

## **Document A**

**All points raised are referenced with a letter and number applied to each screenshot of relevance from various documents. The associated document bundles are provided along with this complaint, each referenced as 'Doc' along with number. Apologies that some of the documents and screenshots are not presented in numerical & alphabetical, chronological order; due to case complexities and weight of evidence to include, some items have had to be included later in the final case presentation. Nonetheless, each item of evidence is clearly marked.**

I Ella Gareeva, formerly Ella Draper, here present my witness statement as originally submitted to CCRC, along with original and new evidence to support my complaint against Mrs Justice Pauffley's Family-Division, High Court Judgement on March 20th 2015 (Doc1), which found in favour of lawful suspects alleged as operating in a group, for purpose of organized crimes against children and babies. Although many people were exonerated via said Judgement, only one suspect was in attendance at that Hearing.

**In the interest of child protection and prevention of crimes against children, I request an urgent review into the case presented herein.**

I refer specifically, to my children's crime reports of September 5th, 2014 cited to London, Barnet police and thereafter, Barnet police and other local authority/LA and UK Court responses to those crime reports which cite extensive details related to organised child sexual abuse, sadistic and ritual abuse and murder, alleged to be regularly practised by what appears to be, a Satanic Cult whose members include their estranged father and others, who occupy a variety of prominent positions within every London authority of law, courts, police, healthcare, education etc., as well as, various business people, clergy and leisure centre staff.

Main sites of alleged abuse are Christchurch School and adjoining Church in school grounds. Other alleged sites include, Finchely Swimming Baths, a Coffee Shop, a MacDonalds, teachers homes and properties provided by an estate-agent

- all located in and around Hampstead London. Some alleged venues of abuse i.e. School Church and teachers homes, are cited as having "secret rooms" used specifically for organised abuse.

My statement and evidence as presented below, refers to father: RD, myself, Ella Draper/mother: ED, my children girl and boy then age 9 & 8, their half-brother (my eldest son): J, my then partner: AC and also, numerous others by name or initial, as among various suspects, professionals and witnesses, as are directly related to this case.

Since RD was the only suspect from 70+ named and known others, to be so much as questioned by Barnet police in relation to our children's crime reports, the transcript of his tape-recorded interview with police is surely, a vital submission of evidence to the Court in terms of proving RD, alleged "*head of the special culture*", as "completely innocent" via evidence provided by apparently, "*thorough and extensive*" police investigations: Somehow, Mrs Justice Pauffley failed to notice the severe, police failures exposed in that interview.

**Discrepancies within said \*interview are exposed here, with attention focusing first on the 2nd part of that interview (tape 2) and with references also, to police tape 1. (Doc2)**

*\*It is to be noted that RD was contacted by police through a 3rd party at social services and had benefitted from a few days notice in order to prepare for that interview. He arrived at an undisclosed police station with a solicitor and was informed by police that he was free to end that interview at any time:*

Prior to police interview with RD, child witness, age 8, reported to Interviewing Officer DC Steve Martin, that his Dad has "pictures of him doing sex to me on his computer" and in another interview, same child reports to DC Martin that his Dad forces him to sniff "white powder". \*The child describes the impact and effects of the "white powder", he explains that the white powder is kept in a "big bag" and that he also, puts it in "lots of little mini-bags". *Such bags are known to used by drug-dealers.*(Doc 3)

***\*It is noted that above allegations were not volunteered by boy witness (as would be expected in event of 'coaching') but rather, were in prompt response to questions asked by DC Martin - such promptness in response to police questioning is indicative that child witnesses are describing real events and crimes.***

DC Martin did not see fit to arrest RD nor to seize his computer for investigation nor search his home or person for illegal drugs.

While other allegations are deemed 'incredible', still, no mention of those very credible allegations are presented to RD by police in their single interview with RD.

**Both children had repeatedly stated on record that they had lived in fear under threat of death, if ever they "broke the deal" via disclosing details of the crimes they had allegedly, regularly suffered and witnessed from early childhood**

**during contact visits with their estranged dad: RD was never questioned about that threat.**

### **RD Police Interview**

Given the nature and detail in the volume of allegations against RD, it is noticeable that his police interview equates to only two tapes, while in comparison, police interview with ED is 5 tapes: According to police and other authorities, ED's statement is evidence that she is suffering from "mental instability". Nothing ED shares in the police interview is given any credibility and yet, by contrast, RD's claims of historical and present-day 'malicious accusations' against him from ED and children, are given top priority to the extent they form the foundation of Barnet police assumptions and approach: Only RD's version of events makes sense to them.

**Why was RD granted positive police discrimination while \*ED recieved the opposite?**

*\*Surely, a concerned mum who has full custody of her children with no criminal record, a Master's Degree graduate who runs her own nutrition business, would ordinarily receive greater credibility as a witness, than an unemployed suspect, semi-professional actor with a criminal record and history of violence and aggression against his children and their mum - children with whom, contact was restricted to a few hours every fortnight after periods of supervised contact only, by order of local authorities?*

**Of further concern and especially, given the nature of later 'retractions', Barnet police decided it was not necessary to interview AC. (A4)**

**At no point was RD presented with the findings of police-invited medical expert, Dr Deborah Hodes.**

On Tape 2, Barnet police officer, DC Savage's interview with RD (in presence of DC Martin), cites approximately 109 comments from DC Savage: 80 of those

comments consist of the single phrases: right, okay, yeah, yes, hmm, so and no, in responses to RD: Certainly, DC Savage is not much interested in questioning RD and one might wonder what was the purpose of that interview beyond providing a reason to support the idea that ED is an unfit parent who will do or say anything to discredit RD?

Approximately 128 comments on Tape 2, are from RD: 32 of his comments consist of single phrases: okay, yes, no, yeah, i know and hmm in response to DC Savage.

Only 29 comments from DC Savage amount to more than one or two words. None of those comments refer to children's allegations. Only one allegation related to historical abuse, is mentioned by DC Savage, on Tape 1 and still, the crime is not presented to RD in the way it was described by boy-child witness, RD's son who describes his recollection of abuse at age 4 in a swimming baths and yet, RD is unchallenged as he attempts to account for the incident by referring to a more recent time at that swimming baths during contact visit.

Clearly, RD was questioned according to police protocols for recording witness testimony i.e. Minimal questions and interruptions from police. This is in direct contrast with the manner in which children were interviewed:

*'Ideal ABE interviews would show minimal questioning with an 80%-20% split of conversation in the ratio of witness 80% interviewer 20% (or less) of the conversation.'* (Doc4)

It is evident that RD was permitted to ramble on about matters related to historical, child-contact issues and domestic acrimony between himself and ED and through which, RD presents ED as a malicious character who blindly refuses to accept he is a "fantastic dad", none of which, has any bearing on the child allegations referring to historical and ongoing; sexual abuse, illegal drugs, child trafficking, making of child pornography and 'snuff' videos, child prostitution, organized crime, torture and murder of babies.

Police had prior knowledge of the family; they knew of RD's criminal history of

violence and aggression. They knew of ED's (then age 7) eldest son's historical police statements against RD citing him as violent, abusive, manipulative and controlling. Also known to police and LAs, was the historical statement provided by a concerned neighbour who contacted authorities after he heard the children screaming at their mum whom he said "*appeared confused*"; said neighbour states that things had been "*a lot calmer*" since RD had vacated the home. He describes RD as a violent and abusive character - he says, "*most of the neighbours are scared of him*". (A1)

**It is evident therefore, that said neighbour may have contacted authorities due to concerns that the screaming was related to presence of RD, who had previously returned unexpectedly on occasion, to assault, harass and intimidate ED and children, long after he had vacated their home.**

DC Savage knew from RD's statements on Tape 1 and by ED's statement to police, that he had not had contact with his children for a period of 2 years by his own choice, while he travelled to America and India, that he had never provided for his children financially despite his having appropriated to himself, over £75,000 from

ED's personal funds during their relatively short relationship (*for purpose of starting his own business from which, no income ever materialised*) and furthermore, according to his statement, it appears that RD was after his return, granted only supervised contact with his children until, just a few months prior to the allegations. (A8)

It is strange that DC Savage did not therefore, query RD's statement that he is a "fantastic father". DC Savage fails to ask RD why he left England to stay in America and also, India, when according to him, his children were left alone with a "malicious, neglectful" mother who fails to feed them properly and has no control over them?

RD states that he is "vegan" same as ED; why no focus on what *he* fed his children then? His children claim he "eats babies" and feeds *them* baby too: *Again, another opportunity to discuss the allegations is ignored by DC Savage.*

DC Savage, also fails to ask any questions as raised by ED's earlier interview with

Barnet police: He fails to ask why RD was so upset to the point he took legal action against ED about his daughter going to stay with her grandparents in Russia, when it appears he was quite happy to forgo all contact with his children for two years?

On his return to Britain, RD went so far as to acquire legal resource that meant ED had to hand over her children's passports to LA's in order to prevent their possible move to France: *This is an important point because according to original allegations, an ulterior motive behind his 'concerns' is evidenced: It is apparent that RD could have been worried about what his daughter may disclose to grandparents and/or that she was no longer available for abuse and associated profits to himself. (A2)*

RD claims he's "*won every court case*", when actually, the opposite is true, with ED being granted non-molestation and injunction orders against RD and subsequently, RD being granted only supervised contact with his children (*though children state they nonetheless, saw dad almost every day at school*): DC Savage fails to put those facts to RD by way of challenging his claims of victimisation and

thereby, providing room to put forward the allegations and confirming, medical evidence, which was in police knowledge at time of the interview and, with medical expert adding to her report, that she has 'grave concerns'. (A3)

At no point does RD request that arrest and charges of child abuse be brought against mother and her partner. He does not request any investigation into partner. His main concern is that his children are at that point, in care and yet, according to his testimony, his children are safer in care than with their mother.

Since RD has stated on Tape 1 that he is fully aware of his children's allegations prior to attending the police interview; it is strange that on same Tape 1, nonetheless, he \*praises the porn industry for their skills in utilizing the internet and explains how he has been studying such methods with intent to utilise them for his own future, business purposes (A5, A6):

*\*Was this statement/admittance issued in order to provide 'cover' in event of police actually doing their job and investigating RD's online activity? ED had previously reported him to police for 'harassment' after RD repeatedly sent her*

*sexually explicit texts and links to internet porn sites.*

**More strange, is the fact that DC Savage does not seize on RD's reference to and knowledge of the internet porn industry, in relation to allegations about making and selling of child pornography.**

In relation to allegations of child trafficking, a quick internet search into RD's publicly viewable YouTube account, would have revealed that RD has solid connections to a Haiti orphanage, run by an American \*charity with connections to the Clintons. Other suspects have direct connections to children's charities in Africa and Asia. It is noted that RD has, since his Haiti Orphanage video for 'Love for Haiti' was exposed as evidence, now removed that video from his YouTube. Why? Still, we have video recorded evidence of that same YouTube video which shows conclusively, it is narrated by RD and was on his YouTube account.

*\*Suspects connections to children's charities abroad are an important point of evidence, being as, both child witnesses provide extremely detailed accounts*

*about who brought in the babies and how they arrived i.e. Sometimes by courier in boxes, taxi or collected from the airport or else, by two British social workers who "get the babies off poor people".*

**The reference to babies brought in by Social Workers is actually, well within the realms of probability, when we consider that on average, up to 200 babies under age 1, vanish from UK Social Services records every year and with no one able to give any account of what has become of those babies:**

<https://www.newsweek.com/thousands-missing-children-care-system-could-be-sexually-exploited-311607>

It is a known fact of evidence, that selling of child pornography is today, largely achieved via access to the internet and the 'dark web', which offers advantage of untraceable transactions via outsourced or encrypted IP addresses. Therefore, investigations into RD's online activities needed to be a matter of priority in the interim between children's crime reports and his arrival at police station for questioning: It is noted that police had written in their notes as submitted to the

Family Courts that; 'investigations into RD are ongoing'.

**What did those investigations amount to prior to his questioning? Why is there no record of said 'investigations'?**

Since at time of his interview and prior to going abroad, RD was of no fixed abode and surviving on State Benefits, why did DC Savage, in relation to possible funds earned via making and selling of child pornography and selling of illegal drugs, fail to ask RD to provide evidence as to how he had been able to afford visits to America and India for over a year and, how did he fund his stay in those countries during that time?

**Why did police fail to investigate RD's finances in relation to tracing possible funds earned through criminal activities and possibly laundered, through his online business ?**

A Catholic Friar operating in Camden and very close to alleged crime scenes; \*Mr

Gardner, was convicted in June 2014, for making and possessing, thousands of indecent images of children: Did Barnet police reinvestigate those images in an attempt to identify child witnesses and other, named and known children cited as suffering same abuse?

**No they did not.**

<https://www.hamhigh.co.uk/news/crime-court/catholic-friar-caught-with-sexual-image-of-dog-and-child-could-return-to-camden-church-1-3518921>

*\*Noticeably, London Courts did not prohibit Mr Gardner from having contact with "people under age 16" and his conviction amounting to a suspended sentence.*

Barnet police failed to investigate CCTV footage from around the school and local area; children describe being taken out of school on a Wednesday to various locations around Hampstead, allegedly for purpose of child prostitution: Surely, the prime purpose of CCTV in public places is to help with criminal investigations?

Instead, Barnet police were busy arranging a 'strategy meeting' with representatives from the school where suspect headteacher and teachers are

employed, so they can discuss the children's crime report and seek permission to search the school and adjoining church; was it any surprise that a few days later when the search happens, police find nothing of interest to the case? (A7) How is it possible that e.g. Ms K, headteacher at the school and an alleged member of abuser-group, is invited to a 'strategy meeting' by Barnet police, instead of being arrested and examined to confirm whether she does or does not have a "large red birthmark" on her genitals?

When one examines child witness and ED testimonies, it is apparent, that the police interview with RD, facilitates an 'explanation' for their collective allegations against him i.e. References to ED's reports of sexual harassment, a private party at Finchely swimming baths, how they used the larger family changing rooms there, visited a MacDonalds, Costa Coffee shop; the historical record provided by children to ED and Social Services, that RD had left them on a very high wall and drove off for 30 minutes, is explained by RD as a "*pack of lies that children were persuaded to believe really happened*". Reading through transcripts of RD's police interview, it seems clear that he's read every detail of the crime reports against him.

### **Child Witness Police Interviews:**

According to evidence cited via police CRIS reports, immediately after the aforementioned Strategy Meeting, Barnet police then *focused most of their attentions toward seizing the children from ED.* They were initially unsuccessful and had approached several professionals before finding one to support such action; within 6 days of entering LA care both children suddenly retracted their crime reports and yet, there is no record whatsoever about whom the children had approached, to request facilitating those retractions.

A detailed analysis of the manner in which Barnet police performed child witness interviews is shared in Kylie Wilson's Report as attached among documents. ED hired Ms Wilson to examine the police and home recordings of children's interviews and disclosures, after the case was closed as 'false' on September 22nd: Ms Wilson an ex-child protection police officer who, had never met ED and knew nothing about the case history, studied the transcripts purely, on their own merit

and with no predetermined opinion on the case. (Doc 4)

*'In the first interview of A on 05/09/2014 conducted by Steve there is little in the way of rapport building, in fact family structure appears to be used loosely to build rapport. This is not a suitable rapport topic. The style of interviewing is very closed. There are very few open questions and the interviewer interrupts or talks over A regularly. There is very little apparent structure to this interview and topic hopping is apparent. There is a forced choice question and a leading question. There is some use of minimal encouragers, silences and summaries, however a lot of the minimal encouragers are yes or okay and these are poor minimal encouragers that seem to leak that the interviewer is impatient, does not really want to listen to what is being said or perhaps has a particular specific agenda for the interview.'*

**Kylie Wilson was later admonished by police and LAs for her evidence and analytical contribution to this case.**

The points made by Ms Wilson fully support ED's concerns that Barnet police

were bias against her children from the moment they reported their crimes to DC Martin the Interviewing Officer/IO.

It is also, of concern to note, that there is no evidence of any attempt by the IO to corroborate one child witness statement with the other. He just lets the children disclose and then, tries to 'catch-them-out' by asking things like "Where did the white bowl come from?" - "Where did the goblet come from?" - "Which cupboard" etc. Why, when there are two witnesses and when his professional duty is to ensure that both witness accounts are supporting each other? (A9)

Two witnesses are much stronger evidence and therefore, attention first, is focused on making sure both crime reports support each other (which they do). This is standard police practice.

It is evident that DC Martin is using a pre-established formula toward covertly discrediting child CSA witnesses as they deliver their crime report. Clearly, he does not believe the children's original allegations and clearly, he does believe

their later partial retractions. Why? *Surely, a police officer's job is simply to determine the truth of whether a crime has been committed or not?*

Of significance is the fact that DC Martin invites boy witness to report an historical crime, asking him if he can remember the first time he was sexually abused and then, uses that incited disclosure to record the whole crime report as 'historical'; hence, RD is only questioned about that one historical incident. Boy witness cites abuse at age 4 in a changing cubicle for the disabled, at Finchely swimming baths while on a contact visit with RD and which included, teachers, parents and children from his sister's school.

Furthermore, DC Martin then, persuades boy witness to agree that he was abused by "20 people" as gathered in said disabled cubicle at same time: It is clear from boy's statement that there were around 20 people and other children at that private party and some waited outside the cubicle while others were in the pool. Finchely swimming baths did close to the public for purpose of private parties at certain times of the week: How would the boy know about this unless, he had attended a private party there - had he and his mum attended any private parties

there too?

DC Martin is only interested in *how many people were inside the disabled cubicle.*

DC Martin then uses the "20 people" confirmation to claim the boy's disclosure about that is 'false'. DC Martin neglects to take into account, the boy was recalling abuse at age 4. The child is only 8; to a child of 4, suffering painful abuse, it may have seemed there were *100 people in that cubicle.*

**Even more damning therefore, that DC Martin undermines even, that historical crime report from the offset, by persuading the child to agree to an impossibility as 'fact'.**

Even the IPCC 2016 Report which, despite upholding many of ED's complaints, clings to DC Martin's investigations of measuring said cubicle and proving that 20 adults could not fit into it. IPCC claim they believe DC Martin's 'investigation' of said cubicle is evidence to prove the incident did not happen even though the boy

adamantly reaffirms that in his later 'retraction'.

It is of concern to note the very different tone of the 2016 IPCC Report as compared to that of the 2015 IPCC Report: The word 'whitewash' springs to mind as it seems the only evidence of crime the IPCC can find, is 'minor negligence' calling for 'management actions', 'internal inquiries', 'more funding' and 'retraining'. At no point do they recommend further investigations of suspects nor do they accept suspicions of a perversion of the course of justice. (Doc 6 & Doc 6+)

This is in direct ignorance of the 2015 IPCC Report which very clearly, upholds the complaint that investigations were inadequate: Why was RD not arrested and investigated nor any of the other suspects?

It is easy for an adult with an ulterior motive, to trick a child into affirming a false statement and due to the nature of the crime report which includes police, social workers, clergy and teachers, the lawful suspicions raised via evidence related to questions about the swimming-baths, provide further grounds of evidence to support the risk that those officers handling this case, from the start, had no intention of investigating the crimes and employed their powers merely, to seize

the child witnesses and thereafter, *illicit retractions toward closing the case as 'false'*.

### **Children's Crime Reports: An Issue of National Security?**

ED is reliably informed that there was a D/A Notice placed on her case that prohibited media coverage of her concerns. Such a notice is given in relation to matters of 'national-security'. Does Britain's national-security depend on protecting powerful professionals from arrest and investigation? Apparently, it does because certainly, none of the regular media are interested to share the valid and lawful points of concern. The media only reported on the case in full support of Justice Pauffley's judgement.

The IPCC 2016 Report (Doc 6) states: **Point 6: *On balance of 'probabilities', the IPCC do 'not find any merit' in the allegation that the case was covered up so as not to cause a stir in society:***

To the contrary, all aforementioned suspicions and failures irrefutably support lawful suspicions related to a cover up and especially, when we weigh in the balance of probability the terrible scandal and embarrassment of London authorities to be exposed as potentially harbouring professionals engaged in criminal, group activities which include, selling children for sex and killing and eating trafficked babies.

The desire to hush this up with 'negligence' and 'retractions' is immense and in lawful fact, that is exactly what the suspect authorities did.

**If the children's crime reports really are a "hoax" then why prohibit the media from airing public concerns after the case got dumped into public awareness via Youtube in February 2015? Can a "hoax" be an issue of 'national security' when all it takes to prove that alleged 'hoax' is for even just one of suspect-teachers with genitals described & drawn e.g. Mr H, to submit to a police medical examination to prove he does *not* have "*red dots*" and a "*tattoo*" on his genitals?**

Children describe interior of Mr H's home and state that he drives a Porsche; is that a common choice of transport on a primary school teacher's salary?

All of the suspicions around police and local authority actions in this case amount to an issue of national security; perverting the course of justice and abuse of authority powers for malicious prosecutions, in order to cover up and/or negate, lawful suspicion of very serious crimes which include, murder of "hundreds of babies", is indicative of severe risks to public health & safety posed by the very authorities relied on to protect the public.

### **Justice pauffley: The Fact Finding Hearing:**

It is evident that police actions discriminated against victims and witnesses in favour of suspects. It is equally evident that Justice Pauffley chose to ignore all of the discrepancies, discrimination and failures as exposed via police interviews with RD, ED and children, in her 'fact finding' Hearing of March 2015:

**On what foundation of "fact" exactly, did Mrs Justice Pauffley found her judgement that RD is "completely innocent"?**

Ultimately, there are only, the very shoddy, contradictory and highly suspect 'retractions' coupled with hearsay against ED from school and other authorities where alleged abusers as RD's friends, are employed as social workers, cafcass officers, teachers, headteacher and officers from various London police stations.

On examining the multiple claims against mother, as issued by aforementioned authorities, it is clear, many are disproven e.g. Claims that Mum just gave the children a bit of fruit and lettuce-leaves for lunch. (B1)

Going through school reports on children's lunches, it is clear, that quorn, tofu and other protein-rich foods were included among the fruit and salad and yet, these are omitted from some of the teachers reports on children's home-packed lunches; it transpires from ED's police statement, that children had opted for

vegetarian school dinners during that period and ED had nonetheless, continued to provide children with fresh fruit and salad in their lunchboxes for snacks. (B2)

It is strange too, that Justice Pauffley failed to request other supportive evidence confirming that children were underweight or nutrient-deficient especially, since children are reported as "scavenging" for food at school.

LAs focus a lot of attention on children's "obsession" with food and strongly imply this is evidence of emotional abuse from ED as a "health freak". No one bothers to recognise that eating disorders are often, directly related to all kinds of child abuse and in this case, ED was desperately trying to combat her children's behavioural and health problems, through diet.

**Sexual Abuse and Eating Disorders by Mary Anne Cohen, CSW, Director – The New York Center for Eating Disorders:**

*'Sexual abuse can have many different effects on the eating habits and body image of survivors. Sexual abuse violates the boundaries of the self so*

*dramatically that inner sensations of hunger, fatigue, or sexuality become difficult to identify. People who have been sexually abused may turn to food to relieve a wide range of different states of tension that have nothing to do with hunger. It is their confusion and uncertainty about their inner perceptions that leads them to focus on the food.*

<https://www.edreferral.com/blog/sexual-abuse-and-eating-disorders-by-mary-anne-cohen-csw-director-aaa-the-new-york-center-for-eating-disorders-206>

Children constantly claiming to be "hungry" therefore, is professionally accepted as evidence that further supports children's original crime reports. We cannot forget that child witnesses allege they were sexually abused for years and forced into silence under threat of death if ever they "broke the deal"; a threat which included, killing their mum/ED too. A threat the children had to take very seriously since they allege it came from a man, their dad/RD who, they claim regularly kills and eats babies as part of a large and socially powerful group which included police officers.

**With no medical confirmation that children were underweight or under-nourished, all concerns expressed about children's diet, are effectively, an unevidenced concern based on opinions about a vegan diet which, to many, appears extreme. Still, the fact remains that a balanced vegan diet is *quite the opposite* of an unhealthy option and since RD alleges to be "vegan" too, all concerns about that diet, also relate to RD.**

There is also, much ado about girl child reportedly stealing from other children at school even though, her classmate S was cited by same sources, as an accomplice in that activity: S is also, alleged to be one the "20 special children" singled out for alleged regular abuse at the school: S is referred to in girl child's 'retraction' interview as a child who has images of sex-items on her ipod and adult pornography. Girl's statement about S, is later, repeated to foster carer. Again, no one from police or LAs deemed it necessary to investigate S or her parents. (B3, B4 & B5)

The reports from school on the issue of children's behaviour and packed lunches, can be construed (in light of original allegations), as evidence of a covert

conspiracy against mother by lawful suspects employed at the school, who are alleged to be among RD's criminal accomplices and who therefore, have motive to conspire toward building a case against ED, in order to give LAs justification for at some point, to place children in *sole care of RD*.

Certainly, the school does not express any concerns whatsoever about RD after he is recorded by headteacher, Ms K, as visiting and phoning the school; on 20/09/2013. Ms K quotes in her records that RD had called and she recorded his complaint about ED's "*verbally abusive behaviour*" toward himself and their children (D10).

Ms K had not seen fit to include in her record, any questions as to why RD was suddenly complaining to the school on behalf of children he had abandoned for 2 years and equally, it is odd, that for purpose of fair-balance, Ms K had not seen fit to officially record ED's numerous concerns as expressed to the school, in relation to RD and the resulting impacts of his officially confirmed violence & aggression on their children?

**Given the alleged relationship between Ms K and RD, it is not unreasonable to suspect that in recording RD's hearsay accusation against ED, she was assisting toward building a case against ED.**

With no police investigations into suspects employed at the school and church, it is discriminatory and negligent that Barnet police chose to suppose suspects innocence and chose to doubt two child witnesses matching, detailed testimonies supported by medical evidence coupled with instantly, verifiable evidence, related to detailed descriptions of various teachers and headteacher's genitals.

18 other "special children" cited as suffering same abuse and whose 'parents' are alleged to be part of the abuser group, are also cited as having star or devil tattoos, on their privates. Children state that they did not have such tattoos because they lived with mum and she was not part of the group: Again, no police or local authority investigations ensued in interest of confirming or disproving those allegations and in interest of assuring children's welfare.

**Justice Pauffley did not find it strange that child witnesses were submitted to medical examinations which, corroborated their crime reports and yet, no medical examinations of known suspects and other victims whose genitals were described by child witnesses?**

ED asserts that if children need to submit to a medical examination to substantiate their allegations, then so too, do suspects with genitals described, in order to substantiate their own allegations that the children are lying and/or were coached by mother and her boyfriend.

Suspects claims of innocence are in fact, an allegation of perjury and malice against child witnesses; unlike the suspects, the children have medical evidence consistent with their allegations.

Again, more evidence of police discrimination against child witness-victims in favour of suspects who, are assumed to be honest while children are assumed to

be liars even, with medical evidence supporting their allegations; in what lawful circumstances and in light of the countless police apologies for their repeated historical failures, can this level of discrimination be deemed acceptable?

**How are police failures in this case, any different , if not worse, than those exhibited by e.g. Rotherham police?**

**Rotherham scandal: watchdog reveals 98 investigations into police**

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/apr/25/rotherham-scandal-watchdog-reveals-98-investigations-into-police>

Justice Pauffley was equally unperturbed that the children's crime report is cited in police CRIS report as 'historical abuse' even though, girl child invited police to visit the school on Monday and "catch them" abusing children.

Authorities and police constantly refer to mother as "robotic": It is strange that mother was given no support worker when we consider the terrible ordeal she had undergone on hearing her children's disclosures. It is very likely mother at

that time, was suffering from trauma-related shock and experiencing what is commonly known as *'emotional-detachment'* due to the severity of her children's disclosures coupled with her needs as a mother, to remain stable enough to care for her children and simultaneously, seek legal assistance. (B6)

*\*Emotional detachment can be a positive, [instinctive] behavior which allows a person to react calmly to highly emotional circumstances.*

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotional\\_detachment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotional_detachment)

Similarly, there are reports of children's bad behaviour at school and at home; no one bothered to connect such behaviour as indicative of their regularly suffering the trauma of all such abuse as disclosed in their crime reports. Instead, those incidents are cited as a means of incriminating the mother as inept and the medical evidence is cited in Family Courts, as *'proof'* that ED had *'failed to protect her children'*: *How can a mother protect her children from secret abuse at school she knows nothing about and, when she is being threatened with fines etc., if she keeps her children away from school?* (B7 & B8)

It is noted that school and other authorities express concerns about the children's poor attendance rate and unpunctuality: Again, constant ill health and tardiness in getting ready for school, are signs related to ongoing abuse alleged to be regularly occurring there. Trauma and associated stress, are a common factor behind many illnesses in both children and adults: ED shares this recent realization about the cause for her children's behavioural and health problems in her police interview and these are evident in historical GP reports (Doc 13) cited as evidence for limiting contact with RD (E9 & E10). Still, the children's school attendance was not very far below the national average.

Considering the dreadful content of both children's crime reports to police, it is clear from the start, that the case was a criminal matter requiring special investigation units for organized crimes i.e. Child trafficking: *Justice Pauffley failed to ask police why the case was not referred to other London police units who have greater skills and resources into investigating such crimes?*

Since the retractions implicated AC and ED as complicit in abusing and coaching children to deliver a false crime report to police, why were neither of those parties arrested, investigated or charged? The only investigations police did in relation to AC, was to pull up his criminal history of crimes committed in his youth and early 20's.

Why did Justice Pauffley fail to question or admonish police about their failures to arrest and charge, ED & AC since, according to her 'findings', ED, an "evil" child "torturer", had continued to have twice monthly contact with her children for many months and, had allegedly, gone on to uploading videos of her children's disclosures to police onto Youtube and thereby, subjecting children to further abuse?

**Why did Justice Pauffley fail to note the significance of the fact it was ED and not RD, who had complained to police and applied for a Judicial Review to get the case reopened for further investigations? *Are those the actions of a guilty parent?* (Doc5)**

Why did Justice Pauffley pay so little credence to the findings of Ms Kylie Wilson, a highly experienced professional who teaches techniques in the field of interviewing child witness-victims and has far greater skills than displayed by Barnet police? Ms Wilson states in her report on the Barnet police child-witness interviews:

*'To state categorically that the children had been coached (which is written on the Crime Report) which I understand is the assertion from Social Services, is simply not feasible'*

Why did Justice Pauffley fail to ask why London authorities repeatedly appealed against reopening the case when it was clear, no adequate investigations had happened and instead, all attentions of police and LAs were focused specifically, toward incriminating and negating mother, partner and her children?

It is an important feature of this case that all authorities support RD's stance that

ED is a liar, a child abuser, is mentally impaired, malicious and emotionless: Why are all of those apparently, non-bias authorities so keen to ignore all of the evidenced concerns related to RD i.e., the fact he disappeared abroad for 2 years, and failed to send his children so much as a postcard, is barely mentioned?

Police gave the High Court a forensic report from LEX citing evidence of cannabis in children's hair samples: Why were only *children's* hair samples taken for forensic analysis and *not*, hair samples from lawful suspects of dad, teachers, mum or her partner? (Doc LEX)

**Why did Barnet police close the case BEFORE the LEX hair sample results were received?**

**What were the forensic results of the children's hair samples that were taken in presence of ED? (C2) Barnet police claim they have gone 'missing'.**

**Why were *more* hair samples taken *after* children were taken into care and had**

given their 'retractions' and only those test results presented to the High Court?

Why was it not made clear to the Court that evidence of cannabis did not necessarily mean children had ingested cannabis but also, could mean that children had been around someone who smoked cannabis?

Barnet police also lied to to the Court about *when* they received confirming medical evidence, claiming it had not arrived until January 2015, when in fact, they had urgent, preliminary confirmation at time of RD's interview: Again, *no questions from Justice Pauffley about why police decided to close the case then, before medical report had arrived?*

The tenuous link to cannabis was transferred onto the hemp-protein smoothies ED and AC were feeding the children: Justice Pauffley talks about the "green liquid" children were fed, implying that the LEX forensic results proved conclusively, that the hemp was cannabis.

***It really makes no sense that people coaching children to memorize and repeat lies, would employ cannabis for an aid; it is widely known that cannabis impedes on short-term memory. None among the professionals supporting RD in this case, cared to focus on that point; doubtless, if the situation were reversed and it was RD accused of using cannabis to coach his children to lie, many of those same professionals would be referring to aforementioned point, as evidence to strongly discredit any such possibility.***

Given the nature of evidenced concerns related to an organized criminal network running through all authorities dealing with this case, *are the LEX results even credible as evidence* or indeed, *any* of the opinions expressed in suspect LAs collective reports against ED?

Justice Pauffley fails to ask the necessary questions in relation to providing evidence as conclusive support for her judgement that ED and AC, were responsible for presence of cannabis in children's hair samples.

Children cite dad and others as plying them with alcohol and a variety of medical and illegal drugs which, could easily include cannabis; why is only the mother suspected of supplying her children with cannabis and not dad? It is significant that foster carer notes girl child explaining how to use cannabis by putting it in tobacco or in food. Since ED and AC do not smoke tobacco or use cannabis, it is most likely, girl child has witnessed cannabis use through RD and his associates.

This point is of special significance in relation to ED's previously expressed concerns via historical reports to local-authorities/LAs, in relation to her eldest son J, who alleged his own dad smoked tobacco and cannabis around him. Again, LAs did nothing by way of proving or disproving that allegation:

**It was known to LAs that ED does not smoke tobacco, does not drink alcohol or take any illegal or medical drugs.**

Reading through the multitude of reports from various London authorities as submitted to Family Courts, it is disturbing to note that the bulk of those reports

are devoted to citing concerns against ED and AC: Justice Pauffley fails to notice the blatant discrimination at work i.e. AC is accused of hitting children with metal and wooden spoons, of pushing them against walls, of calling the girl child a "C\*\*\*", pouring cold water over the children, splashing their faces with water and of causing damage to boy child's ear.

Though AC's historical record displays poor parenting skills and a criminal past, this does not in any way detract from the allegedly, barbaric parenting activities performed by RD and which equally includes, a criminal record for aggression and violence against men, women and children: How can allegations or evidence against AC or ED justify a squeaky-clean analysis for RD? Accusations against AC arrive from the same sources as accusations against RD.

**Considering the crime reports against RD and others, as juxtaposed against severity of risks as reported against mother by police, RD and LAs: *Are ED and AC accused of drug-dealing, making and selling child pornography, baby trafficking, child prostitution and murder? Is there medical evidence against them of child sexual abuse too? Have child witnesses described a group of their***

***friends, genitals?***

Much is made of AC's past, criminal history and domestic crimes none of which, are recent and none of which include, sexual abuse of children. No one cares to mention that AC had by time of middle-age, managed to self-develop and overcome problems associated with his past and had been granted an Honourary Doctorate for his research into health benefits of hemp-protein. This was after AC contracted TB while in prison, during his early 20's; on release, he discovered hemp protein and managed to recover, this proved to be a turning point in his life.

Though AC has a criminal record for dealing cannabis during his youth, those drug crimes do not include, hard drugs such as cocaine as referred to in children's crime report via details of the "white powder". How would a child of 8 know the effects of that white powder or anything at all about drug dealing and the kind of packets it is sold in, when *neither his mum nor anyone connected with her, is involved in using, buying or selling such substances?*

The same attention is not given to RD and allegations in original crime reports, that it was RD who "licked" the children "really hard" with metal and wooden spoons and a ladle, kicked them in the privates, pushed them against walls, smacked, swore and shouted at them, terrorized them, forced them to physically and covertly attack each other, their mum and her partner and subjected them to horrendous sexual abuse via himself and his friends - allegations which included, detailed accounts of how he helped them kill babies. It is on record that previously, it was RD who had damaged his son's ear.

More of this type of discriminatory focus on evidence for or against, all suspect parties in this case, is shown in relation to police and LA reports related to AC's historical police-caution for a physical assault against his own then teenage son; why did those same LAs fail to focus on RD's treatment of ED's eldest son J then age 7? The child's historical testimony as recorded by social workers, cites RD's aggression and violence against his mum and half siblings and states that RD "*locked me in a store-room with a bucket*" for his toilet needs while ED was at work. Was J "coached" with cannabis too? (B9)

**It appears that evidence can be accepted or dismissed by Justice Pauffley, not according to its *merit* and *relevance* but according to how well it serves, a *predetermined* narrative.**

Many of the allegations made against RD have simply, been transferred onto AC or else, injuries were sustained before AC knew the children. An example of this is shown in how a "well healed scar" on Boy child's head is claimed to be a result of being hit by AC on the head with a metal spoon (B10), however, it is clear from medical records, the scar was *most likely* the result of a head injury the boy sustained after falling off his scooter in January the previous year (B10+).

RD is presented as a long-term victim of malicious allegations via ED and her children. However, that hypothesis of 'malice' is severely undermined by evidence presented in historical police reports where on more than two occasions, ED is invited by police to press charges of assault against RD and yet, she declines.

Furthermore, there is evidence that shows police were requesting that Dr Hodes support their hypothesis that AC was responsible for the sexual abuse. It transpires however, that AC had not known the family long enough to be responsible for any such damage.

**It is a noticeable fact of evidence, that Barnet police lied to the High Court about exactly *when* the medical confirmation was received (C1).**

Note that in CRIS report (S6), dated 13/09/2014, police had received conclusions from Dr Deborah Hodes and already, in direct opposition to her findings, had put forward the proposal that the medical confirmation of child witnesses crime reports, was false and that deep anal scarring, RAD & signs of PTSD as evidenced in both children, are due, to a '*large, solid poo*'.

**No account is given as to why Barnet police were querying medical evidence prior to any retractions or, with whom they had consulted in order to immediately query the medical confirmation as soon as it arrived: *Even more***

***disturbing then, that this same explanation was later, upheld by the High Court.***

Justice Pauffley dismissed Dr Hodes evidence in support of the original allegations as that of an "*over dogmatic expert*". In making that decision she cites a Barnet police officer's opinion and that of child psychologist Dr Sturges; neither parties are qualified in Dr Hodes field of expertise and neither party had examined the children physically and yet, Justice Pauffley described the difference of opinion around medical confirmation as a "*peer review*". A Dr Gunn had also found evidence in keeping with children's allegations.

**Why even bother examining children reporting anal rape, if the confirmation can just be brushed aside as a result of "*a large, solid poo*" or else, a "possible, normal variant"?**

**If something is only 'possible' how can it be cited also, as 'normal'?**

It is noted that DC Martin's witness statement to High Court, February 17th, cites

the medical evidence as referring to "possible" sexual abuse when in lawful fact, medical evidence is cited by Dr Hodes as; '*consistent with allegations*'. Indeed, Dr Hodes explains very clearly, that damage related to constipation would have been minor and could not have left the kind of scarring caused by sexual abuse neither, could it account for PTSD or, RAD which signifies long-term abuse.

**Here, we cannot forget boy child's statement to police that he sometimes bled after abuse, that his dad would "stretch" his bottom and, that it felt like it was "going right up into my belly".**

Another important point, is that when describing how he was forced to "*lick the middles*" of female suspects, boy child 'instinctively' performs the action of that during his description, indicating that task was a regular feature of his childhood.

The same is revealed in home recorded child testimonies as children cite how their dad helped them kill babies with girl child miming the act of slicing a baby's throat: It is here submitted, that anyone 'coaching' children would be unlikely to

include bodily actions or, in case of allegedly killing babies, explain that their dad would put their hands on the knife and place *"his hands over theirs"* and then take care to insist that the head was *not cut off completely*, but only enough to let *blood drip* into a *white bowl* placed beneath the spot where the baby was hung upside-down with *string around the feet* and attached to a *screw on the wall* and even, provide the name of the guy who fixed the screw on the wall.

Since police and Social Services claim that ED & AC's 'motive' for allegedly "coaching" the children, was to *"stop contact"* with dad, no explanation is given as to why then, that mother and even, her new partner, would include in that narrative, the allegedly forced admission that her children themselves had *actively participated in murder of hundreds of babies?*

**Then, there's the issue of alleged "*secret rooms*" abusers have in their homes and allegedly, created via partition-walls within the school Church, by a named member of the alleged abuser group, or else, a door to a cellar in a named suspect's home is concealed behind a backless wardrobe full of coats. We can ignore the extensive past case precedents which cite known abusers using**

**secret rooms as venues for abuse and/or to imprison their victims and instead, just blindly accept, that all mention of those is due to "coaching" by mother and her partner?**

Both children disclose that they were anally abused by real and plastic 'willies'.

\*Boy child explains to police that the various colours of the plastic willies indicate a kind of hierarchy within the group e.g. RD has a "*white one*" because he's the "head".

***\*Again, is it likely, a child of 8 could memorise such details via 'coaching with aid of torture and cannabis' while on a two week holiday abroad? Is it even likely, that adults wishing to falsely incriminate a parent, would include such details in the narrative?***

The casual dismissal of child witness original allegations and the immense detail shared therein, is highlighted as evidence of criminal negligence because it really makes no sense that instead, more credibility is given to i.e., anonymous phone

calls to NSPCC during a time in which RD is concerned about his children moving to France and within weeks of his returning to UK. ED strongly suspects that RD has on that and other occasions been responsible for anonymous phone calls to NSPCC as part of a covert attack in an effort to eventually, be granted custody of their children.

**It is clear that NSPCC found no evidence to support the reports against ED, who had continued to hold full custody of her children until after their disclosures to Barnet police: Why then, were those anonymous NSPCC calls warranted credibility enough, to be included as 'evidence' supporting otherwise unsubstantiated allegations, against ED? In contrast and in relation to weighing up evidence on balance of probabilities, ED and children's allegations against RD, are supported by officially recorded historical crime reports and independent witness statements. Again, unlawful discrimination against witness-victims is thus highlighted; hearsay from suspects takes precedence.**

At no point does Justice Pauffley include in her "balance of probabilities", the evidence of motive and intent arising from suspects. Instead, she focuses on

motive and intent of mother and partner i.e. They had abusively coached the children to lie in order to "*stop contact*" with father.

Justice Pauffley did not think it strange that a mother so obviously concerned for her children's mental and physical health, would subject her children to memorizing and repeating such horror and including so many other suspects, for purpose of *denying contact with dad*?

On the otherhand, motive and intent among a group of suspects operating within various London authorities, is far greater in terms of a desire to; *silence, control, coerce and intimidate witnesses, conceal and/or cover up evidence of crimes, deploy 'negligence' as a deliberate strategy toward closing of the case and thereafter, citing lack of training and resources, as the main source of that negligence*. Again, Justice Pauffley fails to give fair consideration to any such equally valid and evidenced probabilities as presented by ED's legal representative.

Neither mother nor her partner dispute the fact that tensions were high when children first disclosed their crime reports while on holiday in Morocco: AC was very angry to discover children, on instructions from their dad, had been running his toothbrush around the loo and mixing faeces into their mother's food. AC and ED had suffered ill health as a direct result. Girl child is on a home video-recording admitting to this to family friend and community police officer, JCY.

No one among any authority and most especially, Dr Sturges (recruited by LAs to psychologically assess the children), bothers to so much as for a moment, entertain even the possibility, that the children's original crime report could be honest and therefore, has provided evidence to verify that all such terrible abuse and crimes as they describe, are known to cause severe, behavioural problems and even, outrageously bad behaviour in children, which is known to incite angry responses from bewildered adults trying to love and care for those children: Much is made of girl child's alleged comment to one of the suspect teachers, that she "*hates her mum*". (C3)

**It is also, important to take into account that children allege they were regularly**

**given illegal drugs and alcohol by RD; such substances can cause addiction and withdrawal responses which, would very likely foster extremely annoying and aggressive behaviour.**

Very little attention is paid to evidence related to RD's alleged regular use and sale of illegal drugs. From children's descriptions, white powder is commonly identified as amphetamine/'speed' or cocaine: Is RD an addict? Why did nobody perform a blood or urine test? Two children he has contact with, have stated he feeds them illegal drugs: Was this a lie or truth? We have no confirmation and yet, Justice Pauffley is convinced enough that the children are lying, she claims RD is a "*good dad*".

Dr Sturges fails to take into account how a drug like cocaine impacts on human psychology, with reference toward determining the veracity of *all* the statements children gave to police and also, with reference to RD: Cocaine and Speed are known to be a drug favoured by psychopathic personalities; both induce a strong sense of ego, selfishness and dampen allegiance to social ethics/morality:

*'Psychopathy is a personality disorder with cardinal traits that include superficial charm, antisocial behavior, sensation-seeking and impulsive behavior, a lack of empathy and sensitivity to punishment, and shallow emotional experiences. The disorder is recognized to be a strong predictor of criminal behavior and recidivism.'*

[https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/718950#vp\\_1](https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/718950#vp_1)

According to the original allegations, it is strongly suggested that both children have been manipulated by father to regularly, physically attack each other, touch each other's privates ("five times a day"), take photos of their privates to send to dad, steal from, covertly attack and lie to mum and to generally spy on her activities and friends: Yet, Justice Pauffley fails to ask why authorities have given so much credence to girl child's alleged comment to a suspect teacher, that she "*hates her mum*" and no credence whatsoever, to statements from J and his half-siblings, as recorded by police and social workers, against RD?

**A Family Or A Criminal Case?**

All of the above, reflects the gross negligence that permitted this case to be handled solely, by the Family Courts, a scenario which allowed for RD to give his evidence in secret and for a host of suspect and/or negligent social workers, police, teachers etc., to deliver historical reports citing 'evidence' against mum as a 'health-freak', 'robotic', 'detached' individual who, can barely get her children to school and who is easily manipulated by her partner.

Same sources cite ED as a woman who makes poor choices in partners, having connected with two violent men. The implication is that ED should never have custody of her children due to the likelihood she will connect with another violent partner: Considering that according to national statistics, 1 in 4 UK women will experience domestic abuse and over a 3rd will have experienced domestic violence as children, the problem of violent males is *not* down to a woman's "poor choice" but due to continued historical patterns of socially accepted misogyny and women's continued lack of social authority and financial power coupled with, a male consciousness socially programmed toward violence and, to objectify women and girls primarily, as sex-aids.

**Data on violence against women and girls:**

<http://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/about/data-on-violence-against-women-and-girls/>

ED's vegan life style and whether or not she is "robotic", or how often her children went to school and what was in their lunch boxes, would have been of no significance whatsoever, had police followed regular procedure and arrested, investigated and charged suspects who then, could have been publicly tried in a criminal court. Certainly, had examinations of suspects confirmed genital descriptions, it is *they* and not ED, who would be under scrutiny, her children's history of ill health and behavioural problems would have been cited as evidence against *them*.

**The Family Court scenario is evidence to support lawful suspicion of a perversion of the course of justice, when one includes in the balance of probabilities, that all of those authorities collectively supporting RD and**

**providing evidence against mother, provide employment to 70+ named and known and another 100+ alleged child sexual abusers, baby traffickers and murderers, all described by children as their dad's "friends" who form part of a "*special culture*".**

The Family Court processes are now evidenced as an effective means of keeping the case and suspects, hidden from public knowledge and with concerns related to a child's rights to privacy, being equally applied to all of the lawful suspects, only one of whom, RD, was required to attend Justice Pauffley's 'fact finding' Hearing at the High Court. Again, highly suspicious that unemployed dad arrives in court with 16 representatives and not even mother's single, legal representative (her McKenzie Friend, Belinda McKenzie) being granted audience by the Court: RD's testimony and evidence, was given in secret.

**Justice Pauffley was already familiar with ED's position statement and associated, evidenced concerns, being as she had \*presided over and refused, ED's application for a Judicial Review in Januray 2015 and had found nothing to support re-opening of the case via a previous "fact finding" Hearing in February**

**2015.**

*\*It is noted that Justice Pauffley had stepped outside her remit as a Family Court Judge and had taken on the role of Administrative Courts specifically, to preside over the request for Judicial Review.*

**A representative attending the JR request, from Harringey Council, under whose authority, many of the suspect police are employed, asked for all evidence related to the case to be "*destroyed*".**

To highlight the veracity of the evidence supporting criminal abuse of authority powers; *imagine, a child reports to police, that her neighbour had anally raped her, she describes the rapist's genitals and medical evidence confirms damages in keeping with that allegation, she describes the interior of his home; child also describes illegal drugs and child pornography on his computer: Do police remove child from mum and focus on extracting retractions? Or, do they promptly arrest and investigate the suspect?*

Commonly, one would expect arrest and investigation of the suspect but suppose the suspect is a police chief and a revered member of the local freemasons? Suppose the police receiving that child's crime report are members of that same masonic lodge?

It is an added fact of evidence that DC Martin, who interviewed both children for their crime reports and 'retractions' and who was instrumental in promptly removing child witnesses from care of mother, was at that time, the Almoner for the local masonic lodge; his basic function was to be the eyes and ears for fellow masonic members and to report to them any significant developments and news, which might affect or be of interest to those members: DC Martin was in 2015, promoted to Lodge Treasurer. (C3+)

Mrs Justice Pauffley fails to note the significance of DC Martin's and other suspects masonic connections i.e. 20 police officers from 16 London police stations.

By today, it is well evidenced that criminal professionals are attracted into organizations like masonic lodges for purpose of wider connections and assuring group security. That is not to suggest Masonic Orders themselves, are inherently criminal but rather, that their circles attract criminal types seeking a veneer of social credibility and respect as well as, access to socially powerful members who may be open to bribery and blackmail and/or into doing 'favours' via inside influence.

There is already, an established link between members of masonic orders and organized crimes against children: Police are known to have strong links within masonic lodges throughout Britain:

**Freemasons are blocking reform, says Police Federation leader: Steve White, stepping down as chair, says the society is thwarting progress of women and BAME people**

White said: *"It's about trust and confidence. There are people who feel that being a Freemason and a police officer is not necessarily a good idea. I find it odd that*

*there are pockets of the organisation where a significant number of representatives are Freemasons.”*

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/dec/31/freemasons-blocking-reform-police-federation-leader>

**The publicly available Marantha Report on Satanic Ritual abuse, compiled for the UK Children's Commissioner in 2012, directly supports many of the concerns and suspicions held by ED:**

*Satanist ritual perpetrator groups are composed of individuals who often have professional jobs in the police, legal and social services and local authority. Satanist groups also frequently include members who are freemasons. There is deliberate intent to have members in different spheres of influence in order to maximise the security of the group and to gain social respectability for individual participating members.*

*Many groups have extensions of their own member networks to those in other parts of the nation, and even other nations, which increases their*

*capacity to control their victims .*

<http://www.maranathacommunity.org.uk/pdf/jan12-satanist-ritual-abuse-of-children.pdf>

Despite the evidence presenting lawful grounds for suspicion and therefore, a thorough investigation, Justice Pauffley decided the children's crime report was part fantasy and part coached by mother and partner, she failed to notice the retractions were only partial, contradictory and clearly, led by DC Martin.

Justice Pauffley failed to notice the evidence of coercion as unwittingly provided by the police driver who collected the children with DC Martin for purpose of giving their retractions. He is quoted as stating that DC Martin told the children during that car journey, *"I heard you saw a film called Zorro and there's someone in that film has their head cut off isn't there?"* Later, Zorro is mentioned by DC Martin during the 'retractions'. (C4 & C5)

**Again: To whom, did the children state a desire to retract? Why didn't the foster**

**carer accompany the children to the retraction venue? Did both children make a decision to retract simultaneously?**

No details as to why DC Martin suddenly went to collect the children for delivery of their 'retractions', are recorded in the police report; since police claim the retractions provided sufficient evidence to close the case on 22nd September, this is a very serious omission of evidence.

**It appears that a plan had been concocted to pin foundation of the allegations onto a fiction stretched-out by children's 'wild imaginations' and subsequently, abusively encouraged by mum and partner, with an intent to stop contact with**

***RD: Was this plan developed via the 'Strategy Meeting' police and social services held with local authorities and even, suspects from the school, in order to discuss the children's crime reports and to seek permission to search school and church?***

Certainly, the manner in which DC Martin performed original interviews, appears

to be more about seeking cause to discredit the crime reports rather than any genuine attempt to identify further routes for investigation: Regarding the retractions, Kylie Wilson notes;

**Final Conclusions: Kylie Wilson:**

- \* It is clear that both [girl] and [boy] are clearly articulate children capable of using their language skills and education to give an elaborate, detailed and extensive account. The children easily pick up on the language used by others, can be led by suggestion, and even well intentioned questioning.
- \* It is clear from the retractions that [girl] and [boy] are not giving the same account in their retractions. They do not give the same sources of material as to where they got their ideas from for touching, whether they touched or not, where the idea for plastic willies came from etc. Boy's retraction is particularly confused and he appears to be led through it by the police interviewer.
- \* The police interviewer Steve appears from the start of these interviews to have pre-conceived ideas that the accounts are untruthful, for example there is a large amount of challenging within the first interviews when the interviewer asks how and why. This is not appropriate at that stage of the

interview process and should be saved to the end of an interview.

- \* Unfortunately due to the quantity of interviews conducted the children themselves are highly likely to be confused as to what is reality and what is make believe. It cannot be ruled out that abuse has occurred in some form, it need not necessarily be of a sexual nature. What abuse and by whom is unfortunately tainted by the questioning and handling of this matter.

**'I do not feel it was suitable to close this investigation at this point without further enquiries and corroboration being sought.'**

Failure to arrest and charge e.g. AC, is itself, evidence of the cover-up because in that event, the case against AC would be heard in public via criminal court

proceedings; all of the evidence would have been placed before a judge and jury:

Police failings would have come under immense scrutiny and, in event of AC's

likely acquittal, the original allegations would once again, have come into force

along with reprimands for negligence. In any event, how could Barnet police

justify arrest of AC and *not* RD and Mr H a teacher at the school? Being as Mr H is

alleged as "dad's best friend", RD is equally implicated in any abuse inflicted by

Mr H: *All three were implicated in the retractions and criminal lawyers would have examined those retractions very closely.*

Justice Pauffley did not notice that DC Martin's retraction interview with boy child, was littered with thinly veiled threats that the boy "*won't get into trouble if you've lied before, so long as we talk about that now...*" The first time was after the boy had affirmed 7 times that "*yes, my dad does kill babies*" followed with intermittent attempts to nonetheless, minimise those alleged crimes by adding "*...but not many...*" (C6)

Justice Pauffley equally dismisses foster carer notes in relation to girl child's comments about Mr H and how his fridge is full of "*baby meat*", which was stated after her retraction interview: Girl also talks to foster carer about a "secret" she can only discuss in private which transpires to be about RD doing "*sexual things to children*" (C7+).

Justice Pauffley does not notice the sharp contradiction between boy and girl's retraction statements in relation to Mr H; originally described as their dad's close friend, a fellow abuser, along with detailed descriptions of his genitals: Boy child

emphatically reaffirms that Mr H and his dad did sexually abuse him in a disabled cubicle at a swimming baths when he was age 4 and that Mr H is his dad's "*best friend*" and that his dad regularly "*stays at Mr H's house*". Girl child states that dad "*has never met Mr H*"(C8 & C8+).

Such contradictions are not present in the original crime report.

**It is an important feature of this case that the retraction interviews are of exceptionally poor quality when compared with original crime reports and in fact, leave even more questions and present further lines for investigation into i.e. RD, Mr H, AC, child S and her parents.**

It appears child witnesses and other witness statements, are to be considered credible only inasmuch as they support a favoured narrative by Barnet police and LAs i.e. Mr H is also referred to as stated by children, in the medical report (C9+) and yet, still no investigations into that suspect ensued.

Justice Pauffley fails to question Barnet police about why they did not arrest Mr H (*who has a vending machine full of toys in his classroom*), since both allegations and retractions implicate him as a suspect and his genitals are graphically described. (D1)

**Did Justice Pauffley bother to read the police CRIS Reports? (Doc12) If she had, Justice Pauffley might have thought it quite odd, that DC Rogers, states in the CRIS report on 05/09/2014 at 10:30pm (while children are being interviewed by DC Martin), with no evidence whatsoever, that he thinks the allegations are 'malicious' and mother has a 'history' of reporting malicious allegations against RD and despite the fact that RD's repeated crimes against ED and children, are well documented by police and other authorities; in contrast to DC Rogers assumptions, ED had been granted Non Molestation and Injunction Orders against RD. (C10)**

How could DC Rogers make such a statement unless, he had already spoken to RD and heard his version of events? RD had never made any formal complaints against ED for 'malicious' allegations, other than, as part of his defence in County

Courts and which was not accepted. Where did DC Rogers receive that information from? DC Rogers comment is evidence that police had spoken personally to RD prior to children arriving at Barnet police. ED has a home recorded statement from boy child, stating that he had just seen RD at the police station. This recording was done by Jean Claude Yahirou.

Recordings made by family friend and community police officer, Jean Claude Yahirou, were removed from his home by police who seized his computer on 04/09/2014, the day prior to children arriving at Barnet.

This is evidence that Barnet police and members of alleged CSA-gang, were forewarned and all parties having prior knowledge of the children's disclosures before they arrived to give their statements to Barnet police.

Certainly, DC Martin does give the strong impression that he's well aware of what the children are going to tell him. This also explains *how* DC Rogers was able to put forward the suggestion that allegations are 'malicious' before the children had

even completed their crime report to DC Martin on 5/09/2014. However, police allege that both ED's and Mr Yahirou's recordings, were immediately sent to a secure storage facility and allegedly, never veiwed by police.

**One would have thought a 'fact finding' Hearing at the High Court is meant to cover at least, the CRIS reports and address any queries evidenced there.**

The only 'facts' accepted as valid, during Justice Pauffley's Hearing, were; the retraction interviews; a host of local authority reports of which, many, are written by alleged suspects; a transcript of Barnet police's completely inept and highly inappropriate interview with dad/RD and, the loosely discredited, medical evidence: *How is it possible to ignore the glaringly obvious points of concern as exposed by all the facts deemed 'invalid' by the High Court, when one considers the resulting risks to children and trafficked babies?*

With no arrests or investigations other than measuring a swimming baths disabled cubicle and searching of school and church 5 days after suspects

controlling those premises, had been forewarned by police via their 'Strategy Meeting'; the only evidence supporting RD's plea of 'innocence' were the very doubtful 'retractions' and the suspect-discrediting of confirming medical evidence: **The 2016 IPCC Report in response to ED's 2nd complaint after 2015 IPCC Report was ignored by LAs, finds that the retraction interviews; 'appear to be led by the IO'. (D2)**

***If retractions were enough to close the case on September 22nd 2014, then why is the serious doubt on validity of those retractions, not enough to immediately reopen the case to ensure child safety, arrest and investigate suspects which would now include, suspects involved in police actions and compiling reports against witnesses?***

The 2015 IPCC Report cites a long list of failures and mishandling of the case by Barnet police e.g., their decision not to arrest RD and examine his computer or search his home for illegal drugs, when arrest criteria was satisfied. (D3)

Justice Pauffley failed to notice any such concerns even though, which ever way one examines the case, one party or the other, was guilty of child abuse: \*Can someone be suspected of abusing children and plying them with cannabis to memorize and repeat, explicit sexual activity between adults and children and even, gross descriptions of murder and yet, be left free from arrest and investigation? According to Barnet police and Justice Pauffley, they can, just as RD can be accused of all aforementioned crimes and equally, remain free from arrest and investigation.

***\*It appears that Barnet police were only moved to attempt arrest of ED and AC, when they were suspected of violating child witnesses rights to privacy: 10 police officers arrived at ED's door, two of them carrying medical kits; ED & AC escaped from the house and fled the country, while their legal representative discussed matters with those police who were threatening to force entry.***

Justice Pauffley failed to attach any significance whatsoever, on the foster carer notes, which cite a repeat of original allegations and various incidents related to signs of abuse: Foster carer states that girl child told her in secret, that she can't

live with her dad because he "*does sexual things to children*" and, that it has to be a secret because otherwise, she could; "*go to prison if I tell anyone*". (D4)

**Since both children had stated to police that they were forced to participate in killing babies, it does not take any great leap of imagination to realise the probability, that both children were told they would as "murderers", they will get into *a lot of trouble* and "*go to prison*" if they "*keep on saying all those other things*".**

It is evident too, that both children express concerns about what will happen to ED and AC; boy child states his worry that ED will be angry with him. Girl child appears to imply a form of covert 'bargaining' has taken place prior to the retraction interviews as she seeks reassurance from the IO, that ED won't get into trouble.

Much is made by LAs about the fact that after the 'retractions' neither child wants contact with AC again and do not want to return home to ED in case AC will visit:

Considering the evidence supporting lawful suspicion of coerced retractions during which, children are forced to lie about the crimes they disclosed to ED and AC and instead, have now implicated them as the abusers, it is hardly surprising they no longer wish to return home, especially, given AC's sharp temper and strong dislike of lying. (D5 & D6)

**No one appears concerned at all about evidence related to the immense emotional and psychological damage inflicted on two already traumatised children who, are forced to lie by the very professionals they had turned to for help and, as a direct result of that force, they are left feeling estranged from and afraid of, those who had tried to protect them and seek justice.**

To further support suspicions related to a cover up, there is available to the Court, a police video recording exposing evidence of suspects being warned from the moment children gave their initial crime reports to DC Martin: Girl child is reporting crimes to DC Martin and very clearly, in the background, a phone is heard to ring in room next door and then, another police officer talking on the phone. At one point, the girl child pauses in her disclosure as the officer's voice

next door, rises in volume; he states with alarm: "...Get in touch with their dad...  
They've come to Bar-net...(illegible)... and they're making a video now!"

DC Martin stops the interview and calls to officer in the other room saying: "*Can you be quiet please? I'm doing an interview in here!*" to which, the officer in the next room most sarcastically replies: "*I really didn't know that!*"

Noticeably, the unseen officer's reply is recorded in police transcript as "Sorry. I didn't know that" and there is no mention of his audible conversation on the phone.

**Since it was at that point, past 10pm at night, it is unlikely that anyone else was at that moment delivering a video interview at Barnet police station. The assumption that unseen officer in the next room, was discussing child witnesses, is not an idle supposition: Video interviews are not the usual manner of delivering crime reports and are almost exclusively employed for purpose of reporting sexual crimes. Also, who else at Barnet police station required**

someone to "get in touch with their dad" ?

The children were very vulnerable to threats of severe punishment from suspect authorities; they had reported to police, that they were forced to assist in killing babies as part of psuedo religious ceremonies seemingly (according to allegations), employed as a 'theatrical' backdrop for the abuse and probably, to negate a child's credibility if ever they were to report the crimes: Such professionals alleged as police, social workers etc., would doubtless, be fully aware of Keir Starmer's 'credibility clause':

*'Under the guidelines, prosecutors investigating child, sexual abuse, are told to focus on the credibility of allegations, not on whether victims make good witnesses.'*

According to the children's crime reports, prior to the date of the 'credibility clause', group sexual abuse of children, took place largely in leisure centres, or at school, adjoining church, teachers houses and other properties they would be escorted out of school to visit on a Wednesday, for what appears from their

descriptions, to be for purpose of child prostitution and making of child pornography i.e. "*£50 a go*".

It is appears the "special culture" was at liberty to take full advantage of Keir Starmer's 'credibility-clause' as a context for satisfying sadistic desires under guise of 'Satanism' knowing any crime reports citing such activities can be 'lawfully' dismissed as "*incredible*".

Justice Pauffley appears happy to abide by the credibility-clause; she does not exhibit any degree of concern about remaining risks to any of the children and babies referred to in this case. She fails to consider the dreadful implications and risks to countless, very vulnerable children, to whom, many of the lawful suspects have direct access via their professions in social services and police etc.

In the light of ED's attempts to find justice for her own and other children, it cannot be easily dismissed that prior to her March 2015 Hearing, Justice Pauffley had previously, not only only ignored the issues in mother's Position Statement

on 26 January 2015, she had also, appropriated to herself on 22 December 2014, the Judicial Review filed by mother against the Metropolitan Police and then ignored it.

Despite the children having retracted their retractions as reported by foster carer, which under normal circumstances should have reinforced the original allegations, Justice Pauffley continued to favour the 'retractions'. It was directly after Justice Pauffley's refusal in January 2015, to take the application for the Judicial Review forward and her failure to demonstrate impartiality, that this case went public, when appeals to Theresa May, then, Home Secretary, were also unheeded.

Also, there are questions regarding the professional integrity of child psychologist Dr Sturges. Her personal testimony to the High Court, reflects her failure to pick-up on some very serious discrepancies in the children's later narrative whereby, the mother and AC had become the alleged abusers who had forced the children to lie.

Considering Dr Sturges is described by Justice Pauffley as one of Britain's "*most experienced child psychologists*", either she is proven professionally negligent in this case or else, she is criminally complicit in alleged cover-up:

'Dr Sturges assessed the children on 5 November 2014... P commented, "*Abraham [AC] loved my Mum so much. He even blamed her for being in the gang.*" p144

Pauffley Judgement.

It is highly improbable that a man who was coaching ED's two children to memorise false allegations in order to report them credibly to police, would also, in the presence of those children and ED, have "*even blamed her [mum] for being in the gang*". What 'gang' - surely, he wasn't referring to the 'Satanic Cult' that both he and mum were allegedly, 'coaching' the children to lie about?

Though it may seem a very little thing, that statement from P as child who, in light of the evidence and according to the legal requirements for suspicion in good faith, is probably, suffering in the hands of alleged abusers who have contrived to

control her, speaks volumes. It is these 'little things' on which authorities investigating child sexual abuse need to be vigilant and most particularly, a High Court Judge presiding over a case in which the children at risk, are absent.

*Dr Sturges: 'P related that Mr Christie would tell her that "for lying she would go to prison for 20 years and never see her grandparents or Mum again."*

Is that statement allegedly issued by AC, most probably said by a man trying to get a child to tell the truth or is it more reflective of a man trying to force a child to lie? Why would a child go to "prison for 20 years for lying" unless, those possible 'lies' are so serious they could cause a very lot of damage to a lot of innocent people? Why would a man allegedly, forcing a child to lie, then threaten that child with 20 years in prison for lying? Where is the "common sense" referred to by Mrs Justice Pauffley, as a prime factor in this case?

The above observations fully support the children's original testimony in which, they claim during original allegations, that AC employed some force in getting the

children to disclose with aid of "*gentle licks*" with a wooden spoon (D7) and later, "*lukewarm water*", to calm their worsened aggressive behaviour after the disclosures. While few would applaud such actions, nonetheless, AC's actions and comments as reported by Dr Sturges, are reflective of shock, disbelief, disgust, mistrust of the whole family (considering the horrific content of the allegations) and then, a sudden and intense need to be sure that the children *are* telling the truth. Certainly his alleged comment that 'P' "*could go to prison for 20 years for lying*", supports an attempt to arrive at the truth, more than it supports the notion he was actively engaged, in coaching the children to lie.

It is just as likely (in light of DC Martin's covert threats during retraction interviews), that suspects employed within all authorities handling the case, had themselves made aforementioned threat, as a means of persuading the children to abandon their original crimes reports and agree instead, to a false narrative.

One would have *hoped* a "*top psychologist*" would fully appreciate that, according to original crime report, the children had been under full control of an abusive, manipulative and controlling dad. Very probably, they are subliminally

programmed to expect and need, AC to be equally controlling and authoritative in order to maximize their sense of security by handing power over themselves to him instead, as a caring controller as opposed to a sexually abusive and murderous one who had threatened to kill them, their mum and AC.

**Children state they had asked AC to give them "licks" to encourage their disclosures and it is likely, this would also, provide added security with RD in that they could claim AC had *forced* them to "*break the deal*". Given the nature of their fears about being killed by RD, the children needed to be sure that the person they were disclosing to was at least, as strong and powerful as RD. The children allegedly, do not know of any other type of relationship with a father-figure, other than submission to his dominance and total control.**

*'...our kids push our buttons precisely because they are our children. Psychologists call this phenomenon "ghosts in the nursery," by which they mean that our children stimulate the intense feelings of our own childhoods, and we often respond by unconsciously re-enacting the past that's etched like forgotten hieroglyphics deep in our psyches. The fears and rage of childhood are powerful*

*and can overwhelm us even as adults. It can be enormously challenging to lay these ghosts to rest.*

*'Parents and kids have the ability to trigger each other as no one else can. Even as adults we are often irrational in relation to our own parents. (Who has greater power to annoy you and make you act childish than your own mother or father?)'*

<http://www.ahaparenting.com/parenting-tools/positive-discipline/handling-anger>

In AC's case, the above quote is especially relevant as it is known, he suffered a traumatic childhood under thumb of an overbearing, brutally strict stepfather.

Indeed, it was probably exactly AC's strong, survivor-personality that encouraged the children to connect with him to the degree they called him "Papa Hemp": AC simply represented the same type of male authority as RD but who at least, did not sexually abuse them or force them to kill babies and who instead, showed a genuine interest in their health, bought them gifts and took them on holiday.

While RD, used force and threat to make the children to touch each other sexually,

AC employed similar methods to a lesser degree, to force them *not* to touch each

other sexually.

***Who can be prepared for dealing with two children who have according to their disclosures, been sexually abused for years in secret from their mum, have regularly witnessed and participated in, murder of babies, witnessing them \*skinned "with special tools" by two men from the local shoe repair shop and then, dismembering, cooking and eating babies, been regularly plied with drugs and alcohol and ordered by the "head of the whole thing", their dad, to attack you?***

*\*There is actually, a niche 'luxury' market for human leather.*

Both ED and AC were at one point, after the disclosures given on that 'holiday', afraid of the children as they kept "switching" back into the abuse-patterns and attack-mode as programmed by RD and which, increased in intensity after their disclosures; hence, the "cleansing ritual" via a "jug of lukewarm water" being poured over them also, described by children as; "water torture".

According to the children's testimonies, it is evident that both AC and ED were desperately trying to attend to the very severe psychological damage they now realized, her children had suffered; AC and ED are not child psychologists, they decided the first thing was to stop the children touching each other sexually because this reinforced the pattern.

*In total ignorance of ED's and children's statements, LAs placed both children together in their foster care home:* Foster carer states that children were constantly touching each other but not sexually; did she have eyes on them every moment? (D8) Even their own mum had only caught them out on the odd occasion and once, taking indecent photos of each other and a video which ED confiscated and deleted (D9).

*Justice Pauffley is unconcerned that police did not seek to corroborate ED's testimony about the children's photo's and video, or why they took them and/or who told them to take such photos?* Again, more evidence exposing the levels of discrimination displayed toward ED and her testimony (Doc 7). She is assumed to be lying.

**Since ED has no criminal record, no professional diagnosis of mental illness, is educated to Masters Degree level, runs her own vegan nutrition business and teaches yoga; why was her testimony so casually discredited not only by police but even, by the Family Division of the High Court?**

Surely, someone as highly acclaimed as Dr Sturges, would be well aware of all such psychological dynamics as are evident in child statements to herself, foster carers and police, along with a detailed, background history of children, RD, ED and AC? Did Dr Strurges read ED and RD's statements to police? Did they have no bearing on her interviews with child witnesses by way of arising questions from those, in attempt at determining the truth?

**Is Dr Sturges fully versed in the impacts of ritual trauma and how during process of disclosure, children are known to manifest heightened emotional and behavioural problems? (Doc 10)**

*"...As the process of disclosure brought children closer to their psychological pain and terror, behavioral and emotional problems emerged. Indeed, it appeared that children got worse before they got better. Depression with an unusual impending sense of death at their own or another's hand, extreme hyperactivity, aggressive acting out, obsessive fears and compulsions, reenactment of abusive rituals, and intense sibling conflict characterized the children's behavior as the disclosure process progressed."*

[https://web.archive.org/web/20120428043329/http://archive.suite101.com/article.cfm/ritual\\_abuse/63761](https://web.archive.org/web/20120428043329/http://archive.suite101.com/article.cfm/ritual_abuse/63761)

Dr Sturges also missed a variety of 'tells' in the girl child's 'retraction' statement to DC Martin; for example, when discussing AC's physical and verbal abuse against herself in Morocco, the girl states; "No" when she's asked if AC ever did anything like that in England to which DC Martin replies "Always in Morocco?" and then, girl answers; "He never knew that when we was here": **What was it that AC "never knew" when they were in England?** (H1 from Doc 3+)

In same interview, girl child goes on to state; "*Because I lied to him all this time.*

*Because that's why I keep on saying, changing things so I keep saying err, and my father done that and then that and then after, I keep on changing things because I don't know what to say, that's why I keep on getting hurt and that's why he [AC] thought I was lying":*

Who has told the child that saying "err" signifies a lie? What did AC think she was "lying" about? Again, does it make any sense that AC thought she was "lying" about the alleged "lies" he was allegedly "torturing" her to memorise and repeat to police? (H2)

A little further on in same interview, DC Martin says; "...*You don't know why there's scars on your bum?*" and then when child answers "no", he adds; "*but it's not because anyone's put anything in there?*" to which the girl replies; "*No, I don't know, maybe when I was little when I was having a bath, I think that's, I don't remember but maybe I slipped or something...*"

First, DC Martin is talking about scars ON the girl's bottom and then, he's talking

about people putting things IN her bottom? (H3) Clearly, the girl is afraid of getting into that "trouble" DC Martin has assured the girl she "*won't get into*" so long as she "*tells the truth*" now; *is it feasible that deep anal scarring and signs of RAD & PTSD (as evidenced in both children) could be caused by slipping on something in the bath when she was a toddler?* Why is the child so keen to give another account of how she sustained any such injury and even, going so far as to cite the address she lived at then i.e. "*When I was coming out of the bath in H C Avenue*"? Again, the child's apparent fear, is evidence of coercion.

**Was Dr Sturges employed to reinforce a chosen narrative or was it not her job simply, to determine the facts regardless of which narrative they supported?**

**Neither Dr Sturges nor Justice Pauffley, appeared to notice the sharp contrast in girl child's body language as exposed in original allegations and retractions; delivering the initial crime report, girl child is sitting upright, she appears alert and confident in her verbal delivery, while in retraction interviews, her body language signifies nothing short of total defeat - her verbal delivery is hesitant and lacks the same fluidity in response to questions from DC Martin.**

**The same applies to boy child-witness during his retraction interview too; his body-language strongly indicating confusion, fear and agitation, as he shifts uncomfortably in his seat and repeatedly makes a rolling motion with his hands, suggesting an innate desire to just get the interview over and done with. Why so keen to complete the interview? *Is he afraid that minus the retraction he will go to prison?***

It is disturbing that ED's, her children's and even a neighbour's historical statements referring to RD's violence and aggression, were presented to Justice Pauffley as 'evidence' that ED has a history of 'malicious accusations' against RD and that, in spite of the fact that County Courts had acted to protect ED and children, with RD being granted only supervised contact for a while.

**It was up to Justice Pauffley to adjudicate over the evidence fairly and without discrimination or bias for or against any party: It is important to recall that the hearing included the submission of secret evidence provided by RD and not**

**made available to ED's legal representative who herself was refused audience by the Court. AC had no legal representative at the Court and yet, nonetheless, a judgement was issued against himself as well as ED.**

**According to a House of Lords Ruling such circumstances represent a miscarriage of Justice:**

*"The control order regime enacted by the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 (and still in force at the time of publication) imposes severe restrictions, including house arrest, on anyone suspected of being involved in terrorism-related activity. Under the policy, the Secretary of State makes a decision as to whether a control order should be made and the courts then consider the decision made. In many cases, control orders have been made on the basis of closed material – where the person subject to the control order has never been given the chance to see the case against them.*

*"The House of Lords held in June 2009 that this breached the right to a fair trial under Article 6. The Law Lords held that a person subject to such a restrictive order had to be given sufficient information to know the essence of the case against him or her. It was held that there could never be a fair trial if the case against a person*

*was based solely or to a decisive degree on closed materials and where any open material consists only of general assertions. The Court held that in conducting control order hearings judges must consider whether material needs to be disclosed to ensure the fairness of the trial.'*

*"It was held that there could never be a fair trial if the case against a person was based solely or to a decisive degree on closed materials and where any open material consists only of general assertions."*

<https://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/human-rights/what-are-human-rights/human-rights-act/article-6-right-fair-trial>

In light of Justice Pauffley's judgement against ED & AC, it is unfathomable that she had commended Barnet Police and LAs, for their "thorough and extensive investigations" instead of admonishing them for closing the case after failing to arrest and charge ED and AC during September 2014.

Justice Pauffley blithely found both ED and AC in their absence, guilty of "torturing" and drugging children with "cannabis" in order to deliver a false crime

report to police against dad. Justice Pauffley implies that the lies were further embellished under influence of the film 'Zorro' and the book, '*The Lion The Witch And The Wardrobe*'. This judgement in favour of RD and against mum and partner, was then widely published throughout Britain:

**'Evil' mother tortured children into telling police their father was leader of**

**Satanic sex cult:** '*Ella Draper and her partner Abraham Christie, forced the eight and nine year old youngsters to lie they had been sexually abused by a secret sex ring*'.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/11483750/Evil-mother-tortured-children-into-telling-police-their-father-was-leader-of-Satanic-sex-cult.html>

**Justice Pauffley's judgement solely favours suspects, police and local authority unevidenced narratives, most especially, those of DC Rogers, DC Martin and RD.**

**Most disturbingly, the professional conclusion from Ms Kylie Wilson, a highly accredited expert in the field of interviewing child-witnesses, is casually brushed aside and what she describes as "*unfeasible*" in terms of children being 'coached', is accepted by Justice Pauffley as undoubted 'fact' that the children**

**were 'coached'.**

Five months later, October 2015, the foundations for that judgement were utterly undermined by the conclusions of the IPCC; all of their conclusions further support evidence of a highly organised cover-up or else, at the very least, criminal and/or gross negligence: Again; how is it possible for a High Court Judge during a 'fact finding Hearing', to miss all of those points queried by IPCC and most especially, *when hanging in the balance between fact and fiction, are the lives and welfare of countless children?*

Justice Pauffley has systematically failed in her duties as Judge in that she has exhibited extreme bias and discrimination against non-attending parties and victims, has exonerated 100+ lawful suspects on the flimsiest of evidence, has failed to correctly assign the case for reinvestigation with a view to prosecutions via criminal courts, failed to identify children at risk, failed to note police failings which cite; negligence, perjury, bias, discrimination and evidence related to; suspicions of a perversion of the course of justice, malicious seizure of witnesses with intent of coercion via fear and threat, malicious prosecutions against a

deeply concerned mother and her partner.

**Justice Pauffley, failed to admonish all authorities concerned, for their collective failures in assuring child safety and carrying out an adequate investigation even, on strength of instantly verifiable allegations i.e. Description of Mr H's genitals and various crimes scenes available for immediate forensic testing.**

Not at any point does Justice Pauffley question the motive and intent of any of the professionals presenting evidence against ED and AC, she casually accepts their statements and opinions just as she casually dismisses all evidence to the contrary. The children's crime report is pure "fantasy" she claims.

Perhaps Justice Pauffley would say the same to the United Nations Child Protection Committee who, in their Report for Britain June 8th 2014, cite ALL of the crimes and types of criminals, described by the children, as happening prolifically throughout Britain and most especially, in central London where abusers benefit from "extremely low" arrest and conviction rates and who thus,

are able to operate with impunity. The UN Report was widely published throughout Britain and sent to all appropriate authorities in order to raise 'vigilance and awareness': *Did the Family Division of the High Court not receive a copy?* (Doc 8)

## **8. 'Child trafficking**

*30. The Committee is strongly concerned that thousands of children continue to be trafficked every year in the State party, particularly for sexual exploitation and labour, and it expresses its deepest concern about reports that hundreds of children have been abducted from their families in Africa and trafficked to the State party for brutal religious rituals, such as the so-called voodoo and juju rituals. The Committee is particularly concerned that:*

*(a) The number of prosecutions and convictions of perpetrators of trafficking and other offences covered by the Optional Protocol is extremely low across the State party, leading to impunity for perpetrators; and that the prosecutors often choose to charge perpetrators of human trafficking with other offences, such as rape or abduction, in order to secure convictions...' pge 8*

[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=CRC/C/OPSC/GBR/CO/1](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=CRC/C/OPSC/GBR/CO/1)

It appears that Justice Pauffley had also, failed to read British MPs Report of 2013 that was broadcast via BBC: MPs state that organised child sexual abuse is "widespread throughout England" and that child protection authorities are presently "divorced from reality":

*'Their report said: "On the evidence we took, the alarming conclusion is that Rotherham was not an outlier and that there is a widespread problem of organised child sexual exploitation in England."*

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-south-yorkshire-30083835>

Indeed, it would seem that Justice Pauffley's judgement is too, "*divorced from reality*" and as a direct result, children continue to suffer and remain at risk, with all lawful suspects free to operate with impunity.

**Disturbingly, in the interim between 2014 to 2017, many of alleged crime scenes have been refurbished, these include, Finchely swimming baths, a MacDonalds**

**and the school; *the adjoining, school church where babies are alleged to have been killed, is reported to have had all of its wooden floorboards replaced.***

**Doubtless, suspects have had time to have tattoos, birthmarks warts etc surgically removed via lazer treatment and perhaps this is why some (after initially fleeing to other parts of Uk & EU), have recently returned to their former positions at Christchurch school & church? Regardless, any such treatments will leave some form of visible evidence either on skin surface or else, in case of tattoos, traces remain visible deeper under skin's epidermis layers.**

Some of the suspects and in particular, RD, continue to punish those asking questions: On behalf of RD, Barnet police, are keen to arrest anyone who shares links to the case via youtube videos on their facebook etc., and issue charges of harassment and intimidation; computers are seized and some, enduring periods in police cells and facing Crown court prosecutions: All such actions are supported by Justice Pauffley's judgement that has found RD "completely innocent".

Considering the nature of children's allegations against head and teachers at Christchurch school, it is odd that those teachers and the head, did not instantly volunteer to submit to medical examinations in order to disprove child statements about "red dots", "warts", "birthmarks", "tattoos" and "piercings" and thereby, quickly eradicate suspicions after the case went public. *Instead, the very few suspects who yet remain local, prefer to stand by RD and demand arrest and prosecution of those asking questions about their supposed "innocence".*

**It is noticeable that those expressing concerns about failures of Barnet police and resulting risks to children, can be immediately arrested and prosecuted by members of Barnet police i.e. DC Martin, who in contrast, had failed to arrest a single suspect on strength of two children's detailed and matching, medically evidenced crime reports.**

Such arrests of those resharing videos of children's police recorded testimonies online, are punitive, since regardless of all such arrests, the videos are reuploaded onto Youtube and other internet sites, almost as quickly as they're removed. Again, it is unfair as well as a waste of police time and resources, to single out

certain individuals for arrest and prosecution when such actions achieve very little progress toward protecting children's rights to privacy and serve only, to *increase* public suspicions and concerns. At the fore of public concerns about this case, is that in face of UK authority failings, who else but the public can remain alert to the safety of children now? Has Youtube been prosecuted?

Although ED initially suspected that her then McKenzie Friend Sabine K McNeill had uploaded documents relating to her case online, it remains unknown as to who exactly, uploaded the videos of children's disclosures onto Youtube.

Certainly, the Youtube uploads were not performed by ED, were completely against her wishes and without her knowledge: ED continued for some time, to suspect her McKenzie Friend was responsible for that action too and yet, with no evidence whatsoever, 10 police officers arrived at ED's home to arrest herself and AC for publishing details of the case when it was known to police, that multiple parties had access to that material.

Children grow up and soon, will be unrecognisable, if not so already - names can be changed: The Youtube videos were not published for "entertainment" whoever uploaded those, obviously did so out of sheer alarm after the JR request was refused and countless, very vulnerable children left at continued risk and rendered 'easy-prey' for a host of suspect professionals who had conspired to deny or else, had negligently denied, children's Human Rights; professionals engaged in rescuing trafficked children or removing children from their families on grounds of a '*future emotional risk*'.

Child trafficking is a very serious issue; trafficked children are especially vulnerable and there's a strong financial incentive behind child trafficking, with illegal drugs being a leading factor within that 'black market'/criminal-economy. Justice Pauffley appears oblivious to the issue as reality for "*thousands*" of children and babies entering Britain each year. Examining the Ecpat Report as referenced to below, the UNCPC are *absolutely correct*, arrest and rescue rates are 'extremely low':

**Child trafficking victims disappearing from UK care at 'alarming' rate:**

*'The report also underscores issues with identification and recording practices.*

*Despite London being a prime destination for human traffickers, 10 of 33 local authorities reported zero trafficked children, and an additional four local authorities were unable to provide any information.'*

*“There has to be an improved data recording system put in place for trafficked and missing children,” said Setter. “Many of the authorities we asked couldn’t even search for these children in their existing databases.”*

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/nov/14/child-trafficking-victims-disappearing-from-uk-care-at-alarming-rate>

*'The responses from local authorities in London show considerable variance between neighbouring boroughs. London is considered a key destination for human traffickers, where some of the highest numbers of victims are currently recorded. However, nearly a third (10 of 33) of London authorities reported no trafficked children, as shown in Figure 5, prompting concerns about low awareness, a lack of training and possible poor recording practices in these areas.'*

<https://www.ecpat.org.uk/heading-back-to-harm-a-study-on-trafficked-and-unac>

companied-children-going-missing-from-care-in-the-uk

Children have rights to justice: *It appears London authorities are more concerned about upholding family Court privacy rules than they are about protecting children from lawful suspects who have direct access to them.*

**The upshot of it all, is that a mother has been unlawfully tried and judged in her absence, remains estranged from her children, children are receiving no therapy for damages they have in all probability sustained and, children remain at risk.**

Regardless of which side of children's testimonies one believes, the point, is that justice needs to be seen to be done and when justice is lax around crimes that leave children damaged for life or dead, this is a cause for alarm and a root-cause behind the steady and ever increasing flow of historical CSA crimes now being heard in UK Courts. The social and economic costs of all such damage to the next generation, are tremendously steep.

Public morale on the issue of police actions toward combating child sexual abuse is presently, *very low to outraged*. Only a few months ago, London Metropolitan police were severely reprimanded for their extremely poor responses to children's crime reports: ED's experience is now fully supported by the HMICFRS - Criminal Justice Inspectorates:

**'Over 90% of 135 cases inspected found to be substandard, despite force repeatedly being told it was endangering children.'**

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/nov/24/met-police-still-failing-child-protection-policies-report-finds>

It is possible that Justice Pauffley was simply overwhelmed by the sheer amount of professionals standing by RD and against ED and AC and, that in face of their collective agreement on the case, a mum's concerns and two child witness crime reports were subsequently, greatly diminished. Indeed, it is odd that the only person among all those professionals to question the veracity of the 'retractions', is Dr Deborah Hodes, another highly accredited professional who, informed the High Court that she felt the children's original allegations needed to be taken "**very seriously**".

**It is imperative that the Court promptly address the points of concern and evidence as presented here and thoroughly investigate Mrs Justice Pauffley's repeated involvement in this case and with her input, serving only to deny the validity of any evidence supporting the child witness victims original allegations.**

In light of the two IPCC Reports, Justice Pauffley's Judgement on the case is lawfully rendered invalid and yet most disturbingly, continues to endorse multiple, lawful suspects as "*completely innocent*" and thus at liberty to continue their careers within child protection authorities, education, courts, leisure centres and police.

**New Evidence:**

**Part 1**

**Besides the 2015 and 2016 IPCC Reports, further new evidence proves RD (an unemployed, semi-professional actor) is a calculating liar, keen to say anything for purpose of inviting positive social regard, is presented via BBC News shown**

**April 2015, soon after the High Court Judgement: RD is given an empathic, 25 minute interview with Victoria Derbyshire, as a "victim of a cruel hoax":**

*RD states he was asked by police about "killing and cooking babies" and expresses his alarm on being asked such ridiculous questions; he implies that police had shown him the home-recorded videos of his children's allegations; he describes and mimics, their hand movements as they cite RD helping them to kill babies: The truth, as previously shared, is that RD was questioned only about one incident of alleged abuse in a swimming baths and, he was never shown the home-recorded interviews because allegedly, even police had not examined them.*

RD also blatantly lies on that same BBC News programme, about the levels of violence he inflicted against ED, citing "pulling at her sweater" and "accidentally" breaking her glasses, claiming ED was responsible for his actions.

We cannot forget there's ED's historically recorded testimony, her son J and her daughter, who all cite same details of the brutal violence ED had suffered on that

occasion by RD and to such an extent, J called police and had to protect his younger siblings, while RD allegedly, slammed him into a corner: J at age 7, recalls seeing his mum on the bathroom floor with a large lump "sticking out of her hair" after RD is reported by J, as having repeatedly banged his knee against ED's head on the floor and after he had "broken her glasses". (E1)

***Why does a "completely innocent man" need to lie to the BBC ?***

**Why was a top BBC news presenter, Victoria Derbyshire, so misinformed, she delivers a false statement to the public in claiming that ED had "*recorded videos of her children*" making gruesome allegations, while on holiday abroad "*and then, \*uploaded them onto Youtube*"? When in fact, ED had then taken her children to report those allegations to police and spent the next 9 months seeking justice for her own and other children; \*there is not a single shred of evidence to support the notion that ED or AC, had published the recordings onto Youtube.**

## Part 2

**Further evidence not then available to Justice Pauffley, relates to RD's extensive knowledge of computing and internet mechanisms and his involvement with a malicious and vindictive, online hate-group:**

As a result of her later attempts to get public support for the children's rights to justice, after all appeals to London authorities had failed, ED and supporters, since 2015, have been under regular, online attack, which amounts to stalking & harassment from an organised group, who run a website titled 'Hoaxtead Research', their sole purpose, is to discredit people who express concerns about Barnet police response to children's crime reports and resulting risks to children.

Various members of the British public suffering online attack via Hoaxtead, have reported their libel and vile comments, to police but to no avail; Hoaxtead remain free to publish terrible lies and insults against anyone publicly expressing concerns about the original allegations; commonly they stalk targets online presence, spy on their Facebook etc., and/or issue threats e.g. A link to a photo of

the individual's home road and the comment "*anyone fancy a house warming party?*" (E1, E2, E3, E4)

Hoaxtead members regularly find ways to get themselves on campaigners Facebook friends or email lists and then, publish screenshots on Hoaxtead website as a means to discredit or ridicule the target.

**Are Hoaxtead members and their tactics, indicative of innocent people established to defend innocent people?**

ED has evidenced reason to suspect that RD is responsible for creating 'Hoaxtead' (E2, E3); certainly he has the online capability and his own business is specifically related to indepth, internet knowledge, for purpose of providing advanced levels of internet-business-promotions. RD now runs a company in New York, titled 'Lighthouse Media Group Ltd' for exactly those purposes among others.

*<https://www.manta.com/c/mm09cv4/lighthouse-media-group-limited>*

Without doubt, RD has detailed knowledge about how to operate on what is commonly referred to as the "dark web" where all kind of illegal online activities occur, from selling and buying of illegal drugs to child pornography and 'snuff' videos: Such venues also, attract customers through advertising certain products deemed 'offensive' on mainstream networks i.e. The different coloured, "plastic willies" children allege RD "*makes in his [mum's] shed*". (E5 & E6)

Barnet police are not interested in arresting or investigating RD, for 'harassment, stalking and libel' nor, for evidenced suspicions about his operating from behind multiple, fake online identities in order to troll, libel, threaten and harass ED and others.

RD (who now operates under a new identity), previously sold his skills in advanced, online, advertising: 'Sock-puppet' accounts are translated for potential customers, as; 'strategic research strategies on competitors', undoubtedly, this would include, setting up fake online identities to leave positive online-reviews, attack anyone who left negative reviews or else, give negative reviews against competitors. Beneficiaries of such tactics are then enabled to; 'dominate your

industry.'

*'The main focus, to simplify, taking out the overwhelm that limits a companies growth (ROI) and apply expert strategic research strategies on competitors, allowing you to go into a market place either for the first time or ongoing and dominate your industry through expert Media Buying...'*

<https://uk.linkedin.com/in/dearmanricky>

**The problem of online 'sock-puppet' accounts has become a serious concern, with numerous businesses and individuals facing regular attack by competitors or adversaries: One individual can appear as 100+ online identities which collectively, operate to intimidate and discredit the target or business:**

*'Kumar and his colleagues at the University of Maryland and Stanford University in California analysed commenter accounts on news websites including CNN, NPR, Breitbart and Fox News. They identified the sock puppets by finding accounts that posted from the same IP address in the same discussion at similar times. This approach isn't always possible, so they wanted to develop a tool that*

*automatically detects sock puppets based only on publicly accessible posting data.*

*'They found that sock puppets contribute poorer quality content, writing shorter posts that are often downvoted or reported by other users. They post on more controversial topics, spend more time replying to other users and are more abusive. Worryingly, their posts are also more likely to be read and they are often central to their [online] communities, generating a lot of activity.'*

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/2127107-sock-puppet-accounts-unmasked-by-the-way-they-write-and-post/>

Further new evidence provided by an independent IT expert, connect RD to an internet IP address which has connections to a child pornography website titled '2heartsdelight.com' (Doc 14); hearts are commonly used by paedophiles to denote a preference for little girls and on that site a little girl of same name as RD's daughter, advertised as 'age 9' is being offered (H4). It appears that RD uses his 'Natural Vitality Research' company and website as a means of accessing such sites (H5) and also, to cover his online tracks.

Given the nature of allegations, RD's online activity and that of his supporters at Hoaxtead, is certainly an added fact of evidence and further cause for concern.

The internet link below shares insight related to Hoaxtead members: Although such research is unofficial, members of the public expressing concerns about the case and suffering online-attack by Hoaxtead, in absence of police investigations, are moved to conduct their own research (*see Hamspead Exposed/The Evidence*).

<https://www.hopegirlblog.com/2018/05/30/my-experience-with-hoaxtead-a-gch-q-trolling-website-with-satanic-roots/>

### **Part 3**

**Very recently, RD under another name, has himself broken a High Court Order prohibiting children's photographs etc., being published in the UK and, we cannot forget that RD has keenly prosecuted many UK citizens for sharing Youtube videos of his children giving their crime reports to Barnet police. Nonetheless, in video link below, RD is featured with both his children as beneficiary of an Ebay business-award for his high sales of "slime", a children's product of multi-coloured 'goo'.**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fQhn5t5-j8w&app=> [Now removed after complaints from ED to London LAs]

ED is naturally, deeply concerned and disturbed by this recent Youtube video. It has immediately been noticed by the global public showing ongoing interest in the case and the concerns are, that both children are once again receiving publicity as young teenagers.

ED, did not publish any images or videos of her children and whoever published those did so, without her consent. ED had gained some comfort in knowing that by now, her children's appearances would have altered so as not to be easily instantly recognised and by adulthood, will be unrecognisable. That 'comfort' is no more - being now known publicly as teenagers, even in their young adulthood, they will be recognised as the infamous "Hampstead Children".

The very fact RD has given further publicity to himself and children as "*victims of a malicious hoax and torturous abuse*", is further evidence supporting the veracity

of the concerns as fully exposed in this case complaint. In light of the negative publicity and allegations, this may lawfully be construed as yet more evidence exposing RD's suspected, psychopathic-narcissist personality disorder - a psychology known to be a prime feature of characteristics in those who sadistically abuse and even kill children.

RD is shown via the Ebay award video, to be covertly profiting from his own and children's infamy and probably, sending a covert 'thumbs-up' to his alleged fellow 'Satanists'/sadistic-abusers at 'Hoaxtead'. Furthermore, the 'Satanic' references remain, being as 'Slime' is most popular around Halloween: Examining that Ebay Award video, girl child witness, is decidedly uncomfortable and boy child's broad grin, appears somewhat forced.

Strangely, London LA's (Harrow Council), though alerted to RD's violation of the Court Order protecting his children from further publicity, were casually unconcerned about the fact that RD has 'blown' his children's anonymity; no arrest or charges against RD - no concerns or questions are raised about how, as victims of a gruesome and malicious hoax, a genuinely innocent dad could ever

submit his children to such heavy online scrutiny again? Indeed, the online community showing ongoing interest in the case, have lost no time picking up on the Ebay Award video and using it to attract viewers for funding their Patreon accounts, selling merchandise and to expose even, the children's Facebook accounts and new names!

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6qFYStH\\_Y9w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6qFYStH_Y9w) [Now removed from Youtube]

In fact, when ED contacted London LAs, supposedly caring for her children, to complain and alert them, she was advised by one of their lawyers, a Ms Susanna Hargreaves to '*contact the Family Courts if she's not happy with their decisions*'. Considering that according to the evidence, ED is a victim of organised crime that has denied all her parental right of contact and responsibility and is surviving on limited funds abroad, after being forced to flee the country on strength of mere suspicion she had violated her children's privacy, how can it be down to ED to address any newly identified evidence exposing ongoing risks to children who are now in LA care? It is responsibility of the care-providers to submit any evidenced concerns to Family Courts.

**In contrast, RD is not 'suspected' of violating his children's privacy, he HAS violated their rights to privacy.**

This case-submission had already at that time, been sent to Harrow Council and their solicitor, along with IPCC Report and IICSA letter supporting the case-submission to CCRC, after 'examining the case very thoroughly'.

Unfortunately, the CCRC can only review cases that have been though Appeal and ED has repeatedly been denied right to Appeal by Justice Pauffley: The point being; if ED has no right of Appeal to Family Courts, how can she possibly be expected to reopen the case via Family Courts?

#### **Part 4**

**The link below, shares a Freedom of Information request via Ms Jane Webb to whom we here, express our sincere thanks and appreciation for her extensive research and valuable contribution toward achieving justice for all the children cited at risk in this case:**

[https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/hampstead\\_christ\\_church\\_child\\_ab?](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/hampstead_christ_church_child_ab?)

fbclid=IwAR3f4knYulav2y2e4kPd51TxqG3FMRj2xFPyez364BU4RbsmXKsOHpPW1K

Y

To summarise, it transpires that RD, had numerous associates in London who had formed into a group as early as 1984, many of whom, 23 in all, are included as directors or shareholders etc., in this dormant company that has been in existence for 34 years. Members include:

**A Church Of England Minister**

**A Police Inspector**

**RD**

**"Tollgate Square Management Company" '**

<http://suite.endole.co.uk/insight/company/01872112-tollgate-square-management-company-limited?page=people-contacts&loggedin>

The Tollgate link above, reveals associates that include teachers, doctors, clergy, a lorry driver, taxi driver and even, a top international financier. Although many of

the original members are no longer active in the company, nonetheless, it is not unreasonable to suspect that some, may continue to remain in contact with each other.

It is noticeable that many of the company associates listed, all have or had, addresses at Greenwich Crescent, London. When ED met RD around 2005, he informed her that he was in the process of selling his house at Greenwich Crescent.

This information corresponds with the now convicted members of a Satanic group who operated in Wales, as featured in link below:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/mar/09/paedophile-satanic-cult-batley-kidwelly>

Group members all from London, had brought properties in a cul-de-sac situated in Kidwelly South Wales. Greenwich is a crescent; cul-de-sac, crescent - both areas afford a sense of privacy to the residents being as non-resident pedestrians or cars, rarely drive or walk through such areas.

There are many anomalies with police handling of the Kiddwelly case and it is strange so few members were prosecuted and equally few victims identified, when it is clear, many more abusers and victims were involved.

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/g00/news/article-1364583/Evil-paedophile-guilty-running-cul-sac-sex-cult-seaside-home.html>

Certainly, RD's Tollgate \*connections, do confirm aspects of the children's original allegations that place him as someone with a wide range of social-associates; teachers, clergy, police, taxi drivers, financiers etc. Why was he involved in that dormant company? Why were so many members living at Greenwich Crescent where average house-prices today, are around £400,000 - £500,000? How did RD manage to afford such an upmarket home in the years before he partnered with ED?

**\*We do not state that all 23 former and present members of Tollgate LTD, are or have been, involved in organised crimes against children. We do state that in**

relation to the children's allegations, the Tollgate LTD members are all persons of interest as likely associates of prime suspect RD cited by his children as; "head of the whole thing".

*We cannot forget that London is home to numerous occult groups and to the degree, there is a veritable concentration of such groups when compared to the other large cities in Britain.*

The next part of the FOI request, refers to Christchurch school Church's choice of band who were invited to perform at the Church during 1983. The band/group named 'Psychic TV', had previously played at The Hell Fire Club caves and Caxton Hall; there are strong links between Caxton Hall and the infamous 'Satanist' Aleister Crowley.

In 1982, Phsyic TV had released a video titled 'First Transmission' - *'a deeply unsettling compilation video that features several films made by 'The Temple ov Psychick Youth'. It's about 6 hours long, it has the 'satanic abuse and murder' on it,*

*a bunch of interviews, some ritual pornography, footage of People's Temple leader Jim Jones, Psychic TV on BBC2, and truly sick quasi-snuff film called "Castration Movie". "Psychic TV Vol.1" for example contains "The Ritual of Psychick Youth" which documents a brutal and sadistic TOPY initiation ritual...'*

**Again, it is very strange that a Church located in grounds of a primary school, would invite such a group with undeniable and widely published Satanic associations, to perform there.**

On its own, such information may appear to have little relevance but when coupled with two children's very serious allegations, this evidence cannot be dismissed as 'coincidence' and when such coincidences appear so numerous in this case; can we equally assume the confirming medical evidence is a 'coincidence' too and that the Barnet police officer is correct i.e. deep anal scarring and RAD are due to 'large, solid poos' or else, a 'possible normal variant'?

**Another concern raised in the FOI request is as follows:**

*'Is it any surprise The Judge involved within the case, called out by MPs and Journalists alike for her position on immigrants hitting their children as being OK, deferred the opinion of a respected paediatrician Dr Hodes, in favour of a Tavistock Psychologist [Dr Sturges], who is infamous among working class families as being a means of distinct psychological distress but furthermore, the illegal nature of the relationship between Tavistock, Coram and CAFCASS operating together, as admitted here*

---

*Dear Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust,*

*Do Tavistock work in partnership with CAFCASS and CORAM?*

*Yours faithfully,*

*Jane Webb*

---

*Dear Ms Webb,*

*The Trust does work with both.*

*Yours sincerely,*

FOI Officer

Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust

---

When they are required by statute to be independent of the courts, social services, education and health authorities and all similar agencies?

Yours faithfully

Jane Webb'

**When added to the evidence we already have, all of the above evidence adds even more weight to the veracity of the children's original allegations and to such a degree, we can be in no doubt that all children cited as victims in this case, remain at risk and not least, ED's own children who as yet, remain in care of RD.**

**Part 5**

**More evidence in relation to profits from ritual murder, has come to light and exposed via the police-video-recording as previously referred to, in relation to officers at Barnet police warning suspects; girl-child witness is delivering her initial crime report to DC Martin as revealed in the video shared here:**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jj-fvrijTg4>

Note that the girl child is responding promptly to questions asked by DC S Martin i.e. No signs of hesitance while she is allegedly, trying to remember what ED & AC, have "coached" her (with cannabis) to say:

***"...Yes, yes - they keep the bones - they make stuff out of them - carving people - a man called Felix - near Swiss Cottage - he makes statues of churches..."***

Barnet police chose to completely ignore that first interview, claiming it did not meet CAIT standards of having an expert professional to support the child witnesses (see CRIS reports) and yet, all following interviews were performed by same Interviewing Officer and no 'expert-professional' named as 'present'.

**It transpires that carvings made from human bones has its own niche market and indeed, child skulls etc., sell for high sums:**

**This link to an online 'shop' sells 'fetal & child skulls' for \$2,000+**

[https://www.boneroom.com/store/c205/Fetal\\_%26\\_Child\\_Skulls.html](https://www.boneroom.com/store/c205/Fetal_%26_Child_Skulls.html)

The shop is based in USA where it is legal to buy and sell human bones. The children's bones on sale in that shop, are cited as from India and China:

*'Once India stopped exporting human bones China took over as the main supplier of human bones to the United States. However, just prior to the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing, China too stopped exporting human material. No other country has yet stepped up and material is much more scarce than it once was, but a decent number of bones from India and China still remain in the United States and may be freely sold.'*

[https://www.boneroom.com/store/c83/About\\_Our\\_Products.html](https://www.boneroom.com/store/c83/About_Our_Products.html)

ED has recently discovered that bone-carving is a popular and often cultural, hobby or profession; an artist based in Virginia USA, Zane Wylie:

*'is making thousands of dollars not just by using his head, but using the skulls of others.*

*Zane Wylie carves intricate designs on to real human skulls he has obtained legally, \*usually online\*.*

*He sells them online at RealHumanSkull.com for as much as \$8,000 each.*

[https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/zane-wylie-skull-carver\\_us\\_58175e58e4b064e1b4b38192](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/zane-wylie-skull-carver_us_58175e58e4b064e1b4b38192)

**Ritual child sacrifice remains a covert feature of mostly rural, Indian culture, with village authorities regularly opting to ignore such crimes which are often, performed as a cover for purpose of extracting human organs to be sold for transplants:**

### **INDIA'S KILLER 'GODMEN' AND THEIR SACRIFICIAL CHILDREN**

Gavande cites the example of Rupesh Mule, 9, who was killed as a sacrifice in November 2014, by a tantric wanting to locate a hidden treasure in Maharashtra. Nine people were accused of kidnapping the boy, removing his kidneys and heart

and dismembering him. Tantrics allegedly consumed the organs while chanting mantras. A court acquitted the group in 2017.

*"I saw my son's body," says Rupesh's father, Hiramand, 32, "They had carved his organs out with the precision of surgeons and butchers. But despite the evidence, including confessions of the accused, the case didn't stand in court. All these people, who killed my child, were let off. I've filed an appeal in a higher court, but I'm not very hopeful."*

*"Human flesh is considered as maha prasad (great oblation) in Tantrism.*

*Kalika-purana, a Tantric text of from the 12th century, has an entire chapter on the procedure of human sacrifice, and it states that the sacrifice of a man would keep the goddess Kali pleased for a thousand years. Devotees subject their victims to a lingering death, preferably under prolonged torture, as by this means the flesh, blood and bones are believed to be properly confected."*

[https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/society/article/2141250/indias-killer-godmen-and-their-sacrificial-children?fbclid=IwAR0XLxLfDWD8Jloso7n\\_Yj5JAmdL5XLzOkV4YrV23e1SI5iNbRLSflzQPRc](https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/society/article/2141250/indias-killer-godmen-and-their-sacrificial-children?fbclid=IwAR0XLxLfDWD8Jloso7n_Yj5JAmdL5XLzOkV4YrV23e1SI5iNbRLSflzQPRc)

**As Barnet police interview with RD confirms; from 2011 to 2013, RD, an estranged dad, dependent on unemployment Benefits, with a criminal history of violence and aggression toward women and children, later accused of organised abuse, trafficking and murder, who has in-depth knowledge of the internet and has studied the online-porn-industry, spent a period of two years visiting America & India:**

Did he make contact with someone in USA who buys children's bones and has contacts with child-bone-sources in India? Did he employ profits from crime, to travel to India in order to participate in and learn, how to perform child sacrifice, dismember the bodies and eat the flesh? Did he also, procure human bones to sell to his contact in USA?

**In context of 21st century reality, the children's crime reports are not a "fantasy": A ritually sacrificed/murdered baby-skull is, according to the evidence, valued in excess of £1,000. RD's children state he's murdered and eaten "hundreds" of them. A hundred baby skulls equates to £100,000+, if one has the 'right' connections for finding buyers.**

**How much would a "*statue of a church*" allegedly made out of ritually-murdered, 'babies bones' fetch on the 'Dark-Web' ? How much more would it sell for if the 'statue' was accompanied by e.g., a 'snuff' video or photo's of the baby being 'sacrificed'/killed?**

Considering London is an epicentre for trafficked children and a place where children are known to be suffering 'torture' via 'brutal religious ceremonies' - according to the United, Nations Child Protection Committee; 'hundreds' every year, surely, a central London Police CAIT team are not employed to be that naive?

**We cannot forget that the child witnesses did not cite 'Satanism', they stated that their dad and his friends are part of a "*special culture*" who participate in a "*special religion*" with "*special children*".**

All of the above is further evidence of motive, opportunity and intent - evidence

that weighs far greater than the comparatively, ludicrous and unevidenced idea that a sane and caring mum and her new boyfriend, would 'coach' her children to state such details to "stop contact with dad" and, with aid of "torture & cannabis" while on two week holiday abroad.

**Again, this is further testament to Dr Sturges incompetence because any child psychologist understands that torture, abuse and cannabis, are definitely not helpful tools for coaching children to remember a fictional narrative. Trauma especially, is known to cause psychological 'splitting' which operates to bury the traumatic memory:**

*'Dissociative amnesia occurs when a person blocks out certain information, usually associated with a stressful or traumatic event, leaving him or her unable to remember important personal information.'*

*'With dissociative amnesia, the memories still exist but are deeply buried within the person's mind and cannot be recalled. However, the memories might resurface on their own or after being triggered by something in the person's surroundings.'*

<https://www.webmd.com/mental-health/dissociative-amnesia#1>

In case of ED's children, it appears AC was the 'trigger' for the children's disclosures in that he presented an alternative male authority, who provided alternative surroundings and who noticed their behaviour was strange/abnormal. As such, it is likely AC was the first adult to validate their own inner but to them, as yet unsubstantiated idea, that what RD and his friends were allegedly doing to them, was actually criminal.

## **Part 6**

**In light of allegations against herself, ED has recently submitted to a lie-detector test performed by a highly accredited professional expert in that field:**

**<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=65jhjtLmyU8>**

The test itself, was organised by an independent legal professional who took an interest in ED's case on behalf of child rights and safety.

Although UK Court procedures do not usually include lie-detector tests, nonetheless, this does show a williness on part of ED to further prove her innocence; the results of said lie-detector test, reveal conclusively that ED did not "coach" her children to give a fabricated crime report to London police.

*According to the officially recorded and accepted evidence, the children in this case including other alleged, special children and hundreds of trafficked babies, have received the same level of justice as provided by an Indian village 'court', though it has to be noted that at least, the Indian village court did not attempt to prosecute the parents or members of the public for discussing the case and demanding justice.*

## **Part 7**

**Further to previous new evidence, there have been some recent developments related to aforementioned 'Ebay Awards', which highlight all of ED's concerns:**

To recap: *ED's concerns cite lawful suspicion that criminals operating within UK*

*police and London authorities in particular, are directly involved in both committing and/or covering up, organised crimes against humanity, are abusing their powers to negate adults & children's crime reports as well as, abuse their collective professional powers to pervert the course of justice, legitimise abusers and traffickers as adoptive parents or foster-carers, hand victims reporting CSA into care of known suspects, discriminate against victim-witnesses in favour of suspects, engage in malicious prosecutions against victims and witnesses, and also, coerce, threaten and control, victims and witnesses (including 'Whistleblowers' employed in police & LAs).*

It has come to our attention that prime suspect RD, had during 2019, been visited by a Sussex Police officer who received his statement, in an effort to silence & prosecute yet another member of UK public; MT, due to his online activities asking questions about the case and referring to RD. Regardless of MT's online activities and whether or not they constitute harassment etc., some of the details disclosed via RD to Sussex police, are now relevant to this case and amount to new evidence supporting ED's concerns relating to RD, the children, UK London Police and associated Local-Authorities.

Two police-recorded video links were sent to ED and are available to the Court within the case bundle. ED has since contacted Sussex police sending evidence and requesting they act to assure child safety but they have declined and insisted ED contacts London Metropolitan Police about the matter, despite the fact that multiple officers employed at the London Met' are themselves, implicated among lawful suspects and to date, the London Met' have ignored any evidence that contradicts RD's claim that he is "completely innocent".

At start of video 1: RD claims that Mother & partner tortured & drugged his children to deliver a false crime report against himself and others, to police and, they uploaded home recorded videos of children citing gruesome allegations against himself onto YouTube. This is Hearsay. No charges were ever issued against said parties - neither have criminal records in relation to any such charges and neither have been convicted for such crimes. There are no arrest warrants for either party. There is no evidence to support the allegations that those parties uploaded videos onto YouTube and, a Family Court decision addressing a 'custody-dispute' does not 'completely exonerate' RD from remaining a lawful

suspect. Nonetheless, such is the power of a Family Court judge & London Met', the Sussex police officer does not query or seek to validate RD's claims.

**It appears that both children were placed in RD's care despite Dr Sturges reporting to the Family Court that girl child had stated she "*does not want to live with her Dad*" but would like to "*stay with her Foster Carer*":**

**Video 2 @ 0:47: RD states: "*They [police-Social Services?] created a smokescreen and said children were going into foster care but the foster carer was me*".**

This is an example of evidence to support suspicion that UK London Police & LAs, regularly abuse their powers to hand victim-witnesses into care of lawful suspects; children who were denied the justice of due-process in relation to crimes against humanity and were further abused and threatened/coerced while in police & LA custody: *When ED and UK public were informed via Family Courts that children had gone into Foster Care, after March 15th Hearing under Justice Pauffley, this was a 'lie' and RD as an uninvestigated prime suspect and beneficiary of positive-discrimination, cited as 'head' of a national & international*

CSA-child-trafficking, murder-ring, was in fact, given the status of 'Foster carer' in order to receive his children.

RD Talks about children's FaceBook accounts being targeted by online characters but neglects to mention that the children's FB accounts were accessed directly, due to worldwide internet exposure via his own aforementioned Ebay-Award promotion video during 2017, through which, children's new identities were broadcast to the UK & global public, thus, reigniting public interest in children, RD and the case.

As RD explains to the Sussex police officer that his children won Ebay awards for their online company selling 'Wonderful Slime', one can see via the video that RD's and children's home, is largely, a business premise. RD states that his children "*run the business*" which he claims is "*therapeutic*" and "*educational*".

UK police & authorities clearly have no concerns about child labour (i.e.

'handmade' toys exported to 15 countries) or, a father who blatantly ignores

Court Orders protecting his children's rights to privacy and himself, subjects his already infamous children, to further global online scrutiny for purpose of his business interests, children who, as a direct result, suffer online invasions into their FB accounts etc., via public disclosure of their new identities?

RD talks to the Sussex police officer about how his children are travelling all around UK to do 'Slime Parties'

**RD was accused of profiting from his children via sales of child pornography, child prostitution, CSA & murder videos in which children are allegedly, forced to participate in killing trafficked babies. No longer at liberty to earn income from such crimes, is he continuing to exploit his children to earn income in other ways e.g. via selling 'wonderful slime'? What else might RD & associates be selling under cover of selling 'slime' and hosting 'slime-sessions'?**

If said business was meant to be a form of 'therapy' - surely, an innocent & caring parent would have made sure that the 'therapeutic business' did not include

material that is most popular around 'Halloween' and could trigger disturbing memories about 'witches, Satan, skulls' etc., as details the children were allegedly drugged & tortured to memorise and recite to police?

Again, is this not more evidence to support aforementioned suspicion that RD, being fully aware of his children's infamy, is inviting business/financial support from among fellow abusers & 'Satanists' throughout the world via selling 'slime' and, that this suspected objective is WHY he chose to publicise his children and their new identities online via the Ebay Award video?

RD states in Sussex police video, that his children promote their slime-product via local activity sessions etc., in various locations which include, churches; same venues children had cited as locations for regular abuse and murder. RD brags about how much money his children's business has raised for child charities: ED is left wondering if RD & other alleged, criminal associates, are using 'slime' as a means of continued abuse against her own children and/or to access other children? Of particular concern is mention of charity work for & with, children who are sick - Sir Jimmy Savile used such charitable work as cover for his own CSA

crimes and also, to gain access to vulnerable children for abuse. Professional people using charities as a cover for organised CSA & child trafficking, is also cited by United Nations Child Protection Committee.

### **Wonderful Slime, Brighton**

*Gab and his children run an eBay store selling handmade slime toys. They have already exported to 15 countries, and have hosted slime parties for 70+ children suffering from cancer and other debilitating diseases.*

<https://www.birminghammail.co.uk/special-features/winners-first-ever-ebay-business-13652320>

**Again, why involve children in a business that takes them to all the same kind of venues they were allegedly drugged & tortured to 'memorise' as sites of horrendous abuse & murder?**

**Slime Planet Half Term Workshop in Brighton @ St Mary's Church**

*Join Slime Planet for a spooky slime session in Brighton, making bugtastic glow-goo, amongst other slimy things!*

<https://www.familiesonline.co.uk/local/brighton-and-hove/whats-on/slime-plane-t-half-term-workshop-in-brighton>

It appears RD & ED's children do not receive much of a weekend or school-term break being as weekends are regularly spent hosting slime-sessions at a Church etc., and doubtless, would have involved many nights preparing for such events. How MANY toys and weekend 'Slime-Sessions' are the children making & hosting each month? RD listed names of several places across Britain where he says his children have held 'slime-parties'.

How can *any* of this be accepted as "*therapeutic*" when even, the children are again, this time as part of their business promotion, subjected to SAME mass publicity and public debate about the children's allegedly 'coached' crime reports?

**UK Police & LAs appear oblivious to any of the above questions.**

Equally disturbing is Sussex police officer's comment to RD at end of Video 2:

"You're creating new laws for us" i.e. Setting precedents.

**Basically, RD's case is being exploited by UK police and LAs, to 'tighten up' controls around children's crime reports and heavily punish UK citizens who ask questions or share evidence of lawful suspicion, related to crimes against humanity and/or individual cases of CSA.**

**Directly due to such 'precedents' UK citizens can expect up to 10 years imprisonment for 'harassment' related to CSA allegations posted online, while people convicted of CSA and/or making, owning & selling indecent images of children suffering often, extreme levels of abuse, are commonly receiving suspended sentences of one or two years and even, in some cases, still at liberty to have contact with children!**

Note it appears 'Wonderful Slime' has changed in name to *'Slime Planet'*. RD informs the Sussex Officer that the company "*had to change the name*" due to public harassment against himself and children, when as previously stated, it was himself who invited public interest by giving himself & children mass publicity via the Ebay Awards for Wonderful Slime. RD complains that he's been unable to work and the business has been suspended due to people like MT. He says he had to "sell" his car, that his children have to "walk to school" and states that the previous week he had "no money to buy bread & milk".

*\*We cannot state for certain that 'Slime Planet' is the renamed 'Wonderful Slime' company run by RD & children. It may simply be a coincidence that Slime Planet as an entirely different company, was operating similarly to 'Wonderful Slime' in same location as RD & children are now known to have been residing in at that time.*

All of those statements imply that RD is financially dependent on the business run by his children in their spare time from school work. But why this focus on the business and finance in relation to his latest prosecution against a member of UK public?

We cannot forget that to date, on RD's behest, the London Met have successfully prosecuted many people on charges of 'harrasment' against RD & children. RD tells the Sussex officer that it is now "illegal" to mention his name online.

In relation to police arrests on his behalf, RD refers to Rupert Quintescence & Sabine McNeill (formerly ED's lay-legal advocate). Rupert a USA Radio-DeeJay (who expressed published interest in the case and disgust at what he believes is a cover-up), took a photo of himself on a public pathway outside Christchurch school in London and posted it on his FB. No children or any other people were included in the photo. One FB commentator asked if he had a "biscuit" in his pocket and RQ replied "you mean a knife?" as it appears 'biscuit' is a slang word for 'knife' in USA. Those comments and the picture, were enough to get Rupert arrested and imprisoned for 9 months (on charges of threatening behaviour), via same London police [mis]handling children's original crime reports. RQ did not have a knife in his pocket and no knife was visible in his FB photo.

It transpires that RQ was, after expressing his concerns publicly, repeatedly harassed, publicly ridiculed & threatened online by Hoaxtead members, such tactics extended also, to RQ's mother. He had responded angrily to such attacks and retaliated with threats himself. His visit to UK and Christchurch school was therefore, judged 'malicious-intent'.

Sabine McNeill was tried via Crown Court in 2016 on charges of malicious harassment against children & RD. She was found 'not guilty' by the Crown Court Jury.

**Despite this, the Judge after dismissing the Jury, imposed a RESTRAINING ORDER on Ms McNeill.**

Just prior to Christmas December 2017, Ms McNeill (disabled, age 74, former CERN employee), was imprisoned on Remand for 9 months, charged with breaking the RO.

It transpired she had discussed the case-concerns at a Church Synod and had, prior to that, unknowingly shared links to the case on a private, German internet forum i.e. She had shared links to another case without realising that link included

links to ED & RD's case. During her 'trial', she was forbidden from discussing original case.

**All the allegations Ms McNeill had been acquitted from in 2016, were reintroduced as 'evidence'.**

**The Judge threatened to hold in contempt and with threat of imprisonment, anyone who publicly discussed Court proceedings during Ms McNeill's case. A media blackout was issued.**

In 2018, Ms McNeill was sentenced to 9 years imprisonment. She is now about to be returned to her native country, Germany, after serving over 2 years (due to Brexit). She will be released on arrival into Germany as German Law does not impose such sentences for the level of crime Ms McNeill (allegedly via 'fair trial'), has been found guilty of committing in UK.

According to the volume of online evidence RD shows to Sussex officer, it appears he devotes a lot of time toward finding online posts about the case and certainly, supporters among 'Hoaxtead' members are equally reporting anyone sharing FB, Twitter & YouTube posts citing RD & children, to police and very probably also,

RD.

**ED strongly suspects that RD is recipient of financial compensation as a victim of crime, those payments would include income lost via inability to work or run a business. Does every successful prosecution against UK citizens unwittingly sharing YouTube videos etc., render RD eligible to apply for compensation? *Is that why he spends so much time talking to the Sussex officer about how the ongoing harassment has impacted him financially?***

At one point RD 'slips up' as he informs the officer that he "*showed*" the children MT's 'harassing' posts/videos and then hastily alters that word "show" to "*told*". Since RD DID slip up there, ED believes that RD did indeed SHOW their children online material allegedly posted to harass himself & children. Why would he do that? The Officer asks RD if the children are receiving therapy and he replies "No" and states that the last time they received therapy was "four and a half years ago" via talking to Dr Sturges prior to the 2015 March Hearing. He claims the children are doing very well - clearly, RD's concerns as related to MT's online activities, are solely related to harassment against himself and not his children.

It has since transpired that MT received a 2 year suspended sentence, a fine and 18 months Community Service for asking questions about the case and mentioning RD's name online. He is also, restricted from working with children. Noticeably, a far harsher sentence than that given to aforementioned Friar Gardner of Camden Town, who in 2014 was convicted for possessing & making "thousands" of indecent images of children - some including a child and a dog.

While very few if any of the people prosecuted on behalf of RD, have issued threats or directly harassed himself or children, those being prosecuted are burdened with the crimes of others, who have made all kinds of vile comments and threats against RD - such people never use their real names and are untraceable. RD claims such mass online attack has left him "suicidal" and therefore, those simply asking questions etc., are deemed to be perpetuating such attacks. ED suspects that RD and/or his supporters at Hoaxtead, could themselves be sending such threats (via their numerous, fake online identities) in order to further support RD's role as "persecuted-victim" and thereby 'justify' harsh prosecutions against people asking questions online as well as, bump up

amounts granted as 'compensation'.

The fact is, ALL of the original police & home-recorded videos remain on YouTube to this day and each with YT 'share' buttons inviting people to share to their FaceBook, Twitter etc. This can be construed as a form of entrapment; people have no idea it is now a 'crime' to share those videos or mention RD's name alongside such posts until, police arrive at their doors to force entry, perform arrests, confiscate phones, computers and search their home.

Though RD claims to the Sussex officer, that he's "suing" YouTube in reality, he's spent most of his time prosecuting those sharing the YouTube videos: How much income in 'compensation' has RD earned via YouTube now? Is that why YouTube to date, remains unprosecuted by RD and is it why all of the YT videos remain so prolifically available?

According to one arresting UK police officer (whose name & number are available to the Court), over 1,000 individuals across Britain, were arrested & charged on

same day during January 2018, for sharing details of the case online and expressing their doubts about RD's alleged innocence.

During that same period of the 2018 mass arrests, Hoaxtead 'trolls' are recorded as discussing online (mostly via comments on certain individuals YouTube videos or Facebook comments), in reference to a "big scoop" and inexplicably, knew full details of charges and conditions imposed on the various individuals they targeted. 'Inexplicably' because those charged were prohibited from discussing their arrest & charges in public and none were in direct contact with Hoaxtead members. Such knowledge could only have come from RD himself, implying that either RD was writing such posts under fake identities or else, he is in contact with Hoaxtead members and therefore, is himself implicated in the libel and death threats many of those prosecuted, have received via Hoaxtead supporters & members.

Basically, the opportunities for reporting organised crimes against children are fast shutting down completely in Britain and with Brexit threatening to leave Britain as a law-unto-itself; with few adequate child protection protocols in place,

the future does not bode well for a nation cited already, as 'Child Abuse Capital of The World'. The British public are being covertly programmed via actions taken against people like Ms McNeill etc., to STAY AWAY from CSA allegations - even so much as discussing them in public can land one in prison!

### **Conclusion:**

It is evident via information shared in this complaint, that the criminal activities as alleged by child witnesses, along with Barnet police and LA failings, have all been heavily smothered by a 'fog' of Family Court issues which, bear no relevance to the allegations that; *professional adults employed within a variety of central London authorities and businesses, have colluded to commit and cover up, very serious crimes against children in their care.*

Of further concern is the fact that ED's previous crime reports against RD and as confirmed by her three children as witnesses and, as further upheld by County Courts who granted non molestation and injunction Orders against RD, were cited

by Barnet police as evidence to support RD's opinion that all such crime reports and County Court decisions, are actually, the result of 'malice' via ED: An opinion, most disturbingly, later upheld by Justice Pauffley and despite the fact not a shred of evidence has been presented to support that allegation and instead, all the evidence confirms that ED's historical crime reports to police against RD, were genuine to such a degree, the County Courts acted to protect ED and her children.

The same scrutiny applied to ED and AC, has not to any degree, been applied to all of the lawful suspects in this case. Right from the start, police have acted to minimise concerns raised via child witness statements and supporting evidence; the gist of police and LA opinion is that the original allegations are 'incredible'.

Considering Justice Pauffley had already refused a Judicial Review on the case in January (after children had retracted their retractions), and thereafter, refused to request any further investigations on strength of the February 17th Hearing (which barely, if at all, focuses on children's original allegations), was she really, the right choice of Judge to preside over the March 2015 'fact-finding' Hearing?

(Doc 3C)

It is disturbingly clear, that the narrative most favoured by Barnet police and associated LAs, is the same narrative suggested by RD in his police interview and by DC Martin via the 'retractions'. The levels of discrimination at work are without doubt e.g. Much is made of the fact that ED left her children in care of a trusted adult, while she went abroad for a couple of weeks (which is not a criminal offence) and yet, meanwhile, no one cares to focus on RD vanishing to America and India for 2 years?

Authorities are deeply concerned about what ED puts into her children's lunch boxes but are not concerned at all that RD's 9 year old daughter has stated to social workers who visited her at school to discuss contact with dad, on 5/08/2014, that her 8 year old brother is not happy to be seeing RD again because he [RD] "had hit him" in the past (E8): That same social work report goes on to state that RD had not seen his children since July 2013. Again, no concern is expressed either, about children's reports to mum and social workers, that RD had placed them both on a very high wall and then drove away for half an hour as a "punishment" for not speaking to him on the phone. (E7)

Justice Pauffley expresses no concern that Barnet police failed to seek child witnesses confirmation on statements about RD as recorded in ED's police interview. ED like her children, is simply assumed to be lying and even, in face of Barnet police recorded evidence that e.g. RD is deeply engaged in "learning" from the porn industry. (E7)

It is evident that no credibility whatsoever was given to ED's interview with police, which shares officially confirmed details about how she has been a long-term victim of overt and covert attack via RD, whose main interest is in having easy and direct access to their children i.e., the children he never bothered to contact for a couple of years and then, suddenly reappears in their lives, expecting to be 'dad' again.

In comparison, RD's statements against ED to police, are nothing more than hearsay backed up by lawful suspects who are given most credibility against ED, due directly to their professional status.

The IPCC Report of October 2015 is of particular importance: Why were UK authorities and the BBC not as interested in what the IPCC had to say on the issue, as they were on what Justice Pauffley had stated and also, RD?

**Child protection in Britain is surely, a very sad state of affairs when it is apparently, *perfectly normal* for medically evidenced children's crime reports also, involving child trafficking and murder, to be casually dismissed after suspect authorities have seized witnesses and coerced them to 'retract' via such methods as are exposed in this case.**

***Considering the evidence presented herein, one is left wondering what does it take for London police to investigate crimes against children?***

**The British public are effectively asked to accept that black is white when it comes to investigating children's crime reports and certainly, the discrepancies in this case, have exposed the dire impact of Keir Starmer's '*credibility clause*'**

**and how it can be used to inhibit investigations the moment any reference to 'Satanic' abuse is involved.**

The idea that satanic cults are a 'myth' is an ongoing conclusion and this, despite the fact that many such 'cults' are now evidenced i.e., the aforementioned 'Satanic/sadistic Cult' exposed in Wales, where a group of people from London, bought properties in one area and had conspired to abuse children for many years. Welsh LAs and police had failed to investigate even, when an 11 year old girl became pregnant and reported the criminals to LAs.

The Wales case was only investigated when said child had grown to adulthood and reported historical crimes due to fears for the safety of her own child. Again, looking at that case, there are many anomalies in police investigations with only 3 people being arrested and charged when it is clear, that many more were involved: Funds for lavish life-styles were said to have been earned via prostitution of two female suspects.

The Satanic cult in Wales (which bears some semblance of details to this case) and other cases as exemplified in aforementioned Marantha Report, are legal, case precedents that Justice Pauffley ought to have taken into consideration: It is a known fact, that such 'cults' are often controlled by very powerful individuals with equally powerful connections and, there is strong evidence to support suspicion that publicity around organised sexual abuse of children and 'satanism' have been kept largely hidden from the general public via the very same methods as are revealed in this complaint.

**'Paedophile cult leader convicted for 'satanic' rape campaign: Colin Batley was self-styled high priest of group that handed children around for sex in Kidwelly, west Wales':**

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/mar/09/paedophile-satanic-cult-batley-kidwelly>

Ritual Abuse is an ongoing crime in this world and to this very day, established authorities throughout the developed world, continue to negate the reality of it.

Micheal Salter, a reknown professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice, has devoted much of his professional career toward exposing the issue and its impacts:

### **Organised child sexual abuse in the media**

*'Drawing on Kitzinger's (2000) notion of media templates, the essay demonstrates how patterns of media reporting on organised abuse in the US came to inform reporting in the UK and Australia. The subsequent "echo chamber" reinforced a homogenised stereotype of organised abuse allegations that was highly conducive to the claims that the problem of sexual abuse had been exaggerated for ideological reasons. Recent trends in media coverage of sexual abuse have challenged such claims, and the essay closes by considering the uncertain and contradictory state of contemporary media coverage of organised abuse allegations.'*

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306017225\\_Organised\\_child\\_sexual\\_abuse\\_in\\_the\\_media](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306017225_Organised_child_sexual_abuse_in_the_media)

Psychopathy is a very real aspect of human psychology and within that mindset, criminal types (not all psychopaths are criminals), enjoy inflicting sadistic acts against their victims and most often, for sexual pleasure; children are especially desired because their powerlessness, fear, innocence and sensitivity to pain, increases the levels of power and illicit pleasure, sadistic-psychopaths crave.

**Britain's 'Credibility-Clause' appears to have given a 'green-light' to sadists who are thus at liberty to perform 'incredible' acts against children as people who profess an affinity with 'Satan' or similar type demonic-entites. In contrast, survivors, non-abusive and caring individuals show kindness & respect to children and find an affinity with e.g. Jesus. Considering Jesus is a socially accepted character supporting compassion, it stands to reason that non compassionate, abusive people, turn to his antithesis as supporter of their criminal and sadistic activities.**

*'...Sadistic individuals have poor behavioral controls, manifested by a short temper, irritability, low frustration tolerance, and a controlling nature. From an interpersonal standpoint, they are noted to be harsh, hostile, manipulative,*

*lacking in empathy, cold-hearted, and abrasive to those they deem to be their inferiors. Their cognitive nature is considered rigid and prone to social intolerance, and they are fascinated by weapons, war, and infamous crimes or perpetrators of atrocities. Sadists classically are believed to seek social positions that enable them to exercise their need to control others and dole out harsh punishment or humiliation. For this reason, some have postulated that there is a higher prevalence of sadism among individuals who work in such settings as law enforcement, correctional facilities, the military, government, and the justice system.<sup>14</sup> In addition, several studies have demonstrated a significant sex bias, with most individuals with SPD being male, consistent with the theoretical literature and clinical findings.<sup>8,18–20</sup>*

<http://jaapl.org/content/34/1/61>

ED's, her children's and others, officially and historically recorded testimonies against RD in particular, reflect an apparent, sadistic and/or psychopathic personality type and that is perfectly in-keeping with the children's crime reports of 2014: Why was this not counted as evidence by Dr Sturges, in Justice Pauffley's fact finding hearing?

**Evidence supporting suspicion of a cover up is shown from the first instance, in relation to Barnet police decisions about who to interview and who to ignore i.e. AC was never interviewed - why, when he had helped initiate disclosures, had home-recorded children's allegations and was implicated as an abuser in the retractions?**

Barnet police claim it was because he committed the crimes alleged via retractions, abroad. Still, AC had played an active role in hearing those disclosures, he was in fact, a prime witness but no one in any authority wanted to hear his testimony? (Doc 12 1-3) By choosing to only interview ED and RD, it was easy for police to bring domestic issues to the fore and to negate the case as an issue of domestic acrimony and a 'custody battle' falling into sole remit of Family Court.

They could not do that if AC was involved because ED had met AC years after splitting with RD, so he cannot be assumed by police to have malicious intent against RD. Police failure to interview AC (even after the retractions), is very

strong evidence supporting suspicions of a criminal conspiracy to deny justice to children in an effort to protect lawful suspects from arrest and investigation.

**Barnet police have provided NO account for why they failed to interview or even arrest AC other than, he committed the crimes in Morocco and yet, he cannot be assumed to have committed ANY crime if police have failed even, to interview him in order to substantiate either original allegations or the retractions.**

The point is, there needed to be investigations after the retractions - furthermore, police provided no motive other than his relationship with ED, as to why AC would abusively force the children to tell such terrible lies?

This idea that police could not prosecute AC for crimes against the children because they were committed in Morocco, is very tenuous rationale for their inaction because AC had himself as a UK citizen, taken the children to Morocco and had returned to reside with them in UK.

As UK citizens in care of UK citizens while on holiday, UK police have a duty-of-care to address any crimes those children suffered while in Morocco because they were all UK citizens while in Morocco and were not permanent residents there; any risk AC may present to children as a UK citizen is therefore, an ongoing concern. Indeed, aforementioned UNCPC Report complains about UK police failures to prosecute UK citizens for their crimes against children while abroad.

According to Barnet police opinions, any British parent or adult, may take a child outside the EU to abuse that child knowing they'll be free from prosecution here in the UK.

**Another very important point is that the retractions are also, another crime report; it is gross negligence that police decided to ASSUME that crime report was true without bothering to interview AC.**

No one can go to police, make a statement against someone and thereafter, UK Courts can just accept that statement as 'fact' minus police seeking any statement whatsoever from the suspect: Court actions happen through CPS after police have submitted evidence to support prosecution; the CPS are lawfully required to have valid grounds for prosecution in form of evidence of crime, witness and suspects statements and any other associated evidence - these are BASIC requirements and yet, somehow, assumptions about AC based ONLY on two child witness statements by children who are 'known' (according to Barnet police) to have "*lied before*", get introduced to the High Court and even, accepted as 'solid evidence' against AC: Police had ample time between September 2014 and February 2015, to arrest and interview AC & ED.

***If UK citizens can be publicly condemned as 'guilty' via such flimsy evidence as presented before Justice Pauffley, surely, all of the evidence shared herein amounts to cause for a multitude of urgent arrests and investigations?***

As stated previously, any charges against AC would have put the whole case into the criminal courts. Clearly, all authorities involved, wished to keep the case

within confines of Family Courts and their protective secrecy and indeed, the March 2015 High Court Hearing operated partly, in case of evidence presented by RD, within the boundaries of its Family Court division:

**In essence, Justice Pauffley presided over a discriminatory Hearing being as RD was heard within privacy of Family Court secrecy, while ED and AC were afforded the full publicity as given to a criminal case.**

Justice Pauffley hears the case as a custody battle between RD and ED, she concludes that the now doubtful retractions were solid evidence and that, in spite of the obvious and very serious concerns, later raised by two IPCC Reports regarding those retractions; *all such concerns, were presented to Justice Pauffley by ED's legal representative and case-bundle.*

Further evidence of discrimination against ED and in favour of RD, is shown in police and LA and other professionals willingness, to suppose that ED is suffering from mental health problems when all of the evidence most strongly points to RD

as mentally unstable and yet, Justice Pauffley recommended in August 2015, that RD should be given full custody of his children within 6-12 months: *Obviously, J, ED's eldest son had simply lied to police? The concerned neighbour who stated to LAs that all the neighbours were "scared" of RD, had 'lied' too? County Courts and Social Services were previously incorrect, when they decided that RD posed a risk to his children via his propensity for 'violence and aggression' ?*

**Justice Pauffley perhaps, had missed the part of Dr Sturges testimony in which she states girl-child does not want to live with her dad but would like to remain with her foster carer?**

It is noticeable that neither child expressed any concern to DC Martin about what would happen to RD on account of their disclosures and yet, both children express concerns about what would happen to ED and AC after their retractions, which shows at the very least, they have a deeper emotional connection with ED and AC than they do with RD.

No one bothered to check on RD's family either even though, both children state that RD had suffered same abuse within his own family as a child and, that they would be expected to "do it" to their own children when they grew up.

**If one applies the same scrutiny to RD as has been applied to ED, on strength of child witness statements, a very different picture emerges than the one favoured by London LAs.**

Without doubt, ED had struggled to account for and deal with, her children's severe behavioural problems and it is noticeable that children had become "a lot calmer" when RD vanished abroad for over a year; this would strongly support the understanding that children's behavioural problems were directly related to contact with RD.

Given the nature of their crime reports, ED's children appear to have suffered very severe psychological and emotional damages over a long period of time and all within the confines of strict secrecy under threat of death from people who

allegedly, murder babies. It is difficult to understand how any among the professionals casting judgement against ED in this case, have failed to appreciate the enormity of what this mother has had to face and deal with in parenting her children; *essentially she is left to cope with untold damages that actually require expert attention far beyond the capabilities of the average parent, it is akin to judging a parent for their 'failures' in delivering psychiatric therapy. Most disturbingly, those same rules of absolute secrecy are later, reinforced by the Family Courts.*

**At no point is there any concern regarding a child's right to justice: Can a child's right to 'privacy' take priority over their right to justice? The truth is, a child's safety takes priority over their rights to privacy and most especially if 'privacy' amounts to secrecy for abuse: A missing or abducted child is not given any rights to privacy, those rights are wavered for more vital concerns for their whereabouts and safety.**

According to the evidence, ED's children are suffering continued secrecy on behalf of abusers under cover of their removal into 'care' by London LAs. To all intents

and purposes, from ED's perspective, her children are both missing and abducted.

Justice for children by necessity, cannot depend on a child reporting crimes; a trafficked baby cannot report crimes to police: How does a nation provide justice for children if crime reports citing trafficked babies and crimes against them, are ignored as "incredible". Is Britain a nation that just flatly refuses to provide justice for victims of child trafficking, torture and murder?

***Are "thousands" of children being trafficked into Britain each year or not?***

Within the context of Family Court concerns, the criminal aspects of the case were largely omitted and most especially in relation the 20 "special children" who are alleged to belong to 20 special families with parents and their other children involved in the abuse and murder; the count of "special children" therefore, increases to around 30+. Given the nature of suspect professions, it is probable that some of those 'parents' may be adoptive parents, foster carers or child

traffickers, all of whom, could easily be legitimised via the powers of associates within the group.

**According to past case precedents, the understanding that professional people of respectable social status, can and do, abuse their powers to abuse children, is *not* a "myth" and the examples shared below, are by no means, isolated incidents:**

*'Myles Bradbury was jailed in December 2014 after carrying out medical examinations on boys "purely for his own sexual gratification" while working at Addenbrooke's hospital in Cambridge.*

*'The paediatric consultant haematologist used a spy pen to take photos of some of his victims and abused others behind a curtain while their parents were in the room.*

*'His victims included children with haemophilia, leukaemia and other serious illnesses.'*

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2017/oct/07/nhs-trust-pays-600000-to-abuse-victims-of-childrens-doctor>

**Hundreds arrested as Canadian police smash worldwide pedophile ring in 2013:**

*“The arrests included 40 schoolteachers, nine doctors and nurses, 32 people who volunteered with children, six law-enforcement personnel, nine pastors or priests and three foster parents,” said inspector Joanna Beavan-Desjardins.*

*<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/hundreds-arrested-as-canadian-police-smash-global-paedophile-ring-8940562.html>*

Basic Human, Child and Family Rights demand a fair Court Hearing and access to justice, protection and professional support, none of which, was granted to any of the children included in this case, instead, they have received the exact opposite via a long line of negligent professionals leading ultimately, right up to the Family Division of the High Court.

**In light of official Reports and associated evidence, the children's crime reports are entirely credible. The children could not 'retract' the medical evidence.**

It is noticeable that DC Martin expresses plans to interview children again once they're in care and before the alleged retractions. DC Martin also, arranges for another medical examination to occur while children are in care thus, subjecting children to further trauma: Why, when the first examination had confirmed abuse? (E4) This is evidence that DC Martin had a predetermined plan of action to illicit retractions and to possibly pin medical evidence on AC or else, produce a 'reason' to doubt it.

*Again: What is the point of medically examining children reporting anal rape, if the results can be casually dismissed as a "large, solid poo" or else, a "possible normal variant"?*

**Given the evidenced suspicions and concerns as shared in this complaint, it is hardly a surprise to witness the avalanche of historical child sexual abuse cases now coming to light in Britain. Considering all abusers in those historical cases were, for many years, left free to commit ever more crimes against children, it is not unreasonable to assume that in all probability, such criminals were free also, to invite more of their ilk into power and authority and to such a degree, it is by**

**today's knowledge, perfectly feasible that central London could very well harbour an unusually high percentage of criminal professionals who, have long benefitted from the London Met's shoddy responses to crimes against children.**

The information cited in 'New Evidence', is of immense significance and not least, the evidence exposed via the aforementioned FOI request: A school church cited in 2014, as a venue for ritual murder of trafficked children, had in 1983, invited a Satanic-Cult band to perform on their premises; was it around that time the 'Cult' had begun?

Certainly, Tollgate LTD was up and running just a year later, with its members including all of the professionals cited by children as members of the criminal-group i.e. Teachers, police, clergy, a nurse, a lorry driver, taxi driver and with many members, residing at Greewich Crescent which in itself, is highly suspicious being as it does correspond with members of the Satanic cult in Wales.

Did members of Tollgate Ltd, have more in common than business interests? We

cannot forget that RD had himself, allegedly owned a home at Greenwich Crescent and was also, a member of Tollgate Ltd. Given RD's knowledge of computing and internet, perhaps, he was welcomed as a skilled and experienced addition to the group, which allegedly, by 2014, he was the 'head' of.

Having been at liberty to allegedly commit crimes with impunity for for a period of 31 years by 2014, doubtless, the suspect group would be highly organised and well protected via a network of powerful professionals employed in key positions of authority throughout central London.

Such criminal-syndicates work to entrap often, very reluctant accomplices, usually via provision of illegal drugs and/or coercion, threats, bribery and blackmail: One criminal with power, can control a million unarmed people. Therefore, the concerns of this case are extremely serious as the evidence does relate to an issue of national-security: *What kind of political, economic and decisions related to law and rights, will sadistic criminals be responsible for e.g. Will sadists not thoroughly benefit via both profit & pleasure, from imposing 'austerity' on a nation and then using the harsh conditions of poverty, to justify removing children from their*

*family homes?*

Will sadists, not happily bomb innocent people and children with depleted uranium (as Britain has endorsed in Iraq), on strength of lies about WMDs and even, lies to Parliament claiming that Depleted-Uranium weapons have been passed via the Geneva Weapons Review?

In 2011, the Minister for the MoD, had to give an apology to Parliament for lying to its members a decade earlier, in relation to the legality of DU weapons; it transpired they had not been through the Geneva Weapons Review:

**Armed forces minister sorry for misleading MPs over depleted uranium**

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/nov/14/minister-sorry-dangers-depleted-uranium>

With such evidence in mind, it is not 'conjecture' or 'far-fetched' to arrive at seriously alarming suspicions when we are faced with evidence exposing a huge, secretive and highly protected criminal-ring of sadistic and murderous child

abusers, who clearly, have immense powers of authority reaching into the highest echelons of UK society e.g. In 2015, Patrick Rock as senior advisor to David Cameron PM, was convicted for possessing and making 'indecent images of children'. Patrick Rock (commonly known as David Cameron's 'fixer'), was at the time, head of David Cameron's 'policy-making' cabinet at no10. Mr Cameron had recommended Mr Rock for a Knighthood:

### **Was Patrick Rock tipped off about arrest for child abuse images?**

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/mar/04/cameron-patrick-rock-tip-of-f>

With Britain's history of past-case precedent of granting Knighthoods to suspected child abusers, it is sadly, no surprise that the UK public have recently received confirmation via Wiltshire police, that former Prime Minister, 'Sir' Edward Heath, had repeatedly sexually abused children (many procured by 'Sir' Jimmy Savile from UK children's homes). Mr Heath was commonly known among his victims, as "The Claw":

### **Police chief '120 per cent convinced' Edward Heath was a paedophile**

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/mike-veale-convinced-edward-h-eath-paedophile-wiltshire-police-child-sex-abuse-a7588101.html>

**Such 'big' names as cited above from historical cases, reflect a mere fraction of the countless 'high profile' CSA-criminals now convicted and hence, supporting all of the suspicions as shared here, on the lawful foundations of past-case-precedence and on balance-of-probability.**

It is known beyond doubt, that all such crimes committed by 'high-profile' individuals, have been repeatedly covered up and in total ignorance of the ongoing and actually increasing risks against countless children. It appears that criminals embedded in UK authorities, have been at liberty to go from strength-to-strength, while British children have suffered ever tightening levels of secrecy around their crime reports, coupled with greater degrees of police and local authority negligence.

Is it any surprise that child abusers would deploy their powers toward creating

Family Courts that are a law-unto-themselves and operate in strict secrecy? That the same powers have endorsed privatisation of UK Social Services and children's homes etc? All earning huge 'profits' through causing actual emotional damage to children, by permanently removing them from their family homes on grounds of a 'future emotional risk' and parents, threatened with long term imprisonment if they dare to discuss their case in public?

**Is it any wonder, that every year, thousands of children go permanently missing from Social Services records i.e. Babies age of 1 year and under, and *not a single individual held to account?***

Evidence of a cover-up, is equally disturbing as the crimes described by child witness-victims in this case. A Family Court judge's gavel, cannot be employed as a 'magic-wand' i.e. A Judge's decision based on negligence, discrimination and perjury, does not render all the evidence here presented, obsolete and in fact, the time elapsed since Justice Pauffley's decisions, has done nothing to diminish ED's suspicions and instead, her concerns are strengthened via yet more evidence supporting allegations against RD and his lawfully suspect associates as well as,

against all professionals entrusted to handle the case.

Further cases coming to light since 2014, continue to expose the thoroughly negligent response from UK police toward reports citing sexual crimes against children:

**Lostprophets' Ian Watkins admits sex offences including attempted rape of baby.**

<https://www.theguardian.com/music/2013/nov/26/lostprophets-singer-ian-watkins-admit-offences-attempted-rape-baby>

As with this case, a key witness citing evidence to police against Ian Watkins, was repeatedly dismissed as an "incredible witness" and even, after she had submitted her laptop and phone displaying texts & photos involving children as sent to her by Ian Watkins. Furthermore, police attempted to prosecute that same witness for "harassment" and then later, as a suspect acting in complicity with Mr Watkins!

**All such evidence as listed herein, do expose exactly how easy it is for criminal associates to control a school, a church, local police and social services and even, a judge, via abuse of their collective social-powers whereby, the law is completely reversed; suspects are cited as 'witnesses' and witnesses are cited as 'suspects'.**

Not a single named & known suspect arrested, only one suspect questioned in an interview which fails to deliver barely even a fraction of the medically confirmed allegations, no forensic testing of crime scenes or intimate examinations of suspects with identifying marks described & drawn, no seizure of phones or computers, no searches into suspects online activities or their involvement in child charities abroad, no examinations of CCTV, results of drug tests on children's hair samples go "missing" and, anyone failing to accept the narrative that children were tortured, drugged and coached by their Mum & new partner, is, according to Justice Pauffley, "*evil and foolish*" ?

One is left wondering; *what level of evidence DOES it take for London police to investigate crimes against children?* Do children need to bring forth a video record

of the abuse? Or, is that not the job of police to unearth, on hearing medically confirmed allegations related to making of child pronography and 'snuff' videos'?

***Due to the fact that according to the evidence here presented, many children remain at risk to this very moment in time, it is a matter of urgency, that the prevailing concerns are promptly addressed.***

### **Mother's Final Plea to the Supreme Court**

*I cannot put into words, the anguish I feel for my children. London police negligence and the High Court judgement, have added to that anguish; it is even more evidence that my children's crime report was honest. On being forced to flee Britain, I had hoped then, that other authorities would have stepped forward to assist and I would be able to return.*

*I feel my children's original crime reports have been greatly negated through an imbalanced focus of attention, onto the actions of AC as facilitator of my*

*children's initial disclosures to he and myself.*

*AC did use some force and display anger against my children during disclosures but he did not do so to force them to lie; his actions were in direct response to requests from my children and later, to the extreme nature of disclosures coupled with the very vindictive, aggressive and sexually disturbing behaviour displayed by my children, all of which, did trigger post-trauma related to his own suffering as a child. Looking back to that time, it is as if AC had become unhinged, he was thrown back into his own childhood experience of brutality from his stepfather. I tried my best to stay calm and deal with the situation rationally.*

*When we returned to Britain, AC wanted to gather more evidence - he wanted to know where the teachers lived and was telling everybody about my children's disclosures, even strangers serving in local shops. This is evidenced in the CRIS reports as one shop assistant reported AC's statements to police. This is also evidence that AC was himself suffering from post trauma due to the shocking disclosures, he clearly felt out of his depth; telling others perhaps helped him to feel that somehow, such public disclosures more validated my children's*

*disclosures as real and perhaps, afforded some form of safety through public awareness? AC did initially, have great difficulty in accepting my children's disclosures and later, he was even suspicious of myself in terms of my own possible involvement with the alleged "special culture".*

*AC's behaviour was as totally unexpected as my children's disclosures; both my children confirm to police in disclosures and retractions, that he had only behaved in that manner during course of our stay in Morocco.*

*Although I had only been committed to a relationship with AC for a few months. He had fully disclosed to me his criminal past and errors he had made. I placed my trust in the man he had worked hard to become. I appreciated his honesty about his past, an honesty I had not experienced from RD.*

*AC had suspected signs of sexual abuse in my children from July 2014, having already witnessed impacts of sexual abuse on a child within his own family. However, neither he or myself were prepared for the deeply disturbing details*

*disclosed to us in Morocco.*

*I am no longer with AC, after initially, I was forced to rely on him for moral support on returning to and later, in fleeing from Britain on facing arrest for allegedly, violating Family Court secrecy rules. AC too can no longer return to Britain, he cannot see his family, he like myself, has lost faith in British authorities.*

*Given the nature of my children's very serious disclosures and the impact on us all, I did not feel at that time August 2014, at liberty to submit myself and children and also, AC, to an acrimonious break-up after serious flaws in his character were suddenly revealed. It was clear that AC has a very poor coping mechanisms in face of severe stress and his responses were at times, verbally & physically abusive against my children and myself: Nonetheless, AC is now a witness to my children's behaviour and disclosures which, at that time, presented a far more serious and immediate concern of risk than his reactions to them.*

*AC did try to persuade me not to return to Britain and instead, flee to Russia my*

*homeland. With hindsight, I wish I had heeded that advice but at the time, I sincerely believed my children and all the other children would receive justice. I knew many of the alleged "special children" as my children's friends at school and then, all those allegations about trafficked babies. My conscience could never allow me to ignore the severity of ongoing risks - I was sure that once other authorities were involved, all of the children would be rescued.*

*I struggled alone for many years to raise my children and provide for their every need; I could not know what physical and sexual damage they suffered with RD but I did notice the psychological and emotional impact on their behaviour and health and tried everything I could to address their often, severe problems. I never experienced sexual abuse myself as a child, it was a far distant issue, not something I ever imagined would be afflicting my own children.*

*I am now, most alarmed to have recently been reliably and indirectly, officially informed that RD now has custody of both our children.*

*How is it possible that London LAs can continue to abide by Justice Pauffley's now proven negligent Judgement in favour of RD, when they have been sent details of IPCC Reports and both of those official bodies supporting my complaints which most severely undermine the validity of that much earlier judgement?*

*It is deeply distressing to think that after all RD's complaints about my taking our children to Russia to visit their Grandparents, the endless harassment, the constant LA scrutiny by teachers and social workers critically watching my every move as a parent, the trauma of the constant worries, the difficulties in trying to connect with my damaged children and blaming myself and even, their diet, for their often, terrible behaviour and health issues; RD, now has full custody of our children who are employed in RD's family-business and escorted to Churches etc across Britain, to sell a Halloween product?*

*Even, UK LAs have no legal obligation to inform me of any details relating to my children's welfare or whereabouts.*

*How can it be that RD is prohibited from having full weekend contact with our children and then only supervised contact which eventually, amounted to a few hours twice a month, yet now, is suddenly deemed "fit" to be full time parent?*

*How did he get from being judged a risk to being judged totally safe?*

*What else, other than my children's crimes reports and their clearly coerced retractions, has added or detracted anything to so significantly alter LAs past judgements?*

*Only Justice Pauffley's judgement which claims that all my own and my children's crime reports against RD, were untrue and/or malicious and thereby, implying that injunction orders and non molestation orders against RD, are based on lies.*

*I am deeply troubled to hear through RD's statement to Sussex Police, that my children have received no therapy since 2015 and, any therapy my children had received before then, has probably caused them more damage being as all those therapists accepted only, the 'retractions'. Instead, "therapy" now amounts to child labour and being trafficked around Britain hosting slime parties!*

**I fear for my children's present and future safety and the same, for all children included in my children's crime reports to Barnet police.**

***It is my hope that the Court will fully appreciate the lawful validity of my evidenced concerns and complaint and now take steps to remedy the immense, ongoing damage and risks, Justice Pauffley's judgement supports.***

**I declare that everything stated herein, is true to the best of my knowledge.**

Ella Gareeva (formerly Draper)