

LYN BROWN MP
HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Paul GRANT
JC8360
HMP FORD
ARUNDEL
WEST SUSSEX
BN18 0BX

2ND MAY 2006

DEAR Ms BROWN,

THANK YOU FOR YOUR LETTER DATED 24 APRIL 2006.

FIRST OF ALL, I WOULD LIKE TO CONFIRM THAT I AM UNREPRESENTED IN MY QUEST FOR JUSTICE. I HAVE HAD GREAT DIFFICULTY RETAINING LEGAL REPRESENTATION BECAUSE OF THE SEVERE IMPLICATIONS OF THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN MY CASE. THEREFORE I WILL HAVE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH THE BACKGROUND DETAILS MYSELF.

UNFORTUNATELY THERE IS A LONG BACKGROUND HISTORY TO ALL THE ISSUES INVOLVED, HOWEVER, THE ACTUAL ISSUES ARE VERY STRAIGHTFORWARD AND I HOPE, UNPRECEDENTED.

IN AN EFFORT TO AVOID ANY UNNECESSARY CONFUSION, I WILL SUMMARISE THE BACKGROUND OF THE ISSUES TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY, FROM WHICH I'M ABSOLUTELY SURE YOU'LL BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND.

AS I'VE ALREADY SAID IN MY LETTER OF 18 APRIL, YOU SHOULD HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED A COPY OF THE DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE WHICH SUPPORTS EVERYTHING I HAVE TO SAY.

THE MAIN ISSUE AT THIS POINT IS THAT I HAVE BEEN WRONGLY CONVICTED AND IMPRISONED WITHOUT HAVING THE RIGHT OF APPEAL. IRRESPECTIVE OF THE ALLEGATIONS, IRRESPECTIVE OF MY DEFENCE AND IRRESPECTIVE OF MY GROUNDS OF APPEAL, THE FACT THAT I HAVE BEEN REFUSED AND DENIED THE RIGHT TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION, OR TO REPRESENT MYSELF AT AN ORAL HEARING IS WITHOUT ANY DOUBT A VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 6 OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998.

HOWEVER, I SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN CONVICTED IN THE FIRST PLACE. THE REASON IS SIMPLY BECAUSE I HAVE AN UNRESOLVED CLAIM AGAINST THE JUDICIARY FOR A PREVIOUS PERIOD OF FALSE IMPRISONMENTS. THE VIOLATIONS OF MY RIGHTS WERE GIVEN AS AN EXPLANATION FOR MY ACTIONS AT TRIAL, BUT THE TRIAL JUDGE TOLD THE JURY THAT MY MOTIVES WERE IRRELEVANT AND THAT "THERE IS NO DEFENCE OF JUSTIFICATION IN ENGLISH LAW" HE FURTHER TOLD THE JURY THAT IF THEY ACQUIT ME NO OTHER JURY OR COURT COULD STOP ME OR CONVICT ME FOR "ANYTHING."

CLEARLY THE JUDGE MISDIRECTED THE JURY TO SECURE MY CONVICTION AND AVOIDED THE ISSUES OF MY COMPLAINT.

I MENTIONED EARLIER THAT I HOPE THIS MATTER IS UNPRECEDENTED, BECAUSE I WOULD HATE TO THINK THAT IT WAS STANDARD PRACTICE FOR JUDGES TO LOCK UP INNOCENT PEOPLE INSTEAD OF ADMINISTERING JUSTICE. THE UNPRECEDENTED NATURE OF MY CASE IS THAT THE JUDICIARY IS MY ADVERSARY AND THEREFORE THEY ARE ABUSING THEIR POSITION

Key
Paragraph
to have
prompted
MP
to
action

OF POWER TO DENY ME AN ADVERSARIAL HEARING,
OF WHICH I AM ENTITLED TO BY LAW.

IT IS CLEAR THAT WHILST I HAVE AN UNRESOLVED CLAIM
AGAINST THE JUDICIARY THE PRINCIPLES GUARANTEED
UNDER ARTICLE 6 OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION AND
OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998 CANNOT BE MET,
THAT IS, MY RIGHTS TO BE HEARD BY AN INDEPENDENT
IMPARTIAL TRIBUNAL.

HAVING HAD MY RIGHTS TO ACCESS TO JUSTICE BLOCKED
BY THE JUDICIARY, I PRESENTED A DETAILED APPLICATION
TO THE CRIMINAL CASES REVIEW COMMISSION WITH ALL
THE RELEVANT ISSUES, BUT AGAIN THE C CRC AVOIDED
THE ISSUES AND WENT OUTSIDE THEIR REMIT TO
COMMENT ON MY "GUILT." THE APPLICATION IS INCLUDED
IN THE DOCUMENTS PREVIOUSLY SENT TO YOU.

AS THE C CRC HAVE FAILED TO ACT ACCORDING TO
THEIR PUBLIC DUTY, THIS MATTER NOW REVERTS TO
THE HOME SECRETARY AND I WOULD EXPECT, AS MY
MP, THAT YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO BRING ABOUT
THE NECESSARY PRESSURE FOR THE HOME SECRETARY
TO ACT IN SECURING MY IMMEDIATE RELEASE OR
REFERRING THIS CASE TO THE COURT OF APPEAL.

Failure
of
UK
MPs
to act
in
Constituent
Interest.

IN ADDITION TO THE PREVIOUS DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE,
I FURTHER ENCLOSE A COPY OF A RECENT COURT OF
APPEAL JUDGEMENT ON WHEN A JUDGE MUST RECUSE
HIM/HERSELF FROM HEARING CASES WITH THE POTENTIAL
FOR BIAS OR APPARENT BIAS.


PLEASE TAKE YOUR TIME TO STUDY THE DOCUMENTS,

BUT DO BARE IN MIND THAT I'VE NOW SPENT NEARLY
3 YEARS UNLAWFULLY IN PRISON.

IF YOU FEEL IT'S NECESSARY TO COME AND SEE ME
IN PERSON I WOULD BE MORE THAN HAPPY TO SEE YOU.

IN THE MEANTIME I LOOK FORWARD TO YOUR POSITIVE
RESPONSE.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature consisting of several overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

C. GRANT.