

For the attention of Paul Jonson  
Head of Dispute Resolution  
PANNONES LLP

7<sup>th</sup> December 2012

## NOTICE OF ACTION

Private Criminal Prosecution – Against all Pannone Partners.

Sir,

Please be advised as follows: -

I am acting in the capacity of a **common law advocate** on behalf of Mike Clarke – with whom you are in dispute.

I am aware that Mike has a perfected and thus an enforceable commercial lien against each of the partners in the law firm Pannone LLP – total valued at nine million pounds. **This is a substantial claim** and will have serious implications for each partner if this matter were to be pursued in the high court. I am of the opinion that you have an obligation to inform your insurers of this lien – and that failure to do so could invalidate your cover. I believe also that there is good cause to raise the issue of the conduct of Pannone LLP with the Solicitors Regulation Authority and the Financial Services Authority under the circumstance.

It is my hope to avoid all of the above by agreeing a resolution to this long drawn out matter.

I have suggested to Mike that as the stakes have been raised (by you) that an attempt at arbitration would be a sensible option... he informs me that you have declined any previous offer to negotiate - which I find a little ironic bearing in mind your job title - as 'Head of dispute resolution.'

**Mike has every right to publish the details of the lien in the Mercantile Gazette...** and every right to seek enforcement of his claim through the High Court. I am confident that such a claim would be successful – bearing in mind that not a single partner has made any effort to rebut any of the claims made therein... instead they have relied on a dubious attempt at an injunction – issued by a fellow legal practitioner.

I note that the so-called order on which you are relying for committal proceedings is void. Any administrator that made use this to commit a man to prison would find themselves at the receiving end of a VERY substantial claim for damages. I have advised Mike to inform the court of this fact.

You will be aware I am sure that a growing number of people are challenging the authority of hearings where a member of the legal profession sits as a lone arbiter in a tribunal – insisting on referring to him/herself as a judge and the hearing as a court. There is no act of Parliament that authorises these so-called courts and no orders emanating from them have any validity – unless consented to by all parties to the dispute. You will be aware that Mike has categorically withheld his consent to any arbitration process... insisting on his common law right to a jury trial. There is no act of parliament that you can rely on to suppress a man's common law rights and no government would ever be lunatic enough to attempt to produce one.

Mike has a valid grievance against Pannone LLP – which your firm has refused to address – hence the commercial lien.

This letter is an offer to attempt to resolve the matter – once and for all. Mike has suggested that you respond by Monday 4 pm - this having been influenced by your own threats of action and deadlines.

You should know that Mike will not be consenting to any tribunals where a member of the legal profession is involved in arbitration as this would be patently bias against Mike. Only a jury trial would be acceptable.

In the event that any administrator acts unlawfully to imprison Mike – on the basis of an invalid, unsigned and void order... we are recommending that he commence action by way of a private criminal prosecution against each partner in Pannone LLP – who we would regard as culpable in the criminal acts of unlawful imprisonment.

I would suggest that negotiation is the best way forward.

Yours sincerely

Roger Hayes