



An independent panel of experts unanimously agreed the winner of our 2022 Humanitarian Award

Data protection and legal experts redacted the victim's full name pursuant to the Victim's Code, human rights, judicial security, safeguarding and human dignity

1. Introduction:

Simon, who is same age as the Ukrainian President, is a UK-based human rights expert and senior therapist specialising in helping victims of human rights abuse. Communities around the world recognise Simon as a humanitarian who

dedicates his life to making contributions to all humans. He had a clear purpose in life, which is to improve the human race. As a result of his extensive advocacy work, he endured over 35 years of intense persecution, in the form of horrific human rights abuse, menacing harassment and unprecedented smears from the UK Establishment, which continued to this day. The appalling and unprecedented persecution led Simon, a severely disabled person with life threatening medical conditions, to suffer extreme poverty, near starvation and constant threat of homelessness. Despite the travesty of justice, Simon dedicated his life to serve the public in a wide variety of elected, statutory and voluntary roles across Britain.

2. Career:

In his distinguished career, Simon has worked as a lecturer in psychology and sociology, university researcher, government research officer who regularly wrote reports for the Secretary of State for Education, manager responsible for £55 million NHS projects and local authority senior policy officer for health scrutiny.

3. Education:

Simon's undergraduate and postgraduate training were completed at 4 universities in London, Southampton and Sheffield. He specialised in mental health and human rights.

4. Representing UK communities in elected roles:

As a result of his award winning advocacy work and despite extensive smears from the UK Establishment, communities across London repeatedly elected Simon to represent them as Governor of 20 major NHS Hospitals (combined they treated half of the UK population) and 5 Schools in the last two decades.

At the University of Southampton, Simon was elected Disability Officer in the Students Union (1997-1998) and represented issues on health & well-being for all 20,000 students (including the students who wished to disclose their physical and/or mental disabilities).

5. Professional life:

In his professional life, Simon earned Fellowships of the Royal Statistical Society (2002 to 2021) and the Royal Society of Arts (2003 to 2021). He was successfully nominated to be a Senior Associate at the Royal Society of Medicine (2016 to 2020) due to his professional achievements in the field of mental health and

achieved Full Member status at the Society of Expert Witnesses (2016 to 2021). He was also an active member of the Chartered Insurance Institute (2007 to 2008), the Chartered Management Institute (2007 to 2008), the American Counselling Association (2015 to 2018) and the National Counselling Society (2016 to 2021).

6. Recognition, respect and support from the highest authorities in the United Kingdom and upper echelon of the British Establishment (in chronological order):

On 27 February 2006, the Right Honourable Lord Bingham provided a formal letter from the House of Lords Senior Law Lord's Office confirming he accepted Simon's invitation to be Patron of a Community Centre in London, which Simon ran with friends. Lord Bingham was Master of the Rolls (highest ranking judge of all British civil courts) from 1992 to 1996, Lord Chief Justice (highest ranking judge of all British criminal courts) from 1996 to 2000 and Senior Law Lord (today's equivalent of Supreme Court President) from 2000 to 2008. Lord Bingham is regarded as the greatest judge in British legal history. During the years when Lord Bingham was patron of Simon's community centre, they became good friends and their friendship was maintained until Lord Bingham passed away in 2010. After Lord Bingham passes away, Simon exchanged letters with Lady Bingham and kept in touch with his friends. The photos of Lord Bingham with Simon and the many personal letters they wrote to each other will always be cherished.

On 19 April 2006, the British First Lady wrote a hand written thank you letter to Simon, a rare honour that is reserved for major national treasures.

On 3 January 2007, the higher echelon of UK Establishment's most inner circle and the British Prime Minister's sister-in-law, who is the wife of a High Court Judge, arranged for Simon to be published in mainstream newspapers in Hong Kong (a major global financial centre with over 7 million residents), including the front page of one major newspaper. The news articles contained professional photos of Simon working with the British First Lady, Leader of House of Lords, Lord Chancellor and Mayor of London. The articles described Simon as a hard working and talented professional who serves the public and cares about the world. Copies of those newspapers were widely circulated beyond Hong Kong, residents in Singapore, Macao, Tokyo, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Vancouver, Toronto, Sydney, Melbourne, Taipei, Shenzhen, Guangzhou and many major cities around the world also read the news articles. The British First Lady and the Lord Chancellor had both met Simon at the 2005 Lord Chancellor's Annual Legal Dinner and other occasions, evidenced by photos taken by journalists. A board member of Her Majesty's Courts Service (in 2011 it merged with the Tribunal

Service to form Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunal Service), whom Simon successfully nominated for a national honour, also attended the 2005 Lord Chancellor's Annual Legal Dinner. In 2007 the aforementioned board member received an OBE from Her Majesty the Queen as a result of the nomination coordinated by Simon. In another national honours nomination, Simon received a letter of support dated 2 June 2009 from a High Court Judge in-charge of the Administrative Court (responsible for judicial reviews) inside the Royal Courts of Justice.

On 28 June 2007, the British Prime Minister wrote a hand written thank you letter to Simon, a rare honour that is reserved for major national treasures.

On 18 April 2010, Simon and his colleagues were invited to 10 Downing Street (two years since the last visit).

On 17 January 2013, a Judge in the UK Supreme Court provided a formal letter from the Supreme Court confirming he accepted Simon's invitation to be the Patron of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network.

On 15 January 2014, the Right Reverend and the Right Honourable the Lord Williams of Oystermouth provided a formal email from the University of Cambridge confirming he accepted Simon's invitation to be an Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network. Lord Williams was the Archbishop of Canterbury and Leader of the Church of England from 2002 to 2012, Master of Cambridge University Magdalene College from 2013 to 2020 and Chancellor of the University of South Wales since 2014. Thirteen days after Lord Williams accepted the invitation, on 27 January 2014, His Eminence Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O'Connor also accepted the invitation, as confirmed in a formal email from his office. Cardinal Murphy-O'Connor was the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster Cathedral, President of the Catholic Bishops Conference of England & Wales and Catholic Primate of England & Wales from February 2000 to April 2009.

On 24 November 2014, the Right Honourable Baroness Mary Warnock (wife of the former Oxford University Vice-Chancellor) provided a formal email from the House of Lords confirming she accepted Simon's invitation to be the Patron of this health support network.

On 19 March 2015, the Chief Crown Prosecutor of CPS London provided a formal email from her office confirming she accepted Simon's invitation to be Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health

charity which established this health support network.

On 23 March 2015, the Master of the Rolls and Head of Civil Justice (highest ranking judge in British civil courts) provided a formal letter from his office in the Royal Courts of Justice confirming he accepted Simon's invitation to be Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network.

On 20 October 2017, the President of the UK Supreme Court confirmed, in an official letter, Simon's voluntary work is "fantastic" (this is a direct quote) after reading some of the charity reports.

On 12 April 2018, Simon became the first and only professional in recent British legal history to receive the recognition of being "extremely distinguished" (this is a direct quote) in an official letter from the third most senior Judge in the UK Supreme Court.

On 8 April 2019, a formal letter from the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) confirmed Simon has been committed to community cohesion and dedicated his life to supporting communities across Britain (including London).

On 1 April 2020, Simon finally won his long-standing appeal against the Ministry of Justice Civil Procedure Rules (CPR) Committee. It was the first time in human history for a statutory regulator to consider an appeal against the Ministry of Justice and to rule in favour of the victim. The Ruling from the Office of Public Appointments Commissioner, the statutory regulator of all public appointments, is final and is in the victim's favour.

On 19 October 2020, Simon was informed by the UK Government's Representative that he made it onto the longlist of the candidates for the position of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of the Crown Prosecution Service but they didn't shortlist him, even though experts agreed he fully met all criteria.

7. Recognition, respect and support from the UK Police, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), Home Office, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Defence (MoD), Department of Health, London Assembly, Local Authorities and Universities (in chronological order):

In his distinguished career, Simon worked closely with the police. In all the statutory, elected and voluntary roles he held, he regularly met or liaised with the police. When Simon was a career civil servant, he worked closely with the Home Office.

Simon built and maintained excellent working relationships with the police, evidenced by the fact numerous high ranking senior police officers (such as Borough Commanders) provided Simon with letters and emails confirming he is an outstanding pillar of society. For instance, he received a very nice hand-written letter from a Deputy Assistant Commissioner of the London Metropolitan Police.

When Simon was working in the local government, he lived with the police and there are many police officers of all ranks in his personal life.

On 6 June 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with Senior MP (former Chief Secretary to the Treasury), whom became Chair of the Work and Pensions Select Committee on 29 January 2020.

On 24 June 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with London Assembly Member, who is former Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, in the City Hall.

On 27 June 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with the former President of the British Medical Association.

On 3 July 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with the former Minister of State for Care Services in the Parliament.

On 7 July 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with the Minister of State for Care and Support and his Private Secretary at the Department of Health Minister's Private Office.

On 25 July 2014, Simon and a University Senior Lecturer in Psychology were both invited to a private meeting with the UK Chief Inspector of Hospitals and his Deputy (Mental Health) at the Care Quality Commission (CQC) head office.

On 29 July 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with the UK Victims Commissioner and her Chief Executive at the Ministry of Justice headquarters.

On 8 August 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with the Director of Policy at the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS).

On 16 October 2014, Simon was invited to a private meeting with the Member of the London Assembly, who is the Deputy London Mayor and sits on the London City Hall Police and Crime Committee.

On 22 October 2014, the Minister of State for Policing and Justice (formerly Minister of State for Disabled People) and Simon had both agreed to have a private meeting in the Parliament at 4:30 pm but his representative cancelled it citing urgent business.

On 17 November 2014, the Minister of State for Justice and Civil Liberties had a private meeting with Simon in the Parliament. One year earlier the Minister's professor brother, who later became President of the British Psychological Society (professional body of all qualified psychologists in the UK), agreed to be Honorary Ambassador of this health support network and Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network.

On 15 July 2015, the above mentioned politician, who is now a former Minister of State for Justice and Civil Liberties, met with Simon again and agreed to be Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network.

On 28 January 2016, Simon, due to his excellent work as Residents Association Chairman in London, was invited by the Deputy Leader of Southampton City Council and Cabinet Member for Housing to attend the opening ceremony of a newly built care home. The aforementioned elected senior politician and Simon both studied at the University of Southampton and were both elected officers in the Students Union during their undergraduate years.

On 30 January 2016, a local government Cabinet Member for Community Safety (who later became Deputy Mayor) accepted a charity award from Simon in the local community centre. A photo was taken and published in the charity newsletter. In the same year, numerous elected politicians across the Greater London region accepted charity awards from Simon in various meetings and he met most of the senior politicians, including the former Minister for London, to discuss social issues. Professional photos of Simon's public service and meetings with senior politicians are kept in the charity photo album for members to view.

On 18 April 2016, Simon, in his role as Charity Chairman, was invited to meet with the Dean and Deputy Dean of Nottingham Trent University's Law School. They had lunch in the Dean's Office and then enjoyed a tour of the Legal Advice Centre, during which the centre manager took a photo of them and it was published in the charity newsletter. Due to the fact Simon had studied at 4 universities in Southampton, London and Sheffield and worked in 2 universities, he developed and maintained good working relationships with many universities across Britain. In subsequent years, Simon made it onto the longlist

of candidates for the position of Governor at City University and shortlist of candidates for the position of Governor at the University of London Heythrop College.

On 26 April 2016, the Deputy London Mayor for Policing and Crime (one day before his term of office expired) provided a formal email from London City Hall confirming he accepted Simon's invitation to be Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network. The honorary life member later became a Peer in the House of Lords and a Government Minister in the UK Home Office.

On 5 May 2016, Simon met a London Assembly Member at a community event and a photo of them was published by the charity. The aforementioned politician later became the Deputy Chair of the Police and Crime Committee at London City Hall, which examines the work of the London Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and holds the Commissioner of London Metropolitan Police to account, accepted a charity award from Simon in his City Hall office.

On 16 May 2016, a Senior MP who is former Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice provided a formal email from the UK Parliament confirming he accepted Simon's invitation to be Honorary Life Member of the Little Portion Community Project, the health charity which established this health support network. The honorary life member later became Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, Minister for the Cabinet Office and First Secretary of State.

On 18 July 2016, the newly appointed Deputy London Mayor for Policing and Crime sent a reply letter to Simon after reading examples of his extensive voluntary work. The third paragraph states: *"It is always wonderful to read examples of people actively engaging in their communities to make London safer and I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the work that you do"*.

On 26 October 2016, Simon and a group of senior advisors had refreshments with the Lead Commissioner and Commissioner of Tower Hamlets Council (at the time it was in special measures) in the Supreme Court cafe and presented them with charity awards. The UK Government appointed lead commissioner of the local authority in special measures was a retired Commissioner of the London Fire Brigade (2007 to 2013) and was awarded a knighthood for his service. The commissioner was a retired Chief Executive of Hackney Council and was awarded CBE for his service.

On 6 December 2016, Chair of the Police and Crime Committee at London City Hall, which examines the work of the London Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and holds the Commissioner of London Metropolitan Police to

account, accepted a charity award from Simon in the City Hall. A photo was taken and published in the charity newsletter.

On 17 March 2017, Simon was interviewed by the Ministry of Defence (MoD) for a prominent position: Member of the Veterans Advisory and Pensions Committee. Simon's step-grandfather was a senior officer in the British Armed Forces, as a result he developed loyalty to the Ministry of Defence and understanding of British veterans. The Ministry of Defence did not appoint Simon but being one of the few candidates on the shortlist is an honour.

On 31 March 2017, Simon took the Judiciary Oath in the Crown Court in front of many judges and was sworn into the judiciary as a Justice of the Peace for England & Wales (Magistrate). In the previous year, he passed the rigorous and lengthy assessments at the Ministry of Justice.

On 16 January 2018 Simon, in his capacity as an elected charity chairman, was invited to shadow an Assistant Director at the Home Office as part of the NCVO's "a day in the life" programme. The Home Office is the parent body of all police forces in the UK, including London Metropolitan Police.

On 9 February 2018, the above mentioned Home Office Assistant Director shadowed Simon's charity work.

On 3 February 2020, Simon was invited to the New Scotland Yard (Greater London regional police headquarter) to present a charity award to the London Metropolitan Police, which was received by a Police Superintendent on behalf of London's Police Commissioner. Over the next few days, Simon and the Police Superintendent (based in the Office of the Commissioner at the New Scotland Yard) exchanged many positive communications via email, which included evidence from the Home Office about Simon's professional standing. Email replies from the Office of the Commissioner, written by the Police Superintendent, indicated they have no objection if Simon's legal advisors initiate Private Prosecutions against the individuals and organisations who maliciously turned his life upside down and made his life a living hell. The same Police Superintendent kindly agreed to help Simon shadow another Police Superintendent, since he was advised by experts to become a Police Superintendent via the direct entry application route for experienced professionals, sadly the plan did not progress any further due to the pandemic.

On 10 February 2022, several hours after the sudden resignation of the London Metropolitan Police Commissioner, communities emailed the Home Secretary recommending Simon to be the new Commissioner on the basis of his extensive

community work and deep understanding of policing. Then on 18 February 2022, communities published a succinct summary of their recommendations on social media, which was read by millions of people around the world.

8. International Criminal Court:

On 9 January 2019, Simon became an Expert in mental health at the International Criminal Court (5-year term), as confirmed by the Office of the Director of Judicial Services.

9. Expert Witness Award:

On 13 March 2019, Simon won an Expert Witness Award for Mental Health from the Lawyer Monthly magazine.

10. Working with communities across Britain:

In the last decade, Simon has submitted large volumes of hard evidence (checked by lawyers) on problems in the mental health service to UK Parliament's Select Committees, been active in many All-Party Parliamentary Groups in the UK Parliament and campaigned for human rights around the world.

11. Helping innocent people being framed by bullies:

As an expert recognised by the International Criminal Court, Simon has many years of experience in helping innocent people being framed as "bad and mad".

12. Empowering marginalised communities:

In his work as a senior therapist, Simon helped victims to cope with challenges, make positive changes in their life and enhance personal well-being. He has worked collaboratively with clients in a holistic, insightful and facilitative way to enable them to consider change.

Simon always listened attentively to victims in a safe and confidential setting. He offered clients the time, empathy and respect their need to express their feelings. Feedback from communities confirmed he offered clients hope in times of distress.

He has extensive experiences in helping victims with a wide range of complex difficulties which may revolve around severe stress, anxiety, major life changes, bereavement, health issues, relationship break ups and general dissatisfaction with life.

13. Enhanced background checks:

Simon is subscribed to the UK Government's Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) Update Service and regularly undergo full background checks at DBS Enhanced Level (the highest level), which he always passed.

He passed all the Enhanced DBS Checks in the many distinguished and prominent positions he held in his life, including Justice of the Peace for England & Wales (Magistrate), Governor of Schools and Governor of NHS Hospitals in London.

14. Acceptance of the Award:

Due to the ongoing persecution from the UK establishment, Simon was too unwell to give an award acceptance speech but his authorised representatives sent a signed letter, below are the words from that letter:

Simon is overwhelmed with gratitude to have been selected to receive the prestigious Humanitarian Award. He is extremely honoured to be receiving such an important award.

He is grateful for the recognition he has received for his work.

The 35 years of non-stop persecution from the UK establishment has only strengthened this remarkable human being to make him the honourable man he is today.

Despite the unprecedented level of intensive smears from the UK establishment spanning 35 years, communities across Britain did not trust any of the propaganda from the ruling class and their supporters, pillars of society all over Britain gathered enormous support and as a result, people repeatedly elected Simon as their representative in the health service (Governor of 20 major NHS Hospitals) and education system (Governor of 5 Schools).

Communities also supported Simon's application to become a Member of the British Judiciary, which was a great success. In 2016 Simon passed all the rigorous assessment at the Ministry of Justice, took the Judicial Oath on 31 March 2017 and was sworn into the judiciary as a Justice of the Peace for England & Wales (Magistrate). Sadly, discrimination and victimisation brutally destroyed his judicial career.

Thank you all so much for the immeasurable support and help in the last 35 years.

Simon is so honoured to have his work recognised in this way by the multi award winning and world-renowned Healed by Compassion International Health Support Network.

15. Recently one of his elderly relatives, a retired university professor, shared the following with senior journalists:

“If Simon had not suffered as he has, there would be no depth, no humility and no compassion to him. The suffering led Simon to be filled with wisdom, kindness and compassion, which he generously shared with communities.

The immeasurable pain and incalculable suffering brutally inflicted by the UK establishment failed to crush or paralyse Simon, but motivated him to serve the public, which made him a hero in people’s hearts all over the world.

Communities across Britain, who were helped by Simon when he was a Governor of 20 Hospitals and 5 Schools and who are helping him back, told us that whilst they don’t know how Simon’s story will end, but the words we gave up will definitely not appear in this story. Simon’s story is about hope, joy and love.”

16. Summary of the severe persecution spanning 35 years:

(a) Bullying, harassment, multiple discrimination and victimisation suffered in personal capacities during the last 35 years (e.g. victim of hate crimes spanning three decades, survivor of multiple abuse, patient, client, service user etc) and professional capacities (e.g. magistrate, NHS hospital governor, school governor, civil servant, local authority officer, public sector manager and various other professional roles).

(b) After the victim picked up the courage to report the incalculable incidents and file complaints based on legal advice to management, authorities and regulators, all of them either ignored the complaints or victimised the whistleblower (e.g. defamation, slanders, libellous statements, restrictions on communication, arbitrary punishments etc).

(c) The extreme victimisation included and not limited to:

1. Falsely accusing the victim of being “mad and bad”;
2. Removing the victim from his positions and jobs;
3. Banning him from lodging complaints and lawsuits;
4. Banning him from accessing taxpayer-funded legal services and/or his offices;

5. Banning him from seeking justice, communicating with witnesses and trying to find help;
6. Publishing his highly sensitive personal details (written inaccurately) on UK government website to shame and humiliate him;
7. Denying the victim all of his entitlements such as reasonable adjustments for his complex permanent disabilities when using court & tribunal services;
8. Rejecting all of his legitimate concerns;
9. Ignoring all of his real suffering.

(d) Brutal impact of the severe persecution that lasted 35 years and is ongoing:

- (i) Life ruined;
- (ii) Robbed of all human dignity and lifelong achievements;
- (ii) Loss of reputation that took a lifetime to build;
- (iv) Became unemployable;
- (v) Severe damages and immeasurable harm to all aspects of health;
- (vi) Permanent disabilities worsened;
- (vii) Suffers from extreme poverty everyday;
- (viii) Horrific stigma after being forced to become a social pariah by the perpetrators and their large group of loyal supporters;
- (ix) Public humiliation and constant threats of hate crimes, malicious communication and personal safety after having confidential personal information, written inaccurately, published on UK government website;
- (x) Constant threats of harassment, homelessness, starvation, bankruptcy and more extreme persecution from the establishment and their large group of loyal supporters.

(e) The significance of the multiple appeals to the United Nations (UN), international courts and international agencies after none of the UK courts, from the lowest to the highest, delivered even 0.1% of the justice needed for the gross injustice silently suffered by the community leader spanning many years.

1. This high profile case is receiving international support. Thousands of people who deeply care about the appellant in 195 countries are successful in persuading the global community to get involved. The appellant's 80,000 followers on social media are persuading the 500 million people they are connected with to help. In a typical month, the appellant's true story is read over 3 million times on one social media platform alone, this statistics excludes the other social media sites. Most of mainstream press and media in 195 countries around the world are aware of the high profile case.

2. At the time of the incidents, the appellant was a Justice of the Peace for England and Wales (as confirmed in the judicial appointment certificate), also known as Magistrate. In Cambridge University English Dictionary, Magistrates are described as Judges. This definition is correct as Magistrates sit as judges in Magistrates' Court and have the power to sentence people to up to one year in prison for multiple offences.

(f) Succinct summary of the main grounds of the multiple appeals and which aspects of the human rights legislation, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), were violated.

ECHR Article 3 – failure to protect the victim from degrading treatment (the ruling from the UK Supreme Court in *Gilham v Ministry of Justice* is the authority)

The UK public bodies, their regulators and the courts did not stop the bullying and harassment but victimised the appellant after he raised genuine concerns in good faith. The victimisation included refusing to use discretion to waive or reduce cost orders, erecting many barriers and hurdles to prevent the appellant from seeking justice, labelling everything from the appellant as “totally without merit” despite the fact that the pleadings were based on legal advice from over 100 pro bono lawyers around the world.

ECHR Article 6 – the judges in the UK failed to give a fair trial (the ruling from the UK Supreme Court in the case of *P v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis* is the authority)

- (a) Refused to make reasonable adjustments for disabilities
- (b) Let hearings go ahead when the victim is medically certified as very ill
- (c) The presiding judges all had conflict of interests with the appellant
- (d) Failed to properly handle internal complaints about service

- (e) Labelled everything and anything as “totally without merit” even though the advice was from top QC and experts
- (f) Ignored a higher ranking judge’s order for a private hearing
- (g) Let the bullies sent letters and strangers to frighten the victim in his home
- (h) Interpreted the law in perverse ways to punish the victim
- (I) Made decisions that are not supported by evidence
- (j) Failed to analyse evidence
- (k) Quoted a Civil Procedure Rule (CPR) that does not exist to justify unfair and arbitrary punishment
- (l) Prevent the victim from seeking justice by banning him from the entire UK legal system with civil restraint orders
- (m) Plus hundreds of other incidents of abuse/victimisation

As a result of failure to provide a fair trial, the victim suffers from:

- (a) Effects of contempt of court and impact similar to other victims who suffered miscarriage of justice
- (b) Effects of pervert the course of justice
- (c) Significant harm to all aspects of health and well-being
- (d) Threat of homelessness and starvation
- (e) Threat of bankruptcy
- (f) Losing all public offices (the victim was a Justice of the Peace for England & Wales and Governor of many major Hospitals and Schools)
- (g) Having distinguished career ruined and becomes unemployable
- (h) Harassment from the bullies who tried to enforce the cost orders despite the fact the victim is living below the poverty line
- (i) Public humiliation for everyone involved in the high profile case

(j) Loss of confidence in the justice system by the communities whom the victim represented in his many elected roles across London

(j) An employment judge spitefully published 11 pages of the victim's highly sensitive and confidential data, which put his life in danger from criminals due to his judicial position and other roles (e.g. in one of his past jobs, he was a Manager at a science company that provides forensic analyses to the police)

ECHR Article 8 – invasion of privacy and home life

The victim's privacy and home life were all invaded due to the extensive smear campaign and intensive bullying. As the victim is a Magistrate, his home is the private sanctuary of a Judicial Office Holder's residence. Despite this, the courts refused to intervene when the bullies sent letters and strangers to scare the victim in his home. Due to the extensive smear campaign, every aspect of the victim's private life was scrutinised by the authorities but the none of the bullies were investigated for their malicious accusations.

ECHR Article 10 – no freedom of speech

The human rights abuse (e.g. bullying and harassment of a Magistrate) are rare even in police states with no human rights law. The UK has the best human rights law but when the victim (a Magistrate) used to legal system to seek justice, he was faced with indifference, prejudice and victimisation. Prior to filing the lawsuits, the victim was vindicated and exonerated by the authorities and establishments, including the NHS and the government's DBS, therefore the claims are not "totally without merit".

ECHR Article 14 – discrimination based on characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010

(a) The courts had failed to provide reasonable adjustments for disabilities and made negative assumptions about the victim, who is severely disabled and an ethnic minority, that are racist. The unrepresented victim's experience of the legal system left him feeling degraded, humiliated and victimised. The regulators of the courts and judges refused to intervene when the victim complained of discrimination.

(b) The victim is an expert in the field of mental health and government policies (the matters in the lawsuits) but the Judges labelled everything from the victim as "totally without merit", which is discrimination as the Judges did not provide

analyses of the bundles of evidence and in fact, experts' opinion can be rejected by Judges but are exempt from the "totally without merit" labels because a professional's expert opinion takes many years to accumulate.

17. Below are twenty-one questions (asked by senior investigative journalists) and answers (based on hard evidence, kindly provided by some of the experts in 195 countries who helped the victim in the last 35 years) explaining how the UK establishment prevented the victim from seeking justice and used extreme methods to silence, ruin and destroy the community leader who is an honourable man.

Question 1: What role did the regulators play in pushing the victim towards legal action and what was the overall outcome?

Answer 1:

(a) In the last decade, in response to public pressure, there had been many UK government funded inquiries and reviews on the massive failures of the regulators. Mainstream press and media regularly published how the British public are let down by all the regulators. Despite all of these efforts, the regulators' unwritten functions continue to be covering up mistakes, protecting the establishment and repeatedly telling the public that there is nothing wrong with the broken system.

(b) In this high profile case, regulators behaved in the same way as management, the appeals were either ignored or led to more victimisation. Following independent legal advice, the victim was left with no choice but to file lawsuits. Prior to lodging the civil claims, the victim's representatives provided the defendants with plenty of opportunities for mediation but were ignored or mocked. In the pre-action process, all the defendants hid behind the government and used taxpayers' money to fund best legal defense.

(c) Like all the other victims who are too poor to hire lawyers, instead of receiving well deserved justice, the victim in this case suffered more victimisation during the legal battles and was even banned from the entire legal system when he was medically signed off.

(d) Communities who supported the victim throughout the lengthy ordeal read numerous articles about serious misconduct committed by various UK judges (a few of them were directly or indirectly involved in this case), published by British mainstream press and media. This clearly proved the system is not perfect and judges are human beings with their flaws, faults and weaknesses like the rest of us.

Question 2: What do victims really want after suffering injustice?

Answer 2: Victims' groups all over Britain agree what most victims really want is not money but for time to be turned back and not experience the unwanted incidents that damaged or ruined their lives. A court of law has no power to do this and can only offer compensation. Despite this, some of the judges who handled this distressing case harshly criticised the defenseless victim for wanting a small sum of well deserved compensation for the immeasurable losses, suffering, distress and damages he silently endured over a long period.

Question 3: Give one example of the unsubstantiated assumptions the judges made about the victim (whom at the time was a Member of the Judiciary).

Answer 3: One of the judges wrongly accused the victim of being lazy whereas in fact the abuse had ruined his health and prevented him from employment. The victim in this case began working from the age of 13, as a newspaper delivery boy, despite multiple disabilities. After graduating from 4 universities, he worked as a lecturer, civil servant, local authority officer and public sector manager. In those jobs, he suffered abuse, bigotry, harassment and prejudice on daily basis. He worked longer hours than his colleagues but was denied promotion and pay rise. In one job (civil service), a manager and her friends ganged up to humiliate him everyday, after he complained, her boss gathered a group of loyal supporters to victimise him including evicting from office.

Question 4: Give examples of the disregard for human rights the victim (whom at the time was a Member of the Judiciary) suffered from the UK legal system.

Answer 4:

(a) An employment tribunal (first-tier tribunal) judge published a large volume of the victim's highly personal, sensitive and private information such as extracts from confidential medical records (not direct quotes but written with the interpretation from a person who is not a medical doctor registered with the General Medical Council), contained within an 11-page "strike out decision" from a pre-hearing review (PHR), when the unrepresented disabled victim was medically exempt from participating, as evidenced by medical letters from a Senior General Practitioner (GP), a Consultant Physician and two Consultant Surgeons from major London Hospitals.

(b) At the time, the victim was a Member of the British Judiciary and Senior Governor of NHS Hospitals and Schools, which meant his personal, sensitive and private information must legally be redacted prior to publication due to judicial security policies, GDPR (general data protection regulations), data

protection, human rights, safeguarding and human dignity. But the tribunal and the senior court all refused to redact the sensitive private data or the victim's full name.

(c) The international community noticed that thousands of strike out decisions from pre-hearing reviews published on Ministry of Justice website clearly shows such decision is almost always written on the same day and approximately one paragraph long.

(d) As stated in many law books and law journals, discrimination cases are normally heard by a panel of 3 (one judge and two experts) and the victim did follow the correct procedures by requesting a panel of 3 to hear his case after full recovery from ill health. This was ignored.

(e) In this case, a single tribunal judge sitting alone without the two wingers ignored all the valid medical evidence and spent 3 months writing 11 pages of unevidenced justifications for dismissing a legitimate strong claim before a full hearing when the unrepresented victim was medically signed off by a group of Senior Medical Doctors from fighting a stressful legal battle against the UK government's Ministry of Justice and the large army of aggressive lawyers they sent from the Government Legal Service. On paper, the tribunal judge labelled the "strike out decision" as "judgment" even though it was from a pre-hearing review and no full hearing had taken place.

Question 5: Give examples of how the UK legal system disrespected the victim's human dignity.

Answer 5:

(a) **As the 11-page document was published on the internet for the whole world to read, the international community who read it are bewildered by its content.** Readers from around the world who read the publication asked supporters to publish the legal analyses of the many unsubstantiated comments made by the tribunal judge in her "strike out decision" from a pre-hearing review (PHR) wrongly labelled as "judgment", which the government published on their website. "Strike out decision" from a pre-hearing review is not "judgment" because no substantive or full hearing had taken place. In this case, the unrepresented victim was medically signed off due to flare up of physical illness, as a result he did not have an opportunity to present the fact and evidence. Therefore, everything in the publication was entirely from the defendant's side and the defendant in this case is the Ministry of Justice, the employer of the tribunal judge who wrote the "strike out decision" from a pre-hearing review. Readers felt it was indefensible for a first-tier tribunal judge

sitting alone in a preliminary hearing without the victim to write those unfounded comments about a Member of the Judiciary, whom on 12 April 2018 became the first professional in recent British legal history to receive the recognition of being “extremely distinguished” (this is a direct quote) in an official letter from the third most senior Judge in the UK Supreme Court.

(b) Used the words “useless” and “ridiculous” to describe the unrepresented disabled victim, even though his achievements were praised by other judges many ranks higher than her. She claimed the victim, who was a Member of the Judiciary at the time, did not comply with the rules during legal proceedings, whereas the bundles of hard evidence, witnesses and independent legal advice all confirmed he followed every rule.

(c) Alleged there is nothing good in the community leader, despite the fact higher authorities and senior judges many ranks higher than her had already confirmed his profound integrity, kindness, compassion and wisdom. The victim was elected Governor of 5 Schools in London and many Head Teachers, Senior Teachers, School Governors and Parents who read the published criticisms pointed out every person has at least 3 good points, therefore it is wholly inaccurate to say there is nothing good in the victim.

(d) Accused the victim of failing to properly explain his concerns in his whistle blowing and discrimination claim against the Ministry of Justice and also in the written complaints against her. This unfounded accusation was later repeated by the regulators and her supporters. How is this possible? The victim had graduated from 4 elite British Universities and had a distinguished career as a lecturer, civil servant, local authority officer and public sector manager. As a matter of fact, all the written concerns were carefully checked by friends and supporters who are judges, lawyers, professors and civil servants. At the time the victim was a Member of the Judiciary and an active member of numerous organisations, networks and groups for judicial office holders, many of them offered help and support.

(e) Described the victim as an “former lay magistrate”, whereas in fact the Judicial Appointment Certificate from the Ministry of Justice HR Office in the Royal Courts of Justice clearly stated he is a Justice of the Peace for England and Wales. Justice of the Peace is often referred to as Magistrate or JP, as stated on official websites and explained in law books. The Magistrates Association had advised it is not accurate to describe magistrates as lay because most of them have university degrees and are experts in their fields. When the strike out decision was published, the victim was still a Member of the Judiciary (and remained for a few more years, as confirmed in letters from the Ministry of

Justice HR and the Office of Public Appointments Commissioner), therefore it was wrong to describe him as a “former lay magistrate” in the document. Experts and lawyers who read the published words “former lay magistrate” advised it is proof the decision to evict the victim from the judiciary was “pre-determined” due to the fact a courageous Judicial Office Holder with highest integrity dared to blow the whistle and sue the UK government’s almighty Ministry of Justice.

(f) Rejected the hard evidence proving higher authorities confirmed the victim had achieved the status of national treasure, whereas the hard evidence had proved he achieved the status of UK national treasure via all three routes: (1) he received hand-written thank you letters from the UK Prime Minister and First Lady; (2) communities across Britain elected him to represent them as Governor of 20 major Hospitals (combined they treated half of the UK population) and 5 Schools and (3) his extensive contributions to British society (e.g. represented millions of people in the NHS as an elected Governor of 20 major Hospitals, including St Thomas Hospital, which saved the life of British Prime Minister in March 2020). Experts pointed out whilst the victim is certainly not a celebrity or a wealthy person, but he had significantly surpassed the threshold of being a national treasure years ago. Further, legal experts pointed out it is not up to a single judge in an employment tribunal (first tier tribunal) to decide who is a national treasure and this matter was not among the concerns for her to consider. The tone and language she used in the publication appears to mock, degrade and publicly humiliate the unrepresented disabled victim, who had no funds to hire lawyers and who was not there to defend himself because Senior Medical Doctors had certified him as unfit to fight stressful legal battles on his own.

(g) Accused the victim of making unfounded complaints about bias and conflict of interests, whereas the legitimate strong complaints were fully based on robust evidence, carefully written and checked by many experts.

(h) Alleged she recognised the victim’s words in the charity letter. Firstly, the victim was elected chair of the charity, which meant the letter of support was written with his input based on procedures. This was based on professional advice, therefore there was nothing improper for the victim’s words to be included in the letter. In fact, since the victim was the charity chairman, letters of support for victims are normally written by him. On that occasion, he was unwell and as a result, volunteers wrote it (with his input).

(i) Alleged the tribunal had never received the medical evidence. Communities who were helping the unrepresented victim had emailed all the medical documents to the tribunal. The tribunal email system automatically provided

acknowledgement of receipt on each occasion medical evidence was emailed to them.

(j) Alleged Magistrates are not entitled to the judicial style of “Your Worship” in court settings. At the time, the victim was a Member of the Judiciary who took the Judicial Oath and was sworn into the Judiciary of England & Wales as a Justice of the Peace (Magistrate). Historians confirmed it is a 700-year old tradition for all Magistrates to be addressed as Your Worship in court settings. In fact, on the official website of Her Majesty’s Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS), the guidance on how to address judges clearly stated the judicial style of magistrates are “Your Worship”. Further, in law books, law journals, films and documentaries, magistrates are always addressed as “Your Worship”. Many of the victim’s friends who are Magistrates advised when Magistrates become victims and need to seek justice in courts and tribunals, judges normally use their judicial style “Your Worship” when addressing them in hearings.

(k) Alleged the disabled victim wanted “a bow” from the judge presiding over his hearing as a reasonable adjustment, whereas in fact the written requests for reasonable adjustments were for severe disabilities and all those permanent disabilities were confirmed by senior medical doctors, another tribunal and higher authorities. Members of the public who read this pointed out that since taxpayer-funded judges are public servants serving the public, bowing to taxpayers is not unreasonable, as a matter of fact, some of the judges in other cases did bow in public inquiries and court hearings. The victim did, in a respectful manner, raised a valid point on paper why none of the British judges who handled his claims followed long standing tradition by returning his bow in court hearings when he, as a Member of the Judiciary of England, showed respect by bowing in front of everyone. Lord Bingham (Lord Chief Justice from 1996 to 2000 and then Senior Law Lord from 2000 to 2008), who was the patron of a community centre the victim ran from 2006 to 2010, did return the victim’s bow in their final meeting.

(l) Quoted a large quantity of rulings from other cases that are either not relevant or outdated. Scientists confirmed that each and every human being is unique, therefore everyone is baffled as to why the employment judge compare and contrasted the victim in this unique case to the individuals in other cases. In any case, all the cases she quoted proved the system does not work for individuals who are not rich or famous because the rulings were all in favour of powerful organisations and the government.

(m) Held the pre-hearing review (PHR) in public even though a judge of higher rank had ordered for such hearing to be held privately due to the sensitive issues in the discrimination claim

After the legitimate claim against the Ministry of Justice was successfully lodged in the employment tribunal, the regional judge ordered the pre-hearing review to be held privately. Experts in the legal field advised private hearings are common in discrimination claims due to the nature of the sensitive issues. After all, the purpose of employment tribunals are to deliver justice and not punish victims with public humiliation or degradation. Decisions made in private hearings cannot be made public. In the judicial hierarchy, a regional judge is of higher rank than an employment tribunal. Since the order made by the regional judge was never withdrawn or quashed by a more senior judge, the pre-hearing review held by the employment judge in public is, in many ways, unlawful. This means every single word typed on the 11-page publication from the aforementioned pre-hearing review carries no weight whatsoever in the eyes of the law, because it should not have happened in the first place due to the order made by a more senior judge.

(n) Alleged the charity award received by the victim is invalid because he had never sat in a Magistrates' Court as a Justice of the Peace (JP) after taking the Judicial Oath on 31 March 2017.

An independent panel of experts unanimously agreed the victim deserved the charity award on the basis of his extensive public service, as confirmed in the Court of Appeal ruling, even though the ruling did not uphold the appeal from the High Court. The victim is well respected by the Senior Judiciary. On 20 October 2017, the President of the UK Supreme Court confirmed, in an official letter, the victim's work is "fantastic" (this is a direct quote) after reading some of the charity reports. On 12 April 2018, the victim became the first and only professional in recent British legal history to receive the recognition of being "extremely distinguished" (this is a direct quote) in an official letter from the third most senior Judge in the UK Supreme Court. Based on evidence from over 100 lever arch files, the panel members all agreed the victim, who became a Member of the Judiciary after encouragement from Lord Bingham (Lord Chief Justice from 1996 to 2000 and then Senior Law Lord from 2000 to 2008), is one of the 10 most distinguished judicial office holders in legal history. As for the matter of never sat as a JP in Magistrates Court, this was beyond the victim's control as the Ministry of Justice denied sitting after they learnt the victim was seeking justice in the legal system. Notwithstanding this, when the victim was invited to visit the Supreme Court, court staff did let the victim sit in the court room presiding judge's chair due to ill health caused by his disability and for a

souvenir photo to remember his friend Lord Bingham (who moved Britain's highest appeal court from the House of Lords to the Supreme Court). Friends in the legal community pointed out Lord Bingham would be very proud of the victim for overcoming all the hurdles and obstacles to be a part of the judiciary, sadly Lord Bingham passed away in 2010.

(o) Ignored the reasonable adjustment request for speech disability

Stammering, also known as stuttering, is a legally recognised speech disability under the provisions of the Equality Act 2010. In the Oscar winning movie entitled *The King's Speech*, His Majesty King George VI suffered from profound stammering. King George VI is the father of Queen Elizabeth II and according to the victim's principal carer, who used to work for the Queen Mother, Queen Elizabeth II and Princess Diana, treating someone with contempt because of stammering is a deep insult to both Queen Elizabeth II and the entire Royal Family. The letters of support from a senior governor of NHS Hospitals, a retired medical doctor and the British Stammering Association, which represents 400,000 people in Britain who suffers from stammering, were also ignored.

(p) Alleged the victim is ignorant of the International Criminal Court

Simon, being a highly qualified expert witness, has deep understanding of how the International Criminal Court works.

On 9 January 2019, Simon became an Expert in mental health at the International Criminal Court (5-year term), as confirmed by the Office of the Director of Judicial Services.

(q) The 11-page publication has remained on the UK government website despite strongest objections from the international community, because it depicted the well respected community leader who sacrificed so much in his professional and personal life for public benefit, as someone you would avoid at all costs and this ruined all aspects of his life, made him unemployable, subjected him to stigma, exposed him to harassment, violated his human dignity and put his life in immediate danger from vigilantes. All hard evidence sent to the regulators and data controllers were ignored or dismissed. They insisted strike out decisions from pre-hearing reviews are always published, but ignored the fact that those publications simply state the claim has been dismissed whereas in this case, the unprecedented publication was 11 pages long and filled with irrelevant and unsubstantiated information, as explained in answers 5(a) to 5(p). The individuals responsible faced no consequences, despite the horrific, permanent and life changing impact of their actions.

(r) Helpful analyses in answers 5(a) to 5(q) from the legal experts who read the online publication clearly shows the legal system in the UK does not work unless the victim is rich or famous. The unprecedented publication appalled the readers around the world, but enabled them to see the British legal system in its true colour. The victim has represented millions of British people in his role as Governor of 20 major NHS Hospitals and 5 Schools, including judges, politicians, journalists and pillars of society. They agreed the publication is a reflection of the broken system and does not in any way reflect the victim's integrity, intelligence, professional standing, wisdom, compassion, talents, kindness and sacrifices, which were all confirmed multiple times by higher authorities such as the senior courts (e.g. the words in rulings, transcripts and letters from the High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court in the judicial reviews and civil claims), publications in quality broadsheets and major election successes (e.g. Governorships of 20 major NHS Hospitals and 5 London Schools). Since the data controller refused to rectify, amend or redact the questionable publication, supporters followed tradition by publishing this public response based on the wishes of the communities across Britain and around the world. Communities pointed out the fact that action speaks louder than words, which means the unfounded words in the online publication have been superseded by rulings, judgements and decisions from higher authorities, e.g. the ruling against the Ministry of Justice made by the Office for Public Appointments Commissioner on 1 April 2020, an official letter confirming the victim's excellent work from the President of the UK Supreme Court on 20 October 2017 and an official letter from the third most senior Judge of the UK Supreme Court confirming the victim's accomplishments on 12 April 2018. Since the victim has already been vindicated and exonerated by the aforementioned higher authorities and hard evidence in over 100 lever arch files, the unfounded words from an individual judge from an employment tribunal (a first-tier tribunal, the lowest in the judicial hierarchy) no longer carry any weight.

Question 6: Give one example of the UK Establishment trying to frame the victim, who is a highly qualified expert in mental health, as insane, after he filed a whistle blowing civil claim on discrimination and victimisation against the Ministry of Justice.

Answer 6: Without any valid medical evidence and having never met the victim in person, an employment tribunal judge (the same person mentioned in the last answer) alleged the victim suffers from 2 extremely serious psychiatric diseases of delusion of grandeur and delusion in response to his well founded complaint to the regulators about bias from her and his legitimate lawsuit against her employer the Ministry of Justice. The allegation was in the 11-page strike out decision published on the Ministry of Justice website. The international

community who read her published words are baffled how she reached this shocking conclusion, considering that the remit of the pre-hearing review was strictly limited to whether the discrimination case can proceed to a full hearing and not a psychiatric assessment of a widely published mental health expert she had never met.

Question 7: What was the professional advice from medical experts on how someone can be legally diagnosed with a psychiatric disease in the United Kingdom?

Answer 7: According to professors of psychiatrists and psychologists, many of whom taught the victim at undergraduate and postgraduate levels when he trained to become a mental health practitioner, serious psychiatric diseases such as delusion of grandeur and delusion can only be legally diagnosed by a qualified psychiatrist who is registered with the General Medical Council (GMC), assessment must be face-to-face and done with the person's consent (unless she/he is a danger to herself/himself or to society). If the person disagrees, then she/he is entitled to a second opinion by a different psychiatrist. In this case, none of the criterion were met.

Question 8: What was the general response from the public who read the above mentioned publication on UK government website?

Answer 8: Members of the public who read the publication on the internet are bewildered how an employment judge with an undergraduate degree in law can so casually make unsubstantiated comments on highly personal matters such as the mental health of a highly qualified, widely published, multi award winning expert on mental health whom she had never even met. Experts who helped the victim with this case felt the unfounded accusations of 2 serious mental illnesses from a non-medically qualified individual are vindictive, spiteful and malicious, serving no purpose except to discredit, disparage, degrade and defame the unrepresented claimant, who was a distinguished Member of the Judiciary (the victim's judicial status remained for a few more years after the "strike out decision") and a well respected mental health expert. Even the people who dislike the victim agreed the publication is a grotesque distortion of facts, especially all the disclosures of inaccurate personal, private and confidential information.

Question 9: What was the response from the victim's fellow judicial office holders around the world after they read the above mentioned publication on UK government website?

Answer 9: Friends, supporters and fans at the Magistrates Association, the Commonwealth Judges & Magistrates Association and the International Judicial Support Network agreed:

(a) The unsolicited comments from a non-medically qualified individual on the judicial office holder's mental health, which the defendant in this lawsuit (the Ministry of Justice) published on the internet for the whole world to read, is perverse and vindictive. The defendant refused to correct the publication or redact it despite receiving bundles of hard evidence, even though the onus and burden of proof is on the accuser and in this case, the accuser have never supplied any legally, medically or socially acceptable evidence.

(b) The remit of a pre-hearing review (PHR) in an employment tribunal is strictly limited to the issue of whether the claim can proceed to a substantive full hearing. In discrimination cases, the claimant is entitled to have the decision made by a panel of 3 (judge and 2 experts), which was requested in writing. In this unprecedented incident, the tribunal refused to change the judge despite profound conflict of interests and formal complaints against her. Then the same tribunal judge, sitting alone, used the PHR as an opportunity to deny and suppress justice on an unrepresented disabled victim, who was medically signed off from legal battles due to flare up of physical illness and not in a position to defend himself. The analyses from the legal community, highlighted in answer 5 provides a succinct summary of the whole situation. Applications for review of the wrong decision and appeal to the employment appeals tribunal (EAT) were all rejected, which shocked everyone who supported the victim.

Question 10: What were the major contradictions in the above mentioned publication on UK government website and what are the ongoing persecutions?

Answer 10:

(a) Friends and supporters who are lawyers and doctors pointed out an exceptionally massive contradiction in the published criticisms. If the tribunal judge genuinely believed the victim was suffering from 2 extremely serious psychiatric diseases of delusion of grandeur and delusion, she was obliged to follow procedures and exempt him from the legal battle. In the publication, she insisted there was no good excuse to grant the unrepresented victim a respite from the lengthy legal battle, which proved she did not believe he has gone insane at the time. In fact, her published non-medical interpretation of the evidence from Senior Medical Doctors about the disabled victim's physical

illness clearly shows she did not feel the victim wasn't coping and this was confirmed by her decision to reject the victim's strong application to postpone the preliminary hearing on health grounds (i.e. flare up of physical illness).

(b) After the publication, the defendant in the claim (i.e. the Ministry of Justice) referred the claimant to their doctors on the basis that the victim is no longer fit to be a Member of the Judiciary. This breached the procedures because the referral was not discussed with the Member of the Judiciary, the occupational health system was for salaried judges and not for unpaid magistrates, the content of the referral form was filled with unfounded accusations and the motive was spiteful. For instance, the Ministry of Justice claimed the victim is not fit to remain as a Magistrate because of his 2 physical illnesses, but they ignored the fact he had those 2 physical illnesses for 40 and 20 years respectively and during those years, he had been a lecturer, university researcher, civil servant, local government officer, public sector manager, governor of hospitals, governor of schools, expert at the International Criminal Court and many other prominent roles that are more demanding than an unpaid magistrate.

(c) As recent as last year, the defendant (i.e. the Ministry of Justice) repeated their unfounded accusation of the victim not fit to remain as a Magistrate because none of the judges ruled in his favour, despite the fact case law databases revealed UK judges had never ruled in favour of people who cannot afford lawyers and sued the government. On this occasion, enough is enough, the victim's supporters around the world informed the defendant that the appeals are ongoing and there will be new lawsuits, new judicial reviews, public inquiries, press conferences and private prosecutions. And if the victim died as a result of the ongoing persecutions, then there will be a murder inquiry.

Question 11: What was the independent legal advice on publication of highly sensitive, private, confidential and personal information such as health?

Answer 11: Pro bono lawyers and legal helplines advised sensitive and private information such as a judicial office holder's health are exempt from publication pursuant to data protection, GDPR, judicial security, human rights, safeguarding, human dignity and basic human decency. In this instance, the tribunal judge did not publish the exact words from the medical letters but published her non-medical interpretation, which was written inaccurately (according to doctors).

Question 12: What was the overall outcome of seeking justice in the UK legal system based on independent legal advice?

Answer 12:

(i) The judges made orders that would lead to bankruptcy, homelessness and starvation, even though the small claims filed by the victim are except from such brutal, severe and inhumane punishments.

(ii) Friends who work in the legal field and pro bono lawyers checked all the case law databases and found out all the UK judges, including the ones wronged the victim in this case, mostly uphold claims from powerful corporations, celebrities and wealthy individuals. Published data shows that a third of all judicial reviews against the UK government and public bodies are partially or fully upheld, but the claimants are almost always powerful corporations, celebrities, wealthy individuals, government agencies or government funded organisations. There are rare cases where individuals in poverty won their lawsuits but the chance of this happening is extremely slim.

Question 13: What was the real purpose of all the court orders, according to independent legal advice?

Answer 13: None of the court orders asked the perpetrators to stop the objectionable behaviour or provided workable remedies. All the orders either dismissed the genuine concerns or punished the victim for raising the concerns. None of the arbitrary punishments were needed or necessary, and served no purpose except to suppress justice.

Question 14: Why communities felt it was betrayal of the highest level?

Answer 14: The victim, who was a Member of the Judiciary (until the court orders ruined his judicial career), had served the UK population as Governor of 20 major NHS Hospitals, Governor of 5 Schools and Chairman of 3 voluntary organisations. This rare and unusual case is particularly distressing and received enormous support from around the world because all the UK judges who hurt and harmed the innocent victim had either directly or indirectly benefitted from his extensive community work as Governor of 20 major NHS Hospitals, Governor of 5 Schools and Chairman of 3 voluntary organisations.

Question 15: Among all the judges from the lowest to the highest UK courts who handled the complex case from 2017 to 2019, were there any positive comments?

Answer 15: A Lord Justice in the Court of Appeal, in his ruling, expressed concern for the victim's poor health caused by the persecution and acknowledged the huge amount of unpaid community work done by the victim spanning many years. The Lord Justice, who made the ruling without a hearing, stated the victim should be proud of his public service, but did not uphold the

appeal. Whilst none of the judges in the other courts ruled in favour of the victim, but a few of them did say words that brought hope to supporters who accompanied the victim to the hearings. On 7 June 2017, a judge who presided over a hearing in the High Court praised the victim's extensive community work and agreed the victim, who chairs a medical charity, deserve respect. On 13 September 2017, a judge who presided over a hearing in the County Court agreed the victim's integrity is not open to questioning or scrutiny. On 6 November 2017, another judge who presided over a hearing in the County Court praised the victim's good manners towards her (e.g. bowing) and agreed his personal story is very moving.

Question 16: What about the errors and mistakes typed on court orders, according to independent legal advice?

Answer 16: The court orders contained various errors and mistakes (e.g. facts, procedures and evidence), appeals to higher courts were rejected and all the rejections failed to provide accurate analyses of the grounds and/or evidence. The legal experts around the world felt that the judiciary was teaching the victim a lesson, if you are poor, there is no justice and no respect for human rights in the British legal system. Friends, supporters and fans at the Magistrates Association, the Commonwealth Judges & Magistrates Association and the International Judiciary Support Network (the victim has been an active member of all these eminent organisations) felt that what happened to the victim, who evidently has made enormous contributions to British society, was unforgivable considering that he was forced to seek justice in the legal system after appalling treatment from management, authorities, regulators, press and media.

Question 17: Did the court decisions and rulings accurately reflect the main issues, according to independent legal advice?

Answer 17: In the orders rejecting the claims or appeals, all the judges provided inaccurate summary of the problems. The inaccurate summaries, which does not reflect the main issues, depicted the concerns are frivolous and portrayed the victim as someone you would avoid at all costs.

Question 18: What happened when the victim, who was a Member of the Judiciary until the court orders ruined his judicial career, escalated the issues to the regulators of the UK judiciary and legal system?

Answer 18:

(a) Complaints to the regulators of the courts and judges all failed to deliver any kind of justice or resolve any of the issues. The regulators of the courts and judges refused to address any of the issues and ignored all the evidence. They even told the victim, in no uncertain terms, that they will no longer read or respond to his new complaints and appeals.

(b) Replies from the judicial regulators insisted the legal system is perfect and it is the victim who is the problem. Experts in the legal community used the British Post Office Horizon IT scandal as a good example to prove the British legal system is broken beyond repair. According to the BBC and Sky News, the British Post Office Horizon IT scandal is the UK's most widespread and worst miscarriage of justice in recent legal history. Over 700 innocent pillars of communities were wrongly prosecuted by the UK courts, which made a mockery of the judicial system. Many years after the wrong convictions, it was discovered that hidden faults in the Post Office computer system (called Horizon) were responsible for the shortfalls. Due to judicial immunity, none of the judges who wrongly convicted the innocent victims faced any consequences, even though some of the victims died (suicide, ill health and natural death) before they received any justice. This shows judges are humans who make mistakes and some of those mistakes have fatal consequences on victims. Thousands of news articles pointed out how the UK Establishment used taxpayers' money to defend the mistakes and repeatedly told each victim she/he is the only one who experienced the problem, even though hundreds of people have suffered the same issues. Some of the victims sued but the sum of compensation awarded did not reflect their losses and suffering due to the legal costs. Many prominent British lawyers have written widely published books on the broken UK legal system, e.g. "Justice on Trial", "The Secret Barrister: stories of the law and how it's broken", "Fake Law: the truth about justice in an age of lies" and many other books.

(c) In the Government's Lammy Review, it was concluded that the legal system discriminates people based on their ethnicity.

Question 19: Were all the free legal advice clinics helpful, sympathetic and impartial?

Answer 19: In the free legal advice clinics, many of the lawyers who are loyal supporters of the establishment wrongfully threatened the innocent victim with cost orders, civil restraint orders and list of vexatious litigants, instead of providing impartial legal advice.

Question 20: How did loyal supporters of the UK establishment tried to destroy the victim's support network?

Answer 20: Many loyal supporters of the establishment joined the voluntary organisations chaired by the victim. They pretend be volunteers but in fact had arrived to cause disruptions, abuse the victim and frame him. The UK government funded charities stopped providing support to the disabled victim.

Question 21: What victimisations did the unrepresented disabled victim suffer in wider society after he spoke the truth?

Answer 21:

(a) All UK government controlled or funded organisations, agencies and groups threatened, bullied, harassed, intimidated, discriminated or victimised Simon after he picked up the courage to report and expose corruption.

(b) This is so sad because the victim was recommended by experts and organisations for many prominent positions in Britain, including the Prime Minister's Principal Private Secretary, 10 Downing Street Chief of Staff, 10 Downing Street Director of Communications, 10 Downing Street Director of Policy, Ministry of Justice Permanent Secretary and Lead Board Member, Chair of Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS), Judicial Conduct & Appointments Ombudsman, Board Member at the Bank of England, Parliamentary Service and Health Ombudsman, Housing Ombudsman, Commissioner of London Metropolitan Police, Non-Executive Director of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), Chair of the College of Policing, Board Member of the National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) and Chief Executive of the Independent Police Conduct Office (IPCO).

(c) The victim made it onto the longlist of candidates for the position of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and Governor of City University in London.

(d) The victim made it onto the shortlist of candidates for the positions at 3 of Ministry of Justice's highest level judicial committees in the Royal Courts of Justice, which are: Civil Justice Council, Family Procedure Rules Committee and Civil Procedure Rules Committee (appeal on failure to interview was upheld by the Office for Public Appointments Commissioner) and a high profile committee at the Ministry of Defense. The victim also made it onto the shortlist of candidates for Governor position at the University of London Heythrop College (before it closed).

18. Succinct summaries of the many testimonies and quotes from communities and pillars of society across Britain and around the world

(a) Summary of the testimonies from the communities helped by Simon in his elected roles as Governor of NHS Hospitals and Schools:

“Simon, a man of humility and a prominent community leader who dedicated his entire life to serving British communities, has been a loyal friend of the United Kingdom throughout his life, and especially during the defining struggles of the last three decades. More than he was known for his accomplishment and accolades, Simon was known for the way he loved the communities he helped and supported throughout his life. Simon has lived his life guided by values and principles that mirror ones that most British people can recognise. He understands the struggles of everyday folks. Generations of British people will always remember and respect his compassion and strength of character. The robust evidence, contained in over 100 lever arch files, submitted to the UK courts, regulators and government by post and email in the last 6 years proves Simon is a deeply entrenched part of the British Establishment. The international community frequently praised Simon for his compassion, resilience and sound judgement. Simon taught us to never forget yesterday, but always live for today, because you never know what tomorrow can bring, or what it can take away”.

(b) Summary of the support letters from the judiciary and legal communities:

“Simon has been an exemplary Judicial Office Holder and a well respected community leader. His peers across the judiciary spectrum praised his independence, fair mindedness and impartiality.”

(c) Summary of the support letters from the British National Health Service (NHS):

*“As advised by governors and directors at many NHS Trusts, some of which the victim previously served as Governor, **health is the highest law**. The victim in this case, being severely disabled with life threatening incurable congenital medical conditions, is entitled to rest when required by his health.”*

(d) The Right Honourable Andy Burham, who was Secretary of State for Health from 2009 to 2010, published a statement on social media in response to the issue of broken justice system:

“Having witnessed how the families were treated by all aspects of our legal system, we can only conclude that it is not a level playing field for ordinary people and does not deliver justice for all.”

(e) Three quotes from the books by the Right Honourable Sir Winston Churchill (British Prime Minister 1940 to 1945 and 1951 to 1955), which inspired Simon to live a life his family and communities are proud of:

“United we stand, divided we fall.”

“If you are going through hell, keep going, don’t stop.”

“You have enemies? Good, it means you have actually stood up for something.”

(f) The Right Honourable Baroness Margaret Thatcher, who was the British Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990, published a statement in one of her books in response to unfair criticisms from people who dislike you for personal reasons:

“If they attack you personally, it means they don’t have a single argument left.”

(g) The Right Honourable Aneurin (Nye) Bevan, who was the Minister of Health from 1945 to 1951 and was the founding father of the NHS, published a statement in one of his books in response to the issue of people who are unwell being ill treated:

“Illness is neither an indulgence for which people have to pay, nor an offence for which they should be penalised, but a misfortune the cost of which should be shared by the community.”

(h) Morgan Freeman, the winner of 5 Oscars, published a statement in one of his books in response to disability discrimination and prejudice:

“Attacking people with disabilities is the lowest display of power.”

(i) Advice from Professors to Simon during the ordeals:

It’s going to be a tough and long road ahead, but it’s paved with the wisdom gained from past experiences.

When the road ahead seems too long, look back to see how far you have come, the view will give you hope to finish the journey. Keep moving forward.

(j) Advice from Scientists to Simon during the ordeals:

“When individuals treat you without respect, remember to look at the 2 photos of planet earth we sent you.

The first photo of earth was taken by a robot during one of the missions to Mars.

The human world is full of people who feel they are extremely important and their great achievements must be celebrated for an eternity.

When you look at the photo from Mars, you can see our entire planet, containing 7 billion humans alive today and another 107 billion humans who have lived on this planet in the past 1.4 million years, is merely an insignificant dot in the vast universe.

The second photo of earth was taken by Voyager 1 when it was 6 billion km away.

There are humans living on earth who feel they are masters of the universe and yet their whole world is just a tiny dot in the sky.

The diameter of the observable universe is approximately 93 billion light years, Voyager 1 has so far only travelled 1 second of a light year from this planet. This shows in the grand scheme of things, humans and all their creations are completely insignificant. When you put things in perspective, taking everything into account, sometimes what has previously been considered significant isn't quite significant.

Therefore, do not be intimidated by the individuals or socially constructed systems that has caused detriments to your life. Instead of dwelling on the past, devote your time and energy on rebuilding your life and live a meaningful life that you can be proud of.

Finally, remember all humans on this planet are fellow travellers to the same final destination, the graveyard."

(k) Summary of the ongoing concerns from the communities helped by Simon in his elected roles as Governor of NHS Hospitals and Schools:

"As the horrific victimisation is ongoing and Simon is severely disabled with life threatening medical conditions, medical experts envisage the victim won't last much longer. In the event Simon dies as a result of the harassment, communities in 195 countries who care about him will press charges for murder. The prosecution will be carried out by authorities outside the UK and then reinforced via Interpol, because the delicate fabric of trust was permanently broken beyond repair due to the incalculable volume of injustice originated from the UK authorities (including the police) throughout all those years."

"Communities agreed in the event Simon died as a result of the persecution, the ashes from the cremation will be shared with some of the communities represented by the victim in his life (approximately half of the UK population), who agreed to scatter the ashes across the United Kingdom and around the world. Olympic athletes offered to scatter

some of the ashes into the Pacific Ocean, Atlantic Ocean and Indian Ocean. Astronauts offered to take some of the ashes into space on their next mission and scatter them during their space walk."

*"People all over Britain helped and supported by Simon have selected a poem entitled **Do not stand at my grave and weep** for his funeral, because throughout Simon's entire life dedicated to public service, his main wish was for every human being on earth to live a happy, healthy and meaningful life. Communities across Britain and around the world will always cherish the precious memories they shared with Simon, they will remember his smile, warmth, compassion, wisdom, kindness, courage and an enormous heart. Through his advocacy work as Governor of Hospitals and Schools and Chairman of voluntary organisations, Simon brought peace, joy and happiness to immeasurable number of communities. In the hearts of all the communities across Britain and around the world, Simon lives on, in all of us. According to the people helped and supported by Simon, we are all Simon."*

The poem entitled "Do not stand at my grave and weep"

Do not stand at my grave and weep,

I am not there, I do not sleep.

I am a thousand winds that blow;

I am the diamond glints on the snow.

I am the sunlight on ripened grain;

I am the gentle autumn's rain.

When you awaken in the morning's hush,

I am the swift uplifting rush

Of quiet birds in circled flight.

I am the soft star that shines at night.

Do not stand at my grave and cry.

I am not there; I did not die.

Please note:

1. If you are reading this as a PDF copy but wish to view the online version, please visit the award page on our website.

Web address: <http://www.hope-and-compassion.com/humanitarian-award>

2. If you are reading this online, click on the green italic words below to access the relevant web pages.

Further information for supporters:

If you would like to support this health support network, please click on the Support Us page on the website to make a small donation. To join us, visit the volunteer page.

If you would like to support the victim mentioned in the press release, please click on the Support Us page on the website to make a small donation. For further details, visit the news and stories pages.

If you are a journalist and would like to publish the victim's untold story, please click on the Contact Us page on the website for details of how to communicate with our Press and Media Team.

Disclaimer: If you are part of the UK establishment (or their loyal supporters) and wish to threaten or intimidate us because you feel we are easy targets, please note it's not you versus us, but it's you versus 195 countries and 7 billion people (according to senior members of our Grand Council in Switzerland). All malicious communication containing threatening words will be blocked by the advanced filter system installed by our PhD level computing engineers and supervised by professors and scientists at over two dozen universities who helped to establish this international support network in 2010.

Finally, we thank the university post-doctoral research fellows for their assistance and the law professors for all the legal support.

THE END