

The 'Colour of Law'

“Colour of law” refers to the use of legitimate administrative, legal, and institutional mechanisms to inflict harm that appears procedurally normal from the inside. The violence is not overt. There is no dramatic censorship, no visible suppression, no act that, taken in isolation, looks unlawful on its face. Each individual action — a referral, a report, a letter, an application, a hearing, a certification — follows a recognised administrative pathway. The harm arises because those pathways are initiated on a false evidential base, and each downstream institution reads from the output of the previous one without verifying its origin.

In the matter documented by this chronology, the colour of law was applied through a specific and traceable sequence. A single ASB Officer, acting in a dual capacity as both a public-facing housing official and a private complainant, initiated referrals to police based on unsubstantiated assertions. Those assertions — including allegations of illicit drugs, child pornography, weapons, and email harassment — were adopted as operational context by police without independent verification. The police acted on that context: the author was arrested on 27 September 2020 on the basis of a crime report filed by the ASB Officer as a private citizen. That arrest was later determined to be unlawful and settled as a concluded tort.

Simultaneously, the same ASB Officer filed a civil application for injunction (N16a, dated 9 October 2020) containing a false statutory declaration that the matter raised no issues under the Human Rights Act 1998. That certification was false at the time it was sworn: state agents had conducted an unlawful arrest seventeen days earlier that engaged Article 5 ECHR at minimum. The false HRA certification operated as a jurisdictional choke-point. It diverted the matter out of public-law scrutiny, denied access to HRA-linked legal aid, forced the author to act as a litigant in person, and lowered the procedural safeguards applicable to coercive relief. Every downstream order, enforcement step, breach finding, and committal issued from that foundation.

The author was subsequently detained under Section 135 of the Mental Health Act on 28 May 2021, on a referral originating from the same narrative chain — the assertion that the author’s documented complaints of abuse were evidence of paranoid delusion. The author substantiated the abuse on appeal and was released on 3 June 2021. On 13 October 2022, the author was committed to prison for civil contempt under the injunction — sentenced in absence while held under a 72-hour Mental Health Act assessment at Poppy Ward, Ipswich.

None of these actions — the arrest, the injunction, the MHA detention, the committal — were conducted outside formal institutional channels. Each followed a recognised procedure. Each was documented on official forms, processed through official systems, and executed by officials acting within their apparent authority. That is the colour of law: the machinery of the state functioning exactly as designed, processing inputs that were false at origin, and producing outputs that were administratively coherent but substantively unjust. The RTF chronology was compiled inside that machinery, by the person it was processing, in the only format that could not be taken away by the next institutional action.