CONTENTS LIST AND SUMMARY

PAPER RECEIVED FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL ABOUT THE MOST PREPOSTEROUS FRAUD IN THE 400 YEAR HISTORY OF CONVEYANCING

HANNAH ARENDT

REPRESENTATION BY PAGE KC, HARVIE KC AND ENGEMENT

d) ANALYSIS. THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE AND THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE

a) PRELIMINARY MATTERS

i) SUBSTANTIVE AND NON SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS

ii) THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS OF THE 1974 ACT

1) THE SUBSTANTIVE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES

2) THE NON SUBSTANTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES

4) CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

k) IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED AT ALL? 1258-1264

l) IS A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE VESTING RESOLUCTION SERVED 1258-1264

m) IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROPERTY SERVED 1258-1264

d) VESTING RESOLUTION CREATED AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD

a) PARA 6 (1) 1258-1264

b) 'VEST' USED BECAUSE NO ONE WOULD KNOW WHAT IT MEANT

i) ORDINARY USAGE 1258-1264

ii) WIKIPEDIA 1258-1264

iii) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND VOLUME 98. TRUSTS AND POWER VESTING ORDERS IN GENERAL. POWERS OF THE COURT 1258-1264

iv) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. WILLS AND INTESTACY. VOLUME 102. VESTING OF INTERESTS. DISTINCTION BETWEEN VESTING AND PAYMENT 1258-1264

v) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. REAL PROPERTY AND REGISTRATION. VOLUME 87. VESTED AND CONTINGENT INTERESTS 1258-1264

vi) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND VOLUME 9. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS. VESTING ORDERS 1258-1264

vii) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. COMPANY AND PARTNERSHIP INSOLVENCY. VOLUME 16. APPLICATION FOR VESTING ORDER 1258-1264

viii) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. BENEFICES. VOLUME 34. VESTING OF PATRONAGE 1258-1264

ix) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS AND HIGHWAY LAND. VOLUME 55. EFFECT OF STATUTORY VESTING 1258-1264

x) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. SETTLEMENTS UNDER THE SETTLED LAND ACT 1925. VOLUME 91. WHEN A VESTING INSTRUMENT IS UNNECESSARY 1258-1264

xi) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND . CREATION OF CHARITABLE TRUSTS. VOLUME 8. RIGHTS VESTED IN TRUSTEES OR OTHERS 1258-1264

xii) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND . PLANNING. VOLUME 81. EFFECT OF ORDER VESTING PROPERTY IN THE RELEVANT TRANSFEREE 1258-1264

xiii) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND .TRUSTEES. VOLUME 98. NECESSITY FOR VESTING 1258-1264

xiv) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. LEGAL PROFESSIONS. VOLUME 65. MONEY VESTING IN LICENSING AUTHORITY 1258-1264

xv) HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. LANDLORD AND TENANT. VOLUME 62. VESTING ORDERS 1258-1264

INTERESTS

e WHY THE VESTING RESOLUTION CANNOT FREEZE THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS

a) THE 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION AND THE 1974 ACT VESTING RESOLUTION 1258-1264

b) THE TYPES OF MONEY A SOLICITOR HOLDS

i) SOLICITORS' ACCOUNT RULES 1988 APPENDIX 1 1258-1264

ii) PRACTICE MONEY 1258-1264

iii) THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY 1258-1264

iv) CLIENTS' OWN MONEY 1258-1264

c) WHAT IS VESTING' RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY ?

i) PRACTICE MONEY IN OFFICE AND CLIENT ACCOUNT 1258-1264

ii) GROUND 8 RELEVANT MONEY 1258-1264

iii) GROUND 1 RELEVANT MONEY 1258-1264

iv) GROUND 2 RELEVANT MONEY 1258-1264

d) WHAT IS NOT VESTING' RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY ?

i) CLIENTS' OWN MONEY 1258-1264

ii) THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY 1258-1264

e) HOW EASY IS IT TO IDENTIFY THE BENEFICIAL OWNER OF VESTING RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY? 1258-1264

f) WILL THE LAW SOCIETY INEVITABLY CONTRAVENE STATUTE WHEN IT USES THE VESTING RESOLUTION TO FREEZE THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS? 1258-1264

g) HOW CAN GROUND 8 RELEVANT MONEY BE FROZEN? 1258-1264

h) THE PARA 6 (3) NOTICE PROHIBIITING PAYMENT OUT DEFECTIVE BECAUSE IT IS NOT SIGNED OR PROPERLY CERTIFIED 1258-1264

i) IF THE VESTING' RESOLUTION IS A FREEZING ORDER WHAT IS THE POINT OF THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER? 1258-1264

j) IS PARA 6 VOID BECAUSE IT DUPLICATES PARA 5 1258-1264

k) IF THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS A FREEZING INJUNCTION, HOW CAN BANKS PAY OUT MONEY (WHICH THEY DO) ? 1258-1264

l) HOW IS MONEY PAID OUT AFTER THE SOLICITOR'S BANK ACCOUNTS ARE 'FROZEN' ? 1258-1264

m) WOULD THE BANK RECOGNISE THE VESTING RESOLUTION AS A FREEZING INJUNCTION? THE PRINCIPAL OF LEGAL CERTAINTY 1258-1264

n) HOW WOULD THE BANK KNOW WHETHER OR NOT THE LAW SOCIETY HAS COMPLIED WITH THE STATUTE? 1258-1264

ix) THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT MUST DECIDE WHETHER CIRCUMSTANCES EXISTED , NOT WHETHER OFFENCES HAVE BEEN COMMITTED 1281-1286

ix) HOW CAN THE COURT DETERMINE WHETHER THE COUNCIL HAD REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY IF THE COUNCIL IS NOT CALLED TO GIVE EVIDENCE

1) 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 1281-1286

2) COUNCIL'S REASONS BASED ON THE REASONS OF THE SENIOR CASEWORKER'S BARTLETT'S) WHO SHOULD ALSO GIVE EVIDENCE, BUT DOES NOT

a) BARTLETT'S FRAUDULENT REPORT FORGED AND FALISFIED 1281-1286

3) CASEWORKER'S REPORT BASED THE REASONS OF THE FORENSIC TEAM WHO SHOULD ALSO GIVE EVIDENCE BUT DO NOT

a) THE FRAUDULENT CALVERT TO MIDDLETON LETTER FORGED, AND FALISFIED 1281-1286

b) MIDDLETON'S PERJURY AT TRIAL 1281-1286

4) FORENSIC TEAM'S EVIDENCE BASED ON INVESTIGATOR'S FINDINGS

a) SHAW'S AND PATRICK'S NOTES FORGED, AND FALISFIED 1281-1286

b) SHAW'S AND PATRICK'S PERJURY AT TRIAL 1281-1286

5) SHAW SAYS HE NEVER MADE THE (MAIN) ALLEGATION COUNSEL MADE THEM AFTER HIM ! 1281-1286

6) THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THE SOLICITOR'S CHALLENGE WILL NEVER BE HEARD

a) PARA 6(4) APPLICATION CANNOT BE SUMMARILY UNDER CPR 67.3 1281-1286

b) CASE WOULD REQUIRE 2 YEARS PREPARATION AND COST THE SOLICITOR A MINUNUM OF £2M 1281-1286

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

1) CHADWICK LJ IN SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY 2006 COURTOF APPEAL 1281-1286

2) THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION

   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) 1281-1286

   b) JULY 2005, THE LAW SOCIETY'S BARRISTERS HODGE MALEK KC AND TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SAY THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANFSERS 1281-1286

   c) JULY 2005. TREVERTON JONES KC SHOWS THERE WERE NO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS 1281-1286

   d) JULY 2005. IN THE HIGH COURT PARK J FINDS THERE WERE NO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS 1281-1286

   e) SEPTEMBER 2005. IN TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE, HE SAYS SHAW SAID THERE WERE RSTS 1281-1286

   f) JULY 2006. IN THE COURT OF APPEAL TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SAYS THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS 1281-1286

   g) JULY 2006. , TREVERTON JONES KC IMPLIES THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS, BUT 'THEY WERE ALL ALLOCATED LATER' 1281-1286

   h) APRIL 2008. AT THE SOLICITORS DICIPLINARY TRIBUNAL SHAW SAYS HE HAS NEVER SAID THERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS, 'COUNSEL SAID SO AFTER HIM' . 1281-1286

   i) THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL 'FINDS' THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS 1281-1286

2) THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION

   a) SHAW SAID HE HAD BALANCED THE ACCOUNTS AND THERE WAS NO CASH SHORTAGE 1281-1286

	b)	MIDDLETON REPORTED THAT THE ACCOUNTS COULD NOT BE BALANCED AND THERE WAS A MINUMUM 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)	1281-1286
	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)	1281-1286
	d)	JULY 2005 PARK J FOUND IT WAS NOT RIGHT REFER TO A BILL AS A CASH SHORTAGE	1281-1286
	e)	SEPTEMBER 2005. IN TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE, HE SAYS THERE IS CASH SHORTAGE	1281-1286
	f)	JULY 2006. TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SAID THE THIRKETTLE TOOK 3 WEEKS (NOT 3 YEARS)TO COMPLETE (NOT A ERROR)	1281-1286
3)	THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES		
	a)	THE LAW SOCIETY RETURNED THE £254000 SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTAGE MONIES TO PAUL SAFFRON BECAUSE THEY WERE MY REMORTGAGE MONIES.	1281-1286
	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	1281-1286
	c)	JULY 2005. PARK J ACKNOWLEDGES THE MONEY IS MY REMORTGAGE MONEY	1281-1286
	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)	1281-1286

e) JULY 2006. TREVERTON JONES KC TELLS THE COURT OF APPEAL THAT I REMORTGAGED MY HOME TO PAY HIS LEGAL FEES FOR THE INTERVENTION — 1281-1286

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) — 1281-1286

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 — 1964-9661

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. — 1281-1286

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 — 1281-1286

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 — 1281-1286

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 — 1281-1286

c) WHY DIDN'T THE LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION INTERVENE? 1287-1295

d) WHY DIDN'T THE RICS CONSIDER THE COMPLAINT AGAINST WIGGS? 1287-1295

e) DOES THE JUDICIARY COLLUDE WITH THE RISC (AS IT DOES WITH THE SRA (SOLICITORS), THE BSB (BARRISTERS), THE FCA (BANKS), THE GMC (DOCTORS), IPOC (POLICE) AND JICO (JUDGES) TO PROTECT CERTAIN MEMBERS? 1287-1295

f) BY PROTECTING WIGGS DID THE DISTRICT JUDGE COMMIT CRIMINAL OFFENCES INCLUDING CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT THEFT FROM THE LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION? 1287-1295

iii) MCGONNELL.

1) IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR., INSTRUCTED TO MINIMIZE INHERITANCE TAX LIABILITY ON DEATH TO COMPLY WITH THE INSTRUCTION: THE SOLICITOR MUST MAXIMISE IHT LIABILITY 1287-1295

2) IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO DISCHARGE THE INSTRUCTION OF A DYING WIFE TRYING TO PREVENT HER CHILDREN'S STEPFATHER FROM GAINING CONTROL OF HER ASSETS: THE SOLICITOR MUST DISCHARGE THE INSTRUCTIONS OF THE STEPFATHER AND GIVE HIM CONTROL OF HER ASSETS 1287-1295

3) IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR NOT TO NOTIFY A DYING CLIENT IN WRITING ABOUT A £100 FEE INCREASE RESULTING FROM A CHANGE OF INSTRUCTION : THE SOLICITOR MUST FIRST ADVISE THE CLIENT IN WRIING ABOUT THE INCREASE, THEN OBTAIN HER PERMISSION IN WRITING BEFORE COMPLETING THE WORK (A WILL) (AND PRESUMABLY HAVE THE WILL SIGNED THROUGH A PSYCHIC MEDIUM IF THE CLIENT DIES IN THE INTERIM) 1287-1295

iii) MODOOD.

1) IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO DISCOVER IF A PERSON ASKING FOR HELP WANTS TO FORMALLY INSTRUCT HIM AND TO PAY FEES FOR HIS WORK. THE SOLICITOR MUST DO THE WORK FREE OF CHARGE, OR HIDE WHEN HIS HELP IS SOUGHT. 1287-1295

iv) HELMAN

1) IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR ONE LAWYER TO MAKE A DECISION WITHOUT TAKING ADVICE FROM ANOTHER LAWYER 1287-1295

2) IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER 1287-1295

vi) CLODE. IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO COMMIT ANY ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR 1287-1295

iii) THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES

1)	A BARRISTER AND HEATHER LEESON PROCURE THE FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER AND FIRST FRAUDULENT DISCLOSURE ORDER	1287-1295
2)	A BARRISTER AND HEATHER LEESON PROCURE THE SECOND FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER AND FIRST FRAUDULENT DISCLOSURE ORDER (25 MARCH 2005)	1287-1295
3)	A BARRISTER AND HEATHER LEESON MAKE THE SECOND ATTEMPT TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES (4 MARCH 2005)	1287-1295
4)	A BARRISTER , HEATHER LEESON, TREVERTON JONES KC AND PAUL SAFFRON MAKE THE THIRD ATTEMPT TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES (8TH MARCH 2005)	1287-1295
5)	TREVERTON JONES AND PAUL SAFFRON STEAL £10,000 AS ALLEGED COSTS (8 MARCH 2005)	1287-1295
6)	JOHN WEAVER AND THE LAW SOCIETY MAKE THE SIXTH ATTEMPT TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES (MARCH –MAY 2005)	1287-1295
7)	TREVERTON JONES KC, PAUL SAFFRON AND LINDA LEE MAKE THE SEVENTH ATTEMPT TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	1287-1295
8)	PAUL SAFFRON STEALS £250,000 FROM RADCLIFFES WHICH WAS PROBABLY THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	1287-1295

iv) SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL PROCEEDINGS. 2007-2009

1)	PETER CADMAN AND PATRICIA ROBERTSON KC CRAFT A FRAUDULENT PART 4 STATEMENT REPEATING THE CHARGES DEALT WTIH IN THE HIGH COURT AND RELY ON THE LAW SOCIETY'S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE	1287-1295
2)	A SOLICITOR MEMBER BRIBED TO DISMISS AN APPLICATION TO CLARIFY THE MEANING OF ROUND SUM TRANSFER	1287-1295
3)	HUGO PAGE KC CONSPIRES WITH THE LAW SOCIETY AND WITH THE SDT TO PRETEND THAT A TRANSFER OF COSTS WHICH ENDS WITH A ZERO IS A BREACH OF THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULE	1287-1295
4)	ANESTA WEEKES KC, A BLACK BARRISTER, INDUCES THE CLIENT TO PAY THE CLIENT'S LAST £20,000 AS A FIXED FEE BY PRETENDING TO TAKE UP THE RACE CAUSE	1287-1295
5)	ANESTA WEEKES KC CONSPIRES WITH THE LAW SOCIETY AND WITH THE SDT TO PRODUCE FALSE FINDING AGAINST HER CLIENT	1287-1295
6)	ANESTA WEEKES KC WITHDRAWS FROM THE SDT 'TRIAL' AND LIES ABOUT HER REASONS	1287-1295
7)	PETER CADMAN, PATRICIA ROBERTSON KC RELY ON THE LAW SOCIETY'S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE	1287-1295

a) FORGERY 5 SHAW'S FALSE RST NOTE OF 24 APRIL 2004 AND FAULKNER'S FALSE RST RECORD (PART ONLY. DATE UNKNOWN) COMBINED TO CREATE CALVERT'S FRAUDULENT REPORT 1346-1349

b) FORGERY 6 CALVERT CHANGES FAULKNER'S 'ESTIMATE OF TOTAL SUM' TO 'ROUND SUM ESTIMATE' 1346-1349

c) FORGERY 7. CALVERT MAKES UP THE WORDS SHE MADE A ROUND SUM TRANSFER 1346-1349

d) FORGERY 8. CALVERT MAKES UP THE WORDS 'OF THESE COSTS' 1346-1349

e) FORGERY 9. CALVERT OMITS THE WORDS 'I KNOW EXACTLY HOW MUCH I AM ABLE TO TAKE' 1346-1349

f) FORGERY 10. CALVERT OMITS THE WORDS 'THEY ARE BILLED TO CLIENTS'' 1346-1349

g) FORGERY 11. CALVERT INCLUDES CONTRADICTORY VERSION OF BILLING PRACTICE 1346-1349

h) FORGERY 12. CALVERT OMITS SHAW'S AND FAULKNER'S RECORD THAT BILLS HAD SEEN TO CLIENTS BEFORE TRANSFER OF COSTS 1346-1349

i) FORGERY 12- FORGERY 100 1346-1349

13) SARAH BARTLETT TOLD CHARLES SNEARY (THE PANEL) THAT CALVERT SAID SHAW HAD SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS 1346-1349

14) NO ONE KNOWS WHAT CHARLES SNEARY READ, HEARD, THOUGHT OR KNEW ABOUT ROUND SUM TRANSFERS 1346-1349

15) DAVID SHAW, MIKE CALVERT, DAVID MIDDLETON AND SARAH BARTLETT COMMIT PERJURY AT TRIAL

a) TRANSCRIPT OF DAVID SHAW'S EVIDENCE PAGE 60-64, PAGE 78 TO PAGE 84, PAGE 97 – 110. PAGE 150-154 1346-1349

b) PERJURY 1. SHAW'S ADMISSION AT THE SOLICITOR'S DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL MEANS THAT HIS EVIDENCE AT THE HIGH COURT WAS PERJURED 1346-1349

c) PERJURY 2 - SHAW'S ADMISSION AT THE SOLICITOR'S DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL MEANS THAT MIKE CALVERT'S EVIDENCE AT THE HIGH COURT WAS PERJURED 1346-1349

d) PERJURY 3 - SHAW'S ADMISSION AT THE SOLICITOR'S DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL MEANS THAT DAVID MIDDLETON'S EVIDENCE AT THE HIGH COURT WAS PERJURED 1346-1349

e) PERJURY 4 - SHAW'S ADMISSION AT THE SOLICITOR'S DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL MEANS THAT SARAH BARTLETT'S EVIDENCE AT THE HIGH COURT WAS PERJURED 1346-1349

f) PERJURY 5 – SHAW'S ADMISSION DURING CROSS EXAMINATION THAT HE HAD SEEN EVIDENCE OF MY BATCH POSTING MEANS THAT HIS WITNESS STATEMENT WAS PERJURED 1346-1349

g) PERJURY 6 – SHAW'S ADMISSION DURING CROSS EXAMINATION THAT HE HAD SEEN EVIDENCE OF MY BATCH POSTING MEANS THAT MIKE CALVER'S WITNESS STATEMENT AND EVIDENCE WAS PERJURED 1346-1349

b) DOCUMENTS

i)	THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL FOR £35,000	1356-1379
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY"S FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (THIRKETTLE)	1356-1379
iii)	THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS 1 (£31,530)	1356-1379
iv)	THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS 2 £3,172)	1356-1379
v)	MY CALCULATION FOR THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL	1356-1379
vi)	LAW SOCIETY'S CALCULATIONS SUPPORTING ITS FRAUDULENT ALLEGATION OF DISHONEST OVERCHARGE	1356-1379
vii)	PROJECTIONS FOR THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1356-1379
viii)	WHAT THE THIRKETTLE BILL MIGHT HAVE BEEN	1356-1379
ix)	THIRKETTLE ATTENDANCE NOTES 1	1356-1379
x)	THIRKETTLE ATTENDANCE NOTES 2	1356-1379
xi)	THIRKETTLE ESTATE ACCOUNTS	1356-1379
xii)	THIRKETTLE FILES (16 ARCH LEVER FILES, 5 BEING FOR WORK DONE)	1356-1379

c) THE PROPOSITION IN THE FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (THIRKETTLE) THAT A BILL IS A CASH SHORTAGE ('THE ABSURD PROPOSITION IN THIRKETTLE) 1356-1379

d) HOW THE LAW SOCIETY ATTEMPTED TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS PRESENTED BY THE ABSURD PROPOSITION AT TRIAL

i)	THE LAW SOCIETY TRIES TO HIDE THE THIRKETTTLE FILES	1356-1379
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY USES THE INTERIM BILL AND THE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS AS A DISTRACTION	1356-1379
iii)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS THE LAW AND PRACTICE ABOUT INTERIM BILLS FROM THE COURT	1356-1379
iv)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLD THAT MY CHARGES FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF WOULD ONLY BE KNOWN IN THE FINAL BIL	1356-1379
v)	THE LAW SOCIETY PLAY ON THE USE OF THE WORD 'QUALIFIED' . MR SAMPAT WAS UNQUALIFIED AS A SOLICITOR, BUT HAD MORE APPROPRIATE EXPERTISE	1356-1379
vi)	THJE LAW SOCIETY FALSELY ALLEGES THAT THE TWO CALCULATIONS SHOULD BE ADDED TOGETHER CREATING A SHORTFALL	1356-1379
vii)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHOLDS THE PROJECTION FOR THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1356-1379
viii)	THE LAW SOCIETY LIES ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE MARK UP	1356-1379

h)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY FAILING TO SAY THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD MISLED LLOYDS ABOUT THE LAW	1448-1458
i)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY NOT ADVISING THAT THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY IS NOT PRACTICE MONEY	1448-1458
j)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING THAT THE MONEY WAS THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL REMORTGAGE MONEY WHICH SHE WELL KNEW	1448-1458
k)	LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS ALSO CONSIDERED APPLYING FOR RESTITUTION AGAINST THE LAW SOCIETY	1448-1458
l)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING THAT POWELL CULLEN HAD CONFIRMED THAT THE MONEY WAS THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL REMORTGAGE MONEY	1448-1458
m)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING THE CONVERSATIONS THE CUSTOMER WITH MARTIN COCKRELL	1448-1458
n)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY MISSTATING THE USE OF OFFICE ACCOUNT	1448-1458
o)	LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD THAT ASHLEY & CO IS A CONVEYANCING PRACTICE, SO IT WOULD PERFECTLY USUAL FOR LARGE SUMS OF MONEY TO BE DEPOSITED AND WITHDRAWN	1448-1458
p)	LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD THAT I HAD BOUGHT AND SOLD SEVERAL PROPERTIES IN MY OWN NAME USING OFFICE ACCOUNT	1448-1458
q)	LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT JOHN WEAVER HAS ADVISED HER THAT THE MONEY MIGHT VERY WELL BELONG TO ME	1448-1458
r)	LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY WITHHOLDING RADCLIFFES' LETTER	1448-1458
s)	LEESON, AS A BANKING EXPERT, WITHHOLDS WHY THE APPLICATION FOR RESTITUTION IS UNLAWFUL UNDER BANKING LAW	1448-1458
t)	LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT THE APPLICATION IS BEING MADE BECAUSE LLOYDS HAS BEEN NEGLIGENT	1448-1458
u)	LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS SHOULD HAVE APPLIED AGAINST THE LAW SOCIETY	1448-1458
v)	LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD THAT LLOYDS SHOULD HAVE PAID FOR ITS OWN MISTAKE (OR SUED THE LAWYER ADVISING THE BANK)	1448-1458

.