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

Dear Paul Kernaghan,

I write to you as directed by the office of the Lord Chief Justice in a letter from them dated 26 April 2016 to handle judicial complaints against Simon Brown QC, Lord Charles Haddon-Cave, Lord Burnett and Nicholas Rose.

As you may know, if you read the press, Deutsche Bank have recently settled gold and silver price manipulation lawsuits in New York - *London Silver Fixing Ltd. Antitrust Litigation, 1:14-md-02573 and Commodity Exchange, Inc. Gold Futures and Options Trading Litigation, 14-md-2548.* In that lawsuits Deutsche Bank tried to have them dismissed as nuisance ('vexatious') lawsuits and settled when the strike-outs failed.

This settlement confirms the allegations in my lawsuit in the Birmingam High Court B40BM021 which was heard by Simon Brown QC. In the settlement Deutsche Bank have agreed to help the claimants find against their conspriators in the manipulation cartel – which includes UBS, HSBC and Barclays – three of the other defendants in the Birmingham lawsuit.

Now my lawsuit accused them of faking their gold price manipulation audit, an audit reported by Reuters on 19 June 2014. The defendants issued a bare denial and refused to supply any evidence for that audit and refused to attend the oral heaing that they applied for. Part of their reasoning was that the accusations consisted of a conspiracy theory. Now we find Deutsche Bank have admitted to a criminal conspiracy. They refused to disclose a report by BaFin, the German regulator, that accused Anshu Jain, the only natural person defendant, of supplying the Bundesbank with fake Libor statistics. Simon Brown QC called my demands to cross examine the applicants to the oral heaing vexatious. He called the references to regulator reports vexatious. Well we can see with the latest settlement, that if he did his job, Jain would have been forced to prove an audit that we now know cannot have been authentic. Simon Brown's restraining order against me helped Deutsche Bank, HSBC, UBS and Barclays Bank evade civil and criminal remedy for financial fraud that they now admit. The accusation that their shared defence was absurd – that competing businesses should assume each other's audits were authentic, when such businesses had been found guilty of faking audts and deceiving regulators – is now undeniable. Simon Brown made me apologize for drawing this inference – as if I had done wrong to the counsel.Counsel knew what they doing and know enough about business that you do not collude to form a common defence when the parties accused are separate individuals.

Any appeal judge will tell you that if you issue a bare denial the normal result is summary judgement. It is spelled out in CPR rules. There is no excuse for a judge in the Commercial Court not knowing that. The extremely rare exception, as you should know as a former police officer, is that people accused of rape must use a lawyer to cross-examine the accuser. Also, in civil litigation a party that refuses to attend a hearing for which they apply loses. Simon Brown completely turned civil law on its head.

Now when I asked Lord Haddon-Cave to strike-out the defendants' defence, because counsel had not turned up for court with witness statements denying perjury, in the face of UBS's confession to the matters alleged to the US Department of Justice, he said that my accusations against Simon Brown was scurrillous and stonewalled my objections. Again, with Deutsche Bank having admitted

guilt and settled, we now know for certain that they refused to supply witness statements, because they were guilty as alleged – they had committed perjury in Simon Brown's hearing. We also know that Haddon-Cave had judged the allegations against Simon Brown as scurrilous without having a transcript of the hearing. It was not supplied by me, the defendants, nor the Court of Appeal. Thus his decision was ignorant, biased and an abuse of process. He was not a in a positiion to judge my accusation without the transcript. The person handling the JCIO complaint against him was Mrs Sarah Murrell, the same person who I had accused of whitewashing the complaint against Simon Brown QC. Her finding was made while she was under 'investigation' by Nicholas Rose.

When the former ombudsman of the JCIO gave me permission to determine whether the JCIO handled the complaint against Simon Brown QC fairly, did he intend to allow Nicholas Rose to insist on not reading the transcript of the hearing? I really do not believe that the JCIO can do its job if it refuses to consider transcripts to determine instances of bias. Am I to belive it has found against judges, that is publishes on the government website, without veryifying the allegations in the transcript. Or am I to believe that in my case, and my case alone it was not appropriate to study the transcript? If the Court of Appeal had done its job, and procured the transcript of Simon Brown's hearing, as Master Bankcrot Rimmer said he would, then Mr Rose could simply have asked people in the same building to email a copy of the documents on the day he needed them. It all sounds to me that the Court of Appeal, Deutsche Bank, the High Court and the JCIO are in collusion to suppress the transcript. Without the transcript Lord Burnett could not address the accusations of misconduct against Simon Brown QC in a meaningful way – which is why he dismissed my allegations without oral appeal. With Deutsche Bank having admitted guilt and identified its membership of a cartel it is without question that I should not have lost the appeal. The Court of Appeal is meant to be able to revise its own decisions when it discovers that one party has committed perjury to win an appeal.

I recently supplied Deutsche Bank a Notice to Admit Facts to deny the matters alleged. They refused to file it, as you can see in the email from them, and so the allegations of perjury to win that appeal are uncontested by the defendants. Nobody should be able to act this way and win a lawsuit.

As ombudsman of the JCIO I ask for your personal intervention. This should consist of:

- a public release of the transcript of Simon Brown's hearing, which was made at public expense. As is consistent with procedure, it should be delivered to me by email.
- Emails to and from Steve Tai and Master Bancroft-Rimmer to identify if/when that transcript appeared in the Court of Appeal.
- Finding against Lord Haddon-Cave for allowing defendants to argue without having supplied witness statements.
- Finding against Lord Haddon-Cave for judging in ignorance, for his bias, and for telling an outright lie – that UBS's confession was part of the evidence supplied to Simon Brown-s hearing. This was never so. It was an outright material fact lie as the transcript should prove.
- Finding against Simon Brown QC for egregious abuse of my rights to a fair trial.
- Finding against Lord Burnett for judging an appeal without having the transcript being filed in the appeal bundle.
- A letter of reconmmendation to the Court of Appeal that they overturn Lord Burnett's court orders on the basis that they are a serious abuse of process and the defendants lied to pervert the Court of Appeal's verdict. Accusations of market manipulation against Deutsche Bank are clearly not scurrilous, not vexatious and not fanciful. There is no reason to strike-out the claim, and no reason to issue a restraining order against me.
- Dismissal of Nicholas Rose and Mrs Murrell for failing to handle JCIO complaints with due diligence, thus sabotaging the complaint invesgiations against Simon Brown QC

which should otherwise have found against the judge There was no reason to refuse to consider a transcript when copies would have be obtained in the same building.

Please consider that I have been kept waiting since Feb 2015, over a year since I served Deutsche Bank and the other defendants. Nicholas Rose kept me waiting three months for no good reason, yet another reason to dismiss him. The last letter I received from the Lord Chief Justice's office was some four weeks after my last letter to him. All of these delays keep in stress, depression and poverty – and no excuse was ever given for them. Please respond positively within a week.

Yours sincerely
Mark Anthony Taylor

P.S – I attach the Notice to Admit Facts as was delivered to Deutsche Bank, and then its reply from Linklaters, DB's lawyers, which was delivered to the Court of Appeal and by email.

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

Dear Sir/Madam

We refer to Mr Taylor's emails to you on 16 April 2016 and 18 April 2016 below.

There are no extant proceedings. Proceedings 2015/2818 and related proceedings 2015/3933 were applications by Mr Taylor for permission to appeal orders made in proceedings below (number A07YQ334 in the County Court, transferred to the High Court with number B40BM021) including to strike out the proceedings. Permission to appeal the strike out was refused and Mr Taylor remains subject to an Extended Civil Restraint Order. In the circumstances, we intend not to engage with any further correspondence initiated by Mr Taylor in relation to the above proceedings.

Yours faithfully

Linklaters LLP, London

Tel: +44 20 7456 2000
Fax: +44 20 7456 2222
http://www.linklaters.com