

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-jit@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 6 November 2006 2:31 PM
To: 'probate@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: Erini Stiliano Probate - Undisclosed Assets
Attachments: 2006_10_24_Undisclosed Probate Properties_p1.jpg; 2006_10_24_Undisclosed Probate Properties_p2.jpg

Probate Registrar
Supreme Court
Adelaide

The attached letter indicates that the Executor/Solicitor have deliberately withheld disclosing 12 properties known to belong to the title holder and testator Erini Stiliano.

The title searches were conducted by the Public Trustee Administrator and can be viewed at http://www.maureenhalse.com/rhodes/media/media.htm#THE_TITLE_SEARCHES

I had warned the Probate registrar that that is what they probably would do. Anderson's lawyers had also warned them not to do it.

The Executor and solicitor have spent some six months finding a way of avoiding probating the properties the Executors had coveted.

The motivation for the probate cheating is that the Executors had already been gifted between one and two million dollars in property capital and income over a period of 30 years, and the wise and fair testator took this into account when she made me sole beneficiary, because I had received nothing at all and did not ever expect or demand anything or ever complain to anyone - in stark contrast to the Adelaide ungrateful siblings who drove their parents to ill health (my opinion). Stella has expressed gratitude and considers she has received enough. By 1993, when my mother made her final will, my mother had had enough of their excessive greed and had even changed her religion for a more meaningful life.

They clearly have been avoiding the proper probate procedures of declaring all of the testator's assets and then opening those assets to challenges by interested eligible persons.

They mention "once the disputeis finalised." They don't indicate who it is they are disputing, but it is clear it is not me - I did not write the Will. If they are disputing the Will then they need to list all the assets that are in dispute and then dispute the testator's Will through the Supreme Court as non-Executors.

What they are attempting to do is to dispute properties which they are "unsure whether (the properties) formed part of the estate". They are clearly unsure of how to go about undermining the estate, and their research and correspondence with other lawyers indicates they cannot win any of the estate through legitimate channels.

On the matter of George Stiliano, when he died in 2001 there was no attempt by the same current Executor/s to mention or include his 'alleged given estate'. This is because the Executor's husband had illegally acquired, in 2000 and 2001, the 'title deeds' that were once meant for George back in 1987. The estate was also in my mother's name.

As far as the Registrar is concerned, the Executor and solicitor have committed Summary Offences, and the contents of the letter indicates illegal nonsensical means of trying to deal with an estate by bypassing probate.

Philip Stilianos
6 November 2006

Philip S

From: Yarlett, Kathryn (CAA) [Kathryn.Yarlett@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Friday, 16 February 2007 4:45 PM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: URGENT - ESTATE OF ERINI STILIANO

Dear Mr Stilianos,

I confirm receipt of your email and I will provide a copy to His Honour Justice Gray.

I also confirm that the matter will be called on for mention on Wednesday 21 February 2007 at 10:15am at the Supreme Court of South Australia.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Yarlett
Associate to the Honourable Justice

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Friday, 16 February 2007 1:11 PM
To: anneveer@yahoo.com.au; 'Nicky V'; 'sonja w'; 'Irene Stilianos'
Cc: 'Treloar and Treloar'; Yarlett, Kathryn (CAA)
Subject: FW: URGENT - ESTATE OF ERINI STILIANO
Importance: High

Hi Daughters

I think this is an expensive joke.

It seems the Executor and her law firm are confused and/or frustrated and are resorting to the comfort of an Australian court in their own State rather than face the proper jurisdiction of a Greek Court which has strict inheritance laws which are not in the Executor's favour.

I won't be wasting time and money and effort with this nuisance affidavit when the plaintiff and her solicitor knows it's a matter to be dealt with under Greek jurisdiction.

Still the fact that for the first time ever the Executor has put something in writing means that her claims can be quashed. No lawyer required either.

The affidavit contains a number of lies, and a number of omissions.

The plaintiff should pay the cost of this affidavit and all legal expenses.

I'm not sure why 'defendants' appear when they have not been actually charged with anything.

Why doesn't the plaintiff submit the affidavit at her expense to a Greek court via a Greek lawyer. That was the understanding Treloar & Treloar made clear in their letter to me where they said they wanted nothing more to do with Greece, that I was not to correspond to them about any Greek matter, and that I and my siblings had to engage our own lawyers in Greece.

Now it appears that Anna and T&T, having failed to get a good deal from Greece, are going to try and get some Judge in an SA Court to read a bunch of lies and get away with

it. T&T know how vulnerable and desperate Anna is.
It was understood that the plaintiff would pay at her own expense. Now T&T are attempting to get away with the estate paying for the plaintiff's personal interests.

I booked my flight to Greece a week ago and am leaving tomorrow. If the plaintiff has any claim or complaint to make she can lodge it in Greece, and the Greek court will decide under its laws what properties she is entitled to.

Philip Stilianos
16 February

From: Vanessa Varga [mailto:vanessa.varga@treloar.net.au]
Sent: Friday, 16 February 2007 10:25 AM
To: philstil2005-home@yahoo.com.au; philstil2005-temp3@yahoo.com.au; philstil2005-msnzone@yahoo.com.au
Subject: URGENT - ESTATE OF ERINI STILIANO
Importance: High

Dear Philip

Please see attached letter, summons, affidavit and exhibits.

Kind regards

Vanessa Varga
Solicitor
Treloar & Treloar
Ph: (08) 8231 4757
Fax: (08) 8410 0083

This email (including any attachments) is confidential to the intended recipient and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you are advised that any use, reproduction, disclosure and distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please, delete this email immediately and inform us of the error. Please note that Treloar & Treloar Barristers & Solicitors do not accept any responsibility for any viruses that may be contained in this email or in any attachments. It is therefore your responsibility to ensure that your systems have adequate protection against virus infection.

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 15 March 2007 4:04 PM
To: 'Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: File 192/07 - Itsines v Stilianos

Judge Lunn

I don't know why this strange Itsines v Stilianos file is a 'versus' with me. It's me versus Probate Registrar and that's all. I resent lawyers creating a family confrontations.

I do not have any contact with the Executor Itsines or her solicitor.

I do wish to be listed as a defendant because the **writs are invalid and in the wrong jurisdiction**. The jurisdiction is in Greece not Australia.

The writs show Anna Itsines as a plaintiff but she is in fact the Executor pursuing her own interests on claims and has currently allowed properties in excess of \$200,000 to be claimed by squatters in Greece. The Executor has stalled probate and issuing certificate of probate because she needs to do that in order to succeed in simultaneous fraudulent estate transfers in Greece. She has provided **zero protection of the estate and has allowed her lawyer in Rhodes to conduct fraudulent property transfer/s by way of rigged lawsuits**. As long as she provides no protection and can con the Probate Registrar and the Probate Court to stall issuing certificate of probate, she is able to perform property fraud in Rhodes with relative ease.

Because the **plaintiff is in fact the Executor using up estate funds to stall issuing probate to Greece whilst pursuing fraudulent activities in that jurisdiction**, I do not recognise the writ as legitimate.

Greece regards the act of not issuing a certificate of probate to a beneficiary of its land as offensive and extremely dangerous and foolish thing for Australia to do because it immediately places the foreign properties at risk of squatting and possession for growing trees and buildings which by Greek law cannot be removed by the land owner and must be paid for by the land owner wants his land.

Because the hearing transcripts prove that Probate Registrar and Court has proactively (albeit ignorantly and foolishly) supported the Executors ability to cause loss of property/s in Rhodes, it is requested that the SA Government compensate me for their unprecedented intrusion into foreign inheritance laws and culpable ignorance of foreign property laws.

Judge Lunn should **immediately direct that the Probate Registrar to issue me or my sister Stella a certificate of probate** in order that either of us make an immediate submission to Greece which will enable us to take control of the land away from the squatters.

Could you please do this as a matter of urgency and priority.

The lawsuit is being heard on 26 April 2007 in the Rhodes Court and if we don't have inheritance papers (certified probate) in Greece to show that someone is taking an interest in the \$200,000 then we will LOSE it. You cannot leave this submission to the Executor Anna because she has arranged this lawsuit with her lawyer who is a renowned expert on arranging rigged squatter lawsuits and has a large collection of properties himself in that area of Rhodes (Lahania).

It's the **beneficiary/s that must directly handle the inheritance, no one else**. That is Greek law and that's the way were doing it, Stella and I, Gary can join in. Gary and Stella get a

1/6 each.

As for the **Grandchildren's inheritance**, they will apply for Legal Aid to get a Codicil to the Will from the SA Supreme Court under section 43 of the Guardianship Act. As 6 months from grant of probate on 20 Sep 2006 will have lapsed in a few days, Section 43 of the Act requires that an extension of time be obtained to submit application to the Supreme Court. Are you able to do this?

Please **tell Varga to stop using me as a defendant and as an Itsines opponent**. It irks me and my children and Stella.

Philip Stilianos
15 March 2007

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 15 March 2007 4:05 PM
To: 'Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: FW: Estate of Erini Stiliano - Lawsuit on Property 671

To Judge Lunn

This has a bearing on this [Itsines vs World 'mention'](#) on 16 March 2007.

The Greek Courts are ready to receive the Australian Probate and distribute the estate as per Greek Law.

Philip Stilianos
14 March 2007

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 15 March 2007 3:33 PM
To: 'Treloar and Treloar'; 'npan@pk-law.gr'
Subject: Estate of Erini Stiliano - Lawsuit on Property 671

Dear V. Varga et al

I request that you withdraw from any involvement in this lawsuit because Stella and I are able to handle it at relatively little expense.

There is no need to engage a lawyer from Athens when we already have one in Rhodes.

Stella (my sister) and I have already prepared a very strong defence. We have material and personal knowledge that no one else has. The lawsuit *cannot be won by anyone* without this material.

It was **I who discovered the Lawsuit** on Property 671. **I also now have the full lawsuit details** which I obtained myself whilst in Greece, at **zero cost**, and at the same time I registered a defence with the Rhodes Court by presenting my passport. The Court were very annoyed that no one had shown any interest in the property and that I had shown up at the eleventh hour.

We have engaged a local lawyer (less expensive) **in Rhodes** who can present this material. There are no State Trustees necessary and no huge fees required such as the **12,000 euros** (\$20,000) estimated by N. Pantazis which is what would be required working in the dark. **Please withdraw from any involvement in this lawsuit**, because **you do not have information nor evidence** to defeat this **very strong lawsuit**. As I say, the Executor and her husband will *never* provide you with crucial information to win it.

I discovered the lawsuit because I took an interest in the estate, and I obtained the lawsuit because I presented myself to Greece.

The Executor did not take an interest in the estate (however see below) , and has made no effort to obtain the evidence that I have to defeat the lawsuit.

I strongly suspect (99.99%) that this lawsuit was arranged by the Executor's husband and their renowned property lawsuit lawyer in Rhodes whom they have engaged for the past 7 years.

If their Rhodes lawyer has such an intimate knowledge of Lahlania and is an expert on arranging tax-free lawsuit transfers, owns many properties in Lahlania himself and is their best chance of winning the lawsuit then why wasn't he asked to do it?

Now let me say this. Anna Itsines and her husband and their lawyer know how to protect property as well as anyone in Rhodes. This is no accidental lawsuit - it is fraudulent.

In view of this out of control estate handling, I will take steps to see that 3 of the 4 siblings take responsible control. It was just me but Stella is very alarmed at the non-management of this estate. The beneficiaries will take control **no State Trustee is necessary**.

Regards.

Philip Stilianos
15 March 2007

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]

Sent: Thursday, 15 March 2007 9:04 PM

To: 'Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au'

Subject: Erini Stiliano Estate - File 192/07 - Itsines v World - ATT: JUDGE LUNN

Behind A Perfect Will

This is just a personal note.

This is for the many uninformed who have been misled into believing the plaintiff's tale of my mother's Perfect Will being an accident.

The **plaintiff received over a million in property pre-gifting** between 1975 and July 1993. This is assets plus asset income in today's values. These assets are not mentioned anywhere in the affidavits. After my mother's POA (her husband) had beaten her senseless many times over his wanting control over her property - he wanted to give it all to three eagerly receptive children and none to me - my mother made her Perfect Will in August, at the risk of life and limb, in which she willed what was left of the estate in Greece to me and my 4 daughters who are the *only* beneficiaries should I get eaten by a crocodile, shark or an alien. I had made the *cardinal sin of having relationships/marrying Australian women*. I was told this was the reason for my being omitted.

My three siblings were *at the time* willing recipients of the spoils of racism.

All the prime properties had by the time my mother made her Will been transferred to two of siblings, **the great bulk of it to the plaintiff.**

Therefore, my mother's **declaration in 1987 to transfer all her inheritance in Greece to her 5 children had been made totally obsolete in 1993** when a raging POA under pressure from persistent children transferred the bulk of estate to the plaintiff. My oppressed, suppressed mother, who *changed her religion* because of disillusionment with her increasingly dysfunctional Adelaide family, was shut out of their lives after making her will. They would only go to their father for more gifting of her property, and she was never involved by them. Poor Mum how did that make her feel.

None of this is presented in the affidavits. Normality is the theme, as though our family was completely normal and that the Will had a minor inconsistency in it.

The will itself is *A Perfect Will*, it's just the rest of the family that was, and still very much is, 100% dysfunctional.

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Friday, 16 March 2007 5:12 AM
To: 'Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: File 192/07 - Itsines v World - ATT: JUDGE LUNN. PLEASE READ THIS IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Importance: High

IN CONFIDENCE - URGENT

To Judge Lunn

My four daughters are extremely distressed and in tears over what you Judges have done.

They cannot believe that responsible people - lawyers, judges cannot see what they see through their innocent eyes. They are frustrated at my inability to make myself understood by the SA government's courts campaign of opposition. They themselves are too traumatised and so distressed by these experiences which they don't want in their lives, and I have told them that I need their crucial support, for them to make a stand, because I'm having to fight so many people without any support.

This has now caused a deep rift in my family. They were hopeful of some helpful gifting from me passed down via their grandmother, but I think if *this goes to the Public Trustee that I am going to walk away from the entire estate and resume a normal life after 7 years since 2001.*

They are too naive to think that people behave so dishonourably - they have never seen this kind of behaviour in their lives (they are in their late 30's).

My sister Stella fully supports me and cares for my daughters and is very concerned about the wanton financial damage that the plaintiff has caused.

The plaintiff has said to Stella: "I LOST MY DAUGHTER, SO WHY SHOULD THEY WORRY ABOUT LOSING \$60,000"

My sincere urgent recommendation is that SA Jurisdiction be ordered to completely and immediately cease all involvement in the Greek properties. This will immediately calm everyone down as Stella, myself and soon Gary will soon have this all under control. The plaintiff is clearly 'suicidal' in her affidavits (known forgeries now appear as crucial exhibits VAV1 and VAV3 in Affidavit File 192/07 - see documentation website) and her behaviour and her mind appear to just be in another dimension where there is no reality. I know this can happen when one someone very close to them dies, it happened to me in 1983 when I lost my young wife of 36 and for years I was not on planet Earth.

Dozens and dozens of relationships are at stake here Judge Lunn. We are counting on you to turn this around and allow sensible people to take control.

I am *temporarily* placing all documents and email/letter correspondence on http://www.omegaenterprises.info/rhodes/emails/emails_tt.htm for reference.

Behind A Perfect Will

This is just a personal note. This is the first time any Judge will have seen this.

This explanation of my mother's will is meant only for some employees of the SA Government who have been misled into believing the plaintiff's tale of my mother's Perfect Will being portrayed as an accident.

The **plaintiff received over a million in property pre-gifting** between 1975 and July 1993. This is assets plus asset income in today's values. These assets are not mentioned anywhere in the affidavits. After my mother's POA (her husband), of an innate violent nature, had beaten her severely a number of times over his wanting control over her property - he wanted to give it all to some children and none to me - my mother made her Perfect Will in August 1993, at the risk of further beatings, in which she willed what was left of the estate in Greece to me and my 4 daughters who are the *only* other beneficiaries-in-line mentioned. I was told that reason for my being omitted was that I had relationships with Australian women.

All the prime properties had by the time my mother made her Will been transferred to two of my siblings, the great bulk of it to the plaintiff.

Therefore, my mother's **declaration in 1987 to transfer all her inheritance in Greece to her 5 children had been made totally obsolete in 1993** when her errant POA under pressure from persistent children transferred the bulk of her estate to the plaintiff. My oppressed, suppressed mother, who *changed her religion* because of disillusionment with her increasingly dysfunctional Adelaide family, was shut out of their lives after making her will. They would go only to their father for more gifting of her property, and she was never consulted by them. Poor Mum how did that make her feel. She confided in me once in about 1997/98 the degree to which she had been affected by the endless greed of unspecified children.

My mother and father lived apart, and they left nothing to each other in their Wills.

None of this is presented in the affidavits. Normality is the theme, as though our family was completely normal and that the Will had a minor inconsistency in it.

All the affidavits falsely convey the implicit impression that the relationship between my father and mother was loving and normal. This is to cast doubt into various Judges minds about the intentions of my mother's Will.

The will itself is *A Perfect Will*, it's just the rest of the family has been for many years highly dysfunctional.

Philip Stilianos
16 March 2007

Philip S

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 19 March 2007 3:42 PM
To: philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au
Cc: vanessa.vargas@treloar.net.au
Subject: File 192/07 - Itsines v Stilianos & Ors

I refer to your recent e-mails addressed to Judge Lunn. His Honour is not prepared to receive communications about the merits of action 192/07 in this Court in this way. If you wish to participate in this action and be heard on whatever orders this Court makes you are required, under the Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006, to file a notice for address for service and to put forward any evidence you wish to place before the Court in affidavits filed in the action. You can do this either through a lawyer authorised to act in this State who you employ for this purpose or you can do so in person.

Heather Gameau
Personal Assistant to Judge Lunn
8204 0462

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 2:13 PM
To: 'Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au'
Cc: 'Treloar and Treloar'
Subject: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

Judge Lunn

I need time to prepare my affidavit or response to AMI's affidavit, and include exhibits not presented by Treloar & Treloar and the plaintiff. The material below I am compiling will need to be put into a more suitable format. I am 60 years old and on a disability pension and do things very slowly. My glaucoma medication appears to drain me and I need to take breaks. It takes me ages to organise things, when I remember that things need organising :-).

Note that stress exacerbates my glaucoma and my vision suffers, that is why I take long breaks and try to find alternatives to doing anything that is too mentally emotionally stressful, or do nothing at all. I have no problem with the Greek jurisdiction which is relatively stress free.

I cannot afford to be paying lawyers in two jurisdictions, so I'm doing this one here on my own.

This is about 50% of it. My telling mother's story will also be included.

In view of the material here, dealing almost entirely with fraud, forgery and a comprehensive police submission, is the Civil Court the correct venue to deal with this material?

This is more like a counterclaim. She has always been the 'defendant' and I the 'plaintiff'. It's just that I found another much easier and simpler way by doing it via the more humane Greek method and found no need to remove her as executor as I had planned.

Do we really need to persist with this hearing in Australia? I'll win it easily here and/or in Greece because I'm telling the truth and the plaintiff has made it very easy for me by submitting her crimes in affidavits, but It'll drain me.

I don't mind who sees this stuff because it's the truth and contains no libel. Even Treloar & Treloar can have a look and give themselves plenty of time to come up with answers and no excuses.

I'll need at least two weeks to get everything together as per Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006.

Philip Stilianos
20 March 2007

DRAFT

Table of Perjuries and Forgeries

of Anna Maria Itsines

affidavit file	date	section	exhibit	perjury comment	comment
AMI - Affidavit of Anna Maria Itsines	15 Feb 2007	11		The deceased made no such specific instruction to her attorney. Stella who lived with the deceased all of her life, has stated that that is untrue.	perjury
				<p>I had no concept of the existence of 'Greek titles' until I rang, from Melbourne where I reside, the 4th defendant in April 2001 and he said 'I have found my 3 titles, I don't know where yours are you'll have to find your own, goodbye'. Despite my sister (5th defendant) searching many times in her father's house in Adelaide (next door to hers) she never found them.</p> <p>By about August 2001, I was told by Greek lawyers that names on the back of any titles were <i>invalid</i>. The names had to be <i>notarised without exception</i> otherwise the titles are <i>never</i> deemed as gifting.</p> <p>Therefore the non-notarised titles became irrelevant to me because they were <i>rejected as gifts by Greek law</i>. By about November 2001, on the eve of an Administrator hearing that I had initiated, the plaintiff phoned to say she had a premonition that the titles were under my father's mattress.</p> <p>She begged me not to appoint an administrator and screamed uncontrollably at one very loud single pitch, and after some time passed I hung up the phone.</p> <p>I think it was quite some time later (months or weeks) later that year in 2001 that I</p>	

	13		<p>had asked Anna if the documents she had found were in her possession as I wanted 'mine' for documentation's and curiosity's sake. She said she did not know where they were. <i>They were discovered in their possession in November 2004</i> at a District Court hearing. I think the plaintiff's husband handed me 'mine' but held onto my deceased brother's 'titles', which he had planned to steal. His intentions to steal my titles and my deceased brother's titles can be found in the transcripts of the GB hearing in August 2004 where he yells repeatedly '5 titles are mine, I need those titles' as he was being evicted from the Court. An extract of that hearing's transcript where the defendant's husband claims his titles is presented as exhibit PSS4.</p> <p>This claim is again made at a District Court hearing in November 2004. This extract is presented as exhibit PSS5</p> <p>This exhibit proves the <i>perjurious nature</i> of of the plaintiff when she attempts throughout her affidavit to falsely and deceitfully convey that equal distribution was being implemented.</p>	perjury
			<p>This is perjury proved in forgery proof below. My mother was terrified by her attorney. He asserted the properties as his and that he could with them as he wished. The POA document, as I have have</p>	

just read in the translation in another exhibit, gives him absolute control so long as he distributes fairly, so there was no need to give him these specific directives.

The fact is however, that he distributed the bulk of the estate (estimated at more than \$500,000 asset plus income) to the plaintiff in an inexplicable series of property giftings in March to July 1993, and he also distributed some properties to the 5th defendant.

The terms of the 1987 POA were thus violated, thus rendering obsolete and void all prior 'gifting' declarations and any arrangements that had been made in 1987 prior to draft Will of August 1993 that was made immediately, just weeks, following the POA violation.

The plaintiff has omitted any mention of this gross pre-gifting, and has instead resorted to perjury and forgery in her capacity as Executor, attempting to misuse the estate by some \$30-50,000 (estimate) to pay for her legal indiscretions.

MAJOR PERJURY

This document is overlaid with forgery.

This single exhibit proves the plaintiff's propensity to commit perjury after perjury and forgery after forgery in order to obtain property she is not legally entitled even under Australia's inheritance laws.

The original document is submitted as exhibit PSS1.

Compare this exhibit with the same document submitted as exhibit AMI4

	14	AMI4	<p>by the plaintiff. <i>The plaintiff's husband has written names alongside the list of properties and made special notes, and with that forgery in hand the plaintiff committed the affidavit perjury AMI4 viz: "the deceased also instructed her Attorney, being my father, to write the names of her children next to the respective titles listed on a piece of paper."</i></p> <p><i>This forged document has been referenced as a crucial document by the barrister and judge upon which they directly based their arguments judgements.</i></p>	MAJOR FORGERY
	15		<p>I was never ever aware of a list of gifts of the properties as evidenced by the perjury and forgery proven in Section 14 of the plaintiffs affidavit.</p> <p>I had absolutely no concept, no communication from my parents, and absolutely no knowledge of anything to do with the land in Greece. The ones with any knowledge were the plaintiff and the 4th and 5th defendants.</p> <p>I lived in Melbourne, they in Adelaide, and I had no knowledge of any of the activity that was going on in Adelaide.</p> <p>I will go one better. I was not even aware that I was going to receive anything in my mother's will.</p> <p>As a brief side note, when I phoned the 4th and 5th defendants in August 2000</p>	major perjury

			<p>asking about my share of my mother's gifting, the 4th and 5th defendants said they knew absolutely nothing about the Rhodes land, and that I should contact my father.</p> <p>My father in early mid 70's had gifted his three shops to 3 of his 4 Adelaide children and had omitted me. As a result of this I had minimal contact with family in Adelaide.</p> <p>Note that this gifting of commercial property by my father has been omitted by the plaintiff.</p> <p><i>The plaintiff is aware of all the shameful giftings she has received, commercial, investment house and land, by virtue of her deliberate omission of them in her affidavit.</i></p>	
	16		<p>This is a perjury domino in a long chain of perjury dominos deriving from the the plaintiffs affidavit Section 14 perjury and affidavit exhibit AMI4 forgery. Massive pre-gifting of March-July 1993 intentionally not mentioned clearly because that would break the plaintiff's case. In August 1993, just WEEKS after the POA was violated ad abused, my mother made her DRAFT will, submitted as exhibit PSS2.</p> <p>The draft will makes it even more clear that my mother's entire estate was to only go to myself, all of my children and my grandchildren, and none of her other children or grandchildren. This clearly was by careful design as all</p>	perjury through omission

			<p>her other children had been provided with substantial wealth by their parents.</p>	
		17	<p>clearly a perjury domino.</p> <p>The deceased wanted her properties sold in 1987 as indicated in her letter submitted as exhibit PSS3.</p> <p>In 1999 he leased them for 5 years with a farmer in Rhodes. That's clearly not an arrangement to sell land.</p> <p>As a side note, in September 2000 when I asked the deceased's POA for the first time ever if I could receive my share for my family he said there was no land for me. That's hard to believe but that's what I conveyed back to my daughter and my partner.</p> <p>In addition he told me that he had removed the deceased's son George from receiving anything and he put the plaintiff's husband in his place!!! Although the plaintiff;s husband initially denied it , he eventually confessed in exhibit PSS1.</p> <p>So much for "distributing to all the deceased's (5) children."</p> <p>There was one intention, that of distributing to only THREE children.</p> <p>I learnt that the deceased's POA had opened only 3 bank accounts in Greece to receive proceeds of land sales.</p> <p><i>That is even more proof that he did not have</i></p>	perjury

				arrangements in place before he died.	
		18		This is a most perjurious statement and forgery, as proved above. The plaintiff repeats the perjury as it appears it is an essential statement to make in order to successfully deceive the Court	major perjury
		18	AMI4	This forgery has been proved above. The plaintiff repeats the forgery and presents it as a table, it appears that it is an essential forgery to make in order to successfully deceive the Court	major forgery
		19		This is perjury domino. The properties are not in dispute neither in Australian or Greek law. The plaintiff committed a number of perjuries and forgery leading up to this domino.	perjury
		21		<p>At the hearing the plaintiff and her husband committed perjuries and deceived the Board. The major perjury is presented as exhibit PSS5</p> <p>This does not even appear in the transcript of the hearing. It was told to the Board <i>in secret</i> and the Board used that perjury, <i>just like this Civil or Probate Court had used the perjury in that exhibit</i>, to deem that I could not be administrator.</p> <p>I responded to the GB in Exhibit PSS6 and they acknowledged it in Exhibit PSS7.</p>	perjury committed at GB hearing by plaintiff
				matter was NOT reviewed by GB. I did not call that hearing, I did not apply as administrator, and I did not attend that hearing. I had advised the GB	

		23	<p>beforehand that the forgeries the plaintiff had committed were presented to the SA Police in a 26 page document and that they should deal with that before an hearing went ahead. The document presented to the police appears as exhibit PSS7</p> <p>The Crown solicitor Lesley McPharlin had instructed the SA Police Fraud Squad not to proceed with the fraud investigation that they were about to undertake.</p> <p>The deceived Crown solicitor had personally sought to assist the plaintiff, and the Crown solicitor herself had falsely told police that the fraud investigations had already been dealt with by a number of government departments. Attached as Exhibit PSS8 is the response by the police.</p> <p>None of GB, the CS or the police had any insight into the highly perjurious nature of the plaintiff.</p> <p>Every decision made by the GB, PT and police and the Probate Registrar were based on perjuries presented here, just as the decisions of Judge Gray and the were based on these perjuries.</p>	perjury
		25	<p>The Crown Solicitor Lesley McPharlin had befriended the plaintiff, and as can be seen by the plaintiff's propensity for perjury and forgery, the Crown Solicitor had been misled, just as everyone else has been misled.</p> <p><i>That single purpose of the plaintiff has been to lie, cheat, mislead, perjure and</i></p>	major perjury

				<i>commit forgery (through her husband) to every Government officer.</i>	
		28		Her Greek lawyer already knows the law as well as any other Greek lawyer. Exhibit PSS8 proves this, where he states the titles are all invalid and that exhibit also proves that the plaintiffs exhibit AMIxxx is a fraudulent forgery. The Greek Court decides on examining the will and nothing but the will on what properties a beneficiary is entitled to. This is <i>never</i> influenced by any lawyer.	perjury and nonsensical procedure in Greece
		31		This has been carefully set up so that the plaintiff can control sale of land. Once this perjurious, fraudulent plaintiff gains this access, she will continue her mission.	ploy to gain access to Greek properties to commit fraud.
		33		Plaintiff could easily and is duty and legally bound to submit application herself. Every family member under Greek law has <i>exact same right</i> to submit application under Greek law. The Court must agree now that the threat to remove the perjurious and fraudulent Executor were more than justified. Legal action had been initiated, but when I discovered that a beneficiary could apply directly to a Greek court and bypass the Executor, I chose that path as being the least costly and most efficient. By virtue of my mother's death certificate listing all her children, the Court automatically takes into consideration their entitlements under Greek	distortion

				law.	
		34		A perjury domino. The plaintiff against drives home this point, but as can be seen from the evidence of perjuries and forgery, she has deceived everyone that she has been in contact with. Treloar & Treloar were warned of the plaintiff's behaviour.	MAJOR PERJURY
		35	the flood	Stella was present at mum's Will preparation. <i>There were no special notes.</i> The plaintiff tries to create a notion that there were special notes in her favour.	nice try
		36.1 to 36.4		These are matters entirely for Greek jurisdiction. Greece will not be impressed when they are advised that these Greek matters were brought by the plaintiff at great expense to herself and her solicitor before an Australian court.	wrong jurisdiction
		36.6		The debts are payable by the plaintiff due to acts of premeditated perjury and fraud. The funeral related expenses <i>only</i> can be met from the estate, the only other expenses being minor probate expenses on the <i>Australian component only</i> (\$66,000 cash assets). It is likely that a Greek court, when presented with the plaintiff's behaviour, will remove her from any inheritance consideration .	plaintiff to pay due to acts of perjury and forgery Greece to decide after this table is submitted to them
		36.7		All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay - perjury and forgery
		36.8		All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay- perjury and forgery
				This forgery, prepared in	

Affidavit of VAV 0313.pdf	9 March 2007	VAV1	<p>2001, was presented to the SA Police, but the Crown Solicitor persuaded the police not to investigate. The authentic letter, contains TWO signatures, the forgery contains only ONE signature. The authentic is being withheld by the plaintiff and her Greek solicitor, because I believe the forgery contains a list of properties that is not the same as the list of properties in the authentic letter. The evidence that it is a forgery is in the email submitted as Exhibit PSS10, where her Greek solicitor states that the only letter he had received contained TWO signatures, one from my FATHER (POA) and one from my MOTHER. The plaintiffs forged letter contains only one letter.</p> <p>Furthermore this email is proof that the plaintiff received substantial property gifting which she perjurious omits to mention throughout the affidavit.</p> <p>Furthermore, property 624 in the forged, the most expensive beachside property in the estate, was transferred to the plaintiff in 1996. The validity of this gift, whether in fact it was mentioned in the authentic letter, needs to be ascertained by the Court by subpoenaing that letter.</p>	major forgery
		VAV3	This is a new forgery prepared especially for the plaintiffs affidavit as an apparently pivotal document presented repeatedly in her affidavit and by her	major forgery

				barrister. It has been proven a forgery above.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Philip S

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 2:49 PM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

This material is unacceptable to the Court and will not be received.

Heather Gameau
PA to Judge Lunn

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 1:43 PM
To: Gameau, Heather (CAA)
Cc: 'Treloar and Treloar'
Subject: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

Judge Lunn

I need time to prepare my affidavit or response to AMI's affidavit, and include exhibits not presented by Treloar & Treloar and the plaintiff. The material below I am compiling will need to be put into a more suitable format. I am 60 years old and on a disability pension and do things very slowly. My glaucoma medication appears to drain me and I need to take breaks. It takes me ages to organise things, when I remember that things need organising :-).

Note that stress exacerbates my glaucoma and my vision suffers, that is why I take long breaks and try to find alternatives to doing anything that is too mentally emotionally stressful, or do nothing at all. I have no problem with the Greek jurisdiction which is relatively stress free.

I cannot afford to be paying lawyers in two jurisdictions, so I'm doing this one here on my own.

This is about 50% of it. My telling mother's story will also be included.

In view of the material here, dealing almost entirely with fraud, forgery and a comprehensive police submission, is the Civil Court the correct venue to deal with this material?

This is more like a counterclaim. She has always been the 'defendant' and I the 'plaintiff'. It's just that I found another much easier and simpler way by doing it via the more humane Greek method and found no need to remove her as executor as I had planned.

Do we really need to persist with this hearing in Australia? I'll win it easily here and/or in Greece because I'm telling the truth and the plaintiff has made it very easy for me by submitting her crimes in affidavits, but It'll drain me.

I don't mind who sees this stuff because it's the truth and contains no libel. Even Treloar & Treloar can have a look and give themselves plenty of time to come up with answers and no excuses.

I'll need at least two weeks to get everything together as per Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006.

Philip Stilianos
20 March 2007

DRAFT

Table of Perjuries and Forgeries

of Anna Maria Itsines

in File 192 of 2007

affidavit file	date	section	exhibit	perjury comment	comment
AMI - Affidavit of Anna Maria Itsines	15 Feb 2007	11		The deceased made no such specific instruction to her attorney. Stella who lived with the deceased all of her life, has stated that that is untrue.	perjury
				<p>I had no concept of the existence of 'Greek titles' until I rang, from Melbourne where I reside, the 4th defendant in April 2001 and he said 'I have found my 3 titles, I don't know where yours are you'll have to find your own, goodbye'. Despite my sister (5th defendant) searching many times in her father's house in Adelaide (next door to hers) she never found them.</p> <p>By about August 2001, I was told by Greek lawyers that names on the back of any titles were <i>invalid</i>. The names had to be <i>notarised without exception</i> otherwise the titles are <i>never</i> deemed as gifting.</p> <p>Therefore the non-notarised titles became irrelevant to me because they were <i>rejected as gifts by Greek law</i>. By about November 2001, on the eve of an Administrator hearing that I had initiated, the plaintiff phoned to say she had a premonition that the titles were under my father's mattress.</p> <p>She begged me not to appoint an administrator and screamed uncontrollably at one very loud single pitch, and after some time passed I hung up the phone.</p>	

		13	<p>I think it was quite some time later (months or weeks) later that year in 2001 that I had asked Anna if the documents she had found were in her possession as I wanted 'mine' for documentation's and curiosity's sake. She said she did not know where they were. <i>They were discovered in their possession in November 2004</i> at a District Court hearing. I think the plaintiff's husband handed me 'mine' but held onto my deceased brother's 'titles', which he had planned to steal. His intentions to steal my titles and my deceased brother's titles can be found in the transcripts of the GB hearing in August 2004 where he yells repeatedly '5 titles are mine, I need those titles' as he was being evicted from the Court. An extract of that hearing's transcript where the defendant's husband claims his titles is presented as exhibit PSS4.</p> <p>This claim is again made at a District Court hearing in November 2004. This extract is presented as exhibit PSS5</p> <p>This exhibit proves the <i>perjurious nature</i> of of the plaintiff when she attempts throughout her affidavit to falsely and deceitfully convey that equal distribution was being implemented.</p>	perjury
			<p>This is perjury proved in forgery proof below. My mother was terrified by her attorney. He asserted the properties as his and that he could with them as he wished. The POA document, as I have have</p>	

		14	<p>just read in the translation in another exhibit, gives him absolute control so long as he distributes fairly, so there was no need to give him these specific directives.</p> <p><i>The fact is however, that he distributed the bulk of the estate (estimated at more than \$500,000 asset plus income) to the plaintiff in an inexplicable series of property giftings in March to July 1993, and he also distributed some properties to the 5th defendant.</i></p> <p><i>The terms of the 1987 POA were thus violated, thus rendering obsolete and void all prior 'gifting' declarations and any arrangements that had been made in 1987 prior to draft Will of August 1993 that was made immediately, just weeks, following the POA violation.</i></p> <p><i>The plaintiff has omitted any mention of this gross pre-gifting, and has instead resorted to perjury and forgery in her capacity as Executor, attempting to misuse the estate by some \$30-50,000 (estimate) to pay for her legal indiscretions.</i></p>	MAJOR PERJURY
			<p>This document is overlaid with forgery.</p> <p><i>This single exhibit proves the plaintiff's propensity to commit perjury after perjury and forgery after forgery in order to obtain property she is not legally entitled even under Australia's inheritance laws.</i></p> <p>The original document is submitted as exhibit PSS1.</p> <p>Compare this exhibit with the same document submitted as exhibit AMI4 by the plaintiff.</p> <p><i>The plaintiff's husband has written names alongside</i></p>	

		14	AMI4	<p><i>the list of properties and made special notes, and with that forgery in hand the plaintiff committed the affidavit perjury AMI4 viz: "the deceased also instructed her Attorney, being my father, to write the names of her children next to the respective titles listed on a piece of paper."</i></p> <p><i>This forged document has been referenced as a crucial document by the barrister and judge upon which they directly based their arguments judgements.</i></p>	MAJOR FORGERY
		15		<p>I was never ever aware of a list of gifts of the properties as evidenced by the perjury and forgery proven in Section 14 of the plaintiffs affidavit.</p> <p>I had absolutely no concept, no communication from my parents, and absolutely no knowledge of anything to do with the land in Greece. The ones with any knowledge were the plaintiff and the 4th and 5th defendants.</p> <p>I lived in Melbourne, they in Adelaide, and I had no knowledge of any of the activity that was going on in Adelaide.</p> <p>I will go one better. I was not even aware that I was going to receive anything in my mother's will.</p> <p>As a brief side note, when I phoned the 4th and 5th defendants in August 2000 asking about my share of my mother's gifting, the 4th and 5th defendants said they knew absolutely nothing about the Rhodes land, and that I should contact my</p>	major perjury

			<p>father.</p> <p>My father in early mid 70's had gifted his three shops to 3 of his 4 Adelaide children and had omitted me. As a result of this I had minimal contact with family in Adelaide.</p> <p>Note that this gifting of commercial property by my father has been omitted by the plaintiff.</p> <p><i>The plaintiff is aware of all the shameful giftings she has received, commercial, investment house and land, by virtue of her deliberate omission of them in her affidavit.</i></p>	
		16	<p>This is a perjury domino in a long chain of perjury dominos deriving from the the plaintiffs affidavit Section 14 perjury and affidavit exhibit AMI4 forgery. Massive pre-gifting of March-July 1993 intentionally not mentioned clearly because that would break the plaintiff's case. In August 1993, just WEEKS after the POA was violated ad abused, my mother made her DRAFT will, submitted as exhibit PSS2.</p> <p>The draft will makes it even more clear that my mother's entire estate was to only go to myself, all of my children and my grandchildren, and none of her other children or grandchildren. This clearly was by careful design as all her other children had been provided with substantial wealth by their parents.</p>	perjury through omission
			<p>clearly a perjury domino.</p> <p>The deceased wanted her</p>	

		17	<p>properties sold in 1987 as indicated in her letter submitted as exhibit PSS3.</p> <p>In 1999 he leased them for 5 years with a farmer in Rhodes. That's clearly not an arrangement to sell land.</p> <p>As a side note, in September 2000 when I asked the deceased's POA for the first time ever if I could receive my share for my family he said there was no land for me. That's hard to believe but that's what I conveyed back to my daughter and my partner.</p> <p>In addition he told me that he had removed the deceased's son George from receiving anything and he put the plaintiff's husband in his place!!! Although the plaintiff's husband initially denied it, he eventually confessed in exhibit PSS1.</p> <p>So much for "distributing to all the deceased's (5) children."</p> <p>There was one intention, that of distributing to only THREE children.</p> <p>I learnt that the deceased's POA had opened only 3 bank accounts in Greece to receive proceeds of land sales.</p> <p><i>That is even more proof</i> that he did not have arrangements in place before he died.</p>	perjury
		18	<p>This is a most perjurious statement and forgery, as proved above. The plaintiff repeats the perjury as it appears it is an essential statement to make in order to successfully deceive the Court</p>	major perjury
			<p>This forgery has been</p>	

		18	AMI4	proved above. The plaintiff repeats the forgery and presents it as a table, it appears that it is an essential forgery to make in order to successfully deceive the Court	major forgery
		19		This is perjury domino. The properties are not in dispute neither in Australian or Greek law. The plaintiff committed a number of perjuries and forgery leading up to this domino.	perjury
		21		<p>At the hearing the plaintiff and her husband committed perjuries and deceived the Board.</p> <p>The major perjury is presented as exhibit PSS5</p> <p>This does not even appear in the transcript of the hearing. It was told to the Board <i>in secret</i> and the Board used that perjury, <i>just like this Civil or Probate Court had used the perjury in that exhibit</i>, to deem that I could not be administrator.</p> <p>I responded to the GB in Exhibit PSS6 and they acknowledged it in Exhibit PSS7.</p>	perjury committed at GI hearing by plaintiff
				<p>matter was NOT reviewed by GB. I did not call that hearing, I did not apply as administrator, and I did not attend that hearing.</p> <p>I had advised the GB beforehand that the forgeries the plaintiff had committed were presented to the SA Police in a 26 page document and that they should deal with that before an hearing went ahead. The document presented to the police appears as exhibit PSS7</p> <p>The Crown solicitor Lesley McPharlin had instructed the SA Police Fraud Squad not to proceed with the</p>	

		23	<p>fraud investigation that they were about to undertake.</p> <p>The deceived Crown solicitor had personally sought to assist the plaintiff, and the Crown solicitor herself had falsely told police that the fraud investigations had already been dealt with by a number of government departments. Attached as Exhibit PSS8 is the response by the police.</p> <p>None of GB, the CS or the police had any insight into the highly perjurious nature of the plaintiff.</p> <p>Every decision made by the GB, PT and police and the Probate Registrar were based on perjuries presented here, just as the decisions of Judge Gray and the were based on these perjuries.</p>	perjury
		25	<p>The Crown Solicitor Lesley McPharlin had befriended the plaintiff, and as can be seen by the plaintiff's propensity for perjury and forgery, the Crown Solicitor had been misled, just as everyone else has been misled.</p> <p><i>That single purpose of the plaintiff has been to lie, cheat, mislead, perjure and commit forgery (through her husband) to every Government officer.</i></p>	major perjury
		28	<p>Her Greek lawyer already knows the law as well as any other Greek lawyer. Exhibit PSS8 proves this, where he states the titles are all invalid and that exhibit also proves that the plaintiffs exhibit AMIxxx is a fraudulent forgery.</p> <p>The Greek Court decides on examining the will and nothing but the will on what properties a beneficiary is entitled to. This is <i>never</i></p>	perjury and nonsensical procedure in Greece

				influenced by any lawyer.	
		31		This has been carefully set up so that the plaintiff can control sale of land. Once this perjurious, fraudulent plaintiff gains this access, she will continue her mission.	ploy to gain access to Gre properties to commit frau
		33		<p>Plaintiff could easily and is duty and legally bound to submit application herself. Every family member under Greek law has <i>exact same right</i> to submit application under Greek law.</p> <p>The Court must agree now that the threat to remove the perjurious and fraudulent Executor were more than justified.</p> <p>Legal action had been initiated, but when I discovered that a beneficiary could apply directly to a Greek court and bypass the Executor, I chose that path as being the least costly and most efficient. By virtue of my mother's death certificate listing all her children, the Court automatically takes into consideration their entitlements under Greek law.</p>	distortion
		34		A perjury domino. The plaintiff against drives home this point, but as can be seen from the evidence of perjuries and forgery, she has deceived everyone that she has been in contact with. Treloar & Treloar were warned of the plaintiff's behaviour.	MAJOR PERJURY
		35	the flood	Stella was present at mum's Will preparation. <i>There were no special notes.</i> The plaintiff tries to create a notion that there were special notes in her favour.	nice try
				These are matters entirely	

		36.1 to 36.4	for Greek jurisdiction. Greece will not be impressed when they are advised that these Greek matters were brought by the plaintiff at great expense to herself and her solicitor before an Australian court.	wrong jurisdiction
		36.6	The debts are payable by the plaintiff due to acts of premeditated perjury and fraud. The funeral related expenses <i>only</i> can be met from the estate, the only other expenses being minor probate expenses on the <i>Australian component only</i> (\$66,000 cash assets). It is likely that a Greek court, when presented with the plaintiff's behaviour, will remove her from any inheritance consideration .	plaintiff to pay due to acts perjury and forgery Greece to decide after this t is submitted to them
		36.7	All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay - perjury a forgery
		36.8	All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay- perjury a forgery
			This forgery, prepared in 2001, was presented to the SA Police, but the Crown Solicitor persuaded the police not to investigate. The authentic letter, contains TWO signatures, the forgery contains only ONE signature. The authentic is being withheld by the plaintiff and her Greek solicitor, because I believe the forgery contains a list of properties that is not the same as the list of properties in the authentic letter. The evidence that it is a forgery is in the email submitted as Exhibit PSS10, where her Greek solicitor states that the only letter he had received contained TWO signatures, one from	

[Affidavit of](#)

VAV 0313.pdf	<p>9 March 2007</p>		<p>VAV1</p>	<p>my FATHER (POA) and one from my MOTHER. The plaintiffs forged letter contains only one letter.</p> <p>Furthermore this email is proof that the plaintiff received substantial property gifting which she perjurious omits to mention throughout the affidavit.</p> <p>Furthermore, property 624 in the forged, the most expensive beachside property in the estate, was transferred to the plaintiff in 1996. The validity of this gift, whether in fact it was mentioned in the authentic letter, needs to be ascertained by the Court by subpoenaing that letter.</p>	<p>major forgery</p>
			<p>VAV3</p>	<p>This is a new forgery prepared especially for the plaintiffs affidavit as an apparently pivotal document presented repeatedly in her affidavit and by her barrister. It has been proven a forgery above.</p>	<p>major forgery</p>

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 3:07 PM
To: 'Gameau, Heather (CAA)'
Subject: RE: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

Heather

I said in my email that I needed more time to prepare acceptable material.

"The material below I am compiling will need to be put into a more suitable format."

"I'll need at least two weeks to get everything together as per Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006."

I am asking Judge Lunn for more time.

Philip Stilianos

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [mailto:Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 2:49 PM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

This material is unacceptable to the Court and will not be received.

Heather Gameau
PA to Judge Lunn

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 1:43 PM
To: Gameau, Heather (CAA)
Cc: 'Treloar and Treloar'
Subject: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

Judge Lunn

I need time to prepare my affidavit or response to AMI's affidavit, and include exhibits not presented by Treloar & Treloar and the plaintiff. The material below I am compiling will need to be put into a more suitable format. I am 60 years old and on a disability pension and do things very slowly. My glaucoma medication appears to drain me and I need to take breaks. It takes me ages to organise things, when I remember that things need organising :-).

Note that stress exacerbates my glaucoma and my vision suffers, that is why I take long breaks and try to find alternatives to doing anything that is too mentally emotionally stressful, or do nothing at all. I have no problem with the Greek jurisdiction which is relatively stress free.

I cannot afford to be paying lawyers in two jurisdictions, so I'm doing this one here on my own.

This is about 50% of it. My telling mother's story will also be included.

In view of the material here, dealing almost entirely with fraud, forgery and a comprehensive police submission, is the Civil Court the correct venue to deal with this material?

This is more like a counterclaim. She has always been the 'defendant' and I the 'plaintiff'. It's just that I found another much easier and simpler way by doing it via the more humane Greek method and found no need to remove her as executor as I had planned.

Do we really need to persist with this hearing in Australia? I'll win it easily here and/or in Greece because I'm telling the truth and the plaintiff has made it very easy for me by submitting her crimes in affidavits, but It'll drain me.

I don't mind who sees this stuff because it's the truth and contains no libel. Even Treloar & Treloar can have a look and give themselves plenty of time to come up with answers and no excuses.

I'll need at least two weeks to get everything together as per Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006.

Philip Stilianos
20 March 2007

DRAFT

Table of Perjuries and Forgeries

of Anna Maria Itsines

in File 192 of 2007

affidavit file	date	section	exhibit	perjury comment	comment
AMI - Affidavit of Anna Maria Itsines	15 Feb 2007	11		The deceased made no such specific instruction to her attorney. Stella who lived with the deceased all of her life, has stated that that is untrue.	perjury
				I had no concept of the existence of 'Greek titles' until I rang, from Melbourne where I reside, the 4th defendant in April 2001 and he said 'I have found my 3 titles, I don't know where yours are you'll have to find your own, goodbye'. Despite my sister (5th defendant) searching many times in her father's house in Adelaide (next door to hers) she never found them. By about August 2001, I was told by Greek lawyers that names on the back of any titles were <i>invalid</i> . The names had to be <i>notarised without exception</i> otherwise the titles are <i>never</i> deemed	

as gifting.

Therefore the non-notarised titles became irrelevant to me because they were *rejected as gifts by Greek law*. By about November 2001, on the eve of an Administrator hearing that I had initiated, the plaintiff phoned to say she had a premonition that the titles were under my father's mattress.

She begged me not to appoint an administrator and screamed uncontrollably at one very loud single pitch, and after some time passed I hung up the phone.

I think it was quite some time later (months or weeks) later that year in 2001 that I had asked Anna if the documents she had found were in her possession as I wanted 'mine' for documentation's and curiosity's sake.

She said she did not know where they were.

They were discovered in their possession in November 2004 at a District Court hearing.

I think the plaintiff's husband handed me 'mine' but held onto my deceased brother's 'titles', which he had planned to steal.

His intentions to steal my titles and my deceased brother's titles can be found in the transcripts of the GB hearing in August 2004 where he yells repeatedly '5 titles are mine, I need those titles' as he was being evicted from the Court.

An extract of that hearing's transcript where the defendant's husband claims his titles is presented as **exhibit PSS4**.

This claim is again made at a District Court hearing in November 2004. This

			<p>extract is presented as exhibit PSS5</p> <p>This exhibit proves the <i>perjurious nature</i> of of the plaintiff when she attempts throughout her affidavit to falsely and deceitfully convey that equal distribution was being implemented.</p>	
		14	<p>This is perjury proved in forgery proof below. My mother was terrified by her attorney. He asserted the properties as his and that he could with them as he wished. The POA document, as I have have just read in the translation in another exhibit, gives him absolute control so long as he distributes fairly, so there was no need to give him these specific directives. <i>The fact is however, that he distributed the bulk of the estate (estimated at more than \$500,000 asset plus income) to the plaintiff in an inexplicable series of property giftings in March to July 1993, and he also distributed some properties to the 5th defendant.</i></p> <p><i>The terms of the 1987 POA were thus violated, thus rendering obsolete and void all prior 'gifting' declarations and any arrangements that had been made in 1987 prior to draft Will of August 1993 that was made immediately, just weeks, following the POA violation.</i></p> <p><i>The plaintiff has omitted any mention of this gross pre-gifting, and has instead resorted to perjury and forgery in her capacity as Executor, attempting to misuse the estate by some \$30-50,000 (estimate) to pay for her legal indiscretions.</i></p>	<p>MAJOR PERJURY</p>

		14	AMI4	<p>This document is overlaid with forgery.</p> <p><i>This single exhibit proves the plaintiff's propensity to commit perjury after perjury and forgery after forgery in order to obtain property she is not legally entitled even under Australia's inheritance laws.</i></p> <p>The original document is submitted as exhibit PSS1.</p> <p>Compare this exhibit with the same document submitted as exhibit AMI4 by the plaintiff.</p> <p><i>The plaintiff's husband has written names alongside the list of properties and made special notes, and with that forgery in hand the plaintiff committed the affidavit perjury AMI4 viz: "the deceased also instructed her Attorney, being my father, to write the names of her children next to the respective titles listed on a piece of paper."</i></p> <p><i>This forged document has been referenced as a crucial document by the barrister and judge upon which they directly based their arguments judgements.</i></p>	MAJOR FORGERY
				<p>I was never ever aware of a list of gifts of the properties as evidenced by the perjury and forgery proven in Section 14 of the plaintiffs affidavit.</p> <p>I had absolutely no concept, no communication from my parents, and absolutely no knowledge of anything to do with the land in Greece. The ones with any knowledge were the plaintiff and the 4th and 5th defendants.</p>	

		15	<p>I lived in Melbourne, they in Adelaide, and I had no knowledge of any of the activity that was going on in Adelaide.</p> <p>I will go one better. I was not even aware that I was going to receive <i>anything</i> in my mother's will.</p> <p>As a brief side note, when I phoned the 4th and 5th defendants in August 2000 asking about my share of my mother's gifting, the 4th and 5th defendants said they knew absolutely nothing about the Rhodes land, and that I should contact my father.</p> <p>My father in early mid 70's had gifted his three shops to 3 of his 4 Adelaide children and had omitted me. As a result of this I had minimal contact with family in Adelaide.</p> <p>Note that this gifting of commercial property by my father has been omitted by the plaintiff.</p> <p><i>The plaintiff is aware of all the shameful giftings she has received, commercial, investment house and land, by virtue of her deliberate omission of them in her affidavit.</i></p>	<p>major perjury</p>
			<p>This is a perjury domino in a long chain of perjury dominos deriving from the the plaintiffs affidavit Section 14 perjury and affidavit exhibit AMI4 forgery. Massive pre-gifting of March-July 1993 intentionally not mentioned clearly because that would break the plaintiff's case. In August 1993, just WEEKS after the POA was violated ad abused, my mother made her DRAFT</p>	

		16	<p>will, submitted as exhibit PSS2.</p> <p>The draft will makes it even more clear that my mother's entire estate was to only go to myself, all of my children and my grandchildren, and none of her other children or grandchildren. This clearly was by careful design as all her other children had been provided with substantial wealth by their parents.</p>	perjury through omission
		17	<p>clearly a perjury domino.</p> <p>The deceased wanted her properties sold in 1987 as indicated in her letter submitted as exhibit PSS3.</p> <p>In 1999 he leased them for 5 years with a farmer in Rhodes. That's clearly not an arrangement to sell land.</p> <p>As a side note, in September 2000 when I asked the deceased's POA for the first time ever if I could receive my share for my family he said there was no land for me. That's hard to believe but that's what I conveyed back to my daughter and my partner.</p> <p>In addition he told me that he had removed the deceased's son George from receiving anything and he put the plaintiff's husband in his place!!! Although the plaintiff;s husband initially denied it , he eventually confessed in exhibit PSS1.</p> <p>So much for "distributing to all the deceased's (5) children."</p> <p>There was one intention, that of distributing to only THREE children.</p>	perjury

				<p>I learnt that the deceased's POA had opened only 3 bank accounts in Greece to receive proceeds of land sales.</p> <p><i>That is even more proof that he did not have arrangements in place before he died.</i></p>	
		18		<p>This is a most perjurious statement and forgery, as proved above. The plaintiff repeats the perjury as it appears it is an essential statement to make in order to successfully deceive the Court</p>	major perjury
		18	AMI4	<p>This forgery has been proved above. The plaintiff repeats the forgery and presents it as a table, it appears that it is an essential forgery to make in order to successfully deceive the Court</p>	major forgery
		19		<p>This is perjury domino. The properties are not in dispute neither in Australian or Greek law. The plaintiff committed a number of perjuries and forgery leading up to this domino.</p>	perjury
		21		<p>At the hearing the plaintiff and her husband committed perjuries and deceived the Board.</p> <p>The major perjury is presented as exhibit PSS5</p> <p>This does not even appear in the transcript of the hearing. It was told to the Board <i>in secret</i> and the Board used that perjury, <i>just like this Civil or Probate Court had used the perjury in that exhibit</i>, to deem that I could not be administrator.</p> <p>I responded to the GB in Exhibit PSS6 and they acknowledged it in Exhibit PSS7.</p>	perjury committed at GI hearing by plaintiff
				<p>matter was NOT reviewed by GB. I did no call that</p>	

		23	<p>hearing, I did not apply as administrator, and I did not attend that hearing. I had advised the GB beforehand that the forgeries the plaintiff had committed were presented to the SA Police in a 26 page document and that they should deal with that before an hearing went ahead. The document presented to the police appears as exhibit PSS7</p> <p>The Crown solicitor Lesley McPharlin had instructed the SA Police Fraud Squad not to proceed with the fraud investigation that they were about to undertake.</p> <p>The deceived Crown solicitor had personally sought to assist the plaintiff, and the Crown solicitor herself had falsely told police that the fraud investigations had already been dealt with by a number of government departments. Attached as Exhibit PSS8 is the response by the police.</p> <p>None of GB, the CS or the police had any insight into the highly perjurious nature of the plaintiff.</p> <p>Every decision made by the GB, PT and police and the Probate Registrar were based on perjuries presented here, just as the decisions of Judge Gray and the were based on these perjuries.</p>	perjury
		25	<p>The Crown Solicitor Lesley McPharlin had befriended the plaintiff, and as can be seen by the plaintiff's propensity for perjury and forgery, the Crown Solicitor had been misled, just as everyone else has been misled.</p> <p><i>That single purpose of the plaintiff has been to lie,</i></p>	major perjury

			<i>cheat, mislead, perjure and commit forgery (through her husband) to every Government officer.</i>	
		28	Her Greek lawyer already knows the law as well as any other Greek lawyer. Exhibit PSS8 proves this, where he states the titles are all invalid and that exhibit also proves that the plaintiffs exhibit AMIxxx is a fraudulent forgery. The Greek Court decides on examining the will and nothing but the will on what properties a beneficiary is entitled to. This is <i>never</i> influenced by any lawyer.	perjury and nonsensical procedure in Greece
		31	This has been carefully set up so that the plaintiff can control sale of land. Once this perjurious, fraudulent plaintiff gains this access, she will continue her mission.	ploy to gain access to Gre properties to commit frau
		33	Plaintiff could easily and is duty and legally bound to submit application herself. Every family member under Greek law has <i>exact same right</i> to submit application under Greek law. The Court must agree now that the threat to remove the perjurious and fraudulent Executor were more than justified. Legal action had been initiated, but when I discovered that a beneficiary could apply directly to a Greek court and bypass the Executor, I chose that path as being the least costly and most efficient. By virtue of my mother's death certificate listing all her children, the Court automatically takes into consideration their entitlements under Greek law.	distortion

		34		A perjury domino. The plaintiff against drives home this point, but as can be seen from the evidence of perjuries and forgery, she has deceived everyone that she has been in contact with. Treloar & Treloar were warned of the plaintiff's behaviour.	MAJOR PERJURY
		35	the flood	Stella was present at mum's Will preparation. <i>There were no special notes.</i> The plaintiff tries to create a notion that there were special notes in her favour.	nice try
		36.1 to 36.4		These are matters entirely for Greek jurisdiction. Greece will not be impressed when they are advised that these Greek matters were brought by the plaintiff at great expense to herself and her solicitor before an Australian court.	wrong jurisdiction
		36.6		The debts are payable by the plaintiff due to acts of premeditated perjury and fraud. The funeral related expenses <i>only</i> can be met from the estate, the only other expenses being minor probate expenses on the <i>Australian component only</i> (\$66,000 cash assets). It is likely that a Greek court, when presented with the plaintiff's behaviour, will remove her from any inheritance consideration .	plaintiff to pay due to acts perjury and forgery Greece to decide after this t is submitted to them
		36.7		All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay - perjury a forgery
		36.8		All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay- perjury a forgery
				This forgery, prepared in 2001, was presented to the SA Police, but the Crown Solicitor persuaded the police not to investigate. The authentic letter,	

<p>Affidavit of VAV 0313.pdf</p>	<p>9 March 2007</p>		<p>VAV1</p>	<p>contains TWO signatures, the forgery contains only ONE signature. The authentic is being withheld by the plaintiff and her Greek solicitor, because I believe the forgery contains a list of properties that is not the same as the list of properties in the authentic letter. The evidence that it is a forgery is in the email submitted as Exhibit PSS10, where her Greek solicitor states that the only letter he had received contained TWO signatures, one from my FATHER (POA) and one from my MOTHER. The plaintiffs forged letter contains only one letter.</p> <p>Furthermore this email is proof that the plaintiff received substantial property gifting which she perjurious omits to mention throughout the affidavit.</p> <p>Furthermore, property 624 in the forged, the most expensive beachside property in the estate, was transferred to the plaintiff in 1996. The validity of this gift, whether in fact it was mentioned in the authentic letter, needs to be ascertained by the Court by subpoenaing that letter.</p>	<p>major forgery</p>
			<p>VAV3</p>	<p>This is a new forgery prepared especially for the plaintiffs affidavit as an apparently pivotal document presented repeatedly in her affidavit and by her barrister. It has been proven a forgery above.</p>	<p>major forgery</p>

Philip S

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 3:10 PM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

[There will be no final determination of the matter on Friday 23 March 2007.](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 2:37 PM
To: Gameau, Heather (CAA)
Subject: RE: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

[Heather](#)

[I said in my email that I needed more time to prepare acceptable material.](#)

"The material below I am compiling will need to be put into a more suitable format."

"I'll need at least two weeks to get everything together as per Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006."

I am asking Judge Lunn for more time.

Philip Stilianos

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [mailto:Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 2:49 PM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

[This material is unacceptable to the Court and will not be received.](#)

[Heather Gameau](#)
[PA to Judge Lunn](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2007 1:43 PM
To: Gameau, Heather (CAA)
Cc: 'Treloar and Treloar'
Subject: File 192/2007Att Judge Lunn - Request for Time to prepare Response to Affidavit

Judge Lunn

I need time to prepare my affidavit or response to AMI's affidavit, and include exhibits not presented by Treloar & Treloar and the plaintiff. The material below I am compiling will need to be put into a more suitable format. I am 60 years old and on a disability pension and do things very slowly. My glaucoma medication appears to drain me and I need to take breaks. It takes me ages to organise things, when I remember that things need organising :-).

Note that stress exacerbates my glaucoma and my vision suffers, that is why I take long breaks and try to find alternatives to doing anything that is too mentally emotionally stressful, or do nothing at all. I have no problem with the Greek jurisdiction which is relatively stress free.

I cannot afford to be paying lawyers in two jurisdictions, so I'm doing this one here on my own.

This is about 50% of it. My telling mother's story will also be included.

In view of the material here, dealing almost entirely with fraud, forgery and a comprehensive police submission, is the Civil Court the correct venue to deal with this material?

This is more like a counterclaim. She has always been the 'defendant' and I the 'plaintiff'. It's just that I found another much easier and simpler way by doing it via the more humane Greek method and found no need to remove her as executor as I had planned.

Do we really need to persist with this hearing in Australia? I'll win it easily here and/or in Greece because I'm telling the truth and the plaintiff has made it very easy for me by submitting her crimes in affidavits, but It'll drain me.

I don't mind who sees this stuff because it's the truth and contains no libel. Even Treloar & Treloar can have a look and give themselves plenty of time to come up with answers and no excuses.

I'll need at least two weeks to get everything together as per Supreme Court Civil Rules 2006.

Philip Stilianos
20 March 2007

DRAFT

Table of Perjuries and Forgeries

of Anna Maria Itsines

in File 192 of 2007

affidavit file	date	section	exhibit	perjury comment	comment
AMI - Affidavit of Anna Maria Itsines	15 Feb 2007	11		The deceased made no such specific instruction to her attorney. Stella who lived with the deceased all of her life, has stated that that is untrue.	perjury
				I had no concept of the existence of 'Greek titles' until I rang, from Melbourne where I reside, the 4th defendant in April 2001 and he said 'I have found my 3 titles, I don't know where yours are you'll have to find your own, goodbye'. Despite my sister (5th defendant) searching many times in her father's house in Adelaide (next door to hers) she never found them. By about August 2001, I was told by Greek lawyers that names on the back of any titles were <i>invalid</i> . The names had to be <i>notarised without exception</i> otherwise the titles are <i>never</i> deemed	

as gifting.

Therefore the non-notarised titles became irrelevant to me because they were *rejected as gifts by Greek law*. By about November 2001, on the eve of an Administrator hearing that I had initiated, the plaintiff phoned to say she had a premonition that the titles were under my father's mattress.

She begged me not to appoint an administrator and screamed uncontrollably at one very loud single pitch, and after some time passed I hung up the phone.

I think it was quite some time later (months or weeks) later that year in 2001 that I had asked Anna if the documents she had found were in her possession as I wanted 'mine' for documentation's and curiosity's sake.

She said she did not know where they were.

They were discovered in their possession in November 2004 at a District Court hearing.

I think the plaintiff's husband handed me 'mine' but held onto my deceased brother's 'titles', which he had planned to steal.

His intentions to steal my titles and my deceased brother's titles can be found in the transcripts of the GB hearing in August 2004 where he yells repeatedly '5 titles are mine, I need those titles' as he was being evicted from the Court.

An extract of that hearing's transcript where the defendant's husband claims his titles is presented as **exhibit PSS4**.

This claim is again made at a District Court hearing in November 2004. This extract is presented as **exhibit PSS5**

This exhibit proves the

			<p><i>perjurious nature</i> of of the plaintiff when she attempts throughout her affidavit to falsely and deceitfully convey that equal distribution was being implemented.</p>	
		14	<p>This is perjury proved in forgery proof below. My mother was terrified by her attorney. He asserted the properties as his and that he could with them as he wished. The POA document, as I have have just read in the translation in another exhibit, gives him absolute control so long as he distributes fairly, so there was no need to give him these specific directives. <i>The fact is however, that he distributed the bulk of the estate (estimated at more than \$500,000 asset plus income) to the plaintiff in an inexplicable series of property giftings in March to July 1993, and he also distributed some properties to the 5th defendant.</i> <i>The terms of the 1987 POA were thus violated, thus rendering obsolete and void all prior 'gifting' declarations and any arrangements that had been made in 1987 prior to draft Will of August 1993 that was made immediately, just weeks, following the POA violation.</i></p> <p><i>The plaintiff has omitted any mention of this gross pre-gifting, and has instead resorted to perjury and forgery in her capacity as Executor, attempting to misuse the estate by some \$30-50,000 (estimate) to pay for her legal indiscretions.</i></p>	<p>MAJOR PERJUR</p>
			<p>This document is overlaid with forgery. <i>This single exhibit proves the plaintiff's propensity to commit perjury after perjury and forgery after</i></p>	

		14	AMI4	<p><i>forgery in order to obtain property she is not legally entitled even under Australia's inheritance laws. The original document is submitted as exhibit PSS1. Compare this exhibit with the same document submitted as exhibit AMI4 by the plaintiff. The plaintiff's husband has written names alongside the list of properties and made special notes, and with that forgery in hand the plaintiff committed the affidavit perjury AMI4 viz: "the deceased also instructed her Attorney, being my father, to write the names of her children next to the respective titles listed on a piece of paper."</i></p> <p><i>This forged document has been referenced as a crucial document by the barrister and judge upon which they directly based their arguments judgements.</i></p>	MAJOR FORGER
				<p>I was never ever aware of a list of gifts of the properties as evidenced by the perjury and forgery proven in Section 14 of the plaintiffs affidavit.</p> <p>I had absolutely no concept, no communication from my parents, and absolutely no knowledge of anything to do with the land in Greece. The ones with any knowledge were the plaintiff and the 4th and 5th defendants.</p> <p>I lived in Melbourne, they in Adelaide, and I had no knowledge of any of the activity that was going on in Adelaide.</p> <p>I will go one better. I was not even aware that I was going to receive anything in my mother's will.</p>	

		15	<p>As a brief side note, when I phoned the 4th and 5th defendants in August 2000 asking about my share of my mother's gifting, the 4th and 5th defendants said they knew absolutely nothing about the Rhodes land, and that I should contact my father.</p> <p>My father in early mid 70's had gifted his three shops to 3 of his 4 Adelaide children and had omitted me. As a result of this I had minimal contact with family in Adelaide.</p> <p>Note that this gifting of commercial property by my father has been omitted by the plaintiff.</p> <p><i>The plaintiff is aware of all the shameful giftings she has received, commercial, investment house and land, by virtue of her deliberate omission of them in her affidavit.</i></p>	major perjury
		16	<p>This is a perjury domino in a long chain of perjury dominos deriving from the the plaintiffs affidavit Section 14 perjury and affidavit exhibit AMI4 forgery. Massive pre-gifting of March-July 1993 intentionally not mentioned clearly because that would break the plaintiff's case. In August 1993, just WEEKS after the POA was violated ad abused, my mother made her DRAFT will, submitted as exhibit PSS2.</p> <p>The draft will makes it even more clear that my mother's entire estate was to only go to myself, all of my children and my grandchildren, and none of her other children or grandchildren. This clearly was by careful design as all her other children had been provided with substantial wealth by their parents.</p>	perjury through omis:

				<p>clearly a perjury domino.</p> <p>The deceased wanted her properties sold in 1987 as indicated in her letter submitted as exhibit PSS3.</p> <p>In 1999 he leased them for 5 years with a farmer in Rhodes. That's clearly not an arrangement to sell land.</p> <p>As a side note, in September 2000 when I asked the deceased's POA for the first time ever if I could receive my share for my family he said there was no land for me. That's hard to believe but that's what I conveyed back to my daughter and my partner.</p> <p>In addition he told me that he had removed the deceased's son George from receiving anything and he put the plaintiff's husband in his place!!! Although the plaintiff;s husband initially denied it , he eventually confessed in exhibit PSS1.</p> <p>So much for "distributing to all the deceased's (5) children."</p> <p>There was one intention, that of distributing to only THREE children.</p> <p>I learnt that the deceased's POA had opened only 3 bank accounts in Greece to receive proceeds of land sales.</p> <p><i>That is even more proof</i> that he did not have arrangements in place before he died.</p>	perjury
		17		<p>This is a most perjurious statement and forgery, as proved above. The plaintiff repeats the perjury as it appears it is an essential statement to make in order to successfully deceive the Court</p>	major perjury
		18		<p>This forgery has been</p>	

		18	AMI4	proved above. The plaintiff repeats the forgery and presents it as a table, it appears that it is an essential forgery to make in order to successfully deceive the Court	major forgery
		19		This is perjury domino. The properties are not in dispute neither in Australian or Greek law. The plaintiff committed a number of perjuries and forgery leading up to this domino.	perjury
		21		At the hearing the plaintiff and her husband committed perjuries and deceived the Board. The major perjury is presented as exhibit PSS5 This does not even appear in the transcript of the hearing. It was told to the Board <i>in secret</i> and the Board used that perjury, <i>just like this Civil or Probate Court had used the perjury in that exhibit</i> , to deem that I could not be administrator. I responded to the GB in Exhibit PSS6 and they acknowledged it in Exhibit PSS7 .	perjury committed at GB h plaintiff
		23		matter was NOT reviewed by GB. I did no call that hearing, I did not apply as administrator, and I did not attend that hearing. I had advised the GB beforehand that the forgeries the plaintiff had committed were presented to the SA Police in a 26 page document and that they should deal with that before an hearing went ahead. The document presented to the police appears as exhibit PSS7 The Crown solicitor Lesley McPharlin had instructed the SA Police Fraud Squad not to proceed with the fraud investigation that they were about to undertake. The deceived Crown	perjury

			<p>solicitor had personally sought to assist the plaintiff, and the Crown solicitor herself had falsely told police that the fraud investigations had already been dealt with by a number of government departments. Attached as Exhibit PSS8 is the response by the police.</p> <p>None of GB, the CS or the police had any insight into the highly perjurious nature of the plaintiff.</p> <p>Every decision made by the GB, PT and police and the Probate Registrar were based on perjuries presented here, just as the decisions of Judge Gray and the were based on these perjuries.</p>	
		25	<p>The Crown Solicitor Lesley McPharlin had befriended the plaintiff, and as can be seen by the plaintiff's propensity for perjury and forgery, the Crown Solicitor had been misled, just as everyone else has been misled.</p> <p><i>That single purpose of the plaintiff has been to lie, cheat, mislead, perjure and commit forgery (through her husband) to every Government officer.</i></p>	major perjury
		28	<p>Her Greek lawyer already knows the law as well as any other Greek lawyer. Exhibit PSS8 proves this, where he states the titles are all invalid and that exhibit also proves that the plaintiffs exhibit AMIxxx is a fraudulent forgery. The Greek Court decides on examining the will and nothing but the will on what properties a beneficiary is entitled to. This is <i>never</i> influenced by any lawyer.</p>	perjury and nonsensical procedure in
		31	<p>This has been carefully set up so that the plaintiff can control sale of land. Once this perjurious, fraudulent plaintiff gains this access, she will continue her mission.</p>	ploy to gain access to C properties to commit fi

		33		<p>Plaintiff could easily and is duty and legally bound to submit application herself. Every family member under Greek law has <i>exact same right</i> to submit application under Greek law.</p> <p>The Court must agree now that the threat to remove the perjurious and fraudulent Executor were more than justified.</p> <p>Legal action had been initiated, but when I discovered that a beneficiary could apply directly to a Greek court and bypass the Executor, I chose that path as being the least costly and most efficient. By virtue of my mother's death certificate listing all her children, the Court automatically takes into consideration their entitlements under Greek law.</p>	distortion
		34		<p>A perjury domino. The plaintiff against drives home this point, but as can be seen from the evidence of perjuries and forgery, she has deceived everyone that she has been in contact with. Treloar & Treloar were warned of the plaintiff's behaviour.</p>	MAJOR PERJUI
		35	the flood	<p>Stella was present at mum's Will preparation. <i>There were no special notes.</i> The plaintiff tries to create a notion that there were special notes in her favour.</p>	nice try
		36.1 to 36.4		<p>These are matters entirely for Greek jurisdiction. Greece will not be impressed when they are advised that these Greek matters were brought by the plaintiff at great expense to herself and her solicitor before an Australian court.</p>	wrong jurisdiction
				<p>The debts are payable by the plaintiff due to acts of premeditated perjury and fraud.</p>	

		36.6		<p>The funeral related expenses <i>only</i> can be met from the estate, the only other expenses being minor probate expenses on the <i>Australian component only</i> (\$66,000 cash assets). It is likely that a Greek court, when presented with the plaintiff's behaviour, will remove her from any inheritance consideration .</p>	<p>plaintiff to pay due to acts of perjury and forgery</p> <p>Greece to decide after this evidence is submitted to them</p>
		36.7		All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay - perjury and forgery
		36.8		All costs have been incurred by the plaintiffs perjuries and forgeries	plaintiff to pay- perjury and forgery
Affidavit of VAV 0313.pdf	9 March 2007		VAV1	<p>This forgery, prepared in 2001, was presented to the SA Police, but the Crown Solicitor persuaded the police not to investigate. The authentic letter, contains TWO signatures, the forgery contains only ONE signature. The authentic is being withheld by the plaintiff and her Greek solicitor, because I believe the forgery contains a list of properties that is not the same as the list of properties in the authentic letter. The evidence that it is a forgery is in the email submitted as Exhibit PSS10, where her Greek solicitor states that the only letter he had received contained TWO signatures, one from my FATHER (POA) and one from my MOTHER. The plaintiffs forged letter contains only one letter.</p> <p>Furthermore this email is proof that the plaintiff received substantial property gifting which she perjurious omits to mention throughout the affidavit.</p> <p>Furthermore, property 624 in the forged, the most expensive beachside property in the estate, was transferred to the plaintiff in</p>	<p>major forgery</p>

				1996. The validity of this gift, whether in fact it was mentioned in the authentic letter, needs to be ascertained by the Court by subpoenaing that letter.	
			VAV3	This is a new forgery prepared especially for the plaintiffs affidavit as an apparently pivotal document presented repeatedly in her affidavit and by her barrister. It has been proven a forgery above.	major forgery

Philip S

From: De Bortoli, Simon (CAA) [Simon.DeBortoli@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 21 March 2007 4:47 PM
To: philstil2005-temp3@yahoo.com.au
Subject: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome
Attachments: ap20881.pdf

-----Original Message-----

From: huron@courts.sa.gov.au [<mailto:huron@courts.sa.gov.au>] **On Behalf Of** kcassqd@courts.sa.gov.au
Sent: Wednesday, 21 March 2007 4:22 PM
To: kcassqd@adl0676.courts.sa.gov.au
Subject: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome

<<ap20881.pdf>>

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 5 April 2007 4:41 PM
To: 'supreme.registry@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: Erini Stilianos Estate - Request for Deferment of FDN 192/2007 scheduled for 11 April 2007

To the Service Clerk
SA Supreme Civil Court

I would like the hearing rescheduled in the light of the following:

- There is a **high priority squatter lawsuit hearing on 26 April 2007 in Rhodes Greece** on a valuable Greek beachside property 671 for which the plaintiff is legally responsible. I request that the new hearing be held sometime after the 26 April 2007.
- The plaintiff is accused of arranging a lucrative squatter lawsuit in conjunction with the lessee and the 'squatter'. This is supported by evidence which suggests the squatter could not have made this covert lawsuit without the consent/cooperation of the plaintiff and the lessee.
- Is the Court able to request that Greece suspend the squatter lawsuit in Greece until the plaintiff has been investigated and charged in Australia with this fraud? I would like the Court to switch emphasis to the Greek lawsuit and the plaintiff's legal liability. There are really no inheritance issues to dispute, the issues are those of forgery, perjury and fraud on property in general.
- Mr Roder, barrister, in his letter of advice, found that the plaintiff lost her case to refrain me from investigating the estate, and lost her case to have 'her' properties recognised. She lost, despite her as yet unanswered forgeries and perjures in her affidavits. However overall she will be \$100,000+ ahead even if she pays all the legal costs if her partners-in-crime can win the squatter lawsuit in Greece on 26 April 2007.
- It was essential for the plaintiff to stall submitting probate to Greece in order for the squatter lawsuit to succeed. Even after the lawsuit was revealed (though good luck) she still refused to submit probate which was the first thing one would do to try and defeat the lawsuit. Well, she has still not submitted probate 13 months after my mother passed away, and that clearly indicates her desire and intention that the fraudulent lawsuit succeed. Her attempt to exempt property 671 from the deceased estate also failed.
- The plaintiff has submitted easily proven forgeries Exhibit AMI 14 in her affidavit and Exhibit VAV1/013 in another affidavit, and the consequential numerous perjures linked to these forgeries. Her husband has authored these forgeries. I will email well-presented graphic details of them.
- Another forgery not presented in her affidavit reinforces perjures committed. I am currently compiling the graphics and text.
- The plaintiff has not mentioned the commercial, investment house and land properties she had been gifted and transferred to her in 1975, 1993 and 1996. There are a number of perjures ensuing from this deliberate omission. I estimate a conservative \$600,000 received by the plaintiff in today's money value, well in excess of the value of the deceased estate.
- In view of the forgeries and perjures presented in her affidavit/s, and the imminent covert fraudulent property transfer operation underway in Greece, she should be ordered to pay all costs because Greece will not pay from the Greek estate when the forgeries and perjures and an account of a pell-mell series of affidavits against the beneficiaries is presented to them,

because Greek law and Greek culture honours its beneficiaries and its testators and regards denial of probate a serious breach of beneficiary rights.

Could you please reply asap as to what action is being considered?

Than you.

Philip Stilianos
Melbourne
5 April 2007

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 9 April 2007 6:59 PM
To: 'supreme.registry@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: Court Action FDN 192/2007. Erini Stiliano estate - New Overseas Property Fraud is A Higher Priority.

Attachments: ENGLISH - lawsuit_property671.pdf; ENGLISH - 2004_10_11_faxed_leasing_document.pdf; 2004_10_11_faxed_leasing_document.pdf; 2004_10_05_Squatter_Transcript_of_GB_Hearing.pdf; behind_Erinis_perfect_will.pdf; statement to police.pdf

To Court Clerk

Could you please print and/or pass this on to the Judge hearing this action on 11 April 2007.

New Squatter Property Fraud is A Higher Priority Court Action FDN 192/2007

Overview

As you can see below, the plaintiff is the person who has committed all the crimes, and losses of property should be recovered from her own current personal estates in Adelaide and Greece, and all expenses must be paid out of her own pocket because she has been single-minded in her fraudulent intent from the outset.

For someone to have the temerity to falsify probate, then issue affidavits and summonses designating herself the plaintiff and innocent people as defendants, and commit brazen perjuries and forgeries in her affidavits whilst undertaking simultaneous property fraud overseas, has got to be one the most twisted cases of abuse and manipulation of the South Australian legal system that has occurred, and almost have succeeded.

Where I use the word plaintiff it refers to either the plaintiff Anna Maria Itsines or her husband Stan Itsines. They operate as a single entity in every thought and deed in their fraudulent conduct in relation to the estate of Erini Stiliano deceased.

Because of the frequent changes of Judges hearing this case, I have endeavoured to provide a concise but comprehensive background of information of how it all fits together. You may not enjoy what you read, but it was far less enjoyment writing this, and a lot less enjoyment being subjected to these things. The reader should be thankful they are not the innocent victim of maladministration.

I request that the Squatter Lawsuit Hearing in Greece Take Priority - and request that SA request this lawsuit be suspended.

I would like to request that SA Government/Court request the Rhodes court through a Greek lawyer, at the estate's expense, *to suspend the squatter lawsuit hearing* at the **Rhodes Court on 26 April 2007** until the investigations of fraud by the Executor have been completed in South Australia. In any case the Executor is legally liable for the loss of this property under Australian law, not only in a civil sense but also in a criminal sense, and it is in her interests to ask the squatter to not proceed with this lawsuit, as they have been 'found out'. I quite accidentally discovered this lawsuit. The plaintiff spent some \$20,000+ or more (probably a lot more) attempting to restrain me through the SA Supreme Court from obtaining details of estate properties such as this lawsuit, and attempted to convince the Supreme Court that this property should be exempt from the deceased estate (thereby exempting her from legal liability).

Because of Greek law jurisdiction which prohibits any nation from restraining a beneficiary's rights or from making decisions on the Greek estate, her mission has failed. The plaintiff had already known what the Greek laws were through her personal lawyer/accomplice in Rhodes. Her attempts to mask her overseas fraud with a charade of inexplicable Australian affidavits and summonses and failed hearings should be punished by ensuring she pays for all costs and is further investigated by the SA Police Fraud Squad.

What happens on 26 April 2007 in the Rhodes Court, should it be allowed to occur, will inevitably determine the fate of the Executor and others in South Australia.

Greece is oblivious to South Australia's Guardianship and Public Trustee and Probate Administration

I must stress a thousand times that Greece has been oblivious since 2001 to all of South Australia's hearings, its administration orders, its court orders on my mother's properties. As far as Greece is concerned the Guardianship Board or Public Trustee administrator never presented themselves to Greece and thereby did nothing in Greece itself to protect the properties. I earnestly sought an Administrator order so that I could present myself to Greece. However a very ignorant South Australia thought Greece was like Australia in property law and administration, and did not appreciate that it is essential that the properties in Greece, especially in Greece, not be left in limbo land. Greece does not have an advanced property registration system as Australia has. I think most of Greece basically does not know who owns what. Land does not have 'council rates', so a property can lie around for decades without an addressee for billing because there are no bills. Opportunistic Greeks will exploit these conditions to make squatter claims on neglected properties.

Probate Registrar must be ordered to issue certificate of probate to beneficiary

If this is done immediately I can show Greece that someone is showing interest in the property/s. So far, all Greece can see is that only squatters are interested. Greece's laws encourage squatting and claims where properties are neglected.

Any losses of property will be the responsibility of the Executor and/or those in the SA government administration who bent over backwards to assist the plaintiff achieve her nefarious aims.

Executor to Remain as Executor To Answer to Squatter Fraud and Negligence

She has the audacity at this stage of scrutiny and impending investigation to attempt to resign as Executor and pass the role over to the Public Trustee, in the hope she can't be sued for property losses.

Squatter Fraud Participants

It appears that 5 persons viz the plaintiff (Executor), her husband, their Rhodes lawyer, the lessee of the 'protected' properties, and the acquaintance of theirs Maria Theofilis (who lodged the lawsuit), are committing property fraud on the Greek estate. They are participants in a lucrative squatter lawsuit on a prime beachside property belonging to my mother's deceased estate. This squatter lawsuit is being heard soon on 26 April 2007 in the Rhodes Court. It is imperative that South Australia take legal action to prevent this hearing occurring, because its administration was warned that this (squatting) would happen but the plaintiff assured the administration it would never happen (Guardianship Board hearing August 2004 attached).

It should be noted the the Greek lawyer who prepared the lawsuit for the squatter acquaintance was found guilty of fraud in early March 2007, on another matter, and has been barred from practicing law by the Greek lawyers union.

There is a wealth of evidence, in emails and hearing and court transcripts, in their Rhodes lawyer's 1988 letter, in the anti-squatter leasing document, in the attempted perjurious property claims by plaintiff and her husband, and phone threats, that convincingly demonstrates motives, intentions, means, and knowledge and threats. Every possible scenario one comes up with inevitably points to the Executor and lessee.

[To make the squatter lawsuit possible the Executor:](#)

a) had stopped me, by falsely denigrating my character, from being administrator in 2001 and 2004

- b)** sacked my mother's Adelaide Greek solicitor in 2006, because he said the plaintiff had no claim and had to pay her own expenses.
- c)** engaged an all-Australian legal firm that knew nothing about Greek law.
- d)** had not intended and did not and has not submitted probate to Greece
- e)** had instructed the Probate Registrar not to allow me the means to submit probate to Greece
- f)** took supreme court action attempting to prevent me from investigating properties in Greece
- g)** took supreme court action to have the squatter property (No 671) exempted from the deceased estate so she would not be legally liable as Executor
- h)** did *not* appoint her experienced Rhodes lawyer to have the lawsuit dismissed. That's presumably because of his interest in it. See below.
- i)** attempted to resign as Executor following the supreme court hearing to avoid being liable for loss of property through squatter lawsuit
- j)** together with her Australian solicitor made no attempt at any stage to protect or administer any properties of the deceased estate
- k)** on telephone saying to me over and over "you will pay dearly for this" - May 2006
- h)** *the plaintiff (husband) had stolen the anti-squatter leasing document in 2001, with a view to committing squatter property fraud.*

To this day, 13 months after my mother passed away on 7 March 2006, as far as Greece is concerned the properties have no administrator, no executor, no probate submission, no inheritance claim. This is just what the Australian Executor wants in order to facilitate her squatter fraud. The Probate Registrar's personal interference is a major contributor to this state of affairs.

[The plaintiff has a disposition to perjury, forgery and fraud as evidenced in the statement to police attached.](#)

a) she submitted perjury and forgery in her affidavit in Exhibit AMI14. Her husband extensively spoliated the original to make it look as though there had been a prior gifting arrangement to all the children. I have the original to prove the forgery and perjury.

b) she submitted forgery to the Public Trustee and by way of Exhibit VAV1 of Affidavit by Vanessa Varga dated 9 March 2007. The forged letter purports to claim gifts from the plaintiffs mother to her. There was a genuine authentic letter, unsighted, which contained **two** signatories (there is email evidence of this). The forgery, which purported to be that genuine letter, contained a huge gaffe - it contained only **one** signatory. This forgery may contain properties not listed in the authentic letter. In addition even the authentic letter is incriminating in that it proves that there was a great amount of property transfer (*the bulk off the estate's value*) to the plaintiff, and this contradicts her affidavit perjuries where she said none of this 'arrangement' of property distribution had ever occurred. Why one would lie about property gifting when simple title searches provide proof of perjury indicates the plaintiff's inability to perceive the consequences of her nefarious spontaneous deeds.

c) she submitted forgery to Public Trustee in 2001. This forgery, containing both fact and fiction, shows factually that the deceased's son George had been excluded by the deceased's attorney from any gifting. That reinforces all the perjuries about the 'prior arrangements'. The plaintiff (her husband) had in fact acquired all of George's titles from the attorney because the attorney was not pleased with George. Further evidence can be provided by way of email where the plaintiff confesses, and I was personally told of this arrangement in September 2000 by the attorney himself.

The setting up of a squatter lawsuit would be a cinch for one with that record and mindset. Having just been to Greece and the area where the properties are, I can see that all one needs to do is phone up an interested acquaintance, ask him to make/arrange plausible squatter claims by neighbours on various properties in return for cash transfers. The courts do not oppose undefended squatter claims.

[The threats on the phone by Executor's husband to me and/or daughter](#)

- a)** "we will get you" - 2004, 2005
- b)** "I'll cut you up into quarters" - 2001
- c)** "I have 5 properties I need these properties" - 2001 and 2004 in hearing transcript. Makes perjury of 'prior gifting arrangement' claims.
- d)** "these properties all belong to Anna under Greek tradition" - 2001

e) "we will get lawyers in Greece to <demolish> you"

The above is backed by primary documentation all stored on computer apart from the phone calls, which I would swear to under oath.

Properties Squatter free - 'Never was squatters'.

An important piece of evidence is the hearing transcript attached where the plaintiff's husband gives an absolute guarantee to the Guardianship board at the August 2004 hearing that the properties are/were/had always been totally free of squatters and that no administrator was required to prevent squatters. He provides details of his assurances and the Board is satisfied. It is actually true that the properties were totally squatter free. After all it was in his interests that they be squatter free. *That is exactly why he and the lessee are implicated, through his own trail of incriminating evidence.* His own evidence precludes the existence of genuine squatters - he invented a squatter (Maria Theofilis) in order to steal what is meant to be my inheritance.

To recap, he provides evidence of the non-existence of squatters, then becomes one himself. Unexpected, but very elegant, a true Trojan style corruption of the estate of my mother.

Executor's Rhode's Lawyer Participation in fraud

As for the Executor's Rhodes lawyer, I recently discovered a letter from him to my father, dated 23 September 1988, where he wished to buy the particular *coveted property in question (no. 671) and made my father an offer of 1,400,00 drachmas*. He made offers to purchase a number of other properties near/on the beach as well. He owns other properties very near this one. Apparently we had appointed this lawyer to be our POA to handle land transfers. The property can be viewed from the beach. The lawyer owns many properties in the vicinity, and *is renowned for his large collection of properties in the area.*

He is renowned too for his expertise in arranging many squatter lawsuits. This is an easy thing to do in Greece when the parties involved consent, because it is a tax dodge - no taxes are paid on property transferred via squatting.

At some point in 2001 the Executor's husband had arranged a deal with the lawyer and the lawyer stopped communicating with me and any solicitor enquiring on behalf of the SA Public Trustee about my mother's properties.

The fruits of this deal are now manifested as a fraudulent squatter property transfer set up, which had I not stumbled across it, would have succeeded without opposition on 26 April 2007. The lawsuit is so full of lies that it necessary for the defence to demonstrate the collusion between Executor, lessee and squatter in order to defeat it. South Australia should contribute to this investigation and defence because it occurred as a result of manipulation of its Guardianship and probate administration by the plaintiff.

Executor planned Squatter Fraud in 2001

The squatter property fraud appears to have been planned as far back as 2001 when the Executor discovered my mother's Will which to my pleasant surprise left her residuary estate to me. I assumed my mother had done this because *the other siblings had already received commercial, residential and land investment properties as gifts from their parents, far exceeding the value of her residuary estate.* As I had not received any gifts, to everyone except for two avaricious siblings the Will was straightforward.

SA Government Maladministration

This squatter lawsuit could not have happened if the South Australian government administration had not negligently supported the efforts of the plaintiff since early 2004 to prevent administration of this property and others, and the personal efforts of the Probate Registrar in preventing administration of the deceased estate because of his stated personal belief that the estate should be divided equally.

Since about April 2004, the Guardianship Board, the Ombudsman, the District Court, the SA Police have been corrupted by Public Trustee Crown solicitor officer Lesley McPharlin in her

personal mission to support the plaintiff's opposition to my mother's last will and testament.

The SA government departments had *made no effort to obtain evidence*, just blind acceptance of word of mouth and bits of crudely handwritten scraps of paper in untranslated Greek that have all been forged and tainted by the in-law.

The Public Trustee Crown solicitor officer (contracted) Lesley McPharlin has been the culprit who has propagated her personal desire to overturn my mother's will, and has single-handedly, and corruptly influenced the Guardianship Board, the ombudsman, the District Court, the SA Police and the Probate Registrar into making decisions, adverse to the security of the estate, that are illogical, inane and groundless, and based on hearsay and prejudice.

In about August 2005, Lesley McPharlin instructed police who were about to investigate the plaintiff's husband fraudulent activities, to not proceed with the investigation. She lied to them in saying the allegations had already been investigated by a number of departments. No department had ever investigated anything. I don't know why this Crown solicitor was driven to lie, but I hold her accountable for property loss because the plaintiff was allowed to continue her destruction unabated to this day. If the police had investigated there would be no hearing today, she would have been stopped from contemplating any further acts of fraud.

Plaintiff's manipulation of SA Government administration

I have been falsely portrayed repeatedly as untrustworthy by these persons (two siblings and an in-law) and the Guardianship Board and the rest of the herd have believed the embittered, vengeful persons and made decisions adverse to myself, my mother and the security of overseas land in Greece.

Two of those embittered, vengeful persons (siblings) are unfortunately Executors of my mother's Will. One Executor has chosen to be passive and not take an active role (smart move in view of the property fraud revelation).

Ministerial Action Taken Against Probate Registrar's Personal Involvement

I wrote to the Minister for Justice in Feb 2007 accusing the Probate Registrar, the Crown solicitor officer (Lesley McPharlin) and the Executor's solicitor (Vanessa Varga of Treloar & Treloar) of conspiring to undermine my mother's will. I did not hear back from the Minister, but the reaction was to concoct and contrive these affidavits and court actions to make it appear as though the Probate Registrar was above board. I was in Greece at the time of these contrived hearings and there was no defence. Besides I kept telling the Judge as I was leaving for Greece that Australia had no Jurisdiction over the inheritance of Greek estate. The hastily convened hearings resulted in the plaintiff losing her strictly personal mission, even though there was no defence present and she engaged a barrister. The embarrassed plaintiff's solicitors, who foolishly advanced the plaintiff tens of thousands of dollars, are now desperately scheming various ways of getting paid.

The barrister discovered that Greece honours the beneficiaries of a Greek mother's will, and that Greece is too street-wise (with 8000 years of civilisation) to believe in 'lying Greek bastards', and too street-wise to believe these scraps of paper written by some 'lying Greek bastards'.

I believe that this current court action - whatever it is about exactly is not clear - is not a matter for the courts and was and still is a matter for the Minister for Justice, the Minister for Police and the Premier to attend to. It involves a number of SA government departments and even the Court itself in mishandling the administration of their laws. It's in my opinion a silly court action -two of the defendants (4th and 5th) are actually plaintiffs not defendants, another two defendants (2nd and 3rd) are minors and know nothing of this, nor does their mother have any idea as to what it's all about, and there are four persons, *my daughters, who are in their late 30s, who should appear as defendants because they have greater rights and claims under the Inheritances Act 1972 section 7(b) than does the perjurious plaintiff. They have been deliberately and cunningly omitted by the plaintiff/plaintiff's solicitor.*

Greece rejects Executor's statements and document claims

The Executor's Australian solicitor tried her hardest in vain to harass Greek lawyers (see her emails in affidavits) into believing the Executor but no Greek court and Greek lawyer anywhere in the world would ever accept this because Greeks know Greeks, and Australian lawyers should learn a lesson about meddling with foreign inheritance.

Greece respects a mother's Will, and respects her knowledge of her children. There are no family-destroying executors and no family-destroying lawyers permitted in Greece. There are no desecrating affidavits and desecrating challenges in Greek property inheritances. The beneficiaries or children of the deceased apply directly to the Greek Court for their inheritance, and the Court decides based on the Will and its Inheritance laws what the children receive. The laws forbid pitting family member against family member, whereas Australia's Inheritance laws morbidly encourage families to destroy themselves in court.

Perjurious Affidavit

The entire affidavit of the plaintiff-Executor is filled with perjuries and two forgeries. There was no valid prior arrangement of gifting, *that arrangement was destroyed by the plaintiff in 1993 when she grabbed huge valuable chunks of my mother's estate (about \$600,000+ today's value). This is not mentioned by the perjurious plaintiff in her affidavit* - she had conned everyone in the SA administration right through to the Supreme Court who blindly accepted her statements without any questioning whatsoever.

As I explained before, Greece would not even allow any family members to even present these destructive views.

Plaintiff's Home Ground Advantage

The vengeful persons have a home-ground advantage in that they live in Adelaide whereas I and the rest of my family live in Melbourne and Canberra. They have constantly put pressure on the local SA departments, and the parochial departments have never questioned the truthfulness of any statement (in private and in hearings and in court) the vengeful persons have made. However whenever I have made a statement favourable to protection of the overseas estate, the government departments and court have been insulting and have been quick to support insulting comments by those Adelaide siblings and in-law. It's all in various transcripts and Statement of reasons.

I was raised in Adelaide and graduated at Adelaide University, and three of my four daughters were born in Adelaide. I used to barrack for West Torrens and support both the Crows and Port Adelaide. I hope that counts.

Remote communications by remote defendants

It is essential that remote defendants to be able to make any or effective contact by telephone conferencing. I believe there is a need for a robust, reliable and sophisticated system with in-court participants speaking into a decent radio-microphone so that the remote defendants can hear what is being spoken.

More often than not a remote defendant is lost through frequent disconnection but the hearing still continues without defendants. It appears that the Court's mind is already made up and that it needs no defendants views. I don't think the Court should allow itself to enjoy that luxury of unchallenged thought.

Website Access to Primary Documents

This website is password protected and contains presentations and any primary document that may be required.

http://www.omegaenterprises.info/rhodes/inheritance/perjury/login_pff.asp

Philip Stilianos
9 April 2007
Melbourne

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 9 April 2007 6:59 PM
To: 'supreme.registry@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: Court Action FDN 192/2007. Erini Stiliano estate - New Overseas Property Fraud is A Higher Priority.

Attachments: ENGLISH - lawsuit_property671.pdf; ENGLISH - 2004_10_11_faxed_leasing_document.pdf; 2004_10_11_faxed_leasing_document.pdf; 2004_10_05_Squatter_Transcript_of_GB_Hearing.pdf; behind_Erinis_perfect_will.pdf; statement to police.pdf

New Squatter Property Fraud is A Higher Priority Court Action FDN 192/2007

Overview

As you can see below, the plaintiff is the person who has committed all the crimes, and losses of property should be recovered from her own current personal estates in Adelaide and Greece, and all expenses must be paid out of her own pocket because she has been single-minded in her fraudulent intent from the outset.

For someone to have the temerity to falsify probate, then issue affidavits and summonses designating herself the plaintiff and innocent people as defendants, and commit brazen perjuries and forgeries in her affidavits whilst undertaking simultaneous property fraud overseas, has got to be one the most twisted cases of abuse and manipulation of the South Australian legal system that has occurred, and almost have succeeded.

Where I use the word plaintiff it refers to either the plaintiff Anna Maria Itsines or her husband Stan Itsines. They operate as a single entity in every thought and deed in their fraudulent conduct in relation to the estate of Erini Stiliano deceased.

Because of the frequent changes of Judges hearing this case, I have endeavoured to provide a concise but comprehensive background of information of how it all fits together. You may not enjoy what you read, but it was far less enjoyment writing this, and a lot less enjoyment being subjected to these things. The reader should be thankful they are not the innocent victim of maladministration.

I request that the Squatter Lawsuit Hearing in Greece Take Priority - and request that SA request this lawsuit be suspended.

I would like to request that SA Government/Court request the Rhodes court through a Greek lawyer, at the estate's expense, *to suspend the squatter lawsuit hearing* at the **Rhodes Court on 26 April 2007** until the investigations of fraud by the Executor have been completed in South Australia. In any case the Executor is legally liable for the loss of this property under Australian law, not only in a civil sense but also in a criminal sense, and it is in her interests to ask the squatter to not proceed with this lawsuit, as they have been 'found out'. I quite accidentally discovered this lawsuit. The plaintiff spent some \$20,000+ or more (probably a lot more) attempting to restrain me through the SA Supreme Court from obtaining details of estate properties such as this lawsuit, and attempted to convince the Supreme Court that this property should be exempt from the deceased estate (thereby exempting her from legal liability). Because of Greek law jurisdiction which prohibits any nation from restraining a beneficiary's rights or from making decisions on the Greek estate, her mission has failed. The plaintiff had already known what the Greek laws were through her personal lawyer/accomplice in Rhodes. Her attempts to mask her overseas fraud with a charade of inexplicable Australian affidavits and summonses and failed hearings should be punished by ensuing she pays for all costs and is further investigated by the SA Police Fraud Squad.

What happens on 26 April 2007 in the Rhodes Court, should it be allowed to occur, will inevitably determine the fate of the Executor and others in South Australia.

Greece is oblivious to South Australia's Guardianship and Public Trustee and Probate Administration

I must stress a thousand times that Greece has been oblivious since 2001 to all of South Australia's hearings, its administration orders, its court orders on my mother's properties. As far as Greece is concerned the Guardianship Board or Public Trustee administrator never presented themselves to Greece and thereby did nothing in Greece itself to protect the properties. I earnestly sought an Administrator order so that I could present myself to Greece. However a very ignorant South Australia thought Greece was like Australia in property law and administration, and did not appreciate that it is essential that the properties in Greece, especially in Greece, not be left in limbo land. Greece does not have an advanced property registration system as Australia has. I think most of Greece basically does not know who owns what. Land does not have 'council rates', so a property can lie around for decades without an addressee for billing because there are no bills. Opportunistic Greeks will exploit these conditions to make squatter claims on neglected properties.

Probate Registrar must be ordered to issue certificate of probate to beneficiary

If this is done immediately I can show Greece that someone is showing interest in the property/s. So far, all Greece can see is that only squatters are interested. Greece's laws encourage squatting and claims where properties are neglected.

Any losses of property will be the responsibility of the Executor and/or those in the SA government administration who bent over backwards to assist the plaintiff achieve her nefarious aims.

Executor to Remain as Executor To Answer to Squatter Fraud and Negligence

She has the audacity at this stage of scrutiny and impending investigation to attempt to resign as Executor and pass the role over to the Public Trustee, in the hope she can't be sued for property losses.

Squatter Fraud Participants

It appears that 5 persons viz the plaintiff (Executor), her husband, their Rhodes lawyer, the lessee of the 'protected' properties, and the acquaintance of theirs Maria Theofilis (who lodged the lawsuit), are committing property fraud on the Greek estate. They are participants in a lucrative squatter lawsuit on a prime beachside property belonging to my mother's deceased estate. This squatter lawsuit is being heard soon on 26 April 2007 in the Rhodes Court. It is imperative that South Australia take legal action to prevent this hearing occurring, because its administration was warned that this (squatting) would happen but the plaintiff assured the administration it would never happen (Guardianship Board hearing August 2004 attached).

It should be noted the the Greek lawyer who prepared the lawsuit for the squatter acquaintance was found guilty of fraud in early March 2007, on another matter, and has been barred from practicing law by the Greek lawyers union.

There is a wealth of evidence, in emails and hearing and court transcripts, in their Rhodes lawyer's 1988 letter, in the anti-squatter leasing document, in the attempted perjurious property claims by plaintiff and her husband, and phone threats, that convincingly demonstrates motives, intentions, means, and knowledge and threats. Every possible scenario one comes up with inevitably points to the Executor and lessee.

To make the squatter lawsuit possible the Executor:

- a)** had stopped me, by falsely denigrating my character, from being administrator in 2001 and 2004
- b)** sacked my mother's Adelaide Greek solicitor in 2006, because he said the plaintiff had no claim and had to pay her own expenses.
- c)** engaged an all-Australian legal firm that knew nothing about Greek law.
- d)** had not intended and did not and has not submitted probate to Greece
- e)** had instructed the Probate Registrar not to allow me the means to submit probate to Greece
- f)** took supreme court action attempting to prevent me from investigating properties in Greece

- g)** took supreme court action to have the squatter property (No 671) exempted from the deceased estate so she would not be legally liable as Executor
- h)** did *not* appoint her experienced Rhodes lawyer to have the lawsuit dismissed. That's presumably because of his interest in it. See below.
- i)** attempted to resign as Executor following the supreme court hearing to avoid being liable for loss of property through squatter lawsuit
- j)** together with her Australian solicitor made no attempt at any stage to protect or administer any properties of the deceased estate
- k)** on telephone saying to me over and over "you will pay dearly for this" - May 2006
- h)** *the plaintiff (husband) had stolen the anti-squatter leasing document in 2001, with a view to committing squatter property fraud.*

To this day, 13 months after my mother passed away on 7 March 2006, as far as Greece is concerned the properties have no administrator, no executor, no probate submission, no inheritance claim. This is just what the Australian Executor wants in order to facilitate her squatter fraud. The Probate Registrar's personal interference is a major contributor to this state of affairs.

[The plaintiff has a disposition to perjury, forgery and fraud as evidenced in the statement to police attached.](#)

- a)** she submitted perjury and forgery in her affidavit in Exhibit AMI14. Her husband extensively spoliated the original to make it look as though there had been a prior gifting arrangement to all the children. I have the original to prove the forgery and perjury.
- b)** she submitted forgery to the Public Trustee and by way of Exhibit VAV1 of Affidavit by Vanessa Varga dated 9 March 2007. The forged letter purports to claim gifts from the plaintiff's mother to her. There was a genuine authentic letter, unsighted, which contained **two** signatories (there is email evidence of this). The forgery, which purported to be that genuine letter, contained a huge gaffe - it contained only **one** signatory. This forgery may contain properties not listed in the authentic letter. In addition even the authentic letter is incriminating in that it proves that there was a great amount of property transfer (*the bulk off the estate's value*) to the plaintiff, and this contradicts her affidavit perjuries where she said none of this 'arrangement' of property distribution had ever occurred. Why one would lie about property gifting when simple title searches provide proof of perjury indicates the plaintiff's inability to perceive the consequences of her nefarious spontaneous deeds.
- c)** she submitted forgery to Public Trustee in 2001. This forgery, containing both fact and fiction, shows factually that the deceased's son George had been excluded by the deceased's attorney from any gifting. That reinforces all the perjuries about the 'prior arrangements'. The plaintiff (her husband) had in fact acquired all of George's titles from the attorney because the attorney was not pleased with George. Further evidence can be provided by way of email where the plaintiff confesses, and I was personally told of this arrangement in September 2000 by the attorney himself.

The setting up of a squatter lawsuit would be a cinch for one with that record and mindset. Having just been to Greece and the area where the properties are, I can see that all one needs to do is phone up an interested acquaintance, ask him to make/arrange plausible squatter claims by neighbours on various properties in return for cash transfers. The courts do not oppose undefended squatter claims.

[The threats on the phone by Executor's husband to me and/or daughter](#)

- a)** "we will get you" - 2004, 2005
- b)** "I'll cut you up into quarters" - 2001
- c)** "I have 5 properties I need these properties" - 2001 and 2004 in hearing transcript. Makes perjury of 'prior gifting arrangement' claims.
- d)** "these properties all belong to Anna under Greek tradition" - 2001
- e)** "we will get lawyers in Greece to <demolish> you"

The above is backed by primary documentation all stored on computer apart from the phone calls, which I would swear to under oath.

Properties Squatter free - 'Never was squatters'.

An important piece of evidence is the hearing transcript attached where the plaintiff's husband gives an absolute guarantee to the Guardianship board at the August 2004 hearing that the properties are/were/had always been totally free of squatters and that no administrator was required to prevent squatters. He provides details of his assurances and the Board is satisfied. It is actually true that the properties were totally squatter free. After all it was in his interests that they be squatter free. *That is exactly why he and the lessee are implicated, through his own trail of incriminating evidence.* His own evidence precludes the existence of genuine squatters - he invented a squatter (Maria Theofilis) in order to steal what is meant to be my inheritance.

To recap, he provides evidence of the non-existence of squatters, then becomes one himself. Unexpected, but very elegant, a true Trojan style corruption of the estate of my mother.

Executor's Rhode's Lawyer Participation in fraud

As for the Executor's Rhodes lawyer, I recently discovered a letter from him to my father, dated 23 September 1988, where he wished to buy the particular *coveted property in question (no. 671) and made my father an offer of 1,400,00 drachmas.* He made offers to purchase a number of other properties near/on the beach as well. He owns other properties very near this one. Apparently we had appointed this lawyer to be our POA to handle land transfers. The property can be viewed from the beach. The lawyer owns many properties in the vicinity, and *is renowned for his large collection of properties in the area.*

He is renowned too for his expertise in arranging many squatter lawsuits. This is an easy thing to do in Greece when the parties involved consent, because it is a tax dodge - no taxes are paid on property transferred via squatting.

At some point in 2001 the Executor's husband had arranged a deal with the lawyer and the lawyer stopped communicating with me and any solicitor enquiring on behalf of the SA Public Trustee about my mother's properties.

The fruits of this deal are now manifested as a fraudulent squatter property transfer set up, which had I not stumbled across it, would have succeeded without opposition on 26 April 2007. The lawsuit is so full of lies that it necessary for the defence to demonstrate the collusion between Executor, lessee and squatter in order to defeat it. South Australia should contribute to this investigation and defence because it occurred as a result of manipulation of its Guardianship and probate administration by the plaintiff.

Executor planned Squatter Fraud in 2001

The squatter property fraud appears to have been planned as far back as 2001 when the Executor discovered my mother's Will which to my pleasant surprise left her residuary estate to me. I assumed my mother had done this because *the other siblings had already received commercial, residential and land investment properties as gifts from their parents, far exceeding the value of her residuary estate.* As I had not received any gifts, to everyone except for two avaricious siblings the Will was straightforward.

SA Government Maladministration

This squatter lawsuit could not have happened if the South Australian government administration had not negligently supported the efforts of the plaintiff since early 2004 to prevent administration of this property and others, and the personal efforts of the Probate Registrar in preventing administration of the deceased estate because of his stated personal belief that the estate should be divided equally.

Since about April 2004, the Guardianship Board, the Ombudsman, the District Court, the SA Police have been corrupted by Public Trustee Crown solicitor officer Lesley McPharlin in her personal mission to support the plaintiff's opposition to my mother's last will and testament.

The SA government departments had *made no effort to obtain evidence*, just blind acceptance of word of mouth and bits of crudely handwritten scraps of paper in untranslated Greek that have all been forged and tainted by the in-law.

The Public Trustee Crown solicitor officer (contracted) Lesley McPharlin has been the culprit who has propagated her personal desire to overturn my mother's will, and has single-handedly, and corruptly influenced the Guardianship Board, the ombudsman, the District Court, the SA Police and the Probate Registrar into making decisions, adverse to the security of the estate, that are illogical, inane and groundless, and based on hearsay and prejudice.

In about August 2005, Lesley McPharlin instructed police who were about to investigate the plaintiff's husband fraudulent activities, to not proceed with the investigation. She lied to them in saying the allegations had already been investigated by a number of departments. No department had ever investigated anything. I don't know why this Crown solicitor was driven to lie, but I hold her accountable for property loss because the plaintiff was allowed to continue her destruction unabated to this day. If the police had investigated there would be no hearing today, she would have been stopped from contemplating any further acts of fraud.

Plaintiff's manipulation of SA Government administration

I have been falsely portrayed repeatedly as untrustworthy by these persons (two siblings and an in-law) and the Guardianship Board and the rest of the herd have believed the embittered, vengeful persons and made decisions adverse to myself, my mother and the security of overseas land in Greece.

Two of those embittered, vengeful persons (siblings) are unfortunately Executors of my mother's Will. One Executor has chosen to be passive and not take an active role (smart move in view of the property fraud revelation).

Ministerial Action Taken Against Probate Registrar's Personal Involvement

I wrote to the Minister for Justice in Feb 2007 accusing the Probate Registrar, the Crown solicitor officer (Lesley McPharlin) and the Executor's solicitor (Vanessa Varga of Treloar & Treloar) of conspiring to undermine my mother's will. I did not hear back from the Minister, but the reaction was to concoct and contrive these affidavits and court actions to make it appear as though the Probate Registrar was above board. I was in Greece at the time of these contrived hearings and there was no defence. Besides I kept telling the Judge as I was leaving for Greece that Australia had no Jurisdiction over the inheritance of Greek estate. The hastily convened hearings resulted in the plaintiff losing her strictly personal mission, even though there was no defence present and she engaged a barrister. The embarrassed plaintiff's solicitors, who foolishly advanced the plaintiff tens of thousands of dollars, are now desperately scheming various ways of getting paid.

The barrister discovered that Greece honours the beneficiaries of a Greek mother's will, and that Greece is too street-wise (with 8000 years of civilisation) to believe in 'lying Greek bastards', and too street-wise to believe these scraps of paper written by some 'lying Greek bastards'.

I believe that this current court action - whatever it is about exactly is not clear - is not a matter for the courts and was and still is a matter for the Minister for Justice, the Minister for Police and the Premier to attend to. It involves a number of SA government departments and even the Court itself in mishandling the administration of their laws. It's in my opinion a silly court action -two of the defendants (4th and 5th) are actually plaintiffs not defendants, another two defendants (2nd and 3rd) are minors and know nothing of this, nor does their mother have any idea as to what it's all about, and there are four persons, *my daughters, who are in their late 30s, who should appear as defendants because they have greater rights and claims under the Inheritances Act 1972 section 7(b) than does the perjurious plaintiff. They have been deliberately and cunningly omitted by the plaintiff/plaintiff's solicitor.*

Greece rejects Executor's statements and document claims

The Executor's Australian solicitor tried her hardest in vain to harass Greek lawyers (see her emails in affidavits) into believing the Executor but no Greek court and Greek lawyer anywhere in the world would ever accept this because Greeks know Greeks, and Australian lawyers should learn a lesson about meddling with foreign inheritance.

Greece respects a mother's Will, and respects her knowledge of her children. There are no

family-destroying executors and no family-destroying lawyers permitted in Greece. There are no desecrating affidavits and desecrating challenges in Greek property inheritances. The beneficiaries or children of the deceased apply directly to the Greek Court for their inheritance, and the Court decides based on the Will and its Inheritance laws what the children receive. The laws forbid pitting family member against family member, whereas Australia's Inheritance laws morbidly encourage families to destroy themselves in court.

Perjurious Affidavit

The entire affidavit of the plaintiff-Executor is filled with perjuries and two forgeries. There was no valid prior arrangement of gifting, *that arrangement was destroyed by the plaintiff in 1993 when she grabbed huge valuable chunks of my mother's estate (about \$600,000+ today's value). This is not mentioned by the perjurious plaintiff in her affidavit* - she had conned everyone in the SA administration right through to the Supreme Court who blindly accepted her statements without any questioning whatsoever.

As I explained before, Greece would not even allow any family members to even present these destructive views.

Plaintiff's Home Ground Advantage

The vengeful persons have a home-ground advantage in that they live in Adelaide whereas I and the rest of my family live in Melbourne and Canberra. They have constantly put pressure on the local SA departments, and the parochial departments have never questioned the truthfulness of any statement (in private and in hearings and in court) the vengeful persons have made. However whenever I have made a statement favourable to protection of the overseas estate, the government departments and court have been insulting and have been quick to support insulting comments by those Adelaide siblings and in-law. It's all in various transcripts and Statement of reasons.

I was raised in Adelaide and graduated at Adelaide University, and three of my four daughters were born in Adelaide. I used to barrack for West Torrens and support both the Crows and Port Adelaide. I hope that counts.

Remote communications by remote defendants

It is essential that remote defendants to be able to make any or effective contact by telephone conferencing. I believe there is a need for a robust, reliable and sophisticated system with in-court participants speaking into a decent radio-microphone so that the remote defendants can hear what is being spoken.

More often than not a remote defendant is lost through frequent disconnection but the hearing still continues without defendants. It appears that the Court's mind is already made up and that it needs no defendants views. I don't think the Court should allow itself to enjoy that luxury of unchallenged thought.

Website Access to Primary Documents

This website is password protected and contains presentations and any primary document that may be required.

http://www.omegaenterprises.info/rhodes/inheritance/perjury/login_pff.asp

Philip Stilianos
9 April 2007
Melbourne

Philip S

From: Baxter, Jan (CAA) [Jan.Baxter@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 April 2007 11:48 AM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: Erini Stilianos Estate - Request for Deferment of FDN 192/2007 scheduled for 11 April 2007
Attachments: 192 of 07 corres.doc

Dear Mr Stilianos,

Please find attached a letter in response to your email below of 5 April, 2007.

Kind regards,

Jan Baxter
Deputy Registrar, Manager Registry Services
Supreme Court Civil Division

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 5 April 2007 4:11 PM
To: CAA:PM Supreme Court Civil Registry (CAA)
Subject: Erini Stilianos Estate - Request for Deferment of FDN 192/2007 scheduled for 11 April 2007

To the Service Clerk
SA Supreme Civil Court

I would like the hearing rescheduled in the light of the following:

- There is a **high priority squatter lawsuit hearing on 26 April 2007 in Rhodes Greece** on a valuable Greek beachside property 671 for which the plaintiff is legally responsible. I request that the new hearing be held sometime after the 26 April 2007.
- The plaintiff is accused of arranging a lucrative squatter lawsuit in conjunction with the lessee and the 'squatter'. This is supported by evidence which suggests the squatter could not have made this covert lawsuit without the consent/cooperation of the plaintiff and the lessee.
- Is the Court able to request that Greece suspend the squatter lawsuit in Greece until the plaintiff has been investigated and charged in Australia with this fraud? I would like the Court to switch emphasis to the Greek lawsuit and the plaintiff's legal liability. There are really no inheritance issues to dispute, the issues are those of forgery, perjury and fraud on property in general.
- Mr Roder, barrister, in his letter of advice, found that the plaintiff lost her case to refrain me from investigating the estate, and lost her case to have 'her' properties recognised. She lost, despite her as yet unanswered forgeries and perjuries in her affidavits. However overall she will be \$100,000+ ahead even if she pays all the legal costs if her partners-in-crime can win the squatter lawsuit in Greece on 26 April 2007.
- It was essential for the plaintiff to stall submitting probate to Greece in order for the squatter lawsuit to succeed. Even after the lawsuit was revealed (though good luck) she still refused to submit probate which was the first thing one would do to try and defeat the lawsuit. Well, she has still not submitted probate 13 months after my mother passed

away, and that clearly indicates her desire and intention that the fraudulent lawsuit succeed. Her attempt to exempt property 671 from the deceased estate also failed.

- The plaintiff has submitted easily proven forgeries Exhibit AMI 14 in her affidavit and Exhibit VAV1/013 in another affidavit, and the consequential numerous perjuries linked to these forgeries. Her husband has authored these forgeries. I will email well-presented graphic details of them.

- Another forgery not presented in her affidavit reinforces perjuries committed. I am currently compiling the graphics and text.

- The plaintiff has not mentioned the commercial, investment house and land properties she had been gifted and transferred to her in 1975, 1993 and 1996. There are a number of perjuries ensuing from this deliberate omission. I estimate a conservative \$600,000 received by the plaintiff in today's money value, well in excess of the value of the deceased estate.

- In view of the forgeries and perjuries presented in her affidavit/s, and the imminent covert fraudulent property transfer operation underway in Greece, she should be ordered to pay all costs because Greece will not pay from the Greek estate when the forgeries and perjuries and an account of a pell-mell series of affidavits against the beneficiaries is presented to them, because Greek law and Greek culture honours its beneficiaries and its testators and regards denial of probate a serious breach of beneficiary rights.

Could you please reply asap as to what action is being considered?

Than you.

Philip Stilianos
Melbourne
5 April 2007

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.11.17/951 - Release Date: 13/08/2007 10:15 AM

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 April 2007 2:50 PM
To: 'supreme.registry@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: Court Action FDN 192/2007. Erini Stiliano estate - Summary of Issues Regarding Dual Hearings in Greece and Australia

For Hearing 11 April 2007

To Judge Burley

The main issues as I see them are:

1. There is a squatter lawsuit against Erini Stiliano (deceased) that claims her prime property 671 in Rhodes, Greece. This is to be heard on 26 April 2007. The plaintiff covertly fraudulently arranged this lawsuit as detailed in previous emails.
2. The plaintiff has litigated in South Australia to exempt the property 671 from the deceased estate, ostensibly to exempt herself from legal liability as Executor.
3. The plaintiff has also litigated to resign as Executor and pass her responsibilities on to the Public Trustee, ostensibly to escape litigation on the loss of property 671.
4. A lawyer cannot be appointed by the plaintiff to defend the lawsuit because the only way the lawyer can win this lawsuit is by charging her own client and her client's lessee with collusion to commit property fraud.

The plaintiff is the one who has committed crimes overseas against an Australian citizen/s (myself and others adversely affected), and is trying through a charade of twisted litigation to arrange her affairs in South Australian so she is legally exempt as Executor.

I ask your Honour to not allow the plaintiff to achieve her nefarious mission, and to warn her that she is legally responsible for the loss of today's market value of the property 671, regardless of what happens on the 26 April 2007, so that she may have the opportunity to tell her squatter acquaintance to abort the squatter lawsuit hearing.

The above makes it clear that the estate will pay any cost so the issue of payment of expenses is straight forward - the felonious plaintiff pays everything because she has been single-minded in fraudulent intent only.

Philip Stilianos
10 April 2007
Melbourne

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.10.8/904 - Release Date: 16/07/2007 5:42 PM

Philip S

From: Baxter, Jan (CAA) [Jan.Baxter@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 April 2007 5:37 PM
To: philip s
Subject: RE: Court Action FDN 192/2007. Erini Stiliano estate - Summary of Issues Regarding Dual Hearings in Greece and Australia
Attachments: 192 of 07 corres 2.doc

Dear Mr Stilianos,

Please find attached a response in relation to your further email of 10 April, 2007 in letter form.

Kind regards,

Jan Baxter
Deputy Registrar, Manager Registry Services
Supreme Court Civil Division

-----Original Message-----

From: philip s [mailto:philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 April 2007 2:20 PM
To: CAA:PM Supreme Court Civil Registry (CAA)
Subject: Court Action FDN 192/2007. Erini Stiliano estate - Summary of Issues Regarding Dual Hearings in Greece and Australia

For Hearing 11 April 2007

To Judge Burley

The main issues as I see them are:

1. There is a squatter lawsuit against Erini Stiliano (deceased) that claims her prime property 671 in Rhodes, Greece. This is to be heard on 26 April 2007. The plaintiff covertly fraudulently arranged this lawsuit as detailed in previous emails.
2. The plaintiff has litigated in South Australia to exempt the property 671 from the deceased estate, ostensibly to exempt herself from legal liability as Executor.
3. The plaintiff has also litigated to resign as Executor and pass her responsibilities on to the Public Trustee, ostensibly to escape litigation on the loss of property 671.
4. A lawyer cannot be appointed by the plaintiff to defend the lawsuit because the only way the lawyer can win this lawsuit is by charging her own client and her client's lessee with collusion to commit property fraud.

The plaintiff is the one who has committed crimes overseas against an Australian citizen/s (myself and others adversely affected), and is trying through a charade of twisted litigation to arrange her affairs in South Australian so she is legally exempt as Executor.

I ask your Honour to not allow the plaintiff to achieve her nefarious mission, and to warn her that she is legally responsible for the loss of today's market value of the property 671, regardless of what happens on the 26 April 2007, so that she may have the opportunity to tell her squatter acquaintance to abort the squatter lawsuit hearing.

The above makes it clear that the estate will pay any cost so the issue of payment of expenses is straight forward - the felonious plaintiff pays everything because she has been single-minded in fraudulent intent only.

Philip Stilianos
10 April 2007
Melbourne

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.11.17/951 - Release Date: 13/08/2007 10:15 AM

Philip S

From: Pritchard, Debbie (CAA) [Debbie.Pritchard@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 15 May 2007 1:24 PM
To: vanessa.varga@treloar.net.au; philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au
Subject: FW: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome
Attachments: ap15396.pdf

Dear Ms Varga and Mr Stilianos

Further to my telephone calls, I forward a copy of the fiat vacating the Status Hearing before Judge Withers on 16 May 2007 in the matter of Itsines v Stilianos and Ors.

Kind regards
Debbie Pritchard
PA to Judge Withers

-----Original Message-----

From: huron@courts.sa.gov.au [<mailto:huron@courts.sa.gov.au>] **On Behalf Of** kcsdlp@courts.sa.gov.au
Sent: Tuesday, 15 May 2007 12:54 PM
To: Pritchard, Debbie (CAA)
Subject: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome

<<ap15396.pdf>>

Philip S

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2007 12:38 PM
To: philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au
Subject: FW: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome
Attachments: ap16027.pdf

Good afternoon Mr Stilianos

Attached is a copy of the orders made today by Judge Burley. A copy of the sealed orders will be served on you at a later date.

Heather
PA to Judge Burley
8204 0462

-----Original Message-----

From: huron@courts.sa.gov.au [<mailto:huron@courts.sa.gov.au>] **On Behalf Of** kcshag@courts.sa.gov.au
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2007 12:01 PM
To: Gameau, Heather (CAA)
Subject: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome

<<ap16027.pdf>>

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.11.17/951 - Release Date: 13/08/2007 10:15 AM

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 24 May 2007 11:47 AM
To: 'Gameau, Heather (CAA)'
Subject: RE: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome
Attachments: philips affidavit_and_exhibits_source_watermarked.pdf

To the SA Supreme Court,

This matter, originally a political matter, is clearly unable to be resolved by the court I will deal with it from today as a political issue, in Greece and in Australia.

My comprehensive affidavit has clearly been ignored due to the sensitivity of its contents.

I am the 1st deft and the sole beneficiary of the Greek estate.

I have not agreed to the following conjured at the hearing:
"In addition, the 1st deft agrees to the substitution of a new administration and the revocation of the grant of probate."

As explained in detail my affidavit, as far as the Greek estate is concerned, **no administrators** are required in Greece. As prime beneficiary I have already done almost all the inheritance administration at a cost of \$3,000 dealing directly with Greece.

As stated by an expert in Greek Inheritance Law in Exhibit 3, "We further advise that our client is entitled under Greek law to act independently from the Executor."

I *reject* the following statement by the Judge, who states:
"In my opinion, it is appropriate to substitute PT as requested by the other parties"
The other parties are non-beneficiaries of the Greek estate, and have no rights over my my rights of majority control of the Greek estate.

As for my health, I'm fine dealing *only* with Greece. I cannot deal with a hostile, parochial SA administration and judiciary.
In my affidavit I state: *"I am unable mentally to handle the constant victim assault as an innocent beneficiary."* This hearing is full of such assaults.

The order is clearly all about trying to recover costs due to maladministration.
Due to wrongful litigation caused directly by inappropriate conduct by certain SA government officers, the cost should be met by the SA Government and/or the plaintiff.

The cost of obtaining probate for the Australian estate of \$66,000 should have been no more than \$1,200.

The cost of my submitting/handling probate in Greece *has cost nothing* to the estate. The beneficiaries (myself) initiate and perform all of that and I have done it already at my *personal* expense.

Australia should never have gotten itself involved with the shenanigans of a Greek estate claimant, who deliberately turned to uninformed Australian officials and lawyers when Greek law had already rejected the plaintiff's claims.

The SA administration has out of ignorance illegitimately attempted unorthodox methods of blocking my Greek inheritance rights and caused probably over \$100,000 in expenses (incurred

by the plaintiff) in the process.

I consider the court orders invalid because the orders are all about trying to recover costs from my estate inheritance due to maladministration by certain SA government officers. These officers had a legal duty to block the plaintiff, but instead aided and abetted her.

Philip Stilianos
24 may 2007
0409001450

From: Gameau, Heather (CAA) [mailto:Heather.Gameau@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2007 12:38 PM
To: philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au
Subject: FW: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome

Good afternoon Mr Stilianos

Attached is a copy of the orders made today by Judge Burley. A copy of the sealed orders will be served on you at a later date.

Heather
PA to Judge Burley
8204 0462

-----Original Message-----

From: huron@courts.sa.gov.au [mailto:huron@courts.sa.gov.au] **On Behalf Of** kcshag@courts.sa.gov.au
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2007 12:01 PM
To: Gameau, Heather (CAA)
Subject: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome

<<ap16027.pdf>>

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.10.8/904 - Release Date: 16/07/2007 5:42 PM

Philip S

From: philip s [philstil2005-home@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 17 July 2007 2:19 PM
To: 'supreme.registry@courts.sa.gov.au'
Subject: FDN 192/2007 - Erini Stiliano Probate - Hearing Scheduled for 18 Jul 2007

IN STRICT CONFIDENCE

A ministerial investigation is currently looking into the mishandling of probate by responsible officers.

I don't know if the hearing schedule for 18 Jul 2007 is still going ahead in view of the ministerial investigation which began 6 June 2007.

If the hearing is going ahead then the judge should be informed of the following as a **matter of life and death**.

1. I had learnt late last year that beneficiary Sara Stilianos is a **long term drug addict** who rapidly spends every dollar available to her. She very nearly died of an overdose last year, and was admitted to Alfred Hospital Melbourne. Her boyfriend was partly responsible, and she still has the same boyfriend. Sara even mentioned to the drug dealers she resided with, who were supplying her with an endless supply of drugs, that she was expecting an inheritance.
2. Her mother Irene Stilianos is an undeclared long term bankrupt, owing some \$25,000 and has avoided her creditors for a number of years. Her creditors are unaware of her address and contact details.
3. Sara Stilianos receives a Centrelink allowance of some \$360 per fortnight. It is an Youth Allowance for Independent Person, meaning that the **mother is not recognised as a Guardian acting in Sara's interests**.

There are volumes of documents in Centrelink, the Victorian Department of Human Services, and the Victorian Police to back up my statements.

It was never contemplated by my mother in her Will that Irene be the Guardian. It was also never contemplated that Sara receive cash in any form, because the property bequeathed to Sara was a tenant-in-common with Stella Stiliano as a 50% tenant-in-common. Thus Sara Stilianos would not have been able to easily liquidate the bequeathed asset. If you read the Will carefully you should see that ultimately my mother has given her trusted son Philip Stilianos the responsibility of financial and security responsibility.

The executors could have assumed this responsibility, but they chose instead to defraud the overseas estate and exploit the vulnerability and financial desperation of Irene and Sara Stilianos in reassuring them that their money was safe and that they would be receiving it all.

Irene Stilianos is desperate to get a hold of some money, any amount, that's why she cooperated with Treloar & Treloar's Vanessa Varga in falsifying an affidavit regarding serving of summons, and was induced by Vanessa Varga to agree to transfer executorship to the Public Trustee in return for some ready cash. The court order made on 23 May 2007 is thus a sham

Even though the Court order was not condoned by me (I did not agree to any of it), the disgraced Executors should be allowed to complete their resignation. I have considered applying for Letters of Administration, but I had already spent some \$6,000 in administration of the Greek estate and is now all but complete in Greece.

It is therefore crucial that Section 43 of the Guardianship Act not be used to apply for a codicil

02/07/2008

reinstating Sara as a beneficiary, because she would become a beneficiary of cash, contrary to the Will. More importantly however she would consume her inheritance within several weeks and feed herself a large amount of drugs. Her mother would equally consume the inheritance if it were available to her.

My concern is not that they will consume the money within weeks, but that there may very well be fatal consequences. This real concern is shared by Stella Stiliano.

Sara lost her status as beneficiary when the 1/2 house she and her twin sister Shamano were to inherit was sold by the Public Trustee.

As residuary beneficiary I have inherited what was to be Sara and Shamona's (her twin sister) inheritance.

This situation should not be altered by the Court now that knows of the dire consequences for Sara. The court (Judge Lunn) received a long handwritten letter from Stella Stiliano explaining in detail the circumstances (but did not mention drugs). **Stella fully agrees that I use all the money as a deposit on a cash-flow positive investment property in their names with possibly Stella as a fractional co-tenant (to prevent early liquidation).**

If Irene were to get her hands on the inheritance, legally she may owe it to her creditors. Fortuitously for my granddaughters the inheritance has ended up as technically 'mine', which means that it can be protected and preserved by me for their benefit.

I have just made Stella Stiliano aware of the contents of this email, and she fully supports it and has said if anybody contacts her she will back it fully.

Philip Stilianos
17 July 2007

Philip S

From: Coster, Adam (CAA) [Adam.Coster@courts.sa.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 24 September 2007 4:39 PM
To: philstil2005-greece@yahoo.com.au
Subject: FW: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome
Attachments: ap14586.pdf

-----Original Message-----

From: huron@courts.sa.gov.au [<mailto:huron@courts.sa.gov.au>] **On Behalf Of** kcsapc@courts.sa.gov.au
Sent: Monday, 24 September 2007 4:16 PM
To: Coster, Adam (CAA)
Subject: scciv-07-192_record_of_outcome

<<ap14586.pdf>>

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.13.22/1015 - Release Date: 18/09/2007 11:53 AM

Philip S

From: Message Delivery [messages@mbox.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 16 April 2008 12:50 PM
To: philstil2005-mbox@yahoo.com.au
Subject: mBox Fax message from Unknown
Attachments: 1208314193926983.pdf

Dear Fax User,

You have received a new message on 0386100078 in Melbourne!

Type: Fax
Number: 0386100078
Sender: Unknown
Time: Wed 16 Apr 08 12:50:19 PM

Please contact service@mbox.com.au if you have any further questions.

Regards,
service@mbox.com.au
www.mbox.com.au

