

Justification for Means Exemption (LASPO) based on Unlawful Deprivation of Liberty (Article 5 ECHR)

I posit that my case qualifies for an exemption or a significant relaxation of the standard financial **Means Test** under the **Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO)** due to the nature of the core legal challenge.

The case is not a standard civil claim for damages, but a challenge to the **unlawful deprivation of liberty** and **severe Human Rights Act breaches** perpetrated by state actors.

I believe the funding application should be pursued under the **Civil Legal Aid (General) Regulations 2013** and the related guidance concerning **Public Law/Civil Liberties**, using the following justifications:

1. Challenge to Unlawful Imprisonment

The most direct and compelling vector is the **unlawful committal to prison** and the ongoing status of the underlying injunction.

- **The Claim:** The primary objective is an **Application to Set Aside the Committal Order** (13/10/2022) and the underlying Injunction on the grounds of **Fraud on the Court** (due to the procedural defect and false statutory declaration).
- **The Exemption:** Legal Aid is frequently granted, often **without a means test**, for individuals challenging an **unlawful deprivation of liberty** or defending themselves in contempt proceedings. Challenging the source of the unlawful imprisonment (the void committal) should fall under this critical exception.

2. Challenge to Unlawful Clinical Detention

The systemic misconduct also led to a subsequent loss of liberty via the Mental Health Act.

- **The Claim:** The **Section 2 MHA detention** was arguably initiated based on a contaminated clinical file, traceable to the **Professionals Meeting.pdf** where the NHS adopted the ASB Officer's false narrative. This constitutes a challenge to the **lawfulness of MHA detention and treatment**.
- **The Exemption:** Challenges to unlawful detention under the Mental Health Act are frequently **exempt from the financial means test** due to the severity of the liberty infringement.

3. Public Interest & State Actor Misconduct

The systemic nature of the failure justifies public funding regardless of my means.

- **The Claim:** The case involves systemic breaches of **Article 5 (Liberty)** and **Article 8 (Private Life/Data Integrity)** by multiple state actors (Police, NHS, Housing Group). This includes documented procedural fraud and misfeasance.
- **The Exemption:** The **Civil Legal Aid (Procedure) Regulations 2012** allow for consideration of the **Public Interest** in cases that expose fundamental failures of judicial and institutional integrity, which this case clearly does.

I request that the Legal Aid application be structured to prioritize the **Civil Liberties/Unlawful Detention** categories to maximize the chance of securing a **Means Test exemption** or access to a highly relaxed Means Test threshold.