

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

CHANCERY DIVISION

CASE NO. HC04C042565

Claimant Witness

Lisa Pahne

First

LP1

26th December 2004

BETWEEN:

CHARLES SEVEN

CLAIMANT

-and-

CHRISTOPHER GOSSAGE (1)

RUSSELLS (2)

RICHARD HANNAH (3)

CLARION, NTL (4)

HELEN ALEXANDER (5)

JIM MANSON (6)

SMG SCOTTISH MEDIA GROUPS (7)

TAMSIN ALLEN BINDMAN AND PARTNERS (8)

DEREK ROSENBLATT RONALD FLETCHER AND CO (9)

CHRISTOPHER VAUGHAN SYCRIS FILMS (10)

DEFENDANTS

- FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF -

LISA PAHNE

SUMMARY

1. I, Lisa Pahne attended the meeting with Richard Hannah from Clarion and NTL, Helen Alexander and James Manson from SMG on 11th November 2003, following their invitation for us to discuss the launch of Charles's lifestyle multimedia productions. I witnessed the events before and after this meeting. I counter signed the contract as a witness for disclosure of the documents and witnessed when Helen Alexander stole the documents. The stolen documents became flagrantly exploited in mainstream broadcasting without authorisation or consent directly afterwards, despite our attempts to stop Helen. Charles and I attended meetings with lawyers to take legal action on 8th Dec 03 and onwards, and reported the crime to the police on 16 Jan 04. The crime reference number is 5807567/04.
2. Since all this took place, there have been continuous problems with private nuisance on Charles's phone by way of monitoring and interference of our conversations. This became violent after Charles's disk and manuscript was stolen on 19 Feb 04, and it intensified when further commercial documents belonging to Charles in March 04 also became infringed.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

3. Recently I was trying to make a call on my home phone, but the number I dialled was re-routed to NTL's call centre's answer machine, I hadn't dialed NTL's call centre and knew the number I dialled by heart. Something very weird was definitely going on especially as other strange things had been happening. Other people connected to Charles have said their phone calls have been re-routed too. None of this happened to any of us before Charles and I went to meet the defendants at NTL on 11 Nov 03.
4. I know Charles has also been followed around and watched. All kinds of evil horrible things have happened since her work was sold. It's the result of wanting to take this case to court. She is being constantly threatened and bullied because they want to control, own, profit from her property, and work for free. They just don't want to acknowledge, credit or pay Charles after stealing and selling her work. Because they work for corporations they obviously believe they can blatantly steal and exploit peoples property and get away with it. Obviously we don't accept this; there are laws to prevent and stop this kind of abuse. Court action is the only way that the law will be enforced with these particular individuals. There's been an abuse of the law and denial of property and human rights. The situation was unbearable a year ago, now it has become critical and dangerous for Charles. The defendants have been so destructive that her life is now in turmoil as a result.

DEFENCE STATEMENTS AND APPLICATIONS TO STRIKE CASE OUT

5. Apart from knowing the truth as a witness, when you actually read the defence statements you can clearly see that all the defendants are lying. It's very sad that the defendants don't have a conscience profiting from this abuse to Charles. And that they think lying to cover this up makes it legally justifiable. Which, is why we want "Access to justice" under the 1999 Act. There 'must' be court action because they don't believe this abuse is wrong and are likely to continue causing misery. They have had ample opportunity to resolve this civilly, but they don't want to. Their answer to resolving this has been to inflict further hurt, and damage. So much damage has now been done, not just to Charles but to the children and other people around her. It's unbearable for anyone to endure living under this kind of injustice.
6. Trying to strike this case out is an attempt to prevent the rules of law, order and justice and also a denial of our 'Convention rights'. Everybody has rights to justice in this country, particularly if safety, security and protection is at risk as in this case, rule of Article (2) Human Right's Act 1998. "Everyone" must be paid by law, and should not be exploited for slave labour and systematic abuse. Article (4) Nobody has to live with discrimination Article (14) We all have right's to privacy, and peace with our families Article (8) Under "Convention rights" rulings Articles (6) It's a breach of human rights to prevent this case being resolved in court. Article (17) nobody has the right to repeatedly abuse their victims rights to avoid facing justice and liability.

MY RELATIONSHIP WITH CHARLES SEVEN

7. I've known Charles for almost 5 years, although we're very good friends we also have respect for one and other professionally. We share a similar love of knowledge and the arts. There's always been honesty, trust, and consideration between us. Anyone who knows Charles well will tell you she's warm, friendly, conscientious and a very caring person. She has a profound respect for humanity. Her family and work mean everything to her, but she also regularly voluntarily gives freely of her time to help and support others. Sadly, these defendants have brought so much distress to her home, that it has since torn her family life apart.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

8. Neither, Charles nor myself expect anything in life for free. We're not work shy, we both believe in hard work ethics because there is no short cuts or substitution for it. Over the years we've worked very hard building our careers. My career has been largely based around studying law; I graduated and received my law degree this year 2004. Charles has had a 20-year career within creative entertainment industries. She's a skilled music producer, creative writer and also specialises in devising innovative lifestyle concepts. (Proof included in her witness statement.) Charles and I both have families, so we take our professional careers very seriously. That's why we can't understand the mentality of these defendants. Charles was a very respected innovative artist renowned for her work until these people felt they had to steal it. We don't know how or why they think they have the right to exploit peoples hard work for free.

THE STOLEN INFRINGED PACKAGE PRODUCTION DOCUMENTS

9. Several years ago, she created various production documents for a lifestyle Multimedia package. These documents comprised of a confidential formula for a launch to promote health, beauty, fitness and culture in mainstream entertainment. The concept had been copyright protected since the 1990's, and became the subject of discussions regarding the documents sale or license with the defendants in 2003.
10. These documents detailed an innovative easily accessible interactive concept that provided a vast variety of enjoyable ways to help the public achieve complete fitness beauty and health. It catered for a wide demographic audience, highlighted serious health conditions, and provided wide range of advise from leading experts and advisers: The emphasis was to promote Health and fitness for the nation in Mainstream entertainment as a whole. There was featured celebrity element that gave the concept both universal and commercial appeal that made it instantly marketable in world market territories.

HOW I BECAME INVOLVED

11. Last year in 2003, I had a meeting with Charles and graphic design consultant Gilis Mclutason about my becoming involved in the productions. Charles had put a small team together for a creative production company being formed. I had a year left before completing my law degree and also have a creative background. Charles and I had talked before about working on a project together anyway, so when she proposed what she wanted to do, I saw it was a sound very commercial venture that I could add something to. She had already spent a lot of time working on this, so it was well researched, thought out and devised. With the mass cross- market appeal there was no way it wasn't going to work out, success was inevitable. That's why I agreed to get involved.

WHAT CONVINCED ME THE THAT CONCEPT WOULD BE SUCCESSFUL

12. We both knew lot's of people this would appeal to. No terrestrial channels had ever done anything like it before so it was original. We have many years worth of backdated previous mainstream broadcasting schedules, to prove the concepts originality. This will be referred to in the full hearing if necessary.

PROTECTION AND SALE OF THE CONCEPT

13. The project was handled with strict confidentiality because the concept was valuable and very lucrative, so it had to remain a secret because we knew if it got exposed someone would try to steal it. That's why Charles got lawyers involved before discussing it with anyone. No one was given any documents or told any details before the lawyers became involved.
14. I read the lawyer's agreement and it was definitely official. They provided copyright statements and contracts, and were suppose to stop the concept from being stolen and protect the rights. After the concept was disclosed and the commercial value realised that's when problems started. Charles acted on the advice of the lawyers. She had numerous discussions with them about selling the concept to international productions houses, commissioners and broadcasters. Endemol in particular. Charles, others and myself discussed going to see the companies she was referred to in June 2003. At the time this occurred I had to go to Sweden so we planned to set up meetings when I got back. Unfortunately someone passed away in Charles's family. So it wasn't until 11 Nov 03 that we went to any meetings. Proof exhibited with Charles and other witness statements.

HOW THE MEETING ON 11. NOVEMBER 03 CAME ABOUT

15. Richard Hannah originally got in contact with Charles in connection with an Internet Ad. He was suppose to be making a programme for the BBC produced by Clarion and NTL and was looking for people to do the show. After learning about Charles launching her own productions, he began calling her regularly about co-producing for the planned launch. It seemed like he had become fascinated with Charles. She explained about having a team, lawyers and plans to do business with other production houses already so declined when he offered his services. But he continued to call and express interest in becoming involved. He spoke to Charles about not trusting Endemol because of corruption. I also recall he wanted Charles to send him photos of herself and the production documents. But she didn't send anything.
16. October 03 sometime, he called again saying he had set up a meeting for Charles to discuss deals with Helen Alexander for the launch of the concept. Richard made these arrangements independently without request so we were surprised. Neither of us knew him or Helen Alexander, but knew the companies they represented and claimed to be commissioning for. The meeting was arranged for 11. November 2003 and after much deliberation we agreed to meet them on the condition that the strict binding terms of the agreement we would present had to be signed for and honoured. Proof of all this is exhibited with Charles's statement as "CS1"

JUST BEFORE THIS MEETING

17. Charles's friend came over from Germany, she didn't get any sleep for a week so was exhausted. We considered cancelling the meeting but Hannah called the morning before to say Helen was flying in from Scotland. Charles explained being tired so he said he would collect us at the station. He emailed directions with his picture so we could identify him at the station.

WHEN WE MET MR. HANNAH AT FELTHAM STATION 11 NOV 03

18. Mr. Hannah pulled up at Feltham station in a black car after us waiting about ten minutes or so. He was a tall large black male of African origin. We didn't get time to print his picture so didn't know what to expect. He called Charles and I by name so we knew it was him. We got into his car and he drove us some distance from the station to this meeting held at NTL's broadcasting facilities. Mr. Hannah didn't say much to us during the journey. He was cold and not particularly friendly, which was not what we were expecting considering he gone out of his way for weeks to get us to attend this meeting. I remember Mr. Hannah having funny looking hands and over all was a strange looking man. I remained quiet throughout this journey. Charles was tired so didn't say anything either.

WHEN WE ARRIVED AT NTL

19. We arrived at NTL's facilities, and were walking through the entrance when Mr. Hannah abruptly told Charles to give him her documents. The way he sprung it on her was very unexpected so we were taken aback. In response she said she needed the ladies lavatory, where she pulled me aside to ask my opinion of Mr. Hannah, but at that point, to be honest I really I couldn't tell without gauging the full situation. Charles is usually perceptive, but because she hadn't slept for days she wasn't her normal self. But she said she got a strange feeling about Hannah. I also felt they way he asked for the documents in an entrance seemed overly eager, and noticed that he appeared agitated and anxious. But we had literally just arrived, so it was a bit early for me to form any kind of conclusion.

20. Minutes after we returned to the reception area where Mr. Hannah was waiting for us. He continued asking Charles for her documents and Charles insisted as pre-arranged the agreements would have to be signed first. Eventually we were taken into a room where we were introduced to Richard's partner Susanne Hills. She was doing her make up and hair and I think we took her by surprise. There was another woman seated who mostly remained quiet. She looked very spaced out.

21. After introducing us to Suzanne, Richard left the room. We sat down and Suzanne did all the talking. I remember it was like she was trying to paint the impression she was an important boss of Clarion and NTL, but there was something insincere about the things she said. She spoke about her dislike of contracts when selling TV formats. She was trying to convince Charles not to bother with them. Charles did try to respond to her comment's but whenever Charles spoke, Suzanne cut in, and spoke over her. I did think the way Suzanne behaved was arrogant. She spoke to Charles as if she knew nothing about the entertainment industry. Even though she didn't actually ask Charles about her professional background. Charles was extremely tired that day, so let Suzanne talk. Mr. Hannah returned to the room and asked to be given Charles's documents again, he obviously trying to avoid signing any contracts. The meeting wasn't professional and I remember being confused about what was going on.

THE SIGNED CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT 11 Nov 03

Exhibit in "LP1" the contracts signed by Richard Hannah and Suzanne Hills witnessed and counter signed by myself

22. Hannah said something about Helen Alexander being in another room. It wasn't clear what was going on. This was not your normal business meeting there was unnecessary tension. From the moment we met Hannah he was trying to be bossy.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

23. He was also very arrogant, and deliberately cunning. He showed us his own Clarion and NTL contracts and wanted to sign and keep those. But we refused. We said either he signed the agreement we presented or we would leave. He wasn't happy about it and left the room with Suzanne.
24. While they briefly left the room, we asked the other woman still seated about the company, but she told us she wasn't involved and was only there because Mr. Hannah asked her to hang out for the day. Eventually when Mr. Hannah and Suzanne came back, they said they would sign our contracts for the meeting. Mr. Hannah didn't want me to sign as a witness and asked the other quiet woman to do it, but we insisted and I did counter sign as the witness.
25. I remember Mr. Hannah scanning at the front page, briefly flicking the first pages, then putting the documents in a bag. It was strange they way he immediately put them in his bag and very rude. When Charles saw the cunning way he did that, she asked him give the documents back. We could see he didn't want to but he had to. So he did. Then we got up to leave. Hannah then said Helen was waiting and still expecting to meet us. He asked for us to at least see her because she had flown from Scotland.
26. The meeting was actually arranged for us to discuss the launch with Helen Alexander anyway, so we decided to honour it. Mainly because she flew in from Scotland. Had Helen have come by train we would've left. Mr. Hannah asked Charles to present at least two options. The second concept was included onto the signed agreement. We were led into a canteen where we met Helen Alexander, Jim Manson and Tony Orwin. Mr. Orwin was introduced as NTL's managing director.

WHILE IN THE CANTEEN.

Proof exhibit in LP1 of the 2 business cards given by Alexander and Manson.

27. When we realised the business meeting was actually being held in NTL's canteen, we were both speechless. We sat there not knowing what was going on in an awkward silence. I could see Charles was tired and feeling uncomfortable. We were very confused.
28. Helen Alexander introduced herself as the head commissioner for Scottish media Groups representing Virgin Radio and Ginger productions, which was part of ITV group Carlton, GMTV and other companies. She gave us her business card, and introduced Jim Manson as her executive producer. There was no doubt they had come to do business. Charles gave Helen and Jim her business cards, we were struggling to make head or tails, but as Helen and Jim business cards showed they were definitely representing legitimate media companies, we stuck with this situation out of politeness to give Helen and Jim the benefit of the doubt.

GINGER PRODUCTIONS

29. Charles asked Helen how she came to work for Ginger productions and Chris Evans, Helen laughed and boasted that she got 'Ginger productions and Virgin Radio' from Chris Evans after court battle with him, and got his formats too. She was laughing and bragging about it and was obviously feeling very proud of herself.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

30. We didn't know anything about Helen's involvement in the Chris Evans's court case. It did seem like a strange thing to be laughing about. We can both clearly recall the look on Helens face as she talked about getting Ginger productions from Chris Evans and it wasn't nice. Since then it's been said that Helen went out of her way take to over running Ginger productions and gain control of all Chris Evans formats. We now realise that this is what Helen was boasting about during this meeting. Until Helen told us about her case with Chris Evans we didn't know anything about it. We were a bit shocked to learn that Helen was behind Chris Evans's case and downfall. We had been deliberately lured and misled into this meeting.
31. If we had been told the truth from the beginning about how Helen Alexander acquired control of Ginger productions we would've been able to make an informed decision and seen the warning signs to steer well clear of her. We would never have gone to meet any of these people. Helen would not have got the documents because we would've known what she was capable of.

WHEN THE MEETING COMMENCED WITHIN NTL'S CANTEEN

32. After Helen's speech about Chris Evan's, Suzanne Hills spoke at length then Mr. Hannah introduced Charles as the person he had spoken to Helen about and Hannah told Charles to tell Helen and Jim about her up and coming new productions. Charles was thrown completely off guard. We were still expecting to be shown into another meeting room somewhere else. The fact that we were sitting in the tiny little canteen with no one else around just didn't make any sense.
33. Mr. Orwin spoke a lot about NTL. Charles and I sat quietly feeling uncomfortable. Charles whispered not wanting to discuss anything. When Hannah introduced her into the discussions she felt obliged to discuss her work, but she was very reluctant to discuss her work due to the circumstances and this was obvious to everyone present. But thought as Helen was coming from a supposedly reputable company we would try to honour the arrangement.

DISCLOSING THE PRODUCTIONS

34. Charles was hesitant everyone could see she was nervous and obviously very concerned about the situation. We did sense something strange was going on, and the way Charles spoke everyone could see she was very tired. She didn't want to let Helen down, so reluctantly disclosed her health and fitness concept, and themed live Chat show /question time concept, (the second politically based productions) Helen and Jim asked lots of questions which she politely answered. Everyone could see she was uncomfortable about disclosing her work but was merely obliging Helen and Jim. Charles is not normally like that but it was exceptionally strange circumstances. We didn't realise that Helen and Jim also had bad motives, which is why Helen got Charles's documents.
35. Everything happened very quickly. Looking back in retrospect and experiencing all that has happened since, it was obvious what was really going on. But when you're not expecting such ruthless actions to come from professionals it comes as a shock to the system, so you don't automatically respond like you should have at the time. We now realise we should've immediately ran out of that NTL building and away from these corrupt people as quickly as possible. But the agreements were signed, so we thought the very worst that could happen was Helen returning the documents. But once they were in her custody she refused to give them back.

NTL'S CAPABILITIES

36. After the discussions we were shown round NTL facilities that's when knew for sure we were the only people in the building that day. The studios had state of the art satellite equipment for digital broadcasting and telecommunications. It was a large place with lots of empty offices. Hannah did not say that the meeting would be held in an empty place full of empty offices. Charles did try to find out from Mr. Hannah was really going on, but was undoubtedly told lies.
37. After this we all left. Helen got into a car with Mr. Hannah, Suzanne Hill's and the other quiet woman. We got a train to London with Mr. Manson. He said was going to Paddington as well to catch the Bristol train so was going travel with us. Mr. Manson asked Charles questions about the concepts again and said he really liked her ideas because the way she had incorporated the cultural social political element was original. He said he had not seen that done before and was definitely inspired. He gave us his and Helen's business cards again. We were all talking, then a few stops into our train journey he received a call on his mobile from a female and was told to get off the train. I could hear the voice and think it was Helen Alexander who phoned. We remember Mr. Manson change from being friendly to then looking nervous and guilty and getting off the train at the following train stop. It was very weird. We said goodbye to him and left it that either they or us would be in touch.

RICHARD HANNAH'S MISREPRESENTATION AND INTENTIONAL DECEIT
Exhibit in "LP1" proof of false picture Hannah sent as himself.

38. When we got back home and had time to digest this meeting we knew something very bad had happened. We were left with a very bad feeling. We went and took a look at the picture Hannah had emailed for us to recognise him at the station beforehand, and it wasn't even him. He sent a picture of a senior white male to pose as himself. He was deliberately out to deceive us from the beginning, and had sent a false picture as himself to give the impression he was somebody very important. That's when the penny really dropped. Mr. Hannah turned out to be an identity fraudster and a con man.
39. Mr. Hannah roped us into the meeting on a false misrepresentation. We have seen that NTL are now claiming not to be associated with Hannah at all, but this is a complete lie and a cover up. Even Hannah's emails to Helen and Charles prove that NTL and Mr. Hannah have had a business alliance since 1982 . NTL lying about their business Alliance with Hannah proves their covering the truth up because these NTL facilities were used to carry out the theft and fraud with Charles's documents.

THE MISREPRESENTATION ACT 1967

I refer to Misrepresentation Act 1967 on "Torts" s.2 (1)

NEGLIGENT STATEMENTS RELIED UPON BY THE CLAIMANT:

Derry V Peek (1889) "Established that dishonesty is an essential requirement for the tort of deceit"

WHEN CHARLES INFORMED RUSSELL'S ABOUT MR. HANNAH AND HELEN
Proof in "CS1" Charles's witness statement.

40. After the meeting we were very concerned, so Charles contacted Russell's on the 14. November 03 in order to let Mr. Gossage know what had happened to put him on red alert. Charles was contracted to them and they had been specifically instructed to prevent, and protect any misuse of the copyrights and documents. Russell's were already involved so were expecting them to act. Once we saw the truth about Hannah we also became very concerned about Helen having the documents. But Russells did not respond.

EMAIL TO HELEN TO PREVENT INFRINGEMENT

Exhibit in "LP1" email to Helen on 14 Nov 03 (2 pages)

41. Charles also sent Helen an email on 14. Nov 03 to explain that Russell's were involved in the project and let Helen know she was already officially being legally represented (so we thought). This was politely letting her know the documents were protected and very important because we didn't want them stolen or plagiarised. Charles also took the opportunity to apologise and explain the reasons why she was so tired during the meeting and why she was reluctant and nervous about discussing the productions. She didn't think it was professional to complain to Helen about Mr. Hannah's conduct so just stuck to the facts about the launch for the Health and fitness project.

42. Charles explained about wanting to take her concept of promoting health and fitness in the UK to the government to highlight the obesity crisis via entertainment, which is expressed in paragraph 10 of this email of 14. Nov 03.

WHEN HANNAH EMAILED USING DECEPTIVE "BLOW OFF" TACTICS

Proof in exhibit "CS1" email from Mr. Hannah on 15 Nov 03

43. After sending the email to Helen, Charles showed me this very strange email from Hannah on the 15 Nov 03, making it appear as if she had been chasing them. I was baffled. He was the one who had called repeatedly for us to go to that meeting. Even down to the day before we almost didn't go. We only went along because they lured us with dishonesty. The timing of this email alerted us to the possibility that Helen probably informed him about Charles being in touch. After us going all the way there in good faith, disclosing the concepts, he was using every trick in the book to get Charles out of the picture altogether. That's why he tried to undermine her. Besides being patronising and rude it wasn't even factual. When he referred to Charles as a 'student' saying she should buy the 'stage magazine'. It was laughable. This is proof of what he was like at that meeting.

44. We suspected his underhanded behaviour, he had already told many lies. His emails showed he was a fraud with suspicious sinister motives. The picture he sent of himself as a prestigious white male also shows that he is a con. It all made sense when we read what he said: **On his command, unleashing sales hell' about 'murder' and getting his vengeance.**

45. Everybody became concerned about Mr. Hannah's statements. Under scrutiny they showed he was a brute and dictator with sinister intentions. There was no way on earth a character like Hannah would ever just let Helen walk away with those documents. Mr. Hannah had gone to far too much effort to get them in the first place.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

And he was getting his cut by hook or crook. He knew the documents were exceptionally lucrative so wanted to sell them to make himself wealthy. It became a question of whether Helen and Jim were also in on his scam and whether they were going to give him the documents to assist him with his plans.

THE INTENTION TO DE-FRAUD

Exhibit in "LP1" email from Hannah to Tony Orwin and Suzanne Hill's copied to Charles date 31 Oct 03.

Mr. Hannah states:

HIS SUBJECT: "On my command unleash sales Hell"

"My name is Maximus TVprogramme Sellingus, Husband of a murdered career Father of a murdered brainchild and I will have my vengeance "IN THIS LIVE EVENT" or the next." Then in paragraph 3 he shows us "The live event" he is referring to is the meeting he organised for Charles to meet SMG's Helen Alexander.

Next Hannah states "Charles and Suzanne can you be at the Feltham Studios at 1.30pm on Tuesday 11th Nov 03, Directions attached, I'd like to talk about Revision, but "more importantly" than that it is a chance to share your "format ideas "with 'Helen Alexander of SMG' plc, Head of Factual".

46. This email explains why Mr. Hannah was so desperate to get the documents when we first arrived at the meeting on the 11.11.03. Helen now states that she didn't know anything about this meeting, but this email proves she did. She pretended to be a commissioner, but she was only really interested in stealing and selling Charles's format ideas. That's why they wanted the documents so badly.

47. After meeting Hannah and reading his emails about the Clarion and NTL alliance we realised something suspicious was going on. We noticed that Hannah and NTL were running a weird set up of 'converting' other people's intellectual property into formats.

NTL'S STATEMENTS FOR DEFENCE

- (A) "The fourth defendant maintains that the claimant has joined the fourth Defendant in these proceedings under a misapprehension?"
- (B) "It is the fourth Defendant's understanding that the events complained of Occurred when Richard Hannah was "renting" studio accommodation at the Fourth defendants premises".

THE NTL AND CLARION ALLIANCE

Proof in exhibit "CS1" from Hannah about Clarion and NTL alliance and services. This states:

"Clarion Television is one of the UK's longest established production houses. It's is the third iteration of a business that formed 1982, and is the culmination of the 'merging' of no less than businesses and "the forging of a key alliance with world's largest broadcaster, 'NTL'."

Proof is also the "12" emails exhibited by Helen Alexander between herself and Hannah. This also shows the Clarion and NTL alliance and services on offer.

HANNAH AND NTL'S SERVICES

Proof in "CS1"

Intellectual property & Media Consultar

And Format 'Conversion'. (Opposed to Format Creation.)

In real terms, using knowledge of the law to convert then Plagiarise other people's intellectual property to prevent getting caught or sued i.e: And get away without paying the copyright owners.

This also explained why Hannah had hounded Charles for her documents. And why Helen and Jim Manson were there ready and willing. Despite NTL claiming no association with Hannah, every email from Hannah ended with Clarion Television, NTL or Affiliated companies. OR Clarion/NTL.

48. This evidence proves Clarion and NTL 'are' affiliated companies. So why are NTL denying "a key business alliance"? To evade any liability and keep their involvement from the fraud hidden. Where there is no offence there is nothing to hide.

INTENTION'S TO STEAL 'CHARLES'S NAME

Proof in "CS1" email from Hannah on 18 Nov 03

49. This email was also very weird because it mentioned Charles's name in third person terms, being successful in the music industry? At the time we knew this like all Mr. Hannah's statements had sinister connotations

Hannah stated: "I suspect I am more likely to come across a successful "Charles Seven" in the music world."

50. Considering he had never heard or knew nothing of Charles's music, in light of what we had experienced this statement created unease. It wasn't until we saw that a blond girl was fronting a new pop band with Charles's name in May 04 ('Not 1998') did the full weight of Hannah's statement become apparent. The website of this girl states "**A not so tragic cover up.**" And "**is someone using your name.**" This was done to taunt and cause Charles harm. They all knew Charles had been taking steps to sue them for months. We had absolutely no doubt who was behind the creation of this new band. But when we saw they had actually done this we felt the threats became personal and perverse.

51. They obviously wanted to humiliate and attack Charles on an emotional level. It was when we all felt that this was very perverse. Elizabeth Partyka makes up a fake story about where this band came from, which, she herself knows isn't true. She knows this band was not created in 1998.

CHARLES EMAIL TO HANNAH ABOUT OTHER INTERESTED COMPANIES

Exhibit in "CS1" Charles's last email to Hannah 19. Nov 03 Time: 16:16:30

52. By then we were very concerned and suspicious about what Mr. Hannah was doing. so Charles emailed him again to let him know we knew the commercial value of the documents and that others companies would be interested to talk business. In other word's we didn't need any of these people.

WHEN HELEN CREATED A DISTRACTION

The exhibit in LP1 is the proof of what Helen done on 19 Nov 03 Time: 19:57:

53. Just a few hours after emailing Mr. Hannah, Helen then contacted us saying it was “**good**” to meet Charles, and that she was going to discuss the productions with Jim Manson regarding budgets. At the time we did wonder whether or not Mr. Hannah had informed Helen about Charles’s email, and whether Helen’s contact was only to create a deliberate diversion. This turned out to be exactly what Helen did.

WHEN CHARLES REPLIED TO TEST HELEN & JIM’S SINCERITY

In exhibit “LP1” Charles emailed Helen again on 24 Nov 03

54. This was sent to outline some more background info about the research and concepts objectives and she attached the agreement again to see if Helen and Manson were genuine or not. Hannah had already signed the contract, which also covered them because the meeting was “specifically” about “doing business with Clarion NTL and Helen’s companies. She knows this. The contract prohibited her as a third party from infringing the documents in anyway. When we saw that Mr. Hannah was a very dishonest person we wanted to know whether Helen and Jim were also dishonest or honourable people too. If Helen were genuine, she would’ve conducted herself professionally, in accordance with broadcasting rules and been above board about everything.

CONTACT WITH THE LAWYERS ABOUT HELEN ALEXANDER

55. Charles kept trying to reach Mr. Gossage and emailed again on the 25 Nov 03. Because of concern’s about the possibility of Helen infringing the documents. But we really wanted to believe that Helen was a decent professional person who wouldn’t stoop so low. Charles was contracted to prevent anything from going wrong, so was expecting Gossage to be alerted and act in any event. Charles always made her concerns and instructions clear. We found out later, by this stage Helen, Jim and Hannah had already converted the documents and were selling all the rights to networks and third parties for several new TV formats and Health and Fitness campaigns.

Exhibit in “CS1” from Mr. Gossage to Charles 26 Nov 03

56. Charles got one last email from Russell’s they completely ignored all her calls from that date onwards. It was obvious they were not going to carry out the contract, there was no formal termination of the agreements they were just suddenly unavailable.

MY EMAIL TO HELEN FOR A DECISION

I refer to exhibit ”LP1” my email to Helen and Jim on 3 Dec 03

57. We waited like Helen had asked, when she went silent as well we knew something was going on. You don’t invite people to meetings take valuable documents and then disappear with them without a word. She created extreme anxiety for us, and halted our progress because Christmas was coming up. We expected to sell or launch the concept ourselves by 2004. So on 2 and 3 December 03 I emailed Helen and explained we needed to press on. She had the documents so we needed a decision or the documents returned. I forwarded this correspondence to Charles.

58. Charles continued calling Russell's and leaving urgent messages but they ignored her too. Helen knew she had valuable property belonging to Charles. She knew how Charles felt about her work because she was also told this in all the correspondence. Helen knew we couldn't proceed while she was withholding the material. It could 'only' have panned out one of two ways. If Helen and Jim were 'not' in on Hannah's scam to scoop the profits from Charles's documents, Helen would follow through with what she had expressed in her email on 19 Nov 03. Realising not doing so, would be "professionally negligent" illegal and cause great anguish. Helen knew we were waiting for a reply. If she "genuinely" were not interested she would've returned the documents. Not kept them. Working for a media corporation does not give her the right to steal peoples property. We don't care who she works for, or care who she thinks she is because she's not above the law.

WHEN WE FOUND OUT HELEN SOLD THE RIGHTS TO THE WORK ILLEGALLY

59. On the Friday of 5 Dec 03, Channel four and Endemol announced that they were going to create and launch Charles's concept. That was it. This was the ultimate insult. Helen had taken advantage, they blatantly reconstructed and converted Charles's documents into a catalogue of new Multimedia formats and sold the rights to all the leading networks and production houses. They had executed the plan to "Unleash the sales Hell" that Mr. Hannah had expressed. From Dec 03 and onwards until now, one after the other Charles's productions appeared "featured all over in the Multimedia advertised as the "new approach" to help "the nations coach potatoes" back to "Health and fitness" with "interactive" productions advertised to be screened through NTL's digital platforms.

60. The proof of this is clearly stated on page 4 of the documents Helen stole. See the heading "**The Concept**" and throughout the others pages of the documents. Helen and Jim proved themselves to be cut throat ruthless as well. Here find listed according to appearance "some" of the Television formats illegally converted and plagiarised from the documents. One after another we saw Charles's work turned into high profile formats screened throughout 2004. We can identify each page these new productions were illegally converted and plagiarised from.

DOCUMENTS CONVERTED INTO

(In order of appearance) **exhibits are in "CS1"**

(A) GET FIT (working title name) later changed to **FIT FARM Endemol /Channel 4** sold late Nov 03 screened twice daily March - May 04 Morning and Evenings. This format plagiarised and infringed copyright details about using daily motivational mantra's on page 1 of documents. In the "reality" context with the use of leading experts interactively. The E4 digital version was broadcast through NTL.

MY EMAIL TO HELEN TO RETURN THE MATERIAL

Exhibit "LP1" my email to Helen and Jim 7 Dec 03

That Friday 5 December 03, was a terrible day. When we realised we had been set up Charles, others and myself were all shocked devastated, particularly after going to all the bother of getting lawyers to protect the documents and them allowing this to happen anyway. The whole situation was traumatic and very distressing. We tried to act as quickly as possible to stop the sale of the work, so Charles made dozens of calls to urgently find another lawyer and secured an appointment with solicitor Mr. Tony Morris in Holborn WC1 for Monday 8th Dec 03. I then emailed Helen Alexander on 7 December 03 to immediately

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

return the Material and reminded her that all the formats were copyright protected. However, Helen completely ignored me, refusing to return the documents and she blatantly continued to proceed selling the rights to third parties. This woman was a thief. She didn't give a damn that what she was doing was illegal, and didn't give a damn that we wanted the work back either.

PROOF THEY ALL KNEW THEY WERE GOING TO BE SUED DEC 03

61. On 8th of December 03 Charles and myself had an urgent conference about it with lawyer Mr. Tony Morris to issue immediate proceedings and get injunctions. When we explained the case he wasn't surprised at all, and said it was nothing new, but the done thing. He said it was easy for media executives to sell peoples copyrights because everyone in the business knew each other anyway and it merely takes a phone call to have got the rights sold from (A) to (B) into production and onto the screens. He also said BBC executives had the worst reputation for doing this to people but all networks behaved this way. He mentioned a few other cases where others had been ripped of too and was quite candid. When we explained that we both did yoga, and was launching a Health and fitness concept to address the obesity crisis and other serious illnesses, he said they would've taken all the leads from us an executed them without us. But even he said the blatant way we were duped at the meeting was nasty. He said we should've ran out of the NTL meeting. He arranged to call the defendants and networks on our behalf and let them know we were going to take legal action and get injunctions.
62. He made these call's as promised, and found out the roll out for Charles's concept was in excess of Multi-millions with Channel 4 and Endemol, and that was just the "Get fit" format alone. But when he said Charles as the copyright owner was only entitled to 10 percent of that figure, We knew this was incorrect. The boss of Endemol was a friend and client of Mr. Morris, so it was obvious when he was informed about the money involved he would protect Endemol's interests before ours. He wasn't totally inhuman he knew this was a horrible situation, but was obviously advised not to take the case and told throw us off track. To delay legal action. So told us a story about not suing the defendants responsible, and that us suing Channel 4 and Endemol would an impossible task because they were a big corporation. But they were sold someone's else's property illegally, It was blatant breach of contract so should've been straightforward to resolve immediately. This was also theft by way of obtaining property by deception with the intention to permanently deprive the rightful owner s.15 (1) (2) of the theft act 1968, and it was also copyright infringement of the 1988 Act s.77. s.78. s.80 s.84 besides them taking advantage. Working for a corporation should not give people the exclusive right to abuse the law. Binding contracts had been breached so like anyone else, we had the right to take legal action.
63. What Mr. Morris said about not suing the defendants, was him taking sides and protecting the defendants despite the fact they had broken the law. We were deemed foolish and naïve girls, who had no common sense or knowledge of the law, therefore could easily fobbed off and disposed of. This was deeply insulting, offensive and discriminating. It was obvious enormous financial deals had already been secured for the rights to trade Charles's work, and we knew he didn't not want to alienate corporate bosses. But he was honest enough to say that we should prosecute Mr. Gossage. Proof of these discussions is in letters with Tony Morris exhibited in "LP1" on 8th, 9th, 12th 14th 16th December 2003.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

64. And further proves Alexander, Manson, Hannah, Gossage, Russell's and NTL broadcasting networks and production companies all knew they were going to be sued from 5 December 03 and onwards. Lying in their statements to cover it all up is perverting the course of justice.

LETTER TO HELEN AND JIM 19 DEC 03

65. Another letter was sent to Helen and Jim but they continued to ignore us. After this, things got very heavy, and a whole list of sinister things started happening. Since then there's been a whole list of other violations to prevent legal action, like the phone tapping, Charles being followed and threatened. It's been absolute hell. Other solicitor's said off the record, "nobody wants to go up against the big boys". they knew Charles had been abused. But nobody wanted to help her enforce her contract rights, and copyright ownership or even recover her documents. People know she was really the person responsible for the launching of all health and fitness format productions in entertainment 2004. That's why the case had to be taken as litigants in person. They seem to expect people to just accept being abused, and do nothing about it. It's been a very unjust situation from the moment we met these people.

66. I know Charles also wrote to Mr. Gossages but was still ignored. The more we tried to get help the worse things became. Until it descended into cruel and sinister state of affairs. These people were selling the work blatantly, the more Charles disproved and tried to take action the more and more horrible this became. These were what followed created from the stolen documents.

(B)'TIME OUT MAGAZINE' first front covers for Jan 04 featured Charles's details: Here we see use of the new slogan. "Fitness made easy." "Everything from Dance routines, Boxing, to Tai Chi" as is written on page 5 using the diverse fitness routines listed on page 7 of the documents that Helen stole.

(C) VICTORIA WOODS BIG FAT DOC BBC1 rushed into production **Nov/ Dec 03** Screened January 04. Plagiarises splitting the show into to two half's as on page 1 and interviewed the cast list outlined on pages 8 and 9. Duchess of York on page 8 and Venessa Feltz Ann Diamond page 9. Video evidence is available. This format also interviewed guests about topics within the documents. Host as was described on page 3. Victoria Woods was not the author of this work. This was a false attribution.

(C) BODY ON: Endemol's announced a' new interactive Health and Fitness platform: Feb 04 This infringed the idea to help support everyday people achieve healthier lifestyles through Multimedia platforms with the assistance of experts. Plagiarising the interactive elements from paragraph 5 page 2. Endemol even state Body On was Endemol's 'first' concept to directly target the end consumer. Proving this was a new idea that had not been exploited by anyone beforehand.

DINNER WITH PORTILLO BBC 4, JAN 04

This was the second concept the themed live political chat show also disclosed during the NTL meeting.

(A) "NEW" XCLUSIVE SHOW CALLED 'CELEBRITIES EXPOSED': ITV2 Feb 04 This was the optional "exclusive show" on the health and fitness lifestyle practices by famous personalities in paragraph 1 page two. Extracts "*This series leaves no stone unturned*" from page 6 (bottom of the page)

(B) **STRICTLY COME DANCING: MAY 04** After this conversion this was given a name of an old show "**come dancing**" to disguise where this had come from. They obviously plagiarised Charles's concept to use a diverse list of famous personalities from different fields to learn dance routines from professional dance teachers and other experts. Charles devised this to inspire viewers at home. This info came from pages 4, 5 and 6 of the stolen documents. Charles had already got a list of dancers. Anita Letang was one of them she is listed on page 8 and has given evidence too.

67. All productions were sold unlawfully. Everyone who has profited was not entitled to.

WHEN WE REPORTED THE CRIME AND THE DEFENDANTS TO THE POLICE

68. I went with Charles to report the situation to the police on 16 January 04, reference already stated. Police advised to find new lawyers to start civil proceedings. So Charles phoned other lawyers from mainly large law firms. She was repeatedly told that Mr. Gossage should be prosecuted. Unfortunately none of these firms could take individual clients cases. While she was trying to replace Russells, Helen and the others were quite blatantly selling more formats from the conversion and plagiarism of her documents. They didn't even try to hide what they were doing there was definitely a strong element of spite involved.

69. I had told Helen to return the material, she knew they were copyright property. It's written on the covers and also inside the documents on page 7. Helen has been totally ruthless and manipulative in the way she has gone about keeping the work and profits for herself. The statements written on pages 7 proves she knew these documents were intended for sale or license and not free.

70. ***The statement clearly say's: "Please note that this shows format is subject to copyright and protection laws. It cannot therefore provide and detailed authorisation rights to any copies of the show as they as strictly prohibited and reserved exclusively to the 'purchasing' party. 'Any' copying, plagiarism or recreation or duplication, pirating and recording of this idea or show format and concept in any shape or form 'with or without' the usage of the shows 'current title name' or 'change to mention hosts or celebrities' in any world territory will result in swift prosecution to the offending party or parties.***

71. Helen is using her profession to cover illegal activities. We were disgusted that she could thoughtlessly steal from another woman with children right before Xmas. It takes a very cold heartless person to do what she did. Helen put Charles and her family through immense pain, especially her youngest son.

72. There were enormous repercussions, Charles had to be seen by the hospital and doctors in Dec 03. This was much more than these defendants just stealing a few ideas, hard work had gone into this project. It was created in memory of Charles's late elder brother who died of illness. That's what particularly hurt and angered her family. I felt really bad that us going to that meeting turned out like this. I don't understand why they have done this or why they treat people so horribly. All the Channels have guidelines, Helen knows this very well. ITV states:

ITV CREDIT RULES

“To give on screen recognition to those who make a “substantial” creative and/ or technical contribution to programmes”.

These guidelines” are also re-iterated on other Channels so there was no excuse for this.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT 1957-88

Copyright gives moral rights to copyright owners and enforces infringement remedies for Gross copyright infringement.

COPYRIGHT BROADCASTING OFFENCES AND ENFORCEMENT ACT 2002

Copyright, Patent, Designs 1998 Act 114(A) and (B) Section 107 (b) (4) 107(a) (1) (2) For offences as follows: Criminal liability for making or dealing with infringing articles.

Criminal liability for making, or dealing with illicit recordings (b) an offence under the trade Descriptions Act 1968 (c.29) (c) an offence involving dishonesty or deception

Copyright, Patent, Designs 1998 Act 204(A) (order of disposal of illicit recordings) Forfeiture of illicit recordings England and Wales or Northern Ireland 204 (B) Forfeiture of illicit recordings in Scotland

In Civil and Criminal terms, these defendants are all liable. These formats should no longer be screened. What's the point having laws or a legal justice system and legislation that people in corporations blatantly break. There can't be one law for these defendants and another law for the people who do all the hard work. I have also included code of practice for media broadcasting.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROGRAMME PROPOSALS

The guideline I refer to here are exhibited in “CS1”

legislation applies to:

(A) any professional person or company not employed by a Receiver who originates Creative Material

(B) any professional Person or company who receives Creative Material

DEFINITIONS OF CREATIVE MATERIAL:

Creative Material means proposals (Which may include formats, treatments, scripts, outlines, development documents, tender submissions, storylines, artwork, and synopses) as the same comprise and are submitted as proposals for radio and television programmes.

AN ORIGINATOR:

A professional person or company who originates creative material

Procedures by Originator

“The originator should ensure that creative material submitted to a Receiver is stated as being submitted in confidence.

Helen Alexander was told on 14 Nov 03 on page 2 paragraph 13,

“You are the only other person with copy's of the shows so I trust you will treat with confidentiality” and in paragraph 14 also states “please be discretional”.

The originator should also ensure that"

"That Creative material is in 'writing and it's distinctive and original features are clearly identified."

Each page of the documents are original and identifiable This was not in mainstream before the theft.

THE RECEIVER

By adopting this code, a receiver accepts that 'it will observe procedures which ensure that it observes due confidentiality of creative Material until and superseding agreement concerning the use of creative Material is reached between a Receiver and a Originator.

The receiver "must" ensure that:

- 1. that confidentiality will be observed by the receiver***
- 2. that all creative material is "logged on receipt", by reference to title, date, receivers name***
- 3. the receiver thereafter provides a fuller response indicating rejection or a wish to continue to consider the creative material(within such a reasonable time frame***
- 4. If the creative material is rejected, the receivers will upon request use reasonable endeavour to return any and all original Materials supplied by the originator.***

Paragraph 26 show's further proof Helen Alexander deliberately did not fulfil 'any' of these procedures and knew she was breaking the law. Even when we requested the documents return Helen refused to give them back.

THE HARASSMENT AND PRIVATE NUISANCE

73. We first realised our phone conversations were being listened to late Dec 03. Minutes into the conversations we started hearing clicking sounds. We started hearing the sinister aggressive noises then the phone line would go completely dead. Every time we called each other back it would start up again. It was awful. This was definitely done to intimidate, cause anxiety, distress and fear. We went back to the police. But it continued to happen everyday until it became impossible to have any conversations. But the threats got worse. Charles shut down her original phone lines and I know she tried to move house. Even though Charles changed her numbers it has continued. It has been a serious problem.

WHEN CHARLES'S HOME WAS PUT UNDER SURVEILLANCE

74. She first told me about seeing a van with Carlton television written on it circling around her home early Dec 03. When they began following her around we knew something dangerous and terrible was happening. After Charles went to the other lawyers in the case defendants (8) and (9) and even more work was stolen. Charles and other people saw that some creepy Arab looking man was following her around and watching her home. Her relation Roni Nicholas had to confront and get rid of him, they called the police. She wrote to the lawyers and that's when the threats and harassment to pay large sums of money for council tax debts that previously had not existed began this was around April 04. I saw her proof that her council tax was already fully paid so we knew something sinister was going on. Then her post went missing and her email files were copied.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

75. It was one thing after another. I was finishing my law degree, and this became so distressing. I was very worried for Charles and her son who was obviously being affected by all this. Once the next batch of material was sold and launched, that's when we saw another female had been given Charles's name for a pop band. It escalated way out of control. Around June 04, was when she had received a note saying harassment fear and murder. She was definitely being victimised. With all the horrible things happening we could only conclude that there was some kind of vendetta against Charles and it was now a very dangerous situation.
76. No one wanted to help stop this horrifying situation. That's why this case is now brought as a litigant in person. If this case didn't get to court, everyone feared what these defendants were planning to do to Charles next. Charles's youngest son was trying study for exams while all this was happening. He had to cope with this going on around him for months, until his grandmother and brother took him in because this situation got too much for him to endure. It's been the most gruesome case I have ever come across physically and mentally.

FITNESS MADE EASY AND MAKE MONEY FAST BOTH IN "TIME OUT" JAN 04.

Exhibit in "CS1"

77. I alerted Charles to this Time out cover back in Jan 04 because the edition the week before featured Charles's work on the cover. Obviously as these were people with connections and "manpower" to exploit Charles's work worldwide in a short space of time. We knew it would be easy for them to have this "Make money fast" put on Time out too.

LETTER TO THE OSS LAW SOCIETY 21 JAN 04

Exhibits in "CS1"

78. Charles spoke to the OSS in my presence on the 20 Jan 04 and wrote to them on 21 Jan 04. They did acknowledge the letter but there was no case- worker so no action was taken against Mr. Gossage. In April 04 I know they called to close the file and didn't want to do an investigation, but still wanted the evidence. It did seem very suspicious and very much like they were also being told not to do anything.

LETTER'S TO VARIOUS ORGANISATIONS

79. Other friends and relatives collectively wrote letters to parliament and various other organisations to get help. There were positive responses of support. But nothing concrete in terms of action. But it was good to learn other people in media didn't agree with what was going on. People have expressed shock and horror about this case.

HUSTLE ' THE CON IS ON' NEW SERIES BBC1 24 FEB 04

Exhibits of this are in "CS1"

80. With these prevailing circumstances, when this new series glorifying conning people arrived on BBC1 in Feb 04, it caught many people's attention because of how we were so ruthlessly conned in Nov 03 by the defendants. It was especially suspicious because it was about a "Black con man" fitting Hannah's description with four other professional white-collar criminals as his accomplices also fitting the characteristic description of Helen, Jim and the other people involved. The quote "**You get nothing for something.**" Had Helen and Mr. Hannah's hallmarks all over it. This was quoted in the same vindictive vein we had witnessed in the statement "**On his command**" **unleashing sales hell!**

81. The whole thing was too close for comfort. The timing of the arrival of this “how to con” drama was also too much of a coincidence. As much as one would like to believe that nobody could do this, the people who conned us are not regular people. They are totally corrupt and capable of doing anything. That’s what made this program ring alarm bells. This drama detailed everything the defendants did to us as con tricks. For instance: Selecting and befriending and targeting the victim to be conned “The Mark” Then luring the victim “The Mark” to be conned into an empty real life offices (NTL), then “blowing them off” getting rid of them quickly etc: This was no coincidence.

WITNESS DEFENCE OF HELEN MARY ALEXANDER

82. Helen Mary Alexander’s witness statement is not only riddled with lies and total contradictions but reveals exactly “how and why” Charles’s copyrighted productions have gone from her possession to “now” being sold and screened onto every terrestrial Channel world-wide. The motive for the lies is to cover up mass fraud.

THE CAUSAL LINK

83. I refer first to paragraph’s 3 and 17 of Helens defence statement her employment role. Helen emphasis’s **“My role is to “sell” ideas”** Then why did ‘she’ and ‘Hannah’ both say she was the head commissioner for SMG and Ginger productions then. And why was Charles relentlessly pursued in the first place?

84. She goes further to say “In 2004 SMG TV has produced, or is producing, for BBC1, BBC2, ITV, Channel 4, Five, Trouble Channel, Sky One and the History Channel international.” Basically all the Channels who are screening the converted plagiarised productions from the documents Helen stole. Also Helen conveniently omits to mention having any business association with NTL although she cover’s the whole spectrum of other Channels. One would expect Helen to mention NTL, especially since they are linked to SMG and ITV’s corporate structure. So why is Helen not revealing the full picture about that? Seen in exhibits “CS1” ITV SMG corporate structure and links

85. In paragraph 17 Helen states **“My role is to “sell” ideas to all UK commissioners.” “I consider myself to have a good sense of “who” is looking for what.”** Here the mystery unfolds.

86. Jim Manson tells us how and why they turned Charles’s documents into the long list of new formats.

**JAMES MANSON FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT PARAGRAPH 3 ALSO CONFIRMS
“ My responsibility is to is to “win” network commissions from a wide range of
broadcasters, and as such my role is to “sell” ideas to commissioners rather than
to buy ideas as a commissioner”**

87. Neither, Charles or myself are in the business of buying ideas either. So what was the point? Obviously to supply them with creative ideas to be converted plagiarised and sold to industry connections.

Paragraph 4 States:

“I was responsible for 300 hours of programming a year and 80 staff” I have worked with ITV, the BBC, Channel Five, and several other broadcasters.”

88. Basically Mr. Manson thought the way to meet his obligations, responsibilities and targets was by luring and duping us under false pretences to get away with theft, copyright infringement and fraud. We don't understand why he doesn't want to pay people.

HELEN'S STATEMENT

89. In this statement Helen has completely and blatantly lied about what happened at NTL on 11 Nov. 03 in paragraph 20, you can she has changed the story and is trying to cover up.

THE NEW VERSION OF THE EVENTS BY HELEN

“My strongest recollection of the session was that Charles Seven almost completely dominated the meeting”?

90. This is an absolute lie. Charles had not even slept for a whole week so was just about keeping awake. We spent the whole time in that meeting quiet completely stunned and was trying to work out what we were roped into. When Charles did speak she was obviously very nervous about sharing her work with them, because we had such a bad feeling from very the start. We had absolutely no knowledge or interest in any of them beforehand. Charles was very prudent and concerned.

For proof refer to exhibits “CS1” email to Helen Alexander 14. Nov 03

91. Paragraph 1 “Dear Helen, I must apologise for my waffling my way through, I'm normally on the ball, but I was completely sleep deprived because I had been looking after my friend”

92. “Paragraph 2: “as “I didn't” really clarify I thought I should give you a bit more background. ”Paragraph 6 & 7: I'm always reluctant to discuss anything” which is also the reason I was a bit nervous during my pitching the idea. These ‘facts’ are reiterated also in Charles's email to Hannah's first paragraph on 17 Nov 03. And by Alexander 19. Nov 03

HELEN'S NEW VERSION OF THE EVENTS

Paragraph 20 of Helen's statement: “(in addition, ITV1 had already broadcast “Celebrity fit club” in peak-time, commencing on 27 September 2002.) Despite pointing out these facts to Miss Seven, she was virtually unstoppable. towards the end of the session, I think it's fair to say that I was somewhat irritated.” Alexander even goes even further to say ‘I was being ‘forced’? to listen to Ms Seven talk ‘non stop’ about a “woolly concept”

93. Firstly, this conversation about “celebrity fit club Helen now refers to having with us on 11 Nov 03 ‘never ever’ actually took place and she knows it. It's a total lie for the courts. If Alexander had ‘ever’ dared say such a lie to Charles's face, she would definitely ‘not’ have got away with Charles's production documents.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

94. In regards to the “*Celebrity fit club*’ format Helen refers to, she is careful not to mention that this was a “Army boot camp” format set in the Army, with a Major giving drill orders. This is nothing to do with what Charles created. They can never be compared. Charles’s concept is fun and ‘sexy and contemporary. That Army format did ‘not’ include dance, it wasn’t inspirational or exciting, and did not focus on our nations serious health sickness problems’. It “did not” have a vast list of leading advisers and experts. They never before went to the celebrity’s participants homes to examine their health diet and fitness practices like in the stolen documents.
95. This previous *Celebrity Fit Club* format was based in army barracks’ with one dominant Army Major. That format can ‘never ever’ be described as a mind body and spirit journey with a interactive complete guide to provide “How too tips to help people achieve health beauty and fitness goals. After Helen ‘*stole*’ the documents, when she was informed about us having a conference to issue proceedings, instead of doing the honourable thing and owning up, she quickly changed ‘*Celebrity fit club*’ format to make it *look like* the documents she stole. We don’t know how she can even try to lie about it.
96. “Come dancing” name was also used for fraudulent reasons. Helen is an experienced con woman. She never had any intention of ever paying or crediting Charles. Helen treated us like we were beneath her. This woman actually believes she can abuse who ever she wants. This work has been very successful but she has done everything to avoid paying for it.

Exhibits in “CS1” show proof of the revamped ‘Celebrity fit club’ Dec 03 and ‘Strictly come dancing.’ now incorporating details from Charles’s documents.

97. If Charles behaved anything like she said and she highly irritated, why did she take Charles documents for consideration at all? And if Helen thought it to be “*woolly concept*” why didn’t Helen return the documents when ‘repeatedly’ told to? Why has the rights been sold illegally to all the networks and Channels Alexander, Manson, and Hannah do deals with? She lie’s over and over.

HERE IS PROOF

Exhibit “LP1” the email from Helen on 19 Nov 03

I quote Helen stated: “Hi Charles,

It was “good” to meet you too- and “don’t worry about being tired”, I wasn’t at my best either.” “Jim my colleague is away at the moment, but once he’s back will talk about your format.”

98. There is no substance or merit in any of Helen’s statement this a very cruel human being who lies, hurts and abuses without conscience. How can someone who she knew was exhausted and completely sleep deprived, she knew very well Charles was reluctant and very nervous about speaking during this meeting, so how could she have been virtually unstoppable?
99. Helen has deliberately distorted the truth. She’s created a ‘false image and impression of Charles to cover up her illegal practices. She’s been trying to prevent exposure about how they’ve all abused Charles. Helen ‘has exposed herself’ for the wicked corrupt person she is. Blatantly lying makes it worse. She can’t be trusted.

HELEN ALEXANDER'S DECEPTION TO THE COURT

Paragraph 22 of her statement

“ I do not recall Ms Seven orally presenting any format ideas other than for a daytime health show” Helen Alexander’s memory loss here is just another calculating and deliberate lie.

100. We saw and can recall reading about the plagiarised format in the Sunday supplement in January 04, which I gave to Charles. The same themed live political chat show concept disclosed at the meeting on 11.11.03 was now called “Don’t eat Talk” with Michael Portillo hosting the show for the BBC.

101. In the email to Helen on 14. Nov 03 “CS1” (which Alexander does submit paragraph 15) and to my emails sent 2,3, and 7 of December 03 and Charles’s letter 19 December 03 Shows the truth.

***In paragraph 15 of email to Helen on 14 No 03 Charles States:
“ Your colleague expressed that he liked the idea my “other format” “the themed chat show /question time concept”***

My email on 2 and 3 December 03

“Hi Helen,

Hope your well, thought I’d just touch base to get your feedback regarding our two TV show’s”

THIS WAS IGNORED

My email on 7 December 03

To Helen Alexander: Head of Factual/Ginger productions

And Jim Manson Executive producer SMG/ Ginger productions

Subject: “RETURN OF FORMATS.” Paragraph 3

Your executive producer Jim Manson also expressed to us on 11.11.03 during our train journey that he very much liked our themed live chat show/ question time concept. We must remind you that this format is also copyright protected.

We would appreciate a speedy return of our property.

THIS WAS IGNORED.

19. December 03, Letter to Helen Alexander and Jim Manson from Charles

Re: Theft and infringement of my copyrighted production documents paragraph 1

Charles states: “It was requested that I also put forward other TV formats and then I also disclosed my themed live chat show/question time concept which as you are aware your colleague Mr. Manson expressed much interest in.

Paragraph 9 Charles states: “If you do not” “immediately” cease the illegal selling and profiting from my material, and don’t immediately implement the correct legislative procedures expressed in all guidelines for all those working in British Broadcasting without exception. With the immediate return of my documents, we will not hesitate to report you to the police and bring proceedings against “you and your company”.

THIS TOO WAS IGNORED.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

102. Despite all this, Alexander nor Manson have “no” recollection’ of any other formats. They are blatant liars.

HELEN ALEXANDER’S STATUTORY NEGLIGENCE

In paragraph 25 of her first statement Helen say’s

“I have no recollection of reading the documents and strongly suspect I never did”?

103. Helen is the ‘head of dept’ yet doesn’t know what she does? Either she read the documents or she didn’t. How was she able to refer to budgets in her email on the 19. Nov 03 as this also ‘not’ discussed during our meeting.

104. **Paragraphs 25- 29** is trying to justify theft, statutory negligence, not following guidelines and criminal practices. Helen knew exactly what she was doing then, just like she ‘knows’ now.

105. **In paragraph’s 25-29** there isn’t an ounce of truth. In these lies she pretends she put Charles’s valuable documents into a ‘wire basket’ and didn’t touch them again? The truth is as I have already stated. These paragraphs are insulting and attempting evade fraud.

DELIBERATE NON IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES

106. Helen Alexander is the “Head of department” in a huge corporation, but yet does not follow broadcasting codes of practice or procedural guidelines of logging material? The theft was blatant. She is criminally liable, even if she lies to get out of it. It’s nobody else’s fault but hers. For someone who claims to be a ‘professional’ working in broadcasting in such a senior position for many years now, she knows the law. She didn’t log the documents into the system so that there would be no comebacks. Its no excuse to say “she did not log this work into the system because it didn’t come through the post” it doesn’t change the 1968, or 1978 “Theft Act”. Why does she think the law is different for her? It make’s no difference whether the work arrived by the post. Everybody knows executives always steal unsolicited scripts that arrive through the post anyway. Even Mr. Gossage stated this in his email to Charles on 13 June 03-exhibited in paragraph 3, so that doesn’t wash either.

107. Helen also say’s the documents were buried in papers etc. She’s a liar. She stole them for fraud. This statement is lies from start to finish. She sold what wasn’t hers to sell.

HELENS DISCRIMINATION

I refer to paragraph 16 of her Statement.

Here Alexander say’s:

“I generally try to be ‘encouraging’ to ‘new talent’ which is how I “perceived” Charles and Suzanne.”

108. This statement is ridiculous and offensive. Suzanne Hill’s was Mr. Hannah’s partner and much younger than Charles. Charles has been in the industry respected as a professional for over 20 years. Charles has run a home, a family, Charles has grown up children, one of which is closer to Suzanne’s age. This statement was to make herself look like a kind considerate person, when she behaves the exact opposite.

109. As a thief and fraud Helen is not qualified to give her opinions on anything. We went along to the meeting in “good faith” and she responded with treacherous abuse. This patronising, condescending statement says everything about her as a person. She is trying to make her innocent victim look like the one with the problem to cover what she has done up. She thought Charles was young and stupid so disrespected, and tried to take advantage of her. This statement seems to suggest Helen felt superior, and not Charles’s equal. She really believes stealing the documents was doing Charles some kind of favour. Stealing doesn’t make anyone superior, it’s a low and nasty thing to do. She’s the one with the problem, which she has spitefully inflicted onto Charles. Suzanne was Mr. Hannah’s partner. Suzanne and Charles don’t know each other, and are not even in the same category. Suzanne posed as a Clarion, NTL representative and worked with Hannah for over 2 years proof is shown in the contract Suzanne signed. Neither Charles nor myself would ever be closely associated with a sinister character like Mr. Hannah in a million years. We’ve come to conclusion that Helen must have been stealing and getting away with it for years. Because of the way she looks, people probably don’t suspect she could do all the cruel criminal things she does. She seems to think it will never catch up with her, and is obviously not concerned about the damage and pain she’s causing. It looks all very normal to her. That’s why it’s got this far.

110. **Paragraph 30 and onwards:** This is all lies so not worth commenting on anymore.

WITNESS STATEMENT OF JAMES MANSON

In paragraph 5 he states:

“ I have absolutely no hesitation in stating that in my opinion she (Helen Alexander) always follows the highest standards of professionalism.

111. Mr. Manson considers someone who steals, lies, abuses, and exploits people’s rights, who doesn’t follow guide lines or respect law, does not acknowledge copyright legislation or any other legislation lies to the courts, and makes programs on national television about conning people and getting away with it as being the highest standard of professionalism? We have no doubt why. Then he mentions having integrity? It’s horrible.

CONTRACT AND MEETING WITH TAMSIN ALLEN

Exhibit in “LP1” Contract to Miss Allen 19 Feb 04

112. Since witnessing what happened to Charles’s documents, I have seen how the events have escalated into this nightmarish situation. I was suppose to attend the meeting with Ms. Allen together with Charles, that’s why my name is on the agreement Ms. Allen signed. I didn’t make the meeting but saw Charles later that day to find out how it went. Charles left the disk with Ms. Allen. There is no doubt about this. Charles and Christine’s evidence speaks for itself and shows what the truth is. Helen had already stolen from Charles so she also took advantage. Despite signing an agreement.

MY KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT “THE WALK” SCRIPT WAS BASED

113. When Tamsin stole the disk, Charles and myself did an online search around April 04 that’s when we saw her manuscript had been sold on and converted to create a new literary competition for BBC Scotland. It was blatant. It actually featured different stories plagiarised from the chapters. Famous authors were competing to redraft it. Even the title was blatant. They wanted Charles to know they had done it.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

They were flaunting it because they think they can do what ever they want to people. By May 04 this was everywhere. On TV, Radio, Billboards Taxi cabs. Campaigns sprung up all over the world. Charles and others contacted the BBC and the agents of the Authors, but got the same treatment we got when Helen stole the documents. The shoe shop I knew well, but after calls about the script were made Pippins shoe shop was closed down around April or May 04 time. It had been there for years and was definitely very popular in the area. It was spooky they way it just closed down.

WITNESS STATEMENT OF TAMSIN ALLEN

114. I've seen Ms. Allen's statement and you can see it just does not relate to truth or any facts. She even changed the date and times of when the meeting took place, proof is in the contract she signed. Charles and her friend Christine's exhibits and statements will further prove the truth.

WITNESS STATEMENT OF DEREK ROSEN BLATT

115. No one knows John Bennett so why has he written Mr. Rosenblatts statement? Charles wrote to Rosenblatt to ask why her master document's details were also advertised after giving them to him. She never ever got any direct answers then either. I saw when straight afterwards this work was also being advertised on TV broadcast back to back on every channel.

FORMATS THAT EMERGED AFTER DEREK WAS GIVEN DOC'S

116. *You are what you eat, "10 years younger" for Channel 4* April 04 *"Fit Street" Channel 4 August 04, Fat Nation BBC1 Sept 04, Cosmetic Surgery live Channel 5 Sept 04. All seen in Charles's statement* After all this the harassment definitely became dangerous.

WITNESS STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER VAUGHAN

117. Charles met Mr. Vaughan in the High Court around March 04, the situation had become desperate. When he learned about the case he offered to help and got a barrister Proof in CS1. He was suppose to be finding out what happened to stolen manuscript after Tamsin sold it. He was suppose to have connections to the BBC's Stuart Murphy and said he was going help to stop the abuse. Help was urgently needed and he was offering, so it was welcomed. They made an agreement, which can be heard on tape. It's no point reading his statement either because none of what he say's is true. Unfortunately Mr. Vaughan sold the rights to "The Walk" movie to ITV (connected to Helen) without getting authorisation or consent from Charles or Christine. This happened in May 04, this was when things became extreme. This is when Charles started having bailiff's turn up threatening her on a daily basis for council Tax debts I saw evidence to prove that she didn't owe. I've read Mr. Vaughan's denials claiming this being all lies and that he hadn't been entrusted with any information about the movie. He try's to make out he was never told anything about it. But Charles has two separate authentic recordings with Mr. Vaughan, and he is the one lying. He made an agreement with Charles and was definitely was discussing selling the movie rights with Charles. The Walk movie was sold to ITV without Charles, if he didn't sell it why is he lying? He has tried to twist what really happened in his statement.

APPENDIX F – LISA PAHNE STATEMENT

MERITS OF THIS CASE

118. We all believe these defendants have behaved in ways animals would be ashamed of. With the profits secured (one format can generate as much as 40 million in revenue) Charles should have been respected and paid. It is only right that the court now orders these defendants to pay for all costs, loss's and damages and ensures that these defendants never get the opportunity to abuse or de-fraud anyone else like this again.

Witness statement of Truth of:

Lisa Pahne

I know and believe that the facts in this witness statement are completely true

Signed:



Dated:

26/12/04