

MEMO 1

Appendix B (20 August 2021) vs. Actual Evidence (Email Thread 5–15 January 2021)

Chronology Anchor: First Committal Attempt (2021)

Purpose

To assess whether the allegations contained in **Appendix B dated 20/08/2021** were grounded in evidence disclosed during the first committal process, and whether they accurately represented the conduct alleged.

Documents Examined

- **Appendix B (20/08/2021)**
- **Full Email Thread: 5–15 January 2021** (Sharples ↔ Suffolk Police)
- **Committal Bundle (19/08/2022)** – for comparative contamination mapping

Summary of Findings

Appendix B (2021) contains **allegations with no evidential foundation**, and several that are **directly contradicted** by contemporaneous documents. These defects critically undermine the legitimacy of the first committal and demonstrate narrative fabrication by the ASB/Flagship agents (Sharples/Birketts).

A. Key Allegation in Appendix B (Para 3)

Appendix B alleges:

“On 6 March 2021 the victim posted messages on social media alleging a resident... had been run out of the area for being a paedophile and alleging that an employee of the Claimant was a ‘pimp’.”

This is presented as a factual, evidenced breach.

B. Findings from the Extracted Email Thread (Primary Evidence)

The **full January 2021 thread** — the only contemporaneous documentary evidence available — contains:

No evidence whatsoever of:

- Any social-media posts by the victim
- Any messages by the victim about paedophilia
- Any messages by the victim alleging a Claimant employee was a “pimp”
- Any online activity by the victim on 6 March 2021
- Any communication from the victim resembling the allegation in Para 3

Instead, the email thread shows:

It is SHARPLES making defamatory or speculative statements, including:

- Claims of “fixation on women”
- Claims the victim “consorts with prostitutes”
- Claims a woman “moved because of him”
- Attempts to persuade police he is a risk to a demographic
- Attempts to get him classified as PPU-relevant

These are **originating from Sharples**, not from the victim.

There is **no transmission, no publication, no screenshot, no platform, no timestamp, no exhibit, and no corroboration** for the allegations in Appendix B.

C. Evidential Inconsistencies

1. Date Misalignment

The entire extract of evidence (emails) is January 2021 — not March 2021.

Appendix B alleges conduct on **6 March 2021**, but **produces no material from March**.

2. Fabrication Indicators

Sharples appears to *generate* rumours internally and then re-present them as if they were statements made by the victim.

3. No Chain of Custody / No Digital Artefacts

Alleged “social media posts” are completely unsupported — no URLs, no screenshots, no metadata, no reader reports, no capture logs.

4. Abandonment in Later Proceedings

These allegations were **not repeated** in the 2022 committal, indicating their unreliability.

D. Conclusion

Appendix B (2021):

- Contains **allegations with zero evidential support**.

- Is *directly contradicted* by internal documents showing Sharples manufacturing narrative content.
- Relied on **hearsay and gossip**, not Defendant conduct.
- Was capable of misleading the court during the first committal.
- Forms part of the **fraud continuum** and demonstrates early narrative fabrication.

The first committal collapsed because Appendix B was unsalvageably defective.

FORENSIC MEMO 2

Statement of Truth – Second Committal (19 August 2022) vs. 2021 Narrative

Chronology Anchor: Second Committal – 13/10/2022

Purpose

To determine how the Claimant's case changed between the **First Committal (2021)** and the **Second Committal (2022)**, focusing on the Statement of Truth (Sharples/Birketts) filed **19/08/2022**, and whether material omissions or alterations indicate narrative manipulation.

Documents Examined

- **Committal Bundle – 19 August 2022**
- **Appendix B (20/08/2021)**
(for comparison of alleged breaches)
- **Full Email Thread (5–15 Jan 2021)**
(to confirm factual contradictions)

A. The 2022 Shift: Appendix B (2021) Disappears Completely

The 2022 committal bundle **removes ALL allegations from the 2021 Appendix B**, including:

- The alleged March 2021 social-media posts
- The “paedophile” allegation
- The “pimp” allegation
- ANY allegation about Shrub House Close residents
- ANY allegation about early 2021 conduct

This disappearance is **not explained** in the bundle.

B. The 2022 Statement of Truth (Sharples) – What it Actually Alleges

In the 2022 bundle (pp.157–159):

Sharples' allegations are restricted to:

- **Emails sent between 23–29 July 2022**
- All communications to **legal** email addresses
- No social-media posts
- No 2021 conduct
- No March 2021 incident
- No allegations resembling those in 2021 Appendix B

This is a total reframing.

C. The 2022 Case is Built ENTIRELY on Emails to Legal Enquiries

The Claimant's 2022 case asserts that the victims lawful attempts as Litigant in Person to contact the landlord's **legal department** (because they were ignoring you) constitute "breaches."

Notably:

- Every email was sent to flagshipresponse@flagship-group.co.uk or **legal enquiries**
- Every email was litigation-related
- Every email was consistent with standard LIP disclosure and enquiry practice
- No email in 2022 contains ANYTHING resembling the 2021 allegations

Yet Sharples signs a **Statement of Truth** certifying this as committal-worthy conduct.

This raises concerns under **CPR 32.14 (False Statements)**.

D. Indicators of Narrative Fabrication

1. Silent Abandonment of 2021 Allegations

If Appendix B (2021) was true, it would have been the **strongest** ground for committal. Its complete removal indicates:

- It was never true
- It was indefensible
- It collapsed under evidential scrutiny
- Birketts could not risk perjury exposure

2. Introduction of a New Theory of Breach

The 2022 case reframes lawful emails to legal staff as “harassment” or “contact.”

3. Sharples Avoids Mentioning His Own 2021 Emails to Police

The damaging January 2021 thread — showing him generating rumours — is absent from his affidavit.

4. Material Omission = Misleading the Court

By excluding the 2021 Appendix B, Birketts present a **false impression** that the record has always concerned only July 2022 emails.

E. Conclusion

The 2022 committal is based on a **rewritten, sanitised, and selectively curated narrative** that excludes all earlier fabricated allegations once exposed.

The shift between 2021 → 2022 demonstrates:

- deliberate abandonment of false allegations
- re-engineering of the committal foundation
- selective omission constituting procedural unfairness
- potential breaches of CPR 32.14
- continuation of the fraud continuum

The second committal (13/10/2022) is fatally compromised by material non-disclosure and narrative alteration.