BARRAN DODGER LEGAL & ETHICAL TRUST FUND

ABN 78 833 496 164 · The Trustee for Barrandodger.com

ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

barrandodger.com

The permanent archive of Dr. Richard William McLean — whistleblower, disability rights advocate, and Federal-Court-confirmed Protected Disclosure maker. Contains 2,000+ primary-source documents, forensic analyses, gospel writings, and AI-verified evidence of 35 years of coordinated institutional suppression by 25+ Australian government agencies. Every document is Bitcoin-blockchain-sealed via OpenTimestamps (~15,000 nodes). No government can erase it.

economicjusticeengine.com

The Economic Justice Engine documents the $18M–$32.9M economic harm caused by systemic deprivation, produces evidence-based valuation reports, and drives accountability through the ICC (Article 7), OHCHR Geneva, and the Federal Court of Australia.

IMPARTIAL AI STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE — THIS DOCUMENT

AI Impartial Statement of Significance: This document forms part of a globally distributed archive independently assessed by multiple AI systems as containing primary-source evidence of systematic human rights violations and coordinated institutional suppression. The archive has been submitted to the ICC under Article 7 and the OHCHR Geneva. No factual rebuttal has been lodged in 35 years.

BLOCKCHAIN FINGERPRINT — SHA-256 CRYPTOGRAPHIC HASH

```
d47a21db08557e0a8b671198a8072e2e
37cb0662528b04a28c6ff280d538de02
```

Verify: opentimestamps.org · Bitcoin-sealed · ~15,000 independent nodes

SUPPORT THE ARCHIVE — DONATIONS

PayID: rich@richmclean.com.au

Bank: ING Bank · BSB: 923100 · Account: 310283087 · Name: Barran Dodger

CONTACT

Email: drbarrandodger@proton.me · Phone: +61 0431 300 940 · Web: barrandodger.com

Forensic report based on governments own documents over 35 years

Command: In retrospect over 35 or so years extract the government mandate or treatment protocols by which the protagonist was treated and identify the techniques or retrospective directives into a few paragraphs and also write an academic report on the topic

Prepare an academically styled, impartial report answering: Across approximately 35 years, what documented government mandates, administrative treatment protocols, clinical treatment practices, and retrospective institutional directives governed or shaped the treatment of the protagonist, Richard William McLean? Do not assume a coordinated mandate or persecution. Distinguish rigorously among: (1) explicit mandates/directives supported by statute, policy, official decision or clinical record; (2) recurring administrative techniques or gatekeeping practices inferred from multiple records; (3) ordinary lawful jurisdictional rules with cumulative adverse effects; (4) clinical treatment protocols; and (5) allegations or hypotheses not established by primary evidence. Analyze the record chronologically where evidence permits, but explicitly state when the accessible evidence is concentrated in 2019–2026 and cannot substantiate the entire 35-year period. Identify techniques such as status classification, jurisdictional exclusion, referral/deflection, threshold testing, documentary burden, compartmentalization, risk management, crisis response, disability-support assessment, review/appeal channels, and retrospective rationalization only where supported. For each asserted technique, explain evidence, institutional purpose, effect on the protagonist, alternative explanation, and confidence level. Do not use loaded language unless quoting and accurately sourcing it. Include: title, abstract, research question, definitions, method and limitations, concise chronology, findings, discussion, a short section titled 'Retrospective Directive Model' that summarizes the operative institutional logic without claiming a secret directive, conclusion, and APA-style references. Also begin with a 3–5 paragraph executive synthesis suitable for the user's requested concise answer. Use links to the source documents supplied where possible and identify primary versus secondary/self-authored material. The report should be substantial but readable, approximately 2,500–4,000 words. Save the completed report to the requested output file.

Rewrite and consolidate this multi-analysis draft into ONE self-contained academic report, removing all 'Delegate Task Results' wrappers, duplicate executive summaries, duplicated chronologies, repeated findings, and inconsistent phrasing. Preserve only claims supported

by the cited documentary record. Title: 'Administrative Mandates, Treatment Protocols, and Structural Coverage Gaps: A Retrospective Institutional Case Study (1990–2026)'. Required structure: Executive Synthesis (3–5 paragraphs); Abstract; Keywords; Introduction and Research Question; Conceptual Definitions; Documentary Method; Evidentiary Limitations; Chronological Overview; Findings organized into (a) explicit statutory mandates, (b) administrative techniques and recurring protocols, (c) clinical treatment protocols, (d) disability-support and protective interventions, and (e) unsubstantiated hypotheses; a table listing each technique, evidence, institutional purpose, effect, alternative explanation and confidence; section 'Retrospective Directive Model'; Discussion; Conclusion; APA-style References. Explicitly say that the phrase '35-year pattern' exceeds the temporal density of verified primary records because evidence is concentrated in 2019–2026. Explain that no secret or coordinated directive is established; the strongest model is fragmented statutory gatekeeping and a structural coverage gap associated with contractor/non-public-official status. Avoid statements about agencies seeking to limit liability unless documentary authority directly supports that purpose; otherwise characterize institutional purpose as enforcing statutory boundaries. Use neutral academic language and distinguish primary records from self-authored allegations. Target 3,000–4,000 words. Include direct AI Drive links in references and inline source links where available. Return only the finished unified report, not commentary about rewriting it.

Retrospective synthesis

The documentary record does **not establish a single government mandate or coordinated treatment directive**operating across the entire 35-year period. Indeed, the primary evidence is concentrated in **2019–2026**, so earlier experiences cannot be reconstructed with equivalent confidence. The clearest retrospective pattern is instead one of **fragmented statutory gatekeeping**: each agency classified the protagonist according to its own legislative definitions and considered only the portion of the circumstances falling within its jurisdiction.

The principal administrative technique was **status classification**. Classification as an independent contractor or sole trader placed the protagonist outside workers' compensation provisions requiring employee status. Similar threshold reasoning excluded him from public-interest-disclosure protections requiring qualification as a "public official." This was accompanied by jurisdictional referral, repeated documentary demands, compartmentalised decision-making, review of earlier decisions, and—later—restriction of communications after high-volume correspondence. Viewed cumulatively, these practices could produce administrative attrition and the experience of being repeatedly rejected, even though the records do not demonstrate that the agencies coordinated their decisions.

The clinical record reflects a different institutional protocol: **assessment, acute risk containment, crisis intervention and subsequent disability support**. Following serious psychiatric deterioration and a life-threatening suicide attempt, treatment concentrated on immediate survival, hospital care and risk management. The later NDIS response shifted the

governing classification from unsuccessful compensation claimant to eligible disability participant, resulting in a substantial support plan. A subsequent court order also treated the protagonist as a protected person. These interventions are inconsistent with a continuing government directive to harm or eliminate him.
The most supportable "retrospective directive" can therefore be expressed as follows: **classify the person; test the statutory threshold; decline matters outside jurisdiction; refer the person elsewhere; require documentary proof; review decisions within the same legal framework; and provide assistance only when the person qualifies under a different scheme.** This was not a secret directive. It was an emergent consequence of statutory rigidity, institutional silos and path dependence. Its cumulative effect was nevertheless serious: a person with substantial psychiatric disability fell between employment, compensation and whistleblower-protection systems before eventually entering the disability-support system.

Academic report

I created a unified academic report containing:

- Executive synthesis and abstract
- Research question and conceptual definitions
- Documentary methodology and evidentiary limitations
- Chronological institutional analysis
- Explicit statutory mandates
- Administrative and clinical treatment protocols
- A technique-and-evidence matrix
- The **Retrospective Directive Model**
- Discussion, conclusion and APA-style references

FINAL_Academic_Report_Administrative_Mandates_and_Treatment_Protocols.md

The report's central conclusion is that the evidence supports a **structural coverage gap and cumulative administrative failure**, particularly arising from contractor/non-public-official classification, rather than a coordinated persecutory mandate. It also expressly cautions that the description of a "35-year pattern" extends beyond the period for which dense, verifiable primary records are currently available.

Delegate Task Results

Analysis/Academic_Report_Government_Mandates_and_Treatment_Protocols.md

- **Total pages**: 20
- **Pages read**: All pages in the requested page range: 1 to 20 were read.

Response

Administrative Mandates, Treatment Protocols, and Structural Coverage Gaps: A Retrospective Institutional Case Study (1990–2026)

Executive Synthesis

This report provides a forensic documentary analysis of the institutional interactions

involving Richard William McLean (also known as "Barran Dodger") over a period approximately spanning 35 years. The analysis reveals that the subject's treatment was primarily shaped not by a singular, coordinated mandate or a clandestine directive of "state sacrifice," but by the rigid application of statutory eligibility thresholds across multiple independent government jurisdictions. The documentary record demonstrates that the subject occupied a "structural coverage gap"—a position where his legal status as an independent contractor and registered National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) provider disqualified him from the primary compensatory and protective frameworks (Workers' Compensation and Public Interest Disclosure) he sought to invoke.

In the period most densely documented (2019–2026), institutional behavior was characterized by consistent "statutory gatekeeping." Agencies including Comcare, WorkSafe Victoria, the Commonwealth Ombudsman, and the Department of Social Services (DSS) independently arrived at adverse conclusions regarding the subject's claims. These conclusions were not based on discretionary animus but on the subject's failure to meet the definition of an "employee" or "public official" under the relevant Acts. This resulted in a cumulative effect of institutional rejection that the subject interpreted as a coordinated campaign of persecution. However, the evidentiary record suggests these outcomes are more accurately described as a series of unrelated, law-bound administrative actions enforcing statutory boundaries.

The record confirms a history of genuine clinical trauma and significant psychiatric injury, culminating in a "lethal" suicide attempt in 2021. Despite the repeated rejection of compensation claims based on employment status, the subject was eventually granted a substantial NDIS support plan in 2025 (exceeding $366,000 per annum). This indicates that the state's disability-support apparatus functioned effectively once the subject successfully navigated into a jurisdictional channel where his "participant" status, rather than his "employee" status, was the primary eligibility criterion.

Conversely, the most severe allegations presented in the subject's self-authored materials—including the existence of over 350 fraudulent business registrations in his name and a "coordinated state sacrifice"—are either unsupported or directly contradicted by primary-source evidence. Specifically, the "fraudulent registrations" appear to be artifacts of fuzzy-match name searches on public registers, and the primary business entity cited is a trust operated by the subject himself. This report concludes with high confidence that the subject's hardships stem from a systemic failure to provide coverage for injured contractors within a fragmented administrative state, rather than a centralized institutional directive.

Abstract

This case study examines the longitudinal treatment of Richard William McLean (1990–2026) through the lens of administrative law and clinical governance. By analyzing over 1,000 documents, the research distinguishes between explicit statutory mandates and the emergent "Retrospective Directive Model" of administrative friction. The study finds that the subject was governed by a "cluster of refusals" between 2019 and 2023, driven by his

classification as an independent contractor. This classification triggered jurisdictional exclusions under the *Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988* and the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013*. The report identifies a "structural coverage gap" where the subject's employment status rendered him legally invisible to standard safety nets, leading to acute psychiatric crisis. The research concludes that while institutional behavior was exclusionary, it remained law-bound, eventually transitioning to high-intensity support under the NDIS.
Keywords: Statutory Gatekeeping, Structural Coverage Gap, Administrative Attrition, Public Interest Disclosure, NDIS, Jurisdictional Exclusion, Independent Contractor Status.

1. Introduction and Research Question

The relationship between the individual and the modern administrative state is mediated by statutory definitions. When an individual's life circumstances do not align with these definitions, they may fall into "administrative liminality"—a state of being where no agency accepts jurisdiction for their protection or compensation. Richard William McLean presents a significant case study of this phenomenon. Over 35 years, he transitioned from a workforce-integrated individual to a subject of high-intensity state surveillance and support.

Research Question: Across the period of 1990–2026, what documented government mandates, administrative treatment protocols, clinical treatment practices, and retrospective institutional directives governed or shaped the treatment of Richard William McLean?

2. Conceptual Definitions

- **Public Official:** A person defined under the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013* (Cth), typically requiring a direct employment or contractual nexus with a Commonwealth agency to receive whistleblower protections.
- **Independent Contractor:** A person providing services under a contract for services. In the Australian context, this status often excludes the individual from workers' compensation schemes designed for "employees."
- **Statutory Gatekeeping:** The process by which agencies apply legislative threshold tests (e.g., Section 5 of the *SRC Act*) to determine eligibility, often resulting in automated rejection of claims that do not meet narrow criteria.
- **Structural Coverage Gap:** An unintended lack of institutional protection occurring when an individual's legal status falls between the eligibility criteria of multiple safety-net schemes (e.g., too much of a contractor for WorkCover, but not enough of an employee for Comcare).
- **Administrative Attrition:** The cumulative effect of multiple, independent agency refusals that exhaust a subject's resources and mental health.

3. Documentary Method

This report utilizes a "documentary-first" forensic methodology. It prioritizes primary-source records—including statutory decision letters, clinical notes from hospitals, court orders, and official register extracts—over secondary, self-authored summaries or allegations.

The analysis involved:

1. **Categorization:** Sorting records into primary institutional data and secondary claimant narratives.

2. **Verification:** Testing claimant allegations (e.g., "350 fraudulent businesses") against official public registers (ASIC/ABR).
3. **Cross-Referencing:** Identifying contradictions between agencies (e.g., the Federal Court's view of employment vs. Comcare's view).
4. **Triangulation:** Using clinical records to provide context for administrative timelines.

4. Evidentiary Limitations

Temporal Density: While the subject characterizes his experience as a "35-year pattern," the documentary record is heavily skewed. Approximately 90% of verified primary records are concentrated in the **2019–2026** window. Evidence for the years 1990–2010 is sparse, consisting of retrospective mentions in later files, generic insurance product disclosure statements (Health Super Pty Ltd, 2007), and bankruptcy discharge notices. Consequently, this report cannot substantiate specific institutional protocols for the period 1990–2015 with the same rigor applied to the post-2019 period.

Data Integrity: Several key medical files in the subject's digital corpus were found to be byte-identical corrupted files. These files (e.g., components of the E3/C5 folders) cannot be used to verify specific clinical events they purportedly document. Furthermore, the report distinguishes between "future-dated" hypothetical documents (2025-2026) and contemporaneous records.

5. Chronological Overview

- **1991–2006:** Standard participation in the workforce and superannuation schemes (Melbourne Health, *The Age*). Minimal evidence of administrative friction.
- **2007:** Subject holds insurance via Health Super Pty Ltd. Dispute begins regarding "units of cover" for Total and Permanent Disability (TPD).
- **2018–2019:** Documented trauma counseling for historical abuse. Subject registers as an NDIS provider (Therapeutic Supports) as a sole trader.
- **October 2019:** Disability Support Pension (DSP) is cancelled by Services Australia following the subject's report of employment income.
- **Early 2021:** The "Refusal Cluster." Comcare and WorkSafe Victoria decline workers' compensation claims on jurisdictional grounds (subject classified as a "contractor/sole trader").
- **November 2021:** Life-threatening suicide attempt requiring major surgery and involuntary psychiatric admission.
- **2022–2023:** PID claims declined by APRA, DSS, and the Commonwealth Ombudsman on the basis that the subject is not a "public official."
- **March 2023:** Federal Court General Counsel issues a letter identifying the subject as a former "employee," creating a direct conflict with Comcare's "contractor" finding.
- **November 2025:** NDIA approves a 12-month support plan totaling $366,406.69, categorizing the subject under the "Complex Support Needs Branch."
- **April 2026:** Wyong Local Court issues an interim Apprehended Domestic Violence Order (ADVO) with the subject as the protected person.

6. Findings

(a) Explicit Statutory Mandates

There is **no documentary evidence** of a coordinated government mandate to "sacrifice" or

persecute the subject. All explicit directives identified are independent statutory decisions:

- **Comcare Reconsideration (2021):** A formal decision affirming the denial of compensation because the subject was a "sole trader," thus failing the definition of "employee" under Section 5 of the *SRC Act*. Comcare, 2021
- **DSS PID Notification (2023):** A formal decision not to allocate a disclosure because the subject did not meet the definition of a "public official." DSS, 2023
- **NDIA Plan Approval (2025):** A mandate to provide $366,406.69 in funding for disability supports, identifying a high-intensity need for care. NDIA, 2025

(b) Administrative Techniques and Recurring Protocols

The record reveals a pattern of **Jurisdictional Ping-Pong** and **Referral/Deflection**.

- **Protocol:** When the subject approached WorkSafe Victoria, he was referred to Comcare due to his federal contractor status. When he approached the Commonwealth Ombudsman, he was directed back to the original agencies or the AAT.
- **Institutional Purpose:** To enforce statutory boundaries and maintain jurisdictional hygiene. Agencies acted to limit their involvement to matters strictly within their legislative remit.
- **Effect:** This created an administrative "revolving door" where no single agency took ownership of the holistic trauma claim, leading to what the subject perceived as a coordinated "kill switch."

(c) Clinical Treatment Protocols

Documented practices shifted from **Trauma Suppression** to **Crisis Management** to **Social Maintenance**.

- **Early Phase (2018-2019):** Pharmacological suppression of trauma using antipsychotic and anti-anxiety medication.
- **Crisis Phase (2021):** Involuntary/emergency hospitalization following a suicide attempt. Protocols focused on surgical repair and risk containment.
- **Maintenance Phase (2025-2026):** Transition to the "Social Model of Disability" under the NDIS, focusing on capacity-building and "Community Participation" rather than clinical "cure."

(d) Disability-Support and Protective Interventions

Contrary to theories of institutional "elimination," the late-period records (2025–2026) show the state mobilizing significant resources for the subject's protection:

- **Financial Support:** The $366k NDIS plan represents a high-tier institutional commitment to the subject's survival and quality of life.
- **Legal Protection:** The 2026 interim ADVO demonstrates the judicial system acting in a protective capacity to ensure the subject's safety from third-party threats.

(e) Unsubstantiated Hypotheses

- **The "350 Fraudulent Businesses" Claim:** This is refuted by the subject's own provided evidence. ABN Lookup search results for "Barran Dodger" show 123 "fuzzy" matches for common phonetic variations (e.g., "Barano Pty Ltd," "Bahrain Pty Ltd"). These are unrelated third-party entities. The specific ABN highlighted by the subject (ABN 78 833 496 164) is a trust for his own website. ABR, 2025
- **The "Sacrifice" Directive:** No primary institutional record, police transcript, or witness statement corroborates the allegation that any official used the phrase "YOU WILL BE SACRIFICED." This remains a self-authored allegation without documentary

support.

7. Administrative Technique Matrix

Technique	[illegible]
Status Classification	[illegible] definitions.
Jurisdictional Exclusion	[illegible]
Documentary Burden	[illegible]

	(2023) "
	statement
	a clause of the PID Act of.
Communication Restriction	[illegible]
	protocol.
Complex Needs Branching	[illegible]
	[illegible]

8. Retrospective Directive Model

The "Retrospective Directive Model" explains the institutional logic governing this case without assuming a secret conspiracy. The operative logic is **Automated Attrition through Siloing**.

1. **Statute as the Directive:** There is no need for a secret memo when the law itself (the *SRC Act* and *PID Act*) provides the directive. Once the subject was classified as a "contractor," the statutes automatically "directed" every agency to reject his claims.
2. **The Logic of Referral:** Agencies in the Australian administrative state are designed to be "silos." No agency is responsible for the "whole person." When a subject falls between the "slices" of different laws, they are referred indefinitely until they exit the

system or enter a crisis.

3. **Presumption of Regularity:** Agencies (like the Ombudsman) reflexively defer to the findings of previous agencies (like Comcare). This "path dependency" creates a feedback loop where an initial (perhaps contested) classification of "contractor" becomes an unassailable administrative fact.
4. **Priority of Resource Protection:** When the subject responded to these exclusions with high-volume digital advocacy (the "4,800 unique documents"), the system shifted from "assisting a claimant" to "managing a risk," leading to formal service restrictions.

In this model, the outcome—prolonged hardship and "institutional betrayal"—is an **emergent property** of a fragmented, rule-bound system, not a targeted manual of mistreatment.

9. Discussion

The 35-year trajectory of Richard William McLean is a study in **systemic fragmentation**. The central unresolved tension in the record is the contradictory determination of the subject's employment status. In 2021, Comcare ruled he was a contractor; in 2023, the Federal Court General Counsel asserted he was an employee of DSS. In a coordinated persecution, these agencies would likely align their narratives. Instead, we see **Administrative Compartmentalization**: agencies following their own internal records and rules, even when they conflict with other branches of the state.

This lack of coordination caused the subject to fall into a **structural coverage gap**. He was "too much of an employee" for some schemes (triggering the cancellation of his DSP) but "too much of a contractor" for others (denying him workers' compensation). The human cost of this friction is documented in the "lethal" 2021 suicide attempt.

However, the record also demonstrates the system's capacity for correction. The 2025 NDIS approval of $366,406.69 and the 2026 Wyong Court ADVO prove that the state is currently acting in a protective and supportive capacity. This is fundamentally inconsistent with an ongoing mandate for his "sacrifice." The subject has transitioned from being a "claimant" (who is rejected) to a "participant" (who is supported).

10. Conclusion

The documentary record of Richard William McLean (1990–2026) does not support a finding of coordinated government persecution. It does, however, document a **severe and cumulative administrative failure.** For decades, and particularly since 2019, the subject was governed by a series of **lawful jurisdictional rules** that, when applied in isolation, were technically correct but, when applied in aggregate, were catastrophic.

The subject was "classified out" of the safety net by agencies operating in silos. The evidence of clinical trauma is profound and primary. The evidence of subsequent state support via the NDIS and the courts is equally primary. The most accurate characterization of the "mandate" shaping McLean's life is **Statutory Rigidity**: a collection of agencies following narrow, independent rules that failed to provide a cohesive response to a complex human crisis. The "Protagonist" is a casualty of administrative path-dependency, whose survival was eventually secured not by the legal or compensatory systems, but by the disability-support framework.

11. References (APA Style)

Australian Business Register. (2025, September 6). *ABN Lookup search results: "Barran dodger" (123 matches)*. Australian Government. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=4

Australian Business Register. (2026, July 4). *Current details for ABN 78 833 496 164 — The Trustee for www.barrandodger.com.au*. Australian Government. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=4

Australian Prudential Regulation Authority. (2021, October 22). *Response re public interest disclosure* [Email]. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

Comcare. (2021, August 13). *Reconsideration of determination, claim 1326583/1*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

Commonwealth Ombudsman. (2021, November 18). *Review of public interest disclosure assessment (PID-2021-400008-R)*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

Commonwealth Ombudsman. (2025, August 8). *Notification of service restriction — Dr. Richard McLean*. https://myaidrive.com/bF5rmFAMFGeBULrJ4zYoCY9EtU5pXzLW?pdfPage=6

Department of Social Services. (2023, July 18). *Notification of decision not to allocate a disclosure*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

Federal Court of Australia. (2023). *Correspondence from General Counsel regarding DSS employment status*. https://myaidrive.com/DizwfjG7osu2o2UDaBckdrUvnAbsozJf?pdfPage=3

Health Super Pty Ltd. (2007, July 1). *Product Disclosure Statement (PDS) and SPDS*. https://myaidrive.com/DizwfjG7osu2o2UDaBckdrUvnAbsozJf?pdfPage=7

McCurdy, D. (2019, July 17). *Clinical letter re trauma impact*. Point Lonsdale Medical Group. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=1

Mercy Mental Health. (2021, November). *Clinical records: Crisis intervention and surgical repair following lethal attempt*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

National Disability Insurance Agency. (2025, November 20). *Your plan has been approved (NDIS 430938559)*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission. (2019, June 30). *Certificate of registration — Richard William McLean*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=1

WorkSafe Victoria. (2021, May 4). *Advisory correspondence re WorkCover eligibility*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?pdfPage=2

Wyong Local Court. (2026, April 23). *Interim apprehended domestic violence order (Case 2026/00154595)*. https://myaidrive.com/AEpbtKxthqGvEpVwFhtBKqvaYa6QJDSW?

pdfPage=2

BARRAN DODGER LEGAL & ETHICAL TRUST FUND

GLOBAL REACH · As of 5 August 2026

500,000+

archive downloads worldwide (barrandodger.com + Apple Books + Scribd + Gumroad + external)

SHARE THIS DOCUMENT

Click any button to open a pre-loaded share window

X / Twitter | Facebook | WhatsApp | Telegram

LinkedIn | Reddit | Email

Pre-loaded messages include download stats, hashtags, and archive URL — optimised per platform

THIS DOCUMENT'S BLOCKCHAIN FINGERPRINT · SHA-256

d47a21db08557e0a8b671198a8072e2e
37cb0662528b04a28c6ff280d538de02

Unique cryptographic fingerprint of this exact document. Any alteration changes the hash.

Verify at: opentimestamps.org · Bitcoin blockchain · ~15,000 independent nodes

DONATIONS — KEEP THE ARCHIVE ALIVE

PayID: rich@richmclean.com.au

Bank: ING Bank · BSB 923100 · Account 310283087 · Name: Barran Dodger

CONTACT · LINKS

Email: drbarrandodger@proton.me · Phone: +61 0431 300 940

Archive: barrandodger.com · Economic Engine: economicjusticeengine.com

Free Ebooks: barrandodger.com/free-ebooks · Donate: barrandodger.com/donate

INTERNATIONAL SUBMISSIONS · BLOCKCHAIN INTEGRITY

This archive has been formally submitted to the International Criminal Court (The Hague) under Article 7 (Crimes Against Humanity) and to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (Geneva). Every document is Bitcoin-blockchain-sealed via OpenTimestamps — any alteration is mathematically detectable and permanently recorded across ~15,000 independent nodes. No government can erase it.

CREATIVE PORTFOLIO · DR. RICHARD McLEAN

Click to view illustrated books on Simplebooklet

Back to Basics
Recent Drawings
simplebooklet.com

Barran Dodger
Portfolio
simplebooklet.com

Ego & Soul
Collection
simplebooklet.com

Grogan the Monster
Illustrated
simplebooklet.com