

Preamble - The Law Society - Solicitors Regulation Authority - Antony Townsend

**National Union of Journalists
International Federation of Journalists**

Distribution Proviso

The author and publisher has restricted content of this series of articles to National Union of Journalists (NUJ) and International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) members (also named parties, police officers and solicitors who colluded with them) pending investigation of alleged criminal activity and legal action under: Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992; Fraud Act 2006; Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006; Equality Act 2010; Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The author reported police officers for dereliction of their duty in accordance with the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) guide for handling complaints pursuant to Section 22 Police Reform Act 2002. Complaints against solicitors for professional misconduct referenced: Solicitors Code of Conduct 2007; Solicitors Act 1974; Administration of Justice Act 1985 and Courts and Legal Services Act 1990.

Law enforcement investigations involve an alleged pattern or practice of joint and several illegal or criminal activities by: National Union of Journalists (NUJ) executives, lawyers, and staff; National Executive Council (NEC) officers; and London Freelance Branch (LFB) officers.

Other branches and chapels do not form part of intended civil and criminal complaints; therefore, the author has no opinion on their activities. Adverse comments, all verified and validated to insure accurate reporting, meet legal requirements. This proviso in no way restricts NUJ and IFJ members from releasing excerpts (with accreditation) to interested third parties including news media.

Prepublication Information

All individuals featured in *Contra Cabal* received prior notice in accordance with international codes of ethics agreed among journalists. They had an opportunity to mitigate damage and to refute statements that could negatively affect their reputations or cause investigation or prosecution of them for alleged illegal acts. Several of those codes have international legal precedent.

The notices gave them an opportunity to challenge with substantiated evidence any charges affecting their ethical or moral character. For public accountability, the author encouraged them to respond in open exchange before a deadline. Individuals mentioned incidentally received a copy of the notice as a courtesy.

Journalists must report the truth no matter whom they offend and with disregard for the consequences of publication. Accurate reporting predicates a higher purpose and the common good. The author did not solicit personal opinions and informed individuals that they should address only matters of fact.

The notices declared personal or conflicting interests that related to topics or to opinion especially when the content drew upon advocacy, experience, conclusion, or interpretation. They advised of a responsibility to gather information and develop public awareness about wrongdoing and violation of codes of conduct. Primarily, the articles expose malfeasance and misuse of public funds also abuse of members by trade union officials and officers and law enforcement agencies.

Named individuals neglected to adhere to their duty of care. Some maliciously damaged others and their reputations by libel, slander, assault, or other unlawful acts. No person received immunity from investigation. Anything published results from investigation, verification and validation which took into account violations of law or breach of established rules and ethical practices.

For two years, Antony Townsend, Chief Executive Officer, Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) spent his time propagandizing a rehash of the SRA Handbook on YouTube while he neglected to address incompetence and age discrimination among his staff. His bureaucratism caused anarchy which effectively granted impunity for Roy M Mincoff, National Union of Journalists (NUJ) In-House Solicitor (a rogue solicitor already subject to an SRA complaint for professional misconduct) maliciously to hold kangaroo courts and conduct a cover-up of criminal fraud by NUJ officials while bullying the Complainant. Repeated politically expedient handling of complaints shows an urgent need for an independent ombudsman to investigate agism then publicly report the findings.

Incidences of delaying process to deny justice and evade responsibility properly to investigate complaints have drastically increased by use of a number of evasive ploys. The most common disgrace relates to delay of process to such an extent that the time taken for a decision exceeds the normal life expectancy of a complainant. SRA employees take a gamble on death to evade their responsibility in law to act expeditiously then call it "risk management".

[Age Discrimination] [Without Let or Hindrance - The Sequel]

National Union of Journalists (NUJ) has two solicitors facing fraud complaints with Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) for discrimination in withholding legal services and professional misconduct for over a decade based upon agism: complaints which SRA has deliberately delayed investigating for two years.

John Norton, Legal Services Ombudsman (charged with investigating incompetent or deliberately subversive actions by SRA executives and staff) states that he cannot proceed with an investigation until SRA makes a decision: a decision that should have taken about 30 days to make. However, Townsend and a bevy of SRA bimbos have not properly investigated the complaint although two years have elapsed since the filing. Arguably, both Norton and Townsend rely upon a "kick-the-bucket catch-22" that they have deliberately created and now await Complainant's demise which they think will end their responsibility to act. *[Norton]*

Norton did not process a complaint filed under the old rules during the recent statutory transition and has used Kristianne James as a proxy to disingenuously confuse the issues. James, who will not reveal her job title and responsibilities, hides behind an anonymous email address to respond to the complaint with insolence and ignorance, arguably to cover up Norton's kick-the-bucket shell game.

SRA and the Legal Ombudsman have neither investigated nor made a determination on a complaint (filed 18 May 2009) which has compounded the problems and caused substantial financial damage through delay and denial of process. Both Townsend and Norton have taken advantage of the transition of authority to confuse the issues to their own advantage. Their ethics rank no better than those of the shyster subject to the complaint.

Norton's latest attempt to weasel out of his responsibility to investigate starts yet another merry-go-round by referring the complaint to Independent Complaint Resolution Service (ICRS) which does not hold a mandate to address the issues. By that, Norton has created another disingenuous catch-22.

ICRS can only investigate complaints after SRA has concluded its complaints process; however, for two years SRA has not started a legitimate investigation. In fact, under the new rules ICRS mandate calls for it to refer some of the issues back to Norton as Legal Services Ombudsman and the remainder to the Legal Ombudsman. None of them can address the problem until SRA renders a decision on the complaint which Townsend continues to obstruct.

Independent Complaint Resolution Service asserts:

How we deal with complaints about the SRA. It is important to stress that:

- We can only investigate after the SRA's internal complaints process has been concluded. The SRA should inform you when this stage is reached, and should tell you how to contact ICRS.
- We can only investigate complaints about the conduct of SRA – for example about delay, inefficiency or unfairness. We cannot review any regulatory decisions that have been made.
- We cannot investigate complaints against individual solicitors or organisations employing solicitors. Complaints about solicitors should be referred to the Legal Ombudsman.

Townsend's delay and deny tactics have created another dilemma because the complaint now spans two separate and contradictory policies (the old and the new). That allows Norton to use a time-warp stratagem to further confuse the issues and deny due process.

Cuan Gibson, Team Manager, SRA Conduct Investigation Unit made arbitrary assertions that no professional misconduct by the solicitors named in the complaint ever took place without investigating the complaint. He also stated (quoting Manfield and Forde) that in-house solicitors do not act for trade union members (who pay their salaries), an assertion made without substantiation and contradicted by the *SRA Handbook*.

Gibson then threatened Complainant that: ". . . the SRA would strongly advise you to consider carefully the contents of any statements you make about members of the SRA or LCS staff on any web site or in any press release as we will not hesitate to take appropriate action where defamatory statements are made" before a word had been spoken or written which defines as an unlawful prior restraint.

With Townsend's knowledge, a confused and arrogant Carolyn Jones, Complaints Officer, Inclusion Directorate, SRA slithered out of the long grass to start another merry-go-round in the SRA three-ring-circus. Jones joined Gibson in unlawfully threatening Complainant that she would apply an unlawful prior restraint on communication and made false and misleading claims to support those threats. She then withheld documents to prevent a challenge to her allegedly unlawful assertions.

As a public sector employee, Jones has ignored her duty of care to address the issues and avoid conflicts of interest. In her attempts to support rogue solicitors in their professional misconduct, Jones effectively granted them impunity then confused the issues to deny Complainant due process of law at an unbiased hearing.

Since publication of this article, Michelle Stanistreet, Deputy NUJ General Secretary evidently plagiarized (14 Jun 11) Gibson's copy. Stanistreet allegedly committed election fraud by violating Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 which resulted in her unlawful appointment (election unopposed) as NUJ General Secretary (01 Jul 11).

Stanistreet asserted without any substantiation in law that:

You are required to confirm by return that you will remove forthwith from your websites any and all untruthful or defamatory content as to the NUJ or any of its members or employees and issue an apology in wording to be supplied by NUJ, on receipt of your confirmation that you will take down such offending remarks and publish the apology. You are required to confirm that you will permanently desist from publishing any further untruthful or defamatory material about NUJ, its members or employees. . . . Should you fail to agree, or contravene the above, such steps as may be appropriate will be taken against you without further notice with a costs order sought and enforced against you.

Stanistreet did not say what she finds "untruthful and defamatory" neither did she prove malice. Moreover, she did not say what authority in law she had to try to control the individual rights to freedom of expression of 37,000 journalists. It is even more preposterous for her, as an official of a journalists' trade union that claims to fight for freedom of expression, to publish an illegal censorship statement on an NUJ letterhead. The public has the right to know about the corruption within NUJ and the fraud perpetrated by Mincoff and Stanistreet to cover it up.

No untruthful or defamatory content knowingly exists on any *Contra Cabal* web site as everything has had ethical validation and verification prior to publication. Furthermore, the Complainant, first published in 1944, has never received a libel challenge. That amounts to 66 years of unblemished record in comparison to Stanistreet who cannot go 66 hours without behaving disingenuously. By that, she jumped on Gibson's bandwagon to win the *Contra Cabal* bimbo of the week ignominy award.

Moreover, unlike most other investigative journalists, *Contra Cabal* writers have always given individuals featured in *Contra Cabal* prior notice in accordance with international codes of ethics agreed among journalists. They all have an opportunity to mitigate damage and to refute statements that could negatively affect their reputations or cause investigation or prosecution of them for alleged illegal acts: a procedure not followed by Stanistreet who repeatedly slags NUJ members without reason.

Do Gibson, Jones and Stanistreet genuinely believe that their arrogant remarks and arbitrary decisions overrule a unanimous decision by nine judges in Washington State Supreme Court which determined the right freely to publish *Contra Cabal* with content similar to that which they would censor to cover up corruption and their own dereliction and fraudulent behavior?

That ruling does not provide much protection when despotic administrators make illegal threats because they disagree with the content of messages: a disagreement probably based upon

disclosure of their own malfeasance. They fear dissent and have an aversion to controversy. Their addiction to political correctness frequently causes them to invoke censorship. They act upon an irrational expectation that a publication may contain something that they would not wish others to read, then arbitrarily suppress it.

Censors participate in a cover-up of crime when they exclude or censor material which contains statements that expose criminal activity. A US Supreme Court opinion declared that any system of prior restraint carries a heavy presumption against constitutionality and that censors must bear the heavy burden of justifying prior restraint or censorship of content protected by the First Amendment.

Some administrators mistakenly distinguish between speech and electronic communication and wrongly apply different rules. Systems operators may not censor the electronic media any more than bookstore owners may censor books. US Supreme Court agreed with a similar contention on First Amendment grounds in *Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union* (1997). Similar precedents apply in UK and EU.

Legal Complaints Service (LCS) and Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) received a notice that if they did not take action on an outstanding complaint instead of stonewalling it, then complaints would be filed against them collectively. Since that time, the system has changed and the complaints will need filing against each of them individually. Consequently, the case studies that will appear on this web site before filing will address egregious individual behaviour that supports complaints against each of them.

SRA Complaint

In response to a complaint with comprehensive substantiation (02 Oct 08), LCS and SRA employees have issued outrageous general denials. They have based those denials upon false and misleading information in a deliberate plan to obstruct justice. That obstruction has effectively granted impunity for Kirby and Mincoff to do as they please for more than two years since the filing of SRA complaint.

Thompsons Solicitors receives a £250,000.00 retainer from NUJ to provide legal services to NUJ members and now employs Claire S Kirby #21078 former NUJ In-house solicitor. Roy Martin Mincoff #112029, current NUJ In-house solicitor, arbitrarily and discriminatingly decides for political expedience which NUJ members receive legal support from Thompsons despite entitlement to legal representation existing as a condition of NUJ membership. Without any legal authority he changes rules then retroactively forges minutes to support his actions.

Rules of legal ethics that govern behavior by solicitors require them to avoid conflicts of interest and other unethical practices. When they violate any of those rules they commit professional misconduct and, after a disciplinary hearing, can suffer suspension or disbarment from practice. After reading the extensive evidence against Mincoff presented to SRA over a two-year period, a reasonable person must ask why SRA repeatedly stonewalls investigation of a pattern or practice of alleged criminal behavior and gross professional misconduct that could establish probable cause for Mincoff's disbarment.

Kirby did not provide a duty of care in violation of Vienna Conventions and allowed the unlawful jailing of Complainant in Seattle. Former HM Consul David C Broom (with whom Kirby neglected to file papers) colluded with a corrupt judge which resulted in Complainant (then 70 years of age) suffering solitary confinement, torture and a heart attack. Broom now resides in Norwich under the auspices of the Bishop of Norwich. Broom has received no retribution and HM Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) has not made reparation to the Complainant.

Instead, in a distinct conflict of interest (while NUJ represented the Complainant as *amicus curiae* in the Washington State Supreme Court action) Mincoff negotiated a Labour government payoff of £262,000.00 to cover up the dereliction by Kirby and FCO. John Toner, UK Freelance Organiser and Philip Sutcliffe, NUJ NEC officer prevented the Complainant from knowing about that payoff while feigning to support him at a meeting in the House of Commons with his MP (Gareth Thomas) ostensibly to address the issues in Washington State. Thomas participated in that deception.

Instead of applying the *quid pro quo* toward legal support for the member, NUJ officials distributed it as expenses and fees to NUJ officers under a suspect "educational program". Mincoff has since covered up Broom's neglect of his duty of care as consul. By that, Mincoff arguably became an accessory after the fact to Broom's dereliction in Seattle effectively condoned by the Bishop of Norwich who has granted him "sanctuary".

Christopher Graham Wheal, an NUJ officer and Chair, NUJ Professional Training Committee, also Chair, NUJ Extra (Charity) and Sutcliffe financially benefitted from that quid pro quo. Threats by Wheal and abuse by Sutcliffe form part of an organized campaign of derogation and agism orchestrated by Jeremy Dear (former NUJ General Secretary) since NUJ received the government grant.

Wheal received a routine media release as do all NUJ officers, staff and several thousand members under an opt-out program. He did not request that his name be removed from the mailing list. The Complainant neither had any previous contact with Wheal nor did he write about him or refer to him in any way. [*Grievous Bodily Harm*] [*Quid Pro Quo*]

Christopher Graham Wheal, NUJ Officer and NUJ-Left Thug and Hit Man

Will you piss off with your inane ramblings. My nephew was killed in a tragic accident on Tuesday and all I get is wank from you. Now take me off your email list, or better still, fuck off and die you complete and utter tosser*. One more peep from you and if I bring harassment charges you'll be lucky. I find you personally I'll fucking break your legs. [sic]

*tossler. A derogatory term for a stupid, irritating, or ridiculous person.

Complainant has reported to Metropolitan Police (Lewisham) that Wheal committed a criminal offense by threatening grievous bodily harm against an NUJ member in violation of Protection from Harassment Act 1997. Neglect by MPS properly to investigate the grievous bodily harm threat by Wheal has now become subject to investigation by Independent Police Complaints

Commission (IPCC). Mincoff, evidently acting in behalf of Wheal, filed backdated malicious criminal complaints against Complainant as a "retroactive preemption" which MPS used to delay and obstruct justice. [*IPPC Complaint - Di Fabio*]

The original complaint filed with SRA contained information on a series of Internet denial-of-service attacks that Mincoff did not address in his resolution document. During the four weeks preceding the filing, the actual and collateral damage amounted to over \$150,000.00. Mincoff has maliciously caused costs since the SRA filing through barratry which exceed an estimated £200,000.00 for which the listed SRA individuals must hold joint and several liability. [*Without Let or Hindrance - The Sequel*]

Mincoff's complicity in those Internet attacks, increased the cost to over £500,000.00 during 2008; however, SRA continues to evade the issues. The latest denial-of-service attack (24 Apr 11) retaliated for reporting issues that SRA had not addressed and the Wheal incident to Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). That completed a pattern or practice of international Internet crimes sanctioned by Mincoff. That incident alone cost £14,400.00 to repair not including loss of publication revenues and destruction and restoration of mailing lists.

Internet attacks have continued for the two years that SRA has failed to address the complaint. The cost in systems and mailing system repairs, also the replacement and reprogramming of damaged computers, exceeds £1,000,000.00. In addition to the Internet attacks by his associates, Mincoff filed false and misleading criminal charges against Complainant with two MPS divisions as "retroactive preemption" of complaints already filed with MPS against NUJ. Mincoff has also maliciously released private member information protected by Data Protection Act to third parties including police officers also forged NUJ minutes and removed access to them to cover up his professional misconduct.

In a conflict of interest, SRA employees have acted in a consort with rogue solicitors subject to a complaint. Moreover, they have shown a total lack of respect, knowledge of the principles and procedures necessary to handle a complaint and have stonewalled investigation of the issues to evade due process of law.

Evidentiary case studies, now a work in progress, will appear on this site and concurrently will file with the appropriate disciplinary authority. They will also form part of an addendum to the Petition for Public Inquiry filed with Kenneth Clarke QC, Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice. SRA bureaucrats do not qualify as solicitors or barristers and have refused to reveal their job functions or CVs that show experience and qualifications to act as investigators or make legal determinations on complex issues. [*Public Inquiry*]

SRA Executive Dereliction

The two principals in the delay and denial of justice, Antony Townsend and John Norton lay claims to experience for their present positions as:

Antony Townsend

Townsend took up his SRA post in 2006, having been Chief Executive at the General Dental Council (GDC) from 2001. At the GDC he led a large reform programme to modernise dental regulation involving legislative, structural and operational change and including the extension of regulation to new groups of dental professionals. Before that Townsend held a number of senior roles at the General Medical Council, including Director of Standards and Education also Head of Conduct.

John Norton

Norton, one of six legal ombudsmen, worked as an investigator and customer services manager. Since 2005, he worked with Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC), first as a Deputy Senior Investigator then he managed casework and customer services. Most recently his role at IPCC focused on organizational planning and change management. Earlier in his career he investigated serious drugs importation and commercial fraud for the former HM Customs and Excise.

Neither Townsend nor Norton claim university degrees or to have read law. Incredibly, they try to manipulate Complainant who has read law for sixty years and qualifies for the bar in several US states, has two PhD(ABD) degrees at leading US universities with 25 years experience as a CEO and 25 years as a university professor. As professor emeritus and public intellectual, he now investigates elder abuse, university and trade union corruption also bureaucratic fraud. He has found that neither Townsend nor Norton hold qualifications which entitle them to investigate malfeasance and professional misconduct by rogue solicitors. Moreover, none of their staff have provided requested information to show that they hold qualifications to make legal determinations in misconduct proceedings.

List of Individuals arguably with Complaints Pending

The Law Society, Legal Services

Robert Stanley, Information Compliance Manager.
Joao Curro, Information Compliance Officer.

The Law Society, Legal Complaints Service

Ruby Heer, Caseworker, Customer Contact Centre.
Geraldine Davis, Customer Support Administrator, Customer Contact Centre.
Amy Manfield, Senior Caseworker. Customer Contact Centre.

Solicitors Regulation Authority

Antony Townsend, Chief Executive Officer, SRA
Cuan Gibson, Team Manager, Conduct Investigation Unit.
Leah Bringas, Fraud and Confidential Intelligence Bureau (FCIB)
formerly Quality Officer Policy (Inclusion) Unit.
Jennifer Forde, Caseworker, Conduct Investigation Unit.

Carolyn Jones, Complaints Officer, Inclusion Directorate.
Sarah Levis, Caseworker, Conduct Investigation Unit.
Tracey O'Callaghan, Customer Services Officer, Conduct Investigation Unit.
Rachel Pillinger, Senior Quality and Service Standards Adviser.
Amy J Rheams, Customer Services Officer, Conduct Investigation Unit.

Legal Ombudsman, Assessment Centre

John Norton, Legal Ombudsman.
Kristianne James, Legal Ombudsman's General Factotum and Machinator.

National Union of Journalists (NUJ)

Claire S Kirby#21078, Thompsons Solicitors, Cardiff.
Roy Martin Mincoff #112029, In-house Solicitor, National Union of Journalists.

The Author cannot stress too strongly the importance of complete disclosure at this stage to enable him to hold harmless as many of the named people as possible. The author has already received individual requests from SRA staff members which deny complicity in wrongdoing and request removal from the list.

If requested to apply a duty of care to an individual, then the Author must have facts which enable him to do so. To start the process, he needs a copy of the individual's CV and job description with substantiation of all the assertions contained in them. He will not act upon individual requests without verification and validation of facts.

The prepublication notice that each of the named individuals received, which had a deadline (23 Sep 09), contained the following:

Prepublication Information

All individuals featured in *Contra Cabal* received prior notice in accordance with international codes of ethics agreed among journalists. They had an opportunity to mitigate damage and to refute statements that could negatively affect their reputations or cause investigation or prosecution of them for alleged illegal acts. Several of those codes have international legal precedent.

The notices gave them an opportunity to challenge with substantiated evidence any charges affecting their ethical or moral character. For public accountability, the author encouraged them to respond in open exchange before a deadline. Individuals mentioned incidentally received a copy of the notice as a courtesy.

Journalists must report the truth no matter whom they offend and with disregard for the consequences of publication. Accurate reporting predicates a higher purpose and the common good. The author did not solicit personal opinions and informed individuals that they should address only matters of fact.

The notices declared personal or conflicting interests that related to topics or to opinion especially when the content drew upon advocacy, experience, conclusion, or interpretation.

They advised of a responsibility to gather information and develop public awareness about wrongdoing and violation of codes of conduct. Primarily, the articles expose malfeasance and misuse of public funds also abuse of members by trade union officials and officers and law enforcement agencies.

Named individuals neglected to adhere to their duty of care. Some maliciously damaged others and their reputations by libel, slander, assault, or other unlawful acts. No person received immunity from investigation. Anything published results from investigation, verification and validation which took into account violations of law or breach of established rules and ethical practices.

UK/EU law firms with US associates interested in acting for Contra Cabal Foundation Limited in several tort actions against organizations described on *Contra Cabal* web pages should contact: Paul Trummel, Chairman and Managing Director, Contra Cabal Foundation Limited, PO Box 3692, Chester, Cheshire, CH1 9RH, UK.

© Copyright 2011 by Paul Trummel
All Rights Reserved: 01 Jun 11/06:48
Edition: #880-49-10/11-0713-1334
Feedback: Webspinner@ContraCabal.org