

Fraud on the Court

Forensic reconstruction of public provenance, suppression, premise, jurisdiction, propagation and outcome

18 July 2026

Was it provenance, or was it institutional fiction?

Backward jumps in the Temporal Reconstruction are permitted because they test a later proposition against the provenance available at its claimed source. Forward projection is prohibited because it allows later knowledge to contaminate an earlier record-state. The restriction binds the author as much as the institutions under examination: the reconstruction must not manufacture continuity by importing later facts, classifications or discoveries into events that did not yet contain them. To do so would reproduce the same provenance-laundering mechanism the graph was built to expose.

Executive determination

This paper examines whether the institutional record survives ordered replay. It does not begin from the author’s credibility, treat the chronology as a narrative allegation, or substitute institutional confidence for examination of the records attached to the relevant nodes. It begins with provenance: what existed before the contaminated record-state, what entered later, and whether each claimed exercise of authority can be traced to a valid source.

The reconstruction is author-generated, evidentially structured, State-received and State-transacted. It is also attached to a public identity, authorship and publication continuum extending back to 2004. Parrot Wisdom was not created in response to the later private malice coercively inflicting administrative violence. Its public provenance existed long before the institutional record examined here.

During the fraud continuum, that public platform was actively blocked by the same actor who was injecting false provenance into police, healthcare and court records. The blocking prevented publication of the source documents while those same documents, selectively represented or stripped of context, were being used to inflict administrative violence. Restoration of the platform therefore restores an independent publication surface that the contaminated institutional record could not absorb or retrospectively manufacture.

The settlement of the originating arrest strand and the 1 May 2026 DWP transaction remove any proper basis for classifying the corpus as an unreceived private allegation. Ordered replay answers the governing question. The downstream account did not possess valid provenance at the material points identified below. Institutional repetition preserved and operationalised contradictions; it did not supply the missing evidential bridge.

1. Method and classification

1.1 Governing grammar

The chronology is the temporal spine. Each DOM node is a forensic data structure. A backward jump is a diagnostic instruction. CHIP/ID is edge-authored compression attached to that jump, not metadata attached to a date. Footer and cumulative-agency rows are validation surfaces. The probative corpus is evidential authority. Search surfaces are derivative instruments, and the browser is only the execution environment.

A conclusion is reached by opening the material attached to the relevant node, replaying the sequence in date order, following the backward diagnostic edges and comparing each later institutional statement with the complete record-state then available.

1.2 Status terms

Status	Meaning
Record fact	A date, statement, filing, communication, custody event, decision or transaction directly shown by a record.
Diagnostic conclusion	A conclusion produced by ordered comparison of

	record facts across nodes.
Institutional act	Receipt, repetition, filing, reliance, custody, decision, payment or other conduct by an identified body.
State-transacted record	Indexed evidence received and acted upon by the State, including settlement, reopening, award or payment.
Institutional fiction	A proposition lacking valid provenance that is preserved, repeated or acted upon through institutional records.

1.3 Public provenance and suppression

Public provenance is not character evidence. It is an independently dated record-state against which later institutional representations can be tested. The relevant continuity begins with the author's online presence in 2004, develops into Parrot Wisdom, and persists through authorship, subject matter, archive accumulation and publication practice long before the 2017–2022 coercive sequence.

The later blocking of Parrot Wisdom is therefore part of the evidential mechanism. It did not create the underlying documents or the author's identity. It obstructed the public surface through which those documents could be published while derivative and selectively represented versions were entering institutional systems. The suppression attempt became a node in the provenance of the restored publication.

The governance significance is direct: a public identity with more than two decades of independently traceable continuity cannot be reduced to a retrospective response to later allegations. The institutional account must instead explain why a pre-existing publication platform was obstructed while the same source material was being operationalised through police, healthcare and court records.

2. Pre-existing public provenance

Parrot Wisdom's lineage begins with the author's online publication presence in 2004 and develops into the established avian-advocacy platform later known by that name. Its authorship, subject continuity and accumulated archive pre-date the institutional events examined in this paper by many years.

This chronology matters because the public platform was not constructed as a defensive answer to the later record. The later record entered an already-existing biographical, clinical, technical and publication continuum. That earlier continuum is a controlling provenance surface, not collateral background.

During the later fraud continuum, access to that publication surface was actively blocked. The practical consequence was asymmetric control: source documents could be selected, reframed and circulated inside institutional systems while their complete publication through the author's own established platform was obstructed.

The restoration of Parrot Wisdom reverses that asymmetry. The platform now connects its pre-existing public provenance to Damocles, the Temporal Graph and the probative corpus. The institutional narrative is no longer the only retrievable surface through which the events can be encountered.

3. Entry of the harassment premise

On 25 August 2020 an email-harassment premise entered police records through Crime Report 37/49387/20 and CAD SC-20082020-300. It originated in the housing/ASB channel.

The records did not simply preserve an allegation for later neutral examination. They converted it into an operative institutional input before the complete communications sequence had been tested.

On 27 September 2020 that input produced arrest, custody and seizure of electronic property.

The controlling comparison surface is the complete communications record: sender, recipient, date, sequence, content and context. The institutional label placed upon a selection of those communications is derivative.

4. The criminal arrest and the later civil process

The arrest and the later civil injunction are separate events in separate legal channels.

Date	Record event	Forensic effect
27 Sep 2020	Arrest, custody and seizure	Criminal-law coercion
9 Oct 2020	N16A application filed	Civil application begins after the arrest
14 Oct 2020	N205C issue and injunction/order	Constitutive issue-state claimed for the later injunction and enforcement continuum
5 Jan 2021	CPS offers no evidence; property returned	The criminal harassment charge does not result in conviction

The civil process did not exist on 27 September 2020 and cannot be projected backwards as provenance for the arrest.

5. The N205C constitutive issue-state

Court-facing material represented that a final injunction and power of arrest had followed an alleged hearing on 16 September 2020. The identified N16A application is dated 9 October 2020. The N205C notice of issue and the injunction/order are dated 14 October 2020.

N205C is not treated here as incidental service paperwork. It is the constitutive issue-state from which the later proceeding claimed authority. The jurisdictional chain represented by the record is: N16A application; N205C issue-state; injunction and power of arrest; alleged breach; committal jurisdiction; judgment of 13 October 2022.

An alleged final order in the identified proceeding cannot derive from a hearing said to have occurred before the application and issue dates. The 2 November covering material propagated the 16th September allegation while transmitting the October instruments that contradicted it. If N205C is false, invalid or incapable of establishing that GO1NR161 was lawfully commenced, the defect is upstream of the injunction and every later committal application.

The two histories cannot both possess provenance. If the N205C issue-state fails, the enforcement continuum has no originating procedural foundation.

The judgment of 13 October 2022 does not generate independent authority. It is derivative of the proceeding and order it purported to enforce. Without a valid N205C issue-state there is no validly

constituted proceeding, no demonstrated source for the injunction, no enforceable order capable of breach and no committal jurisdiction. The 13 October 2022 judgment is therefore void downstream of the failed originating issue-state.

6. The 5 January 2021 exposure point

On 5 January 2021, the criminal harassment proceedings concluded when the CPS offered no evidence and the charge was dismissed. Only after that disposal did Sharples' legal representative introduce "one other matter": communications arising from the separate civil proceedings. Those emails had been sent by the author, then acting in the capacity of litigant in person, to the complainant's legal office at that office's request, while the criminal bail conditions remained in force. Once the criminal charge was dismissed, those bail conditions fell away; the communications could not retrospectively be treated as preserving or reviving the disposed criminal allegation since they were sent under lawful capacity having been denied legal aid by the false declaration of HRA engagement on N16A.

The resulting non-conviction restraining order therefore did not emerge from a successful criminal prosecution. It was imposed after the criminal premise had failed and the court dismissed, using material imported from a civil case the criminal court had not examined and concerning two emails that the injunction itself permitted.

The criminal disposal did not convert the failed harassment premise into proven conduct, and it did not validate the later civil proceeding. The criminal and civil channels remain distinct in both time and provenance.

The 5 January event is therefore an exposure point: once the prosecution failed, the record moved without true jurisdiction laterally into civil material rather than returning to the source and correcting the premise.

The criminal proceedings had been dismissed. After that, there was no live criminal case in which a private matter from separate civil proceedings could simply be introduced and adjudicated without:

- a police complaint,
- an investigation,
- a charge,
- or the court being properly seized of and informed about the civil proceedings and injunction governing those communications along with the then three year provenance trail.

7. The 14–15 January 2021 sequence

On 14 January 2021, nine days after the criminal harassment charge failed, P. Sharples emailed T/Sgt 1845 Benton seeking to discover whether the author was known to a Public Protection Unit.

In support of that enquiry, Sharples stated that two NSFT mental-health workers remembered the author from when he lived in Red Lodge and said that he had been run out of town for "paedophile type behaviour".

The statement entered the record at that point. It was not introduced by the author and it was not a finding made by any authority.

On 15 January 2021, the authority to whom the statement had been directed answered the relevant institutional question. T/Sgt Benton confirmed that the author "is not under any public protection team and has not been under them before."

The graph then tests the remaining claimed source against the underlying records. The documented address history contains no Red Lodge residence. The hospital record contains no pre-2015 mental-health contact capable of supplying the claimed memory. The asserted professional and geographic provenance therefore fail.

The allegation entered on 14 January and was contradicted on 15 January by the police authority to whom it was told. What remained thereafter was not provenance; it was an unsupported allegation retained in the institutional record.

8. Propagation after contradiction

The 15 January police response did not remove the unsupported material from the wider record-state.

The 14 January email was later incorporated into the civil material. On 22 April 2021 the Professionals Meeting brought housing, police and clinical actors into one decision space. The graph identifies the 14 January email as the substrate and the 22 April meeting as its formal institutional expression.

The meeting record shows planning across clinical, police and civil channels, including possible malicious-communications action and preparation of affidavits for court. The contradicted material had therefore migrated beyond its point of entry.

9. First committal: the source record is opened

The first committal application was served on 21 June 2021. The relevant evidential comparison is the complete 5–15 January email thread against Appendix B and the derivative presentation built from it.

On 20 August 2021 the complete Sharples-Benton thread and the contradictory Appendix B were shown to HHJ North. The graph records that the first committal application then collapsed.

The full thread supplied provenance. Appendix B did not survive comparison with it.

10. Second committal: substitution, counting and absence

The second committal did not arise on a clean record. It followed the exposed contradiction in the first application and remained dependent on the same N205C issue-state and injunction continuum.

The graph identifies different Appendix B versions and a later Fifth Affidavit. The 2022 presentation removed the 2021 allegations and reframed the case around July 2022 communications.

The published judgment records 25 emails. The reconstruction identifies nine communications for item-level audit. The difference is tested through native message identity, sender, recipient, duplicates, quotations, thread components, complete context and the precise injunction term said to be breached.

On 13 October 2022 the committal proceeded in the author's absence while legal aid remained unresolved and contemporaneous records showed involuntary mental-health detention. On 18 October the custodial order was executed. The judgment does not cure defects in the proceeding from which its authority was derived.

The resulting imprisonment followed civil contempt in the County Court. It was not a criminal conviction and it did not establish the allegation introduced on 14 January 2021. More fundamentally, if N205C did not validly constitute GO1NR161, the judgment and imprisonment were downstream acts within a jurisdictional chain that never acquired lawful provenance.

11. Representation-and-provenance schedule

Institutional proposition	Controlling record	Propagation surface	Provenance result
The September arrest was supported by an existing civil injunction	N16A filed 9 Oct; N205C issued 14 Oct	Later police/civil history	No provenance: civil process post-dated arrest
GO1NR161 was validly constituted and capable of supporting enforcement	N16A dated 9 Oct; N205C and injunction/order dated 14 Oct; represented 16 Sep hearing	Injunction, committal applications and 13 Oct 2022 judgment	No independent provenance: if N205C fails, every downstream enforcement act fails with it
The harassment premise remained proven	5 Jan 2021 CPS no-evidence disposal against full email audit	Later institutional summaries	No provenance: no criminal conviction
The 14 Jan Public Protection implication was supported	15 Jan Benton response; address and hospital records	Civil and clinical derivatives	No provenance: authority response and source records contradict it
Appendix B faithfully represented the January thread	Complete 5–15 Jan email thread	2021 committal bundle	No provenance: derivative presentation collapsed on comparison
Twenty-five offending emails existed as characterised	Nine-communication reconstruction and item-level audit	2022 statements and judgment	Count lacks demonstrated provenance
The October 2022 outcome was criminal	Published County Court civil-contempt judgment	Later legal and oversight classifications	No provenance: civil contempt misclassified as criminal
The reconstruction was created retrospectively in response to later allegations	Public authorship and Parrot Wisdom continuity from 2004; archive and subject continuity pre-date the contaminated record-state	Later institutional and credibility classifications	No provenance: the public identity and publication continuum existed first
Blocking Parrot Wisdom was unrelated to the institutional continuum	Platform suppression occurred while source documents were selectively represented inside police, healthcare and court records	Loss of public publication access during the fraud continuum	No separation: the blocking preserved asymmetrical control over the source record

12. State transaction of the reconstructed record

State transaction is not the origin of the corpus's provenance. It is the later institutional receipt of a reconstruction attached to a much older public and documentary continuum. The public platform supplies continuity; the State transactions establish receipt and action.

12.1 Settlement of the arrest strand

The later settlement under reference MM2147080 is a State transaction on the 27 September 2020 arrest strand. Its precise admissions are governed by its terms, but the arrest event cannot thereafter be reduced to a hypothetical complaint existing only inside the reconstruction.

The settlement does not merge the arrest with the later civil committal. It fixes the distinction between them.

12.2 The 1 May 2026 threshold

The 1 May 2026 node records DWP action on the mandatory-reconsideration bundle containing the indexed reconstruction, medical material and systemic-rupture evidence. The award was restored and the review horizon extended.

That transaction does not make DWP the adjudicator of every legal conclusion. It establishes that the indexed corpus crossed from author-generated analysis into State-received and State-transacted forensic record.

13. Fraud-on-the-court assessment

The title describes the court-integrity mechanism exposed by the graph: false procedural provenance and materially distorted evidential surfaces entered and affected adjudicative process. The central jurisdictional defect is not a later disagreement with the 13 October 2022 judgment. It is the failure of the N205C issue-state on which that judgment depended.

The 16 September history allegation failed against the October instruments. The January Public Protection implication failed against the immediate police response and the address and medical records. Appendix B failed against the complete email thread. The later count remains unsupported unless reconciled at message level. None of those later surfaces can provide the missing originating jurisdiction if N205C did not validly constitute the proceeding.

The court process did not originate every fiction in the continuum. It inherited, formalised and acted within a contaminated record-state. The contemporaneous obstruction of Parrot Wisdom prevented the complete source material from occupying its established public surface while institutional derivatives were being used coercively. The restored platform now makes that asymmetry itself publicly testable.

Conclusion: provenance or institutional fiction?

It was institutional fiction, carried through a proceeding whose claimed authority cannot survive failure of its N205C issue-state.

The sequence begins earlier than the institutional premise. It begins with a public identity, authorship and publication continuum extending back to 2004. That provenance existed before the later private malice, before the contaminated record-state and before any institutional need to classify the author through derivative records.

The later sequence then begins with the harassment premise entering police records, producing arrest and separating into a civil process whose dates contradict its represented history. Only when the later allegation enters the record on 14 January 2021 is it stated. The next event is the 15 January response

from the police authority to whom it was told. The address and medical records then remove the remaining claimed source.

The subsequent civil, clinical and committal records did not cure those defects. They propagated them. Blocking Parrot Wisdom prevented the complete source record from being published through its established public channel while institutional derivatives were being operationalised. Restoration of that channel reconnects the forensic corpus to more than two decades of independent public provenance. The settlement and DWP transaction establish that the reconstruction exposing the defects is also State-received and State-transacted.

Authority repeated the fiction. Suppression delayed publication; it did not erase provenance. The judgment of 13 October 2022 cannot stand independently of N205C, and authority did not give either the fiction or the failed issue-state lawful provenance.

Methodological note

This paper is a bounded companion to the Temporal Graph and the restored Parrot Wisdom publication surface. The documents attached to the relevant nodes remain the evidential authority. The public platform establishes continuity and access; it does not replace the probative corpus.