

2017 JULY www.opposepredatoryguardians.com - www.opg.me - www.victimsofabuseofpower.com

from son/carer/ www.opg.me/will20082012.pdf living will executor mikeclarke@rake.net

as www.ukrefugees.com **4 years on** we remain in exile from www.jewdicialterrorism.com

COPY - 22 July 2013 · FOA Dear MP Gordon Marsden

I refer to your recent letter by email on 22.07.2013 & the clarity you need of the current situation is;

1. We fled the Tyranny of the UK which clearly is run by criminals and the common laws that would protect one from such a tyranny are not being upheld by the powers that be, favouring their own rules and acts that are laced in BIAS, UNFAIR & without IMPARTIALITY. [ie Judging in his own cause]

2. This is clearly in breach of our HUMAN RIGHTS the last time I took the time out to understand such rights, leaving my 72 year old mother & me, your purged into exile, constituents that are indeed still CURRENT. [2017]

3. With the exception of my prison sentence brought about by corruption & treason we have moved no further on than when we last met, which to my recollection was indeed a trial within itself to attempt to make contact with you as you are well aware. I understand that you are busy but I do believe our situation warrants a lot more attention to it than you are offering to undertake. [2017!]

4. If this problem was a one off occurrence where we were the only people affected I might be able to give some understanding to your partial brush off letter but this is certainly not the case as you are also fully aware of the problems associated via news and press articles ie DAILY MAIL and the involvement on other constituents fronts from court reformer MP JOHN HEMMING which I personally with many others hold a lot of praise for, in the time, effort and work, where he is attempting to bring about some justice to families.

5. It is not like we are even asking a lot, because John Hemming MP had offered to indeed put the work into the complex procedure of a petition to parliament that requires only, I believe, your delivery.

6. If it had been easy for me and mum to have moved to JOHN HEMMING MP's constituency area, believe me I would, as I have considered it and that is a measure of how desperate things have become that you surely, obviously have no understanding of, or indeed do express no care either to my astonishment.

7. It was Jack Straw and your party whom pushed the implementation of this corrupt body and whom seem to care not about the injustices it is dishing out to innocent elderly whom have capacity and their carers or relatives to imprison and separate from loved ones so as gain access to remaining wealth or property to place for sale.

8. I HAVE NOT BEEN IN CONTEMPT – This is purely a creature of common law and as such demands a jury of my peers where upon if my rights had been met and a jury present this would have been easy to sort out as a jury would not convict. And further - Sir John Donaldson M.R. (Master of the Rolls?): "Mens rea in the law of contempt was something of a minefield. The reason was that it was wholly the creature of the common law and had developed on a case by case basis".

"Wholly the creature of the common law"? Wow!

In *Dean v. Dean* [1987] F.L.R. 517, C.A. (Civ. Div.), the court said that: "Contempt of court, whether civil or criminal, is a common law misdemeanor and it had long been recognised that proceedings for contempt were criminal or quasi-criminal in nature and that the case against the alleged contemnor must be proved to the standard of criminal proof namely, beyond reasonable doubt"

A misdemeanor? Not even a felony? And had to be proved to criminal standards? Wow!

Until *Att-Gen v. Newspaper Publishing plc and others* [1988] Ch. 333, C.A. (Civ. Div.), there was widespread acceptance of the classification of contempts as being either civil or criminal. Civil contempt consisted of disobedience to an order of the court in circumstances where the disobedience is principally a matter that affects the parties to the case. Sir John Donaldson (again) later pointed out that the classification was not really relevant, since contempts have to be proved to criminal standards anyway.

Now, get this.

First of all we have Lord Diplock in *Att-Gen v. Times Newspapers Ltd.* [1974], ante, outlines the various ways which the due administration of justice might be prejudiced: "The due administration of justice requires first that all citizens should have unhindered access to the constitutionally established courts of criminal or civil jurisdiction for the determination of disputes as their legal rights and liabilities; secondly, that they should be able to rely upon obtaining in the courts the arbitrament of a tribunal which is free from bias against any party and whose decision will be based upon those facts only that have been proved in evidence adduced before it in accordance with the procedure adopted in courts of law; and thirdly that, once the dispute has been submitted to a court of law, they should be able to rely upon there being no usurpation by any other person of the function of the court to decide according to law. Conduct which is calculated to prejudice any of these requirements or to undermine public confidence that they will be observed is contempt of court"

"They should be able to rely on freedom from bias"? "They should be able to rely on no usurpation by any other person of the function of the court"? Errr... Judges, Magistrates, Clerks, Ushers, Security Men? Well, they are 'functions of the court'. "Conduct which is calculated to prejudice any of these requirements is contempt of court"?

Here's something else:

Buckley J. held that "No contempt had been committed because the case was to be tried by a Judge sitting alone, who would be unaffected"

And, lastly (for now):

At common law, a contempt of court is an act or omission calculated to interfere with the due administration of justice: *Att-Gen v. Butterworth Islands*, re a special reference from [1893] A.C. 138. There is no impediment to a court making a finding of contempt, when it is appropriate to do so, not against the Crown directly but against a government department or a minister of the Crown in his official capacity: *M. v. Home Office and another* [1993] 3 All E.R. 537, H.L.

If you read all those quotations again ... which by the way, can use in Court ... since you will be quoting from Archbold ... then the conclusions you can draw are:

1. Only Judges, Magistrates and Clerks of the Courts can be held as having been in Contempt of Court if they don't act STRICTLY under their Oaths of Office. Thus, when demanding them to repeat their Oath - and they say that is irrelevant - you can say "It is far from irrelevant, according to what Lord Diplock said, which is quoted in Archbold. Would you like a copy of what he said?". The point is that,

IN LAW, mens rea is a crucial factor, i.e. INTENT. When refusing to give your Name, etc. what is your INTENT? The answer is to refuse the deception of acquiescing to Admiralty Law, by virtue of being a Land-dweller and only subject to the Law-of-the-Land. Whereas their INTENT is to deceive you into acquiescing to the Laws-of-Waters (whether they realise it [Judges] or not [Magistrates]!). YOU are attempting to bring the entire Court back to honourable, true, real 'justice' ... whereas they are trying to pervert that course.

2. You can't be in Contempt of a Court where the Judge is sitting alone ... because s/he is unaffected. You can be in contempt of the other Party ... but NOT of the Judge or the Court. (Fundamentally this saying that a Judge's shoulders should be sufficiently broad as to brush off even direct insults! Assuming, of course, they acted diligently and with integrity, i.e. under their Oaths, etc). Without any shadow of a doubt a Local Council (for example) will be in contempt of you ... otherwise they would not have summonsed you.

3. And note: "There is no impediment to a court making a finding of contempt, when it is appropriate to do so, not against the Crown directly but against a government department or a minister of the Crown in his official capacity".

9. I have been a victim of LAS legal abuse syndrome facilitated through the Deputy, The Office of the public guardian, The Court of Protection, The PHSO and MPs lack to act.

10. My mother is a victim of fraud, theft, mal administration, criminal neglect and suffering the TORTS that go along with it without being able to secure legal redress where her own funds have been used to defend the very persons committing the acts listed above.

11. Without such access to those funds we turned indeed to common law in which we believe we have a right to.

12. The statute acts and provisions laid out in the Mental Capacity Act 2005 is not protecting the people it was put there to protect.

13. It is protecting criminals.

I do hope your clarity is further enhanced on this matter.

We, my mother and I, sincerely hope that as our MP you will assist and liaise to the best of your ability with JOHN HEMMING MP to bring about some peace and security to our lives that have been in upheaval for not just 13 years but the 6 years prior to the settlement, making the total misery lasting some 19 years now, perhaps on the 20th year justice might prevail under common law. [**NOW 2017**]

Yours sincerely

Regards,

Mike & Ann Clarke
31 Cherry Tree Rd
Blackpool
FY4 4NS

Admiralty case ref numbers unconsented to, so no jurisdiction 14.1.2013 Manchester 2MA90015 **unpublished** & Court of Protection 10370284 Ann:Clarke - **both living and standing on the land**