Kalamata
Billington Lane
Derrington
Stafford
ST18 9LR
Email: mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com
28 September 2016

To:

Prime Minister Theresa May
Lord Chancellor Elizabeth Truss

Rt Hon Andrew Tyrie MP – Chairman of HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Steve Baker MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Mark Garnier MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Helen Goodman MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Stephen Hammon MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon George Kerevan MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon John Mann MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Chris Phillip MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Jacob Rees Mogg MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Rachel Reeves MP – HoC Treasury Committee
Rt Hon Wes Streeting MP – HoC Treasury Committee

Copies To:
Sir Bernard Hogan Howe

Rt Hon Jeremy Lefroy MP
Rt Hon Jeremy Wright MP
David Green, Chief of the SFO
Andrew Bailey, Chief of the FCA
Sir Edward Leigh MP
Lynne Owens, Chief of the NCA
And others

How the Judiciary covered up Deutsche Bank's gold manipulation, money laundering & conspiracy to pervert the course of justice.

Dear Sirs,

I wrote to you last week on the 21st September 2016, and provided evidence that the FCA and the SFO had neglected to update Parliament with evidence that Deutsche Bank manipulated the price of gold, and also referred you to Deutsche Bank's settlement for the allegations that also incriminated Scotiabank and HSBC. At the time of writing that letter I received a disturbing reply from the Lord Chancellor to an earlier inquiry in the matters. As Deutsche Bank seems to be teetering on the brink of the abyss, its civil liabilities having caught up with it, I was disposed to complete my first letter with celerity. What I write here-on, an ammendment to that letter, should shock you.

A little background for those unfamiliar with my lawsuit....

I have been suing Deutsche Bank, HSBC and others for precious metal price manipulation. Anshu Jain, former CEO of DB, was the first defendant in my British lawsuit, and issued a strike-out application against the action: and refused to attend his own hearing. I know from all legal precedents that when an applicant refuses to attend his own hearing he is expected to lose. He could also possibly expect legal sanctions for his conduct, in addition to losing the strike-out.

Judge Simon Brown in that hearing (now retired within three weeks of DB's money laundering became a matter for public record), deemed my demands to cross-examine Jain as vexatious and issued a restraining order *against me* preventing further litigation. He also deemed references to market regulator reports as equally vexatious. This is contrary to all civil precedents and rules of procedure in all jurisdictions since the beginning of time. As you can guess I issued an appeal and cited about 20 points of misconduct against him. If there is any doubt to his integrity consider that at the start of the hearing he claimed to have read everything, and in the verdict asserted that the key evidence of a fake audit was missing. I attached the evidence to my last letter to Parliament, and as you can see it is damning. It not only shows that Deutsche Bank were lying to Reuters about their audit, but it provides a paper trail for investigators to identify who at the bank was responsible for the fake press release.

As UBS's confession to the US DoJ emerged, which incriminated a cartel. I advanced a second hearing, which was meant to be under Judge McKenna of the Birmingham Mercantile Court, but ended up being heard by Charles Haddon-Cave at the last minute. With the confession I had grounds to allege perjury against all defendants. Nobody, not one of the eight defendants, turned up with a signed witness statement. UBS's counsel did not even know whether her client admitted or denied the allegations of perjury. I objected, demanding disclosure of the details of the confession to the Court of Appeal and disqualification of the defence. Haddon-Cave kept interrupting my opening paragraph, until I was forced to recuse him. If you had a recording of the hearing you would hear him bring up questions of jurisdiction that had been fully answered in the Application Notice to the hearing. Again his conduct, or lack there-of, yielded another application to appeal.

The matter was also sent to JCIO and JACO – the complaints offices for judicial misconduct. Against the first hearing Mrs Sarah Murrell of the JCIO refused to consider the transcript of hearing and closed the complaint on the basis of what she had 'imagined' was in the complaint. A second complaint was sent by the ombudsman to Nicholas Rose of the JCIO who spent three months writing a couple of paragraphs whitewashing the complaint. He too refused to study the transcript of the hearing. The former head of the JCIO had retired and my final complaint was issued to the new ombudsman Paul Kernaghan. As you can guess, he also refused to study the transcript of hearing. He was given a complaint that judges were guilty of egregious court orders, contrary to all precedent, procedure and common sense, that allowed a proven recidivist fraudster – Deutsche Bank – to manipulate markets and avoid having to give evidence that may have incriminated it for Anti-Money-Laundering law violations.

My appeals were rejected by Lord Burnett on the very day that the Court of Appeal received a demand from me of the transcript of hearing for Brown's hearing. I needed it it file into the appeal bundle so that the appeal judge could make a fair judgement. The timing caused me to think the Court of Appeal had deliberately procrastinated, and only acted when it knew further action - to acquire that transcript - would incriminate Haddon-Cave and Brown and expose Deutsche Bank's gold manipulation.

How the Lord Chief Justice and Paul Kernaghan of JACO are incriminated

I started corresponding with Baron Thomas, the Lord Chief Justice and informed him that the FCA had secretly found Deutsche Bank guilty of money laundering, which was alleged in my

lawsuit. The FCA had alleged that the money laundering could have been used to fund terrorists. I realized that if Deutsche Bank had destroyed Over-The-Counter bullion receipts, as I had alleged in *Common Elements to the Replies to the Defendants,* then it was entirely possible that ISIS sympathisers throughout Germany could have acquired bullion from the bank and shipped it off to Syria, Iraq and Libya. Gold bullion is known be used by ISIS to trade between oil and munitions. I had also informed Baron Thomas that it appeared to me that Lord Burnett had closed the appeal I filed without having a copy of the transcript of hearing, and the transcript was essential, because the *Grounds for Appeal* consisted almost exclusively of allegations of misconduct which are substantiated or contradicted in the transcript of hearing. I asked the Lord Chief Justice five times whether the transcript ever existed. These constitute Data Protection Act requests, because the transcript contains data personal to me. Even without such an Act, it was in the interests of justice for him to identify whether the Court of Appeal asserts it fair to dismiss appeals on the grounds of judicial misconduct without a transcript of hearing being present, and without judges having to admit or deny such documents exist. He stonewalled every request – clear violations of the Data Protection Act.

Paul Kernaghan was on the CC list for the correspondence sent to Baron Thomas. He would have seen that I demanded to know the status of the transcript five times. It was made plain to him – and he stonewalled the accusation. Kernaghan in one of his final letters to me said that he did not believe that Deutsche Bank would launder money. So you have the Ombudsman of JACO, who would have to know that HSBC were found guilty of laundering money to the Mexican drugs cartel, who has given the news links to the fines of BaFin and the FCA against DB for money laundering, assumed no wrongdoing With the *New Yorker* now disclosing DB's $10 billion of laundering between Russia and London there can be no doubt that Paul Kernaghan, JACO and JCIO are entirely compromised. The boss is bent, and his underlings followed corrupt orders.

Baron Thomas was also informed that Deutsche Bank had misled the Court of Appeal, since it had settled and incriminated its co-defendants in New York for the same allegations it had denied in Birmingham and the Court of Appeal. This normally results in an appeal being re-opened. Baron Thomas immediately stated he would no longer answer my correspondence. Paul Kernaghan followed suit.

The Lord Chancellor's Reply

I had written to Michael Grove, when he was Lord Chancellor of the misdeeds within the judiciary – but he stonewalled my letters and issued no reply. Following the Brexit vote and the appointment of Elizabeth Truss as the new Lord Chancellor, I wrote to petition her to fix things – what I received convinces me that the office of the Lord Chancellor is just as compromised as that of the Lord Chief Justice, that of JACO and the JCIO, and that of the FCA and the SFO.

You can see she has not replied directly herself, but has used a proxy. Through the proxy she suggests I consult the Citizen Advice Bureau. Does she really expect me to phone up the CAB and ask them what I should do about a Lord Chief Justice, Lord Chancellor and Ombudsman for JACO who refuse assert or deny the existence of a transcript of hearing that would have exposed a $10 billion fraud. If I want to know the law, I look it up on the Internet. I frequently do. That is how I studied the Enterprise Act 2002 and the Competition Act of 1998, and the EU TFEU 107.1 legislations, and the UK and German Civil Procedure Rules. I know what the law is, and I know that Baron Thomas has knowingly allowed Lord Burnett to issue illegal, corrupt, unjust and materially counter-factual court-orders. I know the purpose of their procrastination and why they refused to assert the existence of the transcript of hearing – to cover up Deutsche Bank's gold manipulation and money laundering.

I suggest the House of Commons Treasury Committee drag the Lord Chancellor in to answer the basic questions, along with Baron Thomas and Paul Kernaghan. They all conspired to cover up corruption of three judges.

I have also issued a complaint against Master Marie Bancroft Rimmer of the Court of Appeal to Paul Kernaghan, on the grounds she had lobbied for Nigel Farage to be prosecuted for his Brexit poster. The evidence was presented as an image from her Facebook page. I received no reply from him. Could the Lord Chancellor explain whether she thinks it fit for judges to lobby for the prosecution of politicians for campaigns with which they disagree? I attach a copy of the image sent to Paul Kernaghan for your perusal.

Yours sincerely
Mark Anthony Taylor