

Neutral citation number: [2026] EWHC 856 (Ch)

Case No: CR–2025-005970

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
BUSINESS AND PROPERTY COURTS OF ENGLAND AND WALES  
INSOLVENCY & COMPANIES LIST (ChD)

Court 17

The Rolls Building  
7 Rolls Buildings  
Fetter Lane  
London  
EC4A 1NL

Wednesday, 11<sup>th</sup> February 2026

Before:  
THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ADAM JOHNSON

B E T W E E N:

INTELLIGENCE UK INVESTIGATIONS LTD  
(formerly Deuda Limied)

and

ANTHONY HANNON & THE OFFICIAL RECEIVER OF LONDON & ORS

Mr MARTIN WALSH (director) appeared on behalf of the Claimant  
MR SAMUEL HODGE appeared on behalf of the First to Third and Fifth and Sixth Defendants  
The Fourth Defendant did not appear and was not represented

JUDGMENT  
(Approved)

*This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part, other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.*

MR JUSTICE ADAM JOHNSON:

1. This is a Part 8 Claim by Intelligence UK Investigations Limited. Its director is Mr Martin Walsh. He has attended the present hearing remotely from Hong Kong.
2. The Defendants include, amongst others, the Lord Chancellor and Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service.
3. The Claim Form is dated 29 August 2025. The immediate procedural context is that by Order dated 11 September 2025, ICC Judge Prentis stayed the proceedings, amongst other grounds on the basis that they were not suitable to be tried as a Part 8 Claim. Further directions were given by ICC Judge Barber on 2 October 2025, and hence the matter comes before the Court today.
4. There is a threshold question to address. This arises because of an Order made under section 42 of the Senior Courts Act 1981, dated 6 July 2021. The Order is directed to Mr Paul Millinder. It is an "*all proceedings*" Order made against Mr Millinder as a vexatious litigant, restraining him from issuing any proceedings, whether civil or criminal, in any Court or Tribunal. Importantly, the Order prevents Mr Millinder from instituting proceedings whether personally "*or through any other person on his behalf or acting under his direction*", without the leave of the Court. No leave was granted for the Part 8 Claim. The question which arises is whether, although brought in the name of Intelligence UK Investigations Ltd, it was nonetheless brought on behalf of Mr Millinder or at his direction. If it was, then it cannot continue and must be treated as a nullity: see Williamson v The Bishop of London & Ors [2023] 1 WLR 2472.
5. The wider background involves disputes which originally developed between Mr Millinder on the one hand and on the other, Middlesbrough Football and Athletic Company 1986 Limited. On Mr Millinder's side, two companies were also involved, namely Empowering Wind MFC Limited and Earth Energy Investments.
6. The dispute escalated quickly and the changing landscape involved Orders being made by a number of High Court Judges, including Arnold J and Nugee J during 2017 and 2018. The two companies, Empowering Wind MFC Limited and Earth Energy Investments, were wound up, the latter in March 2018. Since then, Mr Millinder has pursued a lengthy campaign designed to demonstrate what he sees as the injustice of these outcomes and to vindicate his position. This campaign has unfortunately involved indiscriminate allegations of wrongdoing including fraud against many people, including Judges. That was the background to the section 42 "*all proceedings*" Order I have referred to.
7. I come back to the main question. Can I conclude that the Part 8 Claim was instituted on Mr Millinder's behalf or by persons acting under his direction?
8. Representing Intelligence UK Investigations, Mr Walsh has said not. His submission, as I understand it, is that Intelligence UK Investigations has the benefit of a valid assignment of Mr Millinder's claims and is able to sue in its own right.
9. There are, however, strong factors pointing in the opposite direction. I mention the following.
10. To begin with, there is the structure and purpose of the Part 8 Claim itself. Lengthy details of claim are set out, including an annexure which runs to 18 pages. Many points touch on Mr Millinder's position or that of his former companies and seek to resurrect points which have already been resolved and to unwind the effect of litigation which has long been settled.
11. I will give just two examples. Paragraph 1.14 of the Claim Form reads:

*"C seeks a declaratory judgment disposing of this claim, finally ascertaining the level of compensation in damages payable by the Ds to be £20,344,829.77 in respect of the fraud against EW and Mr Millinder, its requisite majority creditor, being the sum that was to have set off D4's*

*fictitious proof of debt prior to D5 and D6 winding up 'in fraud of the bankrupt laws' on 19 September 2016."*

12. The reference to EW in this quotation is to Empowering Wind MFC Ltd, the first of Mr Millinder's companies which was wound up in 2016.
13. The second example then comes from paragraph 3.18 of the Claim Form which reads as follows:

*"C is seeking a final declaratory judgment that it was an abuse of process for D4, D5 and D6 to have wound up EEI one-week later to defeat the order by Nugee J listing EEI's application to set aside for a hearing, and in consequence of the serious abuse and human rights violations suffered by Mr Millinder and C, C applies for a declaration that the Ds are to pay aggravated damages compensation in the sum the Court thinks just, together on top of the sums it declares to be payable in damages, compensation in disposal of this claim."*
14. The reference to EEI is to Earth Energy Investments, the second of Mr Millinder's companies which was wound up in 2018.
15. It seems to me that the overall purpose of the Claim Form is entirely clear. It is an attempt by Mr Millinder to seek to vindicate what he perceives to be his position, notwithstanding the outcome of the former litigation which has resolved that position definitively. It is an entirely fair inference to say that the Claim is therefore brought for his benefit and thus on his behalf or at his direction.
16. That conclusion is reinforced by the wider context. I will mention six points.
17. First, the present Part 8 Claim in the Chancery Division was preceded by a similar claim in the King's Bench Division issued in January 2025 but then struck out Master Armstrong. The King's Bench Claim was accompanied by a draft judgment representing the findings and reasoning Intelligence UK Investigations wished the Court to adopt. This has been exhibited to Mr Walsh's evidence in this action. It is a similar attempt to vindicate Mr Millinder. I think I need refer only to paragraph 52 of the draft judgment which reads as follows:

*"Consequentially, I declare that the Section 42 order made against Mr Millinder on 6 July 2021, the committal order of 1 November 2022 for civil contempt of court, the Extended Civil Restraint order by His Honour Judge Pelling KC of 28 June 2018 and the General Civil Restraint Order of 11 November 2020 by Fancourt J are void acts in excess of judicial jurisdiction and are herewith declared to be void and are set aside."*
18. One sees here the same pattern exhibited in the present Claim. It reinforces the conclusion that the intended objective is the exoneration of Mr Millinder, the condemnation of others involved in the conduct of the litigation in which he was unsuccessful, and the unwinding of the Orders which have been made since then to seek to regulate Mr Millinder's conduct.
19. The second point concerns the general course of correspondence following the issue of the present Part 8 Claim. There has been voluminous correspondence in the period since September 2025. Much of it comes from Mr Millinder. This leads me in no doubt of Mr Millinder's continuing interest and involvement in the present action.
20. The third point is a related and more particular one. In one of his emails dated 29 November 2025, Mr Millinder said as follows:

*"I make no secret of the fact that Fancourt got one part right, **I am the mastermind behind this** and I had to do what I had to do to ensure this case was properly investigated and you lot were brought to justice for the indictable crimes you are proven beyond doubt to have committed. You are*

*immune from your acts in fraud acting non-judicially without non-jurisdiction. I however always have been since 9/01/2017 and you illegally trespassed on my privilege of absolute immunity from suit, you had no jurisdiction to have done it. You are the fraud, conspiracy and misleading Mr Vos, go and look in the mirror.”*

21. The reference in this email to “*Fancourt*” appears to be a reference to an Order dated 23 January 2025, by which Fancourt J dismissed earlier applications made by the Claimant on the footing that they were in fact made on behalf of or at the direction of Mr Millinder. The email, in my opinion, could not be clearer. It is a direct admission that Mr Millinder is the controlling mind and will behind the ongoing activity to seek redress for what he perceives to be the wrongs he has sustained.
22. The fourth point is to note that in an email to the Court last week, dated 5 February 2026, Mr Walsh sought permission, which I refused, for Mr Millinder to, “ ... *attend remotely to give evidence in relation to the crucial contractual facts and insolvency set off for at least an hour.*”
23. The fifth point is that in his skeleton argument for this hearing, Mr Walsh has suggested that Mr Millinder should in fact be joined as a Second Claimant to these Part 8 proceedings.
24. These further matters again reinforce the overall picture as to the intended purpose of the present Claim.
25. The sixth matter is that it became clear during the course of the hearing before me that Mr Millinder, although I had directed that he should not be permitted to attend the hearing remotely, was in fact present with Mr Walsh. He was described as Mr Walsh’s assistant. However, that seems to me a questionable description because once his presence had been identified, Mr Millinder, unprompted, made lengthy submissions of his own advocating for his own position, traversing some of the history of his historic dispute with Middlesbrough Football and Athletic Company 1986 Limited and explaining - as he has done previously in correspondence - that he has been the victim of a conspiracy or conspiracies. This intervention by Mr Millinder puts the matter beyond any doubt.
26. To conclude, it seems to me that the position is entirely clear. The available facts all point in the same direction. Mr Millinder’s interest in the intended claim, the desire to have him participate in its resolution and the desired outcome from the Claimant’s point of view - namely vindication of Mr Millinder’s position - all support the conclusion that the Claim is being brought for his benefit and therefore on his behalf or under his direction.
27. That being so, and no leave having been sought or given, the Claim can go no further and must be treated as a nullity and dismissed. In the circumstances and given its obvious deficiencies, I will mark it as totally without merit. The application made by the Claimant to set aside the stay ordered by ICC Judge Prentis likewise falls away in consequence.

**End of Judgment.**

Transcript of a recording by Acolad UK Ltd  
291-299 Borough High Street, London SE1 1JG  
Tel: 020 7269 0370  
legal@ubiquis.com

Acolad UK Ltd hereby certify that the above is an accurate and complete record of the proceedings or part thereof.

This transcript has been approved by the judge.