

NOTICE OF FILING

Details of Filing

Document Lodged:	Notice of a Constitutional Matter under s78B Judiciary Act 1903 - Form 18 - Rule 8.11(2)
Court of Filing	FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA (FCA)
Date of Lodgment:	18/08/2026 4:04:29 AM ACST
Date Accepted for Filing:	18/08/2026 2:01:55 PM ACST
File Number:	SAD80/2026
File Title:	JANETTE GAIL FRANCIS v JUDICIAL REGISTRAR SOPHIE BIRD
Registry:	SOUTH AUSTRALIA REGISTRY - FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Sia Lagos".

Registrar

Important Information

This Notice has been inserted as the first page of the document which has been accepted for electronic filing. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties.

The date of the filing of the document is determined pursuant to the Court's Rules.



SECOND
Notice of a Constitutional matter
under section 78B of the Judiciary Act 1903

No. SAD 80 of 2026

Federal Court of Australia
District Registry: South Australia
Division: General

JANETTE GAIL FRANCIS

Applicant

JUDICIAL REGISTRAR SOPHIE BIRD

Respondent

The Applicant gives her **second** notice that the proceeding involves **many matters** arising under the Constitution or involving its interpretation within the meaning of section 78B of the *Judiciary Act 1903*.

Nature of Constitutional matter

The Applicant apprehends that historical constitutional matter or the REJECTED application became an overweighted Constitutional matter in this case which gives rise to the lack of available "specific topic" search facilities for self representing litigants to competently research the documents required by the Federal Court of Australia clerical or judiciary public officers; and gives rise to the following **Constitutional conflicts** or **inconsistency** of Commonwealth **laws and policy as Rules**:

- 1) The Respondent's refusal to accept the applicant's original application of civil lawsuit with the State of South Australia as the proposed respondent, is **in conflict with** the general **imputation of equality** and **separation of powers** expressed by The Constitution.

NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY for COURT APPLICANT EXCLUSION

- 2) The exclusion clause used by Respondent (Federal Court Rule 2.26) allows the exclusion decision to be formulated on **personal opinion of each decision maker** and **despite contradictory evidence in any excluded document that may prohibit exclusion**.

Filed on behalf of the Applicant Janette Gail Francis

Prepared by Janette Gail Francis

Litigant in Person

Address for service

34 Whitestone Cr, Seaford Rise, SA 5169

Witness.Sbs@proton.me

No phone

Email: Witness.Sbs@proton.me

- 3) The decision maker is **not** required to have or describe any evidence to support their Rule 2.26 exclusion decision.
- 4) Not having an evidence to exclude a person from protection of any Australian law is automatically unconstitutional. Therefore, all exclusion clauses similar to Federal Court Rule 2.26 are Constitutionally void.

SECTION 102 and SECTION 51(xxvi.)

- a) in particular in **section 102** (Parliament may forbid preferences by State)
 - i) **section 102** infers outlawing preferential treatment for or against **the individual people** of any State, where, **without any individuals** resident in referenced State the preference exclusion refers to a **protection** of a plot of land.
 - ii) **individual people** are in need of protection those of a specific social economic status are grouped into a category that targets them for exclusion from enforcement or protections of Australian law, naturally derived from applications to the civil Court system. In this instance Federal Court.
 - iii) Where the Chief Justice and others are targeting self-represented persons for exclusion, then section 51(xxvi.) must be evoked to prevent unconstitutional discrimination by **abuse of ambiguous Rules** of the Federal Court.

SECTION 117 and SECTION 109

- b) in particular in **section 117** (Rights of residents in States)
 - i) 126 years later, any reasonably impartial person understands this section to be **prima facie evidence** that The Constitution was intended to draw all States under one legislative umbrella, not to continue with separate laws in every State on same matter. A notion supported by **section 109 (Inconsistency of laws)**.
 - ii) The issue with modern interpretation of the Constitution is the historical custom of the legal system and parliament is to **resist** change.
 - iii) 126 years later, any reasonably impartial person understands that The Constitution's continuation of States was to appease the notion of control by State land holders before Federation, but that the national consensus of all "White males" as the **only voters** was to restrict the States parliament's legislative powers, to matters **not** occurring in any other State, which is the theory again further corroborated by **sections 109 and 117**.

SECTION 118

- c) in particular in **section 118** (Recognition of laws & c. of States)
 - i) Its obvious to any reasonable person that The Constitution's reference to **section 118** (Recognition of laws & c. of States) means recognition of records and orders that are lawful pursuant to the Common Law and The Constitution.

- ii) Section 118 with **Rule 2.26** or similar exclusion clauses in the Rules and the Act, means both clerical court staff and judiciary are allowed to use various ***unlawful means conspiracies to aid and abet crimes*** of State government public officers associated with forgery of Government records, or judicial orders to willfully ***pervert the course of justice***.
- iii) Exclusion clauses in the Rules and the Act based on opinions or unspecified or non-existence evidence, like **Rule 2.26**, allow singular public officers to **defeat** the statutory intent to **prevent corruption** or **prevent misfeasance in public office**, as expressed by: *Division 3, Subdivision A (General duties of officials) of the Public Governance Performance and Accountability Act 2013*.

SECTION 119

- d) in particular in **section 119** (Protection of States from invasion and violence)
 - i) Where the **“every State”** notation represents the **“individual people”** of that State on the logical fact that **“The Commonwealth”** is nothing more than a plot of land. Likewise, without the individual people resident on land **“every State”** is also only a plot of land without the people resident in that state.
 - ii) Therefore the Constitution directs the individual people of Parliament of **“The Commonwealth”** to protect the individual people of **“every State”** and the Constitutional responsibility (duty of care) to call on the Commonwealth is on the individual people elected to the ‘State’ parliament to alert the individual people elected to the ‘Federal’ parliament that individual people are in need of protection **“against domestic violence”**. Even if that domestic violence is generated by individual people as public officers, including police, under the statutory control of the responsible Minister in that State. Which for SA State police, represents SA State Attorney-General.
 - iii) At the foundation of the lodgement rejected by the Respondent are organised crimes of NSW State police, involving multiple children raped, multiple people murdered, and surgical mutilations that infringe Ms Francis’ basic human right of bodily integrity and autonomy, because she is eyewitness to those crimes.

s18C Racial Discrimination Act

- e) s.18 of this Act makes it illegal to **“offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate”** a person based on their race.
 - i) The Applicant, was born in the era of “White Australia” to multiple generations of white Australians, therefore her race is logically “white Australian”.
 - ii) The Applicant in this judicial Review has been **“offended, insulted, humiliated or intimidated”** by the rejection for filing, enforced by the Respondent (Judicial Registrar Sophie Bird) because the effect of Rule 2.26, in this circumstance,

gives lawful authority to organised criminals in NSW as ***lawful slavers*** in South Australia, that authority designates them as the lawful ***owners of the Australian resident citizen described as the Applicant*** (Janette Gail Francis). As owners of the Applicant these slavers and have legal rights that ***over-ride any human right*** of the Applicant.

- iii) The Respondent's decision failed to recognise the Applicant's basic human right of ***bodily autonomy*** and ***bodily integrity*** by ignoring reference in Applicant's lodged documents that she is enduring ***serious harm that is physical*** caused by unlawful actions of public officers of the State of South Australia.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL COURT APPLICANT EXCLUSION as LAW

5) s.37P(6) *Federal Court of Australia Act* (Power of the Court to give directions about practice and procedure in a ***civil*** proceeding) In particular, the Court or Judge may do any of the following: ***dismiss*** the proceeding in whole or in part; ***strike out, amend or limit*** any part of a party's ***claim*** or defence; ***disallow*** or ***reject*** any ***evidence***.

a) The above have previously been used by the judiciary in Federal Family Court (*file PA3302 of 1999 HALL v HALL, where Ms Francis was the 2nd "Hall"*) specifically to conceal considerable and compelling evidence of crime associated with this matter under Judicial Review, as the crimes being covered up by public officers of the State of South Australia. At the time Ms Francis was suffering ***traumatic shock amnesia*** as direct result of witnessing 24 April 1988 murder inside Camden NSW police station, therefore unaware of the full effect of the actions of that Federal Court Judge who was empowered by these unconstitutional inclusions in Federal law to allow exclusion of evidence — ***38 years later in 2026 that 1988 murder witnessed at close range by the Applicant is still classified as a 'self inflicted' shooting.***

b) Had her application and evidence been lawfully investigated by Federal Court judiciary in 1999 and 2000, then Ms Francis would have had no need to relocate to South Australia in 2004 to ***further endure extensive perversions of justice*** at the hands of hundreds of public officers, as recorded in official State records.

RULE 2.26 and PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE

6) The exclusion clause used for the decision under Judicial Review in this matter requires only the ***'Registrar's satisfaction'*** no evidence is required by rule 2.26 to be expressed or explained or demonstrated in any way. Which means in application of rule 2.26 ***"if the Registrar is satisfied"*** they have enough public officer support they can ***lawfully (criminally) pervert the course of justice and due administration of law by banning*** a proposed litigant from the entire judicial system, if the Applicant attempts to use the Common law to address a crime harming.

- 7) Aiding and abetting a State crime is a Federal criminal offence with a State aspect pursuant to ***The Criminal Code Part 9.9—Criminal associations and organisations.*** At the foundation of the Respondent's rejected documents now under judicial review, regardless of whether she knew all the details or not, the Respondent is aiding and abetting **South Australia** State crimes since about 2 December 2005 which include:
- a) ***abduction*** of Ms Francis; and
 - b) ***aggravated assault*** of Ms Francis (includes amnesia causing drugs); and
 - c) ***attempted murder*** of Ms Francis; and
 - d) ***conspiracy to murder*** Ms Francis; and
 - e) ***intimidation of a witness*** (Ms Francis) to prior, aided and abetted crimes; and
 - f) ***physical and mental torture*** of Ms Francis as defined by The Criminal Code, Chapter 8—Offences against humanity and related offences, Division 274—Torture.

Date: 18 August 2026

Janette Gail Francis

 Applicant