Left: Lady Justice Andrews, a Court of Appeal judge. **Right:** Mr Justice Cavanagh, a judge of the Kings Bench Division

Report dated 11 November 2022

Intelligence UK International S.A was commissioned by the third-party Claimant to produce this digital report.

The Insolvency Act 1986 ("**IA 1986**") & accompanying Insolvency (England & Wales) Rules 2016 ("**IR 2016**") provides rights to creditors to ensure that those creditors are repaid debts or claims owed to them when companies or individuals become insolvent, and to prevent creditors being defrauded. This case originated from corporate insolvency proceedings.

It is our finding is that the corrupt English administration have weaponised the applicable laws and courts into mechanisms of fraud and injustice. Law was deliberately maladministered, defrauding creditors of those rights granted, to keep assets that law intended were to be mandatorily paid to creditors, beyond reach of creditors, and to prevent the perpetrators who caused the insolvencies from being prosecuted. An aggravated criminal cover-up and malicious campaign of abuse by corrupt judges and public officials ensued.

Table of contents

Hyperlin s to relevant section Mouse right clic return to previous view

1. Summary

1.1. Lady Justice Andrews, AKA Geraldine Mary Andrews – D.O.B: 19 April 1959 ("**Andrews**"), Mr Justice Jonathan Swift, AKA Jonathan Mark Swift D.O.B: 11 September 1964 ("**Swift**") and Cavanagh J, AKA John Patrick Cavanagh – D.O.B: 17 June 1960 ("**Cavanagh**") are found to be complicit in corruption and a cover up, affronting multiple laws and authorities of the superior courts, acting on "varying degrees of nullity" to create "something on nothing", originated by the Court's maladministration and judicial fraud.

1.2. It is alleged that 15 senior judges embarked upon a protracted criminal conspiracy, wilfully failing to apply the law, acting wilfully blind, concealing evidence of fraud against creditors and offences in conspiracy in proceedings under the IA 1986 / IR 2016 between 19 September 2016 – 1 November 2022.

1.3. The Government Legal Department ("**GLD**"), Attorney General ("**AG**"), Solicitor General, ("**SG**"), the Treasury Solicitor, Susanna McGibbon ("**TS**"), HMCTS, the Lord Chancellor and the Insolvency Service acted in breach of the public trust to cover up, deploying a series of void, in excess of jurisdiction restraint orders to conceal serious corruption at the heart of the UK justice system.

1.4. In conspiracy, the offenders committed a series of acts intended to prevent justice being served on a Tory Teesside politician's corporation, their lawyers, Thomas Ulick Staunton ("**Staunton**") counsel instructed by them, and Anthony Hannon ("**Hannon**"), the Official Receiver of London, deployed by the Court to act as liquidator. A course of civil and criminal justice was perverted over a protracted period.

1.5. The majority creditor who was defrauded by Hannon, a public official of the Insolvency Service, has been targeted by the Law Ministers, public officials and judges who are sponsored by the taxpayer to act lawfully. **UKJ**, page 64 – end of page 74 sets out with evidence, 30 criminal offences committed by Hannon. 28 of those offences overlap with 2 counts of fraud by abuse of position.

1.6. The victim of fraud and corruption was consistently denied rights granted to him by law and then denied justice. A kleptocracy of colluding judges and public officials vilified the victim in a campaign of targeted human rights abuse. A "smear campaign" ensued, broadcasting malicious falsehoods, branding him a vexatious litigant with acts designed to discredit and damage his personal and business reputation online to detract focus away from a heinous aggravated criminal conspiracy.

1.1. The perpetrators clearly thought, and probably still do, that they are all "*above the law*", then again, so did Huhne, the former BEIS Minister, Pryce, his ex-wife and Constance Briscoe, who were **all jailed for perverting** for preventing justice being served over Huhne's 3 penalty points driving offence. In that case, it was not until 8-years later their offending was discovered.

1.2. Unlike the 15 judges in this case, Briscoe, a recorder judge of the Crown court, was not in office at the time, and there were not millions in criminal property in issue and no less than 60 criminal offences concealed during the course of biased and predetermined civil and criminal proceedings that cannot be called a determination at all.

1.1. There is a point of law that must be ruled upon:

"One cannot breach a nullity, for in law, a decision or act which is a nullity is void ab initio and has no legal effect from the outset. Therefore, there was nothing from Millinder to be in contempt of"

1.2. In *MacFoy v United Africa Company Limited [1961] 3 All ER 1169*, Denning LJ in the Court of Appeal confirmed that a void act or order is automatically void:

"If an act is void, then it is in law a nullity. It is not only bad, but incurably bad. There is no need for an order of the court to set it aside. It is automatically null and void without more ado, though it is sometimes convenient to have the court declare it to be so. And every proceeding which is founded on it is also bad and incurably bad. You cannot put something on nothing and expect it to stay there. It will collapse"

1.3. On 1st November 2022, Andrews was recorded in the High Court Administrative Court stating:

"What Mr Millinder and Deuda have failed to grasp is that a court order is a valid court order unless and until it is set aside"

1.4. In MacFoy, the Court of Appeal set the distinction between a voidable order, and a nullity:

"...it has been held that it only applies to proceedings which are voidable, ***not to proceedings which are a nullity*****: for** ***those are automatically void*** **and** ***a person affected by them can apply to have them set aside ex debito justitiae in the inherent jurisdiction of the court without going under the rule*****:*** *see Anlaby v. Praetorius; Craig v. Kanssen."*

1.5. It was ultra-vires (beyond powers) of the High Court to affront the long-established decisions of both the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords. Those determinations affirm that a nullity is void from the outset, having no legal effect, from the outset.

1.6. It is the right of any party affected by a void act or order, to ask the court to set aside that decision and this is a right, ex debito justitiae, that the court has no discretion to refuse. On 1st November 2022, Andrews and Swift abused their powers, acting in excess of jurisdiction, to refuse that right.

1.7. Andrews, who is referred to in Millinder's January 2022 submissions as "D21" (Defendant 21) acted as "***judge of her own cause***" contrary to **the rules of natural justice**, presiding over a case of which she is defendant. A proven violation of the rule on no bias, (nemo judex in causa sua), committing the decision a nullity on this stand-alone ground.

1.8. On 1st November 2022, making a finding of civil contempt of court for breaching a nullity, an order founded by acts in excess of jurisdiction, Andrews and Cavanagh passed sentence of 15 months in prison. The victim of fraud, a creditor, was jailed for standing up and challenging lawless tyranny, corruption and serious fraud. Millinder was jailed for breaching a nullity, that has no legal effect.

1.9. This report appends our core summary entitled **CORE-SUMMARY-11-11-2022** ("**CS11**") setting out key evidence and facts. Page 1 attests that judges in the insolvency proceedings committed fraud by false representation and acted to conceal evidence of fraud and criminality that all have known all along had never been tried, whilst failing to administer the law.

1.10. **CASE-FILE-PART-3**: **DOC-13**: **tab_E1** is the transcript of the 6 November 2020 proceeding before Fancourt J in the Chancery Insolvency & Companies Court. At page 11 of the transcript, we cite the finding of the High Court:

Fancourt J: *The Chancellor was saying was that, that* ***the underlying substantive issues have never in fact been tried****, that* ***there was an opportunity to raise such substantive issues at an earlier time****, but* ***they were not taken as points at the right time*** *and, because of orders that were then made,* ***it is too late to try to raise them now****. That, that is really his line of reasoning, I think.*

1.11. On 6 November 2020 it was established that the "substantive underlying issues" had never been tried. Fancourt was referring to the preliminary consideration, set out at **REPORT-31-05-2022** ("**R31**"), page 2 paragraphs A & B.

1.12. On 17 June 2020, the Supreme Court in the Bresco Electrical Services Ltd judgment affirmed that the duty of the courts to apply insolvency set off is mandatory, taking effect on commencement of presentation of insolvency proceedings. At p 30 of the Bresco judgment it was established that if the Club disputed the claims against it by the company (EW and EEI), the disputes would first need to be resolved, prior to the Court applying mandatory statutory set off.

Paragraph 30 of the Supreme Court decision in Bresco Electrical Services:

*"**The identification of the net balance is to be ascertained by the taking of an account:** see IR 14.25(2).* ***If there is no dispute as to the existence and amount of the claims and cross-claims*** ***this is in practice a matter of simple arithmetic****, the net balance being the difference between the aggregate of the claims and the aggregate of the cross-claims. But* ***if any of the claims and cross-claims are in dispute, then those disputes*** ***will need first to be resolved, by reference to the individual merits of each****,* ***before the arithmetic resumes****"*

1.13. It is Millinder's case that by 19 August 2015, both EW and EEI had indefensible claims against the Club, founded by unlawful forfeiture of the lease and the assignment of the investment made by Millinder in EW to EEI.

1.14. It was the Club's £256,269.89 claim for rent and energy supply that was used to unlawfully forfeit the lease, a mutual dealing originating the EW c£9.2 million claim for unlawful forfeiture of the wind turbine lease against the Club that law intended be mandatorily set off. (See: **CASE-FILE-PART-1**: **DOC-19**: tab_Y7 – page 190, p 55 – 63).

1.15. The preliminary consideration, which "goes to the heart" of the fact that there is no debt owed to the Club by either EW or EEI in truth and reality, is inextricably linked with the fact that the multi-million-pound claims vested in both EW and EEI against the Club, are indefensible and have been due and payable since 19 August 2015. Standard interest accrues from that date.

1.16. There are three issues at the heart of the case, issues that have been concealed and deliberately evaded:

a. **Force majeure in the lease suspended the 365-day period free of rent provided for in schedule 7 of the lease:** from which there was an obligation to have "commissioned" the wind turbine. The delay constituting force majeure was encountered on 23 September 2013, 96-days after the lease was completed. The delay subsisted until 23 December 2014 when the delay, which prevented the turbine from being commissioned (it could not lawfully operate), was resolved. Contractually, in the lease therefore, EW was to enjoy 296-days free of rent from 23 December 2014 to commission the wind turbine. The first installment of rent in the sum of £15,000 was therefore payable to the Club on 17 September 2015.

b. **On 25 June 2015 when the Club blackmailed EW and Millinder**: demanding payment of rent in the sum of £75,000 and payment for energy supply in the sum of £181,269.89, knowing that any "entitlement to agreed output" (agreement by EW to supply any power) was conditional upon EW / Millinder's "satisfaction in full" of "entering into a connection agreement" which on 30 April 2015, the Club themselves refused to enter into, preventing EW from performing on the rights granted.

c. **4-days later, on 29 June 2015 Millinder assigned the investment made in EW to EEI**: On 29 June 2015 Millinder assigned the investment he made in EW by absolute legal assignment to EEI, serving notice of assignment on the Club the following day. Section 136(1) of the Law of Property Act 1925 affirms that the assignment is effective from 30 June 2015.

1.17. After failing to apply mandatory law of due process in rule 14.25 of the IR 2016, evading firstly setting off the EW claim against the Club's £256k claim it sought to prove on 19 September 2016. Secondly, on 28 March 2018 failing to set off the Club's £25k claim against EEI's claim exceeding £1 million as law intended, the compromised judiciary then acted contrary to the long-established law that there is no res judicata in insolvency proceedings. The judges of the insolvency court evaded conducting any inquiry into the fact that anyone could determine no money was ever owed to the Club, when it was their duty to have done so. Hannon did the same.

1.18. **CS11**, page 1, p D – W of page 3 attests that Jones, who had no jurisdiction to hear the application, committed fraud by false representation, lying about when rule 14.11 of the IR 2016 becomes operative to assist the offenders in sustaining the c£4.1 million third proof of debt which originated from the £256,269.89 blackmail, whilst preventing Hannon from being prosecuted for fraudulent abuse of his fiduciary duty.

1.19. Between March – 6th July 2021 Andrews and Swift, and then on 11 November 2021, Easthope-Davis in the Court of Appeal, misrepresented the law and affronted the decision of the Court of Appeal to sustain a restraint order founded by a nullity.

1.20. Millinder's 10-page skeleton argument (**P---Analysis 11 11 2021 Order**) dated 25 April 2022 dealt with the Administrative Court's misrepresentation of the law, also addressing fraud and concealment. It is apparent from the outcome that Andrews and Cavanagh evaded each and all Millinder's submissions filed in the case over 7-months prior to the hearing.

1.21. Page 7 of Millinder's 25 April 2022 skeleton, p 68, quoted from page 2 of the 11 November 2021 Court of Appeal decision:

> *"The Appellant relied on Re Fraser(1892) 2 QB 633 to argue that it could not be vexatious to seek to set aside an order in bankruptcy proceedings if the order had been made on the basis of a false liability. in relation to the applications for criminal summonses the Appellant argued that either the relevant DJ(MC) was acting ultra vires or that there was evidence to support the applications. The Divisional Court rejected the argument based on Re Fraser by reference to the explanation of Re Fraser given by Etherton J (as he then was) in Dawodu v American Express (2001) as follows*
>
> *" ... what is required before the Court is prepared to investigate a judgment debt, in the absence of an outstanding appeal or an application to set it aside, is some fraud, collusion, or miscarriage of justice. The latter phrase is of course capable of wide application according to the particular circumstances of the case. What in my judgment is required is that the Court be shown something from which it can conclude that had there been a properly conducted judicial process it would have been found, or very likely would have been found. that nothing was in fact due to the Claimant"*
>
> *Swift J in his judgment found that, for the principle relied on by the Appellant to have any application, there must be fraud or similar. **His conclusion** (**with which Andrews LJ agreed**) was that **there was no evidence of fraud**"*

1.22. Easthope-Davis, who made the decision above, was High Court Judge when he covered up perversion of the course of justice by corrupt police in the Hillsborough Inquiry, prior to being promoted by the establishment to a Lord Justice of Appeal.

1.23. It is evident in the very same paragraph that he evaded the fact that the former Master of the Rolls set out the test for miscarriage of justice: "*had there been a properly conducted judicial process it would have been found, or very likely would have been found. that nothing was in fact due to the Claimant*"

1.24. The proofs of debt Millinder sought to set aside all originated from the Court's own maladministration in failing to apply mandatory statutory law which intended those claims to be set off in full against the EW and EEI claims, prior to making the insolvency orders.

1.25. In Millinder's case, there was both fraud and miscarriage of justice, yet all the judges involved evaded the duty of inquiry, when law in any event, had it been applied, intended that the Club's claims were to be extinguished by EW and EEI's claims.

1.26. The 15 judges involved acted to conceal, failing to try what they all knew had never been tried, whilst concealing fraud by Hannon and criminal fraud by the Club and their conspirers. Millinder was defrauded by the Club, then by the judges themselves.

1.27. They sought, acting in excess of jurisdiction to certify Millinder's applications to remove the fraudulent proofs of debt as "totally without merit" after they refused to apply the law, denying Millinder, requisite majority creditor, all of his rights granted by law that are in his favour.

1.28. The punchline throughout the proceedings by all 15 judges involved is "I can see no evidence of fraud", yet in truth and reality, they are the fraud. They purport to administer the law fairly and impartially, it is proven they do not. They defraud innocent parties of their rights granted by law and with intent to obtain pecuniary advantage by such deception. That is a fraud, and a very serious fraud in its own right with overwhelming public interest to prosecute.

Left: Lady Justice Geraldine Mary Andrews

2. Criminal fraud by false representation originated the 28 March 2018 EEI winding up order

2.1. Millinder relied on the doctrine that "fraud unravels all, even post judgment" and in his submissions referred to the Supreme Court decision in ***Takhar v Gracefield Developments Limited and others [2019] UKSC***, finding that there is no reasonable diligence requirement barring a fresh action to set aside a judgment obtained by fraud.

2.2. We revealed an obvious pattern in judges of the Insolvency & Companies Court, then the Kings Bench Division, concealing proven fraud originating the 28 March 2018 winding up order, then failing to try what they knew had never been tried.

2.3. At page 12, paragraph 50, of the Vos C 8 February 2019 decision after he failed to exercise the duty of inquiry when the case was made out to have done so, he stated this:

"On 28th March 2018, ICC Judge Barber refused Earth Energy's application to adjourn Middlesbrough's petition, and made a compulsory winding up order against Earth Energy based on the costs debt of £25,000 in the consent order. There was no appeal against that order. This order was in fact made in Mr Millinder's absence. He did not attend court as he was unwell, as appears from page 1 of the transcript of the hearing.

Mr Millinder makes a number of allegations about ***Mr Staunton's misconduct and non-disclosure at this hearing****. I need not set out those allegations at length, though they are elaborated in paragraphs 70-74 of his first skeleton. In reality, once Norris J had continued the injunction obtained by Middlesbrough implying that there was no undisputed debt owed by Middlesbrough to Earth Energy, and Nugee J had declined to set that consent order aside,* ***the compulsory winding up ordered by ICCJ Barber was inevitable****, unless Mr Millinder could satisfy any court that Earth Energy had a genuine cross-claim based on substantial grounds*"

2.4. Paragraph 70 – 74 of Millinder's 12 November 2018 skeleton argument pleaded two counts of fraud by false representation, a criminal fraud that has been covered up by 15 judges throughout the course of criminal and civil justice.

2.5. **FRAUD-FALSE-REP-Staunton-2-counts** is Millinder's 10 May 2022 1-page submission in the proceedings brought by the Solicitor General proving criminal fraud which has been concealed throughout, yet which "goes to the heart" of Millinder's case.

2.6. The 1-page skeleton proves beyond reasonable doubt that on 5 February 2018 it was Staunton's actual state of mind, in his own words that "*what's assigned to EEI are the investments, the £200,000*". Nugee J replied, "*yes*". (See: **CS11**, p B).

2.7. The 1-page skeleton proves the same fraud that Vos concealed, when the application before Vos of 28 March 2018 was to try Millinder's contention that the 28 March 2018 is void, founded by fraud. On 5 February 2018 Nugee concealed the Club's perjury, which came in tandem with fraudulent non-disclosure. Successive judges then concealed it throughout. (See: **UKJ**, page 47, p 10(a) – 10(m) of page 49). The perjury which came in tandem with fraudulently failing to disclose the assignment has been concealed, along with 4 counts of fraud by failing to disclose information between 9 January 17 – 5 February 2018 & 22 October 2020 – 6 November 2020. The preliminary issue at the heart of proving the EEI statutory demand is the same as the fact that the Club cannot establish any claim against either EW or EEI, being the same reason both companies have substantial indefensible claims against them.

2.8. The ordinary informed lay observer could determine that Staunton knew the representations he made on 28 March 2018 to cause the winding up were false, as he did on 11 April 2018 during the EEI winding up order rescission proceeding when it is recorded on the official transcript of the proceeding that he said this:

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.*

2.9. It is evidenced at paragraph B of the 1-page skeleton linking to the evidence, being the 3 official hearing transcripts, that Judge Barber did not consider any such cross claim, or an assignment.

2.10. It is attested by his own oral representations at that hearing that Staunton knew that on 28 March 2018 he committed fraud by false representation and lied about the investment assigned from EW to EEI when he admitted in court he knew it was effective on 5 February 2018.

2.11. It is proven beyond reasonable doubt that the winding up order against EEI is void ab initio, for firstly it was founded by the Court's wilful failure to apply the law conferred in rule 14.25 IR 2016. Secondly, the order of 28 March 2018 is proven to have been founded by Staunton's conscious and premediated criminal fraud by false representation.

2.12. Despite being taken to this proven criminal fraud during the 2021 proceeding originating the section 42 Senior Courts Act order against Millinder, all the judges involved, from the insolvency proceedings to the criminal prosecution by Millinder, and then the Administrative Court, have concealed this proven fraud to prevent justice being served on the offenders.

2.13. **UKJ** page 57 set out the law conferring jurisdiction and circumstances as to when an order under it may be made. Paragraph 3(c) refers to the Court of Appeal's definition of "vexatiousness" as:

"a vexatiousness proceeding is in my judgment that it has little or no basis in law (or at least no discernible basis)"

2.14. Millinder's applications all had discernable basis, for the originating winding up orders are proven to be nullities and it is one's right, *ex debito justitiae*, to have the Court declare proceeding void, having no legal effect from the outset. The Court had no discretion to refuse, yet, acting unlawfully, it refused.

2.15. Concealment of criminal offences, and in the civil context, aggravated fraud by breach of duty by Hannon, the Official Receiver as liquidator, was convened to pervert the civil and then from 16th June 2018, the criminal course of justice. Millinder's private criminal prosecution against Hannon and Staunton for the criminal offences they are proven to have committed was never determined. It is proven beyond doubt that Millinder is not a vexatious litigant, and there was no jurisdiction under section 42 of the Senior Courts Act 1981 for the AG, SG, Andrews and Swift to have made one. Rather, it is proven beyond doubt that all 15 judges involved, and the Ministers they colluded with are criminal offenders who have abused their powers.

2.16. **R31** which was filed on 31 May 2022, page 2, p 1 cited 3 paragraphs from the highest court of the land, the House of Lords in *Ansiminic (1969)* and the first p cited that:

> *"A provision to the effect that the determination of a tribunal" shall not be called in question in any court of law"* ***does not exclude the power of the High Court to quash a decision which has been reached by the tribunal acting in excess of its jurisdiction***"

2.17. A decision reached in excess of jurisdiction is confirmed by the highest court of the land as being a nullity, and the Court of Appeal affirmed that a nullity is "*automatically void without more ado*" and that "*every proceeding which is founded on it is also bad and incurably bad*". The High Court Administrative Court has inherent jurisdiction to quash any void order made in the High Court.

3. Fraud, evidence, criminal offences & vital facts concealed by the GLD, AG, SG, TS and 15 judges

3.1. Millinder effected private criminal prosecution proceedings, which were said to have given cause to originate the section 42 Senior Courts Act 1981. Those proceedings are proven to be nullities, for four reasons:

a. **UKJ**, page 75, paragraph 16(a) law, the Criminal Procedure Rules, affirms that jurisdiction to hear a case against a corrupt public official is of the Special Jurisdiction of the Chief Magistrate. The Chief Magistrate and deputy reside at Westminster Magistrates Court. Fanning, a district judge of Huddersfield, was precluded by law from hearing the application, proving beyond doubt that the decisions were made in excess of jurisdiction, and are therefore a nullity on this ground alone.

b. **UKJ**, page 76, p 19(a) – 22(f) of page 78 attests that in any event Millinder's evidence and submissions were concealed and evaded. The 5-emails containing the evidence and submissions relied on for the 22 November 2018 hearing before Fanning were deleted from the court file.

3.2. The "Not read" receipts on 17 October 2019, prove beyond doubt that nobody in Kirklees Magistrates Court ever opened the email prior to then. There was never a determination of Millinder's submissions or evidence at all, and therefore the decisions by Fanning are a nullity.

3.3. Those emails were deleted from the Court file first thing the following morning after Millinder threatened to prosecute Fanning, Daley and Shrimplin for perverting. See: page 77, p 20(a).

3.4. When Millinder lodged his private criminal prosecution at Westminster Magistrates, where the Chief Magistrate resides, page 78 of the report evidences a series of "not read" email return reports, confirming that the Court had once again deleted his private criminal prosecution.

3.5. The 4 emails containing the application for warrants of arrest against corrupt public officials (judges & Hannon) was deleted from the court file. It is proven that nothing was ever determined in any of Millinder's criminal proceedings.

3.6. Page 64 – end of page 74 proves that Hannon is guilty of 30 criminal offences. Therefore, it is proven that there was never any jurisdiction to make any order founded by a nullity.

3.7. Millinder's civil case is proven, and the 3 sets of insolvency proceedings are founded by fraud, and the criminal offences are proven. There was always a discernible legal basis and a public interest need to make an application for Millinder's private criminal prosecution, which was never determined.

3.8. The compromised judiciary have sought to lend credence to varying degrees of nullity, founded by fraud. The court concealed the fraud, a fraud within itself, whilst failing to apply the law. The judges are compromised, rendering the case void from the outset for fraud on the court and prolific violations of the rule of natural justice.

4. Millinder has been victim of serious judicial fraud, corruption & human rights abuse

4.1. Millinder, requisite majority creditor of both EW and EEI, was deprived of his right of equality before the law. Knowing that both his companies had claims that extinguished the Club's, which could not be established anyway. The compromised judiciary defrauded Millinder of his right to enjoy the law designed to recover assets for creditors of insolvent companies. The judges were conflicted, acting to sustain fraudulent liabilities by failing to act according to statute and then failing to conduct any investigation whatsoever when it was their duty to have done so, causing Millinder to be defrauded.

4.2. A cover up ensued, with a malicious campaign of targeted harassment and defamation designed to destroy Millinder's business and personal reputation, with oppressive, gross human rights abuse over 6-years. Void orders founded by the Court's own fraud and lawless abuse were broadcast in the public domain to vilify Millinder, oppressively branding him a vexatious litigant because he sought to exercise rights granted by law.

4.3. At all times since 19 September 2016 Millinder has been deprived of his right to a fair trial, contrary to Article 6(1) of the Human Rights Act 1998.

4.4. The November 2022 proceeding, sentencing Millinder to 15 months prison for breaching a nullity, in excess of jurisdiction order made to conceal criminality adds a new dimension to the abuse. There is a most serious and aggravated breach of Millinder's human right in contravention of Article 7(1) of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Article 7 – No punishment without law

(1) No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national or international law at the time when it was committed.

4.5. The U.K government have internationally binding obligations to provide restitution to victims of human rights abuse, undertaking to guarantee the Universal Human Right, Article 7:

Article 7 – Universal Declaration of Human Rights

"All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination"

4.6. Millinder was defrauded of his right of equality before the law, with HMCTS and the judicial officers discriminating against him by unlawfully depriving him of his right to enjoy democratic rights granted in rule 14.25 and in rule 14.11 of the Insolvency Rules 2016. (See: **CS11, page 1, p D** – p V of page 3).

4.7. Millinder, a creditor of both EW and EEI was defrauded of assets that were always due and payable and were to be paid as dividends to him in accordance with rule 14.25(5).

4.8. Contrary to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, contrary to law, Millinder has been unlawfully deprived of his property assets by Hannon, HMCTS, the judicial officers involved and the Insolvency Service.

4.9. Had the judicial officers applied the law, Millinder would have received dividend payments exceeding £10 million.

4.10. Any application or claim made to seek human rights remedy was disposed of by the judiciary without a hearing or consideration. All the key elements to this case have been consistently concealed. Millinder has been oppressively denied remedy, including remedy for proven human rights violations.

5. Perverting the course of justice – "subject to status"

5.1. Huhne, Briscoe and Pryce were all sentenced for perverting the course of justice, and prior to that, Middlesbrough lad, David McLuckie, the former Chairman of Cleveland Police Authority, also affiliated with Middlesbrough Football Club ("**Club / MFC**"), was jailed in 2013 at Newcastle Crown Court;

"*A jury found 62-year-old McLuckie guilty of perverting the course of justice by persuading his friend Maurice Ward to take some speeding penalty points on his behalf in 2005*". Source: Gazette Live – 13/07/2013

5.2. In Millinder's case, a course of public justice commenced from 19 September 2016 when insolvency proceedings were initiated against Empowering Wind MFC Ltd ("EW") in which the Club sought to have presented a false claim as creditor, when they had no right to have done so.

5.3. On 9 January 2017 a course of public justice commenced when the Club made an ex-parte (without notice) injunction application against EEI to refrain presentation of a winding up petition for the sum of the indisputable 6 January 2017 statutory demand served on them.

5.4. On 16 November 2017, a course of public justice recommenced when EEI, acting by its director, Millinder made an application by its creditor, also requisite majority creditor of EW, to a High Court Judge, pursuant to rule 14.11 of the Insolvency Rules 2016, to remove a clearly and obviously fraudulent proof of debt made by the Club, in the sum of £4,111,874.75, of which Hannon had accepted as a proof of debt.

5.5. Knowing the claim was false, the liquidator refused to interfere in the matter.

5.6. **UKJ**, the table of contents headlines at page 30 refers to our part 2 report that proves that between 8 January 2017 and 5 February 2018, the Club and their conspirers, all lawyers who knew what they were doing was dishonest, committed 2 counts of fraud by failing to disclose information and the indictable only offence of section 5 Perjury is also proven to the criminal standard. It was this offending that has been concealed, proven criminal fraud, originating the £25,000 proceeds of crime that law intended was to be set off against the EEI claim, being the assigned investment.

5.7. Robin Bloom, the Club's legal counsel's 8 January 2017 witness statement is proven to be false, and the evidence proves he knew the statements he declared true, were false. The judges concealed and prevented justice being served on the offenders, knowing they have committed perjury and criminal offences of fraud. At all times since 8th June 2018, the judges had before them the admission by Staunton as recorded on the 11 April 2018 hearing transcript that: :

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.***

(See: **FRAUD-FALSE-REP-Staunton-2-counts**)

5.8. Briggs, the Chief Registrar admitted on 11 April 2018 during rescission of the EEI winding up order agreed with Staunton that there was no debt on which the EEI winding up petition was based. Briggs was asked to exercise the duty of inquiry or to have set off the £25,000, rescinding the EEI fraudulent winding up. Briggs did nothing but deny remedy for wrongdoing, adjourning the proven rescission case to HHJ Philip Mark Pelling.

5.9. Acting with intent to pervert the course of justice, Pelling was factored in from 8 June 2018 to conceal the proven case, certifying Millinder's 3 proven applications as "totally without merit" meaning no more or less than bound to fail, affronting the law which intended that the Club's claims were to be set off against the EW and EEI indefensible multi-million £ claims.

5.10. Pelling was acting in excess of jurisdiction, knowing he had no jurisdiction to do it, to fabricate an "Extended Civil Restraint Order" against Millinder to conceal proven criminal fraud and maladministration by the corrupt judiciary. Pelling's orders of June 2018 were founded by the nullity, irredeemably defective insolvency proceedings and according to the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeal, his orders are void ab initio (from the outset). One nullity cannot create another.

5.11. The right to self-determination under the rule of law is the very fabric of the liberty of society. Our laws are the best in the world, yet the administration funded by the taxpayer to apply those laws who wilfully fail, and with fraudulent intent.

6. Affront to the rule of law by Swift, Andrews and Cavanagh who acted with favour and ill-will

6.1. One of the leading constitutional law judgments by the House of Lords, now the Supreme Court, **Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission [1969]**, established the "*collateral fact doctrine*" which means that misconstruction of the law, or failure to apply statute, where statute is to be applied, renders the decision a nullity.

Paragraph 170 of the House of Lords judgment:

"They say that "determination" ***means a real determination and does not include an apparent or purported determination which in the eyes of the law has no existence because it is a nullity****. Or, putting it in another way, if you seek to show that a determination is a nullity you are not questioning the purported determination – you are maintaining that it does not exist as a determination. It is one thing to question a determination which does exist: it is quite another thing to say that there is nothing to be questioned"*

6.2. In Millinder's case, it is evident that nothing that needed to be determined ever was. The evidence and submissions Andrews, Swift and Cavanagh concealed, proves that point by Fancourt J's admission, recorded on the 6 November 2020 official transcript of the proceeding.

a. **Paragraph 167(b) of the House of Lords judgment:**

"The House of Lords here has the opportunity to say (1) that no ouster clause will protect a nullity without specific words to that effect, because ***a nullity is not a determination*** *and (2) that* ***it is for the courts to interpret the statute, by which an inferior tribunal is given jurisdiction, to see whether it acted within it****"*

"Not every error in law can be corrected, but ***what can be done is to see whether the tribunal asked itself the questions which the statute, truly interpreted, says it should ask****"*

b. Paragraph 155(E) of the House of Lords judgment:

"What the court must do is to give the statute its proper interpretation and then see whether what was done was within it. It does not matter whether the reason for the inferior tribunal's action was misconstruction, mistake, bad faith or fraud, whether it asked itself the wrong question or whether it took into account something which was extraneous, the result is a nullity. If the tribunal has misconstrued the statute giving it jurisdiction and has acted on the misconstruction, it follows that it is not within its jurisdiction: see Ridge v. Baldwin [1964] AC. 40, 71, 80; Armah's case [1968,] AC. 192, 212, 225, 230, 233, 237-238, 241, 250, 253, 257, 260-61, 263-264; and Padfield v. Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food [1968] AC. 997"

6.3. It is one's constitutional right, *ex debito justitiae* (of or by reason of an obligation of justice, as a matter of right) for the Court to set aside any order which is established to be a nullity.

7. When taken to the evidence that Andrews and Swift evaded in March 2021 where Fancourt admitted nothing in the case had been determined, Andrews muted Millinder

7.1. There are two incontrovertible preliminary issues at the heart of Millinder's case. The first is that force majeure absolved any liability to pay rent and that the energy supply agreement is conditional upon Millinder's "satisfaction in full" of "entering into a connection agreement" which the Club refused. It was proven therefore that no money has ever been owed to the Club and that on 19 August 2015, they unlawfully forfeited the lease.

7.2. The second is that the assignment notice, served on the Club on 30 June 2015, just 4-days after Millinder being blackmailed by them, is, in law, a valid legal assignment, an absolute assignment of all the investment made in EW, assigned to EEI. It was for that reason that on 5 February 2018 Nugee J committed fraud by false representation to alter the outcome of the case. (See: **CS11**, page 1, p B).

7.3. On 1st November 2022 it was witnessed by Mr Walsh, director of Deuda Ltd, the 3rd party applicant directly affected by the order that when Millinder took Andrews to the document entitled **R31**, page 31, paragraph 11, where it is recorded on the 6 November 2020 hearing transcript that Fancourt found nothing had been tried, Andrews muted him to conceal the fact.

7.4. Issue estoppel applies to the High Court's 6 November 2020 finding, as recorded on the official transcript, that there was never a determination at all of the issues that needed to be determined:

Fancourt J: Well, it seems to me the position is that the, the validity of the assignment by EW MFC to EE was never actually decided by a judge at a, at a trial.

Fancourt J: "The Chancellor was saying was that, that the underlying substantive issues have never in fact been tried"

7.5. **R31**, which contained Millinder's witness statements, was filed 154-days (5-months and a day) prior to the hearing before Andrews and Swift on 1 November 2022. Any judge, acting reasonably, could establish that Millinder's case was proven from the outset.

8. A pattern of lawless abuse and dishonest concealment throughout the proceedings

8.1. We set out above that the highest court of the land affirmed that failure to determine issues that need to be determined in a tribunal, renders the decision a nullity. Likewise, as does failure of the Court to apply law, when law is to be applied. Both apply in the present case, which has also been founded by criminal fraud and fraud on the court.

8.2. It was said that the insolvency proceedings were ruled as being "totally without merit", defined by the Court of Appeal as "no more or less than bound to fail". An application to set aside a void order which is proven to be void is no more or less than bound to succeed.

8.3. The void acts were all founded by the void insolvency proceedings and it is one's right, by way of obligation of justice, to set aside the void orders, a right that the Court had refused, when it had no jurisdiction to have done so.

8.4. After statutory insolvency set off of cross claims in rule 14.25(1) and 14.25(2), 14.25(3) & 14.25(4) affirm that:

(3) If there is a balance owed to the creditor then only that balance is provable in the winding up.

(4) If there is a balance owed to the company then that must be paid to the liquidator as part of the assets.

8.5. Law affirmed that only after application of mandatory set off in rule 14.25(1) and 14.25(2) can a creditor go on to prove in the liquidation. The Club never had a claim to prove, yet the court failed to apply the law anyway. The acts can be nothing other than intentional and of dishonest intent. In the case of both EW and EEI, rule 14.25(4) determined that the balance owed to each company must be paid to the liquidator as part of the assets. Law intended the claims against the Club to be realised as an asset and paid as a dividend to Millinder. The judges and the liquidator were working contrary to the law to ensure that never happened.

8.6. Rule 14.11 of the IR 2016 provides jurisdiction for the court to "exclude or amend down" a proof of debt that has been wrongly admitted by the office holder. Jones misrepresented the application of the law to sustain the £4.1 million fraud by false representation in the form of the 3rd proof of debt, originating from the first which law intended was to be set off entirely. (See: **CS11**, page 1, p D – U of page 3).

9. The multi-million £ claim vested in EW against the Club was to set off MFC's c£4.1 million claim

9.1. Millinder instructed specialist counsel, **Edmund Robb** of Prospect Law to prepare written advice on several aspects of the case.

9.2. Hannon was using the false claim to assert that Millinder had insufficient voting interest to call a meeting of creditors to replace him, wilfully failing to perform on his statutory duties in using "all available means" "including alternative dispute resolution" to recover the asset payable to EW and EEI creditors pursuant to rule 14.25(5) of the IR 2016.

9.3. **PLL LoC sealed 17 11 2017** is the 18 August 2017 letter of claim. Hannon's decision was to do nothing, sustaining the knowingly false proof of debt to defraud creditors through failure of the Court to apply mandatory law.

9.4. Page 1 of the letter refers to setting off the £4,111,874.75 claim founded by the conditional energy supply agreement. (See: **OPERATION UKJ 2**, page 39, reading paragraph 6.3(a) – end of page 44).

9.5. Paragraph 29 of the 2020 Supreme Court judgment in *Bresco Electrical Services* affirmed that:

"…the statutory regime for set-off in insolvency, now to be found in IR 14.25 operates ***upon an altogether more comprehensive and rigorous basis****. First,* ***it applies to every type of pre-liquidation mutual dealing****, and* ***also to secured, contingent and future debts****"*

9.6. The third proof of debt claimed against EW, originated from the first, the unwarranted demand of 25 June 2015. The EW claim against the Club originated on 30 April 2015, when the Club breached a collateral contract and refused the connection. Without a connection, the turbine cannot operate. The c£4.1 million claim was a "future debt".

9.7. On 19 August 2015, the EW claim became indefensible when the Club unlawfully forfeited the lease based on their blackmail, for even if the Club did not refuse the connection on 30 April 2015, they still unlawfully forfeited the lease. (See: **R31**, page 2 p A).

9.8. Page 5 of the letter of claim served on Hannon is where Millinder's counsel set out that:

*"****MFC is wrong to claim, as it does in the proof of debt form, that it has a claim for payments pursuant to clause 3.4.2*** *for a period of 20 years"*

9.9. Page 9 of the letter of claim, paragraph 57 – 63 set out that the EW quantified claim against the Club for unlawful forfeiture of the lease is £9,231,096, a substantial asset that was to be mandatorily paid to EW creditors.

9.10. Hannon knew of the very substantial asset that was to be paid as dividends to creditors of EW and it is proven beyond reasonable doubt that he criminally fraudulently abused his position, committing 30 counts of different criminal offences, of which 22 are offences under the Insolvency Act 1986.

9.11. On 16 July 2019, Hannon, who himself was fraudulently acting as liquidator of EEI when he was never lawfully appointed, dissolved EEI to defraud Millinder, the sole creditor, of over £1 million which was to be paid to him pursuant to rule 14.25(5). The 6 January 2017 EEI demand for 69% of the assigned investment was likewise, indefensible. (See: **R31**, page 2, p B).

9.12. **UKJ**, page 72 lists the 22 criminal offences under Schedule 10 of the Insolvency Act 1986 that Hannon is proven to have committed in breach of his duty as liquidator of EW, then as purported liquidator of EEI.

9.13. Page 73, paragraph 15(a) links to the criminal offence committed when a liquidator fails to publish notice of his appointment. The link refers to page 64 where the offence of section 109(2) of the Insolvency Act 1986 is set out.

9.14. Unlike the speeding points offence in **Huhne, Pryce**, or **Mcluckie in Middlesbrough**, this offence Hannon is proven to have committed is more serious, and is subject to a daily default fine until the breach is remedied. It never was.

9.15. The screenshot of the London Gazette notice history taken in March 2020 affirms that Hannon failed to publish notice of his appointment. This is likely because Hannon was never lawfully appointed, Mr Dionne was. Hannon was acting solely to defraud EEI creditors of the indefensible claim against the Club, being the £770,000 assigned investment plus 8% interest accruing from 30 June 2015 when notice of assignment was effected.

9.16. Vos, and his fellow conspirers, the 15 corrupt, politically influenced judges affronted the law of assignment, section 136(1) of the Law of Property Act 1925 which affirms that:

"Any absolute assignment by writing under the hand of the assignor (not purporting to be by way of charge only) of any debt or other legal thing in action, of which express notice in writing has been given to the debtor, trustee or other person from whom the assignor would have been entitled to claim such debt or thing in action, is effectual in law"

9.17. **DIRECTIONS 15 03 2021** is one of two documents, being the directions Millinder applied for before Andrews and Swift in relation to the criminal offences and criminal property he has been defrauded of.

9.18. The directions, page 7, paragraph 51 – 76 refers to the same offences committed by Hannon under the Insolvency Act and fraud by breach of fiduciary duty. Andrews and Swift concealed the offending and evaded providing the directions. On 7th July 2021, acting in excess of jurisdiction, Andrews and Swift deployed the restraint order to conceal those offences to prevent justice being served on the offenders.

9.19. On 31 March 2020 Hannon dissolved EW to defraud Millinder and its creditors of the proven claim that was due and payable from 19 August 2015 when the Club unlawfully forfeited the lease. The claim was to be recovered by Hannon and paid to Millinder, 86% requisite majority creditor, and the remaining creditors as a dividend, without any discount whatsoever.

9.20. Vos was shown two pieces of evidence which were filed in support of Millinder's case, both admissions by Staunton during official court proceedings were suppressed and concealed. Vos evaded determining what the application sought to have determined.

9.21. We took a screen shot of the first page of Millinder's 22 January 2022 skeleton in the Administrative Court proceeding which was again concealed by Andrews and Cavanagh:

The preliminary consideration / core issues:

14. Aside from the obvious, referred to above, there are two underlying frauds which were aided and abetted: (a) & (b) below:

a. The c£4.1 million fraud by false representation claim deployed to defraud A of his democratic rights as requisite majority creditor of EW to keep the proven asset, the multi-million damages claim, beyond reach of creditors and to prevent justice being served on the offenders:

1) On 09/01/2017 after admitting that the claims could not be established because "Force Majeure has effect", Staunton (D4), D1, D2 and D3's counsel, stated this;

"Para 110 of the ske. The assertion that Rs did something wrong in respect of the wind turbine project is one that may provide a foundation for a claim by Empowering, not A. The para ends with an assertion that "the Defendant" cannot bring any claim against "the Applicant"; this is not understood. Rs do not bring any claim against A, or Empowering or Earth Energy, save that Rs claim £25,000 from Earth Energy under the consent order of 16 January 2017". [See: **DOC-1:** page 24, p213(a)]

b. The £25,000 fraudulent liability used to originate a winding up petition to defraud A of the £770,000 assigned investments;

1) On 05/02/2018 D4 admitted that *"what's assigned are the investments"*. On 28/03/2018 D4 and his conspirators wound EEI up for the £25,000 to defeat EEI's application of 01/03/2018 to set aside the fraudulent liability and on 11/04/2018, D4 admitted this:

"MR STAUNTON: --and paras.17 to 24. So there's a cross claim which extinguishes the liability to pay £25,000". [See: **DOC-1:** page 24, p213(a)]

15. 671-days (1-year 10-months and 2-days) after D4 admitted on 09/01/2017 that no claims could be established because *"Force Majeure has effect"*, D4 retracts the claims but only after using the £4.1 million claim to defraud A and fellow creditors whilst making a gain for his conspirators of c£45,000 in legal fees originating from that fraud, originating from the blackmail of 25/06/2015.

16. 216-days (7-months and 1-day) after D4 admitted on 11/04/2018 that the cross claim assigned investments extinguished the £25,000 fraudulent liability, he is maintaining on 12/11/2018 that he and his conspirators still bring that claim. How does a claim that was extinguished over 7-months previously, re-materialise?

9.22. It is evident that Staunton and his conspirators have always known, since 9th January 2017 by his own admission, as recorded on the official hearing transcript, that the Club cannot establish any claim against either EW or EEI as "*force majeure has effect*". On 12 November 2018 Staunton admitted that himself in writing when he said that "Rs" (Respondents) do not bring any claim against A, or Empowering (EW) or Earth Energy (EEI). Once again, the Court sustained the fraudulent claims to assist the offenders.

9.23. This evidence (out of the horse's mouth) recorded on court documents, proves that there was never any debt owed to the Club in truth and reality, by the Club's own counsel's admission.

9.24. The 12 November 2018 skeleton argument containing the admission at paragraph 37 where Staunton "u-turned on the claims" was before Vos. Vos was asked to exercise the doctrine of inquiry, to investigate and remove the fraudulent liabilities. Vos failed to try the issues at the heart of the case, because doing so would have ensured that Millinder, requisite majority creditor was not defrauded.

9.25. There was never a real determination of the issues and evidence relied on in the 28 September 2018 application which required determination, rendering the decision by Vos a nullity, which was in any event, founded by a nullity.

9.26. The decision by Vos was founded by violation of the rules of natural justice, perversion of the course of justice, gross misconstruction of law, the void, in excess of jurisdiction insolvency proceedings and the Extended Civil Restraint Order originating from them. The judgment by Vos is void ab initio and so is everything founded upon it thereafter.

9.27. **UKJ**, page 55, the table of contents, number 11 is "*Criminal fraudulent abuse of position by liquidator – The Official Receiver of London*" and page 63 - 64 sets out the offence and multiple other criminal offences Hannon is proven to have committed.

9.28. Page 63, paragraph 11(a) – (h) of page 74 proves beyond reasonable doubt that Hannon is guilty of fraud by abuse of position for defrauding the creditors of EW and then appointing himself liquidator of EEI when he was never appointed, to defraud the creditors of EEI, namely Millinder, requisite majority creditor. Millinder commented that:

"We, the British people, have the inalienable constitutional right to be governed justly, according to the laws of the land. We have the right to enjoy the birthright gift of the rule of law, and the rights granted by those laws.

Under this vile kleptocracy of human rights abusers and criminals, that no longer happens. I have been oppressively and maliciously denied my statutory rights from the outset, by the very judges who you are paying to administer those laws. There is no judicial separation of powers"

One cannot steal sweets off the shelf, then run back after being caught to return the sweets to the shop, for the offence of theft has already been committed. Unlike all the offenders in public and judicial office in this case, and the sweets, criminal offences do not come with an expiration date.

The malicious and void acts by Andrews and Cavanagh, the 13 other judges in my case and the corrupt Law Ministers are intended to pervert the course of justice. They affront the rule of law they are paid by the taxpayer to administer, and the long-established authorities of the superior courts.

The mouthpiece of the corrupt establishment, the biased Law Society Gazette carry over their lies and judicial fraud.

I am not "jailed", and neither am I a vexatious litigant. I have been defamed and branded a vexatious litigant after being defrauded of my rights by the judges themselves. I know the law, I am just someone who won't tolerate their fraud, corruption and lawless gross human rights abuse.

I am non-domicile and I have committed no criminal offence. I am not jailed and neither will I be. I want to make it clear that the Law Society Gazette's article by the aptly named Michael Cross, is absolutely false. Cross by name, cross by nature.

One cannot be in contempt of a nullity, and the restraint order deployed by the criminals of the Attorney General's Office, Government Legal Department, Andrews and Swift of the Administrative Court was convened solely to defeat the ends of justice. It has no legal effect, from the outset. They dream up legal fiction, contrary to the law, then act off it, to conceal their own fraud.

The law conferred in section 42 of the Senior Courts Act 1981 affirms that Andrews and Swift never had jurisdiction to make one against me last year. Andrews, the same judge that covered up the offences to make it, came in to cover up again, targeting me, the victim of their abuse to detract attention away from the true perpetrators.

It is time to drain the swamp."

10. Request for comments and explanation by the public officials involved in the case

10.1. We have invited the Government Legal Department: Anna Maria Rehbinder and Susanna McGibbon, the Treasury Solicitor with conduct over the case who represented the Attorney General in 2021 and from January 2022 – 1st November 2022 for comments on this report, along with:

10.2. Dominic Raab, the Lord Chancellor, with a responsibility for the justice system, HMCTS, the Prime Minister, the Law Society Gazette and;

10.3. William Hays of 6 Kings Bench Walk (6KBW) who represented the Attorney General and Solicitor General, confirming on the court record that he had read the report: **R31** filed 5 months prior to the hearing.

10.4. Please provide your comments on this report prior to 4PM on 18 November 2022. Failure to have commented will result in us disclosing that despite being provided opportunity to counter the allegations, those responsible failed to do so. Email your comments to: intel@intjustice.com

Corrupt administration: Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos the Master of the Rolls, head of civil justice for England & Wales – a ringleader in the aggravated judicial conspiracy to defraud. Vos remains in office with his 14 co-conspirers leeching off public funds of which they are not entitled. Judges who act with ill-will, contrary to the law, are not judges.

With a criminal offender heading up the civil justice system, and the corrupt Lord Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor who conceal and shield the wrongdoers from prosecution, no business or individual in the UK is safe. It's only going to get worse.

Judges who act with "favour & ill-will" contrary to the law have vitiated their constitutional oaths of office.

Judges that breach their oaths are not judges, none of them have any standing in judicial office. That is the law.

"No one is above the law"

Cressida Dick – August 2021

Public officials, lawyers and Tory cronies and their lawyers are made "above the law" by the corrupt English administration. The police cover it up for them acting as "soldiers to the kleptocracy". A wholesale abuse of the public trust and taxpayer's funds.

INTELLIGENCEUK.com