

Your Excellency
The Hon. Quentin Bryce
Governor of Qld
Government House
Fernberg Road c.c. Mr P. Beattie
PADDINGTON, 4064 c.c. Ms L. Clare
20 JUNE, 2005

Your Excellency,

My name is Doug Ensbey and I have no doubt you are aware of the case where I was recently convicted for cutting up pages of a diary.

I can assure you that I meant no wrongful intent, but my careless action resulted in the process of law having its way. I have always felt that ignorance of the law is no excuse and therefore I have 'taken my medicine'.

I have followed to a degree the Heiner issue due to the parallels with my situation.

I am aware that last week, June 14 to be precise, Mr Beattie, in answer to Question 643 on notice, referred to Mr Lindeberg's 'misconceived assertion' re his interpretation of Section 129 of the criminal code.

Now this has caused confusion for me.

Is Mr. Beattie correct in his interpretation - one which has allowed Senior politicians to escape prosecution for destroying legal documents which, I understand, they knew were required for legal purposes?

If so, then Section 129 has been wrongfully interpreted in my case and I believe it is in your power to grant me a pardon under the constitution of Qld, 2001.

However, if Mr. Lindeberg and many others, including Judge Nick Samios and my 3 appeal court judges are correct in their interpretation of Section 129 - which I believe to be a binding authority - then again Mr. Beattie's words confuse me.

So I ask you to please let me know who is correct.

The political establishment (under the Premier) or the judicial system?

Of course I may have misunderstood what Mr Beattie said and am happy to have someone enlighten me.

I believe in the 'Separation of Powers' and at first glance this situation seems to indicate that politicians are outside of the law that applies to ordinary citizens.

I would respectfully ask you for a prompt reply so that my confusion can be alleviated.

I remain,

Your subject,

DOUG ENSBEY