

.

From: Anne S [anneveer@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 30 March 2011 1:53 PM
To: Dorothy Hoverd; nickytig68@yahoo.com.au; renie_68@hotmail.com; Sonja Withoos
Cc: shamona.s@hotmail.com; mama_sara31@live.com.au; Stella Stiliano; Phillip Stilianos
Subject: Re: A reply to Facebook abuse - Last March 2010

Dorothy,

I spoke to a solicitor here and even showed him a copy of the will. We are not entitled to anything at this stage because our father is still alive. We are only next in line to inherit if our father had passed away.

As for the bullshit about our father being a good decent man, you still have no idea about the history. You have not been around long enough and he will only let you see what you want to see.

. I still have the email where he told me that because I couldn't get the documents he wanted because I reiterate I was **NOT LEGALLY** entitled to them that I will get nothing from him. So as for trusting him, don't make me laugh.

I don't give a fuck about this issue anymore so please do not include me in the future.
 Anne

----- Original Message -----

From: [Dorothy Hoverd](#)
To: [anneveer@yahoo.com.au](#) ; [nickytig68@yahoo.com.au](#) ; [renie_68@hotmail.com](#) ; [Sonja Withoos](#)
Cc: [shamona.s@hotmail.com](#) ; [mama_sara31@live.com.au](#) ; [Stella Stiliano](#) ; [Phillip Stilianos](#)
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 11:05 AM
Subject: A reply to Facebook abuse - Last March 2010

30 March 2011

Hi Anne-Marie, Nicky, Irene, and Sonja

The attached letter to you is the research I have done, because of the abuse from you all in March last year.

It shows that your father was not the person you made him out to be, and I know he is not like that, I have never found him to be a liar, or to be untrustworthy, and I am confident he has never lied to you.

It would be nice if you could make some effort to support yourselves in understanding that you each had a legal stake in your grandmother's estate. Under the South Australian Supreme Court Rules, you all had been deliberately and illegally omitted from the summons. Had you been included, the summons would never have been issued, because the plaintiff knew that you were the main threat to discrediting her 'claims'. Under South Australian Inheritance Law, you all had a much greater claim to the estate than the plaintiff did.

You should never have trusted a word the plaintiff's solicitor and barrister told you. They saw you, not your father, as the main threats to their case. They knew they could not undermine your claims to the estate, but you had so much against the plaintiff's claims, and they knew that. You had to be stopped at all costs, apparently some have been.

So if you are interested in pursuing any action of your own, you will need the fine details, just ask your father.

Dorothy

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 10.0.1209 / Virus Database: 1500/3540 - Release Date: 03/30/11