



Print - Close Window

From: "John Hancock" <alcheera@hotmail.com>
To: biancs_r@yahoo.com.au
Subject: RE:
Date: Fri, 14 May 2004 14:51:19 +1000

poots, you will always be my sis.

1) you would be up shit creek if you had not done the article after your income from Grant dried up.

2) Fat would have quickly tired of supporting your shopping and leisure activities in Hong Kong, and you would be penniless. She wanted you back in Australia looking after AA and Carmen. Your giving her information in return for mandarin school will take you only so far, until you dry up funding again. Hopefully you will have another man to take care of you, or you can be at GHR mercy until you are 34 and you get a small amount of money from the Trust vesting.

3) You will probably not get much out of your 'inheritance' because most will go to the babies and the trust will be overspent every year until it vests- and you will get no where near what you should because of what she has done to the terms of it.

You can send my correspondence and your reply to fatty (in hoping she will pay for your mandarin education), but at the end of the day, you will still come off second best whatever path you choose. I don't need you for the path I am taking, and nor will the babies when they reach maturity. Try your hardest Bianca, to be recognised, just as you always have. There might be moments in the sun, when you are doing so well in a foreign country (the easiest thing in the world to do when you have free money from the Trust, a boy, or New Idea) but after the glory of your twenties fades, be ready for the reality you create now.

I will always be there for you, no matter what happens to you.

John

>From: Bianca Rinehart <biancs_r@yahoo.com.au>
>To: John Hancock <alcheera@hotmail.com>
>Subject: RE:
>Date: Fri, 14 May 2004 14:35:02 +1000 (EST)
>
>a few things plont.

>
>first i don't mind what you say in regards to my position of
>avoidance. i
>must only do what i am comfortable with. i learned a long time ago
>that
>money does not necessarily bring happiness, and had a recent reminder
>of
>this by doing the article. in hindsight it was a huge mistake, and
>yes, i
>have you to thank for it. sure, the money makes day to day life
>easier, and
>has given me some independence, but at what cost - my soul?
>friendships?
>not worth it for me, and i have learned from it now.
>
>second you can say what you like about my weaknesses. we are different
>people, each with a different set of strengths and weaknesses. i see
>myself
>as strong in living overseas on my own and trying to learn a
>challenging
>language so i can live and work in a dynamic and challenging country
>like
>china, which is something i have wanted to do for years.
>
>in regards to my starting this legal action. yeah, i was curious about
>a
>few issues, and looked into some documents. we both know i wanted to
>be
>clear on my responsibilities as director, and i also knew that
>potentially
>we would eventually inherit some money, or shares in the company so i
>wanted to understand where i stood with that too. but i never intended
>to
>go to court and fight our mother. i gave the whole thing up a long
>time ago
>and have tried to go my own way. it is not the right thing to hold on
>to,
>and i had realised this for myself.
>
>in terms of benefitting from your efforts in this regard, i do not
>believe
>this will eventuate, as i don't think you will 'win' a thing. this is
>why i
>have stood my ground (avoidance) and tried to express to you how i
>think
>you should do the same.
>
>but you will do what you want, as will i, and i think neither of us
>should
>hold that against the other.
>
>plus i can not deal with the media like you can and i know it will be
>unbearable for everybody if they become involved.
>
>just be careful
>
>john Hancock <alcheera@hotmail.com> wrote:
>tiny one looks a bit pissed. Hope you didn't fil baby sitting duty,
>but I
>know she can take alot of booze.
>
>I am disappointed Bianca about your attitude towards this thing about
>the
>Trust. You know its wrong, and I wonder what your attitude would have

been
>if I had not brokered your \$18500 from New Idea.
>
>Until you can stand up to her, you will never feel whole. You can
grovel
>and
>beg for your mandarin course- but you can pay for it yourself out of
your
>free money. Why are you still reliant on GHR being the Queen of the
Trust?
>
>I don't understand where your weakness lies that you over-compensate
with
>your overly outward shows of 'strength'. Maybe its because you are a
girl (
>a 'tough' one at that- or so you try to project) or that you are a
year
>younger than me (which at our age does not mean very much).
>
>You can make money or be supported much easier than I. Men will always
pay
>the way of an attractive girl, just look at the lives of Gem and Jess-
Gem
>who for most of the last year I have paid for without any fat fat
help.
>
>No, Bianca, the time has come for you to really stand up for yourself
and
>be
>heard, not hide behind some external act of 'strength' as you like to
>portray. Time and time again you have shown to me who you really are-
and I
>know you are more than that, or at least you have always been that to
me.
>It
>is only now that I am really understanding who you are.
>
>After your 'strong' words to me about how I should leave fattys employ
and
>go out on my own, you were my 'stregnth' to pursue that. You started
this
>legal action. Not me- although I wanted to do something.
>
>I will pursue this with or without this 'help' to which you refer. I
am
>sure, and I know that you know, that you will share in the benefits of
my
>actions. But from now on, that you do not join me, know that the
benefits
>you receive are because of me, and that I am strong. That you can not
stand
>up to GHR is a sign of extreme weakness. If you do not consider
yourself
>better than her, how on earth do you face each day? You talk the talk
>poots,
>but when do you walk the walk?
>
>I don't mind doing this for you, and if it fails I will face the
>consequences and I know you will be as weak as ever and siddle up to
the
>fat
>and say you were never part of it. I won't be bothered to tell her it
was
>you from the start, my satisfaction will lie, until our deaths, in

your
>ability to take the money against all that you supposedly are.
>
>So enjoy your 'victory' Bianca of starting something, handing it to
me, and
>winning either way- as you know you will win if I lose, of if Fatty
wins.
>So
>enjoy your life poots. I am here for you, but always know I know the
real
>you. Whcih is fine. But in front of me, don't pretend to be something
you
>are not.
>
>Chiao,
>
>John
>
>
>
> >From: Bianca Rinehart
> >To: john Hancock
> >Subject: babysitting
> >Date: Fri, 14 May 2004 13:18:21 +1000 (EST)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>-----
> >Find local movie times and trailers on Yahoo! Movies.
> ><< DSC00907.JPG >>
> ><< DSC00910.JPG >>
>
>
>
>
>-----
>Find local movie times and trailers on Yahoo! Movies.



Print - Close Window

From: "John Hancock" <alcheera@hotmail.com>
To: biancs_r@yahoo.com.au
Date: Wed, 12 May 2004 15:05:45 +1000

poots,

how is it going? U are probably back in HK now. We are staying at this awesome house in Hollywood hills. Great view and amazing house, at least USD 7m. Pool, spa, etc. Retired gay doctor who is in realestate, Tim met him.
Nice guy.

What is happening with the fat? I have finished my affidavit. I want to get the show on the road. Where u at?

We have a big meeting with the studios thursday, and am preparing for it.
Hopefully they will take over the project- I just wish I had a bit more substance behind me and I could participate. Without cash/backing you are at other peoples mercy. Oh well.

Let me know how you are going.

John.

pco

From: john Hancock [alcheera@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 19 June 2006 2:07 PM
To: pco@esperanza1986.com

Dear Mother,

I will reply to the legal issues raised later, however at the end of your letter you say "for many years I have given you opportunities in the hope you would contribute positively to the family company".

Exactly what opportunities you have given me to contribute to the family company- ~~real opportunities not just sitting at a desk or a few public speaking outings?~~

* I completed the full 2 year Iscor traineeship. I toughed it out on the edge of the Kalahari desert with 6 am starts each day- no flying back home for weekends and in a country that predominately spoke another language. Contrary to your wishes to forever keep me off-shore, the guidance given to me by Johan Detleefs was, at the end of this period, for me to get my degree (which I did).

* I stood by you for years, publicly defending you against Rose, and the memory of my Grandfather from often unfair and incorrect attacks.

* I completed (with mainly High Distinction) my Masters of Business Admin, in the face of a very difficult time through the Inquest and associated publicity.

* I refused the very lucrative package from Andrew Forrest on your advice. Shares offered to me continue to be worth more than \$35m. This I did on the expectation I would be properly involved with Hancock projects. Regardless of the quality of the project, it was a real opportunity for commercial exposure.

You on the other hand have done all you can to squash me (for lack of better word), even go as far as planning to take my Trust entitlement in return for a rotting wooden boat after I had supported you in these years. That is certainly no 'opportunity'!

I think (ownership issues aside) you are doing a good job with Hope Downs and I think there is an important role for you to play there for as long as you want to do so. Your experience and guidance are similarly important with the remaining projects but you will need to face the reality that you will not be able to control everything forever, do you really think the person who supplied me with the documents that have exposed what you have done- and was too weak/too many headaches after starting it, to go through with it herself- is the best choice?!

As I said years ago, this type of planning is very important, especially in family companies. I cannot see what makes HPPL different from the Packer organisation, Stokes, Roberts, Wylie etc etc. Even Bill Gates (richest in world and younger than you) has appointed his replacements effective immediately.

When you 'offered' me the Queensland coal etc (after you had already offered it to someone else and it was refused) it was in hindsight clearly another tactic to delay proceedings. Or perhaps it was so you could go back to the other party to give it to them after maybe making it more attractive since I was interested. The further offer of the iron ore projects ditto.

I am struggling to see what these 'opportunities' are you refer to?

I will respond to the other matters in your letter shortly.

John

pc0

From: Hope Rinehart [hopie85@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, 22 June 2006 3:32 PM
To: pco@esperanza1986.com
Subject: RE: John's information

I have no idea. Does it really matter? What is 'information'? Does everything have to be top secret?! We are not secret agents, nothing is life or death, who cares if everyone knows the TRUTH?!

I'm so sick of having to lie and keep secrets from other family members!!!
Gin is like don't tell mem this and your like don't tell John this and Bianca's taken trust documents from the office and smugeled them to John and I. This is so messed up. We are your children. What the hell are we doing signing CA's?!

>From: "pc0" <pco@esperanza1986.com>
>Reply-To: <pco@esperanza1986.com>
>To: "'Hope Rinehart'" <hopie85@hotmail.com>
>Subject: John's information
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 13:57:00 +0800

>Dear Hopie,

>Please see attached email of Monday from John, (only reviewing today),
>particularly his paragraphs near end.

>Ryan has been subject to a Confidentiality Agreement since last year,
>and you have assured me you never speak to John of company matters (and
>more recently have signed a CA), so how did John get such info??

>As far as I'm aware Ginia never speaks or writes to John, and Terry and
>our secretaries who have been greatly inconvenienced by John, and are
>bound by CA's anyway, certainly wouldn't.

>I thought you well understood you should not pass any information to
>John and that was the very least you should do, but as it appears you
>have broken this, while John has been sucking up to you for
>information, please advise exactly what you have disclosed to him asap.
>If nothing, what has Ryan disclosed to John in breach of his CA?

>Love

Mother
>Att.

><< Document(30).pdf >>

Meet Sexy Singles today @ Lavalife - Click here [http://a.ninemsn.com.au/b.aspx?URL=http%3A%2F%2Flavalife9%2Eninemsn%2Ecom%2Eau%2Fclickthru%2Fclickthru%2Eact%3Fid%3Dninemsn%26context%3dan99%26locale%3Den%5FAU%26a%3D22740&_t=751140432&r=emailtagline_meetsexy_june&m=EXT](http://a.ninemsn.com.au/b.aspx?URL=http%3A%2F%2Flavalife9%2Eninemsn%2Ecom%2Eau%2Fclickthru%2Fclickthru%2Eact%3Fid%3Dninemsn%26context%3Dan99%26locale%3Den%5FAU%26a%3D22740&_t=751140432&r=emailtagline_meetsexy_june&m=EXT)

pco

From: john Hancock [alcheera@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, 22 June 2006 5:38 PM
To: pco@esperanza1986.com
Subject: RE: Response to better road?

Dear Mother,

I have always made myself available for HPPL projects. I have undertaken the most training and have the highest qualifications. I have spent the most time and in the most difficult situations progressing family company matters and indeed supporting you in trying circumstances.

I disagree with you about J.Detleefs, I was there in his office when he said "Your Mother wants you to go to Europe, and I can organise this, but the best path for you is to finish your Uni degree." (Which I did) Unfortunately you must be thinking of someone else or are confused or he presented a different story to you- but I can't see why he would.

Time will tell if the other children (or their husbands) will be able to work with you at your direction- or are really interested in the iron industry or importantly- want to live in Perth. None are easy. Now that they have the freedom of not having their Trust entitlements arbitrarily stopped they are free to travel and do what they wish. This new power is a by-product of my actions regarding the Trust.

We both know Bianca's allegiance lies in the easiest path and most beneficial to Bianca path. Less than a month ago she leaked the documents from your internal office to complain about Trust monies being used for your legal expenses defending yourself against my claims. (A breach of Trust in itself, no doubt you have rectified this). Bianca knows she wins both ways, by sucking up to you and by my action succeeding. Should you blame her for that? Or should she be congratulated for playing both sides so successfully?

In any event, you know not to dock Bianca's (blood) money again!

I have found out more about your actions in the 1990's and the weeks leading up to the April 1 'Deed'. It is disappointing to say the very least. However, I am strong and forgive you.

Your life has not been the easiest- often through events beyond your control. Working against you is often how you deal and react to these events.

I do hope for everyones sake we can get through this and move forward united.

fortunately you must first realise fully the situation you are in now before forward progress can begin. My letter is nearly ready. Perhaps a time can begin soon when we don't need to be confrontational. The ball is in your court.

John

>From: "pco" <pco@esperanza1986.com>
>Reply-To: <pco@esperanza1986.com>
>To: "'john Hancock'" <alcheera@hotmail.com>
>Subject: Response to better road?
>Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:21:30 +0800

>
>Please see attached

>
>

><< Document (43) .pdf >>

pco

From: john Hancock [alcheera@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 23 June 2006 7:45 AM
To: Tad Watroba
Cc: pco@esperanza1986.com
Subject: RE: Your email

Mother,

When the Trust assets are returned- including Hope Downs and the full 49% of HPPL shares- this will benefit all 4 children far more than the forensic accountants fees. Plus the dividends not properly paid to the Trust since your 'reconstruction' in 1995 whereby you increased your share in the company. As you well know, the only person to suffer in this is you- for these are your past actions that have benefited you as Trustee to the detriment of your children, the beneficiaries of LGH's direction. The accountants fees would be recouped merely by the 'farm tax', your over- charging lawyers fees returned (if not already) and other amounts you have taken over the years which although reach many thousands pale in comparison to the removal of Hope Downs and the HPPL shares.

Again, see the March 1992 Deed giving children Hope Downs, 1988 Agreement setting out the 49/51 split.

I find it very amusing you can't even face the fact Bianca is still leaking documents from your office and complaining to everyone who will listen when you get up to your usual tricks of taking money improperly from the Trust and reducing her payments in any way. How silly "Or should we congratulate her for having more sense later?". Yes, congratulations are due for her being a master manipulator and playing both sides!

And this 'settlement'. Despite your tactics and my forced signing, even on the face of it I received nothing- a 'loan' (which is nothing) and a reduced amount of Trust income despite you knowing the large increase in royalties. In fact, the true amount is more than 4 times the yearly amount! This far reduced entitlement does not even cover the interest you are charging on the 'loan'. When this matter comes to Trial your tactics against your own son will be exposed.

I will be responding to your first letter soon, but it appears trying to explain things to someone with their head in the sand is pointless.

John

>From: "Tad Watroba" <tad_watroba@hancockprospecting.com.au>
>To: <alcheera@hotmail.com>
>CC: "Cheryl Edwards" <cheryl_edwards@hancockprospecting.com.au>
>Subject: Your email

>Date: Fri, 23 Jun 2006 01:06:52 +0800

>

>John,

>

>

>

>Re: Your email

>

>

>

>Even though you may be telling Hopie that your actions are in her
>interests and will secure her Trust monies for her flit around the
>world

>- you know very well that this is not what you are planning or trying
>to achieve at all.

>

>

>
>You have interested an accountant in earning fees from the Trust and he
>or you have additionally engaged lawyers to represent him. But worse,
>his lawyers' letter of May 18, 2006 specifically refers to his engaging
>even more people to review the "past management" of the Trust and to
>distribute Trust dividends on a "fair(ly)" basis to "each of the
>beneficiaries", seemingly willing to overlook the Settlement provisions
>wherein you have already benefited.

>
>
>

>This very considerable expenditure you plan from the Trust, doesn't
>matter to you of course, because under your Settlement you were not to
>receive any more quarterly distributions from the Trust anyway!

>
>
>

>If you were successful with your plan, Hopie and her sisters would of
>course be extremely lucky to achieve any distributions from the Trust
>for years to come, after paying for all such expenses, and then being
>subject to what your nominated Trustee, who has no duty of care for
>your sisters, may consider "fair", irrespective of the fact you have
>already received immense company benefits, which Hopie and Gins have
>not from the company - hence you required and received less from the
>Trust over several years, and also given that your education was nearly
>complete while theirs was not, and hence again you received less from the Trust.

>
>
>

>How much of this do you now really plan to persuade your nominated
>Trustee to distribute for a "fair" distribution from the Trust, when he
>does not have to take into account monies you have separately received
>from the company and pre any Trust distribution (which did not start
>till during 1992) after you had already had most of your school
>education and other benefits paid, and Hopie and Gins were then only
>starting school!

>
>
>

>The scope of a potential redistribution from the Trust after looking at
>"past management" to then be "fair" to "each of the beneficiaries",
>must be very tempting and exciting to you (assuming you are confident
>you can instruct your nominated Trustee to ignore the Settlement).

>
>
>

>But, what about Hopie's and Ginia's, where will their monies come from
>if your plans ever come into fruition?!

>
>
>

>
>
>

>
>
>

>John, stop trying to manipulate Hope and stop pretending she will be
>benefiting from your scheming when you know very well that this is not
>what you are endeavouring to do and you plan for their trust quarterly
>payments to be spent on professional fees for lengthy reviews and if
>any left over, for redistribution to "each of the beneficiaries".

>
>
>

>John, I have listened to your sisters including Bianca, tell me they do
>not want the difficulty of having to cope with you the rest of their
>lives if you are all together in ownership/commercial activities. Yet
>they would need to be involved to secure anything for themselves and
>their own future families if you were involved. Is having such problems
>with you really worth it in their lives? They have seen how you have
>treated me!

>

>
>
>Stop being so greedy and jealousy driven and get yourself on a positive
>and better path and let me know your decision today.
>
>
>
>I think you mentioned more in your email (including something
>derogatory about Bianca), no doubt I've heard it all before and
>responded, but it is late and there is probably no point in responding further
anyway.
>
>
>
>
>
>Mother
>
>
>
>
>Typing not checked
>
>
>
>
>please respond to:
>
>mail@hancockprospecting.com.au
>
>
>
>
>
>



hope85@hotmail.com

Printed: Tuesday, 27 June 2006 4:40:16 PM

From : john Hancock <alcheera@hotmail.com>
Sent : Friday, 23 June 2006 1:51:03 PM
To : hope85@hotmail.com
CC : ginjarinehart@hotmail.com

Hi Hope and Gins,

I hope this finds you well. It is a bit of a 'business' letter.

I have the feeling that Mother is sending you copies of her letters to me as they are written to me in a very strange manner- usually twisting or disregarding what I say. If she is, I think it is to try to turn you against me for some reason.

Very briefly, through corporate restructures and moving companies around in the 1990's (when you were very young), she has taken Hope Downs from the Childrens Trust, and increased her own personal holding in HPPL (where the iron ore royalties are paid) from 51% GHR/ 49% Children (as our grandfather intended) to around 76% GHR and 24% children.

I am trying to restore these things. Obviously this will mean GHR must return money and assets to the Trust and she will not want to do this voluntarily. Indeed she will fight very hard and use all sorts of tactics.

I am trying to work this out in the best possible manner and in a way we all are treated equally, including Bianca who originally provided the documents my lawyers have used. Bianca was the first to approach lawyers when Mother was treating her poorly, and when Bianca left to be with Grant Hackett I took over the case. Indeed Bianca is still sending out information and assisting to stop unfairness, such as about Mother taking deductions for farm expenses out of the Trust and also taking legal expenses for defending her behaviour. Mother is not allowed to take this money from the Trust and she must put it back- do not be afraid of her, she is the Trustee at the moment and is there to support and serve you- not give you a hard time or force you to do something you don't want to do!

(These monies, the 'farm tax' or other company expenses improperly charged to the Trust, are nothing compared to the huge assets she has removed!)

To clarify, the 'settlement' I was forced into means I receive \$50,000 a year, paid upfront as my Trust money. As you all know, this is far less than 1/4 of Trust income, and nothing compared to the income of the Trust with the assets taken out, put back in. I also have a 'loan' and the small Trust income does not even cover the interest on the 'loan'. Once the assets are returned to the Trust, the Trust should be split fairly 4 ways.

If you wish more information let me know, just be aware that there is alot more going on than may be disclosed by other sources.

John