



23rd July, 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: FG131 Reed; G-v-LCFA.

Your Ref:

F [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] G [REDACTED]
~V~

Lancashire Fire & Rescue Authority

My Lord President,

I regret that this is the third occasion I have had to trouble you with this matter which now involves the curious behaviour of your Registrar Mrs di Mambro but in any event I have to say that curiosity has got the better of me which results in further correspondence.

From the outset my dealings with the Court of Appeal have been deliberately tortuous, disappointing, and surprisingly disquieting considering their alleged Judicial standing.

Firstly, I will take a step back to the dealings which I have had with the Court of Appeal, where following my last submission to it I received a letter dated 8th April 2021 from a Registry layperson clerk who presumably has no judicial authority.

In that letter I was informed that correspondence with this Court had now ceased even though it had been properly issued by the Court of Appeal on the 4th February 2020 and that my papers would be returned to me together with a refund of Court fees which I had paid and submitted with my original Application and bundle of 203 pages(then issued).

Finally after a further unexplained extraordinary delay the Court fees, amounting to £1199, appeared on my bank statement on 9th April 2021 ; cashed by the Court of Appeal.

As your Lordship well knows encashment of my cheque brings with it a common law duty of Contract which requires the Court of Appeal (and to avoid more confusion), to duly process my *first and only* Appeal issued at the Court of Appeal.

The consequence of my lack of trust and its failure in the person of the Master of the Rolls Vos to dispense justice then brought me to the Supreme Court and to your door.

In respect of the Supreme Court although I have received my uncashed cheque for £1000.0 returned, to date I have yet to receive back my Application and bundles from the Supreme Court Registry during which, to avoid anticipated interference, I sent a total of four copies to your Lordship by various routes.

In order to ensure that my trust in the judiciary was to be restored I sent a bundle twice comprising 203 pages to the Supreme Court marked 'Personal & Private' and a copy bundle to the Scottish Crown Office, for your Lordship's attention, out of which I am led to believe you also work from time to time.

The bundle comprised an introductory letter, the official Application form, a cheque for Court fees and an Appeal bundle based on Extraordinary Circumstances, all comprising legal and official documentation of 203 pages. Most of the work having been written by an eminent Inner Temple barrister who I am sure your Lordship will by now be aware of.

Curiously I subsequently received a short letter purporting to come from you but authored by your Registrar Mrs de Mambro in which she states, in a curious choice of language for a barrister that ... " I have been asked to reply to the letter you sent to Lord Reed"but she fails to elucidate who actually 'asked her', was it in fact your Lordship?

One would assume that she would use the phrase ...'I have been instructed by Lord Reed to'...or something similar confirming that it was coming directly with your authority; when in fact the 'letter' that I had sent to you Lordship, four times in fact was an official legal submission comprising 203 pages.

Mrs di Mambro stated in one line that the Court, presumably your Lordship, could not help me and she returned my original uncashed cheque.

Clearly that statement was very disappointing and might I say 'extraordinary' because Mrs di Mambro was fully aware that every Application has to follow the Supreme Court administrative regime which she directs and furthermore which ironically she is the recognised official author of?

In response to the second set of papers Mrs.de Mambro stated... " I have been asked to acknowledge receipt of your letter to Lord Reed"...AND...but there was nothing else, no courtesy, no explanation, no nothing, so with respect, what am I supposed to make of all this?

I believe that as an attempt to dispense British justice the Extraordinary Appeal should have been given special consideration at least and then sound reasons given as to the future of the formerly and carefully worded 203 page bundle.

Proceeding from there after I received nothing from the Scottish Crown office where over more time two copy bundles were also sent. I find it odd that I did not have any acknowledgement from there either however cursory that might have been?

As your Lordship will know, by now, because it has been published at large, a considerable amount of professional work went into the preparation of the original bundle and I would like all these copies to be sent back to me together with the copy bundle from the Scottish Crown office and perhaps you would be kind enough to bring this about?

I trust that all these bundles remain intact and were indeed so when at least two, I was lead to believe twice by Mrs. di Mambro, had been placed before your Lordship for your scrutiny?

Unfortunately in my recent jousting with the Court of Appeal this has left me rather sceptical. I found that seeking plain and simple straight forward "justice" to be a convoluted process in which obstacles, real and invented, can be, and are, put in one's way as a result of indiscretion or as a pernicious act by those who should know better.

The law on my case has been meticulously demonstrated in the Appeal papers referred to and repeated in the Extraordinary Application to the Supreme Court. What more is to be done in the UK jurisdiction?

The judiciary have proved themselves good at sending submissions back unread. Now is the time to subject the Appeal to the Supreme Court judicial procedure and scrutiny. There are no favours sought, only courteous respect for those seeking justice, British justice, as it is written.

Now in the event that Mrs.de Mambro took it upon herself, or at the inducement of a third non judicial person, to obstruct my Applicant by destroying all of these copies it is not unreasonable on my part, and in the transparency your Lordship espouses, to demand an explanation personally from Mrs.di Mambo on whose authority she carried out these perverse actions and to give me an accounting of herself, actions which we must remember amounts to perverting the course of justice...

Unfortunately, to prevent this latest letter being interfered with, I have decided to have this letter hand served at your home address; such is the direct responsibility Mrs.di Mambro bears for this extraordinary state of affairs which brings the Supreme Court and your Lordship into grave disrepute.

Yours Sincerely,

F [REDACTED] M G [REDACTED] M.I.Fire E.

Litigant-in-Person.