

Mark Anthony Taylor  
Kalamata  
Billington Lane  
Derrington  
Stafford  
ST18 9LR

Email: [mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com](mailto:mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com)

31 July 2016

To:

Sir Bernard Hogan Howe, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis

Copies To:

Lord Chief Justice Baron Thomas  
Prime Minister Theresa May  
Lord Chancellor Elizabeth Truss  
Financial Conduct Authority  
Paul Kernaghan of JACO  
Serious Fraud Office  
Rt Hon Jeremy Lefroy MP  
Rt Hon David Davis MP

### **Judicial Misconduct That Undermines The Fight Against Terrorism**

Dear Sir Hogan Howe,

I believe it is my responsibility to notify you of events in the High Court and Court of Appeal that undermined the Metropolitan Police Force's ability to detect, investigate and prosecute terrorists. These events should have reached your ears by official channels, and if they have not you can consider the FCA, the SFO and the Courts of Appeal to have failed in their basic duties.

If you have studied the financial news lately you will have learned **i)** that Deutsche Bank (DB) have settled a bullion rigging lawsuit in New York and **ii)** they were accused by the FCA and BaFin or having lax controls against of money laundering. According to the Financial Times, the FCA accused DB of having potentially laundered money for terrorists (we can guess ISIS), and of having destroyed materials to possibly cover up such felonies. I will (i) and (ii) together in subsequent paragraphs for now consider that ISIS is known to use bullion to trade between arms and oil.

### **Issue of FCA's Misfeasance**

I would think the FCA should have contacted the Metropolitan Police Force directly in this matter, if not, then the head of the FCA, Andrew Bailey, should resign. The Financial Times article dates from the 1<sup>st</sup> May 2016. So if the FCA were doing their job they should have notified your office before that date. That the FCA letter had to be leaked to the Financial Times suggests that field agents in the FCA knew that their executives were not making these matters public, when they should be public.

### **The Courts and the FCA knew of DB's money laundering back in July 2015**

In Feb 2015 I started a lawsuit B40BM021 against Deutsche Bank for silver price manipulation in the Birmingham Commercial Court. This was based upon private correspondence from Deutsche Bank that seemed to contradict its official line, published by Reuters on June 19 2014, that it was investigating itself for bullion price manipulation. I had challenged the board of Deutsche Bank to explain the discrepancy, and its members refused to do so.

Meanwhile in New York, it was facing another lawsuit for the same allegations of bullion price rigging, *London Silver Fixing Ltd Antritrust Litigation 14-MD-2573* under Judge Valerie E Caproni.

In both lawsuits Deutsche Bank issued a strike-out application, based upon the assertion that the claims were nuisance vexatious lawsuits – in other words they were petitioning courts to have claims dismissed and claimants barred from issuing further lawsuits.

In the US lawsuit, they lost, and were immediately forced to settle and expose their other collaborators. This is public domain news you can Google for yourself.

In the UK lawsuit, under Simon Brown QC, they won. A restraining order was issued against me, that declared that such a claim is totally without merit.

Now the applicant to that strike-out application was the first defendant, Anshu Jain, CEO of Deutsche Bank – who refused to attend his own oral hearing. That is normally deemed vexatious behaviour, and it is accepted by any lawful authority that the fundamental of a fair-hearing is the right to cross-examine the people who apply for it - so Jain's absence, together with the absence of his only witness, Emma Slatter, meant there was nobody to cross-examine on the state of Deutsche Bank's audits, and the hearing was patently unfair. In their defence Jain and DB submitted an explicit bare-denial – explicit in that 'bare-denial' was worded verbatim – and it submitted no evidence in its defence. These alone should have yielded summary judgment against all defendants.

In a previous claim for gold manipulation in the German courts (the Frankfurt Landgericht under Judge Frau Lorenz), Deutsche Bank had disputed the validity of a bullion trading receipt I issued in the court, although they did not dispute having sold and bought the bullion from me, nor did they allege a fraudulent lawsuit against me.

In the Birmingham lawsuit for silver manipulation, under Judge Simon Brown, I invited defendants to supply their own copies of the receipts, and I gave them my bank account number through which Over-The-Counter (OTC) bullion was transacted with me. They stonewalled the invitation and refused to issue receipts.

The other six defendants, UBS, RBS, HSBC, Barclays Bank, Citigroup and JP Morgan (all part of the proven Libor manipulation cartel), expressed no desire at all to see copies of the OTC receipts. They were ostensibly independent counterparties, each a competitor to Deutsche Bank in the silver bullion market, and yet none of them cared anything whatsoever to see trading receipts that I had alleged had been destroyed, nor they did see any importance in seeing evidence that undermined the validity of their audits. Any honest counterparty to Deutsche Bank's bullion trading should normally be very interested in a lawsuit in which that Deutsche Bank were manipulating the market in which the counterparty trades.

My conclusion, which was asserted as fact in materials before the July hearing, was that Deutsche Bank had destroyed its receipts as part of some accountancy fraud. Since there was investigations of money laundering to the Russians in 2014, to allow Russia to escape trade sanctions from the West, the very real possibility arose: ***Deutsche Bank had destroyed OTC bullion receipts systematically to cover up money laundering.***

The court materials in which this conclusion arose was supplied to the FCA and the SFO at the same time it was delivered to the courts. The FCA and the SFO were also informed that DB had refused to supply any evidence to substantiate the Reuters reports on their audit. They were also informed that the audit contradicted the correspondence DB sent to me, which was attached in emails to the SFO and the FCA. BaFin the German regulator, and Elke Konig, the former head of BaFin were all informed that the audit was probably fake. Neither party showed an interest to validate that audit, even as DB were under investigation by BaFin for bullion rigging and money laundering.

BaFin, the FCA and the SFO appear to have done nothing to inform the courts that the allegations of money laundering and destruction of materials to cover up money laundering were entirely consistent with their own findings.

The likely source of the misfeasance is George Osborne, who is accused by members of the US Congress of undermining the prosecution against HSBC for money laundering to the Mexican

drugs cartel. From the timestamp and the name on the restraining order against me, HSBC had arranged to have me barred from litigation BEFORE Deutsche Bank and Jain had been served with the Birmingham lawsuit. Given the defendants collusion, in hiding bullion price rigging and money laundering, one might guess that HSBC are exposed as collaborators in the cartel in the New York lawsuit.

### **On the Duties of the Lord Chief Justice**

The issue of OTC bullion laundering to Russians and terrorists was sent to Baron Thomas in an open letter to him by email and by post on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2016. Three weeks later, on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2016 Simon Brown of the July 2015 hearing, who was the subject of twenty points of misconduct in my appeal against his hearing, mysteriously retired early.

Simon Brown was not the only judge to have covered up money laundering and bullion rigging. He was assisted in a second court hearing by Lord Charles Haddon-Cave. In that second hearing, held on October 2015, corroboration of the evidence that UBS had confessed to the US DoJ in the matters alleged was kept out of court on the basis that defendants need not provide witness statements nor need testify. UBS's counsel did not even know whether her client admitted or denied perjury. No defendant turned up for court with a witness statement against the allegation of perjury. For allowing an obviously guilty party (UBS's confession is public domain and reported by Bloomberg and Reuters) to avoid having to plead against perjury, I demanded Haddon-Cave's recusal. He refused recusal without explanation. He refused to explain anything. He refused to force UBS to disclose its confession to the Court of Appeal. He at once denied that his court had jurisdiction in the matters, but at the same time went on to deliver a verdict anyway. He said that the confession was part of the July hearing, even though the news article was dated 28 September, and thus post dated the July hearing. It was an outright lie, and his conduct outright corrupt.

Baron Thomas is fully aware that Lord Charles Haddon-Cave collaborated with Anshu Jain to give Deutsche Bank and the other defendants effective immunity to market manipulation and money laundering.

### **The Failure of the Court of Appeal and JACO**

The issue of misconduct against Lord Charles Haddon-Cave and Simon Brown QC was handled by Lord Burnett in two appeals that shared the same appeal bundle. Paul Kernaghan's office spent about five months 'investigating' my allegations of misconduct against the two judges. In that time they refused to have commissioned or studied the transcripts of the hearings on the basis that it was 'inappropriate.' Thus five months of JCIO and JACO investigations involved no materials. They instead delegated the responsibility to Lord Burnett of the Court of Appeal.

The appeal was submitted shortly after the July hearing, after several attempts to have the appeal documents accepted, and when it was finally accepted in August 2015 the transcript to the July hearing that had been commissioned by the court was dragging on for months.

In the morning of the 18 Feb 2016, I sent an email to Steve Tai of the Court of Appeal, asking whether the *transcript of the hearing* had been completed. In the afternoon in the day that the court received that email, Lord Burnett immediately found against me. He had dismissed UBS's confession and deemed the allegations of misconduct and the accusations of bullion price manipulation totally without merit.

Since the timing of the emails make it look like the Court of Appeal was deliberately procrastinating, I sent an open letter of protest to the Lord Chief Justice. I had demanded to see the transcript of the hearing.

Baron Thomas, while acknowledging my email, refused to mention the transcript, and would not even say whether or not it existed. In parallel materials to JACO, Paul Kernaghan would not say whether it existed. Quite obviously, if it did not exist, then Lord Burnett was in no position to judge misconduct, and effectively allowed Deutsche Bank to get away with its crimes, once again.

After five letters to the Lord Chief Justice and Paul Kernaghan, I finally have a reply from

Mr Kernaghan that I may need to obtain the transcript of the hearing myself.

I asked Master Bancroft Rimmer of the Court of Appeal to commission a transcript of the hearing at public expense, for I came to believe only the transcript of the verdict was existant (and it should not have taken six months to procure). I was quite reasonable in the pursuit of justice to re-open the appeal that Lord Burnett closed. The Court of Appeal had been properly informed that Deutsche Bank's settlement was proof positive it had misled the Court of Appeal. It is apparent to all that Anshu Jain of Deutsche Bank submitted false documents to all courts, and refused to attend hearings because his bank's 'audit' was indefensible. Steve Tail, of the Court of Appeal staff, blocked my letter to Master Bancroft Rimmer, she whom originally commissioned the transcript to the verdict at public expense, so I sent it to her home address. During a search for that address I discovered her Facebook page, in which she lobbied to have Nigel Farage prosecuted for his Brexit poster. Quite obviously she cannot act as both prosecutor and judge. I received an email from the Court of Appeal, in which her secretary refused to handle my petition. The petition also was mailed back to me unread. Given these two instances of unprofessional conduct, I reported her to JACO, demanding her disqualification from office. The only prosecution for which she lobbied was for Nigel Farage, which suggested to me that she was a political activist. Given that the Court of Appeal is employing pro-EU political activists for judges, then it makes sense that their largesse towards Deutsche Bank is part of their largesse to the ECB and the EU project. DB having BaFin's approval to rig markets to the detriment of EU investors, is hardly news that the Breinain campaigners wanted broadcasting.

Baron Thomas is involved in drafting EU law. It seems to me he has surrounded himself with too many such partisan toffs, and it has undermined the integrity of his office, and more generally, the Rule of Law.

JACO seems to function to rubber-stamp Political Correctness into the system, and not do the job it is paid to do, which is investigate judges for corruption. Paul Kernaghan is new to JACO and has fallen at the first hurdle.

### **Conclusions**

I should think this letter gives you the ammunition you need to recuse Lord Burnett, Lord Haddon-Cave and even Baron Thomas himself in any legal action in which the judges stand against your police force. They have all conspired to pervert the course of justice in most serious matters. Simon Brown's early retirement is not enough. I would also expect that any prosecution brought by the police should demand that none of these individuals have any part in the proceedings.

### **On the Collusion of the SFO, & the FCA with Deutsche Bank and HSBC**

All of the materials exposing Deutsche Bank's fake audit and money laundering were delivered to the FCA via its email [market.abuse@fca.org.uk](mailto:market.abuse@fca.org.uk). Much of it was copied to the SFO via email [confidential@sfo.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:confidential@sfo.gsi.gov.uk). As regulators it was their duty to be aware of the lawsuit in which banks are accused of generalizing their market manipulation algorithms they used in Libor and FX manipulation to rig precious metal contracts on the COMEX.

They were in a position to know that my accusations in the High Court matched that of their own internal investigations. By keeping in quiet, as they did with HSBC and its Mexican Drugs Cartel money laundering, they are as much culpable in the frauds as Simon Brown and Anshu Jain. It is not the job of the regulators to conceal the frauds of banks. To do so is conspiracy to commit fraud and misconduct in public office.

If you lack any materials that you feel may be needed in the proof of these matters, feel free to email me and I will supply them. If these matters are not of the concern of the Metropolitan police force, say so and I will take you off the mail list.

Yours sincerely  
Mark Anthony Taylor