

# 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](mailto: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.**