

SUBMISSION:

Submission by Kenneth Michael Ryan. Dated 02/04/2019

Prior to this latest amendment to the rule changes now dating back to 2008 I lodged a complaint to AFCA, case NO. [REDACTED] to which I received a reply that the matter has already been determined by a court and AfCA after referring my complaint to the [REDACTED] then closed our case file.

I would strongly argue that our complaint of , (I was given credit I couldn't afford to repay), (Lending Decision), has never been heard and we were, like it or not, lumped into a class action which was called the UMIS Proceedings,(Unregistered Managed Investment Scheme) which involved almost every Bank, ASIC , Class action Solicitors and [REDACTED] , all with their entourage of Barristers, and the proceedings, which I attended on several occasions and lasted 3 months, never went near the area of our complaint, and concluded with the Judge reserving his decision, that was NEVER handed down.

We object to rule No F.2.1 c) and recommend in the strongest terms that it should be changed to allow matters that were not addressed in the UMIS proceedings, to now be addressed by AFCA. We have evidence of glaring overstatements and omissions by [REDACTED] in a Loan Application to them in 2008 that did not comply with The National Consumer Protection Act , or their own lending guidelines and their failure over the ensuing years , to properly and sincerely address our matter despite several written attempts by us, still ongoing as a result of your referral of our complaint (your Reference Case No [REDACTED] ) to them on 02/11/2018.

I request that serious consideration be given to this rule change along the lines I have recommended as I know many people involved in the [REDACTED] disaster will be like affected.

Yours faithfully,

K.M.Ryan