

---

**EXHIBIT COURT COMPLAINT 04-05-2022**

---

**EMAIL 1:****From:** Paul M**Sent:** 11 May 2022 11:53**To:** Administrative Court Office, General Office <[generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk](mailto:generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk)>; Martin Walsh**Subject:** Re: CO/915/2022 - ADMINISTRATIVE COURT - 04/05/2022 - FORMAL COMPLAINT OF SERIOUS CORRUPTION AND LAWLESSNESS \* OFFICIAL \*

Dear Mr Geraint Evans,

Yes I disagree with the decision. There is an email entitled "*CO/915/2022 - ADMINISTRATIVE COURT - 04/05/2022 - FORMAL COMPLAINT OF SERIOUS CORRUPTION AND LAWLESSNESS*" dated 4th May 2022 at 07.10AM setting out my complaint of fraud and corruption. You allege there is abuse. There is no abuse whatsoever. I see this as nothing more than an excuse to conceal the corruption and lawlessness I have had to endure for over six-years. I request that you direct me to any correspondence that you suggest is abusive in my complaint. There is none whatsoever.

My right of action has been assigned to a Scottish company. They will be taking action in relation to this malfeasance. It is clear that you cannot handle the complaint, because it is the truth, so you conjure up this nonsense as yet another excuse to suppress and evade dealing in a constitutionally proper way.

I request a review and a properly balanced and weighted decision for refusing to deal with my complaint of maladministration when the maladministration is proven.

Thank you.

--- Paul Millinder

---

**EMAIL 1 ENDS**

---

**EMAIL 2:****On Wed, 11 May 2022 at 09:50**, Administrative Court Office, General Office <[generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk](mailto:generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dear Mr Millinder,

The Administrative Court Office has received emails from you via the email address [paul@i1uk.com](mailto:paul@i1uk.com) in relation to claim number CO/915/2022, the nature and content of these emails have resulted in them being referred for management action.

It is the duty of court staff to handle all emails politely, professionally and in line with HMCTS policies concerning working with the public and equal opportunities however, any emails which are consider inappropriate, (e.g. abusive, argumentative and irrelevant, or frivolous and time-wasting) will be referred for management action which may include blocking the source of those emails.

It has been decided that the nature of **the emails recently received from you** constitutes good reason to terminate this correspondence, **as they are considered to be inappropriate and an abuse of the court's process.** This email is therefore formal notification that all further emails from [paul@i1uk.com](mailto:paul@i1uk.com) will not be responded to with immediate effect.

If you disagree with the decision, you may write to Geraint Evans at this address stating the reasons for your disagreement, and requesting a review. A review response will be sent within twenty days of receipt of your request.

Yours sincerely,

Olu Onasanya  
Delivery Manager, Administrative Court Office

---

**EMAIL 2 ENDS**

---

**EMAIL 3:****From:** Paul M <[paul@i1uk.com](mailto:paul@i1uk.com)>**Date:** Tue, 10 May 2022 at 12:47**Subject:** CO/915/2022 - Witness statements for pre-reading & directions**To:** <[mandy.torrens@justice.gov.uk](mailto:mandy.torrens@justice.gov.uk)>, Administrative Court Office, Case Progression <[caseprogression@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk](mailto:caseprogression@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk)>

Dear Ms Torrens,

I applied for directions in furtherance of the overriding objective. I require a directions hearing. No application is necessary in the Court administering its duty in furtherance of the overriding objective. My complaint made that very clear. I request that the judge pre-reads these salient documents and that you confirm you have sent them for pre-reading (in order):

1. [WITNESS-STATEMENT-08-05-2022](#) - First witness statement dated 08/05/2022:
2. [SECOND-WITNESS-STATEMENT-09-05-2022](#) - Second witness statement dated 09/05/2022:

3. [SUMMARY-VIOLATIONS-OF-LAW-10-05-2022](#) - Summary of the case referring to those witness statements and other important matters:

4. [311019 Letter Beale Shrimplin Hannon A-Stansfeld 31 10 2019](#) - Anthony Stansfeld's letter to the insolvency criminals dated 31/10/19:

It is my learned opinion that the majority of the purported judges cannot be trusted and are politically controlled, so I am going to use the proceeding to draw them out ready for the next set I have lined up. I am not bothered about recusing Kerr J. It is up to him whether he wants to continue the conspiracy by suppressing evidence, if so, he will be D44. I have put the evidence and the case before you. My submissions are very clear. The evidence does not deceive. There has been more than sufficient time to pre-read. I think below is also fairly helpful in consolidating. Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

**Paul Millinder:**

---

From: Paul M <[paul@i1uk.com](mailto:paul@i1uk.com)>

Date: Tue, 10 May 2022 at 09:49

Subject: CO/915/2022 - 8-page must read submission - JUDICIAL FRAUD & CORRUPTION - SUMMARY-VIOLATIONS-OF-LAW-10-05-2022

To: <[lindsey.chiswick@met.police.uk](mailto:lindsey.chiswick@met.police.uk)>

1. To round this all off perfectly, I have prepared this 8-page submission. It should be read by the judges today, along with my first and second witness statements (in order) with this being read last. Also read the enclosed straight forward letter from Anthony Stansfeld, the former PCC for Thames Valley who wrote to the insolvency criminals in respect of £4.1 million proof of debt [fraud by false representation](#). I apply to strike out D41's void committal claim and to immediately set aside the void orders. I would like to use the day's trial for dealing with everything that has been concealed by these hoodlums instead. I apply for an award of costs in the interim, summarily assessed in the sum quoted at paragraph 83 of my submission against D33 (**Braverman**) and D41 (**Chalk**) and D42 (**McGibbon**) personally. In any event, **I provide this email notice to attach them personally for costs as non-parties**. In case anyone is still suffering with wilful blindness, the fraud by Staunton is proven, "out of the horse's mouth" affirming his actual state of mind as to the circumstances he falsely represented, recorded on the transcripts of the hearings themselves. The evidence does not get stronger than that. Follow this, simple but effective:

**Green** = truth      **Blue** = result of misrepresentation      **Red** = conscious and premeditated dishonesty

**A. From the transcript of the proceeding on 05/02/2018:**

*Mr Staunton: Second page in. Reading that second paragraph, [what's assigned to EEI are the investments](#), the £200,000.  
Nugee J: [Yeah](#).*

**B. From the transcript of the fraudulent winding up hearing on 28/03/2018 in my absence:**

*Mr Millinder then said, "Well, [the subsidiary has a significant claim for damages against Middlesbrough](#)", [but it never brought any proceedings](#).*

*JUDGE BARBER: [It's not a cross-claim then](#).*

*MR STAUNTON: [That is the cross-claim](#).*

*JUDGE BARBER: Well, [it's not a cross-claim though, is it?](#)*

*MR STAUNTON: Well, I – [in my submission, no](#)*

**C. From the transcript of the rescission of the fraudulent winding up order on 11/04/2018:**

*MR STAUNTON: --and paras.17 to 24. So [there's a cross claim which extinguishes the liability to pay £25,000](#)*

*THE CHIEF REGISTRAR: [Yeah](#).*

*MR STAUNTON: But [we see that also was before Judge Barber and she made the Winding Up Order](#).*

*MR STAUNTON: [There is the cross claim. There is the assignment. So the two grounds upon which Earth Energy invite you to rescind the Winding Up Order were before Judge Barber](#)---*

*THE CHIEF REGISTRAR: [Yes](#).*

*MR STAUNTON: --and [she considered them. I attended that hearing](#).*

*THE CHIEF REGISTRAR: [Yes](#).*

*MR STAUNTON: [I explained the situation to her](#).*

2. It is evidenced that what was before Barber on 28/03/2018 was D4's lies where he committed [fraud by false representation](#) on the 5th count to defraud me of the £770,000 assigned investments he admitted he knew were assigned on 05/02/2018. It is simple, proven serious criminal fraud that Vos (D15) and other delinquent criminals purporting to be judges have concealed to prevent justice being served on the offenders throughout the proceedings when the course of public justice had started.

3. Now then, Law Ministers, The Treasury Solicitor, Government Legal Department, Royal Courts of Injustice, what are you doing exactly? Answer the question, but only after reading my two witness statements and that enclosed submission, very carefully indeed. You are all in more trouble than you are worth. Send this to Kerr J and confirm it has been done, at once. Thank you very much. It really is as easy as A,B, C, or 1,2, 3.

EMAIL 3 ENDS

**EMAIL 4:**

From: Paul M <paul@i1uk.com>  
Date: Tue, 10 May 2022 at 12:21  
Subject: Re: CO/915/2022 - ADMINISTRATIVE COURT - 04/05/2022 - FORMAL COMPLAINT OF SERIOUS CORRUPTION AND LAWLESSNESS  
To: Administrative Court Office, General Office <generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk>

Dear Mr Membu,

Ok thank you. When you do, can you please refer to the enclosed [Annex A MOJ Core Fraud Policy](#) which applies to HMCTS and all MoJ departments.

I quote from p2 of the policy: *"The MoJ's policy on fraud and corruption is one of zero tolerance, whether involving its own staff, or other external individuals or bodies. It is MoJ's policy to refer all instances of fraud both actual and reasonably suspected to the relevant police authorities"*

The purported judges in this case are the fraudsters and criminals who have perverted the course of justice. Please provide the crime reference number and date the report to police was made by the Court. Additionally, please respond and confirm receipt of my email of earlier today entitled: *"CO/915/2022 - 8-page must read submission - JUDICIAL FRAUD & CORRUPTION - SUMMARY-VIOLATIONS-OF-LAW-10-05-2022"*

That should be considered in conjunction with my first and second witness statement. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Millinder (Attached: [Annex MOJ Core Fraud Policy.pdf](#))

---

On Tue, 10 May 2022 at 11:29, Administrative Court Office, General Office <generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk> wrote:  
Dear Sir,

Thank you for your email, which I can confirm receipt of.

I will escalate your complaint on to senior management to investigate and respond

Regards,  
Emmanuel Membu \* Official \*  
Administrative Court Office Team Leader | Issues and Enquiries  
Queen's Bench Division | HMCTS | Royal Courts of Justice | Strand, London | WC2A 2LL  
Phone: 020 7947 6655 (Option 6)  
Web: [www.gov.uk/hmcts](http://www.gov.uk/hmcts)

---

From: Paul M [mailto:paul@i1uk.com]  
Sent: 09 May 2022 11:57  
To: Administrative Court Office, General Office <generaloffice@administrativecourtoffice.justice.gov.uk>; Torrens, Mandy <Mandy.Torrens@Justice.gov.uk>  
Subject: Re: CO/915/2022 - ADMINISTRATIVE COURT - 04/05/2022 - FORMAL COMPLAINT OF SERIOUS CORRUPTION AND LAWLESSNESS

Where is the acknowledgement of my complaint? What do you purport to administer exactly apart from lawlessness, fraud, injustice, human rights abuse and perversion of the course of justice?

I have had enough of my rights being violated by judicial fraudsters and imposters who are intent on gangstalking me whilst being sponsored by the taxpayer in the process. I want answers and I want them now. I have had enough of this abuse and rightfully so.

On Wed, 4 May 2022 at 07:10, Paul M <paul@i1uk.com> wrote:

**COMPLAINT OF SERIOUS CORRUPTION DATED 4<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2022**

Dear Sir / Madam,

Following my call with case progression yesterday, I was asked to write to this email address setting out my formal complaint (which serves several purposes). My points of reference are numbered below accordingly:

I refer to the suite of submissions already filed listed in: [SCHEDULE-OF-DOCUMENTATION](#), referring to each document by the identifier. I also refer to the email directly below, referencing the paragraphs accordingly.

1. I refer to [doc-R](#), page 8, line 19 contains a link to the 2 min 09 sec recording ([RCJ Admin Ct 20 04 2022-11.32AM](#) - attached). I made a directions application within proceedings that had already been issued in my duty to further the overriding objective conferred in [Part 1 of the CPR](#). It is the overriding objective for the Court to deal with cases justly. R.1.3 is the duty on me, a litigant party to the case to assist the Court in furtherance of the overriding objective.

R.1.4 provides a duty of the Court to actively manage cases. R.1.4(2) Active case management includes: (b) identifying the issues at an early stage; (c) **deciding promptly which issues need full investigation and trial.**

1.1. **Perverting the course of justice is a serious matter. I sought directions in relation to that.** On 14/04/2022 directions were passed by the corrupt legal advisor to Swift (D20) the criminal offender who is being sustained courtesy of the taxpayer after breaching his oath and perverting the course of justice in this case since 15/03/2021 and at all times thereafter. **(See p4 of my 22/04/2022 email below)**. Swift has no jurisdiction to continue presiding as a judge, let alone continuing to interfere with this case knowing he is a defendant. Judges who breach their oaths have broken the law, judges that break the law are not judges, but Swift and the rest of them are criminals. Why are they being harboured in office after they have broken the law? They are imposters. You keep them there so they can continue their lawless acts of state terrorism, contrary to the law and the public interest. I refer to **doc-F**; page 17 of my detailed skeleton citing the authorities appended to it. At p98 I cite Girvan J in **Re Downes for Judicial Review [2006] NIQB 79** and I quote:

**"Public authorities have a duty to ensure that the court can fulfil its functions properly. For this reason irregularities that affect its process should be properly investigated in a manner that can allay public concern and the concern of the court to ensure that its process is not abused. Any possible attempted interference with or obstruction of the course of justice is a grave matter which demands a proper investigation"**

1.2. The corrupt case lawyer's way of dealing with that was to pass the directions for perverting back to Swift, D20, who is one of the defendants. Swift's way of dealing with that, was to lie, which is what he does best, along with perverting the course of justice and affronting the rule of law in every way possible in the process. Moving back to **doc-R** page 8, line 20 - 21, I quote from what **I was told (on the tape) on 20/04/2022 at 11.33AM:**

**"Can I just tell you what's on the system. Please let me just read what's on the system. It says on the 14th of April the case was, ur, flagged by the case lawyer for directions, papers sent to the judge"**

1.3. Swift had the directions on 14/04/2022 but **adopting his usual corrupt practice in perverting the course of public justice, he sought, as he did previously**, to suppress the directions and conceal the proven criminality to prevent justice being served on the offenders (including himself) knowing he had no jurisdiction to do it.

1.4. On 19/04/2022 I had submitted a further detailed skeleton (**doc-K**) focusing on the two counts of S.5 perjury and the 4 counts of fraud by failing to disclose information in conspiracy between 09/01/2017 - 16/01/2017 and then from 23/10/2020 - 06/11/2020, explaining how Fancourt (D18) perverted the course of justice and suppressed evidence to assist the offenders. The skeleton was also passed to Swift by the case lawyer.

1.5. Referring to doc-R, page 8, line 25 - 26 (from the recording), on **22/04/2022** Swift instructed the case lawyer to come out with this nonsense:

**The case lawyer has responded and until we receive an application for this matter your request below will be disregarded.**

1.6. Every application and claim I have ever made has been suppressed and has never been dealt with. Moreover, no application is necessary in obtaining directions in furtherance of the overriding objective conferred in CPR Part 1, R.1.4(2)(c) and, **perverting the course of public justice is a grave matter that requires full investigation. Swift continued in his quest to pervert the course of justice. The issue is that criminals are playing judge, there is no fairness, no impartiality, no law and no justice, principally due to that fact.**

1.7. I refer to **CASE-FILE-PART-2: DOC-8**: from page 792 of the case file (page 2 of the active index), click on **tab 12**: This is the line numbered submission that Swift and Andrews suppressed to prevent justice being served on the offenders. The submission was filed on 04/03/2021 when the course of public justice had commenced in this Court. The submission proves perjury, judicial fraud and fraud by false representation by D4 and his conspirators. I refer to page 10 of the submission (page 284 of the exhibit - **DOC-8** / page 1076 of the case file). In just that one page, I set out irrefutable evidence of fraud by false representation on the part of D4. Knowing that the corrupt judiciary would suppress and conceal, I deliberately repeated the submissions so that any suppression can be proven to be nothing other than deliberate. I refer to page 276 (the top of page 2 of the submission), citing from line 7 which came from the 05/02/2018 hearing transcript: **Mr Staunton: What's assigned are the investments, the £200,000**

1.8. **It is attested that Staunton (D4's) actual state of mind on 05/02/2018 was that the investments were assigned from EW to EEI** and he referred to only a small part of the investment in the sum of £200,000, which was only the lease premium I paid. I assigned all the investments, absolutely, to EEI on 30/06/2015. The total of the investment being £770,000 invested in the project only for D1 to refuse the connection they jointly agreed during the option period then unlawfully forfeit the lease.

1.9. Moving back to **page 284 of the line numbered exhibit** (page 10 of the 11 page document), at line 16 - 38 I cited from the 28/03/2018 transcript where D4 falsely represented the cross claim assigned investments. It is proven beyond reasonable doubt he knew the representation he was making was false, as attested in p1.7 above.

He made the false representation to defraud me of the assigned investments so that EEI would be wound up, only for the criminal, Hannon (D5) they co-conspirator to affix himself as liquidator to ensure I am defrauded of the assigned investments, after he defrauded me of the proven damages claim by sustaining the £4.1 million fraud by false representation. At line 6 - 7, on 11/04/2018 during the pre-determined rescission hearing before Briggs, his co-conspirator, D4 admitted this: So *there's a cross claim which extinguishes the liability to pay £25,000*. D4 admitted what they have all known from the outset, prior to 09/01/2017 when he, D1, D2 and D3 attended the ex-parte hearing, fraudulently failing to disclose 172-pages of witness evidence in tandem with D4 lying about the operative provision of Force Majeure (because it proved unlawful forfeiture) and in tandem with Bloom of D1 making a knowingly false witness statement, lying about the assignment he had in his possession by then 3-times over. The £25,000 proceeds of crime originated from their offending in breach of their legal duty to disclose between 09/01/2017 - 16/01/2017. The corrupt court allowed them to continue advancing their fraud whilst they were shielded from prosecution. Swift, (D20) Andrews (D21) and the other dishonest cretin, Easthope-Davis (D34) (no hope) are purely manifestations of that conspiracy to pervert the course of justice.

1.10. At line 8 - 9, I cited from the 11/04/2018 transcript where D4 lied and stated the Nugee J order of 21/03/2018 listing EEI's application to set aside the fraudulently obtained £25k was before Judge Barber when it is evidenced what was before Barber was his lies where he stated:

**MR STAUNTON:** *Indeed, but that matter has been fully ventilated in front of Judge Jones, terminating Monday of this week when he dismissed (inaudible) application*

1.11. D4 lied again and stated this, as cited from line 10 - 12:

**MR STAUNTON:** *"There is the cross claim. There is the assignment. So the two grounds upon which Earth Energy invite you to rescind the Winding Up Order were before Judge Barber"*

1.12. They were desperate to achieve their preconceived plan in conspiracy to defraud to wind up EEI for their £25,000 proceeds of crime (the nullity consent order when there was no consent), so that the right of action fell back to Hannon who would go on to appoint himself (he was never appointed) as liquidator to EEI to defraud me of the assigned investments. It is plainly evidenced, on that same page that what was before Barber was D4's conscious and premeditated dishonesty (fraud by false representation) as clearly evidenced at page 284, line 16 - 38. The representation is proven to be dishonest and was convened to defraud me of the assigned investments. That is a serious criminal offence that has been concealed by the corrupt judiciary throughout the proceedings when the course of public justice had started. It is proven beyond reasonable doubt that all involved have conspired to pervert the course of justice, defrauding me in the name of it. It was for that reason the corrupt court deliberately failed to apply the mandatory law in set off conferred in R.14.25 of the Insolvency Rules 2016. (See: [doc-O](#), page 3, reading p15 - p22).

1.13. Any ordinary informed lay person could determine, just by reading the 1 page within that line numbered document ([DOC-8; tab-12](#), page 284) that D4 is guilty of fraud by false representation and that the order of 28/03/2018 was founded by conscious and pre-meditated dishonesty. The dishonesty is prolific and the evidence is "out of the horse's mouth" attested from the transcripts, accurate records of D4's actual state of mind on 05/02/2018, on 28/03/2018 and on 11/04/2018. He had the order of 21/03/2018 by Nugee J listing the application to set aside the fraudulent £25,000 proceeds of crime that was in any event extinguished by the cross claim assigned investments by over 30 times in his possession on the same day. On 28/03/2018 the hearing to set aside the 16/01/2017 consent order (where there was no consent) and that the order was founded by fraud, had not taken place. The order of 21/03/2018 listed EEI's application for a hearing in the usual way. In the opinion of any ordinary informed lay observer, the actions of D4 across all 3 proceedings would be considered flagrantly dishonest. It is proven that D4 is guilty of fraud by false representation, in fact on 4 counts in conspiracy. There are category A aggravating factors.

1.14. [CASE-FILE-PART-2: DOC-8; tab-13](#) is the 54-page report proving further criminality. It was suppressed throughout the proceedings and then by Swift (D20), Andrews (D21) and then by Easthope-Davis (D34) when the course of public justice had commenced. The front page of the 54-page report at page 286 of DOC-8 contains an active table of contents with self-explanatory headlines. It was all concealed.

1.15. [CASE-FILE-PART-3: DOC-9](#): pages 1143 & 1144, the active index for exhibit [DOC-9](#) contains the extent of the submissions and evidence that was suppressed by D20, D21 and D34 to prevent justice being served on the offenders. Each and every part of my case was disregarded, yet all the offending was proven beyond reasonable doubt. I refer to tabs 5 and 6, both of which encompass the directions I applied to Swift and Andrews for in furtherance of the overriding objective to deal with the proven criminality. Read both of those documents carefully. They were suppressed entirely, the directions were not forthcoming, and they failed to deal with the issues during the hearing on 30/03/2021, deliberately concealing to prevent the offenders from being prosecuted whilst coming out with the common punchline *"I can see no evidence of fraud"* they are the fraud. I was told during the hearing that in order to have the issues tried that had not been, I would need to make an application. I refer to [DOC-9; tab-9](#), is the sealed application notice, bearing a seal of 06/04/2021 along with the continuation sheet at pages 226 - 240. The application was suppressed and never heard to prevent justice being served on the offenders.

1.16. Each and every single application I have made in the protracted proceedings has been suppressed, yet the case was proven before it came to Court. I refer to [doc-Q](#), reading and following the simple 2-page document. I refer to [doc-P](#), reading and following the 10-page skeleton with a diligent standard of review.

2. I refer to [doc-D](#) (attached). My 4-page skeleton was filed on 28/03/2022 and deals with the fact that there has been conspiracy to pervert the course of justice whereby the corrupt, politically controlled judiciary (including Swift - D20 and Andrews - D21) are the defendants. (See: [doc-C](#) and the indictment attached to it).

[Doc-D](#), the 4-page skeleton linked to the appended submission of 13-pages setting out that **no less than 60 criminal offences have been concealed and all my evidence has been suppressed throughout the lawless, protracted, pre-determined politically controlled proceedings designed only to prevent justice being served on the offenders** whilst each and all of the purported judges suppress all the evidence and every single part of the case including the proven preliminary consideration. That is not dealing with cases justly, for avoidance of doubt. **The course of public justice commenced on 19/09/2016 and from then on, the purported judges have acted to impede the proper administration of both civil and criminal justice.**

3. The purported judges, the heads of the justice system and the quislings, including Raab and the Law Ministers, have breached their legal duty conferred in [Section 3\(1\) of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005](#) by defeating the independence of the judiciary. Raab and the rest of his cabal, including the corrupt Law Ministers, Chalk and Braverman, have broken the law. Raab is in breach of oath of his office as Lord Chancellor, Burnett is in breach of his duties and all responsible are guilty of conspiracy to pervert the course of justice, misconduct in public office and the two standalone offences of S327(1) and S328(1) of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. Nobody is above the supremacy of the rule of law.

3.1. Conclusively, my complaint is therefore that the Administrative Court, its judges and the entire justice system is compromised, utterly lawless and systemically corrupt and until the perpetrators are arrested and removed, the UK is in serious threat as it is proven that nobody can rely on the judges to act impartially, nor to administer even the most basic, proven contractual law, let alone laws of statute.

3.2. I repeat, [R.14.25 of the Insolvency Rules 2016](#), does indeed provide a mandatory duty of the court to apply set off and failure to have done so does indeed render the 3 sets of proceedings fundamentally and irredeemably defective and void. The corrupt court has assisted the offenders by **creating varying degrees of nullity, one void order upon another**, convened with protracted malicious intent only to assist the offenders, perverting the course of justice and defrauding me of my assets in the name of "law" and "justice" when there is neither. I have been mentally tortured and hoodwinked of my rightful property assets and of right of equality before the law, all because my case is proven, and because the corrupt judiciary have "stepped into the shoes of the fraudsters". I am the man that wrote the contracts. I am the man who paid these cretins, D1, D2 and D3, D3's legal fees to complete them in order to construct, connect to the grid and operate the wind turbine. One does indeed need a connection in order to do that. I am not stupid, I am not going to contractually agree to supply them power without first having comfort that my turbine is first generating it. It was for that reason I made any agreement to supply power conditional, the idiotic, entirely dishonest corrupt clowns purporting to be judges in this case can't even address that, let alone anything else. They are a risk to everyone they come into contact with.

3.3. Lastly, application of diligence is necessary. I draw your attention to [CASE-FILE-PART-1](#) (the updated version I filed yesterday). I refer to [DOC-E](#) (working from the front page active index) the 12-page skeleton linking to the most detailed core navigation documents ([DOC-1](#) & [DOC-2](#)) which sets out the case and all the evidence in chronological order.

3.4. Finally, a message for Swift and the other dishonest quislings who were only too happy to go along with this protracted aggravated conspiracy to defraud and to have perverted the course of justice:

*"After you have completed your sentences, which will, undoubtedly, given the aggravating factors be extremely lengthy, just you remember this, nobody is above the supremacy of the rule of law, least of all those who are paid generously by the taxpayer to administer it and wilfully fail in their duty to do so, and, never underestimate the strength of one's opposition. I am an intelligence expert, I know more of the law than all of you combined, and I am also a strategist. The best is always saved until last". I quote Swift's own analogy, it's always the last hearing one needs to win". I have won, yet I won before the case even came to court. The cross claim always extinguished D1's fraudulent liabilities many times over. It was for that reason you failed to apply the mandatory law in set off and likewise why you retained the fraudulent c£4.1 million proof of debt"*

3.5. I refer to the sentencing remarks contained at [doc-F; the index of authorities](#); no 18 & no 19. I cite some of the parts that apply to you all:

**No 19 sentencing remarks by Baker J:**

*Constance Briscoe, you are the third individual to have been convicted of criminal offences arising out of a saga whose origin goes back to 2003, when both Chris Huhne and Vicky Pryce lied about who had driven a speeding motor vehicle, and extends to you in 2011, when you sought to hide your true motive and role in the exposure of that story. You then compounded your position by deliberately fabricating evidence when you thought that you might be exposed.*

*"If there is a common thread between you all, then, from the insights I have had into the character of the each of you during this case, I regret that it is one of arrogance by educated individuals who considered that respect for the law was for others".*

3.5. Unlike all the offenders in this case, Briscoe, a recorder judge, was not in office at the time and the originating offence entailed just 3 driving points and a menial fine, unlike the 60 plus offences in this case, the aggravated and most protracted conspiracy by the highest echelons of the judiciary who clearly consider themselves above the law. I synergise the 22 offences Hannon has committed under the Insolvency Act 1986, which are for the most part all subject to a substantial fine, albeit that they overlap with his conspiracy to defraud, 2 counts of perjury, 2 counts of fraud by failing to disclose and 2 counts of fraud by abuse of position, with the originating driving points offence in Huhne, Briscoe, Pryce.

The actus reus is complete when the course of public justice had commenced and one acts to prevent justice being served on themselves, or upon others. That is precisely what all the offenders have done in this case.

**No 18 - Pryce / Huhne sentencing remarks by Sweeney J:**

"It must be clearly understood that **it amounts to the serious criminal offence of doing acts tending and intended to pervert the course of justice** and that, save in the most exceptional circumstances, **an immediate custodial sentence must follow**".

3.6. The function of the courts is to administer the rule of law. They have failed. The function of the Administrative Court is to adjudicate on disputes concerning the exercise of public power and to ascertain that official acts are consistent with the law, yet it is compromised by criminals leading the show, it has failed on all accounts to administer even the most basic statutory law at the heart of this case.

3.7. It is plainly evidenced in this complaint and in the evidence I have referred to that the Administrative Court has been concealing acts of corruption and criminality by Hannon (D5) and those in the Insolvency Service who have conspired to assist him. at **doc-P**, page 7, p68 it is evidenced that the purported judge in charge of the Administrative Court not only failed in his duty to account for the fact that this protracted conspiracy arose through wilful failure of the inferior court to apply the mandatory law in set off, but then he too made utterly nonsensical excuses, affronting the rule of law, as an excuse to sustain those fraudulent liabilities to defraud creditors. D34 followed suite.

3.8. It is proven that one cannot rely on the corrupt, politically influenced courts to administer the law or justice. That is a serious issue with overwhelming public interest to address. You must do so.

Now, stop this protracted menacing around with our justice system and get my directions application listed for a hearing without further procrastination. I do hope this makes the position clear, in the interim.

--- Paul Millinder

---

**Subject:** CO/915/2022 --- S.26 of the Criminal Justice & Courts Act 2015 --- An open message to Commander Sue Williams

**Date:** 22 Apr 2022, 08:11

Dear Commander Williams,

1. Certain particulars that have already been suppressed in the civil case and contents of this email will be made public in an article which is being released today. You had best follow this carefully. You have a duty to act to apprehend offenders and to prevent crime. You have a duty to act in accord with the Nolan Principles. You won the Queen's medal for your duties in policing and you are responsible for the operations of the Met Police.

2. The return report enclosed below is from our sophisticated email tracking system confirming that you have duly read the email proving that lawyers and the purported judges have committed indictable only offences. I had set out the offences with incontrovertible detail, synergising the 22 offences that Hannon (the Official Receiver of London) is proven to have committed (those offences conferred in Schedule 10 of the Insolvency Act 1986) with the originating driving points offence in **Huhne, Briscoe & Pryce (2014)** (watch the video) when all were jailed for perverting the course of justice. It is simple, proven but very effective.

The course of public justice commenced on 09/01/2017 and at all times thereafter, each and all of the purported judges have acted with favour and ill-will, in conspiracy to pervert the course of justice.

The email entitled: **URGENT: ADMIN COURT: CO/915/2022 - DIRECTIONS - Conspiracy to pervert the course of justice by purported judges (See: Huhne, Pryce, Briscoe)**

Opened by [Sue.Williams@met.police.uk](mailto:Sue.Williams@met.police.uk) 21 Apr, 2022 at 9:25

Opened by [Sue.Williams@met.police.uk](mailto:Sue.Williams@met.police.uk) 21 Apr, 2022 at 9:23

The email entitled: **Law Ministers & judges perverting the course of justice - Insolvency Act 1986 criminal offences**

Opened by [Sue.Williams@met.police.uk](mailto:Sue.Williams@met.police.uk) 26 Mar, 2022 at 14:47

**(There are more, as you know).**

3. The reason our once great country is in such a mess is due to systemic corruption coming from the highest echelons of government down. In short, the regulators wilfully fail to regulate, the police have become "soldiers to the kleptocracy", making "justice subject to status", providing impunity to all members of the systemic corruption collective organisational structure, and the judges are oath violating, politically controlled criminal racketeers who wilfully fail to administer the rule of law to assist fellow amoral lawyers and insolvency practitioners in using the courts to asset strip the people and their businesses. My own case is the classic example.

4. **The Promissory Oaths Act 1868:** Is statutory law, the one primary law which is designed to regulate the conduct of the judiciary. If a judge acts with "favour and illwill" contrary to the law, then law commits them to have vitiated their constitutional oath of office, which they can only retain whilst on good behaviour. In other words, a judge that breaches his oath, in the way that all the criminals purporting to be judges have in the present case, they are no longer judges.

The law is not administered, so that criminals, purporting to be judges can go on terrorising innocent civilians in the name of justice and law, whilst the corrupt establishment they work for, promotes them for following their orders.

5. **The rule of law:** Comprises constitutional law (the written and unwritten constitutional principles), statutory law, both civil and criminal, and case law, the latter of which is ever evolving. In this case, all have been wilfully violated.

6. **Misconduct in public office:** Is an indictable only offence commissioned when a public office holder wilfully neglects to perform on their obligations in office to such a degree as to constitute abuse of the public trust.

7. **Perverting the course of justice:** Is an indictable only offence commissioned when the offender does an act or series of acts, when the course of public justice has commenced (whether that course be civil or criminal justice) that are intended to interfere with, or to otherwise obstruct or impede the proper administration of a course of justice, to prevent justice being served on either that person, or others.

8. **Section 26 of the Criminal Justice & Courts Act 2015 - Corrupt or improper exercise of police powers & privileges:** Is an indictable only offence, punishable by up to 14-years imprisonment, is commissioned when a police constable or one of successive superior office: (a) exercises the powers and privileges of a constable improperly, and (b) knows or ought to know that the exercise is improper.

(4) For the purposes of this section, a police constable exercises the powers and privileges of a constable improperly if— (a) he or she exercises a power or privilege of a constable for the purpose of achieving— (i) a benefit for himself or herself, or (ii) a benefit or a detriment for another person, and (b) a reasonable person would not expect the power or privilege to be exercised for the purpose of achieving that benefit or detriment.

9. **A wilful failure to exercise proper duties of a police constable constitutes the offence.** Undoubtedly, knowing that the purported judges and lawyers in this case have conspired to pervert the course of justice and that they are all guilty of misconduct in public office, does, indisputably constitute the actus reus of the offence.

10. There is overwhelming public interest in apprehending and prosecuting the offenders. I am a widely experienced litigator with skillsets that rival most High Court Judges (even by admission of Vos, the criminal who heads up the civil injustice system for England & Wales). My submissions and the evidence I have presented is irrefutable.

11. I am asking you, where is the crime reference and why have you failed in all this time to apprehend the offenders when you know these most serious offences have been committed. I invite you to provide comment, by return, and by 1PM GMT at the absolute outside. Failure to do so will result in the article being published disclosing the fact that you have wilfully failed to comment after being presented with these incontrovertible facts.

The malfeasance / wilful failure of officers under the Crown to perform on their duties has diminished British constitutional principles and the rule of law. See attached. ([D---SKELETON-PERVERTING-28-03-2022](#))

I do hope to hear from you by return.

Yours faithfully,

**Paul Millinder**

---

EMAIL 3 ENDS