

8 THE CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, TREVERTON JONES, RADCLIFFES, SAFFRON, DUTTON AND OTHERS TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES

1)	LAW AND LEGAL PRINCIPLES	
a)	THE PRINCIPLE OF LEGAL CERTAINTY	1607
b)	BANKING AW	
i)	THE RELATIONSHIP AND CONTRACT BETWEEN THE BANK AND THE CUSTOMER	1607-1608
ii)	UNAUTHORISED PAYMENTS	1609-1610
iii)	CURRENT ACCOUNTS	1610-1611
iv)	INTERFERENCE BY THIRD PARTIES	1611
v)	SOLICITOR ACCOUNTS	1612-1613
vi)	LIMITATION OF ACTIONS – CREDIT BALANCES	1613
c)	FREEZING ORDERS	1613-1616
d)	RESTITUTION	1616-1617
e)	HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1988	
i)	S. 6 ACTS OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY	1617
ii)	ART. 3 PROHIBITION OF TORTURE	1618
iii)	ART. 8 RIGHT TO RESPECT FOR PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE	1618
iv)	ART.14 PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION	1618
v)	ART. 1 PROTOCOL 1 PROTECTION OF PROPERTY	1619
2)	DOCUMENTS	1620-1624
3)	COMPLETION OF THE £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE OCTOBER 2004- 17 FEBRUARY 2005	1625-1626
4)	WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED TO £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES UNDER THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	1627-1633
5)	WHAT HAPPENED TO £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES UNDER THE LAW SOCIETY’S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	1633-1636
6)	CALENDAR	1636-1637

7) THE NINE ATTEMPTS TO STEAL AND LAUNDER THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES

a) THE FIRST ATTEMPT. THE LAW SOCIETY'S ATTEMPTED THEFT AND PLACEMENT USING THE VESTING RESOLUTION

- i) THURSDAY 17 FEBRUARY 2005.
 - 1) NOTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF £258,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE 12.30PM 1638-1640
 - 2) LAW SOCIETY SERVES LLOYDS WITH VESTING ORDER AND LETTER 4.30PM 1640-1647
 - 3) LAW SOCIETY SERVES CUSTOMER WITH VESTING ORDER AND LETTER 6PM 1648
- ii) FRIDAY 18 FEBRUARY 2005. INTERVENTION. 1648-1651
- iii) TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2005. PLACEMENT IN RUSSELL COOKE'S ACCOUNT 1652

b) THE SECOND ATTEMPT. A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, LLOYDS, HEATHER LEESON AND LLOYDS' BARRISTER TO STEAL AND LAYER THE MONIES USING A BOGUS CLAIM

- i) WEDNESDAY 23 FEBRUARY 2005
 - 1) DISCOVERY THAT THE £254,000 SHEIKH – NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES HAD BEEN TRANSFERRED TO ME 1652
 - 2) EXCHANGE BETWEEN SHEIKH AND LLOYDS 1652-1654
 - 3) LLOYDS VERIFIES THE SHEIKH REMORTGAGE WITH POWELL CALLEN 1655-1658
 - 4) HEATHER LEESON SPEAKS TO POWELL CALLEN 1659
- ii) THURSDAY 24 FEBRUARY 2005. HEATHER LEESON OBTAINS THE FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER AND THE FRAUDULENT DISCLOSURE ORDER.
 - 1) EXCHANGE BETWEEN SHEIKH AND LLOYDS 1659
 - 2) EXCHANGE BETWEEN LLOYDS AND THE LAW SOCIETY (RUSSELL COOKE) 1659-1665
 - 3) THE FRAUDULENT WITHHOLDING OF CLAIM FORM 1665
 - 4) LLOYDS' FRAUDULENT APPLICATION ISSUED 1665-1666
 - 5) HEATHER LEESON'S FRAUDULENT AFFIDAVIT AND AFFIDAVIT USING WENDY LAVINGTON'S NAME
 - a) THE FRAUDULENT AFFIDAVITS 1667-1672

- b) LEESON USES NON SOLICITOR TO FALSELY STATE THAT VESTING RESOLUTION IS A FREEZING ORDER 1672-1673
- c) LEESON USES NON SOLICITOR TO FALSELY STATE THAT THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS AN AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER THE CUSTOMER'S FUNDS TO THE LAW SOCIETY 1673
- d) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS HAS COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENCE UNDER THE SOLICITOR'S ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (6) BY TRANSFERRING FUNDS TO THE LAW SOCIETY 1673
- e) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS HAS COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENCE BY TRANSFERRING FUNDS TO THE CUSTOMER 1673
- f) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY NOT ADVISING THAT THE MONEY SHOULD HAVE REMAINED AT LLOYDS 1673
- g) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT THE LAW SOCIETY ENCOURAGED OR INCITED LLOYDS TO COMMIT A CRIMINAL OFFENCE UNDER PARA 6 (6) 1674
- h) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY FAILING TO SAY THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD MISLED LLOYDS ABOUT THE LAW 1674
- i) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY NOT ADVISING THAT THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY IS NOT PRACTICE MONEY 1675
- j) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING THAT THE MONEY WAS THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL REMORTGAGE MONEY WHICH SHE WELL KNEW 1675
- k) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS ALSO CONSIDERED APPLYING FOR RESTITUTION AGAINST THE LAW SOCIETY 1676
- l) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING THAT POWELL CULLEN HAD CONFIRMED THAT THE MONEY WAS THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL REMORTGAGE MONEY 1676
- m) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING THE CONVERSATIONS THE CUSTOMER WITH MARTIN COCKRELL 1676
- n) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY MISSTATING THE USE OF OFFICE ACCOUNT 1676-1677
- o) LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD THAT ASHLEY & CO IS A CONVEYANCING PRACTICE, SO IT WOULD 1677

PERFECTLY USUAL FOR LARGE SUMS OF MONEY TO BE DEPOSITED AND WITHDRAWN

- p) LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD THAT I HAD BOUGHT AND SOLD SEVERAL PROPERTIES IN MY OWN NAME USING OFFICE ACCOUNT 1677
- q) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT JOHN WEAVER HAS ADVISED HER THAT THE MONEY MIGHT VERY WELL BELONG TO ME 1678
- r) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING RADCLIFFES' LETTER 1678-1680
- s) LEESON, AS A BANKING EXPERT, WITHHOLDS WHY THE APPLICATION FOR RESTITUTION IS UNLAWFUL UNDER BANKING LAW 1681
- t) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT THE APPLICATION IS BEING MADE BECAUSE LLOYDS HAS BEEN NEGLIGENT 1681
- u) LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS SHOULD HAVE APPLIED AGAINST THE LAW SOCIETY 1681
- v) LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD THAT LLOYDS SHOULD HAVE PAID FOR ITS OWN MISTAKE (OR SUED THE LAWYER ADVISING THE BANK) 1681
- w) LEESON AND LAVINGTON MAKE THE FALSE STATEMENT THAT NO CLIENT HAS SUFFERED LOSS 1681-1682
- x) LEESON FAILS TO ADVISE THE COURT THAT LLOYDS WERE UNAFFECTED BY CONSTRUCTIVE THIRD PARTY INTERESTS 1682
- y) LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD FROM THE COURT THAT LLOYDS CONSIDERED ME TO BE AN EXCELLENT CUSTOMER 1682
- 6) LEESON FRAUDULENTLY WITHHOLDS POWELL CULLEN'S EVIDENCE 1682
- 7) LEESON FRAUDULENTLY WITHHOLDS MARTIN COCKRELL'S EVIDENCE 1682
- 8) LEESON FRAUDULENTLY WITHHOLDS THE FRAUDULENT RESTITUTION CLAIM 1682
- 9) THE FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER 1682-1698
- 10) THE FRAUDULENT DISCLOSURE ORDER 1699-1697

iii) FRIDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2005. LLOYDS ISSUES A FRAUDULENT CLAIM

1)	CLAIM	1698-1701
2)	CLAIM FOR RESTITUTION FRAUDULENT	1701-1703
3)	CLAIM OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT FRAUDULENT	1703
4)	CLAIM OF INTERVENTION FRAUDULENT	1703
5)	CLAIM OF MISTAKE FRAUDULENT	1703-1704
6)	CLEAN HANDS?	1704-1706
c)	THE THIRD ATTEMPT THE LAW SOCIETY, HEATHER LEESON AND LLOYDS' BARRISTER ACT IN CONSPIRACY TO TORMENT ME BY HARASSING MY MOTHER	1706-1713
d)	THE FOURTH ATTEMPT ON 8 TH MARCH 2005	
i)	MONDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2005. THE FIRST MEETING WITH PAUL SAFFRON	1714
ii)	FRIDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2005. PAUL SAFFRON'S LETTER TO HEATHER LEESON	1714-1717
iii)	WHY PAUL SAFFRON WROTE 'THIS WAS INCONTROVERTIBLY CLIENT MONEY'. THE CASE FIXING CONSPIRACY BETWEEN TREVERTON JONES KC AND THE LAW SOCIETY	1717
iv)	HEARING 8 MARCH 2005. DID MY LEGAL TEAM EVEN SAY 'THIS IS REMORTGAGE MONEY'?	1717
e)	THEFT OF £10.000 COSTS FOR FRAUDULENT HEARING	1717
f)	THE FIFTH ATTEMPT IN MARCH 2005. MR DOGAN'S ATTEMPTED THEFT	1717-1718
g)	THE SIXTH ATTEMPT. A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, RUSSELL COOKE AND JOHN WEAVER	1719
8)	THE SEVENTH ATTEMPT TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES CASE FIXING. TREVERTON JONES KC BRIBED WITH THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY AND OTHER INDUCEMENTS TO TRY AND LOSE SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (HIGH COURT 2005	
a)	WHAT IS CASE FIXING?	1719
b)	THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN TREVERTON JONES KC , THE LAW SOCIETY AND RADCLIFFES TO LOSE CASE	1719
c)	THE LEGAL ARGUMENT WHICH AN HONEST BARRISTER WOULD HAVE PUT IN RELATION TO THE £254,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	1719
d)	WHAT TREVERTON JONES DID AND SAID ABOUT THE £245,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	
i)	SKELETON ARGUMENT 17 APRIL 2005. TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS	1719

	SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY.	
ii)	CLOSING SUBMISSIONS 17 MAY 2005 TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY	1719
iii)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS THAT HE FAILED TO PUT THE PROPER LEGAL ARGUMENT AT THE INJUNCTION HEARING IN THE FRAUDULENT RESTITUTION PROCEEDINGS	1719
iv)	SKELETON ARGUMENT 6 JUNE 2005 TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY.	1719
v)	TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS CALLING MR BANK MANAGER, MARTIN COCKRELL	1719
vi)	TREVERTON JONES CONCEALS THE FACT THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD EXCISED THE HEADING OF THE COCKRELL'S STATEMENT WHICH HAD BEEN MADE IN A DIFFERENT CASE.	1719
vii)	TREVERTON JONES STOPS ME FROM TELLING THE COURT ABOUT THE TT FORMS	1719
ix)	TREVERTON JONES LAYS THE GROUND FOR THE COURT OF APPEAL TO ALLEGE FORGERY OF THE TT FORMS	1719
x)	SAFFRON STEALS 254,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	1719
e)	HOW TREVERTON JONES KC AND RADCLIFFLEBRASSEUR TRIED TO LOSE MY INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	
i)	INTERVENTION LAW AND PROCEDURE	
1)	THAT THE PARA 6 (4) WAS THE WRONG APPLICATION TO CHALLENGE THE INTERVENTION	1720
2)	THAT THE RIGHT APPLICATIONS WERE THE PARA 5 (1), PARA 9(4) AND PARA 10(1) APPLICATIONS	1720
3)	THAT THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION WAS NOT A FREEZING ORDER	1720
4)	THAT THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION WAS NOT A TRANSFER ORDER	1720
5)	THAT THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION DID NOT APPLY IN GROUND 1 DISHONESTY CASES IN RELATION TO THE SOLICITOR SAVE FOR FOR AFTER DISCOVERED MONEY	1720
ii)	FALSE ADJUDICATIONS	
1)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT ADJUDICATIONS ARE BOGUS DECISIONS BY SRA CASEWORKERS	1720
2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT BOGUS ADJUDICATIONS ARE THE FIRST STAGE OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD	1720
iii)	BOGUS INVESTIGATIONS	
1)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO INVESTIGATION	1720

2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THE PURPOSE OF SO CALLED INVESTIGATIONS IS TO STEAL DOCUMENTS AND DATA WHICH HE AND OTHERS INVOLVED IN THE INTERVENTION FRAUD CAN FALSIFY	1720
iv)	DOCTORING , FALSIFICATION AND FORGERY OF INVESTIGATION RECORDS	
1)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT SHAW'S FALSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 24 APRIL 2004 HAD BEEN FALSIFIED	1720
2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD - DATE UNKNOWN. PART EXTRACTED AND PART DELETED HAD BEEN FALSIFIED	1720
3)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT SHAW'S WITHHELD NOTE RECORDING THAT HE SAW COMPUTER SCREEN SHOWING BATCH POSTING. 21 JULY 2004? HAD BEEN WITHHELD	1720
4)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT CALVERT'S LETTER TO MIDDLETON HAD BEEN FALSIFIED	1720
5)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT SARAH BARTETT'S FRAUDULENT FORENSIC REPORT HAD BEEN FALSIFIED	1720
v)	THE NON EXISTENT PANEL	
1)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT ONLY ONE PERSON CONSTITUTED 'THE PANEL MEETING'	1720
2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THERE WAS NO PANEL MEETING	1721
3)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT CALL SNEARY BECAUSE IT WOULD SHOW THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO PANEL MEETING	1721
4)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT CALL SNEARY BECAUSE IT WOULD SHOW THAT SNEARY HAD PROBABLY BEEN BRIBED FOR HIS SIGNATURE TO THE MINUTES OF RESOLUTION	1721
5)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT UNDER THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE ANY DECISION MADE BY THE PANEL WAS IRRELEVANT. THE VESTING RESOLUTION WAS NOTHING MORE A COMPANY RESOLUTION TO START THE SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES	1721
vi)	THE FRAUDULENT ALLEGATIONS	
1)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THE ALLEGATION OF CASH SHORTAGE ON THIRKETTLE WAS BOGUS AND FRAUDULENT	1721

2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION WAS BOGUS AND FRAUDULENT	1721
3)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION PAYMENTS) WAS BOGUS AND FRAUDULENT	1721
4)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THE ALLEGATION OF NOT ENTERING 11 BILLS WAS BOGUS AND FRAUDULENT	1721
5)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT THE OVERCHARGING ALLEGATIONS WERE BOGUS AND FRAUDULENT	1721
vii)	FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL	
1)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT DAVID SHAW'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT KIRSTEN PATRICK'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
3)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT DAVID MIDDLETON'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
4)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT MIKE CALVERT'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
5)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT SARAH BARTLETT'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
6)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT MARTIN COCKRELL'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
7)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT JOHN WEAVER'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED	1721
viii)	NICK SHELLEY, THE LAW SOCIETY'S CLAIMED COSTS EXPERT	
1)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT ARGUE THAT SHELLEY'S FRAUDULENT COSTS REPORT WAS NOT A COSTS JUDGMENT	1721
2)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS OR FAILS TO DISCLOSE THAT WHY THE LAW SOCIETY HAD TO PRETEND THAT SHELLEY'S FRAUDULENT COSTS REPORT WAS A COSTS JUDGMENT	1722
3)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO SHOW THAT	1722

SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT THE PERCENTAGE COSTS UPLIFT WAS DISHONEST

4)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO SHOW THAT SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED BECAUSE HE WITHHOLDS THE LAW ABOUT INTERIM BILLING	1722
5)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO SHOW THAT SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE WAS FALSE AND PERJURED BECAUSE HE WITHHOLDS THE FACT THAT HE HAS NOT ASSESSED THIRKETTLE	1722
6)	TREVERTON JONES DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO SHOW THAT PATRICK AND SHELLEY WERE ACTING IN COLLUSION WITH EACH OTHER	1722
7)	TREVERTON JONES COLLUDES WITH THE LAW SOCIETY BY TRYING TO HIDE THE THIRKETTLE FILES	1722
ix)	TREVERTON JONES SUPPRESSES THE LAW SOCIETY'S BREACH OF TRUST IN FAILING TO PROMPTLY RETURN THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE PROCEEDS	1722
x)	TREVERTON JONES SUPPRESSES THE LAW SOCIETY'S BREACH OF THE TRUST BY DEBITING £55,000 FOR RUSSELL COOKE'S ADMINISTRATION COSTS	1722
xi)	TREVERTON JONES SUPPRESSES THE LAW SOCIETY'S ATTEMPTED THEFT THE £254,000 SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE PROCEEDS	1722
xii)	TREVERTON JONES MAKES A BOGUS APPLICATION FOR THE RETURN OF MY PRACTICING CERIFICATE TO INCUR COSTS	1722
9)	PAUL SAFFRON'S ACTUAL THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTAGE MONIES	1722-1723
10)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE COURT LAUNDERED THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTAGE MONIES	
a)	DIAGRAMS	
i)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THREE STAGES OF MONEY LAUNDERING	1724-1725
ii)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	1726
iii)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE SEVEN ATTEMPTED THEFTS OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	1727
iv)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	1728
v)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT AND MONEY LAUNDERING OF ALL MY ASSETS	1729
b)	PLACEMENT	
i)	WHAT IS PLACEMENT	1730-1731

- ii) FIRST PLACEMENT. THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES TRANSFERRED TO RUSSELL COOKE ON 'INTERVENTION' 1731
- iii) SECOND PLACEMENT. THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES TRANSFERRED BY RUSSELL COOKE TO RADCLIFFES 7 DAYS BEFORE TRIAL 1731
- iv) ATTEMPTED THIRD PLACEMENT. £55,000 DEDUCTION FOR RUSSELL COOKE'S FALSE INVOICES 1731
- v) FOURTH PLACEMENT. THE £55,000 TRANSFERRED TO RADCLIFFES 3 DAYS BEFORE TRIAL 1731

c) LAYERING

- i) WHAT IS LAYERING AND HOW WAS IT USED 1731-1733
- ii) HOW GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC USED 'FALSE REPRESENTATIONS TO CONVERT THE SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY INTO CLIENT MONEY. THE HIGH COURT HEARING . MAY 2005- JULY 2005
 - 1) THE TERMS OF THE CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY AND TREVERTON JONES TO LOSE THE CASE 1733-1734
 - 2) THE LEGAL ARGUMENT WHICH AN HONEST BARRISTER WOULD HAVE PUT IN RELATION TO THE £254,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES 1734-1740
 - 3) SKELETON ARGUMENT 17 APRIL 2005. TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY 1741-1743
 - 4) CLOSING SUBMISSIONS 17 MAY 2005 TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY 1744-1745
 - 5) TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS CALLING LLOYDS BANK MANAGER, MARTIN COCKRELL 1745-1746
 - 6) TREVERTON JONES CONSPIRES WITH THE LAW SOCIETY'S TO HIDE THE FALSIFICATION OF MARTIN COCKRELL'S WITNESS STATEMENT 1746-1749
 - 7) TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS CROSS EXAMINING ME ABOUT THE TRANSFER SO I CANNOT EXPLAIN ABOUT RULE 7 OF THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1750
 - 8) TREVERTON JONES DISSUADES ME FROM TELLING THE COURT ABOUT THE TT FORM 1751
 - 9) TREVERTON JONES LIES TO THE COURT OF APPEAL BY TELLING THEM THAT I HAD REMORTGAGED MY HOME TO PAY HIS FEES 1751
- iii) TIMOTHY DUTTON'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION PANEL. HOW TIMOTHY DUTTON KC MADE FALSE REPRESENTATIONS TO CONVERT THE SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY INTO CLIENT MONEY.

1)	DUTTON COMMITS S. 3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE) BY FAILING TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES WERE MY MONEY	1751-1753
2)	DUTTON'S FAILURE TO ADVISE THAT LLOYDS HAD COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENCE UNDER THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (6). S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE)	1753
3)	DUTTON'S FALSE STATEMENT THAT REMOVING THE MONEY FROM CLIENT ACCOUNT WAS WRONG. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT)	1754-1755
4)	DUTTON'S FALSE STATEMENT THAT REMOVING THE MONEY FROM CLIENT ACCOUNT WAS IN BREACH OF SAR 23. S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE)	1755-1756
5)	DUTTON'S STATEMENT THAT THE REMOVAL OF THE MONEY WAS TO DELIBERATELY PUT OUT OF REACH OF LLOYDS S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT) S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE) CONSPIRACY OFFENCE WITH RADCLIFFES AND PAUL SAFFRON	1756
6)	DUTTON'S STATEMENT THAT ANOTHER COURT HAD FOUND DISHONESTY. S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT)	1757

c) INTEGRATION

- i) WHAT IS INTEGRATION

- ii) HOW THE COURT OF APPEAL USED IT SHAM JUDGMENT TO INTEGRATE THE STOLEN REMORTGAGE MONIES

d) CRIMINAL LIABILITY

1)	LLOYDS' CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1760
2)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1760
3)	MARTIN COCKRELL'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1760
4)	WENDY LAVINGTON 'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1761
5)	HEATHER LEESON'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1761
6)	RUSSELL COOKE 'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1761-1762
7)	JOHN WEAVER'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1762
8)	PAUL SAFFRON'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1762
9)	GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1762
10)	TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1762