IN THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE **A3/2005/2301**

COURT OF APPEAL (CIVIL DIVISION)

ON APPEAL FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BLACKBURNE

Claim No: HC0402565

BETWEEN:

CHARLES SEVEN *Appellant/Claimant*

-vs-

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)

Respondents/Defendants

SECOND
"ADDITIONAL" SKELETON ARGUMENT
OF THE APPELLANT

Introduction

1. This second additional skeleton argument is in support of the previous skeleton arguments for the permission to appeal hearing with the appeal bundle marked as (A). In response to the skeleton arguments forwarded by Mr. Brian Nicholson counsel for the 1st, 2nd 5th 6th, 7th ,8th and 9th respondents. As I have only received Mr. Nicholson's argument today Friday 28th April 2006 (at the last minute) and

368

the adjourned hearing is listed for the 2nd May 2006, the day after 1st May 2006 a bank holiday, I have not been given much time to respond, but I draft this second additional argument in response to the respondents, in the hope that it will still be forwarded to the 2 Lord Justices on the morning of our hearing 2nd May 2006.

The "Application" issues in relation to my request for permission to appeal

2. As the hearing was adjourned by his Lord Justice Chadwick specifically to examine what actually occurred when my representatives Mr. Nicholas and Miss Letang sought to file an application on my behalf on 12th August 2005, I will take this opportunity to examine what has occurred when I have sought to file applications in general.

3. As referred to in paragraphs (4) and (45) of my letter to his Lordship Justice Chadwick dated 4th April 2006, since lodging my claim on 5th August 2004 there has been many errors and mistakes when I have sought to file applications. They have so far either been rejected with staff refusing to stamp them, and in one instance, the forms we filed were lost altogether (on purpose). Or applications are not recorded or wrongly recorded.

4. We know and respect that court staff work very hard handling large volume of cases on a daily basis, but when applications filed to be issued are rejected, lost, wrongly recorded or not recorded, as has happened on this occasion, *we* are the ones penalised. As these problems have occurred with almost every application filed to date, it's very important that we take a closer inspection of this situation.

The First experience of problems filing and issuing an application for the case.

5. As has already been documented in Mr. Roni Nicholas's "first" witness statement dated 16th December 2004, please refer to the exhibits for proof itemised as **"Exhibit 5 "RN1" located pages 166-177"** in claimant witness **"Bundle (F)".** These provide proof that the 12th August 2005 was actually not the first experience of attempting to file and have an Application stamped and issued but it being totally rejected. Court will see on this particular occasion, a member of staff in the Thomas Moore issuing office subsequently lost the 2 copies of these application forms that were filed.

Details

6. After lodging the claim form on 5th August 2004 all defendants were given until the 28th August 2004 to acknowledge service of the claim and respond accordingly. In this evidence court will see that right up until the 23rd of September 2004 I had regularly visited the Thomas Moore issuing office in Chancery Division accompanied by Mr. Nicholas and others to search the file to obtain any responses to the claim. This was always assisted by staff who also checked computer records for me, and was usually very helpful.

7. At the time Richard Hannah defendant (3) had served a late out of time response and "NTL" had not acknowledged the claim or served any response at all. So as stated on claim response form, "where defendants fail to acknowledge service of the claim within the specified appointed time given by the court, the claimant can apply to enter a default judgement." See from the evidence I had obtained the forms, filled them in, then requested that they be stamped, filed and served on these particular respondents. But a young lady working as staff refused to stamp or file them and had an attitude towards us. When we asked why she wouldn't do it, she said in no uncertain terms that she didn't have to do it and was not going to do it. This did not seem like procedure, but I handed in the 2 applications forms to her anyway and kept a set for my own record. She said she would stamp them later and hand them into the relevant department. Mr. Nicholas and I asked when we would hear an outcome, she said I would receive a letter from the court about it.

8. However, when we next returned to this office and asked why we hadn't heard anything about these applications, she said she hadn't handed the forms to the department because she had lost them. But the expression on her face showed she was lying. She deliberately threw my forms away. Then when we searched the file there was suddenly a statement from "NTL" with a date saying it was served on 15th September 2004. It was impossible for this date to be genuine because as you can see from this evidence, we had previously searched the file and computers with staff on 23rd and also the 24th September 2004 and there was absolutely nothing at all from NTL. They definitely did not acknowledged service of the claim at all.

9. This was the "first" experience of not having an application stamped, appropriately filed and then finding out later that it had been lost on purpose. Evidently to prevent "NTL" being served with a default judgement to evade paying the liabilities for breach of contract in tort and copyright theft. Had this application been stamped and filed and appropriately then served for failure to acknowledge claim a default judgement would have been entered against them in September 2004 "two years ago". Instead they got away without any penalties whatsoever, whilst continuing to exploit the courts, others and myself with arrogant defiance. In misguided belief that they don't have to respect the rules of law "applicable to everyone" living and doing business in the UK.

10. In respect of law, under **"The contempt of court Act 1981"**. "The strict liability rule" provides that: "Conduct may be treated as a contempt of court as tending to *interfere* with the course of justice", in particular legal proceedings regardless of the intent to do so. And under the **"Theft Act 1978 section 2" subsections (1)(2) (a) " Evasion of liability by deception" provides.** Where persons by *any* deception dishonestly secures the remission of the whole part of any existing liability to make a payment, whether his own liability or another's he shall be guilty of an offence in criminal law.

Consequences of my first application not being stamped and intentionally lost

11. Due to this fraudulently served statement, the *legitimate* application I made for "default Judgement" was never filed or acknowledged by the court. Despite "NTL" being entirely guilty, owing me vast amounts of money for the thefts, infringements of my documents and breaches of the signed contracts located in **"Bundle (C)"**. The exhibit shows this was an enforceable contract.

12. Had CPR rules been acknowledged and appropriately applied (to the letter) on that occasion. (when civil procedure was being blatantly abused) unarguably "Default Judgement" would have been entered and awarded in my favour in September 2004. However, two years on and I am *still* having to deal with these same shenanigans, and am *still* the only person in reality that "CPR" has actually applied to during the course of these proceedings! And the only person repeatedly penalised and being deprived of my property, copyrights, human rights, and civil

liberties and consistently abused. Evidently there is one rule for the respondents and another for me. I am being set up for a fall and made to take the rap. Well let it known "I will not be the sacrificial lamb to save those clearly categorised and defined "by law" as exceptionally ruthless dangerous criminals.

13. Unarguably, what happened on that previous occasion amounted to an **"abuse of due process"** and has **"obstructed just disposal of proceedings". CPR, r 3.4 (2)(b)** gives court the power to "strike statements of case" of those fraudulently seeking to exploit the justice system and misuse it's procedure, because it is bringing the administration of justice under disrepute among right thinking people.

How this abuse and obstruction further escalated

14. In November 2004, NTL then instructed solicitors firm Charles Russell to apply to strike out the claim. After **(a) never ever actually acknowledging service or responding to the claim.** (Remember the courts deadline to do it was "28th August 2004") (b) Then presenting a backdated statement with 15th September 2004, when this was delivered to the court right at the end of September 2004. (Note-whilst secretly having me bullied and terrorised to death) However, despite these facts evidently their "strike out application" was still accepted and filed by court staff.

15. "NTL" then sent me a letter informing of their intention. Of course with the defiant pretence of not having anything to with Richard Hannah or Clarion defendant (3) or involvement in the thefts or fraud with my intellectual property. Despite the fact that we were lured to "NTL" facilities on 11th November 2003 under by false pretences. Proof of our being lured by deception, contracts signed and documents stolen (contained in bundle (C)) "CS1" and also bundle (F) in exhibits marked as **"LP1" pages 32- 59**. In this evidence you will also see the false picture Mr. Hannah sent as himself. Proof of "NTL" being publicly known and boycotted for promoting copyright infringement and providing tools to anonymously hack into computers to do it **"AL1" pages 85-88** and the list of times they have been reported for advocating crime is in "CS1" (C)

16. Exhibit in "RN1" page 162 is a copy of NTL's letter me whilst I was being brutally terrorised to the brink of death, headed by the disturbing and sinister reference **"DE/AD"/017739/00178".** But the reference that "NTL's" solicitor provided to "the courts offices" and "all other respondents solicitors", court will see is entirely different and states **"DE/JAM/"** whilst the latter numbered section of the reference remains **"/017739/00178"** exactly the same as mine. That reference can be seen on the back page of Blackburne J's Order 13th October 2005 for an example located bundle (A) on page 19. Therefore there is no question that this **"DE/AD"** section of the reference was directed at and intentioned only for me.

17. Let's take a second or two to think about why out of all the billions of words available in the English language, these respondents selected the word **"DEAD"** specifically for me. We all know what dead means. So lets combine this with the numerous death threats I was receiving over the phone and via sinister notes put through my door about murder, and fake bailiffs threatening violence etc. (In answer to Mr. Nicholson, you will see proof of these respondents corporate links to each other and Westminster in the ITV corporate structure evidence provided in Bundle (C)). Then view this dead reference sent, in light of Mr. Hannah's (defendant (3)) statement in his email on 31st October 2003 (for convenience find it on **page 159 Exhibit 1 "RN1"**) entitled subject **"On my command unleash sales Hell"** to his "NTL" colleagues Tony Orwin, and Suzanne Hills. Re. our bringing my documents to the supposed business meeting with him and Helen Alexander at NTL's facilities on 11th November 2003. Then view Richards Hannah's statement about murder and vengeance at "this" proposed meeting or the next.

18. Now all normal intelligent people who have read these exhibits and witnessed or experienced these events clearly see these statements for what they are. In short very very evil. Normal people don't state or actually seek to carry out doing these things. Only people with something gravely wrong with them set out to con someone's valuable intellectual property, then terrorise by making repeated death threats. These amounts to extremely serious offences in respect of law, and the perpetrators of such by definition are viewed as extremely evil dangerous highly

volatile people with psychopathic tendencies. The evidence shows they not only conspired to de-fraud and racketeer with my property, but also to murder.

19. There is no argument that can ever excuse, defend or cover up what facts and the evidence clearly spells out here. The intentions and motives from the outset of our meeting these respondents were evil beyond belief. Specifically sending me **"DEAD"** as a reference typifies the type of abuse that I have been bombarded with ever since our meeting them. Thus demonstrates and proves beyond any doubt, not only that the respondents have targeted and directed very evil and dangerous threats at me, but also that these threats were intended to wound with "malice a fore thought." These are mature individuals who knew exactly what they were doing and revelled in it. They have plotted, schemed and connived the most vicious and malicious assault against me from the beginning. Designed to instil fear, and for well over two years now, continuously make others and me fear for my life, and "believe" I was going to murdered. They have done everything in their power to induce psychological and emotional terror, trauma to distress and torture. Specifically to obstruct exposure of the racketeering and court action against this wrongdoing. You will see from all witness's accounts and that of myself that this was perceived exactly as it was intended. Consequently, landing me in hospital on 8th December 2004 and throughout 2005 as this continued to escalate.

20. In respect of law doing this is a criminal offence under **"Offences against the person Act 1861"** as **"threats to kill"** and **"wounding with intent"**. Refer to particulars of claim or my first witness statement dated 11th January 2005.

The Strike out applications

21. Having absolutely no defence or prospect of success after doing all they have done, seeing that I had applied for Default Judgement against respondents (3) and (4), in October 2004, all other respondents rushed to strike out the claim to block my ability to file another application for Default Judgement. (Initially all respondents said they were going to defend the claim and Derek Rosenblatt emphasised doing it strenuously) Knowing they were all thoroughly guilty and going to be found out, they sought the tactic of trying to "striking out" my claim

entirely on hoax and pretence. Hoping that their use of more and more strenuous sinister brutal "covert" methods would obstruct and destroy any possible chance of the evidence being lodged at court.

When we first forwarded the bundles of evidence for court

22. In answer to paragraphs 20 and 23 of the respondents counsel Mr. Nicholson's nonsense argument regarding not delivering evidence etc. Bluff, Bluff, By looking in Bundle (A) at pages 96 onwards that well before I was taken into St Mary's hospital W2, (within the courts designated time frame). We had instructed counsel on 1st October 2004. Specifically, to ensure the case was dealt with expeditiously. This was hell on earth worst than any nightmare and I wanted it over as quickly as possible. So we paid this barrister what he asked in order to deliver the case and bundles to court. And begged him to stop the harassment, even my neighbours were sick of it so contacted him to do something. But he too began making up excuses to get out of not doing any of the things we all signed the contractual agreements to do. I was very very ill by this stage and had lost six stones in weight going from a full size 12 to a size 6 in a very short period. The blackouts were frequent, I was weak and in and out of consciousness, but very anxious about the case being heard.

23. The court will see from the six bundles themselves that a great deal of time, expense and many sleepless nights went into gathering the evidence to mount proceedings. So that by the grace of God the truth would finally be told. Excuse my frankness, but only an absolute moron would go such lengths then deliberately not bother to hand our evidence into the court. In bundle (A) pages 96 onwards and in "RN1" the "proof" that on the 27th October 2004 we gave the bundles to direct access barrister Kelvin Jones which he signed for receipt of. (He crossed out the sections only relating to confidentiality) But at the time of our dealings with him due to the ferocity of the harassment my health was rapidly declining. By November 2004 I felt physically, mentally, and emotionally exhausted and was taken to hospital by December 2004 and told I was in a critical way and needed urgent treatment. My Doctor's sent letters regarding all this to both the courts and respondents solicitors. In reality they all already knew about my condition because they were the ones responsible strenuously trying to induce and inflict the

damage. They are also kept fully informed by the surveillance and monitoring of my every move.

24. These letters are all in Bundle (A) for Mr. Nicholson to ignore the facts when this evidence is clearly available for all to see, shows he's struggling and really clutching at straws. And in effect wasting court time. Our counsel was the sole reason the evidence didn't get to court. He had from October 2004 until December 2004 to deliver our cases evidence to the court and been paid to do it. As a direct access barrister he was suppose to give advice help draft letters, arguments etc. But he did nothing. My relative Mr. Nicholas and others ended up having to do everything we paid and instructed this counsel to do. The bundles were in the counsels chambers for months, and he tried to cover up the fact that he did nothing for us, probably because he had been influenced not to, by writing a letter nearing the hearing date pretending he hadn't been given any evidence. This was such treachery that we sacked him and reported him to the bar council. As seen from the evidence. He had been given the whole case up until that point. All the relevant documents contracts, proof of the thefts and infringement of my work etc, to prove that we definitely had a valid case. I did what was required even under the given circumstances and once again was sold down the river to make it look as if I hadn't followed procedure. He was paid and had every opportunity to do it. especially as his Chambers was directly across the road from the courts. I was very very ill and relying on him.

25. You will even see the photographic proof in bundle (A) of exactly what he was provided with. He was clearly was adversely influenced to conceal our evidence and cheat on us too. To make it look as if there was no evidence or witnesses. This has been a typical tactic used in attempts to conceal this case with all people we have gone to. As all this has evolved out of conspiracy to de-fraud and corruption, deceit and betrayal comes part and parcel. These people smile in your face as they cheat you behind your back. The most insulting thing is being treated like an idiot who doesn't know their legal rights.

The problems with Application on 12th August 2005

26. The next time we experienced problems with filing a application as the court is now aware is the one we sought to file on 12th August 2005. What happened then was much like the first time it happened. First the woman Amanda rejected us from doing it implying she was going to make sure we couldn't do it. After that another staff refused to take any money or stamp anything. Instead saying Mr. Nicholas and Miss Letang had to go before a Judge. Implying the application had to be approved by a Judge first.

27. In answer to Mr. Nicholson argument. Remember we sought to do this application strictly in relation to the Order by Pumfrey J. so there can be no question that didn't intend fulfil the Order. That's why the Order was shown and presented to staff. Our intention was always clear as can be seen from the letters written and exhibits now also forwarded. If staff had stamped and filed the application accordingly as had been requested we would not be in the court of appeal now. All we had to do was file the application before 4 o'clock on or before the 12th August 2005. And has also been pointed out by Chadwick L.J in the Judgement of 23rd February 2006, CPR 23.5 provides "where an application must be made within a specified time, it is so made if the application notice is received by the court within that time". It was received by staff within the designated time and I also further sent it on to the respondents as proof that the application was made. The fact is there is proof of a bank statements from the court's bank, a court letter from Jennifer Foley, and a court transcript. All prove without doubt that we sought to file the required application. It is really nit picking and against CPR, rule 1 the Overriding Objectives to being searching for flaws when the intention of what we sought do is abundantly clear.

28. The surrounding issues of why I couldn't do my own application should not be ignored either. It must be brought into the equation to really examine where the fault lies. I couldn't leave my home because the respondents (nobody else) kept letting know they wanted me dead. This is a fact has already been established herein. I have seen the same white transit surveillance van that was watching my home outside the Royal Courts. Photos are in Appeal Bundle (A) so there is not a shadow of doubt who was hemming me in. So please put this in context. Just for a

second just consider how traumatic this was. Having your home surrounded, your every move being watched by the people who keep giving you death threats. This was also during the London bombings. In bundle (D) notice that I also had a daily bombardment of men threatening to do me harm via violence using fake council Tax debts as a cover for 12 months non stop who had intentionally sent a fake debt with 7/7 date on it knowing I was trapped inside. Now you place most ordinary people in this exact situation and they wouldn't leave there home either. The police and many other organisations were contacted for help throughout this ordeal. The only means of communication was by letter because the people terrorising me wanting to me believe to they I was going to be killed was actually monitoring and blocking whoever I contacted over the phone for help. This was like being imprisoned in your own home. Secrecy was required to get myself out of it.

29. I had an important application to make but the very people I am suing are hemming me in. Trying to make it look like there was no evidence and I was wasting everyone's time, incompetent not following procedural rules etc. Basically setting me up for a fall. Now lets be realistic. How likely is it that I'm going to really be able to discuss CPR, with the very people psychologically terrorising and threatening to murder me? Not a hope in hell. They have one personality on paper and another behind the mask. However, I on the other hand am required by CPR to treat the very people terrorising me Civilly? Remember they had even given someone my name Charlie 7 to trade with. **Pages 211-215 (D)** notice the album was blatantly called "The not so tragic cover up!" There is nothing Civilised about this situation.

30. I desperately wanted get to the court, that's why I wrote to inform the doctors who knew me well enough to know I was genuine. If I said I was in danger they knew I was saying it because I was actually in danger! I hoped the Doctor alerting the court would get help but it didn't.
31. I desperately wanted to file my own application but because of the obstruction I couldn't. After I was told about my medical records being stolen and respondent's links I felt traumatised. So Anita and Roni stepped in as already explained in their statements. However, somehow I have been penalised for not following CPR?

32. It was not a case of not honouring a court order, because the evidence shows clearly that my representatives went to court within the specified time, with order in hand which in itself was self-explanatory. So there is no question of them seeking to do otherwise that day. After explaining the circumstances to staff on the phone that morning why I couldn't do the application myself, they rightly said to see the Judge about what was going on. We had hoped that something would be done to address the whole situation. That's why I requested restraining orders in my letter.

33. The respondents created a situation deliberately to restrict me from CPR, but have used cruel torturous means to wriggle out of having to follow civil procedure themselves. Something is clearly wrong here. The fact is had they not obstructed my right to due process in the first place, I would have been able to file the application myself with no one else having to do so.

Third time there was a problem with my application

34. The third time a serious mistake was made, was when my case was listed for hearing without my permission to rely on further evidence being listed too.

Fourth time there was a problem with my application

35. The fourth time (as referred to in letter to Chadwick L.J 4th April 2006) was when I was told by staff name Robin, that I was not allowed to have my application for injunction 28th February 2006 dealt with straight away as a penalty for my adjourning the hearing on the 23rd February 2006. This time someone had put entirely false information onto the court computer. Resulting in my receiving further penalties. When I first asked for the computer to corrected it was refused. However, staff member Andre kindly said I was entitled to have the computer information corrected if what was stated wasn't true. I was told to put my request in writing, which I did.

The "Fifth" time there was a problem filing my application

36. The Fifth time a problem occurred with filing my application was when I received the record of an old existing application already issued on 18th October 2005 had been re- entered and recorded again instead of the one I had actually filed on 28th

February 2006 for injunctions. My application for injunctions didn't get recorded at all. Despite this time the application being stamped and filed. It had to be re-entered again on the 9th March 2006.

The "Six" time there was a problem filing my application

37. The Six time was when I filed an application for abuse of process but it was rejected altogether saying I was not entitled.

38. These mistakes and errors all amount to serious procedural irregularities. Because each mistake has resulted in penalties and unjust decisions. Had none of these irregularities occurred judgement would have already been passed in my favour. Because the defendants never had any defence or grounds to strike out in the first place. And clearly intend to keep up this abuse for as long as the court permits.

Problems receiving my letters from the court

39. On a few occasions there has also been problems receiving my court letters. It appears my court letters are being diverted to a third party (maybe to be read) before they actually get to me. An example of this is when the case manager Mrs. Ahmed had sent me a letter about checking the bundles on the 3rd April 2006, and I had up until the 7th April 2006 to check the bundles over. But someone from "Revenue Protection" held the letter first before it getting to me? They stamped it on the 10th April 2006, then finally forwarded on to me on the 12th April 2006 after the deadline date stated on the letter. I have know idea who "revenue protection are" but they withheld my private letter from the court. Fortunately Mrs. Ahmed still allowed me to check the bundles after the Easter holidays. I am concerned that revenue protection withholding important letters from the court in the future.

Record of all my Ex-Parte applications

40. **First Ex-parte** application: I think was on the 6th or 7th August 2004 was told to see the Judge when I issued the claim form.
41. **Second Ex-parte** application: Also in August 2004 before Master Mark re. I applied for a "Specified" claim Master Mark said it was to be treated as "Unspecified" because of the nature of the case.

42. **Third Ex-parte** application: was before Master Bowles September 2004, about my wanting to instruct counsel queries about CPR
43. **Fourth Ex-parte** application: before Master Bowles October 2004 about harassment and death threats wanting something done about it
44. **Fifth Ex-parte** application: before Cox J September 2005 for directions about what was going on with my case.

45. These applications were only relevant to be heard "without notice." In entirety Mr. Nicholson's argument amounts to nothing more than a gross waste of court time. He is trying to defend the indefensible. Looking for loopholes and get out clauses where there are none. Why these solicitors have encouraged this charade to be frank is a disgrace. He mentioned offering me legal advice. How can he legally advise me when he can't correctly legally advise his guilty clients? What kind of moron does he think he's dealing with? He is being paid to get rid of my case, but claims he also wants to help "win" my case without payments? This barrister has presented nothing but nonsense and presented it as a skeleton argument. He has no argument to argue. He defends the wrong against the right, protects and defends the evil against the wronged. With such obviously opposing values what can he possibly advice me on? According to his statement on paragraph (c), where he states "Even if the defendants had stolen the claimants works" as if theft is not an offence. What planet is he living on? What kind of law is he practising?

46. Does he not know the "law of theft"? Or that theft is a **"criminal offence"** punishable by a custodial prison sentence? Then he hypothetically implies because his client flagrantly infringed the stolen property to such an extent that they are now diffused throughout media, this makes the offence itself unworthy of punishment?. In other words, the worst the crime the more pointless or hopeless it is to do anything about it. This illustrates my point about very bad legal advice is obviously being given here.

47. I may not have done "the bar", but I've read enough legal books to know this is legally rubbish. Amounting to exploitation of the courts system. As is evident the case presents a range of offences and there are wide of range legal remedies applicable deal effectively with each and everyone of them. However, grossly his

clients have infringed the copyrights and have spread the corruption in attempts to disguise it. I devised and created the concept so know exactly how to identify what re-productions belong to me. So the plan of trying to deliberately disperse my work everywhere to lose the trail didn't work. The "paper trail" and "causal links" proving when each of the documents and scripts were stolen/plagiarised and each infringed reproduction was immediately sold remains exactly the same. So there's no loop hole in that argument either I'm afraid!

48. I was not served the respondents adjournment bundle, but the civil registry staff member named Sally kindly copied the 2 bundles for me on the 24th April 2006. He refers to a letter apparently sent to me on 6th February 2006 contained within Tab 9 but I have no recollection of ever receiving this letter. And I can't find it, in the bundle I have been copied. But in relation to this I provided a further statement 19th September 2005 to support all my appeal applications. So don't know what he's talking about here. It appears that either Mr. Nicholson is deliberately choosing not to actually read or acknowledge the evidence, or believes organised crime can be easily brushed aside with pretence.

Sworn bundles and Affidavit

49. Please note the "six" bundles were further sworn as exhibits together with my affidavit dated 22nd February 2006 as "evidence in support" required by CPR, r25.3(2). The sworn affidavit is to further support the legitimacy of the overall claim and applications for interim remedies.

Interim Injunctions

50. These are requested on the grounds stated in my letter 4th April 2006 Overriding objectives must be considered in relation to this. Extension of time is as stated in last addition argument 22nd February 2006

51. The appeal bundle (A) shows exactly who has been hacking into, monitoring and bugging my computer. NTL and Virgin names are crystal clear to see. And in bundle "CS1" (D). You will also find the proof of my name and identity also being stolen as also witness Christine Agnews re The script refer to bundle (E). "CS1" (D) in addition the manuscript and proof that Tamsin Allen, and

Christopher Vaughan involvement in the treachery. Derek Rosenblatt contract trying to make me sign to irrevocably give up any settlement monies, before his trading on my master documents himself. See my application for Trade Mark in bundle (C) Bundle (E) will show that they also sold my friends story-using giving here name to the actress.

52. We request "Restraining orders" on any further harassment trading our identity details.

Breached Confidentiality and contracts

53. There is no denying that Christopher Gossage took me on as a client protect to my confidential intellectual property. My documents devised concept, was a valuable trade secret with lucrative market value. These documents were protected under the equitable doctrine of confidential information.

54. In the case Dowson V Mason (1986) the court of appeal considered damages for breach of confidence. The court view then was that the value of such information could be on the basis of a presumed market value of a "willing seller." " or buyers" As seen in exhibits bundles (C)(D)there were many purchasers world wide.

The indisputable facts

55. Remember <u>none</u> of the re-productions or my concepts existed in media beforehand there was absolutely nothing like it. That's why the concept has been such a success. It was due to the freshness and originality of my concept. As has been stated in the new licensing bill and other press articles.

56. In the case mentioned in my letter 4th April 2006, ***R-v-Willets (1906)*** it was held that if two or more persons combined together to deliberately infringe copyright for sale (this case related to printed music) at the expense of the copyright owner. This would be held to be a conspiracy to deprive the owner of copyright and is punishable as a criminal conspiracy. Penalties apply in both civil and criminal terms as expressed in **ss.107-10 CDPA 1988** and fraudulent reception **s.297. "Thou shall not steal"** was quoted in Macmillan and co ltd VK and J cooper

61. **Section 18 CDPA 1988** is breached by the issuing of copies to the public. **Sections. 175 (1)** this is defined as publication of literary,, dramatic or artistic works to the public

62. **Section 16.** gives me alone sole exclusive rights to:

(A) Copy the work (B) Issue copies of my work to the public (C) Perform or show or play my work in public (D) Broadcast my work or include it on cable programs (E) Make any adaptations of my material.

63. **Section 16 (2)** states doing *any* of these acts without gaining my authority as the author is an blatant infringement of copyright. Whether it be in relation to the work as a whole or substantial parts of it. Directly or indirectly (s.16 (3)(a)(b)

64. **Section 16. CDPA 1988** makes it a "Strict liability" for breaches

65. **Section 17.** provides firm "restrictions" allowing "Only" me as the author the right to grant permission of the sale of the varying rights to different parties. The respondents entered into a ferocious bidding war licensing these rights.

66. In the case ***Nicholas advanced vehicle systems v Rees Oliver (1979) Templeman J***, in awarding additional damages, he regarded the condition satisfied where the defendants had received benefits and inflicted humiliation and loss. (The case was said to involve copyright drawings in formula one racing cars) Defendants in this case had also been particularly deceitful and treacherous.

My sole exclusive rights as the creative devisor and author illegally deprived

(a) I should have been consulted in relation to titles, covers designs, and other aspects of production

(b) There have been provisions for me to proofs make corrections

(c) There should have been provisions for quotation fees

(d) provisions for me to inspect company accounts relating to my work

(E) Review dates

(F) My paternity rights

(G) Provision of copyright notice and prominent credit on screen or title page of any publications with similar provision in and sub license

(H) I have second serial rights

(I) Miscellaneous rights i.e.

(J) Condensation rights for books/magazines

(K) Strip cartoon rights

(L) One-shot periodical rights

(M) Merchandising rights

(N) Large print rights

(O) Quotation rights

(P) Online publishing rights

(Q) First serial rights

(R) First British serial rights

(S) First us serial rights

(T) First Australian rights

(U) Electronic rights

(W) Us and translation rights

(Y) Rights to royalties from sublicensed versions of my work

(Z) Television, radio, film and dramatic rights

(A) Public lending rights

67. Needless to say, none of these rights have been honoured and paid for. I request court of Appeal use of powers under **CPR, 52,10(1)(2)** refer case for determination as stated in Additional Skeleton Argument 21st February 2006 and complete "forfeiture" of *all* infringing copies/conversions/reproductions of the "three" misappropriated "Health Beauty and Fitness" Multimedia documents and manuscript "The Walk". (Exhibited in Bundles (C) and (D)). A chronology of the re-productions conversions also listed my affidavit dated 22nd February 2006.

Charles Seven

28th April 2006

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE
COURT OF APPEAL (CIVIL DIVISION)
ON APPEAL FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BLACKBURNE

A3/2005/2301

Claim No: HC0402565

BETWEEN:

CHARLES SEVEN — *Appellant/Claimant*

-vs-

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)

Respondents/Defendants

ADDITIONAL SKELETON ARGUMENT OF THE APPELLANT

Introduction

1. This additional skeleton argument is in support of the original skeleton argument attached to appellant's notice in the appeal bundle marked as (A). At the oral hearing we seek permission to (a) "set aside" the order of the lower court by "Blackburne J' dated 12 August 2005 (Entered on 13 October 2005) (b) to present crucial fresh evidence previously obstructed. And (C) a extension of time in

457

respect of the delay that occurred between the date the application was made before Blackburne J 12th August 2005 and date "the order" was finally drafted and entered 13th October 2005. As the delay was purely administrational and not of my making, I seek permission not let this delay affect the time the appellants notice was served.

The Respondents and the hearing

2. Respondents 3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10 did not formally respond or acknowledge service of the appellant's notice, although I am aware there has since been later communication with the civil registry's case management lawyer Mr. Hendy. No respondents filed or served respondents notices on receipt of the appellants notice, or expressed a wish to be present at oral hearing or otherwise on receipt in October 2005, therefore I request that the court prevent them trying to "bully" their way into the permission to appeal hearing. The 3rd respondent's served appellant's notice was "returned" to the civil registry by Royal Mail because the address has since changed. This respondent is still party to the claim but has made no attempt to provide the courts with a forwarding address for service. So besides the other pressing issues I would also like to address this at the oral hearing.

The representatives who made my application on 12 August 2005

3. For clarification, I Charles Seven am the Claimant, however I am not the only person who has been severely effected by the respondents criminal exploits, harassment and abuse. Which, can be seen by the 14 other witness testimonies and exhibits produced for evidence in Folder bundles (E) and (F).

4. My relative Mr. Nicholas and Ms. Anita Letang made my application on the 12 August 05 because of the serious threats made against my life. They have both also been very extremely disturbed by the distressing events arising from this case. As they made my application before Blackburne J on my behalf, I made an application to allow them the address the courts at the hearing on the 11th January 2006 and by way of letters on 17th and 29th of January 2006 to the civil registry. Copies should have been forwarded for the hearing; however, I shall submit them again just in case they have not.

5. It is most important that Mr. Nicholas and Ms. Letang be given the opportunity to address the courts to explain the events before, during and after the application.

Reasons for granting the permission to appeal

6. CPR provides that permission to appeal will be granted where:

(a) The appeal appears to have real prospect of success

(b) There are compelling reasons why the appeal should be heard

7. Examination of the facts shows clearly that this case indisputably fulfils CPR's criteria for granting the appeal. Because as there has been a series of mistakes, errors and irregularities giving rise to compelling grounds and reasons why the appeal must be granted. I have a strong meritorious case which would have succeeded had it not been wrongly dismissed on account of a mistake.

8. The respondent's have committed extremely serious barbaric crimes, which remain unresolved. Given the large volume of evidence produced establishing the facts, there is absolutely no question regarding the case's authenticity and merits. Or question re; the respondent's guilt, liability and reprehensible conduct. This was a blatant, malicious very calculated and organised crime with no excuse or defence. These offences have had devastating far-reaching consequences, and caused serious damage needing immediate redress. The use of perjury and foul play was a total abuse of due process wasting court time and costs.

9. Despite the extensive evidence this case has never been argued, given a fair hearing, and I have never had an Equal Footing. This is a fundamental requirement of CPR, r.1.1 of Overriding Objectives in civil proceedings. Instead I have been savagely repeatedly abused since 2003, to the extent of having to be urgently hospitalised for life threatening injuries. These are very disturbed dangerous people, and whilst they continue this abuse there is no question that there are compelling grounds for the courts to address.

Court correcting the procedural Errors and Mistakes made

10. CPR, r.52.11 provides: ***(a) "that there are valid grounds to grant appeals where substantial procedural irregularities caused a unjust decision in the lower court resulting in a merituous case being dismissed". (b) Or where there have been obvious errors and mistakes.***

11. Legal advisors and myself have closely examined "the Order" made in May 05 by Pumfrey J and what exactly was required of me during "Stay" of my case. (Refer to order in Appeal Bundle (A) page 38) The Order only states I should make an application to "continue or release" the Stay On or before 12 August 2005. (Refer now to Blackburnes J's Order 12 August 2005 in Appeal Bundle Page 18) You clearly see that I made the application in accordance with CPR, r 23.4(2) and PD 23, para 4.2 because of the distressing and terrifying circumstances, so there were absolutely no grounds as a point of law for dismissal of my case. However, on closer inspection, the substantial procedural irregularities, errors and mistakes have become obvious. Proving there were no actual grounds for dismissal.

Surrounding issues validating grounds for appeal

12. The whole case was "Stayed" in May 05 by Pumfrey J to allow me to receive urgent hospital treatments requested by doctors as a result of the injuries I incurred by the respondents. Under CPR's rules on EU convention on Human rights, I was entitled to continue "the Stay" to conclude the urgent required hospital treatments. We now realise that the hospital and medical evidence from the court file was not forwarded to Blackburne J. There is no question that I had a Human Right to continue hospital treatment under Acts (2) 1998 Act, and as I was forced into a dangerous life threatening situation, under Arts(5) I had a right to security and protection.

13. On speaking to Mr. Nicholas and Miss Letang they both explained Blackburne J not having any background knowledge about the case when the application was made. Evidently he didn't get my full court file with all the relevant medical, hospital or "Met" Police" crime evidence from court staff. So was unable to make a informed decision about the case. This amounts to a "non-admission" of important evidence under CPR. 55,11(3) which, should have been forwarded by court staff.

14. This was obviously an administrative irregularity, particularly as we had pre arranged the application with the court staff beforehand due to urgency and emergency of the circumstances. The evidence not being forwarded resulted in unjust decision, and a very dangerous case of abuse being left unaddressed. Had this irregularity not occurred, my case would have been kept "alive" to allow the hospital treatment to continue, and restraining orders would have been granted for my protection.

The Stay of case

15. I must emphasise while the Stay" was in effect I was not required to do anything further to progress the claim. Therefore, it cannot be argued that I failed or did not fulfil the requirements of Pumfrey J's Order. Because as a matter "of law" and CPR in respect of "Stay's", I was not legally entitled to do anything further other than "releasing" or "continuing" the Stay On or before 12 August 2005, which I did.

The Transcript- Errors on the face of the record

16. The transcript also has the wrong case number **"HC0402563"**, my case number is **"HC0402565"** and had the wrong date of "8th February 2005" stated as the date my application was made. My application was on 12 August 2005, so this also highlights the obvious errors. This transcript cannot be relied upon as evidence because as it states the wrong information it is legally invalid so should be quashed. This show's there has definitely been a serious mix up in the administration department. We strongly believe my case has been wrongly mixed up with someone else's.

No explanation or written reasons for Judgement on the order.

17. I have written to explain and alert his lordship Justice Blackburne of these facts. Legal assistants have also spoken to his clerk Christopher Ellis in regards to his written reasons for Judgement and reconsideration based on the facts. Chiefly because we still don't have a reason for the dismissal as nothing was stated on Blackburne J's Order". We don't know the exact reasons to be appealed against. I

because it was a mistake to begin with. (Please refer to the forwarded letter to Justice Blackburne dated 31st January 2006)

Permission to admit evidence

18. If the courts turns to pages 96- 117 exhibit appeal bundle marked as (A) you will see we paid and supplied this evidence to a direct barrister Kelvin Jones on 27th October 04 to deliver to the court. Prior to my going into hospital. However, he took the money but did not keep to his signed contractual promise, or deliver the bundles of evidence to the courts.

19. As this is a fairly complex intellectual property claim, involving serious frauds, misrepresentation, descending into life endangering levels of abuse by individuals misusing public services, it is essential in CPR that such allegations are proved and supported by evidence. Particularly, as they are relevant to the various immediately required relief remedies.

20. PD 23, para 9.1 specially requires that as a practical matter court needs to be satisfied by "evidence in support" as equally expressed by CPR. R.25.3 (2). And equally for Rules, 32.2(1) and 32.6(1) in relation to relying on the other witness's statements testimonies who have seen and been horrified by the abuse. Therefore, not being granted admission of the evidence would contravene my rights to substantiate my case and deprive my Human rights to protect my family, and loved ones lives. We have a right to address the heinous crimes we're being subjected too. All evidence shows the paper trial, casual links, and defendants gross deceit, to show the merits. Without question these have an important influence on the result. As it establishes the full extent of the exploitation and value of the claim, and show's the defendants motives for the extreme levels of abuse being suffered.

21. We have suffered at the hands of this evil coming up for three years and it's a long time to live under these inhuman oppressive conditions. I've had to fight to get the evidence into court against all odds, to get this evidence before the courts. So it should not now be over looked when lives are at stake. This case will save other

people with children falling victim to these people. Besides the money, they are inflicting dangerous harm on innocent people, which must be stopped as a matter of urgency. Their activities are utterly despicable with serious ramifications.

22. Proof of all contracts, misrepresentation, deceit, racketeering thefts and sale of my works, and foul play in Folder bundles (C)(D) (E) (F), find perjury in statements of defence inside Folder (B) and also cross referenced in detail within my witness statement on 11th January 05. The hospital and medical letters about my injuries is found in appeal folder bundle (A) from pages 133 onwards and leads onto the evidence of the covert monitoring surveillance activities still taking place of my home, phone and laptops .

23. Court will see the evidence that Goodman Derrick like all other solicitors are aware of the serious injuries I received by their clients, and why the case was "Stayed" in May 05. Despite lying in a letter to My Hendy on the 15th of Decemeber 05. Court will see clearly they were notified alongside the court why I was in hospital. It was immediately after these letters were sent, that my medical records were stolen from the hospital. See the evidence of defendant (9's) connection to St Mary's hospital also in bundle (A) and isobel trust highlighting malpractice by removal of medical records. This trust is linked to all the networks who have since been sold rights to trade my intellectual property by the respondents.

Immediate determination of Judgement

24. Initially I was claiming for 100 Million, however you will see from the long list of productions accruing from my "three" sets of documents, the book and film script, that the total sum of profits generated from my property is considerable higher than my initial figure. This is an "Unspecified" Claim and the exact figure claimed will be determined by examination of profits made in all relevant accounts turnover and profits. I seek to recover for all various damages, losses and injuries stated in my particulars and witness statement. I aim to recover "every single penny" made at my family and I's expense from this evil and not a penny less!

Chronology of listed productions from my stolen literature

25. I have listed a chronology of the productions with my affidavit. The extraordinary levels brutality I received for my work, is well know throughout international media. However, embarrassing it is being caught, my belongings should have been immediately returned and the outstanding liabilities settled immediately on receipt of the claim, without hesitation. For these thoroughly guilty people to have dragged this through the mire using violence and brutality, wasting time and money in attempts to cover this up is not something the court should take lightly. Their criminal activities must be dealt with in accordance with the law, just like any other criminal. We should not be the ones penalised, and this should not be left to further escalate.

26. As stated in my affidavit, enough is enough. They have long abused, and forfeited their chances to come clean. They must firmly stopped. In the interests of costs and saving time we request that the court use powers of CPR, r.3.4 (2)(b) to strike out all defendants statements of case for abuse of process, and use Rule. 52.10 (2) for immediate Judgement by:

(a) Immediately setting aside the order of lower court, and preventing all respondents from trying to enforce it

(b) Immediately refer claim for determination

(c) Make the Order's expressed in affidavit and particulars of claim for payments in awards of costs damage's etc: With the view that these liabilities owing are paid up in full within 14 days of determination of facts.

(d) Immediate and total termination of all further screenings of my all my works world wide

(e) Complete removal of "all" covert surveillance vehicles trespassing outside my home; complete removal of "all" taps and bugging devices on our phones and laptops. And complete removal from my life.

(f) Additional Order for the "Met" Police immediately submits the case's " full crime file" to the court.

(g) Refer all respondent's to be immediately "detained in custody" to protect the public's safety and case to Crown Prosecution Service to.

Ms. Charles Seven

21th February 2006

464