

# HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

BEECH-JONES J

---

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY  
SPYROS TRANGOLA FOR LEAVE TO ISSUE OR  
FILE

APPLICANT

[2025] HCASJ 51

*Date of Judgment: 19 December 2025*

M93 of 2025

## ORDERS

- 1. The application for leave to issue or file the document entitled "Writ of Summons" dated 7 November 2025 is dismissed without an oral hearing.*

## Representation

The applicant is unrepresented



1 BEECH-JONES J. This is an ex parte application for leave to issue or file a writ  
of summons directed to the Commonwealth of Australia ("the Writ"). The Writ is  
accompanied by a statement of claim.

2 On or around 7 November 2025, the applicant sought to file the Writ. On  
10 November 2025, Gordon J directed the Registrar of this Court to refuse to issue  
or file the Writ without the leave of a Justice first had and obtained by the party  
seeking to issue or file it.<sup>1</sup> On or about 17 November 2025, the applicant sought  
that leave.

3 In support of the application for leave to issue or file the Writ, the applicant  
affirmed and filed an affidavit dated 17 November 2025. In that affidavit, the  
applicant contends that the statement of claim "provides a sound and proper basis  
for the matter to commence".

4 By the Writ and the statement of claim, the applicant proposes to seek, inter  
alia, orders for disclosure and production of material relevant to  
"nano-technological interference on human subjects" and monetary compensation  
for, amongst other things, "[p]hysical, psychological, emotional, and reputational  
injury said to have resulted from the non-consensual use or toleration of  
technologies capable of affecting neural or bodily functions". The applicant  
requests a written acknowledgement from the Commonwealth that it has received  
a copy of the statement of claim and that the applicant's matter has been "escalated  
to the highest levels of decision-making". The applicant also requests that "the  
Commonwealth authorise or coordinate special operations or intelligence  
safeguards", inter alia, to "[p]revent further deployment or use of clandestine  
technologies without informed consent".

5 As concerns the basis for the relief proposed to be sought, the applicant  
contends, inter alia, that the Commonwealth was directly involved in, or  
negligently failed to prevent, the "non-consensual use of advanced technological  
interference targeted at human cognition and physiology". The applicant says in  
an unparticularised manner that this conduct is part of a "systemic practice" that  
involves the "commercialization of the human mind and body", and "could amount  
to breaches of human rights or international law". The applicant provides little  
further detail to explain, for example, the nature of technological interference  
alleged, its specific effects, the specific persons said to be affected by it, or why  
any such interference could be the subject of a claim against the Commonwealth.  
The applicant seeks to rely upon specific statutes and treaties, and provides  
descriptions of what the applicant contends is the operation of certain provisions  
in those statutes and treaties, but does not identify with any specificity the conduct  
or matters that could be said to engage them.

---

1 *High Court Rules 2004 (Cth)*, r 6.07.2.

6           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".<sup>2</sup> 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".<sup>3</sup> The exercise of the discretion to refuse leave "is appropriate only in the clearest of cases".<sup>4</sup>

7           On its face, the Writ is confused and manifestly untenable. The allegations sought to be made are unparticularised and the applicant does not identify any arguable basis for the relief proposed to be sought. The Writ, if filed, would consequently be an abuse of process.

8           Leave to issue or file the Writ is refused. The applicant's ex parte application is dismissed without an oral hearing.

---

2    *High Court Rules*, r 6.07.1.

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

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