

PRESTON COMBINED COURT CASE NO 10370284

[2012] EWHC 2947 (COP)

24.10.2012

Dear Judge Jackson

I ask;

1. Why have you chosen to dismiss our request for full disclosure of all paperwork and accounting?
2. Why have you chosen to ignore the allegations of financial neglect where the professional care of mum's finances have failed?
3. Why have you chosen to ignore the claims of overcharging by the deputy and the further hiding of that overcharging for 10 years?
4. Why have you chosen to ignore the question of financial Jurisdiction whilst emigrated.

How can you claim to dispense justice in a fair and impartial manner when the judgement of the 'bar' in which you are a part of, is a clear conflict of interests?

As a Judge what is it that you can clearly see is honourable in this procedure that we have had to endure, where the other parties have extracted costs from my mother's estate when she had been deprived of representation by the clear obstruction of a flow of her own funds to her, for her own solicitor. This in the end made us turn toward common law with jury court refused by you and a commercial lien claim that you also have chosen to ignore. An affidavit, which was sworn under oath & witnessed by a notary & by ignoring this, would you call this poor conduct?

How can you be referred to as 'HONOURABLE' when there is no HONOUR in your actions?

You have accused me of poor conduct but you have paid the other parties costs from mum's estate whereby one of those 2 parties has clearly obstructed mum's access to her own funds for representation. Is this not poor conduct?

Could lying to a client be classed as poor conduct?

Could the proof of deceit to a client be classed as poor conduct?

Could the proof of theft be classed as poor conduct?

Criminal neglect, the failure to do what a normal person would, is that poor conduct?

No wonder I am belligerent! This is my mother that you have and are sanctioning all these crimes upon and then committing further thefts against her by extracting more payments to the person committing the crimes.

I do not see the honour that you attach to your name. Perhaps you could provide something for me to understand that resembles such honour.

Your section 10. The applications by Mr Michael Clarke are refused. There is no basis for delaying the conclusion of the proceedings – how did you arrive at this decision when all the above is clearly on display?

Could your relationship to the Master Denzel Lush & the cogs that turn within this organisation be a factor in your not being able to arrive at a fair and impartial result, as I doubt any common law jury court would have arrived at the conclusion you just have. It is normal procedure in any court to have full disclosure so what is it that's not normal in your court?

By: Mike Clarke