

LYN BROWN MP
HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

CALL GRANT
JC8360
HMP FORD
ARUNDEL
WEST SUSSEX
BN18 0BX

7 JULY 2006

DEAR MS BROWN

I AM IN RECEIPT OF YOUR LETTER DATED 3 JULY
AND ITS ENCLOSURES.

WHILST I WISH TO MAKE IT ABUNDANTLY CLEAR AND
WITHOUT ANY DEGREE OF AMBIGUITY THAT I DO NOT
BELIEVE IN, NOR DO I CONDEMN ANY ACT OF
UNJUSTIFIED VIOLENCE, I READILY UNDERSTAND WHY THE
FORMER MP, DR JENNY TONGE, EXPRESSED HER SYMPATHY
FOR THE MIND SET OF A PALESTINE SUICIDE BOMBER.

FROM MY OWN PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF FIGHTING FOR
A LEGITIMATE AND JUST CAUSE, WHO OR WHERE DOES
ONE TURN TO WHEN NO ONE, WHO IS SUPPOSED TO
LISTEN, LISTENS?

OVER A PERIOD OF TIME THE POTENTIAL SUICIDE
BOMBER IS CREATED FROM HAVING A LOSS OF FAITH IN
THE SYSTEM AND GRADUALLY DEVELOPS A DESPERATE
FEELING OF BELIEF THAT HE/SHE HAS NOTHING TO LOSE.

SURELY THEN, IF MAN IS TO BE PREVENTED FROM HAVING
REBELLION AS A LAST RESORT, HIS RIGHTS TO BE HEARD
OR LISTENED TO MUST BE EMBODIED AND PROTECTED
BY THE RULE OF LAW, NOT JUST IN THEORY, BUT
FIRMLY AND TRANSPARENTLY IN PRACTICE.

EVEN THE PERSON WHO IS TALKING NONSENSE DESERVES TO BE HEARD, OTHERWISE HOW CAN IT BE DETERMINED THAT WHAT HE WANTS TO BE HEARD IS NONSENCE.

A DEAD MAN CANNOT SPEAK, BUT HIS MORAL ARGUMENT MAY NOT NECESSARILY DIE WITH HIM.

THE ABOVE STATEMENT IS NOT A THREAT, BUT IT IS EXPRESSIVE OF MY FEELINGS.

I HAVE NOT APPROACHED YOU FOR REPRESENTATION IN COURT. HOWEVER, I HAVE APPROACHED YOU, AS MY MP TO REPRESENT ME IN PARLIAMENT. THE ISSUES FOR WHICH I SEEK YOUR REPRESENTATION ARE STRAIGHT FORWARD AND WITHOUT ANY COMPLEXITY. IT IS PARLIAMENT WHERE THE LAWS ARE MADE WHICH GOVERNS OUR COURTS. WHEN JUDGES VIOLATE THE LAWS ENACTED BY PARLIAMENT, THE GOVERNMENT AND ALL MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SHOULD BE CONCERNED. JUDGES ARE NOT ABOVE THE LAW AND THEIR JUDICIAL DECISIONS MUST ALWAYS BE IN LINE WITH THE RULE OF LAW.

IT IS NOT LAWFUL FOR ANY JUDGE TO DELIBERATELY MISDIRECT A JURY IN ORDER TO SECURE A CONVICTION AND WHEN A MISDIRECTION OCCURS, IT IS NOT LAWFUL TO DELIBERATELY PREVENT AN APPLICANT ACCESS TO COURT TO CHALLENGE THE LAWFULNESS OF THE CONVICTION.

I HAVE BEEN WRONGLY CONVICTED BY A DELIBERATE MISDIRECTION FROM A JUDGE AND I HAVE BEEN DENIED ALL ACCESS TO COURT TO CHALLENGE OR APPEAL MY WRONGFUL CONVICTION.

IT IS ON THE ISSUE OF DENIAL OF ACCESS TO COURT THAT I SEEK YOUR REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT.

I WOULD NOT EXPECT YOU TO OFFER ANY ASSISTANCE TO ANY MEMBER OF YOUR CONSTITUENCY WITHOUT FIRST SEEKING YOUR OWN LEGAL ADVICE REGARDING THE ISSUE THEY RAISE. IT WOULD BE UTTERLY FOOLISH OF YOUR CONSTITUENTS TO EXPECT YOU TO HAVE KNOWLEDGE PERTAINING TO EVERY POSSIBLE ISSUE YOU MAY BE ASKED TO DEAL WITH, BUT IT WOULD NOT BE AN UNREASONABLE EXPECTATION, BY YOUR CONSTITUENTS, TO EXPECT YOU TO MAKE INQUIRIES THAT ARE RELEVANT ON THEIR BEHALFS.

I DO NOT THEREFORE, BELIEVE THAT IT IS UNREASONABLE FOR ME TO EXPECT YOU TO MAKE INQUIRIES TO THE LORD CHANCELLOR AS TO HOW IT IS THAT I SHOULD BE CONVICTED AND IMPRISONED WITHOUT HAVING THE RIGHT OF ACCESS TO COURT TO CHALLENGE MY CONVICTION. THIS IS A SIMPLE AND STRAIGHTFORWARD QUESTION.

IF HOWEVER, I HAVE A FALSE IMPRESSION OF WHAT A MEMBER OF YOUR CONSTITUENCY CAN EXPECT FROM YOU, THEN PLEASE ACCEPT MY APOLOGIES FOR HAVING TROUBLED YOU.

YOURS SINCERELY



C. GRANT.