

and with contempt. It is not a question of a concerted conspiracy but rather a culture of prejudice against him. He would say that an example of this was the holding of him in custody for several days on the obviously false basis that the police did not know who he was. This is not the way that he puts it in his statements of case, but he has made the general allegation many times both orally and in writing. Mr Lloyd Williams who appeared before me on behalf of the Defendant said that this was the real issue. He also said that no attempt to confine a jury trial to the discrete consideration of half a dozen allegations would prevent the general complaint becoming the real topic of the hearing. I agree, but that does not mean that there should be no jury.

5. One of the reasons for the delay between the initial raising of the question of whether there should be trial by a jury and its determination has been the suggestion by the Claimant that his case can be made by large volumes of documents in respectively his possession, that of the Defendant (in his public capacity) and that of the CPS. Prior to this point being raised, the assertions in the Claimant's statements of case had to be clarified sufficiently for the Defendant to address them. To a very large degree this exercise has been successful. It then became necessary to obtain a sense both of the volume of the documentation and its contents. This involved obtaining documents from the CPS. I have now had the opportunity to consider a number of files which I think give a sense of what the others are likely to contain.
6. The variety of documentation is considerable. I have transcripts of judgments, transcripts of evidence, police officers' notebooks, correspondence between the CPS, the police and counsel, notes taken by the Claimant's secretary, witness statements and a great deal of assertion by the Claimant both by way of narrative and comment.
7. A number of important points may be made in respect of the documents that I have seen :
 - i) Almost all the documents are easy to understand. Only rarely would a jury require guidance as to their meaning: usually in respect transcripts of judicial rulings.
 - ii) A large number of the documents are irrelevant to any probative exercise. They are simply didactic utterances by the Claimant that should be excluded from the evidence.
 - iii) Many of the documents reappear in a variety of contexts.
 - iv) Many of the documents are duplicated for no obvious reason.
 - v) Whatever the Claimant's views of the matter, there will be a trial judge whether or not there is a jury. There will also be a judge with the task of