

CONTENTS LIST AND SUMMARY

1	'IF IT'S NOT IN HALSBURY'S IT'S NOT THE LAW'.	
1)	IS THERE A LAW OF INTERVENTION? IF NOT, HOW HAS THE UK'S JUDICIARY BEEN ABLE TO DETERMINE INTERVENTION CASES FOR THE LAST 50 YEARS ?	125-137
2)	WHAT IS THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD?	137-150
3)	<u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY [2005] EWHC 1409 (CH)</u> PARK J UNWITTINGLY DISMANTLES THE INTERVENTION FRAUD. TIMOTHY DUTTON REINSTATES IT THE FOLLOWING YEAR. THE 161 LIES IN DUTTON'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE	151-158
4)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD: A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE GRAVER THAN THE POST OFFICE SCANDAL	159-164
5)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S HARASSMENT AND PERSECUTION OF THE SOLICITOR AND HIS FAMILY	
a)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S TORTURE OF SOLICITORS. TORTURE TO DEATH. THE SUICIDE RATE.	164-174
b)	FIXING OF CASES AT THE SOLICITOR'S DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL . THE TAPE RECORDINGS OF <u>PAUL BAXENDALE –WALKER V DAVID MIDDLETON AND MARTIN DUERDEN HQ10X02119</u>	175
c)	UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENTS AND THREATS OF IMPRISONMENT	
i)	THE UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT OF A NIGERIAN SOLICITOR	175
ii)	<u>THE SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY V SOPHIE KHAN (1) (2) SOPHIE KHAN & CO LIMITED (3) JUST FOR PUBLIC LIMITED 2022]</u> <u>EWHC 45 (CH)</u>	175-188
iii)	THE FIRST WITHOUT NOTICE FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER IN THE THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE PROCEEDS AGAINST ANAL SHEIKH 25 FEBRUARY 2005	189-197
iv)	THE SECOND WITHOUT FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER IN THE THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE PROCEEDS AGAINST THE SOLICITOR'S MOTHER 4 MARCH 2005	198-202
v)	LORD JUSTICE BURNETT'S THREAT TO IMPRISON ME IN <u>ANAL SHEIKH V MARC BEAUMONT</u> AND THE THEFT OF MARC BEAUMONT DEFAULT JUDGMENT	203-212
vi)	THREAT TO IMPRISON MY MOTHER <u>RABIA SHEIKH V HUGO PAGE KC AND NIGEL MEARES</u> AND IN THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	213
vii)	THREAT TO IMPRISON ME FOR MAKING ANY APPLICATION TO ANY COURT IN ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER	213
d)	THE HARASSMENT AND TORTURE OF THE SOLICITOR'S FAMILY	213
e)	STRIPPING THE SOLICITOR AND HIS FAMILY OF EVERYTHING THEY OWN	213-220
f)	THE WEAPONIZATION OF LITIGATION. THE LITIGATION VORTEX	221

6)	HOW MANY CLIENTS' LIVES HAVE BEEN DESTROYED BECAUSE THEY HAVE LOST THEIR SOLICITOR ? WHAT ARE THE STATISTICS FOR CLIENT SUICIDES?	222-223
7)	WHO ARE THE VICTIMS OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD?	233-224
8)	THE SUPERLATIVE GENIUS OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD MEANS THE ARCHITECTS OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD HAD TO HAVE BEEN PARLIAMENT AND THE JUDICIARY	224-225
9)	WHY THE ABSENCE OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS MEANS THE FRAUD CAN NEVER BE DISMANTLED AND THE SOLICITOR VICTIM WILL EVER BE ABLE TO OBTAIN JUSTICE	226-229
10)	THE BIGGER QUESTIONS	
a)	IS THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD A STATE CRIME?	230-235
b)	THE LAW SOCIETY AND TREASURY'S CONSPIRACY TO STEAL BONA VACANTIA FROM THE CROWN. IS THE TREASURY SELECT COMMITTEE TOO SCARED TO GET INVOLVED OR THE MEMBERS ALSO INVOLVED?	235-236
c)	APPLYING THE DEFINITION OF TREASON BY PROFESSOR DAWN OLIVER, , ARE THE LEGISLATURE, THE JUDICIARY , THE EXECUTIVE AND THE GOVERNMENT GUILTY OF TREASON?	236-238
d)	IS SLAVERY PRACTICED IN THE UK; ARE THE LAW SOCIETY AND BARRISTERS SLAVEMASTERS?	238-239
e)	MANSLAUGHTER	
i)	IS THE LAW SOCIETY GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER?	240
ii)	CAN A BARRISTER BE GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER? IS TIMOTHY DUTTON KC GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER?	240
iii)	IS UK'S SUPREME COURT GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER?	241-242
f)	DOES THE UK PRACTICE TORTURE? ARE THE LAW SOCIETY AND ITS BARRISTER STATE ACTORS IN THE TORTURE OF SOLICITORS?	243
g)	IS UK'S JURISPRUDENCE NOW BASED ON SHARIA LAW "TALIBAN WHIPS NINE WOMAN AND TEN MEN 39 TIMES BASED ON SUSPICION OF ADULTERY AND WITHOUT A TRIAL DECEMBER 2022. SODOMY UNDER THE TALIBAN AND INTERVENTIONS BY THE LAW SOCIETY BOTH BASED ON MERE SUSPICION	
i)	THE AFGHANISTAN CASE	243
ii)	NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN UK LAW AND SHARIA LAW: SODOMY UNDER THE TALIBAN AND INTERVENTIONS BY THE LAW SOCIETY BOTH BASED ON MERE SUSPICION	243
iii)	NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN UK LAW AND SHARIA LAW: NO RIGHT OF TRIAL FOR EITHER THE SODOMIST OR FOR THE SOLICITOR	244
h)	DO BARRISTERS ESTABLISH THE LEGAL PRECEDENTS NEEDED TO COMMIT FRAUD? ARE BARRISTERS LIKE DUTTON KC AND TREVERTON JONES KC THE LAW SOCIETY'S PROXIES?	244
i)	DOES THE UK PRACTICE KIN PUNISHMENT (GUILT BY ASSOCIATION) ?	
i)	AITKEN J AND CRESSWELL J MAKE FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDERS IN RELATION TO THE £254,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES AGAINST MY MOTHER	245

ii)	A HIGH COURT JUDGE CAN HOLD A MOTHER RESPONSIBLE FOR HER LAWYER DAUGHTER'S CONDUCT OF A CASE	245-247
j)	AN MP HAS SAID ' WE ARE ALL TERRIFIED OF THE JUDGES. THE ONLY WAY TO DEAL WITH JUDICIAL CORRUPTION IS TO GET A GUN, SHOOT A JUDGE, THEN SHOOT YOURSELF' . IS THE JUDICIARY TERRORISING PARLIAMENT?	247-248
11)	LETTERS AND RESPONSES	
a)	LETTER TO THE LAW COMMISSION	249-251
b)	LETTER TO THE ADVISORY BOARD OF HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND DATED 23 NOVEMBER 2023	252-253
c)	LETTER TO THE ADVISORY BOARD OF HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND DATED 12 JANUARY 2024	254-258
d)	LETTER TO THE RT. HON. THE LORD COLLINS OF MAPESBURY IN THE CASE OF <u>AHMED & CO, BIEBUYCK SOLICITORS, DIXON & CO & ORS RE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 [2006] EWHC</u> (COLLINS J) ('THE COMPENSATION FUND CASE')	259-251
e)	RESPONSE FROM THE PARLIAMENTARY SELECT COMMITTEES TO QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO SCHEDULE 1 OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974	262
f)	RESPONSE FROM THE COUNCIL MEMBERS OF THE LAW SOCIETY	263
g)	RESPONSE FROM PROFESSOR MICHAEL PARTINGTON, CONSULTANT EDITOR OF HALSBURY VOL 65	264
12)	A SIMPLE CONCEPTUAL APPROACH TO THE CASE --TO SEE INTERVENTION PROCEEDINGS AS A MONUMENTAL DISTRACTION FROM BASIC BANK SCAM	
a)	THE GREATEST DISTRACTION TECHNIQUE IN THE HISTORY OF BANK FRAUD	264-270
b)	THE TWO SHEETS OF PAPER WITHHELD FROM THE COURT	271
c)	THE THREE INDICATORS OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD IN THE TWO SHEETS OF PAPER	
i)	BASIC BANKING LAW	272
ii)	PARA 6 (6) CRIMINAL OFFENCE TO PAY OUT	273
iii)	THE LINE OF INQUIRY WHICH WOULD REVEAL THE ENTIRE INTERVENTION FRAUD TO THE JUDGE.	273-277
d)	IT IS REALLY CREDIBLE THAT THE JUDGES IN THE SHEIKH INTERVENTION AND IN <u>AHMED & CO, BIEBUYCK SOLICITORS, DIXON & CO & ORS RE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 [2006] EWHC</u> SAW THE TWO SHEETS OF PAPER, BUT DID NOT SEE THE FRAUD?	277-278

2 THE TOTALITY OF WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT INTERVENTION LAW

1)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND 5 TH ED. VOL. 65 PARA 415 (LEGAL PROFESSIONS)	279
2)	THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART I AND PART II (AS AT <u>SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY 2005</u>)	280-285
3)	ISSUES	
a)	GROUNDS	286-287
b)	HOW DOES THE SOLICITOR MAKE HIS SUBSTANTIVE CHALLENGE ?	287-289
c)	HOW ARE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS DEALT WITH?	289-290
d)	WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION? HOW IS MONEY DEALT WITH?	290-292
e)	HOW ARE DOCUMENTS DEALT WITH?	292-293
f)	HOW IS MAIL DEALT WITH?	293
g)	HOW IS SIMULTANEITY ACHIEVED?	293-295
4)	THE TOTALITY OF INTERVENTION LAW ACCORDING TO LEADING BARRISTERS (23 LINES)	296

3 WHAT DO PARLIAMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE LAW SOCIETY , THEIR LAWYERS AND THE SOLICITOR'S LAWYERS REALLY UNDERSTAND ABOUT INTERVENTIONS?

1)	THE MEANING OF 'INTERVENTION'	297
2)	THE MEANING OF 'VEST' OR 'VESTING'	297
3)	THE MEANING OF 'ROUND SUM TRANSFER'	297-298
4)	THE MEANING OF 'PANEL'	299-300
5)	ACCORDING TO PARLIAMENT 'REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY' IS A TRIGGER TO START THE INTERVENTION; ACCORDING TO THE JUDICIARY 'REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY IS THE GROUND FOR INTERVENTION'	300-302
6)	IS AN INTERVENTION A SINGLE ACT, OR A PROCESS?	302-303
7)	HAS THE COURT REALISED THAT THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY IS TRANSFERRED, THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS ARE REMOVED AND THE SOLICITOR'S MAIL IS REDIRECTED WITHOUT A COURT ORDER?	303
8)	VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 OF THE FIRST PROTOCOL OF THE CONVENTION. THE FINDING IN <u>HOLDER</u> PREMISED ON A MONUMENTAL MISUNDERSTANDING	303-306
9)	PARLIAMENT IGNORANT OF SOLICITORS' AND OR GENERAL BANKING PRACTICES	306
10)	THE COURT OF APPEAL'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE OPERATION OF CLIENT ACCOUNT	306-312
11)	MISCELLANEOUS POINTS	313-315

4	THE 23 LINE BOILERPLATE LEGAL SUBMISSION SUBMITTED BARRISTERS AND APPLIED BY JUDGES	
1)	THE JUDGES AND LAWYERS IN <u>SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY</u> WHO HAVE ACCEPTED THE SUBMISSION AS BEING A STATEMENT OF THE LAW	316-318
2)	ANALYSIS OF THE SUBMISSION	319-336
3)	THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION AND FOR THE NATIONAL AND GLOBAL ECONOMY	337-339
5	HOW THE INTERVENTION FRAUD WORKS, ITS SCOPE, ITS VICTIMS AND ITS BENEFICIARIES; WHY IT CAN NEVER BE DISMANTLED	
1)	OVERVIEW	340-342
2)	DIAGRAMS AND TABLE	
a)	DIAGRAM SHOWING THE MONEY GENERATED BY THE INTERVENTION FRAUD	343
b)	COMPOSITE TABLE OF THE QUANTUM OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S THEFTS, FRAUD AND CORRUPTION PER 100 INTERVENTIONS	344-348
c)	DIAGRAM SHOWING THE GENERATING OF MONEY BY THE INTERVENTION FRAUD	349
3)	TARGETING OF HIGH NET WORTH INDIVIDUALS	350
4)	THEFT OF PRACTICING CERTIFICATE FEE REVENUES	350-351
5)	THEFT FROM THE COMPENSATION FUND	
a)	£27.7M (OR £100M) STOLEN ANNUALLY DISGUISED AS AGENCY COSTS IN FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS	351
b)	FALSIFICATION OF EVIDENCE AGAINST THE SOLICITOR AND FABRICATION OF REASONS FOR INTERVENTION	351
c)	SENIOR FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT, DAVID SHAW 'A CLIENT TO OFFICE TRANSFER WHICH ENDS WITH A ZERO IS A ROUND SUM TRANSFER AND SHOWS DISHONESTY'	351-354
d)	SHAM DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL HEARING FUNDED BY THE COMPENSATION FUND	355-357
e)	LAW SOCIETY ACCEPTS BRIBES NOT TO INTERVENE @ £25,000 PER FIRM	357
f)	FUNDING OF SHAM TRIALS UNDER THE WRONG PROCEDURE	357-360
g)	CASE FIXING BY BARRISTERS	361
h)	BRIBES TO PAID TO THE JUDGES AND DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL MEMBERS	361-363
6)	FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS USED TO STEAL MONEY AND PROPERTY	
a)	THEFT ON THE DAY OF INTERVENTION	
i)	GENERAL CLIENT MONEY	364
ii)	CLIENTS OWN MONEY	364

iii)	UNTRACEABLE RESIDUAL BALANCES	365
iv)	CLIENTS' MAIL	365
vi)	CLIENTS FILES, DOCUMENT, DEEDS, WILLS, AND DATA	365
v)	CLIENTS' TITLES AND INTERESTS IN LAND	366
vi)	BONA VACANTIA FROM THE CROWN	366-367
vii)	THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE MONEY	367
viii)	THE SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MONEY	367-368
ix)	THE VALUE OF THE SOLICITOR'S WORK AND TIME : THEFT OF UNBILLED COSTS AND WORKS IN PROGRESS	368-369
x)	THE SOLICITOR'S COSTS BILLED, BUT NOT TRANSFERRED	369
xi)	THE SOLICITOR'S CHOSES IN ACTION AGAINST CLIENTS	369
xii)	THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS IN CLIENT CASES	369-370
b)	THEFT OF THE SOLICITOR'S AND CLIENTS' PROPERTY DISCOVERED AFTER INTERVENTION	370
c)	THEFT OF PROPERTY YEARS OR DECADES LATER	370
7)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY LAUNDERS WHAT IT STEALS. MONEY LAUNDERING	
a)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THREE STAGES OF MONEY LAUNDERING	371
b)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	372
c)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE SEVEN ATTEMPTED THEFTS OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	373
d)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	374
e)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT AND MONEY LAUNDERING OF ALL MY ASSETS	375
8)	THE MULIPLICITY OF CRIMES AND HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES COMMITTED AGAINST THE SOLICITOR.	
a)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY , THE RED RIVER JUDGES AND LORD BURNETT, THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE STOLE ALL MY ASSETS AND HAVE TORTURED ME	376-379
b)	THE LITIGATION VORTEX	380
9)	THE IMPLICATIONS OF DISMANTLING THE INTERVENTION FRAUD AND WHY THE SUPREME COURT HAS REFUSED TO DO IT.	381

7	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY USES INVESTIGATIONS TO STEAL AND USES THE COURTS TO LAUNDER
---	---

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------|
| 1) | HOW THE LAW SOCIETY USES INVESTIGATIONS TO STEAL AND THE COURTS TO MONEYLAUNDER. HOW TIMOTHY DUTTON KC AND PATRICIA ROBERTSON USED <u>AHMED & CO, BIEBUYCK SOLICITORS, DIXON & CO & ORS RE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 [2006] EWHC</u> (TIMOTHY DUTTON KC AND PATRICIA ROBERTSON ACTING) USED TO INTEGRATE THE STOLEN PROCEEDS | 392 |
| 2) | 18 FEBRUARY 2005. THE LAW SOCIETY'S UNLAWFUL ENTERS MY PRACTICE AND COMMITS THEFT AND BURGLARY | 392-393 |
| 3) | 05 MARCH 2005 HEARING. AITKIN J . THE START OF THE CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, TREVERTON JONES, RADCLIFFES, SAFFRON, DUTTON AND OTHERS TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES | |
| a) | THE FIRST AND SECOND FRAUDULENT HEARINGS IN THE LLOYDS CASE | 393-394 |
| b) | MAY 2005, THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES HANDED TO PAUL SAFFRON AND GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC AS A BRIBE TO LOSE THE CASE- THE CASE FIXING AGREEMENT. PAUL SAFFRON STEALS THE 254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES | 395-397 |
| c) | THE LEGAL ARGUMENT WHICH AN HONEST BARRISTER WOULD HAVE PUT IN RELATION TO THE £254,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES | 397-401 |
| d) | WHAT TREVERTON JONES DID AND SAID ABOUT THE £245,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES | 402-409 |
| 5) | THE LAW SOCIETY'S ATTEMPTED THEFT OF £55,000 FROM THE STATUTORY FUND FOR ' MANAGEMENT COSTS' DURING THE TRIAL | 409 |
| 6) | MY SOLICITOR, PAUL SAFFRON FINALLY STEALS THE 254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES | 409-410 |
| 7) | DEVON MANSIONS AND ALL SAINTS MEWS STOLEN THROUGH A SECURITY OF COSTS ORDER | 411 |
| 8) | 33/35 MOUNTSIDE REPOSSESSED BECAUSE THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES WAS NEVER RECEIVED | 411 |
| 9) | THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD. | 411-412 |
| 10) | DIAGRAM SHOWING | |
| a) | PROPERTY THEFTS, | 413-416 |
| b) | MONEY LAUNDERING | 417 |
| c) | LITIGATION VORTEX | 418 |

7 THE LAW SOCIETY'S SHAM ALLEGATIONS

- 1) TRANSFERRING COSTS WHICH END WITH A ZERO OR 'WITH A LOT OF NOUGHTS' (BREACH OF THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULES) 419-441
- 2) THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS : THE CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION/ ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION. AFTER SEEING THE £35,000 INTERIM BILL AND COSTS TRANSFER ON THIRKETTLE THE LAW SOCIETY, BARRISTERS AND JUDGES WERE AFFLICTED FROM TIME TO TIME BY AMAUROSIS FUGAX OR TEMPORARY VISION LOSS WHICH STOPPED THEM FROM SEEING THE 16 ARCH LEVER FILES OF WORK SUPPORTING THE BILL 442-445

9 DO THE CHAIRS OF THE BAR COUNCIL AND THE BAR STANDARDS BOARD AND THEIR CONNECTIONS ACQUIRE THE RIGHT TO COMMIT THE INTERVENTION FRAUD, OR IS THEIR APPOINTMENT GIVEN FOR COMMITTING IT? IS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL APPOINTED TO THE BAR COUNCIL SO THAT HE CAN PROTECT DISHONEST BARRISTERS?

- 1) TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, CHAIRMAN OF THE BAR COUNCIL AND HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002] (HC) 2002 (CA) 2003 (HL) 446
- 2) GREGORY TREVERTON JONES AND ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY 2006 (HC) 2005 446-447
- 3) TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, GREGORY TREVERTON JONES AND ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY 2006 (CA) 2007 447
- 4) TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, GREGORY TREVERTON JONES AND ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY 2007 (HL) 447
- 5) NICHOLAS VINEALL KC CHAIRMAN OF THE BAR COUNCIL, AND MIRESKANDARI V THE LAW SOCIETY 447
- 6) DUTTON KC AND PATRICIA ROBERTSON KC, CHAIR OF THE BAR STANDARDS BOARD AND AHMED & CO, BIEBUYCK SOLICITORS, DIXON & CO & ORS RE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 [2006] EWHC (THE COMPENSATION FUND CASE) 447
- 7) PATRICIA ROBERTSON KC AND THE LAW SOCIETY V ANAL SHEIKH SDT 2009 447-448
- 8) THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AS A MEMBER OF THE BAR COUNCIL PROTECTS BARRISTERS WHO COMMIT THE INTERVENTION FRAUD. DOMINIC GRIEVE FORMER MP KC , GEOFFREY COX FORMER MP KC AND VICTORIA PRENTIS MP KC 448

10 WHY THE ARCHITECTS OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD HAD TO HAVE BEEN PARLIAMENT AND JUDICIARY

- 1) ABSTRACT 449-450
- 2) READING 450
- 3) THE PROBLEM: HOW COULD TENS OF MILLIONS OF POUNDS BE STOLEN FROM THE COMPENSATION FUND WITHOUT DETECTION? THE SOLUTION: MAKE INFLATED COSTS CLAIMS FOR FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS. 450-451
- 4) PARLIAMENT DESIGNS THE SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD
 - a) WHAT 'TO INTERVENE' AND 'INTERVENTION' MEANT IN THE 1941 ACT, THE 1957 ACT, AND IN THE 1965 ACT 451-454
 - b) THE INTERVENTION PROCEDURE UNDER THE 1965 ACT
 - i) INTERVENTION STARTS WITH THE SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES 454-455

ii)	INTERVENTION ENDS WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES	455
iii)	NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	455
iv)	DIAGRAMS	457-459
c)	PARLIAMENT USES THE 1974 GENERAL ELECTION TO DISHONESTLY PRESENT THE SOLICITORS' AMENDMENT BILL AS CONSOLIDATED LEGISLATION	
i)	WHAT IS CONSOLIDATED LEGISLATION	460-461
ii)	PARLIAMENT'S PRETENCE THAT THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS WERE THE SAME AS THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS	461-462
iii)	NO MENTION OF ANY AMENDMENTS IN THE MINUTES OF THE LAW SOCIETY COUNCIL COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING FROM 16 MAR 1972- 23 JUL 1974	462
d)	THE AMENDMENTS PARLIAMENT SURREPTITIOUSLY INTRODUCED AND WHY	
i)	PARLIAMENT ENLARGES GROUND AND POWERS TO INCREASE INTERVENTION NUMBERS	462-464
ii)	GROUND 3 (BREACH OF ACCOUNT RULES) MAKES NO SENSE BECAUSE PARLIAMENT DID NOT CARE WHETHER THE GROUNDS MADE SENSE OR NOT	
1)	THE INTENTION THAT GROUND 3 APPLIED ONLY IF CLIENT MONEY WAS IN JEOPARDY NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 1(1)(C)	465
2)	PARLIAMENT'S INTENTION THAT THE SOLICITOR BE GIVEN RIGHT TO EXPLAIN BREACH NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 2	466-467
3)	PARA 1 (1) (2) AND PARA 2 DEROGATE FROM SOLICITORS' ACCOUNT RULES 1967 RULE 6 AND ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES GENERALLY	467
4)	GROUND 3 MEANS THAT A FIRM MUST BE INTERVENED INTO IF COSTS BILLED TO THE CLIENT ARE £5,000.00, , BUT COSTS TRANSFERRED ARE £4,999. 90 LEAVING A CREDIT OF 10P IN CLIENT ACCOUNT	467-458
5)	GROUND 3, AS ENACTED, OBLIGES THE LAW SOCIETY TO EXAMINE EVERY SINGLE ACCOUNTING ENTRY MADE BY EVERY SINGLE FIRM. HOW DID IT PLAN TO DO THAT?	468
e)	PARLIAMENT'S STATED INTENTION NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 1(1) (G) (GROUND 7 (SOLICITOR STRUCK OFF/SUSPENDED))	468
f)	PARLIAMENT RETAINS OBSOLETE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE SO THAT THE LAW SOCIETY TERRORISE AND BLACKMAIL THE SOLICITOR WITH IT	
i)	DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE OBSOLETE AFTER THE INTRODUCTION OF S44B	468
ii)	WHY THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE SHOULD HAVE CHANGED SINCE THE 1941 ACT	469-470

iii)	PARA 9 (3) PENALTY RETAINED TO BLACKMAIL SOLICITOR	470-473
iv)	THE NONSENSICALITY OF THE PARA 9 (3) PENALTY	473-474
v)	PARLIAMENT ARTFULLY USES THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE AS A PRECEDENT FOR THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
	1) APPARENT SIMILARITIES IN PROCEDURE	
	a) GIVING OF NOTICE	474
	b) SERVICE ON OTHERS	474
	c) 48 HOURS NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPLY TO COURT	474
	d) 8 OR 14 DAYS TO APPLY TO COURT	474
	e) APPLICATION CAN ALSO BE MADE BY OTHERS	474-475
	2) PARLIAMENT IGNORES THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO PROCEDURES	476-477
g)	PARLIAMENT'S CHANGES 'REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE' TO 'REASON TO SUSPECT' SO THAT JUDGES WILL DECIDE THE WRONG ISSUE IN THE WRONG APPLICATION MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURE	
	i) THE OSTENSIBLE REASON FOR THE CHANGE OF WORDING	478
	ii) 'REASON TO SUSPECT' MADE NO SENSE AFTER THE ENACTMENT OF S44B, SO WHY WAS IT RETAINED?	478
	iii) WORDING RETAINED SO THAT JUDGES COULD SPURIOUSLY CLAIM THEY HAD TO DECIDE NOT WHETHER THE SOLICITOR WAS DISHONEST OR NOT, BUT WHETHER THE (NON EXISTENT) PANEL HAD REASON TO SUSPECT THE SOLICITOR WAS DISHONEST	479
h)	THE THREE VERSIONS OF SCHEDULE 1 AND HOW THEY WERE USED BY PARLIAMENT TO CREATE THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE, WHILE APPEARING TO ENACT THE LAWFUL ONE	
	i) USE OF THE SAME DECEIT AS KITCHIN, BRIGGS AND BURGESS SALMON IN THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	479
	ii) THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
	1) THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE STARTS WITH THE SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES AND ENDS WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES	479-481
	2) THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE WAS CONCERNED WITH INTERVENTION MONEY, NOT THE INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	481-482
	3) VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE CONTEMPLATES MULTIPLE PARTIES MAKING REPEATED PARA 6(4) APPLICATIONS AFTER THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE HAS CLOSED DOWN	482

4)	DIAGRAM SHOWING THE USE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	482-483
5)	SERVICE OF PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION AND PARA 6(3) THIRD PARTIES PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT COULD BE A MERE LETTER	484-485
6)	THE ISSUES DETERMINED AT THE PARA 6(4) APPLICATION HEARING	485
7)	THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION NOT 'WITHDRAWN' ON A SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	486
iii)	THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE)	
1)	THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS BY WAY OF THE NON SUBSTANTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES	486-487
2)	THE WRONG APPLICATIONS MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURES	487-488
3)	PARA 9(7) AND PARA 9(8)	488-489
4)	STARTS AND ENDS WITH THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION (OR A MERE LETTER	489-490
5)	TABLE SHOWING THE APPLICATION OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	491
iv)	VERSION 1, THE VERSION CONSISTENT WITH THE REPRESENTATION THAT THE 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 WAS THE SAME AS THE 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 AND THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
1)	DIAGRAMS	492-495
2)	PARLIAMENT CONCEALS THREE MATERIAL DIFFERENCES	
a)	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)	496
b)	OMISSION OF 1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 12- PARA 13 (THE PROVISION FOR THE TRANSFER OF MONEY WITH CONSENT)	496
c)	1965 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 10 TAKING CONTROL OF MONEY CHANGED IN 1974 ACT SCHEDULE 1 PARA 6 (1) TO VESTING OF MONEY	496
v)	VERSION 2, THE VERSION PARLIAMENT WHICH APPEARS TO HAVE ENACTED AND WHICH IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE DEBATE	
1)	DIAGRAMS	496-499
2)	THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VERSION 1 AND VERSION 2	
a)	THE CONFLATING OF THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION AND VESTING RESOLUTION	500-501
b)	THE REPOSITIONING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	502

	c)	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	502
	d)	THE CHANGE FROM 'TAKING CONTROL' TO 'VESTING'	502
	3)	PARLIAMENT DESIGNS AMENDMENTS TO DUPE THE READER	
	a)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY THE OMISSION OF THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION	502-503
	b)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY MAKING THE VESTING RESOLUTION A STAND ALONE PROVISION	503
	c)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY THE POSITION OF PARA 6	503
	d)	THE AMBIGUITY CREATED BY USE OF THE TERM 'VEST'	503
	v)	VERSION 3. THE VERSION THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE JUDICIARY PRETENDS HAD BEEN ENACTED ,	
	1)	DIAGRAMS	503-506
	2)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION BASED ON VERSION 3	507
	vi)	SUMMARY OF PARLIAMENT'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERVENTION FRAUD: THE CREATION OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FRAUD	507
5)		WIDENING THE TARGET GROUP EVEN FURTHER. PARLIAMENT, THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS AND THE LAW SOCIETY CONSPIRE TO CHANGE PRIMARY LEGISLATION USING SECONDARY LEGISLATION	
	a)	GROUND 3 BREACHES (SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES) INCLUDED SOLELY TO INCREASE NUMBER OF INTERVENTIONS AND FOR NO OTHER PURPOSE	507-508
	b)	THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES USED TO ENACT LEGISLATION BY THE BACK DOOR BY CREATING INTERVENTION GROUNDS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ENACTED	508
	c)	THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULE SPECIFICALLY DRAFTED TO FACILITATE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS	508-510
	d)	THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS' DETERMINES SOLICITORS APPEALS AGAINST HIS OWN SHODDY DRAFTING (JUST LIKE RIMER IN THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD)	510-511
	e)	HAVE PARLIAMENT, THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS COMMITTED TREASON?	511
6)		THE LAW SOCIETY CREATES THE FICTION OF THE PANEL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE COURT	
	a)	LAW SOCIETY'S SHAM DECISION MAKING PROCESS USED TO SAVE THE JUDICIARY THE EMBARRASSMENT OF ADJUDICATING BOGUS INTERVENTIONS	511-512
	b)	THE PRETENCE THAT A BOARD RESOLUTION OR A MERE LETTER IS S COURT FREEZING ORDER AND TRANSFER AUTHORITY	513

c)	ACCORDING TO PARLIAMENT ALL IT IS A NOTICE WHICH STARTS THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE	513
d)	VESTING RESOLUTION CAN BE A LETTER	513
e)	NO RULES GOVERNING THE MAKING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION	513
f)	RIGHT TO DELEGATE? WAS THE CHAIRMAN UNQUALIFIED ? DID PARLIAMENT INTEND THAT NON SOLICITORS WOULD DECIDE ON INTERVENTIONS ?	514
g)	IS PARLIAMENT AWARE THAT FORMER GYM INSTRUCTORS, LIFE COACHES AND SALES ASSISTANTS CAN DETERMINE THE FUTURE OF PROFESSIONAL MAN?	514
h)	'PANEL' MEANS MORE THAN ONE, SO HOW COULD ONE PERSON BE THE DECISION MAKER IN THE SHEIKH INTERVENTION	514
i)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROPERLY SIGNED?	515
j)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH S. 80 (3) OF THE 1974 ACT.?	515-515
k)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED AT ALL?	516
l)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROPERLY SERVED ?	516
7)	SOLICITOR'S RIGHT OF CHALLENGE REMOVED BY THE JUDICIARY BY DECIDING THE WRONG ISSUES IN THE WRONG APPLICATION MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURE IN INTERVENTIONS WHICH HAVE NEVER LAWFULLY TAKEN PLACE	
a)	THE JUDICIARY USES 'REASON TO SUSPECT' WORDING TO CREATE BOGUS TWO STAGE PROCESS GUARANTEEING THAT EVERY INTERVENTION CHALLENGE WILL FAIL	
i)	WHAT IS THE TWO STAGE PROCESS AND WHY IT MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR CAN NEVER WIN	517
ii)	TWO STAGE PROCESS IS BASED ON TWO SEMANTIC MISCHIEFS	
1)	'REASON TO SUSPECT'	517-519
2)	'INTERVENTION'	519-520
3)	THE COMBINED EFFECT OF 'REASON TO SUSPECT' AND 'INTERVENTION'	520-521
iii)	THE PRINCIPLE OF CERTAINTY IN ACCOUNTING PRACTICE DOES NOT APPLY UNDER THE TWO STAGE PROCESS : THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION.	522
iv)	TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THERE ARE NO ACTUAL OFFENCES UNDER SCHEDULE 1 GROUNDS 1,2,3 AND 8	522
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	522
vi)	DIAGRAM COMPARING INTERVENTION PROCEDURES WITH CRIMINAL PROCEDURES	523-524
vii)	THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR IS NOT GUILTY OF ANY OFFENCE: HE IS GUILTY OF 'CIRCUMSTANCES'	525-527

viii)	THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE COURT MUST DECIDE WHETHER CIRCUMSTANCES EXISTED , NOT WHETHER OFFENCES HAVE BEEN COMMITTED	527
ix)	HOW CAN THE COURT DETERMINE WHETHER THE COUNCIL HAD REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY IF THE COUNCIL IS NOT CALLED TO GIVE EVIDENCE	528
x)	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	528
xi)	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	529-529
xii)	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	529-531
xiii)	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	531
xiv)	THE TWO 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	532
xv)	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	532
xvi)	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	532

11 THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD AND THE FRAUDULENT CIVIL RESTRAINT ORDERS

1)	THE START: THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	532-578
2)	THE EMAILS PASSING BETWEEN SIR ANDREW MORRITT, CHANCELLOR OF THE CHANCERY DIVISION , HENDERSON J AND NORRIS J	579-586
3)	THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD LEADS TO THE THEFT OF THE DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN <u>SHEIKH V MARC BEAUMONT</u> , A BARRISTER	586-595
4)	THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD AND BEAUMONT CASE LEAD TO THE (FRAUDULENT) CIVIL RESTRAINT ORDERS	595-603
5)	THE COURTS TORTURE MY MOTHER TO DEATH. LORD ETHERTON, MASTER OF THE ROLLS. REFUSES TO TURN OVER PAGE 2 OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND READ PAGE 3	604-617
6)	DO SOME JUDGES TERRORISE OTHER JUDGES ? THE TWO OR THREE BITS OF	

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

- a) LORD PHILIP MATRAVERS OF WORTH, LORD CHIEF JUSTICE (2005-2008)
 - i) THE FACILITATOR OF THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD 618
 - ii) A FACILITATOR OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD 618
- b) 2006. PHILLIPS ARRANGES FOR HALLETT LJ, LORD JUSTICE DYSON, LORD JUSTICE CHADWICK. LORD JUSTICE MOORE BICK, LORD JUSTICE TUCKEY TO PERPETRATE THE INTERVENTION FRAUD IN THE COURT OF APPEAL 618
- c) 2007. PHILLIPS ARRANGES FOR LORD JUSTICE CHADWICK, LORD JUSTICE RIMER, LORD CLARKE, LORD JUSTICE STEPHEN RICHARDS AND LADY MANCE TO PERPETRATE THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD IN THE COURT OF APPEAL 619
- d) THE THREE BITS OF PAPER IN THE COURT OF APPEAL CREATED TO PRESERVE BRIGGS' FRAUDULENT INSTRUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLETE STAGE 2 AND 3 OF THE FRAUD
 - i) PURPORTED REFUSAL ON PAPER. CHADWICK SELLS HIS SIGNATURE TO ENDORSE ON THE INSTRUMENT 620
 - ii) RIMER WHO STARTED THE FRAUD IN THE HIGH COURT, PURPORTS TO REFUSE PERMISSION IN THE COURT OF APPEAL 621-623
 - iii) RICHARDS DEALS WITH CASE AT A TIME WHEN HE WAS SUSPENDED FROM THE BENCH ON SUSPICION OF HAVING COMMITTED ACTS OF SEXUAL DEPRAVITY FOR A SECOND TIME 624-625
- e) 2009 . APPEAL AGAINST BRIGGS ORDER 7 NOVEMBER 2007. LORD CLARKE MASTER OF THE ROLLS, APPARENTLY COULD NOT SEE ANYTHING WRONG IN THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD 625
- f) 2010. BURNETT STEALS THE MARC BEAUMONT DEFAULT JUDGMENT FOR £1M-£30m 625
- g) 2010, NICHOLAS BARD WILL NOT TO ENTER THE DEFAULT JUDGMENT IN RABIA SHEIKH V HUGO PAGE QC AND NIGEL MEARES 625
- h) 2011. MANN J OBSTRUCTS THE ISSUING OF FRAUD CLAIM AND OR BREACH OF DUTY CLAIM OF ANAL SHEIKH V RADCLIFFES (1) GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC (2) AND THE LAW SOCIETY(3) 626
- i) 2010. LORD NEUBERGER, MASTER OF THE ROLLS AND LEADING LAND LAWYER WRITES 'SORRY, I CAN'T HELP. 626
- j) 2009 –FOR LIFE. USE OF CIVIL RESTRAINT ORDERS BY CORRUPT JUDGES' TO HIDE THEIR FRAUD (AND THEIR TECHNIQUES) FROM OTHER JUDGES. GREY J, BURNETT J, TUGENDHAT J, NICOLA DAVIES J PATTERSON J, TURNER J, JAY J 626-632
- k) 2017. LORD ETHERINGTON, MASTER OF THE ROLLS REFUSES TO TURN OVER PAGE 2 OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND LOOK AT PAGE 3, AND DECLARE BRIGGS' FRAUDULENT INSTRUMENT VOID AND NON EXISTENT 633
- l) ARE JUDGES' APPOINTMENTS TO THE COURT OF APPEAL , THE SUPREME COURT AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS BASED ON HOW MUCH THEY STEAL ?

i)	RED RIVER JUDGES, PHILLIPS, BRIGGS, KITCHIN, CLARKE AND ARDEN APPOINTED TO SUPREME COURT AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS (AFTER FRAUD REPORTS WERE DELIVERED TO EVERY JUDGE PERSONALLY)	633
ii)	LAW SOCIETY JUDGES, PHILLIPS, BRIGGS AND DYSON APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS	633
iii)	RED RIVER JUDGES, RIMER, LEWINSON, HENDERSON AND SIMON APPOINTED TO THE COURT OF APPEAL	634
iv)	JUDGES NOT INVOLVED IN THE FRAUDS, SIR ANDREW PARK , MR JUSTICE MORGAN AND MR JUSTICE PETER SMITH REMAIN AS HIGH COURT JUDGES	634
v)	PHILLIPS, CLARKE, NEUBERGER AND HALLETT APPOINTED TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS	634
5)	ARE THE CRIMINAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES BEING TERRORISED BY THE JUDICIARY? THE TWO OR THREE BITS OF PAPER RECEIVED FROM LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES ABOUT THE MOST PREPOSTEROUS FRAUD IN THE 400 YEAR HISTORY OF CONVEYANCING	634
a)	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES INFILTRATED BY THE LAW SOCIETY	635-636
b)	2008. METROPOLITAN POLICE (HARROW) IGNORES COMPLAINT	636
c)	2009. METROPOLITAN POLICE (WEMBLEY) IGNORES COMPLAINT	636
d)	2009 THAMES VALLEY POLICE (MARC BEAUMONT) IGNORES COMPLAINT	637
e)	2010. THE SOLICITOR GENERAL VERA BAIRD KC 'THIS IS A CASE OF JUDICIAL CORRUPTION WHICH SHOULD BE REPORTED TO THE POLICE	638-641
f)	2010. AVON AND SOMERSET CONSTABULARY TAKES THE FRAUD REPORT TO THE SERIOUS FRAUD OFFICE AND PLANS TO RAID BURGESS SALMON	642
g)	THE METROPOLITAN POLICE STOPS THE RAID OF BURGESS SALMON AND TAKES OVER CASE . DS SHERRIFF : ' I WILL NOT SIT HERE AND LISTEN TO YOU TALKING ABOUT A COURT ORDER LIKE THAT'	642
h)	THE SERIOUS FRAUD OFFICE: 'THE FRAUD IS TOO SIMPLE FOR US. GO TO THE ECONOMIC CRIME UNIT'	642-646
i)	ECONOMIC CRIME UNIT OF THE CITY OF LONDON POLICE : 'THE FRAUD IS TOO DIFFICULT FOR US. GO TO THE SERIOUS FRAUD OFFICE, ANYWAY NO ONE WILL INVESTIGATE THE SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY BECAUSE WE SHARE A DESK WITH THEM'	647
j)	THERESA MAY MISLEADS PARLIAMENT AND THE UK ABOUT THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL CRIME AGENCY	647-650
k)	IS THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TERRIFIED OF THE JUDICIARY, OR IS IT JUST AS CORRUPT? DOMINIC GRIEVE'S 6 LINE RESPONSE TO THE MOST PREPOSTEROUS FRAUD IN THE 400 YEAR HISTORY OF CONVEYANCING	
i)	2011. DOMINIC GRIEVE MP KC ' THIS IS A MATTER FOR THE POLICE'	651
ii)	GRIEVE BELIEVES CONVEYANCING IS PRIVATE LIGATION	652
iii)	GRIEVE STOPS AVON AND SOMERSET CONSTABULARY FROM RAIDING BURGESS SALMON	652

iv)	GREIVE INSTRUCTS THE METROPOLITAN POLICE TO IGNORE THE FRAUDS	652
v)	IS GRIEVE A 'PAKISTAN IS FANTASTICALLY CORRUPT' . IS GRIEVE A RACIST?	652-653
i)	WHY DOESN'T THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WRITE THE FIVE WORDS WHICH WOULD STOP THEFT FRAUD AND MONEY LAUNDERING AT THE RATE OF £100,000 BN PER ANNUM IN THE UK: ' <i>THIS OFFICE INTENDS TO INTERVENE</i> 'THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	653-656
k)	2019. EMAIL SHOWING THAT THE JUDICARY (JAY J) AND GRIEVE COLLUDED TO BAN ME FROM COURT FOR LIFE.	657
i)	WHICH IS MORE PROBABLE: THAT MY ANALYSIS OF THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE IS WRONG IN EVERY DETAIL, OR THAT DOMINIC GRIEVE AND GEOFFREY COX MP HAVE BEEN BRIBED WITH SOME OF THE 100 UNITS?	657

12 THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE JUDICIARY'S CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT OF SOLICITORS. THE ARGUMENT FOR TORTURE

1) MATERIALS

a) THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

i)	UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT, 1984 ('UNCAT')	658.660
ii)	COMBATING TORTURE AND OTHER ILL-TREATMENT. A MANUAL FOR ACTION. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL	
1)	WHAT CONDUCT IS PROHIBITED?	660-661
2)	DEFINITIONS OF TORTURE	661-663
3)	WHAT IS OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN AND DEGRADING TREATMENT AND PUNISHMENT?	663-666
4)	THE LINK BETWEEN DISCRIMINATION AND TORTURE	666-667
5)	STATES' OBLIGATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW FOR ACTS COMMITTED BY NON-STATE ACTORS	667-669
6)	WHAT MUST STATES DO	669-670
7)	SAFEGUARDS AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER ILL-TREATMENT -	
a)	ARREST	671-673
b)	BRINGING DETAINEES BEFORE A JUDICIAL AUTHORITY	673-674
8)	THE ROLE OF THE JUDICIARY AND LEGAL PROFESSIONALS IN THE PREVENTION OF TORTURE AND OTHER ILL-TREATMENT	674-675
iii)	HUMAN RIGHTS	
1)	EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS	

a)	ART. 1 PROTOCOL 1 PROTECTION OF PROPERTY	675
b)	ART. 3 PROHIBITION OF TORTURE	676
c)	ART. 5 RIGHT TO LIBERTY AND SECURITY	676-677
d)	ART. 6 RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL	677
e)	ART. 7 NO PUNISHMENT WITHOUT LAW	677
f)	ART. 8 RIGHT TO RESPECT FOR PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE	678
g)	ART.14 PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION	678
2)	HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1988 S. 6 ACTS OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY	678
iv)	PROTECTION FROM HARASSMENT ACT 1997	678
v)	DICEY'S FIRST PRINCIPLE: PUNISHMENT WHERE NO THERE IS NO OFFENCE. THE USE OF ARBITRARY POWER.	679
vi)	LORD BINGHAM'S 8 PRINCIPLES OF THE RULE OF LAW	679
vii)	THE LAW ON VOID ORDERS	
1)	THE VOID ORDER BY SHIRLEY LEWALD	679-687
2)	THE LAW OF VOID ORDERS AND SUPREME COURT DECISIONS . (US AUTHORITIES)	688-689
b)	PUBLICATIONS	
i)	THE OFFICIAL CIA MANUAL OF INTERROGATION AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE: KUBARK	690-712
ii)	UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY. TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT . REPORT OF THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR	713-730
iii)	GUANTANAMO BAY ' I DIDN'T KNOW WHO I WAS ANY MORE': HOW CIA TORTURE PUSHED ME TO THE EDGE OF DEATH. GUARDIAN 29 JANUARY 2022	731-741
iv)	HEALING IN SURVIVORS OF TORTURE. ATHAR YAWAR BM MSC. JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF MEDICINE. VOL 97. AUGUST 2004 (J R SOC MED)	742-746
v)	THE MILGRAM EXPERIMENT ON OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY	747-750
c)	EXTRACTS FROM 'THE TORTURE LAWYERS' JENS DAVID OHLIN. CORNELL UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL	751-756
d)	LITERARY REFERENCES	
i)	SOME ONE MUST HAVE BEEN TELLING LIES ABOUT JOSEF K. HE KNEW HE HAD DONE NOTHING WRONG BUT, ONE MORNING, HE WAS ARRESTED' <u>FRANS KAFKA, THE TRIAL</u> 1914 -1915	756-758
ii)	' 1984' GEORGE ORWELL	757-758
iii)	EICHMANN IN JERUSALEM: A REPORT ON THE BANALITY OF EVIL BY	758-760

HANNAH ARENDT

2)	COMPARISON OF STATE TORTURE	761-766
3)	WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE TORTURE?	
a)	CREATING THE VICTIM: HIS DESTRUCTION AND ENSLAVEMENT IN A SINGLE MOMENT OF TIME BY MEANS OF A FEW TYPED PAGES, A SINGLE TYPED PAGE OR A SINGLE PARAGRAPH	
i)	THE LIFE OF A MAN, A PEOPLES, A STATE, OR THE DESTINY OF THE WORLD TERMINATED WITH A SINGLE SHEET OF PAPER	767-769
1)	THE DOCTRINE OF SHOCK AND AWE OR RAPID DOMINANCE. A TEMPLATE TAKEN STRAIGHT FROM THE BRITISH EMPIRE	770
2)	HITLER T4 DIRECTIVE AND THE EXTERMINATION OF THE SICK AND DISABLED	771
3)	UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1441 AND THE 2003 IRAQ WAR	772
4)	KHOMEINI'S 1989 FATWA CALLING FOR THE DEATH OF SALMON RUSHDIE	772
ii)	THE TWO SHEETS OF PAPER USED BY THE LAW SOCIETY TO DESTROY THE SOLICITOR	772-775
iii)	THE THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES)	
1)	THE 6 SHEETS OF PAPER WHICH CAN BE USED BY THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE JUDICIARY TO FREEZE ALMOST ALL THE BANKED MONEY IN THE WORLD	776
2)	THE NINE LINE CLAIM USED BY LLOYDS AND THE LAW SOCIETY TO ENSLAVE ME AND MY MOTHER AND TO MAKE US HOMELESS	777
3)	THE 4 PAGES USED BY MR JUSTICE AITKEN TO MAKE ME AND MY MOTHER HOMELESS : THE FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER	778-783
4)	THE 4 PAGES USED BY MR JUSTICE AITKEN J TO TORTURE MY MOTHER TO DEATH : THE SECOND FRADULENT FREEZING ORDER	784-792
iv)	THE REFUSAL BY 150 JUDGES OF THE HIGH COURT, COURT OF APPEAL AND SUPREME COURT AND 500 MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO TURN OVER PAGE 2 OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND READ PAGE 3. THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	
1)	PAGE 2 OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT; THE JUDICIARY'S REFUSAL TO TURN OVER PAGE 2 AND READ PAGE 3	793-800
2)	THE 4 PAGES THAT IS BRIGGS' FRAUDULENT INSTRUMENT	800-806
3)	WHAT THE SITE REPRESENTED TO THE RED RIVER JUDGES	807
4)	WHAT THE SITE REPRESENTED TO MY FAMILY	808-822

5)	DIAGRAM SHOWING THE PROPERTY THEFTS AND THE CONSEQUENCES	823-827
v)	THE TWO PAGES USED IMPRISON THE VICTIM IF HE PROTESTS : THE FRAUDULENT CIVIL RESTRAINT ORDERS	828
b)	PUNISHMENT WHERE THERE IS NO LAW; PUNISHMENT WITHOUT CHARGE; PUNISHMENT WITHOUT TRIAL; PUNISHMENT WHERE THERE IS NO OFFENCE; AN INTERVENTION WHICH IS NOT AN INTERVENTION; A TRIAL WHICH IS NOT A TRIAL; JUDGES WHO ARE NOT JUDGES	829
c)	THE BARRISTER'S ROLE TO DRAW THE VICTIM INTO THE PURPORTED COURT TO STEAL FROM HIM AND TURE HIM. THE LITGATION VORTEX	
i)	CREATING THE VICTIM'S DEPENDENCY ON THE BARRISTER AND TORTURER. THE BARRISTER IS NO DIFFERENT TO A MIGRANT SMUGGLER WHO PREYS ON HIS VICTIMS HOPELESSNES	829-832
ii)	WEAPONIZATION OF LITIGATION . TIMING OF CASES COORDINATED TO MAXIMISE PRESSURE ON THE VICTIM	832-833
iii)	THE MULTIPLICITY OF SHAM AND FRAUDULENT PROCEEDINGS ORCHESTRATED TO TAKE PLACE SIMULTANEOUSLY	833
iv)	THE VICTIM FORCED TO PARTICATE IN HIS OWN TORTURE BY MAKING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALING	833
v)	TRIALS ARE WITH TANTAMOUNT TO MOCK EXECUTIONS	833
vi)	TORTURE CHOREGRAPHED BETWEEN BARRISTERS, SOLICTORS AND JUDGES	833
vii)	BINDING THE VICTIM TO THE TREADMILL OF BOGUS LITIGATION UNTIL HE GIVES UP OR DIES	833
e)	WEARING DOWN OF THE VICTIM ON THE TREADMILL OF LITIGATION UNTIL HE GIVES UP, OR DIES.	
i)	THE LAW SOCIETY CASE	834
ii)	THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	834-843
f)	THE ENSLAVEMENT OF THE VICTIM IN PERPETUITY	834-843
g)	TORTURE BY THE WITHDRAWAL OF A JUDICIAL SYSTEM	
i)	COMMUNAL TRUST (INSTITUTIONAL ARBITRARINESS AND PERSECUTION) PART 6 UNITED NATIONS REPORT	844-845
ii)	J R MED SOC EXTRACT ON SADISM TORTURE IS THE INVERSION OF THE TRIAL	846
iii)	TABLE SHOWING COMPARISON OF TRIAL TIMES WHERE NO ONE KNOWS WHAT THE REASONS WERE FOR THE INTERVENTION	847-852
3)	THE PURPOSE OF THE TORTURE AND TORTURE TECHNIQUES USED	
a)	WHY SOLICITORS HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO SEE THE INTERVENTION FRAUD FOR HALF A CENTURY	
i)	THE APPLICATION OF COERCIVE TECHNIQUES TO IMPAIR THE HIGHEST CREATIVE ACTITIVEIS'. KUBARK	853

ii)	BOGUS ADJUDICATIONS TO UNSETTLE THE SOLICITOR AND SHIFT HIS REALITIES	854-857
iii)	BOGUS INVESTIGATION UNDERTAKEN TO WEAKEN AND DEMORALISE THE SOLICITOR IN PREPARATION FOR THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION	857
iv)	THE ABSURD PROPOSITIONS: ROUND SUM TRANSFERS , CASH SHORTAGE, THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL, TAKING OWN REMORTGAGE MONIES	857-868
v)	MULTIPLE SHAM INTERROGATIONS OPPRESSIVE ENQUIRES AND FILE REQUESTS COORDINATED TO MAXIMISE STRESS FOR THE SOLICITOR	868-881
vi)	CONFINEMENT USED AS STRESSOR	882
vii)	DISORIENTATION THE PRISONER SHOULD NOT BE PROVIDED WITH ROUTINES'. KUBARK	882-884
ix)	FEELINGS OF ANXIETY AND UNCERTAINTY	884
x)	FALSE SENSE OF SECURITY	884
xi)	THE SHOCK AND AWE OF THE INTERVENTION AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SOLICITOR'S LIFE	885
b)	TORTURE TECHNIQUES	
i)	NO MARKS TORTURE	886
ii)	TORTUROUS ENVIRONMENTS.ACCUMULATION OF STRESSORS	886-887
iii)	THE USE OF COERCION ,THREATS AND FEAR TO DESTROY RESISTANCE <u>KUBARK PAGE 92</u>	888-891
iv)	HUMILIATION AND DEGRADATION: LOSS OF DIGNITY AND IDENTITY	892-894
v)	PAIN , INTENSE PAIN CAUSING FALSE CONFESSIONS	895-896
vi)	PSYCHOLOGICAL MANIPULATION. CUTTING VICTIM OFF FROM THE KNOWN AND REASSURING . DISTORTION OF REALITY. THE VICTIM'S LIFE IS GOVERNED BY DYSTOPIAN NOTIONS	896
vii)	DOMINATION AND SUBJUGATION KUBARK . LOSS OF AUTONOMY	897
viii)	DETENTION. CUTTING VICTIM OFF FROM THE KNOWN AND REASSURING.	897-898
ix)	THE ASSUMPTION BY THE TORTURER OF A PARENTAL FIGURE. UN REPORT PARA 49 –PARA 50	898
x)	REGRESSION AND FEELINGS OF GUILT	899
xi)	IMPOSING ABSURD ILLOGICAL OR CONTRADICTIONARY RULES OF BEHAVIOUR SANCTIONS AND REWARDS	900
x)	DEPRIVATION OF SENSORY STIMULI. SOLITARY CONFINEMENT AND ISOLATION , LACK OF SLEEP KUBARK PAGE 89-90	901-902
xi)	FEELINGS OF FORBODING, AND APPREHENSION .	903

xii)	ATTACKS ON FAMILY	903-904
xiii)	TORTURE BY PROXY	905-906
xiv)	HOW CAN A MAN LIVE WITH NO RULES? <u>EICHMANN IN JERUSALEM: A REPORT ON THE BANALITY OF EVIL BY HANNAH ARENDT</u> THE ABSENCE OF LEGAL CERTAINTY AND LEGITIMATE EXPECTATION	906
c)	NO RELIEF FROM TORTURE BECAUSE THE JUDGES ARE THE TORTURERS.	
i)	THE JUDGES KNOW THAT WHAT THEY ARE DOING IS UNLAWFUL AND WILL DESTROY THEIR VICTIM, BUT THEY DO IT ANYWAY	906-907
ii)	'THEY WOULD LAUGH AND SAY YOU HAVE NO RIGHTS AND WE ARE ENTITLED TO DO TO YOU WHATEVER WE PLEASE' ABU ZUBAHDAH, HELD AT GUANTANAMO BAY	907-909

13 THE SOLICITOR'S RIGHTS TO OBTAIN REPARATION

1)	REPARATION FROM THE UK GOVERNMENT	
a)	VIOLATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS BASIC PRINCIPLES ON THE ROLE OF LAWYERS	
i)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT XI JINPING. THE 709 CRACKDOWN (2016)	910-911
ii)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTERS TO AYATOLLAH KHAMENEI , IRAN. THE ARREST AND IMPRISONMENT OF LAWYER NASRIN SOTOUDEH (2018) RIGHT TO LAWYER	912-913
iii)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO PRESIDENT ERDOGAN. ARREST AND DETENTION OF 10 LAWYERS (2020)	914-915
iv)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO HONG KONG (2020)	916
v)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ZIMBABWE HARASSMENT OF LAWYERS MTETWA AND COLTART JINPING (2020)	917
vi)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER COLUMBIA LAWYERS AT RISK AND SUPPORT FOR JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE (2020) (LAWYER ARRESTED AND IMPRISONED FOR ALLEGING FRAUD)	918
vii)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT LUKASHENKO, BELARUS. ARREST AND DETENTION OF LAWYER, LEANID SUDALENKA (2021)	919-920
viii)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE, BELARUS. REVOCATION OF LICENCE TO PRACTICE OF 5 LAWYERS (2021)	921-922
ix)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF ROMANIA. CONVICTION AND IMPRISONMENT OF LAWYER ROBERT ROSU(2021)	922-924
x)	THE PHILLIPINES - ATTACKS ON LAWYERS (2021)	925
xi)	ARREST, DETENTION AND ILL TREATMENT OF LAWYERS IN IRAN (2022)	926-927

xii)	ARREST, DETENTION, PROSECUTION AND TORTURE OF LAWYER CHANG WEIPING (2023)	928-929
xiii)	ARREST, DETENTION, PROSECUTION AND TORTURE OF LAWYER DING JIAXI (2023)	930-931
b)	SEPARATION OF POWERS	
i)	DIAGRAMS	932-936
ii)	THE LEGISLATURE THE EXECUTIVE AND THE JUDICIARY CONCEIVES OF AND IMPLEMENTS THE INTERVENTION FRAUD (1941-1985)	
1)	PRE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW REFORM ACT 2005 ARRANGEMENTS.	937
2)	PARLIAMENT'S IGNORANCE ABOUT SCHEDULE 1 OF THE SOLICITORS ACTS OF 1941, 1957, 1965 AND 1974	937
3)	WHY THE SUPERLATIVE GENIUS OF THE INTERVENTION FRAUD MEANS ITS ARCHITECTS HAD TO HAVE BEEN PARLIAMENT AND JUDICIARY	937-938
4)	THE PRIMARY LEGISLATION WHICH ENABLES THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD	
a)	SCHEDULE 1 OF THE SOLICITORS ACTS OF 1941, 1957, 1965 AND 1974	939
b)	ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1988, S44B MAKING SCHEDULE 1 PARA 9 SOLICITORS ACT 1974 OBSOLETE	939
c)	THE LEGISLATION WHICH ENABLES THE LAW SOCIETY TO DELEGATE TO UNQUALIFIED STAFF. 1932 ACT S. 74 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF LAW SOCIETY AND S.81 DEFINITION OF COUNCIL, 1941 ACT S. 28 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY S.29 INTERPRETATION , 1957 ACT S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES, S.80 POWER TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY, S.86 INTERPRETATION ,1965 ACT S.80 AMENDMENT OF S.80 OF PRINCIPAL ACT S.28 INTERPRETATION ,1974 ACT AS ENACTED S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES S.80 POWERS TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY-	939
5)	SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1988 ENACTED THE LAW SOCIETY (THE QUASI LEGISLATURE, QUASI JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE) AND THE JUDICIARY (THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS) THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION.	
a)	PAGE REFERENCES	939
b)	WHAT IS THE REAL RULE BREACH?	940
c)	WHY THE LAW SOCIETY USES THE RULE 19 (1) BREACH AS GROUNDS TO INTERVENE WHEN IT KNOWS THE SOLICITOR HAS NOT BREACHED THE RULE	940
d)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY SUCCEEDS IN INTERVENING ON A RULE 19 (1) BREACH WHEN THERE HAS BEEN	

NO RULE 19 (1) BREACH: THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS COLLUDE TO CALL IT A 'ROUND SUM TRANSFER' BREACH

i)	WAS THE MISCHIEF PLANNED IN 1974? THE INTENTION THAT GROUND 3 APPLIED ONLY IF CLIENT MONEY WAS IN JEOPARDY NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 1(1)(C)	940-941
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S RIGHT TO MAKE SECONDARY LEGISLATION WITH THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS CONCURRENCE	941-942
iii)	RULE 19 OF THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES (SAR)	942-944
iv)	NOTE X TO RULE 19 IS NONSENSE SO WHY DID THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS CREATE IT?	945
v)	DAVID SHAW, THE LAW SOCIETY'S FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT, BELIEVES RULE 19 (1) BREACH AND THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS NOTE X (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) ARE TWO DISTINCT ACCOUNT RULE BREACHES	945-955
vi)	IN THE HIGH COURT SHAW SAYS HE THINKS THE BREACH IS TRANSFERRING COSTS WITH A LOT OF NOUGHTS	956-958
vii)	SARAH BARTLETT AND THE PANEL ALSO RELY ON THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS' DEFINITION OF THE BREACH I.E NOTE X (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) AND NOT ON RULE 19 (1)	958
viii)	DUTTON'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE ALSO REFERS TO THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS' DEFINITION OF THE BREACH I.E NOTE X (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) AND NOT ON RULE 19 (1)	959-960
ix)	THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION IN RELATION TO LEGAL AID MONEY	960-961
ii)	THE LEGISLATURE , THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE DEPRIVE THE SOLICITOR, THE CLIENT, THE CROWN AND ANY THIRD PARTY OF THEIR RIGHTS AGAINST THE LAW SOCIETY IN THE PRE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW REFORM ACT 2005 ENACTED LAW	
1)	NO RIGHT UNDER SCHEDULE 1 FOR CLIENT TO RECOVER HIS MONEY FROM THE LAW SOCIETY	961
2)	NO RIGHT UNDER SCHEDULE 1 FOR CLIENT TO RECOVER HIS DOCUMENTS FROM THE LAW	961
3)	NO RIGHT UNDER SCHEDULE 1 FOR THE CROWN TO RECOVER BONA VACANTIA FROM THE LAW SOCIETY	961
iii)	THE LEGISLATURE , THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE (THE LAW SOCIETY, THE BAR COUNCIL) DEPRIVE THE SOLICITOR OF STATUTORY OR ANY RIGHT TO CHALLENGE THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION	
1)	PRIMARY LEGISLATION (COURTS ACT 2003 AND CIVIL PROCEDURE ACT 1997) ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE ,	961-962

EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIARY PRIOR TO THE
CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM ACT 2005

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 2) | SECONDARY LEGISLATION (CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 67.4) MADE BY THE JUDICIARY (MASTER OF THE ROLLS) AND THE EXECUTIVE (LAW SOCIETY AND THE BAR COUNCIL) | 962-963 |
| 3) | SECONDARY LEGISLATION (SUPREME COURT RULES 2009) | |
| a) | THE JUDGES OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS DEBATE THE SOLICITORS AMENDMENT BILL, SCHEDULE 1 OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 FALSELY REPRESENTED AS CONSOLIATED LEGISLATION. THE WRONG SCHEDULE 1 PROVISIONS ENACTED | 963 |
| b) | SENIOR LORD OF APPEAL OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS (LORD BINGHAM) DRAFTS THE SUPREME COURT RULES 2009 GOVERNING THE APPEAL PROCEDURE | 963 |
| c) | LORD BINGHAM REFUSES PERMISSION TO APPEAL <u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY</u> | 963 |
| d) | THE EXECUTIVE (THE BAR COUNCIL AND THE LAW SOCIETY) CONSULTED IN THE DRAFTING OF THE SUPREME COURT RULES 2009 | |
| i) | THE LAW SOCIETY EXECUTES THE INTERVENTION FRAUD | 964 |
| ii) | THE BAR COUNCIL ALSO PERPETRATES THE INTERVENTION FRAUD. DO THE CHAIRS OF THE BAR COUNCIL AND THE BAR STANDARDS BOARD AND THEIR CONNECTIONS ACQUIRE THE RIGHT TO COMMIT THE INTERVENTION FRAUD, OR IS THEIR APPOINTMENT GIVEN FOR COMMITTING IT? | |
| 1) | TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, CHAIRMAN OF THE BAR COUNCIL AND <u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (HC) 2002 (CA) 2003 (HL) | 964 |
| 2) | GREGORY TREVERTON JONES AND <u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY</u> 2006 (HC) 2005 | 964 |
| 3) | TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, GREGORY TREVERTON JONES AND <u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY</u> 2006 (CA) 2007 | 964 |
| 4) | TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, GREGORY TREVERTON JONES AND <u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY</u> 2007 (HL) | 964 |
| 5) | NICHOLAS VINEALL KC CHAIRMAN OF THE BAR COUNCIL, AND <u>MIRESKANDARI V THE LAW SOCIETY</u> | 964 |
| 6) | DUTTON KC AND PATRICIA ROBERTSON KC, CHAIR OF THE BAR STANDARDS BOARD AND <u>AHMED & CO, BIEBUYCK SOLICITORS, DIXON & CO & ORS RE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 [2006]</u> EWHC (THE COMPENSATION FUND CASE) | 964 |

	7) PATRICIA ROBERTSON KC AND <u>THE LAW SOCIETY V ANAL SHEIKH</u> SDT 2009	964
iv)	THE LEGISLATURE , THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE DEPRIVE SOLICITOR, THE CLIENT AND THE CROWN OF THE RIGHT TO CLAIM CONVENTION RIGHT VIOLATIONS (ART 1 PROTOCOL 1, RIGHT TO PROPERTY, ART. 4 FREEDOM FROM SLAVERY, ART 8 RESPECT FOR PRIVATE LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE)	
	1) THE VICTIM DEPRIVED OF RIGHTS AGAINST THE EXECUTIVE (THE LAW SOCIETY)	
	a) WHAT ARE THE VIOLATIONS?	964
	b) PRIMARY LEGISLATION (HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998) ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE , EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIARY PRIOR TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM ACT 2005	965-966
	c) SECONDARY LEGISLATION CREATED BY THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE (THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE BAR COUNCIL) REMOVING THE RIGHT	
	i) S. 7 CLAIM OF CONVENTION RIGHT VIOLATION CAN NEVER BE MADE BY THE SOLICITOR BECAUSE PARA 6(4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION CAN NEVER BE MADE	966
	ii) S. 7 CLAIM OF CONVENTION RIGHT VIOLATION CAN NEVER BE MADE BY THE CLIENT	966
	iii) S. 7 CLAIM OF CONVENTION RIGHT VIOLATION CAN NEVER BE MADE BY THE CROWN	966
	d) ART 1 PROTOCOL 1 CLAIMS PREVENTED BY <u>HOLDER</u> TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, CHAIRMAN OF THE BAR COUNCIL AND <u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (HC) 2002 (CA) 2003 (HL	966-968
	2) THE VICTIM DEPRIVED OF RIGHTS AGAINST THE JUDICIARY FOR VIOLATION OF HIS CONVENTION RIGHTS	968-969
	3) THE VICTIM DEPRIVED OF RIGHTS AGAINST THE LEGISLATURE. DECLARATION OF INCOMPATIBILITY	969
v)	THE JUDICIARY ADJUDICATES THE SOLICITOR'S CASE AGAINST THE EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATURE AND QUASI JUDICIARY (THE LAW SOCIETY) APPLYING LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE JUDICIARY, THE LEGISLATURE, AND THE EXECUTIVE	
	1) <u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (HC) 2002 (CA) 2003 (HL AND OTHER INTERVENTION CASES HEARD BY THE HOUSE OF LORDS	969
	2) <u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY HL</u> AND OTHER INTERVENTION CASES WHERE PERMISSION TO APPEAL WAS REFUSED BY THE HOUSE OF LORDS.	969
	3) INTERVENTION CASES WHERE PERMISSION TO APPEAL WAS REFUSED BY THE SUPREME COURT	969

	4)	HIGH COURT AND COURT OF APPEAL CASES WHICH RELY ON THE PRECEDENTS ESTABLISHED BY THE HOUSE OF LORDS	969
	5)	THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS AND THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1988 MASTER OF THE ROLLS' RULE 19 NOTE (X) . RULE 21	
	a)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS, THE HEAD OF THE CIVIL DIVISION OF THE COURT OF APPEAL	969-970
	b)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS, HEAD OF THE CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES COMMITTEE, SPONSORED BY THE EXECUTIVE (THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE) RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FACT THAT INTERVENTIONS HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UNDER THE WRONG PROCEDURE SINCE 1974	970
	c)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS, RESPONSIBLE FOR AMBIGUITY IN THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1988 MASTER OF THE ROLLS' RULE 19 NOTE (X)	970
	d)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS, DETERMINES OR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THOSE WHO DETERMINE THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE WHERE IT PERTAINS TO RULE 19 NOTE (X)	970
	e)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS DETERMINES OR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THOSE WHO DETERMINE THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE WHERE IT PERTAINS TO THE RULE 21	970
	f)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS, DETERMINES OR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THOSE WHO DETERMINE THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE WHERE IT PERTAINS TO UNLAWFUL REMUNERATION CERTIFICATES . SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 57	970
	g)	MASTER OF THE ROLLS, DETERMINES OR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SOLICITOR'S APPEAL FROM THE SOLICITOR'S DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL WHERE THE SOLICITOR HAS BEEN INTERVENED INTO ON ANY GROUND, INTERVENED INTO RELYING ON RULE 19 NOTE (X) INTERVENED INTO RELYING ON RULE 21,OR RELYING ON UNLAWFUL REMUNERATION CERTIFICATES	971
	vi)	THE JUDICIARY'S FUNCTION DISCHARGED BY THE EXECUTIVE. THE TWO STAGED PROCESS	971
NB	vii)	THE JUDICIARY'S FUNCTION DISCHARGED ADMINISTRATIVELY	971
	viii)	THE JUDICIARY'S FUNCTION NOT DISCHARGED BY ANYONE	971
	ix)	THE SOLICITOR ENTITLED TO CLAIM FRAUD, PERJURY AND ABUSE OF PROCESS AGAINST THE EXECUTIVE (THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE BAR COUNCIL) ONLY WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE JUDICIARY CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 81	972
	x)	NO RIGHT UNDER THE CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES TO SET ASIDE A FALSE JUDGEMENT	972-973
	xi)	UNDER WHICH CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES CAN PERSON AVE A JUDGMENT STRUCK OUT BECAUSE THE JUDICIARY APPLIED LAW WHICH DID NOT EXIST OR WHICH WAS TOO UNCERTAIN TO BE	973

	APPLIE?	
xii)	THE CRIMINAL OFFENCES COMMITTED BY LAW SOCIETY (THE EXECUTIVE, THE QUASI LEGISLATURE AND THE QUASI JUDICIARY)	
1)	THE LAW SOCIETY IMMUNE FROM PROSECUTION BY THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES (THE EXECUTIVE)	973-974
2)	THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TURNS A BLIND EYE TO THE CONDUCT OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES	975
3)	THE HOME SECRETARY TURNS A BLIND EYE TO THE CONDUCT OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	975
4)	THE LEGISLATURE (THE HOME AFFAIRS SELECT COMMITTEE) TURNS A BLIND EYE TO THE CONDUCT OF THE HOME SECRETARY, THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE LAW SOCIETY	975
5)	THE LAW SOCIETY CAN BE PROSECUTED PRIVATELY ONLY WITH THE CONSENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS (THE EXECUTIVE) FOR WHOM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IS RESPONSIBLE	975
xiii)	THE BANK SCAM	
1)	THE FINANCIAL CONDUCT AUTHORITY (THE EXECUTIVE) TURNS A BLIND EYE TO THE CONDUCT OF THE BANK	975
2)	THE PRUDENTIAL AUTHORITY AND THE BANK OF ENGLAND TURN A BLIND EYE TO THE FINANCIAL CONDUCT AUTHORITY	975
3)	THE TREASURY (THE EXECUTIVE) TURNS A BLIND EYE TO THE CONDUCT OF THE FINANCIAL CONDUCT AUTHORITY	976
4)	THE LEGISLATURE (THE TREASURY SELECT COMMITTEE) TURNS A BLIND EYE TO CONDUCT OF THE TREASURY, THE PRUDENTIAL, THE BANK OF ENGLAND AND THE FINANCIAL CONDUCT AUTHORITY	976
xiv)	THE THEFT OF BONA VACANTIA FROM THE CROWN BY THE LEGISLATURE , THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE	976
xv)	THE EXECUTIVE (THE ATTORNEY GENERAL) BELIEVES THAT THE JUDICIARY CAN VIOLATE THE LAW, DISAPPLY THE LAW OR MAKE UP THE LAW AND IT IS THE FUNCTION OF THE EXECUTIVE (THE POLICE) TO APPLY IT	976-979
xvi)	THE UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT OF THE VICTIM BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (THE EXECUTIVE) WHILE SITTING IN THE LEGISLATURE AND COMMUNICATING WITH THE JUDICIARY (DOMINIC GRIEVE MP AND JAY J) AND ALSO BEING A MEMBER OF BOARD OF THE BAR COUNCIL (THE PERPETRATOR)	980
c)	SLAVERY	980-992
d)	TORTURE	993
e)	TREASON	993-999

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| 1) | THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK | |
| a) | CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND
FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS | 1000-1001 |
| b) | HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998 | 1001-1003 |
| 2) | CLAIMS FOR DECLARATIONS OF INCOMPATIBILITY | 1003-1012 |
| 3) | CLAIMS FOR CONVENTION VIOLATIONS | |
| a) | ARTICLE 6 – RIGHT TO FAIR TRIAL | 1013-1026 |
| b) | PROTOCOL 1 OF ARTICLE 1- RIGHT TO ENJOY PROPERTY | 1027-1028 |
| c) | ARTICLE 8- RIGHT TO RESPECT FOR PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE | 1029 |
| d) | ARTICLE 4 – PROHIBITION OF SLAVERY AND FORCED LABOUR | 1029 |
| e) | ARTICLE 3- PROHIBITION OF TORTURE | 1029 |

- | | | |
|------|--|-----------|
| 1) | RESPONSE TO APPENDIX 1 | 1029-1030 |
| 2) | REPORT TO PARLIAMENT ABOUT THE COSTS TO THE TAXPAYER FOR THE USE
OF THE HIGH COURT, COURT OF APPEAL AND HOUSE OF LORDS TO COMMIT
THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD AND LAUNDER THE PROCEEDS | |
| 3) | DIRECTIONS | |
| a) | DIRECTION TO OVERSEE LISTING AND MANAGEMENT OF THE LAW
SOCIETY CASE AND THE LAW SOCIETY/LLOYDS CASE | |
| b) | DIRECTION THAT I BE TREATED AS ACTING IN A REPRESENTATIVE
CAPACITY | |
| c) | DIRECTION THAT THE CASES BE LISTED FOR AN EN BANC HEARING IN
THE SUPREME COURT AND BEFORE FIVE JUDGES IN THE HIGH COURT | |
| d) | DIRECTION THAT THE SUPREME COURT RULES 2009 AND THE CIVIL
PROCEDURE RULES 1988 DO NOT APPLY | |
| i) | UNIVERSAL AND FUNDAMENTAL PRACTICES, PRINCIPLES,
CONVENTIONS AND LAWS WHICH HAVE EXISTED SINCE THE
BEGINNING OF RECORDED TIME HAVE NOT APPLIED | |
| ii) | THE RULE OF LAW DOES NOT APPLY | |
| iii) | INTERNATIONAL LAW DOES NOT APPLY | |
| iv) | UK'S CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES DO NOT APPLY | |
| v) | PRIMARY LEGISLATION DOES NOT APPLY | |
| vi) | SECONDARY LEGISLATION AND RULES DO NOT APPLY | |

vii)	THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE DOES NOT APPLY	1051
viii)	NO STATUTE LAW, OR NO CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS LAW, GOVERNING INTERVENTIONS APPLIES	1051
ix)	NO PROCEEDINGS TO WHICH THE COURT PROCEDURAL RULES CAN APPLY	1051
x)	NO APPLICATION, APPEAL OR CLAIM NEED BE MADE WHERE PROCEEDINGS ARE VOID	1051
xi)	NO RIGHT TO VOID NON EXISTENT PROCEEDINGS UNDER GENERAL COURT PROCEDURE RULES	1052
xii)	COURT PROCEDURAL RULES CANNOT APPLY WHERE THERE ARE STATE CRIMES	1052
xiii)	COURT PROCEDURAL RULES CANNOT APPLY WHERE THERE IS NO COURT AND THE COURT NOT A COURT IF IT DOES NOT KNOW THE LAW	1052
xiv)	COURT NOT A COURT IF PARTY HAS TO TEACH THE COURT THE LAW	1052
xv)	COURT NOT A COURT IF A PARTY'S BARRISTER CAN ACT FOR HIS OPPONENT WHILE PRETENDING TO ACT FOR HIM	1052
xvi)	COURT NOT A COURT WHERE THERE IS NO SEPARATION OF POWERS BETWEEN THE LEGISLATURE, THE EXECUTIVE AND THE JUDICIARY	1052
xvii)	THE HIGH COURT, THE COURT OF APPEAL AND THE UK'S SUPREME COURT NOT COURTS BUT PUBLIC AUTHORITIES WHICH HAVE VIOLATED MULTIPLE CONVENTION RIGHTS	1052
e)	DIRECTION THAT THERE BE NO REQUIREMENT TO PAY FEES	
i)	DIAGRAMS AND FLOWCHARTS	
1)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT AND MONEY LAUNDERING OF ALL MY ASSETS	1053
2)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY , THE RED RIVER JUDGES AND LORD BURNETT, THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE STOLE ALL MY ASSETS AND HAVE TORTURED ME	1054-1057
3)	THE LITIGATION VORTEX	1058
ii)	TABLES	
1)	COSTS IN THE LAW SOCIETY CASE	1059-1061
2)	FEES PAID IN THE LAW SOCIETY CASE	1061
3)	FEES PAID IN THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	1062-1063
4)	FEES PAID IN OTHER CASE IN THE LITIGATION VORTEX AS AT 2011	1064-1067
iii)	APPLICATIONS NEVER LISTED, HEARINGS NOT HEARD BY A COMPETENT TRIBUNAL AND ORDERS FORGED	1067

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| f) | DIRECTION THAT THE FRAUDULENT CIVIL RESTRAINT ORDERS BE TREATED AS VOID , UNLAWFUL AND NON EXISTENT IN THE LAW SOCIETY INTERVENTION FRAUD | 1068-1076 |
| g) | DIRECTION THAT NO PERSON VIEWS ANY JUDGEMENT, ORDER OR ANY DOCUMENT USED IN THE LAW SOCIETY CASE AND LAW SOCIETY/ LLOYDS CASE WITHOUT CONSENT | 1077 |

16	SIR JOHN CHADWICK, THE LAW SOCIETY, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC CBE, GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC, HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC , PHILIP ENGELMAN, ANDY PEEBLES AND OTHERS CONSPIRE TO DECEIVE THE HOUSE OF LORDS (LORD HOFFMAN, LORD RODGERS, LORD CARSWELL) TO RESTORE THE INTERVENTION FRAUD
----	---

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1) | PARK J DISMANTLES THE INTERVENTION FRAUD. THE COURT OF APPEAL, THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS EXTINGUISHES HIGH COURT JUDGEMENT TO RESTORE THE FRAUD | 1078-1080 |
| a) | JULY 2005. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PARK J'S JUDGMENT | 1078-1080 |
| b) | SEPTEMBER 2005. TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE 'HER PRACTICING CAREER MAY NOT BE A LONG ONE' | 1080-1081 |
| c) | THE LAW SOCIETY LIES TO THE HIGH COURT ABOUT ITS REASONS FOR APPEALING | 1081-1083 |
| d) | SEPTEMBER 2005. THE 136 FALSE STATEMENTS, SPECIOUS ARGUMENTS AND OUTRIGHT LIES IN THE TIMOTHY DUTTON'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE FOR APPEAL FUNDING C | 1083-1099 |
| e) | JULY 2006, INTERVENTIONS BACK UP TO ANNUAL RATE BEFORE PARK'S JUDGMENT | 1100 |
| f) | 2009. DAVID SHAW : ' I NEVER MADE THE ALLEGATION THAT THERE WERE NO BILLS. COUNSEL MADE IT AFTER ME' | 1100 |
| 2) | DIAGRAMS AND FLOWCHARTS SHOWING HOW THE LAW SOCIETY USES THE COURTS TO PLACE, LAYER AND INTERGRATE ITS PROCEEDS OF THEFT | |
| a) | THE THREE STAGES OF MONEY LAUNDERING | 1101 |
| b) | THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT NTERVENTIONS IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS | 1102 |
| c) | THE SEVEN ATTEMPTED THEFTS OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS | 1103 |
| d) | THE USE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS | 1104 |
| e) | THE THEFT AND MONEY LAUNDERING OF ALL MY ASSETS | 1105 |
| f) | THE ABSURD PROPOSITION AND MONEY LAUNDERING | 1106 |
| 3) | DIAGRAMS ILLUSTRATING THE ABSENCE OF SEPARATION OF POWERS | |
| a) | HOW THE INTERVENTION PROCEDURE WORKS WHERE THERE IS THE SEPARATION OF POWERS | 1107-1108 |
| b) | INTERVENTIONS UNDER THE LAW SOCIEY'S UNLAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE | 1109 |

4)	THE HOUSE OF LORDS DECISION AND ORDER	1110-1117
5)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S VESTING RESOLUTION AND LETTER TO THE BANK WITHHELD FROM THE LAW LORDS BY THE CONSPIRATORS	1118-1120
6)	PROFILES OF THE CONSPIRATORS	
a)	SIR JOHN CHADWICK	1121
b)	LAW SOCIETY'S LEGAL TEAM	
i)	HODGE MALEK (HIGH COURT)	1121-1122
ii)	TIMOTHY DUTTON KC (COURT OF APPEAL, HOUSE OF LORDS)	1123
iii)	ANDREW PEEBLES . (HIGH COURT ,COURT OF APPEAL, HOUSE OF LORDS)	1124
iv)	PETER CADMAN , RUSSELL COOKE (HOUSE OF LORDS)	1124
c)	THE SOLICITOR' S LEGAL TEAM	
i)	GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC . (HIGH COURT, COURT OF APPEAL)	1124-1125
ii)	HUGO PAGE KC, (HOUSE OF LORDS)	1125-1127
iii)	JONATHAN HARVIE KC, (HOUSE OF LORDS)	1127-
iv)	PHILIP ENGELMAN. (HOUSE OF LORDS, EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS)	
v)	PAUL SAFFRON (HIGH COURT AND COURT OF APPEAL)	1127-1128
vi)	CHARLES BUCKLEY (HOUSE OF LORDS)	1129-1130
7)	THE CASE FIXING AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC, PAUL SAFFRON AND THE LAW SOCIETY TO LOSE THE HIGH COURT CASE AND COURT OF APPEAL CASE. TREVERTON JONES KC BRIBED WITH THE £254,000 SHEIKH – NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY AND OTHER INDUCEMENTS .	
a)	WHAT IS CASE FIXING?	1130
b)	THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN TREVERTON JONES KC , THE LAW SOCIETY AND RADCLIFFES TO LOSE CASE	1130-1131
c)	THE LEGAL ARGUMENT WHICH AN HONEST BARRISTER WOULD HAVE PUT IN RELATION TO THE £254,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	1131-1136
d)	WHAT TREVERTON JONES DID AND SAID ABOUT THE £245,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	
i)	SKELETON ARGUMENT 17 APRIL 2005. TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY.	1137
ii)	CLOSING SUBMISSIONS 17 MAY 2005 TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY	
iii)	TREVERTON JONES WITHHOLDS THAT HE FAILED TO PUT THE PROPER LEGAL ARGUMENT AT THE INJUNCTION HEARING IN THE FRAUDULENT RESTITUTION PROCEEDINGS	

iv)	SKELETON ARGUMENT 6 JUNE 2005 TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS SAYING THAT THE MONEY WAS MY MONEY.	
v)	TREVERTON JONES AVOIDS CALLING MR BANK MANAGER, MARTIN COCKRELL	1141
vi)	TREVERTON JONES CONCEALS THE FACT THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD EXCISED THE HEADING OF THE COCKRELL'S STATEMENT WHICH HAD BEEN MADE IN A DIFFERENT CASE.	1145
vii)	TREVERTON JONES STOPS ME FROM TELLING THE COURT ABOUT THE TT FORMS	1147
ix)	TREVERTON JONES LAYS THE GROUND FOR THE COURT OF APPEAL TO ALLEGE FORGERY OF THE TT FORMS	
x)	SAFFRON STEALS 254,000 SHEIKH NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	1147
8)	THE CONSPIRACY BETWEEN HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC, PHILIP ENGELMAN AND THE LAW SOCIETY TO LOSE THE APPLICATION TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS	1148
9)	SIR JOHN CHADWICK AND HUGO PAGE QC COMMIT THE RED RIVER CONVEYACING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD. LORD NEUBERGER (WHO GAVE LIMITED PERMISSION TO APPEAL TO THE LAW SOCIETY) MASTER OF THE ROLLS AND LEADING LAND EXPERT WRITE S` I CAN'T HELP` WITH THE JUDICIAL CORRUPTION THE RED RIVER CONVEYACING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	1148
10)	THE BARRISTER'S ROLE TO DRAW THE VICTIM INTO THE PURPORTED COURT TO STEAL FROM HIM AND TURE HIM. THE LITGATION VORTEX	
a)	CREATING THE VICTIM'S DEPENDENCY ON THE BARRISTER AND TORTURER. THE BARRISTER IS NO DIFFERENT TO A MIGRANT SMUGGLER WHO PREYS ON HIS VICTIMS HOPELESSNES	1148
b)	WEAPONIZATION OF LITIGATION . TIMING OF CASES COORDINATED TO MAXIMISE PRESSURE ON THE VICTIM	1148
c)	THE MULTIPLICITY OF SHAM AND FRAUDULENT PROCEEDINGS ORCHESTRATED TO TAKE PLACE SIMULTANEOUSLY	1148
d)	THE VICTIM FORCED TO PARTICATE IN HIS OWN TORTURE BY MAKING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALING	1148
e)	TRIALS ARE WITH TANTAMOUNT TO MOCK EXECUTIONS	1148
f)	TORTURE CHOREGRAPHED BETWEEN BARRISTERS, SOLICTORS AND JUDGES	1148
g)	BINDING THE VICTIM TO THE TREADMILL OF BOGUS LITIGATION UNTIL HE GIVES UP OR DIES	1148
6)	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.	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION PARA 1, PARA 3. PARA 5.5	1149-1150
b)	HIGH COURT SKELETON.THE SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE. TREVERTON JONES' FALSE 23 LINE REPRESENTATION	1151-1165
c)	HOUSE OF LORDS PETITION.THE SCHEDULE 1 PROCEDURE. THE FALSE	1165-1168

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	
1)	WHAT ARE SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS	1168-1169
2)	WHAT ARE NON SUBSTANTIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS	1169
ii)	THE MATERIAL PROVISIONS OF THE 1974 ACT	
1)	THE SUBSTANTIVE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES	
a)	PARA 5 (1) THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER APPLICATION	1169
b)	PARA 9 (4) THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION ORDER APPLICATION	1170
c)	PARA 10 (1) THE MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER APPLICATION	1170
2)	THE NON SUBSTANTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE APPLICATIONS AND PROCEDURES	
a)	PARA 9 (7) SERVICE OF THE LAW SOCIETY'S DOCUMENTS LIST	1170
b)	PARA 9 (8) THE DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION	1171
c)	PARA 9 (10) THE DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION APPLICATION	1171
d)	PARA 9 (11) THE MAKING OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER (DOCUMENTS)	1171
e)	PARA 6 (1) THE ISSUING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION	1171
f)	PARA 6 (2) VESTING RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY	1172
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	1172
h)	PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL OF THE NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT APPLICATION	1172
i)	PARA 6 (5) THE MAKING OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER (MONEY)	1173
3)	NO PROCEDURE FOR PARA 7 (1) POSSESSION OF MONEY	1173
4)	CRIMINAL PROVISIONS	

	a)	PARA 6 (6) TRANSFER OF VESTING RESOLUTION RELEVANT MONEY	1173
	b)	PARA 9 (3) FAILURE TO MAKE VOLUNTARY DOCUMENT PRODUCTION WHERE PARA 9 (4) APPLICATION NOT MADE	1174
b)		THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
	i)	THE COMMENCING RESOLUTION ISSUED TO START INTERVENTION	1174-1175
	ii)	INTERVENTION STARTS WITH THE LAW SOCIETY'S SUBSTANTIVE CLAIMS MADE IN THE HIGH COURT	
	1)	PARA 9 (4) THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION ORDER APPLICATION	1176
	2)	PARA 5 (1) THE STATUTORY FREEZING ORDER APPLICATION	1177
	3)	PARA 10 (1) THE MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER APPLICATION	1178
	iii)	SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS HIS DEFENCE IN THE HIGH COURT PROCEEDINGS	1179
	iv)	ORDERS MADE ON FAILED INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	1179
	v)	PARA 9 (8) DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION BY THE SOLICITOR AND PARA 9 (7) THIRD PARTIES WHERE INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS LOST	1179-1180
	vi)	THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	
	1)	A PROCEDURE CONCERNED WITH INTERVENTION MONEY NOT THE INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	1180-1181
	2)	WHEN THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE APPLIES	
	a)	TABLE SHOWING GROUNDS IN WHICH THE FREEZING ORDER PROCEDURE APPLIES	1182
	b)	DIAGRAM SHOWING APPLICATION OF VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	1183
	c)	MONEY SUBJECT TO THIRD PARTY INTERESTS	1184
	d)	MIXED MONEY	1184-1185
	e)	LATER DISCOVERED MONEY	1185
	3)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE CONTEMPLATES MULTIPLE PARTIES MAKING REPEATED PARA 6(4) APPLICATIONS AFTER THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE HAS CLOSED DOWN	1185-1186
	4)	DIAGRAM SHOWING THE USE OF THE VESTING	1186-1187

RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN RELATION TO MONEY

vii)	SERVICE OF PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION AND PARA 6(3) THIRD PARTIES PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT COULD BE A MERE LETTER	1188-1190
viii)	THE HEARING OF THE PARA 6 (4) APPLICATION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF PARA 6 (3) NOTICE TO THIRD PARTY PROHIBITING PAYMENT	1191-1193
ix)	THE PARA 6(1) VESTING RESOLUTION NOT 'WITHDRAWN' ON A SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	1193
x)	TRANSFER OF MONEY	
1)	THE TRANSFER OF MONEY IN SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS	1194
2)	THE TRANSFER OF MONEY AFTER SUBSTANTIVE PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE	1194-1195
3)	WHY THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE MEANS IT HAS TO USE FRAUD TO OBTAIN THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE MONEY	1195-1198
c)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	
i)	INTERVENTION STARTS AND ENDS WITH THE PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION OR A MERE LETTER	1199-1200
ii)	THE SOLICITOR'S INTERVENTION CHALLENGE IS BY WAY OF THE NON SUBSTANTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES	
1)	PARA 6 (4) VESTING RESOLUTION WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION	1201
2)	PARA 9(8) THE DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION	1202
iii)	THE WRONG APPLICATIONS MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURES	
1)	PARA 6(3) AND PARA 6(4)	1203
2)	PARA 9(7) AND PARA 9(8)	1204
iv)	SUMMARY	1205
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	
i)	DOCUMENTS	1204-1207
ii)	HOW WOULD THE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE SOLICITOR BE KNOWN ?	
1)	THE PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION	
a)	THE SOLICITOR	1208-1212

	b) THE PARA 6 (3) THIRD PARTIES	1212
2)	THE PARA 9 (8) DOCUMENTS RECOVERY APPLICATION	
	a) THE SOLICITOR	1212-1213
	b) THE PARA 9 (7) THIRD PARTIES	1213
iii)	WHY WOULD A THIRD PARTY GO TO THE TROUBLE AND EXPENSE OF CHALLENGING THE INTERVENTION?	1213
iv)	THE APPLICATION OF CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE PART 67.4	1213-1215
v)	HOW CAN SIMULTANEITY BE ACHIEVED?	1215-1216
vi)	PARA 6 (4) WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION DOES NOT DISPOSE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION ONLY THE PARA 6(3) NOTICE PROHIBITING PAYMENT OUT	1218
vii)	NO PROVISION FOR THE TRANSFER OF MONEY UNDER THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	1219
viii)	SUBSTANTIVE HEARING HAS ALREADY TAKEN PLACE SO WHAT IS THERE TO CHALLENGE AT THE PARA 6(4) HEARING?	1219-1220
ix)	WITHDRAWAL APPLICATION HAS NO EQUIVALENT PROCEDURE	1221
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	1222
xi)	IT IS THE ACTUAL CHARGE OR THE INDICTMENT WHICH IS DEFENDED, NOT THE DECISION TO PREFER THE CHARGE OR INDICTMENT.	1222-1223
xii)	HOW CAN CIRCUMSTANCES BE CHALLENGED?	1224
xiii)	HOW CAN A (COMPANY) RESOLUTION TO DO SOMETHING BE WITHDRAWN ?	1224
xiv)	BASED ON VERSION 3, THE LAW SOCIETY'S FICTITIOUS VERSION OF SCHEDULE 1	1224
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	1224-1225
xvi)	TRANSFER OF THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND MAIL REDIRECTION CAN ONLY BE DONE UNLAWFULLY AND CRIMINALLY	1226
e)	DIAGRAMS AND TABLES	
i)	DIAGRAM SHOWING APPLICATION OF VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE IN THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE IN RELATION TO MONEY	1227
ii)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 2	1228

iii)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE VERSION 3	1229
iv)	TABLE ILLUSTRATING VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE WITH REFERENCE TO GROUNDS	1230
v)	TABLE SHOWING ISSUES DEALT WITH AT SUBSTANTIVE HEARINGS AND AT PARA 6 (4) HEARINGS	1231
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	1232-1235
2)	GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC AND HODGE MALEK KC PERMITTED TO GUESS WHAT THE ALLEGATIONS MIGHT HAVE BEEN OR TO MAKE THEM UP	1236
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	1236
ii)	STATUTORY VIOLATIONS GO UNCHALLENGED UNDER THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT PROCEDURE	1237
iii)	DISREGARD OF THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS WHOLESAL, A DENIAL OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF PARLIAMENT AND AN ATTACK ON DEMOCRACY	1237
iv)	TREASON	1237
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)	1238
2)	TRANSFER IN VIOLATION OF FUNDAMENTAL LEGAL PRINCIPLES	
a)	THE PRINCIPLE OF LEGAL CERTAINTY	1238
b)	BANKING LAW	1238
c)	HUMAN RIGHTS LAW	1238
3)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	
a)	PARA 6 (6) OFFENCE . CONSPIRACY AIDING, ABETTING AND ENCOURAGING OFFENCE. SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015 S. 45	1238
b)	FRAUD ACT 2006 . S. 2 (FALSE REPRESENTATION) S. 3 (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION) S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION)	1238

	c)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE ABUSE OF PROCESS	1238
	d)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1238
ii)		THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS PROCURED BY THREATS, BLACKMAIL AND FRAUD	
	1)	DURESS	1238
	2)	BLACKMAIL BY THE THREAT OF PARA 9 (1) CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS	1238
	3)	THE THREAT OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IS A FALSE STATEMENT	1238
	4)	BLACKMAIL BY THE THREAT OF COSTS	1238
	5)	THE THREAT OF COSTS IS A FALSE STATEMENT	1238
	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)	1238
	b)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE ABUSE OF PROCESS	1238
	c)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1238
iii)		THE SOLICITOR'S MAIL REDIRECTED USING DURESS	
	1)	PARA 10 (1) APPLICATION FOR MAIL REDELIVERY ORDER	1238
	2)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE DOES NOT APPLY TO MAIL	1238
	3)	LAW SOCIETY USES DURESS TO OBTAIN THE SOLICITOR'S CONSENT TO MAIL REDELIVERY	1238
	4)	LAW SOCIETY'S VIOLATION OF STATUTE	
	a)	MAIL REDELIVERY PROCEDURE DOES NOT PROVIDE FOR SOLICITOR'S CONSENT	1238
	b)	CONSENT FORCED FROM SOLICITOR GIVEN WITHOUT LIMIT OF TIME	1239
	5)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	
	a)	S.84 POSTAL SERVICES ACT 2000	1239
	b)	THEFT OF SOLICITOR'S PERSONAL MAIL AND DATA	1239
	c)	FRAUD ACT 2006 . S. 2 (FALSE REPRESENTATION) S. 3 (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION) S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION)	
	d)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE ABUSE OF PROCESS	1239
	e)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1239

h)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES AND THE VESTING RESOLUTION	
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)	1239
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)	1239
iii)	<u>CHARLES BUCKLEY V THE LAW SOCIETY (1984)</u>	1239
iv)	<u>DOOLEY V THE LAW SOCIETY 2000</u> (UNREPORTED)	1239
v)	<u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (HC) TIMOTHY DUTTON QC AND PHILIP ENGELMAN	1239
vi)	<u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2002]</u> (CA) TIMOTHY DUTTON QC, NICHOLAS PEACOCK , PHILIP ENGELMAN AND ROGER PEZZANI	1239
vii)	<u>HOLDER V THE LAW SOCIETY [2003]</u> (SC) TIMOTHY DUTTON QC, NICHOLAS PEACOCK , PHILIP ENGELMAN AND ROGER PEZZANI	1239
viii)	<u>LAW SOCIETY V BALDWIN [2004]</u>	1239
ix)	<u>PATHANIA PS & ORS V LAW SOCIETY [2004]</u> PHILP ENGELMAN, BOWER COTTON BOWER, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC. RUSSELL COOKE	1240
x)	<u>SRITHARAN AND ANR V THE LAW SOCIETY [2004]</u> (HC) MANJIT GILL KC, KENNETH HAMER KC	1240
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	1240
xii)	<u>SIMMS & ORS V THE LAW SOCIETY [2005]</u> (CA) TIMOTHY DUTTON KC. RUSSELL COOKE	1240
xiii)	<u>GAUNTLETT V THE LAW SOCIETY [2006]</u> NICHOLAS PEACOCK	1240
xiv)	<u>HERBERT & ORS V THE LAW SOCIETY [2007]</u> TIMOTHY DUTTON QC , RUSSELL COOKE	1240
xv)	<u>LAW SOCIETY V ELSDEN & ORS [2015]</u> TIMOTHY DUTTON QC, ANDREW PEEBLES, JEREMY BARNETT	1240
xvi)	<u>RAMASMY V THE LAW SOCIETY [2016]</u> JEREMY BARNETT	1240
xvii)	<u>BLAVO V THE LAW SOCIETY [2017]</u>	1240
xviii)	<u>NEUMANS LLP V THE LAW SOCIETY [2017]</u> RADCLIFFES	1240
12)	LAW LORDS DUPED INTO CONFUSING 'CIRCUMSTANCES' WITH 'GROUNDS'	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION. HEADING, PARA6 (I) AND (II) PARA 7. 2, PARA 7.10, PARA 7. 15	1241-1243

b)	PART 1 OF THE SCHEDULE 1 OF 1974 ACT	1243-1244
c)	COMPARISON WITH CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS	1244-1249
d)	IF SCHEDULE 1 IS BASED ON CIRCUMSTANCES, BY WHAT PROCEDURE ARE THE GROUNDS MADE OUT AND WHO ADJUDICATES ON THEM? THE PANEL? THE COURT? WHAT IF THE SOLICITOR DOES NOT MAKE THE PARA 6 (4) APPLICATION? DOES THAT MEAN HIS PRACTICE IS DESTROYED BECAUSE OF CIRCUMSTANCES?	1249-1250
e)	THE AMBIGUITY USED TO CREATE THE FICTION THAT THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS A COURT ORDER IN THE FALSE NARRATIVE THAT THE INTERVENTION IS A SINGLE ACT ACHIEVED BY THE VESTING RESOLUTION	1250-1251
f)	THE AMBIGUITY USED TO REINFORCE THE FICTION OF THE TWO STAGE PROCESS	1252
13)	'THE LAW SOCIETY TOOK CONTROL OF HER PRACTICE THE FOLLOWING DAY' ,	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION PARA 5.4	1252
b)	HOW DO THE LAW LORDS THINK THE LAW SOCIETY GAINS CONTROL OF THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY?	
i)	THE VESTING RESOLUTION AND THE LAW SOCIETY'S LETTER TO THE BANK?	1253-1255
ii)	DID THE LAW LORDS UNDERSTAND THAT THE BANKS COMMIT CRIMINAL OFFENCE BY TRANSMITTING THE MONEY TO THE LAW SOCIETY	1256
iii)	DID THE LAW LORDS UNDERSTAND THAT THE LAW SOCIETY COMMIT AIDING AND ABETTING OFFENCES	1256
c)	HOW DO THE LAW LORDS THINK THE LAW SOCIETY 'GAINS CONTROL' OF THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS?	1256
d)	HOW DO THE LAW LORDS THINK THE LAW SOCIETY 'GAINS CONTROL' OF THE SOLICITOR'S MAIL?	1256
e)	WHY DO THE LAW LORDS USE THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 OF THE 1965 ACT INSTEAD OF THE WORDING OF SCHEDULE 1 OF THE 1974 ACT? ARE THEY AWARE THAT THE 1965 ACT HAS BEEN REPLACED ?	1256
14)	THE CONSPIRACY TO WITHHOLD FROM THE LAW LORDS THE FACT THAT THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS FRAUDULENTLY USED TO TRANSFER SOLICITOR'S BANKED MONEY	1256
a)	THE LAW ACCORDING TO TREVERTON JONES KC	1257-1258
b)	THE LAW ACCORDING TO THE CONSPIRATORS HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC CBE, THE LAW SOCIETY AND OTHERS	1258
c)	FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE BASED ON VESTING RESOLUTION, BUT WHAT IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION?	
ca)	THE NOTION OF 'VESTING'	1258-1264
cb)	THE FICTION THAT THE PARA 6 (1) VESTING RESOLUTION IS A COURT ORDER.	

i)	THE NINE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE CONFLATED INTO A SINGLE INSTRUMENT	1258-1264
ii)	VESTING RESOLUTION USED TO FREEZE MONEY, TRANSFER MONEY, SEIZE DOCUMENTS AND REDIRECT MAIL	1258-1264
iii)	VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE USED TO AVOID THE SCRUTINY OF THE COURT	1258-1264
iv)	VESTING RESOLUTION USED TO DEPRIVE SOLICITOR OF RIGHT OF CHALLENGE	1258-1264
v)	VESTING RESOLUTION USED INTERVENE WITHOUT GROUNDS	1258-1264
a)	DISCHARGE OF COUNCIL'S FUNCTIONS AND DELEGATION	
i)	THE CHARTER OF THE SOCIETY (1845)	1258-1264
ii)	1932 ACT S. 74 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF LAW SOCIETY AND S.81 DEFINITION OF COUNCIL	1258-1264
iii)	1941 ACT S. 28 COUNCIL TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY S.29 INTERPRETATION	1258-1264
iv)	1957 ACT S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES, S.80 POWER TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY, S.86 INTERPRETATION	1258-1264
v)	1965 ACT S.80 AMENDMENT OF S.80 OF PRINCIPAL ACT S.28 INTERPRETATION CHECK TO SEE IF RESOLUTION IS SIGNED BY COUNCIL	1258-1264
vi)	1974 ACT AS ENACTED S.79 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES S.80 POWERS TO ACT ON BEHALF OF SOCIETY,	1258-1264
vii)	1974 ACT AS AT <u>ANAL SHEIKH V LAW SOCIETY HIGH COURT CASE 2005</u>	1258-1264
b)	COMPARABLE WITH A COMPANY RESOLUTION ABSURD	1258-1264
c)	ACCORDING TO PARLIAMENT ALL IT IS A NOTICE WHICH STARTS DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE	1258-1264
d)	VESTING RESOLUTION CAN BE A LETTER	1258-1264
e)	NO RULES GOVERNING THE MAKING OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION	1258-1264
f)	RIGHT TO DELEGATE? WAS THE CHAIRMAN UNQUALIFIED ? DID PARLIAMENT INTEND THAT NON SOLICITORS WOULD DECIDE ON INTERVENTIONS ?	1258-1264
g)	IS PARLIAMENT AWARE THAT FORMER GYM INSTRUCTORS, LIFE COACHES , SALES ASSISTANTS AND THE LIKE ARE DETERMINING THE PROFESSIONAL LIVES OF SOLICITORS?	1258-1264
h)	'PANEL' MEANS MORE THAN ONE, SO HOW COULD ONE PERSON BE THE DECISION MAKER IN THE SHEIKH INTERVENTION ?	1258-1264
i)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION PROPERLY SIGNED?	1258-1264
j)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH S. 80 (3) OF THE 1974 ACT.?	1258-1264

k)	IS THE VESTING RESOLUTION CERTIFIED AT ALL?	1258-1264
l)	IS A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION 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

xvi)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. OPEN SPACES AND COUNTRYSIDE. VOLUME 78. VESTING.	1258-1264
xvii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND ENVIRONMENTAL LAW VOLUME 45. VESTING OF SEWERS IN SEWERAGE UNDERTAKERS. EFFECT OF VESTING	1258-1264
xviii)	HALSBURY'S LAWS OF ENGLAND. EUROPEAN UNION . VOLUME 47A. THE PRINCIPLE OF ACQUIRED OR VESTED RIGHTS	1258-1264
c)	DID PARLIAMENT INTEND 'VEST' TO HAVE A LEGAL MEANING?	1258-1264
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	1258-1264
ii)	1957 ACT S. 58 REMUNERATION OF SOLICITOR MORTGAGEE	1258-1264
iii)	1965 ACT S. 14 DECEASED SOLICITORS BANK ACCOUNTS VEST IN LAW SOCIETY TO THE EXCLUSION OF PR	1258-1264
e)	HOW THE VESTING RESOLUTION WAS CREATED	
i)	DIAGRAM	1258-1264
ii)	THE CONCEPT OF VESTING TAKEN FROM 1965 ACT S.14 MERELY A RIGHT TO OPERATE DECEASED ACCOUNT IN PRIORITY TO PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES	1258-1264
iii)	THE CONCEPT OF TAKING CONTROL TAKEN FROM 1965 ACT NON VESTING RESOLUTION PROCEDURE SCHEDULE 1 PARA 9 – PARA 13	
1)	THE PROVISIONS	1258-1264
2)	DIAGRAMS	1258-1264
3)	COUNCIL RESOLUTION GAVE RIGHT TO TAKE CONTROL THE SOLICITOR'S BANKED ACCOUNTS	1258-1264
4)	CONTROL GIVEN AFTER INTERVENTION HAD CONCLUDED	1258-1264
5)	MONEY TRANSFERRED ONLY WITH CONSENT	1258-1264
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	1258-1264
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	1258-1264
f)	THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VESTED RIGHTS AND VESTED	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 PROHIBITING 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

o)	PARLIAMENT DOES NOT DESCRIBE THE VESTING RESOLUTION AS A FREEZING ORDER	1258-1264
f)	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?	1258-1264
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?	1258-1264
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 ?	1258-1264
d)	PARA 6 (6) PROVIDES THAT IT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE TO TRANSFER MONEY TO ANYONE (INCLUDING THE LAW SOCIETY)	1258-1264
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	1258-1264
f)	'VEST' DOES NOT MEAN 'TO TRANSFER'	1258-1264
g)	'VESTING' DISTINGUISHED FROM 'TAKING POSSESSION'	1258-1264
h)	WHY WOULD PARLIAMENT EXPECT THE PUBLIC TO TRUST THE LAW SOCIETY OR ITS SOLICITORS WITH THEIR MONEY?	1258-1264
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	1258-1264
15)	CONSPIRACY TO WITHHOLD THE USE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION TO REMOVE THE SOLICITOR'S DOCUMENTS BY FRAUD AND OR BY BLACKMAIL AND OR BY BURGLARY FROM THE LAW LORDS	
a)	WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENS ON AN INTERVENTION	1265-1268
b)	HOW THE OBSOLETE DOCUMENTS PRODUCTION PROCEDURE IS USED IN THE INTERVENTION FRAUD	
ii)	OBSOLETE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE USED IN FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS	
1)	DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE OBSOLETE AFTER THE INTRODUCTION OF S44B	1269
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	1269
3)	WHY THE DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PROCEDURE SHOULD HAVE CHANGED SINCE THE 1941 ACT	1269
4)	PARA 9 (3) PENALTY RETAINED TO BLACKMAIL SOLICITOR	1269

5)	THE NONSENSICALITY OF THE PARA 9 (3) PENALTY	1269
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	1269
ii)	SERVICE ON OTHERS	1269
iii)	48 HOURS NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPLY TO COURT	1269
iv)	8 OR 14 DAYS TO APPLY TO COURT	1269
v)	APPLICATION CAN ALSO BE MADE BY OTHERS	1269
b)	PARLIAMENT UNABLE TO SEE THE TWO PROCEDURES WERE FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT	1269
16)	CONSPIRACY TO WITHHOLD THE FRAUDULENT USE OF THE VESTING RESOLUTION TO REDIRECT THE SOLICITOR'S MAIL AND POSTAL ACT 2000 OFFENCE FROM THE LAW LORDS	1269-1270
17)	LAW LORDS DUPED INTO TREATING 'REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY' IS THE CHARGE; ACCORDING TO PARLIAMENT ITS ONLY THE TRIGGER WHICH STARTS THE PROCESS	
a)	THE HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION. PARA. 4, PARA 6 (1) PARA 7.2, PARA. 7.4, PARA 7.10. PARA 7.13, PARA 7.15.	1270-1272
b)	THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ON THE SOLICITORS AMENDMENT BILL. FIRST PRESENTATION 2 MARCH 2072	1273-1274
c)	NO DIFFERENCE TO FINDING IN CRIMINAL LAW THAT THE DEFENDANT ACCUSED OF MURDER GUILTY OF 'THE SUSPICION OF HAVING COMMITTED MURDER'	1274
d)	NO DIFFERENCE TO FINDING IN CIVIL LAW THAT THERE IS A SUSPICION THAT THE DEFENDANT IS IN BREACH OF CONTRACT	1274
e)	WHERE PUNISHMENT IS BASED ON MERE SUSPICION	
i)	"TALIBAN WHIPS NINE WOMAN AND TEN MEN 39 TIMES BASED ON SUSPICION OF ADULTERY AND WITHOUT A TRIAL. SHARIA LAW ENFORCED IN AFGHANISTAN". DECEMBER 2022	1274-1275
ii)	MCCARTHYISM	1275
iii)	THE TRUTH NEVER MATTERED AT GUANTANAMO 'THE DECEIT AND LIES AND COVER-UPS OF THE WORST MOMENTS IN POST 9-11 HISTORY HAVE CREATED AN ENDLESS STAGE OF HYPOCRISY FOR ALL THE WORLD TO SEE	1276-1277
iv)	STALINIST RUSSIA . ARTICLE 58 OF THE RUSSIAN SFSR PENAL CODE	1277
18)	'REASON TO SUSPECT DISHONESTY' LAW LORDS DUPED INTO REINFORCING THE FRAUDULENT TWO STAGE PROCESS TO DETERMINE THE SOLICITOR'S CHALLENGE	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION PARA 7.8 – 7.11	1278

b)	THE LAW ACCORDING TO HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC, TIMOTHY DUTTON KC, TREVERTON JONES KC, THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE OTHERS LAWYERS	1278-1280
c)	SCHEDULE 1 CRAFTED TO HOODWINK JUDGES INTO DECIDING THE WRONG ISSUES IN THE WRONG APPLICATION MADE IN THE WRONG PROCEDURE	
i)	GROUNDS	
1)	'REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE' CHANGED TO 'REASON TO SUSPECT'	
a)	PARLIAMENT'S REASON FOR THE CHANGE OF WORDING	1281-1286
b)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS FROM PARLIAMENT THAT 'REASON TO SUSPECT' MADE NO SENSE AFTER THE ENACTMENT OF S44B	1281-1286
c)	REASON TO SUSPECT' WORDING RETAINED TO CREATE BOGUS TWO STAGE PROCESS WHICH GUARANTEES THAT EVERY INTERVENTION CHALLENGE WILL FAIL	1281-1286
i)	WHAT IS THE TWO STAGE PROCESS AND WHY IT MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR CAN NEVER WIN	1281-1286
ii)	TWO STAGE PROCESS IS BASED ON TWO SEMANTIC MISCHIEFS	
1)	'REASON TO SUSPECT'	1281-1286
2)	'INTERVENTION'	1281-1286
3)	THE COMBINED EFFECT OF 'REASON TO SUSPECT' AND 'INTERVENTION'	1281-1286
iii)	THE PRINCIPLE OF CERTAINTY IN ACCOUNTING PRACTICE DOES NOT APPLY UNDER THE TWO STAGE PROCESS : THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION.	1281-1286
iv)	TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THERE ARE NO ACTUAL OFFENCES UNDER SCHEDULE 1 GROUND 1,2,3 AND 8	1281-1286
v)	TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT WHETHER THE SOLICITOR IS GUILTY OF ANY OFFENCE UNDER GROUND 1,2,3 AND 8 IS NEVER CONSIDERED BY THE COURT	1281-1286
vi)	DIAGRAM COMPARING INTERVENTION PROCEDURES WITH CRIMINAL PROCEDURES	1281-1286
vii)	THE TWO STAGE PROCESS MEANS THAT THE SOLICITOR IS NOT GUILTY OF ANY OFFENCE: HE IS GUILTY OF 'CIRCUMSTANCES'	1281-1286

- | | | |
|-------|--|-----------|
| 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 <u>ANAL SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (2005)</u> AND IN <u>SRITHARAN AND ANR V THE LAW SOCIETY [2004]</u> 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 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) 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 REMORTGAGE 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

	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	1281-1286
	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	1281-1286
19)		LAW LORDS DECEIVED ABOUT THE REGULATORY COMPLAINTS. THIS COURT ACCEPTS THE SOCIETY'S SUBMISSION THAT A POOR REGULATORY HISTORY IS RELEVANT TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE INTERVENTION NOTICES SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN'	
	a)	HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION PARA.7.6.	1287
	b)	16 COMPLAINTS OVER 17 YEARS HANDLING OF 2000-2500 CASE, 8 UNLAWFUL BECAUSE OF S 57 SOLICITORS ACT 1974, AND 6 BEING RAISED DURING THE INVESTIGATION TO HARASS ME SO, IN REALITY, 2 COMPLAINTS IN 2000-2500 CASES	1287-1295
	c)	ADJUDICATIONS WEAPONISED TO WEAR DOWN THE SOLICITOR AND TO STEAL HIS COSTS	1287-1295
	d)	ADJUDICATIONS WHICH ARE NOT ADJUDICATIONS	1287-1295
	e)	DOES PARLIAMENT KNOW THAT SALES ASSISTANTS, LIFE COACHES, STUDENTS AND OTHERS 'ADJUDICATE' CLIENT COMPLAINTS?	1287-1295
	f)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY USES ADJUDICATIONS TO STEAL COSTS FROM THE SOLICITOR AND STEALS MONEY FROM THE COMPENSATION FUND TO BRIBE THE COMPLAINANT	
	i)	THE LAW	
	1)	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 57	1287-1295
	2)	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 71	1287-1295
	3)	THE SOLICITORS' (NON-CONTENTIOUS BUSINESS) REMUNERATION ORDER 1994 REMUNERATION CERTIFICATE BY THE LAW SOCIETY'S COUNCIL	1287-1295
	4)	THE SOLICITORS' (NON-CONTENTIOUS BUSINESS) REMUNERATION ORDER 1994 TAXATION BY COURT	1287-1295
	ii)	THE ADJUDICATORS' REDUCTION OF COSTS WHERE THERE IS A CLIENT CARE AGREEMENT IS UNLAWFUL	1287-1295
	iii)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	
	1)	THEFT ACT 1968 S. 1 (THEFT)	1287-1295
	2)	THEFT ACT 1968 S.17 (FALSE ACCOUNTING)	1287-1295
	3)	FRAUD ACT 2006 . S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION)	1287-1295
	4)	SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015	1287-1295

5)	CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD	1287-1295
6)	ABUSE OF PROCESS	1287-1295
7)	MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE	1287-1295
8)	BRIBERY ACT 2010	1287-1295
f)	PERPETRATION STRATEGIES COMMON TO FRAUDULENT ADJUDICATIONS, FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS AND FRAUDS LIKE THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD	
i)	THE UNLAWFUL USE OF PROCEDURE TO COMMIT VIOLATIONS WHICH CAN NEVER BE REVERSED	1287-1295
ii)	VIOLATIONS WHICH ARE VALID UNTIL THEY ARE SET ASIDE BY THE VICTIM (WHICH THEY NEVER ARE)	1287-1295
iii)	THE LAW SOCIETY AVOIDS HAVING THE COMPLAINT HEARD SUBSTANTIVELY (JUST AS IT AVOIDS THE SUBSTANTIVE HEARINGS IN FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS)	1287-1295
e)	THE USE OF ADJUDICATIONS TO FACILITATE THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION	
i)	ADJUDICATION IN FAVOUR OF THE SOLICITOR REVERSED: MODOOD.	1287-1295
ii)	ADJUDICATIONS MADE TACTICALLY DURING 2004 INVESTIGATION	
1)	CHRONOLOGY	1287-1295
2)	BULKING UP OF DOCUMENTS AGAINST THE SOLICITOR FOR THE PANEL	1287-1295
3)	THE LAW SOCIETY USE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL TORTURE TECHNIQUES	1287-1295
f)	THE PRECEDENTS ESTABLISHED BY THE SHEIKH ADJUDICATIONS	
i)	BURROWS. IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN ESTATE OVER 14 MONTHS RESULTING IN FILE 6 INCHES IN THICKNESS REQUIRES ONLY 7 HOURS WORK	1287-1295
ii)	WIGGS.	
1)	IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO ATTEMPT TO STOP THE LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION FROM BEING DEFRAUDED	1287-1295
2)	IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO ATTEMPT TO STOP HIS CLIENT FROM BEING DEFRAUDED	1287-1295
3)	OTHER ISSUES	
a)	DID THE DISTRICT JUDGE PROTECT THE SURVEYOR BECAUSE HE WAS A WELL KNOWN COURT EXPERT?	1287-1295
b)	IS IT THE JUDICIARY'S POLICY TO MAINTAIN THE FICTION THAT THERE IS NO CORRUPTION IN THE UK (EXCEPT WITHIN THE BLACK AND ETHNIC COMMUNITY)?	1287-1295

	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 WRITING 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

viii)	SODHA .IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO REFUSE TO COMMIT FRAUD, IF THE CLIENT INSTRUCTS HIM TO DO SO	1287-1295
ix)	WALKER. IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT FOR A SOLICITOR TO COMMIT THE MOST MINOR ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR	1287-1295
x)	HEPHERD . IT IS GROSS MISCONDUCT TO DISCHARGE THE CLIENT'S INSTRUCTIONS	1287-1295
g)	CONDUCT AND SERVICE COMPARATORS	
i)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S INTERVENTION FRAUD	
1)	SUCCESSIVE PRESIDENTS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS (AN ESTIMATED 1000 SOLICITORS OVER THE YEARS) HAVE COMMITTED THE INTERVENTION FRAUD FOR 50 YEARS	1287-1295
ii)	2005 INTERVENTION.	
1)	SOLICITOR AND PANEL MEMBER, CHARLES SNEARY, IS BRIBED TO ENDORSE AN INTERVENTION	1287-1295
2)	GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC (FOUNTAIN COURT) AND PAUL SAFFRON (RADCLIFFES) CONSPIRE WITH LAW SOCIETY TO PRETEND THAT THERE HAS BEEN AN INTERVENTION AND ATTEMPT (UNSUCCESSFULLY) TO LOSE THEIR CLIENT'S CHALLENGE	1287-1295
3)	HODGE MALEK KC, ANDY PEEBLES, TREVERTON JONES KC AND PAUL SAFFRON RELY ON EVIDENCE WHICH THEY KNOW IS FALSE AND PERJURED	1287-1295
4)	TREVERTON JONES KC AND PAUL SAFFRON CONSPIRE WITH THE LAW SOCIETY TO DEFRAUD THEIR CLIENT BY AGREEING THAT THE LAW SOCIETY'S COSTS PAYMENT SHOULD BE SECURED AGAINST HER PROPERTIES	1287-1295
5)	TIMOTHY DUTTON KC LIES TO THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE TO OBTAIN FUNDING FOR AN APPEAL	1287-1295
6)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE COLLUDE WITH DUTTON KC AND GRANT FUNDING TO REINSTATE THE INTERVENTION FRAUD	1287-1295
7)	TREVERTON JONES KC , ANDY PEEBLES, TIMOTHY DUTTON, PAUL SAFFRON AND PETER CADMAN CONSPIRE WITH THE LAW SOCIETY, HALLETT LJ, DYSON LJ, CHADWICK LJ, MOORE-BICK LJ AND TUCKEY LJ TO PROCURE A FALSE COURT OF APPEAL JUDGMENT	1287-1295
8)	HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC (BLACKSTONE CHAMBERS) AND PHILIP ENGELMEN CONSPIRE WITH THE LAW SOCIETY AND WITH THE SUPREME COURT TO PRETEND THAT THERE HAD BEEN AN INTERVENTION AND SUBMIT SHAM GROUNDS FOR APPEAL	1287-1295
9)	PHILIP ENGELMAN CONSPIRES WITH THE LAW SOCIETY AND WITH THE ECHR TO PRETEND THAT AN INTERVENTION HAD TAKEN PLACE AND SUBMITS SHAM GROUNDS IN THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	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 (8 TH 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 WITH 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

- iv) THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD. 2007
- 1) BARRISTERS HUGO PAGE KC, NIGEL MEARES, TOM SMITH KC, LEXA HILLARD KC CONSPIRE WITH BRIGGS, MANN , KITCHIN, RIMER AND LEWINSON TO COMPLETE STAGE 1 OF THE FRAUD 1287-1295
 - 2) PAGE KC AND MEARES FALSELY REPRESENT THAT THEY ACT FOR PERSON WHEN THAT PERSON HAS NOT INSTRUCTED THEM 1287-1295
 - 3) MEARES CREATES THE FABRICATED ORDER 1287-1295
 - 4) SOLICITORS, DEPUTY REGISTRAR SCHAFFER, HOWARD RICHARDS, SIMON LEVINE MICHELE MONAGHAN OF ISADORE GOLDMAN, AND STEVE ROBINSON AND AN UNKNOWN PARTNER OF BURGESS SALMON COMPLETE STAGES 1-3 OF THE FRAUD 1287-1295
 - 5) ROBERT LEONARD CONSPIRES WITH HENDERSON TO COMMIT STAGE 2 OF THE FRAUD 1287-1295
 - 6) HUGO PAGE KC SUBMITS SHAM GROUNDS OF APPEAL 1287-1295
 - 7) PRESIDENTS OF THE LAW SOCIETY 2007 TO DATE TURN A BLIND EYE TO THE FRAUD 1287-1295
 - 8) THE CONVEYANCING COMMITTEE OF THE LAW SOCIETY TURN A BLIND EYE TO THE FRAUD 1287-1295
- vi) MARC BEAUMONT'S ROMANCE SCAM. 2008.
- 1) BARRISTER, MARC BEAUMONT, COMMITS A ROMANCE SCAM TO STEAL £120,000 FROM HIS CLIENT AND HAS HIS CLIENT CARE AGREEMENT SIGNED IN INTIMATE CIRCUMSTANCES 1287-1295
 - 2) BEAUMONT CREATES A SHAM ADVICE IN THE RED RIVER CONVEYANCING AND MORTGAGE FRAUD 1287-1295
- vii) THE BAR MUTUAL FRAUD 2008-2010
- 1) TREVERTON JONES KC AND SAFFRON COMMIT PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO THEIR CONDUCT OF SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (2005 HIGH COURT) 1287-1295
 - 2) TREVERTON JONES KC AND SAFFRON COMMIT PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO THEIR CONDUCT OF SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (2006 COURT OF APPEAL) 1287-1295
 - 3) HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC, PHILIP ENGELMAN COMMIT PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO THEIR CONDUCT OF SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (2007 HOUSE OF LORDS) 1287-1295
 - 4) PHILIP ENGELMAN COMMITS PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO HIS CONDUCT OF SHEIKH V THE UK GOVERNMENT (2010 ECHR) 1287-1295
 - 5) HUGO PAGE KC, MARC BEAUMONT AND ANESTA WEEKES KC COMMIT PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO THEIR CONDUCT OF LAW SOCIETY V SHEIKH 1287-1295

(2008-2009 SDT PROCEEDINGS)

6)	HUGO PAGE KC AND NIGEL MEARES COMMIT PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO THEIR CONDUCT OF <u>RED RIVER V ANA SHEIKH</u>	1287-1295
7)	HUGO PAGE KC AND NIGEL MEARES COMMIT PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO THEIR CONDUCT OF <u>RED RIVER V RABIA SHEIKH</u>	1287-1295
8)	MARC BEAUMONT COMMITS PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO HIS CONDUCT OF <u>RED RIVER V SHEIKH (APPEAL) AND SHEIKH V PAGE AND MEARES (BREACH OF DUTY AND FRAUD CLAIM)</u>	1287-1295
9)	PHILIP NEWMAN COMMITS PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FRAUD IN RELATION TO HIS CONDUCT OF <u>RED RIVER V SHEIKH (APPEAL) , SHEIKH V PAGE AND MEARES (BREACH OF DUTY AND FRAUD CLAIM AND SHEIKH V BEAUMONT (BREACH OF DUTY AND FRAUD CLAIM)</u>	1287-1295
h)	COSTS COMPARATORS	1296
22)	THE LAW LORDS DECEIVED ABOUT WHAT WAS BEHIND THE INVESTIGATION	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS PETITION PARA 5.1. 'FOR REASONS UNDISCLOSED, THE LAW SOCIETY DECIDED TO EXERCISE ITS POWERS OF INVESTIGATION INTO THE PETITIONER'S PRACTICE	1296
b)	BURROWS ADJUDICATOR BRIBED FOR FRAUDULENT BURROWS ADJUDICATION TO JUSTICE BOO TARGET PRACTICE FOR INVESTIGATION AND INTERVENTION	1296
c)	LAW SOCIETY COMMITS OFFENCES CONTRARY TO THEFT ACT 1968 S. 1 (THEFT), THEFT ACT 1968 S.17 (FALSE ACCOUNTING),FRAUD ACT 2006 . S.4 (ABUSE OF POSITION) ,SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2015, CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD ABUSE OF PROCESS ,MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC OFFICE ,BRIBERY ACT 2010	1296-1297
d)	WHY DIDN'T PARK J, HALLETT LJ, DYSON LJ, MOORE BICK LJ, TUCKEY LJ REFER THE LAW SOCIETY TO THE CRIMINAL AUTHORITIES? WERE THEY BEING TERRORISED? WAS CHADWICK TERRORISING THEM?	1297-1298
21)	LAW LORDS DECEIVED INTO BELIEVING AN INVESTIGATION HAD TAKEN PLACE	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS PETITION PARA 2, PARA 5.1.	1299
b)	BOGUS INVESTIGATIONS. HOW AN INVESTIGATION SHOULD TAKE PLACE: THE LAW, CODES AND GUIDANCE	
i)	S. 44B OF THE 1974 ACT AS AMENDED BY S 1 OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1985	1299-1301
ii)	POLICE AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT 1984 (PACE) CODE C REVISED CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE DETENTION, TREATMENT AND QUESTIONING OF PERSONS BY POLICE OFFICERS	1299-1301
iii)	THE GOVERNMENT'S PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND GUIDANCE ON COMPETENCY AND REPORT PREPARATION	1299-1301
iv)	DISCIPLINARY AND REGULATORY PROCEEDINGS 4 TH EDITION BRIAN HARRIS OBE KC	

1)	EXTRACT FROM CONTENTS AND INDEX	1299-1301
2)	EXEMPLARS OF THE DISCIPLINARY ARRANGEMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL BODIES	1299-1301
3)	A MODEL INVESTIGATORY PROTOCOL	1299-1301
b)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY UNDERTAKES ITS INVESTIGATIONS	
i)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS FROM THE SOLICITOR THAT IT HAS NO STATUTORY RIGHT TO QUESTION HIM	1299-1301
ii)	THE USE OF BOGUS INVESTIGATORS	
1)	DAVID SHAW, THE SENIOR FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT WHO THINKS A ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULE BREACH IS A TRANSFER OF COSTS WHICH ENDS WITH LOTS OF NOUGHTS	1299-1301
2)	KIRSTEN PATRICK, A LAW STUDENT WHO COULD NEVER OBTAIN A TRAINING CONTRACT THINKS A NOTE SAYING 'MAKE UP A TRIAL BUNDLE' IS A SIGN OF THE SOLICITOR'S DISHONESTY	1299-1301
3)	SUSAN FAULKER, POSSIBLY A FORMER SALES CLERK	1299-1301
iii)	THE SHROUD OF SECRECY . THE SOLICITOR NOT TOLD WHAT IS BEING INVESTIGATED, WHEN HE COULD HELP THE INVESTIGATORS	
1)	WHEN THE NATURE OF THE INVESTIGATION SHOULD NOT BE DISCLOSED TO THE SOLICITOR AND WHEN IT SHOULD	1299-1301
2)	HAD THEY TOLD ME THEY THOUGHT I HAD BREACHED THE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS RULE , I COULD HAVE GIVEN THEM A SHORT TRAINING COURSE ON THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1988	1299-1301
3)	HAD THEY TOLD ME THEY THOUGHT THE £35,000 TRANSFER ON THIRKETTLE WAS A CASH SHORTAGE, I COULD HAVE ASKED THE LAW SOCIETY FOR SIGHTED INVESTIGATORS TO TAKE THEIR PLACE	1299-1301
iv)	NO CAUTION ADMINISTERED BEFORE INTERROGATION	1299-1301
v)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FAILURE TO ADVISE THE SOLICITOR ABOUT RIGHT TO OBTAIN LEGAL ADVICE BEFORE INTERVIEWING HIM AND ITS IMPLICATIONS	
1)	BREACH OF TRUST	1299-1301
2)	SOLICITOR UNABLE TO DISTINGUISH INVESTIGATION FROM OTHER ROUTNE INSPECTIONS	1299-1301
3)	AN INTERROGATION WHICH IS NOT AN INTERROGATION	1299-1301
4)	INTERROGATIONS ARE CASUAL AND INFORMAL THE SOLICITOR DOES NOT KNOW HE IS BEING INTERROGATED	1299-1301
5)	DAVID SHAW READY TO COME TO STAFF LUNCH	1299-1301
6)	SOLICITOR DOES NOT ASK FOR MANUSCRIPT NOTES TO BE AGREED BECAUSE HE DOES NOT RECOGNISE THE INTERROGATION AS AN INTERROGATION	1299-1301

viii)	FALSE CONFESSIONS	1299-1301
c)	THE REAL PURPOSE OF INVESTIGATIONS: THEFT OF DATA, WEAPONIZATION OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION STOLEN FROM THE SOLICITOR MONEY LAUNDERING.. THE IMITATION OF COURT PROCEEDINGS.	
1)	INVESTIGATION USED AS A PRETEXT TO STEAL INFORMATION, DOCUMENTS AND DATA	
a)	MARKING THE VICTIM: 'THE BURGLAR CODE'	1299-1301
b)	FRAUDULENT ADJUDICATION USED TO PROMPT FRAUDULENT INVESTIGATION	1299-1301
c)	BURGLARIZING THE SOLICITOR'S OFFICE.	1299-1301
d)	CLIENTS' AND SOLICITOR'S DATA AND DOCUMENTS STOLEN IN FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS USED LATER TO COMMIT LAND THEFT	1299-1301
2)	STOLEN DOCUMENTS MANIPULATED, FORGED AND FALSIFIED BY THE LAW SOCIETY TO FABRICATE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SOLICITOR	1299-1301
3)	DIAGRAM SHOWING HOW LANGUAGE MANIPULATION IS USED TO FALSELY ALLEGE AN HONEST SOLICITOR IS DISHONEST	1299-1301
4)	BLACKMAIL AND BRIBERY	1299-1301
22)	LAW LORDS BELIEVE 'A DETAILED INVESTIGATION' TOOK PLACE. THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULE BREACH PARA' ROUND SUM TRANSFER '	
a)	AN ACCOUNTING RULE BREACH SO EASILY DISCOVERABLE, A TEN YEAR OLD CHILD COULD SAY WHETHER A SOLICITOR HAS OR HAS NOT COMMITTED IT	1301-1302
b)	A NON EXISTENT ALLEGATION. THE LAW SOCIETY PRETENDS THE WORDS 'ON ACCOUNT' DO NOT EXIST	1301-1302
c)	ASHLEY & CO'S PRACTICE OF BATCH POSTING	1302-1303
d)	WHAT AN INVESTIGATING SOLICITOR WOULD HAVE DONE	1303-1306
e)	WHO THE 'INVESTIGATORS' WERE	1307-1308
f)	THE TOTALITY OF THE INTERVIEW RECORDS RELATING TO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	
i)	SHAW'S FALSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 24 APRIL 2004	1308-1310
ii)	FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD - DATE UNKNOWN. PART EXTRACTED AND PART DELETED	1311-1314
iii)	SHAW'S WITHHELD NOTE RECORDING THAT HE SAW COMPUTER SCREEN SHOWING BATCH POSTING. 21 JULY 2004?	1315-1317
g)	DAVID SHAW NEVER SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS AND DOES NOT KNOW WHAT A ROUND SUM TRANSFER	
a)	SHAW'S EVIDENCE AT THE HIGH COURT IN 2005	1318-1319
b)	SHAW'S EVIDENCE AT THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL IN 2009	1320

h)	SHAW, NOW FED UP WITH LYING ADMITS TO THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL THAT IT WAS COUNSEL WHO HAD SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS; HE HAD NEVER SAID IT	1321
23)	LAW LORD DECEIVED INTO BELIEVING THAT THE LAW SOCIETY HAD WRITTEN LETTERS	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS PETITION PARA 5.1 AND 5.2	1321
b)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTERS ARE NOT LETTERS; THEY ARE INSTRUMENTS OF FRAUD AND MONEY LAUNDERING USED TO CREATE A FALSE RECORD TRAIL.	
i)	SARAH BARTLETT'S FRAUDULENT FORENSIC REPORT TO THE PANEL	1322-1323
ii)	CALVERT'S FRAUDULENT REPORT TO MIDDLETON- A REPORT WHICH NO SOLICITOR WOULD WRITE	1323
c)	LAW SOCIETY'S LETTERS USE AS A METHOD OF TORTURE THE PURPOSE OF THE TORTURE AND TORTURE TECHNIQUES USED. WHY SOLICITORS HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO SEE THE INTERVENTION FRAUD FOR HALF A CENTURY	
i)	THE APPLICATION OF COERCIVE TECHNIQUES TO IMPAIR THE HIGHEST CREATIVE ACTIVITIES'. KUBARK	1323-1336
ii)	BOGUS ADJUDICATIONS TO UNSETTLE THE SOLICITOR AND SHIFT HIS REALITIES	1323-1336
iii)	BOGUS INVESTIGATION UNDERTAKEN TO WEAKEN AND DEMORALISE THE SOLICITOR IN PREPARATION FOR THE FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION	1323-1336
iv)	THE ABSURD PROPOSITIONS: ROUND SUM TRANSFERS, CASH SHORTAGE, THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL, TAKING OWN REMORTGAGE MONIES	1323-1336
v)	MULTIPLE SHAM INTERROGATIONS OPPRESSIVE ENQUIRES AND FILE REQUESTS COORDINATED TO MAXIMISE STRESS FOR THE SOLICITOR	1323-1336
vi)	CONFINEMENT USED AS STRESSOR	1323-1336
vii)	DISORIENTATION THE PRISONER SHOULD NOT BE PROVIDED WITH ROUTINES'. KUBARK	1323-1336
24)	THE FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (£41.125 THIRKETTLE) WITHHELD TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS	
a)	THE FACTS	1337-1340
b)	THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS : AFTER SEEING THE £35,000 INTERIM BILL AND COSTS TRANSFER ON THIRKETTLE THE LAW SOCIETY, BARRISTERS AND JUDGES WERE AFFLICTED FROM TIME TO TIME BY AMAUROSIS FUGAX OR TEMPORARY VISION LOSS WHICH STOPPED THEM FROM SEEING THE 16 ARCH LEVER FILES OF WORK SUPPORTING THE BILL	
1)	OTHER CASES OF UNEXPLAINED AFFLICTIONS: THE SWEATING SICKNESS 1529 TUDOR ENGLAND, THE DANCING PLAGUE OF 1518, THE WRITING TREMOR EPIDEMIC OF 1892, THE TANGANYIKA	1341

LAUGHING EPIDEMIC 1962.

2)	WHAT WAS THE THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS AND WHO SUFFERED FROM IT	1341-1342
3)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S INVESTIGATORS UNAFFECTED BY THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS	1342
4)	CALVERT , MIDDLETON, BARTLETT AND THE PANEL SUFFER FROM THE THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS	1342
5)	THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS DISAPPEARS DURING THE HIGH COURT HEARING	1342
6)	TIMOTHY DUTTON KC SUFFERS FROM THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS WHEN DRAFTING HIS FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION COMMITTEE	1342
7)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S LEGAL TEAM, MY LEGAL TEAM , LORD JUSTICE CHADWICK, LADY JUSTICE HALLETT, LORD DYSON, LORD JUSTICE MOORE BICK , LORD JUSTICE TUCKEY ALL SUFFER FROM THE THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS	1342-1344
8)	LORD BINGHAM, LORD CARSWELL, LORD RODGERS SUFFER FROM THE THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS	1344
9)	SIR NICHOLAS BRATZA SUFFERS FROM THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS IN THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS	1344
10)	THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL INFECTED WITH THIRKETTLE BLINDNESS WHICH HAD NOW MUTATED INTO PARALYSIS OF THE UPPER LIMBS	1344
c)	WHAT THIRKETTLE WAS ALL ABOUT	
i)	BACKGROUND AS SET OUT IN LETTER TO THE LAW SOCIETY	1345-1346
ii)	EXTRACT FROM ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST ACCOUNTS	1345-1346
iii)	EXAMPLE OF ANOTHER SOLICITOR'S WORK	1345-1346
c)	DOCUMENTS	
i)	THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL FOR £35,000	1345-1346
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (THIRKETTLE)	1345-1346
iii)	THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS 1 (£31,530)	1345-1346
iv)	THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS 2 £3,172)	1345-1346
v)	MY CALCULATION FOR THE THIRKETTLE INTERIM BILL	1345-1346
vi)	LAW SOCIETY'S CALCULATIONS SUPPORTING ITS FRAUDULENT ALLEGATION OF DISHONEST OVERCHARGE	1345-1346
vii)	PROJECTIONS FOR THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1345-1346
viii)	WHAT THE THIRKETTLE BILL MIGHT HAVE BEEN	1345-1346

ix)	THIRKETTLE ATTENDANCE NOTES 1	1345-1346
x)	THIRKETTLE ATTENDANCE NOTES 2	1345-1346
xi)	THIRKETTLE ESTATE ACCOUNTS	1345-1346
xii)	THIRKETTLE FILES (16 ARCH LEVER FILES, 5 BEING FOR WORK DONE)	1345-1346
c)	THE PROPOSITION IN THE FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (THIRKETTLE) THAT A BILL IS A CASH SHORTAGE ('THE ABSURD PROPOSITION IN THIRKETTLE)	1345-1346
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 THIRKETTLE FILES	1345-1346
ii)	THE LAW SOCIETY USES THE INTERIM BILL AND THE INTERIM BILL CALCULATIONS AS A DISTRACTION	1345-1346
iii)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS THE LAW AND PRACTICE ABOUT INTERIM BILLS FROM THE COURT	1345-1346
iv)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLD THAT MY CHARGES FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF WOULD ONLY BE KNOWN IN THE FINAL BILL	1345-1346
v)	THE LAW SOCIETY PLAY ON THE USE OF THE WORD 'QUALIFIED' . MR SAMPAT WAS UNQUALIFIED AS A SOLICITOR, BUT HAD MORE APPROPRIATE EXPERTISE	1345-1346
vi)	THE LAW SOCIETY FALSELY ALLEGES THAT THE TWO CALCULATIONS SHOULD BE ADDED TOGETHER CREATING A SHORTFALL	1345-1346
vii)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS THE PROJECTION FOR THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1345-1346
viii)	THE LAW SOCIETY LIES ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE MARK UP	1345-1346
ix)	THE LAW SOCIETY LIES ABOUT MY TIME RECORDING SYSTEM	1345-1346
x)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ESTATE AND THE £100,000 SAVING MADE AS AGAINST THE £270 ALLEGED SHORTFALL	1345-1346
25)	FRAUDULENT ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (£475,125) CONCEALED TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS. HOW THE LAW SOCIETY GENERATED £5M IN LEGAL FEES FROM 6 YEARS OF LITIGATION INVOLVING 125 LAWYERS, WHEN ALL IT HAD TO DO WAS TO OPEN A FILE AND LOOK AT IT	
1)	SARAH BARTETT'S FRAUDULENT FORENSIC REPORT TO THE PANEL	1346-1349
2)	AN ACCOUNTING RULE BREACH SO EASILY DISCOVERABLE, A TEN YEAR OLD CHILD COULD SAY WHETHER A SOLICITOR HAS OR HAS NOT COMMITTED IT	1346-1349
3)	THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RULE	
a)	S 32 SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (AS AT 2001)	1346-1349
b)	RULE 19 SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998	1346-1349

c)	RULE 19 (2) SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998	1346-1349
d)	NOTE 10 TO RULE 19 SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1998	1346-1349
e)	HOW SOLICITOR'S ACCOUNTS WORK	1346-1349
f)	WHEN A ROUND SUM TRANSFER MIGHT BE MADE, AND WHAT IT WOULD INDICATE	1346-1349
g)	ROUND SUM CASES	1346-1349
4)	A NON EXISTENT ALLEGATION. THE LAW SOCIETY PRETENDS THE WORDS 'ON ACCOUNT' DO NOT EXIST	1346-1349
5)	ASHLEY & CO'S PRACTICE OF BATCH POSTING	1346-1349
6)	WHAT AN INVESTIGATING SOLICITOR WOULD HAVE DONE	1346-1349
7)	WHO THE 'INVESTIGATORS' WERE	1346-1349
8)	THE TOTALITY OF THE INTERVIEW RECORDS RELATING TO ROUND SUM TRANSFERS	
a)	SHAW'S FALSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 24 APRIL 2004	1346-1349
b)	FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD - DATE UNKNOWN. PART EXTRACTED AND PART DELETED	1346-1349
c)	SHAW'S WITHHELD NOTE RECORDING THAT HE SAW COMPUTER SCREEN SHOWING BATCH POSTING. 21 JULY 2004?	1346-1349
9)	DAVID SHAW NEVER SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS AND DOES NOT KNOW WHAT A ROUND SUM TRANSFER	
a)	SHAW'S EVIDENCE AT THE HIGH COURT IN 2005	1346-1349
b)	SHAW'S EVIDENCE AT THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL IN 2009	1346-1349
10)	SHAW, NOW FED UP WITH LYING ADMITS TO THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL THAT IT WAS COUNSEL WHO HAD SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS; HE HAD NEVER SAID IT	1346-1349
11)	THE LAW SOCIETY MAKES SHAW FORGE HIS RECORDS	
a)	FORGERY 1. SHAW'S FORGED ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 24 APRIL 2004	1346-1349
b)	FORGERY 2. FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM RECORD (PART ONLY. DATE UNKNOWN)	1346-1349
c)	FORGERY NO. 3. SHAW'S FORGED ROUND SUM RECORD OF 28 APRIL 2004 DOCTORED WITH FAULKNER'S FALSE ROUND SUM RECORD	1346-1349
d)	FORGERY 4. SHAW'S WITHHELD NOTE RECORDING THAT HE SAW COMPUTER SCREEN SHOWING BATCH POSTING 21 JULY 2004?	1346-1349
12)	MIKE CALVERT SAID SHAW HAD SAID THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFERS: CALVERT'S FRAUDULENT LETTER TO MIDDLETON	

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 OMITTS THE WORDS 'I KNOW EXACTLY HOW MUCH I AM ABLE TO TAKE'	1346-1349
f)	FORGERY 10. CALVERT OMITTS THE WORDS 'THEY ARE BILLED TO CLIENTS'	1346-1349
g)	FORGERY 11. CALVERT INCLUDES CONTRADICTIONARY VERSION OF BILLING PRACTICE	1346-1349
h)	FORGERY 12. CALVERT OMITTS SHAW'S AND FAULKNER'S RECORD THAT BILLS HAD BEEN SHOWN 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 CALVERT'S WITNESS STATEMENT AND EVIDENCE WAS PERJURED	1346-1349

h)	PERJURY 7 – SHAW’S ADMISSION DURING CROSS EXAMINATION THAT HE HAD SEEN EVIDENCE OF MY BATCH POSTING MEANS THAT DAVID MIDDLETON’S WITNESS STATEMENT AND EVIDENCE WAS PERJURED	1346-1349
i)	PERJURY 8 – SHAW’S ADMISSION DURING CROSS EXAMINATION THAT HE HAD SEEN EVIDENCE OF MY BATCH POSTING MEANS THAT SARAH BARTLETT’S WITNESS STATEMENT AND EVIDENCE WAS PERJURED	1346-1349
j)	PERJURY 9 . SHAW’S WITHHOLDING OF PAGE I (10) (a)/10 IS PERJURY	1346-1349
k)	PERJURY 10 – SHAW’S LYING ABOUT THE WITHHOLDING OF PAGE I (10) (a)/10 IS PERJURY	1346-1349
l)	PERJURY 11 - SHAW’S DOCTORING OF HIS ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 28 APRIL 2004 MEANS HIS EVIDENCE THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFER WAS PERJURED	1346-1349
m)	PERJURY 12 – THE PAINTING OUT BY SHAW OF SOME WORDS IN HIS ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 28 APRIL 2004 MEANS HIS EVIDENCE THAT THERE WERE ROUND SUM TRANSFER WAS PERJURED	1346-1349
n)	PERJURY 13 SHAW’S VERSION OF HIS ROUND SUM TRANSFER RECORD OF 28 APRIL 2004 IS PERJURED	1346-1349
16)	TABLES	
a)	THE TIME AND MONEY INVOLVED HAD A SOLICITOR BEEN INVOLVED FROM THE START : 3 ½ MINUTES. NIL COSTS	1346-1349
b)	THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE SHEIKH 2005 INTERVENTION	1346-1349
c)	THE MONEY STOLEN FROM THE COMPENSATION FUND TO FUND THE SHAM ALLEGATION IN THE HIGH COURT :£1M	1346-1349
26)	THE FRAUDULENT ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION (£58,000 LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION PAYMENTS) CONCEALED TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS.. AN ALLEGATION THAT CANNOT BE MADE	1349-1350
27)	THE FRAUDULENT ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION . THE ‘SMOKING GUN’ ROUND SUM TRANSFER (STRUPCWESTKI £25) CONCEALED TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS. (COPYING BILL NOTIFIED IN ESTATE ACCOUNTS, BUT NOT ENTERED IN OFFICE ACCOUNT)	1350
28)	THE LAW LORDS RELY ON THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS’ SLOPPY DRAFTING OF SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES 1988 RULE 19 NOTE X	
1)	PAGE REFERENCES	1351
2)	WHAT IS THE REAL RULE BREACH?	1351
3)	WHY THE LAW SOCIETY USES THE RULE 19 (1) BREACH AS GROUNDS TO INTERVENE WHEN IT KNOWS THE SOLICITOR HAS NOT BREACHED THE RULE	1351-1352
4)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY SUCCEEDS IN INTERVENING ON A RULE 19 (1)	

BREACH WHEN THERE HAS BEEN NO RULE 19 (1) BREACH: THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS COLLUDE TO CALL IT A 'ROUND SUM TRANSFER' BREACH

a)	WAS THE MISCHIEF PLANNED IN 1974? THE INTENTION THAT GROUND 3 APPLIED ONLY IF CLIENT MONEY WAS IN JEOPARDY NOT REFLECTED IN PARA 1(1)(C)	1352
b)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S RIGHT TO MAKE SECONDARY LEGISLATION WITH THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS CONCURRENCE	1352-1353
c)	RULE 19 OF THE SOLICITORS ACCOUNT RULES (SAR)	1353-1356
d)	NOTE X TO RULE 19 IS NONSENSE SO WHY DID THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS CREATE IT?	1357
e)	DAVID SHAW, THE LAW SOCIETY'S FORENSIC ACCOUNTANT, BELIEVES RULE 19 (1) BREACH AND THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS NOTE X (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) ARE TWO DISTINCT ACCOUNT RULE BREACHES	1357-1367
f)	IN THE HIGH COURT SHAW SAYS HE THINKS THE BREACH IS TRANSFERRING COSTS WITH A LOT OF NOUGHTS	1368-1370
g)	SARAH BARTLETT AND THE PANEL ALSO RELY ON THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS' DEFINITION OF THE BREACH I.E NOTE X (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) AND NOT ON RULE 19 (1)	1370-1371
h)	DUTTON'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE ALSO REFERS TO THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS' DEFINITION OF THE BREACH I.E NOTE X (ROUND SUM TRANSFERS) AND NOT ON RULE 19 (1)	1371-1372
i)	THE ROUND SUM TRANSFER ALLEGATION IN RELATION TO LEGAL AID MONEY	
j)	TREASON	
	i) THE EXECUTIVE AND THE JUDICIARY SUBSTITUTE THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS NOTE X FOR RULE 19. DOES THAT MEAN THAT THEY DO NOT ACKNOWLEDGE PARLIAMENTARY SUPREMACY AND THEREBY GUILTY OF TREASON?	1374
	ii) THE EXECUTIVE AND THE JUDICIARY DO NOT ACKNOWLEDGE THE WORDS 'ON ACCOUNT' IN NOTE X. DOES THAT MEAN THAT THEY ARE THEY GUILTY OF TREASON?	1374-1375
	iii) IS THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE JUDICIARY'S REFUSAL TO ACKNOWLEDGE RULE 21 (LEGAL COMMISSION MONEY) TREASON?	1375
29)	THE LAW LORDS DECEIVED BY THE LAW SOCIETY'S ALTERNATIVE FRAUDULENT THIRKETTLE ALLEGATION OF OVERCHARGING	
a)	THE FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION MADE SOLELY TO CREATE A FALSE RECORD TRAIL TO CREATE THE PRETENCE OF A INVESTIGATION, REPORT MAKING AND PANEL DECISION	1376
b)	THE FRAUDULENT OVERCHARGING ALLEGATION ALSO MADE TO CREATE A FALSE RECORD TRAIL TO CREATE THE PRETENCE OF A INVESTIGATION, REPORT MAKING AND PANEL DECISION	1376

c)	LAW LORDS DUPED INTO NOT SEEING THAT THE ALLEGATIONS WERE MUTUALLY CONTRADICTIONARY AND THAT BOTH COULD NOT BE MADE	1376
30)	THE LAW AND FACTS ABOUT THE LAW SOCIETY'S ALTERNATIVE FRAUDULENT THIRKETTLE ALLEGATION CONCEALED TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS	
1)	HOW SOLICITORS COSTS ARE ASSESSED WHERE THERE IS A COMPLAINT	
a)	THE LAWFUL METHODS OF ASSESSING SOLICITORS' PROBATE COSTS	
i)	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 71. ASSESSMENT BY COURT.	1356-1379
ii)	THE SOLICITORS' (NON-CONTENTIOUS BUSINESS) REMUNERATION ORDER 1994 REMUNERATION CERTIFICATE BY THE LAW SOCIETY'S COUNCIL	1356-1379
iii)	THE SOLICITORS' (NON-CONTENTIOUS BUSINESS) REMUNERATION ORDER 1994 TAXATION BY COURT	1356-1379
b)	SOLICITORS ACT 1974 S. 57. REMUNERATION CERTIFICATE PROCEDURE DOES NOT APPLY WHERE THERE IS A CLIENT CARE AGREEMENT	1356-1379
c)	THE LAWFUL AND RATIONAL APPROACH IN OVERCHARGING CASES	1356-1379
d)	WHY INTERVENTION CANNOT POSSIBLY BE THE LAW SOCIETY'S FIRST RESORT IN ALLEGED OVERCHARGING CASES	1356-1379
2)	THEFT DISTINGUISHED FROM OVERCHARGING	1356-1379
3)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY MANAGES TO INTERVENE ON ALLEGATIONS OF OVERCHARGING WHEN NO ONE HAS COMPLAINED ABOUT THE BILL	
a)	THE USE OF THE FRAUDULENT OVERCHARGING ALLEGATION IN PROBATE CASES RATHER THAN IN ANY OTHER TYPE OF CASE	1356-1379
b)	FRAUDULENT ADJUDICATION TO PROMPT INVESTIGATION - BURROWS	1356-1379
c)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S THEFT OF THE SOLICITOR'S PROBATE FEES IN BURROWS	1356-1379
d)	THE LAW SOCIETY USES SHELLEY TO IMPERSONATE A COSTS DRAFTSMAN TO DRAFT THE OPPONENT'S BILLS OF COSTS, TO ADVISE THE COURT AS AN EXPERT, AND TO BE THE COSTS JUDGE	
i)	WHAT EXACTLY WAS COSTS DRAFTSMAN AND COST EXPERT NICK SHELLEY DOING IN COURT?	
1)	WHO WAS SHELLEY?	1356-1379
2)	SHELLEY REMUNERATED BY THE LAW SOCIETY AND WORKING WITHIN A BUDGET	1356-1379
3)	WHEN AND HOW A COSTS EXPERT WOULD BE USED IN COURT	1356-1379
4)	WHEN AND HOW A COSTS EXPERT WOULD NOT BE USED IN COURT	1356-1379
5)	WHAT IS A COSTS DRAFTSMAN'S ROLE	1356-1379

6)	WHAT IS NOT A COSTS DRAFTSMAN'S ROLE	1356-1379
7)	WOULD A COSTS EXPERT EVER BE USED IN COURT IN A COSTS FRAUD CASE?	1356-1379
e)	SHELLEY USED IN THE LAW SOCIETY'S TECHNIQUE OF CREATING ILLUSION AND PRETENCE.	
i)	WHY THE LAW SOCIETY HAD TO PRETEND THAT SHELLEY'S FRAUDULENT COSTS REPORT WAS A COSTS JUDGMENT	1356-1379
ii)	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE AND ABUSE OF POWER	1356-1379
f)	SHELLEY'S FRAUDULENT COSTS REPORT '	
i)	SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S CONSPIRE IN AN ATTEMPT TO PROVE WORK WAS NOT DONE	
1)	'IT DOESN'T HELP BECAUSE (HER ATTENDANCE NOTES ARE) EVIDENCE OF WORK DONE' APPENDIX	1356-1379
2)	HIDING THE ATTENDANCE NOTES FROM COURT	1356-1379
3)	PATRICK AND SHELLEY'S PERJURED EVIDENCE OF CHARGES AT CLERK'S RATES WHEN SHELLEY RECORDS THE OPPOSITE	1356-1379
4)	PATRICK'S FALSIFICATION OF HER NOTES SAYING THAT SECRETARIES MAKE UP ATTENDANCE NOTES	1356-1379
ii)	SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT THE PERCENTAGE COSTS UPLIFT WAS DISHONEST	
1)	THE CASE OF JEMMA TRUSTS AND THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE OF CHARGING THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1356-1379
2)	SHELLEY'S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1356-1379
3)	PATRICK DOCTOR'S HER NOTES TO TRY AND SHOW THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT WAS INCLUDED IN THE HOURLY RATE	1356-1379
iii)	SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE FALSE AND PERJURED BECAUSE HE WITHHOLDS THE LAW ABOUT INTERIM BILLING	1356-1379
iv)	SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE FALSE AND PERJURED BECAUSE HE WITHHOLDS THE FACT THAT HE HAS NOT ASSESSED THIRKETTLE	1356-1379
v)	THE EXCHANGE BETWEEN PATRICK AND SHELLEY	1356-1379
4)	THE FRAUDULENT CASH SHORTAGE ALLEGATION (THIRKETTLE)	
a)	WHAT THIRKETTLE WAS ALL ABOUT	
i)	BACKGROUND AS SET OUT IN LETTER TO THE LAW SOCIETY	1356-1379
ii)	EXTRACT FROM ADMINISTRATION OF TRUST ACCOUNTS	1356-1379
iii)	EXAMPLE OF ANOTHER SOLICITOR'S WORK	1356-1379

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 THIRKETTLE 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 BILL	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)	THE LAW SOCIETY FALSELY ALLEGES THAT THE TWO CALCULATIONS SHOULD BE ADDED TOGETHER CREATING A SHORTFALL	1356-1379
vii)	THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS THE PROJECTION FOR THIRKETTLE FINAL BILL	1356-1379
viii)	THE LAW SOCIETY LIES ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE MARK UP	1356-1379

	ix) THE LAW SOCIETY LIES ABOUT MY TIME RECORDING SYSTEM	1356-1379
	x) THE LAW SOCIETY WITHHOLDS THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ESTATE AND THE £100,000 SAVING MADE AS AGAINST THE £270 ALLEGED SHORTFALL	1356-1379
5)	APPENDIX.	
	a) THE THIRKETTLE ATTENDANCES NOTES IN FULL COVERING 4 YEARS WORK	1356-1379
	b) THE THIRKETTLE ESTATE ACCOUNTS IN FULL	1356-1379
	c) WITHOUT EVEN SEEING THIRKETTLE HALLETT LJ SAYS 'CHARGING FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF'S TIME AT QUALIFIED SOLICITOR'S RATES – REFER HER TO THE SDT'	1356-1379
	d) THE TWO SHEETS OF PAPER WHICH TIMOTHY DUTTON KC HELD UP TO THE COURT OF APPEAL AND SAID 'LOOK- THIS IS ALL THE WORK SHE HAS DONE'	1356-1379
	e) CHADWICK , MOORE BICK AND TUCKEY LJ'S JUDGMENT ' WHAT COULD SHE POSSIBLY HAVE DONE TO JUSTIFY HAVING BILLED £35,000 FOR THREE WEEKS WORK?'	1356-1379
31)	LAW LORDS DUPED INTO FINDING SOLICITOR GUILTY OF OVERCHARGING WHEN THE FILE HAS NOT BEEN FINISHED, COSTED, ADJUDICATED UPON, TAXED, OR EVEN SEEN	
	a) HOUSE OF LORDS' DECISION PARA 7.2	1380
	b) SHELLEY'S FRAUDULENT COSTS REPORT '	
	i) SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S CONSPIRE IN AN ATTEMPT TO PROVE WORK WAS NOT DONE	
	1) 'IT DOESN'T HELP BECAUSE (HER ATTENDANCE NOTES ARE) EVIDENCE OF WORK DONE' APPENDIX	1381-1384
	2) HIDING THE ATTENDANCE NOTES FROM COURT	1385
	3) PATRICK AND SHELLEY'S PERJURED EVIDENCE OF CHARGES AT CLERK'S RATES WHEN SHELLEY RECORDS THE OPPOSITE	1385-1386
	4) PATRICK'S FALSIFICATION OF HER NOTES SAYING THAT SECRETARIES MAKE UP ATTENDANCE NOTES	1386-1388
	ii) SHELLEY AND PATRICK'S ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT THE PERCENTAGE COSTS UPLIFT WAS DISHONEST	
	1) THE CASE OF JEMMA TRUSTS AND THE SOLICITOR'S PRACTICE OF CHARGING THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1389-1392
	2) SHELLEY'S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1392-1393
	3) PATRICK DOCTOR'S HER NOTES TO TRY AND SHOW THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT WAS INCLUDED IN THE HOURLY RATE	1393-1396
	iii) SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE FALSE AND PERJURED BECAUSE HE WITHHOLDS THE LAW ABOUT INTERIM BILLING	1397

iv)	SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE FALSE AND PERJURED BECAUSE HE WITHHOLDS THE FACT THAT HE HAS NOT ASSESSED THIRKETTLE	1398-1402
v)	THE EXCHANGE BETWEEN PATRICK AND SHELLEY	1403-1412
c)	SHAW'S EVIDENCE AT TRIAL. HE IS UNABLE TO ASSESS THE FILE	1413-1414
d)	WITHOUT EVEN SEEING THIRKETTLE HALLETT LJ SAYS 'CHARGING FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF'S TIME AT QUALIFIED SOLICITOR'S RATES – REFER HER TO THE SDT'	1414
e)	THE TWO SHEETS OF PAPER WHICH TIMOTHY DUTTON KC HELD UP TO THE COURT OF APPEAL AND SAID 'LOOK- THIS IS ALL THE WORK SHE HAS DONE'	1415-1416
f)	CHADWICK , MOORE BICK AND TUCKEY LJ'S JUDGMENT ' WHAT COULD SHE POSSIBLY HAVE DONE TO JUSTIFY HAVING BILLED £35,000 FOR THREE WEEKS WORK?'	1416-1418
g)	WHY THE COURT OF APPEAL HAD NO JURISDICTION TO DEAL WITH THIRKETTLE	
i)	LEGEND	1419
ii)	CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 44.	1419-1423
iii)	DIAGRAM SHOWING PARK J DEALT WITH MATTERS	1424
iv)	DIAGRAM SHOWING WHY IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE FOR COURT OF APPEAL TO MAKE ANY FINDING ON THIRKETTLE	1425
v)	HOW SIR JOHN CHADWICK , DUTTON CBE KC, TREVERTON JONES KC AND THE LAW SOCIETY CONTRIVED TO HAVE A DETERMINATION OF DISHONESTY MADE ON AN INTERIM BILL WHEN NO ONE HAS EXAMINED THE FILE . THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DUTTON'S LIE THAT THERE HAD BEEN AN ADJUDICATION	1426-1427
h)	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DUTTON'S LIE THAT THERE HAD BEEN AN ADJUDICATION ON THIRKETTLE	1427
32)	THE FACTS OF SILLS AND PARK J'S FINDING CONCEALED TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS	1428-1429
33)	PARK J'S FINDING ON ALLEGATION OF NON PAYMENT OF INTEREST CONCEALED TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS	1430-1434
34)	DEMEANOUR. LAW LORDS DECEIVED BY THE BARRISTERS' FALSE SUBMISSION ABOUT PARK J'S CONDUCT OF THE CASE TO DISCREDIT HIS JUDGMENT	
a)	HOUSE OF LORDS DECISION PARA 7. 12	1434
b)	HOUSE OF LORDS PETITION. SHAM SUBMISSION MADE BY HUGO PAGE KC. JONATHAN HARVIE KC AND PHILIP ENGELMEN	1434-1436
c)	ANALYSIS OF PARK J'S JUDGMENT	1437
d)	DUTTON'S SPECIOUS USE OF THE DEMEANOUR ARGUMENT	
i)	PARK J'S OBSERVATIONS ABOUT ME	1348-1439
ii)	DUTTON'S FALSE REPRESENTATION ABOUT PARK J'S RELIANCE ON DEMEANOUR	1348-1439

iii)	DUTTON'S ARTICLE BY JUDGE NUGENT OF SOUTH AFRICA	1348-1439
iv)	DUTTON IS ABSOLUTELY RIGHT ABOUT RELIANCE ON DEMEANOUR	
	1) MR JUSTICE BLACKBURNE' I CAN TELL A DISHONEST MAN FROM THE WAY HE WALKS'	1348-1439
	2) HALLETT LJ REMARK WITHOUT SEEING THIRKETTLE 'CHARGING FOR UNQUALIFIED STAFF'S TIME AT QUALIFIED SOLICITOR'S RATES – REFER HER TO THE SDT'	1348-1439
	3) LADY HALLETT'S STATEMENT 'THE TRANSFER OF £254,000. WAS THAT NOT ADMITTED'?	1348-1439
	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?'	1348-1439
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	1348-1439
vi)	WHAT WERE THE FACTS AND WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR FINDING THEM AND WHETHER DEMEANOUR PLAYED A PART. TABLE	1348-1439
vii)	WHEN DEMEANOUR WOULD HAVE BEEN A RELIABLE INDICATOR	
	1) CHARLES SNEARY, PANEL CHAIRMAN	1348-1439
	2) DAVID SHAW, MIKE CALVERT AND SARAH BARTLETT,	1348-1439
	3) DAVID MIDDLETON	1348-1439
	4) KIRSTEN PATRICK	
	a) WHO WAS PATRICK?	1348-1439
	b) KIRSTEN PATRICK, CASEWORKER : A SOLICITOR WHO INSTRUCTS HIS STAFF TO 'MAKE UP A TRIAL BUNDLE' IS GUILTY OF DISHONESTY	1348-1439
	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	1348-1439
	ii) HIDING THE ATTENDANCE NOTES FROM COURT	1348-1439
	iii) PATRICK AND SHELLEY'S PERJURED EVIDENCE OF CHARGES AT CLERK'S RATES WHEN SHELLEY RECORDS THE OPPOSITE	1348-1439
	iv) PATRICK'S FALSIFICATION OF HER NOTES SAYING THAT SECRETARIES MAKE UP ATTENDANCE NOTES	1348-1439

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	1348-1439
ii)	SHELLEY’S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL ABOUT THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT	1348-1439
iii)	PATRICK DOCTOR’S HER NOTES TO TRY AND SHOW THE PERCENTAGE UPLIFT WAS INCLUDED IN THE HOURLY RATE	1348-1439
e)	SHAW’S AND PATRICK’S NOTES FORGED, AND FALISFIED	1348-1439
f)	SHAW’S AND PATRICK’S PERJURY AT TRIAL	1348-1439
viii)	TABLES SHOWING THE FRAUDULENT NATURE OF DUTTON Demeanour ARGUMENT	
a)	HOW DUTTON KC CRAFTED HIS FALSE ARGUMENT	1440
b)	LEGEND	1440
c)	TABLE 1. REPORT, JUDGMENT AND ADVICE: ALLEGATIONS COMPARED	1441
d)	TABLE 2 REPORT, JUDGMENT AND ADVICE ALLEGATIONS. NUMBER OF WORDS COMPARED	1442
e)	TABLE 3 . JUDGMENT AND ADVICE: TIME SPENT ON ALLEGATIONS COMPARED	1443
f)	TABLE 4 . HIGH COURT DOCUMENTATION COMPARED WITH DOCUMENTATION VIEWED BY DUTTON	1444
g)	TABLE 5 . HIGH COURT DOCUMENTATION COMPARED WITH DOCUMENTATION VIEWED BY DUTTON	1445-1446
35)	CONSPIRACY BY CHADWICK LJ, TIMOTHY DUTTON CBE KC, TREVERTON JONES KC, HUGO PAGE KC, JONATHAN HARVIE KC PHILIP ENGELMAN AND THE LAW SOCIETY TO DECEIVE THE LAW LORDS ABOUT THE ATTEMPTED THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH REMORTAGE MONIES BY THE LAW SOCIETY,TREVERTON JONES KC AND PAUL SAFFRON	
a)	HOUSE OR LORDS’ DECISION PARA 7.5	1446
b)	THE BARRISTERS’ SHAM SUBMISSION IN THE PETITION	1447
c)	THE CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, TREVERTON JONES, RADCLIFFES, SAFFRON, DUTTON AND OTHERS TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTAGE MONIES	
a)	THE PRINCIPLE OF LEGAL CERTAINTY	1448-1458
b)	BANKING AW	
i)	THE RELATIONSHIP AND CONTRACT BETWEEN THE BANK AND	1448-1458

	THE CUSTOMER	
	ii) UNAUTHORISED PAYMENTS	1448-1458
	iii) CURRENT ACCOUNTS	1448-1458
	iv) INTERFERENCE BY THIRD PARTIES	1448-1458
	v) SOLICITOR ACCOUNTS	1448-1458
	vi) LIMITATION OF ACTIONS – CREDIT BALANCES	1448-1458
c)	FREEZING ORDERS	1448-1458
d)	RESTITUTION	1448-1458
e)	HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1988	
	i) S. 6 ACTS OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY	1448-1458
	ii) ART. 3 PROHIBITION OF TORTURE	1448-1458
	iii) ART. 8 RIGHT TO RESPECT FOR PRIVATE AND FAMILY LIFE	1448-1458
	iv) ART.14 PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION	1448-1458
	v) ART. 1 PROTOCOL 1 PROTECTION OF PROPERTY	1448-1458
2)	DOCUMENTS	
3)	COMPLETION OF THE £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTAGE OCTOBER 2004- 17 FEBRUARY 2005	1448-1458
4)	WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED TO £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTAGE MONIES UNDER THE LAWFUL INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	1448-1458
5)	WHAT HAPPENED TO £ 254.000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTAGE MONIES UNDER THE LAW SOCIETY’S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTION PROCEDURE	1448-1458
6)	CALENDAR	1448-1458
7)	THE NINE ATTEMPTS TO STEAL AND LAUNDER THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	
a)	THE FIRST ATTEMPT. THE LAW SOCIETY’S ATTEMPTED THEFT AND PLACEMENT USING THE VESTING RESOLUTION	
	i) THURSDAY 17 FEBRUARY 2005.	
	1) NOTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF £258,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE 12.30PM	1448-1458
	2) LAW SOCIETY SERVES LLOYDS WITH VESTING ORDER AND LETTER 4.30PM	1448-1458
	3) LAW SOCIETY SERVES CUSTOMER WITH VESTING ORDER AND LETTER 6PM	1448-1458
	ii) FRIDAY 18 FEBRUARY 2005. INTERVENTION.	1448-1458
	iii) TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2005. PLACEMENT IN RUSSELL COOKE’S ACCOUNT	1448-1458

- b) THE SECOND ATTEMPT. A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, LLOYDS , HEATHER LEESON AND LLOYDS' BARRISTER TO STEAL AND LAYER THE MONIES USING A BOGUS CLAIM
- i) WEDNESDAY 23 FEBRUARY 2005
- 1) DISCOVERY THAT THE £254,000 SHEIKH – NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES HAD BEEN TRANSFERRED TO ME 1448-1458
 - 2) EXCHANGE BETWEEN SHEIKH AND LLOYDS 1448-1458
 - 3) LLOYDS VERIFIES THE SHEIKH REMORTGAGE WITH POWELL CALLEN 1448-1458
 - 4) HEATHER LEESON SPEAKS TO POWELL CALLEN 1448-1458
- ii) THURSDAY 24 FEBRUARY 2005. HEATHER LEESON OBTAINS THE FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER AND THE FRAUDULENT DISCLOSURE ORDER.
- 1) EXCHANGE BETWEEN SHEIKH AND LLOYDS 1448-1458
 - 2) EXCHANGE BETWEEN LLOYDS AND THE LAW SOCIETY (RUSSELL COOKE) 1448-1458
 - 3) THE FRAUDULENT WITHHOLDING OF CLAIM FORM 1448-1458
 - 4) LLOYDS' FRAUDULENT APPLICATION ISSUED 1448-1458
 - 5) HEATHER LEESON'S FRAUDULENT AFFIDAVIT AND AFFIDAVIT USING WENDY LAVINGTON'S NAME
 - a) THE FRAUDULENT AFFIDAVITS 1448-1458
 - b) LEESON USES NON SOLICITOR TO FALSELY STATE THAT VESTING RESOLUTION IS A FREEZING ORDER 1448-1458
 - c) LEESON USES NON SOLICITOR TO FALSELY STATE THAT THE VESTING RESOLUTION IS AN AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER THE CUSTOMER'S FUNDS TO THE LAW SOCIETY 1448-1458
 - d) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS HAS COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENCE UNDER THE SOLICITOR'S ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (6) BY TRANSFERRING FUNDS TO THE LAW SOCIETY 1448-1458
 - e) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT LLOYDS HAS COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENCE BY TRANSFERRING FUNDS TO THE CUSTOMER 1448-1458
 - f) LEESON MISLEADS THE COURT BY NOT ADVISING THAT THE MONEY SHOULD HAVE REMAINED AT LLOYDS 1448-1458
 - g) LEESON WITHHOLDS THAT THE LAW SOCIETY ENCOURAGED OR INCITED LLOYDS TO COMMIT A CRIMINAL OFFENCE UNDER PARA 6 (6) 1448-1458

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

w)	LEESON AND LAVINGTON MAKE THE FALSE STATEMENT THAT NO CLIENT HAS SUFFERED LOSS	1448-1458
x)	LEESON FAILS TO ADVISE THE COURT THAT LLOYDS WERE UNAFFECTED BY CONSTRUCTIVE THIRD PARTY INTERESTS	1448-1458
y)	LEESON AND LAVINGTON WITHHOLD FROM THE COURT THAT LLOYDS CONSIDERED ME TO BE AN EXCELLENT CUSTOMER	1448-1458
6)	LEESON FRAUDULENTLY WITHHOLDS POWELL CULLEN'S EVIDENCE	1448-1458
7)	LEESON FRAUDULENTLY WITHHOLDS MARTIN COCKRELL'S EVIDENCE	1448-1458
8)	LEESON FRAUDULENTLY WITHHOLDS THE FRAUDULENT RESTITUTION CLAIM	1448-1458
9)	THE FIRST FRAUDULENT FREEZING ORDER	1448-1458
10)	THE FRAUDULENT DISCLOSURE ORDER	1448-1458
iii)	FRIDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2005. LLOYDS ISSUES A FRAUDULENT CLAIM	
1)	CLAIM	1448-1458
2)	CLAIM FOR RESTITUTION FRAUDULENT	1448-1458
3)	CLAIM OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT FRAUDULENT	1448-1458
4)	CLAIM OF INTERVENTION FRAUDULENT	1448-1458
5)	CLAIM OF MISTAKE FRAUDULENT	1448-1458
6)	CLEAN HANDS?	1448-1458
c)	THE THIRD ATTEMPT THE LAW SOCIETY, HEATHER LEESON AND LLOYDS' BARRISTER ACT IN CONSPIRACY TO TORMENT ME BY HARASSING MY MOTHER	1448-1458
d)	THE FOURTH ATTEMPT ON 8 TH MARCH 2005	
i)	MONDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2005. THE FIRST MEETING WITH PAUL SAFFRON	1448-1458
ii)	FRIDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2005. PAUL SAFFRON'S LETTER TO HEATHER LEESON	1448-1458
iii)	WHY PAUL SAFFRON WROTE 'THIS WAS INCONTROVERTIBLY CLIENT MONEY'. THE CASE FIXING CONSPIRACY BETWEEN TREVERTON JONES KC AND THE LAW SOCIETY	1448-1458
iv)	HEARING 8 MARCH 2005. DID MY LEGAL TEAM EVEN SAY 'THIS IS REMORTGAGE MONEY'?	1448-1458
e)	THEFT OF £10.000 COSTS FOR FRAUDULENT HEARING	1448-1458
f)	THE FIFTH ATTEMPT IN MARCH 2005. MR DOGAN'S ATTEMPTED THEFT	1448-1458

g)	THE SIXTH ATTEMPT. A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE LAW SOCIETY, RUSSELL COOKE AND JOHN WEAVER	1448-1458
8)	THE SEVENTH ATTEMPT TO STEAL THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES CASE FIXING. TREVERTON JONES KC BRIBED WITH THE £254,000 SHEIKH –NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY AND OTHER INDUCEMENTS TO TRY AND LOSE <u>SHEIKH V THE LAW SOCIETY (HIGH COURT 2005</u>	
e)	HOW TREVERTON JONES KC AND RADCLIFFLEBRASSEUR TRIED TO LOSE MY INTERVENTION CHALLENGE	
i)	INTERVENTION LAW AND PROCEDURE	1448-1458
ii)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S FALSE ADJUDICATIONS	1448-1458
iii)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S BOGUS INVESTIGATIONS	1448-1458
iv)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S DOCTORING , FALSIFICATION AND FORGERY OF INVESTIGATION RECORDS	1448-1458
v)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S THE NON EXISTENT PANEL	1448-1458
vi)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT ALLEGATIONS	1448-1458
vii)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S FALSE AND PERJURED EVIDENCE AT TRIAL	1448-1458
viii)	TREVERTON JONES KC CONCEALS THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT USE OF NICK SHELLEY, THE LAW SOCIETY'S CLAIMED COSTS EXPERT	1448-1458
ix)	TREVERTON JONES SUPPRESSES THE LAW SOCIETY'S BREACH OF TRUST IN FAILING TO PROMPTLY RETURN THE £254,000 SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE PROCEEDS	1448-1458
x)	TREVERTON JONES SUPPRESSES THE LAW SOCIETY'S BREACH OF THE TRUST BY DEBITING £55,000 FOR RUSSELL COOKE'S ADMINISTRATION COSTS	1448-1458
xi)	TREVERTON JONES SUPPRESSES THE LAW SOCIETY'S ATTEMPTED THEFT THE £254,000 SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE PROCEEDS	1448-1458
xii)	TREVERTON JONES MAKES A BOGUS APPLICATION FOR THE RETURN OF MY PRACTICING CERIFICATE TO INCUR COSTS	1448-1458
9)	PAUL SAFFRON'S ACTUAL THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	
10)	HOW THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE COURT LAUNDERED THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES	
a)	DIAGRAMS	
i)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THREE STAGES OF MONEY LAUNDERING	1448-1458

ii)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE LAW SOCIETY'S FRAUDULENT INTERVENTIONS IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	1448-1458
iii)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE SEVEN ATTEMPTED THEFTS OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	1448-1458
iv)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT OF THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES IN MONEY LAUNDERING TERMS	1448-1458
v)	FLOWCHART SHOWING THE THEFT AND MONEY LAUNDERING OF ALL MY ASSETS	1448-1458
b)	PLACEMENT	
i)	WHAT IS PLACEMENT	1448-1458
ii)	FIRST PLACEMENT. THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES TRANSFERRED TO RUSSELL COOKE ON 'INTERVENTION'	1448-1458
iii)	SECOND PLACEMENT. THE £254,000 SHEIKH-NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES TRANSFERRED BY RUSSELL COOKE TO RADCLIFFES 7 DAYS BEFORE TRIAL	1448-1458
iv)	ATTEMPTED THIRD PLACEMENT. £55,000 DEDUCTION FOR RUSSELL COOKE'S FALSE INVOICES	1448-1458
v)	FOURTH PLACEMENT. THE £55,000 TRANSFERRED TO RADCLIFFES 3 DAYS BEFORE TRIAL	1448-1458
c)	LAYERING	
i)	WHAT IS LAYERING AND HOW WAS IT USED	1448-1458
ii)	HOW GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC USED 'FALSE REPRESENTATIONS TO CONVERT THE SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY INTO CLIENT MONEY. THE HIGH COURT HEARING . MAY 2005- JULY 2005	1448-1458
iii)	TIMOTHY DUTTON'S FRAUDULENT ADVICE TO THE LAW SOCIETY'S HIGH PROFILE LITIGATION PANEL. HOW TIMOTHY DUTTON KC MADE FALSE REPRESENTATIONS TO CONVERT THE SHEIKH- NRAM REMORTGAGE MONEY INTO CLIENT MONEY.	
1)	DUTTON COMMITS S. 3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE) BY FAILING TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE £254,000 SHEIKH -NRAM REMORTGAGE MONIES WERE MY MONEY	1448-1458
2)	DUTTON'S FAILURE TO ADVISE THAT LLOYDS HAD COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENCE UNDER THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 SCHEDULE 1 PART II PARA 6 (6). S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE)	1448-1458
3)	DUTTON'S FALSE STATEMENT THAT REMOVING THE MONEY FROM CLIENT ACCOUNT WAS WRONG. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT)	1448-1458
4)	DUTTON'S FALSE STATEMENT THAT REMOVING THE MONEY FROM CLIENT ACCOUNT WAS IN BREACH OF SAR 23. S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE)	1448-1458

5)	DUTTON'S STATEMENT THAT THE REMOVAL OF THE MONEY WAS TO DELIBERATELY PUT OUT OF REACH OF LLOYDS S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT) S.3 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FAILURE TO DISCLOSE) CONSPIRACY OFFENCE WITH RADCLIFFES AND PAUL SAFFRON	1448-1458
6)	DUTTON'S STATEMENT THAT ANOTHER COURT HAD FOUND DISHONESTY. S. 2 FRAUD ACT 2006 OFFENCE (FALSE STATEMENT)	1448-1458
c)	INTEGRATION	
i)	WHAT IS INTEGRATION	1448-1458
ii)	HOW THE COURT OF APPEAL USED IT SHAM JUDGMENT TO INTEGRATE THE STOLEN REMORTGAGE MONIES	1448-1458
d)	CRIMINAL LIABILITY	
1)	LLOYDS' CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
2)	THE LAW SOCIETY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
3)	MARTIN COCKRELL'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
4)	WENDY LAVINGTON 'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
5)	HEATHER LEESON'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
6)	RUSSELL COOKE 'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
7)	JOHN WEAVER'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
8)	PAUL SAFFRON'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
9)	GREGORY TREVERTON JONES KC'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458
10)	TIMOTHY DUTTON KC'S CRIMINAL OFFENCES	1448-1458

