



*Common Law Courts
Great Britain & International*

John Smith
CLC Embassy
Cruinn House
1 Wurzburg Court
Dundee
[DD2 1FB]

Date: 10th April 2024
James Paton
Employment Appeal Tribunal (EAT)
George House
126 George Street
Edinburgh, EH2 4HH

ET No. 80000177/2023
EA-2023-SCO-000113-JP

Leave to Appeal to the Court of Session

F.A.O. James Paton,

I write to you as I have been informed by Mathew Gullick KC, that if I wished to continue, I will have to obtain leave to Appeal to the Court of Session.

The previous Appeal was refused by Mathew Gullick KC, without merit, to highlight the grounds that I rely upon, please note the following:

1. The parties in the Employment Tribunal had never been established. Despite seeking clarity regarding the position of the Defendant, no facts were presented to establish this position and no authorities were produced. I did, however, produce an ownership deed for the PERSON which was lodged in the case file, this was not challenged.
2. Judge Kemp, dealing with the issue above failed to give due regard of the merits of this point, as no parties had been established, the case should have been struck off for failure to identify the parties involved.
3. The position of the Claimant had not been established as the Claimant could have been a PERSON, a corporation, or a Living Man/Woman. This was challenged but the issue was ignored and by proceeding and choosing to depart from the operation of law, Judge Kemp was guilty of attempting to traffic the PERSON involved.
4. In refusing to produce a signed contract, Mathew Gullick stated that this can be evidenced by other means, this would have been acceptable if the other means had been established. As no other means were presented, this confirmed and established that there



Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

was no contract, I had presented my ownership deeds for the PERSON referred to, but this inequitably was ignored.

5. The Employment tribunal failed to establish authority or jurisdiction to deal with this matter. This issue had been raised on numerous occasions but was ignored.

When this challenge had been made, it was not possible for a judge just to claim that they had authority and jurisdiction. If facts are ignored, in a dispute about jurisdiction, the proper course to follow, by operation of Law, was to refer this issue to a superior court. Failure to do so may be a reckless abandonment of jurisprudence principles and be an automatic ground for appeal. A judge must always act in the Public Interest and in performing their role as independent arbiter, they must demonstrate at all times, that they have a character above reproach.

This also seems to be a failing in the Scottish judicial system as we do not have a fully independent and impartial system, this point also confirms that we have not had a lawful legal system in place since the creation of the Scottish Parliament. As evidenced by, the qualified expert on the subject, Roger Livermore.

6. The statement made by Mathew Gullick KC, that "*the Employment Tribunal was empowered by an Act of Parliament to determine the claim that was made*" is reasonably questionable.

How can The Scottish Parliament empower any court or tribunal to deal with any issue when it is not independent of the crown office and the courts, as there is no separation of powers, how can they comply with the Rule of Law?

How could the Lord Advocate be prosecuted for committing criminal offences when the case would have to be raised by the Lord Advocate? This would open up the Scottish courts, their staff, the Scottish Government and the Lord Advocate to a private prosecution, which they could not reasonably defend.

If there is no Rule of Law, you have no lawful justice system and no credible democracy.

7. On the issue of an order issued by the International Common Law Court, this has already been legally accepted as binding within the UK legal system, and an insolvency practitioner has already accepted the following, please note:
 - The International Common Law Court is a separate judicial system,
 - the lawfully issued Common Law Court Order,
 - the lawful finding of guilt against the Defendant,
 - the award for damages which was made against the guilty Defendant,
 - they have accepted the award of damages as a legal debt and have attached it as part of an insolvency procedure, and



Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

- this award is now being enforced through the insolvency practitioner with the named Plaintiff, listed as a creditor.
8. Referring to point 7 above, it is clear that we are dealing with a conflict of laws, and two judicial systems. This point was raised on various occasions but was ignored.

What authority did the judge rely upon to choose to ignore the issue of a conflict of laws and what authority did he rely on which allowed him to ignore a lawfully issued court order?

At the very least, before proceeding with this case, the issue of a conflict of laws needed to be addressed.

9. Although with this point, we are not questioning the mental competence of the judges, that dealt with this case, there does seem to be an issue with their understanding in relation to the written word.

Both judges seem to ignore the fact that the paperwork lodged in the case file, confirms that the living man (John Smith) had obtained ownership of the PERSON (MS KENDRA MANN), the appropriate ownership deed was also lodged in the case file.

Both judges in this case chose to refuse to acknowledge this fact and chose to state that 'one person cannot own another under the law of Scotland' which is irrelevant, as I demonstrated, as a matter of record, that a living individual can own a PERSON and that We the People are all Living Men and Living Women.

There was no challenge made to the ownership deed and no challenge issued to the 'We the People' who had had issued this ownership deed.

As this deed was not challenged, it stands as a fact in law. Accordingly, this confirms that the judges had no authority or jurisdiction to deal with this case.

10. The Employment Tribunal is capable of being found guilty of failing to comply with international law, as they have failed to:
- acknowledge or accept, Living Men/Women,
 - acknowledge the Living Men/Women within the Cruinn Community,
 - address the issue of committed fraud,
 - address the issue of slavery in this case,
 - address the issue of racism in this case, and
 - address the issue of ignoring the religious beliefs for members of the Cruinn Community.



Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

11. In relation to the final point made by Mathew Gullick KC, it was stated that no arguable error of law was set out, which may be a deliberate attempt to mislead the court, as it is not based on facts. I disagree and draw your attention to the following:

- the parties were not established, no evidence was provided to confirm their standing, despite the requests made. This is not equitable in law.
- no authority or jurisdiction had been established, despite the challenge that was made. This is not equitable in law.
- Judge Kemp, chose to refuse to deal with the issue of a conflict of laws,
- Judge Kemp chose to refuse to accept the authority of The People and their lawfully issued order,
- Judge Kemp, chose to refuse to provide a legal authority he was relying on or a Rule of Law to explain why he chose to ignore the issued International Common Law Court Order,
- Judge Kemp did not act equitably in dismissing lawful Common Law Court deeds. In doing so, Judge Kemp undermined the Rule of law and disregarded the right that Living Men and Women have to choose not to consent to a court jurisdiction which engages in slavery practices,
- despite the need to investigate fully the case before him, and to ensure that justice was done, Judge Kemp refused an adjournment to deal with the many issues that were raised, believing that he could proceed without establishing his authority to do so,
- the devolution act in 1998 was responsible for removing the Rule of Law in Scotland, as well as the separation of the powers. This made it impossible for Scotland to have a lawful, constitutional, and functioning justice system which remains tainted, as a result. This case confirms this position.

By Operation of Law, this confirmed that the Employment Tribunal did not have the authority or jurisdiction to proceed with this case,

- the Scotland Act 1998 unlawfully transferred what must be an independent judicial process, over to the control of the Scottish Government. The Act produced a political and unlawfully party-controlled justice system, an unlawfully government-controlled police force, and an unlawful government-dependent judiciary. A tainted and inequitable judicial system which does not deal with facts is anathema to justice.



Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

- the first and main requirement of the Rule of Law is that no-one can be outside the law, especially not a government. The Scotland Act 1998 made the Scottish Government the prosecutor and the investigator of crimes, and thereby unconstrained by, or answerable to the law and the Scottish judiciary have participated and allowed this unlawful situation to exist, to protect Vested Interests rather than to preserve the Public Interest.

In conclusion, although we are dealing with an employment dispute, the issues involved need to be addressed in the correct forum. I put it to the Court of Session that leave to proceed must be granted in the interests of justice and the Rule of Law, this would then allow me to obtain a ruling which could provide a way forward.

We are currently dealing with two separate jurisdictions, which exist as a fact in law. We are also dealing with the issue of a conflict of laws, the issue of Living Men/Women and the legal entity of the PERSON, which cannot be lawfully ignored.

To ensure that we return to the Rule of Law to a system that is fit for purpose, the above issues need to be addressed. This case has inadvertently exposed the failings within the current legal system and if leave to proceed with this action is refused, it will only confirm what we already know. Albeit those responsible must reasonably expect to be inevitably held Personally Accountable.

John Smith

Subject solely to the authority and jurisdiction
of Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

