## HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

| BEECH | -JON | <b>NES</b> | J |
|-------|------|------------|---|
|       |      |            |   |

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY CINDY TAYLOR FOR LEAVE TO ISSUE OR FILE

[2024] HCASJ 28 Date of Judgment: 15 July 2024 M53 of 2024

## **ORDER**

1. The application for leave to issue or file the document entitled "Application for a constitutional or other writ" dated 9 June 2024 is dismissed without an oral hearing.

## Representation

The applicant is unrepresented.

BEECH-JONES J. This is an ex parte application for leave to issue or file an application for a constitutional or other writ. For the reasons that follow, leave should be refused.

On or about 9 June 2024, the applicant, Cindy Taylor, sought to file an application for a constitutional or other writ. On 18 June 2024, Steward J directed a Registrar of this Court to refuse to issue or file that document without the leave of a Justice first had and obtained by the party seeking to issue or file it. On 21 June 2024, Ms Taylor sought that leave. She relies on an affidavit that she affirmed on 21 June 2024.

The discretion to refuse leave to issue or file a document will ordinarily be exercised where the document appears "on its face" to be "an abuse of the process of the Court, to be frivolous or vexatious or to fall outside the jurisdiction of the Court". The concept of abuse of process includes "an attempt to invoke the original or appellate jurisdiction of the High Court on a basis that is confused or manifestly untenable". The exercise of the discretion to refuse leave "is appropriate only in the clearest of cases".

The application filed by Ms Taylor contains numerous prayers for relief, all of which are nonsensical. For example, prayer 2 seeks an order for mandamus directed to the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth requiring, amongst other matters, that he "[i]mmediately instruct the Crown, Parliament and the Governor General that it is essential to: '[d]eclare a National Emergency due to the uncontained emotions of Hue-Mans', and immediately place the [applicant] in the role of 'The Grand Mother advising on World reformation', and follow Her recommendations to" "[r]estructure society" and "[e]nter into a Treaty with (the Humans of) ALL Countries in the World". Ms Taylor's affidavit is also nonsensical. She refers to various studies she has undertaken that are said to prove, amongst other matters, that "made up characters are a danger to all Family Members".

On its face, Ms Taylor's application is clearly confused and untenable. This is very much an example of the clearest of cases that warrants the refusal of leave to issue or file a document.

1

2

3

4

5

<sup>1</sup> *High Court Rules 2004* (Cth), r 6.07.2.

<sup>2</sup> High Court Rules (Cth), r 6.07.1.

<sup>3</sup> Re Young (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [13]; 376 ALR 567 at 570.

<sup>4</sup> Re Young (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [13]; 376 ALR 567 at 570.

The ex parte application for leave to issue or file the document entitled "Application for a constitutional or other writ" dated 9 June 2024 is dismissed without an oral hearing.