

Evidence

Questions for Patrick John Wheeler, under oath:

Question 1 – Is to prove that there was a conspiracy between Betafence and FH Brundle and several other firms and that they intended to injure me by unlawful means. They targeted my successful business and intellectual property rights out of sheer greed and jealousy. I will show proof that they knew that their actions would injure me. The defendants further plotted with Collyer Bristow LLp and Mr. Patrick John Wheeler who used his extensive knowledge of the law to attempt to conceal the conspiracy and their criminal activity, by bringing a malicious prosecution against me that was based on false testimony and misleading statements that were designed to pervert the course of justice, which is also a criminal offence.

Good Morning Mr. Wheeler, I'm Richard Perry and I have some questions for you.

1. Would you kindly state your full name and occupation for the court please?

(Witnesses reply should be: Patrick John Wheeler, partner, solicitor etc. in accordance with his own Witness Statement PJW1)

2. And your employer is Collyer Bristow LLp is that correct?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

3. Is your email address used in conjunction with any of the proceedings:
patrick.wheeler@collyerbristow.com

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

4. Do you agree that any correspondence in any proceedings so far, including letters and emails that display your email address, have been written or overseen by you?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

5. As a partner in a large London law firm, are you aware of the consequences of Perjury and making or submitting false statements or statements that you know to be untrue and misleading to a court of law or otherwise?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

6. Does your employer Collyer Bristow LLP have knowledge of, condone and support everything you have said and submitted to the court in any of the proceedings known as CC13P00980, IP2015000090, the bankruptcy proceedings 92 OF 2014 and B30BS329?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *(if no he would be coercing with the other defendants without the knowledge of his employer and using his employer's credentials to do it which is fraudulent – which would automatically mean a miss-trial and the bankruptcy would have to be rescinded.)*

THEN IF NO: so have you acted alone with your clients FH Brundle, Betafence and Britannia Fasteners? **YES OR: NO:** *is the truth – CONTINUE...*

7: Do you confirm that all documentation submitted to the courts throughout any of the proceedings on behalf of your employer Collyer Bristow LLP or your only client in 2012, 'FH Brundle', has been submitted through or by you, or has your approval?

YES: CONTINUE *should be the only truthful answer*

NO: but you do have knowledge of and/or have seen all of the documents including your own letters submitted in proceedings is that correct?

8: Have you seen all of the TWENTY documents consisting of 98 pages in the white numbered folder that I sent to you on 24TH February 2017 by Recorded Delivery and emailed to you in a pdf file also on 24TH February 2017?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: OK no problem, well I will hand these documents to you again as we proceed because all of them were used in your action against me - **CONTINUE**

9. Do you accept that you have acted with your employer 'Collyer Bristow's' blessing/supervision and you confirm that you haven't acted alone or independently?

YES: CONTINUE *I worked with my team etc.: Still the answer is Yes.*

NO: So you admit that you have acted independently or without the authority or permission of your employer Collyer Bristow LLP? *If yes: ask for miss-trial in previous proceedings – false testimony / fraud as he has used his firm's letterhead to bring proceedings.*

10. Are you the team leader or lead solicitor in the action? *(all emailed correspondence to me and the courts is from his email address that he has confirmed in question 2 above).*

YES: CONTINUE *is likely the only truthful answer*

NO: then please give the name of the person who is.

11. Do you accept that you've still had your employer's blessing or permission on all of your submissions?

YES: CONTINUE *should be the only truthful answer*

12. Have you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp offered to, threatened or warned your client FH Brundle, that you would withdraw legal services in relation to these circumstances at any time during any of the proceedings, especially those known as CC13P00980?

YES: Was that because you have found that they have broken the law and didn't want anything to do with it? Please give details to the court.

NO: CONTINUE *this is likely to be the only truthful answer.*

If he had in fact threatened or warned to withdraw legal services it would be because he didn't want any involvement with criminal activity. By not withdrawing services and continuing with his action based on false witness testimony it proves

he has willingly sought to conceal criminal activity that he was aware of and has broken the law.

13: Before I continue with my questions: Here is your chance to confess and own up. Were you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP aware, or made aware, at any time between 2004 to 2013 that FH Brundle was conspiring with either Betafence Limited and/or Britannia Fasteners Ltd to injure me, or that I was, or would have been, the target of their unlawful actions?

If he states he is not representing Britannia Fasteners Ltd this is good – I will need this later as this is untrue. If he does say he is not representing Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd , clarify for the court. “I was not aware” etc. = Good, because I will later prove he was aware of the conspiracy through his own letters and witness statements that I will prove to be false or that he knew to be untrue. Therefore a ‘no’ answer to this question would also be a lie under oath and he has just testified that he understands the consequences of perjury. His firm told HHJ Hacon on 25th September 2015 that they were representing all three firms in IP2015000090 ‘for convenience’ after they thought they had won. Mr. Wheeler must have known the original plot to have produced his own evidence to try to conceal it.

YES: then you would admit that your claim for ‘unjustified threats’ was a malicious and meritless claim to conceal crime or civil offences by your client and that you have breached the conditions of your practice licence?

NO: CONTINUE

14. Thank you Mr. Wheeler, so you testify that you were unaware of any unlawfulness involving your client FH Brundle at any time between 2004 - 2013 when you served your claim upon me and that if there is any, neither you or your employer Collyer Bristow LLP are involved in it: is that correct?

YES: CONTINUE

NO: *he would be admitting he has been involved in unlawful conduct = miss trial and automatic rescission of the bankruptcy order and Mr. Wheeler’s licence.*

15. Before we go any further, do you admit that you have made false statements or statements that you know to be untrue and misleading for the purpose of misleading me, the courts and the authorities and to conceal the criminal activity of your client FH Brundle and their associates?

NO: CONTINUE .. *subsequent questions will prove false testimony*

YES: THIS WOULD BE A CONFESSION: in that case, can you tell the court which of the statements are untrue and/or false and/or misleading and make a confession?

16. Mr. Wheeler, In the course of normal day to day business life, if a customer, client or individual made a serious complaint to your law firm, and the complaint contained confidential or privileged information and outlined serious allegations against your firm, and if the complaint only concerned your law firm and no other law firm, would it be a normal business practice to share this complaint and trade private or confidential information with the managing partner or chief executive of another unrelated law firm?

NO: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

YES: Mr. Wheeler, please explain your answer for the court because surely as a partner in a large London law firm you would know that trading that type of information between unrelated firms would be a breach of confidentiality and trust, as well as breaching a host of other confidentiality laws?

17. So to clarify for the court, you testify and agree that it would NOT be a normal course of business or business practice for ‘owners’ or ‘senior executives’ or ‘managing partners’ of two separate and unrelated firms, to disclose or trade, confidential, private or privileged information about customers, sales figures, or complaints from individuals, especially if the ‘complaint’ was only addressed to and concerning, only one of the firms?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *would be a lie and an insane answer and he would have just said in Q.16 he agrees that practice would be unlawful (or commercial suicide!).*

18. In 2012 and before you issued any proceedings known as CC13P00980 against me AT ALL, was FH Brundle your ONLY client that you represented in the situation?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *would be a lie because his own Witness Statement PJW2 says he only represents FH Brundle and his Claim Form is in the name of FH Brundle as the only claimant in the action – will be addressed later.*

19. Is this the firm FH Brundle operating at 24-36 Lamson Road, Rainham, Essex, Post code: RM13 9YY?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: In that case can you explain why your Certificate of Service that you have numbered as 3.1.4.3 found in your own Witness Statement, only states FH Brundle as your only client in the action and has the same Essex address on it?

20. For how long has you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp represented FH Brundle ? How long has FH Brundle been a client of Collyer Bristow LLp?

Expected answer: for many years....etc..

CONTINUE

21: So as a professional course of business you would have access to the full details of the situation as well as all of the private and confidential information given to you by FH Brundle, and you would have asked FH Brundle in October 2012 for all of the correspondence and documentation related to the matter, to enable you to carry out your due diligence before any proceedings were ever issued, is that correct?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Are you saying that you have withheld information that proves my case or disproves yours, from the court? *Ask Judge for an immediate miss trial in CC13P00980.*

22. Who is Michael Frank Brundle?

Wait for Answer: co –owner, shareholder, executive, blah blah blah.

CONTINUE

23. To confirm, Michael Frank Brundle is at the board level or a decision maker of the national firm FH Brundle?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: then why is Michael Frank Brundle signing Claim Forms wherein he claims to be a Director of the ‘private unlimited firm’ and has knowledge of information that would only be available to senior members of a firm which you have submitted to the court?

24. Have you dealt with anyone else at the firm FH Brundle and if you have, who have you dealt with?

Wait for Answer: get the names because it will shine light on and implicate the other defendants/suspects. I expect him to include Richard Brundle.

CONTINUE

25. Have you ever had any conversation with Mr. Richard Brundle who is also a co-owner or major decision maker of the firm FH Brundle?

YES: please give details to the court. Then **CONTINUE**

NO: CONTINUE

26. As you would have been given all of the private and confidential information relating to the circumstances, what is the name of the person supervising or making board level decisions with Michael Frank Brundle?

*Wait for answer – expect him to say Richard Brundle who is a co-owner of FH Brundle and (I think) Michael Frank Brundle’s father. If he doesn’t know or refuses to answer, continue anyway, Then **CONTINUE.***

HAND MR WHEELER THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED ‘REPLY TO DEFENCE AND COUNTERCLAIM’ IN CC13P00980 MARKED AS H.1 THROUGH TO H.9. (TAB 1, NUMBERED BUNDLE)

THEN SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, this is a copy of your firm’s nine page document entitled ‘Reply to Defence and Counterclaim’ in CC13P00980 that you have numbered as H.1 through to H.9.

26. Do you recognise this document?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Then how do you explain that this document is signed by Michael Frank Brundle and served on 27 June 2013 by your firm Collyer Bristow LLP, as is shown on the last page? **CONTINUE**

27. Did you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp submit this document to the court for use in your action against me known as CC13P00980 on behalf of FH Brundle?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Then who did? *Wait for answer – it can only be FH Brundle themselves or Stuart Baran as shown on the last page of the document.*

SAY TO Mr.WHEELER: Please turn to page H.9.

28. Mr. Wheeler, as found and stated on page H.9, do you accept that this document was prepared by Stuart Baran, signed and witnessed as a Statement of Truth by Michael Frank Brundle (who states that he is a ‘Director’ of FH Brundle), and which was served on me and/or the court by your firm Collyer Bristow LLp on 27th June 2013?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer,*

NO: That’s a lie under oath isn’t Mr. Wheeler? *point to the statement on H.9 and read it out.*

29. In 2012, was FH Brundle in a recognised contracted legal partnership with Betafence or legally identified as a sister company of Betafence or have any major shareholding in Betafence or vice versa?

YES: *The next question will prove he is lying because of point 9 in the same document.*

NO: CONTINUE *which is the only truthful answer otherwise he would have to show proof on the court file and he never filed any. It would also prove the current document in question is false testimony before we go any further. His own witness statement PJW2 confirms.*

THEN SAY TO HIM:

PLEASE TURN TO PAGE H.3 OF THE DOCUMENT.

WOULD YOU PLEASE READ OUT FOR THE COURT PARAGRAPH/POINT 9 OF PAGE H.3, THE LAST SENTENCE:

HE WILL SAY:

“It is further denied that the three Companies to whom the Defendant says he wrote – namely the Claimant, Betafence Limited and Britannia Fasteners Ltd are “closely linked”; they are wholly independent business entities”.

30. Do you testify that in this nine page document known as your Reply to Defence and Counterclaim in CC13P00980 which was submitted to the court either by you and/or Collyer Bristow LLP, it states that the three entities in question: FH Brundle, Betafence Limited and Britannia Fasteners Ltd are wholly independent business entities?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer unless his statement is false.*

NO: if he answers no: in that case are you confirming your document has false and misleading statements that you know to be untrue because you’ve just read out an extract from your own document that you submitted as a Statement of Truth?

31. Do you stand by your testimony that FH Brundle, Betafence Limited, and Britannia Fasteners Ltd “are wholly independent business entities” and are completely separate?

YES: CONTINUE *has to be the only answer*

NO: *if no, he is lying and contradicting himself under oath.*

SAY TO HIM:

THANK YOU MR. WHEELER JUST KEEP HOLD OF THAT DOCUMENT FOR THE MOMENT.

NEXT:

HAND TO WHEELER A COPY OF MICHAEL BRUNDLE’S CLAIM FORM NUMBERED A.1 – A.2 (TAB NUMBER 2 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE) AND A COPY OF THE PARTICULARS OF CLAIM MARKED B.1 – B.10 (TAB NUMBER 3 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE).

SAY TO HIM:

OK Mr. Wheeler, this is a copy of your Particulars of Claim in FH Brundle’s claim against me known as CC13P00980 for alleged ‘unjustified threats’. The Particulars of Claim document has ten pages that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp have numbered B.1 through to B.10 and the Claim Form has two pages numbered as A.1 and A.2. This is a copy from your own file that you served on me and lodged with the court.

32. Do you recognise these Particulars of Claim and your own Claim Form that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp, or your client FH Brundle, issued at the court?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: *if no, point out that he numbered the page himself and HIS numbering with his own firm’s name and address found in the second page of the Claim Form or get him to confirm that even if he didn’t number it himself he supervised the document and submitted it to the court, which he must have done to have served it.*

33. Do you confirm that these are the same, or a copy of the same, Particulars of Claim that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP or your client FH Brundle issued at the court on the 12th March 2013, as shown and dated on page A.1 of the Claim Form, in the copy of the two page Claim Form that you have marked A.1 – A.2?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: *make a note of any other answer and continue.*

33A. Do you accept that the Particulars of Claim that you have numbered as B.1 through to B.10 are the same Particulars of Claim used in conjunction with the Claim Form that you have numbered as A.1 – A.2 in proceedings known as CC13P00980?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *make a note of any other answer and continue.*

NOW MR. WHEELER PLEASE TURN TO PAGE 2 OF THE PARTICULARS OF CLAIM THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED AS B.2 AND READ OUT POINT 5 FOR THE COURT IF YOU WOULD.

Wheeler will read out that Point 5 on page B.2 of the Particulars of Claim document states:

The defendant [richard perry] sent by recorded delivery a letter dated 5th October 2012 to the claimant [fh brundle](“the First Threat Letter”); the First Threat Letter comprises Annex 3 hereto.

When he has finished reading, say: Thank you.

HAND WHEELER A COPY OF ANNEX 3. (TAB NUMBER 4 OF NUMBERED BUNDLE)

SAY TO HIM:

MR. WHEELER, THIS IS A COPY OF YOUR ANNEX 3 THAT FORMED A PART OF YOUR PARTICULARS OF CLAIM IN CC13P00980. THERE ARE THREE PAGES IN YOUR ANNEX 3 THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED B3.1, B3.2 AND B3.3. B3.1 IS YOUR COVER PAGE TO THE ANNEX,

AND B3.2 – B3.3 TOGETHER FORM A COPY OF MY FIRST THREAT LETTER, AS YOU PUT IT, TO FH BRUNDLE ON 5TH OCTOBER 2012.

WOULD YOU KINDLY TURN TO PAGES B3.2 AND B3.3.

SAY TO HIM:

THIS IS A COPY OF MY FIRST TWO PAGE LETTER TO FH BRUNDLE ALLEGING ANY OFFENCE, DATED 5TH OCTOBER 2012 THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED AS B3.2 - B3.3 OF ANNEX 3 THAT YOU SUBMITTED TO THE COURT AND SERVED ON ME.

34. Do you accept that this is a true and accurate copy of my ‘First Threat Letter’ to your client FH Brundle alleging ANY offence, dated 5th October 2012 and marked as B3.2 – B3.3 of Annex 3, that you submitted to the court and served on me in your action against me?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *then first claim is a miss-trial; false statement and misleading evidence. Declare as such to the Judge.*

35. Does my First Threat Letter of 5th October 2012, that you have numbered as B3.2 – B3.3 to FH Brundle, state anywhere within it that I have written to, or had any reply from, Betafence or their legal representatives KOB at any time in July 2012 or prior to 5th October 2012?

NO: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

YES: *if he says yes ask him to show where in the letter it does say that, because it doesn't - it's there in evidence in black and white.*

SAY TO HIM: THANK YOU MR.WHEELER. CONTINUE

NOW HAND MR WHEELER A COPY OF HIS OWN WITNESS STATEMENT MARKED AS 3.1.3.1 – 3.1.3.2 AND DOCUMENT MARKED EXHIBIT PJW1 THAT IS NUMBERED AS 3.1.4.1, 3.1.4.2, 3.1.4.3, 3.1.4.4.

(TAB NUMBER 5 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE)

SAY TO HIM:

Now Mr. Wheeler, here is a copy of your own Witness Statement in the proceedings CC13P00980 and dated 1st May 2013 that you or your firm has labelled 3.1.3.1 – 3.1.3.2 and submitted to the court. Here is also a copy of your Exhibit PJW1 that accompanies your Witness Statement. The Exhibit PJW1 comprises four pages that you have numbered as 3.1.4.1, 3.1.4.2, 3.1.4.3 and 3.1.4.4.

36. Do you recognise these two documents that form your own Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013 and which you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp issued and served at the court in proceedings known as CC13P00980?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: *point out to him his own signature and page numbering no page 2 so he obviously knew somebody did serve his Witness Statement and must recognise it.*

37. Can you confirm that this is your signature found on page two of your Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013; page two that is numbered as 3.1.3.2?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: are you saying under oath, that this document, your own Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013 that clearly matches the one that you submitted to the court, is false or not a true and accurate copy of your Witness Statement?

YES: *ask the Judge to declare immediate miss trial in CC13P00980.*

38. Do you accept that this a true and accurate copy of your Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013 and Exhibit PJW1 that again you have numbered yourself ?

YES: CONTINUE *has to be the only answer – if he says no, show him the original.*

NO: Really Mr. Wheeler? But you or your firm numbered it? Same numbering and same handwriting as the other documents? *If still no, continue anyway.*

PLEASE TURN TO THE SECOND PAGE OF YOUR WITNESS STATEMENT THAT YOU HAVE MARKED AS 3.1.3.2.

SAY TO HIM:

Would you please read out for the court your Statement of Truth found at the end of your Witness Statement on page 2 that is numbered as 3.1.3.2.

HE WILL SAY:

“I believe that the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true”

39. Can you confirm that it is your signature that appears under your Statement of Truth?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Are you saying that this signature isn't yours and yet this same signature also appears under the Statement of Truth in your Second *AND THIRD* Witness Statements that you also submitted to the court and used to bring proceedings against me?

40. Do you still stand by your Statement of Truth found on the second page of your Witness Statement?

YES: CONTINUE

NO: = *Declare a miss trial in CC13P00980 because it would be false testimony.*

SAY TO HIM:

WOULD YOU PLEASE READ OUT FOR THE COURT Paragraph 5 OF YOUR WITNESS STATEMENT ALSO FOUND ON PAGE 3.1.3.2 JUST SLIGHTLY HIGHER UP THE PAGE.

HE WILL SAY:

“As shown by the letters sent by my firm to the Defendant dated 15 October, 25 October and 29 November 2012 attached at Annex 5 to the Particulars of Claim and has consequently complied with paragraph 7.1 (1) and Annex A (paragraph 2) of the practice direction (Pre-Action Conduct).”

WHEN HE HAS FINISHED SAY: ‘THANKYOU’.

41. Now, Mr. Wheeler, in relation to you and your client’s Particulars of Claim and your own Witness Statement in CC13P00980 that I have just given you copies of, do you confirm that this ‘First Threat Letter’, (as you put it), was received by your only client at the time, ‘FH Brundle’, on 5th October 2012, and that this two page letter, or this copy of it, numbered as B3.2 – B3.3 of Annex 3 of the Particulars of Claim was submitted to the court by you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *would be a lie under oath = perjury. Page B.10 of the Particulars of Claim states his firm Collyer Bristow LLP served the claim on 13 Feb 2013. Ask Judge for immediate miss trial in CC13P00980.*

42. In relation to Paragraph 5 of your own Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013 that you read out earlier for the court, did your ONLY client in the matter in 2012 ‘*FH Brundle*’ receive ANY other letter or email from me prior to the letter of the 5th October 2012, alleging ANY offence?

NO: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

YES: then why doesn’t that appear anywhere in any of the proceedings because surely you would have used that correspondence to further your allegation and support your claims that I had made unjustified threats? *Ask for him to produce a copy to the court which he wouldn’t be able to do unless he fabricates false evidence.*

43. Again in accordance with Paragraph 5 of your own Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013, is your letter to me that is dated the 15th October 2012, your or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP’s first contact with me in the matter at the time of October 2012?

YES: CONTINUE is the only truthful answer – *he has his own Witness Statement and court summons in his hand.*

NO: *if he says no he is perjuring himself* **SAY: THAT ISN'T TRUE MR WHEELER;** Your own letter of 15th October 2012 introduces yourself and your firm and states you are acting for FH Brundle. Letter found Annex 5. **(TAB 8).**

SAY TO HIM: OK THANK YOU.

NEXT:

HAND COPY OF THE 5 PAGE LETTER FROM BETA FENCE (KOB) TO RP dated 25TH JULY 2012. (TAB NUMBER 6 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE).

SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, this is a copy of the five page letter that I received from KOB law firm on 25th July 2012 who were acting for Betafence Ltd on 25th July 2012. This letter is in response to my complaint to Betafence alleging an offence. Again, either you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLp have numbered the five pages of this letter as 4.1.37, 4.1.38, 4.1.39, 4.1.40, 4.1.41 and submitted it to the court in proceedings known as CC13P00980.

44. Do you accept that the date of this letter sent by KOB to me is 25th July 2012; as shown on the first page of the letter that you have numbered as 4.1.37?

YES: CONTINUE *has to be the only answer.*

NO: *Are you blind Mr. Wheeler? Point to the date on the letter and show the Judge and have the original letter ready to confirm.(red folder).*

45. As you have testified earlier and as proven in Point 5 on page B.2 of your Particulars of Claim in CC13P00980; did I disclose any of the correspondence between myself and KOB, acting for Betafence, to you, your firm 'Collyer Bristow' or your ONLY client FH Brundle, at ANY TIME prior to 5th Oct 2012 which is the date of my 'First Threat Letter' to FH Brundle alleging any offence?

YES: *this would be a lie under oath and is perjury.* **really? Then why doesn't that correspondence appear in your Particulars of Claim or ever mentioned in your own Witness Statement? If a yes answer is given, it has to be untrue**

because 5th October 2012 was the first contact with FH Brundle alleging any offence as proven in the evidence in proceedings that Mr. Wheeler submitted himself on Michael Brundle's behalf, supported in essence by FH Brundle's own Particulars of Claim numbered as page B.2, Point. 5.

NO: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer..*

46. Again Mr. Wheeler, do you accept that this is this a true and accurate copy of the letter from KOB law firm addressed to me and dated 25th July 2012 and is the same letter that you have lodged a copy of with the court yourself, in proceedings of CC13P00980, and numbered as pages 4.1.37 through to 4.1.41?

YES: CONTINUE *the only truthful answer*

NO: *ok well here is the original for you. Hand him a copy. Also point to page numbering that is from his own court bundle. Are you certain because the copy of this letter was taken from your own court bundle and has your own numbering sequence in the bottom right corner?*

47. Do you accept that you, your firm Collyer Bristow LLP or your ONLY client in 2012 'FH Brundle', submitted, or relied up the content of, this five page letter dated 25th July 2012 from KOB to me, in your proceedings against me to try to prove 'unjustified threats'?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *why does it have your numbering on it then? If he says he didn't rely on it, say: but you did submit it to the court in the pre action or trial bundles didn't you?*

48. Does this same letter sent from KOB law firm to me dated 25th July 2012 mention your client FH Brundle or your firm Collyer Bristow anywhere AT ALL within its five pages that you have numbered yourself as 4.1.37, 4.1.38, 4.1.39, 4.1.40 and 4.1.41 and submitted to the court?

NO: (The only answer HAS to be NO) *as shown by the letter: neither FH Brundle or Collyer Bristow LLP are mentioned, because at the time, I didn't know FH Brundle were even trading with Betafence and, Wheeler would have to prove I did know which he can't unless he fabricates evidence, because I didn't.*

48A. Mr. Wheeler, please state for the court the DATE on which you first received or saw a copy of the letter sent to me from KOB acting for Betafence Ltd dated 25th July 2012.

ANSWER: If BEFORE 5th October 2012 (date of my ‘First Threat Letter’ to FH Brundle as confirmed in his own Particulars of Claim) this would prove Betafence Ltd and FH Brundle had unlawfully shared private and confidential information, between two (according to his own Witness Statement) “wholly independent business entities” and who are according to him definitely not “working together”, that would only need to be shared for the unlawful purpose of concealing their intent to injure me and/or their conspiracy, because he has just proven in his answer to the previous question number 48 that the letter from KOB to me doesn’t mention FH Brundle anywhere at all within its 5 pages and there isn’t any other correspondence.

ANSWER: If AFTER 5th October 2012, this would prove without any doubt that he couldn’t have known about the letter from KOB to me, which **proves conspiracy – BUT THIS IS THE FINAL QUESTION AT THE END OF THIS QUESTIONING SO DO NOT ALERT WHEELER TO THIS IF BY NOW HE HASN’T FIGURED IT OUT.**

WHATEVER ANSWER HE GIVES, SAY TO CONFIRM:

48B: To confirm under oath Mr. Wheeler, the DATE you first received or had sight of the letter sent to me from KOB dated 25th July 2012 is _____?

WRITE THE DATE HE GIVES IN SPACE IN QUESTION 62 AND BULLET POINT 8 IN SUMMING UP BELOW. CONTINUE SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT AND Q.49.

HIS Answer: If he answers: *I can’t remember, or I don’t know, OR if he remains silent say in quick succession:*

48C: Was it BEFORE 5th October 2012 OR was it AFTER 5th October 2012? Which one? Which one, Mr. Wheeler?

Answer :

Before 5th October 2012 – GOOD – this will later prove conspiracy through unlawful sharing or confidential information that need only be shared for the purpose of concealing a conspiracy.

After 5th October 2012 – GOOD – this will later prove conspiracy because he couldn't have known of the letter of 25th July 2012 that he mentions in his letter of 15th October 2012.

If in between 5th October 2012 – 15th October 2012: GOOD – if FH Brundle gave Patrick Wheeler or Collyer Bristow LLP a copy of the letter at any time in between 5th October 2012 – 15th October 2012 so that Wheeler or Collyer Bristow LLP did know, it would mean FH Brundle has still seen the letter from KOB to me which still would only need be shared for the unlawful purpose of concealing their conspiracy and intent to injure me by unlawful means and Wheeler and/or Collyer Bristow know about it as stated in their letter of 15th October 2015 and they've concealed this fact from the court and continued to bring an unfounded civil case before the United Kingdom courts based on false witness testimony and Perjury.

48C. Mr. Wheeler, you have testified that being a partner in a London law firm you understand the consequences of perjury therefore what is the date you or your law firm or your only client in 2012 FH Brundle first received or saw a copy of the letter sent to me from KOB dated 25th July 2012?

Wait for answer if still no answer, continue next to his Second Witness Statement next question 49. – do not respond to any answer or get drawn into a dispute. Let him mix himself up and make note of his statements. Use that in final summing up before Big ultimate question.

SAY TO HIM: THANK YOU, MR. WHEELER.

NEXT:

HAND WHEELER A COPY OF HIS SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT DATED 12TH NOVEMBER 2013 IN CC13P00980. (TAB NUMBER 7 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE).

SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, this is a copy of your Second Witness Statement that you submitted to the court and used in proceedings against me known as CC13P00980. It is your Second Witness Statement dated 12th November 2013 consisting of five pages that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP have

numbered as 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.3.3.3, 3.3.3.4 and 3.3.3.5. and which you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP submitted to the court.

49. Do you recognise and accept that this is a true and accurate copy of your Second Witness Statement dated 12th November 2013 that consists of five pages that you or your firm ‘Collyer Bristow LLP’ have numbered as 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.3.3.3, 3.3.3.4 and 3.3.3.5 and used in proceedings against me known as CC13P00980 ?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Please explain why it isn’t your own Witness Statement Mr. Wheeler? *If he says it is different because I have annotated it or underlined parts of it, say to him: but you agree the printed content on the pages form your Witness Statement that you drafted and signed?*

SAY TO HIM:

PLEASE TURN TO PAGE 5 OF YOUR SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED AS 3.3.3.5 AND READ OUT YOUR STATEMENT OF TRUTH.

HE WILL SAY:

“I believe that the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true”

50. Do you accept that this is your Statement of Truth and that it is your own signature found underneath it?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: but you’ve testified to the truth and accuracy of your First Witness Statement that also has the same name and the same signature on it which you accepted is yours?

SAY TO HIM:

PLEASE TURN TO PAGE 3 OF YOUR SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED AS 3.3.3.3 AND READ OUT THE 4TH, 5TH AND 6TH SENTENCES OF POINT OR PARAGRAPH 8, STARTING FROM “the Claimant has no knowledge...”

HE WILL SAY:

“the Claimant has no knowledge of the sales levels of the alleged infringing goods either by Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd. Indeed, the Claimant has no business connection with Britannia Fasteners Limited. My firm is not representing Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd.”.

51. Mr. Wheeler, as stated in your Second Witness Statement dated 12th November 2013, do you still testify today that your firm Collyer Bristow LLP is not representing Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd in October 2012 or even at the time of 12th November 2013, which is more than a year after your first contact with me on behalf of your only client ‘FH Brundle’ in October 2012?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Are you saying your testimony is false?

52. And you confirm that neither you or your only client FH Brundle even have any knowledge of any sales figures in 2012 or 2013 of either Betafence Ltd OR Britannia Fasteners Ltd is that correct?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: NO? but you said earlier in your first Witness Statement that the three firms are “*wholly independent business entities*” – so your current answer must be false testimony?

53. So do you accept that in 2012 or in 2013, neither you or your only client FH Brundle even know any of the sales figures for these other two companies, that you testify are “wholly independent business entities” ?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: but Mr.Wheeler, you state in your own Witness Statements that you have used in proceedings against me, that the three firms are entirely separate and don't have any knowledge of any sales figures?

54: By answering YES, you mean: neither you or FH Brundle know any of the sales figures for the other two companies Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd in 2012 or 2013 is that correct?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *lying under oath – perjury*

55. So if neither you or your only client in 2012 'FH Brundle' even know the sales figures of the other two firms for a Betafence product that all three firms are involved in distributing or 'reselling' (as you put it), you also must testify that your only client in 2012 'FH Brundle' definitely did not receive or share any private or confidential information or correspondence with Betafence, because you testify that Betafence are a "*wholly independent business entity*" to your only client in 2012, FH Brundle, is that correct?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *means he realises he has been caught out and will only try to cover his tracks. Don't say anything and listen for the lies that follow. That would mean your Witness Statements are untrue Mr. Wheeler aren't they? Ask judge for immediate miss trial in CC13P00980.*

SAY TO HIM: OK THANK YOU MR. WHEELER

NEXT:

HAND WHEELER THE COPY OF ANNEX 5 OF FH BRUNDLE'S PARTICULARS OF CLAIM. ANNEX 5 IS NUMBERED AS B5.1 THROUGH TO B5.6. AND CONTAINS THE LETTER OF 15TH OCT 2012.

(TAB NUMBER 8 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE)

SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, this is a copy of your Annex 5 of your Particulars of Claim in CC13P0980. Annex 5 consists of six pages that you have numbered as B5.1, B5.2, B5.3, B5.4, B5.5 and B5.6. Would you kindly find pages B5.2 and B5.3 which together form a two page letter which is your letter that you sent to me on 15th October 2012. This letter is printed on Collyer Bristow's letterhead and is addressed to me 'Richard Perry' at my home address '19 Yerbury Street, Trowbridge' and is dated 15 October 2012.

56. Do you recognise and accept that this is a true and accurate copy of your two page letter that you sent to me on 15th October 2012 on behalf of your only client at the time, FH Brundle?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: so do you admit that you have submitted a false statement and evidence to the court and used it in proceedings?

57. Do you accept that this is a copy of your letter dated 15 October 2012 typed on your firm's letterhead and that the letter displays your email address used in proceedings which is 'patrick.wheeler@collyerbristow.com' and your own reference number which is PWH/23640.12, as found in the top right hand corner of the letter?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: so do you admit you have submitted a false statement and evidence to the court and used it in proceedings?

58. Is this the ONLY letter that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP sent to me on 15th October 2012?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: do you have a copy of any other letter you sent to me on 15th October 2012 and any proof that you sent it that will clearly and obviously coincide or clearly relate to any other documents that you have submitted to the court in proceedings?

NO: *is the only truthful answer. If Yes ask him to show any copy of any other letter dated 15 October 2012 and proof that he sent it to me – there isn't one.*

So do admit you have submitted a false statement and evidence to the court and used it in proceedings?

59: Is this letter dated 15 October 2015 the same letter that you refer to in paragraph 5 of your own Witness Statement dated 1st May 2013 on the page you have numbered as 3.1.3.2?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *Turn back to the Witness Statement and point out para 5 again. (TAB 5, PG.2, POINT 5. If this is not the same letter he refers to (which we know it is) then ask him to produce any other letter which we know doesn't exist. A 'No' answer would be perjury.*

60. Is this a copy of the same letter of 15th October 2012, on which you based your claim against me for 'unjustified threats' in 2013 and submitted to the court?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: if no say: it must be Mr. Wheeler because it is typed on your firm's letterhead and has your own numbering on it. *Then repeat the question until a 'yes' answer is produced and you mention this letter in your own Witness Statement.*

61. Would you kindly read out the first sentence of Paragraph 5 found on the first page of your two page letter dated 15 October 2012? (I've underlined it for you)

HE WILL SAY:

"we are aware that you have written to our client's supplier, Betafence Limited, and that their advisers have provided detailed reasons in their letter to you dated 25th July 2012 why, if the patent is valid and subsisting at all, the brackets do not infringe."

SAY TO HIM:

OK MR. WHEELER, LETS GO BACK TO THE LETTER OF 25TH JULY SENT FROM KOB TO ME: (TAB NUMBER 6 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE)

62. Do you accept that the letter sent from KOB law firm (acting for Betafence) to me, of 25th July 2012, was sent at least 2-3 months before I wrote and sent my letter of 5th October 2012, to your only client at the time, FH Brundle?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *if he says I don't know when it was sent, say: ok but you've already testified that you first saw it or received a copy of it on _____.* **Please turn to pages 52 – 58 found under TAB 13 of the numbered bundle.**

SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, This document is a 6 page document that is a copy of an email sent to me by Mr. Veerle Hostens from KOB law firm acting for Betafence Ltd on 25th July 2012. The first page, page 53, shows a screenshot of the email. It shows that the date the email was sent to me as WED 25th July 2012 AT 11:19 AM. The email also shows it has two attachments – one is the KOB image and the other attachment is marked as: 3158_104_ADV_reply_to_Perry.pdf;

63. Do you accept that is what the email states?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer.*

NO: well it does Mr. Wheeler – it's there in black and white.

SAY TO HIM:

OK, PLEASE TURN TO PAGE 54 (NEXT PAGE).

PAGE 54 SHOWS THE FIRST PAGE OF THE FIVE PAGE DOCUMENT ATTACHED TO THE EMAIL FOUND ON PAGE 53. ON THE FIRST PAGE OF THE DOCUMENT THERE IS A REFERENCE NUMBER SHOWN AS 3158-104 ADV / VHO. THIS DOCUMENT CONSISTING OF 5 PAGES, IS IN FACT THE EMAILED COPY OF THE SAME LETTER DATED 25TH JULY 2012 THAT KOB SENT TO ME BY POST. THE FIRST PAGE ALSO STATES 'Per e-mail and per registered letter'. IT ALSO HAS THE SAME DATE OF 25TH JULY 2012 AND IS CLEARLY ADDRESSED TO ME AT MY HOME ADDRESS AND HAS THE KOB LOGO. ALL PRINTED CONTENT OF THIS LETTER IS EXACTLY THE SAME AS YOUR COPY THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED 4.1.37, 4.1.38, 4.1.39, 4.1.40 AND 4.1.41 AS FOUND UNDER TAB 6 OF THE NUMBERED BUNDLE.

PLEASE HAVE A QUICK LOOK AT THE OTHER 4 PAGES, PG.55 – 58.

64. Mr. Wheeler, Do you accept that this is in fact the emailed copy of the same letter of 25th July 2012 sent from KOB to me and in fact sent by email on the very same day the letter is dated and has the same reference number and date?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *continue*

65. Do you accept that we now have two separate forms of proof that the letter addressed from KOB to me and dated 25th July 2012 was in fact sent by KOB both by email and registered post on 25th July 2012?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *no or negative response; ignore and continue.*

66: Does the letter of 25th July 2012 precede the letter of 5th October 2012 by at least 2-3 months?

YES: CONTINUE *has to be the only answer*

NO: SAY: how can your answer possibly be true if, as everyone knows, the month of July 2012 comes at least 3 months before the month of October 2012 in the world calendar? *Repeat questions 62 and 66 again to hopefully produce a 'YES' answer otherwise he is perjuring himself under oath.*

SAY TO HIM: Thankyou MR. WHEELER.

NEXT:

HAND WHEELER THE SECOND COPY OF THE TWO PAGE LETTER OF 15 OCT 2012 NUMBERED AS C.95 – C.96 (TAB NUMBER 9 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE).

SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, this is another copy of the same two page letter that you or your firm Collyer Bristow sent to me on 15th October 2012 that you have numbered as C.95 – C.96. This one is signed ‘CB’ on the second page. This is also printed on Collyer Bristow’s letterhead and has all the same sender’s details in the same position etc. as the first copy you were shown earlier.

67. Do you recognise and accept that this is in fact yet another copy of the same two page letter of the 15th October 2012 that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP numbered as C.95 – C.96 and has the same reference number ‘PWH/23640.12’ and is a copy of the same letter which you sent to me and submitted to the court and used in proceedings against me?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *ask him to testify why he believes it isn’t, because it is. Please explain to the court why it isn’t Mr. Wheeler? Listen for his answer and then counter with truth.*

68. Do you accept that this is in fact another copy of the same two page letter of the 15th October 2012 this time numbered as C.95 – C.96 that is found in your Annex 5 that you have numbered B5.2 – B5.3 in the version that appears in Annex 5?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: It is obvious that it’s another copy of the same letter Mr. Wheeler. CONTINUE.

NEXT: HAND COPY OF LETTER DATED 15 OCTOBER 2012 FOUND UNDER TAB 14 OF THE NUMBERED BUNDLE.

SAY TO HIM:

Mr. Wheeler, This is a third unannotated copy of your two page letter dated 15 October 2012 that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP sent to me in October 2012 and used in proceedings against me. This time you have numbered the two page letter as 5.1.3 – 5.1.4. This again is another copy of your two page letter that hasn’t been annotated or had its content underlined anywhere by me and again it has all the same details and same printed content, including Collyer Bristow’s letterhead and your own email address and reference number PWH/23640.12.

68A. Do you accept that this is a true and accurate copy of your two page letter dated 15 OCTOBER 2012 that you sent to me and that you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP have numbered this copy of it as 5.1.3 – 5.1.4?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: say to him: can you explain how it can possibly be different - it's exactly the same and there in front of you in black and white?

Wait for answer and continue without any further follow up – Judge will know he is lying if he gives a 'no' answer.

69: Do you accept that you have submitted the same two page letter that you sent to me on the 15th October 2012, to the court on at least three separate occasions?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *do not answer him continue with questioning.*

NEXT:

HAND WHEELER THE COPY OF THE LETTER HE SENT TO ME DATED 17 OCTOBER 2013. (TAB NUMBER 10 IN NUMBERED BUNDLE).

SAY TO HIM:

OK MR.WHEELER, HERE IS A COPY OF ANOTHER TWO PAGE LETTER THAT YOU SENT TO ME IN PROCEEDINGS CC13P00980 THAT IS DATED 17 OCTOBER 2013 AND THAT YOU HAVE NUMBERED AS 5.2.39 AND 5.2.40.

70. Now Mr. Wheeler, do you also recognise this two page letter that you sent to me dated 17 October 2013 also typed on Collyer Bristow's letterhead, and that you have numbered as 5.2.39 – 5.2.40 and submitted in the court bundle to the court?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *say to Judge – he is clearly perjuring himself you honour.*

71. Again did you or your firm Collyer Bristow LLP write and/or send this letter to me on the 17th October 2013 that has your email address ‘patrick.wheeler@collyerbristow.com’ and reference number PWH/NJW/23640.12 on it?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: *say to Judge – he is clearly perjuring himself you honour.*

SAY TO HIM:

MR WHEELER, I’m looking at the first page of your two page letter dated 17 October 2013 that you have numbered as 5.2.39.

The first four sentences of Paragraph 3 of your two page letter to me of the 17th October 2013 state:

“Your letter continues with an assertion which we have refuted on numerous occasions. You are under the impression that our clients are “working together” with Betafence and with Britannia Fasteners. That is not, and has never been, the case. Other than being a customer of Betafence in relation to the brackets in dispute, our client is not “working together” with either company”.

72. You have a copy of your letter of 17th October 2013 in your hand. Do you accept that this is what you have written in your letter and that is what the letter says?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: It says so right here Mr. Wheeler – in the letter, in black and white , the letter you have in your hand!

73. Do you still testify that your client FH Brundle was NOT ‘working together’ with Betafence or Britannia Fasteners in 2012, which is why you testify that you don’t have any of the sales figures, and by the term ‘working together’ I mean ‘working together’ for any unlawful purpose such as conspiring to injure me?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO: Please explain your answer or your version which would mean they are in fact working together for an unlawful purpose which would contradict your own

testimony – *get a confession from witness and ask Judge for immediate miss trial in CC13P00980.*

74. Mr. Wheeler, Do you still stand by your testimony today that the letters you sent to me dated 15 October 2012 and 17 October 2013 are yours or your firm Collyer Bristow’s, and that my ‘First Threat Letter’ to your only client at the time, ‘FH Brundle’ alleging any offence AT ALL is dated 5th October 2012, which is at least 2-3 months after KOB acting for Betafence sent their letter of 25th July 2012 to me, AND you still testify that your ONLY client in the matter in 2012 ‘FH Brundle’ WAS NOT according to you ‘working together’ with Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd and that the three firms according to you are “wholly independent business entities” ?

YES: CONTINUE *is the only truthful answer*

NO – *if no – then proves false testimony – ask for miss trial and bankruptcy order to be immediately rescinded*

THEN ADDRESS MR. WHEELER AND SUMMARIZE FOR THE COURT:

SAY TO HIM:

SO, Mr. Wheeler to summarise:

- 1. You confirm that all of the documents that I have presented to you in this first section of questioning today and which you have commented on under oath, are true and accurate copies, and you confirm that you or Collyer Bristow LLP have submitted these documents to the court yourself or overseen their administration and service throughout proceedings (with the exception of the 6 page email from Veerle Hostens at KOB to me).
- 2. You confirm that all of the documents (with the exception of that one email from Veerle Hostens) shown to you today, have your own numbering system on them and have been numbered either by yourself or Collyer Bristow LLP and submitted to the court either by your or Collyer Bristow LLP.

- 3. You confirm all documents are true to your knowledge and/or contain Statements of Truth made under oath or otherwise that you believe to be true.
- 4. You declined the chance today to offer any confession or own up to any of the alleged law breaking or unlawfulness that I believe you and your clients carried out.
- 5. You have testified and agreed that in twelve different documents shown to you today that neither FH Brundle or yourself or your firm Collyer Bristow had any contact with me at any time prior to 5th October 2012 in relation to any alleged offence, and that you do not have any other correspondence WHATSOEVER between myself and FH Brundle alleging any offence at any time prior to 5th October 2012.
- 6. You also testify and confirm in your own letter of 15 October 2012 (first sentence of paragraph five) that you were aware that I had contacted Betafence and that they had replied to me through KOB law firm on 25 July 2012; said letter that you yourself number as 4.1.37 through to 4.1.41 and which you submitted to the court in proceedings.
- 7. You confirm that the letter of 25th July 2012 from KOB (on behalf of Betafence) to me, does not have any mention of FH Brundle or alleges any offences against FH Brundle, your only client in the matter in October 2012, or your firm Collyer Bristow.
- 8. You confirm that the DATE on which you, your firm Collyer Bristow LLP or your only client in 2012 FH Brundle first received or saw a copy of the letter sent to me from KOB dated 25th July 2012 was: _____
- 9. You testify to the court that FH Brundle is only a ‘customer’ of Betafence as found stated in your own letter of 17 October 2013 and you confirm that FH Brundle is not a contracted partner or sister company and that your client FH Brundle is a completely separate entity to Betafence Ltd and Britannia Fasteners Ltd.

- 10. You agree that the letter addressed to me from KOB acting for Betafence, is dated 25th July 2012 which you also agree is dated at least several calendar months before I ever had any contact with FH Brundle, alleging any type of offence, on 5th October 2012.
- 11. You have also told the court today that I did not disclose any of the correspondence or the letter or email of 25th July 2012 (between myself and KOB representing Betafence), to you or your client FH Brundle at any time prior to, and at least not at any time before, either my First Threat Letter of the 5th October 2012 marked as B3.2-B3.3 or the 15th October 2012 marked as B5.2-B5.3 or the second copy of the same letter marked C.95 – C.96.
- 12. You have testified to the court that neither your only client in October 2012 ‘FH Brundle’, nor you or your firm Collyer Bristow ‘are working together’ in terms of unlawfulness with Betafence Ltd or Britannia Fasteners Ltd and you testify that my allegation/insinuation of these firms ‘working together’ with your only client in 2012 FH Brundle for an unlawful purpose “*is not and has never been the case*” and that they are “*wholly independent business entities*” from FH Brundle, and neither you, your firm Collyer Bristow LLP or FH Brundle even have any sales figures of the other two companies and that you haven’t shared any information such as sales figures or customer correspondence that would be considered confidential between unrelated firms.
- 13. You have also testified to the court that you agree that sharing, trading, or divulging legally privileged or private or confidential information concerning a firm’s customers or complaints from individuals or sales figures, is way beyond the level of information that is, or would, or should, be shared in the course of normal day to day business dealings between unrelated firms that are not ‘*working together*’ whether that is to commission a crime or commit an offence, or firms who are not heavily involved in one another’s operations, because you agree that to share such information would be unlawful.

75. Is that an accurate summary Mr. Wheeler?

(Yes is the only truthful answer)

76. NOW HIT HIM WITH THE BIG ONE:

The problem is Mr. Wheeler, that unless your ONLY client, on 15th October 2012, ‘FH Brundle’, WAS IN FACT ‘working together’ with Betafence Ltd, and sharing privileged and confidential information about my complaint, for the only possible purpose of conspiring to injure me or concealing their conspiracy, how could you or your client ‘FH Brundle’ have possibly known that KOB acting for Betafence Ltd had written to me on 25th July 2012?

BOOM.

Wait for answer although he probably won't have one. Look for the sheer guilt and his red face and point it out to the judge.

THEN SAY TO WHEELER (and/or to Judge)

Your Honour / Mr. Wheeler:

The correspondence from KOB to me on 25th July 2012 is at least 2-3 months before I contacted FH Brundle on 5th October 2012. October doesn't come before July does it????

So unless FH Brundle conspired with Betafence Ltd to injure me and tried to steal and defraud my intellectual property rights worth tens of millions of pounds, how could you or FH Brundle have possibly known before 5th October 2012 that Betafence had written to me on 25th July 2012?

If the copy of the KOB letter dated 25th July 2012 was seen by Patrick Wheeler or Collyer Bristow LLP or their only client FH Brundle *before* 5th October 2012 this proves conspiracy through unlawful sharing or confidential information that need only be shared for the purpose of concealing a conspiracy because he testifies or confirms in over fourteen documents that Betafence Ltd and FH Brundle Ltd are “wholly independent business entities” and don't even know one another's sales figures for the same Betafence product that they are both distributing.

If the copy of the KOB letter dated 25th July 2012 was seen by Patrick Wheeler or Collyer Bristow LLP or their only client FH Brundle *after* 5th October 2012 this proves conspiracy between Betafence Ltd and FH Brundle because Mr. Wheeler or Collyer Bristow LLP couldn't have known of the letter of 25th July 2012 that he clearly identifies in his letter of 15th October 2012.

If in between 5th October 2012 – 15th October 2012: if FH Brundle gave Patrick Wheeler or Collyer Bristow LLP a copy of the letter at any time *in between* 5th October 2012 – 15th October 2012 meaning that Patrick Wheeler or Collyer

Bristow LLp did know of the letter at this time, it would mean FH Brundle has still seen the letter from KOB to me dated 25th July 2012 which would still only need be shared between Betafence Ltd and FH Brundle who Mr. Wheeler testifies are “wholly independent business entities” for the only unlawful purpose of concealing their conspiracy and intent to injure me by unlawful means and, Patrick Wheeler and/or Collyer Bristow LLp know about it as stated in their letter of 15th October 2015 and they’ve concealed this fact from the court. THEN THEY WILFULLY AND DELIBERATELY UNDERMINED THE RULE OF LAW by continuing to bring an unfounded civil case against me, based on Perjury and costing me my lifetime’s work and the general public tens of thousands of pounds, before the United Kingdom courts based on false witness testimony and Perjury.

Your honour, (his) own letters and your (his) own testimony prove that FH Brundle and Betafence Ltd were without any doubt sharing confidential and legally privileged information between themselves **that would only need be shared for the purpose of carrying out their conspiracy to injure me or planning a defence to conceal their conspiracy that the defendants were already carrying out**, because Mr. Wheeler (a partner in a London law firm), has testified that the firms are “*wholly independent business entities*” and you (he) have (has) given false testimony and made false and misleading statements to the court and brought a malicious prosecution against me based on false testimony to pervert the course of justice. This is so serious an offence that it undermines the Rule of Law in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Wheeler has subsequently made more threats against me stating that he intends to apply for my committal after I filed an appeal to the Court of Appeal because he had thought he had won and wouldn’t ever get caught. My appeal is my legal and constitutional right. Mr. Wheeler realises that I have proven my allegations of a multi-million pound conspiracy against me, in evidence.

In Mr. Wheeler’s desperation to get these worldwide and national firms absolved of their multi-million pound conspiracy, fraud and economic tort, he brought a meritless and malicious prosecution claim against me in the Patents Court for the purpose of concealing the unlawful and criminal activity of himself and his clients.

THEN SAY TO WHEELER:

SO I HAVE THREE MORE QUESTIONS FOR YOU MR. WHEELER TO END THIS FIRST SECTION OF QUESTIONING:

77. Do you now accept that your statement that these firms are ‘not working together’ for an unlawful purpose and that they are “wholly independent business entities” was an outright lie and a false statement that was intended to mislead me, the authorities and the courts and to conceal you and your clients multi-million pound conspiracy and other offences?

It doesn't really matter what his answer is at this point – he's done.

78. Do you still believe that you should be allowed to retain your licence to practice law when clearly you have perjured yourself and made false statements designed to mislead a court of law, throw off a Police investigation, and deliberately pervert the course of justice, which has caused me to lose my business, all of my friendships and my lifetime's work consisting of an intellectual property portfolio worth in excess of £10m and possibly up to £40m pounds?

His only answer if he has any morals or integrity has to be a sombre NO.

79. Would you agree that it is fortunate that as the victim of your serious organised corporate crime, I haven't killed myself or that nobody else has been fatally injured by it?

SAY TO JUDGE:

Your Honour, these are extremely serious circumstances and I ask that you detain Mr. Wheeler for contempt of court and revoke his practice licence and Collyer Bristow's practice licence, rescind the bankruptcy order with immediate effect and declare a miss trial in CC13P00980.

ADDRESS THE READER/JUDGE:

This now proves Betafence's and FH Brundle's actus reus (guilty act) and mens rea (guilty mind) in hard evidence in black and white and the fact that they were indeed conspiring to injure me, knew that I would suffer as a result of their unlawful conduct and went to unfathomable lengths to try to cover it up by bringing

meritless and malicious prosecutions against me, therefore abusing the process and integrity of the legal system.

This doesn't even begin to touch upon the unlawful use of my name to order all of the goods by Britannia Fasteners Ltd and the individuals who are also involved, or even the second set of conspirators in the second patent theft and proves the three firms have plotted and planned a crime and plotted concealment of that crime after they had carried it out. I will come to this shortly in my next section of questioning. This is just one of about 10 questions.

This is the end of the first question to Mr. Wheeler to prove intent and knowledge of the crime. I haven't yet asked any of the other 10 questions or any of the other firms which is coming next. Their entire case has been fabricated and based on false testimony, which is Perjury or offences akin to Perjury under the Perjury Act 1911.

CC.

- **Metropolitan Police, London**
- **Wiltshire Police, Devizes**
- **Office of the Lord Chief Justice. Royal Courts of Justice.**
- **HRH Prince Charles, Clarence House, London**

© Copyright, Richard Perry, February 2017