

Colour code: **GREEN** = actual words spoken in Court redacted / misrepresented in the official record.
Red highlight = redaction and or insertion of alien text. **Red bold underlined** = knowingly false statement.

NOTES OF PERVERSION BY CONCEALMENT OF CRUCIAL EVIDENCE AND FACTS

Knowingly false statements by Samuel Hodge (counsel for the GLD) in Court before Adam Johnson J on 11 February 2026:

In this submission we recite from APPENDIX-B (retained by the Claimant as criminal evidence), which is the Acolad purported transcript.

The alleged lie intended to pervert that has been the punchline for the GLD, their co-defendants and the '**Judges**' involved, is that it's all been '**finally determined**'. It follows therefore that Mr Hodge was to have adopted that lie knowing that everything that needed determination, never was.

To prove the contention, we used the PDF search of APPENDIX-B and we came up with 4 exact matches for the term '**finally**'. The first in order of the 4 appear at page 10, it is not material. The second, appears at page 12, it is material. We recite the passage spoken by Mr Hodge:

*"the heading is conclusively on page 1799. And Mr Walsh says, "Conclusively, there is no restraint order against C or Mr Millinder, in truth and reality it was all aggravated conspiracy to commit collateral fraud and perversion by concealment of the crucial evidence and facts. B, even if there was a restraint order against Mr Millinder, **IT WAS** it was not **finally decided** by **ANDREWS LJ** [Andrew DeJ J] that the restraint order does not prevent the claimant from litigating. Certifications as TWM in this case are all contrary to the **FINAL** **filed** Court of Appeal public policy decisions."*

The third exact match for the term 'finally' appears at the top of 15 of APPENDIX B, which contains the knowingly false statement, as follows, spoken by Mr Hodge:

*"The Court of Appeal has determined there's **no evidence of the** **DIVISIONAL COURT** **division of court** **acting with any impropriety, as Mr Millinder alleges.** And **there are no arguable grounds with any real prospects of success of challenging the section 42 order on the basis that it is void because it's based on earlier orders which are also alleged to be void.** **And Mr Millinder cannot reopen those issues. They've been finally and definitively determined against him on the merits by an appeal court judge"***

The last of the 4 exact matches in the severely redacted transcript, is another knowingly false statement spoken by Mr Hodge, and that is at page 15 of 30 (APPENDIX B), paragraph E:

*"MR HODGE: Right. **Well, this is all been finally determined by Andrews in the administrative court"***

The conscious and premeditated dishonesty in lying to say that the case is 'finally determined' is inextricably linked with the tampering with either the audio, and or the transcript at page 7 of APPENDIX B.

The perpetrators were seeking to conceal the substance of what was said in the Claimant's 2nd skeleton argument dated 1st October 2025. That is **document number 10** of the Claimant's schedule.

What was done, was to obfuscate from the 3-pager, the Claimant's final skeleton prior to the purported hearing before the conflicted ICC Judge Barber on 2nd October 2025. The redaction is this (from page 7 of 30):

*"MR WALSH: Right. Okay. Well, I've been involved in this for a very long time now. I witnessed what went on in Newcastle in my final statement that was set across the three **PAGER** **inaudible**. And such to touch on this, you know, at the end of the day, the crux of all of this is there's no money owed and it's being concocted to – in defraud of the bankruptcy laws. These three proofs of debt have been concocted and then withdrawn"*

We request that the reader diligently considers **the 3-page skeleton argument dated 1st October 2025** to appreciate the context and as to why Mr Hodge and or Mr Johnson J took out the word "pager" to obfuscate from the fact that Mr Walsh was talking about the skeleton, not the statement.

Knowingly false statements by Andrews LJ, Mr Hodge and the GLD Defendants:

Andrews LJ made the knowingly false statement intended to pervert on 1st November 2022 in the Divisional Court and Mr Hodge subordinated that act intended to pervert on 11 February 2026.

At page 14 of 30 (APPENDIX B) the passage below was spoken by Mr Hodge on 11 February 2026, conveying the knowingly false representations made by Andrews LJ in subordination of that intended to pervert:

"permission was refused on papers by Lord Justice William Davis, November 2021. He gave unimpeachable reasons for refusing Mr Millinder's request that the application for permission be determined at an oral hearing"

Mr Hodge, like Andrews LJ knew as well as we did before the start of the hearing (see the 11-page transcript which the GLD, Mr Hodge and Johnson J were under official duties to have diligently read (see: page 11 of the 11-page skeleton), and for clarity, we will set it out below:

*"11. It is evident that after the High Court of first instance, this Court in EEI's originating application and throughout the proceedings, **then the Administrative Court, concealed and evaded each and all of Mr Millinder's 341 submissions in the proceedings in relation to 'set off' / '14.25 Insolvency Rules 2016', then Easthope-Davis LJ, acting fraudulently, evaded ground 6 of Mr Millinder's 7 grounds of appeal for precisely the same reason, then lying and saying this, knowing there are in fact 5 important points of law and public interest legal principle at issue:***

"However important the issues in this case are for the Appellant, they do not involve any point of legal principle."

It was a knowingly false representation in Court by Mr Hodge to represent that Andrews LJ "finally determined" anything in the Administrative Court and this is proven beyond doubt, against the real evidence, the material facts and evidence set out, that they were all under official and professional duties to have pre-read prior to those hearings.

On 4 April 2022, Mr Millinder filed and served his skeleton argument of 20-pages with his schedule of authorities in defence of the automatically void civil all proceedings order deployed by this sect of extremists and white-collar criminals, to conceal fraud and crossover offences. Below, we exhibit a photograph / screenshot of page 1 of that skeleton argument which is in fact [document number 20](#) of the Claimant's schedule of documentation in support of the claim:

SKE-04-04-2022-&-AUTHORITIES

**IN THE HIGH COURT
ADMINISTRATIVE COURT OF ENGLAND & WALES**

Case ref: CO/915/2022

SKELETON ARGUMENT - SUMMARY OF CASE LAW

1. The Respondent provides this skeleton summarising the case law on which he relies referring to: **AUTHORITIES** appended herewith, linked to the synergising parts within those cases accordingly.
2. This case originates from 3 sets of void insolvency proceedings, summarised as:
 - a. **CR-2017-008690:** Wilful failure to apply mandatory statutory procedural law in set off conferred in rule 14.25 of the Insolvency Rules 2016 in the EW winding up and then sustaining the fraudulent liabilities arising therefrom that were to have been set off:
 - b. **CR-2017-000140:** The EEI proceedings in setting aside the fraudulently obtained orders of 09/01/2017 & the 16/01/2017 purported consent order:
 - c. **CR-2018-001137:** The fraudulent winding up of EEI based upon the 16/01/2017 £25,000 proceeds of crime again founded by wilful failure to apply the mandatory law in set off conferred in rule 14.25 of the IR 2016
3. All three proceedings were founded by blackmail, as in section 21 of the Theft Act 1968 when after refusing the connection for the wind turbine, D1 made an unwarranted demand with menaces on 25/06/2015 in the sum of £256,269.89. Everything founded by fraud and the 3 sets of void proceedings is void ab initio. That includes the S.42 order and the civil restraint orders.

It is evident that page 1 of Mr Millinder's defence skeleton relied on the crucial defence of nullity dealing with the fraudulently maladministered insolvency proceedings just as the Claimant's second skeleton argument of 1st October 2025 did and just as the Claimant's skeleton of 9 February 2026 did, and just as ground 6 of Mr Millinder's 7-grounds of appeal did that Easthope-Davis LJ bypassed and just as Andrews LJ and Cavanagh J concealed, it is proven beyond doubt, for unlike them, A.I search does not lie and naturally it all goes back to the 3-page skeleton dated 1st October 2025 and the Claimant's skeleton of 11 February 2026.

It is a fact that Fancourt J lied and said he determined the Claimant's 2 application of 7 and 11 September 2023, but they too were exclusively dedicated the fraud by dishonest deprivation of the mandatory automatically engaged rule of due process, "insolvency set off" / [14.25 Insolvency Rules 2016](#).

So, to prove the number of acts intended to pervert with lies by the GLD, Mr Hodge, Andrews LJ and Easthope-Davis LJ, is that we simply go to the 3 fraudulent "purported determinations" contained together in the exhibit called [13 OB6](#) (63-pages). It was maintained by Mr Hodge, who knew that Easthope-Davis had concealed fraud and crossover offences, just as he knew that Andrews LJ, Swift J and Cavanagh J had done, also acting in conspiracy with bent GLD lawyers like Mr Hodge was, that in fact there is no singular reference to "set off" / "14.25" anywhere in any of their 3 fraudulent "purported determinations" because they concealed their own fraudulent failure to judge.

Consequent of all the application and claims out by the Claimant and Mr Millinder when his entire case was about the contractual terms of the deeds and the set off claims in the Claimant's favour, there is no singular purported determination that touched on either the completed simple contractual terms proving no money was ever owed to D4, or the consequential of that, the set off claims exceeding 10 million GBP in Mr Millinder / the Claimant's favour, which is precisely the reason, acting fraudulently and with intent to pervert, they bypassed the mandatory law, and then concealed the fraud and crossover offences in conspiracy.

Below we adduce from APPENDIX B, a screenshot of page 17 of 30 showing where the crucial words spoken by Mr Millinder in Court on 11 February 2026 were either redacted from the hearing audio or the transcript and was replaced with the alien text in red to obliterate the gravity of the crucial oral evidence he gave:

C MR MILLINDER: Yes, it's Mr Millinder yes, no problem. I'm the witness in this case and I'm giving assistance to Mr Walsh in relation to the evidence that I HAD FIRST GIVEN I've both given. It's myself. Yes. Do you have a problem with that? I'm going to use it as evidence in Hong Kong, in our High Court for this conspiracy to PERVERT THE COURSE OF PUBLIC JUSTICE [inaudible]. Do you have a problem with that?

D MR JUSTICE JOHNSON: Well, there is a problem for the reasons I explained earlier.

MR MILLINDER: Well, YOUR RESTRAINT ORDER, [inaudible] just let me hear me out for one minute here. Your restraint order has been used to conceal fraud against me by dishonest deprivation of the mandatory rule in setoff. You're talking about EASTHOPE [inaudible] Davis LJ LPA[?] who BYPASSED by far in ground six OF and my SEVEN GROUNDS seventh ground of appeal which was all about setoff because there's not one singular mention, not one singular judgment and ever in my case referring to setoff or 14.25 ANYWHERE because they've been using restraint orders to conceal the evidence that I'D FIRST GIVEN I'm going - given, which was THE CONTRACTUAL TERMS that in factual terms, the fact that no money was ever owed and the fact that they BYPASSED bypass the mandatory law of due process.

In doing so. Your Lordship will appreciate that the only thing THAT CAN ARISE OUT OF IT IS A NULLITY, AND THERE AREN'T VARYING DEGREES OF NULLITY in the right out space is another thing and there are various degrees nullity. My Lord. The fact is that the mandatory law of setoff WAS TO HAVE BEEN which has been administered prior to making an insolvency ORDER. Your Lordship will know about STEIN v BLAKE [inaudible] paragraphs five to seven where the Lords talked about the occasion for setting off, the occasion FOR TAKING AN ACCOUNT to pay the account.

Concealment of criminal fraud by failure to disclose information:

A There was no debt on which the fourth defendant's winding out petition WAS BASED with basis. It was an ABUSE OF abusive process TO HAVE WOUND UP [inaudible] EEI on 28 March 2018 as it was an ACT action that the court had no jurisdiction to have done in absence of administration of the RULE OF SET OFF [inaudible] 14.55 14.25 Insolvency Law RULES 2016.

B My order of 28 March 2018 is automatically void for failure to comply with the statutory requirements and the claimant asks the court to declare it to be so, exercising its right *ex debito justitiae* to do so. I had no option but to do so in these circumstances. The other rest of the order talks about failure to comply with the statutory requirements for consent orderS because 16 January 2017 consent order which was obtained by FRAUD the board by failure to disclose the two PENNINGTONS [inaudible] letters, and in breach of THEIR CONTINUING LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE that continue to be in breach [inaudible] AND Whereas had that disclosure arisen and the defendants did return to court with those two letters, it would have been discovered that I didn't consent TO paying the THEM 25 grand costS. The appropriate order sought WAS that each party was to bear their own cost and therefore the order the consent order underline the 25,000 is non-compliant with the statutory provisions as under PRACTICE DIRECTION 40B practise direction 43, rule 3.41 and 3.4A and 3.4B. So the underlying order is void. Also, the failure to comply with the statutory requirements on consent orderS, My Lord.

D Nobody's ever touched on this YET THESE ARE THE This is a core issueS at the heart of the case. There's a PURPORTED [inaudible] determination, there are A range OF PURPORTED DETERMINATIONS [inaudible] determination which are just that, NULLITIES nullity, because they don't determine anything that needs to be ever at all.

Further crucial evidence:

Refer to the Claimant's bundle called: [OP-BLACKJACK-1111](#) revealing real evidence of non-determined claims and applications that were issued and then deliberately evaded to conceal the same crucial evidence and facts as those deliberately redacted from the official court records. Refer to the self-explanatory hyperlinked index page of [OP_BLACKJACK-1111](#) setting out what's what.

Refer to [the email chain from Paul Millinder to Ms Ford \(clerk to Adam Johnson J\) of 8 February 2025 at 02.20AM](#).

Notes:

This document has been produced pursuant to Section 9 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 as evidence in a criminal investigation alleging serious judicial and central government corruption and aggravated conspiracy to pervert the course of public justice.

The City of London Police reference is:

The Defendants are required to respond by way of witness statements setting out and defence / mitigating circumstances.

For questions in relation to this submission email: admin@intelligenceuk.com