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

To:

Theresa May, Prime Minister
Rt Hon George Osborne
Judge Simon Brown QC
Paul Kernaghan of JACO
Members of the US Congress
& Others

Re: Deutsche Bank's Money Laundering
Alleged in B40BM021 of the Commercial Court Birmingham UK
In the Context Of
HSBC Money Laundering Revelations

Dear Sirs,

I remind/inform all recipients that I accused Deutsche Bank of hiding money laundering by destroying its Over The Counter - 'OTC' - bullion trading receipts in materials delivered to the Commercial Court in the hearing on 16 July 2015 sat by Simon Brown.

This deduction arose from Deutsche Bank's conduct and is summarized thus:

1. When BaFin announced an investigation into DB for gold price manipulation DB resigned its chair from the LBMA.
2. Deutsche Bank announced it would no longer offer OTC bullion trading.
3. When I bought civil action$_3$ (in Germany) against Jürgen Fitschen for gold price manipulation his defence team challenged one of the receipts issued to the court on the basis that it lacked a signature, but did not offer to provide its own copies, even though I had bought and sold the bullion as a DB current account holder via monies transferred from that account.
4. When I bought civil action in the UK against Anshu Jain, DB, HSBC, RBS, UBS, Barclays, JP Morgan and Citigroup, I provided defendants with my DB current account number so they could establish DB's copies of its OTC receipts: DB stonewalled, along with the other defendants who did not seem to mind that the quantities I claimed I had traded were correct or not. This caused me to think DB had destroyed the receipts as part of some accountancy fraud and I challenged the defendants on this matter as part of the replies to the defence.
5. News articles emerged just before the July hearing that accused Deutsche Bank of money laundering to the Russia – then under sanctions from the US government.

I brought up the issue of OTC receipts in the July hearing, specifically that they may have been destroyed to cover up bullion transfers to Russian clients of DB. The allegation was dismissed opaquely by Simon Brown.

Anshu Jain and his lawyer Emma Slatter refused to appear in court, even though Jain applied

for the hearing. Had they attended I would have cross-examined them on the issue.

Simon Brown showed not the slightest bit of interest that DB had refused to supply the courts or other defendants with receipts or contest the quantities of materials I alleged I had traded, even when he knew that DB had challenged the legitimacy of some of my receipts in another court case. He knew the receipts had been challenged because he began the hearing by saying that he had read all the materials submitted to the court, and the contest of those receipts in the German lawsuit were part of the materials filed by the defendants' counsel in the Birmingham Court.

In a lawsuit in which defendants explicitly issued a bare denial, normally outlawed by UK Civil Procedure Rules, refused to supply any evidence, refused to turn up for the hearings they applied for, one would expect the judge to have found summary judgement against them. Such a judge – a fair judge – would also be highly suspicious of defendants who would not admit or deny trading with the claimant. He should be doubly suspicious when the defendants are accused of money laundering by an independent government regulator.

Now we turn to the matters brought before the US Congress[1] in which George Osborne and the FCA are accused of undermining the prosecution of HSBC for money laundering to the Mexican drugs cartel.

It makes sense that if charges were brought against DB for the same class of fraud, then the German government could rightly ask why its bank was penalized while those of its British competitors go free. The most logical deduction is that George Osborne and the FSA not only undermined HSBC's prosecution but also ordered that any parallel actions against DB be neutralized.

As reported by the Financial Times, the FCA found DB guilty of money laundering to terrorists and to have destroyed records of such transactions. BaFin have recently fined DB for money laundering. The findings of both regulators were not disclosed to the press by the regulators themselves.

Given that DB has now settled for silver price manipulation in a New York lawsuit - the same allegations for the claim in the Birmingham High Court - then it is undeniable that Simon Brown's verdict – that the claim had no merit – is contrary to the facts.

The Court of Appeal were informed of DB's settlement in New York, the regulator findings against the banks for money laundering, which the Birmingham lawsuit had alleged prior to those findings, and DB's refusal to answer a *Notice to Admit Facts (appended on page 4)*, where it was given the opportunity to deny that it had perverted the verdicts of the Court of Appeal and the Commercial Court by denying its internal gold manipulation audit[4] was fake, an audit that we now know cannot have been substantial and virtuous. The Court stonewalls my demands to re-open the appeal – it provides no explanation whatsoever why I have a restraining order against me stopping me suing Deutsche Bank for silver price manipulation while the same bank confesses to such manipulation, and had denied guilt at every stage of its defence.

It should be obvious that office holders are guilty of misconduct, having given Deutsche Bank a license of commit fraud, and George Osborne played a key role in subverting the legal process at all levels. That the Lord Chief Justice stonewalls to reverse patently corrupt verdicts tells us that there is no reform and the fraud is ongoing and is orchestrated at the highest levels in the British courts.

In Simon Brown's hearing I asked the judge why the Director of Public Prosecutions had not prosecuted anyone for *Cartel Offence*, as outlawed by the Enterprise Act of 2002. Simon Brown did not give an answer, but he knew the answer – because George Osborne and the FSA subverted criminal procedures as much as civil procedures. The FSA were petitioning the DoJ to undermine its investigation against HSBC – it makes perfect sense that they would apply unlawful pressure to pervert the verdict of the Birmingham lawsuit.

I asserted in the Birmingham hearing that the regulators exist to mitigate liabilities to the banks, rather than expose them. The argument was supplied in the hearing without challenge from the judge or the defendants. Lacking a transcript for the hearing, I cannot repeat the exposition at this point in time. The conclusion has proven to be correct. In the July hearing Simon Brown said that it was the regulators' job to investigate market manipulation and not mine, and in the same hearing declared that all references to regulator reports, via *Notices to Admit Facts* issued to the defendants, constituted vexatious conduct and served in part as the justification for a restraining order against me. If that sounds asinine, it is because it was.

Now some may say that George Osborne and the FSA may have been justified for applying pressure to the DoJ, for had HSBC been prosecuted for money laundering, and prevented from trading in the USA, that this would have resulted in systematic banking collapse. But a compromise solution was always obvious – to prosecute the directors of the bank, and not the bank itself. That this route was not considered is probably explained by George Osborne's Etonian background – he comes from an elite class and he believes the elite should be above the Law. His snobbery is such that it compromises the duties of his office.

I had issued a complaint to the JCIO alleging political influence against Simon Brown. With these latest reports put to the US Congress we now know not just why he perverted the verdict, but with whom he conspired. We also know that if my assertion is correct, that DB destroyed its OTC bullion receipts to cover up money laundering to terrorists, then Anshu Jain and Emma Slatter knew about it and conspired to pervert investigations that could have averted terrorist atrocities that followed the serving of the claim in February of 2015.

I invite Theresa May to force the Lord Chief Justice to resign, along with all the judges in the court case who have shown not the slightest penitence.

Ask why we have a deflationary collapse? Because honest people cannot do business when there is no Rule of Law.

References:

1. http://financialservices.house.gov/uploadedfiles/07072016_oi_tbtj_sr.pdf
2. https://next.ft.com/content/3be2e2be-0e27-11e6-b41f-0beb7e589515
3. *Taylor gegen Fitschen* 32C 1953/14 (72)
4. http://uk.reuters.com/article/gold-fix-investigation-idUKL5N0OY4VA20140619

Yours sincerely
Mark Anthony Taylor

Notice To Admit Facts

In the Cout of Appeal no. A2/2015/2818
Claimant: Mark Anthony Taylor
Defendant: Deutsche Bank

I give notice that you are requested to admit the following facts or part of case in this claim:

1. Deutsche Bank are a defendant in US lawsuit London Silver Fixing Ltd Antritrust Litigation 14-MD-2573 under Judge Valerie E Caproni.
2. In that lawsuit Deutsche Bank were accused of manipulating the price of gold and silver.
3. Deutsche Bank have settled and paid money or promised to pay money to the claimants in that lawsuit..
4. Deutsche Bank have promised to expose its other collaborators in the cartel in that lawsuit.
5. If Deutsche Bank were manipulating the price of precious metals then its internal audit - as publicized by Reuters - had to be fake.
6. Anshu Jain and Emma Slatter and the board of Deutsche Bank have covered up a fake audit.
7. In the hearing under Simon Brown QC and in its defence documents Deutsche Bank pleaded that the audits were genuine.
8. No evidence that the audit was authentic was supplied to the court.
9. Deutsche Bank and Anshu Jain potentially misled Simon Brown QC, Lord Haddon-Cave and Lord Burnett and so falsely obtained a Civic Restraining Order against me and unjustly perverted the results of the two hearings and the application to get permission to appeal.
10. The cartel activity was a criminal conspiracy as outlawed by the Competition Act of 1998 and Enterprise Act of 2012.
11. Defendants and their counsel argued that the claim should be struck-out as a fanciful conspiracy theory when they were knowingly part of a conspiracy to commit fraud as stated in the allegations in the Particulars of Claim.
12. Deutsche Bank tried to get London Silver Fixing Ltd Antritrust Litigation 14-MD-2573 struck out on the basis it was a 'nuisance lawsuit'.
13. Settling one claim while having another struck out, while both make the same allegations constitutes duplicity and contempt of court.
14. Deutsche Bank traded precious metals with me through my current account with them and has a full set of receipts.
15. Defendants have tied up two years of life in litigation when they should have been honest and settled.
16. Counsel for the defence were in a position to know their own clients were committing frauds and perjury.
17. The other collaborators in the cartel include at least some of the co-defendants in A2/2015/2818.
    1. Defendant 3 is a collaborator in the cartel'
    2. Defendant 4 is a collaborator in the cartel'
    3. Defendant 5 is a collaborator in the cartel'
    4. Defendant 6 is a collaborator in the cartel'
    5. Defendant 7 is a collaborator in the cartel'
    6. Defendant 8 is a collaborator in the cartel'
18. The other collaborators in the cartel include all of the co-defendants in A2/2015/2818.
19. Deutsche Bank and Anshu Jain refused to issue witness statements to Judge Haddon-Cave's hearing to protect themselves from further accusations of perjury as the exposure of Deutsche Bank's cartel's manipulation of precious metal prices was inevitable.
20. The restraining order issued against me constitutes serious criminal libel, an abuse of process and is entirely absurd and unwarranted and should be revoked.

I confirm that any admission of facts or part of case will be used in this claim

Signed

Mark Anthony Taylor - 18 April 2016