
渋味

Lara Johnstone
PO Box 5042
George East, 6539
Tel: (044: 870 7239
Cel: (071) 170 1954

悟り

03 November 2012

Benedikte Strøm
Secretary for the Environmental Information Appeals Board
Climate and Pollution Agency
Postboks 8100 Dep, 0032 Oslo (Strømsveien 96)
E-mail: post@miljoklagenemnda.no
Phone: + 47 22 57 34 00 - Fax: +47 22 67 67 06
Website: www.miljoklagenemnda.no

Ms. Strøm,

Request to Environment Appeals Board in terms of Public Administration Act (PAA), section 23, 24, 25¹, and (iii) Freedom of Information Act: Section 22².

I have received no response to my request for information submitted to you on 08 October³: **Appeals Board for Environmental Information Decisions: Media Censorship & AdvokatForengin Disc. Brd & Committee**, in response to your ruling of 18 September 2012.

Relief Requested:

In terms of the Public Administration Act, Section, 24, 25, and 26, and Freedom of Information Act, Section 2:

Please could you kindly provide a ruling in consideration of clarifying what factual and legal grounds you considered in terms of coming to your conclusion that my complaint 'clearly had to be denied'; including clarifying exactly how my complaints do not fit the definition of Environment as clarified by the Aarhus convention and **LAW 2003-05-09 # 31: Act concerning the right to information and participation in public decision-making processes relating to the environment (environmental law)**, as requested in correspondent of 08 October.

18 September 2012: Secretariat of Env. App Board Ruling:

¹ <http://www.ub.uio.no/ujur/ulovdata/lov-19670210-000-eng.pdf>

² <http://www.ub.uio.no/ujur/ulovdata/lov-19700619-069-eng.pdf>

³ http://ecofeminist-v-breivik.weebly.com/1/post/2012/10/121008_eab.html

The secretariat for the Appeals Board for Environmental Information refers to your e-mails of September 10 and 11 2012.

The Appeals Board`s reference number for you appeal of June 18 2012 against Adresseavisen, Aftenposten, Bergens Tidende, Dagbladet, NRK, TV2 and VG is 2012/2. For archival purposes the reference number 2012/708 is used in addition. The Appeals Board's reference number for your appeal of August 16 2012 against the Norwegian Bar Association`s Disciplinary Committee and the Disciplinary Board is 2012/5. For archival purposes the number 2012/1023 is used in addition.

The information on www.miljoklagenemnda.no about how cases prepared has only status as guidance. The rules that are binding for the Appeals Board are found in the regulation December 14 2003 regarding the Appeals Board for Environmental Information. This regulation is available in Norwegian at <http://www.lovdatabank.no/for/sf/md/xd-20031214-1572.html>.

When receiving appeals that clearly have to be denied, it is not necessary to ask the respondents to provide their arguments. In these cases the secretariat prepares a draft decision and consults the members of the board. If the draft decision is approved by the members of the board, no further discussion is needed. This makes the Appeals Board able to settle obvious cases without arranging unnecessary meetings. Your appeals have been settled this way. Because no meeting has taken place, you will not receive a signed decision.

08 October: Request for Clarification Re: ‘Definition of Environment’ and Written Reasons for ‘clearly have to be denied’:

Please could you clarify for me your reasoning viz a viz: “When receiving appeals that clearly have to be denied”

It is not remotely clear to me why my complaints ‘clearly had to be denied’; unless your office is massively corrupt, like many other Norwegian government offices, on the matter of Mr. Breivik’s case and surrounding issues.

The Dept of Environment clearly encourages people to be active in holding Government Departments and corporations accountable on environmental issues:

A prerequisite for environmental law to work as intended is that the public uses it actively.

The law will put citizens able to:

- * contribute to the protection of the environment
- * protect against health and environmental

* influence public and private decision makers in environmental issues

According to: LAW 2003-05-09 # 31: Act concerning the right to information and participation in public decision-making processes relating to the environment (environmental law).

<http://www.lovdato.no/all/hl-20030509-031.html>

§ 2 What is understood by environmental

(1) An environmental means factual information and reviews about

a) environment,

b) factors that affect or may affect the environment, including

- planned and implemented measures and activities in the environment,

- product features or content,

- Ratio of operating the business, and

- administrative decisions and actions, including individual decisions, agreements, regulations, plans, strategies and programs, and associated analyzes, calculations and assumptions,

c) human health, safety and living conditions to the extent they are or may be affected by the state of the environment or the factors mentioned in b

(2) The environment means the environment including cultural heritage.

The Aarhus Convention defines 'environmental information' as:

3. "Environmental information" means any information in written, visual, aural, electronic or any other material form on:

(a) The state of elements of the environment, such as air and atmosphere, water, soil, land, landscape and natural sites, biological diversity and its components, including genetically modified organisms, and the interaction among these elements;

(b) Factors, such as substances, energy, noise and radiation, and activities or measures, including administrative measures, environmental agreements, policies, legislation, plans and programmes, affecting or likely to affect the elements of the environment within the scope of subparagraph (a) above, and cost-benefit and other economic analyses and assumptions used in environmental decision-making;

(c) The state of human health and safety, conditions of human life, cultural sites and built structures, inasmuch as they are or may be affected by the state of the elements of the environment or, through these elements, by the factors, activities or measures referred to in subparagraph (b) above;

The information requested of the Adresseavisen, Aftenposten, Bergens Tidende, Dagbladet, NRK, TV2 and VG clearly - if you read it - falls under both LAW 2003-05-09 # 31: Environmental Law and the Aarhus Convention definitions.

The information requested of Norwegian Bar Association's Disciplinary Committee and the Disciplinary Board clearly falls under both LAW 2003-05-09 # 31: Environmental Law and the Aarhus Convention definitions.

It is therefore not remotely obvious why you wrote:

"When receiving appeals that clearly have to be denied, it is not necessary to ask the respondents to provide their arguments. In these cases the secretariat prepares a draft decision and consults the members of the board. If the draft decision is approved by the members of the board, no further discussion is needed. This makes the Appeals Board able to settle obvious cases without arranging unnecessary meetings. Your appeals have been settled this way. Because no meeting has taken place, you will not receive a signed decision."

Is the secretariat for the Appeals Board for Environmental Information | www.miljoklagenemnda.no | Environmental Appeals Board just a Fake PR front for Corporate whores raping the planet? Setup just to pretend Norwegian Government gives a fuck about the environment? You just sit there and rubber stamp environmental requests with "clearly have to be denied" and laugh how massively stupid the citizens are for believing the bullshit in your Duhmockery press releases that you legislate laws to encourage citizens to:

- * contribute to the protection of the environment
- * protect against health and environmental
- * influence public and private decision makers in environmental issues

Public Administration Act (1967)

The administrative decision

§ 23. (the formal requirements for individual decisions)

An individual decision shall be in writing except where, for practical reasons, this would be particularly burdensome for the administrative agency.

§ 24. (when grounds shall be given for individual decisions)

Grounds shall be given for individual decisions. The administrative agency shall state the grounds at the same time as the decision is made.

§ 25. (the contents of the grounds)

The grounds shall refer to the rules on which the administrative decision is based, unless the party is familiar with the rules. **Insofar as it is necessary in order to enable the party to understand the administrative decision, the grounds shall also cite the contents of the rules or the assessment of the problem on which the administrative decision is based.**

The grounds shall also mention the factual circumstances upon which the administrative decision is based. If the factual circumstances have been described by the party himself or in a document whose contents have been disclosed to the party, a reference to the previous account shall suffice. In this case a copy of the said account shall be appended to the notification to the party.

Mention should be made of the chief considerations which have been decisive for the exercise of the administrative agency's discretionary powers. If guidelines have been given for the exercise of such powers, reference to these guidelines will as a rule be sufficient.

Freedom of Information Act (1970)

§ 2. The main provisions of the Act

The case documents of the public administration are public insofar as no exception is made by or pursuant to statute.

Any person may demand of the pertinent administrative agency to be apprised of the publicly disclosable contents of the documents in a specific case. The same applies to case registers and similar registers and the agenda of meetings of publicly elected municipal and county municipal bodies. The administrative agency shall keep a register pursuant to the provisions of the Archives Act and its regulations.

Notwithstanding that a document may be exempted from public disclosure pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the administrative agency shall consider whether the document should nevertheless wholly or partly be made public.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lara Johnstone', enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Lara Johnstone