

Analysis of Witness Statement of Nick Bunn (19 August 2022)

Source: "Witness Statement of Nick Bunn", dated 19 August 2022

1. Purpose and Procedural Posture

This Witness Statement was submitted in support of committal proceedings against the victim. As such, it was required to contain **first-hand factual evidence** relevant to the alleged breaches of an injunction. Statements used to support deprivation of liberty must meet the evidential threshold associated with committal: clarity, specificity, direct knowledge, and proof of the alleged acts.

Bunn's statement does **not** meet these requirements.

2. Hearsay Foundation and Absence of First-Hand Evidence

The statement relies almost entirely on **hearsay**, including:

- "Vicki Catchpole informed me..."
- "Sgt Benton informed my colleague..."
- "I was told..."
- "He informed us that..."

No portion of the statement records anything Bunn personally observed or witnessed.

As a result, the statement contains **no direct evidence** of any contemptuous act by the victim.

This renders it **procedurally unsafe** as a foundation for committal.

3. Improper Disclosure of Police Information

Paragraph 5 states that:

- the victim was arrested on 29 July 2022, and
- the victim "denied both offences" in police interview.

Such information should **not** be disclosed to a landlord engaged in civil litigation against the Defendant. It includes:

- interview content
- custody status
- the victim's legal position
- active criminal allegation material

The presence of this information demonstrates **unlawful or improper cross-flow** of policing data into a civil dispute.

4. Reliance on Contaminated and Unverified Allegations

The statement incorporates allegations originating from third parties, including police and mental health professionals, none of whom provide statements of their own. These include claims that the victim:

- consorted with “prostitutes”;
- was “run out of town” for alleged “paedophile” behaviour;
- was involved in unspecified “public order” matters;
- made suicidal threats;
- was the subject of mental health assessments.

These claims are **untested, unverified, and unsupported** by evidence. They are not presented with dates, sources, documents, or corroboration.

Their presence indicates **narrative contamination** rather than evidential record.

5. No Evidence of the Alleged Contempt

A committal statement must:

1. Identify the alleged contemptuous act;
2. Prove when and how it occurred;
3. Provide documentary or factual support;
4. Demonstrate intent.

Bunn’s statement contains:

- **no copies** of the emails allegedly breaching the injunction;
- **no identification** of the recipients;
- **no timestamps** or technical evidence;
- **no explanation** of how any act constituted a breach;
- **no demonstration of intent**.

The accompanying exhibit “NB1” is referenced but not summarised, and the statement does not identify a single email by date, content, or relevance.

The statement therefore **does not prove** the acts relied upon for committal.

6. Material Mischaracterisation of Defendant’s Purpose

Paragraph 5 includes an asserted motive: that the victim “made threats” out of “frustration with the Claimant.”

This is speculative and sourced from third-hand clinical or police commentary. It is **not admissible** as a factual statement regarding the victim’s intentions.

This feature reflects the broader problem within the statement:
interpretation and narrative in place of verified fact.

7. Structural Defect: Narrative Instead of Evidence

Across the document, the pattern is:

- character profile,
- gossip,
- institutional commentary,
- hearsay risk language,
- unrelated allegations,
- and subjective impressions.

This may be suitable for an internal housing chronology.

It is **wholly inappropriate** for a committal statement.

The statement lacks:

- material particulars,
- admissible evidence,
- direct observation,
- supporting documentation.

It is a **narrative statement**, not a **witness statement of fact**.

8. Consequence: Unsafe Basis for Committal

Because:

- no breach is evidenced;
- no act is described;
- no intent is proven;
- the material relies on hearsay;
- improper police disclosures are embedded;
- allegations are untested;
- content is contaminated by prior institutional narratives;

...the resulting committal order is **unsafe**, and the statement cannot properly satisfy the evidential burden required to deprive a person of liberty.

Conclusion

The Statement of Truth submitted by Nick Bunn on 19 August 2022:

- contains almost exclusively hearsay;
- improperly incorporates policing and clinical information;
- fails to establish any contemptuous act;
- mischaracterises motive without evidence;
- imports contaminated narrative material;
- is structurally defective for committal purposes.

It does not meet the standards required for a witness statement supporting an application to commit a person to prison.