paragraphs 38 and 41 of my Second Complaint; and,
  - 26.2. 'failed to uphold, defend and respect the Constitution' (per the Nkandla judgment) and thus violated his judicial oath to 'uphold and protect the Constitution and the human rights entrenched in it'.

ENDNOTEPart One

1. It may be that on seeing from the cc list at the foot of my third petition that I'd copied it to the Minister, the respondent decided to report to him defensively and pre-emptively, before being required to do so.
2. It's also possible that my third petition emailed on 25 February 2011 was discussed by the Board at its meeting held the following day, Saturday the 26th, and that it was resolved to report to the Minister about it.
3. (LASA's annual report for 2010/11 shows that a Board meeting was held in February 2011; and since such meetings are invariably held on the last Saturday of the month, it was almost certainly on the 26th.)
4. I don't know and therefore can't inform the Commission whether my third petition to the Board was discussed at its February 2011 meeting, because LASA is determinedly withholding the minute of it. After it was initially refused and then repeatedly promised over the years, then repeatedly not delivered, and despite my having twice sued for it, I've been unable to extract it from LASA. Part Five below explains why.

Part Two

1. Proving this, a screenshot of the PDF 'Author' properties of the report, recording 'Briann', is annexed marked 'B'.
2. At the trial of my labour claim, Nair initially falsely disputed that he wrote it, and I was persistently but unsuccessfully cross-examined on the issue. Finally appreciating that he was cornered by his electronic fingerprints left behind on the document – like a robber leaving his ID on the floor on his way out the bank – he admitted it in his evidence.
3. My stunning and frankly quite disorientating discovery of Nair's authorship of the report just days before the trial – as well as my approximately simultaneous discovery, from his distinctive, idiosyncratic broken syntactical tics (which at trial he admitted), that he'd ghost-written Vedalankar's October 2010 letter (which at trial he denied) refusing my August records request and feeding me the phony budgetary insufficiency excuse – led me to change my mind and conclude, wrongly it turned out, that Nair was principally responsible for the illegal abortion of my appointment; and I therefore decided to exclude the respondent from involvement in it at the presentation of my case.

4. I told the trial judge so at the outset before evidence, and he was evidently relieved by this major shift in the direction of my litigation, away from the respondent – cautioning me in his chambers to stick to it, shortly after I'd begun testifying, when I said I still had a lot more evidence to lead than just the essential facts noted in my Timeline: 'Don't make the mistake of throwing your net so far out that you catch more than you can bring in.' His meaning in the context was unmistakable: *Keep the respondent out of it, or your case before me is doomed.*
5. In his evidence, however, Nair claimed to have had very little to do with the abortion of my recruitment. Considered against his pathetically weak showing in the witness stand as I cross-examined him – after which the judge found he'd been 'not generous with the truth' on 'a number' of occasions – this particular exculpatory claim of his rang true to me, because it had become clear to me that he didn't have the clout on his own, as I'd wrongly believed, to interfere in the implementation of LASA's Strategic Plan 2009–12, inter alia to employ Senior Litigators; and in my petition for leave to appeal I again indicted the respondent's central involvement in the illegal abortion of my recruitment and the cover-up that followed, criminally escalated all the way to the National Assembly.
6. My reassessment was confirmed correct in April 2016 when I discovered the respondent's long professional relationship with my rival applicant for the post as a brother Labour Court judge. It's certain now that Nair was a patsy in the matter and a tool used by the respondent in the cover-up, both of the illegal abortion of my appointment and of the illegal refusal of my PAIA requests probing it.

### Part Three

1. The respondent's covering letter to the Minister was among the requested records that LASA finally agreed at court in February 2016 to give me, but it reneged on its undertaking to do so, and answered my application to compel its compliance with its total surrender treaty in the manner described in Part Five below.

### Part Four

1. In my agenda for the pre-trial conference held in October 2011 after the close of pleadings in my labour case, I requested a copy of the report, obviously needing it to present in evidence at the trial, and thereafter persistently sought it three more times: in my application to compel discovery (converted at my request into a pre-trial conference at court under judicial supervision); in my agenda for this pre-trial conference at court; and in my agenda for the second pre-trial conference at court (which I had to request when LASA reneged on its discovery undertakings minuted at the first one).

2. That is, LASA determinedly withheld the report from me for about two years for different, shifting reasons – until June 2013 when, at the second conference at court just weeks from trial, at which I was desperately trying to crow-bar records out of LASA that I needed for trial, I chanced to discover it among some other Microsoft Word documents in a folder on LASA's lead in-house attorney Thembile Mtati's laptop computer as we were searching together for a different document that I needed. No longer able to lie that he didn't have it, now that I'd seen it, Mtati agreed to email it to me, which he did, in PDF, a couple of days later.

#### Part Five

1. In the Eshowe Magistrates Court on 14 February 2016, LASA totally capitulated to my several applications to court, set down together, for orders compelling its compliance with my PAIA requests made in the period 2013–15, including for documents I'd tried but failed to disgorge via round after round of document discovery process in the Labour Court, and agreed at last to hand over all requested records that it had until then persistently illegally refused me just as I was on the point of moving for an order that they be surrendered.
2. Among these documents were the Minister's demand for a report and the respondent's covering letter for his report: items B38 and B39 on my Consolidated List of Requested Records.
3. Under section 23 of PAIA, Mtati alleged on oath concerning the Minister's demand: 'No such record exists. ... it cannot be located.' The statements on oath contradict each other, because the second implies the record does indeed exist but has been lost.
4. Concerning the respondent's covering letter to the Minister, Mtati swore: 'No such record exists. The officials specified were consulted and they have no recollection of the existence of the record.' The lie to this is given by the penultimate sentence in the report about 'the attached email'.
5. Concerning 'The minutes of all Board meetings held in the period October 2009 to February 2011', my item H15 Mtati swore: 'No such record could be found', i.e. the records exist but are lost.
6. Mtati's perjury is exposed by the facts that (a) despite this claim, he gave me other Board minutes, besides the February 2011 one which he continued illegally withholding; and (b) LASA cannot possibly just lose the minutes of its Board meetings: Its annual report for 2010/11 states that they're filed with the secretariat in hard copy and stored electronically on the U drive.

7. When in May 2016 Mtati disregarded my plea that he deliver the documents he'd undertaken at court to deliver but had failed to, and to furnish a fully and properly compliant section 23 affidavit in regard to documents not furnished, and I applied:

- (a) to the same Magistrate's Court in July 2016 under the default clause of the settlement agreement to compel LASA's full and proper compliance with it; and,
- (b) to the High Court at Pietermaritzburg in October 2016 to compel LASA's compliance with two other PAIA requests duly made in 2016, both illegally totally refused, the one explicitly contemplated in the settlement agreement, the other for all legal cost vouchers reflecting the colossal waste of public money spent on illegally refusing my PAIA requests in 2013-15 and then unjustifiably opposing my applications to compel them all the way to argument,

LASA responded, in a display of supreme contempt for its constitutional information transparency obligations, by applying to the High Court at Pietermaritzburg to have me stripped of my basic civil rights (i) to information and (ii) to enforce this right in a court of law, by having me banned as a vexatious litigant. The matter has been set down for 27 October 2017.

Signed at Mtunzini on 2 July 2017.

ANTHONY BRINK

Signed before me at Mtunzini on 2 July 2017 by the deponent who has acknowledged that he knows and understands the contents of this affidavit and affirms its contents to be true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

COMMISSIONER OF OATHS

Name: *Khombisile Zwab*  
 Address: *No 1 Clarke Avenue*  
*Mtunzini SAPS*  
 Capacity: *Sergeant*





## REPORT TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### Re: Adv Anthony Brink

#### 1. Background

On 12 July 2010 Advocate Anthony Brink wrote to the CEO expressing his concern with regards the delays in the finalisation of the recruitment process for the senior litigator position at our Pietermaritzburg Justice Centre. Adv Brink was an applicant for this position and he was interviewed by our regional selection panel. He was recommended by the regional selection panel to the second stage of the interview process, before a nationally constituted interview panel.

This nationally constituted panel did not however sit to consider applicants recommended for the second stage of interviews. Whilst the initial reason for this panel not sitting was caused by delays in coordinating a meeting time suitable for all members of the panel, other pressing financial constraints facing Legal Aid SA resulted in a decision being made not to proceed with the filling of vacant senior litigator posts. Adv Brink was subsequently informed of this decision.

This resulted in him generating numerous requests for information in terms of PAIA, arising from his discontent with not being appointed to this post. He also wrote several lengthy letters to various individual and organisations, including to the Chairperson and Board of Directors of Legal Aid SA. In his letter to the Board, Adv Brink also made allegations relating to multiple contraventions of the PFMA, including the presentation of false financial information in our 2009/10 Annual Report.

#### 2. Adv Brink's discontent with non-appointment to Senior Litigator Position

From the many letters received from Adv Brink, it is clear that he believes that he was not appointed because of a racial and political bias against him resulting in a conspiracy to exclude him from Legal Aid SA. The conspiracy he alleges relates to his political views against the use of anti-retro viral drugs for HIV AIDS and also discrimination against him as a white male. He incorrectly believes that the second round of interviews was simply a confirmation process where he appears before the Chairperson of our Board who must ratify his appointment. This however is incorrect. All executives involved in this matter have confirmed that this individual was not known to them, nor his political views or publications, and that the first time they came across his name was when his letter of complaint about his non-appointment was received.

The reason for freezing of senior litigator posts was that Legal Aid SA was going through a very uncertain period with regards the provision of funding by the DoJ to finance our OSD phase 1 implementation, which was resulting in an unbalanced budget for 2010/11. As a result various options to make up for the shortfall in our funding, including the freezing of posts, were considered. Various documents which clearly demonstrate the financial uncertainty that we were experiencing at the time, as well as contingency measures that we were contemplating to cater for this, including the freezing of many positions, were shared with Adv Brink in response to his request for information in terms of PAIA.

Adv Brink however remains unconvinced that our reasons for freezing this post is honest, as he remains convinced that there is a conspiracy against him. Legal Aid SA, has under the current leadership, never refused legal aid nor refused appointment of any individual/s because of their race or political views. He is currently pursuing his requests for further information with the Human Rights Commission and has threatened litigation. We are satisfied that we have been open and transparent with Adv Brink in terms of the provision of information as it relates to his core complaint. We are in the process of ensuring that any outstanding requests for information are attended to in terms of PAIA, notwithstanding the fact that many of his requests do not relate to his complaint regarding non appointment. Whilst Adv Brink has threatened legal action in his correspondence to us, we remain confident that we have acted properly in this matter and that we have complied with the provisions of PAIA.

### 3. Allegations of multiple contraventions of the PFMA

In Adv Brink's November correspondence to the Board Chairperson and members of the Board, he draws attention to the fact that Table 3 in Section 4.1 at page 106 of Legal Aid SA's Annual Report for 2009/10, relating to executives remuneration, contains incorrect column totals for basic salaries, total bonuses and incentives, expenses/allowances and other unspecified payments.

An examination of this table has revealed that these four column totals are indeed incorrect, although the last column relating to total expenditure is correct. It must also be noted that the row totals which show individual executives remuneration is correct. We have since been able to determine that the source of this problem was caused by human error at the time when the annual report was being prepared for printing.

This table is however not a part of the Annual Financial Statements (AFS) nor is it material to the AFS presented later in that section. They therefore do not alter any of the AFS, which do not have any errors. These are the AFS that were audited by the Auditor-General and found to 'present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Legal Aid SA as at 31 March 2010...".

The executive's remuneration is also referred to in Note 18.2 of the AFS (page 145 of the Annual Report) in which the total per executive as well as the overall total is indicated. The total per executive as well as the overall total in Note 18.2 of the AFS is the same as the row totals and overall total in Table 3. This confirms that the material amount included in the AFS was not incorrect and therefore our AFS 2009/10 remain correct.

Given that the AFS remain correct and that the error in Table 3 is not material to the AFS, the allegations by Brink of 'false and misleading figures' being a serious criminal offence and that our Annual Financial Statements in our Annual Report are not a 'true and fair representation' are unfounded.

### 4. Conclusion

Notwithstanding the insulting and malicious tone of most of Adv Brink correspondence with us on this matter, we have tried to convince him, by the provision of relevant documentary evidence, that the basis of his conspiracy theory is unfounded. It is however clear that Adv Brink believes otherwise. Therefore, whilst we would not prefer litigation in the normal course of dispute resolution, it seems in this matter that Adv Brink would be well advised to approach the courts on

*Confidential*

this matter of his alleged non appointment. We are however comfortable that we would be able to show to a court of law that our decisions taken on this matter made good business sense and was in the best interests of our organisation at the time. As a result of Mr Brink's invasive conduct, the Chairperson of the Board wrote to him specifically requesting him to cease contacting Board members as the attached email attests. Despite the Board Chairperson's request Mr Brink has continued with his tirade.

This report is sent to the Ministry to provide the necessary background to this matter as well as to contextualise and clarify the allegations by Brink re contravention of the PFMA and provides the necessary reassurance that in fact the PFMA has not been contravened.

*Judge D Mlambo*

*Chairperson*

*Legal Aid SA*

9 March 2011

1014<sup>3</sup>

12.2

MB

The screenshot displays the Adobe Acrobat Professional interface. The main window shows a PDF document with the following content:

- Header: **Confidential**
- Logo: **LegalAid**
- Title: **REPORT TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT**
- Subject: **Re: Adv Anthony Brinn**
- Section: **1. Background**
- Text: "On 12 July 2010 Advocate Anthony Brinn was the delays in the finalisation of the recruit... Pietermaritzburg Justice Centre. Adv Brinn interviewed by our regional selection panel. He to the second stage of the interview process, b... This nationally constituted panel did not howe..."

Two metadata windows are open:

- Document Properties** (top right):
  - Description tab selected.
  - Title: Brink Matter - Report to Minister\_9March2011 (3)
  - Author: Brinn
  - Subject: (empty)
  - Keywords: (empty)
  - Created: 2013/06/19 07:50:32 AM
  - Modified: 2013/06/19 07:50:32 AM
  - Application: Microsoft Word 2010
  - Advanced tab: PDF Producer: Microsoft Word 2010, PDF Version: 1.5 (Acrobat 6.x), Location: C:\Documents and Settings\Anthony\Desktop, File Size: 238.84 KB (244,570 Bytes), Page Size: 9.27 x 11.69 in, Tagged PDF: Yes, Number of Pages: 3, Fast Web View: No.
- Document Metadata for Brink Matter - Report to Minister\_9March2011 (3).pdf** (bottom left):
  - Description tab selected.
  - Document Title: (empty)
  - Author: Brinn
  - Description: (empty)
  - Description Writer: (empty)
  - Keywords: (empty)
  - Copyright Status: Unknown
  - Copyright Notice: (empty)