Mark Anthony Taylor
Kalamata
Billington Lane
Derrington
Stafford
ST18 9LR
Email: mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com
Phone: 01785 248865
Date: 18 July 2016

In the Birmingham Mercantile Court
Case **B40BM021**
Taylor vs Jain Et Al

CLAIMANT
Mark Anthony Taylor

vs

DEFENDANTS
1. Anshu Jain, former CEO of Deutsche Bank
2. Deutsche Bank

Application for Summary Judgement Against First and Second Defendants With Possible Oral Hearing

On the Basis...
defendants' frauds exposed in New York & Chicago proved defendants misled and corrupted the courts in the UK including the High Court & the Court of Appeal.

Background

1. On July 16th 2015 on application from HSBC, and with the support of all the other defendants, a restraining order was won against me (CRO) preventing legal action that challenged defendants on the integrity of their trade in the precious metal markets. The Judge, Simon Brown QC, stated that my allegations were:
   a) totally without merit,
   b) that the lawsuit was a vexatious repetition and that
   c) my demands that the applicant to the oral hearing, Anshu Jain, attend his own hearing was also vexatious.
   d) He also stated in that hearing that market regulator reports against Jain from BaFin and the FCA were vexatious references.
2. The restraining order has now recently expired.
3. In April 2016, Deutsche Bank settled allegations of precious metal rigging in the New York District Court under Valerie E Caproni, **1:14-md-02573-VEC.** Since then Deutsche Bank disclosed materials, in particular, trader

logs, that showed systemic price suppression in the precious metal markets, incriminating UBS, HSBC, Barclays, Scotia Bank and Société Généralé. The combination of settlement and disclosure constitutes a confession, since the disclosures were self-incriminating.

4. The matter has been taken up by my constituency MP, the Rt Hon Jeremy Lefroy with some consultation from Sir William Cash MP, who is a qualified solicitor. These are rational men who won a number of elections. Mr Lefroy has a significant history in the stockbroker trade, and understands the techniques of short-suppression market manipulation for which Deutsche Bank have incriminated themselves.
5. Mr Lefroy sent a letter of commendation to the Birmingham Courts, not for me, but for the merits of my claim. It is regrettable that I have had to go this far – he is stating the bleeding obvious – that defendants lied to the courts and were given free reign to manipulate markets. If I had been given the opportunities to force disclosure, as we have seen in New York, then the UK courts would have identified the defendants' crimes in July 2015. We can say with certainly that investors worldwide were ripped off because the UK courts failed to apply due scrutiny to the conduct of banks with a history of fraud and a history of misleading regulators.
6. Citizens of the USA are able to sue European and UK banks in their jurisdiction, so UK citizens should enjoy the same liberty. If we are not allowed our basic rights of redress, the USA is free to drain dry the economies of the UK and Europe.
7. Deutsche Bank tried to have the New York lawsuit struck out as a 'nuisance action.' but were denied and then settled for over $90 million - so we can see they also had the intent of perverting the New York court's activities with a dishonest strike-out application, just as they tried in the UK. Only in the UK they succeeded.
8. Given Deutsche Bank's disclosures, Deutsche Bank's Emma Slatter (now an attorney for Visa), submitted a dishonest defence document and responded to *Notices to Admit Facts* with dishonest pleading and mischievous evasiveness. Her defence begged the court to discriminate against me on political grounds, and - most seriously - worded a bare denial, contrary to basic CPR rules of defence.
9. **Bare denials** are normally subject to sanction by courts worldwide, with summary judgement against defendants. Slatter was General Counsel for Deutsche Bank and represented both the bank and its former CEO Anshu Jain. Jain would have had to sign off the defence and would be

in a position to know such a defence was normally inadmissible.

10. Disclosures from Deutsche Bank showed Slatter had enough authority in Deutsche Bank to understand whether audits were fake or genuine. The insulting vocabulary of her defence demonstrates malice. Again Jain signed off on that malicious document. The document did not merely constitute legal evasion, but an attack on my integrity.
11. Judge Simon Brown QC let defendants get away with not having to file the most incriminating evidence against themselves, evidence that tied the directors of Deutsche Bank to their own ground staff in the market rigging fraud – evidence that to this day still provides a paper trail to establish prosecutions. That evidence was served to the court electronically by email on the 2nd of February 2015. As the represented party, it was the defendants' job to put together the evidence bundle. Brown waited till the verdict to reveal that the evidence was missing, and then used that as part of the justification for the restraining order against me. He had every opportunity at the start of the hearing, to get the evidence for himself. He said that he had read everything. Google still has electronically signed records showing the court were given a copy. He could have asked me to print the evidence out during the lunch break.
12. We know from the ICO, that no judge used a transcript of hearing when dismissing allegations of corruption against Simon Brown QC because a transcript of hearing was never commissioned. The judge can confirm this himself or herself by looking at the court records. Nobody was in a position to dismiss allegations of misconduct. The court orders that emerged in B40BM021 undermine the integrity of the courts and can be used to undermine any court case that refers to the orders.
13. An appeal against Simon Brown QC is currently active for another lawsuit and makes parallel allegations. (A3/2015/1222 Intercity Telecom Limited & anr v Solanki)
14. **We now know that the key evidence was entirely pertinent and its inferences correct** – since defendants had lied about their market rigging, and have been exposed for hundreds of counts of spoofing, from Chicago trader David Llew. Audits could not have been substantial and honest. Consider also that the attorneys for the claimant in New York used Deutsche Bank disclosures to prove it was rigging the markets with the help of UBS and HSBC, which is what an honest auditor should have detected and published. According to David Llew's confession, there must have been hundreds of instances of spoofed trades in Deutsche Bank's logs, each trade issued milliseconds before cancellation -

exactly what an auditor would look for when searching for spoofing attacks. This kind of spoofing has been alleged numerous times by silver manipulation analysts. There is no excuse for any competent and honest auditor to miss spoofing on a large scale. It can be algorithmically detected.

15. From the New York disclosures we know that defendants were applying an algorithm 'Taking out the Filth', which is explained in the FCA report against HSBC for Forex and Libor manipulation – the same report to which I had referred in the July hearing. The very reference Simon Brown had deemed 'vexatious.' The algorithm entails a collusion of dominant market participants agreeing to short sell a contract to reduce prices enough to force one manipulator's clients to sell according to their contractual obligations. Clients, of course, were expecting client confidentiality, and not have their own bank trade against them in a cartel.
16. Anshu Jain, who refused to attend the July 2015 hearing, would have been one of the two men with most knowledge in all of Deutsche Bank of the legitimacy of Deutsche Bank's audits. He was applicant of the oral hearing and when challenged to be cross-examined stated in writing that he refused to attend, and the fact he had have to have known audits were fake tells us he was instrumental with the restraining order against me and conspired to commit all of these frauds. He could not afford a court to scrutinize the audits.
17. My claim was entirely vindicated: I have correctly asserted defendants systematically suppressed prices of precious metals
    a) ...as a cartel.
    b) ...from the point I purchased metals to and from them and onwards.
    c) ...as a criminal conspiracy. (Emma Slatter denied the claim was sound on the basis it was a *conspiracy theory* – while she was in a position to know the bank and its executives were conspiring as alleged).
    d) ...with the effect of defrauding their own customers.
    e) ...and this implied its audits had to be fake.
    f) ...that gold and silver had to be rigged together. (Deutsche Bank settled for both gold and silver rigging independently).
    g) ...prices were forced down by naked shorting, breaching client confidentiality and the rapid cancelling of trades with the intent of changing the price without actually having to trade and lose contracts (spoofing).
    h) ...using the same techniques to rig Forex and Libor markets.
    i) ... stealing contracts by naked shorting yielding

supply restriction to counterparties in the UK which is outlawed by the Competition Act.

j) ...using a collusion of market participants outlawed by the Enterprise Act – see *Cartel Offence*.

k) ...with systematic spoofing and contract rigging that creates global suppression of prices, yielding liabilities against any counterparty forced to sell materials during the period of suppression (1999 to the current date).

18. All the points above show that not only did the claim have merit, but there was nothing that was not meritorious – and it was the contradictions to my claim that were totally without merit.

19. There is no honest reason defendants were allowed to get away with not having to:

a) ...admit or deny trading with me. (DB did not admit or deny providing me with a bank account).

b) ...admit to buying or selling bullion from me, in the quantities I had alleged...(DB did not provide so much as a bank statement)

c) ...admit or deny confessing to the US Department of Justice - or to have been incriminated as part of that confession.

d) ...have their counsel turn up for court with a witness statement.

20. The executive of the CME estimates the real price of gold to be $5-6000 per ounce, which is almost five times its current price. Since the price ratio of silver to gold may be as large as 70-1, and silver thought to be no more abundant than gold, in terms of availability of bullion, this suggests about a 350 fold correction in the price of silver. (Gold should be 5 fold higher and silver should be 70 times higher than it is now against gold). Whatever, the argument has been put in the Particulars of Claim and the defendants did not have a legal defence to contest it and no other party has the right to provide a defence on their behalf.

21. Since Deutsche Bank was represented by its CEO Jürgen Fitschen, in the German Courts (Frankfurt Landgericht under Judge Frau Lorenz), and refused to admit or deny its audits were fake, but not challenged by the judge, then the courts were demonstrably misled and were demonstrably lax. Far from being a vexatious repetition, B40BM021 has proven both claims were meritorious. I remind the court that the claim against Fitschen was for gold rigging, and the claim in Birmingham was for silver rigging. The claim in Germany was issued in the small claims court. The claim in the UK used the High Court, and provided more evidence than that in the German court. Had either court demanded the CEOs attend and provide an explanation for the

correspondence sent to me - which contradicted Deutsche Bank's claim it was auditing itself - then either court would have been able to identify the spoof trades – or that no substantial audit took place. I remind the court that Deutsche Bank were under investigation by BaFin for gold rigging at the time I challenged their audits. Nobody had reason to give them the benefit of the doubt – their CEOs never denied gold rigging to the press.

22. In the July hearing I accused Deutsche Bank of laundering bullion to the Russians, and this was dismissed by Brown. Lately DB, HSBC, RBS and Barclays are incriminated in a £65 billion money laundering operation between Russia and New York. Again it appears to be a cartel activity – and again the courts failed to provide due scrutiny that may have exposed the fraud in 2015 and so saved the Treasury of the order of £20 billion in lost tax revenue. Money laundering is used to evade taxes, evade levies and to evade capital flight controls. It was a simple matter to test whether Deutsche Bank had violated Anti-Money-Laundering Laws in the bullion market – force it to supply the court with receipts for the bullion I said I had traded with them. If they no longer have such receipts, that is an AML violation. The EU has famously warned that gold is used for money laundering. This is no trivial matter.

23. John Cryan, current CEO of Deutsche Bank, had enough materials to hand, to understand the gold rigging audits were insubstantial or fake, and that this lawsuit was suspended unlawfully.

The effect of the defendants' actions was not merely to defraud me of my investment, but to cause me to waste years of my life in poverty fighting to expose their frauds. It caused me serious metal health issues, I still get severe rage attacks. Rage attacks are worse than depression for health. I have over two years of sick notes from the doctor to prove the damage done to my mental health. The CRO also functioned as a serious restraint on my civil rights – limiting my free expression and opportunities for employment and investment. I could not afford to go contracting with anyone, given that I needed permission from Simon Brown to enforce litigation that may emerge in such a contract. If you have no legal protection you do business at a great risk.

Contempt of Court, Perjury Et al.

I remind the judge that defendants colluded to mislead the courts, so conspired to commit ongoing frauds, and to get away with their frauds, and thus perverted court verdicts. Rigging an audit is conspiracy to commit the fraud that the audit is meant to scrutinize. When we say 'a bank is guilty of fraud' – this is understood to be shorthand for 'a bank's board members conspired to commit fraud.' Deutsche Bank has been identified as recidivist

fraudsters by the SEC's Cara Stein - for its 'Decade of lying, cheating and stealing...' It has been identified by the Italian authorities as running 'an International Crime Organization.'

Defendants all have a history of misleading the courts, non-attendance of hearings and refusal to file witness statements – I thus ask that they be denied permission to appeal and be denied permission to provide a defence against this application. **I ask that their defence documents so far submitted for my case be struck out as immaterial, discriminatory, prejudicial, dishonest, spiteful and scurrilous and any court orders dependent on them rendered invalid in total. They are in no position to challenge the facts, nor are they in a position to challenge the legalities.**

I originally made a claim for 40kg of platinum bullion. At this point of time I would still like the courts to enforce that as repayment, along with its delivery protection mechanisms to protect me from the possibility of lengthy settlement in which my favoured form of investment, precious metal, is revalued significantly before settlement is finished.

I would like Summary Judgement finding defendants had misled the courts, corruptly lobbied for a restraining order, conspired to commit fraud, and who had deprived me from damages for two years. Nobody is in a legal position to contest the level of damages demanded.

My means are limited, and I do not have the court fees at this time to bring other defendants to court – though I could be in a position to claim legal fee reimbursement should things get bad. I would like to reserve the right to sue Deutsche Bank, Anshu Jain and the other defendants for other damages associated with this claim at a later date.

I believe the onus should be on the defendants to appeal and that permission should be refused. I do not see why the High Courts should avoid jurisdiction, as it is the Hight Court's role to consider new evidence. In any case, defendants clearly lied to the High Court to hide serious frauds, and this needs legal redress.

I believe everything in this application is true. Given so much of this data is public domain, verifiable with any web browser in minutes, it should not require a huge evidence bundle.

I apologize to the judge for my lack of legal knowledge and procedure. I am sure there are things that I have not got right, being in want of legal aid and such. I would ask clemency in these matters if that is so, and to make compromises to effect the least administrative burden. I am sure anything that is missing can be

supplied. My phone number and email address are on the top right of this court order should an amendment be necessary.

If delivered electronically the email credentials should serve as an electronic signature. This document shall be delivered to the courts in paper format with a cheque for the court fee.

Signed
Mark Anthony Taylor
17 June 2017