

Marion Lê, OAM. Registered Migration Agent 9256617
B.A.(Hons); B.Theol.; L.Th.; Grad. Dip. International Law; T.T.C. (NZ, NSW, Qld).
PO Box 3095
Belconnen MC ACT 2617

Phone: +61 (2) 6258 1419
Fax: +61 (2) 6258 1681
Mobile: 0419 419 680
E-mail: marionle@ozemail.com.au

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION & MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS
& INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS
PO BOX 25 BELCONNEN, ACT 2616
By Fax: 02 6264 4310

Attention: [REDACTED]
Co-ordinator FOI Section

RE: FOLLOW-UP OF OUTSTANDING FOI RELEASES –
REMAINING NAURU DETAINEES

Applicants from Afghanistan:

1. A AA
2. AM
3. AJ J
4. AHC
5. A K

Applicant from ... [Country Deleted for this Senate Submission]

1. M SH

Dear [REDACTED]

I refer to my letter dated 23/3/05, regarding the files for the remaining Nauru cases that have yet to be released by your section. I understand that there has been a high turnover of staff in your area and that you have been severely understaffed over a long period of time.

While I understand the logistical barriers your section has suffered over the last fifteen months, receiving these files is a matter of urgency, as I can not finish my submissions on behalf of these cases until I have access to their full files.

I submit that the delay in the release of the full files under FOI for my remaining clients on Nauru is directly contributing to those applicants remaining in long-term detention.

It is of the utmost urgency that I receive these files immediately.
Please note below, a chronology of the progress of the requests under FOI on behalf of applicants housed on Nauru from our phone records and correspondence. The following points are clear from the records kept by my office:

- In real terms I have been waiting over twelve months for the release of the Nauru files of those cases who were rejected. I am still waiting for a number of files from the rejected cases. No FOI releases of accepted cases have materialised at all despite the DIMIA FOI Section having the 956 forms since 4/2/04!
- There were contradictory messages on 18/1/04, (point 5 below) and 18/2/04 (point 15 below) about whether the detainees would have to provide Certified ID and how that would be obtained. On 27/9/04 certified ID was formally requested by FOI Section.
- Some material was released electronically, with the promise that the rest would follow promptly, within days, but the balance was not forthcoming.
- There has been several letters of request for files under FOI, (see letters dated 14/1/04, 4/2/04, 18/2/04, 7/6/04, 21/9/04, 22/9/04), but the majority of cases (particularly the successful cases) have not even been given FA Numbers nor have we received letters acknowledging the requests.
- The purpose of this letter is to obtain six Nauru files in particular, but the broader issue of the fact that all the Nauru clients should have had their DIMIA files released to me promptly, within the legislated time-frame, needs also to be addressed.

Chronology of contact between my office and the FOI Section in central Office:

1. 14/1/04 - A letter requesting access to files under FOI for six Afghans, one Pakistani and one Bangladeshi detained on Nauru was faxed and posted to [REDACTED] FOI Section on 14/1/04. (See Appendix A)
2. The same day, a similar letter with accompanying 956 forms was sent to [REDACTED] from the Refugee and Humanitarian Section, (who was acting in [REDACTED] position). (See Appendix B)
3. 14/01/04 – Phone call with [REDACTED] FOI Section, about the relocation of FOI Section from Regional Office to Central Office RE: where to send requests for FOI. (p119 office call book 2/9/03 – 22/1/04)
4. 15/01/04 – Phone conversation with [REDACTED], FOI Section, Re: FOIs for Nauru (p121).
5. 18/1/04 – Phone conversation with [REDACTED] FOI Section, Re: Nauru FOIs – in which she said “don’t worry about certification – they will liaison with [REDACTED] from IOM (p123).
6. 30/1/04 – 12.50pm -Phone conversation with [REDACTED] FOI Section RE: Nauru FOI – “need to speak with someone else about Nauru FOI now” (p11 office call book 23/1/04 – 27/4/04)
7. 30/1/04 – 1.55pm - Phone conversation [REDACTED] FOI Section, taken by Claire from my office - Re: Nauru FOI – “New Nauru contact number [REDACTED] - Processing – [REDACTED] – Director of the Area – he will have decision-makers under him – FOI – co-ordinator for Central Office – A line area in Central Office is handling line areas – [REDACTED] belongs to an operational area – making decisions re: FOI → liaison person – liaises with a line area.” Claire’s note in the call book then states: “too complicated – I asked [REDACTED] to ring you directly on the mobile (to explain it all!)” (p11)
8. I assume [REDACTED] did ring me on the mobile while I was out of the office that day. My 2004 diary indicates I was at a legal meeting in the city on

30/1/04 that started at 11.30am. If [REDACTED] did get through to me, I have no written record of what was discussed.

9. 4/2/04 – Claire of my office hand delivered to [REDACTED] FOI Section, at Central Office the FOI request letter dated 4/2/04, plus the bulk of the original 956 forms. The 956 forms were also listed on an excel database (with all relevant details like DOB etc) in the order that they were handed over to [REDACTED] (See Appendix C - letter dated 4/2/04 and Appendix D – Database of original 956 forms)
10. 4/2/04 – Letter to [REDACTED] with another copy of the 956 forms and a copy of the above database. (See Appendix E)
11. Phone calls from [REDACTED] Refugee and Humanitarian Section, on 9/2, 10/2 and 11/2 (x3), as well as [REDACTED] (assisting [REDACTED]) 11/2, (pp 22-23)
12. 12/2/04 – Phone call from [REDACTED] - Re: emailing 2002 Review Decision Records, (p23).
13. 13/2/04 - Phone call to [REDACTED] from my office “Fax # for last 956 – 02 [REDACTED] fax # for FOI – Re: the electronic files – she has sent 4 emails (1 of 3, 2 of 3, 3 of 3), with the bulk of the files on – then another email (called 1 of 3 again!) – has just 3 cases on it. This is all they have on hand – the rest of the files are on Nauru! – and copies will be given to Marion when she arrives on Nauru. **They will begin producing the paper files for us on MONDAY!”** (p25)
14. 16/2/04 – Emrys from my office spoke to [REDACTED] Refugee and Humanitarian Section - Re: formatting of the emailed decisions from the files (p27).
15. 18/2/04 – Two phone calls from [REDACTED] FOI Section - Re: Nauru client (late FOI request) HXXXXXXX [REDACTED] stated “we do NOT need to prove his ID – because he is on Nauru” (p31).
16. 5/4/04 – long phone call from [REDACTED] FOI Section - Re: KXXXX GXXX and family – I explained the multiple names for that family as per our extensive conversations with relatives about taking father’s and grandfather’s names (p105).
17. Despite hand delivering the original 956 forms and a letter requesting access under FOI for all the Afghan caseload and a number of other Nauru cases to [REDACTED] FOI Section on 4/2/04, **by May 2004 we had still not received a letter acknowledging they had received the requests and awarding FA Numbers for the Nauru caseload.**
18. In the meantime the majority of the Afghan caseload was successful after their 2004 re-examination interviews.
19. 14/5/04 – Phone call from [REDACTED] “18 handed down, 15 positive and 3 negative” (p35).
20. Further phone calls with [REDACTED] about the accepted and rejected Nauru cases 24/5, 1/6, 3/6, 4/6 and 7/6 x 2.
21. 7/6/04 – Phone call from [REDACTED] Refugee and Humanitarian Section asking if my office could “**fax new FOI requests** for the rejected 18 cases. He hopes their decisions can be collected late today” (p75).
22. 8/6/04 - Further call from [REDACTED] 7/6 - Re: above message and another call from [REDACTED] (p75).

23. 15/6/04 – Phone call from [REDACTED] Refugee and Humanitarian Section, “DIMIA is sending person with final decisions on Thursday 2am flight – further submissions?” (p85)
24. 24/6/04 – Phone call to [REDACTED] FOI Section, [REDACTED] - Re: outstanding FOI requests for Nauru Afghan rejected applicants – “all complaints to [REDACTED] (Manager of FOI) please” (p99).
25. In June and July 2004 the primary focus of my office was producing submissions responding to the issues raised the 2004 decisions for the rejected Afghan applicants, as well as working with DIMIA on the resettlement of the large number of successful Afghans in many locations around Australia.
26. 10/8/04 – Emrys from my office had two phone calls with FOI Section re: long delays in receiving files from FOI requests,
 - a. 11.15 – [REDACTED] - “asked what is happening with FOI situation – he said he would ring back after talking to someone” (p71).
 - b. [REDACTED] – Emrys expressed he was “very concerned about FOI requests which had exceeded the time limit” and [REDACTED] apologised, stating “there has been a complete turnover of management in the section” (p71, office call book - 13/7/04 – 27/9/04).
27. 21/9/04 – Letter to FOI - again requesting access to the files under FOI for the remaining Afghan caseload. (See Appendix F)
28. 22/9/04- Letter to FOI – requesting access under FOI to files for the remaining Iraqi caseload on Nauru (See Appendix G)
29. 27/9/04 – Phone call from [REDACTED] FOI Section, Re: “they have 102 FOI requests from us - have to prioritise otherwise they’ll start at the top and go down the list” (p161).
30. 27/9/04 – Cover Letter to [REDACTED] Re: Priority of recent requests in response to phone call from [REDACTED] (See Appendix H).
31. Letter dated 27/9/04 from [REDACTED] FOI Section, in response to our 21/9/04 letter of request. **Letter contained FA Numbers for the 29 remaining Nauru Afghans.** That letter requested Certified ID for each of the Nauru applicants.
32. 30/9/04 – Emrys from my office made a phone call to [REDACTED] FOI Section, “requesting the ID requirements for Nauruans be lifted - [REDACTED] will talk about it to manager – doesn’t have the power to exempt – [REDACTED] is the decision maker – but have to wait until tomorrow to discuss with manager – re: privacy act etc” (p5 office call book 28/9/04 – 24/11/04 and back page of the letter).
33. 11/10/04 – Emrys rang [REDACTED] FOI Section, - Re: waiving the ID requirement for Nauruans. “[REDACTED] will call this afternoon, or if not call her tomorrow morning” (p17).
34. 12/10/04 – [REDACTED] FOI Section rang in - Re: Nauru IDs – “Privacy problems – Privacy Act – have to ensure that releasing information to the right person and that they ARE who they say they are – etc – [REDACTED] has spent 2-3 hours looking at how to get round. **Nauru Afghans WILL need certified ID**” (p21 and further notes on back page of letter).
35. 21/10/04 – Phone conversation between Emrys from my office and [REDACTED] Refugee and Humanitarian Section, – Re: Nauru FOI ID requirements - “will call [REDACTED] and will see what can be done to get around it. [REDACTED] was very firm about (what [REDACTED] considered was) the fact that there was no agreement that we would be given more than what we were given in the original FOI (electronic email copy of 2002 Review Decision), and in fact they

had decided they would give us the decision records 'off their own bat' before we even put in the FOI, to assist us in our work. I offered to fax [redacted] a copy of the original FOI letter but [redacted] said [redacted] get on to me (later) today or tomorrow!" (p45)

36. 26/10/04 – Emrys phoned [redacted] from the Refugee and Humanitarian Section, Re: Certified ID for Nauru Afghans – “no possibilities after (all) – might be some problems with credibility if the DIMIA have obtained the ID” (p53).
37. 26/10/04 - two further calls by Emrys from my office to the FOI Section, one to [redacted], one to [redacted]. No notes of the phone calls were recorded, simply that they happened (p53)
38. 26/10/04 – Emrys from my office called to [redacted] IOM Chief of Mission on Nauru – no notes of the call.
39. 27/10/04 – email from IOM Chief of Mission, - IOM not able to directly assist migrants to provide certified ID, but suggested a way of supporting the migrants to do it themselves with DIMIA's assistance.
40. 2/11/04 – 1.08pm - Phone call to FOI Section by Emrys from my office – to [redacted] FOI Section, - In the FOI Section, Central Office, “there is only an Assistant Director, a work-place supervisor, [redacted] and a case officer temporarily working ... since the computer upgrade there is no electronic searching for files etc, all done with tape and pen again. DIMIA FOI processed 15,000 files last year ...” (p85).
41. 20/12/04 – Letter to all Nauru rejected applicants (via IOM) Re: Certified IDs.
42. 29/12/04 – Letter to [redacted] FOI Section, - providing Certified ID for 29 Afghan applicants on Nauru. (See Appendix I)
43. 29/12/04 – Letter to FOI Section with Certified ID for 14 Iraqi applicants from Nauru, and a request for the prioritising of two cases above all others. (See Appendix J)
44. 7/1/05 – 12.28pm - Phone call to [redacted] FOI Section – Re: **no acknowledgement letter with FA Numbers for the remaining Iraqis** – gave us [redacted] number [redacted] to clarify (p115).
45. 7/1/05 – 1.30pm – Rang [redacted] – asked for [redacted] or [redacted] – anyone who has already been dealing with it. Got [redacted] – he has the files in close proximity to him (p117).
46. 7/1/05 – 2.06pm – Phone call to [redacted] FOI Section - [redacted] answered, [redacted] not at desk – left message with [redacted] to remind [redacted] to please ring as soon as possible (p117).
47. 7/1/05 – 3.02pm – [redacted] FOI Section, returned call. “Collecting files for the Afghans on Nauru, standard file has decision records and bit of assessment, couple of emails, and tapes (which can't be released).” Claire of my office asked “What about entry interviews or any other applications?” [redacted] answered “There's a client summary sheet, identifiers and original client registration forms.” Claire of my office asked about the material handed to [redacted] June/July 2004 – “**nothing like that on file.**” Claire suggested [redacted] ask [redacted] area about that material – and he said he would. Claire asked about a time frame to get all the remaining files and [redacted] said “[redacted] talk to [redacted] about it” Claire asked about the Iraqi files and [redacted] said “They are a different matter – haven't ascertained where some of them are” – said when [redacted] finds out the “who, the what, the where and the why of the Iraqis [redacted] will be able to let us know” (p117).

48. 7/1/05 – 3.15pm - Phone call to [REDACTED] Protection Programme Management area – left message for [REDACTED] to call the office urgently (p117).
49. 7/1/05 – 3.40pm – Phone call from [REDACTED] FOI Section – Re: timeframe. [REDACTED] said “We will do the best we can with the resources we have – two case officers on deck at the moment – [REDACTED] is assistant Director of FOI Section – [REDACTED] shouldn’t be processing until midnight, but [REDACTED] does for Marion Le (referring to VXXXXX I assume) Suggests a case to the AAT “deemed refusal” \$608.00 unfortunately – that is an option – please fax the priority lists for the Afghans to 6264 XXXX” (p117)
50. 7/1/05 – Phone call in from [REDACTED] Protection Programme Management Area, Re: Why is the new information given to [REDACTED] in June/July 2004 not on the files? – The call was taken by Claire from my office and Claire’s notes read as follows - “they are basically a co-ordination area – not a decision-making area and they would have immediately handed all new submissions/papers onto the decision-makers” (p117). Continued – “[REDACTED] from FOI has already been in contact with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] has suggested to [REDACTED] to ring the three DIMIA case officers who made the decisions in the cases of the 29 rejected Afghans, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] asked me how substantial the extra information was and I read [REDACTED] out an example - [REDACTED] was a bit shocked and said, well that must all be somewhere – did we put that much in for all the rejected cases and I said we put in five to seven extra submissions in, in categories, on average, for the majority of the cases – but not for cases where we received nothing extra – [REDACTED] reiterated that [REDACTED] would have passed it all on and it should be located soon by [REDACTED] and/or the case officers – also [REDACTED] is still in the job, just not there today” (p119).
51. 7/1/05 – Long phone call with [REDACTED] FOI Section, Re: whether to save time by FOI not having to reproduce the 2002 Review decisions, and the 2004 re-examination decisions which had already been released electronically by [REDACTED] area and emailed to us. Claire from my office explained how the decisions released electronically were often unsigned, undated, often did not have page numbers and in several cases more than one decision was merged together, therefore it would be hard to describe precisely what had been released. [REDACTED] asked about whether there were written FOI decisions for what ever had been previously released. It was mutually decided that due to the “merged, undated, unsigned, un-numbered nature of what we had already received, they would re-release the decision records to us in full with the rest of the file” (p119).
52. 7/1/05 – 6pm - Faxed letter to [REDACTED] FOI Section, requesting the remaining Afghan files to be released in a specific order of priority. (See Appendix K)
53. 7/1/05 –A second letter to [REDACTED] FOI Section, adjusting the order of priority for the release of the remaining Afghan files. (See Appendix L)
54. 11/1/05 – 5.20pm - Phone call from [REDACTED] FOI Section, Re: What’s happening with the files? “[REDACTED] has gone home, [REDACTED] has been in meetings with the Director all day – Some Iraqi files will arrive in the overnight bag – all staff pulled off everything else to do the Nauru files – will be working overtime on Saturday and Sunday – (Claire told her Marion leaving on Sunday morning for Brisbane) – [REDACTED] said they will keep bringing the files until Marion leaves” (p125).

55. 12/1/05 – 1.55pm – [redacted] rang in to report that “4 Iraqis by 4pm today, 10 Iraqis Thursday, 7 Afghans Friday, the rest of the Afghans on Saturday!” (p125).
56. 13/1/05 – Letter faxed to [redacted] FOI Section – Requesting the remaining Iraqi files also be released in a specific order. (See Appendix M)
57. 13/1/05 – 3.55pm – [redacted] FOI Section phoned – hiccup Re: [redacted] 956 – talked to [redacted] and [redacted] – “they have the original 956 – please ring direct to [redacted] for any important inquiries- re: the priority list for the 14 Iraqis, seems to have been overlooked – requested (again) that AXXXX and MXXXX (2 very young Iraqi men) be made the priority – they will drop them to us on their way home” (p131).
58. 14/1/05 – Letter to [redacted] FOI Section – Re: Mix up between two Iraqi files. (See Appendix N)
59. 14/1/05 – Phone calls from [redacted] – 10.10am, 10.40am, and 10.55am – Re: FOI Nauru Cases HXXX AXX JXXX (DOB -XXXX74) and [redacted] (DOB- [redacted] – “Gave decision 2 days ago - [redacted] will redo letter with correct name and number – new letter will come by fax – thank for the letter re: [redacted] and [redacted]” (p133)
60. 14/1/05 – later phone call [redacted] – Re: Not releasing the UNHCR papers on file for UNCHR Iraqi cases – “[redacted] had sought a discussion with UNHCR before [redacted] made her decision and acting on my discussion, I made my decision, but you can ask for a review of that decision” (p133).
61. 14/1/05 – Phone call from [redacted] – Re: missing submissions containing new information given to [redacted] June/July, 2004 – [redacted] had “spoken to Nauru Task Force – ie: people who manage Nauru – all [redacted] has is what is on the file at the particular time – ([redacted] asked Claire from my office) – where did you actually send the papers and was told that they were hand delivered during a meeting.” Claire told [redacted] not to worry about that at the moment – but “how are the files going!?” [redacted] answered that [redacted] would have 4 more Iraqis ready today. Claire reminded [redacted] about the commitment made 12/1/05 – to have all the Iraqi cases released by the end of Friday” (p135).
62. 15/1/05 – [redacted] came and delivered eight files, but not in the order we had asked the Afghans to be done in (sorry) – will do more on Monday” (p135).
63. 17/1/05 – [redacted] rang – [redacted] has [redacted] and [redacted] ready to be picked up (p137).
64. 20/1/05 - Left message for [redacted] FOI Section to ring the office (p143).
65. 21/1/05 - Left message with [redacted] for [redacted] to phone us Monday (he has been away Thursday and Friday) – Got [redacted] to call out to [redacted] and ask where [redacted] is up to with the Afghan files, as we are still waiting for about 8 – [redacted] answered that [redacted] didn’t know what [redacted] was up to with the Afghan cases” (p145).
66. 24/1/05 – Phone call to [redacted] FOI Section – “urging [redacted] to hurry up!! – [redacted] said [redacted] can’t work on it until Thursday – agreed to start again then – and have at least two done on Thursday” (p150).
67. 25/1/05 – Phone calls to [redacted] FOI Section 9.45am and 11.00am, “No way can [redacted] have RXXX file ready by 3pm” (p151).
68. 27/1/05 – Phone call from [redacted] FOI Section, for Claire to pick up more files from [redacted] (p155).
69. 31/1/05 – Phoned [redacted] FOI Section and “asked [redacted] to please hurry with the remaining Afghan caseload - [redacted] having to do files that have been ordered for a court hearing - sorry” (p161).

70. 1/2/05 – Left message with [redacted] FOI Section, ([redacted] away), “please ask [redacted] to hurry with the rest of the files” (p163).
71. 7/2/05 – Phone call to [redacted] FOI Section, - “rang to hassle about the rest of the Nauru Afghan files – AK, A M, A AA etc –” (p7 of office call book 2/2/05 →).
72. 10/2/05 – Phone call from [redacted] FOI (Courtesy call) – “[redacted] transferring to Privacy section – [redacted] apologises that [redacted] was not able to finish the Nauru Afghans – very sorry – [redacted] is finishing up Friday. [redacted] has handed the four remaining Afghans and one Iraqi file name to [redacted]. [redacted] can start on them Monday – please confirm that the order you want them done in is still (1) A K, (2) AJ J, (3) A M, (4) A A A, and one more file not released yet for Iraqi husband, K A M, - [redacted] number = 6264XXX” (p15).
73. 2/3/05 – Phone call to FOI Section, rang [redacted] number but [redacted] answered – “[redacted] has transferred - [redacted] has retired and gone back? – [redacted] the boss is off work today – [redacted] on personal leave – and everyone else except [redacted] is in a meeting that will last all day – someone will call us back tomorrow – as [redacted] has no idea who has been allocated the remaining Nauru cases” (p59).
74. 2/3/05 – Long phone call to FOI Section – [redacted] answered the phone – asked [redacted] about the Nauru cases – [redacted] sympathised but said very short staffed, only 2 x “6”s in section and two case officers, [redacted] and [redacted]. [redacted] located the five Nauru Afghan files that we are waiting for and placed them on the edge of [redacted] desk, as [redacted] has left and no-one has been allocated them as yet. (Claire’s notes from her own work book, p4).
75. 3/3/05 and 4/3/05 follow up calls to FOI Section – talked to [redacted] 7/3/05 – “Nothing!” (p6).
76. 11/3/05 – am – left two answering machine messages for [redacted] on [redacted] (p70).
77. 11/3/05 – 2.35pm – left another message for [redacted] re: has the fax requesting the long outstanding file for [redacted] Bangladesh, MSH arrived? (p81).
78. 11/3/05 – 3.30pm – Talked to [redacted] “has S’s file been located as Emrys from the office can pick it up while [redacted] is out and about this afternoon?” – “No, not in a position to give us that file at present – we will ring you when we can give it to you” (p81).
79. 17/3/05 – Left messages on two FOI extensions, [redacted] and [redacted]’ numbers (p103).
80. 18/3/05 – rang [redacted] 6264xxx and [redacted] 6264 xxxx but only talked to [redacted] again – left names of outstanding files – A K, AM, AH C, AAA, A JJ and M S H. [redacted] wrote the names down and [redacted] will ask [redacted] or [redacted] about them (p105).
81. 18/3/05 – Left two answering machine messages on [redacted] phone number (p107).
82. 23/3/05 – [redacted] FOI Section rang in about ex-Baxter cases, but told her that we are still chasing the Nauru files – [redacted] doesn’t know anything further about them sorry!” (p115).
83. 23/3/05 – Letter to [redacted] – Re: Release of last five Afghan files and one Bangladeshi file, plus short summary of interactions with FOI. (See Appendix O)
84. 24/3/05 – Phoned [redacted] FOI Section, to check if they received the 23/3/05 faxed letter – affirmed they did. [redacted] stated “actually, the trouble is that can’t

find the 5 files at present – I told her I had talked to [REDACTED] some time ago, after [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] left the area, and [REDACTED] had located ALL 5 Afghan files and stacked them with a cover-note for [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] desk. [REDACTED] was pleased to hear about [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will go and ask [REDACTED] about where they might be now” (p125).

85. 28/3/05 – Letter to [REDACTED] FOI Section – Re: Unacceptable delays for the release of the last five Afghan cases on Nauru and one Bangladeshi case.

Conclusion:

As can be evidenced from the chronology of the contacts between my office and the FOI Section, the delays in receiving Nauru clients’ files has been the subject of ongoing correspondence and telephone communications between my Office and the DIMIA since February 2004.

On any assessment, these delays are unacceptable and are not isolated, unfortunately, as we have other files beyond the Nauru caseload which have not been released to us within the legislated timeframe.

I wish to add that the communication between the DIMIA staff in the FOI Section and my Office has always been more than cordial.

I am of the considered belief that the delays are because of under-resourcing and understaffing in that Section rather than the fault of the Officers concerned in the processing.

Clearly we need these files in order to best serve our mutual clients. Therefore I am requesting that those identified above be released to us by close of business this coming Friday.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

MARION LE, OAM

28/3/05

cc [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sen Amanda Vanstone’s office