

“BELLA LONDON” July 23, 2012. USA time. Add 14 hours for AU time.

An example (redacted) of multiple public, abusive, troll attacks on Facebook by a person identifying as “Bella London”, against the 82 year old Plaintiff, Peterson, in *Peterson v. Hottes*. “Bella London” claims to be a “supporter of the defendant”, between July 23 (illustrated) to the present (Jan 2013).

A recent trial in...


▶ 🔖 A A + [https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story\\_fbid=111649428954226&i](https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=111649428954226&i)

Google Voice...all features Google Apple (871)▼

A recent trial in...

**Transcripts and recordings – Queensland Courts**  
www.courts.qld.gov.au  
The proceedings in Queensland courts and tribunals are generally recorded and produced in a written transcript or electronically on cassette tape or CD.

Like · Comment · Share

 **Bella London** Bella London To those who 'like' this – has it ever crossed your minds that this might be a false accusation? ✕

I know both these people and this is misleading and based on lies. This is a private vendetta by [REDACTED] – also [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] of the defendant! Do you not notice that the plaintiff's name and whereabouts are protected and yet the defendant's full name and whereabouts are splashed all over the internet by this vicious, vindictive excuse for a human being? There is no abuse – get the facts straight! The money that was gifted to the defendant [REDACTED] the very beginning of a dispute, driven by the power of attorney. So how could it possibly be financial abuse? It was pure greed on the part of the plaintiff and her power of attorney [REDACTED] that prevented this sad case from settling from the very beginning. This is no place for this trial information. And when the judgement was handed down they got no more than [REDACTED] But in their greed they knocked back many offers from the defendant - [REDACTED] ! Abuse is NOT part of this case – greed is and they (the plaintiff [REDACTED] Peterson of [REDACTED] Australia and her power of attorney, [REDACTED]) should be ashamed. The abused here is the defendant. The idea that 'abuse hurts at any age' is not denied and daughters of the selfish elderly are not immune to this pain. The current actions (of [REDACTED] for driving this and also [REDACTED] Peterson for allowing this to happen) in relation to this case and their vindictive efforts to do harm to the defendant, are defamatory. And an absolute disgrace. What kind of a mother does this to their own daughter? If you have anything to say – say it after reading the truth – say it in support of the defendant in this horrendous case that should never have left the realm of family counseling.

12 hours ago · Like

**“BELLA LONDON”** July 23, 2012. USA time. Add 14 hours for AU time.

## NOTES

**THE FOLLOWING HAVE BEEN REDACTED FROM THE EXAMPLE ABOVE: Names and locations of private individuals, location of the Plaintiff, and statements by “Bella London” which venture into *sub judice* matters all of which were multi-published by “Bella London”.**

The elderly Plaintiff is not herself a Facebook user. The verbal attacks were posted at Facebook pages frequented by the elderly lady’s other daughter.

“Bella London” claims, in the following example, “I know both these people...”. However, The Plaintiff and her other daughter have declared that they have never met anyone named “Bella London” and do not know anyone of that name.

It is suggested that readers ask themselves: Why would a mere “supporter” bother to launch more than 60 online verbal attacks over a sustained period from July through September?

It is important to note that some matters remaining before the lower court and the Plaintiff’s entire Appeal have not yet been heard so remain *sub judice*. How is “Bella London” privvy to details of both? Many of “Bella London’s” published attacks defy standard protocol governing *sub judice* cases and, as well as publicly arguing *sub judice* matters, could be interpreted as not only prejudicial both to matters remaining before the lower court and to the Plaintiff’s appeal but also an attempt to intimidate the Plaintiff into dropping the Appeal.

As you read the following, you will no doubt agree that the 82 year old Plaintiff in Peterson v Hottes has not only endured the harrowing circumstances of litigation but also malicious activities by a “supporter of the defendant”.

It goes without saying that “Bella London’s” trolling of an 82 year woman (in fact, of anyone), is simply a bad thing to do.

Regarding the last sentence in Bella London’s diatribe, the elderly Plaintiff has requested that *australiansense.com* make it known that on more than one occasion between 1995 and 2007 (inclusive) she suggested counselling to the Defendant, both for the family and for her grand son. Earlier suggestions were also made, via the Plaintiff, by the Plaintiff’s other daughter for family counselling. In all instances the suggestions were rejected by the Defendant. Despite the Plaintiff’s best efforts and sincere hopes, the matter never did land in a family counselling office, and that 82 year old lady takes these comments by “Bella London” to be as injurious and harmful as all the other comments in that they represent an egregious departure from reality and fact.