

HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

JAGOT J

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

[2026] HCASJ 24
Date of Judgment: 29 July 2026
M59 of 2026

ORDER

- 1. The ex parte application filed on 15 June 2026 for leave to issue or file the proposed application for a constitutional or other writ is dismissed.*

Representation

The applicant is unrepresented

1 JAGOT J. On 10 June 2026, Gordon J made a direction under r 6.07.2 of the *High Court Rules 2004* (Cth) that the Registrar refuse to issue or file an application by the applicant for a constitutional or other writ without leave of a Justice first had and obtained. By ex parte application filed on 15 June 2026 under r 6.07.3 of the *High Court Rules*, the applicant seeks such leave. The application is supported by an affidavit affirmed on 11 June 2026.

2 For the following reasons, leave to issue or file the proposed application for a constitutional or other writ should be refused.

Relevant principles

3 The criteria governing the exercise of the discretion to refuse leave to issue or file a document under r 6.07.3 of the *High Court Rules* are the same as those that inform the decision of the Registrar to seek a direction from a Justice under r 6.07.1. That is, leave to issue or file the document will ordinarily be refused where the document "appears ... 'on its face' to be an abuse of process of the Court, to be frivolous or vexatious or to fall outside the jurisdiction of the Court".¹ The concept of an abuse of process "cannot be confined within closed categories" but "encompasses an attempt to invoke the original or appellate jurisdiction of the High Court on a basis that is confused or manifestly untenable".²

Consideration

4 The proposed application seeks a writ of mandamus against the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth. The writ would compel the Attorney-General to: "serve an injunction on all the States of Australia, to stop culling animals"; "instruct [t]he Australian Parliament to ... [d]eclare a [n]ational [e]mergency due to uncontained HueMan E-Motions"; and "immediately place the applicant in the role of 'The Grand Mother advising on World reformation', and follow Her recommendations" (including, amongst other things, "to restructure society" and "[e]nter into a Treaty with (the Humans of) ALL Countries in the World"). The applicant's supporting affidavit traverses a number of additional topics, including "the conduct of made up characters" which are said to be "a danger to all Family Members".

5 The applicant previously sought leave to issue a writ of mandamus against the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth in similar terms. Beech-Jones J refused to grant that leave on the basis that the application was, on its face, "clearly

1 *Re Young* (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [11]; 376 ALR 567 at 570, referring to r 6.07.1 of the *High Court Rules*.

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

2.

confused and untenable" and "very much an example of the clearest of cases that warrants the refusal of leave to issue or file a document".³

6 The writ now sought is more expansive in two respects: it would compel the Attorney-General to seek to enjoin the States from "culling animals" as noted above; and it specifies several additional "recommendations" to be followed, compared with those contained in the earlier application. Those differences notwithstanding, the present application, like its predecessor, is incoherent. Neither the application nor the accompanying affidavits provide any intelligible basis for the relief sought. As such the application is both "confused" and "manifestly untenable".

7 The applicant's ex parte application filed on 15 June 2026 for leave to issue or file the proposed application for a constitutional or other writ is therefore dismissed.

3 *In the matter of an application by Cindy Taylor for leave to issue or file* [2024] HCASJ 28 at [4]-[5].