

APPLICATION FOR SUMMONS FOR ALLEGED OFFENCE*(Criminal Procedure Rules, rule 7.2(6); section 1, Magistrates' Courts Act 1980)*

This is an application by Equity Lawyer Mr Edward William Ellis and Citizen Mr Patrick Coyle for the court to issue a summons against the proposed defendant.

Applicant's address: 450 New North Road, Hainault IG6 3EB

Email address: Edward.w.ellis@gmail.com neeluberry@gmail.com

Phone: Mobile: **Edward Ellis 07788371717 + Neelu Berry 07868060083**

Alleged offence(s)

Statute Charges: Misrepresentation Frauds + Non-Disclosure Fraud + Position Abuse Fraud contrary to sections 2, 3 and 4 of the Fraud Act 2006

Common Law Charges: Perjury + Forgery + Conspiracy to pervert the course of justice + Jurisdiction Frauds + Intimidation Frauds + Justice Process Contempt Fraud

Date(s) of alleged offence(s): Start Date Uncertain but Continuing Offenses

Royal Commission Briefing

The European Constitution vested Dictator Powers in the State. The Politicians lost control to Corrupt Officers and Law Court Judges who formed Organised Crime Partnerships. They developed Protection Fraud Networks for Mutual Support and Corruption Co-ordination. They sold market Frauds to Organised Crime, provided Protection Frauds for the Corrupt Officers who manage them and traded Glittering Career Guarantees and Job Profits for Corrupt MPs in exchange for Fraud Services in Parliament. A series of Top Level Corruption Investigations got Corruption Proof, Remedy Denial Fraud Proof and Election Fraud Proof against Top State Offices, Top Judges and Top Politicians created the need for Mass Remedies. The Ultimate Sanction of a Parliament Session Refusal and Forced General Election with Mass Publicity for Corruption Proof and Remedy Denial Proof needs a Credible Choice for Voters. Integrity tests before and during the 2019 General Election got Election Fraud Proof against All Party Leaders. It deprived the Voters of a Credible Choice and invalidated use of the Ultimate Sanction of a Forced General Election. It created the need for a Royal Commission for Corruption Remedies that the Queen announced in the Parliament Session Opening Speech on 19th December 2019.

The Passive Integrity Tests discover what the Cabinet and Prime Minister do about the Election Frauds. They chose Fraud Completion instead of Voluntary Remedies. It created the need for Active Integrity Tests

The Active Integrity Tests in Parliament include Opposition Management Proposals and Remedy Co-operation Requests of the House of Commons Speaker and Question Notices for the Opposition Leadership Contest.

The Active Tests in the Law Courts include Royal Commission Briefing Enquiries of State Officers and Law Officers to discover what the Cabinet and Prime Minister have done to get Remedy Co-operation for the Royal Commission.

The Active Tests in the Law Courts include use of Citizen Cases for Jurisdiction Tests and Evidence Tests and Trial Tests of the State Lawyers and Court Lawyers, State Lawyers, Court Lawyers and Law Court Judges and Credibility Tests of State

Witnesses. They include the use of Similar Fact Case Explanations and Similar Fact Proof and Similar Fact Findings
Proposals that the Royal Commission can use as a Case Management Comparator for the Case Management of the State and
Law Courts

Sample Test Reports

The Integrity Test Questions dated 5th January 2020 are the 1st Questions Set for the Opposition Leadership Candidates.
Email Service that day gave the Labour Party Executive the 1st Questions Set ready for the start of the Leadership Contest
the next day. It will discover what the Executive, Candidates and Members do with the Test Questions. Some of the Labour
Party Members want to know what the Candidates will do to get Election Fraud Remedies.

The Royal Commission Integrity Tests included Royal Commission Briefing Enquiries. They discovered a Loyalty Splits.
Some of the Ordinary State Officers responded with Intelligent Interest and provided Remedy Co-operation for the Crown.
Some of the State Lawyers and Court Lawyers made No Briefing Admissions. The Corrupt Officers, Corrupt Lawyers and
Corrupt Magistrates responded with Jurisdiction Frauds + Before Trial Enforcement Frauds. The Only Credible Explanation
for the Blatant Jurisdiction Frauds by Corrupt Magistrates is Budget Fraud Bribery.

The Bow Administration Officers service Local Magistrates Courts. The Election Campaign Period Integrity Tests got
Business Theft Proof + Money Laundering Proof against Top Police Officers and Top Judges. The Stolen Business is
Barry's Fish Bar at 222 Downs Road. It is less than a mile from Bow Magistrates Court and the Administration Office.
Local Court Officers must have known something and were in a position to find out more. The Metropolitan Police gave
Criminal Immunity to 3 Women in exchange for Harassment Perjury against the Business Owner. The Trial Judge noticed
Innocence Evidence Concealment Frauds, got an Acquittal Decision by the Jury and gave Claim Advice for the Business
Owner against the Metropolitan Police, Ministry of Justice and Defence Lawyers. The Business Owner was unable to act on
the Claim Advice because he was Emotionally Exhausted and Financially Drained and Poor English Language Skills. The
Harassment Framing Fraud failed. A Hygiene Regulation Breach Framing Fraud got a Business Closure + Forced Sale +
Business Theft + Criminal Investigation Denial Fraud + Court Remedy Frauds that are Theft Proof against Top Police
Officer and Top Judges and the Cabinet and Prime Minister Mr Johnson. It made the Thames Magistrates Courts an Obvious
Choice for Royal Commission Enquiry Tests.

The Council Tax Liability Case Management Hearing on 3rd January 2020 against Citizen Ms Berry was used for Royal
Commission Briefing Enquiries. The Previous Hearing on 30th October 2019 got Directions Order that included a Time
Limited Skeleton Filing and Service Order and an Order Breach Contempt Fraud + Before Trial Enforcement Frauds by
Redbridge Council Officers. The Council Officers and Advocate stopped the Royal Commission Briefing Enquiry before it
started. The Before Hearing Contact got Remedy Process Notice Admissions and Engagement Refusals by the Council Tax
Officers. The Duty Solicitor was present at the Council Tax Hearing. The Hearing got a Contempt Fraud Complaint by
Citizen Ms Berry using the Skeleton Order Breach Contempt + Misrepresentation Fraud Contempt. It got Fact Admissions
but Liability Denial Frauds by the Council Advocate, Court Lawyer and 3 Magistrates. The Chairman denied having any
Contempt Remedy Powers. He said all he could do was make a Skeleton Service Request. He made a Jurisdiction Priority
Ruling for the Liability Case against the Justice Perversion Case, then denied having made a Ruling Decision and a Short
Adjournment Order for Citizen Ms Berry to get Legal Advice from the Duty Solicitor. The Advice Interview started with a
Case Briefing Refusal by the Duty Solicitor. He wanted Total Ignorance about the Case Facts for himself and Total

Acceptance by Citizen Ms Berry of his Ignorant Advice. He refused to give his Name and Law Firm but then relented and gave both. Eventually he stopped saying 'listen to me' and was silent when the Equity Lawyer gave a Brief Explanation. When he spoke again it was obvious he had not listened to anything. The Legal Advice was Total Submission by the Citizen to Jurisdiction Frauds by the State. By the Interview End the Duty Solicitor knew the Total Submission Advice was a Total Failure. Citizen Ms Berry, Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis and the Duty Solicitors went back into the Court Room. The Equity Lawyer wrote Case Applications for Citizen Ms Berry to read out. The Magistrates finished Another Case Hearing. The Duty Solicitor gave an Advice Interview Report and then left the Court Room. The Court Lawyer said Duty Solicitor Advice Rights were limited to Criminal Cases and that Council Tax Claims were Civil Cases with No Duty Solicitor Advice Rights. The Court Lawyer did not explain why the Duty Solicitor was present during the Council Tax Hearing and the Duty Solicitor Advice Adjournment. It was Advice Fraud Conspiracy Proof against the Duty Solicitor, Council Advocate, Court Lawyer and 3 Magistrates. Citizen Ms Berry made a Case Priority Ruling Application and a Ruling Written Reasons Application. The Court Lawyer and Magistrates Chairman denied having made a Ruling Application. The Court Lawyer and Magistrates ignored it and used an Adjournment Fraud for a Fearing Denial Fraud.

On Business Theft criminal Complaint Day 97, which was 6th January 2019, the Hygiene Criminal Appeal Enquiries at Thames Magistrates Court Administration Office for the Crown Court Number got Reference Number 1900809731, which appears to be a Magistrates Court Number, and Hearing Dates 9th May 2019 + 6th June 2019 + 4th July 2019 + 19th September 2019. The Crown Court Criminal Appeals Officer received a Royal Commission Explanation and a Case Explanation and the Appeal Papers and Special Notice that the Reference Number appeared to be for the Magistrates Court and not the Crown Court. He provided Stamp Receipt Filing Proof on Multiple Originals of the Appeal Papers for use by the Crown Court and Royal Commission with intent to get either Due Process by the Court of Appeal or an Appeal Jurisdiction Finding for the Crown Court against the Court of Appeal. The next day the Bow Administration Office Manager disclosed the Case Reference was got from the Crown Court and they did not provide Filing Services for the Crown Court. The Office Manager read the Murder Conspiracy Concealment Fraud Summons Application of Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis and Citizen Ms Berry against the Attorney General, Director of Public Prosecutions and Others. He said he could not give Stamp Filing Proof but Email Filing would get an Automatic Reply as Filing Proof. He listened to a Royal Commission Explanation and a Case Explanation with Courtesy and Intelligent Interest. It got a Remedy Co-operation Funding by the Equity Lawyer for the Administration Manager.

The State got issue of Child Maintenance Liability Summons for hearing in Bow Magistrates Court on 10th January 2020. Authority got issue of Lawyer was in Bow Magistrates Court but used Unqualified Case Presenters for Child Maintenance Trial Frauds. The Equity Lawyer entered Court 5 and gave the Usher a Royal Commission Explanation and Case Explanation. The Usher responded with Courtesy + Intelligent Interest and the State Prosecutor stood behind the Equity Lawyer and listened. The Usher accepted 3 Case Papers for the Court Lawyer. The 1st Unqualified Presenter listened with Intelligent Interest and claimed No Legal Qualifications. The Equity Lawyer, Citizen Mr Coyle and Citizen Ms Berry sat in the Public Gallery. The State Prosecutor told the Unqualified Presenters that Citizen Mr Coyle was at court. There were No Case Calls. The 1st Unqualified Presenter told the 3 Magistrates that 3 Names had been removed from the list of 25 Names and asked for Liability Orders. The Equity Lawyer, Citizen Mr Coyle and Citizen Mrs Berry presumed that Citizen Mr Coyle was one of the 3 Omitted Names. The 3 Magistrates appeared to sign the 22 Liability Orders. The Magistrates retired. The Equity Lawyer made a Royal Commission Briefing Enquiry that got a No Briefing Admission from Court Lawyer. He

did what he could to give a Royal Commission Explanation and Case Explanation to the Court Lawyer. She did not want to receive it. Equity Lawyer gave Hearing Management Advice to Citizen Mr Coyle. It was to start by asking the State Lawyer and Court Lawyer and State Lawyer to give a Royal Commission Briefing to the Magistrates, give time for them to do so, and if they did not ask whether they Do Not Know or Dare Not Tel and in any event call Equity Lawyer to give a Royal Commission Briefing. He did. The Magistrates Chairman allowed the Equity Lawyer to speak. He said the Case Call Failure was a Hearing Denial Fraud that invalidated the 22 Liability Orders including the one against Citizen Mr Coyle. The Magistrates Chairman pretended it did not matter. The Equity Lawyer started a Royal Commission Briefing. The Magistrates Chairman used Interruption Frauds for Explanation Sabotage Frauds and Hearing Denial Frauds. It was Blatant Bias Fraud Proof for the Citizen against the State and, Court Lawyer and Magistrates. It was Similar Fact Bias Fraud Proof to that got at the Council Tax Liability Hearing 7 days earlier. The combination of is Systematic Hearing Denial Fraud Proof that raises Trial Fraud Bribery Suspicions + Budget Fraud Benefits Suspicions + Dispossession Fraud Profit Suspicions for the Citizens and Royal Commission against the Ministry of Justice and All Magistrates.

The Royal Commission Cases will use Royal Commission Briefings + Similar Corruption Fraud Proof + Case Management Proposals to get Case Management Evidence Sets from the Citizen, State and Law Courts for Case Management Comparisons. They will get either Voluntary Remedy Proof for the Cabinet and Prime Minister Mr Johnson or Remedy sabotage Fraud Proof against them.

The Royal Commission Cases

1. The SIMILAR FACT CORRUPTION PROOF includes Business Thefts by Corrupt Officers to enable Money Laundering by Organised Criminals. Business Theft Sample Case:
 - 1.1. The Business Theft Criminal Complaint and Business Recovery Claim QB 2019 003741 and Corruption Claim QB 2019 003984 got Corruption Proof + Bribery Proof + Money Laundering Proof for the Citizen, Crown and Parliament against the Metropolitan Police, Law Courts and Top Politicians.
 - 1.2. Corrupt Officers sold Protection Frauds and Money Laundering Services to Drug Dealers. The Money Laundering Services included Business Thefts.
 - 1.3. Citizen Victim Mr Yediayli is a Turkish Citizen with Turkish Literacy + British Residency Rights + English Illiteracy + Business Administration Skills Deficit + Fast Food Shop Skills. From 2004 to 2019 he held a Business Lease from Tower Hamlets Council for 222 Devon's Road, Bow E3 3PN where he ran a Fast Food Business called Barry's Fish Bar. He had a Viable Business with No Books.
 - 1.4. Corrupt Officers planned the use of Prosecution Frauds to get Forced Sale Conditions and a Business Theft. They gave Criminal Immunity Frauds to 3 Women in exchange for Harassment Perjury for a Harassment Framing Fraud.
 - 1.5. On 28th January 2017 Car Criminal Damage by the 1st Woman resulted in Crime Complaint Reference S202037/17 for Citizen Mr Yediayli. It got a No Further Action Notice dated 7th February 2017 from Mrs Claire Brady, Traffic Case Officer, Met Traffic Prosecutions, North A Region, Enfield borough PO Box 510, DE15 0BQ. It was Bias Fraud Proof for Citizen Mr Yediayli against the 1st Woman and the Metropolitan Police
 - 1.6. A Harassment Restrain Application ED18F00198 in Edmonton County Court by Lawyers for the Citizen against the Mistress got Claim Issue but No Hearing. It was Bias Fraud Proof for Citizen Mr Yediayli against the 1st

Woman and the County Court

- 1.7. The Harassment Trial Judge noticed Innocence Evidence Concealment Frauds, supervised the Jury into an Acquittal Decision and gave Claim Advice for the Victim against the Metropolitan Police, Ministry of Justice and Defence Lawyers.
- 1.8. Citizen Mr Yediyali was Emotionally Exhausted and Financially Drained and did not have the Language Competence to act on the Claim Advice.
- 1.9. The Harassment Framing Fraud had failed. The Hygiene Regulation Breach Business Closure + Framing Fraud began. He borrowed Refurbishment Finance at 100% Yearly Interest from Loan Sharks. It resulted in Total Exhaustion and Forced Sale Conditions.
- 1.10. Citizen Mr Yediyali negotiated a Business Sale to a Local Trader. He consulted Sale Lawyers. They consulted Buyer Lawyers. The Lawyers exchanged Transaction Emails. The Sale Lawyers did nothing to protect the interests of Citizen Mr Yediyali.
- 1.11. The Buyer used a Bank Part Payment + Cash Part Payment + Full Payment Promises + Full Accounting Promises to get Premature Possession of the Fast Food Business and then committed Promise Breaches Frauds.
- 1.12. Citizen Mr Yediyali made a Business Theft Complaint dated 9th October 2019 to the Metropolitan Police. It got an Investigation Refusal. Citizen Mr Yediyali consulted Interpreter Mr Can Say who made a Case Reference to Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis.
- 1.13. The Transaction Information Request by the Equity Lawyer got a Transaction Communications Disclosure + Representation Denial + Instructions Request Letter from the Sale Lawyer.
- 1.14. The Business Claim Action Notice got No Response from the Buyers.
- 1.15. The Business Claim and Corruption Claims were produced at the same time. The Business Claim against the Buyers was for Damage Mitigation that should have got the Sale Price or Business Repossession for Citizen Mr Yediyali and a £150 Damage Reduction for Corruption Claim Defendants who were the Attorney General, Metropolitan Police, Ministry of Justice and Law Society.
- 1.16. The Business Claim was issued on 22nd October 2019 with number QB 2019 003741. Personal Service of it that day got Accountability Promises and Settlement Negotiation Promises from the Buyers followed by Promise Breaches.
- 1.17. The Damage Mitigation DRAFT Orders dated 31st October 2019 were produced. The Corruption Claim Draft Order was filed on 1st November 2019 on the Parliament Session File kept by the Director of Public Prosecutions and on the Business Claim File in the High Court Actions Office and Elections Fairness Fraud Appeal QB 2019 000296 in the High Court Appeals Office and the Elections Fairness Fraud Appeal 2019 2700 in the Court of Appeal and Stamp Filing Proof got from the Crown Prosecutors Office and the Law Courts.
- 1.18. The Corruption Claim was issued on 8th November 2019 by the High Court with case number QB 2019 003984 and Damage Mitigation Applications Notices with DRAFT Orders filed the same day in both cases. The choice for the High Court Masters was Sale Price Payment or Business Repossession and £150,000 Damage Reduction for the Corruption Claim Defendants or a Price Waiver Fraud + Unjust Enrichment Fraud for the Buyers. The High

Court Masters chose the Price Waiver Fraud + Unjust Enrichment Fraud using a Hearing Listing Denial Fraud.

- 1.19. The Defence and Counterclaim dated 13th November 2019 of the Buyers made Business Purchase Admissions and Liability Denial and Counter Claim that the Part Payment of the Purchase Price was an Unjust Enrichment of the Seller. It was a Business Theft Guilt Admission. The Service and Filing Notices were dated 15th November 2019 by the Defence Lawyers.
- 1.20. The Business Theft Complaint got on Complaint Day 37, which was 15th November 2019, a 1st Contact Response from the Case Officer. Eventually it got a Complainant Interview Appointment for Complaint Day 60, which was 7th December 2019.
- 1.21. The Business Claim Reply and Defence to Counterclaim dated 21st November 2019 was filed on 26th November 2019 and Stamp Filing Proof got from the High Court Actions Office. It got the **1st Without Hearing Backdated Forged Order** with Alleged Decision Date 31st October 2019 for a 30 Day Stay + Brief Particulars 30 Day Time Limit + After Filing Stay Application Permit with a Day 23 Seal and Day 27 Letter Box Personal Service on Citizen Mr Yedialyi.
- 1.22. The Brief Claim Particulars were made Without Prejudice to Invalidity Arguments, dated 28th November 2019, filed that day and Stamp Filing Proof got from the high Court Actions Office.
- 1.23. The Business Theft Complainant Interview was on Complaint Day 60, which was 7th December 2019, at Bethnal Green Police Station with Officer Ms Georgina Newton. Citizen Mr Yedialyi, Interpreter Mr Say and Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis attended. The Equity Lawyer gave a Case Explanation. Officer Ms Newton agreed that Criminal Conspiracy Proof against Law Court Judges required a Case Reference to Superiors Officers. She wanted to make telephone calls. The Equity Lawyer said the most efficient way for her to manage the Case Reference was to accept the Case Explanation and the Fraud Cases Brief Chronology + Sample Documents both dated 7th December 2019 and some other documents. He did not give the Fraud Proof. A Competent Investigation needed an Evidence Collection Arrangements. Failure to make Evidence Collection Arrangements would evidence an Investigation Refusal. There was No Further Contact from the Metropolitan Police.
- 1.24. The Stay Revocation + Particulars Filing Time Limit Revocation Draft Order dated 28th November 2019 was filed that day and Stamp Filing Proof got from the High Court Actions Office
- 1.25. The Stay Revocation + Particulars Filing Time Limit Revocation Application Notice was filed on 29th November 2019 and Stamp Filing Proof got that day from the High Court Actions Office. It got Hearing Listing Refusal Proof against the High Curt Masters.
- 1.26. The Citizen, Crown and Lord Bishops have Justice Responsibilities called the Equity Monarchy Trusts. They have Corruption Control Jurisdictions that govern Parliament Session Powers. They have used them for a Corruption Remedy Process. Citizens gave Privilege Waivers and Confidentiality Waivers that enabled the Crown and Lord Bishops to use cases for Remedy Publicity.
- 1.27. The **2nd Without Hearing Backdated Forged Order** had the Alleged Date 12th November 2019 + Application Dismissed + Reasons 1. Incomprehensible 2 Action Currently Stayed + Day 28 Seal + Day 40 Service on Citizen Mr Yedialyi on 21st December 2019. It did not disclose whether it was the Damage Mitigation Application or Revocation Application that had been dismissed.

1.28. Interpreter Mr Say was ill. The Equity Lawyer produced the Criminal Appeal Forms using the Incomplete Information that Citizen Mr Yediyali could give without an Interpreter, and got his signature on them.

1.29. On Complaint Day 90, which was 6th January 2019 the Equity Lawyer visited the Thames Criminal Court Administration Offices at Bow. He produced the Criminal Appeal Forms, gave a Royal Commission Explanation and a Case Explanation and asked for the Crown Court Case Number and Hearing Dates. The Court Officer gave the number 1900809731, which is a Magistrates Court Number, and the dates 9th May, 6th June, 4th July and 19th September 2019. The Equity Lawyer inserted them in the Appeal Forms, presented them in the Criminal Appeals Office of the Court of Appeal, drew attention to the Magistrates Case Reference and gave a Royal Commission Explanation and Case Explanation. It got Stamp Filing Proof on All Appeal Papers and the Enforcement Stay Application to the Crown Court because it would get Documented Decisions and avoid the Evidential Uncertainty for the Royal Commission of a Filing Refusal. The Equity Lawyer gave Stay Advice because a Stay Failure would make the Court of Appeal responsible for the Enforcement Frauds.

1.30. The Test Plan was to allow at least 7 Working Days for the Court of Appeal to act on the Stay Advice before filing the Stay Enforcement Application in the Crown Court

1.31. This is a Case Explanation made on Criminal Complaint Day 96

1.32. Reserved Rights for the Citizen to file and serve a Case Update

Business Theft Findings Proposals:

The Victim's Circumstances

1.33. Turkish Citizen Finding + 1998 UK Immigration Date Finding + UK Residency Rights Finding + Turkish Literacy Finding + English Illiteracy Finding + Business Administration Skills Deficit Funding + Fast Food Shop Skills Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali

The Ownership History

1.34. Business Partnership Finding + Equal Ownership Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali and Ms Esme Ispir the hereinafter jointly called the Business Partners

1.35. 222 Devon's Road Bow E3 3PN Business Lease Finding for the Business Partners as Lessees against the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Council as Lessor

1.36. Fast Food Business Finding + Barry's Fish Bar Name Finding + 2004 to 2012 Trading Period Finding for the Business Partners

1.37. 2012 Partnership Dissolution Finding + Business Beneficial Ownership Trust Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against Ms Esme Ispir

1.38. 2012 to 2019 Fast Food Business Trading Period Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali

The Harassment Framing Frauds

1.39. Harassment Conspiracy Finding + Assault Findings + Harassment Criminal Complaint Fraud Conspiracy Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against 3 Women

1.40. Violent Assault Finding + Broken Nose Finding + Severe Bruising Finding + Grievous Bodily Harm Finding +

Broken Nose and Facial Bruising Photographic Evidence Finding + Broken Nose and Facial Bruising Injury
Medical Records Finding + Photographic and Medical Records Innocence Evidence Proof for Citizen Mr Yediyali
against the 3 Women

- 1.41. Violent Assault Criminal Complaint Finding + Harassment Criminal Complaint Finding + Criminal Investigation
Denial Fraud Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against the Metropolitan Police Investigators
- 1.42. Justice Perversion Conspiracy Finding + Perjury Immunity Fraud Finding + Investigation Fraud Conspiracy
Finding + Photographic and Medical Record Innocence Evidence Exclusion Fraud Finding + Prosecution Fraud
Conspiracy Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against the 3 Women and Metropolitan Police Investigators
- 1.43. Justice Perversion Conspiracy Finding + Perjury Immunity Fraud Finding + Investigation Fraud Conspiracy
Finding + Photographic and Medical Record Innocence Evidence Exclusion Fraud Finding + Prosecution
Conspiracy Fraud Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against the 3 Women, the Metropolitan Police and the Crown
Prosecution Service
- 1.44. Justice Perversion Conspiracy Finding + Perjury Immunity Fraud Finding + Photographic and Medical Record
Innocence Evidence Exclusion Fraud Finding + Trial Fraud Fraud Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against the 3
Women, the Metropolitan Police Investigators, Crown Prosecutors and Defenders
- 1.45. Innocence Evidence Observation Finding + Exposure Finding + Trial Fraud Remedy Finding + Jury Acquittal
Finding + Harassment Trial Fraud Failure Finding for the Trial Judge against the Investigators, Prosecutors and
Defenders
- 1.46. Judicial Claim Advice Finding for the Trial Judge and Citizen Mr Yediyali against the Investigators, Prosecutors
and Defenders

The Claim Incapacity

- 1.47. Emotional Exhaustion Finding + Financially Drained Finding + Bad Credit Rating Borrowing Handicap Finding
+ Limited English Language Skills Finding + Claim Management Incapacity Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali

The Hygiene Regulation Breach Framing Fraud

- 1.48. 2004 to 2012 Fast Food Shop Management Success Finding + After Harassment Acquittal Hygiene Regulation
Breach Allegations Finding + Hygiene Regulation Breach Investigation Finding + Investigation Fraud Suspicion
Finding + Hygiene Breach Business Closure Finding + Closure Fraud Suspicion Finding + Loan Shark
Borrowing Finding + 100% Yearly Interest Rate Finding + Extortionate Interest Rate Finding + Refurbishment
Finding + Reopened Business Finding + Hygiene Regulation Breach Prosecution Finding + Prosecution Fraud
Suspicion Finding + Hygiene Regulation Breach Trial Finding + Trial Fraud Suspicion Finding + Hygiene
Regulation Breach Conviction Finding + Conviction Fraud Suspicion Finding for Citizen Mr Yediyali against the
London Borough of Tower Hamlets Council

The Forced Sale

- 1.49. Forced Sale Conditions Finding + Forced Sale Finding + Sale Lawyer Instructions Finding + Buyer Lawyer
Instructions Finding + Transaction Communications between Lawyers Finding + Sale Legal Service Failure
Finding + Part Payment Finding + Full Payment Promise and Full Accounting Promise and Premature Possession

Request Finding + Premature Possession Finding + Full Payment Failure Finding + Full Accounting Failure Finding + Promise Breach Finding + Promise fraud Finding + Promise Breach Fraud Finding + Business Theft Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin

The Business Theft Complaint

1.50. Business Theft Complaint Finding + Complaint Reference Finding + 9th October 2019 Complaint Date Finding + Protection Request Finding + Investigation Failure Finding + Protection Failure Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against the Metropolitan Police

Business Theft Claim + Corruption Damage Claim

1.51. Turkish English Interpretation Need Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli

1.52. Turkish English Interpretation Skill Finding for Citizen Interpreter Mr Can Say

1.53. Business Theft Case Disclosure Finding + Case Reference to Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli and Interpreter Mr Say

1.54. Case History Enquiries Finding for Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis, Citizen Mr Yediayli and Interpreter Mr Say against the Buyer Lawyers and Sale Lawyers and the Landlord Representatives

1.55. Transaction Communications Disclosure Finding + Lawyer and Client Relationship Finding + Care Duty Denial Finding + Lawyer and Client Relationship Denial Finding + Care Duty Denial Finding + Denial Fraud Findings for Citizen Mr Yediayli against the Sale Lawyers

1.56. Business Claim Notice Finding + Notice Response Failure Finding for Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis, Citizen Mr Yediayli and Interpreter Mr Say

1.57. Business Claim Issue Finding + QB 2019 003741 Case Reference Finding + 22nd October 2019 Issue Date Finding + 22nd October 2019 Claim Papers Service Date Finding + Accounting Promise Finding + Resolution Co-operation Promise Finding + Accounting Promise Breach Finding + Resolution Co-operation Promise Breach Finding for Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis, Citizen Mr Yediayli and Interpreter Mr Say

1.58. Business Claim QB 2019 03741 Damage Mitigation Draft Order dated 31st October 2019 Finding + Corruption Claim Damage Mitigation Draft Order dated 31st October 2019 + Corruption Draft Order Stamp Filing Proof dated 1st November 2019 on the Business Claim File from the High Court Actions Office and on the Election Fraud Appeal QA 2019 000296 File in the High Court Appeals Office and Election Fraud Appeal 2019 2700 File in the Court of Appeal and Sussex Crown Prosecutor as receiving Agent for the Parliament Session File held by the Director of Public Prosecutions Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court

1.59. Corruption Claim QB 2019 003984 Issue Date 8th November 2019 Finding + Claims QB 2019 003741 and 003984 Damage Mitigation Application Notice Filing Finding + Valid £150,000 State Damages Reduction or £150,000 Buyer Enrichment Fraud Choice Finding + Buyer Enrichment Fraud Finding + Application Hearing Listing Denial Finding + Denial Fraud Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and High Court

1.60. Defence and Counterclaim dated 13th November 2019 Finding + Adequate Claim Particulars Admission Proof

Finding + Business Acquisition Admission Finding + Part Payment Admission Finding + Full Payment Failure Finding + Part Payment Unjust Enrichment Claim Fraud Finding + Business Theft Guilt Proof Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court

- 1.61. Business Theft Complaint Day 37 Response Text Finding + Response Date 15th November 2019 Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against the Metropolitan Police
- 1.62. Business Claim QB 2019 003741 Reply and Defence to Counterclaim dated 21st November 2019 Finding + 28th November 2019 Filing Date Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court
- 1.63. Business Claim QB 2019 003741 1st Without Hearing Backdated Order Finding + 31st October 2019 Alleged Date Finding + 30 Day or until Further Order Stay Finding + Brief Particulars Filing Order Finding + 30 Day Filing Time Limit Finding + After Filing Stay Application Permit Finding + Filing Default Automatic Strike Out Finding + Order Fraud Finding + Day 23 seal Date Finding + Day 28 and 27th November 2019 Letter Box Personal Service Date Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court
- 1.64. Business Claim QB 2019 003741 Claim Particulars made Without Prejudice to Invalidity Arguments Finding + 26th November 2019 Filing Date Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court
- 1.65. Business Claim QB 2019 003741 Without Prejudice to Invalidity Arguments Stay Revocation and Particulars Filing Revocation Draft Order dated 28th November 2019 Finding + 28th November 2019 Filing Date Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court
- 1.66. Business Theft Complaint Day 60 Interview Appointment Finding + Interview Attendance Finding + Business Theft and Court Fraud Explanation Finding + Chronology and Documents List Finding + Case reference to Superior Officers Finding + No Further Action Finding + No Further Action Notice Failure Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin, the High Court and Metropolitan Police
- 1.67. Business Claim QB 2019 003741 2nd Without Hearing Backdated Order Finding + 12th November 2019 Alleged Date Finding + Day 28 Seal Date Finding + Application Dismissal Finding + Which Application Non-Disclosure Finding + Incomprehensible Stated Reason Finding + Stayed Case Stated Reason Finding + Comprehensible Case Finding + Incomprehensible Case Reason Fraud Finding + Stayed Case Reason Fraud Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the High Court
- 1.68. Business Theft Criminal Conspiracy Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against the Harassment Case 3 Women Witnesses, Investigators, Prosecutors and Defenders, the Hygiene Regulation Breach Investigators and Prosecutors, Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin, the Business Recovery Claim Defence Lawyers, the Business Theft Complaint Investigation Denial Officers and the High Court
- 1.69. Business Theft Crime Proceeds Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Buyers Mr Ahmed and Mr Hussin and the Metropolitan Police and the High Court
- 1.70. Governance Unfitness Finding for Citizen Mr Yediayli against Law Profession Authorities and the Law Court

Royal Commission Case Notice + Magistrates Court Summons Application
Contempt and Terrorism Penalty Warning to All State Officers + All Law Officers

12th January 2019

2. The SIMILAR FACT CORRUPTION PROOF includes Crime Protection Frauds for Corrupt Government Lawyers by the Law Profession Authorities. Profession Unfitness Protection Fraud
3. The SIMILAR FACT CORRUPTION PROOF includes Crime Protection Frauds by the State and Law Courts and Top Politicians for
 - 3.1. Perjury + Forgery + Justice Perversion Conspiracy Frauds + Practice Disqualification Frauds by Profession Authority Officers against Profession Members
 - 3.2. Perjury + Forgery + Justice Perversion Conspiracy Frauds + Practice Qualification Frauds by State Experts and State Lawyers against Citizens
 - 3.3. Perjury + Forgery + Justice Perversion Conspiracy Frauds + Bank Frauds by Corrupt Bankers against Citizens
 - 3.4. Perjury + Forgery + Justice Perversion Conspiracy Frauds + Insurance Frauds by Corrupt Insurers against Citizens
 - 3.5. Reserved Rights for Additional Similar Fact Cases

Proposed defendant

Name:

1. Attorney General The Rt Hon Geoffrey Cox QC MP of 102 Petty France London SW1H 9EA ... Telephone - 020 7271 2492 correspondence@attorneygeneral.gov.uk + geoffrey.cox@parliament.uk
2. Director of Public Prosecutions Alison Saunders 102 Petty France London SW1H 9EA 0203 357 0899 enquiries@cps.gov.uk + alison.saunders@cps.gov.uk
3. Guy's & St Thomas NHS Trust Consultant Transplant Surgeon Professor Martin Drage 0207 188 1543 secretary sophia.chukwumah@gstt.nhs.uk + martin.drage@gstt.nhs.uk
4. Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, Queen's Hospital Dr Nicholas Lever GMC membership number: 4317935 Rom Valley Way, Romford, Essex, RM7 0AG secretary jean.crawley2@nhs.net 01708 504223 + nicholas.lever@nhs.net
5. North East London Mental Health Service Chief Executive Professor Oliver Shanley OBE NELFT NHS Foundation Trust CEME Centre – West Wing Marsh Way Rainham Essex RM13 8GQ 0300 555 1200 + ceoffice@nelft.nhs.uk
6. Redbridge Council Chief Executive Officer Andy Donald, Town Hall 128-142 High Road Ilford IG1 1DD Tel: 020 8554 5000 <http://www.redbridge.gov.uk> + andy.donald@redbridge.gov.uk + Tel 020 8708 2100
7. Redbridge Council Chief Legal Officer Maria Christofi Town Hall 128-142 High Road Ilford IG1 1DD Tel: 020 8554 5000 + Maria.christofi@redbridge.gov.uk
8. Redbridge Council Chief Medical Officer (now under Public Health + Communities under Corporate Director of PEOPLE) Corporate Director of PEOPLE Adrian Loades Tel: 020 8554 5000 + adrian.loades@redbridge.gov.uk
9. Redbridge Council Tax Officer Mr Hayes, Town Hall 128-142 High Road Ilford IG1 1DD
10. Redbridge Council Tax Officer Mr Flaherty, Town Hall 128-142 High Road Ilford IG1 1DD

1. Complete the box above and give the details required in the boxes below.¹

2. Sign and date the completed form.

3. Send or deliver a copy of the completed form to the magistrates' court office.

Do not send this form to the proposed defendant unless the court tells you to do so.

The court may determine your application with or without a hearing and without receiving representations from the proposed defendant. The court will not usually arrange a hearing so it is important that the information you

¹ Forms for use with the Rules are at: www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/criminal/formspage.

put in this form is complete and accurate.

(1) Consent to prosecute

Do you need consent to prosecute?

Yes No

If yes, you must include with your application written evidence of that consent.

Some offences may not be prosecuted without the consent of the Attorney General, the Director of Public Prosecutions or another authority. The legislation that creates the offence will say whether such consent is required.

No Consent requirement because Conflicted Interests created a Remedy Only Jurisdiction Limit for the Equity Lawyer and Citizen against the Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions and All State Lawyers + All Crown Lawyers

(2) Previous application(s)

Have you applied before for the issue of a summons or warrant in respect of any of the allegations you are making? Yes No

If yes, give details. *Include the name of the court to which you applied, the date of the application and the name of the proposed defendant you gave that court if that was different to the name in this application.*

Conflicted Interests create Conflict Disqualifications and Remedy Only Jurisdiction Limits for the Equity Lawyer and Citizen against the use of Corruption Remedy Applications that got Process Denial Fraud Proof and Remedy Denial Fraud Proof against All Authorities with Remedy Powers.

Mass Remedies need Personal Liability Orders by the Royal Commission for the Victims against All Responsible Individuals

(3) Other proceedings

Has any other prosecutor ever brought a criminal case against the proposed defendant in respect of any of the allegations you are making? Yes No

Nothing Known

(4) Details of the alleged offence(s)

CrimPR 7.3 requires that an allegation of an offence in an application for the issue of a summons or warrant must contain (a) a statement of the offence that (i) describes the offence in ordinary language, and (ii) identifies any legislation that creates it; and (b) such particulars of the conduct constituting the commission of the offence as to make clear what the prosecutor alleges against the defendant

The Murder Conspiracy Concealment Fraud + Council Tax Liability Trial Fraud Case Facts

4. The use of State Benefit Denial Frauds + Council Tax Liability Frauds + Benefit Prosecution Frauds + Snaresbrook Crown Court Benefit Trial Fraud 2018 0394 to get Discredit Frauds + Impoverishment Frauds + 3 Peel Drive Mortgage Repossession Frauds
5. The Fraud Proof includes the response to the Mortgage Replacement Finance Offer of Mr George Sofroniou of Mortgage Redemption Statement Denial Frauds + Auction Sale Stay Fraud that made necessary the issue of Bank Fraud Claims HQ18X03276 + Auction Stay Applications before Auction Day that got High Court Stay Refusal Orders and Court of Appeal Fraud Appeals 2018 2325 + 2477 of Citizen Ms Neelu Berry in September 2018 that remain unresolved in January 2020.
6. The Fraud Proof includes use of the Benefit Trial Fraud 2018 0394 for Hearing Denial Frauds + Without Hearing Restraint Frauds against the Equity Lawyer and Citizen Ms Berry

7. The Fraud Proof includes use of the Benefit Trial Fraud 2018 0394 for a Case Withdrawal Notice to get an Appearance Failure by Citizen Ms Berry at the Withdrawal Hearing and use of the Appearance Failure by State Prosecutor Mr Attenborough for a Bench Warrant Application, which failed when Citizen Ms Berry made a late Appearance at the Withdrawal Hearing to find the State Prosecutor making the Bench Warrant Application
8. The Fraud Proof includes use of Corruption Remedy Denial Frauds + Council Tax Liability Frauds against Citizen Mrs Sadhana Chaudhari before she died after her death on 6th December 2018
9. The Fraud Proof includes use of Mental Health Powers for a Murder Conspiracy Concealment Fraud by Redbridge Council. The Citizen, Crown and Lord Bishops have Corruption Control Jurisdictions that govern Parliament Session Powers. They fell into disuse for 45 years when the Politicians developed the European Constitution. It vested Dictator Powers in the State. The European Leaders wanted Referenda Acceptance of the Dictator Powers. In 2004 they committed Election Frauds to get it. In October 2004 Equity Lawyer Mr Ellis used the Election Fraud Proof to revive the Equity Monarchy Trusts and start a Corruption Remedy Process that has continued ever since. The Equity Lawyer provided Investigation Services for the Crown and Lord Bishops. He recruited Citizens, managed cases and got Proof Sets that met the Corruption Remedy Proof Standard. In April 2017 the Remedy Process got completion of a Criminal Conspiracy Proof Set against Top State Officers and Law Court Judges. The Crown and Lord Bishops used it to decide the Corruption Remedy Conditions for the Parliament Session Agreement. They needed an Election Free period to enable a Long Session of 2 ½ years to complete the Corruption Investigations in the Law Courts, get Corruption Cases against Top Judges and use them to continue the Corruption Investigations in Parliament. Prime Minister Mrs May called the Surprise General Election to avoid a Parliament Session Refusal and Forced General Election with Mass Publicity for the Corruption Proof and Reme4dy denial Fraud Proof. It got the Long Session. The Corruption Investigations got Criminal Conspiracy Proof against Many MPs, Attorney General Mr Cox, Prime Minister Mrs May and Opposition Leader Mr Corbyn.
10. The Fraud Proof includes the Corruption Remedy Sabotage Frauds by Prime Minister Mrs May by use of Health Dictator Powers for Mental Health Fraud Orders and Medical Murder Orders by the National Health Service against the Equity Lawyer. The Health Service Frauds used Blood Test Forgeries + Kidney Failure Diagnosis Frauds + Kidney Failure Dialysis Treatment Prescription Frauds + Kidney Transplant Prescription Fraud + Health Service Blackmail using Kidney Failure Treatment Denial to support Mental Health Examination Consent Demands.
11. The Health Service Order Frauds discovered a Commitment Split between Doctors. The Killer Doctors were Enthusiastic Murders. The Decent Doctors gave Missing Symptom Warnings and then Unreliable Blood Test Result Warning that eventually were interpreted as Blood Test Forgery Warnings. The Equity Lawyer used his Known Physical Fitness + the Missing Symptom Evidence for the Mental Examination Consent Refusals.
12. The Fraud Proof includes the Body Parts of the Equity Lawyer. The Ankles are Missing Swelling Symptom Evidence. The Right Arm provides the No Scar Evidence + Normal Pulse Control Evidence for the Left Arm that provides the Fistula Operation Scar Evidence + Abnormal Pulse Evidence.
13. The Fraud Proof includes the Process Denial Frauds by All Relevant Authorities. The Equity Lawyer made Health Service Blackmail Fraud Complaints to Guy's Hospital Trust and Royal Sussex Hospital Trust and got Stamp Filing Proof from the Royal Sussex Trust. The Equity Lawyer made a Care Package Application to the East Sussex County

Council and got Stamp Filing Proof. He continued the Application Processes by Email. Sussex crown Prosecutors acted as Receipt Agents for the Director of Public Prosecutions who kept the Parliament Session file for the Crown and Prime Minister. The Equity Lawyer got Stamp Filing Proof from the Sussex Crown Prosecutor on the Application Evidence. The Hospital Trusts and East Sussex County Council ignored the Parliament Session File Evidence and committed Complaint Denial Frauds + Care Application Denial Frauds. The Failed Corrupt Order Process Signature against Dictator Governors is Process Denial Frauds by All Relevant Authorities.

14. The Fraud Proof includes Imminent Homelessness Warnings that got Warning Omissions from the Treatment Reports and Innuendo Defamation for which the Only Credible Purpose was to service Mental Health Frauds. Nothing stopped the Murder Plan.
15. The Fraud Proof includes the Dialysis Treatment Offer on 26th March 2019 by Sussex Royal Hospital to the Equity Lawyer made with intent to get a Treatment Consent Signature and the Non-Disclosure Fraud of a Hospital Murder within an hour of the Consent Signature. The Treatment Refusal by the Equity Lawyer stopped the Hospital Murder. The Dismissal Process against Prime Minister Mrs May was well advanced. She dare not use a Mental Health Fraud to complete the Murder Plan. It was Totally Predictable that the Killer Doctors would wait for Protection Frauds by Prime Minister Mrs May, would not get them, and would use Mental Health Powers to get them. The Baby Murder Evidence + Council Tax Liability Frauds by Redbridge Council made them the Obvious Choice of Local Authority to service the Murder Cover Up Mental Health Frauds
16. The Fraud Proof includes the Residential Tenancy for part of 450 New North Road, Hainault IG6 3ED from the Personal Representative of the late Mrs Sadhana Chaudhari. The Equity Lawyer used it for the Housing Benefit Claim B2006USI. It got Benefit Denial Fraud Proof against Redbridge Council. It ensured they knew where he was.
17. The Fraud Proof includes the Conservative Party Leadership Resignation on Friday 7th June 2019 by Prime Minister Mrs May that started the Leadership Contest. The Blood Samples given on 10th June 2019 by the Equity Lawyer got Blood Test Result Forgeries that were used for a Dialysis Treatment Offer on Thursday 19th June 2019 subject to a Mental Examination Condition. It got an Examination Refusal by the Equity Lawyer who went into Half Hiding immediately. The Secret Service knew where he was.
18. The Fraud Proof includes use of the Blood Test Result Forgeries for a Mental Health Fraud by the Killer Doctors and Redbridge Council and the North London Mental Health Service and Metropolitan Police. The Council Officers made Premature Calls for Police Assistance. The Video Records evidence the Premature Appearances and Tazer Tyranny Behaviour by Police Officers.
19. The Fraud Proof includes either Identity Perjury or Qualification Perjury to commit either a Qualification Concealment Fraud or a Qualification Fraud for the Unfit Person Appointment Fraud to the office of Chief Executive of the North London Mental Health Service.
20. The Fraud Proof includes Repeat Fraud Notices that Redbridge Council Tax Officers Mr Hays and Mr Flaherty acknowledged receiving, claimed to have understood and ignored to continue the Council Tax Liability Frauds Liability Prosecution Frauds
21. The Fraud Proof includes the Council Tax Directions Order dated 30th October 2019 that Redbridge Council file and serve a Liability Case Skeleton Argument within a Time Limit and the Order Breach Contempt and Continued

Enforcement Frauds

22. The Fraud Proof includes Integrity Tests before and during the 2019 General Election that got Corruption Proof, Remedy Denial Fraud Proof and Election Fraud Proof against organised Criminals, the Media, State, Law Courts and All Party Leaders.
23. The Fraud Proof includes the move on 29th November 2019 of the Sussex Crown Prosecutor's Office in Hove to the 3rd Floor of Brighton Police Station, the Parliament Session Filing Appointment on 4th December 2019 for the Equity Lawyer, his attendance at Brighton Police Station for the Filing Appointment and the Office Access Denial Frauds by Sussex Police and Filing Service Denial Frauds by Sussex Crown Prosecutors that prevented the filing of 59 Documents that day and more documents since then. It made necessary use of the Privy Councillors, Lords Lieutenants and Lord Archbishop Canterbury as Parliament Session Filing Denial Fraud Notice Agent for the Citizens to the Crown
24. The Election Fraud Proof against All Party Leaders created a Pernicious Choice for All Voters and invalidated use of the Ultimate Sanction of a Parliament Session Refusal and Forced General Election. The Crown and Lord Bishops imposed Corruption Remedy Conditions in the Parliament Session Agreement that required a Royal Commission for Corruption Remedies.

(5) Summary of the circumstances

CrimPR 7.2(6) requires that an application for the issue of a summons or warrant for arrest must concisely outline the grounds for asserting that the proposed defendant has committed the alleged offence or offences. Summarise your grounds for alleging that the proposed defendant has committed the offence(s) for which you want the court to issue a summons or warrant. Give an indication of the evidence on which you will rely if the court agrees to do so.

Criminal Conspiracy to pervert the course of justice and Murder Conspiracy Frauds + Murder Conspiracy Concealment Frauds + Impoverishment Frauds against Victims and Employment Frauds and Protection Frauds for Corrupt Officers and Unjust Enrichment Frauds for Organised Criminals.

(6) Application for warrant

Complete this box only if you are applying for the court to issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest. Under s.1, Magistrates' Courts Act 1980 the court can issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest only where (a)(i) the offence to which the warrant relates can be, or must be, tried in the Crown Court, (ii) the offence is punishable with imprisonment, or (iii) the defendant's address is not sufficiently established for a summons to be served on him or her, and (b) the Director of Public Prosecutions consents to the issue of the warrant, if the offence to which the warrant relates is one to which s.1(4A) of the 1980 Act applies (certain offences that can be prosecuted in the UK even though committed elsewhere).

In all cases

(a) Conditions relating to the offence or the defendant. *Tick as many boxes as apply.*

(i) the offence can be, or must be, tried in the Crown Court

(ii) the offence is punishable with imprisonment

(iii) the defendant's address is not sufficiently established for a summons to be served

Explain why, including what you have done to find an address for the defendant.

If applicable

(b) The Director of Public Prosecutions consents to the issue of a warrant for the defendant's arrest

Yes No

If yes, you must include with your application written evidence of that consent.

(7) Declaration. *See Criminal Procedure Rules r.7.2(6), (7). You may be asked to make this declaration on oath.*

To the best of my knowledge, information and belief:

- (a) the allegations contained in this application are substantially true,
- (b) the evidence on which I rely will be available at the trial,
- (c) the details that I have given in boxes (2) and (3) are true, and
- (d) this application discloses all the information that is material to what the court must decide.

Signed: (applicant)

Date:

Decision – this record must be kept by the court

I considered this application today [at] [without] a hearing.

[The applicant confirmed on oath or affirmation the declaration in box (7).]

[The applicant gave me additional information [the essence of which was:]]²

[The proposed defendant gave me additional information [the essence of which was:]]³

On the basis of the information contained in this application [as supplemented by the additional information described above]:

(a) I [am] [am not] satisfied that the requirements for the issue of a summons are met

[(b) I [am] [am not] satisfied that the additional requirements for the issue of a warrant are met]⁴

and I [issue] [refuse to issue] a [summons] [warrant] accordingly.

My reasons are these: *The court should give a brief indication of its conclusions.*

Signed:

Name: [Justice of the Peace]
[District Judge (Magistrates' Court)]
[Justices' Clerk / assistant clerk]

Date:

² Include a brief summary of any information unless it is recorded elsewhere.

³ Include a brief summary of any information unless it is recorded elsewhere.

⁴ Complete only if the application includes an application for the issue of a warrant.