



Keison International Ltd.
PO Box 2124
CHELMSFORD CM1 3UP
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1245 600560
Fax: +44 1245 808399
Email: info@keison.co.uk

19 May, 2016

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth [II]
Windsor Castle
England

May it please Your Majesty,

Final decision by Mr. Registrar Baister in the High Court 9 May, 2016

When Keison International Limited (hereinafter called the company) were served with the purported statutory demand and covering letter from Hill & Abbott, the inference was that the company either pay the sum demanded by Hill & Abbott or they would seek to wind up the company. The statutory demand gave no other options.

Upon closer examination of the statutory demand, it was discovered that the crucial part relating to the right of the company to apply for an injunction had been deliberately omitted.

This omission was grounds for the subsequent letter from the company to the bankruptcy court on 5 May, 2016 and was a complete defense to any proceedings in this matter as **the statutory demand did not comply with the statutory requirements and rules pursuant to it, making it a nullity.**

This being so, the company did not need to take any further action and would rely on the **void proceedings** should the matter proceed to a winding up petition hearing.

A winding up petition was issued on 18 March, 2016 and the matter set down for hearing on 9 May, 2016 at 10:30 am.

On Thursday 5 May, 2016, the company faxed and couriered a letter to the Bankruptcy Court laying out the reasons for not complying with the statutory demand and any other proceedings based on it. The letter was to be presented as evidence in the winding up petition hearing before Registrar Baister on 9 May, 2016 and referred to two claim numbers, one relating to the Winding Up Petition CR-2016-001440 and the other for an Administration Application C12-2016-002292 ('C12' was later penned out¹ and replaced by 'CR' on the "order").

The only notice that the company had received for the Administration Application was via an email sent to Keir Argent by Doug Frame of Hill & Abbott and dated 27 April, 2016 at 16:57 hrs. Attached to the email were the application notice and other documents, minus the supporting evidence, that were apparently personally served on the company that same day.

¹ Indicating, we believe, to those in the know of this 'code', that the **document is fraudulent.**

The email did not specifically say who served the documents on the company but the witness statement of Doug Frame dated 4 May, 2016, confirmed that he effected personal service.

On 4 May, 2016 at around 17:40 hrs, some documents were delivered to the company by a young man driving a Saab with a hand written note from Doug Frame asking that they be inserted into “the bundle”.

This was to imply that the company was already in possession of “the bundle” that Doug Frame had purportedly personally served on the company on 27 April, 2016.

The Application Notice and supporting documents, including the supporting evidence was never served on the company, the witness statement of Doug Frame notwithstanding.

Unusually, process servers were not utilised throughout these proceedings as Doug Frame thought fit to effect service of legal process himself. In a document with the title “witness statement”, there is a paragraph which claims to be a statement of truth in support of the statutory demand. To our knowledge **Doug Frame has not completed an affidavit of service** that must be filed in support of service of the administration application. The witness statement gives no other details of the person served or method of service.

One must wonder why the imperative that service of the statutory demand, the winding up petition and the administration application were effected the same day they were either drawn up or issued, albeit the sealed administration application was never formally served on the company.

We now have a **knowingly defective statutory demand fraudulently used to obtain a winding up petition** and an Administration Application with the company receiving no formal notice of the hearing of the Application.

As the company had never been served with the Administration Application, they were not represented at the hearing on 6 May, 2016, before Mr Justice Morgan, and were unaware that an Administration Order had been granted and the winding up petition ordered to **be dismissed**.

The hearing of the winding up petition came before Mr Registrar Baister on 9 May, 2016 and the ***petition was dismissed***. **The company believes that this decision was made in light of the letter presented to the court and has ended present proceedings in this matter**.

It then came to the attention of the company in an email dated 16 May, 2016, where Doug Frame confirmed that the letter sent to the bankruptcy court, had also been brought to the attention of Mr Justice Morgan, together with *Court of Record* documents.

It would seem that in order to bring life to a dead document, Mr Justice Morgan ignored the contents of the company letter dated 5th May 2016 pointing out the fundamental defect in the statutory demand and granted the administration application and ordered that the winding up petition be dismissed, not by him, but by Mr Registrar Baister on 9 May, 2016.

The same proceedings cannot be dismissed by two different judges, if Mr Justice Morgan dismissed the winding up petition then Registrar Baister would have had nothing to dismiss at his hearing.

Even **if** Mr Registrar Baister was compelled to strike the claim out for reasons given in the letter from the company, he was unable to do so. He was ordered to dismiss the winding up petition. The decision was not of his own accord or freely given.

Mr Justice Morgan granted the Administration Application for the company to be run by administrators even though it had been brought to his attention by way of the company letter, that not only is the statutory demand defective and a nullity, but that it applied to any other proceedings, such as the administration application that flowed from it. This is the tyranny of a **Star Chamber Court with Dual Roman Magistracy²**.

The decision of Mr Justice Morgan has caused tremendous upheaval within the company and prevented the company from continuing to trade in lawful manner. It appears that the purpose is to destroy the company using **colour of law fraud**.

The company also noticed that there was no advertisement placed in the Gazette at least 7 working days before the hearing saying the petition has been served and it is therefore unlikely that a copy of the advertisement and a certificate of compliance was sent to the court at least 5 working days before the hearing.

If the court accepts your petition, they'll arrange a date for a hearing.

The court hearing

Announce the hearing

When you're given a date for the hearing, you must formally announce when and where it will take place.

1) Use form 4.6 to place an advert in The Gazette at least 7 working days before the hearing saying the petition has been served.

2) Send a copy of the advertisement and a certificate of compliance to the court at least 5 working days before the hearing.

3) Give a list of everyone who will be attending to the court by 4:30pm on the day before the hearing.

Quoted from: <https://www.gov.uk/wind-up-a-company-that-owes-you-money/the-court-hearing>

At approximately 09:00 on Monday 9 May 2016, administrator Abigail Jones arrived at the property at 32 Writtle Road, Chelmsford, claimed to be in possession of a 'court order' and proceeded to demand entry under its 'authority', this despite a clear notice at the entrance "Court of Record Trust Property". The bank accounts of HSBC, Lloyds and Barclays were inoperable that morning, indicating **collusion of the banks without lawful due process or authority**. There is mounting evidence that international banks and bankers are in collusion as well.

LEGAL TUTORIAL: The Steps of Common Fraud:

Step 1: **Fraud in the Inducement:** "... is intended to and which does cause one to execute an instrument, or make an agreement... The misrepresentation involved does not mislead one as the paper he signs but rather misleads as to the true facts of a situation, and the false impression it causes is a basis of a decision to sign or render a judgment" Source: Steven H. Gifis, 'Law Dictionary', 5th Edition, Happaage: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 2003, s.v.: 'Fraud'.

² This is covered in the *Court of Record* proceedings, www.courtofrecord.uk/timber.

Step 2: **Fraud in Fact by Deceit** (Obfuscation and Denial) and Theft:

- “**ACTUAL FRAUD**. Deceit. **Concealing something or making a false representation** with an **evil intent [scanter]** when it causes injury to another...”. Source: Steven H. Gifis, ‘Law Dictionary’, 5th Edition, Happaage: Barron’s Educational Series, Inc., 2003, s.v.: ‘Fraud’.
- “**THE TORT OF FRAUDULENT DECEIT**... The elements of actionable deceit are: A false representation of a material fact made with knowledge of its falsity, or recklessly, or without reasonable grounds for believing its truth, and with intent to induce reliance thereon, on which plaintiff justifiably relies on his injury...”. Source: Steven H. Gifis, ‘Law Dictionary’, 5th Edition, Happaage: Barron’s Educational Series, Inc., 2003, s.v.: ‘Deceit’.

Step 3: **Theft by Deception and Fraudulent Conveyance:**

THEFT BY DECEPTION:

- “**FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT**... The **hiding or suppression of a material fact** or circumstance which the party is **legally or morally bound to disclose**...”.
- “The test of whether failure to disclose material facts constitutes fraud is the existence of a duty, legal or equitable, arising from the relation of the parties: failure to disclose a material fact with intent to mislead or defraud under such circumstances being equivalent to an actual ‘fraudulent concealment’...”.
- **To suspend running of limitations**, it means the employment of artifice, planned to prevent inquiry or escape investigation and mislead or hinder acquirement of information disclosing a right of action, and acts relied on must be of an affirmative character and fraudulent...”.

Source: Black, Henry Campbell, M.A., ‘Black’s Law Dictionary’, Revised 4th Edition, St Paul: West Publishing Company, 1968, s.v. ‘Fraudulent Concealment’.

FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE:

- “**FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE**... A conveyance or transfer of property, the object of which is to defraud a creditor, or hinder or delay him, or to put such property beyond his reach...”.
- “Conveyance made with intent to avoid some duty or debt due by or incumbent or person (entity) making transfer...”.

Source: Black, Henry Campbell, M.A., ‘Black’s Law Dictionary’, Revised 4th Edition, St Paul: West Publishing Company, 1968, s.v. ‘Fraudulent Conveyance’.

Fraud by Doug Frame from Hill & Abbott is covered by the Fraud Act 2006 sections 2, 3:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/35/crossheading/fraud>

1 Fraud

(1) A person is guilty of fraud if he is in breach of any of the sections listed in subsection (2) (which provide for different ways of committing the offence).

(2) The sections are—

- (a) section 2 (**fraud by false representation**),
- (b) section 3 (**fraud by failing to disclose information**), and
- (c) section 4 (**fraud by abuse of position**).

(3) A person who is guilty of fraud is liable—

- (a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a **fine** not exceeding the **statutory maximum** (or to both);
- (b) on conviction on indictment, to **imprisonment** for a term not exceeding **10 years** or to a fine (or to both).

(4) Subsection (3)(a) applies in relation to Northern Ireland as if the reference to 12 months were a reference to 6 months.

2 Fraud by false representation

(1) A person is in breach of this section if he—

- (a) dishonestly makes a false representation, and
- (b) intends, by making the representation—
 - (i) to make a gain for himself or another, or
 - (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

(2) A representation is false if—

- (a) it is untrue or misleading, and
- (b) the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading.

(3) “Representation” means **any** representation as to fact or law, **including³ a representation as to the state of mind of —**

- (a) the person making the representation, or
- (b) **any other person**.

(4) A representation may be express or implied.

³ Did Parliament commit fraud by not using an *including but not limited to*? It is our wish that the *Court of Record* investigate the Law Commission and all members involved.

(5) For the purposes of this section a representation may be regarded as made if it (or anything implying it) is submitted in any form to any system or device designed to receive, convey or respond to communications (with or without human intervention).

3 Fraud by failing to disclose information

A person is in breach of this section if he —

- (a) dishonestly fails to disclose to another person information which he is under a legal duty to disclose, and
- (b) intends, by failing to disclose the information—
 - (i) to make a gain for himself or another, or
 - (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

4 Fraud by abuse of position

(1) A person is in breach of this section if he—

- (a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person,
- (b) dishonestly abuses that position, and
- (c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—
 - (i) to make a gain for himself or another, or
 - (ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

(2) A person may be regarded as having abused his position even though his conduct consisted of an omission rather than an act.

5 “Gain” and “loss”

(1) The references to gain and loss in sections 2 to 4 are to be read in accordance with this section.

(2) “Gain” and “loss”—

- (a) extend only to gain or loss in money or other property;
- (b) include any such gain or loss whether temporary or permanent;

and “property” means any property whether real or personal (including⁴ things in action and other intangible property).

(3) “Gain” includes a gain by keeping what one has, as well as a gain by getting what one does not have.

(4) “Loss” includes a loss by not getting what one might get, as well as a loss by parting with what one has.

6 Possession etc. of articles for use in frauds

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if he has in his possession or under his control any article for use in the course of or in connection with any fraud.

4 Once again, is this use of ‘including’ mean including but not limited to?

(2) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable—

(a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or to both);

(b) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years or to a fine (or to both).

(3) Subsection (2)(a) applies in relation to Northern Ireland as if the reference to 12 months were a reference to 6 months.

7 Making or supplying articles⁵ for use in frauds

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if he makes, adapts, supplies or offers to supply any article—

(a) knowing that it is **designed or adapted for use in the course of or in connection with fraud**, or

(b) intending it to be used to commit, or assist in the commission of, fraud.

(2) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable—

(a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or to both);

(b) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding **10 years or to a fine (or to both)**.

(3) Subsection (2)(a) applies in relation to Northern Ireland as if the reference to 12 months were a reference to 6 months.

8 "Article"

(1) For the purposes of—

(a) sections 6 and 7, and

(b) the provisions listed in subsection (2), so far as they relate to articles for use in the course of or in connection with fraud,

"article" includes⁶ any program or data held in electronic form.

Doug Frame et al have broken each and every one of the above and are **fully accountable** under UNITED KINGDOM PLC statutes and the **Common Law of England**, which is, as is known amongst the cognoscenti, to be based on the Word of God revealed in the King James Bible.

It is of vital importance to take *conscious cognisance*, that prior to my return to UK on 5 December, 2015 and anticipating my possible demise or incapacity, I had prepared a signed document placing my affairs in the hands of Joseph Ray Sundarsson, Special Master of the *Court of Record*, should the latter take place.

⁵ Every document produced by solicitor Doug Frame is an article for use in fraud.

⁶ As his 'articles' were sent both in paper and electronic form, even the statutory dodge of 'includes' will not assist Douglas Frame, Hill and Abbot, H.W. Fisher and Company and the Mr. Justice Morgan from the maximum penalty under the statutes of the UNITED KINGDOM, the law they claim to revere.

As it happened I was assaulted and battered in my own home and within an hour, police were called whereupon I was incarcerated at Chelmsford Police Station, while my wife and family abandoned me to take their Christmas holidays and cruises. During my incarceration, my family had taken that statement from my private papers and placed it in the hands of Doug Frame, witnessed by Minal Backhouse.

Whilst fortunately still living, I am denied the capacity to manage my business, therefore Joseph Ray Sundarsson, Special Master of the *Court of Record*, is now in charge of these affairs.

All are equal under God's law, even one's own son. My son lives in a Christian kingdom, behaves like a tyrant and has committed Treason. He appears **not to understand the meaning of words**, he has had **no change of heart** as claimed by Doug Frame.

I can see that the *Court of Record* is leading to **Truth**, how Joseph Ray Sundarsson is a man of YHVH and I trust him. Like Jesus outlined in Luke 19, **my company is my vineyard** that I left and went away and now these administrators think it is theirs.

As the fountain of justice, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth [II], our living Queen, must appoint all magistrates who are guardians of her Majesty's Coronation oath. Her Majesty may constitute legal courts for the administration of the general law of the land, but Her Majesty cannot erect tribunals not proceeding according to the known and established law of the realm, such as the Star Chamber forbidden by the **1688 Bill of Rights** or the commissions of martial law forbidden by the **1628 Petition of Right**.

The hearing of 6th May 2016 before Mr Justice Morgan did not proceed according to these principles and was therefore operating **de facto Star Chamber proceedings**. The **administration order** is a *brutum fulmen* and it **has no lawful authority** and like the statutory demand, is **void ab initio**.

Mr Justice Morgan, by usurping Her Majesty's authority, **doth compass or imagine the death of Her Majesty**, which is an **overt act of treason** under the **treason act of 1351 (C2)**.

Consequent to the *Letter Rogatory to the British Cabinet/Parliament*⁷ by the *Court of Record*, **all officials were stripped of immunity and limited liability** by the *Motu Proprio* of His Holiness Pope Francis of 11 July, 2013 and **effective from 1 September, 2013**.

There is a saying one bad apple spoils the whole barrel. Find one rotten apple and all have to go.

It is our wish that in the **public interest**, those arrested are questioned, leading to **arrests of all colluding parties and puppet-masters** worldwide.

In the Westminster system of nations, the Bishop of Rome is the settlor of the law, the unalterable Law of God to Your Majesty, with the resulting corporate 'nation states', for example, UNITED KINGDOM, or for example, PANAMA⁸.

As **banks are the instrumentality of the 'nation state'**, all bankers worldwide, private or public, national association or credit cooperative, central bank or retail, are subject to Your Majesty's authority of arrest, wherever in the world they may be.

⁷ www.courtofrecord.uk/British-PDF

⁸ Further information on this matter *sub judice* regarding Panama shall follow in due course to Your Majesty.

As a member of the *Court of Record*, I am aware of steps in Admiralty to arrest the Treasonous bankers, for example, in Hong Kong. It is my wish that Your Majesty act with due speed to hold all lawyers, solicitors, bankers and governments **fully accountable**.

http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1990/apr/18/courts-and-legal-services-bill#S6CV0170P0_19900418_HOC_261

Mr. John Morris (Aberavon)

"Any attempt to water down the **collective responsibility of judges**, who have exercised such rights since time immemorial, would be wrong."

Summary Judgement

It is my wish as plaintiff, that Doug Frame, Alexis Argent, Abigail Jones, Brian Johnson and Mark Gishen **are arrested** and delivered to the custody of the Her Royal Highness Princess Anne, The Princess Royal, in Her Majesty's *Court of St James*.

I adore YHVH, BEING, the LORD, with all my heart for Your Majesty!

Yours faithfully,

KEISON INTERNATIONAL LTD

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "K. Argent". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'K'.

Keir Argent
Managing Director