

THE LAW

We will show that the accused did violate the following common, national and international laws on or around the dates specified – namely:

INTERNATIONAL LAW

1. Conducting a “war of aggression” contrary to **Article 5 (1)(d) of The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 1998**, also violation of **Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8** of said Statute (See attached extracts) namely the crimes of:-

Genocide, War Crimes, Crimes Against Humanity

And contrary to **The United Nations Charter Article 2(4)** which declares that,

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations”.

2. Contrary to the **1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment** specifically:

Article 4, (complicity in acts of torture) and **Article 5**, the “*any territory under a states jurisdiction*” Article, i.e. covering stop-overs or landings or even touch-downs at military bases within the United Kingdom or it’s Commonwealth Territories or re-fuelling in UK and/or Commonwealth air space or if the individual was aboard a 3rd party flight or upon 3rd party vessel in port and permission was given to allow them to pass knowing or suspecting the nature of the visit – classical rendition protocols. This WILL include all Commonwealth territories, Embassies, Consular buildings. (See attached extracts)

3. Contravention of the **International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997** in that the accused did act a joint principal and co-conspirator in both statute and common law in acting with others to carry out explosions and endanger life with a view to causing alarm, disorientation of policy and to subject citizens of the United States to treachery and deceit and that he did in particular procure, counsel and wilfully incite acts which resulted in:

“the attempted bombing” of the east coast rail network of the United States of America on or around the week-end of 26th May 2006”.

This being alleged we invoke **Article 7** of Convention:-

Article 7

(1). Upon receiving information that a person who has committed or who is ***alleged to have committed an offence*** as set forth in article 2 may be present in its territory, the State Party concerned shall take such measures as may be necessary under its domestic law to investigate the facts contained in the information.

(2). Upon being satisfied that the circumstances so warrant, the State Party in whose territory the offender or alleged offender is present shall take the appropriate measures under its domestic law so as to **ensure that person's presence for the purpose of prosecution or extradition**.

4. **The 1997 International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings**

5. **The Universal Declaration of Human Rights** 10th December 1948 contravention of almost every article but particularly: Articles 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 and Article 29, (See attached extracts)

6. **The Geneva Convention** (see attached extracts).

7. **Article 75 of 1977 Protocol 1 of the Geneva Convention.**

8. **The Atlantic Charter** (see attached extracts).

DOMESTIC LAW

Murder – Contrary to The Homicide Act 1957 and Common Law

Terrorism Act 2000

Statutory Conspiracy - S1(1) Criminal Law Act 1977 as amended by S5 of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.

Conspiracy, corruption and treason under common law

Incitement to murder at Common Law

Incitement to murder contrary to S4 of the Offences Against the person Act 1861

Incitement to cause explosions and endanger life.

Incitement to cause the release of a toxic virus known as 1957 Scotland/H5N1 “Bird Flu” into UK territories.

Common Law Conspiracy to defraud and corrupt public morals and public decency.

Treasonous Felony and Conspiracy – Contrary to Treason Felony Act 1848

Acts contrary to the Terrorism Act 2000

Constructive Manslaughter

Reckless Endangerment

Perjury contrary to Section 1 of the Perjury Act 1911

Though we fully appreciate the fact that the more serious charges under (say) CAT '84(Convention Against Torture) and The Rome Statute, and the Geneva Convention cover the lesser charges of say, the simple murder of one person, we feel it only right that we alert the public to (a) the scope of the criminality involved and also (b) as a duty of respect to those individuals who were just snuffed out as “irrelevancies”. We’re sure that the people will rally around this cry and appreciate the sincerity of our actions and this simple thought for those “passed over”.

United States Domestic law

United States Code Title 18, Part 1 Chapter 115 at para.2381:

“Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States”.

1. TREASONOUS FELONY

Treason Felony Act 1848

A person who commits treason is known as a **traitor**.

Oran's Dictionary of the Law (1983) defines treason as: "...[a]...citizen's actions to help a foreign government overthrow, make war against, or seriously injure the [parent nation]." In many nations, it is also often considered treason to attempt or conspire to overthrow the government, even if no foreign country is aided or involved by such an endeavour.

Outside legal spheres, the word "traitor" may also be used a person who betrays (or is accused of betraying) their own political party, nation, family, friends, ethnic group, religion, social class, or other group to which they may belong. Often, such accusations are controversial and disputed, as the person may not identify with the group of which they are a member, or may otherwise disagree with the group leaders making the charge.

Treason Felony Act 1848

Offences declared felonies by this Act to be punishable by transportation (now abolished) or imprisonment

“If any person whatsoever shall, within the United Kingdom or without, compass, imagine, invent, devise, or intend to deprive or depose our Most Gracious Lady the Queen, from the style, honour, or royal name of the imperial crown of the United Kingdom, or of any other of her Majesty’s dominions and countries, or to levy war against her Majesty, within any part of the United Kingdom, in order by force or constraint to compel her to change her measures or counsels, or in order to put any force or constraint upon **or in order to intimidate or overawe both Houses or either House of Parliament, or to move or stir any foreigner or stranger with force to invade the United Kingdom** or any other of her Majesty’s dominions or countries under the obedience of her Majesty, and such compassings, imaginations, inventions, devices, or intentions, or any of them, shall express, utter, or declare, by publishing any printing or writing or by any overt act or deed, every person so offending shall be guilty of felony, and being convicted thereof shall be liable to be transported beyond the seas for the term or his or her natural life

2. ILLEGAL WAR Against Iraq, 19 March 2003

Illegal war of aggression contrary to Article 5 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court 1998.(See attached primary statement).

CAUSATION

ACTUS REUS

1. But for what the defendant did, would the result still have occurred? (R v White 1910).
Answer = **NO**
2. Was the result reasonably foreseeable? (R v Pagett (1983) Answer: **Yes**
3. Causation established.

Have we established both causation for the defendant in law and fact. Certainly in fact, but what of law? Was his action an “**operative and substantial**” cause of the consequence in question. Substantial in this context simply means anything more than “de minimis” contribution. R v Hennigan (1971) it was held that the defendant could be found guilty of causing death by dangerous driving even though he was only 20% to blame for the accident.

MENS REA

Did the defendant have intention to wage war against Iraq. YES!

Did he have direct or indirect intention?

If the defendant desires a consequence and it is his purpose to achieve it then this is direct intent. He’s guilty.

3. MURDER

MURDER – Greater charge(s) being Crimes against humanity and being charged as joint principal and/or “accessory before the fact” under **S8 of the Accessories and Abettors Act 1861** (as amended by the Criminal Law Act 1967).

ACTUS REUS

The *actus reus* of murder is causing death of a human being. Have his actions caused the death of human beings?

MENS REA

The *mens rea* necessary for murder is intention to kill or cause grievous bodily harm (R v Vickers (1957)).Has the defendant caused the illegal deaths of human beings? Yes?

Then:-

On the several counts of murder, Incitement and conspiracy to murder by the defendant we list:

Counts:

1. Dr David Kelly -
2. The 7th of July 2005 London state sponsored terrorist bombings, 52 dead, 700~ wounded
3. Saddam Hussein
4. Iraqi civilians 39,821 (probably many, many more.)
5. Iraqi police and Military 7,832
6. Cumulative coalition deaths in Iraq 4,249
7. US Military deaths in Iraq 3,942 as of 31/01/2008
8. Afghanistan 763 coalition dead to date.
9. Various unnamed victims of torture including those "water-boarded" and those immersed in boiling liquids. Details to be supplied by "Amnesty Intl." and "The Red Cross" at trial.

4. FALSE FLAG - STATE SPONSORED TERRORISM (SST).

On the UK mainland contrary to the Terrorism Act 2000 in general and particularly for overseas attempts against the USA under S.59 of the **Terrorism Act 2000** and also conspired and allowed the London, 7 July, 2005 bombings to go ahead and did also conspire to allow the release of a virus commonly known as "H5N1" into the UK bird populations with the intent to kill citizens and spread alarm and despondency amongst residents of the United Kingdom to further an global agenda.

(a) Terrorism Act 2000 S.59 – LONDON 7 July 2005

(1) A person commits an offence if—

(a) he incites another person to commit an act of terrorism wholly or partly outside the United Kingdom, and

(b) the act would, if committed in England and Wales, constitute one of the offences listed in subsection (2).

(2) Those offences are—

(a) **murder**,

(b) an offence under section 18 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861

(wounding with intent),

(c) an offence under section 23 or 24 of that Act (**poison**) H5N1 "bird-flu" release

(d) an offence under section 28 or 29 of that Act (**explosions**) in Washington D.C. USA, and 7/7/05 London bombings, and

(e) an offence under section 1(2) of the [1971 c. 48.] Criminal Damage Act 1971 (endangering life by damaging property).

(3) A person guilty of an offence under this section shall be liable to any penalty to which he would be liable on conviction of the offence listed in subsection (2) which corresponds to the act which he incites.

(4) For the purposes of subsection (1) it is immaterial whether or not the person incited is in the United Kingdom at the time of the incitement.

(b) International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997

And on or around the **26th May 2006**, (Memorial Day Week-end) within the United States of America and contrary to the above convention, that he did attempt to blow up one or several east-coast rail link(s) and, to kill officials of the US Department of Justice, (namely Patrick Fitzgerald).

Article 2

1. Any person commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person unlawfully and intentionally delivers, places, discharges or detonates an explosive or other lethal device in, into or against a place of public use, a State or government facility, a public transportation system or an infrastructure facility:

(a) With the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury; or

(b) With the intent to cause extensive destruction of such a place, facility or system, where such destruction results in or is likely to result in major economic loss.

2. Any person also commits an offence if that person ***attempts to commit*** an offence as set forth in paragraph 1.

3. Any person also commits an offence if that person:

(a) Participates as an accomplice in an offence as set forth in paragraph 1 or 2; or

(b) Organizes or directs others to commit an offence as set forth in paragraph 1 or 2; or

(c) In any other way contributes to the commission of one or more offences as set forth in paragraph 1 or 2 by a group of persons acting with a common purpose; such contribution shall be intentional and either be made with the aim of furthering the general criminal activity or purpose of the group or be made in the knowledge of the intention of the group to commit the offence or offences concerned.

Article 8

1. The State Party in the territory of which the alleged offender is present shall, in cases to which article 6 applies, if it does not extradite that person, be obliged, ***without exception whatsoever and whether or not the offence was committed in its territory***, to submit the case without undue delay to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution, through proceedings in accordance with the laws of that State. Those authorities shall take their decision in the same manner as in the case of any other offence of a grave nature under the law of that State.

CONSTRUCTIVE MANSLAUGHTER

This offence covers dangerous criminal acts that the defendant intentionally committed which resulted in the death of the victims. Iraqi civilians – Iraqi police and military– British Soldiers – Afghan Civilians – Detainees in the various gulags operated globally by the US government and British intelligence – Defence Contractors and members of the public and civilians in the London underground bombings and bus bombing of 7 July 2005 (7/7/7).

TRANSFERRED MALICE

If the defendant with the *mens rea* of a particular crime, does an act which causes the *actus reus* of the same crime, he is guilty, even though the result, in some respects, is an unintended one, [see R v Latimer (1886)]. For example: A intending to cause GBH to B, throws a knife, but misses and hits C, and in so doing cause GBH, then A is guilty of causing GBH to C under the doctrine of “transferred malice” since he has caused the *actus reus* of an offence with the requisite *mens rea* for the same offence.

5. CRIMINAL DAMAGE:

Definitions.

Section 1(1) Criminal Damage Act 1971.

Provides that the “basic offence” of criminal damage is committed where:

“A person who without lawful excuse destroys or damages any property belonging to another, intending to destroy or damage any such property or being reckless as to whether any such property would be destroyed or damaged.”

ACTUS REA present

MENS REA present

See also the **Treaty of Versailles 1919**, where of the many provisions in the treaty, one of the most important and controversial required Germany (and her allies) to accept full responsibility for causing the war and, under the terms of **Articles 231-248**, disarm, make substantial territorial concessions and pay reparations to certain countries that had formed the Entente powers.

Counts:

1. The City of London namely the London bombings 7/7/2005
2. Sovereign state of Iraq March 2003 and on going.
3. Sovereign state of Afghanistan – ongoing.
4. Attempted criminal damage to east coast rail networks between the 26 and 29 May 2006, Washington DC, USA (S.5 Criminal Attempts Act 1981)

INCHOATE OFFENCES

6. INCITEMENT IN COMMON LAW – Murder of David Kelly, Iraq war, etc

In that the defendant, *did encourage or pressurize another to commit an offence*. The defendant is the “incitor”, the person he seeks to incite is the “incite”. We charge the defendant under common law and also **Section 4 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861**, this covers incitement to murder. Also incitement to deceive Parliament, both Lords and Commons and to deceive the British people.

ACTUS REUS

The central conduct of the offence can take various forms, such as suggesting, proposing, requesting, encouraging, persuading, threatening or pressurising another to commit an offence, (see *Race Relations Board v Applin* (1973)).

We realize that the **Criminal Law Act 1977** S.5 (7) abolished the crime of incitement to commit statutory or common law conspiracy, but it would appear that there still remains an offence of inciting incitement [see *R v Sirat* (1986)].

MENS REA

The defendant must intend to incite and intend that the incite act on the incitement (*Invicta Plastics v Clare* (1976)). The accused must also believe that the person he incites will act with the *mens rea* for that offence.

7. STATUTORY CONSPIRACY TO MURDER

The charge of conspiracy to murder, in that as an, “*accessory before the fact*,” and contrary to the **s 1(1) Criminal Law Act 1977** as amended by **S5 of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981** did involve himself in the offence of **Statutory Conspiracy** on the following counts:

Conspiracy to murder

1. Dr. David Kelly.
2. The 7th of July 2005 London state sponsored terrorist bombings, 52 dead, 700 ~ wounded.
3. Saddam Hussein.
4. Iraqi civilians 39,821(probably many, many more!!)
5. Iraqi Police and Military 7,832.
6. Cumulative coalition deaths in Iraq 4,249.
7. US Military deaths in Iraq 3,942 as of 31/01/2008.
8. Afghanistan 763 coalition dead to date.

TOTAL 58,661 <>

Definition:

The statutory offence of conspiracy is created by **s 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977**, as amended by **s 5 of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981**, which provides:

“...*If a person agrees with any other person or persons that a course of conduct shall be pursued which, if the agreement is carried out in accordance with their intentions, either:*

- (a) *will necessarily amount to or involve the commission of any offence or offences by one or more of the parties to the agreement; or*
- (b) *would do so but for the existence of facts which render the commission of the offence or any of the offences impossible,*

he is guilty of conspiracy to commit the offence or offences in question”.

ACTUS REUS

The *actus reus* of a statutory conspiracy consists of an agreement on a “course of conduct” that will necessarily involve the commission of an offence. Irrelevant in our case but bear in mind that section **1(1) (b) of the Criminal Law Act 1977** makes it clear that, as far as statutory conspiracy is concerned, the fact that the agreement is impossible to carry out is no bar to liability.

The agreement must be communicated between the parties to the conspiracy (R v Scott (1979)), however it is not necessary for every party to a conspiracy to be aware of the existence of every other party. The agreement can take the form of a chain – A agrees with B – who agrees with C etc. Or it can take the form of a wheel where numerous parties all agree with one central figure. A third possibility is a cluster where several parties simultaneously agree, for example in aboard room or Cabinet office, or House of Commons chamber!!

MENS REA

There appear to be two elements to the *mens rea* for conspiracy. First, each defendant should have a knowledge of any facts or circumstances specified in the substantive offence. Secondly, each defendant should intend the conspiracy to be carried out and the relevant offence committed.

8. COMMON LAW CONSPIRACY

Section 5 (2) and (3) of the Criminal Law Act 1977 preserves two forms of common law conspiracy: conspiracy to “defraud” and conspiracy to “*corrupt public morals or outrage public decency*”. We maintain that the defendant has committed the offence at common law of conspiracy to defraud the electorate of its vote as a “chase in action” and property. An intention to permanently deprive is not present but it is a common law conspiracy to defraud.

According to S.12 of the **Criminal Justice Act 1987**, statutory conspiracy and common law conspiracy are not mutually exclusive. The prosecution can choose which offences to charge in case of overlap. This right we reserve.

9. SELLING OF HONOURS - The Royal Prerogative

As for the selling of Honours, then this will amount to conspiracy to defraud, as well as conspiracy to corrupt public morals and to outrage public decency.

10. PERJURY

Contrary to the **Perjury Act 1911** the defendant did lie, and deliberately mislead and offer false direction to (a) the Butler Inquiry and (b) the Hutton Inquiry and (c) to the Assistant Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan police, John Yates concerning the Cash for Honours enquiry and (d) to members of Parliament and (e) to the electorate.

S.1.--(1) If any person lawfully sworn as a witness or as an interpreter in a judicial proceeding wilfully makes a statement material in that proceeding which he knows to be false or does not believe to be true, he shall be guilty of perjury, and shall, on conviction thereof on indictment, be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding seven years, or to a fine or to both such imprisonment and fine.

“In the time of Universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act”.

George Orwell

Cc. All docts.

Interpol, BBC, Reuters, Metropolitan Police NSY, Hanley Police, US Dept. Justice, Home Office, Dept of Constitutional Affairs, Elizabeth Battenberg/Saxe-Coberg Gotha at Buckingham Palace , London; The Bushes at The White House, Amnesty International, United Nations NY, ICJ, ICC The Hague, FBI, CIA Langley, Virginia, MI5, MI6 London, The Red Cross, Zurich CH., J.P.Morgan Cazenove Moorgate, London.

INTERPOL

General Secretariat

200, quai Charles de Gaulle

69006 Lyon

France

Fax: (33) 4 72 44 71 63