

Before: Mr Justice Adam Johnson
Hearing: 10.30AM on 11 February 2026

BETWEEN:

Intelligence UK Investigations Ltd (a Firm)
(Claimant / Applicant "C")

v

- (1) Anthony Hannon & the Official Receiver of London
 - (2) Justin Dionne & the Official Receiver of London
 - (3) Dean Beale the Inspector General of the Insolvency Service
 - (4) Middlesbrough Football & Athletic Company (1986) Ltd
 - (5) H.M.C.T.S (His Majesty's Courts & Tribunals Service)
 - (6) Lord Chancellor & Secretary of State for Justice
- (Defendants / Respondents "D")**
-

Pursuant to Section 9 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967
CLAIMANT'S SKELETON ARGUMENT FOR HEARING

Pre-reading approximately 3-hours and in this order: This skeleton argument, the 1st, 2nd, 3rd & 4th WS of Martin Richard Walsh ('MRW') contained in **C's-BUNDLE-A_CR-2025-005970 ('Bundle-A')** and the evidence in the exhibits where referred to. Then **C's-BUNDLE-B_CR-2025-005970 ('Bundle-B')** should be pre-read, using the convenient hyperlinked table of contents which set out the headlines, and then **C's-BUNDLE-C_CR-2025-005970 – ('Bundle-C')**, with this skeleton, first reading C's skeleton argument at pages 18 – 36 and the evidence where referred to, then the draft judgment at pages 2 – 17 & lastly the notice to admit facts (deemed accepted) at pages 325 – 329.

PRE-HEARING APPLICATION DATED 9 FEBRUARY 2026:

C is applying pursuant to CPR 39.6(a) for Mr Walsh to represent the Company and for Mr Millinder to be joined pursuant to CPR 19.2 as the second claimant, as any decision directly affects him, and Mr Hodge has made false statements in his skeleton about him, allegedly.

ACTS VOID CONTRARY TO PUBLIC POLICY:

1. We refer to [Bundle-C](#), page 5, reading p.12 – p.26 of page 8 (C's KBD draft declaratory judgment). Pages 325 – 329 contain the notice to admit the contractual facts that were concealed and are deemed accepted accordingly. The preliminary issue in Mr Millinder's and now C's case acquired from him by assignment of 25 March 2022, is this: **A, B & C below:**

A. THE CONTRACTUAL FACTS WERE CONCEALED AND NEVER TOUCHED ON:

2. No money was contractually owed to D4 prior to them demanding money and forfeiting the lease on 19 August 2015, or at any time thereafter under the terms of the completed deeds, including the 26-year registered lease, and the Connection Deed.

B. THE AUTOMATICALLY ENGAGED RULE – INSOLVENCY SET OFF WAS FRAUDULENTLY BYPASSED AND THEN THE FRAUD WAS CONCEALED THROUGHOUT BY ‘JUDGES’ UNDER D5 AND D6:

3. Consequent of the completed contractual terms of the deeds, and the assignment from EW to EEI effective from 30 June 2015, are the crossclaims vested in EW and EEI respectively that extinguish the purported claims brought by D4 against EW and EEI. D4 sought to prove in EW and EEI's insolvency proceedings, and their spurious claims arise from direct pre-liquidation contractual mutual dealings. Law required that prior to contemplating making a winding up order against either EW or EEI, the sums due from one must have been set off against the sums due from the other. D4 never contractually had a claim to prove and Rule 14.25 Insolvency Rules 2016, precluded D4 from having the right to claim against either EW or EEI. D4 never had a proof of debt to prove, so acting in conspiracy, D1, D2, D3, D4, and 'Judges' under D5 and D6 fraudulently deprived Mr Millinder, requisite majority creditor of EW and sole creditor of EEI of the mandatory rule to make a gain and to have caused loss of many millions of pounds in aggravated fraudulent conspiracy. There are a number of criminal offences crossing over with the obvious fraudulent breach of fiduciary and judicial duties.
4. On 15 August 2016 after an insolvency process commenced against EW, D4 sought to prove for a claim in the sum of £256,269.89. D4's claim presented in the 'notice of intention to appear' by Robin Bloom of D4, automatically engaged the rule on set off (14.15 Insolvency Rules 2016). See: [doc. 14 of C's schedule – 'AUTHORITIES'](#) reading pages 2 – 5). In Stein v Blake, at p.5, Lord Hoffman said this of the rule (bold underlined for emphasis):

“Bankruptcy set-off therefore requires an account to be taken of liabilities which, at the time of bankruptcy, may be due but not yet payable or may be unascertained in amount or subject to contingency. Nevertheless the law says that the account shall be deemed to have been taken and the sums due from one party set off against the other as at the date of the bankruptcy.”

5. Acting in conspiracy, Ds fraudulently 'contracted out' of the mandatory law of due process engaged prior to making an insolvency order against EW and EEI. The EW and EEI proceedings are proven fraudulent, and void contrary to the public policy issue set out in p.1 of the Supreme Court's final judgment, Belmont, relied on in C's authorities, this:

“1. The anti-deprivation rule and the rule that it is contrary to public policy to contract out of pari passu distribution are two sub-rules of the general principle that parties cannot contract out of the insolvency legislation.”

6. On 15 August 2016 EW's claim exceeding 9.2 million net, arising from fraudulent and or negligent forfeiture of the lease based on D4's claim, extinguished it entirely. Judges under D5 fraudulently 'contracted out' of the automatically engaged rule to defraud and deprive Mr Millinder of the EW set off claim. Doing so renders their decisions void contrary to public policy, as well as void for failure to comply with the mandatory statutory requirement.
7. There are not '**varying degrees of nullity**' but the Ds created them, all founded by their void fraudulent acts, which were concealed by 'Judges' under D5 and D6 who persistently worked for the Ds to conceal the crucial evidence and facts Mr Millinder first gave as a witness to Police from 9 January 2017, and then in Court from 21 December 2017 acting for EEI, then throughout the proceedings.
8. It is evident that nowhere in any of the purported determinations is any singular reference to the terms '14.25' or 'set off' for 'Judges' under D5 and D6 not only defrauded Mr Millinder by dishonestly depriving him of the statutory rights granted, but then they perverted by concealing their own fraud, and the fraud by the primary defendants, D1, D2 and D4, along with the criminal crossover offences that came with it.

The 'TWM' certifications in Mr Millinder's case are automatically void contrary to public policy:

9. There was never jurisdiction to deploy any restraint order against Mr Millinder to conceal fraud and criminal offences. Similarly, the acts by those 'Judges' under D5 and D6 are likewise affronts to the final public policy decisions by the Court of Appeal in the judgments described by C in its authorities bundle as '**Grace**' (p.15 recited directly below) and p.19 – 21 in '**Wasif**', with the core point at p.19 recited second below):

“15. The adoption of this approach does contain within it two important safeguards. First, no judge will certify an application as TWM unless he is confident after careful consideration that the case truly is bound to fail. He or she will no doubt have in mind the seriousness of the issue and the consequences of his decision in the particular case. Secondly, the claimant still has access to a judge of the Court of Appeal who, with even greater experience and seniority, will approach the application independently and with the same care”

Paragraph 19 in Wasif:

*“But where the application is certified as TWM, so that the claimant has reached the end of the road (subject to appeal), **peculiar care must be taken to ensure that all the arguments raised in the grounds are properly addressed**”*

10. Peculiar care was taken to ensure that the preliminary issue, the contractual terms and argument presented around them and the set off claims arising in consequence, was never addressed or adjudicated on at all, in collateral fraud. ‘Fraud unravels all, even post judgment’. The classic example of such prolific abuse of Mr Millinder’s constitutional right to any form of fair and unbiased trial is the conduct of Easthope-Davis LJ, who purported to deal with Mr Millinder’s appeal of the automatically void civil all proceedings order. See: 8th WS of MRW dated 7 October 2025 at [no.16 of C’s schedule](#), reading page 17, p.67 – p.80).
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.**”*

The EEI set off claim and the mandatory set off rule that was bypassed to make a gain and to cause loss and to have prevented justice being served on D4:

12. On 6 January 2017, EEI served D4 its statutory demand for the liquidated sum of £530,000, being the investment made by Mr Millinder in EW that was assigned to EEI on 29 June 2015. D4 and their lawyers could not defend the demand, for the reason that the assignment is absolute, and was served on them on 30 June 2015 prior to a process server serving them in person with the statutory demand on 6 January 2017. So acting in fraud, they withheld the assignment on which it was based, and all the material information that proved the crucial contractual fact that even had D4 not refused the connection on 30 April 2015 (the crucial material fact they failed to disclose in breach of their legal duties to have done so), D4 still fraudulently and or negligently forfeited the lease, for the reasons made clear at [Bundle-C](#) pages 5 – 8, at [Bundle-B](#), page 4, section 1.3 – 1.4(c) of page 5. D4 fraudulently withheld the connection related contracts and the emails proving they refused the connection on 30 April 2015. It is precisely for that reason they cannot deal with C’s notice to admit those crucial facts at Bundle-B, pages 325 – 329, because the completed terms of the deeds affirming those facts, cannot be;

- a. Diminished, and neither can the statutory mandatory law of due process, insolvency set off the Ds, acting in conspiracy, dishonestly deprived Mr Millinder of, and neither can the final judgments of the superior courts that C relies on to substantiate with '**a high degree of assurance**' that C and Mr Millinder had won the case from the outset for D4 could not defend either the EW or the EEI quantified claims for the liquidated sums immediately due and payable following their fraudulent and or negligent forfeiture of the lease on 19 August 2015.
- b. D4 withheld the planning related material, proving that the delay was force majeure. Mr Staunton, counsel for D4, lied in fraudulent breach of his legal duty of full and frank disclosure on the ex-parte hearing of 9 January 2017, it is evident, by falsely representing that there was no operative clause of force majeure within the lease, because he knew it had effect. Similarly, is plainly evident, at 'Bundle-B', reading page 6, section 1.6 of the report, the real evidence recited from the 9 January 2017 official hearing transcript where it is attested that Mr Staunton lied also to conceal the crucial contractual terms of the conditional energy supply agreement, after he admitted no payment for energy supply was due because '**force majeure has effect**'. Mr Staunton fraudulently represented that the invoice for energy supply in the sum of £181,269.89 was, in his own words:

"There is the invoice for the rents. Page 67 is the invoice itself"

- c. I refer to page 7 of the 75-page Bundle B, and it is attested by the photographed screenshot that Mr Stanton was lying, as we have the invoice for energy supply in the sum of £181,269.89 at page 67 of D4's ex-parte hearing bundle.
- d. By 9 January 2017, D4 and their corrupt lawyers had fraudulently claimed to be creditors of EW on 20 December 2016, by making a false representation to their co-conspirator, Mr Hannon, D1, the Official Receiver as liquidator. Mr Hannon, acting 'in fraud upon the laws of bankruptcy' bypassed the automatically engaged rule on set off, undoubtedly knowing that contractually no money could possibly be due for energy supply. £466,308.89 of D4's fraudulent 20 December 2016 claim designed to defeat the pari passu distribution principle whilst evading the primary insolvency legislation, was for energy supply.

CONSCIOUS AND PREMEDITATED DISHONESTY BY 'JUDGES' LYING ABOUT THE SAME CRUCIAL CONTRACTUAL FACTS THAT D4 AND THEIR COHORTS WERE LYING ABOUT AND WITHHOLDING IN BREACH OF THEIR LEGAL DUTIES TO HAVE DISCLOSED:

- e. Contrary to the **knowingly false statements made by the shill, Mr Hodge, the agent for the Attorney General's Office** there is incontrovertible evidence of lies by senior judges who are lying to conceal the same crucial facts and evidence throughout the proceedings. The classic examples are at:

Bundle-B, page 11, where on 9 January 2017 in his fraudulent judgment, Arnold J as he then was known, lied at p.3 of this judgment to conceal the £541,308.89 false representation claim he discovered D4 to have made against EW, by doing exactly what Mr Staunton did, by lying and stating that the rent owed was £550,000 and that EW paid rent up until June 2015, when he had the unwarranted demand in the sum of £75,000 in rent and £181,269.89 before him, dated 25 June 2015.

Similarly, we have the evidence of Nugee J, as he then was, forging the terms of the EW to EEI absolute assignment and falsely representing his corrupted version of it in 3 places to make his version not absolute. See Bundle-B, page 15, reading section 2.6, the photographed evidence, through to page 16).

Then, at the end of it (so they thought) Vos C, who wilfully failed to address the crucial points of law on insolvency set off, lied at p.105 of his 8 February 2019 judgment, falsely representing this:

“On 25th June 2015, Middlesbrough invoiced Empowering Wind MFC for a quantified claim for rent in the sum of £256,269.89”

- f. The preconceived plan in conspiracy by these ‘Judges’ who deliberately do not judge and the Ds acting together, is revealed in the real evidence. Their plan was to lie from 9 January 2017 to say that the unwarranted demands for energy supply in the sum of £181,269.89, £466,308.89 and the on 20 February 2017, £4,031,664.80 was ‘rent’. It was the latter that Vos C concealed, after asking Mr Staunton to retract and replace his 12 November 2018 skeleton for the proceedings before him because at p.37, Mr Staunton said this (bold underlined for emphasis):

“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”

- g. The £25,000 proceeds of crime that was obviously set off so many times over by the EEI claim of the demand originated by the assignment which they lied about and withheld. It was for that reason, ICCJ Barber bypassed the law with them.
- h. It is proven beyond doubt that Arnold LJ, Nugee LJ and Vos M.R are criminals who have acted in conspiracy to pervert the course of public justice by lying and tampering with evidence. No mention of the £541,308.89 or £4,111,874.75 claims that the mandatory rule, set off, precluded D4 from proving.

- i. No mention of set off / 14.25 either anywhere in any of the fraudulent purported determinations, only lies by Vos, Arnold and Nugee all concealing the same, and then Easthope-Davis LJ joined in, layers of liars lying.
- j. Vos M.R is the one who rigged these proceedings and put Barber back into it to cover up their fraud from March 2018 where they bypassed / fraudulently deprived Mr Millinder of the mandatory engaged rule to defraud him of his assigned investment that extinguished D4's purported petition debt against EEI so many times over.

ICCJ Barber perverted and acted 'in fraud of the laws of bankruptcy' without jurisdiction defeating the Claimant (EEI) and the order by Nugee J of 21 March 2018:

- k. We refer to Bundle-B, reading our report titled '**ICCJ Barber a danger to the public**' at pages 40 – 54, and then the report on ICCJ Jones and how he bypassed the mandatory engaged rule on set off acting fraudulently whilst lying about the engaged rule, the duty of inquiry on the proofs of debt by D4 to prevent justice being served on them. All of that came from the Attorney General's Office, then Buckland KC MP, one of the masonic brethren who have been doing the same ever since colluding with corrupt individuals who purport to be judges, including Vos C, Arnold J, Nugee J, Fancourt J, Miles J and each and all of them involved in this conspiracy. The orders by Barber of 28 March 2018 and of Jones of 26 March 2018 are void for failure to comply with the mandatory statutory requirement and for the other reasons made out in those 2 reports, and must be declared so and set aside, ex-debito justitiae. There's not 'varying degrees of nullity'. D4 never had a claim to prove against EW or EEI.

The motive was to have perverted and defrauded:

- l. The motive in Nugee J falsely representing the assignment, is the same as the reason D4 withheld it ex-parte, and the reason Mr Bloom lied about it in criminal contempt of court at p.22.2 of his 8 January 2017 witness statement, because a position of 'issue estoppel' has effect as per Vos C, p.108 of this 8 February 2019 judgment, where he found this:

“(b) was sufficiently clear to amount to valid assignment under section 136 of the Law of Property Act 1925”

- m. D4 withheld the assignment on which the demand was based, whilst Mr Bloom, a solicitor of D4 lied at p.22.2 of his ex-parte 8 January 2017 witness statement, that was served on him 2-days prior by independent process server in person with the EEI statutory demand. Fundamentally, D4 could not defend the EEI claim for fraudulent forfeiture of the lease, because the completed terms of the deeds cannot be diminished, neither can the fact that they defeated the contractual purpose, so they fraudulently withheld all the evidence.

- n. The 'Judges' under D5 and D6 then lied and cheated to conceal the same crucial contractual facts under which the EW and EEI cross claims originate, and on which the D4 fraudulent claims were based.
- o. Mr Hodge and his cohorts at the GLD, acting for the Attorney General and his co-defendants have subordinated D4's perjury, only they told even more prolific lies to conceal the blatant fraud, criminal crossover offences and the affront to justice and severe judicial misconduct in this case that has ensued with acts that can have been nothing other than premeditated acts intended to, and which did, severely pervert the course of public justice in Mr Millinder and then C's case.

C. ILLEGAL TRESPASS ON MR MILLINDER'S PRIVILEGE OF ABSOLUTE WITNESS IMMUNITY IN RESPECT OF THE CRUCIAL EVIDENCE & CONTRACTUAL FACTS HE HAD FIRST GIVEN AS A WITNESS TO POLICE FROM 9 JANUARY 2017 AND THEN AS WITNESS IN COURT FOR EEI FROM 21 DECEMBER 2017 AND CONCEALMENT OF WITNESS EVIDENCE IN TANDEM BY FRAUDULENT FAILURE TO JUDGE:

- 13. We refer to the properly reasoned draft declaratory judgment at [Bundle-C](#), pages 2 – 17, requesting that the reader carefully digests the legal argument and case law alongside C's King's Bench Division skeleton supporting its application for that judgment at pages 18 – 36. There was no jurisdiction to have made any civil order against Mr Millinder, and the 15-month jail sentence for being defrauded, for civil contempt off the back of the automatically void restraint order is a serious perversion indeed.

CRIMINAL MATTERS & PRACTICE DIRECTION 2B PRECLUDING JURISDICTION OF A MASTER:

- 14. Mr Millinder's case originated due to D4 and their cohorts fraudulently failing to disclose information during ex-parte financial injunction proceedings before a High Court Judge, constating the offence of Section 3 Fraud Act 2006.
- 15. What was to be the first hearing on notice, was EEI's application to deal with the alleged fraudulent non-disclosure and the unwarranted demand, that transformed into 3 fraudulent claims (fraud by false representation), crossing over with the indictable offence of 1.56 Insolvency Rules 2016. Rule 14.25 Insolvency Rules 2016 precluded Ds from having any right to claim under the rules, and they never had a claim to prove anyway. Similarly, crossing over with D1 and D2's fraud are the summary only offences proven beyond doubt to have been committed by D1 and D2 in breach of their duties as liquidators. See: Bundle-B, page 19, reading the hyperlinked table of contents of C's skeleton argument in the King's Bench Division dated 21 April 2025. I recite:

“N. Expanding on Ground I – Criminality that has been concealed I5
NI. Cross over indictable offence of Rule 1.56 IR 2016 I5

<i>O. Cross over offences proven to have been committed by liquidators.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>O1. Offence of Section 109(2) Insolvency Act 1986 committed by DI</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>O2. Offence of Section 105(3) Insolvency Act 1986.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>O3. Offence of Section 106(4) Insolvency Act 1986.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>O4. Offence of Section 106(6) Insolvency Act 1986.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>O5. Offence of Section 192(2) Insolvency Act 1986</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>P. Offence of perverting the course of public justice.....</i>	<i>18</i>

16. The crucial evidence and facts proving those offences has been concealed throughout the course of public justice by liars like Mr Hodge and those at the GLD and the sect of corrupt judges they have conspired with to achieve their 'two-tier-justice' idealisms in preventing justice being served on Ds, making them 'above the law' That does not alleviate the fact that those offences are proven beyond doubt to have been committed, nor does it that the course of public justice has been severely perverted.

17. ICCJ Jones and Barber were Registrars in 2017 – 2018 when they made orders in Mr Millinder's case that the statutory provisions at Practice Direction 2B, Section 2, Rule 3.1(a) and 3.1(b) precluded them from making. They were sent in to do what they did by Vos C, who is responsible for '**allocation of cases to levels of judiciary**'. They were sent in to dishonestly deprive Mr Millinder of his statutory rights, and then Vos C who was orchestrating it, came in to cover up for them all with his February 2019 lies and concealment.

18. Vos M.R undoubtedly played a part in ensuring that ICCJ Prentis invented the stay off the back of his blatant lie, by lying and saying C had not provided an address for service when it was on the claim form, and had never changed. Similarly, acting knowingly conflicted in blatant violation of the principle of natural justice '**nemo iudex in causa sua**' Barber made an order on 2 October 2025 to 'kick the can down the road' when the statutory provision precluded the ICCJ's / Masters of the High Court from making any order in this case, period. Those orders are automatically void without jurisdiction and the proceedings founded off them void ab initio. That is the law.

'Going behind a judgment / no res judicata in insolvency proceedings where it be shown that there is no debt owed in truth and reality and gross human rights abuse by non-judicial and purportedly judicial acts:

19. We can confidently and obviously submit based on the ground we have covered herein, that Mr Millinder and the Claimant have persistently been denied any form of fair and proper trial contrary to Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 6.1 of the Human Rights Act 1998.

20. We refer to our authorities bundle at [no.14 of the schedule](#), the explanatory note consolidating at pages 2 – 5. We recite from Etherton J in **Dawodo**:
(bold underlined for emphasis):

*“My only qualification to the summary by Warner J. is that the cases establish that 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. It is clear that in those circumstances the Court can enquire into the judgment and the judgment debt, even though the debtor himself has previously applied to have the judgment set aside, and even though that application has been refused and that refusal has been affirmed by the Court of Appeal see *Re Fraser* [1892] 2QB 633.”*

21. In this case, it is absolutely evident that Lord Justice Easthope-Davis was equally part of the fraud and concealment, concealing the crucial facts and evidence contained in Mr Millinder’s appeal grounds and bundle, his 3 skeleton arguments and the evidence proving those Insolvency Act 1986 crossover offences by D1 and D2, and the Rule 1.56 Insolvency Rules 2016 offence by D4. Easthope-Davis LJ deliberately bypassed ground 6 of Mr Millinder’s 7 grounds of appeal in seeking to set aside the automatically void civil restraint order, just as the ‘Judges’ under D5 and D6, along with D1, D2 and D4, bypassed and evaded the mandatory rule to start with. There is not a single reference to ‘set off’ / ‘14.25’ anywhere in any of the ‘purported determinations’ in Mr Millinder or the Claimant’s case, from start to finish, and least of all, in the 11 November 2021 Court of Appeal, purported determination by Easthope-Davis LJ, and there has been no determination of the basic contractual facts on which the set off claims arise.
22. Mr Millinder and C were deprived of the duty of inquiry, no form of judicial inquiry has ever taken place in respect of the 3 points at issue advanced in C’s claim as absolutely clear from this skeleton. Mr Millinder was deprived of the statutory duty of inquiry by ICCJ Jones, who lied to try and convince him that Rule 14.11 Insolvency Rules 2016 was not engaged on all 3 of D4’s fraudulent proofs of debt that Rule 14.25 Insolvency Rules 2016 precluded them from claiming for.
23. Similarly, in Mr Hodge’s skeleton for the GLD, there are only 4 references to ‘14.25’ and 1 of ‘set off’ and all of which are within passages of text recited from either Mr Millinder or the Claimant. Mr Hodge and his cohorts evaded the argument.

24. Throughout, both the corrupt central government apparatus and the "Judges' that work for them, have concealed their own fraud and criminality deploying automatically void restraint orders to pervert. Reliance is placed on the false instruments.

CONCLUSIONS:

25. The duty of inquiry is engaged now, as it was then and the facts are the facts, as well-established in C's properly reasoned draft declaratory judgment. There is fraud, collusion and miscarriage of justice and in those circumstances there was no abuse of process either in Mr Millinder or the Claimant's case from which to have sought to exercise it, it's just that there was willingness to evade and conceal the crucial evidence and facts to prevent the truth from coming to light, a severe perversion throughout.
26. C's claim issued on 29 August 2025 is well-made out and there is 'a high degree of assurance' that C is entitled to the relief sought.
27. There was no jurisdiction for ICCJ Jones or ICCJ Barber to make the orders in 2017 and 2018 and all founded by the void acts without jurisdiction are void ab initio.

Joinder of Mr Millinder as the Second Claimant:

28. It appears to have been envisaged that Mr Millinder would be excluded from participating in these proceedings, when any decision made affects him.
29. Mr Hodge and the GLD defendants have made knowingly false statements, branding Mr Millinder a 'vexatious litigant', a statement that any lawyer with knowledge of fact and circumstance would immediately identify as being false.
30. The witness statement of Ms Haq and the skeleton of Mr Hodge contain serious allegations against Mr Millinder that are obviously false, and Mr Millinder has the right to counterclaim and to defend those allegations in these proceedings and to make representations in resolution of those issues which C asserts to be criminally contemptuous as an absolute starting point, with the intent being to conceal the crucial evidence and facts that have been concealed throughout.
31. In lieu of these circumstances, it is submitted that the Claimant's application for joinder and for both Mr Walsh and Mr Millinder to be heard remotely during the hearing on 11 February 2026 is that an order is made which is substantially the same or similar to the draft order sought by C contained at [Bundle-A](#) pages 507 – 513, for the detailed reasons given, and with the interim payment of damages also for the reasons given here and therein.
32. See also C's 5-page narrative '[VOID-OR-VOIDABLE](#)' to assist with applicable case law, as filed with this skeleton.

Martin Walsh - 9 February 2025