Continuation page 11a

The facts in this criminal case explicitly revolve around the administration of public justice. And Offences against justice.

- *Doing an act tending and intended to pervert the course of public justice - a.k.a. perverting the course of justice, defeating the ends of justice, obstructing the administration of justice*
- *Concealing evidence, contrary to section 5(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1967*

And Participatory and inchoate offences

- *Encouraging or assisting crime - Part 2 of the Serious Crime Act 2007*
- *Aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the commission of an offence*
- *Conspiracy, contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977*
- *Conspiracy to defraud*

And the unlawful act of

- ***misconduct** (or misfeasance) **in public office***
  - A public officer acting as such.
  - Wilfully neglects to perform his duty and/or wilfully misconducts himself. (In English legal language 'he' includes 'she'.)
  - To such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust in the office holder.
  - Without reasonable excuse or justification.
- **miscarriage of justice**

This is an Attorney General's reference under Section 36 of the Criminal Justice Act 1972, as amended.
http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Crim/2004/868.html

SEE PAGE 1-16 OF BUNDLE

On the 16th September 2012, Mr Justice Beatson the single judge sitting at the Court of Appeal stated:

(1) "*The time had long expired for service of a defence statement before your trial team was instructed. In any event you suffered no prejudice from the failure to serve a statement because you were not cross-examined on this matter, nor was it the subject of an adverse comment in the judge's summing-up;"*

The pertinent line

"In any event you suffered no prejudice from the failure to serve a statement because you were not cross-examined on this matter"

Beatson refers to a defendant's statutory requirement to make a 'Defence (Case) Statement', and for this document presented to the court before the Plea and Case Management Hearing (now referred to as the Plea and Trial Preparation Hearing)

SEE PAGE 19 OF BUNDLE

Beatson has made it clear a defendant can have his defence withheld "*provided he is not questioned on it".* According to Beatson a defendant who has an alibi can have this alibi withheld provided he is not questioned on it. Therefore, the defendant can then be found guilt and imprisoned. He does not explain his gobbledygook of how a defendant can be questioned on a defence that does not exists.

He also neglects to state that the first legal team (see below) representing me refused to make a 'Defence Statement' and the judge (Jarvis) at the PCMH Hearing failed in his administration duties. He should have halted the PCMH until a Defence Statement had been completed.

Beatson has made it clear a defendant in a criminal trial has no right of a defence. And taking the 3 judges involved in my case appears to be the opinion of many British judges. Withhold a defendant's evidence for the sole purpose of a conviction.

However, the Rule of Law we are told, is the principle that law should govern a nation, as opposed to being governed by decisions of individual government officials as in my case. It primarily refers to the influence and authority of law within society.

*What is at stake is the confidence, which the courts in a democratic society must inspire in the public, including the accused. Thus, any judge in respect of whom there is a legitimate reason to fear a lack of impartiality must withdraw (**Castillo Algar v. Spain, @45**).*

THOSE INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIONS AGAINST ME (James Colton).

Solicitors involved:

Tracey Watson (Bournemouth) 1st solicitor

- Refused to make defence statement
- Refused to call defence witnesses — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN
- Withheld exculpatory evidence
- Refused to follow Criminal Procedure Rules

Paul Booty (Stowmarket in Suffolk) 2nd solicitor

- Refused to make defence statement
- Refused to call defence witnesses — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN
- Withheld exculpatory evidence
- Refused to follow Criminal Procedure Rules

Barristers involved:

Fern Russell (London) 1st barrister

- Refused to make defence statement
- Refused to call defence witnesses — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN
- Withheld exculpatory evidence
- Refused to follow Criminal Procedure Rules

Christopher Wing (London) 2nd barrister

- Refused to make defence statements
- Refused to call defence witnesses — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN
- Withheld exculpatory evidence
- Refused to follow Criminal Procedure Rules

Crown Court Judges (Bournemouth

Judges Wiggs (retired) Bournemouth Crown Court –

- Withheld exculpatory evidence — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN
- Refused to follow Criminal Procedure Rules

Judge Jarvis (retired) Bournemouth Crown Court

- Withheld exculpatory evidence
- Refused to follow Criminal Procedure Rules — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN

Judge House (retired) Bournemouth Magistrates Court

Kate Brown Crown Prosecution Service Wessex — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN

Mr Justice Beatson acts against justice — EVIDENCE CONTAINED HEREIN

History - SUMMARY

Available evidence confirms that in 1999, the defendant discovered his wife (Sheelagh Colton) had fell for a John Edwards a customer at one of the defendant's businesses (print & copy shop). The defendants second business a teaching school in alternative medicine, proved too much of a prize for his wife and Edwards, a plan was hatched, (involving the wife's two (married) daughters). The defendant was to be murdered, his wife taking a kitchen knife to bed with her, stabbing the defendant while he slept. Unable to go through with this action plan B was activated.

PLAN B

The first action. Involved the wife leaving the matrimonial home, without any explanation. She just up and left taking her sixteen-year-old son with her. An agreement on a divorce was made. The wife contacts a solicitor; letters demanding the defendant's two businesses, the matrimonial house, and all contents is a requirement of the divorce. This action fails.

The second action. Involved a Gordon Moores, a Legal Executive/Private Investigator who they hire to threaten the defendant. Moores accuses the defendant of (historical) sexual abuse against the two stepdaughters. In addition, if he moves out the house and leaves Bournemouth immediately no more be said. This blackmail attempt fails.

The third action. A reign of terror against the defendant by his wife, her daughters and son in laws.

The forth action. The defendant is threatened with his life by the husbands of the stepdaughters. The defendant fled from his Bournemouth home to stay with a friend in Lincolnshire. These actions are evidenced.

The defendant starts divorce proceedings. The allegations of sex abuse are used in divorce proceedings, in support of the mother's financial claim.
The defendant can prove the allegations are false. District judge Cooper accepts the evidence and makes complaints against all lawyers involved in this case (3-day fact finding hearing).

This vital evidence was withheld at an unlawful trial at Bournemouth Crown Courts in May 2009.

Case No T20097078

TIMELINE

19th June 2008 Defendant arrested without warrant, by DC Spencer (Dorset Police) at his home in Norfolk for alleged 'Harassment'. Publishing the facts of his divorce (3-day fact finding hearing).

The police seize items from defendant's home. Harassment is a summary only offence. There are no provisions in the Act for seizure of goods

Mr Duffy CPS (Wessex) refuses to prosecute defendant.

28th September 2008 PC Spencer and DC Darkin meet with John Montague (Chief Crown Prosecutor Bournemouth). In regard the sexual allegations. Mr Montague refuses to prosecute (due to available exculpatory evidence).

John Montague is by-passed by Kate Brown head of the CPS Wessex

10th May 2009 Defendant arrested without warrant, by DC Darkin (Dorset Police) at his home in Norfolk. And charged with alleged 'Historical sexual abuse' against two ex-stepdaughters.

11th May 2009 Questioned by DC's 49 Darkin and DC 2148 TAYLOR. Defendant represented by Ms Tracey Watson (duty solicitor) of Jacobs & Reeves Bournemouth. Defendant refused the presence of an 'appropriate adult' due to his mental health issues (depression and anxiety). In receipt of 'Disability Living Allowance' since 2000. The result of his divorce.

However, the defendant was able to point out the discrepancies between divorce affidavits made by the ex-stepdaughters and the selected questions taken from the complainants (stepdaughters) 'Police Video Interviews' made in October 2008.
See page 30 for example

11th May 2009 The defendant presented before District Judge House sitting at the Magistrates Court (Bournemouth). The CPS do not oppose bail, however DG House refuses bail on the grounds of the defendant's web site (Lawful Rebellion). The defendant held on remand at Dorchester Prison.

16th July 2009 Plea and Case Management Hearing (PCMH)

The PCMH form (advocates questionnaire) had NOT, been completed. Therefore, there were NO DISCLOSURES given, (i.e. NO DEFENCE STATEMENT (statutory requirement), WITNESS NOTICE. DEFENDANTS EVIDENCE DIRECTION. DEFENDANTS INTERVIEW/S. ADMISSIBILITY AND LEGAL ISSUES. OTHER SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS etc.)

Judge Jarvis made no enquiries why no defence statement had been made.

Ms Watson the defendant's solicitor had refused all and any contact with the defendant and a friend acting on his behalf. Therefore, a 'Court Agent' appointed (recorded with the Legal Complaints Service) to represent the defendant at the PCMH.
Defendant changes lawyers who also refused to represent the defendant.
Paul Booty – solicitor
Christopher Wing – barrister

Details follow.

Prosecution Case

The Crown Court, Sitting at Bournemouth
URN: 55CN0385009

R -v - JAMES COLTON

BRIEF OUTLINE OF ALLEGATION & ISSUES

CHARGES:
JAMES COLTON
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/01/1979-30/04/1982
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 03/09/1982-02/09/1984
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 03/09/1982-02/09/1984
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 03/09/1982-02/09/1984
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 03/09/1984-16/09/1985
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/03/1982-31/12/1985
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/03/1982-31/12/1985
RAPE, contrary to section 1(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 01/03/1982-31/12/1985
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 15/09/1985-02/09/1988
INDECENT ASSAULT, contrary to section 14(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956. 03/09/1987-02/09/1988

<u>These charges are provable fake. And why the evidence establishing this was withheld.</u>

The Rights as a defendant in court. The right to raise a defence call witness and obtain further exculpatory evidence.

Thomson Reuters - Practical Law The Disclosure Referencer Chapter 4 - Defence Statements

Defence obligations

Generally

4.13 What the accused is required to disclose by section 6A, CPIA 1996 is what is going to happen at the trial.[23] Where the accused advances a positive case there must be compliance with the statutory obligations, clearly set out in section 6A, or the accused is at risk of the sanctions available under section 11, CPIA 1996.[24]

4.14 The accused is not required to disclose confidential discussions with his advocate nor is he obliged to incriminate himself if he does not want to. The fundamental rights of legal professional privilege and the accused's privilege against self-incrimination have not been taken away by section 6A, CPIA 1996.[25]

4.15 The accused is under a statutory obligation to serve a defence statement and his lawyers must not advise him against doing so. In *R v Rochford*[26] Hughes LJ stated:

'Can the lawyer properly advise an accused not to file a defence statement? The answer to that is "No". The obligation to file a defence statement is a statutory obligation on the accused. It is not open to a lawyer to advise his client to disobey the client's statutory obligation. It is as simple as that.' (para 22)

SEE PAGE 20-33 OF BUNDLE

Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (c.25 Part 1(II))
Code of Practice.

F1 6A Contents of defence statement

(1) For the purposes of this Part a defence statement is a written statement—

(a)setting out the nature of the accused's defence, including any particular defences on which he intends to rely,

(b)indicating the matters of fact on which he takes issue with the prosecution,

(c)setting out, in the case of each such matter, why he takes issue with the prosecution,

[F2(ca)setting out particulars of the matters of fact on which he intends to rely for the purposes of his defence,]

(d)indicating any point of law (including any point as to the admissibility of evidence or an abuse of process) which he wishes to take, and any authority on which he intends to rely for that purpose.

(2) A defence statement that discloses an alibi must give particulars of it, including—

(a)the name, address and date of birth of any witness the accused believes is able to give evidence in support of the alibi, or as many of those details as are known to the accused when the statement is given;

(b)any information in the accused's possession which might be of material assistance in identifying or finding any such witness in whose case any of the details mentioned in paragraph (a) are not known to the accused when the statement is given.

(3) For the purposes of this section evidence in support of an alibi is evidence tending to show that by reason of the presence of the accused at a particular place or in a particular area at a particular time he was not, or was unlikely to have been, at the place where the offence is alleged to have been committed at the time of its alleged commission.

(4) The Secretary of State may by regulations make provision as to the details of the matters that, by virtue of subsection (1), are to be included in defence statements.]

Also, the Criminal justice act 2003 c44 Chapter 2

- Section 119 inconsistent statements
- Section 120 Other previous statements of witnesses
- Section 122 Documents produced as exhibits
- Section 124 Credibility
- Section 125 Stopping the case where evidence is unconvincing
- Section 126 Courts general discretion to exclude evidence (the evidence shows Judge Wiggs withheld evidence in secret).

SEE PAGES 75-83 OF BUNDLE

Case Law. The defendant's rights to raise a defence at court.

Regina and Newell [2012] EWCA Crim 650.

The Court of Appeal stated:

The judge is required to exercise a managerial role with a view to progressing the case at this Hearing.

> *34. "A typed defence statement must be provided before the PCMH. If there is no defence statement by the time of the PCMH, then a judge will usually require the trial advocate to see that such a statement is provided and not proceed with the PCMH until that is done. In the ordinary case the trial advocate will be required to do that at the court and the PCMH resumed later in the day to avoid delay and further cost to be borne by the public purse. Given that position, the trial advocate at the PCMH should see it as part of the trial advocate's duty to help the court with the management of the case by setting out information on the PCMH Form without the risk of the information being provided being used as a statement admissible in evidence against the defendant, provided the advocate complies with the letter and the spirit of the Criminal Procedure Rules."*

SEE PAGE 34-41 OF BUNDLE

R E G I N A v SVS SOLICITORS [2012] EWCA Crim 319

Mr Justice Beatson one of 3 Court of appeal judges AGREED with the statutory requirement of a Defence Statement. Yet! In my case makes a rebellious judgement, which is a crime against justice.

The Court stated:

18. *In his judgment the judge went on to cite the passage in the judgment of Sir Thomas Bingham, MR, in Ridehalgh on the meaning of "improper", "unreasonable" and "negligent", to which we have already referred. He also referred to part 3.5(6)(b) of the Criminal Procedure Rules that provides that if a party fails to comply with a rule or direction the court may exercise its powers to make a costs order. The judge observed that most defendants have no assets and certainly the defendant in this case had none. The judge then said:*
"Plainly, solicitors act on their client's instructions, but they also owe a duty to the court, a duty which is identified by the overriding obligation. A solicitor is not entitled to break the rules with impunity. In the context of a Defence Statement it seems to me that, although a solicitor is required to advise his client that he should comply with a requirement to serve a Defence Statement, if the client, having been given proper advice by the solicitor, still refuses to permit the solicitor to serve the Defence Statement or any Defence Statement, then the solicitors themselves commit no breach of the rules which could be punished by way of a Wasted Costs Order. There is a sanction for the failure to serve a Defence Statement and, in effect, to ambush the

prosecution in the form of the inference direction, always assuming that a jury will understand the meaning of that direction, limited as it is by the various qualifications which the judge summing-up to a jury is required to introduce.

The solicitor owes a duty to the court and is subject to the overriding obligation. In such circumstances all the court need be told is that the client is not permitting the solicitor to comply with the rules. No breach of professional privilege is involved in the process whereby the solicitor would then be permitted by the court to come off the record. So if a solicitor fails to comply with his obligations to give reasons as to why a Hearsay Notice is opposed, one is entitled to assume, where the solicitor continues to act, that it is the failure of the solicitors in providing any reason. In requiring the witness to attend, the solicitor was acting on his client's instructions and implementing them, but, he was not entitled to break the rules in order to do so." **SEE PAGE 42-51 OF BUNDLE**

THE QUEEN ON THE APPLICATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS Neutral Citation Number: [2006] EWHC 1795 (Admin) stated:

24. In April 2005 the Criminal Procedure Rules came into effect. By 15th April they were in force. They have affected a sea change in the way in which cases should be conducted, but it appears from what has happened in this case that not everyone has appreciated the fundamental change to the conduct of cases in the Magistrates' Courts that has been brought about by the rules. The rules make clear that the overriding objective is that criminal cases be dealt with justly; that includes acquitting the innocent and convicting the guilty, dealing with the prosecution and the defence fairly, respecting the interests of witnesses, dealing with the case efficiently and expeditiously, and also, of great importance, dealing with the case in a way that takes into account the gravity of the offence, the complexity of what is in issue, the severity of the consequences to the defendant and others affected and the needs of other cases. Rule 1.2 imposes upon the duty of participants in a criminal case to prepare and conduct the case in accordance with the overriding objective, to comply with the rules and, importantly, to inform the court and all parties of any significant failure, whether or not the participant is responsible for that failure, to take any procedural step required by the rules.

SEE PAGE 84-91 OF BUNDLE

In R E G I N A v GAVIN ROCHFORD

APPLICATION UNDER S.13 ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACT 1960

Section 11 of the 1996 Act provides for the consequences of failure to comply with the plain obligation created by section 5(5). Section 11(2) contains the triggers for the sanction. They are as follows:

"(2) The first case is where section 5 applies and the accused-

(a) fails to give an initial defence statement,

(b) gives an initial defence statement but does so afternoon the end of the period which, by virtue of section 12, is the relevant period for section 5,

(c) is required by section 6B to give either an updated defence statement or a statement of the kind mentioned in subsection (4) of that section but fails to do so,

(d) gives an updated defence statement or a statement of the kind mentioned in section 6B (4) but does so after the end of the period which, by virtue of section 12, is the relevant period for section 6B,

(e) sets out inconsistent defences in his defence statement, or

(f) at his trial-

(i) puts forward a defence which was not mentioned in his defence statement or is different from any defence set out in that statement,

(ii) relies on a matter (or any particular of any matter of fact) which, in breach of requirements imposed by or under section 6A, was not mentioned in his defence statement,

(iii) adduces evidence in support of an alibi without having given particulars of the alibi in his defence statement, or

(iv) calls a witness to give evidence in support of an alibi without having complied with section 6A(2)(a) or (b) as regards the witness in his defence statement."

SEE PAGE 92-97 OF BUNDLE

In R E G I N A v STEVEN HENRY PENNER

The court stated:

2. There are two points that arise in this case: (1) the necessity of compliance of the Criminal Procedure Rules and (2) an understanding of the importance of evidence.

6. The Criminal Procedure Rules have been in force in this country for some time. They have abolished what is known as "trial by ambush". Sometimes it appears that people do not appreciate that and the duties that arise at the Plea and Case Management Hearing (PCMH)."

SEE PAGE 98-103 OF BUNDLE

***In R. v. Essa [2009] EWCA Crim 43**, the Court of Appeal stated that s.5(5) is an obligatory requirement, a defence statement must be served even if the accused remained silent in interview, and that "it is not open to those who advise defendants to pick and choose which statutory rules applicable to the conduct of criminal proceedings they obey and which they do not."*

Section 33(2) of the CJA 2003 creates a new s.6A of the CPIA 1996 (amended by s.110 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008) which increases both the information and detail required in the defence statement. The defence statement must be in writing, it must contain sufficient detail of the nature of the defence; identify the disputed parts of the prosecution's case and give reasons for doing so, outlining the facts the defence intend to rely upon, any points of law, admissibility evidence and case authorities. If the defence intends to rely on alibi evidence, then (s.6A (2)) sufficient detail to enable identification of that alibi must be disclosed in the defence statement.

Whether or not a written defence statement properly served adequately complies with the conditions contained in s.6A will be for the trial Judge to determine. If, however, the defendant does no more than put the prosecution to proof and declines to put a "positive case", (whether voluntarily or deliberate refusal to cooperate) then following R. v. Rochford [2010] EWCA Crim 1928, a minimal statement to this effect would not breach s.6A. That whilst the trial Judge must ensure proper case management and to do so "insistently and trenchantly", if no positive case is being pursued, he cannot then require defence counsel to disclose details of the defendant's instruction.

https://www.criminallawandjustice.co.uk/features/Disclosure-Evidence-Criminal-Trials

In WAYNE PATRICK MALCOLM Appellant- and - THE CROWN [2011] EWCA Crim 2069 the court stated:

16. The PCMH took place on 23 March 2010 in the Crown Court sitting at Kingston upon Thames. The appellant pleaded not guilty. The prosecution had not by then made primary disclosure (in accordance with section 3 of the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996) and was ordered to do so by 7 April 2010. The defence was ordered to serve the defence statement by 23 April 2010. The issue in the case was stated on the PCMH form to be "Intention". The box containing the question "what further evidence is to be served by the prosecution" was left empty. The prosecution list of witnesses to be called in person contained two names:

    Mr Lugg and PC Uppal, the officer in the case. The Court ordered the trial to be listed in the week commencing 5 July 2010 with a time estimate of two days.

17. The defence statement was dated 26 March 2010 and was drafted by the appellant's solicitors. Following a number of "standard" disclaimers which seem to us to be of no value, the statement read:

"A. The nature of the accused's defence in relation to the charge:

By virtue of section 5(5) of the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 where an accused has been committed for trial he "must give a defence statement to the court and the prosecutor".

By virtue of section 6A a defence statement is a written statement:

"(a) setting out the nature of the accused's defence, including any particular defences on which he intends to rely,

(b) indicating the matters of fact on which he takes issue with the prosecution,

(c) setting out, in the case of each such matter, why he takes issue with the prosecution,

(ca)[2] setting out particulars of the matters of fact on which he intends to rely for the purposes of his defence, and

(d) indicating any point of law (including any point as to the admissibility of evidence or an abuse of process) which he wishes to take, and any authority on which he intends to rely for that purpose."

Did the defence statement fail to meet the necessary requirements? As we shall explain in more detail below, it utterly failed to meet them and was seriously defective.

The defence statement not having been served before the PCMH, as it should have been if the prosecution had made timeous primary disclosure, the box in the PCMH form requiring the prosecution to state whether the defence statement complied with the requirements of section 6A could not be filled in. The PCMH form also requires the parties to identify the issues if not identified in the defence statement. The entry "Intention" was quite inadequate.

SEE PAGE 104-135 OF BUNDLE

THE QUEEN - and - DAVID BOARDMAN [2015] EWCA Crim 175

2. The Review goes on to deal with the critical importance of the Criminal Procedure Rules (CPR) and the role of the judges in effectively managing the work of the court. It emphasises (at para. 199):

> "Whatever we do, we must encourage a reduced tolerance for failure to comply with court directions along with a recognition of the role and responsibilities of the Judge in matters of case management. It cannot be right that a 'culture of failure' has developed in the courts, fed by an expectation that deadlines will not be met. If a deadline (e.g. for service of a document(s) or an application) is not met, there must be good reason for it and there must be an expectation that the party which failed to comply can provide that reason. A failure to tackle this culture leads to a general indifference to rule compliance. Whichever party has failed to comply or failed to meet the deadline, the opponent perceives objection as a waste of time because it will be largely pointless: there is no sanction that can be applied. Perhaps most significantly, it allows cases to 'drift', and for further hearings to take place unnecessarily."

> 37. It is now ten years since the decision in R v Jisl [2004] EWCA Crim 464 in which Judge LJ (as he then was) emphasised that case management was "an essential part of the judge's duty". Referring to the issue of trial preparation and the objective of "greater efficiency and better use of limited resources", he went on (at para. 118):

> "When trial judges act in accordance with these principles, the directions they give ... in the exercise of their case management responsibilities, will be supported in this court. Criticism is more likely to be addressed to those who ignore them."

SEE PAGE 138 – 148 OF BUNDLE

[53] It was the responsibility of the appellant's legal representatives to carry out adequate investigations and preparations before the trial to see that his defence was properly presented at trial. It does not appear to us that without more detailed precognitions as to the rules enforced in the household, and without a properly argued attempt to persuade the court to order disclosure of the social work records, the appellant's defence was properly investigated and prepared. As was observed in Hemphill v HM Advocate 2001 SCCR 361 (at 384):

> "We cannot now guess what would have been the consequence of leading such expert medical evidence before the jury... but that is beside the point. The appellant was entitled to have his defence properly investigated with a view to its proper presentation." Emphasis added

The Guaranteed:

RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL

Article 6 of the Act states:

3 Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the following minimum rights:

(a) to be informed promptly, in a language which he understands and in detail, of the nature and cause of the accusation against him;

(b) to have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence;

(c) to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing or, if he has not sufficient means to pay for legal assistance, to be given it free when the interests of justice so require;

(d) to examine or have examined witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him;

(e) to have the free assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court.

The right to a fair hearing, which applies to any criminal charge as well as to the determination of civil rights and obligations, contains a number of requirements

"Article 6 provides that everyone has the right to a fair trial in both civil and criminal cases. A party to legal proceedings has the right to be heard by an independent, impartial tribunal, in public, and within a reasonable amount of time. Article 6 is not subject to any exceptions, though the procedural requirements of a fair trial may differ according to the circumstances.

Article 6 is connected with Article 13, the right to an effective remedy. This sets out that the state must provide redress to anyone whose rights under the Convention are breached. Procedural obligations are also provided by other articles, such as Article 8, the right to a private and family life.

In this respect even appearances may be of a certain importance.

What is at stake is the confidence, which the courts in a democratic society must inspire in the public, including the accused. Thus, any judge in respect of whom there is a legitimate reason to fear a lack of impartiality must withdraw (see Castillo Algar v.Spain, @45).

The right to a fair hearing, which applies to any criminal charge as well as to the determination of civil rights and obligations, contains a number of requirements

There must be real and effective access to a court (although there are limited exceptions in the case of vexatious litigants, minors, prisoners etc). To be real and effective this may require access to legal aid.

There must be a hearing before an independent and impartial court or tribunal established by law (including unbiased jurors).

The hearing must be held within a reasonable time. What is reasonable depends on the complexity of the case, its importance, the behaviour of both the applicant and competent authorities, and the length of time between the conduct in question (i.e. when the offence was committed, or contract breached etc) and when the trial takes place.

The applicant must have a real opportunity to present his or her case or challenge the case against them. This will require access to an opponent's submissions, procedural equality and generally requires access to evidence relied on by the other party and an oral hearing.

The court of tribunal must give reasons for its judgment.

There must be equality of arms between the parties, so, for example, the defence has the same right to examine witnesses against them as the prosecution has and both parties have the right to legal representation etc.

In criminal cases, there is a right to silence and a privilege against self-incrimination (although it may be possible to draw adverse inferences from suspects remaining silent).

An accused person must have the right to effective participation in their criminal trial. Except for strictly limited exceptions, an accused is entitled to be physically present at his or her hearing to give evidence in person and be legally represented.

The hearing and judgment must be made public. Hearings can, however, be held in private where:

- *it can be shown to be necessary and proportionate and in the interest of morals, public order or national security in a democratic society, or*
- *it is in the best interests of a child; or*
- *it is required for the protection of the private life of the parties; or*
- *it is strictly necessary in special circumstances where publicity, in the court's opinion, would prejudice the interests of justice."*

SEE PAGE 136-137 OF BUNDLE

Under the **Human Rights Act 1998** (c42) makes it unlawful for any public body to act in a way which is incompatible with the Convention, unless the wording of any other primary legislation provides no other choice.

It also requires the judiciary (including tribunals) to take account of any decisions, judgment or opinion of the European Court of Human Rights, and to interpret legislation, as far as possible, in a way which is compatible with Convention rights.

The Prosecution CPS (Kate Brown) WESSEX

The evidence establishes that Kate Brown (Wessex CPS) acted on her own volition outside her duties and responsibilities as head of Wessex CPS.

Kate Brown acknowledge that the exculpatory evidence previously mentioned was relevant to my case. Yet proceeded with a prosecution, months before trial, because she was aware the defence evidence would never materialise at trial.

Stating:

POLICE SCHEDULE OF NON-SENSITIVE UNUSED MATERIAL Form MG 6C at section 15 states:

- *Divorce file of Sheila Hagan and James COLTON matter S099D01278. Includes petitions/affidavits and appeals*
- *Held by Southampton county court and copies held on file*

Hand written COMMENT:

- *Contains accounts from witnesses which differs from (video interviews) May assist defence*.

SEE PAGE 149 - 154 (item13) OF BUNDLE

POLICE SCHEDULE OF NON-SENSITIVE UNUSED MATERIAL Form MG 6C at section 13 states:

- *Dorset Police Crime Report C:08:C: 30309. Details report of sexual assault on Tracey Gore and subsequent dealings with her Fleur Thompson/Sheela Hagen. All actions in relation to this investigation detailed on crime. Edited for personal details only.*

Hand written COMMENT:

- *May assist defence*

SEE PAGE 149 – 154 (item15) OF BUNDLE

The following are admissions of corruption

The following arguments made by the defence lawyers are against Kate Brown (CPS WESSEX). The statements (above) clearly state "MAY ASSIST DEFENCE".

Paul Booty (solicitor) in reply to a complaint stated:

> *1. The suggestion that Mr Booty has failed to follow instructions is denied. The videos, photographs, Affidavits, etc., referred to by Mr Colton and which he considers to be crucial to his defence were indeed considered in detail by Mr Booty and then sent on to Counsel instructed, Christopher Wing. I have not personally looked at any of this "evidence" but I am told that the Affidavits in particular, which arise out of Family Law proceedings, rather than cast doubt on what the complainants were saying in fact corroborated their statements to the Police. Quite clearly not useful to Mr Colton's defence. I am told that the video evidence was useful as it showed a happy family gathering and it is my understanding that that video was played during the course of the Trial to the Jury. Mr Colton must appreciate that the conduct of the Trial is in the final analysis in the hands of Counsel and not his instructing Solicitors.*

SEE PAGE 156 - 158 OF BUNDLE

"*but I am told that the Affidavits in particular, which arise out of Family Law proceedings, rather than cast doubt on what the complainants were saying in fact corroborated their statements to the Police"*

This is contrary to what the Crown Prosecution stated:

- "May assist defence"

I had also presented a list of 8 witnesses for PAUL BOOTY to call on my behalf. Of course, they never appeared.

Karim S. Khalil QC in reply to a complaint stated:

> *7. "Mr. Wing refused to put the Divorce Affidavits 2000 before the Jury: Mr. Wing did not "refuse" to put the Affidavits before the Jury but advised that it should not be done as they confirmed the allegations being made against you, The. Judge ruled them to be inadmissible in any event."*

SEE PAGE 159 - 161 OF BUNDLE

"Mr. Wing did not "refuse" to put the Affidavits before the Jury but advised that it should not be done as they confirmed the allegations being made against you"

When District judge Cooper (divorce) was presented with evidence that the stepdaughters, mother and others had lied when giving oral evidence and by Affidavit refused to sign over my home. He also made complaints against all the lawyers.

Karim S. Khalil QC is admitting to criminal activity by Christopher Wing (barrister) and Paul Booty (solicitor) as stated on page 1 of this application.

However, to press this point Karim S. Khalil QC also stated:

> ***8**. "Mr. Wing removed all references to the Affidavits and the "bad character references of his accusers" from the interview summaries — this was done with the agreement of the Crown: this is correct. Both Mr. Wing and prosecuting Counsel were concerned to ensure that the Jury did not receive inadmissible and/or prejudicial material. This course was taken following the Judge's rulings in relation to the inadmissible material in the Affidavits. There were no proper grounds for asserting "bad character" on the part of the complainants."*

SEE PAGE 159 - 161 OF BUNDLE

Karim S. Khalil QC states:

> ***11****. When you threatened to reveal some or all of the above to the Jury, Mr. Wing made a false attempt to rectify the position but actually left it unaltered: this is denied. You made no threat to reveal such matters to the Jury or to expose Mr. Wing in any way. There was nothing to reveal and no real threat to be made*

SEE PAGE 159 - 161 OF BUNDLE

The trial was halted while the removed statements were purportedly put back! I have copies of the edited version! There were defects in the editing of witness statements which should be carried out in accordance with Consolidated Criminal Practice Direction Part III.24. It should always be done by a Crown Prosecutor, not by a police officer. DC Darkin (49) edited witness statements**.**

Bar Standard Board 16 November 2010 stated:

> ***1.*** *The solicitor to whose firm your legal aid certificate was transferred on 10th August 2009 and who instructed counsel on 20th August says that a conference took place on the 27th, says that he is unable to confirm if a defence statement was lodged. He states that in any case, by the time his firm had been instructed, the deadline for filing a statement had passed. He reports that he wrote to the prosecution and sought more time but that they refused.*

SEE PAGE 162 - 167 OF BUNDLE

THE CPS CONFIRM Paul Booty (solicitor) AS A LIAR!

> *"As far as the Defence Statement is concerned I note your request. Whilst I understand your position as having been recently instructed I am conscious of the fact that custody time limits apply in this case and of the trial date. I would have no objection to an extension as such but would respectfully suggest that you liaise with the Court re the length of the extension.*

Yours faithfully J. WOODWARD Senior Crown Prosecutor"

"I would have no objection to an extension as such but would respectfully suggest that you liaise with the Court re the length of the extension."

SEE PAGE 168 - 169 OF BUNDLE

The Bar Standards Board

The Preparation of a Defence Statement

https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiGi9qRocjYAhWBthQKHTL6ALkQFgguMAA&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.barstandardsboard.org.uk%2Fmedia%2F1555712%2F25_-_the_preparation_of_defence_statements.docx&usg=AOvVaw0beEyiE55dQGKuRCp3UQod

> *(b) he has had the opportunity of considering the contents of the statement carefully and approves it.*
>
> *"This may often mean having a conference with the lay client to explain the Defence Statement and to get informed approval, although in straightforward cases where counsel has confidence in the instructing solicitor, this could be left to the solicitor. Where the latter course is taken, a short written advice (which can be in a standard form) as to the importance of obtaining the written acknowledgement before service of the statement should accompany the draft Defence Statement. A careful record should be kept of work done and advice given."*

Paul Booty Brief to Counsel

8. "It is not believed that anything has been done thus far in relation to Social Services records, of which given the mother's assertion there must be and it would appear that nothing has been done in relation to a Defence Statement, or indeed the Special Measures Applications which we have informally suggested we would not oppose." Emphasis added

SEE PAGE 170 - 172 OF BUNDLE

> "This is a very important part of preparing for trial. Counsel will need to be briefed before the Plea and Case Management Hearing. It is important to check that the barrister you instruct to represent client at pretrial stage can also represent the client at trial as this provides some consistency for the client and advice given. A brief to counsel would normally be headed with the title, number and type of case

and the list of enclosures will include the defendant's proof of evidence, draft indictment, committal papers and all correspondence with the CPS. In the main body of the brief, state the defendant's personal details, outline the prosecution case, summarise the defence case outlining all strengths and weaknesses. It is usual to then outline what advice you seek from counsel. This could be in relation to points of law, witnesses or drafting the defence case statement. It may be that a conference with counsel needs to be scheduled either before or after the hearing. Any advice that counsel gives in response must be followed by you and this may well include further interview with witnesses or letter to be drafted to the CPS."

There was no investigation into my case by DC Darkin 49 and DC 2148 TAYLOR whatsoever.

I rely on the **Police and Criminal Evidence Act** 1984 (**PACE**) (1984 c. 60) in this matter.

Criminal Procedure and investigations Act 1999 (s.23 (1))

Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 Code of Practice under Part II

Code of Practice

SEE PAGES 52-74 OF BUNDLE

This code of practice is issued under Part II of the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 ('the Act'). It sets out the manner in which police officers are to record, retain and reveal to the prosecutor material obtained in a criminal investigation and which may be relevant to the investigation, and related matters.

2.1 In this code:

- a criminal investigation is an investigation conducted by police officers with a view to it being ascertained whether a person should be charged with an offence, or whether a person charged with an offence is guilty of it. This will include:
- investigations into crimes that have been committed;
- investigations whose purpose is to ascertain whether a crime has been committed, with a view to the possible institution of criminal proceedings;
- and investigations which begin in the belief that a crime may be committed, for example when the police keep premises or individuals under observation for a period of time, with a view to the possible institution of criminal proceedings;

IPCC

I made a complain to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (Sale) in regard 2 Dorset police officers.

The Sale investigation produced a report. However, the IPCC Dorset undertook their own investigation.

In the words of the Bar Standards Board who stated:

- 9 "I note that you have referred the police handling of your mental health problems to the IPCC, who decided that there was no good reason for the tardy submission of this aspect of your complaint about the Dorset Police to the IPCC. They therefore granted a dispensation to the police, thus lifting their obligation to investigate this matter." Emphasis added

SEE PAGE 166 (Top of page) OF BUNDLE

Kate Brown

Head of Wessex CPS at the time of my arrest and trial.

The Crown Prosecution Service are in breach of their own code.

Kate Brown, DC Darkin (49) and DC Taylor (2148) were also aware of the threats on my life by Mark Thompson and Jimmy Gore and blackmail by Sheela Hagan (ex-wife). Again, this evidence was withheld by judge Wiggs.

The blackmail and threats on my life were admitted in the complainant's police statements. And a letter by the mothers. Also, the police complaint I made to Dorset police on this threat. Of course, they never saw the light of day.

Code for Crown Prosecutors

The Full Code Test

4.1 The Full Code Test has two stages: **(i) the evidential stage**; followed by **(ii) the public interest stage**.

4.2 In most cases, prosecutors should only decide whether to prosecute after the investigation has been completed and after all the available evidence has been reviewed. However, there will be cases where it is clear, prior to the collection and consideration of all the likely evidence, that the public interest does not require a prosecution. In these instances, prosecutors may decide that the case should not proceed further.

4.3 Prosecutors should only take such a decision when they are satisfied that the broad extent of the criminality has been determined and that they are able to make a fully informed assessment of the public interest. If prosecutors do not have sufficient information to take such a decision, the investigation should proceed and a decision taken later in accordance with the Full Code Test set out in this section.

SEE PAGE 173 - 191 OF BUNDLE

Chapter 15 of the Defence Disclosure Manual CPS states:

https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/disclosure-manual-chapter-15-defence-disclosure

15.1. In proceedings before the Crown court, where the prosecutor has provided initial disclosure, or purported to, the accused must serve a defence statement on the prosecutor and the court. The accused must also provide details of any witnesses he or she intends to call at the trial.

15.2. In the magistrates' court, the accused is not obliged to serve a defence statement but may choose to do so, in which case the statutory provisions apply. However, it is a mandatory requirement for the accused to provide details of his or her witnesses

15.3. Following service of initial disclosure by the prosecution, the time limit for service of the defence statement and service of the details of any defence witnesses is 14 days in the magistrates' court and 28 days in the Crown Court, unless that period has been extended by the court: Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (Defence Disclosure Time Limits) Regulations 2011 (in force from 28 February 2011). For cases in which Part 1 of the CPIA 1996 applied prior to 28 February 2011, the 1997 and 2010 Regulations apply, which provide for a time limit of 14 days for both the Crown Court and the magistrates court. Part 1 applies when there is a not guilty plea in the magistrates' court or when a case is committed/transferred/sent etc to the Crown Court: see section 1(1) and (2) CPIA 1996.

15.4. The date of receipt of anything which purports to be a defence statement provided under either section 5 (Crown court) or section 6 (magistrates' court) of the CPIA 1996 or the

details of defence witnesses should be recorded on the disclosure record sheet. It should be acknowledged in writing to the accused and brought to the attention of the prosecutor as soon as possible.

Faults in defence compliance

15.43 The prosecutor should at all times consider the way in which the defence are fulfilling or purporting to fulfil their obligations in relation to disclosure to see whether there is a fault or faults in disclosure by the accused. Such fault or faults may attract an adverse inference under section 11 of the CPIA 1996 at trial. To assist the court in deciding whether to allow comment to be made or whether the jury should be allowed to draw inferences, the prosecutor should put the contents of the defence statement to the accused in cross-examination to elicit the differences between it and the actual defence relied upon and any justification for those differences. Leave of the court is not required for the prosecutor to do this, see *R v Tibbs (2000) 2 Cr App R 309.*

15.44. When considering whether there are faults in disclosure by the accused the prosecutor should to refer to section 11 of the CPIA 1996 as amended.

SEE PAGE 173 - 191 OF BUNDLE

Disclosure Manual – Chapter 2 General duties of disclosure outside the CPIA 1996

https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/disclosure-manual-chapter-2-general-duties-disclosure-outside-cpia-1996

General Principles

2.1. The duties of revelation and disclosure do not only arise under the CPIA 1996. Further legal obligations arise which assist:

the prosecutor in determining whether a person should be charged with an offence (revelation by the police)

the accused by providing certain material during the early stages of a prosecution (common law disclosure to the accused).

2.7. From the start of any prosecution, the prosecutor should consider what (if any) immediate disclosure should be made in the interests of justice and fairness in the particular circumstances of the case. Examples of what should be disclosed are:

- any previous convictions of the victim or a key witness if that information could reasonably be expected to assist the accused when applying for bail
- material which might enable an accused to make a pre-committal application to stay the proceedings as an abuse of process

- material which might enable an accused to submit that a committal should only take place on a lesser charge or that committal should not take place at all, and/or
- material which would enable an accused to prepare for trial which may be significantly less effective if disclosure is delayed (e.g. names of eye witnesses whom the prosecution do not intend to use).

None of the above was adhered to by Kate Brown (Wessex CPS).

The prosecution had obtained the divorce affidavits which conflict with the complaints police statements. Months before my arrest. It is not surprising that the affidavits were never put into evidence.

SEE PAGES 149 – 155 (item 15) OF BUNDLE

The two complaints -stepdaughters

- **Tracey Gore (Bournemouth)**
- **Fleur Thompson (Bournemouth)**

The evidence clearly establishes both these women lied at my divorce (3-day fact finding Hearing 2000 acknowledge by District judge Cooper) while giving oral evidence and by Affidavits (withheld at criminal trial) which conflict with their Police Statements. Their police statements are a litany of lies, as stated by Kate Brown CPS Wessex.

The police statements made by the complainants

The official transcripts have:

- Tracey Gore 96 pages
- Fleur Thompson 1st interview 73 pages. 2nd interview 10 pages

DC Darkin edited these statements into:

Tracey Gore 72 pages

Fleur Thompson (1st) 39 pages (2nd) 5 pages

It was these police edited statements (of the official transcripts) that was put into evidence.

DC Darkin's edited the above statements. These were again edited by the defence barrister Christopher Wing who removed all references made to the divorce affidavits. Admitted!

Editing statements

All editing of witness statements should be carried out in accordance with Consolidated Criminal Practice Direction Part III.24. It should always be done by a Crown Prosecutor, not by a police officer.

- III.24
- EVIDENCE BY WRITTEN STATEMENT
- (III.24.1) Where the prosecution proposes to tender written statements in evidence either under sections 5A and 5B of the Magistrates' Courts Act 1980 or section 9 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 it will frequently be not only proper, but also necessary for the orderly presentation of the evidence, for certain statements to be edited. This will occur either because a witness has made more than one statement whose contents should conveniently be reduced into a single, comprehensive statement or where a statement contains inadmissible, prejudicial or irrelevant material. Editing of statements should in all circumstances be done by a Crown Prosecutor (or by a legal representative, if any, of the prosecutor if the case is not being conducted by the Crown Prosecution Service) and not by a police officer…

http://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/criminal/practice-direction/part3#id6178128

Practice Direction (Criminal Proceedings: Consolidation) [2002] 1 WLR 2870.

Editing single statements

(III.24.3) There are two acceptable methods of editing single statements.

- By marking copies of the statement in a way which indicates the passages on which the prosecution will not rely. This merely indicates that the prosecution will not seek to adduce the evidence so marked. The original signed statement to be tendered to the court is not marked in any way. The marking on the copy statement is done by lightly striking out the passages to be edited so that what appears beneath can still be read, or by bracketing, or by a combination of both. It is not permissible to produce a photocopy with the deleted material obliterated, since this would be contrary to the requirement that the defence and the court should be served with copies of the signed original statement. Whenever the striking out/bracketing method is used, it will assist if the following words appear at the foot of the frontispiece or index to any bundle of copy statements to be tendered: 'The prosecution does not propose to adduce evidence of those passages of the attached copy statements which have been struck out and/or bracketed (nor will it seek to do so at the trial unless a notice of further evidence is served).'
- (b) By obtaining a fresh statement, signed by the witness, which omits the offending material, applying the procedure in paragraph III.24.2…

In the stepdaughters (divorce) affidavit she stated:

"Sometimes she would be in the kitchen, as I can remember on one occasion looking through to the kitchen from the bed in the lounge and seeing her standing with her back to us at the sink. I distinctly remember willing her not to turn round, although we were all under the covers, I did not want her to witness these incidents as I felt sure my stepfather would be very angry and I would be in big trouble."

In my police statement I answered this question stating:

"Because there's something really bizarre going on here she used this same technique this same accusation in the divorce. And she did it under oath standing up in Court and she did it by affidavit but what she said in these was that she could see her mother at the time standing at the kitchen sink. OK. Now when my barrister said to her in Court that you can't see the kitchen sink she says well she was at the draining board which I consider is the kitchen sink. So I employed two private detectives to go into the house and take measurements and photographs. You cannot see the draining board or the kitchen sink so why has she left that out on this one? And the reason she's left it out is because I put it on my website. She's taken stuff off my website and said I can't say that have to change that because he's got proof that it didn't happen."

In the stepdaughters police statement, she stated:

Page 48

TRACEY, "I said in my affidavit for the divorce court that I can remember, um, being in bed in the lounge and seeing mum at the kitchen sink."

Okay.

Well, I don't know whether mum was actually stood at the kitchen sink or not."

Page 65 she states:

TRACEY, "He hired a private investigator to go back to Bracknell Road, to draw a plan to prove that you couldn't see the kitchen sink from the bed and therefore, I was lying."

This example is one of the statements my barrister removed from my police statement. The complainants police statements were hidden!

These examples according to my solicitor and barrister. Are damaging to my case. The admittance of lying under oath should put this woman, her sister and mother in court because they all lied.

Mr Justice Beatson has admitted that this trial was unlawful and conducted by criminals.

- At common law, the crime of conspiracy was capable of infinite growth, able to accommodate any new situation and to criminalize it if the level of threat to society was sufficiently great. The courts were therefore acting in the role of the legislature to create new offences and, following the Law Commission Report No. 76 on Conspiracy and Criminal Law Reform, the Criminal Law Act 1977 produced a statutory offence and abolished all the common law varieties of conspiracy, except two: that of conspiracy to defraud, and that of conspiracy to corrupt public morals or to outrage public decency.

- Mr Justice Beatson has clearly established his bias, along with redefining the Statutory requirement in Defence Disclosure (Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996, section 5 & 6; Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (Defence Disclosure Time Limits) Regulations 2011; Criminal Procedure Rules, rule 22.4).

The descriptions of liabilities in this trial are brief, the bulk of which I retain.

Kate Brown has exposed not only herself but Wing and Booty as co-conspirators in what will be one of the most corrupt criminal trials in the history of English justice. Fact!

It is not only in the public interest, that this case should be made public. But that the public should know how English courts function in a sea of corruption.

Judge Wiggs let me sack my 2nd legal team at trial because I believed they had withheld vital defence evidence.

The facts are that it was judge Wiggs who withheld this defence evidence. He said nothing!

Either a defendant pleading not guilty in a court of law, has the right to raise a defence or not. And we live in an authoritarian regime with a malicious pattern of subjugation.

James Colton

[redacted]

Signed:

Dated: