

PAUL GRANT  
J08360 C2  
HMP THE VERNE  
PORTLAND  
DORSET DT5 1EQ

23<sup>RD</sup> APRIL 2005

DEAR BRO. AHMED

WARM AND SINCERE GREETINGS TO YOU. I HOPE ALL IS WELL.

I CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THE LATEST DOCUMENTS SENT TO ME REFERENCE MR JUSTICE ELIAS.

FIRST OF ALL, I'M VERY PLEASED THAT YOU ARE TAKING THE TIME TO FIND THESE INFORMATION FOR YOURSELF AND FOR THE BENEFIT OF OUR CAUSE. I HOPE ALL THE INFORMATION AT YOUR DISPOSAL WILL GIVE A MUCH GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF OUR ARGUMENT AND HOW IT APPLIES TO THE CASE WE HAVE ALREADY PUT FORWARD.

FROM THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE SENT, YOU WILL REALISE HOW STRONG OUR CASE IS AND THIS SHOULD ALLOW YOU TO GROW IN CONFIDENCE THAT IT DOES NOT MATTER HOW LONG IT TAKES, WE WILL EVENTUALLY SUCCEED.

LET ME BRIEFLY REMIND YOU HOW THIS APPLIES TO US.

CLEARLY THE LAW ALLOWS SOMEONE TO SUE FOR MISREPRESENTATION OR FALSE ADVICE.

THIS WAS THE INITIAL CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST THE HOSPITAL WHERE PRINCE DIED AND AGAINST BINAMAN & PARTNERS WHO TOLD ME THERE WAS NO SUCH LAW.

AS THERE IS CLEARLY SUCH A LAW, MY INITIAL LAWSUIT WAS UNLAWFULLY STRUCK OUT.

THE STATE IS ACCOUNTABLE FOR ACTIONS OF THE COURTS AND FAILING TO RECTIFY ANY ~~THE~~ MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE WILL RENDER THE STATE A LAW-BREAKER.

AS FOR JUSTIFICATION. - JUSTIFICATION IS A DEFENCE TO ANY ACT OF CRIME, SO LONG AS IT CAN BE PROVED THAT THE ACT WAS NECESSARY. IT IS A MATTER WHOLLY FOR THE JURY, ONLY THEY SHOULD DECIDE IF A PERSON HAS GIVEN REASONABLE EXCUSE FOR THEIR ACTIONS.

SO IN OTHER WORDS, FOR INSTANCE, IF YOU GIVE A REASONABLE EXCUSE FOR HAVING A KNIFE IN YOUR VEHICLE IT RENDERS YOUR POSSESSION LAWFUL. YOU HAVE THEREFORE JUSTIFIED THE REASON FOR HAVING IT.

IN REALITY THINGS HAVE BECOME MUCH MORE EASIER FOR US TO PROVE, IT IS NO LONGER NECESSARY FOR US TO PROVE JUSTIFICATION FOR OUR ACTION, AS A RESULT OF CHRISTOPHER PRATT'S DELIBERATE MISDIRECTION TO THE JURY.

THE QUESTION WHICH MUST BE SATISFIED NOW IS ARE THERE ANY DEFENCES OF JUSTIFICATION. AS THE ANSWER TO THIS IS WITHOUT ANY DOUBT YES, THEN IT CLEARLY FOLLOWS THAT THE JUDGE LIED TO THE JURY AND THE RESULT IS THAT MY CONVICTION AND IMPRISONMENT IS WHOLLY UNLAWFUL. I HAVE NEVER DOUBTED THIS FACT.

HOWEVER, IN RELATION TO YOUR QUESTION ABOUT

TAKING ACTION AGAINST JUDGE PRATT, THE ANSWER IS THAT JUDGES ARE IMMUNE FROM LAWSUITS AGAINST THEIR DECISIONS MADE IN COURT. THEY CANNOT BE SUED. HAVING SAID THAT, THE STATE CAN BE SUED, AS THE STATE IS ACCOUNTABLE FOR ALL DECISIONS OF THE COURTS.

\* THE MAIN PROBLEM FOR US IS THAT THE PEOPLE WE ARE COMPLAINING ABOUT ARE THE SAME PEOPLE WHO ARE SITTING IN JUDGMENT OF THE COMPLAINT AND SO WE ARE AUTOMATICALLY DENIED FAIR PLAY, BECAUSE WE ARE DENIED IMPARTIALITY, INDEPENDENCE AND ANY DEGREE OF FAIRNESS.

\* MASS PUBLICITY WOULD ACHIEVE ALL WHAT OUR CASE DESERVES BUT BECAUSE WE DO NOT HAVE THAT, ALL WE CAN DO FOR NOW IS TO MAINTAIN OUR COURAGE AND DETERMINATION FOR JUSTICE, PERSIST AND ENDURE OUR SUFFERING.

I STILL HAVE AN UNBENDING FAITH AND BELIEF THAT WE WILL GET THERE.

FINALLY, AS WE HAVE ALREADY FILED A CASE WITH THE EUROPEAN COURT, THE MOST WE CAN NOW DO IS TO INFORM AS MANY PEOPLE AS WE CAN WITH OUR LIMITED RESOURCES.

THE TRUTH CAN NEVER BE SUPPRESSED FOREVER.

DUE TO REDUCING FUNDS I'M UNABLE TO SPEND MUCH TIME ON THE PHONES, SO I'LL WAIT UNTIL I BELIEVE YOU'VE RECEIVED THIS LETTER BEFORE I CALL.

I REMAIN YOUR BROTHER  
Carl.