Kalamata
Billington Lane
Derrington
Stafford
ST18 9LR
Email: mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com
21 March 2015

An open letter to the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales,
and the Ombudsman of the JCIO
regarding
fraudulent misappropriation of treasury funds in the Court of Appeal by Lord Burnett **and co.**

Dear Lord Thomas,

I wish to thank you for your response dated 14 March 2015. I understand entirely that your office is bound by the Law in the matters of reviewing court orders, and were it not, would result in an unmanageable burden of work from aggrieved litigants. However, the matters alleged involve not just a review of court hearings and court orders, but of financial impropriety within the Court of Appeal to the effect of enriching private parties with public funds. In short, fees have been extracted from the treasury for the production of documents that were then immediately shredded, concealed or otherwise destroyed - there never being any intent to use such documents. I will name the individuals involved, but I cannot determine the proportion of guilt of each party. That task belongs to your office. The matters of misappropriation are interwoven with the matters of bribery, I will use the term *bribery* in this document, and elsewhere, not just to mean the direct sense of being handed brown envelopes stuffed with cash, but in the wider sense, of receiving advantage in return for shirking the duties of one's office. An individual who accepts an illegal order to maintain their job/position is effectively bribed with their own salary. The correct response to such an order is to blow the whistle to a higher authority, and that failing, to blow the whistle to the general public.

In the Grounds for Appeal against Simon Brown's hearing, I explicitly stated that the transcript of the recording would provide the evidence for inferring that he had taken bribes from the defendants. I will go on to say that the response (or lack-thereof) of the Court of Appeal in the last few weeks is sufficient to infer such corruption again. It was thus always paramount for the fair treatment of my appeal case to assess the points of the Grounds for Appeal by reference to the corresponding passages in the transcript. I enclose in the email version of this letter an attachment sent to me from the Court of Appeal confirming that the transcript would be made at public expense and that a copy would be delivered to me.

Consider that a copy of the previous letter I posted to your office was emailed to the Court of Appeal as a secondary means of delivery to your office. Court of Appeal staff would have seen that letter before your office and the allegations I make would be intercepted before hitting your office by the very subjects of those allegations. Let us look at the timing and the responses to that email from the court staff, and from those we can deduce fraudulent misappropriation of treasury funding.

The email would have arrived at the Royal Courts of Justice at about 12.30pm on the 7 March 2015. I believe that I am not misinterpreting Google's time zone from their timestamp. The timestamps may be verified by all the recipients of that email, and if disputed, can also be verified by analysis of the intermediate servers through which the email has traversed. *On the very afternoon* that the email was delivered Lord Burnett issued court orders denying me permission to appeal the two hearings that I had contested in the Court of Appeal. Now in the previous letter/email I had demanded that the court furnish me with the transcript to the first hearing, as the grounds for

appeal consisted of some twenty allegations of misconduct perpetrated by Judge Simon Brown QC. Since, by your office's own edicts, the JCIO has no authority to question Simon Brown's case management, it was the responsibility of the Court of Appeal to judge his misconduct. After seven months the Court of Appeal has failed to produce the transcript of Simon Brown's hearing, **a transcript paid for at the public expense**. Now given that the court fails to supply the transcript, or explain why it was not issued to me, it then goes on to pass judgement on the Grounds for Appeal – thus lacking the transcript that backs up the claims I made.

If the transcript was never made, or shredded, or some such, then whoever pocketed the money for transcribing it has misused taxpayer money for personal gain. Could your office confirm i) who it was who was paid, ii) at what date they were paid, iii) and also provide the receipt for such payment? The recipient of that transcript - if it ever was received by the court - has some explaining to do. We can see in the attachment that Master Bancroft-Rimmer was involved along with Steve Tai. I would guess that one or the other would be emailed with the transcript when it was complete. Your fees office would also keep records in these matters for accounting purposes. I would like to see a signed witness statement from both men in these matters. I would guess that the Master looked through the Grounds for Appeal and decided it was entirely appropriate for a transcript be made at public expense that would resolve the allegations.

On the 19th March 2016 I received a postal letter from Steve Tai which enclosed a transcript of Simon Brown's verdict. This in no way is a substitute for the full transcript of the court recording – and appears to me, and to any sensible jurist, a means of faking incompetence. It comes 7 days after Lord Burnett's verdict, and it was not what was demanded in my email to Steve Tai, a month ago, as was attached in my previous email to the Lord Chief Justice's office. This wording in the demand is without ambiguity and so we can see that Steve Tai's role is not one of innocence.

Steve Tai either failed to inform me of the status of the transcript because he was ordered not to respond, or it may be he decided not to respond - of his own volition. Could you confirm which is the case. Should I blame him personally for the failure of Judge Burnett to address the evidence, or did Judge Burnett order him to suppress the evidence?

Note that the e-mail sent to Steve Tai - requesting the transcript - was copied and sent to the other recipients of the previous e-mail to you, and there was no denial from the Court of Appeal that the demand for the transcript was made, nor any explanation why it failed in its most basic obligations – so that there can be no question the suppression of the transcript is deliberate and dishonest. From the lack of response of the Court of Appeal we can deem the allegations of misconduct in the grounds for appeal material and substantiated – why else would the Court of Appeal suppress the document – but to protect a dishonest judge and dishonest defendants. Defendants have been found guilty by regulators attempting to pervert the results of the regulators' investigations. As a reminder, HSBC has been found guilty of perverting HMRC's tax evasion investigations at the highest level.

There can be no question that the reason Anshu Jain got away with a bare denial and got away with non-attendance of the hearing he applied for, was because he knew in advance of submission of the defence, that he would be be allowed to get away with fraud. That my demand to see BaFin's report into his role in Libor manipulation is deemed justification for a CRO is laughable and contemptible at the same time.

Court officials, particularly Judge Burnett, are in contempt for the rule of law. I believe it is your office's role – for which the taxpayer pays you as public servant – to overturn such judgements, when it is clear that judicial misconduct renders the court orders unlawful, unjust and

immaterial. The timing and the substance of the court orders effectively implicate Judge Burnett in a conspiracy to commit market manipulation fraud as well as a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. This would take place before Burnett's court orders were made, since suppression of the transcript pre-dates the court orders by twenty days, and so Burnett does not qualify for judicial immunity.

Not so long ago your courts imprisoned traders for market manipulation, in decisions that involved you personally. I hope that you are of the calibre that brooks no hypocrisy on this front.

I believe it is within the Court of Appeal's powers to instigate a review on any judgement on it own accord. For this purpose I will summarize for the record:

A number of staff at the Court of Appeal have conspired to prevent the lawful course of the appeal A2/2015/2818 by suppression of the transcript of the recording, paid for at public expense, and so effects a fraud against the treasury and ultimately the general public. The purpose is to conceal the misconduct of Judge Simon Brown, and later the misconduct of Judge Haddon-Cave and from this any sane jurist would find that the defendants have bribed all judges involved in my lawsuits. Given that the defence consists of bare denial, outlawed by CPR rules, this immediately should lead to summary judgement. The lack of lawful defence means no party can issue a lawful challenge against the level of damages demanded. Each defendant is guilty of using unlawful means to effect a restraining order against me, which constitutes serious criminal libel and infringement of my civil liberties. I would expect the damages due to libel should be about as high as any rewarded by the courts for any matter – this would set an example to the banks of what they should expect should they attempt to bribe the courts again.

Lord Burnett issued unlawful court orders on these counts:

1. It was his responsibility to address the allegations of misconduct made in the Grounds for Appeal, because the JCIO does not have that responsibility and he failed to do so. He could not do so, because he did not have a transcript of the hearing.
2. The evidence for the appeal is not merely the particulars of claim – on which Lord Burnett comments - but the conduct of the defence and the judge in response to it. Again he refuses to recognize the obvious – that UBS, for example, were admitting guilt to the DoJ while submitting a patently schizophrenic defence document, a copy of which is attached to the email version of this letter. (One wonders if Lord Burnett read anything in the appeal bundle).
3. Nor does he explain such basic issues as, for example: the applicant to an oral hearing refusing to attend that hearing, and the same applicant refusing to allow his witness to attend that hearing, and the judge called my demand to cross-examine the applicant vexatious and used it to justify a restraining order. This is patently unlawful, corrupt and asinine. In any other legal system it would result in disqualification from office. The applicant was Anshu Jain, he who resigned from Deutsche Bank for the liabilities the bank faces due to market manipulation. The purpose of cross-examination was to verify the statement asserted by his witness – that Deutsche Bank's gold manipulation audit was genuine and substantial. We have absolutely no evidence that there is any substance to it – and all the documents I have furnished the court imply it is a fiction from which notorious lies flow.
4. The orders are opaque and superficial. And yet Lord Burnett made especial emphasis that the lawsuit is vexatious and inadequately particularized and cannot be orally appealed. If the analysis is so superficial then why oppose an oral appeal – the order leads any independent observer to deduce that the analysis is opaque because it is

dishonest, and superficial because the judge deems himself untouchable. The orders are an insult to the intelligence.

5. The timing of the court order was in response to my demand for a transcript. I have effectively been punished for demanding that the Court of Appeal do its legal duty and furnish me with the basic documents.
6. Lord Burnnet's calculation of damages consists of nothing more than an exact repetition of that found in Deutsche Bank's 'defence' and does not consider the obvious argument that the losses amount to the free market price at which the price of my bullion should have commanded and subtracting the manipulated price. Again this blatantly opaque assertion from the judge is without any kind of reasoned basis - and makes no effort at all to assess a free market price. With no intellectual authority there can be no moral authority, and thus no lawful authority.
7. Deutsche Bank, with whom I traded bullion, have refused to admit or deny that the receipts with which I provided the German court are authentic or not. Lord Burnett could just as well have ordered DB to disclose its copy of the receipts, but he did not, nor did Simon Brown, nor did Charles Haddon-Cave, nor did Judge Lorenz of the Frankfurt Court. When I provided receipts, the defendants disputed the authenticity of the signatures on those receipts. When I demand that the defendants show their copy, they claim inadequate particularization. Lord Burnett fools nobody.

Yours sincerely,
Mark Anthony Taylor

I believe everything in this document is true, and no serious distortions have occurred by anything that has been omitted.

N.B When delivered in postal form, this document should carry an ink signature.