Robin Clarke v The United Kingdom

Statement of Facts

Ref 5604/08

Abstract: A claim for possession was granted in absence of any necessity specifed by Article 8. Judges misrepresented the meaning of that article. Judges deployed in excess of 35 cheap falsehoods, all 35-0 against the unrepresented defendant, of which the probability of being due to chance is less than one in 3.4 billion. Not a single genuine fault was shown in any of the six independent defence arguments. The government-subsidised claimants employed a barrister to concoct falsehoods, whereas the defendant was unable to obtain legal aid due to the UK government's policy of underfunding of legal aid. Other UK government policy results in a large number of evictions into so-called "intentional" homelessness, this being abused as a substitute for proper criminal proceedings and sentencing, less costly but much harsher than imprisonment where prisoners are at least housed and fed.

Introduction and Background to the Abuses

1. This case relates to "20-20 Housing Co-operative v Mr Robin Clarke", Claim no. 6BM74906 / Appeal ref. BM70094A in the Birmingham County Court. (The claimants, who were not legitimately 20-20 Housing Co-operative, have always mis-spelled the name as '20/20').
2. For nearly 40 years, from when I was still at school, I have been a chronic invalid, due to various severe problems including severe indecisiveness ('procrastination'), neurasthenia, absentmindedness, memory and attention deficits, phobias, allergic reaction to washing and bathing, circadian cycle disturbances, delirium, and more besides. Writing complex documents such as this I can do only with great effort, and only when I am less ill.
3. In recent years I have come to know that these problems have been caused by mercury poisoning from 20 dental fillings. But the UK government persists in failing to remedy the injury it caused, resorting to cheap propaganda falsehoods instead (even though amalgams are now banned in Norway, Sweden and Denmark, and an FDA committee has refused to confirm their safety). I had gradually improved over the decades via my own trial-and-error, and I had improved yet more in recent years thanks to my growing understanding of antidoting of mercury poisoning. But I am still very ill.

4. Despite this invalidity, and despite a lack of help from universities, I have had published four theories, totally unchallenged yet highly praised, relating to respectively autism, dementia, manic-depressive illness, and social breakdown caused by excessive cars and roads. And have produced several more but not had the time or energy for the huge task of converting them into "publishable" papers. The most famously critical autism scientist Bernard Rimland described me as "one of those rare souls" and my paper as "excellent" "fine work".
5. The 20-20 Housing Co-operative was(/is?) a Registered Social Landlord (RSL, = registered with the Housing Corporation).
(N.B.: Housing *Co-operative* registered with Housing *Corporation*)
It was(/is?) a "fully mutual co-operative", meaning that all tenants must be members and all members must be tenants or prospective tenants. These terms (RSL and fully mutual housing co-op) determine the applicability of certain legal statutes to 20-20's affairs.
6. The Housing Corporation supposedly serves two functions: (1) as an enthusiastic developer/promoter of the joyously harmonious friendly wonders of RSL housing; and (2) as an exposer and regulator of the nasty misconduct of those RSLs. It is thus severely compromised by conflicting motives, much as the 11th Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life found in respect of the Electoral Commission.
7. I became shareholder no. 12 of 20-20 in May 1985, before it had any tenancies to live in (unlike all other recent/current members); I was thereafter a member of the management during 20 years and was Secretary during many of those years.
8. I had thus helped to create this co-operative in a way that cannot be said of any other recent/current members.
9. I was a non-tenant member of 20-20 management for five years before becoming a tenant of 20-20, in respect of Flat 1, 9 Augusta Rd, in 1990.
10. The management of 20-20 was assisted by a professional services agency called BCHS (Birmingham Co-operative Housing Services).
11. The management of 20-20 depended on volunteers, of which there developed a critical shortage. So the organisation easily fell under the control of a secretive small clique of deceitful persons with unworthy, anti-co-operative motivations. This corruption of the co-operative is detailed more fully in my book *The Housing Corporation Scandal* and in my documents to the County Court.
12. The leader of the clique, Nic Bliss, was/is a superlative conman and habitual liar, and even I as Secretary was taken in by his façade of honourableness. He generated a personality cult which infected not only 20-20 but also BCHS where he was the "star" member of the workforce.

13. The apartments of 20-20 vary greatly in their apparent desirability. A member such as Midge Miller would only ever get a better flat if one of those better ones were to become vacant. 20-20 has been a relatively small co-op, with flats only rarely becoming vacant during most of its time.
14. My flat appeared to be particularly desirable for various reasons, not least its being unusually large and on two floors in a relatively quiet location with secluded garden in which I planted and nurtured several fruit bushes etc.
15. Over the years, various odd things happened which became in retrospect understandable as harassment, but I am an overly trusting (co-operative-type) person and my suspicions were not raised.
16. In the spring of 2005 I had recently come to suspect about the dental mercury poisoning, and learned that mercury was known to bind to DNA and thereby impair gene-expression. This "rang a bell", because twenty years before, in my 1982, published 1993, autism theory I had stated that things binding to DNA and thus impairing gene-expression would thereby cause autism*. This led to my discovering the decisive solution to the intense international controversy about autism. So I *started on preparing* an update review paper showing confirmation of three predictions and why the worldwide tenfold increase of autism was caused by the changeover to non-gamma-2 amalgams in the 1970s. *[http://cogprints.org/5207]
17. On the basis of that very exceptional update paper I *would have* by now become the most famous and respected of scientists, due to being the resolver of the most heated scientific controversy of our time. "Autism" was among the top-ten Googled words in 2006.
18. Furthermore, my theory had from its outset had as a central concept the idea that the same factors which cause autism would in lower doses cause raised IQ. My update thereby also provided the only credible explanation of the mysterious Flynn Effect (rising IQ), as being caused by the gradual increase of atmopheric mercury pollution. And thereby there was powerful evidence that common mental retardation could be cured by suitable use of dental amalgam. A straightforward <u>*calculation*</u> *(nota bene)* indicates that the value of this invention over a patent's duration *would have been* several trillions of dollars.*
19. It is rare nowadays for such a hugely-valuable invention to be the work of an individual. It in no way follows that any of the above calculation of trillion-dollar value is untrue or improbable. It must also be very rare that a person with no qualifications has four unchallenged published theories and his ideas are written about around the world. Just because geniuses are rare it does not make them non-existent.

* The maths here really is not very difficult. In outline: there are millions of mentally retarded being born and each one cured saves a million dollars in care (CDC data). And a million times a million <u>does</u> equal a trillion.

20. Thus, in May 2005, the decades of unrewarded work of this "rare soul" (para 4) were about to bear fruit and I was at last on the threshold of escape from a lifetime of poverty and neglect. I *would by now* have become both a most famous scientist and have sold a trillion-dollar value patent, for perhaps several million dollars (which is a trivial amount to a pharma company).

21. But crucially in that spring of 2005, both of the other flats at 9 Augusta Rd became vacant. And thereupon, in May of 2005 a sophisticated, subtle but devastating scheme of harassment was launched against me by the clique. This involved abuses of the management's powers over allocations, repairs, complaints, and policy-making. This harassment scheme is not usefully understood via any short summary. Fuller details are given in my book *The Housing Corporation Scandal*, with my Defence statement and later documents adding more. In the following paragraphs I outline some essential points leading up to this application, but for full understanding reference is needed to these other documents. I certainly didn't write them from shortage of anything else to do.

22. One feature of the harassment scheme was their seeking for the worst possible tenants to put in the two other flats at 9 Augusta Rd. In May 2005, a violent lifestyle alcoholic, lifestyle criminal, Mr Edward Cox, was given the tenancy of the very desirable Flat 2 (much fuller details in above-cited documents).

23. A second feature of the harassment scheme was deliberate prevention of repair of problems known to be very distressing to tenants – not least some harsh cracking sounds from floors over bedrooms (much fuller details in above-cited documents).

24. On 2rd July 2005, a fault in the floor of Flat 3 had still not been corrected, when Nic Bliss brought a new tenant for the flat (though Mr Bliss had not had the share certificate signed by the Secretary (myself), so not a genuinely authorised tenant). I happened to overhear Mr Bliss saying nasty things clearly designed to poison my relationship with this new tenant. This stands in the context that this Nic Bliss is a "Senior Community Regeneration Officer" whose lectures emphasise that friendly neighbours are the most important thing in housing.

25. On overhearing Nic Bliss speak these nasty words, I went out and challenged him, and then explained to the new tenant that this "co-operative" was in reality controlled by secretive liars, and that the flat was not actually ready to move into.

26. The "new tenant" visited Flat 3 a few times then evidently lost interest. Letters later started coming addressed to him - Khalid el-Jid.

27. A few days later, I received notice of a false complaint that I had "obstructed" the new tenant (though quite how I had "obstructed" was never specified). Mr Bliss filed this false complaint into his clique's rigged complaints system, adjudicated by his own professional colleague drinking-mates at 20-20's professional management agency BCHS.

28. Thereby was originated the first key falsehood of this case, that I was supposedly preventing access and preventing the re-letting of Flat 3.

29. And thereabouts, in early July 2005 I came to understand that I was being lied to by Nic Bliss, Midge Miller, and probably others, and that this was indeed related to a deliberate scheme of harassment, and indeed preceded by at least two such schemes against other tenants, one of whom was driven mad, died, and then had his flat taken over by the clique's leader Nic Bliss.

30. In response to my challenges, the clique <u>fundamentally</u> perverted the nature of 20-20 with a regime of total secretisation and total evasion of accountability to the non-clique membership, thereby rendering their management devoid of real legitimacy as landlord authority. The <u>whole point</u> of being a co-operative was the maximal informing and involvement of the tenant-members, as Nic Bliss would be well aware, earning his living as a "Senior Community Regeneration Officer" who had a book published called "Tenants Taking Control".
This illegitimate secretisation is particularised in my book, with additional material in my *Defence*, my *Application to Strike Out the Claim*, and my *Comment on Lynn Mansell Second Witness Statement*.

31. In December 2005, the annual election of the 20-20 committee was conducted under this regime of intimidation and total secretisation and evasion of accountability to the members. The resulting committee was thereby devoid even of formal legitimacy to act as the landlord authority of 20-20. And it had already surrendered all its moral legitimacy months before.

32. Meanwhile during all this time I was struggling to cope with the mercury poisoning plus the critical harassment situation, on the one hand trying to manage the difficult relationships with the alcoholic criminal and his violent associates, and simultaneously trying to sort out and challenge the sophisticated criminality which had taken control of the co-op and BCHS.

33. The regime of Nic Bliss happily finds opportunities for starting eviction legal actions. For instance, if a Birmingham City Council tenant fails to allow the gas servicing, the council gets a warrant to force entry; whereas Nic Bliss's "co-operative" start eviction proceedings instead, violating the Regulatory Code and Residents Charter (but the Housing Corporation don't care).

34. In August 2005 the alcoholic criminal was in a panic that one of his "friends" had stolen his wallet and tv set-top box. He decided he had to urgently change the lock of the communal front door. I was aware that he was a mechanically-incompetent drunk, so I decided it would be best if I intervened to ensure he did not make a serious mess of it. Note that it was the tenant of Flat 2 who decided that this change of lock would take place (I merely prevented it being done defectively). If there was any responsibility to give a key to a third party it lay with the commissioner (and causer) of the lock-change, not with myself. And there is nothing in our tenancy agreements that says or implies that we cannot change those locks anyway.

35. At no time did anyone ask me about the lock being changed, or asked if I could supply a key for them to get in to access Flat 3. Instead the clique sent a letter asserting as a supposed known fact that it was myself who had changed the lock, and that the lock would be changed again on a certain date (when actually it was not). You see here again the falsehood that I was preventing access.

36. The clique did not change the lock on the stated date. But on 25th October 2005 they changed it in my absence without notice, and without providing me with any key. Just one key was left with the alcoholic criminal who was known to be having a paranoid hostility phase against me at the time. A note was casually taped to the outside door inviting me to get the key from him.

37. The preceding can be shown to be grossly improper conduct of supposed housing professionals. As a known seriously ill person I could have found myself locked out of my house (and medicines) for any number of winter days. The obvious proper procedure is to ensure that the tenant has first been supplied with the new keys (plural) before the lock is changed. And as explained more fully in the book etc, there was <u>no need</u> for the clique to change the lock anyway.

38. The situation after this second lock-change was very different from the situation when we had changed the lock the first time. (Full details in book etc.) There had by then been numerous abuses sanctioned by the entire committee of the clique. There had been that harassing change of lock; there had been collusion in covering up my reports of harassments rather than their honest handling. There had been the dismissal of myself as secretary and committee member on wholly false excuses. There had been the most fundamental illegitimate perversion of the co-operative, designed to evade accountability to the non-clique members. So it was therefore then clear that all the officers and management were devoid of any proper worthiness to give directives. And it was clear that my proper duty was not to co-operate with them but instead to seek to impede their abuses of powers. And most especially I had a duty to seek to *impede* their attempts to seriously abuse the re-letting of Flat 3, in the context that my extensive attempts to bring their abuses under proper control were taking much time (see book, hence its title).
39. It was for this reason that I agreed with the alcoholic criminal that we should change the lock yet again. (At that time he was in a passing phase of relatively positive relationship with me.) Note that the alcoholic criminal had joint responsibility for the change of lock this time, but they never sought any legal action against him. Indeed they had appointed him to their secretised committee.
40. This third lock-change naturally gave the clique yet more fuel for their <u>*pretence*</u> that I was *preventing* access. And yet it was only a pretence, because I could not prevent Mr Cox giving them a key or letting them in; and indeed he *did* let them in on 23rd October (else they could not have got in to change the lock). Even more absurd is the notion that they did not have access even though they all knew that their own Committee Member Mr Cox had a key the whole time (as it was the front door of where he lived). In the following correspondence, I honourably *played along with* their pretence, so as to *inhibit* abusive access; it was only their pretence that actually *prevented* their access.
41. Following this third lock-change, the clique-member Jacqueline Rooker sent a letter requesting me to allow access for a clerk of works to look at the floor fault. I sent back a reply explaining why this would be inappropriate, and making clear that the proper requirement was for the illegitimately-functioning committee to resign or at least acknowledge their guilt and make corrections.
42. Following this, Mrs Rooker sent a further request for access (and also a phone message), to which I replied again, noting that there had not been any responses to the points of my previous letter.
43. Ms Rooker's letters also contained threats of legal action, but I thought nothing of that because it would anyway be starkly obvious to the court that they were the criminals and I was blameless and legally sound, and so they would not have the nerve to start any legal action.

44. All this time, from early in July 2005 when I had first come to understand the deceit and other abuses, I had also been trying to get various supposed regulatory authorities to take action against the abuses (see book for fuller details). For this purpose I had composed and submitted substantial reports. Finally, on 1st May 2006 a deceitful reply from the head of regulation of the Housing Corporation made it clear that they were not really in the business of honestly providing decent housing but rather of collusion in concealing harassment by RSL managements (paragraph 6 above, and book pages 15-16).
45. So I set about compiling my reports into a publishable book about that corruption of the Housing Corporation. And I then sent a request to printers for an initial six copies.
46. There was just then a delay due to the printers relocating their plant, and I had to wait a month for the books to arrive, in early June 2006.
47. To my surprise, at just about that same time I also received a "Notice of Hearing of a Claim for Possession", (dated 1st June), featuring the signature of clique-member Lynn Mansell.
48. I decided to suspend distribution of the book, in antipation that the court would vindicate me and establish the harassers' guilt anyway.
49. The Notice and accompanying—incorrect, I later learnt—notes gave no indication of any time-deadline other than that I should attend that hearing on the 13th July 2006. With my usual extreme slowness, under conditions of continuing harassment and untreated mercury poisoning, I struggled to try to work out how I could effectively explain this extremely complex case to a solicitor. I knew nearly nothing about courts, legal actions, or housing law (besides limited research about the ineffective remedies against harassment).
50. After about ten days I had worked out a sort of presentation (as I can only work *extremely* slowly) and went to Tyndallwoods solicitors, who arranged an appointment for the next week, which I attended.

51. I then awaited about two more weeks and the solicitor then presented me with a proposed statement consisting of little more than falsehoods and a false "acknowledgment" that I had no defence. And said I could not get any legal aid to take the matter any further. I wrote to complain to the head of the practice, but he was away, so by the time I had a reply from him there was less than two weeks left before the hearing. There was thus no longer enough time to go through the solicitor process a second time and so I had no option but to set about an ultra-crash-course on writing a defence document and then hastily composing the *Defence and Counterclaim* which I took to the court a few days before the hearing. Naturally it was a far from superb document in consequence. Due to the lack of time, I appended a copy of the book to the *Defence* to provide fuller particulars of the abuses committed by the "co-operative" along with the context thereof. Just by chance the harassment situation was relatively becalmed in those critical days; and the mercury poisoning is less disabling in summer.

52. I also filed a *Part 18 Request for Further Information* at that time. The important questions therein received a <u>non</u>-reply from the claimaints. One would think that any remotely-competent judge would appreciate that when one party is submitting a mass of evidence (even including several tape recordings), while the other party is going to great lengths of minimalism and even evading answering questions, the suspicion of fault must be heavily against the minimalising party.

53. At the first hearing (13th July 2006) it was ordered that both parties should file allocation questionnaires by 25th August and the claimants should file a *Reply to Defence and Defence to Counterclaim* also by 25th August.

54. By that date I myself filed my allocation questionnaire. But the claimants did not file either their allocation questionnaire or their *Reply to Defence and Defence to Counterclaim.* Instead they filed an *Application to Strike out the Defence and Counterclaim*. It consisted entirely of false, straw-man arguments worthy of a political spin-doctor rather than a learned lawyer. I concluded that the filing of that rubbish must have been because the barrister was merely trying to do the "least worst" for his clients in impossible circumstances. And that given that this rubbish was the best that even a barrister could come up with, the case must be certainly won by myself.

55. I had previously assumed that a strike-out application would only be appropriate in cases where the thing to be struck out did not even have the resemblance of a credible case, for instance a defence consisting of just four words or random ranting. But in view of their meritless application, and the abysmalness of their own claim, I thereafter spent the next few months on researching and preparing my own *Application to Strike out the Claim*, which I filed the week before the next hearing on 7th December 2006. I also filed three other documents which were necessitated for exposing the claimants' falsehoods.

56. Just after I got home from filing those documents, the Flat 2 tenant committee member of the claimants threw a brick through my kitchen window. The very same day as the 7th December hearing, he appeared at the Magistrates Court to plead guilty of that crime, but as ever was just let off with a talking to. Six days later he again threw a brick through my kitchen window, and thereafter I went to buy a perspex sheet and installed it inside the window. This is only some of the ongoing harassment <u>by the claimants themselves</u> concurrent with their abuse of this so-called "justice" system.

57. At the hearing on 7th December 2006, it was ordered that the two applications should be heard together. The date of 12th March 2007 was set for that hearing of the applications.

58. I had pointed out in my own application that it made logical sense to start by considering my striking out of the claim before considering the striking out of the defence, because the former makes the latter irrelevant but the latter does not make the former irrelevant. Thereby much time could be saved, especially as there was no honest challenge to my arguments for striking out the claim.

59. The hearing of 12th March was allocated six hours, which is several times longer than I can usefully continue functioning given my severe state of health. But no-one had challenged my logic of ordering (stated in the preceding paragraph). And in any sane, normal forum (which cannot include a courtroom it seems) I could make clear within five minutes that the claim lacked any merit, for several reasons. So I did not raise any concern about the overlong hearing because I anticipated that the false claim could be thrown out within five minutes of the hearing starting and I could leave five hours early.

60. In the event, truth and logic proved to have very little to do with Ms Truman's approach to the proceedings, so instead of five minutes, over seven hours were taken up in a scandalous abuse of my time. From the outset she indicated that "that isn't the way we are going to do it". And instead there would be an absurd procedure of the barrister speaking his nonsense and then me speaking my case and then just she would pronounce her unchallengable supposed revelations and that would be the end of the matter.

61. At that 12th March 2007 hearing, not a single genuine fault was shown in my arguments, but only an outstandingly large number of cheap, not even clever, false excuses for dismissing them. These falsehoods are particularised in the next section (paras 101-131). The transcript shows that Ms Truman engaged in discussion only when it looked to favour the claimants, then resorted to evasion at points where the discussion was being won by the defendant. These evasions are particularised after the falsehoods.
62. Ms Truman then concluded by refusing permission to appeal, for the "reason" that "I think I'm right". She thereby acted with gross impropriety in seeking to prevent any challenge to her false conduct of the hearing and cheap falsehoods used as sole justification for its outcome.
63. I thereafter followed the procedure of "renewed request for permission to appeal". In my *Skeleton Argument (for Appeal)* I specified many of the falsehoods.
64. Circuit Judge MacDuff then wrote dismissing my request, for the supposed "reason" that my case was supposedly wholly devoid of merit.
65. I then applied for the oral hearing of the renewed request for permission.
66. That final hearing of appeal took place on 12th June 2007 before Circuit Judge McKenna. Mr McKenna likewise failed to show any genuine fault in any of my arguments. He generated multiple cheap falsehoods (paras 132-136), including a deliberate falsehood about ECHR Article 8(2). He likewise hypocritically engaged in discussion when it looked to favour the claimants but resorted to evasion where he was losing the arguments to myself (as particularised in later section).
67. Mr McKenna furthermore stated four times (in the transcript) that I could appeal further to the Court of Appeal. This was despite that the Civil Procedure Rules indicated there could be no further appeal.
68. On 25th June, at my request a solicitor of Community Law Partnership wrote to Mr McKenna requesting clarification on his statement that I could appeal further to the Court of Appeal, and mentioning "it appears there may be some merit in Mr Clarke's appeal on grounds he has not previously raised". But Mr McKenna never replied.
69. Meanwhile a possession warrant was granted for eviction to take place on 4th July 2007.
70. I made an application to suspend the eviction warrant pending clarification from Mr McKenna. This was dismissed by Circuit Judge D Hamilton at a hearing on 28th June 2007, citing Housing Act 1980 s.89(1).

71. There followed an appeal hearing with High Court Judge Goldring on 2nd July. I there raised matters which the claimants had concealed from me in breach of the Regulatory Code and Residents Charter, which documents were only brought to my attention when I tried to apply for housing with another RSL. According to those documents, (1) 20-20 must only seek possession as an absolute last resort, which it very clearly had not, (2) must inform the tenant of his rights of tenure, which it had not (instead falsely claiming there was no security and no statutory protection existed when in reality these concealed documents themselves provided it); and (3) it must grant the strongest possible security of tenure, and hence at least the same as other social housing, thus making the possession discretionary and therefore Housing Act 1980 s.89(2)(c) applied, giving power to suspend indefinitely.

72. Again, the barrister generated only a pile of unworthy irrelevances and falsehoods. Mr Goldring failed to show any fault in my argument, merely raising the irrelevant fact that it was "ingenious". His notion of justice was that I had to move out the very next day even though I had nowhere arranged to go to and there was a housing shortage crisis.

Defectiveness of the Transcripts (prefatory note)

73. In considering the following sections, it is necessary to bear in mind that the hearing transcripts are of extremely low quality. A high proportion of words attributed to me were not actually spoken, while whole sentences that actually were spoken are omitted.

This is partly because at the hearing of 12th March the directional microphone was angled away from me, resulting in muffled sound. And more importantly, I was not given any opportunity to hear the tapes by which to enable clarification of what was actually said.

This prevention of my accessing the tape is symptomatic of the whole system of secretiveness behind which these criminals hide their abuses. A further aspect is the extortionate price for the transcripts, combined with the oppressive system whereby copying is not allowed even after paying those extortionate prices for which no legal aid or subsidy is available.

A consequence of this defectiveness is that the transcripts often make me appear to be ranting incoherently. Please listen to the tape for yourselves to hear the reality.

I have only been able to have a part of the March hearing transcribed, due to the high cost.

So please bear in mind that much of what I "say" was not actually said, and that most of what *they* say is untrue. And also that I had with painstaking care already laid out all my arguments in the documents, and the hearings give only a very second-rate substitute.

But these transcripts are still sufficient to make clear the abuses.

Particulars of Falsehoods

(A few of the falsehoods were not in respect of matters *known to be untrue*, but rather of matters *not known (to them) whether true or not*; they nevertheless involve falsehood in that to assert as known that which is unknown is to assert a falsehood.)

74. My *Skeleton Argument re Applications* presented four independent arguments of defence. As indicated below, no genuine fault was shown in any of those four arguments. The following paragraphs 101-131 are closely derived from my *Skeleton Argument (for Appeal)*.

----------(intentional jump in paragraph numbers here)**----------**

Defence (a): Human Rights Act

101. Ms Truman erred in law in thinking that Mr Clarke's HRA argument was rebutted by the citation of White Book Vol.2, 3A-834 with reference to the *Qazi* and *Donoghue* cases. In reality, in both those cases the possession was justified only because of overriding statute law and a clear necessity satisfying the HRA conditions*. Neither of those factors applied in the present case. [See also transcript p. 14-16.]
*(*Qazi:* under-occupancy of council housing; *Donoghue:* need for a system of temporary accommodation for homeless.)

102. No genuine fault was shown in Mr Clarke's HRA defence. So the Claim must be dismissed by the court.

Defence (b): Invalid election / evasion of accountability

103. Ms Truman erred in fact in stating that Mr Clarke had continued to attend the Claimants' meetings

104. and indeed had admitted this. There is no evidence supporting those falsehoods.

105. Ms Truman erred in fact in implying that Mr Clarke had some magic power to transform an illegitimate RSL management into a legitimate one, merely by attending some of their meetings.

106. Ms Truman erred in fact in contending (i) that Mr Clarke had only at the last moment raised the argument of lack of a valid election, and (ii) that he had previously only said that the Claimants had been doing inappropriate things. In reality Mr Clarke's Application had challenged the validity of the election, several months earlier (in paras 31-32).

107. Ms Truman therefrom also erred in fact in stating that the Claimants were legitimate and validly elected.

108. And it is anyway logically impossible for such legitimacy or validity to depend on the date at which Mr Clarke later submitted an argument to the court.

109. Ms Truman erred in fact in the notion that the confidential evidence that was the subject of Mr Clarke's second Application was the audio recordings on CD3. In reality that CD3 was supplied in duplicate with the "Comment on Lynn Mansell Second Statement" so that the Claimants would have a copy, while the real confidential evidence was never filed with the court.

110. The Application to submit confidential evidence was unsoundly refused on the basis of the abovementioned faulty notions. In reality the confidentiality was necessitated and justified by the information being supplied to Mr Clarke in confidentiality in a context of intimidation of other members by the Claimants.

111. No genuine fault was shown in Mr Clarke's illegitimacy argument. So the Claim must be dismissed by the Court.

Defence (c): Need to prove a ground / impossibility of proof

112. Ms Truman erred in law in stating that the correct understanding of the security of tenure was that the grounds did not have to be proved to the court. No fault was shown in the arguments cited in para 30 of the Skeleton (e.g., Application paras 72-74, 76-80, 81-87).

113. Ms Truman erred in fact in stating that Mr Clarke had prevented access to Flat 3. No fault was shown in the observations of Application para 94(f).

114. Ms Truman erred in law in making an incorrect inference from the words *"or adjoining property"* in the Tenancy Agreement. In reality those words can be shown to be intended to relate only to *access into the Premises (the Tenant's flat) to carry out works to* adjoining property, not *access via other routes to carry out works to* adjoining property.
(This is made clear by my Application paras 94(h-i).) Preventing other access to other properties would be at most a tort unrelated to the tenancy/premises to which the Tenancy Agreement pertains.

115. No genuine fault was shown in Mr Clarke's proof-of-grounds Defence. So the Claim must be dismissed by the Court.

Defence (d): Abuse of the court by gross misrepresentation

116. Ms Truman also erred in law in failing to acknowledge that no fault was found in Mr Clarke's heavily-evidenced fourth argument, of gross misrepresentation constituting an abuse of the court contrary to CPR 3.4(2)(b), and that therefore that argument too must remain standing and requiring the striking out of the Claim by that Rule.

---

117. Ms Truman therefore erred multiplely in law and fact in dismissing Mr Clarke's Application to Strike Out the Claim.

---

118. Ms Truman also erred in law in concluding that the Claimant cliques' Application gave basis for striking out the Defence. In reality it only answered points that were not in the Defence anyway. It made no challenge to the arguments that were actually in the Defence document (and/or other defence documents),

(i) in respect of the HRA defence;

119. ditto (ii) in respect of the illegitimacy-of-claimants defence;

120. ditto (iii) in respect of the lack-of-proof-of-a-ground defence;

121. ditto (iv) in respect of the proper duty /reasonable excuse defence;

122. ditto (v) in respect of the abuse-of-court defence.

(vi) (after the appeal I discovered a sixth defence: the Claim would be in breach of the Residents Charter / Regulatory Code. This had been concealed from me by another breach of those rules.)

123. Ms Truman erred in fact in supposing that the in-effect loss of a year of Mr Clarke's life was not a credible notion. She prematurely dismissed this very important question prior to a proper stage of presentation of evidence. The proceedings had not even reached the stage of exchange of witness statements.

124. Ms Truman erred in fact in contending that the in-effect loss of a year of Mr Clarke's life could not be a foreseeable consequence of harassment. Mr Clarke had already presented preliminary documentary evidence that the Claimants had been well aware beforehand that Mr Clarke was barely coping already. Mr Clarke was envisaging to present significant later evidence and argument on this matter but it was prematurely dismissed.

125. Ms Truman erred in fact in contending that the various adverse effects of a harassment scheme involving (among other things) allocating Flat 2 to a carefully-malselected chronic alcoholic lifestyle-criminal (etc, etc.) would be of remote causation or not be reasonably foreseeable. In reality there is an exact analogy with launching a missile at Mr Clarke's residence, an example which Ms Truman accepted would be an instance of direct causation. The Claimant clique personnel include a probation officer, a social worker, and a "senior community regeneration officer" whose lectures emphasise the primacy of friendly neighbours over all mere material considerations. Such people would understand the causation of this scheme just as clearly as a missile launcher operator would understand their own.

126. Ms Truman erred in reasoning about the concept of foreseeableness. It is entirely foreseeable that all manner of adverse consequences (unforeseeable only in specifics) are liable to result from launching attacks against vulnerable victims. It is entirely foreseeable that a catastrophic vicious spiral of multiple adversities is liable to be set in train. That the specific details of those adversities are not all foreseeble is besides the point.* The causal origin, malign intent and guilt of the initiating parties remains, as does the blamelessness of the victim. It therefore follows that the costs of the consequences would justly be imposed on the harassers.
*[There can be few if any cases where forseeable causation does not involve both generalities and unforseeable specifics. For instance falling 4 metres would foreseeably cause "injury" even though it could not be foreseen whether it would be a broken left arm, right leg, neck or whatever. How many courts would dismiss a claim because "it was not foreseeable that the third and fifth vertebrae would be crushed by the fall"?]

127. Ms Truman erred in fact in dismissing the theft as of remote causation. Firstly there are the considerations of the preceding two paragraphs. Secondly, it is not merely foreseeable, but rather to be expected, that an unreformed lifestyle criminal would invite other such untrustworthy persons into the premises and that they would look for opportunities to carry out thefts and other crimes therein.

128. Ms Truman erred in fact in dismissing as improbable that Mr Clarke would have by 2005 have become a most famous scientist in consequence of the update review of his autism theory. Ms Truman's expertise in the history of scientific discovery and scientific creativity is clearly negligible. Likewise her expertise in his life-history. She prematurely dismissed this very important matter before more than a minimal presentation of the evidence could take place. The proceedings had not yet reached the stage of exchange of witness statements, even a Reply to Defence and Defence to Counterclaim had not yet been filed. And even so, remarkable evidence *had* already been presented. The judge drastically erred in fact in a notion that such a thing could be predicted from formal qualifications (of an individual whose disabilities have posed specific difficulties with examinations and yet who still has two maths A-levels among others). Most electrical technology depends on the ideas of the unqualified Michael Faraday, and the ideas of the unqualified James Watt played a pre-eminent part in the Industrial Revolution that enabled the countless other products of the modern world (cars, phones, trains, lighting, radio, etc, etc). It is only thanks to the "enthusiasms" of unqualified, derided, unrewarded, <u>indeed usually persecuted persons</u>, that we are not all still chewing bones in caves.

129. Ms Truman erred in fact in dismissing as not reasonably foreseeable the delay to completion and publishing of Mr Clarke's major update review of his autism theory. The Claimants had been repeatedly informed that Mr Clarke was trying to work on this in the months immediately preceding the launching of the harassment scheme. And they knew that he was already barely coping with just surviving. Again this was dismissed before proper presentation of evidence could take place.

130. Ms Truman erred in fact in dismissing as not reasonably foreseeable the adverse consequences of being forced to delay work on remediation of Mr Clarke's mercury poisoning. His dated computer files show how the Claimants had been repeatedly informed of this very problem in the months immediately preceding the launching of the harassment scheme.

131. Ms Truman erred in fact in dismissing as not reasonably foreseeable a loss of earnings due to (i) delay in treating Mr Clarke's mercury poisoning and (ii) the more general paralysis of his activities. Again this was before any proper presentation of evidence could take place.

132. At the 21st June 2007 hearing, Circuit judge McKenna insisted on asserting as truth a patent falsehood [transcript p12, paras 2-5 make clear that it was no mere accidental slip]. That falsehood was that the necessity specified in HRA 8(2) amounted to no more than "It is necessary to apply the law"* and "It is necessary in a civilised society for there to be a proper means by which possession can be obtained" [transcript p12, para 4]. This falsehood came barely a minute after he had demanded me to point out to him [transcript p9] the paragraphs in which I had quoted (a) exactly that HRA 8(2) necessity criterion and (b) Lord Bingham's judgment about it that mere compliance with national law was not sufficient. Mr McKenna thus brazenly contradicted those documents that were right there before him, uttering patently obvious falsehoods in order to do so. For Mr McKenna's account to be true, then the HRA/ECHR words:

> " is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

must bizarrely mean exactly the same as:

> " is in accordance with the law. ",

and the following words of the HRA and ECHR must be redundant verbal padding in this core Charter of the ECtHR:

> " and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

Not only is that "interpretation" patently absurd, but it furthermore is flatly contradicted by the ECtHR's own caselaw, and by UK caselaw discussions thereupon. For example, *Connors v UK* was won despite the UK courts' judgments having been "in accordance with the law".

*[*Note to lines 5-7 of this paragraph 132: In the context of the defective system for transcripts I have here given both my own contemporaneous recording of what was said (my first quote above) and the official record (the second quote); what actually happened was that I did not hear the latter words because I was already speaking myself at that moment, and the transcriber failed to record the former words also because I was already speaking at that moment. Anyway, I shall give Mr McKenna the benefit of the doubt and count this as only one falsehood of his rather than two.]*

133. At the 21st June 2007 hearing, Mr McKenna cited in support of his judgment the previous judgments of Ms Truman and Mr MacDuff. But the whole point of that hearing was (supposedly) to call into question the soundness of the previous judgments. And it is logically impossible for those previous judgments to be simultaneously in question and available as evidence not in question. Thereby that hearing is proven to be a sham no better than a Stalin show trial.

134. Both Mr MacDuff and Mr McKenna asserted that the Defence case was wholly without merit, despite not even one genuine fault being shown, only the lengthy parade of cheap falsehoods indicated above. In reality it was the claimant case that depended entirely on meritless falsehoods and patently perjurous testimonies.

135. Mr McKenna four* times stated that Mr Clarke could appeal his decision to the Court of Appeal (within 21 days). And yet on 2nd July, High Court judge Goldring insisted that that was not true. In consequence of these assertions, the blameless and seriously ill Mr Clarke was on the basis of a false claim by perjuring criminals forced to suddenly leave his home of 17 years the very next day even though he had nowhere arranged to go to (and only thanks to the kindness of Mr Ayoub his next-door neighbour of 15 years did he avoid becoming totally homeless).
**[Transcript of 12th June: p7 para 11; p12 para 9; p12 para 17; p13 para 12]*

136. Mr McKenna said "I haven't seen a defence yet that comes remotely close to being a valid defence,"**. The falsity of that assertion of Mr McKenna is made clear by the fact that:

a. Ms Truman *et al.* had to raise so many assertions (false as it happens) to supposedly show the unsoundness of the defences. It is self-evident that by doing so they were acknowledging that but for those supposed faults Mr Clarke's defences might indeed be valid defences.

b. Mr McKenna himself immediately thereafter set about raising old/new falsehoods to supposedly show the unsoundness of the defences***. It is self-evident that by doing so he was acknowledging that but for those supposed faults Mr Clarke's defences might indeed be valid defences.

***[Transcript of 12th June: p3 para 14]*
****[Transcript of 12th June: p4 para 1 to p5 para 4; p10 paras 2-6 .]*

137. Mr McKenna said "I've got any number of documents from you", and "I've probably got 20 or 30 documents from you" [transcript p4]. Ms Truman said "there are so many of them". In reality I had filed 9 documents* whereas the claimants had authored 7 documents of perjury and irrelevant falsehood, including their non-reply to my RFFI questions. Admittedly I had included a lot more information including audio recordings. That's because there was a lot of seriously pertinent information they wanted to hide whereas I had nothing to hide.
*[RFFI, Defence, Application to Strike out the Claim, Skeleton Argument, Comment on Lynn Mansell Second Statement, Rebuttal of Application to Strike out the Defence, Application to submit confidential documents, Application for appeal, Key Commentary.]

138. At the 2nd July High Court hearing, Mr Goldring erred in falsely dismissing my argument re Housing Act 1980 s.89(2)(c). He and the barrister failed to show any fault in that argument (presented in *"Grounds of Appeal (in respect of the application to suspend the eviction warrant)"*).

Biased selective switching between discussion and evasion

139. Mr McKenna on page 6 of the transcript said: "this is not a debating chamber", and "It's not a discussion". And yet he and Ms Truman indulged in rather a lot of discussion/debate so long as it looked to be favouring their improper agenda, as the following indicate.

140. The transcript of 21st June 2007, page 3 last line, initiated a discussion about the crucial fact that the claimants were devoid of any legitimacy to present themselves as being 20-20 (the landlord). By page 5 para 4, Mr McKenna was totally losing his side of this debate. So he evaded that "unhelpful" key truth by switching to a long-winded digression about supposed proper court procedure.

141. At p10 paras 2-6 he engaged in debate via his falsehood that "It wouldn't be a breach of the HRA". Then as he had no answer to my laying bare his deceit, he resorted to evasion again at para 8. He did so with yet another falsehood: "I'm not going to make a decision on hearing [only] one side of the argument" – when just a minute later he *did* do *exactly that*. (*And* had just then done in his previous words.)

142. (For some reason Ms Truman had to devise and present the barrister's arguments for him (I can only guess he was charging £100 per word and the claimants were running short of money). This is all the more odd given that she never presented arguments for the unrepresented defendant.)

143. Ms Truman at page 3 last line initiated a quasi-discussion of my illegitimacy defence. By page 4 para 6 I had thrown out all her objections. At that point it would have been reasonable for the judge-barrister collusionship to either (1) acknowledge they had found no fault in that defence, or (2) offer some other cheap falsehood for discussion. Instead she evaded with a digression about supposedly proper court procedure.

144. At page 4 para 13 Ms Truman initiated a lengthy challenging of my Security of Tenure defence. Within this the **learned** Ms Truman twice proffered a very serious deceitfully selective mis-quotation from the Tenancy Agreement (at page 6 para 19, page 6 para 21, page 7 para 2). I had already very carefully clearly presented **precisely*** this whole matter in my documents which she was so insistent she had fully read (* *Application* paras 69-70 and surrounding). By page 7 line 11, I had demolished all these shamelessly dishonourable objections to my Security of Tenure argument, whereupon Ms Trueliar immediately evaded with one of her time-pressuring comments at page 7 line 12.

145. At page 8 para 6-8 again she evaded the soundness of my proof of grounds argument with more time-pressuring.

146. At page 14 para 10 she initiated the barrister's citation of the *Qazi* and *Donoghue* cases as supposed objection to my HRA defence. At page 16 para 11, I demolished this nonsense with "But we're not dealing with the issue of shorthold." At this, Ms Truman instantly evaded the enduring soundness of my argument with the irrelevant comment that "No, but that was the only point that Mr Watkin was raising so can we carry on Mr Watkin".

147. At page 20 line 15 the barrister repeated his pseudo-rebuttal of my illegitimacy defence (as supposedly a matter of 'public law'). I showed its falsity (my defence had nothing whatsoever to do with public law or public authority), at which Ms Truman evaded by digressing to a further lecture about supposed proper procedure.

Demeanour of the Judges

148. A further very telling fact about these hearings was the sharply contrasting demeanour of the judges.

149. At the March hearing, Ms Truman was extremely relaxed and smug. This would be because she was fully confident that I, as a totally inexperienced, seriously ill, unwealthy, lone individual, would be easily crushed to death by her abuses and would not have the capability to gain redress after her refusal of an appeal. Not least, she could rely on her colleagues to cover up her abuses by means of further falsehoods.

150. In marked contrast, at the June hearing, Mr McKenna was conspicuously very uneasy. This would be because he was committed by his perverted code of "honour" to concur with the other judges' false judgments, and yet this could only be done in stark defiance of the truth, and furthermore I had obtained a transcript and had brought along six additional witnesses to his exhibition of deceit, including a County Councillor from Hereford.

Pseudo-"Civil" Proceedings which are in Reality Improper Criminal Proceedings in Disguise

151. While eviction proceedings aka "claims for possession" are supposedly civil proceedings, the actual facts make clear that they are in a great many cases, as in this one, in exact reality criminal proceedings in disguise:

1) Criminal law is about types of behaviour which are forbidden at risk of punishment. A high proportion of possession claims involve alleged "antisocial behaviour" or other abusive misconduct (e.g. my own supposed preventing of the re-letting of Flat 3) as their basis.

2) UK housing organisations have in recent years been given statutory status as adjudicators over allegations of "antisocial behaviour", with power to set in train a penalty of "intentional" homelessness via rubberstamping in the "civil" courts. Indeed, housing organisations (including 20-20) were in 2005 required to introduce policies for how they would act as policers and adjudicators of allegations of "antisocial behaviour". These housing organisations thus function as police, public prosecutors, and even as courts.

3) A record of eviction functions like a criminal record, preventing future obtaining of (affordable) housing from RSLs or from councils.

4) Eviction is liable to be a much harsher penalty than imprisonment, given that prisoners at least get housed and fed, in security, and even with opportunity to study, whereas evictees are liable to freeze or starve to death in the street or even get killed there. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2008/04/25/njail125.xml states: "people are breaking into prisons to bring in drugs, but the prisoners are quite happy to stay inside."

BBC Radio 4 News, at 0.29 a.m. on 25th April 2008 stated:
"Prisoners are passing up the chance of escape because life on the inside is easier than outside."

152. Eviction into "intentional" homelessness is thus demonstrated to be being used as a cheapskate (but more severe) substitute for imprisonment of offenders. The fact that the UK legal system labels these cases as "civil" is merely a choice of words and cannot be a substantive reason for denying a reality that they are criminal proceedings in all the criteria that matter - the gravity of the outcomes, the nature of the allegations, the public authority function status of the initiators of the legal action, and the resulting blacklisting record.

153. It follows that Article 6 (fair trial) must apply to these so-called civil proceedings.

154. The "trial" (i.e., the hearing of the applications) was not even remotely fair, as evidenced in previous sections.

155. I was not presumed innocent until proven guilty.

156. I was not given adequate time and facilities for preparation of my defence, as indicated in paras 45-47.

157. The claimants filed three patently perjurous witness statements and the barrister said he was content to rely on those witness statements [12th March, page 16 para 13]. But no cross-examination of those false testimonies was granted [page 22]. Nor was I given opportunity to present witnesses on my own behalf – indeed I presented no witness statements at all.

158. There was a severe inequality of arms. The claimants abused the publicly-subsidised funds and rent payments of myself and other members (from whom they evaded accountability by a regime of total secretisation) to employ a solicitor and barrister, whereas I was obliged to advise and represent myself without any professional help in this complex case, being unable to obtain any legal aid due to the severe deficiency of the UK legal aid system in recent years .

159. I was unable, despite the most extreme efforts, to obtain legal aid in my defence. Details of this were given in my application for extension of time for appeal (as below).

Unavailability of legal aid in defence of these criminal cases
(excerpted from my application for extension of time for appeal)

160. It can hardly be disputed that the legal aid system is in a severe crisis of underfunding. It was already described as of serious concern back in 2002, and yet just this month the 1st March 2007 Law Gazette stated that "Housing lawyers are deserting legal aid work in droves".

161. My own experience is in line with this. I not only found all the solicitors in Birmingham to be too busy to look into this relatively complex case, but also my enquiries in Coventry were ended with a remark that there was no chance of my finding legal aid of a housing case there either. In Warwick and Leamington there are none even registered, and on phoning to Worcester I was again assured there was absolutely no chance, because the annual quota of justice had been used up at this time of year coming up to April. The advisor at Shelter likewise said that the situation outside the cities was even worse, with no legal aid at all in large areas. On the 26th, I travelled to appointments at two solicitors (Challenor Gardiner and Turpin & Miller) in Oxford (as per attached ticket photocopies), only to find that cases in the Birmingham courts would be outside their legally-aided range.

162. I also engaged in time-consuming correspondence with the public access barrister Marc Beaumont who was interested in possibly taking up my case, along with a solicitor in Reading, but that option also floundered on the problem of not finding a legal aid solicitor to fund him through.

163. Much of the limited time for preparation of the appeal has been consumed in this fruitless search.

164. And at the end of it the Defendant is still without professional legal assistance. The Defendant remains also still seriously ill with fatigue etc. as accepted at the hearing.

165. Supposedly he is also seriously to be expected during this same short period to suddenly find another place to live in substitute of his home of 17 years, and to carry out the massive task of relocation to such place, when he can barely cope even with just ordinary day-to-day life.

166. In addition, the claimants' Counsel has still not supplied me with a copy of his note of judgment, despite several requests over nearly a fortnight (e.g., letter copied herewith).

An Important Fallacy about Repossessions

167. In a context of numerous repossessions from mortgagees, it is liable to be assumed that an eviction from rented property is a relatively trivial matter. The following facts show this to be a fallacy.

(a) The great proliferation of buy-to-let as a means of easy income proves that tenants pay more for their housing than mortgagees do (as otherwise buy-to-let would be loss-making).

(b) A mortgagee is a contractor to a gamble, from which they hope to, indeed commonly do, win very large sums of capital gains, a very lucrative form of unearned income. In exchange for such gambles for high winnings they choose to take a risk.

(c) Tenants tend to be much less wealthy than mortgagees and so are much less fortunately-placed to cope with the consequences of eviction.

(d) Eviction from a tenancy functions like a criminal record, preventing future obtaining of affordable housing from RSLs or from councils.

(e) In the present case, I was involved in the management of 20-20 for five years (1985-1990) before becoming a tenant. In contrast to mortgagee gamblers I invested only in helping to create a community institutional resource (albeit one that became corrupted by Nic Bliss et al).

("Consequences" section follows on the next sheet)

Consequences
(A fuller account of consequences will be sent to replace this one)

168. Due to these abuses of justice, I, the blameless severely ill victim of criminal harassment by the claimants themselves, was obliged to leave my home of 17 years the very next day even though I had nowhere arranged to go to (and it is almost impossible to find anywhere if you are dependent on benefits).

169. Only by extreme chance, Mr Ayoub, my next-door neighbour of 15 years, happened to have some rooms in a small terraced house in nearly-habitable condition (no light, no bathroom water, no functioning lock on the back door, leaking gutterings, and in process of messy building works), which for that reason was unoccupied at that time.

170. Those rooms at 323 Tiverton Rd, Selly Oak, amounted to much less space than my flat in Augusta Rd. So I was obliged to store most of my things at other people's crowded houses, or in storage, including the two pianos I had restored.

171. I was unable to remove more than a part of my property before the time of eviction. As I am a researcher whose home is also his office and workshop, I naturally had a huge archive of documents and other things. Due to two years of harassment and a year of legal case, everything was in much disarray, needing weeks just to sort out.

172. The claimant clique did not allow remotely adequate opportunity to remove my remaining property, and consequently much was lost, of which I am still not entirely sure what. Even that which I was able to remove was thrown into great disorder and scattered between six addresses many miles apart, besides between the rooms of 323 Tiverton Rd.

173. This disorder was made all the worse by the fact that I suddenly no longer had my telephone or internet connection, which as a non-motorist I was very much dependent on.

174. Six weeks after my moving to 323 Tiverton Rd, Birmingham City Council kindly offered me the tenancy of a flat on the 19th floor of Salisbury Tower in Ladywood. Ladywood is the area with the highest unemployment in the UK (19%; the second being 14%), and has a reputation for gun crime. The flat had become vacant because the previous tenant Thomas Heffernan had fallen from the 19th-floor window.

175. I had no alternative than to accept this tenancy within a few days as I would get no other offers. I explained that I was far too tired and confused to move again that month, but there was no option. I had to leave 323 Tiverton Rd anyway because the Housing Benefit refused to pay the full market rent, leaving a shortfall of £300 per month which I could not afford.

176. As previously explained I have to use a shower for washing, and the flat had no shower. And the state of (dis-)decoration was revolting – not surprising the previous tenant had suicided himself. So I decided to spend a few days redecorating and sorting out a shower. Due to my illness and inexperience this few days became four months of endless effort and expense of travelling every day between the locations.

177. The Housing Benefit refused to pay the concurrent rents, with the result that I was forced into a rent arrears bill for £2400 that I did not have anyway.

178. This preliminary account of consequences is incomplete. It is now April, three years since the harrassment scheme was launched, and I still have been unable to move on to almost anything beyond this housing aftermath. I've still not got my mercury amalgams removed. I still have not been able to send my stupendous autism update for publication. Even this flat is still in a very undecorated, unorganised state. There has been huge expense and loss of time/amenity. The blame for this lies with Nic Bliss, Midge Miller, Lynn Mansell, Jacqueline Rooker, the Housing Corporation, and Judges Truman, MacDuff and McKenna.