Crown Parliament

Court of Appeal
High Court
High Court

The People + Honourable Parliamentarians v Corrupt Officers
Citizens v Media + State + Politicians
Citizen v Organised Crime + State
Parliamentary Candidates v Director of Public Prosecutions

Mass Remedies Fraud Appeals 2019 0563 + 2700 Fraud Claims QB 2019 003741 + 003984 Parliament Session File Arrangements QB 2019

Remedy Process + Office Unfitness Cases + Parliament Session Filing Denial Fraud Notice 5th

5th December 2019

From: Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis To: Privy Counsellor Mr Iain Duncan- Smith + All Chingford Candidates

Dear Mr Duncan-Smith,

Politically Neutral Issue: The Parliament Session File

Problem: Crown Prosecution Service Office Access Denial Fraud by Sussex Police

Parliament Session Filing Service Denial Fraud by Sussex Crown Prosecutors

Remedy Proposal Joint Action by Parliamentary Candidates for Reliable Alternative Arrangements

The Citizen, Crown and Lord Bishops have Justice Responsibilities known as the Equity Monarchy Trusts. They have Corruption Control Jurisdictions that govern Parliament Session Powers. They use the Corruption Remedy Proof Standard. It is Official Records that are Justice Proof for Honourable Officers or Guilt Proof against Corrupt Officers and Credibility Irrelevance Proof for the Victim.

The Director of Public Prosecutions keeps a Parliament Session File on trust for the Prime Minister and Crown. The Prime Minister serves the File Content on the Crown. The Service Event is File Content Notice Admission Proof against the Prime Minister. The Admission Proof is Relevant Evidence when the Lord Bishops use the File Content for Parliament Session Decisions.

Since December 2011 the Sussex Crown Prosecutor has acted as Citizen Papers Receiving Agent for the Parliament Session File. I knew about a plan for the Sussex Crown Prosecutor to vacate the Hove Office. I did not know when or the move was to the Police Station at Brighton. On Friday 29th November 2019 I arrived to find the move in progress. I visited Brighton Police Station. Crown Prosecutors agreed that I attend on Wednesday 4th December 2019 for the next Filing Event. The Filing Set includes Election Fraud Proof got before and during the Election Campaign Period. Some of the Election Fraud Proof is against Sussex Police and the Sussex Judges. The entire history raised Reasonable Suspicions of a Filing Service Refusal. The Parliament Session File Letter dated 3rd December 2019 to the Chingford Parliamentary Candidates and the DRAFT Claim Form and the Remedy Process Email were an Issue Notice.

On 4th December 2019 the Sussex Police Officers denied responsibility for giving access to the office of the Crown Prosecution Service. They claimed that the Office Access Protocol required an Access Request Telephone Call to get a Crown Prosecutor Escort for the Citizen from the Police Station Reception to the Crown Prosecutors Office. They denied having the Telephone Number for the Crown Prosecution Service.

A call to a friend got the Crown Prosecutor Telephone Number. The Access Request Call got Options Selections each of which got Call Diverts + No Response or a Voicemail Recorder. One Crown Prosecutor was leaving, listened to a Parliament Session File Explanation and Access Arrangement Explanation and disappeared through the Crown Prosecutors Door with Apparent Intent to make Access Arrangements. A Uniformed Officer appeared, was Rude + Aggressive and made Eviction Threats. I asked for an Eviction Record and Video Tape Preservation. He claimed that he controlled the Video Tapes. I gave a Criminal Liability Warning that a Filing Service Failure was Perversion of the course of Justice. Crown Prosecutors were leaving the building including one who had made the Filing Arrangements on the previous Friday. On the evidence the Absolute Priority of Sussex Police and Crown Prosecutors was a Filing Service Denial Fraud. The Remedy Process needs Reliable Filing Arrangements.