MINISTERIAL BRIEFING REPORT - INSOLVENCY AND JUDICIAL CORRUPTION

Table of Contents

King William III and Queen Mary II – The Bill of Rights Act of 1689

English Constitutional principles are being widely violated:

- The Crown is sworn by oath to protect all subjects from violation of their lawful rights and liberties, retaining the power and the responsibility to ensure redress is exercised:

- "Justice delayed, justice denied". There must be no undue delay in legal proceedings. If wronged, citizens are entitled to a remedy and to seek redress in law. Punishment must fit the crime and must not be excessive or unusual. Judgments must be exercised with impartiality and lawfulness at every level;

- The right to peaceful enjoyment of one's property is being violated under the façade of "justice" and "insolvency", constituting gross human rights violations.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The supremacy of the rule of law is our birthright:

a. The birthright (privileges or possessions that a person has or is believed to be entitled to as soon as he is born) of Englishmen and women depends upon the supremacy of the rule of law, its observance, and the right to control their laws. The right to self-determination under the rule of law is the very fabric of the liberty of our society. The rule of law and custom that determine that we have as a "birthright", our liberty and civilian rights are all the prerequisite duty of office, sworn to be upheld maintained by those taking up any office under the Crown.

b. The laws of the United Kingdom and our written and implied Constitution are the best laws in the world. The problem is with those tasked with administering the laws and maintaining the constitutional standards. There is widespread degradation and diminishment of the rule of law and the standards set by our age-old Constitution presents the long overdue need for this lobbying and overseas litigation to rein in and prosecute the corruptors. The leadership lack integrity, the standards have nosedived too far southwards.

c. One cannot rely on a corrupt system run by the corruptors to prosecute those doing the corrupting. This has all come about as a result of political and other third-party interferences with the judiciary. The doctrine of *nemo judex in causa sua*, meaning, literally, "*no-one is judge in his own cause*", applies. The basic principle of natural justice that no person can judge a case in which they have an interest. Ministerial lobbying and litigation clearly being two separate issues of which the former comes first.

d. All citizens of the United Kingdom all have the responsibility of preserving our birthright gift of the supremacy of the rule of law, so that in turn, every future generation may benefit from and enjoy this liberty under the rule of their laws.

e. The Promissory Oaths Act 1868 is law today, the fundamental law that underpins how justice is to be administered according to our Constitution. The oaths are being breached by the First Ministers and the judges themselves. The standards are not being enforced, the regulators are failing to regulate, independence of the UK's judiciary and administration of justice is compromised and the police are failing to police. Diminishment of the standards, the oaths and the duty of all public officers to act in a constitutionally proper way has put the Country on a downward spiral. It is time to make it right.

1.2. A culture of cronyism, systemic corruption, collusion and concealment prevails:

f. Inter-agency collusion involving a distributed network of corruptors across the public and regulatory authorities ensures secrecy and concealment. Abidance and compliance by the rules are rewarded and non-compliance, such as whistle blowing or acting lawfully is penalised. Judges who have been following orders of the kleptocracy, the political interference I refer to, have been promoted. The culture of systemic corruption is complex and involves shared expectations, internalised management, codes of conduct, strategy and procedures to protect the collective organisational structure and its activities from exposure.

g. The conduct is endemic across the nation's justice system, police forces and the regulatory authorities, the Solicitors Regulation Authority, the Financial Conduct Authority, the Bar Standards Board in particular. Those of the legal profession in public office are the biggest drivers, the orchestrators and colluders across the regulatory authorities, the cogs that drive the wheels of the systemic corruption machine. The heads of state for the justice system and the Attorney General's Office are the biggest culprits, the order givers.

1.3. The rule of law and the principles of our constitution are fundamentally self-preserving:

a. The rule of law and our constitutional principles do not allow provision for diminishment or destruction. The Act of Settlement (12 & 13 Wi. 111. c.2) affirms that the laws of England are the birthright of the people thereof and all the kings and queens who shall ascend the throne of this realm ought to administer the Government of the same, according to said laws and all their officers and ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same. The Monarch, nor any politician, judge or public servant is above the supremacy of the rule of law. The role of the office holder, public and judicial, is governed by our Constitution and common laws of statute. The oaths are supposed to protect civilians from tyranny and the abuse inflicted on many by the rogue establishment.

b. Our laws were not designed to be twisted and degraded to suit the position of the corporation, nor the corrupt official seeking to fulfil their sinister motive, deceiving, nor deviating away from the rule of law and our embedded constitutional principles to favour the position of one party or the other in any proceeding.

C. The courts, with their principal function in administering our laws and justice impartially, have failed and have been weaponised to defraud, asset strip and further the cause of the corrupt corporations, banks, magic circle law firms and insolvency practitioner accountancy firms. The unconstitutional corruptors taking the role of judges allow this to happen, abusing their positions and using the courts as cash cows to feed fellow corruptors off the fruits of one fraud or another or a fraud perpetrated by themselves, acting in a way contrary to their oaths.

"There is no greater tyranny than that which is perpetrated under the shield of the law and in the name of justice". ***- Baron de Montesquieu, 1748***

2. PRIMARY LEGISLATION: The Insolvency Act 1986 / Insolvency Rules 2016:

a. The core function of the primary legislation is to ensure that creditors of insolvent estates can remediate loss caused by the insolvency and to recover assets for those creditors of insolvent estates. The primary legislation is comprehensive, and the rules provide a regulatory framework in which both office holders in insolvency proceedings, who are highly trained insolvency practitioners and act as officers of the court in administration of their fiduciary duties, as well as providing the legal framework when cases are brought to court. The law governs the processes and administration of both personal and corporate insolvencies.

2.1. Duties of the insolvency office holder:

a. It is the principal duty of the fiduciary trustee in insolvency, to act with a high degree of care and skill, with a primary duty to always act in the interests of the estate and body of creditors generally.

b. It is the duty of the office holder to act according to the primary legislation and to maintain his / her independence and impartiality in administration of the fiduciary role. A trustee / liquidator / administrator may not profiteer through their trusteeships whatsoever. (See: *Keech v Sandford [1726] 25 E.R. 223*).

c. A liquidator generally acts as agent of the company over which he has been appointed and there are some instances where a liquidator may have personal liability as an office holder, as is the same respective of a trustee in bankruptcy when the fiduciary trusteeship is breached.

d. In basic terms, a liquidator's function is to ensure that the company's assets are realised and distributed to the creditors and, if there is any surplus, to distribute it to the contributories. A liquidator must fulfil this function following the duties imposed and powers granted to them under the Insolvency Act 1986 and the Insolvency Rules 2016. The functions and same duty apply equally in respect of personal insolvency. In both the cases referred to in this report, that has not happened.

e. A trustee or a liquidator in a compulsory (but not voluntary) liquidation or bankruptcy is also an officer of the court and is under the duty as defined in (*Ex parte James*) to act in an honourable fashion, always acting impartially and independently. Again, that has not been happening in the vast majority of cases my group investigated.

f. Insolvency practitioners, when acting as liquidators, supervisors of voluntary arrangements or trustees in personal bankruptcies, have specific legal obligations to report criminal offences. *Sections 7A, 262B, 218(3)* and *218(4)* of the Insolvency Act 1986 are specific statutory duties to report potential criminal offences to the Secretary of State or the Lord Advocate via the Intelligence & Enforcement Directorate of the Insolvency Service as soon as the facts are known.

g. Additionally, office holders have the same duty to report on money laundering and proceeds of crime if there are reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting that an offence has been committed or is taking place. Failing to report in those circumstances is a criminal offence, (see, *section 328(1) of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002*), as is concealing proceeds of crime or criminal property.

h. A liquidator has a duty to creditors, in addition to his/her duty to the company, to not act in such a way whereby a breach of that duty might cause creditors some loss. In *Pulsford v Devenish [1903] 2 ch.625* it was held that the liquidator had been negligent in his statutory duty and was liable in damages to unpaid creditors of the liquidating company of whose claims he was aware and who had no notice of the liquidation until long after the dissolution of the company. Hannon has caused very substantial losses to my fellow creditors and I.

Likewise, Ingram and Hicken have caused huge losses to Ms Young, who, prior to their fraudulent abuse of position, was, like me, by far requisite majority creditor of the insolvent estate.

i. Office holders have a duty to adjudicate on the proof of debt claims made when a meeting is requested to replace them.

j. In my own case, I requested that meeting on 6th March 2017 and Hannon, acting as liquidator, refused to interfere in the matter, knowing that the proof of debt is false.

k. In **Fielding v Hunt**, the Judge added that: 'A*n order should not ordinarily be made against an office holder personally. Something more is required. Something more relates to the conduct of the office holder. The degree of conduct deserving of a personal costs order will depend on the circumstances of each case. A mere mistake is unlikely to be sufficient. Acting in a neutral manner, on an appeal from a rejection of proof, is unlikely to be sufficient. Acting for a personal advantage in resisting an appeal is very likely to lead to a personal costs order. Such conduct would present a "special case" and a "good reason", and may be characterised as "irrational conduct", or "unreasonable conduct".'*

l. The judge in that case also said that the court will take account of the duties of the office holder to investigate the proof, citing that;

'It has long been the law that an office holder is under a duty to examine every proof and consider the validity of the debt which is sought to be proved: ***Re Home and Colonial Insurance Co [1930] 1 Ch 102.***

"He should require satisfactory evidence that the debt on which the proof is founded is a real debt": ***Re Fraser, ex parte Central Bank of London [1892] 2 QB 633, CA***. And the obligation is not negated even where the proof is based on a judgment: *Re Van Laun, ex p Chatterton [1907] 2 KB 23, CA.*'

m. The well-established authorities in relation to negligent / fraudulent abuse of position applies in both cases respective of Hannon, the Official Receiver acting as liquidator of both Empowering Wind MFC Ltd and Earth Energy Investments LLP after he dissolved both companies whilst ensuring he placed proceeds of crime, the assets of which I was defrauded, beyond the reach of creditors by virtue of his fraudulent abuse of position. Likewise, as do the statutory offence of fraud by abuse of position, section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006 when a fiduciary trustee abuses one's position to obtain pecuniary interest.

n. The same principles referred to above apply in Ms Young's case wherein the assets of Mr Young's estate are in easy reach, yet the Joint Trustees ceased to act in the interests of creditors after defrauding Ms Young of her democratic rights as majority creditor, dishonestly abusing their positions in doing so.

3. INSOLVENCY LAW IS REVERSE ENGINEERED TO DEFRAUD CREDITORS – The common synergy:

a. In all the cases my group have investigated, there are common synergies. The main one is that the façade of insolvency legislation is being widely abused and effectually reverse engineered to defraud creditors or to take away one's standing to further a claim in restitution.

b. In my own case, Hannon accepted false proofs of debt that he knew to be false, when he occupies a fiduciary duty to me, otherwise requisite majority creditor, to have adjudicated on the proofs of debt when a meeting of creditors is called to replace him. Hannon accepted the 3rd proof of debt made by Middlesbrough FC, the £4.1 million fraudulent claim to defraud me of my democratic right as majority creditor to replace him so that he could keep the claim, founded by unlawful forfeiture of the Lease, which is clearly an asset of substantial value that is proven by virtue of unlawful forfeiture, beyond the reach of creditors.

c. In Ms Young's case, Ingram and Hicken, the Joint Grant Thornton Trustees of Mr Young's bankruptcy did precisely the same, only by failing in their duty to recover assets that were always within easy reach and then by creating false liability against Ms Young, in the form of costs encountered through collusion with the corrupt judiciary and predatory litigation, where they sought to challenge Ms Young's application to annul Mr Young's bankruptcy when they were to have remained neutral and impartial in any such application.

d. This malfeasance and abuse of fiduciary duty I describe in paragraph c above came in tandem with holding back a substantial cash asset associated with Mr Young's death and his estate that belongs to Ms Young, namely the Zurich life trust capital they have known about since 2010 held in discretionary trust. Abuse of fiduciary duty originated from the Joint Trustees to defrauding Ms Young of that cash asset, keeping it beyond her reach, with the motive in doing so to then use bankruptcy, founded by their falsely created liability, to defraud Ms Young of the £26.6 million judgment and half of the assets recovered.

e. It was the intent to defraud Ms Young of her democratic rights as majority creditor, with over 84% of the requisite majority voting interest in the estate, meaning that it would have been impossible for the remaining creditors to have voted down Ms Young's proposal to replace the Joint Trustees.

f. The position is identical in relation to Hannon's fraudulent abuse of position, wherein Hannon retained the £4.1 million false claim made by Middlesbrough FC and Womble Bond Dickinson, to defraud me of my democratic rights as requisite majority creditor with overwise over 85% of the voting interest in Empowering Wind MFC Ltd, meaning that were it not for the fraudulent claim, I would have been able to call a meeting to replace Hannon. The motive in doing so was to place assets beyond the reach of creditors. In both cases, there is a high value and serious fraud by abuse of position.

g. I refer to; **Tab 13---Official Receiver London Transcription 15 08 2018**, the transcript of the call I had with Hannon wherein on 15th August 2018 he admitted the intent himself. I refer to page 7, lines 1 through to 12 of the transcript, of which I cite:

AH: *Middlesbrough Football Club are the overwhelming majority creditors they have more than 75% and therefore unless you can get Middlesbrough Football Club to support, er, er a request, er, you cannot garner the necessary support*

h. Hannon admitted categorically, 18-months and 13-days after accepting the 3rd fraudulent claim, that by virtue of the false claim, creating false liability and voting interest, I did not have sufficient locus to call a meeting of creditors. However, from 6th March 2017, when my fellow creditors and I were calling a meeting to replace him, Hannon had a duty to have adjudicated on the proofs of debt, he deliberately failed to do so.

i. On precisely the same basis, Ms Young had by far requisite majority voting interest in Mr Young's bankruptcy estate. It was the duty of the Joint Trustees to call a meeting of creditors to vote on replacing them because they failed (wilfully) to recover assets, they too, deliberately failed to do so.

4. CRIMINAL OFFENCES & CONCEALMENT

a. Law makes dishonest abuse of fiduciary duty a statutory indictable offence, punishable by up to 10-years imprisonment. The offence is that of section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006:

Fraud by abuse of position (Section 4)

The defendant: occupies a position in which he was expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person;

- abused that position

- dishonestly

- intending by that abuse to make a gain/cause a loss

The abuse may consist of an omission rather than an act.

b. In both cases, Ms Young's and mine, the actus reus of the offence is complete, however, the UK's courts, regulatory authorities and police provide impunity to the offenders by failing in their duty to investigate or to prosecute, both in the civil and criminal courts. It is a case of members of this racketeering enterprise being provided impunity by fellow corruptors.

c. In both cases there is criminal property, namely the sums of money and value of the assets we have been defrauded of, the gain and the loss elements of the principal offences.

d. The offence of fraud by abuse of position in my case also overlaps with 5 counts of fraud by false representation respective of the fraudulent proofs of debt used to firstly cause the liquidations and then to place criminal property I was defrauded of beyond my reach, otherwise majority creditor, as it does the frauds by failing to disclose information when Hannon fraudulently withheld the proofs of debt he knew were false contrary to his legal duty to disclose.

e. The offences in both cases are of statutory conspiracy by nature, as in Section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977, wherein there is an agreement where two or more people agree to carry their criminal scheme into effect. The very agreement is the criminal act itself. (See: *Mulcahy v. The Queen (1868) L.R. 3 H.L. 306; R v Warburton (1870) L.R. 1 C.C.R. 274* , *R. v. Tibbits and Windust [1902] 1 K.B. 77 at 89*; *R. v. Meyrick and Ribuffi, 21 Cr.App.R. 94, CCA*.

f. Nothing need be done in pursuit of the agreement. (See: *O'Connell v. R. (1844) 5 St.Tr.(N.S.) 1)*. Repentance, lack of opportunity and failure are all immaterial. See: *R. v. Aspinall (1876) 2 Q.B.D. 48)*.

g. It is the course of conduct agreed upon which is critical. If that course involves some act by an innocent party, the fact that he does not perform it and thus prevents the commission of the substantive offence, does not absolve the parties to the agreement from liability. (See: *R. v. Bolton, 94 Cr.App.R. 74, CA*)

h. When Hannon lied in his statutory "Official Receiver's Report to Court" citing that the proofs of debt did not exist when it is proven they do and contrary to his legal duty to disclose conferred in rule 14.6 of the Insolvency Rules 2016, the actus resus of fraud by failing to disclose information was complete (s.3 of the Fraud Act 2006) and as was the offence of s.5 of the Perjury Act 1911. Hannon remains at large, employed by BEIS, free to inflict financial and emotional harm on all the creditors he comes into contact with, contrary to the public interest, yet harboured by the State.

i. When on 9th January 2017 Middlesbrough FC, Womble Bond Dickinson and Staunton fraudulently withheld 172 pages of witness evidence from the ex-parte hearing, including the assignment, the actus reus of the offence of fraud by failing to disclose information was complete.

j. When on 23rd October 2020, Middlesbrough FC, Womble Bond Dickinson and Ohrenstein presented an entirely false case whilst withholding 13-salient exhibits that otherwise proved my case, the actus resus of the same offence was complete.

k. The investments I had assigned that I was defrauded of by Hannon and the corrupt judiciary is also criminal property, as is the £26.6 million judgment debt and half of the estate vested in Mr Young's bankruptcy that Ms Young has been defrauded of. The offences are in statutory conspiracy.

4.1. Failure to report proceeds of crime and concealment of criminal property:

a. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 creates two standalone offences that are complete when the offender conceals criminal property and when a person with a duty to report fails in their duty to report suspected proceeds of crime to the National Crime Agency. In both cases, the actus resus of the offences are also complete:

Section 327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 - Concealing etc

(1) A person commits an offence if he—

(a) conceals criminal property;

(b) disguises criminal property;

(c) converts criminal property;

(d) transfers criminal property;

(e) removes criminal property from England and Wales or from Scotland or from Northern Ireland.

b. The standalone offence of Section 328(1) is in relation to becoming involved in arrangements respective of criminal property:

Section 328 Arrangements

(1) A person commits an offence if he enters into or becomes concerned in an arrangement which he knows or suspects facilitates (by whatever means) the acquisition, retention, use or control of criminal property by or on behalf of another person.

(2) But a person does not commit such an offence if— (a) he makes an authorised disclosure under section 338 and (if the disclosure is made before he does the act mentioned in subsection (1)) he has the appropriate consent;

(b) he intended to make such a disclosure but had a reasonable excuse for not doing so;

(c) the act he does is done in carrying out a function he has relating to the enforcement of any provision of this Act or of any other enactment relating to criminal conduct or benefit from criminal conduct.

c. Criminal property is defined in the statutory legislation at section 340 of the Act:

340 Interpretation

(1) This section applies for the purposes of this Part.

(2) Criminal conduct is conduct which— (a) constitutes an offence in any part of the United Kingdom, or

(b) would constitute an offence in any part of the United Kingdom if it occurred there.

(3) Property is criminal property if— (a) it constitutes a person's benefit from criminal conduct or it represents such a benefit (in whole or part and whether directly or indirectly), and;

(b) the alleged offender knows or suspects that it constitutes or represents such a benefit.

(4) It is immaterial— (a) who carried out the conduct; (b) who benefited from it;

(c) whether the conduct occurred before or after the passing of this Act.

(5) A person benefits from conduct if he obtains property as a result of or in connection with the conduct.

(6) If a person obtains a pecuniary advantage as a result of or in connection with conduct, he is to be taken to obtain as a result of or in connection with the conduct a sum of money equal to the value of the pecuniary advantage.

(7) References to property or a pecuniary advantage obtained in connection with conduct include references to property or a pecuniary advantage obtained in both that connection and some other.

(8) If a person benefits from conduct his benefit is the property obtained as a result of or in connection with the conduct.

(9) Property is all property wherever situated and includes—

(a) money; (b) all forms of property, real or personal, heritable or moveable; (c) things in action and other intangible or incorporeal property.

(10) The following rules apply in relation to property—

(a) property is obtained by a person if he obtains an interest in it; (b) references to an interest, in relation to land in England and Wales or Northern Ireland, are to any legal estate or equitable interest or power;

(c) references to an interest, in relation to land in Scotland, are to any estate, interest, servitude or other heritable right in or over land, including a heritable security; (d) references to an interest, in relation to property other than land, include references to a right (including a right to possession).

4.2. Value of the proceeds of crime and criminal property:

a. In the case of Ms Young, on 22nd November 2013, Judgment was awarded in the sum of £26,511,945.85. The accrued interest alone, until the date of this report, is £15,369,665.05 and the value of this criminal property is, £41,881,610.90, not including the assets that have been concealed by those Joint Trustees, also constituting criminal property under the Act, founded by their offending.

b. Undoubtedly, Paul Allen, who was deployed as Trustee to act in Ms Young's orchestrated bankruptcy by Ingram and Hicken, failed to seek permission from the National Crime Agency prior to becoming involved in the arrangements. It is suspected that Allen has also therefore committed the offence of section 328(1) of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 for failing to seek permission and report to the National Crime Agency prior to accepting his appointment.

c. In my own case, there are two forms of criminal property. The claim of 1st November 2018 in the sum of £18,730,253.28, plus 8% interest accrued at £3,452,524.50, with the total value of the of the claim being £22,182,777.78. There is also the value of the investments I made in Empowering Wind MFC Ltd in the sum of £770,000 accruing with interest from 30th June 2015, the date I served the assignment on Middlesbrough FC, until today's date, of which the sum of £347,660.27 is standard 8% interest, totalling £1,117,660.27.

d. The total value of the criminal property in my case is therefore £23,300,438.05.

4.3. Failure to report or to have sought consent respective of criminal property:

a. In both cases, undoubtedly, the office holders failed to obtain consent, because effectively, they would be reporting themselves to law enforcement for the crimes they have committed resulting in the criminal property to start with.

b. The failure to report or to have sought consent applies equally in respect of Womble Bond Dickinson and Bloom of Middlesbrough FC, the lawyers, as it does to Ohrenstein and Staunton of counsel. Clearly, they too did not seek consent prior to making their application to Court ex-parte on 9th January 2017, as they would effectually be reporting themselves to law enforcement for the crimes they committed. Therefore, the offenders are guilty of both standalone offences of section 327(1) of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and of 328(1) by failing to have reported or sought consent;

5. THE EVIDENCE

5.1. The Scot Young assets vesting in the bankruptcy estate:

a. The evidence in both cases is incontrovertible. Starting with Ms Young's case, I refer to my statement titled: **WS P.Millinder 02 02 2021**, the link to which is located in my secure 256-bit encrypted folder on my corporate server. The exhibits referred to in that statement can be accessed by inputting the credentials provided at page 1 therein. Page 6, paragraph 25, through to paragraph 38 sets out the number of high value assets that were and undoubtedly still are in easy reach of the Grant Thornton Joint Trustees. The value of those assets alone therein referred to exceeds £150 million.

5.2. The Zurich Life Trust Capital:

a. I refer now to my statement of 23rd November 2019 titled: **MY.PMWS.23_11_2019_PMv04___FINAL**. At page 2, paragraphs 9 and 10, I refer to the life insurance policies held by Mr Young in discretionary trust for the beneficiaries, Ms Young and her two daughters.

b. At page 3, paragraph 11 I refer to the fact that Ingram and Hicken were making enquiries, seeking to have the benefit of the Zurich Life Insurance Policy transferred to them in 2010.

c. I refer to the exhibit titled; **Tab 2M---MY Bundle 2 30 10 2018**, turning to page 148 through to page 152 contain a series of letters to and from Zurich and Grant Thornton from 19th October 2010 through to 8th August 2011. Several of the letters from Zurich tell Ingram, categorically that the insurance capital is held in trust for the beneficiaries and therefore it not an asset of Mr Young's bankruptcy estate. It is proven beyond doubt therefore that in 2010 and from then on, that Ingram and Hicken knew that the capital belongs to Ms Young and her two-daughters.

d. Moving back to my statement; **MY.PMWS.23 11 2019 PMv04 FINAL**, turning to page 13, paragraph 67, I address a clear and obvious motive for the murder of Mr Young.

e. Page 14, paragraph 70 through to 73 identifies the fact that it is highly suspicious that the Joint Trustees would be enquiring into the status of a Life Insurance Policy in 2010 when anyone would know that the policy is only of benefit to the beneficiaries if the policyholder dies.

f. Anyone would know that the life policy is not an asset of benefit to the policyholder. Why therefore would the Joint Trustees be so insistent in having the benefit of the policy transferred to them in 2010, unless they knew or had the pre-conceived plan to murder?

g. On 8th November 2014, exactly 3 years and 3 months (1188 days) from the last letter from Zurich to Ingram respective of the life policy, Mr Young was killed. Page 16 refers to the highly suspicious circumstances surrounding Mr Young's death, yet Met Police failed to investigate whatsoever.

h. There is a common synergy in the police failing to investigate any crime reported or suspected when it comes to the cabal of lawyers, judges and insolvency practitioners.

i. Page 9, paragraph 44, I refer to the fact that it was the premeditated intent to defraud Ms Young of the life insurance policy and that is why the false liability costs were created, so that they could bankrupt Ms Young whilst retaining the asset, the life trust capital that would have been payable extremely quickly following the death of Mr Young.

j. Paragraph 46 indicates that the judiciary were as much a part of the fraud and certainly the aiders and abettors, as they have been in my case and many others my group investigated. From paragraph 46, through to paragraph 51, Garwood himself admits that the hearing would be adjourned if there was a reasonable prospect of an impending payment that would clear the petitioning creditor's claim.

k. Garwood clearly knew that the life insurance policy would do that. As soon as the life policy is mentioned during the hearing, Branson, who did not even have a right of audience in the High Court to represent the Joint Trustees, immediately interjected and cited:

"It's an asset in the bankruptcy sir"

l. Branson, his clients and Registrar Garwood however, knew it was not an asset of the bankruptcy and anyone acting with any reasonable level of diligence have known, just by applying logic. A life insurance policy is only of benefit to the beneficiaries, when the policyholder dies, the benefit is paid to those named on the policy. If the policyholder is made bankrupt, the policy is still only of benefit to those named on it.

m. At page 12, paragraph 61, Garwood gave the game away substantially by stating:

"What entitlement would she have to ever receive that money"

n. Garwood knew that Michelle was the beneficiary of the policy, so clearly, he knew she was entitled to it and likewise, he knew it would have been paid extremely quickly, in fact, it transpired it was paid out less than 2-weeks after Ms Young signed the documentation releasing the trust.

o. After retaining the life trust capital asset in breach of their principal duty to assist creditors in recovery of all assets associated with the bankruptcy estate, causing Ms Young's bankruptcy in doing so in clear and obvious collusion with Garwood, the Insolvency Registrar and Branson, the Joint Trustees appointed Paul Allen of FRP Advisory to act as Trustee in Ms Young's bankruptcy.

p. I move to my skeleton; **Skeleton Zurich Policy 30 10 2018,** the skeleton evidences that it was the focus of Allen to sequestrate Ms Young from her entitlement to the life trust capital, wherein he and his conspirers sought to dupe Ms Young into signing over the life trust policy in the sum of £1,385 million for £15,000 after Ingram and Hicken bankrupted her off the back of it knowing that it would have cleared their alleged petition debt in full. Allen and his conspirers sought to do this in "without prejudice" communications under the guise of a "settlement offer". There was, unsurprisingly, no evidence of Allen pursuing Ingram and Hicken however to make any recovery in the interests of the creditors of Ms Young's estate of which he was appointed. A most serious and protracted conspiracy to defraud.

5.3. THE MIDDLESBROUGH FC CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD & fraud upon the Court:

a. My case is straight forward, it could not be simpler if I tried. On 5th February 2018, Nugee J found that the claims made by Middlesbrough FC in the insolvency of Empowering Wind MFC Ltd are false, yet he failed in his duty to do what the application sought to do in dealing with those frauds. Nugee was perverting the course of justice, just as all the judges have done in my case. Political interference is the driver, the judges have been coerced to provide impunity to the offenders, because Gibson is connected with the Conservative Tees Valley Combined Authority quango, seeking to use public money to acquire private infrastructure projects, a recipe for corruption in its own right. BEIS employs Womble Bond Dickinson as their lawyers. There are close ties with this cabal and Gibson, along with the former Teesside Labour stronghold he is so closely affiliated, has a long history of being associated with asset stripping and shady characters in public office, Ray Mallon, formerly of Cleveland Police being one of them.

b. I move to the transcript and judgment of that hearing of 5th February 2018: **Tab 37--- Transcript & Judgment 05 02 2018**, at page 25, Nugee finds that the application circumvented by Registrar Jones was to be heard by a High Court Judge. The application that came before Nugee sought to recuse Jones, who cited at the first hearing that;

"dishonesty is not going to matter, I can't judge"

c. Jones knew that the application sought to deal with the multiple frauds, the fraudulent abuse of position by Hannon and the fraud by failing to disclose information ex-parte on 9th January 2017 before Arnold J. Jones was operating non-judicially, knowing he had no jurisdiction to do what the application sought to try, because, by his own admission he "*can't judge*". It was, for that reason, the application was to be heard by a High Court Judge, but the request was "crossed out" by Chief Registrar Briggs, who, on the evening of 22nd November 2017 met with Hannon at a drinks reception by Radcliffe Chambers (Staunton's chambers, the barrister acting for the Club).

d. It was Briggs who approved the confidential filings in the case, just one day prior to meeting Hannon. Briggs knew of the multiple frauds, which is why he deployed Jones, who "can't judge", to prevent justice being served on Hannon, Staunton, Middlesbrough FC and Womble Bond Dickinson.

e. The application that came before Nugee on 5th February 2018 sought to sought to deal with the fraudulent non-disclosure ex-parte of 172 pages of witness exhibits that would have otherwise proven my demand against Middlesbrough FC and the false instrument applications to Bristol County Court by lawyers acting for Middlesbrough FC certified as true when they were false. At page 26 of the transcript, the top of the page, Ms Jones QC cited that the purpose of the application that Jones circumvented (See: **A1-PORTFOLIO-App_16_11_2017_Jones**) was to progress the proven damages claim that Hannon was placing beyond my reach by sustaining the fraudulent £4.1 million claim. It is beneficial to read through to the end of page 30. The point being is that Nugee kept Registrar Jones in place when the application sought to recuse him, undoubtedly, because he knew Jones was perverting the course of justice, just as Nugee was doing and what all the judges in my case have been doing from 16th November 2017 until now.

5.4. Staunton himself admitted that the claims are false on 9th January 2017:

f. Moving to page 19 of the transcript (**tab_37**), the following was recited respective of the false proofs of debt:

Nugee J: £541,000 and then 4. --

Ms Jones: Yes, and then 4.1 million.

Nugee J: Yes, I don't think I know how those sums are made up.

Ms Jones: No, I'm not sure I do either –

g. Anyone would know, they are just that, made up, fraudulent claims designed to put the asset, being the claim, proven by virtue of the fact the Lease was unlawfully forfeited, beyond the reach of my fellow creditors and I, so Hannon could go on to dispose of the Company to defraud me of the claim.

h. At page 91, the order arising from that hearing for 1 hour and 40 minutes in the interim applications Court, paragraph 5, Nugee finds that the 3-connection contracts making up the connection agreement were withheld from the ex-parte hearing. That material non-disclosure came in tandem with the offenders failing whatsoever to make any mention of the fact that Middlesbrough FC refused the connection.

i. At paragraph 5, Nugee cited this:

He relies for this on non disclosure of a large number of documents which, as I understand it, supported the statutory demand and which explained the background to the dispute, in particular the connection agreement which, in his submissions to me, he explained was the foundation of his argument that the project was, effectively, killed by Middlesbrough.

j. At paragraph 6, where Nugee finds that it is not disputed that the information was withheld, he refers to the note of hearing ex-parte of 9th January 2017 (**tab X16**). In addition to the fraudulent non-disclosure and failure in duty of candour to disclose the fact that Middlesbrough FC refused the connection, Nugee also found that Staunton had twice lied about the operative provision of Force Majeure in the Lease, but he did absolutely nothing about that either, aside from covering for him, saying it was a "mistake".

k. There was deliberately no standard of review whatsoever, because all the hearings have been about preventing justice from being served on the offenders, who, with the assistance of the likes of Nugee, Vos, Pelling, Arnold, Briggs, Jones and other like-minded oath breaking state terrorists, abuse their positions to assist in defrauding those that come to courts to seek justice.

l. The fact of the matter is that everything said during the ex-parte hearing was false, no money was ever owed to Middlesbrough FC and Staunton admitted that himself.

m. I numbered the left-hand column of the note of hearing for ease in reference. Statements at 1, 2, 4, 6 and 15 are all false and or factually inaccurate. At 3, however, Staunton does admit that Force Majeure does have effect in respect of the Energy Supply Agreement, however, he dishonestly omits the fact that in absence of my "*full satisfaction of*" entering into a "*Connection Agreement*", namely the same and only connection that Middlesbrough FC refused, there was no "*Entitlement to agreed output*" (agreement to supply power) and any "*invoicing & payment*" was also contractually prohibited.

n. I can consolidate substantially from here; the preliminary considerations are inextricably linked. I refer to **Tab 14---Letter Snowden J 01 02 2021 corrected**. My case originates from an indisputable contractual positing arising by the fact that Middlesbrough FC prevented me from performing on the rights granted by refusing the connection for the turbine after making an unwarranted demand for payment that was never owed. It is in fact that simple.

o. At page 6, line 3 through to line 36 of page 7 the preliminary consideration is consolidated substantially. Even if Middlesbrough FC did not refuse the connection, (they did) they still unlawfully forfeited the Lease based on the demand for money that was never owed.

p. Moving back to the transcript and judgment of the hearing on 5th February 2018: **Tab 37**, page 90 and on to 91, whilst Nugee was preventing justice being served on the offenders for what is the most prolific case of material non-disclosure during ex-parte financial proceedings in the history of UK law, he did find, stating the obvious, that no money was ever owed to Middlesbrough FC. See the highlighted passage of his mala fide order and on to paragraph 4 therein.

q. At paragraph 8, Nugee found that the bulk of the non-disclosure went to the argument proving that Middlesbrough FC refused the connection and unlawfully forfeited the Lease, but he did nothing to prosecute the offenders.

r. At paragraph 9, this is where Nugee perverts the course of justice to conceal the fact that Bloom is guilty of perjury for making a false ex-parte witness statement and at paragraph 10, Nugee then commits fraud by false representation himself and misrepresented the terms of the assignment to make it not absolute when he knew it was.

s. The contention at paragraph r above is proven beyond doubt, I move to **tab 7**, my 54-page report, starting from the table of contents at page 1. I click on the one titled:

"Nugee J dishonestly manipulated the terms of and misrepresented the assignment"

t. At page 36, we read carefully from line 1 through to line 18 pf page 37. Nugee has committed fraud by false representation as in section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 to defraud me of the assigned investments in Empowering Wind MFC Ltd. He did so, because Staunton admitted that the assignment had taken place during the same hearing of 5th February 2018. I evidence that at page 37, line 24 and 25. Nugee, assisting the offenders by firstly preventing justice being served on them, but secondly by defrauding me of over £770,000 plus standard interest, misrepresented the assignment to make it not absolute because the law makes any absolute assignment, served on the affected parties, effectual in law from the date of service. The law in question is also quoted at page 37, line 1 through to 6.

u. The point I make is that the judiciary are entirely dishonest, corrupt and are a law unto themselves, assisting fellow white-collar criminals disguised as lawyers in making further gains founded by the frauds they have committed.

On 12th November 2018, Staunton "U-turned" and in writing, retracted the fact that he, Middlesbrough FC and Womble Bond Dickinson made the claims against Empowering Wind MFC Ltd

v. I refer to page 19 of my report (**tab 7**), reading from line 18 through to line 39. Staunton, working in conspiracy with Hannon, Womble Bond Dickinson, Middlesbrough FC and the corrupt judiciary, retracted the claims after causing my fellow creditors and I massive losses resulting from their fraudulent claims; £256,269.89 used to unlawfully forfeit the Lease, £541,308.89 and over £4.1 million used to stymie the liquidation. After himself admitting on 9th January 2017 that "Force Majeure has effect", therefore making the written admission he knew the claims were false, he conspired with the corrupt judiciary, Jones in particular, but all the purported judges involved, racked up over £45,500 in costs made against me personally, and then, exactly 21-days after making me personally liable, he retracted the claims like they were never even made.

w. In full knowledge of those circumstances, Vos, who has now been made head of civil justice, Master of the Rolls, allowed Staunton to retract and replace his skeleton minus the dishonesty.

x. Moving back to my letter to Snowden (**tab 14**), who is just another one of them, at page 1, the second paragraph, I refer to the fact that after concealing the multiple frauds, the corrupt judiciary, in conspiracy then deploy false instrument restraint orders to further conceal those indictable offences whilst preventing me from my right of access to justice to further assist the offenders.

y. I refer to the fact that it is ultra vires for the inferior court to contradict a judgment of the superior court that proves none of my applications can possibly be "totally without merit". The corrupt judiciary have been abusing the law, maliciously certifying applications as "TWM" with no consideration whatsoever, to originate restraint orders with intent to conceal their heinous human rights abuse and conspiracy to defraud. Clearly same does have tendency to interfere with the proper administration of justice, that is their desired outcome.

z. Lastly, halfway down page 3 of the same letter, on 6th November 2020, Fancourt was forced to admit that; *"the substantive issues have never been tried"* and that;

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.*

aa. Fancourt was referring to "substantive issues" being the preliminary consideration that is already tried and proven in my favour, namely the fact that no money has never been owed to Middlesbrough FC and they unlawfully forfeited the Lease. He then refers to the fact that the "*validity of the assignment"* has never been tried. It does not need to be tried, because the rule of law makes both assignments valid and Staunton admitted just that, himself, on 5th February 2018, just as he did that "Force Majeure applies". The purported judges are one and the same as the principal offenders.

CONCLUSION

This briefing report, in a nutshell, proves both cases beyond doubt. It is the judiciary who are at fault, as much as the corrupt Insolvency Service, the office holders and the unscrupulous lawyers they conspire with.

The abuse that both Ms Young and I have had to endure at the hands of a shockingly corrupt governance that is unfit to lead, completely undermines the principles of natural justice and the English Constitution itself. Those responsible are provided with impunity to continue defrauding innocent parties, contrary to the law and the public interest.

- Paul Millinder

19th February 2021
