

Extract from Part 1 . The 131 false representations, sham submissions and outright lies in Timothy Dutton's Fraudulent Advice to the Law Society's High Profile Litigation Committee supporting a request for funding to appeal against Park J's High Court Judgment

6) DUTTON'S ADVICE, A FRAUDULENT INSTRUMENT AND AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD

a) AN INSTRUMENT USED TO PROTECT DUTTON'S PERSONAL LIFETIME INCOME OF £7M-£10M PER ANNUM FROM INTERVENTION FRAUD REVENUES

i) DUTTON ADVANCES HIS OWN CASE AT THE HIGH PROFILE LITGATION COMMITTEE, NOT THE LAW SOCIETY'S CASE

5

1) THE LAW SOCIETY ADMITS THERE IS NO MONEY MISSING, DUTTON INSISTS THERE IS MONEY MISSING 1453-1456

6

2) DUTTON HAS HIS OWN SPECIAL DEFINITION OF WHAT MONEY MISSING MEANS 1456-1459

3) 55M RESIDUAL BALANCES STOLEN IN FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS TAKEN FOR LEGAL COSTS IN AHMED & CO, BIEBUYCK, DIXON & CO AND THE PRACTICES OF MR ZOI AND IN THE MATTER OF SECTIONS 35 AND 36 AND SCHEDULES 1 AND 2 OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 AND IN THE MATTER OF THE LAW SOCIETY COMPENSATION FUND RULES 1995 (2009 (DUTTON ACTING) 1459-1462

7

4) SHAW SAYS HE NEVER SAID THERE WERE NO BILLS: IT WAS COUNSEL WHO MADE THE ALLEGATION AFTER HIM 1462-1464

8

5) DUTTON'S LIE THAT THERE HAD BEEN AN ADJUDICATION ON THIRKETTLE 1459-1467

9

6) DUTTON'S WITHHOLDS THE FACT THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD REPAID THE £254,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES TO ME (BECAUSE THEY WERE MY REMORTGAGE MONIES) 1467

10

7) THE £254,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES WOULD ALSO INCREASED DUTTON'S PERSONAL REVENUES VIA THE COMPENSATION FUND CASE. 1467-1468

ii) DUTTON'S OUTRIGHT LIES TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITGATION COMMITTEE

11

1) THAT THERE WAS A PANEL 1468-1470

12

2) THAT THE JUDGE IN THE LLOYDS CASE MADE A FINDING OF DISHONESTY 1470-1471

iii) DUTTON'S LIES TO COURT OF APPEAL

13

1) THIRKETTLE TOOK 4 YEARS TO COMPLETE. DUTTON LIES BY SAYING IT TOOK 3 ½ WEEKS TO COMPLETE 1470-1472

14

2) THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES 1473

b) INSTRUMENT USED TO REINFORCE THE FICTION OF THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION AND THE LAW SOCIETY'S UNLAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

- 15 i) DUTTON REINFORCES THE ABSURD PROPOSITIONS UPON WHICH THE INTERVENTION IS BASED
- 16 1) THE ABSURD PROPOSITION (CASH SHORTAGE ON THIRKETTLE) 1473-1474
- 17 2) THE ABSURD PROPOSITION (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) 1474-1476
- 18 3) THE ABSURD PROPOSITION (ROUND SUM LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION TRANSFERS) 1476-1477
- 19 4) THE ABSURD PROPOSITION (THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL) 1477-1483
- 20 5) THE ABSURD PROPOSITION (NOT ENTERING BILLS) 1484
- 21 e) THE ABSURD PROPOSITION (£254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES) 1484
- 21 ii) DUTTON REINFORCES THE EXISTENCE OF A FICTITIOUS PANEL 1484
- 21 iii) DUTTON REINFORCES THE NOTION THAT SHELLEY WAS SOME SORT OF EXPERT ENTITLED TO ASSESS COSTS 1484

22 c) DUTTON DECEIVES THE COMMITTEE ABOUT THE LAW

- 23 i) INTERIM BILLING 1485
- 23 ii) NO ONE CAN CHALLENGE BILLS WHERE THE SOLICITOR IS THE SOLE EXECUTOR? 1485-1486
- 23 iii) SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (6) THE VESTING RESOLUTION A FREEZING ORDER 1486-1447
- 23 iv) SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (1) THE MEANING OF VESTING 1447-1493

d) THE CRIMINAL OFFENCES COMMITTED BY DUTTON KC IN HIS ANALYSIS OF THE HIGH COURT JUDGMENT (GENERAL)

- 23 i) DUTTON FALSE INSTRUMENT HELD OUT AS THE ADVICE OF A BARRISTER S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT) S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCES (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE) CONTEMPT OF COURT, ABUSE OF PROCESS, PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE
- 1) HOW A BARRISTER WOULD HAVE PREPARED AN ADVICE ON THE MERITS OF APPEAL VS HOW DUTTON PREPARED THEM
- a) HODGE MALEK KC, THE TRIAL BARRISTER HAD ADVISED AGAINST APPEAL 1493

b)	WHO INSTRUCTED DUTTON ?	1494
c)	A BARRISTER WOULD SEE THE CLAIM OR CHARGE BEFORE EVALUATING A JUDGMENT	1494-1496
d)	A BARRISTER WOULD VIEW THE OTHER SIDE'S SKELETONS	1497
e)	A BARRISTER WOULD VIEW TRIAL BUNDLE	1497-1498
f)	A BARRISTER WOULD VIEW THE TRANSCRIPTS	1498
g)	THE DOCUMENTS DUTTON RELIED ON	1498
h)	KNOWLEDGE OF THE RELEVANT LAW	
i)	SOLICITORS BOOKKEEPING IN PRACTICE (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS)	1498
ii)	BOOKKEEPING TERMS WHAT DOES MONEY MISSING MEAN(ROUND SUM TRANSFERS)	1498
iii)	S 32 SOLICITORS ACT 1974	1499
iv)	RULE 19 SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998 ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULES	1499
v)	RULE 19 (2) SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998 (ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULES LEGAL SERVICES EXEMPTION)	1499
vi)	NOTE 10 TO RULE 19 SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998 (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS)	1499
vii)	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 71 (THIRKETTLE AND OVERCHARGING)	1499
viii)	THE SOLICITORS' (NON-CONTENTIOUS BUSINESS) REMUNERATION ORDER 1994 REMUNERATION CERTIFICATE BY THE LAW SOCIETY'S COUNCIL (THIRKETTLE AND OVERCHARGING)	1499
ix)	THE SOLICITORS' (NON-CONTENTIOUS BUSINESS) REMUNERATION ORDER 1994 TAXATION BY COURT (THIRKETTLE AND OVERCHARGING)	1499
x)	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 57 REMUNERATION CERTIFICATE PROCEDURE DOES NOT APPLY WHERE THERE IS A CLIENT CARE AGREEMENT	1499
xi)	JEMMA TRUSTS CASE (THIRKETTLE AND OVERCHARGING)	1499
xii)	INHERITANCE LAW AND DISCRETIONARY WILL TRUSTS (CLIENT COMPLAINT MCGONNELL)	1499
xiii)	SOLICITORS OBLIGATION TO LEGAL SERVICES	1500

COMMISSION (CLIENT COMPLAINT WIGGS)

- | | | |
|------|--|------|
| xiv) | ART 1 PROTOCOL 1 RIGHT TO PROPERTY
(SHEIKH REMORTGAGE MONIES) | 1500 |
| xv) | SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998 RULE 7
(OBLIGATION TO CORRECT MISTAKES) | 1500 |

2) HOW DUTTON CRAFTED HIS FRAUDULENT ADVICE

a) TABLES

- | | | |
|------|---|-----------|
| i) | LEGEND | 1501 |
| ii) | TABLE 1. REPORT, JUDGMENT AND ADVICE:
ALLEGATIONS COMPARED | 1502 |
| iii) | TABLE 2 REPORT, JUDGMENT AND ADVICE
ALLEGATIONS. NUMBER OF WORDS COMPARED | 1503-1504 |
| iv) | TABLE 3 . JUDGMENT AND ADVICE: TIME
SPENT ON ALLEGATIONS COMPARED | 1505-1506 |
| v) | TABLE 4 . HIGH COURT DOCUMENTATION
COMPARED WITH DOCUMENTATION VIEWED BY
DUTTON | 1507 |

b) IGNORING THE MOST SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS BECAUSE
THEY WERE ABSURD

- | | | |
|------|---|------|
| i) | ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATIONS (£475,125 | 1508 |
| ii) | ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (LEGAL
SERVICES COMMISSIONS £58,000) | 1508 |
| iii) | ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION
(STRUPCWESKI £25) | 1508 |
| iv) | CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (£41,125) | 1509 |

c) IGNORING OTHER PETTY OR ABSURD ALLEGATIONS

- | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|------|
| v) | MISSING FILES | 1509 |
| vi) | MISSING THIRKETTLE JUNK JEWELLERY | 1509 |
| vii) | FAILING TO REPLY | 1509 |
| viii) | HOLDING OUT | 1509 |
| ix) | RETROSPECTIVE POSTING | 1509 |
| x) | CREDIT BALANCES ON OFFICE ACCOUNT | 1509 |
| xi) | UNPOSTED BILLS | 1509 |

xii)	CLIENT NON COSTS RELATED COMPLAINTS	1509
d)	DUTTON'S SPECIOUS USE OF Demeanour ARGUMENT	
i)	PARK J'S OBSERVATIONS ABOUT ME	1510
ii)	DUTTON'S FALSE REPRESENTATION ABOUT PARK J'S RELIANCE ON Demeanour	1510
iii)	DUTTON'S ARTICLE BY JUDGE NUGENT OF SOUTH AFRICA	1511-1518
iv)	DUTTON IS ABSOLUTELY RIGHT ABOUT RELIANCE ON Demeanour	
1)	MR JUSTICE BLACKBURNE' I CAN TELL A DISHONEST MAN FROM THE WAY HE WALKS'	1519
2)	HALLETT LJ REMARK WITHOUT SEEING THIRKETTLE 'CHARGING FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF'S TIME AT QUALIFIED SOLICITOR'S RATES – REFER HER TO THE SDT'	1519
3)	LADY HALLETT'S STATEMENT 'THE TRANSFER OF £254,000. WAS THAT NOT ADMITTED?'	1519-1520
4)	CHADWICK , MOORE BICK AND TUCKEY LJ'S JUDGMENT ' WHAT COULD SHE POSSIBLY HAVE DONE TO JUSTIFY HAVING BILLED £35,000 FOR THREE WEEKS WORK?'	1520-1522
v)	TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF WORDS REFERRING TO Demeanour AS AGAINST TOTAL NUMBER. PARK J'S JUDGMENT COMPARED WITH TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION PANEL	1523
vi)	WHAT WERE THE FACTS AND WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR FINDING THEM AND WHETHER Demeanour PLAYED A PART. TABLE	1524-1525
vii)	WHEN Demeanour WOULD HAVE BEEN A RELIABLE INDICATOR	
1)	CHARLES SNEARY, PANEL CHAIRMAN	1526-1528
2)	DAVID SHAW, MIKE CALVERT AND SARAH BARTLETT,	1529

3)	DAVID MIDDLETON	1529
4)	KIRSTEN PATRICK	1529
a)	WHO WAS PATRICK?	1529
b)	KIRSTEN PATRICK, CASEWORKER : A SOLICITOR WHO INSTRUCTS HIS STAFF TO 'MAKE UP A TRIAL BUNDLE' IS GUILTY OF DISHONESTY	1530
c)	SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S CONSPIRE IN AN ATTEMPT TO PROVE WORK WAS NOT DONE	
i)	'IT DOESN'T HELP BECAUSE (HER ATTENDANCE NOTES ARE) EVIDENCE OF WORK DONE' APPENDIX	1530
ii)	HIDING THE ATTENDANCE NOTES FROM COURT	1530
iii)	PATRICK AND SHELLEY'S PERJURED EVIDENCE OF CHARGES AT CLERK'S RATES WHEN SHELLEY RECORDS THE OPPOSITE	1530
iv)	PATRICK'S FALSIFICATION OF HER NOTES SAYING THAT SECRETARIES MAKE UP ATTENDANCE NOTES	1530
d)	SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT THE PERCENTAGE COSTS UPLIFT WAS DISHONEST	
i)	THE CASE OF JEMMA TRUSTS AND THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE OF CHARGING THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1530
ii)	SHELLEY'S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1530
iii)	PATRICK DOCTOR'S HER NOTES TO TRY AND SHOW THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT WAS INCLUDED IN THE HOURLY RATE	1530
e)	SHAW'S AND PATRICK'S NOTES FORGED, AND FALISFIED	
f)	SHAW'S AND PATRICK'S PERJURY AT TRIAL	

ii) DUTTON COMMITS MONEY LAUNDERING OFFENCES WITH THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (£41,125)

1) DIAGRAMS

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| a) | THE THREE STAGES OF MONEY LAUNDERING | 1530-1531 |
| b) | FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS AND MONEY LAUNDERING | 1532 |
| c) | THE ABSURD PROPOSITION AND MONEY LAUNDERING | 1533 |
| d) | THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION AND MONEY LAUNDERING | 1534 |

2) LAYERING OFFENCE

- | | | |
|----|---|------------|
| a) | STEP 1 CHANGING SPECIFIC SUM (£41,125) TO AN INEXACT SUM (C. £41,000) | 1535 |
| b) | STEP 2 CHANGING SPECIFIC SUM (£41,125) TO MISSING MONIES GENERALLY | 1535 -1536 |
| c) | STEP 3 .DISASSOCIATING CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION FROM THIRKETTLE ALTOGETHER | 1537 -1539 |
| d) | STEP 4. REDIRECTING FOCUS ON ALLEGATION OF OVERCHARGE (THIRKETTLE) | 1539 |
| e) | STEP 5: WITHHOLDING THE LAW ABOUT INTERIM BILLING | 1539 -1541 |
| f) | STEP 6: LYING ABOUT THE ADJUDICATION ON THIRKETTLE | 1541 |
| g) | STEP 7: LYING ABOUT THE FILE HAVING BEEN COSTED BY SHAW | 1541 |
| h) | STEP 8: LYING ABOUT THE FILE HAVING BEEN COSTED BY SHELLEY | 1542 -1543 |
| i) | STEP 9: DECEPTION BY CONCEALING THE THIRKETTLE FILES | 1543 |
| j) | STEP 10 : DUTTON AND TREVERTON JONES COLLUDE IN LYING TO THE COURT OF APPEAL THAT THIRKETTLE WHICH TOOK 4 YEARS TO COMPLETE ONLY TOOK 3 WEEKS | 1543 -1547 |

25-34

iii)	DUTTON'S FAILURE TO DISCLOSE OFFENCES S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT) S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCES (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE) CONTEMPT OF COURT, ABUSE OF PROCESS, PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	1548-1553
	1) DUTTON FALSELY STATES THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD MADE AN ALLEGATION OF CASH SHORTAGE OF C. £41,000	1553
	2) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (£41.125) IN REPORT	1553
	3) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (£41.125) IN REPORT	1553
	4) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (£475.125) IN REPORT	1553
	5) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (£475.125)	1553
	6) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION PAYMENT ALLEGATION (£58.000) IN REPORT	1553
	7) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN ROUND SUM TRANSFER LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION PAYMENT ALLEGATION (£58.000)	1554
	8) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER STRUPCWESKI ALLEGATION (£25) IN REPORT	1554
	9) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN ROUND SUM TRANSFER STRUPCWESKI ALLEGATION (£25)	1554
	10) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE MISSING FILES ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554
	11) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN MISSING FILES ALLEGATION	1554
	12) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE MISSING THIRKETTLE JUNK JEWELLERY ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554
	13) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING I MISSING THIRKETTLE JUNK JEWELLERY ALLEGATION	1554
	14) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE FAILING TO REPLY ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554
	15) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN FAILING TO REPLY ALLEGATION	1554
	16) DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE HOLDING OUT ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554

17)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN HOLDING OUT ALLEGATION	1554
18)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE RETROSPECTIVE POSTING ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554
19)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN RETROSPECTIVE POSTING ALLEGATION	1554
20)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE CREDIT BALANCES ON OFFICE ACCOUNT ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554
21)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN CREDIT BALANCES ON OFFICE ACCOUNT ALLEGATION	1554
22)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE UNPOSTED BILLS ALLEGATION IN REPORT	1554
23)	DUTTON FAILS TO DISCLOSE JUDGE'S FINDING IN UNPOSTED BILLS ALLEGATION	1554
24)	CLIENT NON COSTS RELATED COMPLAINTS	1554
25)	DUTTON FALSELY STATEMENT ABOUT JUDGE'S RELIANCE ON DEMEANOUR IN THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (£475.000)	1554
26)	DUTTON MISPRESENTS JUDGE'S RELIANCE ON DEMEANOUR IN ROUND SUM TRANSFER LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION PAYMENT ALLEGATION (£58.000)	1554

e) DUTTON'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES SPECIFICALLY IN RELATION TO CASH SHORTAGE, ROUND SUM TRANSFER, THIRKETTLE AND BURROWS ALLEGATIONS

60-66

i)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION S.2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE REPRESENTATION)	
1)	DUTTON FALSE REPRESENTATION THAT THERE WAS A CASH SHORTAGE (PARA 8 AND PARA 53)	1555-1556
2)	MIKE CALVERT SAYS SHAW SAID THERE WAS A CASH SHORTAGE	1557
3)	SHAW SAYS THERE IS NO CASH SHORTAGE	1557-1558
4)	PARK J ON THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION IN <u>SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (HIGH COURT 2005)</u> PARA	1558
5)	WHY IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS TO THE COMMITTEE THAT DUTTON WAS BAMBOOZLING THEM	1559-1565
ii)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION. S. 17 (1) (B) THEFT ACT 1968 OFFENCE (FALSE ACCOUNTING)	1565
iii)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION. THE LAW SOCIETY'S OFFENCES AGAINST S.1 THEFT ACT 1968 (THEFT), CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD. DUTTON'S OFFENCES AGAINST S. 45 SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015	1565

(INCITEMENT) AND CONSPIRACY

iv)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION. S. 21 THEFT ACT 1968 (BLACKMAIL) AND S. 45 SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015 (INCITEMENT, CONSPIRACY)	1565
v)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION. HM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE FRAUD	1565
vi)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION. INLAND REVENUE TAX FRAUD	1565
vii)	THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION. DUTTON'S OFFENCES AGAINST CONCEALING OFFENCES CRIMINAL LAW ACT 1967 AND OF PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE, ABUSE OF PROCESS, AND AIDING AND ABETTING MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1565
viii)	ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (£475,125) S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCES (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE)	
1)	THAT THE ALLEGED VALUE OF THE ALLEGED ROUND SUM TRANSFERS WAS (£475,125)	1566
2)	THAT IT WAS HE, TIMOTHY DUTTON, WHO WAS ALLEGING THAT THE SOLICITOR DID ROUND SUM TRANSFERS, NOT SHAW AND THE LAW SOCIETY	1566
3)	THAT SHAW DID NOT KNOW THE PROPER DEFINITION OF ROUND SUM TRANSFER: HE THOUGHT IT WAS A TRANSFER WHICH ENDED WITH A ZERO	1566
4)	THAT SHAW HAD NEVER SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	1566
5)	THAT IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO MAKE THE ALLEGATION WHEN THERE WERE NO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	1566
6)	THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD CHANGED THE WORDING OF THE RULE	1566
7)	THAT SHAW HAD FORGED SHAW'S FORGED ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 24 APRIL 2004, COMMITTING FORGERY 1	1566
8)	THAT SOMEONE HAD FORGED FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM RECORD (PART ONLY. DATE UNKNOWN) COMMITTING FORGERY 2	1566
9)	THAT SHAW HAD FORGED SHAW'S FORGED ROUND SUM RECORD OF 28 APRIL 2004 DOCTORED WITH FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM RECORD COMMITTING FORGERY 3	1566
10)	THAT SHAW HAD COMMITTED FORGERY 4 BY WITHHOLDING THE NOTE RECORDING THAT HE SAW COMPUTER SCREEN SHOWING BATCH POSTING 21 JULY 2004?	1566
11)	THAT SHAW KNEW THE SOLICITOR WAS DOING BATCH POSTING, NOT TRANSFERRING ROUND SUMS IN BREACH OF THE RULE	1566

67-89

	12)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 5	1566
	13)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 6	1566
	14)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 7	1566
	15)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 8	1566
	16)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 9	1566
	17)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 10	1567
	18)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 11	1567
	19)	THAT CALVERT HAD FALSIFIED THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT-MIDDLETON LETTER BY FORGERY 12	1567
	20)	THATSHAW HAD COMMITTED PERJURY AT TRIAL	1567
	21)	THAT SARAH BARTETT HAD COMMITTED PERJURY AT TRIAL	1567
	22)	THAT MIKE CALVERT HAD COMMITTED PERJURY AT TRIAL	1567
	23)	THAT DAVID MIDDLETON HAD COMMITTED PERJURY AT TRIAL	1567
	24)	THAT ACCORDING TO THE DEFINITION USED BY THE LAW SOCIETY EVERY SINGLE SOLICITOR WHO HAS EVER PRACTICED AND HAS TRANSFERRED COSTS FROM CLIENT TO OFFICE ACCOUNT HAD COMMITTED THE BREACH	1567
90	ix)	ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION. DUTTON'S FRAUD ACT 2006. S. 2 OFFENCE (FALSE REPRESENTATION)	1567
91	x)	ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION. DUTTON'S S. 17 (1) (B) THEFT ACT 1968 OFFENCE (FALSE ACCOUNTING)	1567
92	xi)	ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION. DUTTON'S OFENCES AGAINST CONCEALING OFFENCES CRIMINAL LAW ACT 1967 AND OF PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE, ABUSE OF PROCESS, AND AIDING AND ABETTING MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1567
93	xii)	THIRKETTLE ADJUDICATION. S.2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE(FALSE REPRESENTATION)	
	1)	DUTTON'S FALSE REPRESENTATION	1567-1568

2)	THE LAW ON INTERIM BILLS MEANT THAT DUTTON HAD TO LIE ABOUT AN ADJUDICATION HAVING BEEN MADE ON THIRKETTLE	1568-1574
3)	WHY IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS TO THE COMMITTEE THAT DUTTON WAS LYING	1574
xiii)	THIRKETTLE ADJUDICATION. DUTTON'S OFFENCES AGAINST CONCEALING OFFENCES CRIMINAL LAW ACT 1967 AND OF PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE, ABUSE OF PROCESS, AND AIDING AND ABETTING MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1574
xiv)	THIRKETTLE OVERCHARGE. S.2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE REPRESENTATION)	
1)	DOCUMENTS	
a)	THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL FOR £35,000	1574-1575
b)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (THIRKETTLE)	1576
c)	THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS 1 (£31,530)	1576
d)	THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS 2 (£3,172)	1577
e)	MY CALCULATION FOR THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL	1578
f)	LAW SOCIETY'S CALCULATIONS SUPPORTING ITS FRAUDULENT ALLEGATION OF DISHONEST OVERCHARGE	1578
g)	PROJECTED THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1578
h)	WHAT THE THIRKETTLE BILL MIGHT HAVE BEEN	1578-1579
i)	THE OTHER EVIDENCE DUTTON SAW	1579-1580
2)	DUTTON REPRESENTATION IS CONTRARY TO THE LAW ON INTERIM BILLING	1580-1583
3)	WHAT SHAW SAID ABOUT THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL IN CROSS EXAMINATION	1583-1599
4)	THIRKETTLE OVERCHARGE: DUTTON'S S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCES (FALSE STATEMENTS)	
a)	THAT HE WAS ENTITLED TO MAKE ANY COMMENT ON AN INTERIM BILL	1600
b)	THAT THE BILL WAS BASED SOLELY ON AN ADDITION OF CALCULATION 1 AND CALCULATION 1 AND ON NO OTHER CONSIDERATION	1600
c)	THAT HE COULD NOT SEE THAT THERE WERE OBVIOUS ERRORS IN THE CLIENT'S FAVOUR	1600
d)	THAT THE BILL HAD BEEN COSTED BY SHAW	1600
e)	THAT THE BILL HAD BEEN COSTED BY SHELLEY	1600

94

95-106

- f) THAT SOMEONE HAD COSTED THE BILL 1600
- g) THAT SOMEONE HAD LOOKED AT THE FILE 1600
- h) THAT THE BILL WAS HIGHER THAN IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN 1600
- i) THAT THE SOLICITOR INTENDED TO CHARGE A NON SOLICITOR AT SOLICITOR'S RATES 1600
- j) THAT THE NON SOLICITOR'S TIME HAD BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SOLICITOR'S TIME 1600
- k) THAT THE BILL WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED BY APPLICIATION OF THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT IN THE FINAL BILL 1600
- l) THAT THE BILL WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED BY APPLICIATION OF THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT IN THE FINAL BILL 1600

xv) THIRKETTLE OVERCHARGE: DUTTON'S S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCES (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE)

107-129

- 1) THAT THIRKETTLE WAS PART OF THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION, WHICH ITSELF WAS FRAUDULENT 1600
- 2) THAT NO ONE COULD COMMENT ON THE THIRKETTLE BILL BECAUSE IT WAS AN INTERIM BILL 1600
- 3) THE LAW ON INTERIM BILLS 1600
- 4) THAT OVERCHARGING CANNOT BE AN INTERVENTION GROUND WHERE THERE IS NO PRIOR SDT FINDING 1600
- 5) THAT SHAW SAID HE WAS UNABLE TO ESTIMATE WHAT THE COSTS SHOULD HAVE BEEN 1600
- 6) THAT SHELLEY SAID WAS UNABLE TO ESTIMATE WHAT THE COSTS SHOULD HAVE BEEN 1600
- 7) THAT THE COSTS HAD NOT BEEN ESTIMATED BY ANYONE 1601
- 8) THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD PRETENDED THAT SHELLEY HAD COSTED THIRKETTLE 1601
- 9) THAT SHELLEY'S REPORT HAD BEEN FRAUDULENT D8(3) (g) 1601
- 10) THAT SHELLEY'S REPORT HAD BEEN FRAUDULENT BECAUSE HE AND PATRICK HAD TRIED TO HIDE THE ATTENDANCE NOTES 1601
- 11) THAT SHELLEY AND PATRICK HAD PERJURED THEIR EVIDENCE ABOUT CHARGING FOR A CLERK 1601
- 12) THAT PATRICK HAD DOCTORED HER RECORDS ABOUT SECRETARIES MAKING UP ATTENDANCE NOTES 1601

13)	THAT SHELLEY AND PATRICK HAD MISLED THE COURT ABOUT THE CASE OF JEMMA TRUST	1601
14)	THAT PATRICK HAD DOCTORED HER NOTES TO FALSELY SHOW A PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1601
15)	THAT SHELLEY AND PATRICK HAD COLLUDED TO MAKE THE FRAUDULENT ALLEGATION IN THIRKETTLE	1601
16)	THE SOLICITOR'S RATIONALE BEHIND THE CALCULATIONS FOR THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL	1601
17)	THE REASON A NON SOLICITOR WAS USED WAS BECAUSE THE WORK WAS TOO DIFFICULT FOR A SOLICITOR D8	1601
18)	THE CHARGES FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF WOULD ONLY BE KNOWN IN THE FINAL BILL	1601
19)	THAT THE TWO CALCULATIONS SHOULD NOT BE ADDED TOGETHER CREATING A SHORTFALL	1601
20)	THE PROJECTION FOR THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1601
21)	THE PERCENTAGE MARK UP WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN CHARGED	1601
22)	THE SOLICITOR'S TIME RECORDING SYSTEM AND ITS RELEVANCE TO THE ALLEGATION ix)	1601
23)	THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ESTATE AND THE £100,000 SAVING MADE AS AGAINST THE £270 ALLEGED SHORTFALL	1601
xvi)	WHY IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS TO THE COMMITTEE THAT DUTTON'S ADVICE WAS FRAUDULENT	1602-1603
xvii)	THIRKETTLE OVERCHARGE. DUTTON'S S. 17 THEFT ACT 1968 OFFENCES (FALSE ACCOUNTING)	
1)	CONCEALING THE FACT THAT THE THIRKETTLE CALCULATIONS WERE NOT SIMPLY MEANT TO BE ADDED	1603
2)	CONCEALING THE FACT THAT THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT WOULD HAVE BEEN CHARGED	1604
3)	CONCEALING THE FACT THAT THE TIME RECORDED WOULD HAVE BEEN ADJUSTED	1604
4)	CONCEALING THE FACT THAT NO DECISION HAD BEEN TAKEN ABOUT MR SAMPAT'S CHARGES	1604
5)	CONCEALING THE CHARGES WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN INCURRED HAD MR SAMPAT NOT BEEN RETAINED	1604
6)	CONCEALING THE PROJECTED THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1604
xviii)	BURROWS	1605-1606

130-135

136