

15th May, 2021.

Private and Personal To:

The Rt Hon Lord Reed of Allermuir,

President of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom. Parliament Square, London SW1P 3BD.

My Ref: FG126 Reed; G-v-LCFA.

Your Ref: No Reference.



My Lord President,

On Wednesday of this week I received a shabby and dismissive letter from the Supreme Court (attached).

It purports to have been sent by your Registrar Ms. L~Di~Mambro OBE; though I have my doubts about that.

It is not what one would expect to receive from such an eminent and professional person in the employ of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom particularly in reply to a fee paid Appeal bundle comprising 203 pages, together with an Application form.

To refer to my bundle as a "letter" conveys no confidence in the author who also, deliberately or otherwise, omitted a "reference".

Sir, I make no apology for my suspicious attitude given my treatment by the Appeal Court where I was given the run around for eighteen months and was lied to which subsequently produced an apology from them.

Having been at the hands of Messrs Caton, Cobourn, Chowdhury, Angus, et al whose highly questionable methods dissipated my life long trust in the British Justice system; I remain wary of Registrys.

It is with that thought in mind that I wonder, who and for what personal or collective reasons, would wish to produce an obviously flawed and unprofessional reply to my aforesaid Application.

Assuming the absence of your eminent Registrar, perhaps the Deputy Registrar, Mr. Sewell, constructed the letter from a template but misused the word "letter" when in fact the subject matter was a legitimate Extraordinary Appeal on 'Points of Law' Appeal to the Supreme Court and, for his own questionable reasons, Mr. Sewell left out the "reference".

The hand written address on the delivered envelope was franked with a PO Licence Number recorded with its time and date stamp in SC Registry Records which will all track back to SC Registry confirming whether or not in fact Ms~L~Di~Mambro was present, on or about, that day and who authored this missive; or failing this who did?

I might be forgiven for thinking that the same dubious tricks that were played out by the Appeal Court are being repeated by the Supreme Court when, after all, it worked at the Appeal Court, however now once bitten, twice shy.

My Lord,

In Continuum, I sent you two Extraordinary Appeal and 'Points of Law' bundles by 'Signed For Delivery' Royal Mail on 27th April 2021(received 29th April) marked 'Private and Personal To' by two routes, which anticipated unlawful interception by SC Registry.

One direct to you in London at the Supreme Court, the other via the Crown office in Edinburgh.

At this point, Sir, I have to ask what I believe to be relevant and unsurprising questions given my Appeal Court experiences.

Is it possible that both bundles were intercepted somehow to benefit the knowledge of a third party, a political Privy Councillor, or Councillors?

In particular the DWP Minister, Dr Coffey PhD PC MP,. the Minister responsible and was this achieved by passing instructions 'down the line' to Mr. Sewell, who in acting on those instructions, might reasonably be thought to be committing the criminal offences of interfering with Royal Mail; possibly 'perverting the course of justice'; and as a consequence enacting Gross Misconduct in Public Office.

I optimistically anticipated that if my Extraordinary Appeal and 'Points of Law' Appeal Application had not been unlawfully intercepted, my Application would, in following Supreme Court published procedures, be placed before a panel of three Judges for their adjudication with the result ultimately being published at a date and time in the 'Permission To Appeal' List where it would either be granted, or denied.

Instead of this I received a shabby dismissive 'letter' that does absolutely nothing to enhance in my mind the image of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom.

If there be dubious, nay criminal intent, contained in the 'letter' that I received as a reply to my legitimate Application and it was meant to dissuade me, and others, from continuing to fight for Justice it simply highlights the paucity of the intellectual rigour behind these naive amateurish efforts to derail 11,000 disabled Fire Service Veterans, their Widows, and Beneficiaries who have been paid their wrong pensions (less 49%~ for decades) and who have been embattled these last six years.

In its perversity it encourages us all to think that if this government went to the lengths of acting so deviously, nay criminally, with the desire of not paying us what is due, then surely this government must actually agree that the law is correct, as we have repeatedly stated, would it not be simpler and more cost effective in PR damage limitation just to pay the bill?

In my perpetual optimism I have always believed that British justice, in being the best, would win through in the end, but for the moment that seems not to be true.

I have confidence in your Lordship's integrity and no doubt you will wish to provide the transparency, in which I know you believe, at this critical moment by promoting and protecting the national and international reputation of the Supreme Court within the Rule of Law and its role in securing Democratic Freedom which is so obviously required in protecting our Human Right to Justice at this scandalous moment when SC Staff Values seem to be compromised.

Yours Sincerely,



Litigant-in-Person.



Louise di Mambro OBE Registrar

11 May 2021

Dear Mr G

I have been asked to reply to the letter you sent to Lord Reed.

I am sorry but from the information which you have provided it seems that this Court will be unable to help you.

Yours sincerely

Juse di Hambro.

Louise di Mambro Registrar



ME THE TERM IN ACT

The Supreme Court Parliament Square London SW1P 3BD T: 020 7960 1992 Email: registry@supremecourt.uk www.supremecourt.uk

