

REPORT RELEASED ON 12 DECEMBER 2023


'Major City of London Police corruption cover up'

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Who are City of London Police?
2. The purpose and function of the police service
3. Lies, lies cover up and more lies intended to obstruct the course of justice
4. Absolute contradictions
5. A further fraudulent claim made by solicitors in Newcastle
6. Millinder's civil case
 - 6.1. Fraudulent failure to disclose material facts & information
 - 6.2. Real evidence recorded on the official hearing transcript
7. On 12 November 2018 the barrister acting for MFC refuted their claims
8. Equality before the law – a thing of the past?
9. Inspector Younger changed the goalposts
10. Office 911 and the City of London Police crime reference
11. The choreography / sequence of events & conclusion
12. The Crown Prosecution Service explain perverting in this way
13. The offence of corrupt / improper exercise of police powers & privileges

 Double-dealing
Judges



 CARDS on the table with aces in the hole
Medieval style corruption in modern England
Conspiracy at the heart of the City of London

Major City of London Police corruption cover up



Chief **cover up** team Trouble comes in threes



Commissioner
Angela McLaren

Commander
Paul Betts

Commander
Nik Adams

Cover ups by complicit police who degrade the rule of law by making criminal law selective?

'Op Blackjack' - The City of London Police corruption cover up: Living up to our name, we reveal the cards, the truth behind the games, and the players driving the systemic corruption machine swallowing up law and democracy wholesale.

Trouble comes in threes: Pictured, left: Commissioner Angela McLaren. Middle: Commander Paul Betts and right: Commander Nik Adams - City of London Police Chief Officer Team.

It's political interference with courts and law enforcement, resulting in inter-agency cover ups on the cards that keeps the corruption machine running strong.

'Op Blackjack' has intelligence and aces up our sleeve, we show our hand, like nobody ever has. Cards on the table, we come up trumps.

It's not known as ['Londongrad'](#) or the 'economic crime capital of the world' for nothing.

1. Who are City of London Police?

[City of London Police](#) is the smallest force in the UK, responsible for policing the Square Mile in the heart of the City of London financial district where the Rolls Building, the City Court House double dealing judges do their stuff.

To justify its existence the Force is allocated as national lead on fraud, its offshoot is Action Fraud (non-action fraud). They are brilliant at failing to combat or investigate economic crime and corruption, so its victims face further anguish and injustice through their incompetence.

City of London Police go much further than just sheer failure in duty, and revealing their hand, we show the true face of the force.

2. The purpose and function of the police service

"The purpose of the police service is to uphold the law fairly and firmly; to prevent crime; to pursue and bring to justice those who break the law; to keep the King's peace, to protect, help and reassure the community; and to be seen to do this with integrity, common sense and sound judgement"

- The Police Foundation of the United Kingdom

We reveal City of London Police in action covering up serious crime (Click on the video image to listen to the 52 seconds):



City of London Police, Inspector Ian Younger, a fraud detective, paid by the taxpayer to investigate and prevent crimes against you, is telling us that there's no obligation on them to perform on their primary function.

3. Lies, lies cover up and more lies intended to obstruct the course of public justice

Justice, subject to status - Not what you know, but who you know:

In his letter dated 16 November 2021, 2-years and 9-days later (below), City of London Police and Younger was defending for the offenders, the Tory home team in a different way.

4. Absolute contradictions

On 7 November 2019, during that call, Younger admitted there were crimes, but that the crimes of the type Millinder was reporting, did not matter.

In other words, Younger and City of London Police defeated the criminal law itself they purport to administer, as well as equality.

It wasn't just the police who were got at, the kleptocracy of judges were all in on it from the top down.

Whilst Chancellor of the High Court, in his 8 February 2019 judgment, paragraph 103, Sir Geoffrey Vos, now Master of the Rolls, and head of civil justice, lied:

"103. I can say at once that I have been through all the papers in this case in meticulous detail, and I have seen no evidence of any kind for any of the allegations of fraud, conspiracy or misdealing that Mr Millinder has made. He has made these allegations when he became frustrated by his seeming inability to find a forum in which he would vindicate what he saw as his companies' irrefutable claims. He should not have done so, nor should he have threatened any of these professionals or public servants as he has sought to do. I hope that, once he has read and digested this judgment, he will understand why this behaviour has been inappropriate. I hope also that it will hereafter cease".

Lies & dishonest concealment by Sir Geoffrey Vos in the same paragraph

The truth behind the double dealing revealed, our latest exposes [real evidence that the Official Receiver has committed fraud and other criminal offences](#) under the Insolvency Act 1986, proving that Vos is a liar and a cheat.



No. 21 - Sir Geoffrey Vos - Master of the Rolls & head of civil justice for England & Wales who was then Chancellor of the High Court when he made that statement in Court against Millinder on 22 January 2019

A court of civil and criminal justice was perverted, not by a member of the public, but by the City of London Police and the cabal of judges and Law Ministers themselves. They were all playing for Tory team Boro.

Younger was relying on lies told by No. 21, to cover up and fail to investigate, what has been covered up and never investigated.

Political interference prevails, the tentacles of the .Gov kleptocracy are spread across the constitutional separation gaps between courts and law enforcement, designed to protect the people from tyranny.

We exhibit below Younger's letter closing the investigation that never started for the second time:

16/11/2021 (page 2) CITY OF LONDON POLICE: OFFICIAL

It is regrettable that having only recently joined the City of London Police T/Superintendent Miles was not aware of the background to the management of your contact with the City of London Police. So, while he may have said during the telephone conversation with you that he would review the documents sent in by you by email and provide you with a response as to whether or not they would be disseminated for investigation, I am afraid that following discussions with myself he will not now be responding further to you directly.

In reaching this decision we also considered that you were subject to a Senior Courts Act 1981 s.42 Order on the 6 July 2021. While it is acknowledged that the s.42 Order does not extend to reporting criminal matters, it is clear from the Judgement that two High Court Judges consider that the claims you have been making in civil proceedings are vexatious.

Your criminal allegations relate to such proceedings, and it would be a reasonable assumption that there would be no merit in considering further any report for criminal investigation further. It is noted that the Judge, having gone through all the papers in meticulous detail, can see no evidence for any allegations of fraud, conspiracy, or misdealing. The Judge also hoped that you will understand why you should not have threatened professional and public servants as you have sought to do and why your conduct is inappropriate. The judge further hoped that having read the Judgement that you would cease to do so.

However, by pursuing criminal allegations of the same ilk, it appears you have not heeded the Judge's advice, and you are attempting to use the criminal judicial system to continue to threaten those same professionals and public servants.

There is little point in the City of London Police considering further something that a learned member of the judiciary has already reasonably considered and made judgement upon. I can only reiterate the Judge's hope that you will now cease addressing these matters to the City of London Police as we unable to assist you further.


Yours sincerely

Ian A Younger CFE
Deputy Director
Professional Standards Directorate

5. A further fraudulent claim made by solicitors in Newcastle

On 20 March 2017 Millinder reported Womble Bond Dickinson solicitors in Newcastle, who were acting for Tory Boro, to Northumbria Police for an alleged third count of fraud by false representation, the claim against Empowering Wind MFC Ltd (“EW”) in the sum of £4,111,874.75 originating from the Club's alleged blackmail.

We took a screenshot of the letter, dated 20 December 2017 from Acting Detective Inspector Peter Morgan of Northumbria Police who purported to investigate since 20 March 2017.



The 20 December 2017 letter closing down the investigation by Northumbria Police to prevent justice being served on the Tory home team and their cohorts

Uncoincidentally, that letter disposing of the investigation as it's *'not a new head of fraud'* came in exactly a day prior to No. 3 of 21, Registrar Jones being installed into the civil court, playing out his game under orders, keeping the ball in the Tory Boro side's court.

It was not a new head of fraud, but it was a fraud committed by solicitors based in Newcastle, in their jurisdiction.

City of London Police and Northumbria pushed Millinder to civil courts, but the issues were criminal.

Playing at the at the bottom of the league, and with no defence, what choice did they have?

Northumbria Police lawyers, who are likely connected with the lawyers at Womble Bond Dickinson, are not saying that the £4.1 million claim was not fraud, but “not a new head of fraud.”

Similarly, Younger was not saying there was not crime, but that the crimes of the type Millinder reported do not matter to them. A corrupt exercise of police powers and privileges?

6. Millinder's civil case

In Millinder's civil case, it was all about fraud and the fact that TEAM BLACKMAIL never had a claim against either EW or EEI.

Force majeure suspended schedule 7 of the lease (rent) and the Law of Property Act 1925 affirmed that the assignment was “*effectual in law*”, from 30 June 2015 when EW and EEI served notice of that assignment on the Club.

6.1. Fraudulent failure to disclose material facts and information

The EW and EEI claims against the Club were irrefutable, simplified to a contractual provision of force majeure and its application within the lease.

On 9 January 2017, MFC's counsel said "for the purpose of the Energy Supply Agreement, force majeure has effect".

Therefore, by his own admission, Ulick Staunton, and his client, knew, for that reason, that £181,269.89 of MFC's BLACKMAIL in the sum of £256,269.89 was fictitious, but there are other reasons:

The Energy Supply Agreement is a conditional contract subject to Millinder / EW's 'satisfaction in full' of 'entering into a connection agreement' and 'commissioning' of the wind turbine. The 'Start Date' is the date from which the conditions are satisfied.

To be commissioned (constructed and connected to the grid so it can commercially operate), the connection is necessary.

On 30 April 2015, when it came time to implement, MFC refused the connection.

In most obvious criminal breach of duty to disclose, not only did they fail to disclose that no money was ever owed to MFC prior to their BLACKMAIL, but they also failed to disclose that they refused the connection, and that the supply agreement was conditional upon it!

MFC and their counsel withheld over 172-pages of witness evidence served with the demand, including the assignment on which it was based, the connection related contracts and evidence proving they refused the connection, and the material proving that the delay between 23 September 2013 – 23 December 2014 was force majeure, occurring 96-days into the 365 days provided for in schedule 7 of the lease, free of rent, from which to commission the turbine.

Most that know about law, know that force majeure clauses suspend contractual obligations if an event of force majeure arises.

To conceal that the delay was force majeure, and it most certainly was when MFC themselves then refused the connection, they fraudulently withheld all the information and failed to disclose all the material facts.

Counsel for the Club, Ulick Staunton lies prolifically throughout the hearing, failing to disclose material facts and evidence in breach of his legal duty to have done so. That is fraud.

6.2. Real evidence recorded on the official hearing transcript

<p>H</p>	<p>The respondent argues constantly about <i>force majeure</i>. Can you turn back to p.22, please? There is a definition clause for <i>force majeure</i>. The very curious thing is, although it is part of</p> <p>OPUS 2 DIGITAL TRANSCRIPTION</p> <p>3</p>
<p>A</p>	<p>the definition clause of the lease, there is no further mention in the lease of <i>force majeure</i>, what happens should circumstances of <i>force majeure</i> arise. It is very curious.</p> <p>MR JUSTICE ARNOLD: Right. Yes, that is odd.</p> <p>MR STAUNTON: So it does not appear on the face of this document that any event of <i>force majeure</i> excuses Empowering Wind from paying the rent. Where you do find <i>force majeure</i> is, if you turn on to the energy supply agreement, p.51, it has an effective <i>force majeure</i> clause. So p.51. This is the energy supply agreement.</p>
<p>B</p>	<p>MR JUSTICE ARNOLD: Yes.</p>

C MR STAUNTON: If you turn on to p.54, you will see the *force majeure* definition about two-thirds of the way down the page. It is slightly different to the definition of *force majeure* in the lease, but that's neither here nor there in my submission, but this does have effect because if you turn on to p.57----

MR JUSTICE ARNOLD: Yes.

D MR STAUNTON: -- cl.3.1.2, there is an obligation to pay sums, and p.60, cl.6, does have an effective *force majeure* clause. Now, I do not have, in the evidence, any answers to why there is an effective *force majeure* in the energy supply agreement but not in the lease, but that is the evidence before you.

MR JUSTICE ARNOLD: Okay.

MR STAUNTON: Now, the rent was not paid and there was a demand, forfeiture. Can you turn to p.66? There is the invoice for the rents. Page 67 is the invoice itself and p.73----

Pages 3 & 4 of the MFC 9 January 2017 ex-parte injunction hearing

A "Following my conversation with Tracey Flanagan I write as suggested to set out the reasons we have had to resort to legal action to recover our losses in the wind turbine project."

So it is clearly a claim by Empowering Wind. Para numbered "(1)", the first paragraph, last sentence:

B "I submitted an application to Middlesbrough Borough Council in September 2013 with background as to why the planning condition is not necessary, is unreasonable and is also *ultra vires*."

If you look at the final paragraph on that page, the second sentence:

C "The condition was not removed until ... December 2014."

If you turn over the page, third paragraph:

D "Payment of rent and the energy supply would have therefore commenced 12 months after the date the *Force Majeure* issue was finally resolved ..."

Page 5 of the 9-page 9 January 2017 official hearing transcript

It is evidential, having read out the passages he did above, that Staunton knew that force majeure was the most critical part of the EEI case that no money was ever owed to MFC, because it had effect in relation to suspending schedule 7 of the lease.

Was it a coincidence that Staunton was found by Nugee J on 5 February 2018 to have twice lied about it?

We adduce below the evidence to prove it:

5. It is now suggested by Mr Millinder on behalf of EEI that the order of 16th January was obtained as a result of material non disclosure before Mr Justice Arnold on the without notice application on the 9th January. He relies for this on non disclosure of a large number of documents which, as I understand it, supported the statutory demand and which explained the background to the dispute, in particular the connection agreement which, in his submissions to me, he explained was the foundation of his argument that the project was, effectively, killed by Middlesbrough.
6. It is not disputed that those documents were not put before Mr Justice Arnold. I was also shown a note of the hearing in which Mr Staunton, who appeared for Middlesbrough then as he does for Middlesbrough today, says this:

“There is a definition of force majeure in the lease. There is no other reference to force majeure in the lease.”

That was something he repeated before me, but in fact, there was a provision in the lease at schedule 5, paragraph 6, which provided that:

“If either party is prevented for any period of time from performing its obligations under this lease by reason of force majeure, that party shall not be in breach of such obligations for so long as, and to the extent to which such reason shall subsist.”

Paragraphs 5 & 6 of the Nugee J judgment dated 5 February 2018

7. On 12 November 2018 the barrister acting for MFC refuted their claims

After having claimed the sum of £256,269.89 against Empowering in August 2016, then having attended court to defend the Club's claim for £4,111,874.45, from 15 November 2017 onwards, in his skeleton argument dated 12 November 2018, Staunton said this:

37. Para 110 of the ske. The assertion that Rs did something wrong in respect of the wind turbine project is one that may provide a foundation for a claim by Empowering, not A. The para ends with an assertion that “*the Defendant*” cannot bring any claim against “*the Applicant*”; this is not understood. Rs do not bring any claim against A, or Empowering or Earth Energy, save that Rs claim £25,000 from Earth Energy under the consent order of 16 January 2017.

Ulick Staunton's skeleton argument for MFC dated 12 November 2018 confirmed they “*do not bring any claim*”, when they brought claims of £256,269.89, £541,308.89, £4,111,864.75 against EW.

On 22 November 2018 EEI was blackmailed by a High Court Enforcement Officer instructed by MFC who was seeking to levy distress on EEI's goods to the value of £619,774.48, which, when challenged, was dropped, only to be followed up with a fictitious claim for £25,000 founded by criminal fraudulent non-disclosure.

Those are all claims, which are not only fictitious, but by Staunton's own admission, he knew they were on 9 January 2017.

After admitting that no claims for energy supply could be established, but lying about the force majeure provision in the lease because he knew it had effect for the same reason.

Exactly 24-days later, his instructing solicitor, Julian Gill, of Womble Bond Dickinson in Newcastle, who attended the ex-parte hearing and who had a note of hearing containing the admission by his barrister, claimed over £4 million for energy supply!

That is fraud, for avoidance of doubt. “*Not a new head of fraud*” but it is a fraud, (by false representation), and a serious one.

Knowing that the assignment was effective, by his own admission in Court, on 28 March 2018 Staunton attended court and lied, stating that there was no assignment and the claim vested in EEI against the Club was the claim that vested in EW.

In absence of the rules of the game, Rule 14.25 of the Insolvency Rules 2016, EEI was wound up for £25,000 that never even existed in law to defraud Millinder and prevent justice being served on MFC.

Exactly 11-days later, on 11 April 2018, after Millinder had applied to rescind (set aside) the fictitious winding up order against EEI when no money was owed to MFC, in the open court, Staunton was forced to admit what they knew all along in respect of the claim of over £1 million and vested in it:

Transcript of the 11th April 2018 hearing of the rescission of the fraudulent £25,000 winding up petition

MR STAUNTON: So there's a cross claim which extinguishes the liability to pay £25,000.

THE CHIEF REGISTRAR: Yeah.

MR STAUNTON: But we see that also was before Judge Barber and she made the Winding Up Order.

Staunton admitted what he knew all along, that the assigned investment extinguished the £25,000 fraudulent MFC claim

Once again, Staunton was lying in court, which is in fact all he is evidenced to have done throughout, because what was before Judge Barber on 28 March 2018, was more of his lies, where he lied and stated this:

MR STAUNTON: Mr Millinder had failed to put in any sensible evidence to finance the claim and Mr Hammond said that obviously the subsidiary couldn't pursue it. Judge Jones then dismissed that application. That's the cross-claim. That's disposed of Monday of this week.

I'll deny all knowledge of the assigned investments and say there's no cross claim to defraud him of the £770,000



It is proven beyond doubt that Staunton lied on 11 April 2018 stating that the cross claim and the assignment was before Judge Barber on 28 March 2018 when what was before Judge Barber was more of his lies (as evident above) highlighted yellow from the official transcript.

Staunton lied and stated that the EEI cross claim was the claim that vested in EW knowing that both EW and EEI have claims, with the latter originating from the assignment they lied about and fraudulently withheld from the ex-parte injunction hearing on 9 January 2017.

Later in the saga, Acting Detective Inspector Hull of Northumbria Police, wrote to Millinder to shirk their primary duties in apprehending the fraudsters in Newcastle. We took a screenshot of that letter, dated 15 March 2019:

You made a further complaint regarding the actions of Womble Bond Dickinson and provided Detective Sergeant Morgan with a detailed statement dated 22nd August 2018. This statement has been looked at and the matters contained within it reviewed at length.

I have considered the statement and the report I have received and I conclude there is no offence identified that has occurred within the Northumbria Police area and therefore no further action will be taken. This decision was reached on the following basis:

- a) Matters relating to the original Cleveland Police investigation have been reviewed by the City of London Police and have been concluded as civil matters. Indeed our own legal advice concurred with that view when considering your initial complaint.
- b) Evidence relating to Mr Hannon, Official Receiver is not a matter for Northumbria Police and I understand has been reviewed by the courts in civil litigation.
- c) You refer to a conspiracy between Mr Hannon and Ratcliffe Chambers. I cannot see evidence to support that and in any case is not a matter for Northumbria Police and again I understand was part of your civil litigation.
- d) There is evidence supplied by you from internet research which you have yourself concluded is hearsay evidence.

I do understand that you will be disappointed at this conclusion but it has been made on the evidence made available. I have also reviewed the original parameters of the investigation agreed with Detective Sergeant Morgan and concur that it should remain confined to offences occurring in this police area.

The letter from Northumbria Police dated 15 March 2019 did not say there was not fraud or criminality either. On the contrary, just that offences were committed outside their police area, was not a matter of Northumbria.

Knowing that law intended that the purported claim by MFC against EW, to have been set off prior to making the insolvency order against TEAM WIND, Vos negated a singular mention of the mandatory scheme of law in rule 14.25 of the Insolvency Rules 2016, which intended that MFC's fictitious claims were to have been set off.

They just bypass and avoid the law, evidence and everything that doesn't suit them. Vos also knew that the mandatory law applied equally to the claim vested in EEI that extinguished the £25,000, which is why they likewise evaded it.

Bypassing the rules of the game is misdealing, is it not?

Failing to administer the law and dishonestly depriving a person of a statutory right to make a gain and to cause loss is fraud, and so is criminal fraud by false representation.

It becomes clear that not only City of London, but also Cleveland and Northumbria police forces were all in on the game, playing alongside 21 Cards of Injustice.



Double dealing and misdealing the cards is cheating, and according to the Supreme Court, setting the rules of the game, in [Ivy v Genting](#), cheating is dishonest and the test is the same, for both civil and criminal proceedings.

Indeed, they are all proven absolutely dishonest and anyone reading this would agree.

8. Equality before the law - A thing of the past?

Police, and all public authorities, including courts and tribunals, are required to treat all people equally when applying the law, and the laws must provide equal protection for everyone.

The rights granted to everyone under the laws of the land are at stake.

It's not the laws at fault, English law is the most comprehensive in the world. This is a game of your rights, an affront to civil and criminal law itself by a tyrannical kleptocracy of pathologically dishonest cheats in positions of trust of which they are unworthy.

The administration, from the politicians and judges at the top, through the bottom feeding police are systemically corrupt.



Left: Sacked former Lord Chancellor & Secretary of State for Justice, Dominic Raab, and right; Rishi Sunak leader of the current kleptocratic government

“This government will have integrity, professionalism, and accountability at every level. Trust is earned. And I will earn yours. I will always be grateful to Boris Johnson for his incredible achievements as Prime Minister, and I treasure his warmth and generosity of spirit”

Rishi Sunak - Prime Minister of the United Kingdom – 25 October 2022

Accountability he says. Bollocks, we say.

“I do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve the King in the office of constable, with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept”

The constitutional oath of the office of police constable in England & Wales

The biggest issue is complete lack of constitutional independence of the police and courts. Political interference prevails, the tentacles of the .Gov kleptocracy are spread across the separation gaps designed to protect the people from tyranny.

After two-days of making the crime report, on 7th November 2019 our victims of crime were greeted by Inspector Ian Younger, Deputy Director of Professional Standards responsible for dealing with complaints against other members of the same house.



The Deputy Director of Professional Standards responsible for cover ups to prevent justice being served on criminals occupying office under the Crown, sponsored by you, the taxpayer

Inspector Younger acknowledged that the order deployed by the Attorney General's Office, the 'Law Ministers', against Millinder to conceal the criminality after he was defrauded of his rights, *'did not extend to reporting criminal matters.'*

Younger knew, or ought to have known that the restraint order was deployed to conceal those offences, and obviously any police officer would have known that was illegal, but they covered that up also.

You will all note that Inspector Younger acknowledged that the order deployed by the Attorney General's Office, the 'Law Ministers', against Millinder to conceal the criminality after he was defrauded of his rights, *'did not extend to reporting criminal matters.'*

Younger knew, or ought to have known that the restraint order was deployed to conceal those offences, and obviously any police officer would have known that was illegal, but they covered that up also.

9. Inspector Ian Younger changed the goalposts

On 7 November 2019, Younger was cheating, to prevent an investigation from commencing, stating that *"police are under no obligation to investigate any particular crime"* and that *"the crimes you are reporting, do not fall into that category"*.

Younger was referring to the offences of conspiracy to defraud, blackmail, and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. Indictable only offences that carry sentence of up to life imprisonment.

10. Officer 911 and the City of London Police crime reference

On 14 October 2023 Millinder reported the offences of perverting the course of justice alleged to have been committed by judges featuring on 'The 21 Cards of Injustice'. Collar No. 911, an experienced long-term officer at City of London Police took the call.

On 17 October 2023, Millinder called again, and this time, during that call, he was given a crime reference number. The call was recorded and it was transcribed:

Officer 911: *"Ok so one of the sergeants. One of the crime sergeants had reviewed your complaint and has closed the complaint"*

Mr Millinder: *"See, this is what they do"*

Officer 911: *" Urrr, it appears there is an issue regarding the outcome of a court case. From the Law Society urr, you were found guilty on 3 counts of contempt of court and sentenced to 15 months in prison, urr, this was over a dispute from 2012 regarding a contract urr with Middlesbrough Football Club -"*

Mr Millinder: (Angry tone) *"What's that got to do with perverting?"*

11. The choreography / sequence of events & conclusion

To put this into perspective. When Millinder first reported, Inspector Younger intercepted, stating the type of crimes Millinder was reporting did not fall into the category of those that City of London Police investigate (a lie).

Two-years later, In November 2021, Inspector Younger is stating that the civil restraint order did not extend to reporting criminal matters, but relied on the lies by Vos covering up the fraud to do the same.

Less than two years after that, City of London Police absolutely contradicted their own position conveyed by Younger, using the nullity restraint order in the same way as The 21 Cards of Injustice did, to conceal the fraud that was concealed throughout the course of public justice (perverting).

Millinder's call with Officer 911 on 17 October 2023 ended in this way (from the transcript):

Officer 911: *"I am telling you. I am now telling you, if you are not happy with that decision, you now need to make a complaint" –*

Mr Millinder: *"And I'm telling you I'm going to prosecute them all".*

Officer 911: *"And you can do that via the City of London Police website."*

Mr Millinder: *"No no no no. (Angry) I want his collar number. You have a duty to give me his collar number, I want his collar number, coz he's perverted the course of justice and I want his collar number".*

Officer 911: *"How has he perverted the course of justice?"*

Mr Millinder: *" Because he's closed down an investigation without even looking at it. Civil contempt isn't a criminal offence, right. I haven't committed any offence (overspeaking) the order is a nullity".*

Officer 911: *"Sir, it's DS Blower. Ok?"*

Mr Millinder: *"Blower? What like blows hot air is it?"*

Officer 911: *"As in blows hot air, yeah."*

Mr Millinder: *"Yeah, as in hot air, lots of it. Ok, that's it, thanks a lot we will deal. Thanks a lot, bye bye".*



The Kevin in action – Crimes blown away, not only swept under the carpet!

Gone with the wind, turbine?

Officer 911 was sweeping it under the carpet, brushing Millinder off back toward to Ian Younger, Deputy Director of Professional Standards, making a complaint via Professional Standards, so he can investigate himself and find no wrongdoing.

DS Kevin Blower was living up to his name, blowing the investigation and TEAM WIND away.

Blower was blowing hot air, for he had no jurisdiction to dispose of an investigation on the same day the victim was given the crime reference, without even looking at it. That's not playing by the rules of the game now is it?

Blower doubled down, blowing hard against justice, defeating the ends of it to prevent the perpetrators from being prosecuted for indictable only offences.

This goes back to the beautiful game, keeping the ball in the Tory Teesside team's court at all times, making up for what they lack on the pitch.

Neither civil or criminal rules ever come into their games.



Left: Steve Gibson OBE the Tory Teesside politician "Mr Teesside" / Chairman of MFC couldn't help with many big projects from his prison cell, so they all fell into line.

If your game's that good, there's no need for a referee, for a man that knows the truth, cannot be deceived.

12. The Crown Prosecution Service explain perverting in this way

Perverting the course of justice is a serious offence. It can only be tried on indictment and carries a maximum sentence of life imprisonment.

The Crown Prosecution Service for England & Wales

A course of public justice can be either civil or criminal, there is no difference. Civil justice can be perverted just the same as criminal justice can.

City of London Police affronted the law they are paid by the taxpayer to administer, just like the 21 judges involved did.

“*It’s a civil matter*” is the punchline, a lie, also intended to prevent justice being served on the offenders for perverting the civil course of justice, perverting the criminal course of a police investigation in doing so.

The criminal offences are created by the law, but this new breed of policing for the cabal rather than the people, re-invent the law as they go, making criminal law civil, just off their own whim. “Justice, subject to status”.

Laws in the UK do not apply to members of the taxpayer funded criminal racketeering enterprise and their cronies.

Perverting the Course of Justice

The offence of Perverting the Course of Justice is committed when an accused:

- does an act or series of acts;
- which has or have a tendency to pervert; and
- which is or are intended to pervert;
- the course of public justice.

The offence is contrary to common law and triable only on indictment. It carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment and/or a fine. The course of justice must be in existence at the time of the act(s). The course of justice starts when:

- an event has occurred, from which it can reasonably be expected that an investigation will follow; or
- investigations which could/might bring proceedings have actually started; or
- proceedings have started or are about to start.

That's what the CPS say about perverting the course of public justice

Essentially, we have established that a course of justice was under way, and numerous lies have been told, both by police, and by judges, to prevent justice being served on the Tory Teesside team, owned by Steve Gibson O.B.E.

13. The offence of corrupt / improper exercise of police powers & privileges

Laws of England are in place to ensure that police and law enforcement behave in a constitutionally proper way.

Lying with intent to pervert the course of public justice, and wilfully failing to exercise proper duties of a police officer are serious criminal offences.

Section 26 of the Criminal Justice & Courts Act 2015

It looks like not only the whole house of cards are going down, but all the ones that were playing for them also.

26 Corrupt or other improper exercise of police powers and privileges

- (1) A police constable listed in subsection (3) commits an offence if he or she—
 - (a) exercises the powers and privileges of a constable improperly, and
 - (b) knows or ought to know that the exercise is improper.
- (2) A police constable guilty of an offence under this section is liable, on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 14 years or a fine (or both).

The offence is committed when any officer (of any rank) corruptly fails in duty like this lot have.

What use is a police officer who refuses to act on crime? As much use as a chocolate fireguard? Thought as much.

We invited the City of London Corporation, the Lady Chief Justice, the Lord Chancellor, the City of London Police Chief Officer Team, Northumbria Police Chief Officer Team, the Insolvency Service and the Home Office to comment on this release. We will post their comments in the follow up.

Be sure to get your copy of [The 21 Cards of Injustice](#) trilogy today, there's only one of these worldwide, it exposes the double dealing in ways unprecedented. 50% of our sales go to the victims of this state terrorism and fraud.

“There is no greater tyranny than that which is perpetrated under the shield of the law and in the name of justice”

Montesquieu



INTELLIGENCEUK.com

Holding the unaccountable to account

Questions?

Email us: admin@opblackjack.com