

26 September 2007

**Channel 7 , P.O.Box 777
Pymont NSW 2009**

A formal evidence: Reckless about Terrorism

Dear Sir/Madam

If you send a fax to a police station and ask: "Have you received my letter of report about a Bomb which I have sent you few days ago?" , if police has not received your report, should the police officer contact you:

A. As soon as receives your fax **B.** 1 hour after receiving your fax
C. next day **D.** 1 week later **E.** 1 month later **F.** 38 days later

Which answer is correct? Which option is not reckless to terrorist acts?

The attached document is an evidence which proves that the government of PM John Howard has been reckless about terrorist acts in Australia.

On Friday 27 July 2007 ,before APEC, I have sent a report about terrorist acts in Australia to Attorney-General Mr. Philip Ruddock by registered mail. I again on Tuesday 7 August 2007 have sent a fax to Mr. Philip Ruddock questioning him whether or not he had received his report about terrorist acts, 38 days later Mr. Philip Ruddock has answered "No , could you please resend your report". So Mr. Philip Ruddock before APEC knew there was a terrorist acts report that he had not received it and he didn't know what was the details of the terrorist acts, it could have been planning to explode Sydney during APEC or a plan to hijack a plane or something like Glasgow airport attack that Dr. Mohammad Haneef was accused for being reckless or it could have been anything else but he didn't immediately contact the reporter on the same day to ask: "What was that terrorist report? Was it something urgent?".

He contacted the reporter 38 days later, on Friday 14 September 2007. **unbelievable!**

If Channel 7 feels responsibility to make the public aware of what is going on in Australia, particularly terrorism issue which has always been important for the media, here you are: an important formal evidence is attached. But there is only one difference between this kind of terrorism recklessness and another type which has always been important, the difference is that: in this kind of terrorism recklessness the suspect is NOT Muslim and the reporter is Muslim, that's why it is not much important, so if Channel 7 prefers not to make the public aware of this "recklessness about terrorist acts' report by Attorney-General" and likes to remain silent for case of Mr. Philip Ruddock's recklessness but prefers to make controversy for Muslim cases like Dr. Mohammad Haneef's recklessness , I understand the situation and I should not complain because looks like there are two types of Halal (permitted) and Haram (forbidden) terrorism in Australia.

Kind Regards
Sheikh Haron