

9 Lon Bryngwyn, Sketty, Swansea, SA2 0TX

Ref A2/2015/2839

Friday, 23rd December 2016

Dear Mr Hebden

With reference to your letter of the 19th of December.

Where a judge has lied in a permission to Appeal hearing, and it has been proved that they have done so, it cannot possibly be in line with the overriding objective CPR 1.1(2)(e) for any application, including one to re-open appeal on fresh evidence, to be considered first, or solely, by that same judge. To state that it is in line with any notion of justice is disingenuous.

That is a nonsense that can only result in injustice, and create further legal action as a result, in direct opposition to the overriding objective itself. This is illustrated by your caveat that the Civil Appeals Office is unable to provide advice regarding legal options open to litigants.

To insist that a proven biased judge is the only one who gets to look at fresh evidence in a case of this magnitude, where the costs are so enormous, is to guarantee further bias and to create injustice.

That is exactly what is happening here.

The Judge is simply using his authority to breach our Human Rights and bully us into silence by making ridiculous statements, such as that a private admission of lying is exactly the same as a claim in court of not lying.

This is a simple matter of logic, the only question being whether or not the Judge actually did lie. The proof of that has been provided to the Court several times now and the court is deliberately ignoring it, putting yourselves in breach of our Human Rights Articles 2, 6, 10, 11, 14, and 17.

Whilst we recognise and understand CPR 52.30 (7), and its long traditions, we submit that the rule that one Judge gets to look at fresh evidence and if they dismiss it there is no appeal, is only just if that Judge has not first lied, then refused to recuse himself by misrepresenting the request, *and then* misrepresenting the actual fresh evidence as well.

The matters in this case have their roots in matters of child abuse and bullying, cults, stalking and harassment, and the achievement of a landmark Human Rights settlement. It is not in the public interest for whistleblowing families to have their homes robbed by willing abuse of the justice system.

Given the blatant and instantly provable level of misrepresentation by this Judge, we can certainly understand the Court of Appeal's urgency in declaring the matter "closed" and attempting to bury it. However, corruption cannot be "closed" by blank denial. Corruption can only be closed by being addressed, and this matter will only be properly closed when that occurs.

Yours faithfully,

Stéphane Paris & Angel Garden