

Julian Fraser Brennan
3 Byland Road, Skelton, Saltburn-by-the-Sea TS12 2NJ

19 December 2024

Sir Keir Starmer

Via leader@labour.org.uk; ministerial.correspondence@cabinetoffice.gov.uk;
& keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk.

FOR THE PERSONAL AND MOST URGENT ATTENTION OF SIR KEIR

Dear Sir

High Court Proceedings re Defamation

As you have not resigned your public offices or accounted in Parliament for your misconduct, and with exactly ten weeks from the delivery of this letter to 27 February 2025 (ie the last day on which you can issue proceedings), I now assume that you are to act at law and sue me for defamation for writing and publishing that you are “*a fraudster*” (ie a person who is guilty of fraud according to section 1(1) of the Fraud Act 2006) and due to it being possible for other words/phrases that I’ve used to be understood to mean that you have committed the criminal offence of fraud and/or have acted, and are acting, fraudulently. One of the “victims” of your frauds is The Crown. Another is the Labour Party.

You are able to name me personally as the sole author, editor and publisher of those potentially defamatory words and statements as used both in paper documents and on websites. My defences will come within provisions set out in the Defamation Act 2013. I am one of the victims of both your illegal/unlawful conduct (as are others to whom I owe fiduciary duties) and of conduct for which you have accepted personal responsibility. In all legal proceedings I will, under section 7(1)(b) of the Human Rights Act 1998, rely on engaged Convention rights coming within the scope of Articles 9 and 10 (amongst others), as read with Articles 17 and 18. Section 11 HRA applies.

I inform you of the following:-

1. I have discouraged you from commencing proceedings against me – as I still do – because I am so certain that you have committed the statutory offence of fraud (per S. 1(1) of the 2006 Act) that for me to do otherwise would involve me acting illegally.
2. I will see the specific terms of any Claim you issue before deciding finally whether or not to issue a counter claim against you; I reserve my right to do so, though at present I consider the public interest might possibly be served best by me not doing so.
3. There are points/questions of law of general public importance and great constitutional significance which will need to be placed before the Supreme Court, meaning that they will be raised by me with the High Court at an early stage so it can establish that there will be a need for a “leap frog” appeal.
4. I will seek all reasonable legal and other costs on an indemnity basis.
5. What I say at point 4 above is based on my certain belief that you cannot succeed on the facts and the law. I say this as I believe you cannot honestly state, or imply, that you did

not act fraudulently at any time whilst holding an elected public position or being a Servant of the Crown.

6. I suggest that you should stand down from all public positions as you are unfit for office; because you cannot honestly say “No” in answer to the following question: “***Have you acted fraudulently at any time since you were first elected as a Member of Parliament?***”.
7. It is in the public interest that the above fact is known by elected Members of Parliament; Peers; members of the Labour Party’s National Executive Committee; His Majesty the King, and all the Peoples to whom his Coronation Oath was directed.
8. I accept that if what I state here in this letter was not true (or substantially true), and that you were instead an honest person who could be trusted not to knowingly act in breach of law, or in abuse of position, what I say, and the extent to which it will be known about by others, would be likely to cause you serious reputational harm.
9. In respect of what is stated at point 8 above I believe I cause no such harm to “your reputation” (ie the positive reputation you pretend is true). The reputation you claim actually results from you acting fraudulently in breach of sections 2 and 3 of the 2006 Act. What I say is that the words I use align correctly with the reputation that should apply to you, and that it is in the public interest for your frauds to be widely known and for you to be identified as the fraudster that you are in fact and law.
10. No person other than your personal Solicitor and members of your appointed legal team can act for you/on your behalf. If anyone else speaks publicly in support of what you have done they will confirm the effect(s) of your fraudulent behaviour.
11. At an appropriate time I will provide a file to the Serious Fraud Office that will allow SFO officers to bring a case against you that will meet the Full Code Test and allow for your successful prosecution in the Central Criminal Court.
12. I will under no circumstances enter into any agreement that could prevent me from acting in accordance with my legal duties; most notably my duties under Peelian Principles.

Regarding what I say above about what you claim to be your reputation, I do not challenge the widely accepted assertion that you are “***ruthless***”. Indeed, I take it (and the fact you allow it to be said about you and, to my knowledge, have never denied it) as being part of your true reputation. Accordingly, I have taken it into account in forming/confirming views and opinions about you as a person. As the meaning of words, and how they can be understood, are important issues in the Judicial determination of defamation claims I will set out my interpretations and the authorities I cite in support of them.

I now turn to two very specific urgent matters which you **MUST** address today:-

- A. You are due to attend a meeting of the House of Commons’ Liaison Committee this afternoon. That meeting gives you a final opportunity to account for your conduct or to inform Members of Parliament that you are to sue me for Defamation, as otherwise your position would be wholly untenable. Unless you confirm publicly that you will be issuing proceedings you must ensure the House of Lords (Hereditary Peers) Bill, which is currently at Committee stage in the Lords, must be withdrawn by His Majesty’s Government.
- B. You are aware that you acted fraudulently in breach of sections 2, 3 and 4 of the Fraud Act 2006 with persons present on 7 June 2024 at the “Clause V” meeting held to approve Labour’s 2024 Election Manifesto and that, as a result of your breaches of

those provisions, the approval “decision” (regardless of the form in which it was taken at the meeting) was/is *void ab initio*. That means the Salisbury Doctrine cannot apply to any Parliamentary Bill that alters anything which relates to or affects Parliament or any of the UK’s Constitutional arrangements. His Majesty the King will need to be formally advised by the Deputy Prime Minister, the Rt Hon Angela Raynor MP, that he cannot grant Royal Assent to whatever is passed by the two Houses, as to do so would involve him breaking his Coronation Oath; and, thereby, act contrary to section 4 of the Act of Settlement 1700. Ms Rayner will be able to confirm this is the case by obtaining Legal Advice from the Law Officers. The effect of a Prime Minister acting illegally in allowing Royal Assent to be granted to Primary Legislation that alters the composition of Parliament, when doing so would involve a reigning Monarch acting in breach of his/her Coronation Oath, would trigger a Constitutional crisis as great if not greater than any in living memory.

I am in the process of indexing a number of documents extracted from Tabs A and B of my File 1. The indexed documents will be sent to you later for forwarding, with a copy of this letter, to members of the Cabinet as I believe you are under a legal duty to disclose the information contained in them; thereby allowing His Majesty’s Principal Secretaries of State to form a view as to whether or not they will support you in your current positions if you sue me, or decide whether you can continue in post if you do not. This issue has to come to a head.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Julian Brennan'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial 'J'.

Julian Brennan