

Kalamata  
Billington Lane  
Derrington  
Stafford  
ST18 9LR

Date: 08 September 2015

Email: [mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com](mailto:mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com)

To:

The Ombudsman of the *Judicial Conduct Investigations Office*

Dear Sir John Brigstocke KCB,

I recently filed a complaint against Judge Simon Brown QC of Birmingham Commercial Court in court case B40BM021. The complaint was handled by Mrs S Murrell in a way that appears to me to be negligent and I believe she has arrived at an incorrect decision.

The allegations against Judge Brown are extremely serious: that he perverted a market manipulation lawsuit with the effect of protecting the Libor rigging cartel from having to testify and expose their liability in a court of law. This could only be achieved with human rights violations. He also protected the defendants from having to expose ongoing market manipulation both in FX rates and precious metals contract prices. Thus the allegations, if true, would mean he conspired to commit fraud, as well as having conspired to pervert the course of justice in the exposure of that fraud.

I understand that many of the allegations against him are the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal, but in order to destroy my claim he had to violate numerous points of his judicial oath and those of the Equal Treatment Bench-book.

On the 8<sup>th</sup> August 2015 I emailed Mrs S Murrell to address some of the issues she raised. Her response indicated that she did not read the greater body of the email, and her final response on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2015 indicated she had not read them by the time she wrote her conclusion. In fact if you look at point 4 detailed in her conclusion, she left it open without comment. The seriousness of point 4 was particularized in the 8<sup>th</sup> August email, and those points completely ignored by Mrs S Murrell.

Is it the case that violations of the judicial oath and contempt for the Equal Treatment Bench-book are outside the jurisdiction of the JCIO? If not, then the points I particularized need to be addressed before the complaint can be dismissed.

I also accused Judge Brown of acting as an advocate for the defence. To justify this claim I explained that throughout the hearing he never once criticized the defendants for their reticence, their evasiveness, their dishonesty or their recidivism. All the criticisms in that hearing were made against me, and nothing bad was said of the defendants in spite of their proven history of market manipulation. Mrs S Murrell claimed I did not particularize my accusations of his bias, but this is not so, every one of Judge Brown's utterances in that hearing were a particularization of his act of bias, because in every one there was no criticism of the defence. The judge in that regard acted as inquisitor on behalf of the defendants which is the exact opposite of the role he should have fulfilled as specified in 48c Equal Treatment Bench Book on Litigants in Person: *Adopt to the extent necessary an inquisitorial role to enable the litigant in person fully to present their case (but not in such a way as to appear to give the litigant in person an undue advantage)*

I believe that Mrs S Murrell in ignoring these points has acted negligently. She also had over 20 days to respond to my answers to instruct me that they would not be taken to identify misconduct, and so by allowing me to believe I had stated my case in a satisfactory way, misled me to believe she was acting on my allegations. I do not believe she made an effort to study the transcript of the court case, and I can only think she sat and did nothing from 11 August 2015 to the date of the conclusion on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September. She appears to me to be taking salary for a job in which she applies the minimal effort, effecting negligence to the point of *misconduct in office*.

I would be grateful to receive a proper explanation of why serious charges of conspiracy to commit fraud in the class of the most serious frauds of all time (market manipulation of IBOR and FX rates) against a High Court judge is so lightly dismissed.

On successive pages of this document are the copies of the emails sent to and from the JCIO. Please find the original attachments in the emails below in the attachments to the email in which this pdf file was delivered. I believe a full transcript of the court hearing is being compiled by the Court of Appeal. It seems premature to me that the JCIO should have arrived at a decision before the recordings are transcribed and studied by JCIO personnel.

\*\*\*\*\*

Consider the first paragraph from the email on page 5: *"I can inform you that I am not concerned with these documents as I imagine that they detail your technical argument / reasons concerning the rulings of HHJ Brown..."*

Why is Mrs S Murrell using her imagination here? This is lazy and negligent and shows contempt of my time and my situation. There is no scope for her to use imagination to refuse to consider allegations.

\*\*\*\*\*

Consider the second paragraph from the email on page 7: *"I shall consider the information you have provided to support your complaint and I will write to you again in due course, with the next stage of the investigative process, if appropriate."*

The next stage of the investigation was to dismiss the complaint. If the information I provided needed further particularization, then why did she not address it in the weeks that passed? There was never any indication after this email that my allegations lacked particularization.

\*\*\*\*\*

I am thus far not impressed by the JCIO. Its role is to maintain the integrity of the legal system, not the reputation of judges. The distinction should be respected.

Yours sincerely,  
Mark Anthony Taylor

**Email to me sent on 6<sup>th</sup> August 2015**

Delivered-To: mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com  
Received: by 10.79.106.66 with SMTP id f63csp751206ivc;  
Thu, 6 Aug 2015 01:47:32 -0700 (PDT)

**Dear Mr Taylor**

**Please find enclosed for your attention**

**Yours sincerely**

**Mrs S Murrell  
JCIO**

Attached was "Taylor 22093 - Fl - agreed.doc"

**Email sent by me on 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015**

Received: by 10.79.19.194 with HTTP; Sun, 9 Aug 2015 16:35:53 -0700 (PDT)  
From: "TheAbstraction ." <mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com>  
To: "Murrell, Sarah" <sarah.murrell@jcio.gsi.gov.uk>

**Hi, please find attached the reply, in jcio.pdf. There are also a full set of appeal documents attached which may come in useful.**

**Kind regards  
Mark**

Attached was "jcio.pdf"

Email sent by Mrs S Murrell to me on 10<sup>th</sup> August

Delivered-To: mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com  
From: "Murrell, Sarah" <sarah.murrell@jcio.gsi.gov.uk>  
To: "'TheAbstraction .'" <mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, 10 Aug 2015 10:53:45 +0100

Dear Mr Taylor

Thank you for your email of 10th August 2015. I have been able to access your letter of 8th August 2015 addressed to myself however I am unable to open the documents relating to your appeal. I can inform you that I am not concerned with these documents as I imagine that they detail your technical argument / reasons concerning the rulings of HHJ Brown, which will have no bearing on your complaint with this Office about his personal misconduct.

I have read your letter of 8th August, although I admit that I have not done so in great detail just yet. However I have observed that you have touched on point three of your complaint. In my letter of 6th August 2015, I asked you for more information that the Judge had favoured the Defendant because of his political leanings but you say that to understand this part of your complaint I should review the entire transcript of the court recording or listen to the recording itself as the hearing was entirely one sided. Please note that it would not be appropriate for this Office to listen to the whole of the hearing and that it would not be for this Office to identify the behaviour complained of. It would be for you to demonstrate that he because of his political opinions, the Judge was compelled to behave in a certain way during the hearing, in addition, it would be for you to indicate at precisely which parts of the hearing this happened.

May I request this information by the date I previously provided, ie by 27th August 2015. Once I have received further information from you, I will consider your letter of 8th August 2015 in more detail and I will then write to you with my findings about your complaint in accordance with the judicial conduct rules.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

with regards

Sarah Murrell - Caseworker

E inbox@jcio.gsi.gov.uk<mailto:inbox@jcio.gsi.gov.uk>  
T 020 7073 4736  
F 020 7073 4725

Judicial Conduct Investigations Office I 81 - 82 Queens Building I Royal Courts of Justice I 20Strand I London WC2A 2LL

DX 44450

STRAND

<http://judicialconduct.judiciary.gov.uk/>

Email sent by me to Mrs S Murrell on 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015

Received: by 10.79.19.194 with HTTP; Mon, 10 Aug 2015 14:26:47 -0700 (PDT)  
From: "TheAbstraction ." <mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com>  
To: "Murrell, Sarah" <sarah.murrell@jcio.gsi.gov.uk>

Dear Mrs Sarah Murell,

Thank you for the email. Please find attached pdf versions for the appeal files with which you had problems. Please note that the basis of the appeal is mainly that of allegations of judicial misconduct - so the appeal document do express issues that anyone, even those without legal training, can understand, and any lay person can understand that the degree of misconduct undermined the validity of the hearing and its verdict.

The appeal documents argue that the judge violated my human rights to a fair trial on a number of points. Each violation of my rights is an act of misconduct. It does not matter that the they may form an honest basis of opinion, or that he has immunity for his judgements, they are still human rights violations, and they undermine the validity of the verdict. Human rights are called rights because they are fundamental in Law.

It is therefore an act of misconduct for a judge to deny a respondent to a hearing the right to cross-examine the applicant to the hearing. It is misconduct because it denies me my right to a fair trial - fairness means being able to interrogate those that bring a hearing against oneself. It is not just a case of an incorrect decision or an unlawful decision, but a violation of the judicial oath. It is wrongdoing.

The allegation I made, that the judge did a political favour, was explained in my previous email. I refer you to the explanation therein.

The accusation of bias was substantiated on a number of points in particular, as stated in my previous email. The bias was also manifest in general, that the judge never did his duty and allowed the defendants to escape any criticism for their reticence, evasiveness, dishonesty and recidivism. That is in itself misconduct. When judges only serve one side, they function as advocates. You can take my word for it, but the only way to test the assertion is to go through the court record/transcript and try to find a counter-example.

The allegations against the judge are very serious, and they warrant allocation of resources necessary to test the allegations.

yours sincerely,

Mark Anthony Taylor

**Email from Mrs S Murrell to me on 11 Aug 2015**

Received: by 10.79.67.5 with SMTP id q5csp2218900iva;  
Tue, 11 Aug 2015 01:07:15 -0700 (PDT)

From: "Murrell, Sarah" <sarah.murrell@jcio.gsi.gov.uk>  
To: "'TheAbstraction .'" <mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com>

Dear Mr Taylor

I write to confirm safe receipt of your email and your attachments, which I have printed and placed on your file.

I shall consider the information you have provided to support your complaint and I will write to you again in due course, with the next stage of the investigative process, if appropriate.

Please note that you will hear further from me with an update no later than four weeks of the date of this email. If you have any concerns meanwhile, please do not hesitate to contact me.

with regards

Sarah Murrell - Caseworker

E inbox@jcio.gsi.gov.uk<mailto:inbox@jcio.gsi.gov.uk>  
T 020 7073 4736  
F 020 7073 4725

Judicial Conduct Investigations Office | 81 - 82 Queens Building | Royal  
Courts of Justice | Strand | London WC2A 2LL

DX 44450  
STRAND  
<http://judicialconduct.judiciary.gov.uk/>