

DETAILED CONTENTS OF PART 2

A	SOLICITORS ACTS OF 1941, 1957, 1965 AND 1974 (AS ENACTED) AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1985: THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS AND PASSAGE THROUGH PARLIAMENT	
1	LEGEND	1
2	SOLICITORS ACT 1941 (SOLICITORS BILL)	
1)	MATERIAL PROVISIONS	
a)	PREAMBLE	2
b)	S.2 COMPENSATION FUND	2
c)	SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS WITH REGARD TO THE FORMATION ADMINISTRATION AND APPLICATION OF THE COMPENSATION FUND	2-4
2)	PASSAGE OF BILL THROUGH PARLIAMENT	
a)	25 APR 1939. FIRST PRESENTATION .	5-7
b)	30 APR 1940. SECOND PRESENTATION	8-16
c)	11 MAR 1941. THIRD PRESENTATION	16-19
3	SOLICITORS ACT 1957 (SOLICITORS BILL)	
1)	THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS	
a)	PREAMBLE	20
b)	S.13 APPEALS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUE OF PRACTICING CERTIFICATES	20
c)	S.14 SUSPENSION OF PRACTICING CERTIFICATES IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES	20
d)	S 31 POWER OF COUNCIL TO DEAL WITH PROPERTY OF CERTAIN SOLICITORS	21
e)	S.47 JURISDICTION AND POWERS OF DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE	21-22
f)	SCHEDULE 1 CONTROL OF PROPERTY OF A SOLICITOR IN CERTAIN CASES	22-23
2)	PASSAGE THROUGH PARLIAMENT	
a)	08 MAR 1950 FIRST PRESENTATION	24-33
b)	30 NOV 1950 SECOND PRESENTATION	34-35
c)	15 DEC 1955 THIRD PRESENTATION	35-49
d)	20 DEC 1956 FOURTH PRESENTATION	49
4	SOLICITORS ACT 1965	
1)	THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS	

a)	PREAMBLE	50
b)	S. 10 RE-ENACTMENT OF SCHEDULE 1 TO PRINCIPAL ACT	50
c)	S.11 SOLICITORS GUILTY OF UNDUE DELAY IN CERTAIN MATTERS	50-51
d)	S.12 CONTROL OF CLIENTS' DOCUMENTS AND MONEY IN THE CONTROL OR POSSESSION OF CERTAIN SOLICITORS	51
e)	S.13 CONTROL OF DECEASED SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES	52
f)	S.14 ON DEATH OF SOLICITOR PRACTICING ON HIS OWN ACCOUNT SOCIETY TO DEAL WITH THE BANKING ACCOUNTS OF PRACTICE	52
g)	SCHEDULE 1 PROPERTY IN THE CONTROL OR POSSESSION OF CERTAIN SOLICITORS AND OTHER PERSONS	52-57
2)	PASSAGE THROUGH PARLIAMENT	
a)	25 MAR 1959 FIRST PRESENTATION	57-61
b)	22 NOV 1964 SECOND PRESENTATION	61-100
5	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 AS ENACTED (BUT WITH S.44B AMENDMENT)	
1)	THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS	
a)	PREAMBLE	101
b)	S.15 SUSPENSION OF PRACTICING CERTIFICATES	101
c)	S.35 INTERVENTION IN SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE	102
d)	S 36 COMPENSATION FUND	103-104
e)	S44B POWER TO EXAMINE FILES IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLAINTS	105
f)	SCHEDULE 1 PART I CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE LAW SOCIETY MAY INTERVENE	106-107
g)	SCHEDULE 1 PART II POWERS EXERCISABLE ON INTERVENTION	108-111
2)	PASSAGE THROUGH PARLIAMENT	
a)	10 FEB 1972 FIRST PRESENTATION	112-139
b)	21 DEC 1972 SECOND PRESENTATION	139-161
c)	04 DEC 1973 THIRD PRESENTATION	162-186
d)	09 APR 1974 FOURTH PRESENTATION	186-230

6 THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1985

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1) | PART I SOLICITORS S.6 –S.10 | 230-234 |
| 2) | PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE – NO MENTION OF S44B | 235-289 |

7 DISCHARGE OF COUNCIL'S FUNCTIONS AND DELEGATION

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 1) | THE CHARTER OF THE SOCIETY (1845) | 289-290 |
| 2) | 1932 ACT S. 74 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF LAW SOCIETY AND S.81 DEFINITION OF COUNCIL | 290 |
| 3) | 1941 ACT S. 28 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY S.29 INTERPRETATION | 290-291 |
| 4) | 1957 ACT S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES, S.80 POWER TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY, S.86 INTERPRETATION | 291-292 |
| 5) | 1965 ACT S.80 AMENDMENT OF S.80 OF PRINCIPAL ACT S.28 INTERPRETATION | 292 |
| 6) | 1974 ACT AS ENACTED S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES S.80 POWERS TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY | 292-293 |
| 7) | 1974 ACT AS AT <u>ANAL SHEIKH V LAW SOCIETY HIGH COURT CASE 2005</u> | 293-295 |

B THE SOLICITORS ACTS OF 1941, 1957 AND 1965: THE EVOLUTION OF THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS

1 THE SOLICITORS ACT 1941

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1) | BACKGROUND TO ACT | 296 |
| 2) | THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES | |
| | a) THE DEBATES IN FULL | 296 |
| | b) THE DEBATES SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO INTERVENTION | 296-298 |
| | c) COMMENTS (IF ANY) AS TO MEANING OF THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS | 298 |
| 3) | GOVERNING PROVISIONS | 298-300 |
| 4) | GROUNDS | 301 |
| 5) | DIAGRAMS | |
| | a) THE 1941 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS | 301-302 |

		303
6)	THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	
a)	DOCUMENTS	304-305
b)	MONEY	
i)	FREEZING THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS	306
ii)	TRANSFERRING THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY	306
c)	MAIL	306
2	THE SOLICITORS ACT 1957	
1)	BACKGROUND TO ACT	307
2)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES	
a)	THE DEBATES IN FULL	308
b)	THE DEBATES SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO INTERVENTION	308
c)	COMMENTS (IF ANY) AS TO MEANING OF THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	308
3)	GOVERNING PROVISIONS	310
4)	FOUNDATIONS	310
5)	DIAGRAMS	
a)	THE SOLICITORS ACT 1957 INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	311
b)	1957 ACT. THE FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND THE OBTAINING OF DOCUMENTS	312
6)	THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	
a)	DOCUMENTS	313
b)	MONEY	
i)	FREEZING THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS	313
ii)	TRANSFERRING THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY	313
c)	MAIL	313
3	THE SOLICITORS ACT 1965	
1)	BACKGROUND TO ACT	314
2)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES	

a)	THE DEBATES IN FULL	315
b)	THE DEBATES SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO INTERVENTION	315-344
c)	COMMENTS AS TO MEANING OF THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	345-350
3)	GOVERNING PROVISIONS	351-356
4)	GROUND	357
5)	DIAGRAMS AND TABLES	
a)	THE SOLICITORS ACT 1965 INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	358
b)	1965 ACT. THE FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND THE OBTAINING OF DOCUMENTS	359
c)	LEGEND	360
d)	TABLE SHOWING ROUTE TO OBTAINING MONEY AND DOCUMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO GROUND AND WHETHER INVESTIGATION WAS NEEDED	361
e)	HOW THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS SHOULD HAVE WORKED	362
f)	HOW THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS COULD HAVE BEEN MANIPULATED	363-364
6)	HOW THE 1965 ACT INTERVENTION PROVISIONS WORKED	
a)	GROUND	365
b)	INTERVENTION STARTS WITH THE SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES	
i)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S APPLICATION FOR A DOCUMENT PRODUCTION ORDER	365
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S APPLICATION FOR A STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER AND TRANSFER OF MONEY ORDER	365-367
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S APPLICATION FOR A MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER	367
iv)	TRANSFER OF MONEY ORDER	367
c)	INTERVENTION ENDS WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES	
i)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S DOCUMENTS LIST	368
ii)	RECOVERY OF DOCUMENTS PROCEDURE	368
iii)	NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
1)	PARA 9 – PARA 13	369-370
2)	THE APPLICATION OF THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	370-371
3)	ISSUED AFTER CONCLUSION OF DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION PROCEDURE	372

4)	APPLICATION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF THE NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT	372
5)	TRANSFER OF MONEY	
a)	STAGE 1 PARA 13 (1) (A) . OBTAINING CONSENT FROM BENEFICIAL OWNER	373
b)	STAGE 2 PARA 13 (1) EIGHT DAY NOTICE OF TRANSFER	373
c)	STAGE 3 PARA 12. TRANSFER OF MONEY	373-374
d)	COURT ORDER AUTHORISING TRANSFER MONEY WHERE OWNERSHIP NOT KNOWN	374
6)	DIAGRAM ILLUSTRATING THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	375
7)	CONFUSION, FLAWS, INCONSISTENCIES AND MISCHIEFS IN THE 1965 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
a)	HOW THE PROVISIONS COULD BE MANIPULATED TO DEPRIVE THE SOLICITOR OF HIS RIGHT TO ANY SUBSTANTIVE TRIAL	376-377
b)	WHY DID PARLIAMENT CONFINE THE DEBATE TO SCHEDULE 1 PARA. 3 - SERVICE OF THE DOCUMENTS LIST?	377
c)	DID PARLIAMENT UNDERSTAND THAT THE GROUNDS HAD CHANGED?	378
d)	A STRUCK OFF SOLICITOR HAS 21 DAYS TO SELL HIS PRACTICE, BUT A SOLICITOR WHOM THE LAW SOCIETY HAS REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE HAS BEEN DISHONEST DOES NOT HAVE THAT RIGHT	379
e)	GROUND 3 WAS ONLY CONCERNED 'CERTAIN MONEY AND CERTAIN DOCUMENTS'. DOES THAT MEAN THAT AN INTERVENTION WAS DIFFERENT IN EVERY CASE?	379-380
f)	GROUND 3 SHOWS THAT PARLIAMENT DID NOT UNDERSTAND ANYTHING ABOUT SOLICITORS' BANKING	380-381
g)	WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THE OWNER DID NOT CONSENT TO TRANSFER OF MONEY UNDER THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE?	381-382
h)	PARLIAMENT CONTEMPLATED THAT ON THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION ,THE COURT COULD ORDER THAT SOME DOCUMENTS BE RETURNED TO THE SOLICITOR AND SOME BE RETAINED BY THE LAW SOCIETY	382

C HOW, FOR NEARLY 50 YEARS, THE LAW SOCIETY HAS BAMBOOZLED, DUPED AND DECEIVED PARLIAMENT, THE HIGH COURT, COURT OF APPEAL, SUPREME COURT AND THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

1 PARLIAMENTARY PROCESSES

1)	HOW THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS WORKS	383-386
2)	CONSOLIDATION ACTS	387

C2 (1) THE 1974 ACT

2 THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974, THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1985 AND THE DISCHARGE OF COUNCIL'S FUNCTIONS AND DELEGATION

- 1) THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 AS ENACTED
 - a) THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
 - i) THE DEBATES IN FULL AND PROGRESS OF BILL 388
 - ii) THE DEBATES WHERE SPECIFIC TO INTERVENTION
 - 1) 10 FEB 1972 FIRST PRESENTATION 388-392
 - 2) 21 DEC 1972 SECOND PRESENTATION 392
 - 3) 04 DEC 1973 THIRD PRESENTATION 393
 - 4) 09 APR 1974 FOURTH PRESENTATION 394
 - iii) COMMENTS (IF ANY) CONCERNING THE MEANING OF SCHEDULE 1 395
 - b) GOVERNING PROVISIONS
 - i) 1974 ACT S. 15 395
 - ii) 1974 ACT S. 35 395
 - iii) 1974 ACT S. 36 396-397
 - iv) SCHEDULE 1 PART 1 CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE LAW SOCIETY MAY INTERVENE 398-399
 - v) SCHEDULE 1 PART II POWERS EXERCISEABLE ON INTERVENTION 400-403
 - vi) SCHEDULE 2 THE COMPENSATION FUND 404
 - c) SUMMARY OF THE 1974 ACT GROUNDS 405-406
- 2) THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 AS AT 2005
 - a) ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1985 CLAUSE 2 s. 44B POWER TO EXAMINE FILES 407
 - b) THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ON S44B AND THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS 407-409
 - c) DIAGRAM SHOWING CHANGES TO THE INTERVENTION PROCEDURE INTRODUCED BY S44B 410-411

3 HOW THE LAW SOCIETY EXPLOITED OF PARLIAMENT'S CONFUSION AND IGNORANCE

- 1) DID PARLIAMENT EVEN UNDERSTAND WHAT AN INTERVENTION WAS, AND HOW IT TOOK PLACE?
 - a) WHAT 'TO INTERVENE' AND 'INTERVENTION' MEANS 412-413
 - b) HOW PARLIAMENT USES THE TERM 414-417
- 2) HAS PARLIAMENT ACTUALLY EVER DELIBERATED OR DEBATED THE INTERVENTION PROCEDURE OTHER THAN IN RELATION TO DOCUMENTS?

a)	WHAT PARLIAMENT HAS SAID ABOUT GROUNDS IN THE DEBATES FROM 1939- 1974	
i)	1974 ACT	
1)	FIRST PRESENTATION 10 FEB 1972	417
2)	THIRD PRESENTATION 04 DEC 1973	417
b)	WHAT PARLIAMENT HAS SAID ABOUT DOCUMENT PRODUCTION IN THE DEBATES FROM 1939- 1974	
i)	1941 ACT	
1)	SECOND PRESENTATION 10 JUNE 1940	418-419
2)	THIRD PRESENTATION 01 APR 1941	419
ii)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	420-452
iii)	1974 ACT.	
1)	SECOND PRESENTATION 06 FEB 1973	452-453
2)	THIRD PRESENTATION 22 JAN 1974	453-455
c)	WHAT PARLIAMENT HAS SAID ABOUT THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER IN THE DEBATES FROM 1939- 1974	
i)	1957 ACT. THIRD PRESENTATION 19 DEC 1955	456
ii)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	456
iii)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	456
iv)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	457
d)	WHAT PARLIAMENT HAS SAID ABOUT MAIL REDELIVERY IN THE DEBATES FROM 1940- 1974	
i)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	457-458
ii)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	458-459
e)	WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION	
i)	1965 ACT. SECOND PRESENTATION 02 JUL 1965	459
f)	WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION	
i)	FIRST PRESENTATION 02 MAR 1972	459-460
3)	PARLIAMENT OBLIVIOUS OF THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION	
a)	FIRST PRESENTATION 10 FEB 1972	460-464
b)	SECOND PRESENTATION 21 DEC 1972	464-466
c)	THIRD PRESENTATION 04 DEC 1973	466

d)	FOURTH PRESENTATION 09 APR 1974	466-468
4)	WAS PARLIAMENT AWARE THAT THE GROUNDS HAVE CHANGED SINCE 1941?	
a)	1941 ACT, 1957 ACT, 1965 ACT AND 1974 ACT GROUNDS COMPARED	468-469
b)	THE PERCEPTION THAT INTERVENTIONS ARE RARE SHOWS THAT PARLIAMENT DID NOT REALISE THAT THE 1941 ACT GROUNDS HAD CHANGED	470-473
c)	WHY WOULD PARLIAMENT ALLOW A MENTALLY ILL, DECEASED OR DILATORY SOLICITOR TO FACE THE SAME DEVASTATING OUTCOME AS A DISHONEST ONE?	474
e)	IF PARLIAMENT HAD KNOWN ABOUT THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IT WOULD HAVE SCRAPPED THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL	474
5)	DID PARLIAMENT UNDERSTAND WHAT AN INTERVENTION WAS?	
a)	IF PARLIAMENT CONSIDERED THE MERE SEIZURE OF THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS TO EXAMINE TO BE 'DRACONIAN', DOES THAT MEAN THAT THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE AND HIS PROFESSIONAL LIFE WOULD BE 'MORE DRACONIAN'?	474-480
b)	PARLIAMENT THINKS THAT INTERVENTION IS THE POWER 'TO LOOK INTO THE SOLICITOR'S AFFAIRS'	480
c)	LORD HAILSHAM'S 'GREAT PROVISION' IS THE INTRODUCTION OF INSURANCE FOR NEGLIGENCE, NOT THE INTRODUCTION OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION	480-481
d)	WHY DOESN'T LORD DENNING SAY THAT A SOLICITOR WHO HAS STOLEN MONEY SHOULD BE INTERVENED INTO ?	481
e)	IF PARLIAMENT HAD KNOWN ABOUT THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IT WOULD HAVE SCRAPPED THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL	481
6)	IN 1974, PARLIAMENT BELIEVED THAT IT WAS REENACTING THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	
a)	MATERIALS	
i)	DIAGRAMS	
1)	LEGEND	481-482
2)	THE 1941 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	483
3)	THE 1957 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	484
4)	THE 1965 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	485
5)	VERSION 2 OF THE 1974 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE: THE PROCEDURE WHICH APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN ENACTED	486
ii)	TABLES	
1)	LEGEND	487

C3 (6) DID PARLIAMENT THINK IT WAS REINACTING THE 1965 ACT?

2)	SUMMARY OF THE 1941 ACT GROUNDS	487
3)	SUMMARY OF THE 1957 ACT GROUNDS	487
4)	SUMMARY OF THE 1965 ACT GROUNDS	488
5)	SUMMARY OF THE 1974 ACT GROUNDS	489
6)	HOW THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED FUNDS ARE CONTROLLED	490-491
7)	AVAILABILITY OF FREEZING ORDER AND OR VESTING RESOLUTION UNDER 1965 AND 1974 ACTS	492
8)	AVAILABILITY OF FREEZING ORDER AND OR VESTING RESOLUTION UNDER 1965 AND 1974 ACTS	493
9)	1941 ACT, 1957 ACT, 1956 ACT AND 1974 ACT GROUNDS COMPARED	494
10)	1941 ACT, 1957 ACT, 1956 ACT AND 1974 ACT GROUNDS COMPARED	495-499
iii)	DOCUMENTS	
1)	PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION	500-501
2)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK	502
b)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES SHOWING THAT PARLIAMENT THOUGHT IT WAS REENACTING EXISTING LAW AS CONSOLIDATED LEGISLATION	503-505
c)	THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS AND THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	
i)	GROUND 1 DISHONESTY BY SOLICITOR ETC .REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE CHANGED TO REASON TO SUSPECT'	505
ii)	GROUND 1 SATISFACTION OF DISHONESTY PRECONDITION REMOVED FROM STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER APPLICATION	506
iii)	GROUND 1 DISHONESTY BY PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE. REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE CHANGED TO REASON TO SUSPECT'	506
iv)	GROUND 1 DISHONESTY BY PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER CAN NOW BE MADE.	507
v)	GROUND 2 UNDUE DELAY BY PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE. REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE CHANGED TO 'IF THE COUNCIL CONSIDERS'	507-508
vi)	GROUND 3. BREACH OF RULES INTRODUCED AS NEW INTERVENTION GROUND	508
vii)	GROUND 4. DELAY AND RISK TO MONEY NO LONGER A FACTOR IN BANKRUPTCY CASES	508-509
viii)	GROUND 4. STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER CAN NOW BE MADE IN BANKRUPTCY CASES	509

C3 (6) DID PARLIAMENT THINK IT WAS REINACTING THE 1965 ACT ?

ix)	GROUND 5. COMMITTAL TO PRISON INTRODUCED AS NEW INTERVENTION GROUND	510
x)	GROUND 6. DELAY AND RISK TO MONEY NO LONGER A FACTOR IN MENTAL HEALTH ACT CASES	510-511
xi)	GROUND 6. STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER CAN NOW BE MADE IN MENTAL HEALTH ACT CASES	511
xii)	GROUND 7. STRUCK OFF SOLICITOR CAN NO LONGER SELL PRACTICE	511-512
xiii)	GROUND 8. IN UNDUE DELAY CASES, LAW SOCIETY CAN OBTAIN CONTROL OF ALL MONEY NOT JUST MONEY PERTAINING TO COMPLAINT	512-515
xiv)	1974 VESTING RESOLUTION NOW 'FREEZES' ALL MONEY IN DELAY CASES NOT JUST MONEY RELATING TO COMPLAINT	515
xv)	1974 VESTING RESOLUTION NOW 'FREEZES' OFFICE MONEY IN GROUND 4 BANKRUPTCY CASES	516
xvi)	1974 VESTING RESOLUTION NOW 'FREEZES' MONEY IN GROUND 4 MENTAL HEALTH ACT CASES	517
xvii)	1974 VESTING RESOLUTION NOW IMMEDIATELY 'FREEZES' MONEY IN GROUND 7 STRUCK OFF SOLICITOR CASES	517-518
xviii)	SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS CAN EFFECTIVELY BE FROZEN UNDER ALL GROUNDS SAVE FOR GROUND 8	515-519
xix)	BENEFICIAL OWNER'S CONSENT NO LONGER NEEDED FOR LAW SOCIETY TO WITHDRAW MONEY	519
xx)	COURT ORDER NO LONGER NEEDED FOR LAW SOCIETY TO WITHDRAW MONEY WHERE BENEFICIAL OWNER WAS UNKNOWN	520
xxi)	DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION PROCEDURE. REQUIREMENT FOR PARTICULARS OF DOCUMENTS TO BE GIVEN REMOVED	520
d)	THE CONFLICTS AND INCONSISTENCIES IN THE 1965 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE WHICH PARLIAMENT FAILED TO SEE	
i)	WAS THE PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT PRODUCTION TO ENABLE THE LAW SOCIETY TO EXAMINE THEM OR TO KEEP THEM?	
1)	TABLES	
a)	TABLE SHOWNG WHETHER THE GROUND REQUIRES INVESTIGATION	521-522
b)	TABLE SHOWING THE ROUTE TO OBTAIN DOCUMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO THE GROUND (1965 ACT)	523-524
c)	TABLE SHOWING THE ROUTE TO OBTAIN DOCUMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO THE GROUND (1974 ACT)	525-526

C3 (6) DID PARLIAMENT THINK IT WAS REINACTING THE 1965 ACT?

2)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES	527-530
3)	PARLIAMENT'S CONFUSION ABOUT DOCUMENT PRODUCTION	531
ii)	HOW THE PROVISIONS COULD BE MANIPULATED TO DEPRIVE THE SOLICITOR OF HIS RIGHT TO ANY SUBSTANTIVE TRIAL	532-533
iii)	WHY DID PARLIAMENT CONFINE THE DEBATE TO SCHEDULE 1 PARA. 3 SERVICE OF THE DOCUMENTS LIST?	533
iv)	DID PARLIAMENT UNDERSTAND THAT THE GROUNDS HAD CHANGED?	534
v)	A STRUCK OFF SOLICITOR HAS 21 DAYS TO SELL HIS PRACTICE, BUT A SOLICITOR WHOM THE LAW SOCIETY HAS REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE HAS BEEN DISHONEST DOES NOT HAVE THAT RIGHT	535-536
vi)	THE GROUND 3 PROCEDURE ONLY CONCERNED 'CERTAIN MONEY AND CERTAIN DOCUMENTS'. DOES THAT MEAN THAT AN INTERVENTION DID NOT MEAN THE SAME THING IN EVERY CASE?	536
vii)	THE GROUND 3 PROVISIONS SHOW THAT PARLIAMENT DID NOT UNDERSTAND ANYTHING ABOUT SOLICITORS BANKING PRACTICES	536-537
viii)	WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THE OWNER DID NOT CONSENT TO TRANSFER OF MONEY UNDER THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE?	538
ix)	PARLIAMENT CONTEMPLATED THAT ON THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION ,THE COURT COULD ORDER THAT SOME DOCUMENTS BE RETURNED TO THE SOLICITOR AND SOME BE RETAINED BY THE LAW SOCIETY	538
x)	THE 1965 NON VESTING RESOLUTION SHOWS THAT PARLIAMENT THOUGHT THAT PART OF A BANK ACCOUNT CAN BE FROZEN AND REST CAN REMAIN UNFROZEN	539
xi)	THE 1965 NON VESTING RESOLUTION SHOWS THAT PARLIAMENT THOUGHT THAT SOLICITORS HELD CLIENTS MONEY IN INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTS	540
xii)	THE PRESUMPTION OF THE SOLICITOR'S GUILT MISPLACED IN NON DISHONESTY BASED GROUNDS	540-541

4 MATERIALS RELEVANT TO SECTION 5

1)	DIAGRAMS	
a)	LEGEND	542
b)	THE 1941 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	543
c)	THE 1957 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	544
d)	THE 1965 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	545

C4 MATERIALS

e)	VERSION 1 OF THE 1974 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE: THE PROCEDURE WHICH PARLIAMENT INTENDED TO ENACT AND WHICH , IN FACT, IS ENACTED	546
f)	VERSION 2 OF THE 1974 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE: THE PROCEDURE WHICH APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN ENACTED	547
g)	VERSION 3 OF THE 1974 ACT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE: THE PROCEDURE THE LAW SOCIETY PRETENDS HAS BEEN ENACTED	548
h)	THE 1974 ACT INTERVENTION PROVISIONS AS AT 2005 : THE PROCEDURE AS AMENDED BY S. 44B	549
i)	1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	550
j)	1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 1	551
k)	1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 2	552
l)	1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 3	553
m)	DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW VERSION 1 EVOLVED FROM 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	554
n)	DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW VERSION 2 EVOLVED FROM 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	555
o)	DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW VERSION 3 EVOLVED FROM 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	556
p)	THE 1941 ACT. FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND SEIZING OF DOCUMENTS BY COURT ORDER	557
q)	THE 1957 ACT. FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND SEIZING OF DOCUMENTS BY COURT ORDER	558
r))	THE 1965 ACT. FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND SEIZING OF DOCUMENTS BY COURT ORDER	559
s)	THE 1974 ACT (VERSION 2) FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND SEIZING OF DOCUMENTS BY COURT ORDER	560
t)	1974 ACT . THE FREEZING AND TRANSFER OF MONEY AND SEIZING OF DOCUMENTS ACCORDING TO THE LAW SOCIETY	561

2) TABLES

a)	ABBREVIATIONS FOR THE 1965 ACT GROUNDS	562-563
b)	ABBREVIATIONS FOR THE 1974 ACT GROUNDS	565
c)	LEGEND	565
d)	SUMMARY OF THE 1965 ACT GROUNDS	566
e)	SUMMARY OF THE 1974 ACT GROUNDS	567
f)	TABLE SHOWING HOW THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED FUNDS ARE CONTROLLED	568-569

C4 MATERIALS

g)	TABLE SHOWING WHAT MONEY IS CONTROLLED	570
h)	TABLE SHOWING WHETHER FREEZING ORDER OR VESTING RESOLUTION WAS AVAILABLE	571
i)	WHETHER THE TEST FOR INTERVENTION IS SUBJECTIVE OR OBJECTIVE COMPARED	572
j)	TABLE SHOWING WHETHER THE GROUND REQUIRES INVESTIGATION	573
k)	A TABLE SHOWING THE ROUTE TO OBTAIN CONTROL OF MONEY AND DOCUMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO THE GROUND 1965 ACT	574- 575
l)	A TABLE SHOWING THE ROUTE TO OBTAIN CONTROL OF MONEY AND DOCUMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO THE GROUND 1974 ACT	576-577
m)	THE 1941 ACT GROUND, THE 1957 ACT GROUND, THE 1956 ACT GROUNDS AND THE 1974 ACT GROUNDS COMPARED	578
o)	1965 ACT GROUNDS AND THE 1974 ACT GROUNDS COMPARED	578-583
3)	DOCUMENTS	
a)	PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION	584-585
b)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK	586
c)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY	587-588
d)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY (ANNOTATED)	589-590
e)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK (ADAPTED)	591
f)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY (ADAPTED)	592-593
g)	LAW SOCIETY'S COVERING LETTER TO SOLICITOR	594-595
h)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO SOLICITOR	596
4)	SOLICITORS ACTS, ASSOCIATED LEGISLATION AND MATERIALS	
a)	1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	597-600
b)	1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARTS 1 AND 2 (AS ENACTED)	601-604
c)	DISCHARGE OF COUNCIL'S FUNCTIONS AND DELEGATION	
1)	THE CHARTER OF THE SOCIETY (1845)	604-605
2)	1932 ACT S. 74 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF LAW SOCIETY AND S.81 DEFINITION OF COUNCIL	605
3)	1941 ACT S. 28 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY S.29 INTERPRETATION	605-606

C4 MATERIALS

4)	1957 ACT S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES, S.80 POWER TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY, S.86 INTERPRETATION	606-607
5)	1965 ACT S.80 AMENDMENT OF S.80 OF PRINCIPAL ACT S.28 INTERPRETATION	607
6)	1974 ACT AS ENACTED S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES S.80 POWERS TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY,	608
7)	1974 ACT AS AT <u>ANAL SHEIKH V LAW SOCIETY HIGH COURT (2005)</u>	609-610
d)	LAW SOCIETY COUNCIL COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FROM 16 MAR 1972- 23 JUL 1974	611-634
e)	APPENDIX . COMMENTS ON THE AMENDMENTS	635-644
5)	CRIMINAL LAW	
a)	THEFT ACT 1968 S. 1 (THEFT) S.8 (ROBBERY) S.9 (BURGLARY) S.17 (FALSE ACCOUNTING) S.20 (SUPPRESSION) S.21 (BLACKMAIL) S. 22 (HANDLING STOLEN GOODS)	645-648
b)	FRAUD ACT 2006 S. 2 (FALSE REPRESENTATION) S. 3 (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION) S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION)	648-650
c)	MONEY LAUNDERING AND PROCEEDS OF CRIME 2002	651-660
d)	SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015	660-661
e)	CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD	661-662
f)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	662-665
g)	ABUSE OF PROCESS	665-666
h)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	666
i)	POSTAL SERVICES ACT 2000	666
j)	SOLICITOR'S ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 9 (8)	666
k)	SOLICITOR'S ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (6)	666
6)	BANKING LAW AND PRACTICE	
a)	THE RELATIONSHIP AND CONTRACT BETWEEN THE BANK AND THE CUSTOMER	666-667
b)	UNAUTHORISED PAYMENTS	668
c)	CURRENT ACCOUNTS	669
d)	INTERFERENCE BY THIRD PARTIES	670
e)	SOLICITOR ACCOUNTS	670-671
f)	LIMITATION OF ACTIONS – CREDIT BALANCES	671

7) HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

- a) EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS
 - i) ART. 1 PROTOCOL 1 PROTECTION OF PROPERTY 671
- b) HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1988
 - i) S. 6 ACTS OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY 672-675

5 SINCE 1974 JUDGES HAVE BEEN DETERMINING THE WRONG APPLICATION WITH THE WRONG WORDING MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURE IN INTERVENTIONS WHICH HAVE NEVER TAKEN PLACE UNDER PROVISIONS WHICH PARLIAMENT HAS NOT KNOWINGLY ENACTED

1) THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE AND THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

a) PRELIMINARY MATTERS

- i) SUBSTANTIVE AND NON SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS
 - 1) WHAT ARE SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS 676-677
 - 2) WHAT ARE NON SUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS 677
- ii) THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS OF THE 1974 ACT
 - 1) THE SUBSTANTIVE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES
 - a) PARA 5 (1) THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER APPLICATION 677
 - b) PARA 9 (4) THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION ORDER APPLICATION 678
 - c) PARA 10 (1) THE MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER APPLICATION 678
 - 2) THE NON SUBSTANTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES
 - a) PARA 9 (7) SERVICE OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S DOCUMENTS LIST 678
 - b) PARA 9 (8) THE DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION 679
 - c) PARA 9 (10) THE DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION APPLICATION 679
 - d) PARA 9 (11) THE MAKING OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER (DOCUMENTS) 679
 - e) PARA 6 (1) THE ISSUING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION 679
 - f) PARA 6 (2) VESTING RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY 680

C5 (1) LAWFUL VS FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

g)	PARA 6 (3) THE SERVICE OF (1) CERTIFIED COPY OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION AND (2) THE NOTICE TO SOLICITOR AND PARA 6 (3) THIRD PARTIES PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT	680
h)	PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL OF THE NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT APPLICATION	680-681
i)	PARA 6 (5) THE MAKING OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER (MONEY)	681
3)	NO PROCEDURE FOR PARA 7 (1) POSSESSION OF MONEY	681
4)	CRIMINAL PROVISIONS	
a)	PARA 6 (6) TRANSFER OF VESTING RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY	681
b)	PARA 9 (3) FAILURE TO MAKE VOLUNTARY DOCUMENT PRODUCTION WHERE PARA 9 (4) APPLICATION NOT MADE	681-682
b)	THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
i)	THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION ISSUED TO START INTERVENTION	682-683
ii)	INTERVENTION STARTS WITH THE LAW SOCIETY'S SUBSTANTIVE CLAIMS MADE IN THE HIGH COURT	
1)	PARA 9 (4) THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION ORDER APPLICATION	684
2)	PARA 5 (1) THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER APPLICATION	685
3)	PARA 10 (1) THE MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER APPLICATION	686
iii)	SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS HIS DEFENCE IN THE HIGH COURT PROCEEDINGS	687
iv)	ORDERS MADE ON FAILED INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	687
v)	PARA 9 (8) DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION BY THE SOLICITOR AND PARA 9 (7) THIRD PARTIES WHERE INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS LOST	687-688
vi)	THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
1)	A PROCEDURE CONCERNED WITH INTERVENTION MONEY NOT THE INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	688-689
2)	WHEN THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE APPLIES	
a)	TABLE SHOWING GROUNDS IN WHICH THE FREEZING ORDER PROCEDURE APPLIES	689-690
b)	DIAGRAM SHOWING APPLICATION OF VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	691

C5 (1) LAWFUL VS FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

c)	MONEY SUBJECT TO THIRD PARTY INTERESTS	692
d)	MIXED MONEY	692-693
e)	LATER DISCOVERED MONEY	693
3)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE CONTEMPLATES MULTIPLE PARTIES MAKING REPEATED PARA 6(4) APPLICATIONS AFTER THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE HAS CLOSED DOWN	694-695
4)	DIAGRAM SHOWING THE USE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN RELATION TO MONEY	695
vii)	SERVICE OF PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION AND PARA 6(3) THIRD PARTIES PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT COULD BE A MERE LETTER	696-698
viii)	THE HEARING OF THE PARA 6 (4) APPLICATION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF PARA 6 (3) NOTICE TO THIRD PARTY PROHIBITING PAYMENT	698-699
ix)	THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION NOT 'WITHDRAWN' ON A SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	700
x)	TRANSFER OF MONEY	
1)	THE TRANSFER OF MONEY IN SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS	700
2)	THE TRANSFER OF MONEY AFTER SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	700-701
3)	WHY THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE MEANS IT HAS TO USE FRAUD TO OBTAIN THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE MONEY	702-704
c)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
i)	INTERVENTION STARTS AND ENDS WITH THE PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION OR A MERE LETTER	705-706
ii)	THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS BY WAY OF THE NON SUBSTANTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES	
1)	PARA 6 (4) VESTING RESOLUTION WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION	707
2)	PARA 9(8) THE DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION	708
iii)	THE WRONG APPLICATIONS MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURES	
1)	PARA 6(3) AND PARA 6(4)	709
2)	PARA 9(7) AND PARA 9(8)	710
iv)	SUMMARY	711
d)	WHY IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THE PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION AND THE PARA 9(8) RECOVERY OF DOCUMENTS APPLICATION ARE THE WRONG PROCEDURES FOR THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	

C5 (1) LAWFUL VS FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

i)	DOCUMENTS	
1)	PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION	711-713
2)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK	714
3)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY	715-716
4)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY (ANNOTATED)	717-718
5)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK (ADAPTED)	719
6)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY (ADAPTED)	720-721
ii)	HOW WOULD THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE SOLICITOR BE KNOWN ?	
1)	THE PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION	
a)	THE SOLICITOR	722-726
b)	THE PARA 6 (3) THIRD PARTIES	726
2)	THE PARA 9 (8) DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION	
a)	THE SOLICITOR	726-727
b)	THE PARA 9 (7) THIRD PARTIES	727
iii)	WHY WOULD A THIRD PARTY GO TO THE TROUBLE AND EXPENSE OF CHALLENGING THE INTERVENTION?	727
iv)	THE APPLICATION OF CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE PART 67.4	727-728
v)	HOW CAN SIMULTANEITY BE ACHIEVED?	729-732
vi)	PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION DOES NOT DISPOSE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION ONLY THE PARA 6(3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT	732
vii)	NO PROVISION FOR THE TRANSFER OF MONEY UNDER THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	733
viii)	SUBSTANTIVE HEARING HAS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE SO WHAT IS THERE TO CHALLENGE AT THE PARA 6(4) HEARING?	733-734
ix)	WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION HAS NO EQUIVALENT PROCEDURE	735
x)	IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE SOLICITOR TO MAKE HIS CHALLENGE IN A PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION WHETHER IN THE FORM OF THIS ANALYSIS OR AT ALL IN 8 DAYS	736
xi)	IT IS THE ACTUAL CHARGE OR THE INDICTMENT WHICH IS DEFENDED, NOT THE DECISION TO PREFER THE CHARGE OR INDICTMENT.	736-737

C5 (1) LAWFUL VS FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

xii)	HOW CAN CIRCUMSTANCES BE CHALLENGED?	738
xiii)	HOW CAN A (COMPANY) RESOLUTION TO DO SOMETHING BE WITHDRAWN ?	738
xiv)	BASED ON VERSION 3, THE LAW SOCIETY'S FICTITIOUS VERSION OF SCHEDULE 1	738
xv)	THE VESTING RESOLUTION, AN INSTRUMENT WITH MORE APPARENT POWER AND AUTHORITY THAN A HIGH COURT ORDER, IS CREATED BY AN UNKNOWN PROCEDURE BY UNKNOWN PERSONS	738-739
xvi)	TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND MAIL REDIRECTION CAN ONLY BE DONE UNLAWFULLY AND CRIMINALLY	740
e) DIAGRAMS AND TABLES		
i)	DIAGRAM SHOWING APPLICATION OF VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE IN RELATION TO MONEY	740-741
ii)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 2	742
iii)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 3	743
iv)	TABLE ILLUSTRATING VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE WITH REFERENCE TO GROUNDS	744-745
v)	TABLE SHOWING ISSUES DEALT WITH AT SUBSTANTIVE HEARINGS AND AT PARA 6 (4) HEARINGS	746
f) THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE		
i)	VIOLATION OF DICEY'S FIRST PRINCIPLE	
1)	WHAT THE PRINCIPLE 'NO MAN CAN BE PUNISHED EXCEPT FOR A DISTINCT BREACH OF THE LAW ESTABLISHED IN THE ORDINARY LEGAL MANNER BEFORE THE ORDINARY COURTS OF THE LAND' MEANS	747-748
2)	GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC AND HODGE MALEK KC PERMITTED TO GUESS WHAT THE ALLEGATIONS MIGHT HAVE BEEN OR TO MAKE THEM UP	749
3)	THE PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION AND THE TWO STAGE APPROACH GOES BEYOND A REVERSE BURDEN OF PROOF: THE SOLICITOR HAS TO PROVE NEGATIVES	749-751
ii)	STATUTORY VIOLATIONS GO UNCHALLENGED UNDER THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT PROCEDURE	751
iii)	DISREGARD OF THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS WHOLESAL, A DENIAL OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF PARLIAMENT AND AN ATTACK ON DEMOCRACY	751
iv)	TREASON	751

g)	THE CRIMINAL OFFENCES COMMITTED BY THE LAW SOCIETY IN THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
i)	THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY TRANSFERRED BY FRAUD	
	1)	TRANSFER IN VIOLATION OF PARA 6 (6) 752-755
	2)	TRANSFER IN VIOLATION OF FUNDAMENTAL LEGAL PRINCIPLES
	a)	THE PRINCIPLE OF LEGAL CERTAINTY 755
	b)	BANKING LAW 755-756
	c)	HUMAN RIGHTS LAW 757-758
	3)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES
	a)	PARA 6 (6) OFFENCE . CONSPIRACY AIDING, ABETTING AND ENCOURAGING OFFENCE. SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015 S. 45 758
	b)	FRAUD ACT 2006 . S. 2 (FALSE REPRESENTATION) S. 3 (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION) S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION) 758
	c)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE ABUSE OF PROCESS 758
	d)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE 758
ii)	THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS PROCURED BY THREATS, BLACKMAIL AND FRAUD	
	1)	DURESS 758
	2)	BLACKMAIL BY THE THREAT OF PARA 9 (1) CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS 759-760
	3)	THE THREAT OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IS A FALSE STATEMENT 760-762
	4)	BLACKMAIL BY THE THREAT OF COSTS 762
	5)	THE THREAT OF COSTS IS A FALSE STATEMENT 762
	6)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES
	a)	FRAUD ACT 2006 . S. 2 (FALSE REPRESENTATION) S. 3 (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION) S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION) 762
	b)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE ABUSE OF PROCESS 763
	c)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE 763
iii)	THE SOLICITOR'S MAIL REDIRECTED USING DURESS	
	1)	PARA 10 (1) APPLICATION FOR MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER 763

C5 (1) **LAWFUL VS FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE**

2)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE DOES NOT APPLY TO MAIL	763
3)	LAW SOCIETY USES DURESS TO OBTAIN THE SOLICITOR'S CONSENT TO MAIL REDELIVERY	763
4)	LAW SOCIETY'S VIOLATION OF STATUTE	
a)	MAIL REDELIVERY PROCEDURE DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR SOLICITOR'S CONSENT	763
b)	CONSENT FORCED FROM SOLICITOR GIVEN WITHOUT LIMIT OF TIME	764
5)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	
a)	S.84 POSTAL SERVICES ACT 2000	764
b)	THEFT OF SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MAIL AND DATA	764
c)	FRAUD ACT 2006 . S. 2 (FALSE REPRESENTATION) S. 3 (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION) S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION)	764
d)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE ABUSE OF PROCESS	764
e)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	764-765
h)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES AND THE VESTING RESOLUTION	765-768
i)	CASES IN WHICH JUDGES HAVE DETERMINED THE WRONGLY WORDED APPLICATIONS MADE UNDER THE WRONG PROCEDURES IN INTERVENTIONS WHICH HAVE NEVER LAWFULLY TAKEN PLACE	
i)	<u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY [2005]</u> (GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC, HODGE MALEK KC, ANDREW PEEBLES KC, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, HUGO PAGE KC. JONATHAN HARVIE KC, PHILIP ENGELMAN, RADCLIFFES)	768-772
ii)	<u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY [2005]</u> (CA AND HL) (GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, RADCLIFFES HUGO PAGE KC. JONATHAN HARVIE KC, PHILIP ENGELMANM CHARLES BUCKLEY)	773-774
iii)	<u>CHARLES BUCKLEY V THE LAW SOCIETY (1984)</u>	774
iv)	<u>DOOLEY V THE LAW SOCIETY 2000</u> (UNREPORTED)	774
v)	<u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (HC) TIMOTHY DUTTON QC AND PHILIP ENGELMAN	774-779
vi)	<u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (CA) TIMOTHY DUTTON QC, NICHOLAS PEACOCK , PHILIP ENGELMAN AND ROGER PEZZANI	780-783
vii)	<u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2003]</u> (SC) TIMOTHY DUTTON QC, NICHOLAS PEACOCK , PHILIP ENGELMAN AND ROGER PEZZANI	783-789
viii)	<u>LAW SOCIETY V BALDWIN [2004]</u>	790-791

C5 (2) VERSION 1 OF SCHEDULE 1

ix)	<u>PATHANIA PS & ORS V LAW SOCIETY [2004]</u> PHILP ENGELMAN, BOWER COTTON BOWER, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC. RUSSELL COOKE	791
x)	<u>SRITHARAN AND ANR V THE LAW SOCIETY [2004]</u> (HC) MANJIT GILL KC, KENNETH HAMER KC	791
xi)	<u>SRITHARAN AND ANR V THE LAW SOCIETY [2006]</u> (CA) MANJIT GILL KC, KENNETH HAMER KC GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC NICHOLAS PEACOCK KC	792-793
xii)	<u>SIMMS & ORS V THE LAW SOCIETY [2005]</u> (CA) TIMOTHY DUTTON KC. RUSSELL COOKE	794
xiii)	<u>GAUNTLETT V THE LAW SOCIETY [2006]</u> NICHOLAS PEACOCK	794-795
xiv)	<u>HERBERT & ORS V THE LAW SOCIETY [2007]</u> TIMOTHY DUTTON QC , RUSSELL COOKE	795
xv)	<u>LAW SOCIETY V ELSDEN & ORS [2015]</u> TIMOTHY DUTTON QC, ANDREW PEEBLES, JEREMY BARNETT	796-798
xvi)	<u>RAMASMY V THE LAW SOCIETY [2016]</u> JEREMY BARNETT	798
xvii)	<u>BLAVO V THE LAW SOCIETY [2017]</u>	799-801
xviii)	<u>NEUMANS LLP V THE LAW SOCIETY [2017]</u> RADCLIFFES	801-804

2) THE VERSION OF SCHEDULE 1 PARLIAMENT INTENDED TO ENACT IN 1974 AND HAS ENACTED (VERSION 1)

a) PARLIAMENT INTENDED TO REENACT THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1

i)	HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT BILL	805
ii)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES SHOWING THAT PARLIAMENT BELIEVED IT WAS REENACTING THE EXISTING LAW AS CONSOLIDATED LEGISLATOR	805-808
iii)	NO MENTION IN THE LAW SOCIETY'S LAW SOCIETY COUNCIL COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FROM 16 MAR 1972- 23 JUL 1974 OR IN THE AMENDMENTS	808

b) 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 AND 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 COMPARED

i)	GROUNDS	810-811
ii)	POWERS	812-816

c) THE THREE DIFFERENCES

i)	OMISSION OF 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 9 (THE PROVISION THAT THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE TOOK EFFECT AFTER THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION PROCEDURE HAD BEEN CONCLUDED)	817
ii)	OMISSION OF 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 12- PARA 13 (THE PROVISION FOR THE TRANSFER OF MONEY WITH CONSENT)	817-818

C5 (2) VERSION 1 OF SCHEDULE 1

iii)	1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 10 TAKING CONTROL OF MONEY TO 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 6 (1) VESTING OF MONEY	818
d)	WHAT THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 WOULD LOOK LIKE AS VERSION 1	819-822
e)	DIAGRAMS	
i)	1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	823
ii)	1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS (VERSION 1)	824
f)	HOW VERSION 1 WORKS	
i)	GROUNDS	
	1) 'REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE' CHANGED TO 'REASON TO SUSPECT'	825-827
	2) THE INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION (AS DISTINCT FROM THE VESTING RESOLUTION)	827
	3) REMOVAL OF SATISFACTION OF DISHONESTY TEST	828
ii)	THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION PROCEDURE THE SAME UNDER THE 1965 AND 1974 ACT	828-830
iii)	THE HISTORY OF THE RECOVERY OF DOCUMENTS APPLICATION	
	1) 1941 ACT	
	a) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA 4(5)	830
	b) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID	831
	2) 1957 ACT	
	a) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA (5)	831
	b) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID	832
	3) 1965 ACT	
	a) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA (5)	832
	b) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID	833-859
	4) 1974 ACT (AS ENACTED)	
	a) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA 9 (8)	860
	b) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID	861-863
iv)	STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER PROCEDURE	
	1) AVAILABILITY OF FREEZING ORDER AND UNDER 1965 AND 1974 ACTS	863
	2) STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER PROCEDURE THE SAME UNDER 1965 AND 1974 ACTS	

	a)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S APPLICATION FOR A STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER	864-865
	b)	THE SOLICITOR'S SUBSTANTIVE CHALLENGE BY WAY OF A DEFENCE	865
	c)	TRANSFER OF MONEY	866
iv)		MAIL REDELIVERY PROCEDURE THE SAME UNDER 1965 AND 1974 ACTS	866
v)		THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING AND THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
	1)	ISSUING OF THE RESOLUTION TO CONTROL MONEY (THE NON VESTING/ VESTING RESOLUTION)	
	a)	THE 1965 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF PARA 9	867-868
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT ISSUING OF THE RESOLUTION TO CONTROL MONEY	868
		iii) THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION COULD BE IN A FORM A LETTER	869
		iv) WHY THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE WOULD BE USED, AND WHY	
		1) WHERE THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER DID NOT APPLY BECAUSE THE OFFICIAL RECEIVER, TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY ETC HAD AN INTEREST (GROUNDS 4,5, AND 6)	869-870
		2) WHERE THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER PROCEDURE COULD NOT APPLY (GROUND 3 NO EXPLANATION FOR DELAY)	870
		3) COULD THE LAW SOCIETY VOLITIONALLY USE THE NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE ?	870
		4) THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORDS 'EXCEPT WHERE THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 14 OF THE SOLICITOR'S ACT 1965 APPLY'	870-871
		5) ISSUED AFTER CONCLUSION OF THE SOLICITOR'S SUBSTANTIVE CHALLENGE IN THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION PROCEDURE	871
	b)	THE 1974 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF PARA 6 (1)	871-872
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT ISSUING OF THE RESOLUTION TO CONTROL MONEY	873

	iii)	WHEN THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE WOULD BE USED, AND WHY	873
2)		SERVICE OF THE NON VESTING/ VESTING RESOLUTION AND THE NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT	
	a)	THE 1965 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF PARA 10	873-874
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT SERVICE	875
	b)	THE 1974 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF PARA 6(3)	875-876
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT SERVICE	876
3)		APPLICATION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF THE NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT	
	a)	THE 1965 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA 9- PARA 13	876
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT PARA 11 APPLICATION	877
		iii) WHO WOULD MAKE THE PARA 11 APPLICATIONS.	877
		iv) MULTIPLE PARA 11 WITHDRAWAL APPLICATIONS CONTEMPLATED	877
		v) THE PURPOSE OF THE PARA 11 WITHDRAWAL APPLICATIONS	877
	b)	THE 1974 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA 6 (1) – PARA 6 (4)	877-878
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT THE PARA 6(4) APPLICATION	878
		iii) WHO WOULD MAKE THE PARA 6(4) APPLICATION	878
4)		TRANSFER OF MONEY UNDER THE NON VESTING/ VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
	a)	THE 1965 ACT	
		i) THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 PARA 12- PARA 13	879
		ii) WHAT PARLIAMENT SAID ABOUT TRANSFER OF MONEY	879

	iii)	HOW MONEY IS TRANSFERRED	
	1)	STAGE 1 PARA 13 (1) (A) . OBTAINING CONSENT FROM BENEFICIAL OWNER	880
	2)	STAGE 2 PARA 13 (1) EIGHT DAY NOTICE OF TRANSFER	880
	3)	STAGE 3 PARA 12. TRANSFER OF MONEY	880-881
	4)	COURT ORDER AUTHORISING TRANSFER MONEY WHERE OWNERSHIP NOT KNOWN	881
	b)	THE 1974 ACT. NO TRANSFER PROVISIONS AND NO REFERENCE TO THE TRANSFER OF MONEY IN 1974 ACT	881
	g)	DIAGRAMS	
	i)	1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	882-883
	ii)	1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE (VERSION 1)	884-885
	iii)	HOW VERSION 1 EVOLVED FROM THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	886
	h)	SUMMARY OF VERSION 1	887
3)		THE VERSION OF SCHEDULE 1 PARLIAMENT APPEARS TO HAVE ENACTED IN 1974 (VERSION 2)	
	a)	DIAGRAMS	
	i)	1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 2	888-889
	ii)	HOW VERSION 1 EVOLVED FROM THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	890
	iii)	HOW VERSION 2 EVOLVED FROM THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	891
	b)	THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VERSION 1 AND VERSION 2	
	i)	THE CONFLATING OF THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION AND VESTING RESOLUTION	892-893
	ii)	THE REPOSITIONING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	894
	iii)	ONLY ONE PART OF THE THREE STAGE PAYMENT OUT PROVISIONS OF THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE RETAINED IN THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	894
	iv)	THE CHANGE FROM 'TAKING CONTROL' TO 'VESTING'	894-895

c) HOW THE LAW SOCIETY USED THE AMENDMENTS TO DUPE PARLIAMENT		
i)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY THE OMISSION OF THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION	895
ii)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY MAKING THE VESTING RESOLUTION A STAND ALONE PROVISION	896
iii)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY THE POSITION OF PARA 6	896
iv)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY USE OF THE TERM 'VEST'	
1)	WHAT DOES 'VEST' MEAN	896
2)	HOW THE VESTING RESOLUTION WAS CREATED	896
3)	WHY THE VESTING' RESOLUTION CANNOT BE A FREEZING ORDER.	896
4)	WHY 'VEST' DOES NOT MEAN 'TRANSFER' AND WHY THE VESTING' RESOLUTION IS NOT A TRANSFER ORDER	896
d)	SUMMARY OF VERSION 2	896
4) VERSION 3. THE LAW SOCIETY'S FICTITIOUS VERSION OF SCHEDULE 1		
a) DIAGRAMS		
i)	THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE	897
ii)	THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE PARLIAMENT INTENDED TO ENACT AND WHICH IS ENACTED (VERSION 1)	898
iii)	THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE PARLIAMENT APPEARS TO HAVE ENACTED (VERSION 2)	899
iv)	THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE THE LAW SOCIETY PRETENDS PARLIAMENT HAS ENACTED (VERSION 3)	900
v)	THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE AS AT 2005	901
vi)	THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	902
vii)	THE VERSION 1 VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	903
viii)	THE VERSION 2 VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	904
ix)	THE VERSION 3 VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	905
x)	HOW VERSION 1 EVOLVED FROM THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	906
xi)	HOW VERSION 2 EVOLVED FROM THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	907
xii)	HOW VERSION 3 EVOLVED FROM THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1	908

b) DOCUMENTS		
i)	PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION	909-910
ii)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK	911
iii)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY	912-913
iv)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK (ADAPTED)	914
v)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY (ADAPTED)	915-916
vi)	PARA 6 (3) NOTICE TO SOLICITOR PROHIBITING PAYMENT	917
vii)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER OF INSTRUCTION TO SOLICITOR	918-919
c) THE LAW SOCIETY'S FICTITIOUS SCHEDULE 1		
i)	THE PARTS OF SCHEDULE 1 THE LAW SOCIETY DOES NOT ACKNOWLEDGE	920-924
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FICTITIOUS SCHEDULE 1	925-929
d) SCHEDULE 1 CRAFTED TO HOODWINK JUDGES INTO DECIDING THE WRONG ISSUES IN THE WRONG APPLICATION MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURE		
i)	<p>1) 'REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE' CHANGED TO 'REASON TO SUSPECT'</p> <p>a) PARLIAMENT'S REASON FOR THE CHANGE OF WORDING</p> <p>b) THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS FROM PARLIAMENT THAT 'REASON TO SUSPECT' MADE NO SENSE AFTER THE ENACTMENT OF S44B</p> <p>c) 'REASON TO SUSPECT' WORDING RETAINED TO CREATE BOGUS TWO STAGE PROCESS WHICH GUARANTEES THAT EVERY INTERVENTION CHALLENGE WILL FAIL</p> <p>i) WHAT IS THE TWO STAGE PROCESS AND WHY IT MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR CAN NEVER WIN</p> <p>ii) TWO STAGE PROCESS IS BASED ON TWO SEMANTIC MISCHIEFS</p> <p>1) 'REASON TO SUSPECT'</p> <p>2) 'INTERVENTION'</p> <p>3) THE COMBINED EFFECT OF 'REASON TO SUSPECT' AND 'INTERVENTION'</p>	<p>930-932</p> <p>932-934</p> <p>935-936</p> <p>936-938</p> <p>938-939</p> <p>939-941</p>

iii)	THE PRINCIPLE OF CERTAINTY IN ACCOUNTING PRACTICE DOES NOT APPLY UNDER THE TWO STAGE PROCESS : THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION.	941-943
iv)	TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THERE ARE NO ACTUAL OFFENCES UNDER SCHEDULE 1 GROUNDS 1,2,3 AND 8	944
v)	TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT WHETHER THE SOLICITOR IS GUILTY OF ANY OFFENCE UNDER GROUNDS 1,2,3 AND 8 IS NEVER CONSIDERED BY THE COURT	944
vi)	DIAGRAM COMPARING INTERVENTION PROCEDURES WITH CRIMINAL PROCEDURES	945
vii)	THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR IS NOT GUILTY OF ANY OFFENCE: HE IS GUILTY OF 'CIRCUMSTANCES'	946-951
ix)	THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT MUST DECIDE WHETHER CIRCUMSTANCES EXISTED , NOT WHETHER OFFENCES HAVE BEEN COMMITTED	952
ix)	HOW CAN THE COURT DETERMINE WHETHER THE COUNCIL HAD REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY IF THE COUNCIL IS NOT CALLED TO GIVE EVIDENCE	
1)	<u>IN ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (2005) AND IN SRITHARAN AND ANR V THE LAW SOCIETY [2004 TREVERTON JONES KC DOES NOT CALL THE PANEL BECAUSE HE KNOWS THERE WAS NO PANEL</u>	952-953
2)	COUNCIL'S REASONS BASED ON THE REASONS OF THE SENIOR CASEWORKER'S BARTLETT(S) WHO SHOULD ALSO GIVE EVIDENCE, BUT DOES NOT	953-963
a)	BARTLETT'S FRAUDULENT REPORT FORGED AND FALISFIED	953-963
3)	CASEWORKER'S REPORT BASED THE REASONS OF THE FORENSIC TEAM WHO SHOULD ALSO GIVE EVIDENCE BUT DO NOT	953-963
a)	THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT TO MIDDLETON LETTER FORGED, AND FALISFIED	953-963
b)	MIDDLETON'S PERJURY AT TRIAL	953-963
4)	FORENSIC TEAM'S EVIDENCE BASED ON INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS	953-963

	a)	SHAW'S AND PATRICK'S NOTES FORGED, AND FALISFIED	953-963
	b)	SHAW'S AND PATRICK'S PERJURY AT TRIAL	953-963
5)		SHAW SAYS HE NEVER MADE THE (MAIN) ALLEGATION COUNSEL MADE THEM AFTER HIM !	953-963
6)		THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THE SOLICITOR'S CHALLENGE WILL NEVER BE HEARD	953-963
	a)	PARA 6(4) APPLICATION CANNOT BE SUMMARILY UNDER CPR 67.3	953-963
	b)	CASE WOULD REQUIRE 2 YEARS PREPARATION AND COST THE SOLICITOR A MINUNUM OF £2M	953-963
viii)		THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT CAN DECIDE WHETHER THE BARRISTERS REPRESENTING THE PARTIES AT TRIAL (OR A DIFFERENT BARRISTER ON APPEAL) HAVE REASON TO SUSPECT THE SOLICITOR OF DISHONESTY	953-963
	1)	CHADWICK LJ IN <u>SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY 2006</u> COURTOF APPEAL	953-963
	2)	THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION	953-963
	a)	JULY 2005. SHAW SAID THERE WAS NO CASE IN WHICH A TRANSFER WAS MADE BEFORE DELIVERY OF THE BILL (I.E THERE WERE NO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS)	953-963
	b)	JULY 2005, THE LAW SOCIETY'S BARRISTERS HODGE MALEK KC AND TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SAY THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	953-963
	c)	JULY 2005. TREVERTON JONES KC SHOWS THERE WERE NO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	953-963
	d)	JULY 2005. IN THE HIGH COURT PARK J FINDS THERE WERE NO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	953-963
	e)	SEPTEMBER 2005. IN TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE, HE SAYS SHAW SAID THERE WERE RSTS	953-963

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| f) | JULY 2006. IN THE COURT OF APPEAL TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SAYS THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS | 953-963 |
| g) | JULY 2006. , TREVERTON JONES KC IMPLIES THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS, BUT 'THEY WERE ALL ALLOCATED LATER' | 953-963 |
| h) | APRIL 2008. AT THE SOLICITORS DICIPLINARY TRIBUNAL SHAW SAYS HE HAS NEVER SAID THERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS, 'COUNSEL SAID SO AFTER HIM' . | 953-963 |
| i) | THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL 'FINDS' THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS | 953-963 |
| 2) | THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION | |
| a) | SHAW SAID HE HAD BALANCED THE ACCOUNTS AND THERE WAS NO CASH SHORTAGE | 953-963 |
| b) | MIDDLETON REPORTED THAT THE ACCOUNTS COULD NOT BE BALANCED AND THERE WAS A MINIMUM CASH SHORTAGE OF £41,124 AND IMPLIED THAT THERE WAS A MAXIMUM MANY MILLIONS (BEING ALL THE CLIENT MONEY TRANSFERRED SINCE 1945 WHEN THE FIRM STARTED) | 953-963 |
| c) | AT TRIAL IT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT SOLICITORS WERE ENTITLED TO TRANSFER MONEY FOR WORK THEY HAD DONE AFTER THEY HAD DELIVERED BILLS AND THE £41,125 WAS FOR 3 AND HALF YEARS WORK (THIRKETTLE) | 953-963 |
| d) | JULY 2005 PARK J FOUND IT WAS NOT RIGHT REFER TO A BILL AS A CASH SHORTAGE | 953-963 |
| e) | SEPTEMBER 2005. IN TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE, HE SAYS THERE IS CASH SHORTAGE | 953-963 |
| f) | JULY 2006. TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SAID THE THIRKETTLE TOOK 3 WEEKS (NOT 3 YEARS)TO COMPLETE (NOT A ERROR) | 953-963 |

- 3) THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES
- a) THE LAW SOCIETY RETURNED THE £254000 SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES TO PAUL SAFFRON BECAUSE THEY WERE MY REMORTGAGE MONIES. 953-963
- b) JULY 2005, BOTH LEGAL TEAMS REFER TO THE MONEY AS CLIENT MONEY, BUT NEITHER SAY THAT I WAS THE CLIENT AND IT IS MY MONEY 953-963
- c) JULY 2005. PARK J ACKNOWLEDGES THE MONEY IS MY REMORTGAGE MONEY 953-963
- d) SEPTEMBER 2005. IN TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE, HE SAYS THE MONEY WAS CLIENT MONEY (BUT DOES NOT SAY I WAS THE CLIENT) 953-963
- e) JULY 2006. TREVERTON JONES KC TELLS THE COURT OF APPEAL THAT I REMORTGAGED MY HOME TO PAY HIS LEGAL FEES FOR THE INTERVENTION 953-963
- ix) THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT HAS TO DECIDE WHETHER THE COURT ITSELF HAS REASON TO SUSPECT THE SOLICITOR OF DISHONESTY
- 1) THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES
- a) LADY HALLETT IMPLIES THAT IT WAS DISHONEST TO HAVE TAKEN MY REMORTGAGE MONIES. (I SHOULD GIVEN THE MONEY TO HER AND TO THE LAW SOCIETY) 964
- 2) THIRKETTLE/CASH SHORTAGE OF £41.125
- a) JULY 2006. LORD JUSTICE CHADWICK THINKS A SOLICITOR IS DISHONEST IF HE DOES NOT COMPLETE WITHIN 3 WEEKS A CASE WHICH TOOK 4 YEARS TO COMPLETE (THIRKETTLE) AND CONSISTED OF 16 ARCH LEVER FILES 964-966

- | | | |
|------|--|---------|
| b) | APRIL 2008. AT THE SOLICITORS DICIPLINARY TRIBUNAL THE PRESIDENT REFUSED TO OPEN A SINGLE ONE OF THE 16 ARCH LEVER FILES IN FRONT OF HIM TO SEE THE VOLUME OF THE WORK. HE THEN FOUND THAT THERE WAS NO WORK DONE AND THERE WAS A CASH SHORTAGE. | 966 |
| x) | THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE HIGH COURT CANNOT DECIDE THE SOLICITOR'S APPLICATION BECAUSE IT HAS TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE COURT OF APPEAL HAS REASON TO SUSPECT THE SOLICITOR OF DISHONESTY | 967 |
| ix) | THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR CANNOT DISPUTE THERE ARE NO REASONS TO SUSPECT HIM OF DISHONESTY BECAUSE WHETHER THEY ARE REASONS AND WHAT THOSE REASONS ARE WILL ONLY BE KNOWN ON APPEAL | 967 |
| x) | THETWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT NEVER DISCOVERS THAT THE REASONS TO SUSPECT THE SOLICITOR OF DISHONESTY ARE THE REASONS OF A LIFE COACH, GYM INSTRUCTOR, SALES ASSISTANT, FAILED LAW STUDENT OR OTHER UNQUALIFIED PERSON | 967 |
| xi) | THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT MUST DECIDE WHETHER A PANEL (WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT EXIST OR MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE MET TO CONSIDER ANYTHING) HAD REASON TO SUSPECT THE SOLICITOR OF DISHONESTY | 967 |
| xii) | UNDER THE TWO STAGE PROCESS, THE COURT MUST UPHOLD A GROUND 1 INTERVENTION INTO A BLACK LAW FIRM IF THE COUNCIL OF THE LAW SOCIETY BELIEVE THAT ALL BLACKS ARE INHERENTLY DISHONEST | 967 |
| 2) | GROUND 3 (BREACH OF ACCOUNT RULES) | |
| a) | PARLIAMENT'S INTENTION THAT GROUND 3 APPLIED ONLY IF CLIENT MONEY WAS IN JEOPARDY NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 1(1)(C) | 967 |
| b) | PARLIAMENT'S INTENTION THAT THE SOLICITOR BE GIVEN RIGHT TO EXPLAIN BREACH NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 2 | 967-968 |
| c) | PARA 1 (1) (2) AND PARA 2 DEROGATE FROM SOLICITORS' ACCOUNT RULES 1967 RULE 6 AND ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES GENERALLY | 969 |
| d) | GROUND 3 MEANS INTERVENTIONS ARE NOW INEVITABLE IN EVERY PRACTICE IN ENGLAND AND WALES | 969 |

	3)	PARLIAMENT'S INTENTION NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 1(1) (G) (GROUND 7 (SOLICITOR STRUCK OFF/SUSPENDED))	969-970
ii)		OBSOLETE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE USED IN FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS	
	1)	DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE OBSOLETE AFTER THE INTRODUCTION OF S44B	970
	2)	THE COURT APPROPRIATES THE TERM 'DRACONIAN' USED TO DESCRIBE THE POWER TO EXAMINE FILES AND RENDERED OBSOLETE BY S44B FOR USE IN A FALSE CONTEXT	970-980
	3)	WHY THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE SHOULD HAVE CHANGED SINCE THE 1941 ACT	981-982
	4)	PARA 9 (3) PENALTY RETAINED TO BLACKMAIL SOLICITOR	983
	5)	THE NONSENSICALITY OF THE PARA 9 (3) PENALTY	984
	6)	PARLIAMENT DUPED INTO USING THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE AS A PRECEDENT FOR THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
	a)	APPARENT SIMILARITIES IN PROCEDURE	
	i)	GIVING OF NOTICE	984
	ii)	SERVICE ON OTHERS	984
	iii)	48 HOURS NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPLY TO COURT	985
	iv)	8 OR 14 DAYS TO APPLY TO COURT	985
	v)	APPLICATION CAN ALSO BE MADE BY OTHERS	985
	b)	PARLIAMENT UNABLE TO SEE THE TWO PROCEDURES WERE FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT	986-987
iii)		THE NOTION OF 'VESTING'	987
iv)		THE FICTION THAT THE PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION IS A COURT ORDER.	
	1)	THE NINE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE CONFLATED INTO A SINGLE INSTRUMENT	988
	2)	VESTING RESOLUTION USED TO FREEZE MONEY, TRANSFER MONEY, SEIZE DOCUMENTS AND REDIRECT MAIL	988-989
	3)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE USED TO AVOID THE SCRUTINY OF THE COURT	990-994
	4)	VESTING RESOLUTION USED TO DEPRIVE SOLICITOR OF RIGHT OF CHALLENGE	995
	5)	VESTING RESOLUTION USED INTERVENE WITHOUT GROUNDS	995-999

C5 (5) WHAT IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION?

6)	SIMULTANEITY IMPOSSIBLE WITH THE VESTING RESOLUTION	1000
5)	FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE BASED ON VESTING RESOLUTION, BUT WHAT IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION?	
a)	DISCHARGE OF COUNCIL'S FUNCTIONS AND DELEGATION	
i)	THE CHARTER OF THE SOCIETY (1845)	1001
ii)	1932 ACT S. 74 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF LAW SOCIETY AND S.81 DEFINITION OF COUNCIL	1002
iii)	1941 ACT S. 28 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY S.29 INTERPRETATION	1002
iv)	1957 ACT S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES, S.80 POWER TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY, S.86 INTERPRETATION	1002-1003
v)	1965 ACT S.80 AMENDMENT OF S.80 OF PRINCIPAL ACT S.28 INTERPRETATION CHECK TO SEE IF RESOLUTION IS SIGNED BY COUNCIL	1003-1004
vi)	1974 ACT AS ENACTED S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES S.80 POWERS TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY,	1004-1005
vii)	1974 ACT AS AT <u>ANAL SHEIKH V LAW SOCIETY HIGH COURT CASE 2005</u>	1005-1007
b)	COMPARABLE WITH A COMPANY RESOLUTION ABSURD	1007
c)	ACCORDING TO PARLIAMENT ALL IT IS A NOTICE WHICH STARTS DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE	1007-1008
d)	VESTING RESOLUTION CAN BE A LETTER	1008
e)	NO RULES GOVERNING THE MAKING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION	1008
f)	RIGHT TO DELEGATE? WAS THE CHAIRMAN UNQUALIFIED ? DID PARLIAMENT INTEND THAT NON SOLICITORS WOULD DECIDE ON INTERVENTIONS ?	1009
g)	IS PARLIAMENT AWARE THAT FORMER GYM INSTRUCTORS, LIFE COACHES , SALES ASSISTANTS AND THE LIKE ARE DETERMINING THE PROFESSIONAL LIVES OF SOLICITORS?	1009
h)	'PANEL' MEANS MORE THAN ONE, SO HOW COULD ONE PERSON BE THE DECISION MAKER IN THE SHEIKH INTERVENTION ?	1009-1010
i)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROPERLY SIGNED?	1010-1011
j)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH S. 80 (3) OF THE 1974 ACT.?	1011-1012
k)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED AT ALL?	1012

C5 (6) VESTING RESOLUTION CREATED AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD

l)	IS A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION SERVED	1012
m)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROPERTY SERVED	1012
6)	VESTING RESOLUTION CREATED AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD	
a)	PARA 6 (1)	1013
b)	'VEST' USED BECAUSE NO ONE WOULD KNOW WHAT IT MEANT	
i)	ORDINARY USAGE	1013
ii)	WIKIPEDIA	1013-1015
iii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND VOLUME 98. TRUSTS AND POWER VESTING ORDERS IN GENERAL. POWERS OF THE COURT	1016
iv)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. WILLS AND INTESTACY. VOLUME 102. VESTING OF INTERESTS. DISTINCTION BETWEEN VESTING AND PAYMENT	1016-1021
v)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. REAL PROPERTY AND REGISTRATION. VOLUME 87. VESTED AND CONTINGENT INTERESTS	1021
vi)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND VOLUME 9. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS. VESTING ORDERS	1021-1022
vii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. COMPANY AND PARTNERSHIP INSOLVENCY. VOLUME 16. APPLICATION FOR VESTING ORDER	1022
viii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. BENEFICES. VOLUME 34. VESTING OF PATRONAGE	1022-1023
ix)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS AND HIGHWAY LAND. VOLUME 55. EFFECT OF STATUTORY VESTING	1023
x)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. SETTLEMENTS UNDER THE SETTLED LAND ACT 1925. VOLUME 91. WHEN A VESTING INSTRUMENT IS UNNECESSARY	1024
xi)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND . CREATION OF CHARITABLE TRUSTS. VOLUME 8. RIGHTS VESTED IN TRUSTEES OR OTHERS	1024
xii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND . PLANNING. VOLUME 81. EFFECT OF ORDER VESTING PROPERTY IN THE RELEVANT TRANSFEREE	1025
xiii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND .TRUSTEES. VOLUME 98. NECESSITY FOR VESTING	1026
xiv)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. LEGAL PROFESSIONS. VOLUME 65. MONEY VESTING IN LICENSING AUTHORITY	1026
xv)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. LANDLORD AND TENANT. VOLUME 62. VESTING ORDERS	1027
xvi)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. OPEN SPACES AND COUNTRYSIDE. VOLUME 78. VESTING.	1027

C5 (6) VESTING RESOLUTION CREATED AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD

xvii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND ENVIRONMENTAL LAW VOLUME 45. VESTING OF SEWERS IN SEWERAGE UNDERTAKERS. EFFECT OF VESTING	1027-1028
xviii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. EUROPEAN UNION . VOLUME 47A. THE PRINCIPLE OF ACQUIRED OR VESTED RIGHTS	1028
c)	DID PARLIAMENT INTEND 'VEST' TO HAVE A LEGAL MEANING?	1028-1030
d)	HOW PARLIAMENT HAD USED 'VEST ' AND 'COUNCIL RESOLUTION'	
i)	1941 ACT . 4. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL , S.10 DISCRETION OF REGISTRAR, S. 26 TRANSFER TO REGISTRAR OF CERTAIN POWERS	1031
ii)	1957 ACT S. 58 REMUNERATION OF SOLICITOR MORTGAGEE	1031-1032
iii)	1965 ACT S. 14 DECEASED SOLICITORS BANK ACCOUNTS VEST IN LAW SOCIETY TO THE EXCLUSION OF PR	1032
e)	HOW THE VESTING RESOLUTION WAS CREATED	
i)	DIAGRAM	1032-1033
ii)	THE CONCEPT OF VESTING TAKEN FROM 1965 ACT S.14 MERELY A RIGHT TO OPERATE DECEASED ACCOUNT IN PRIORITY TO PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES	1034
iii)	THE CONCEPT OF TAKING CONTROL TAKEN FROM 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE SCHEDULE 1 PARA 9 – PARA 13	
1)	THE PROVISIONS	1034-1035
2)	DIAGRAMS	1035-1037
3)	COUNCIL RESOLUTION GAVE RIGHT TO TAKE CONTROL THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED ACCOUNTS	1038
4)	CONTROL GIVEN AFTER INTERVENTION HAD CONCLUDED	1038
5)	MONEY TRANSFERRED ONLY WITH CONSENT	1038-1039
iv)	THE TWO NEW CONCEPTS	
1)	DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW RIGHT TO TRANSFER WITHOUT CONSENT WAS MADE BY CONFLATING TAKING CONTROL, VESTING AND TRANSFERRING MADE BY CONFLATING S 14 AND SCHEDULE 1 PARA 10 CONTROL	1040
2)	DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW THE CONFLATING S 14 AND SCHEDULE 1 PARA 10 MADE THE VESTING RESOLUTION WAS MADE THE START OF THE INTERVENTION AND MADE IT THE ENTIRE INTERVENTION	1041
f)	THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VESTED RIGHTS AND VESTED INTERESTS	1042-1044

7)	WHY THE VESTING RESOLUTION CANNOT FREEZE THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS	
a)	THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION AND THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION	1044-1045
b)	THE TYPES OF MONEY A SOLICITOR HOLDS	
i)	SOLICITORS' ACCOUNT RULES 1988 APPENDIX 1	1045-1048
ii)	PRACTICE MONEY	1049
iii)	THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY	1049
iv)	CLIENTS' OWN MONEY	1049
c)	WHAT IS VESTING' RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY ?	
i)	PRACTICE MONEY IN OFFICE AND CLIENT ACCOUNT	1049-1050
ii)	GROUND 8 RELEVANT MONEY	1050
iii)	GROUND 1 RELEVANT MONEY	1050
iv)	GROUND 2 RELEVANT MONEY	1050
d)	WHAT IS NOT VESTING' RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY ?	
i)	CLIENTS' OWN MONEY	1051
ii)	THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY	1051
e)	HOW EASY IS IT TO IDENTIFY THE BENEFICIAL OWNER OF VESTING RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY?	1051-1053
f)	WILL THE LAW SOCIETY INEVITABLY CONTRAVENE STATUTE WHEN IT USES THE VESTING RESOLUTION TO FREEZE THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS?	1053-1054
g)	HOW CAN GROUND 8 RELEVANT MONEY BE FROZEN?	1054
h)	THE PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT DEFECTIVE BECAUSE IT IS NOT SIGNED OR PROPERLY CERTIFIED	1055
i)	IF THE VESTING' RESOLUTION IS A FREEZING ORDER WHAT IS THE POINT OF THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER?	1055
j)	IS PARA 6 VOID BECAUSE IT DUPLICATES PARA 5	1055
k)	IF THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS A FREEZING INJUNCTION, HOW CAN BANKS PAY OUT MONEY (WHICH THEY DO) ?	1055
l)	HOW IS MONEY PAID OUT AFTER THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS ARE 'FROZEN' ?	1055
m)	WOULD THE BANK RECOGNISE THE VESTING RESOLUTION AS A FREEZING INJUNCTION? THE PRINCIPAL OF LEGAL CERTAINTY	1055-1065

C5 (8) WHY THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS NOT A TRANSFER AUTHORITY

n) HOW WOULD THE BANK KNOW WHETHER OR NOT THE LAW SOCIETY HAS COMPLIED WITH THE STATUTE? 1066

o) PARLIAMENT DOES NOT DESCRIBE THE VESTING RESOLUTION AS A FREEZING ORDER 1067

8) WHY THE VESTING RESOLUTION CANNOT BE USED TO TRANSFER MONEY

a) HOW CAN THE VESTING RESOLUTION DO WHAT HAS NEVER BEEN DONE IN THE HISTORY OF BANKING? 1067-1071

b) HOW DOES THE LAW SOCIETY HAVE MORE POWER AGAINST A BANKRUPT OR MENTALLY ILL SOLICITOR, OR ONE WHO HAS BREACHED AN ACCOUNT RULE, THAN INTERNATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES HAVE AGAINST CONVICTED CRIMINALS OR THE MOST POWERFUL NATIONS ON EARTH HAVE OVER SANCTIONED TERRORISTS? 1072-1074

c) HOW CAN A VESTING RESOLUTION MADE BY THE LAW SOCIETY'S COUNCIL HAVE MORE POWER THAN A STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER MADE BY A HIGH COURT JUDGE ? 1075

d) PARA 6 (6) PROVIDES THAT IT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE TO TRANSFER MONEY TO ANYONE (INCLUDING THE LAW SOCIETY) 1075

e) WHY DOES THE BANK WHO HAS BREACHED PARA 6 (6) FACE A PENALTY EQUIVALENT TO NOT HAVING A TV LICENCE, BEING INTOXICATED IN PUBLIC OR URINATING IN PUBLIC, AND NOT IMPRISONMENT FOR CONTEMPT 1075-1076

f) 'VEST' DOES NOT MEAN ' TO TRANSFER' 1076

g) 'VESTING ' DISTINGUISHED FROM 'TAKING POSSESSION' 1076-1077

h) WHY WOULD PARLIAMENT EXPECT THE PUBLIC TO TRUST THE LAW SOCIETY OR ITS SOLICITORS WITH THEIR MONEY? 1077

i) THE VESTING RESOLUTION (IF LAWFUL) CAN CAUSE A FINANCIAL MELTDOWN ON A GLOBAL SCALE OF A MAGNITUDE NEVER BEFORE SEEN IN MAN'S HISTORY, AND ONE WHICH WILL END MODERN CIVILIZATION

1) DOCUMENTS

a) 17 FEBRUARY 2005 12. 30PM .COMPLETION OF THE £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTAGE 1078-1082

b) 17 FEBRUARY 2005 4.30PM. PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO BANK 1083

c) 17 FEBRUARY 2005 4.30PM. LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO BANK REQUESTING TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S MONEY 1084-1085

d) 17 FEBRUARY 2005 6.00PM. PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT TO SOLICITOR 1086

e) 22 FEBRUARY 2005. LLOYDS TRANSFERS MONEY TO LAW SOCIETY AND TRANSFERS THE SAME MONEY TO CUSTOMER 1087-1089

C5 (7) WHY THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS NOT A TRANSFER AUTHORITY

f)	LLOYDS' FRAUDULENT APPLICATION AGAINST THE SOLICITOR	1090
g)	LLOYDS' FRAUDULENT CLAIM AGAINST THE SOLICITOR	1091-1092
h)	FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER AGAINST THE SOLICITOR	1093-1099
i)	SECOND FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER AGAINST THE SOLICITOR AND THE SOLICITOR'S PARENTS	1100-1106
2)	FACTS	1107-1108
3)	THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDERS	1109-1112