

Mr Paul Michaels
Low Newbiggin Estate
Aislaby
Whitby
North Yorkshire
YO21 1TQ

Lord Justice Newey.
Court of Appeal
The Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London
WC2A 2LL

30th October 2017.

Cc Scott McPherson Ministry of Justice, Action Fraud NFRC170902001711, Sarah Hall
City of London Police. Robert Goodwill MP

By Registered Post and Email.

TAKE NOTICE.

Dear Lord Just Newy

We refer to the attached order, received from Oliur Rahman at the Court of Appeal on
Friday 27th October 2017, and made by you.

We cannot accept the decision as 'Fair' and or 'Just.'

As Lord Justice Newey you have Prevaricated unauthorised practice of Law Legal Ethics
and Legal Maxims, (Canon Law)

As Lord Justice Newey you have ignored the Defendants Affidavits and Annexes of fact,
sworn under Oath as the truth

The Defendants Affidavits State that payment was made in full to the Claimants (Non Assumpsit) on the 15th October 2017. This was confirmed by the Claimant Lloyds HBOS when they engaged by responding to the Defendants.

As Lord Justice Newey you have ignored the Tort of Misfeasance that was placed on HHJ Raeside, or his immediate requirement to adjourn the case, 'stand down' and abstain from the matter.

The Defendants Bought the said property in June 2001. The Land Registry shows records registered by the bank retrospectively on 12.10.2001, twelve months before the Land Property Act replaced the Land Charges Act 1925. The Defendants home, Low Newbiggin Estate, could not have been registered in Land Registry in 2001.

The Bank of Scotland has No (Zero) legal claim over the property known as Low Newbiggin Estate as it is not the holder of the original title deeds and it never has been.

The bank of Scotland has registered illegal claims outside of the protocols of the Land 14 day period for registration.

As Lord Justice Newey we charge you with 'Tort of Misfeasance' on the basis that in reaching your decision you have breached your Sworn Oath to the Queen. You did not consider and or your decision does not fairly reflect, all the facts (as known and believed by and provided to the defendants) and so you could not possibly consider your decision as 'Fair and or Just', the premise of your promise, under which you serve the United Kingdom Justice system, as a public official who's responsibility it is to serve the people whom allow and employ you to perform your duties.

We DEMAND that the order is recalled and that a different order by consent with the Defendants is raised, requesting that

1. LLOYDS HBOS retract their claim, and
2. enter immediate mediation NOT LATER than Friday the 3rd November 2017, to resolve this matter before a third party declare that this case is a 'Matter of Public interest'

3. Declare that no possession order will be enforced for Low Newbiggin House NYK256562

4. LLOYDS HBOS remove all charges against Low Newbiggin House and Bohunt Manor Barn

5. LLOYDS HBOS are Estopped from bringing any further charges or claims against Paul Michaels & Charlotte Michaels

6. LLOYDS HBOS remove all files and notes derogatory or otherwise from the defendants Credit Reference Agency files and mark them 'satisfactory settled'

Should you and or the HMCTS Court of Appeal not agree to review their decision, then TAKE NOTICE that this matter will be and submitted, concurrently to the Supreme court and to President Ronny Abraham at the World Court, The Hague Netherlands, in order to validate the Defendants case.

The defendants give LLOYDS HBOS until 1600 hours on Tuesday the 31th October to retract the matter from the HMCTS, other wise take FAIR WARNING, that this matter will be escalated as a Criminal matter and reported to the authorities as a crime in an effort to steal the defendants home and other land or properties, without any legal claim or paperwork to support its actions.

In Truth

Paul Michaels

For and on behalf of

Paul Michaels, Charlotte Sarah Michaels & Others.

On 27 Oct 2017, at 16:59, Civil Appeals - Associates
<civilappeals.associates@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Good afternoon,

RE:A3-2017-2879 CoA Order [27-10-17]

Please find attached an Order in relation to the above. Copies have also been sent out by post.

Regards,

Oliur Rahman | Civil Appeals Office
Civil appeals associate
The Royal Courts of Justice | Strand | London | WC2A 2LL
Civilappeals.associates@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk
'020 7947 7856 '020 7947 7945

This e-mail (and any attachment) is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail.

Internet e-mail is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by e-mail.

This e-mail (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the Ministry of Justice. E-mail monitoring / blocking software may be used, and e-mail content may be read at any time. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding e-mails and their contents.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL, CIVIL DIVISION

REF: A32017/2879



BANK OF SCOTLAND PLC -v- (1) PAUL MICHAELS (2) CHARLOTTE SARAH MICHAELS



ORDER made by the The Honourable Lord Justice Newey

On consideration of the appellant's notice and accompanying documents, but without an oral hearing, in respect of an application for permission to appeal against the Order made by HH Judge Raeside QC, sitting as a Judge of the High Court, on 4 October 2017

Decision: granted, refused, adjourned. An order granting permission may limit the issues to be heard or be made subject to conditions.

Permission to appeal (and applications for stay and to rely on new evidence) refused

Reasons

An appeal would have no real prospect of success. The Appellants could not hope to persuade the Court to impugn the Judge's findings of fact, especially since they were made with the benefit of having seen the witnesses, and there is no significant flaw in the Judge's legal analysis either. Nor again is there any good reason to suppose that the Judge's conclusions are open to challenge on the basis of procedural impropriety. The grounds of appeal seek to raise points with regard to production of original documents, payment of a Court fee, transfer to the Chancery Division and the execution of the mortgage, but these matters, as well as being largely technical, do not appear to have featured in any important way in the pleadings or at the trial. As regards the new evidence on which the Appellants wish to rely, there is no reason to think that it could not have been adduced in time for the trial but, in any case, it is no importance to the issues.

Information for or directions to the parties

This case falls within the Court of Appeal Mediation Scheme automatic pilot categories*. Yes [] No []

If not, please give reason:

Where permission has been granted, or the application adjourned

- a) time estimate (excluding judgment)
b) any expedition



Signed: [Signature]
Date: 27 October 2017

Notes

- (1) Rule 52.6(1) provides that permission to appeal may be given only where -
a) the Court considers that the appeal would have a real prospect of success; or
b) there is some other compelling reason why the appeal should be heard.
(2) Where permission to appeal has been refused on the papers, that decision is final and cannot be further reviewed or appealed. See rule 52.5 and section 54(4) of the Access to Justice Act 1999.
(3) Where permission to appeal has been granted you must serve the proposed bundle/index on every respondent within 14 days of the date of the Listing Order. Where necessary, you must also serve the Listing Order/Listing Variation Notification letter (see paragraph 21 of CPR PD 52C).

By the Court

The electronic official copy of the register follows this message.

Please note that this is the only official copy we will issue. We will not issue a paper official copy.