


Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire {LE9 6NW}

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
21 March 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN
OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]
MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o}Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk ,
Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk , compliance@h-f.co.uk ,

Those with knowledge} Attorney General to King Charles}victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk,
Contempt.SharedMailbox@attorneygeneral.gov.uk , Land Registry CEO and board c/o}simon.hayes@landregistry.gov.uk , King
Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP}hcenquiries@parliament.uk ,Lady Chief Justice Sue Lascelles Carr
c/o} contactholmember@parliament.uk , hlinfo@parliament.uk , Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos , Sir Julian Martin Flaux , Sir Antony
James Zacaroli Court of Chancery c/o rcjcompanies.orders@justice.gov.uk , rolls.ICL.hearings1@justice.gov.uk , Rishi Sunak's
Anti-Fraud Champion Simon Fell MP c/o} simon.fell.mp@parliament.uk ,Alex Chalk Secretary of State for Justice and Lord
Chancellor c/o} alex.chalk.mp@parliament.uk , Regulatory corps c/o } professional.ethics@sra.org.uk , firm.queries@fca.org.uk
, icocasework@ico.org.uk , Leicestershire MPs c/o} andrew.bridgen.mp@parliament.uk , alberto.costa.mp@parliament.uk ,
claudia.webbe.mp@parliament.uk , jon.ashworth.mp@parliament.uk , liz.kendall.mp@parliament.uk ,Chief constable Leicester-
shire police c/o} rob.nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk , Lord Ken Macdonald } info@howardleague.org ,
Claire.Than@rcl.ac.uk , Lord Sumption c/o } oforig3@lsbu.ac.uk , beaumoca@lsbu.ac.uk , firm.queries@fca.org.uk , ico

CORPS ID inc}13200208

SRA ID inc}317757, 317762 , 817849 FCA ID inc}LS 817849

Your ref}Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private
prosecutors, Wrongful entering of judgment contra

Our Ref}HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CON-
TROL—HOHO872

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN,

We have noted as of this day the 21 March 2024 that there has been no formal legal response to our previous correspondence and
we attach again under this same cover the Affidavit and the correspondence sent to you on 15 February 2024, 22 February 2024
29 February 2024 , 7 March 2024 and 14 March 2024 respectively. We therefore note that there is a formal agreement to the fol-
lowing:

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872


Security and Surety by way of: Lien HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MC- CANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL— HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) is the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State

Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact

1. I, Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs (being the undersigned), do solemnly swear, declare, and depose:
2. That I am competent to state the matters herein and that I do take oath and swear that the matters herein are accurate, correct, honest, and true as contained within this Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact.
3. That I am herein stating the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that these truths stand as fact until another can provide the material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance to the contrary.
4. That I fully and completely comprehend that before any charges can be brought, it must be first proved, by presenting the material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance to support the facts, that the charges are valid and have substance that can be shown to have a foundation in fact.
5. That I have first-hand knowledge of the facts stated herein.
6. That all the facts stated herein are accurate, correct, honest, and true, and are admissible as material evidence, and that if I am called upon as a witness, that I will testify to their veracity.






are as follows:

which is nothing of any material, physical, or tan-

7. That the eternal, unchanged principals of truth
 - a) All are equal and are free by natural descent.
 - b) Truth is factual and not subjective to belief, gible substance in fact.
 - c) An un-rebutted Affidavit stands as the truth and fact.
 - d) An un-rebutted Affidavit is the documented fact and truth on and for the record.
 - e) All matters must be expressed to be resolved.
 - f) He who does not rebut the Affidavit agrees to it by default.
 - g) He who does anything by another's hand is culpable for the actions of the other's hand.
 - h) A security by way of a lien is, first and foremost, an agreement between the parties, as there is no disagreement between the parties.
 - i) That he who stands as surety, by providing the security by way of a lien, stands in honour, as that surety is undertaken by agreement, without coercion, duress, or protest, and without the threat of harm, loss, or injury, and, as such, stands in honour for the harm, loss, or injury by their own hand.
8. That a security by way of a lien, which is a commercial process (including this Affidavit), is non-judicial and pre judicial, and:
 - a. That no judge, court, government, or any agencies thereof, or any third parties whatsoever, can abrogate the Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact of another, and;
 - b. That only a party affected by an Affidavit can speak and act for himself and is solely responsible for responding with his own Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact, which no one else can do for him, where there is material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance in fact, which definitively is a firm foundation to rebut the rebutted affidavit.
9. That these facts, which form the main body of this Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact, are as follows, and that the material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance to support these facts is provided as exhibits and material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance as a foundation of these facts.
10. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity as of the 21 March 2024 that this is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State whereby MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to stand as a surety for a security by the way of a lien for restoration for the criminal offences of fraud and malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State.
11. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Government Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims..
12. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act & ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—'to interfere with justice' and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims..
13. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; .
14. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing .
15. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; .
16. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including




sections 2-Failing to disclose information &



And Abuse of position.

17. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : .
18. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138 —If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut.
19. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim That the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship.
20. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State.
21. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim of right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.
22. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has never, at any time provided valid, presentable material evidence to support the claim there is authority for MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to wilfully and premeditatedly Act to cause alarm and distress which is a formally recognised act of terrorism which is also a recognised criminal offence upon MRS YVONNE HOBBS without the presentment of the wet ink signed consent of the 64.1 upon this land and including the wet ink signature of MRS YVONNE HOBBS and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims.
23. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has chosen to enter into a lasting and binding tacit agreement through acquiescence by not negating the facts presented in Exhibit (A), and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to the criminal offences documented on and for the record in this correspondence, thus establishing a formal agreement between the parties MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State and MRS YVONNE HOBBS on and for the public record. Since there is no disagreement between the parties, this is a non-judicial matter by default.
24. It is now on and for the record and in perpetuity that all matters must be expressed to be resolved and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State was offered an opportunity to resolve (see Exhibit (B) as material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance and a foundation to this fact). Since it is MRS YVONNE HOBBS who is the victim of these agreed criminal offences of MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, then MRS YVONNE HOBBS has the right to redress and choose the remedy for these agreed criminal offences.





25. It can be noted here, for and on the record, that seven to ten years' incarceration, the latter YVONNE HOBBS is under no legal or State policy regarding this matter and would consider that this extensive term of incarceration would be an insurmountable encumbrance on the public purse. For these reasons, it is decided by MRS YVONNE HOBBS to offer alternative remedy by way of a charge.
26. A second option was also proposed, which is by standing as a surety and, therefore, providing a security by way of a lien, allowing MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to regain honour without any cause for distress to MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State. (see Exhibit (B)).
27. It is important to note here on and for the record that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has chosen by their actions not to resolve their debt by way of personal cheque or a commercial instrument. It is also important to state here on and for the record that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has not communicated by any means reluctance or objection to stand as surety and provide security by way of a lien on the estate and future earnings of MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State extended to the future generations of MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State where the sins of the father are the sins of the sons to the seventh generation, and where there may be an attachment of earnings on future generations of MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT).
28. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has not disagreed by any means of communication or correspondence to stand as surety for a security by way of a lien for their criminal offences, which have been fully documented and declared by way of this affidavit. As a consequence of not disagreeing with this proposed remedy, has formally agreed to this remedy to stand as surety, and agrees to be a security by way of a lien, and once again stands in honour by their actions by accepting the proposed remedy in full knowledge and understanding, without coercion or deception, and without the threat of harm, loss, or injury.


To this effect, the following is now true and on and for the record that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to stand as surety and security by way of a lien to MRS YVONNE HOBBS as follows:

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Surety and security by way of a lien

1. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) of authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Government Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
2. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
3. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act & ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—'to interfere with justice' and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00






4. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
5. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
6. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
7. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
8. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
9. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
10. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
- £5,000,000.00
11. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following —(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including sections 2-Failing to disclose information &. And Abuse of position is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable



criminal offence we will elect to formally
in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIG-
Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five



charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN
NIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich
Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

12. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

13. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

14. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

15. MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP


£5,000,000.00

16. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

17. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) That the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP





£5,000,000.00

18. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

Malfeasance in the office of Horwich
MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the

£5,000,000.00

19. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that the claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

20. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

21. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

22. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

23. For the formally agreed wilful and premeditated Act of causing alarm and distress which is a formally recognised act of terrorism which is also a recognised criminal offence. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State A Hundred and Ten Million Pounds GBP

£110,000,000.00

24. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP


£5,000,000.00

Total agreed debt as resolution for the above listed criminal offences equals Two Hundred and Twenty Five million pounds GBP

£225,000,000.00

29. In accordance with the traditions of this land and as this is a lien then this will be published in all the necessary places.
30. Ignorance is no defence for committing criminal acts. Considering the position of MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State should have shown more diligence and accountability in the office. It is our considered opinion, due to the severity of the most grievous agreed criminal offences, that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited





Corporation/State is no longer a fit and proper office.

person to hold any trusted position in service in the

31. It can also be considered that since these most grievous agreed criminal offences have been committed in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State which is detrimental to the function and the interests of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State and that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has acted in an ultra vires capacity in the position as DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for VHorwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State and without the legal authority to do so, thus it can be concluded that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State could be held culpable for their actions as not in the best interests of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State
32. Let it be known on and for the record that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has chosen, of their own free will, to stand as surety for a security by the way of a lien to the amount of Two Hundred and Twenty Five million pounds GBP (225,000,000.00 GBP). From Exhibit (C) of this Affidavit, in the House of Ward Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact, which is on and for the record, it is noted that the legal tender or fiscal currency, which ever term is used, is representative of confidence, faith, and belief, so this surety for a security by way of a lien is equal to Two Hundred and Twenty Five million pounds GBP (225,000,000.00 GBP) of confidence, faith, and belief.
33. Let it be known on and for the record that confidence, faith, and belief are nothing of any material, physical, or tangible substance or evidence in fact.
34. Let it be known on and for the record that since MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this remedy of their own free will, in full knowledge and understanding, without coercion or deception, and without threat of harm, loss, or injury, that MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State stands in honour, and their dignity is restored by their own hand in the community regarding this matter.

Silence creates a binding agreement.

So let it be said.

So let it be written.

So let it be done.

Without ill will or vexation

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.

For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

All rights reserved.

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State






Exhibit (A)

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Material evidence of claim by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State.

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
and
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

Also Respondents correspondence By MRS YVONNE HOBBS

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State



: Yvonne : Hobbs
33 Lea Close BROUGHTON ASTLEY LE9 6NW

To:
PATRICK JAMES MCCARTHY Doing Business as **HORWICH FARRELLY LIMITED** director
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester M16 0SP

DATE: 02 October 2022

GDPR - DPA 2018 Subject Access Request

HORWICH FARRELLY LIMITED Reference: **33, LE9 6NW**
Our reference number 13200208 / 13249755 LS817849 2022 LAND REGISTRY FRAUD, TRESPASS

Dear Sir or Madam,

I/we am/are writing, formally, to make a 'Subject Access Request' for a hard/paper copy of information that you hold and have held about *me/us* which *I/we am/are* entitled under the General Data Protection Regulation 2018.

You can identify *my/our* records using the following information:

Full name: : Yvonne : Hobbs
Address: 33 Lea Close BROUGHTON ASTLEY LE9 6NW

Please supply *me/us* the data about *me/us* that *I/we am/are* entitled to under the data protection law including:
Confirmation that you are/have been processing *my/our* personal data;
A copy of my personal data you do hold/have held;
The purposes of your processing;
The categories of personal data concerned;
The recipients and categories of recipient you disclose *my/our* personal data to;
Your retention period for storing my personal data or, where this is not possible, your criteria for determining how long you will store it;

Confirmation of the existence of *my/our* right to request rectification, erasure or restriction or to object to such processing;
Confirmation of the existence of your Section 151 officer and their details;
Confirmation of *my/our* right to lodge a complaint with the ICO or another supervisory authority;
Information about the source of the data, where it was not obtained directly from *me/us*;

The existence of any automated decision-making (including profiling); and
The safeguards you provide if you transfer *my/our* personal data to a third country or international organisation.

Please supply complete administrative and financial transactions you have with this account including the original bilateral contract * signed by both parties and including all the individually negotiated terms and conditions and all statements of same—and 'orders'.

Please provide the mapping management process involved in the data usage;

Include the regulatory compliance process used to ensure sufficient governance is in place including proof of the Duties, Responsibilities and Obligations of office and including your Oath of office.
Include the same for any third parties you provide/ have provided access to *my/our* data;
Include what your legal reason for holding such data, and any data you do not/did not have a legal reason to hold,
Please delete and provide necessary regulatory requirements to evidence the deletion of said data.

I/we look forward to receiving your response to this request for data within one calendar month, per the General Data Protection Regulation. If you do not normally deal with these requests, please pass this letter to your relevant corporate employee.

With sincerity and honour,

By: : Yvonne : Hobbs **Authorized**
Representative for MRS Y HOBBS

All Rights Reserved – Without Prejudice – Without Recourse – Non-Assumpsit
Errors & Omissions Excepted – Strictly no rights of Usufruct

* Proof of ID commensurate with the data 'property' freely given by : Yvonne : Hobbs can be made available upon proof the alledg'd agreement exists and no material facts have been concealed in its procuration

NOTE: Copy filed.

- 7 (12.09.2022) UNILATERAL NOTICE in respect of an equitable charge created by an interim charging order of the County Court Money Claims Centre dated 5 September 2022 (Court Reference 022LR104).

NOTE: Copy filed.

- 8 (12.09.2022) BENEFICIARY: Massimo Covino care of Horwich Farrelly Solicitors, Alexander House, Talbot Road, Old Trafford, Manchester, M16 0SP (REF: GAC/140362/8912)
- 9 (19.12.2022) UNILATERAL NOTICE in respect of an equitable charge created by a final charging order of the County Court Money Claims Centre dated 1 November 2022 Court reference 022LR104.

NOTE: Copy filed.

- 10 (19.12.2022) BENEFICIARY: Massimo Covino of Horwich Farrelly Limited, Alexander House, Talbot Road, Old Trafford, Manchester M16 0SP (Ref: 022LR104).

2 of 3

House of Hobbs

Title number LT148945

C: Charges Register continued

GAC/140362/8912).

End of register



Keeper of the Keys

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State



From: Patrick McCarthy <patrick.mccarthy@h-f.co.uk>
Sent: 12 January 2023 19:36
To: Baroness Von -----Andrea Shelp
Cc: penny.mordaunt.mp@parliament.uk; rob.nixon@leics.police.uk;
enquiries.leicester.crowncourt@justice.gov.uk; INVARSHA@PROTON.ME; Patrick
McCarthy; Compliance; Gary Cadwallader
Subject: RE: HOH--PATRICK MCCARTHY HORWICH FARRELLY--HOHO120 L344938
Attachments: RE: PUBLIC NOTICE of SECURITIZED LIEN - HOH--PATRICK MCCARTHY HORWICH
FAR... (205 KB); RE: Your ref 140362/8912-GAC Our ref HOH--PATRICK MCCARTHY
HORWICH FARRELL... (196 KB)
Importance: High

We acknowledge receipt of your email below received this morning (despite purportedly being sent 1st January – despite the body of your correspondence being dated 12th January).

We also acknowledge the 2 emails that you have today forwarded to our Gary Cadwallader. We reiterate the contents of our emails 4th January – copies of which we attach for ease of reference.

Matters clearly cannot be progressed via correspondence. Your assertions have no basis in law or fact, it does not seem that you are reading our responses and we regard your ongoing communications threatening to enforce non-existent rights as vexatious.

Please note from now we (the corporate entity of Horwich Farrelly and all employees) do not accept service of any document or correspondence from yourself by email. Please cease to email this firm. Any future emails we receive from you, from any email address, in respect of this matter will not be replied to. For completeness, our silence will not be acceptance but our refusal to accept your claims.

We therefore suggest that you issue proceedings forthwith should you wish to maintain your position.

We will respond to any proceedings received from you as we have detailed in our email 4th January although any correspondence received from you will not be considered.

We trust that you can understand our position.



MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State
People. Not just lawyers



Patrick McCarthy
Partner & Head of Motor & Casualty Volume
DD: 0161 413 1342 **Office:** Manchester
Correspondence Address: PO Box 149, Blyth,
NE24 9FZ

We prefer electronic communications and emailed service wherever possible so please do email us. Where you need to send us physical post via Royal Mail, please still use: PO Box 149 Blyth, NE24 9FZ. We do not use DX.

We have recently relocated our Manchester office - if you require our office address for couriers or to effect service

on our business address, our Manchester Office address has changed to: Horwich Farrelly Limited, Level 11, Orange Tower, MediaCityUK, Salford Quays, Greater Manchester, M50 2HF

From: Baroness Von -----Andrea Shelp <moandaymoanday@outlook.com>

Sent: 01 January 2023 19:44

To: Patrick McCarthy <patrick.mccarthy@h-f.co.uk>

Cc: penny.mordaunt.mp@parliament.uk; rob.nixon@leics.police.uk; enquiries.leicester.crowncourt@justice.gov.uk; INVARSHA@PROTON.ME

Subject: HOH--PATRICK MCCARTHY HORWICH FARRELLY--HOHO120 L344938

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.




Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





House of Hobbs

Officer for Horwich Farrelly Limited Company/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]
Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk

Your Ref: e-mail of 28/12/22 140362/8912-GAC

CO REG 13200208 SRA ID 817849

cc. rob.nixon@leics.police.uk

cc. enquiries.leicester.crowncourt@justice.gov.uk

cc. King Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP penny.mordaunt.mp@parliament.uk

Our Ref: HOH--PATRICK JAMES MCCARTHY HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR --HOHO120

Dear MR PATRICK JAMES MCCARTHY,

We have noted as of this day the 12 January 2023 that there has been no response to our previous com 29 December 2022 and 05 January 2023 respectively. In the interest of candour we extend the deadline (7) Days. In The interests Of clarity we repeat the same again here.

Without ill will or vexation.

Silence creates binding agreement.

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Dear MR PATRICK JAMES MCCARTHY,


Thank you for your electronic mail of 28th December 2022. We have noted the contents of the correspondence unsigned and Undated--referring as it does to our Letter of 28th December 2022--under ref: HOH--PA HORWICH FARRELLY--HOHO111--which provided PATRICK MCCARTHY Opportunity to Resolve the financial claims made by PATRICK MCCARTHY where PATRICK MCCARTHY having failed to present the material contract showing that MRS YVONNE HOBBS has any obligation to pay PATRICK MCCARTHY any consideration for any property real; And PATRICK MCCARTHY failed to present the material evidence of a government with which he is associated by presenting the 64.1 million wet-ink signed consents of the governed. Its content will be kept on file for future action.

As the recipient of this communication we see the sender failed in his/her Office and did not execute the document in accordance with Companies Act s.44 when they sent it to Us at Our e-address. The action of not signing the document to Us by an embodied hand legally means that no living person has taken legal responsibility for the correspondence on behalf of Horwich Farrelly Limited Company/State and the correspondence cannot be responded to. That very act of not executing the document, renders the correspondence void and therefore unusable in law under current legislation.

This e-mail (copy included under this cover) will now be kept on file as physical, presentable evidence of the criminal activities of the representatives of Horwich Farrelly Limited Company/State, whether aware of this transgression or not. Ignorance of the law is no defence. This is a fact which must be understood and shows an ignorance of current legislation. We note and refer to The Companies Act 2006 S.44 Execution of documents

44. Execution of documents

(1) Under the law of England and Wales or Northern Ireland a document is executed by a company



Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
15 February 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER
for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Limited Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]

MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o}Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk , Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk ,
compliance@h-f.co.uk ,

Your Ref} Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private prosecutors, Wrongful
entering of judgment contra

Our Ref} HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872—
GDPR - DPA 2018 Subject Access Request

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN,

We present our wish to a further 'Subject Access Request' based on claim of Patrick McCarthy, for a hard copy of information that you hold and have
held about us to which we are entitled under the General Data Protection Regulation 2018.

You can identify our records using the following information though procured without our authority or permission:
Full name}MRS YVONNE HOBBS Address} 33 LEA CLOSE County Palatine of Leicestershire [LE9 6NW]

Please supply us the data about us that we are entitled to under the data protection law including}

Confirmation that you are/have been processing our personal data;
A copy of our personal data you do hold/have held;
The purposes of your processing;
The categories of personal data concerned;
The recipients or categories of recipient you disclose our personal data to;
Your retention period for storing my personal data or, where this is not possible, your criteria for determining how long you will store it;

Confirmation of the existence of our right to request rectification, erasure or restriction or to object to such processing;
Confirmation of our right to lodge a complaint with the ICO or another supervisory authority;
Information about the source of the data, where it was not obtained directly from us;
The existence of any automated decision-making (including profiling); and
The safeguards you provide if you transfer our personal data to a third country or international organisation.

Please supply complete instrument and financial transactions, including 'off book' you have with this account and all statements of same and all
instruments including contracts entered in to ; & And the instruments of mutual consideration ; &. And any & all instruments of collateral contracts
including Power of Attorney granted for Aviva Insurance, Massimo Covino, Horwich Farrelly, HMCTS including judiciary, court managers, court
officers to enter us into collateral agreement with any corporate officer with neither our agreement nor wet ink autograph ; &. And any and all exemptions
from shewing lien instruments within your accounting and ledgering—see <https://multy.me/bELptP> ; &. And any and all obligations, agreements including
Power of Attorney over Us, our property real, tangible, intangible and our incorporeal property. Include agreement shewing of #A where 'We have been
provided the legal pack/Case management file' and instruments of our indebtedness to any corporations you claim above or elsewhere ; &. AND
agreement shewing of #B officers of Horwich Farrelly have exemption from, including, not least, the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act and Real
Estates Act,s.107 and 1677 Statute of Frauds Act—176 Anno vicefimo nono.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State

Please provide the mapping management process involved in the data usage;


Include the regulatory compliance process used to ensure sufficient governance is in place ; include your exemptions from Statutes/Acts
Include the same for any third parties you provide/ have provided access to our data; Include what your legal reason for holding such data, and any data
you do not/did not have a legal reason to hold, Please delete and provide necessary regulatory requirements to evidence the deletion of said data.

We look forward to receiving your response within one calendar month, per the General Data Protection Regulation. If you do not normally deal with
these requests, please pass this letter to your Data Protection Officer, or relevant staff member.

We await your response. Silence creates a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence.
No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted.
Without ill will or vexation


For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.





For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.
For and on behalf of Baroness Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.

* Proof of ID commensurate with the data 'property' freely given by Yvonne : Hobbs can be made available upon proof the alleged agreement exists and no material facts have been concealed in its procurement




Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire (LE9 6NW)

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
15 February 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN
OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]
MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o}Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk ,
Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk ,

Those with knowledge} Attorney General to King Charles} victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk,
Contempt.SharedMailbox@attorneygeneral.gov.uk , Land Registry CEO and board c/o}simon.hayes@landregistry.gov.uk , King
Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP}hcnquiries@parliament.uk , , Lady Chief Justice Sue Lascelles
Carr c/o} contactholmemberr@parliament.uk , hinfo@parliament.uk , Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos , Sir Julian Martin Flaux , Sir
Antony James Zacaroli Court of Chancery c/o rcjcompanies.orders@justice.gov.uk , rolls.ICL.hearings1@justice.gov.uk , Rishi
Sunak's Anti-Fraud Champion Simon Fell MP c/o} simon.fell.mp@parliament.uk , Alex Chalk Secretary of State for Justice and
Lord Chancellor c/o} alex.chalk.mp@parliament.uk , Regulatory corps c/o } professional.ethics@sra.org.uk ,
firm.queries@fca.org.uk , icocasework@ico.org.uk , Leicestershire MPs c/o} andrew.bridgen.mp@parliament.uk ,
alberto.costa.mp@parliament.uk , claudia.webbe.mp@parliament.uk , jon.ashworth.mp@parliament.uk ,
liz.kendall.mp@parliament.uk , Chief constable Leicestershire police c/o} rob.nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk , Lord Ken
Macdonald } info@howardleague.org , Claire.Than@rcl.ac.uk , Lord Sumption c/o } oforig3@lsbu.ac.uk ,
beaumoca@lsbu.ac.uk ,

CORPS ID inc}13200208

SRA ID inc}317757, 317762 , 817849 FCA ID inc}LS 817849

Your ref}Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private
prosecutors, Wrongful entering of judgment contra


Our Ref}HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT
CONTROL—HOHO872

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN,


Thank you for Under Your Ref} 022LR104 Fraud, trespass and acts of violence upon our property real and corporeal Acts to
interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private prosecutors,
Wrongful entering of judgment contra—Acts with knowledge to interfere with justice contra, inc., the Abuse of the court system
—use of the processes of the court as a tool of extortion. We cite here Lord Sumption Crawford Adjusters v Sagicor General
Insurance , 1838 GRAINGER v. HILL and 1861 GILDING v EYRE which shews a malicious employment of the process of the
court ; &. And Acts contra the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1), In this Part a “qualifying disclosure” means
any disclosure of information which, in the reasonable belief of the worker making the disclosure, tends to show one or more of
the following—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person
has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice
has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; &. &. And Acts contra the 1861 Forgery Act—Whosoever, without lawful
authority or excuse (the proof whereof shall lie on the party accused), shall in the name of any other person acknowledge any
recognizance or bail, or any cognovit, actionem, or judgment, or any deed or other instrument, before any court, judge, or other
person lawfully authorized in that behalf, shall be guilty of felony ; &. And Acts by claiming you have the authority/Power of
Attorney which you claim, intitules a disregarding of our right of peaceful enjoyment of our property as owner per Land Registry,
and this claim of PoA constitutes wet ink signed contractual obligation upon us to you ; &. And Acts contra the 1861 Forgery Act
—Whosoever, without lawful authority or excuse (the proof whereof shall lie on the party accused), shall in the name of any other
person acknowledge any recognizance or bail, or any cognovit, actionem, or judgment, or any deed or other instrument, before
any court, judge, or other person lawfully authorized in that behalf, shall be guilty of felony thro LAND REGISTRY thro County
Court Money Claims Centre un named judge —in order to subjugate us in terrorem ; & And acts of right thro County Court
Money Claims Centr un named judge to use the County Court Money Claims Centr un named judge as private prosecution service
; Here we cite from the 2019 case Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited and 2021 case Josephine Hamilton and Others
versus Post Office Limited whereby fraud by concealment of data by Post Office Limited was found “no examination of the data,
bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming
POL’s own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton’s prosecution
was unfair and an affront to justice.” ; & The judgment in Bates v Post Office Ltd (No.3: Common Issues) [2019]
EWHC 606 (QB) delivered by Mr Justice Fraser was highly critical of the Post Office stating that it showed
‘oppressive behaviour’ in response to claimants who had been dismissed for accounting errors they blamed on the






Horizon system [§517]. He went on to say that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid ‘no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world’ [§138], that the Post Office ‘seemed to adopt an extraordinarily narrow approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant’ [§34], feared ‘objective scrutiny of its behaviour’ [§28] and operated with a ‘culture of secrecy and confidentiality’ [§36] ; We would refer you to the 1885 Weller versus Stone case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed “yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever.” ; &., Acts contra 1677 Statute of Frauds Act, 1882 Bills of Exchange Act, 1989 Law of Property Act, 2006 Fraud Act—to cause us loss by concealment of data financial instruments recording our Tender and concealment of all our instruments including Contracts, consideration, Notes, Bills, Liens and Affidavits. &. And acts of concealment contra 2006 Fraud Act by omission of the wet ink signed contract , collateral agreements, Bills—Part 35, section 2 (1)A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person, (b) dishonestly abuses that position, and (c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss ; Citing a case before Sir John Stuart and discrete case before Lord Denning 1954, Lazarus v. Beasley “Fraud unravels everything” ; And acts contra the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act and 1689 Bill of Rights Act for the acts of contempt perpetrated against—‘to interfere with justice’ and we are alert again to the Post Office Limited cases above where it was found similarly the ‘interference with justice AND oppression ; &. And the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act—176 Anno vicefimo nono ... or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And Acts contra 2006 Fraud Act Part 35, section 3—Fraud by failing to disclose information A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) dishonestly fails to disclose to another person information which he is under a legal duty to disclose, and (b) intends, by failing to disclose the information—(i)to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii)to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss ; &. And Acts of concealment contra 2006 Fraud Act by omission of the wet ink signed contract , collateral agreements, Bills—Part 35, section 2 (1)A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person, (b) dishonestly abuses that position, and (c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss ; &. And Acts to claim power of attorney and authority contra, not least ,the 1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act section 107—Nothing in this Act contained shall entitle any Person to refuse to make a complete Discovery by Answer to any Bill in Equity, or to answer any Question or Interrogatory in any Civil Proceeding, in any Court of Law or Equity, or in the Court of Bankruptcy ; &. And section 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes ; &. And Acts contra section 106—No Proceeding or Conviction for any Act hereby declared to be a Misdemeanor shall affect any Remedy which any Person aggrieved by such Act may be entitled to, either at Law or in Equity, against the Person who has committed such Act ; &. And Acts contra section 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ; &. And any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud ; &. And claims of first hand knowledge of our indebtedness by concealment of data contra 2018 GDPR Act ; And the consideration not being stated ; &, And Acts contra the 1882 Bills of Exchange Act by omission granting of Our power of attorney” whereby Our consent is not required ; &, And Bills to be predicated upon a wet ink signed contract and to be in Writing and signed ; istofer David Wilson by “contacting the court for paperwork to sort this out” and them havi&, And acts contra 1989 Law of Property Act—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing ; &, And concealment contra the 2006 Fraud Act , including section 2-Fraud by false representation, &. And Acts contra 2006 Companies Act—by omission of company documents bearing the company seal or the wet ink signatures of the parties ; And acts contra 1984 County Courts Act 28 s.135—‘Any person who—(a) delivers or causes to be delivered to any other person any paper falsely purporting to be a copy of any summons or other process of [the county court] , knowing it to be false; or (b) acts or professes to act under any false colour or pretence of the process or authority of [the county court]’ ; &, And we cite Lord Sumption 2014 Crawford Adjusters v Sagicor General Insurance “;





1. We have noted that Mr Ronan Mathew Martin McCann is the claimant.
2. We have noted a claim that Mr Ronan Mathew Martin McCann an employed officer within the Corporation/State intituled Horwich Farrelly has authority over our property corporeal, real, tangible or property intangible without wet ink signed contract and without mutual consideration.
3. We have noted a claim of a First hand knowledge.
4. We have noted unsigned, unsealed and without instrument of contract/agreement for us a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, section 44, the Execution of documents—manifests in your favour a Power of attorney.
5. We have noted a claim contra—That only a party affected by an Affidavit can speak and act for himself and is solely responsible for responding with his own Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact, which no one else can do for him, where there is material, physical, and tangible evidence and substance in fact, which definitively is a firm foundation to rebut the rebutted affidavit.
6. We have noted a claim of “amount due” and an exemption from responding to the Subject access requests for the commercial instruments of contract/agreements/collateral contract, the financial instruments of Bills, Notes, Liens, Affidavits et al and we have noted a claim contra—that where there is no material evidence ; Or omission to show that evidence which is contra to your claim ; Or concealment of discovery/disclosure to support a claim then the claim would be fraudulent in nature which is recognized fraud by misrepresentation, a known criminal offence that is chargeable.
7. We have noted a claim of “Our Client: Aviva Insurance Limted, Their insured Mr Massimo Covino” and exemption from responding to the Subject access requests for the contract/collateral contract and and we have noted a claim contra —that where there is no material evidence ; Or omission to show that evidence which is contra to your claim ; Or concealment of discovery/disclosure to support a claim then the claim would be fraudulent in nature which is recognized fraud by misrepresentation, a known criminal offence that is chargeable.
8. We have noted a claim of “Finally we enclose our Schedule of Costs...secured by way of the charge” and exemption from responding to the Subject access requests for the contract/collateral contract and and we have noted a claim contra —that where there is no material evidence ; Or omission to show that evidence which is contra to your claim ; Or concealment of discovery/disclosure to support a claim then the claim would be fraudulent in nature which is recognized fraud by misrepresentation, a known criminal offence that is chargeable..
9. We have noted a claim of “no lien exists...you have no legal basis” and exemption from responding to the Subject access requests for the contract/collateral contract and and we have noted a claim contra —that where there is no material evidence ; Or omission to show that evidence which is contra to your claim ; Or concealment of discovery/disclosure to support a claim then the claim would be fraudulent in nature which is recognized fraud by misrepresentation, a known criminal offence that is chargeable..
10. We have noted a claim contra—of a security by way of a lien, which is a commercial process is non-judicial and pre judicial..
11. We have noted a claim of Power of Attorney, of authority upon and over Our private property of real estate, our property of treasure and intangible property ; &. We have noted a claim of Power of Attorney, of authority to create collateral contracts for the wresting away from us of that property including authority conferred upon by Gary Cadwallader to seize Our private property when you have been made cognizant to provide instruments and financial instruments you claim shews us to be indebted to you ‘ ;
12. We have noted a claim of exemption from the getting of wet ink autographed contract between the parties—and without contract or agreement we become liable or beholden and must subjugate ourselves and be unto a Power of Attorney with your corporation to have to your avail at will our property ; And by your authority you create detrimental contracts which are binding upon us ; And have exemption from disclosing, from where, if not us, you have obtain this authority, this Power of Attorney.
13. We have noted a claim of exemption under the 1677, Statutes of Frauds Act—upon any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract for Sale of Lands, &c. unless Agreement, &c. be in Writing and signed.;
14. We have noted a claim of exemption—inc 1998 Disclosure Act s.43b whereby admission of no evidence ‘disclosure’ whereby it tends to show—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur from where there is no material evidence —to support a claim then the claim would be fraudulent in nature which is recognized fraud by misrepresentation, a known criminal offence that is chargeable.
15. We have noted a claim of exemption under the 1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act section 107 to make a complete Discovery by Answer to any Bill in Equity, or to answer any Question or Interrogatory in any Civil Proceeding, in any Court of Law or Equity—omissions including of instruments of wet ink sign’d seal’d court orders, warrants, our personal data property Subject access [GDPR] , shewing of indebtedness thro Bills predicated upon contracts, instruments of mutual consideration, agreements, collateral agreements, Contracts for sale of our real property, Notes, financial instrument of tender, Affidavits, Liens






16. We have noted a claim of exemption under the 1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act section 105 to put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information
17. We have noted a claim of exemption under the 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing
18. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act including Section 23—Signature essential to liability
19. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, section 44, the Execution of documents—the getting of the wet-ink consent of MRS YVONNE HOBBS before any of their private charter ; OR the superior branches of Executive or Legislature Acts or Statutes can be acted upon.;
20. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Fraud Act, including section 2—Fraud by false representation ; And section 7—Making or supplying articles for use in frauds
21. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Fraud Act, including Part 35 section 22 (1)—A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person, (b) dishonestly abuses that position, and (c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss ;
22. We have noted the omissions Under the UK 2018 Data Protection Act—Consents Protection of personal data.
23. We have noted a claim of exemption from providing equal contract or agreement consideration under their private charter terms or articles.
24. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2000 Terrorism Act for the repeated threats demanding payment for a proscribed organization and, for the threats of the taking of our property including by the use of enforcers.
25. We have noted a claim made via Patrick McCarthy that our instruments including Affidavit and Lien have no legal basis and the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act and the 1882 Bills of Exchange Act are irrelevant : &. We have noted claims of Horwich Farrelly officers right to create indebtedness merely by their instruments
26. We have noted a claim made via Patrick McCarthy that our instruments including Affidavit and Lien have no legal basis and the 2006 Fraud act has no bearing upon the matter
27. We have noted a claim 'the court paperwork' is in order.
28. We have noted a claim of exemption from providing a wet ink signed court order.
29. We have noted a claim of exemption for all disclosure including for the withholding under the UK 2018 Data Protection Act—Subject Access Requests any and all requests for 'evidence' including that 'evidence' not used—including Consents Protection of personal data and provision of personal data taken.
30. We have noted a claim that officers of the County Court Money Claims Centre Corporation/State, or any "court", of HM Courts Tribunal Services, of Ministry of Justice Corporation/State is not a sub-office of HM Government plc ; And We have noted a claim of exemption from law of—Disagreements arising from 'contracts'—being non-judicial and outside the scope of the private courts of the judiciary.
31. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Fraud Act, including section 2—Failing to disclose information
32. We have noted a claim of exemption in presenting to us any and all valid, presentable material evidence including and all wet-ink signed—contracts/obligations/agreements, Ledgering, indebtedness, mortgage account, breakdown of the total amounts, credit scores, all Notes, Bills—and exemption from presenting this material evidence to the principal legal embodiment of Mrs Yvonne Hobbs for their perusal and rebuttal.
33. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK GDPR Act, including section 169—(ii)has acted outside, or contrary to, the controller's lawful instructions.;
34. We have noted a claim of exemption from the getting of the wet-ink consent of the 64.1 million 'governed' before any of HM Government plc Corporation/state private charter, Acts or Statutes can be acted upon.
35. We have noted a claim of right to act in contempt of court to bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS
36. We have noted the further claims upon the documents hereto attached AND/OR omissions.

It is a Maxim of the rule of law that he who makes a claim also carries the obligation by way of the fact that a claim has been made to present as material evidence, the material and factual substance of that claim. We would note that where there is no material evidence to support a claim then the claim would be fraudulent in nature which is recognized fraud by misrepresentation, a known criminal offence that is chargeable.

We would also draw to the attention of MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State the Baron David Ward Affidavit, served upon every MP in the office of HM Parliament Corporation/State. This is a formal and legal process where, when left un rebutted on a point by point basis leads to a formal, legal





agreement in fact and law and we shall refer to it in detail from hereonin. The self intituled MPs who are employees of a private corporation, were served the Affidavit again—in October 2022—without rebuttal. The link to the public notices is given here: https://justpaste.it/MP_SECURITISED_LIENS And <https://tinyurl.com/BIT-LY-LINKS-LIENS-UptoDate>

We have also noted and it is fact, that a Chief Executive Officer is culpable and liable for the activities of the Officers—which includes Gary Cadwallader and PatrickMcCarthy, where we have no examination of the data, instruments, power of attorney for trespasses against us And refusal to answer disclosure/discovery and interfere with justice—of the corporation(s) under his remit which is why we write to you PATRICK JAMES MCCCARTHY.

There is established a clear and noted obligation of service for MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid and presentable material evidence to support the claims being made.

1. We have noted a claim of authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Government Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

From Exhibit (B). —Case Authority WI-05257F David Ward V Warrington Borough Council, 30thDay of May 2013. Which is a case at court tribunal undertaken by recognised due process.

It is evident David Ward did not challenge the PCN or the traffic Management Act 2004 section 82 but the presumption of the consent of the governed.

What is a mandatory requirement before the Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon is for the consent of the governed to be valid and that it can be presented as material fact before any charges or claims can be brought.

It is clear from this case authority undertaken by due process that: -(1) It is illegal to act upon any of the Acts or statutes without the consent of the governed [where the governed have actually given their consent] and that consent is presentable as material physical evidence of the fact that the governed have given their consent. (2) Where the Acts and statutes are acted upon then this is illegal and a criminal action by the Corporation/State. (3) The criminal action is Malfeasance in a public office and fraud. (4) Where there is no consent of the governed on and for the public record then there is no governed and where there is no governed then there is no government. The one cannot exist without the other—they are mutually exclusive. (5) As this criminal activity is observed to be standard practice and has been for nearly 800 years, then this is clear observable evidence to the fact that LAW is a presumption and there is no such thing as LAW. See Exhibit (A) the twelve presumptions of law.

Without this legal consent—the circa 64.1 million wet ink signed consents of the Governed—there is no legal authority under which there is a recognised officer of the Private Corporation/State that carries the necessary legal authority to create culpability, liability or agreement or otherwise enforce private corporate policy.

We refer you to the Baron David Ward unrebutted Affidavit Exhibit A—Formal challenge to the twelve presumptions of law. We have challenged all the Presumptions of Law. We have since obtained Securitized liens, lawful instruments, without most importantly any rebuttal and to this day not one piece of evidence of Corporate/State authority of Us has been presented.

We repeat, We formally challenge all presumptions of law and as we have formally challenged all the twelve presumptions of law then the presumption of law formally has no substance in material FACT.

We will recognise the rule of law, when and only when there is the material evidence of that assumed rule of law has some material evidence of substance in presentable material fact.


We refer you to Exhibit C of the David Ward Affidavit where Chandran Kukathas PhD details over 7 pages that the State is a private corporation and specifically a legal embodiment by act of registration; And of no material substance.

Fraud however has been defined as a criminal act with full knowledge and intent to engage in criminal behaviour to benefit one, at the expense of another. To bring about by an act of force, support of this fraud is also recognised as an act of terrorism.

From Exhibit (C)—The Material evidence of the FACTS.

In order to interfere with justice it is shown that, with knowledge, of the Fraud, trespass and acts of violence upon our property real and corporeal is accomplished with the aid of others who become as





culpable including thro the use of HM Courts and Tribunal Services as private prosecutors.

In full knowledge of the process of the court and a deliberate abuse of that process—to have HMCTS act as a personal private prosecution service, cheaper than the Royal Courts constitutes ABUSE of PROCESS for he has maliciously employed the process of the court. We cite the 2014 Lord Sumption *Crawford Adjusters v Sagor General Insurance*, 1838 *GRAINGER v. HILL* and here draw to the attention “but if the bailiff touch the person it is an arrest” akin to the POL cases, whereby 2019, 2021 and since 1680s *Post Office Limited*, a corps, claims to have authority over people to investigate them, arrest them and prosecute them and then wrest from those said prosecuted as much and any property of their choosing POL wishes and 1861 *GILDING v EYRE* “has maliciously employed the process of the court”. This abuse applies to the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act and the failure to disclose or by omission, the concealment in for unjust enrichment.

It has been confirmed by the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, on and for the record that:- (1) Whilst there is no material and physical evidence presented to the fact that the governed have given their consent then the office of the Judiciary has no greater authority than the manageress of McDonalds being as the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of a legal embodiment by an act of registration where this act of registration creates nothing of physical material substance and which is also fraud by default. Any objection to this observation of fact should be taken up with the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, whereupon the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA would then have to present the material and physical evidence that the governed have given their consents.

As the office of the Judiciary is nothing more than a private commercial and fraudulent enterprise built upon fraud and criminal intent. This is by no stretch of the imagination a valid government by the people for the people as it is by default a private company providing a judicial service for profit and gain but where there is also and always a conflict of interests—where there is a conflict of interests between the needs of the people and the state (Corporate) Policy which has no obligation to the people or even the needs and wellbeing of corporation staff. This has been confirmed by Chandran Kukathas of the London School of Economics and state office titled the Department of Government.

Disagreements arising from ‘contracts’ are non-judicial and outside the scope of the private courts of the judiciary—these being the sub-offices of the private Corporation/State of HM Government plc as shown above. As has been confirmed by the esteemed Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA the office of the Judiciary (Court) is a sub office of a Private Limited corporation (HM Parliaments & Governments PLC) and that such an officer of a Private corporation court does not have the status to give or grant a Court Order outside of that Private corporation Office. The use of HMCTS as private prosecutors, shews those ‘acts’ fall in to the 2006 Fraud Act Part 35, section 3, as Mr Justice Fraser records within the *Post Office* judgment ‘that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid ‘no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world’ [§138], that the Post Office ‘seemed to adopt an extraordinarily narrow approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant’ [§34],


To bring about by an act of force, support of this fraud is also recognised as an act of terrorism Under the UK 2000 Terrorism Act, s.1,5—action taken for the benefit of a proscribed organisation It is evident from the omissions that there is no wet-ink signed contract between ‘the parties’ including between the Corporation/State of HM Government plc and Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State or Us.

2. We have noted a claim of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act & ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—‘to interfere with justice’ and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims.. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

And to further underline the malfeasance being demonstrated by the taking of our property—intangible and real to ensure subjugation and to extort us, we cite the 1677 Statutes of Fraud Act, Sir John Stuart and we cite Lord Denning 1956 *Lazarus v. Beazley* while again referring you to the Facts including the }UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 2—F RAUD by ABUSE of POSITION (1)A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person, (b) dishonestly abuses that position, and (c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss. (2) A person may be regarded as having abused his position even though his conduct consisted of an omission rather than an act.

Fraud is a deliberate action to defraud where the victim of the crime is unaware having no knowledge of a situation or fact. This crime carries a penalty of incarceration for 7 to 10 years and the latter, where there is multiple instances of. 64.1 million people are subject to this crime everyday as it is now commonplace and is carried out by the largest and most ruthless criminal company in this





country. This same company is also a public office with the enforcement to execute this crime which is inclusive of but not limited to:- The office of the police, The office of the Judiciary, Local government and central government. Independent Bailiff Companies which are licensed by the same company.

3. We have noted a claim of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

We now refer you to Exhibit (A) of the Affidavit which defines that profiteering contravenes the UK 2006 Fraud Act. We should also point out to you that it is a direct contravention of the UK 2000 Terrorism Act, s.15 Fund raising is an offence if a person invites another to provide money or other property and intends that it should be used for the purposes of terrorism. Insisting or demanding payment without a pre existing commercial arrangement which is based on presentable fact in the form of a commercial agreement is an act of deception. Payment is a commercial activity. We are not in the habit of knowingly conspiring to fraud or knowingly funding terrorism. This action would also create a liability against us.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has made claim/demand of indebtedness/for payment, but has not presented Us with a valid and legal Bill—predicated upon a pre existing commercial contract or collateral contract or any agreement—which is recognised under the Bills of exchange act of 1882. Because there is no commercial arrangement in place under which to raise a Bill for a bill to arise is also a direct violation of the 1882 Bills of Exchange Act. Additionally without the wet ink signed commercial arrangement and Bill presented, this Act would also be a contravention of the UK 2006 Fraud Act and to demand payment—under threats—contravenes the UK 2000 Terrorism Act. We are not in the habit of knowingly conspiring to fraud and/or terrorism. See Bills of exchange act of 1882. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61>.

A claim of 'contractual obligations being a non-judicial matter and UTTERING' as act(s) contra the 1861 Forgery Act—Whosoever, without lawful authority or excuse (the proof whereof shall lie on the party accused), shall in the name of any other person acknowledge any recognizance or bail, or any cognovit, actionem, or judgment, or any deed or other instrument, before any court, judge, or other person lawfully authorized in that behalf, shall be guilty of felony.


HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY

4. We have noted a claim of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing . MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

From Exhibit (D) of the Affidavit and Statement of Fact for Case Authority WI-05257F. 30d of May 2013 it is evident there is due process for the execution of legal and commercial documents. Where these processes are not followed then the very presence of a document which does not comply with these processes, is itself is the physical and material evidence of Malfeasance in a public office and fraud. We would point your attention to the FACTs that a corporation must execute documents legally and failure to do so renders the documents non legal and void—(1) Under the law of England and Wales or Northern Ireland a document is executed by a company—(a) by the affixing of its common seal, or (b) by signature in accordance with the following provisions. (2) A document is validly executed by a company if it is signed on behalf of the company— (a) by two authorised signatories, or (b) by a director of the company in the presence of a witness who attests the signature. (4) A document signed in accordance with subsection (2) and expressed in whatever words, to be executed by the company, has the same effect as if executed under the common seal of the company. The legal effect of the statute is that documents and deeds must be signed on behalf of the company by a director in the presence of a witness, or by two authorised signatories. Without adherence to these provisions no contracts can be considered duly executed by a company and their terms are therefore legally unenforceable.

We would refer you to the 1885 Weller versus Stone case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed "yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever." We cite 2019 Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited and 2021 Josephine Hamilton and Others versus Post Office Limited whereby fraud by concealment of data was found ; We cite Lord Denning 1954, Lazarus v.






Beasley "Fraud unravels everything" ; And we cite Sir John Stuart 'when tender has been made the mortgagee has not entitlement to proceed to sale ' ; Continuing, in 1982 1 KB 245, 2 GIFF. 99 Where a mortgagee, after tender of his principal and interest... the Court set the sale aside against him and a person who had bought with knowledge of the tender, 2. A purchaser who buys with knowledge of circumstances sufficient against the mortgagee to invalidate the sale, becomes a party to the transaction and is not protected by the proviso that the purchaser need make no inquiry. 3. Where the costs are unascertained and the security ample, a mortgagee, after a tender of principal and interest, is not entitled to proceed with the sale; And the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act—176 Anno vicefimo nono ... or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; We draw to your attention to the detail of the 11 March 2019 thro 2 July 2019 case reference HQ16X01238, HQ17X02637 and HQ17X04248 in the high court before Mr Justice Fraser of 'Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited'[POL]—a company wholly owned by HM Government—wherein despite the fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery, Bates and Others won their case. Mr Stuart Wentworth QC in questioning Mr. Alan Bates cites an "information sheet"—which is not a contract of reciprocity—that 'postmaster responsible for losses'. Questioning Mrs Pam Stubbs she is referred by Mr Wentworth to section 19 paragraph 4 of a POL contract. Further in the 23 April 2021 appeal in the high court of 'Josephine Hamilton and Others' Mr Justice said in quashing their convictions for the above 'fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery' "there was no examination of the data, bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming POL's own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton's prosecution was unfair and an affront to justice." ; & The judgment in Bates v Post Office Ltd (No.3: Common Issues) [2019] EWHC 606 (QB) delivered by Mr Justice Fraser was highly critical of the Post Office stating that it showed 'oppressive behaviour' in response to claimants who had been dismissed for accounting errors they blamed on the Horizon system [§517]. He went on to say that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid 'no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world' [§138], that the Post Office 'seemed to adopt an extraordinarily narrow approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant' [§34], feared 'objective scrutiny of its behaviour' [§28] and operated with a 'culture of secrecy and confidentiality' [§36] ; Further after the above cases and long after the acts of POL against the sub post masters, it was brought to the attention of Lord James Arbuthnot and the POL Forensic accountant, that within an independent legal advice report commissioned by POL in the Summer of 2013—and concealed by POL—that POL were in full knowledge, and not only failed to disclose but continued their acts, along the lines of the unsafe convictions already given to sub post masters and to those currently being pursued by POL. We cite Lord Arbuthnot 'POL lied to and were in contempt'. As stated above, it should also be kept to the forefront of mind that POL being owned by HM Government and the judiciary being one sub-office of HM Government that HM Government was fully cognizant with these matters throughout. Equally for those whose property including real property was wrested from them on the claims and non disclosures—that is the concealment—[for non disclosure seems anodyne] of POL, HM Land Registry is also owned by HM Government, and a party to the fraud. We, having previously cited cases where Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds bank, act contra, the 1677 Statutes of Frauds act including when in 1721 the Lord Chancellor dismissed the Bill, it appearing that as the Agreement was made in Writing, it was unequal and against Reason. And 1720 Lord Macclesfield 'Court of Equity will not decree execution of articles where they appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity. Sir John Stuart and Lord Denning 1956 [Lazarus vs. Beasley] "No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a court, no Order of a Minister can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by Fraud, fraud unravels everything..." And now we add the citation of Bates and Others vs. Post Office Limited to an already large body of court case material. The fraud of concealment is of no less significance than the fraud of presenting false instruments. That we have brought this to your attention, including the refusal of Charles Alan Nunn contra 2018 GDPR Act and the controllers law is, it seems a further reason to act against us contra the 2010 Equality act for, as in the cases of POL, Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds should they be able to substantiate their claims, would have no reason for concealment or for the preventing of their further acts of fraud should they reveal, by disclosure, an absence of any lawful right to act against us and our property—this includes the claims of Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds that they and their agents have a right to use force against our corporeal property and our real property. A Court of Equity considers iniquitous those contracts/agreements which appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity.

Referencing the UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 2--FALSE REPRESENTATION A representation is false if—(a) it is untrue or misleading, and (b)the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading. (3)"Representation" means any representation as to fact or law, including a representation as to the state of mind of—(a)the person making the representation, or (b)any other person.

We refer you to Exhibit C of the David Ward Affidavit where under the —Including the taking of Our property of data and using it as your own without Our knowledge or consent, the threats against Our property and the further claims to benefit a private Corporation/State and extorting money with neither signature nor contract is an act of force ***in terrorem***.





5. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; . MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.
6. We have noted a claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including sections 2-Failing to disclose information &. And Abuse of position MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

By failing to disclose all information including that which shews facts contra to your claims and by failing to supply information under Subject Access Requests, these acts, for omission is still an act, brings in to force the of refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—Acts with knowledge to interfere with justice contra, inc., the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1), In this Part a “qualifying disclosure” means any disclosure of information which, in the reasonable belief of the worker making the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ;

Under UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 3—Fraud by failing to disclose information A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) dishonestly fails to disclose to another person information which he is under a legal duty to disclose, and (b) intends, by failing to disclose the information—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.


We cite Lord Denning, Lord Chief Justice ‘1956, *Lazarus v Beasley*’ “No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a Court, no Order of a Minister can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by Fraud, Fraud unravels everything.”

We would refer you to the 1885 *Weller versus Stone* case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed “yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever.” We cite 2019 *Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited* and 2021 *Josephine Hamilton and Others versus Post Office Limited* whereby fraud by concealment of data was found ; Sir John Stuart and we cite Lord Denning 1954, *Lazarus v. Beasley* “Fraud unravels everything” ; And we cite Sir John Stuart ‘when tender has been made the mortgagee has not entitlement to proceed to sale ‘ ; Continuing in 1982 1 KB 245, 2 GIFF. 99 Where a mortgagee, after tender of his principal and interest... the Court set the sale aside against him and a person who had bought with knowledge of the tender.

We draw to your attention the 11 March 2019 thro 2 July 2019 case reference HQ16X01238, HQ17X02637 and HQ17X04248 in the high court before Mr Justice Fraser of ‘*Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited*’ [POL]—a company wholly owned by HM Government—wherein despite the fraud and circumvention of POL to discovery, Bates and Others were successful in exposing the fraud and concealment and usury and iniquitous contracts to the wider gaze. Mr Stuart Wentworth QC in questioning Mr. Alan Bates cites an information sheet—which is not a contract of reciprocity—that ‘postmaster responsible for losses’. Questioning Mrs Pam Stubbs she is referred by Mr Wentworth to section 19 paragraph 4 of a POL contract. Further in the 23 April 2021 appeal in the high court of ‘*Josephine Hamilton and Others*’ Mr Justice said in quashing their convictions for the above ‘fraud and circumvention of POL to discovery’ “there was no examination of the data, bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming POL’s own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton’s prosecution was unfair and an affront to justice.”

7. We have noted a claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : . MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH






SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

And We would refer you to the 1885 Weller versus Stone case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed “yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever.” We cite 2019 Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited and 2021 Josephine Hamilton and Others versus Post Office Limited whereby fraud by concealment of data was found ; We cite Lord Denning 1954, Lazarus v. Beasley “Fraud unravels everything” ; And we cite Sir John Stuart ‘when tender has been made the mortgagee has not entitlement to proceed to sale ‘ ; Continuing, in 1982 1 KB 245, 2 GIFF. 99 Where a mortgagee, after tender of his principal and interest... the Court set the sale aside against him and a person who had bought with knowledge of the tender, 2. A purchaser who buys with knowledge of circumstances sufficient against the mortgagee to invalidate the sale, becomes a party to the transaction and is not protected by the proviso that the purchaser need make no inquiry. 3. Where the costs are unascertained and the security ample, a mortgagee, after a tender of principal and interest, is not entitled to proceed with the sale; And the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act—176 Anno vicefimo nono ... or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; We draw to your attention to the detail of the 11 March 2019 thro 2 July 2019 case reference HQ16X01238, HQ17X02637 and HQ17X04248 in the high court before Mr Justice Fraser of ‘Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited’[POL]—a company wholly owned by HM Government—wherein despite the fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery, Bates and Others won their case. Mr Stuart Wentworth QC in questioning Mr. Alan Bates cites an “information sheet”—which is not a contract of reciprocity—that ‘postmaster responsible for losses’. Questioning Mrs Pam Stubbs she is referred by Mr Wentworth to section 19 paragraph 4 of a POL contract. Further in the 23 April 2021 appeal in the high court of ‘Josephine Hamilton and Others’ Mr Justice said in quashing their convictions for the above ‘fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery’ “there was no examination of the data, bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming POL’s own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton’s prosecution was unfair and an affront to justice.” ; & The judgment in Bates v Post Office Ltd (No.3: Common Issues) [2019] EWHC 606 (QB) delivered by Mr Justice Fraser was highly critical of the Post Office stating that it showed ‘oppressive behaviour’ in response to claimants who had been dismissed for accounting errors they blamed on the Horizon system [517]. He went on to say that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid ‘no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world’ [138], that the Post Office ‘seemed to adopt an extraordinarily narrow approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant’ [34], feared ‘objective scrutiny of its behaviour’ [28] and operated with a ‘culture of secrecy and confidentiality’ [36] ; Further after the above cases and long after the acts of POL against the sub post masters, it was brought to the attention of Lord James Arbuthnot and the POL Forensic accountant, that within an independent legal advice report commissioned by POL in the Summer of 2013—and concealed by POL—that POL were in full knowledge, and not only failed to disclose but continued their acts, along the lines of the unsafe convictions already given to sub post masters and to those currently being pursued by POL. We cite Lord Arbuthnot ‘POL lied to and were in contempt’. As stated above, it should also be kept to the forefront of mind that POL being owned by HM Government and the judiciary being one sub-office of HM Government that HM Government was fully cognizant with these matters throughout. Equally for those whose property including real property was wrested from them on the claims and non disclosures—that is the concealment—[for non disclosure seems anodyne] of POL, HM Land Registry is also owned by HM Government, and a party to the fraud. We, having previously cited cases where Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds bank, act contra, the 1677 Statutes of Frauds act including when in 1721 the Lord Chancellor dismissed the Bill, it appearing that as the Agreement was made in Writing, it was unequal and against Reason. And 1720 Lord Macclesfield ‘Court of Equity will not decree execution of articles where they appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity. Sir John Stuart and Lord Denning 1956 [Lazarus vs. Beasley] "No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a court, no Order of a Minister can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by Fraud, fraud unravels everything..." And now we add the citation of Bates and Others vs. Post Office Limited to an already large body of court case material. The fraud of concealment is of no less significance than the fraud of presenting false instruments. That we have brought this to your attention, including the refusal of Charles Alan Nunn contra 2018 GDPR Act and the controllers law is, it seems a further reason to act against us contra the 2010 Equality act for, as in the cases of POL, Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds should they be able to substantiate their claims, would have no reason for concealment or for the preventing of their further acts of fraud should they reveal, by disclosure, an absence of any lawful right to act against us and our property—this includes the claims of Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds that they and their agents have a right to use force against our corporeal property and our real property. A Court of Equity considers iniquitous those contracts/agreements which appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity.

Referencing the UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 2--FALSE REPRESENTATION A representation is false if—(a) it is untrue or misleading, and (b)the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading. (3)“Representation” means any representation as to fact or law, including a representation as to the state of mind of—(a)the person making the representation, or





(b)any other person.

8. We have noted a claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.
9. We have noted a claim That the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.
10. We have noted a claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.


In order to interfere with justice it is shown that, with knowledge, of the Fraud, trespass and acts of violence upon our property real and corporeal is accomplished with the aid of others who become as culpable including thro the use of HM Courts and Tribunal Services as private prosecutors. In full knowledge of the process of the court and a deliberate abuse of that process—to have HMCTS act as a personal private prosecution service, cheaper than the Royal Courts constitutes ABUSE of PROCESS for he has maliciously employed the process of the court. We cite the 2014 Lord Sumption Crawford Adjusters v Sagcor General Insurance, 1838 GRAINGER v. HILL and here draw to the attention “but if the bailiff touch the person it is an arrest” akin to the POL cases , whereby 2019,2021 and since 1680s Post Office Limited, a corps, claims to have authority over people to investigate them, arrest them and prosecute them and then wrest from those said prosecuted as much and any property of their choosing POL wishes and 1861 GILDING v EYRE “has maliciously employed the process of the court”.

We would draw attention to the Contempt of Court Reporting Restriction, "Civil contempt refers to conduct which is not in itself a crime, but which is punishable by the court in order to ensure that its orders are observed. Civil contempt is usually raised by one of the parties to the proceedings. Although the penalty for civil contempt contains a punitive element, its primary purpose is coercion of compliance. We would add that the use of force in a civil matter is a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism and the above Contempt of Court Reporting Restrictions further prevent a judge from holding us in contempt in a civil matter.

11. We have noted a claim of right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

Whilst we bring these your acts contra the Statutes of your corporation and the corporation/state of HM Government to your attention We would draw your attention to Exhibit (G) of the Affidavit of






Truth and statement of Fact--A castle doctrine (also known as a castle law or a defence of habitation law) is a legal doctrine that designates a person's abode (or any legally-occupied place [e.g., a vehicle or workplace]) as a place in which that person has certain protections and immunities permitting him or her, in certain circumstances, to use force (up to and including deadly force) to defend themselves against an intruder, free from legal responsibility/prosecution for the consequences of the force used.[1] Typically deadly force is considered justified, and a defence of justifiable homicide applicable, in cases "when the actor reasonably fears imminent peril of death or serious bodily harm to him or herself or another".

Failure to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support the above listed claims made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State in the next seven (7) days will enter MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State in to a lasting and binding tacit agreement through acquiescence to the following effect:}

1. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Government Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, And there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
2. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
3. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act & ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—'to interfere with justice' and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
4. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
5. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
6. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited






Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.

7. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
8. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
9. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
10. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
11. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including sections 2-Failing to disclose information &. And Abuse of position is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
12. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
13. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by






means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.

14. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
15. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
16. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
17. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim That the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
18. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
19. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.





20. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
21. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
22. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
23. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State THAT the above noted and formally agreed fraud by misrepresentation and Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State is a demonstrated intention to cause MRS YVONNE HOBBS distress and alarm, which is a recognised act of terrorism And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
24. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.

Where there is a known crime there is an obligation to resolve. We would draw MR RONAN M M MCCANN attention to the following public record. –

- a. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E545q2jAgeQ> We would note here formally that the High Court Bailiff in this matter re-evaluated his options and declared no goods to Levy


We would draw your attention to a recent perfected and published lien's undertaken against officers of the Government.

- b. <https://www.barondavidward.com/public/> And here: <https://tinyurl.com/3mas98t5> And here: https://bdwfacts.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/BIT_LY_LINKS_LIENS-UptoDate.pdf, <https://www.facebook.com/groups/527118124607307/permalink/1194932514492528> <https://tinyurl.com/HOHO175-LLOYDS-PUBLIC> ;

We await your response. Silence creates a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence.
No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted.
Without ill will or vexation

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.
For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire {LE9 6NW}

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
22 February 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN
OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]
MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o} Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk ,
Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk ,

Those with knowledge} Attorney General to King Charles} victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk,
Contempt.SharedMailbox@attorneygeneral.gov.uk , Land Registry CEO and board c/o} simon.hayes@landregistry.gov.uk , King
Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP} hcenquiries@parliament.uk , Lady Chief Justice Sue Lascelles Carr
c/o} contactholmember@parliament.uk , hlinfo@parliament.uk , Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos , Sir Julian Martin Flaux , Sir Antony
James Zacaroli Court of Chancery c/o rcjcompanies.orders@justice.gov.uk , rolls.ICL.hearings1@justice.gov.uk , Rishi Sunak's
Anti-Fraud Champion Simon Fell MP c/o} simon.fell.mp@parliament.uk , Alex Chalk Secretary of State for Justice and Lord
Chancellor c/o} alex.chalk.mp@parliament.uk , Regulatory corps c/o} professional.ethics@sra.org.uk , firm.queries@fca.org.uk ,
, icocasework@ico.org.uk , Leicestershire MPs c/o} andrew.bridgen.mp@parliament.uk , alberto.costa.mp@parliament.uk ,
claudia.webbe.mp@parliament.uk , jon.ashworth.mp@parliament.uk , liz.kendall.mp@parliament.uk , Chief constable Leicester-
shire police c/o} rob.nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk , Lord Ken Macdonald } info@howardleague.org ,
Claire.Than@rcl.ac.uk , Lord Sumption c/o} oforig3@lsbu.ac.uk , beaumoca@lsbu.ac.uk ,

CORPS ID inc} 13200208

SRA ID inc} 317757, 317762 , 817849 FCA ID inc} LS 817849

Your ref} Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private
prosecutors, Wrongful entering of judgment contra

Our Ref} HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CON-
TROL—HOHO872

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN, Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

We have noted as of this day the 22 February 2024 there has been no response to our previous correspondence of the 15 February
2024. In the interests of clarity we repeat the same by presenting our letter of the 15 February 2024 again. In the interest of
candour we extend the deadline by another seven (7) Days.

We await your response. Silence creates a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence.

No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted.

Without ill will or vexation

RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872


For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.

For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire {LE9 6NW}

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
29 February 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN

OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]

MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o} Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk ,
Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk ,

Those with knowledge} Attorney General to King Charles} victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk,
Contempt.SharedMailbox@attorneygeneral.gov.uk , Land Registry CEO and board c/o} simon.hayes@landregistry.gov.uk , King
Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP} hcenquiries@parliament.uk , Lady Chief Justice Sue Lascelles Carr
c/o} contactholmember@parliament.uk , hlinfo@parliament.uk , Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos , Sir Julian Martin Flaux , Sir Antony
James Zacaroli Court of Chancery c/o rcjcompanies.orders@justice.gov.uk , rolls.ICL.hearings1@justice.gov.uk , Rishi Sunak's
Anti-Fraud Champion Simon Fell MP c/o} simon.fell.mp@parliament.uk , Alex Chalk Secretary of State for Justice and Lord
Chancellor c/o} alex.chalk.mp@parliament.uk , Regulatory corps c/o} professional.ethics@sra.org.uk , firm.queries@fca.org.uk ,
, icocasework@ico.org.uk , Leicestershire MPs c/o} andrew.bridgen.mp@parliament.uk , alberto.costa.mp@parliament.uk ,
claudia.webbe.mp@parliament.uk , jon.ashworth.mp@parliament.uk , liz.kendall.mp@parliament.uk , Chief constable
Leicestershire police c/o} rob.nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk , Lord Ken Macdonald } info@howardleague.org ,
Claire.Than@rcl.ac.uk , Lord Sumption c/o } oforig3@lsbu.ac.uk , beaumoca@lsbu.ac.uk ,

CORPS ID inc} 13200208

SRA ID inc} 317757, 317762 , 817849 FCA ID inc} LS 817849

Your ref} Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private
prosecutors, Wrongful entering of judgment contra

Our Ref} HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT
CONTROL—HOHO872

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN, Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

We have noted as of this day the 29 February 2024 that there has been no response to our previous correspondence of the 15
February 2024 and, 22 February 2024 respectively. In the interests of clarity we repeat the same by presenting our letter of the 15
February 2024 again. In the interest of candour we extend the deadline by another seven (7) Days.

We await your response. Silence creates a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence.

No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted.

Without ill will or vexation

RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.

For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State






Exhibit (B)

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Opportunity to resolve

Lien Number


and

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

Notice of Default.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire {LE9 6NW}

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
7 March 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN
OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]
MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o}Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk ,
Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk , compliance@h-f.co.uk ,

Those with knowledge} Attorney General to King Charles}victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk,
Contempt.SharedMailbox@attorneygeneral.gov.uk , Land Registry CEO and board c/o}simon.hayes@landregistry.gov.uk , King
Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP}hcnquiries@parliament.uk ,Lady Chief Justice Sue Lascelles Carr
c/o} contactholmember@parliament.uk , hinfo@parliament.uk , Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos , Sir Julian Martin Flaux , Sir Antony
James Zacaroli Court of Chancery c/o rcjcompanies.orders@justice.gov.uk , rolls.ICL.hearings1@justice.gov.uk , Rishi Sunak's
Anti-Fraud Champion Simon Fell MP c/o} simon.fell.mp@parliament.uk ,Alex Chalk Secretary of State for Justice and Lord
Chancellor c/o} alex.chalk.mp@parliament.uk , Regulatory corps c/o } professional.ethics@sra.org.uk , firm.queries@fca.org.uk
, icocasework@ico.org.uk , Leicestershire MPs c/o} andrew.bridgen.mp@parliament.uk , alberto.costa.mp@parliament.uk ,
claudia.webbe.mp@parliament.uk , jon.ashworth.mp@parliament.uk , liz.kendall.mp@parliament.uk ,Chief constable Leicester-
shire police c/o} rob.nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk , Lord Ken Macdonald } info@howardleague.org ,
Claire.Than@rcl.ac.uk , Lord Sumption c/o } oforig3@lsbu.ac.uk , beaumoca@lsbu.ac.uk ,

CORPS ID inc}13200208

SRA ID inc}317757, 317762 , 817849 FCA ID inc}LS 817849

Your ref}Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private
prosecutors, Wrongful entering of judgment contra

Our Ref}HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CON-
TROL—HOHO872

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN,

We have noted as of this day the 7 March 2024 that there has been no legal response to our previous correspondence dated the 15
February 2024, 22 February 2024 and 29 February 2024 respectively. There is now a formal agreement due to the absence of any
valid material legal evidence.

Lien Number

If there is a crime to be redressed then it is important to comprehend the full extent of the crime before a solution or a remedy can
be executed. You MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL have already
been instrumental in this remedy as you have provided vital material evidence which is a part of the solution or remedy. For this
material evidence, we thank you.

This may not be evident at first but the solution or remedy will benefit all including yourself. Complex matters have complex
solutions, we can assure you that this solution is complex and these complexities may not be comprehended at first.


In the interests of candour and clarity:

It is a maxim of the rule of law that whomsoever brings a claim has the obligation to provide the material substance of that claim,
else the claim is fraudulent in nature which is fraud by Misrepresentation and Malfeasance in the office. In addition to this an act
of force where there is no material evidence and substance to a valid claim is also an act **in terrorem**, a wilful and belligerent
act of terrorism.

There is therefore a formal legal requirement for MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH
SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to present the valid material evidence to the
following effect.

1. We have noted a claim of authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Govern-
ment Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of
the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material
fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position
of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has
an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich
Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this





claim.

From Exhibit (B). —Case Authority WI-05257F David Ward V Warrington Borough Council, 30thDay of May 2013. Which is a case at court tribunal undertaken by recognised due process.

It is evident David Ward did not challenge the PCN or the traffic Management Act 2004 section 82 but the presumption of the consent of the governed.

What is a mandatory requirement before the Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon is for the consent of the governed to be valid and that it can be presented as material fact before any charges or claims can be brought.

It is clear from this case authority undertaken by due process that: -(1) It is illegal to act upon any of the Acts or statutes without the consent of the governed [where the governed have actually given their consent] and that consent is presentable as material physical evidence of the fact that the governed have given their consent. (2) Where the Acts and statutes are acted upon then this is illegal and a criminal action by the Corporation/State. (3) The criminal action is Malfeasance in a public office and fraud. (4) Where there is no consent of the governed on and for the public record then there is no governed and where there is no governed then there is no government. The one cannot exist without the other-they are mutually exclusive. (5) As this criminal activity is observed to be standard practice and has been for nearly 800 years, then this is clear observable evidence to the fact that LAW is a presumption and there is no such thing as LAW. See Exhibit (A) the twelve presumptions of law.

Without this legal consent—the circa 64.1 million wet ink signed consents of the Governed—there is no legal authority under which there is a recognised officer of the Private Corporation/State that carries the necessary legal authority to create culpability, liability or agreement or otherwise enforce private corporate policy.

We refer you to the Baron David Ward unrebutted Affidavit Exhibit A—Formal challenge to the twelve presumptions of law. We have challenged all the Presumptions of Law. We have since obtained Securitized liens, lawful instruments, without most importantly any rebuttal and to this day not one piece of evidence of Corporate/State authority of Us has been presented.

We repeat, We formally challenge all presumptions of law and as we have formally challenged all the twelve presumptions of law then the presumption of law formally has no substance in material FACT.

We will recognise the rule of law, when and only when there is the material evidence of that assumed rule of law has some material evidence of substance in presentable material fact.

We refer you to Exhibit C of the David Ward Affidavit where Chandran Kukathas PhD details over 7 pages that the State is a private corporation and specifically a legal embodiment by act of registration; And of no material substance.

Fraud however has been defined as a criminal act with full knowledge and intent to engage in criminal behaviour to benefit one, at the expense of another. To bring about by an act of force, support of this fraud is also recognised as an act of terrorism.

From Exhibit (C)—The Material evidence of the FACTS.


In order to interfere with justice it is shown that, with knowledge, of the Fraud, trespass and acts of violence upon our property real and corporeal is accomplished with the aid of others who become as culpable including thro the use of HM Courts and Tribunal Services as private prosecutors.

In full knowledge of the process of the court and a deliberate abuse of that process—to have HMCTS act as a personal private prosecution service, cheaper than the Royal Courts constitutes ABUSE of PROCESS for he has maliciously employed the process of the court. We cite the 2014 Lord Sumption Crawford Adjusters v Sagor General Insurance, 1838 GRAINGER v. HILL and here draw to the attention “but if the bailiff touch the person it is an arrest” akin to the POL cases, whereby 2019, 2021 and since 1680s Post Office Limited, a corps, claims to have authority over people to investigate them, arrest them and prosecute them and then wrest from those said prosecuted as much and any property of their choosing POL wishes and 1861 GILDING v EYRE “has maliciously employed the process of the court”. This abuse applies to the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act and the failure to disclose or by omission, the concealment in for unjust enrichment.

It has been confirmed by the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, on and for the record that:- (1) Whilst there is no material and physical evidence presented to the fact that the governed have given their consent then the office of the Judiciary has no greater authority than the manageress of McDonalds being as the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of a legal embodiment by an act of registration where this act of registration creates nothing of physical material substance and which is also fraud by default. Any objection to this observation of fact should be taken up with the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, whereupon the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA would then have to present the material and physical evidence that the governed have given their consents.

As the office of the Judiciary is nothing more than a private commercial and fraudulent enterprise built upon fraud and criminal intent. This is by no stretch of the imagination a valid government by the people for the people as it is by default a private company providing a judicial service for profit and gain but





where there is also and always a conflict of interests—where there is a conflict of interests between the needs of the people and the state

(Corporate) Policy which has no obligation to the people or even the needs and wellbeing of corporation staff. This has been confirmed by Chandran Kukathas of the London School of Economics and state office titled the Department of Government.

Disagreements arising from 'contracts' are non-judicial and outside the scope of the private courts of the judiciary—these being the sub-offices of the private Corporation/State of HM Government plc as shown above. As has been confirmed by the esteemed Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA the office of the Judiciary (Court) is a sub office of a Private Limited corporation (HM Parliaments & Governments PLC) and that such an officer of a Private corporation court does not have the status to give or grant a Court Order outside of that Private corporation Office. The use of HMCTS as private prosecutors, shews those 'acts' fall in to the 2006 Fraud Act Part 35, section 3, as Mr Justice Fraser records within the Post Office judgment 'that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid 'no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world' [§138], that the Post Office 'seemed to adopt an extraordinarily narrow approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant' [§34],

To bring about by an act of force, support of this fraud is also recognised as an act of terrorism Under the UK 2000 Terrorism Act, s.1.5—action taken for the benefit of a proscribed organisation It is evident from the omissions that there is no wet-ink signed contract between 'the parties' including between the Corporation/State of HM Government plc and Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State.

2. We have noted a claim of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act & ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—'to interfere with justice' and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims.. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.


And to further underline the malfeasance being demonstrated by the taking of our property—intangible and real to ensure subjugation and to extort us, we cite the 1677 Statutes of Fraud Act, Sir John Stuart and we cite Lord Denning 1954 Lazarus v. Beazley and we refer you again to the Facts including the }UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 2—F RAUD by ABUSE of POSITION (1)A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person, (b) dishonestly abuses that position, and (c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss. (2) A person may be regarded as having abused his position even though his conduct consisted of an omission rather than an act.

Fraud is a deliberate action to defraud where the victim of the crime is unaware having no knowledge of a situation or fact. This crime carries a penalty of incarceration for 7 to 10 years and the latter, where there is multiple instances of. 64.1 million people are subject to this crime everyday as it is now commonplace and is carried out by the largest and most ruthless criminal company in this country. This same company is also a public office with the enforcement to execute this crime which is inclusive of but not limited to:- The office of the police, The office of the Judiciary, Local government and central government. Independent Bailiff Companies which are licensed by the same company.

3. We have noted a claim of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Mesuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

We now refer you to Exhibit (A) of the Affidavit which defines that profiteering contravenes the UK 2006 Fraud Act. We should also point out to you that it is a direct contravention of the UK 2000 Terrorism Act, s.15 Fund raising is an offence if a person invites another to provide money or other property and intends that it should be used for the purposes of terrorism. Insisting or demanding payment without a pre existing commercial arrangement which is based on presentable fact in the form of a commercial agreement is an act of deception. Payment is a commercial activity. We are not in the habit of knowingly conspiring to fraud or knowingly funding terrorism. This action would also create a liability against us.





MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State ment, but has not presented Us with a valid and

cial contract or collateral contract or any agreement—which is recognised under the Bills of exchange act of 1882. Because there is no commercial arrangement in place under which to raise a Bill for a bill to arise is also a direct violation of the 1882 Bills of Exchange Act. Additionally without the wet ink signed commercial arrangement and Bill presented, this Act would also be a contravention of the UK 2006 Fraud Act and to demand payment—under threats—contravenes the UK 2000 Terrorism Act. We are not in the habit of knowingly conspiring to fraud and/or terrorism. See Bills of exchange act of 1882. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61>.

A claim of 'contractual obligations being a non-judicial matter.


UTTERING' as act(s) contra the 1861 Forgery Act—Whosoever, without lawful authority or excuse (the proof whereof shall lie on the party accused), shall in the name of any other person acknowledge any recognizance or bail, or any cognovit, actionem, or judgment, or any deed or other instrument, before any court, judge, or other person lawfully authorized in that behalf, shall be guilty of felony.

4. We have noted a claim of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing . MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

From Exhibit (D) of the Affidavit and Statement of Fact for Case Authority WI-05257F. 30d of May 2013 it is evident there is due process for the execution of legal and commercial documents. Where these processes are not followed then the very presence of a document which does not comply with these processes, is itself is the physical and material evidence of Malfeasance in a public office and fraud. We would point your attention to the FACTs that a corporation must execute documents legally and failure to do so renders the documents non legal and void—(1) Under the law of England and Wales or Northern Ireland a document is executed by a company—(a) by the affixing of its common seal, or (b) by signature in accordance with the following provisions. (2) A document is validly executed by a company if it is signed on behalf of the company — (a) by two authorised signatories, or (b) by a director of the company in the presence of a witness who attests the signature. (4) A document signed in accordance with subsection (2) and expressed in whatever words, to be executed by the company, has the same effect as if executed under the common seal of the company. The legal effect of the statute is that documents and deeds must be signed on behalf of the company by a director in the presence of a witness, or by two authorised signatories. Without adherence to these provisions no contracts can be considered duly executed by a company and their terms are therefore legally unenforceable.

We would refer you to the 1885 Weller versus Stone case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed “yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever.” We cite 2019 Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited and 2021 Josephine Hamilton and Others versus Post Office Limited whereby fraud by concealment of data was found ; We cite Lord Denning 1954, Lazarus v. Beasley “Fraud unravels everything” ; And we cite Sir John Stuart ‘when tender has been made the mortgagee has not entitlement to proceed to sale ‘ ; Continuing, in 1982 1 KB 245, 2 GIFF. 99 Where a mortgagee, after tender of his principal and interest... the Court set the sale aside against him and a person who had bought with knowledge of the tender, 2. A purchaser who buys with knowledge of circumstances sufficient against the mortgagee to invalidate the sale, becomes a party to the transaction and is not protected by the proviso that the purchaser need make no inquiry. 3. Where the costs are unascertained and the security ample, a mortgagee, after a tender of principal and interest, is not entitled to proceed with the sale; And the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act—176 Anno vicefimo nono ... or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; We draw to your attention to the detail of the 11 March 2019 thro 2 July 2019 case reference HQ16X01238, HQ17X02637 and HQ17X04248 in the high court before Mr Justice Fraser of ‘Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited’[POL]—a company wholly owned by HM Government—wherein despite the fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery, Bates and Others won their case. Mr Stuart Wentworth QC in questioning Mr. Alan Bates cites an “information sheet”—which is not a contract of reciprocity—that ‘postmaster responsible for losses’. Questioning Mrs Pam Stubbs she is referred by Mr Wentworth to section 19 paragraph 4 of a POL contract. Further in the 23 April 2021 appeal in the high court of ‘Josephine Hamilton and Others’ Mr Justice said in quashing their convictions for the above ‘fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery’ “there was no examination of the data, bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming POL’s own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton’s prosecution was unfair and an affront to justice.” ; & The judgment in Bates v Post Office Ltd (No.3: Common Issues) [2019] EWHC 606 (QB) delivered by Mr Justice Fraser was highly critical of the Post Office stating that it showed ‘oppressive behaviour’ in response to claimants who had been dismissed for accounting errors they blamed on the Horizon system [§517]. He went on to say that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid ‘no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world’ [§138], that the Post Office ‘seemed to adopt an extraordinarily nar-





row approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant' [§34], feared

'objective scrutiny of its behaviour' [§28] and operated with a 'culture of secrecy and confidentiality' [§36]; Further after the above cases and long after the acts of POL against the sub post masters, it was brought to the attention of Lord James Arbuthnot and the POL Forensic accountant, that within an independent legal advice report commissioned by POL in the Summer of 2013—and concealed by POL—that POL were in full knowledge, and not only failed to disclose but continued their acts, along the lines of the unsafe convictions already given to sub post masters and to those currently being pursued by POL. We cite Lord Arbuthnot 'POL lied to and were in contempt'. As stated above, it should also be kept to the forefront of mind that POL being owned by HM Government and the judiciary being one sub-office of HM Government that HM Government was fully cognizant with these matters throughout. Equally for those whose property including real property was wrested from them on the claims and non disclosures—that is the concealment—for non disclosure seems anodyne of POL, HM Land Registry is also owned by HM Government, and a party to the fraud. We, having previously cited cases where Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds bank, act contra, the 1677 Statutes of Frauds act including when in 1721 the Lord Chancellor dismissed the Bill, it appearing that as the Agreement was made in Writing, it was unequal and against Reason. And 1720 Lord Macclesfield 'Court of Equity will not decree execution of articles where they appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity. Sir John Stuart and Lord Denning 1956 [Lazarus vs. Beasley] "No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a court, no Order of a Minister can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by Fraud, fraud unravels everything..." And now we add the citation of Bates and Others vs. Post Office Limited to an already large body of court case material. The fraud of concealment is of no less significance than the fraud of presenting false instruments. That we have brought this to your attention, including the refusal of Charles Alan Nunn contra 2018 GDPR Act and the controllers law is, it seems a further reason to act against us contra the 2010 Equality act for, as in the cases of POL, Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds should they be able to substantiate their claims, would have no reason for concealment or for the preventing of their further acts of fraud should they reveal, by disclosure, an absence of any lawful right to act against us and our property—this includes the claims of Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds that they and their agents have a right to use force against our corporeal property and our real property. A Court of Equity considers iniquitous those contracts/agreements which appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity.

Referencing the UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 2--FALSE REPRESENTATION A representation is false if—(a) it is untrue or misleading, and (b) the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading. (3) "Representation" means any representation as to fact or law, including a representation as to the state of mind of—(a) the person making the representation, or (b) any other person.

We refer you to Exhibit C of the David Ward Affidavit where under the —Including the taking of Our property of data and using it as your own without Our knowledge or consent, the threats against Our property and the further claims to benefit a private Corporation/State and extorting money with neither signature nor contract is an act of force **in terrorem**.


5. We have noted a claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; . MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.
6. We have noted a claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a) that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b) that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c) that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including sections 2-Failing to disclose information & And Abuse of position MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

By failing to disclose all information including that which shews facts contra to your claims and by failing to supply information under Subject Access Requests, these acts, for omission is still an act, brings in to force the of refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—Acts with knowledge to interfere with justice contra, inc., the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1), In this Part a "qualifying disclosure" means any disclosure of information which, in the reasonable belief of the worker making the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a) that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b) that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c) that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ;

Under UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 3—Fraud by failing to disclose information A person is in breach of this section if he—(a) dishonestly fails to disclose to another person information which he is under a legal duty to disclose, and (b) intends, by failing to disclose the information—(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

We cite Lord Denning, Lord Chief Justice '1956, Lazarus v Beasley' "No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a Court, no Order of a Min-





ister can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by Fraud, Fraud unravels everything.”


We would refer you to the 1885 Weller versus Stone case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed “yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever.” We cite 2019 Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited and 2021 Josephine Hamilton and Others versus Post Office Limited whereby fraud by concealment of data was found ; Sir John Stuart and we cite Lord Denning 1954, Lazarus v. Beasley “Fraud unravels everything” ; And we cite Sir John Stuart ‘when tender has been made the mortgagee has not entitlement to proceed to sale ‘ ; Continuing in 1982 1 KB 245, 2 GIFF. 99 Where a mortgagee, after tender of his principal and interest... the Court set the sale aside against him and a person who had bought with knowledge of the tender.

We draw to your attention the 11 March 2019 thro 2 July 2019 case reference HQ16X01238, HQ17X02637 and HQ17X04248 in the high court before Mr Justice Fraser of ‘Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited’[POL]—a company wholly owned by HM Government—wherein despite the fraud and circumvention of POL to discovery, Bates and Others were successful in exposing the fraud and concealment and usury and iniquitous contracts to the wider gaze. Mr Stuart Wentworth QC in questioning Mr. Alan Bates cites an information sheet—which is not a contract of reciprocity—that ‘postmaster responsible for losses’. Questioning Mrs Pam Stubbs she is referred by Mr Wentworth to section 19 paragraph 4 of a POL contract. Further in the 23 April 2021 appeal in the high court of ‘Josephine Hamilton and Others’ Mr Justice said in quashing their convictions for the above ‘fraud and circumvention of POL to discovery’ “there was no examination of the data, bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming POL’s own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton’s prosecution was unfair and an affront to justice.”

7. We have noted a claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : . MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

We cite the We would refer you to the 1885 Weller versus Stone case which, drawing on the Statutes 13E of Usury and 27E of Fraud whereby all the Judges of England agreed “yet where there is usury, or fraud, or covin ; they may be averred so to be against any act whatsoever.” We cite 2019 Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited and 2021 Josephine Hamilton and Others versus Post Office Limited whereby fraud by concealment of data was found ; We cite Lord Denning 1954, Lazarus v. Beasley “Fraud unravels everything” ; And we cite Sir John Stuart ‘when tender has been made the mortgagee has not entitlement to proceed to sale ‘ ; Continuing, in 1982 1 KB 245, 2 GIFF. 99 Where a mortgagee, after tender of his principal and interest... the Court set the sale aside against him and a person who had bought with knowledge of the tender, 2. A purchaser who buys with knowledge of circumstances sufficient against the mortgagee to invalidate the sale, becomes a party to the transaction and is not protected by the proviso that the purchaser need make no inquiry. 3. Where the costs are unascertained and the security ample, a mortgagee, after a tender of principal and interest, is not entitled to proceed with the sale; And the 1677 Statute of Frauds Act—176 Anno vicefimo nono ... or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; We draw to your attention to the detail of the 11 March 2019 thro 2 July 2019 case reference HQ16X01238, HQ17X02637 and HQ17X04248 in the high court before Mr Justice Fraser of ‘Bates and Others versus Post Office Limited’[POL]—a company wholly owned by HM Government—wherein despite the fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery, Bates and Others won their case. Mr Stuart Wentworth QC in questioning Mr. Alan Bates cites an “information sheet”—which is not a contract of reciprocity—that ‘postmaster responsible for losses’. Questioning Mrs Pam Stubbs she is referred by Mr Wentworth to section 19 paragraph 4 of a POL contract. Further in the 23 April 2021 appeal in the high court of ‘Josephine Hamilton and Others’ Mr Justice said in quashing their convictions for the above ‘fraud and circumvention of POL to conceal discovery’ “there was no examination of the data, bugs, errors or defects...there was no proof of an actual loss as opposed to an Horizon generated shortage. Even more alarming POL’s own investigator has reported there was no evidence of a theft. We conclude Mrs Hamilton’s prosecution was unfair and an affront to justice.” ; & The judgment in Bates v Post Office Ltd (No.3: Common Issues) [2019] EWHC 606 (QB) delivered by Mr Justice Fraser was highly critical of the Post Office stating that it showed ‘oppressive behaviour’ in response to claimants who had been dismissed for accounting errors they blamed on the Horizon system [517]. He went on to say that the submissions provided by the Post Office paid ‘no attention to the actual evidence, and seem to have their origin in a parallel world’ [518], that the Post Office ‘seemed to adopt an extraordinarily narrow approach to relevance, generally along the lines that any evidence that is





unfavourable to the Post Office is not relevant'

[§34], feared 'objective scrutiny of its

behaviour' [§28] and operated with a 'culture

of secrecy and confidentiality' [§36]; Further after the above cases and long after the acts of POL against the sub post masters, it was brought to the attention of Lord James Arbuthnot and the POL Forensic accountant, that within an independent legal advice report commissioned by POL in the Summer of 2013—and concealed by POL—that POL were in full knowledge, and not only failed to disclose but continued their acts, along the lines of the unsafe convictions already given to sub post masters and to those currently being pursued by POL. We cite Lord Arbuthnot 'POL lied to and were in contempt'. As stated above, it should also be kept to the forefront of mind that POL being owned by HM Government and the judiciary being one sub-office of HM Government that HM Government was fully cognizant with these matters throughout. Equally for those whose property including real property was wrested from them on the claims and non disclosures—that is the concealment—for non disclosure seems anodyne of POL, HM Land Registry is also owned by HM Government, and a party to the fraud. We, having previously cited cases where Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds bank, act contra, the 1677 Statutes of Frauds act including when in 1721 the Lord Chancellor dismissed the Bill, it appearing that as the Agreement was made in Writing, it was unequal and against Reason. And 1720 Lord Macclesfield 'Court of Equity will not decree execution of articles where they appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity. Sir John Stuart and Lord Denning 1956 [Lazarus vs. Beasley] "No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. No judgment of a court, no Order of a Minister can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by Fraud, fraud unravels everything..." And now we add the citation of Bates and Others vs. Post Office Limited to an already large body of court case material. The fraud of concealment is of no less significance than the fraud of presenting false instruments. That we have brought this to your attention, including the refusal of Charles Alan Nunn contra 2018 GDPR Act and the controllers law is, it seems a further reason to act against us contra the 2010 Equality act for, as in the cases of POL, Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds should they be able to substantiate their claims, would have no reason for concealment or for the preventing of their further acts of fraud should they reveal, by disclosure, an absence of any lawful right to act against us and our property—this includes the claims of Charles A Nunn CEO of Lloyds that they and their agents have a right to use force against our corporeal property and our real property. A Court of Equity considers iniquitous those contracts/agreements which appear to be unreasonable or are founded on a fraud—for that would be to decree Iniquity.


Referencing the UK 2006 Fraud Act, Part 35, section 2--FALSE REPRESENTATION A representation is false if—(a) it is untrue or misleading, and (b)the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading. (3)"Representation" means any representation as to fact or law, including a representation as to the state of mind of—(a)the person making the representation, or (b)any other person.

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

8. We have noted a claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim. MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State
9. We have noted a claim That the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.
10. We have noted a claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

In order to interfere with justice it is shown that, with knowledge, of the Fraud, trespass and acts of violence upon our property real and corporeal is accomplished with the aid of others who become as culpable





including thro the use of HM Courts and Tribunal Services as private prosecutors. In full knowledge of the process of the court and a deliberate abuse of that process—to have HMCTS act as a personal private prosecution service, cheaper than the Royal Courts constitutes ABUSE of PROCESS for he has maliciously employed the process of the court. We cite the 2014 Lord Sumption Crawford Adjusters v Sagicor General Insurance, 1838 GRAINGER v. HILL and here draw to the attention “but if the bailiff touch the person it is an arrest” akin to the POL cases, whereby 2019, 2021 and since 1680s Post Office Limited, a corps, claims to have authority over people to investigate them, arrest them and prosecute them and then wrest from those said prosecuted as much and any property of their choosing POL wishes and 1861 GILDING v EYRE “has maliciously employed the process of the court”.

We would draw attention to the Contempt of Court Reporting Restriction, "Civil contempt refers to conduct which is not in itself a crime, but which is punishable by the court in order to ensure that its orders are observed. Civil contempt is usually raised by one of the parties to the proceedings. Although the penalty for civil contempt contains a punitive element, its primary purpose is coercion of compliance. We would add that the use of force in a civil matter is a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism and the above Contempt of Court Reporting Restrictions further prevent a judge from holding us in contempt in a civil matter.


11. We have noted a claim of right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has an obligation of service in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State to provide the valid, presentable material evidence to support this claim.

Whilst we bring these your acts contra the Statutes of your corporation and the corporation/state of HM Government to your attention We would draw your attention to Exhibit (G) of the Affidavit of Truth and statement of Fact--A castle doctrine (also known as a castle law or a defence of habitation law) is a legal doctrine that designates a person's abode (or any legally-occupied place [e.g., a vehicle or workplace]) as a place in which that person has certain protections and immunities permitting him or her, in certain circumstances, to use force (up to and including deadly force) to defend themselves against an intruder, free from legal responsibility/prosecution for the consequences of the force used.[1] Typically deadly force is considered justified, and a defence of justifiable homicide applicable, in cases "when the actor reasonably fears imminent peril of death or serious bodily harm to him or herself or another".

Failure to provide the valid presentable, material evidence to support the above listed claims made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State in the next SEVEN (7) days will enter MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State in to a lasting tacit agreement through acquiescence to the following effect:

1. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Government Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, And there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
2. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
3. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act & ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/discovery—‘to interfere with justice’ and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement






between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.

RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.

4. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
5. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
6. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
7. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
8. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
9. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
10. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
11. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following—(a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of






justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to 2-Failing to disclose information &. And Abuseful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.

occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including sections of position. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful, which carries a term of incarceration of seven

12. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
13. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
14. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
15. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/ Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
16. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and premeditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
17. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim That the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries






a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and there is a formal agreement between MRS CANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFF- State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.

and the latter where there is multiple instances of, YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MC-FICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/

18. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and pre-meditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
19. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
20. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and pre-meditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
21. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the claim of right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation, which carries a term of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances of, and there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally agreed to be bound for commercial charges to the same degree.
22. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and pre-meditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
23. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State THAT the above noted and formally agreed fraud by misrepresentation and Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State is a demonstrated intention to cause MRS YVONNE HOBBS distress and alarm, which is a recognised act of terrorism And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.
24. Whereby there is now a formal and binding agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that the above wilful and pre-meditated agreed fraud by misrepresentation is also wilful and premeditated Malfeasance in the office which carries a term of incarceration of twenty five years and the latter where there is multiple instances of; And that there is a formal agreement between MRS YVONNE HOBBS and MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) will stand for commercial charges to the same degree.

These are very serious crimes MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) and under current state legislation there is a cumulative period of incarceration in excess of 150 years' incarceration. We would not wish to encumber the public purse for the costs of this incarceration as the public purse can ill afford this financial encumbrance. There is however an alternative and recognised process as suitable remedy.





As there is now an agreement between the parties
cence, as you have already agreed to the crime then
crime was committed against Us then we reserve


by way of lasting tacit agreement through acquies-
we elect to charge you under this agreement. As the
the right to choose the remedy for these crimes.

Where there is a crime then there is a requirement for a remedy otherwise the crime goes unresolved. As we now have an obliga-
tion to bring this crime to resolution we therefore are giving MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) an opportunity to re-
solve.



1. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) under the oof authority under UK Public General Acts—for which the mandatory requirement for HM Government Corporation/State before any Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon—being the getting of the wet-ink consents of the 64.1 million 'governed' is required and that you had these consents, even if previously concealed, as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
2. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
3. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption from the 1689 Bill of Rights Act ; &. And exemption from the Abuse of Court Process ; &. And exemption from the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, for the acts of contempt perpetrated against us—including concealment, that refusal to complete disclosure/ discovery—'to interfere with justice' and that you had these consents as presentable, material fact before you brought your charges or made your claims. is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. WWhere this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
4. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
5. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption from the 1677 Statutes of Frauds Act with a grant of Power of Attorney or contract for the trespass not declared in signed writing—176 Anno vicefimo nono...or any uncertain Interest of, in, to, or out of any Messuages, Manors, Lands, Tenements or hereditaments made or created by Libery and Seisin onely, or by parole, and not put in Writing, and Signed by the parties to making or creating the same, or their Agents thereunto lawfully authorized by Writing, shall have the force and effect of Leases, or Estates at Will only, and shall not either in Law or Equity be deemed or taken to have any other or greater force or effect ; &. And of exemption—from the UK 1882 Bills of Exchange Act Section 23—Signature essential to liability ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP
£5,000,000.00
6. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable crim-





inal offence we will elect to formally
in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIG-
Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five

charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN
NIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich
Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

7. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption under 1989 UK Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act c.34, s.2—Contracts for sale etc. of land to be made by signed writing is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

8. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

9. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption from the UK 2006 Companies Act, including section 44, the Execution of documents ; is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

10. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

11. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) of exemption under UK Public General Acts—from the UK 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act, section 43B (1) ; the disclosure, tends to show one or more of the following— (a)that a criminal offence has been committed, is being committed or is likely to be committed, (b)that a person has failed, is failing or is likely to fail to comply with any legal obligation to which he is subject, (c)that a miscarriage of justice has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur ; & And 2006 Fraud Act, including sections 2-Failing to disclose information &. And Abuse of position is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP


£5,000,000.00

12. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

13. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 138, 106 107 and 105— If in an Proceeding to obtain the Registration of an Land or any Land Certificate or Certificate of Title, or otherwise in any Transaction relating to Land which is or is to be put upon the Registry, any Person acting either as Principal or Agent shall, knowingly and with Intent to deceive, make or assist or join in or be privy to the making of any material false Statement or Representation, or suppress, conceal, or assist or join in or be privy to the suppressing, withholding, or concealing from any Judge, or the Registrar, or any Person employed by or assisting the Registrar, any material Document, Fact, or Matter of Information, every Person so acting shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor... The Act or Thing done or obtained by means of such Fraud or Falsehood shall be null and void to all Intents and Purposes : is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Milli





on Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

14. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

15. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that of exemption under UK Public General Acts—1862 Conveyance of Real Estates Act not least sections 105, 106 107 and 138—If any Person fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of any Order of the Court of Chancery in relation to registered Land, or fraudulently procures, assists in fraudulently procuring, or is privy to the fraudulent Procurement of the Entry on the Register of any Caveat or Notice of a Charge, or of the Erasure from the Register or Alteration on the Register of any Caveator Notice of a Charge, such Person shall be deemed to be guilty of a Misdemeanor ;and any Order procured by Fraud, and any Act consequent on such Order, and any Entry, Erasure, or Alteration so made by Fraud, shall be void as between all Parties or Privies to such Fraud including concealment of any Agreement, Or any collateral agreement Or promise Or Contract including for Sale of Land, of an accounting ledger showing detail of a Contract/Agreement/Obligation, of mutual consideration shewn, all wet-ink signed to include an Outstanding balance, balance due, Bills raised, outstanding, missed payments made, owed on your account, arrears—for us to peruse and rebut is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

16. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

17. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) tThat the HM Courts & Tribunal Services Corporation/State is not inferior to or one sub-office of HM Government plc ; And that the statement by the Hon. Sir Jack Beatson FBA, at that time the head of the judiciary, was false, in his address to Nottingham University, the private corporations/states of the Executive and legislature are superior to the judiciary by way of re-examination of the relationship is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

18. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00


19. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that the claim contra the statement made by Chandran Kukathas in positing that HM Government plc is an entity, a Corporation/State is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

20. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH



SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich
Five Million Pounds GBP



Farrelly Limited Corporation/State

£5,000,000.00

21. For the formally agreed criminal offence of fraud by misrepresentation where the claim being made by MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) that oof right to act in contempt of court—in concealment of valid, presentable material evidence—including that data requested through Subject Access Requests, wet ink signed contracts, presenting signed Bills, all accounting documents, ledgering AND HMCTS Case Management File—for the principal legal embodiment of us to peruse and rebut to the bias to the detriment of MRS YVONNE HOBBS is fraudulent in nature which is also wilful and premeditated fraud by misrepresentation. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

22. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

£5,000,000.00

23. For the formally agreed wilful and premeditated Act of causing alarm and distress which is a formally recognised act of terrorism which is also a recognised criminal offence. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State A Hundred and Ten Million Pounds GBP

£110,000,000.00

24. For the formally agreed criminal offence of Malfeasance in the office of Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State, where MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State has agreed to this criminal offence of malfeasance in the office. Where this is an agreed chargeable criminal offence we will elect to formally charge MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Five Million Pounds GBP

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

£5,000,000.00

Total agreed debt as resolution for the above listed criminal offences equals Two Hundred and Twenty Five million pounds GBP

£225,000,000.00

Lien Number

Please make remedy by way of commercial instruments or personal cheque to the above address. If this is by personal cheque then please make the cheque in the name of Yvonne Hobbs.


If you MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) elect not to resolve this matter and debt in the next seven (7) days from the receipt of this correspondence then seven (7) days later we will issue a further reminder as you MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) are in default of your agreement and your agreed obligation. There shall be a proceeding to the Notice of Default.

In the event where MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) elects not to make settlement THEN it will be noted that MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) has formally and of their own free will and without coercion elected to stand as a surety for a security by way of a Lien on the estate of MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) and by way of the sins of the father extended to the seventh generation where there may be an attachment of earning on your Grand Children's Grand Children's Pension.

It is not our intent to place you MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in a state of distress or cause any distress loss or harm by this legal action. MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State—we have expressed the criminal offences and there is an obligation to resolve. We have also noted that others in association are also complicit in the same criminal offences. Whomever is complicit in any criminal offences also carries the obligation to bring those also complicit in the same criminal offences to resolution.

This may be viewed to be an excessive action to take as a remedy but we bring your attention back to the affidavit Exhibit (F) No Body gets Paid. The Bank of England note GBP is based upon confidence and Belief where belief is a concept in the abstract which is of no material substance. So is this an excessive action where there is no monetary value. <http://bit.ly/1WV48P> No injury loss or harm can be caused by the action. This is just numbers of no commercial significance as there cannot be commerce without money and there is no such thing as money so there is no such thing as economics.





It could be said that to take this action is to destabilization of the economy was done generations ago Practice—by that we mean Federal Reserve Bank-easing.

ise the economy. WHAT economy? The destabiliza-when the government licensed fraudulent Banking ing practices, fractional lending and quantitative

We did ask ourselves “Are we committing Fraud” Our response to this was. “Is there full disclosure?” YES. “Is there an agreement between the parties as a result of that disclosure?” YES. “Is there any injury loss or harm?” NO. Then there is no fraud.

Are we destabilising Government? See above. Without the consent of the governed on and for the record then there is no gov-erned and no government by default. What Government? See Exhibit under the affidavit Exhibit (H). Without a valid and account-able government then there is no such thing as the public or the public purse.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) we have expressed the criminal offences and there is an obligation to resolve. MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) is either by wilful intent or ignorance from this day forward is not a fit and proper person to be in a position of trust. Ignorance of the law is no defence.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) You have seven (7) days to make reparation for your criminal offences. Seven (7) days after that there will be a legal notice of default. Seven (7) days after that there will be a security by way of a lien.

We await your response. Silence creates a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted.

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.
For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.




Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire (LE9 6NW)

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
14 March 2024

NOTICE of DEFAULT

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN
OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]
MR RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN c/o} Ronan.Mccann@h-f.co.uk , Patrick.Mccarthy@h-f.co.uk ,
Gary.Cadwallader@h-f.co.uk , compliance@h-f.co.uk ,

Those with knowledge} Attorney General to King Charles} victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk,
Contempt.SharedMailbox@attorneygeneral.gov.uk , Land Registry CEO and board c/o} simon.hayes@landregistry.gov.uk , King
Charles, c/o Lord of the Privy Counsel Penny Mordaunt MP} hcenquiries@parliament.uk , Lady Chief Justice Sue Lascelles Carr
c/o} contactholmember@parliament.uk , hlinfo@parliament.uk , Sir Geoffrey Charles Vos , Sir Julian Martin Flaux , Sir Antony
James Zacaroli Court of Chancery c/o rcjcompanies.orders@justice.gov.uk , rolls.ICL.hearings1@justice.gov.uk , Rishi Sunak's
Anti-Fraud Champion Simon Fell MP c/o} simon.fell.mp@parliament.uk , Alex Chalk Secretary of State for Justice and Lord
Chancellor c/o} alex.chalk.mp@parliament.uk , Regulatory corps c/o } professional.ethics@sra.org.uk , firm.queries@fca.org.uk ,
icocasework@ico.org.uk , Leicestershire MPs c/o} andrew.bridgen.mp@parliament.uk , alberto.costa.mp@parliament.uk ,
claudia.webbe.mp@parliament.uk , jon.ashworth.mp@parliament.uk , liz.kendall.mp@parliament.uk , Chief constable
Leicestershire police c/o} rob.nixon@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk , Lord Ken Macdonald } info@howardleague.org ,
Claire.Than@rcl.ac.uk , Lord Sumption c/o } oforig3@lsbu.ac.uk , beaumoca@lsbu.ac.uk ,

CORPS ID inc}13200208
SRA ID inc}317757, 317762 , 817849 FCA ID inc}LS 817849

Your ref}Acts to interfere with justice thro Abuse of court process & of refusal to complete disclosure, use of HMCTS as private
prosecutors, Wrongful entering of judgment contra

Our Ref}HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT
CONTROL—HOHO872

Dear MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT),

Notice of Default – Non Negotiable

Important Legal Information - Do not Ignore

Re: By Formal Agreement dated 29 February 2024 and opportunity to resolve dated 7 March 2024.

This is to notify you that you are now in default of your obligations under the above written formal agreement as a result of your
failure to make remedy by way of commercial instrument.

I hereby declare as of the date above, MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for Horwich
Farrelly Limited Corporation/State is now in default.


So there can be no confusion, this legal Notice is lawfully executed as of the date above. If, however, you make remedy by way of
commercial instrument within the next 7 (Seven) days, the Notice of Default will not be entered against MR RONAN M M
MCCANN (CLAIMANT).

For the avoidance of doubt: failure to make remedy by way of commercial instrument of the Final Demand dated, the 14 March
2024 within the 7 (Seven) days allowance, we will enforce the Notice of Default in its entirety. Further legal action will be taken
to recover the outstanding debt.

Legal proceedings will be taken to resolve this matter by raising a security by way of a lien.

We await your response. Silence creates a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence.
No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted.






Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment

by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.

For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.



Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State






Exhibit (C)

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact.


Placed formally on the record of Government and the State.

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL HO872

As of March 2015

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





33 Lea Close
County Palatine of Leicestershire {LE9 6NW}

Baroness.oftheHouseof+Hobbs_872_OP569@gmail.com
21 March 2024

To: MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT)
OFFICER for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State
Alexander House Talbot Road Manchester [M16 0SP]

Reference Lien Number HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY SOLICITOR with
SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

To the following by email: [Lord President of the Privy Council to King Charles](#) [London Gazette](#) [Edinburgh Gazette](#) [Belfast Gazette](#) [Land Registry](#)
[Information Commissioners Office](#) [Experian](#) [Equifax](#) [Leicester Mercury Newspaper](#) [Daily Mail News](#) [Financial Conduct Authority](#)

This is a formal Notification of the following.

There is a formal and civil obligation to publish this public notice.

This is a notice of a formal and agreed lien by way of a resolution for the criminal offences of Fraud and Malfeasance in the office
of claimant of **MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT)**.

Public Notice

NOTICE that I, Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs, have an Affidavit of Obligation – Security by way of a lien against, and
therefore an interest in, the personal estate of MR RONAN M M MCCANN in the position of DIRECTOR WITH SIGNIFICANT
CONTROL for Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State. For the amount of Two Hundred and Twenty Five million pounds
GBP 225,000,000.00.

Surety for a Security by Way of a lien

This is a formally published legal securitised commercial instrument in PDF format at

Record location: <https://barondavidward.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/a-HOH-DALEWILLET-LIEN-001.pdf> And here: <https://jpst.it/32SKA> <https://tinyurl.com/4eaannz9>

And here: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1191551411479810/> And here: <https://tinyurl.com/HOHO175-LLOYDS-PUBLIC>
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/527118124607307/permalink/1194932514492528>

End of Notice

Without ill will or vexation


For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MRS YVONNE HOBBS.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Hobbs.

For and on behalf of Baroness Yvonne of the House of Hobbs.

MR RONAN M M MCCANN (CLAIMANT) in the position of OFFICER for
Horwich Farrelly Limited Corporation/State





Notification Address List

House of Hobbs

Leicestershire Chief of Police Temporary Police
Headquarters
St Johns
Enderby
LE19 2BX
Rob.nixon@leics.police.uk

The Edinburgh Gazette
PO Box 3584
Norwich NR7 7WD
T: +44 (0)131 659 7032
F: +44 (0)131 659 7039
E: edinburgh@thegazette.co.uk

Information Commissions Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF
www.ico.org.uk
01625 545745
icocasework@ico.org.uk

The Belfast Gazette
TSO Ireland
19a Weavers Court, Weavers Court Business Park
Linfield Road
Belfast BT12 5GH
T: +44 (0)28 9089 5135
F: +44 (0)28 9023 5401
E: belfast@thegazette.co.uk

Experian
The Sir John Peace Building
Experian Way
NG2 Business Park
Nottingham
NG80 1ZZ
consumer.helpservice@uk.experian.com

Surety for a Security by Way

Equifax Credit File Advice Centre
Capital House,
25 Chapel Street,
London
NW1 5DS
Customer.RelationsUK@equifax.com

Lien Number

HOH—RONAN MATHEW MARTIN MCCANN HORWICH FARRELLY
SOLICITOR with SIGNIFICANT CONTROL—HOHO872

The London Gazette
PO Box 3584
Norwich NR7 7WD
T: +44 (0)870 600 33 22
F: +44 (0)20 7394 4572
E: london@thegazette.co.uk

Land Registry
Leigh Court,
Torrington Avenue,
Coventry,
West Midlands
CV4 9XZ
T: 0300 006 0411
Email, contact@landregistry-uk.com

Daily Mail / DMGTplc
Northcliffe House
2 Derry Street
London
W8 5TT
+44 207 938 6000
news@dailymail.co.uk

[Leicester Mercury / Reach Group](#)
One Canada Square
Canary Wharf
London
E14 5AP
dataprotection@reachplc.com

