

**ANOMALIES OF PROCEDURE AND PRINCIPLE IN CASE 3SA90091  
CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**

**1. INTRODUCTION - BRIEF SUMMARY OF EVENTS PRIOR TO LEGAL ACTION (SEE APPENDIX A)**

**SOME OF THE MAIN POINTS OF MISREPRESENTATION IN THIS CASE ARE**

1. Failing to act on a recognised course of conduct of covert stalking and harassment of persons being bereaved, but making the targets of it seek relief by means of defamation claims only, without even allowing them to take the evidence to the police. (Appendix B)
2. Failure to adhere to the mental health act, and procedure regarding mental health diagnosis. Judging as the “honest belief” of a defendant, the use of a doctor’s credentials to add more weight to a very serious mental health smear used to get the claimants ostracised. (Appendices D2 and D5);
3. Allowing and relying on obviously tampered evidence. (Appendix D1)
4. Allowing the Defendants to breach a Court Order to disclose further substantive evidence, with no penalty or negative consequence. (Appendix C1)
5. Stating that a lie admitted in a confidential document was the same as going on the stand and denying having said such a lie. (Appendix H1)
6. Allowing the home of a person supposedly “honestly” believed to be dangerously mentally ill, to be taken as costs. (Appendix D5)
7. Failing to uphold Human Rights (Appendices D5, D9, D10, F8)

**SOME OF THE MAIN ANOMALIES OF PROCEDURE AND PRINCIPLE IN THIS ONGOING CASE**

**2. PRE-TRIAL REVIEW (APPENDIX B)**

The learned Judge ignored his duty to notice and act on an observed and potentially criminal course of conduct (including threats to life and liberty). (Appendix B1)

He did not examine the effects of the harassment upon the Claimants before making his decision. (Appendix B2)

Despite the fact he could see clear examples of harassment, he refused to add the claims back in, leading to foreseeable injustice. (Appendix B3)

**3. TRIAL (3SA90091) (APPENDIX C)**

Not enforcing his own order made at the PTR to disclose further evidence of even more harassing communications. (Appendix C1)

Having excluded the observed course of conduct in harassment, and not examining its effects whatsoever, particularly on persons being bereaved, he nevertheless agree with opposing Barrister Jonathan Price that the communications about us were “limited”, in face of evidence of threats to life and liberty. (Appendix C2)

Allowing Defendants to perjure themselves both in their witness statements and on the stand, without objection. (Appendix C3)

Having promised to look at the harassment evidence in the background to defamation, HHJ Seys Llewellyn then went back on that promise at trial. (Appendix C4)

Leading the witness (Appendix C5)

#### **4. JUDGEMENT (3SA90091) APPENDIX D**

Evidence Tampering: The judge allowed Barrister Jonathan Price to tamper with evidence and alter chronology, and even though his lies were exposed at trial. The Judge then adopted these lies in his judgement. (Appendix D1)

Misrepresenting Facts and Evidence - HHJ Seys Llewellyn ignored facts which had been proved in court, changed the actual basis of the claim, and restated falsities, which had been proved to be so in court, in his judgement. (Appendix D2)

Changing the dictionary definition of words to exonerate the defendants. (Appendix D3)

Ignoring copious evidence of stalking and harassment - HHJ Seys Llewellyn stated there is no evidence of stalking by either defendants in face of evidence from disclosure shows the exact opposite. (Appendix D4)

Allowing mental health smears and disability abuse as “honest belief” (Appendix D5)

Dismissing clear threats to life and liberty (Appendix D6)

Ignoring the course of conduct to turn the whole trial over and allow the Defendants to “benefit from their own wrong” (Appendix D7)

Allowing a court order to be breached (Appendix D8)

Failing to uphold the family’s rights to privacy and integrity. (Appendix D9)

Failing to uphold freedom of speech according to Article 10 of the Human Rights Act. (Appendix D10)  
Chilling Freedom of Speech. (Appendix D11).

Failing in his duty to take account of scientific research into the extreme damaging effects of ostracisation, in spite of the bereavement of the family, and in fact using those effects to chastise the Claimants, especially Angel (as in para 106 of judgement). (Appendix D12)

Failing to take account of the difference in status of the parties. (Appendix D13)

#### **5. APPEAL APPLICATION (A2/2015/2839) APPENDIX E**

Dismissing a valid appeal on paper - citing the judge’s advantage in being present, while ignoring all the misrepresentations and offences that had been clearly pointed out in the permission to appeal documents.

#### **6. PERMISSION TO APPEAL HEARING (A2/2015/2839) APPENDIX F**

Disallowing the applicants to get legal representation. (Appendix F1)

Intimidating the respondents, making one of them who was having difficulty breathing speak and forcing the other one to be silent. (Appendix F2)

Misrepresenting the grounds of appeal. (Appendix F3)

Citing again the original judge’s supposed advantage in seeing the witnesses’ demeanour, in according the defendant’s honest belief. (Appendix F4)

Misusing several words, including “dispute” and “exchanges”, to describe relations between the parties. (Appendix F5)

Saying it was a 'submission' only that spreading lies about a false diagnosis is a harassing course of conduct. (Appendix F6)

Contradicting all these findings again by restating the original Judge's finding that we had not lied. (Appendix F7)

Allowing opposing counsel to dismiss established precedent to deny the appeal and consequent discrimination. (Appendix F8)

#### **7. ORDER FOR SALE ON OUR HOME (C00SA374) APPENDIX G**

This order included a statement contradictory to those made at trial. (Appendix G1)

In the build up to this case, solicitor Robert Dougans kept stating falsehoods (Appendix G2)

#### **8. PERMISSION TO REOPEN APPEAL ON FRESH EVIDENCE (A2/2015/2839/A) APPENDIX H**

Misrepresenting Facts and Evidence - saying admitting to having lied in private was the same as saying in court that you haven't lied. (Appendix H1)

Request for Recusal - (Appendix H2)

#### **9. CURRENT APPLICATIONS - APPENDIX I**

Two further appeals have been applied for on fresh evidence, and which the court has at last recognised as being interrelated (case numbers A2/2015/2839B and A2/2017/1648)