

## **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.