ALAN SMITH

Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp Blowholes Road, RMB 4408 Portland Vic 3305

> Phone: 03 55 267 267 Fax: 03 55 267 265

31 May 1999

Chief Executive Officer Telstra Melbourne 3000 and

Mr
Chairman of the Board
Telstra
Melbourne 3000
and

Mr Chairman of the TIO Board Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman Limited Melbourne 3000

Dear Sirs.

CASUALTIES OF TELSTRA (COT)
Alan Smith / Telstra Arbitration
Telstra's 'Beer in the Phone' report

I refer you to the attached documents numbered from - A 64557 to A 64561. These are taken from a number of graphs, copies received from Telstra under F.O.I.

My previous correspondence dated 26 May 1999 supports Telstra's defence unit knowingly used a fraudulent report to support their defence under arbitration 'Which is a criminal act'.

FOI document A 64557 titled TF 200 Beer etc dated 25/5/94 is a graph showing tests were conducted on that day on a TF 200 touchphone.

For documents A 64553 to A 64561 are further graphs titled TF 200 beer etc dated 26/5/94.

These graphs and further FOI documents show 'Beer' will not stay wet and sticky for 29 days.

This is further evidence to support a fraud was committed by Telstra to pervert the course of justice in my arbitration.

As for the TIO office, by presiding over a process that has been used to perpetrate a fraud on me in the Telstra - TIO arbitration, in my opinion demonstrates that the TIO as administrator has been part of the team that has engulfed in activities that has allowed the fraud to take place. Why hasn't the TIO investigated these matters raised before.

I trust this matter will NOW be brought up at the next TIO scheduled council meeting on 21 June 1999 as a priority.

This then will show that the TiO and his board are concerned as to what has taken place while administrators to my arbitration.

I also trust that the board members of Telstra are likewise provided with the correspondence of the 26 May 1999 as well as the letters and attachments of today's dates.

I await that outcome.

Yours sincerely

A. Smith

CC.

As you can observe these tests were conducted over a two day period.

In my previous correspondence mentioned above, I provided evidence and enough detail that a fraud had been committed by Telstra and or their agents regarding their defence document titled TF 200 beer in the phone, submitted into arbitration on the 12/12/94.

To further that correspondence, these attached graphs show an alarming discovery.

Considering originally ir 's report, he acknowledged that my TF 200 touchphone was collected by Telstra on the 27 April 1994 arriving at Telstra's laboratories on the 10 May 1994.

TELSTRAL states in Telstra's defence document (report) that when his testing took place, a substance was observed inside my collected TF 200 touchphone, which was wet and sticky to touch (later found to be beer).

On his final conclusion to his findings, Mr states the wet and sticky 'Beer' had caused the locking up of my TF 200.

Yet these attached graphs show tests were carried out on a TF 200 with the final result showing within two days, the 'Beer' had dried.

Example

20 other FOI documents that can also be provided to your office, also support this fact.

- My TF 200 was collected on the 27 April 1994 received by on the 10 May 1994. How could he state in his report that beer was wet and sticky caused my phone faults, when his tests show within two days 'Beer' is dried or almost dried.
- If these graphs attached were taken / tested on another TF 200 touchphone to observe
 the outcome, why did Telstra state in their defence they tested the TF 200 touchphone
 collected from Mr Smith's premises on the 27 April 1994.
- Let us assume Telstra told the truth on this occasion in their report, and it was my TF 200 which Telstra tested as shown in these attached graphs - 25 May 1994 to 26 May 1994. How did 'Beer' stay so wet and sticky to the touch when the phone was collected by Telstra on 27 April 1994, 29 days previous.











