

Kalamata
Billington Lane
Derrington
Stafford
ST18 9LR

Email: mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com
21 July 2016

To:

Stuart Gulliver of HSBC

Copies To

The Board of HSBC
Robert Sherman of HSBC
Daniel Chumbley, lawyer for HSBC
Baron Thomas, Lord Chief Justice
Prime Minister Theresa May
Rt Hon Jeffrey Leroy
Lord Chancellor Liz Truss
Members of US Congress
Judge Valerie E Caproni
& Others

Regarding HSBC's collusion with Deutsche Bank to fund ISIS

Dear Sir,

As of late two scandals have entered public domain, the first was HSBC's money laundering for the Mexican Drugs Cartel, and the second was Deutsche Bank's lack of controls for money laundering to terrorists and Russians. Consider these paragraphs from the Financial Times:

Deutsche Bank has “serious” and “systemic” failings in its controls against money laundering, terrorist financing and sanctions, according to confidential findings by the UK’s financial watchdog, which had already put the lender in supervisory “special measures”

The future does not look entirely bright either: a probe by at least three authorities around the world is looking at \$10bn of suspicious trades in Deutsche’s Russian business.

The accusations were never contested by Deutsche Bank and it seems to have paid fines to BaFin for its laxity – so without a public contest we can safely assume Deutsche Bank to be guilty of the allegations against it.

Now in my lawsuit against Deutsche Bank B40BM021, *Taylor vs Anshu Jain et al*, for precious metal price rigging, for which your bank was a co-defendant, it was asserted in various materials delivered to the court that Deutsche Bank's conduct implied it had destroyed OTC receipts to cover up money laundering to the Russian Mafia. This inference was based on the following:

1. In another lawsuit from me in Germany Deutsche Bank had disputed the validity of an OTC receipt I had supplied the court, on the basis a signature was missing.
2. In the Particulars of Claim for B40BM021 I supplied all defendants with my DB current account number through which precious metal was bought and sold OTC at a

DB branch in 57 Zeil Frankfurt.

3. I gave permission for DB to share its copy of the receipts with all defendants to validate that I had bought 44kg of silver bullion bars and 150g of platinum.
4. DB did not refuse to share its receipts, but it did not do so either. Nor did it admit or deny that it had copies of those receipts.
5. None of the other 7 defendants in the lawsuit including HSBC asked DB to see a copy of its receipts.
6. All defendants accused me of 'lack of particularization' for not supplying the receipts
7. When DB were investigated by BaFin for gold price manipulation it quit its chair on the LBMA and announced it was ending OTC bullion trading.
8. Deutsche Bank were under investigation for money laundering to Russian clients.

In the Common *Elements to the Replies to the Defendants* I highlighted points 1-6 as reason to believe that Deutsche Bank had destroyed its receipts to cover up accountancy fraud – probably to cover up liabilities to OTC clients. This was never denied by DB, and no defendant explained why it needed particularization of receipts while refusing to take up my offer and retrieve them from DB direct. In the Court Hearing I linked point 8 to the inference and asserted that the accountancy fraud would help evade criminal liability for money laundering to the Russian Mafia. This also was not denied. Had Anshu Jain, the first defendant, or his witness Emma Slatter turned up for that hearing (the hearing for which he was applicant), he could have been cross-examined on the issue.

The issue of cross-examination was hampered by HSBC's application to have me declared vexatious and a Civic Restraining Order (CRO) issued against me on 23rd September 2014. This date is some 9 months before the 16 July 2015 hearing, and before the Particulars of Claim were served on the defendants. A copy of the CRO is attached.

In the hearing Simon Brown said that my demand to cross examine Jain, the applicant to the hearing was vexatious. In fact not only was deemed cross-examination vexatious, but Jain's written refusal failure to turn up for his own hearing was deemed without issue.

So what we see is HSBC's board having signed off a defence, which entailed issuing a CRO against me prior to a claim being served, which lobbied Judge Simon Brown QC to completely reverse Jain's responsibility to attend the hearing. That had the direct result of protecting Jain from explaining why his bank has neglected to issue receipts to the other defendants.

Now at the time of the lawsuit George Osborne was petitioning the US Department of Justice to grant HSBC immunity to prosecution for money laundering – and the same bank goes on to issue a restraining order that protects another bank from confessing to money laundering in the UK courts.

If you read the financial news you should know by now that Deutsche Bank have settled a precious metal rigging lawsuit *London Silver Fixing Ltd. Antitrust Litigation, 1:14-md-02573*. In that lawsuit Deutsche Bank agreed to blow the whistle on its co-defendants as part of its settlement.

HSBC are represented by Robert Sherman in that New York lawsuit, so we can that if Deutsche Bank implicated HSBC then we can figure that Deutsche Bank and HSBC are part of a precious metal rigging cartel, which is a primary allegation made in B40BM021.

So given that HSBC is cartel member, then we see why its defence was to trust Jain/Emma Slatter's submissions implicitly and exactly, and why it never demanded to see Deutsche Bank's copy of its receipts – it knew they were destroyed, as I had asserted, and it helped cover that fraud up. It also knew DB's internal audit had to be fake, which is why, as an ostensibly competitive business, it never showed the slightest interest in seeing that audit.

The CRO was thus an entirely dishonest and malicious perversion of process – a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice, and serious libel in its own right. HSBC was protecting Deutsche Bank's money laundering, because its own DoJ immunity would be contested if another bank in its cartel was held liable for the same class of felony. In the follow up hearing under Lord Haddon-Cave in October 2015, HSBC would not even submit a witness statement denying perjury when it became clear UBS had confessed to the matters alleged. HSBC can only have expected to be implicated in that confession.

It does not take too much imagination to see that if HSBC were liaising with George Osborne directly to undermine prosecutions against it, then it would be natural to ask Osborne to use his influence to sabotage the UK litigation. Stephen Green former HSBC executive and, Conservative MP, was a HSBC Swiss account holder, and so without question, the bank had the means to blackmail politicians and enough influence to corrupt courts.

HSBC's defence would have to be signed off by the board, and you, Stuart Gulliver, are chief of that board. The CRO against me would have to be with your permission, and that implicates you directly in a conspiracy to keep Deutsche Bank's money laundering and precious metal rigging a secret.

Since it appears to me you are an architect in a fraud that not only has beggared me, but has also libelled me to the effect of seriously diminishing my civil rights, I demand 40 kilogram of platinum bullion from you, and the same materials from your bank, according to the terms for damages specified in the Particulars of Claim to B40BM021.

I intend to re-open the appeal against B40BM021. I will, at that time, add you as a co-defendant, and should the other defendants become insolvent, I will demand you pay their share of the bullion owed to me.

Your position is indefensible. Explain to the Court why a CRO is appropriate when all the major points of the lawsuit against the bank have been verified in the settlement in New York.

Regards
Mark Anthony Taylor