

Catch 42

P.O.BOX 844. OLDBROOK MILTON KEYNES MK6 2YT

1828 to 2000 to 2012

END THESE SERIOUS ONGOING MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE

MR. GEDALJAHU EBERT IS DUE TO BE SENTENCED ON MONDAY AUGUST THE 13TH 2012 AT WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT – PLEASE ATTEND TO ENSURE THAT JUSTICE IS DONE AND FINALLY SEEN TO BE DONE.

He is seriously concerned that he will be incarcerated in order to silence him on the 13th

Monday August 13th 2012

Mr Ebert, is also a victim of the kind of Ejection treatment suffered by Michael Docherty reported in the GUARDIAN ARTICLE BELOW

He is concerned that he will be incarcerated in order to silence him on Monday the 13th

Two police officers accused of kidnap in private prosecution

UK news guardian.co.Uk

District judge issues summons in case brought by man who claims police unlawfully entered home and forcibly removed him

Vikram Dodd

guardian.co.uk, Sunday 15 July 2012 17.04 BST

A district judge has given the go—ahead to a private prosecution against two Metropolitan police officers alleged to have kidnapped a man and threatened unlawful violence when they arrested him at his home, the Guardian has learned.

Sergeant Gareth Blackburn and Detective Constable Stephen MacDonald have been summoned to appear in court next month. The issuing of a summons by a district judge against police officers is believed to be rare.

Michael Doherty, 40, a former aircraft engineer, claims police unlawfully entered his home in West Drayton, Middlesex, on 4 September 2008 and forcibly removed him.

He had complained to police about an alleged crime, setting off a chain of events that led to his arrest. He was subsequently cleared of two charges of harassment

According to the summons, the two officers allegedly threatened to “smash down a glass-panelled door which the homeowner was holding closed”. The statement of offence continues: “You threatened and used a battering ram to support your threat of violence. The occupants were caused fear for their personal safety.”

The officers face charges of affray, burglary, aggravated burglary, misconduct in public office, kidnap and false imprisonment. The statement of offence alleges that during the arrest the officers were trespassers who refused to leave Doherty’s home and attempted to inflict grievous bodily harm against him.

Both officers are alleged to have carried Doherty away “when you had no lawful authority to do so. There was no consent from the victim and you used unlawful violence to carry out this kidnap.”

The summons was issued by the district judge Deborah Wright at Uxbridge magistrates court in west London last week. The officers are scheduled to appear at Westminster magistrates court next month where Doherty hopes the case will be sent for jury trial at a crown court, because the alleged offences carry penalties more severe than those a magistrate has the power to hand down.

The Metropolitan police opposed the granting of the summons. The officers are believed to be on full duties.

Usually criminal cases in England and Wales are brought by the Crown Prosecution Service. The right to bring private prosecutions is granted by section 6(1) of the Prosecution of Offences Act 1985. The director of public prosecutions can seek to take over a private prosecution to continue to pursue charges or stop the case.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk2012/jul/15/police-accused-kidnap-private-prosecution/print>
15/07/2012

STATEMENT OF TRUTH BY MALCOLM GLYNN 23RD MARCH 2000 CASE NUMBER 1995 -M -156

I Malcolm Glynn of 51 Wentworth Avenue, West Finchley, London. N3 1YN make this Statement of Truth pursuant to my attendance at a Hearing before Mr Justice Rougier with Mr G. Ebert on the 2nd March 2000.

1. I have been reviewing all the documents and allegations of Mr Ebert for a number of months and I am familiar with the issues before the court. Mr Ebert insists that he is the victim of a serious Miscarriage of Justice, which has led him to make repeated applications to the court for redress, most of which have been unsuccessful.

2. Mr Ebert has had to resort to making specific and narrow points of law due to the serial abuses of process in the conduct of these proceedings against him. I have studied all the applications made before the making of a Bankruptcy order against him and can state that I have not as yet discovered one procedure or application that has been carried out lawfully. The facts surrounding this matter and the evidence gathered over the last months have led me to write to the Vice Chancellors Department, The Attorney General and to The Insolvency Service placing on record that it is clear from the evidence that Mr Ebert is indeed the victim of a Criminal Conspiracy and that The Bankruptcy Court has been used as the main instrument of the Fraud against Mr Ebert's assets..

3. I have witnessed extracts of this evidence and new evidence being put before the court by Mr Ebert in support of his recent applications without any success. The judges or Masters when contacted by Mr Ebert, ex parte (refused to) allow Mr Ebert leave to pursue his application on merit. That is and for the avoidance of any doubt (that) they look at the evidence submitted by Mr Ebert, (to) see something is wrong and set down an inter-partie hearing on notice to the other side for an explanation of the point raised.

4. He is being, I believe, deliberately obstructed in his attempts to obtain relief by various Grepe and Loam Orders which require him to first make application to the court for leave before any application can be made. This obstruction was put in place and largely maintained by Mr Justice Neuberger who appears to be personally sabotaging all Mr Ebert's applications irrespective of the merits or any legal implications. I have recently filed a formal complaint about Mr Justice Neuberger with the Lord Chancellor's department and The Attorney General's Office in which I list fourteen errors of Law and process including defects of process used against Mr Ebert that were so serious as to deny the court any avenue other than the accede to Mr Ebert's request for relief. On every occasion such relief has been denied.

5. It is in that context that I have been accompanying Mr Ebert to observe what is happening and to make notes.

6. A fundamental obligation of any claimant in Bankruptcy is to establish the amount of any claim and to prove it if challenged. Mr Ebert's case is unique because Mr Justice Neuberger has repeatedly protected the Midland Bank PLC from any order to prove their debt or submit even a Bank Statement in support. This repeated failure by Mr Justice Neuberger is so perverse as to lead to the complaint against him.

7. Apart from the fact that this is a clear injustice Mr Ebert has to suffer allegations of being a Vexatious Litigant when he pursues his attempts to compel the court to set aside a BANKRUPTCY ORDER that was from the evidence indisputably obtained by fraud.

8. The courts repeated failure to address clear evidence has left me with no alternative but to refer the matter to the Anti-Corruption unit of Scotland Yard pursuant to a hearing before Mr Justice Laddie and Neuberger on the 6th March 2000. This was done on the 16th March 2000 and the full details of the complaint, was copied correctly to The Attorney General and The Lord Chancellor.

9. At the hearing on the 2nd March before Mr Justice Rougier, I observed Mr Cook of Eversheds seek to mislead the judge on numerous occasions and in fact he actually changed his story about the Bank Statements twice. A full transcript of this hearing is being obtained and on receipt thereof I will detail. the complaint against Eversheds in their conduct of that hearing.

10. I make this statement of truth in support of Mr Ebert's allegations that he is the victim of a wide ranging a sophisticated fraud utilised against him by his ex business partner Mr Morris Wolff and his Solicitor Mr Rabinowitzc of Teacher Stern to seize assets worth over ten million pound. This is the second time I have received a complaint by victims of Miscarriages of Justice against Mr Rabinowizc.

The first time was when he was action for a Mr Andreas Matheou who now complains that Mr Rabinowicz was sabotaging his claim against Lloyds Bank and deliberately and corruptly obstructing the evidence supplied to him within that litigation and against his own client. That Litigation is continuing with Counsel under a Legal Aid Certificate.

11. I therefore attended with Mr Ebert before Mr Justice Rougier, to make notes as to how the court would deal with the application for specific discovery on this matter. Before the hearing commenced I claim and he clearly stated that no Statements existed. I repeated to him what he had said and advised

Mr Ebert that his hearing was no longer essential because Solicitors for the Bank had just confirmed that asked Mr Cook for Eversheds whether he would produce the Bank Statements to support his clients I what we had always known, that no Bank Statements exist and no claim can therefore exist.

12. I put it to this court or any court for that matter that for a Bank to persist in a claim that cannot be substantiated is and must be fraud. Mr Ebert has always insisted that the Bank received payment in full from the substantial Assets of Europride Limited but that the Bank were corruptly prevailed upon to continue with the personal claim against Mr Ebert with the specific intention of making him Bankrupt and in the full knowledge that no such claim exists on the date specified or at all.

13. The persons responsible for filing corrupt testimony in this action are further named within a litigation commenced by Ernst and Young against BDO Stoy Hayward who are agreeing with Mr Ebert that the Companies property portfolio was transferred NOT SOLD at considerable undervalue. It is incredible that a parallel action by a leading firm of Accountants and as Officers of the court in their appointed capacity as Liquidators should have an action that fully explains the fraud against Mr Ebert but that these facts are ignored and specifically excluded in the convenient and Malicious Bankruptcy proceedings against Mr Ebert.

14. Morris Wolff is accused among other things of stealing £400,000 out of Europride Limited and he has filed Perjured Testimony in that action prepared I believe by the same corrupt lawyer used to falsify documents including FABRICATED CLAIMS and BANKRUPTCY PETITIONS AGAINST Mr Ebert in this action. The evidence in support of these allegations is overwhelming and already filed. Sadly due to the obstructive and perverse Judgements of Mr Justice Neuberger the evidence has been consistently ignored.

I HEREBY STATE THAT THE FACTS CONTAINED IN THIS STATEMENT OF TRUTH ARE TRUE.