

This document suite does not constitute formal pleadings or legal advice.
 Compilation prepared by Client as an evidential and analytical map to assist counsel.
 All legal interpretation and submissions will be undertaken by qualified counsel or solicitors instructed accordingly.

"I did not simply *document* the case; I diligently constructed a *tempered model* of the *continuum* composed of *their documents*. It exists to demonstrate that the *unthinkable* is not only possible but *demonstrable*"

Amat Victoria Curam

Introduction

The following introduction summarises a "*Defect*", it does not constitute the entire narrative, case material or the fraud continuum. These brief details illustrate the cause and the ultimate harm deprivation of liberty. (Chronology 13/10/2022)

To fully realise this took an unconscionably long time; I started with a word document, I knew I had to build some kind of chronology in order to make sense of the document archive I had collected through the period this matter involves. I knew that without a chronology everything else would be meaningless, however I quickly realised how inadequate for the task a flat document printed off was going to be, so I switched gears. I used HTML, JavaScript CSS because those tools I learned over twenty years ago, they have served me well in that time the last six months especially. I only realised on the 30th October 2025 exactly what the difficulties would be, while building the chronology I tried not to think about the enormity of the task ahead. My intention was to build a two tier system of organisation and search that would expose the underlying fraud.

For me, I thought that was all that was needed, I was wrong, this matter is a *three tier* problem. This is where I am thankful I stuck at it in those early days when all I had was a keyboard and a blank white computer screen. The 'Top Tier' then is the "*Defect*":

In legal language, a "judicial defect" isn't a single codified term — it's a shorthand sometimes used to describe a fault in the judicial process itself.

That could mean:

- Procedural defect: The court failed to follow the rules of procedure (for example, an order issued without proper notice or jurisdiction).
- Jurisdictional defect: The judge or court acted outside its lawful authority (for example, relying on incomplete or false information).
- Constitutional or fairness defect: Bias, denial of due process, or failure to give a party a fair hearing (for example. denying legal aid through document defect).

All three of these apply in this instance.

This material is not a 'document dump', neither is it irrationally 'thrown together' in "Lay confusion", this project ate half a year of intense, solitary work while juggling additional, sometimes complex life-function rebuilding tasks. This is all largely detailed within so; the matter at hand... for full meaning see: "*Orientation & Analytical Suite*".

Known Printing Issues: Probative Documents

- Numerous PDFs generated by ASB Officer P. Sharples exhibit technical faults—image overlays, rasterisation, or partial-line rendering—that disrupt context and continuity.

- A small number of probative Adobe PDF documents contain embedded images that must be extracted before they can be reliably printed.
- A few documents can only be extracted manually by transcription or viewed “as is.”

Pattern of Concern ♦

Documents linked to Mr P. Sharples (ASB Officer, Flagship Housing Group) show consistent forensic anomalies—image-based or metadata-stripped files, indirect disclosure routes, and unclear role attribution—placing him simultaneously within police, NHS, and housing channels. His conduct indicates systemic role misrepresentation: inserting himself into inter-agency exchanges without statutory authority and feeding private-source material into official records, creating a self-referential false evidential chain now driving multiple adverse actions that merit judicial scrutiny for unlawful data sharing and abuse of process.

Accreditation Uncertainty

There is presently no evidence that Mr P. Sharples (ASB Officer, Flagship Housing Group) holds accreditation under the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS) or any equivalent certification. Despite extensive search, no record of such authority is publicly available; however, absence of evidence is not yet conclusive proof of non-accreditation. Until verified by disclosure from Suffolk Constabulary, his legal status must be treated as unproven. All inter-agency activity he conducted should therefore be analysed on a “strict proof” basis—requiring production of any warrant, authorisation, or memorandum of understanding conferring enforcement or data-sharing powers. If none exists, his conduct constitutes ultra vires participation in policing and clinical processes and the derivative records are tainted as unlawfully obtained evidence.

- Classification: Accreditation Unproven – Impact on Legality of Actions.
- Scope: Affects all documents and actions derived from or authorised by that individual.
- Directive: All dependent records to be treated as contaminated pending strict proof of authority.
- Documents filed by ASB Officer Sharples demonstrate a disorganisation Client(LiP) finds difficult to explain.

Client-Author (LiP) note: *This basic uncertainty and still active document contamination mandates Chronology remain a live document. The CFA Model claimant intake system, designed to quickly triage small claims in bulk, efficiently filters out routine "money fraud" or "vexatious claims." However, faced with a more insidious Civil Process Defect, or bluntly, fraud on the court by an institutional actor, that is where the the model stalls. It defaults to the safe dismissal of "money fraud," effectively shielding this complex issue from scrutiny. Issues of an institutional "fraud on the court" creates an existential dissonance within the legal profession: it directly threatens operational reality. This systemic threat, in turn, creates a critical 'blind spot' of bias in the initial triage process. Thus, the fraud's institutional nature and deep contamination of the evidence were so subtle and pervasive that it triggered that systemic, defensive failure within the legal firms themselves.*

The 14 January 2021 Letter - Unsigned Service Documents (2–4 Nov 2020) ♦

Ostensibly an official communication from Flagship’s Legal Department, reproduces almost verbatim allegations circulated by Mr Sharples in internal correspondence to police between 5th – 15th January 2021. Its timing—nine days after the failed harassment prosecution against the victim and its textual overlap with the email thread 5th - 15th January 2021 between Mr Sharples and T/Sgt 1845 BENTON demonstrate a retaliatory attempt to perpetuate the same narrative through civil proceedings. The

document therefore evidences cross-contamination between criminal and civil forums and supports the contention that Mr Sharples was acting as a frustrated complainant rather than an impartial officer.

The covering letter (Ian Brown, Legal Department), Form N16A, and Form N205C were served together on 04 Nov 2020. None bear a handwritten or digital signature from Mr Brown or any authorised officer. In consequence, there is no executed instrument of service—only typed names. Absent a signature, the documents fail to evidence personal attestation or corporate authorisation. That absence directly undermines the validity of service and the enforceability of the injunction, and raises a further question as to whether “Ian Brown” was acting as a legally empowered officer at all.

HNK Settlement (MM2147080, 2 Jun 2025) ♦

Higgs Newton Kenyon confirmed settlement of £4,400 in the claimant’s favour for unlawful arrest and trespass arising from the 27 September 2020 incident initiated by Flagship Group’s ASB Officer P. Sharples. The Defendant’s payment constitutes formal acknowledgement of wrongdoing by state agents acting on a private landlord’s misrepresentation, thereby validating the established Pattern of Concern and converting prior evidential anomalies into a concluded tortious act.

The false certification on the N16A application that the matter raised 'no issues under the Human Rights Act 1998' operated as a jurisdictional capture: it misframed a state-engaged deprivation of liberty as a private ASB/property dispute, thereby diverting the case out of public-law scrutiny, denying access to HRA-linked legal aid, lowering the court's procedural safeguards, and enabling the grant of coercive relief without the heightened scrutiny and procedural protections that HRA engagement would have required, thereby rendering unlawful what might otherwise have been a lawful order had it survived proper HRA-compliant review. The subsequent concluded tort of false imprisonment fixes the historical fact that Convention rights—at minimum Article 5—were engaged from the outset, rendering the original certification necessarily false at the time it was sworn. Because that false HRA denial governed the entire procedural pathway, every downstream order, enforcement step, breach finding, and committal flowed from a foundation that was invalid at inception, meaning the process was not merely defective but void ab initio.

The entire Fraud Continuum (2017–2025) was triggered by the definitive rejection of Officer Sharples’s stalking accusation, which was disproved by CCTV evidence. Following the disproval of the allegation, a discernible pattern of retaliatory acts can be observed in the record, establishing the malicious intent required for Misfeasance in Public Office. The officer’s subsequent actions (data manipulation, injunctions, website block) are interpreted as measures to enforce the underlying motive: "I am going to abuse you, but you are not allowed to talk about it."

The material shows at least four distinct but interlocking “life-cycles”:

Seed and narrative-creation phase (2017–2020)

Originating with the false “paedophile/sex-worker” rumour and ASB complaints. Sharples’ emails show deliberate seeding of that narrative into police and housing systems. The August 2020 “Legal Department” letter weaponised those rumours as fact.

Institutional uptake and procedural laundering (2020–2021)

The Jan 2021 email chain proves cross-agency data leakage. The Feb–Apr 2021 period (NSFT meeting) shows laundering of that private data into NHS clinical records and court processes, creating “official” provenance.

Reinforcement and legitimisation (2021–2022)

The fraudulent records then informed committal, imprisonment, and Singh’s later psychiatric report. Each “expert” citation of those records entrenched the fiction, giving it apparent institutional legitimacy.

Persistence and replication (2023–present)

EEAS and PSD disclosures confirm that the same corrupted metadata and allegations remain live in police, NHS, and housing databases — the fraud now self-replicates through automated data-sharing. Each cycle has its own actors, records, and jurisdictional choke-point (injunction, MHA section, data disclosure, etc.), but they all descend from the same defect: Sharples' unauthorised inter-agency role and unverified data injection.

Fraus omnia corrumpit

AI Drafting and Structuring Assistant

AI helped me organise and cross-map material, not generate legal argument. The main obstacle I faced was when I tried to compile outputs; the model treats certain legal text as restricted, so the reasoning determined that which was visible in session, wasn't directly exportable. I had to rebuild the final matrices manually from what I could see, not from what it could save.

This compilation exists to show how the fraud and misfeasance align, not to impress with layout. It demonstrates a continuous institutional misuse of civil procedure to enforce criminal sanctions without due process.

This only worked because the builder; me, understood:

- the evidence,
- the narratives,
- the fraud cycle,
- the metadata contamination,
- the disclosure faults,
- the HTML logic,
- and the causal chains... *all at once*

The record stands on its own. Every subsequent act *post* 27/09/2020 stands or falls on the injunction's legitimacy. Unless that order is set aside, the police can always say they acted under colour of law. The injunction isn't a side issue - it's the keystone, the injunction is the jurisdictional choke-point; everything else (every arrest, every data decision, every NHS escalation) radiates from it.

The suite presents a triune structure:

- 1. Evidence Engine - Chronology + appendices → factual foundation.
- 2. Fraud Continuum Model - Analytical mapping of causation, contamination, and jurisdictional collapse.
- 3. Forensic Delivery System - HTML hyperbook designed for legal review: deterministic, inspectable, cross-linked, and resilient.

The core purpose of the forensic architecture used is to render the "unthinkable" fraud *demonstrable*, traceable, and undeniable. The ease with which ASB Officer Sharples engaged in the grey area between inter agency perception demonstrates a familiarity that is hard to ignore raising the question of 'repeated behaviour', I remain to be convinced I am the *only victim*.

HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE
s/n: 24509688

Note: I was when this began unfamiliar with court procedures requiring native PDF handling, instead converted documents recieved for HTML document rendering, nonetheless all affected documents remain retrievable with time and methodical effort.