

3/4 February 2021 SRA/SDT Hearing at High Court before Mr Justice Saini – Points to make

- As we are being recorded and I may need a transcript of this Hearing for any appeal then I will have to state for the record the background to this case. I will ensure the Court understand fully the facts and my corrective to some misunderstandings and misinformation. What I have to say is all relevant. So please bear with me.
- What I didn't like about the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal was their determination to cover up and frankly, betray their role as impartial investigative adjudicators. Giving me absolutely no idea until the very, very end of the hearing, when their decision was made, that I was to be struck off the Solicitors Roll – and even then giving no reasons. They should have given me reasons as to why they were *thinking* of striking me off, so that if they were misinforming themselves or had the wrong impressions, then I could have corrected them. The SDT Panel themselves, two of whom are solicitors, bring the profession into disrepute by their incompetence. Telling me, for example, that they are not here as “criminal lawyers” when the whole purpose of their role was to investigate my alleged criminal misdemeanours in Norway; this was a ludicrous thing to say. My defence was that the convictions were unfair and that the 2003 conviction was obtained by threats and my co-operation was obtained under duress and that my norwayuncovered.com website would not get me a conviction under ECHR or U.K law. A knowledge of criminal law procedure was therefore essential. The Panel were not fit for purpose. I had to wait another five weeks to learn of their reasons - unsubstantiated reasons - for being struck off and now another 12 months have passed. For a whole year now everyone who Googles my name finds out I have been struck off for ‘harassment’. So, there'll be no beating about the bush now. I have waited 10 years to set the record straight, following Mrs Justice Sharp's incompetent judgment. Ten years, on a matter that began 25 years ago. The essential element that the SRA and SDT failed to appreciate is that if I am described in the Norwegian newspapers before tens of thousands of people in articles from 1995 to 2003, being up to the date of my second conviction for ‘harassment’, by my accuser Heidi Schøne’s quoted comments, herself a registered mental patient, as having threatened to kill her, kill her son and kill her neighbours by way of 13 years of death threats and obscene phone calls and writing 400 obscene letters and raping her and which newspapers call me insane and suffering from erotic paranoia and for 12 years proceed to label me the “sex-crazed Muslim man”, then I do have an *immediate* right to tell the Norwegian public my side of the story by telling them the truth about my accuser, Heidi Schøne and every aspect of her own sex-crazed life – even if the public find it shocking and distasteful. Article 10 ECHR and the case of Handyside v U.K. It WAS Heidi Schøne who was quoted in the Press, but the SDT wrongly ruled she was not quoted at all. Well look at these front pages - from 1995 and 2005 – huge photos of Heidi Schøne. She is quoted ad nauseam in the Press. She has waived her anonymity. I have done absolutely nothing wrong under ECHR or U.K law by my publicity campaigns from 1996-1998 resulting in my 2001 conviction and by starting a website in 2000 resulting in my 2003 conviction. I was quite naturally not required to suffer in silence. The two convictions cannot be recognised here in the U.K and therefore having done nothing wrong by normal standards, not telling the SRA of my trumped up convictions is of no consequence. In fact the SRA should be commending me, not condemning me, for my brave fight against the far-right bigots of Norway. A country who for the last 15 years have failed to co-operate with the Essex Police over the 2005 hate-crime initiated by Norwegian Police Sergeant Torill Sorte following her malicious 2005 newspaper fabrication that my mother sectioned me for two years in an asylum.

- It has been a whole 12 months since the SDT decision, so in order to refresh everyone's memory I shall begin with the reason I am here at all: the revelation of my two Norwegian convictions in the judgment of 29 July 2011 from Mrs Justice Sharp which was the foundation for the Solicitors Regulation Authority's action. But before I do - your having no doubt read the Court papers **my Lord** - I'd like your considered opinion **my Lord** on why exactly Mrs Justice Sharp felt I deserved the vile email abuse directed at me, such as: 'Going to FUCK your mother. She like WHITE man' and 'Go fuck Allah, the Camel' and the assertion that the Prophet Muhammad is "a confused paedophile"? I get the distinct impression that Mrs Justice Sharp thought it was collateral damage that I merited for my alleged wickedness to two Norwegian women. Any judge with a shred of humanity would unreservedly condemn those vile comments. What sort of an example is the honourable Mrs Justice Sharp setting? I'm sure the Black Lives Matter movement and the entire Muslim world would be most interested to hear your explanation for that. Why the Judicial Conduct Rules allow a judge to condone such comments with impunity? It was not a side issue in my 2011 case before Mrs Justice Sharp, those comments directed at me along with others equally vile. It was the defendant, Police Sergeant Torill Sorte, who caused those comments to be sent to me. A hate-crime ruled the Essex Police who sent them to Interpol.
- How exactly did the detail of my 2 convictions for so-called 'harassment' come to the notice of the SRA? Charles Russell Speechlys City of London Solicitors, who acted for my High Court opponent in 2010, Police Sergeant Torill Sorte and her Ministry in Norway, supplied the translations of my convictions to the SRA's Inderjit Johal, together with the remarkable judgment of the Honourable Mrs Justice Sharp. I will come back to **Charles Russell** and their instructing barrister David Hirst from 5 Raymond Buildings shortly.
- Ironically, mention in the Honourable Mrs Justice Sharp's judgment of 29 July 2011 of the two trumped up, manufactured convictions from Norway in 2001 and 2003 were completely unrelated to my 2010 High Court claim. Inserted in the judgment as a red herring solely to blacken my good name. But completely irrelevant to the case and issues at hand. As I will now clearly demonstrate. My suing Police Sergeant Torill Sorte and her Ministry had nothing whatsoever to do with my former friend Heidi Schøne. The catalyst for my 2010 litigation in this Court was the ludicrous fabrication from Police Sergeant Torill Sorte in her national newspaper Dagbladet on 20 & 21 December 2005 that my own mother sectioned me in a psychiatric hospital for two years in 1992. We all know this to be utter rubbish. **My Lord**, from your reading of the papers and for the Court record, can you yourself confirm that Police Sergeant is a liar on this particular point?
- My main argument will be that there is a clear conflict of laws between the jurisdictions of England & Wales and the Kingdom of Norway in relation to my case. No prosecutions for harassment would ever be brought in this country on the assumption that the girl I was alleged in Norway to have 'harassed', Heidi Schøne, was transposed as a U.K citizen. Here in the United Kingdom we have a well-developed sense of what freedom of speech and justified comment entails. Mr Johal berated me for the very few strongly worded letters I wrote to Heidi Schøne *after* discovering her potentially ruinous allegations of attempted rape, then rape, then threatening to murder her two year old son. Those allegations were written in national newspapers. The fact of my not being named by the newspapers, made it all acceptable comment said Mr Johal, but that was a red herring; many people in Norway knew it was me. The reason the newspapers did not name me was because damages in any libel suit would then be minimal. The fact that I was a degenerate Muslim was what mattered to them, not what name I called myself by. Mr Johal said that I had

violated Heidi Schøne's dignity. That I should not as a Solicitor use such industrial language. But even judges use the 'fuck' word and the 'cunt' word themselves in court directed at those defendants who insult them. See pages in Bundle A, part 1. Those judges were not charged with bringing the profession into disrepute. So why should I? I was seriously provoked. Heidi Schøne is a criminal delinquent. She should be in prison. In Norway they have a more xenophobic and Islamophobic view. A country where mass-murderer Anders Behring Breivik's Muslim-hating beliefs, but not his actions, were very well received by the majority of Norwegians. And still are as I will ably demonstrate. [Sindre Bangstad]. Anders Breivik – a man who I have a 'Brentwood' connection with. A man who I am certain got great succour from reading the vile discourse over a decade in the Norwegian Press on me initiated by my Norwegian abusers Police Sergeant Torill Sorte and Heidi Schøne. Schøne's diatribe in particular and to a lesser degree, Sorte's, just *may* have contributed to Breivik's decision to commit mass-murder on 22 July 2011 when he shot dead 69 youths on Utøya island at their Labour Party Summer camp. But before leaving Oslo he blew up the entire premises of my courtroom opponents the Ministry of Justice and the Police, Norway in the same week as Mrs Justice Sharp's judgment. He blamed the Norwegian government for letting too many Muslim immigrants into Norway. He used his fictitious offshore Antiguan company, Brentwood Solutions Limited, to launder money. I lived in Brentwood in Essex for 35 years. Maybe Anders Breivik, a voracious reader of newspapers, who had been reading about me for 10 years on the front pages, was paying me a back-handed compliment. My opposing lawyer at the Ministry of Justice, Christian Reusch, told me he was injured in the bomb blast and was then off sick for the next 16 months. Anders Breivik also managed to blow up the offices of my sworn enemy Verdens Gang newspaper. Some cum-uppance eh, for all my opponents! The Honourable Mrs Justice Sharp managed to get her judgment out a mere seven days later on 29 July 2011. Her vindictive demolition job had ironic timing. Not such a victory for her as it turned out. A woman who condoned comments made to me such as 'Go fuck Allah, the Camel' and 'Going to FUCK your mother. She like WHITE man'. I wonder what the Black Lives Matter movement think of that one not being condemned by a High Court judge. The clear implication from Sharp J. is that I deserved them and others, even worse. Sharp J. condones a hate-crime. A Muslim judge in this Court would never condone the filth that came my way. Especially the comment that the Prophet Muhammad is a confused paedophile. (See page B21 in part B in Bundle A). That's probably why there is not, and never has been, a single Muslim judge on the High Court or Appellate bench. Troublemakers, what? I see the Times newspaper in December last year did a large article in the Law Section entitled 'Non-white barristers do not feel welcome on the bench'. Perhaps Mrs Justice Sharp thinks the Prophet Muhammad is a confused paedophile. My Lord, do you think the Prophet Muhammad is a 'confused paedophile'? You will have read those emails, my Lord. Unlike Mrs Justice Sharp, who refused, when clearly expected to, to condemn them, do you yourself condemn them? Will the Court apologise for Mrs Justice Sharp not condemning them? The Essex Police are still trying 15 years later to get Interpol Norway to trace the senders of those emails and question Torill Sorte on her direct role in them being sent to me. (See last page in part A, Bundle A). The Norwegian jurisdiction, clearly, is not a 'safe' jurisdiction; the SRA's Inderjit Johal thinks it is. How so, when racist and Islamophobic filth is of no concern to the prosecuting authorities in Norway? But more evidence for just how unsafe the jurisdiction of Norway is, will be presented later.

- Which brings me to pages 47-54 of Part 5 in Bundle A. Those vile racist and Islamophobic hate-emails sent to me on 20 December 2005 from Norway within minutes of defendant Torill Sorte and Heidi Schøne being quoted online in national newspaper Dagbladet (see pages 40-46 in Bundle A), saying, respectively, that I had been sectioned in a U.K Psychiatric Hospital for two years in 1992 by my mother and when I came out I was “worse than ever”, i.e. my treatment did not work (see page 41); and further that I had wanted Heidi Schøne's two year old son to die following my alleged threat in writing to murder him (see page 44). Both complete fabrications. The newspaper labelled me “Muslim” and “half-Arab”. Ironically, Heidi Schøne was herself a registered mental patient from the Buskerud Psychiatric Hospital in Lier, Norway under the care of Dr Petter Broch. She was on a 100% disability pension for “an enduring personality disorder initiated in her adolescence”, according to her psychiatrist. Emails declared a hate-crime by the Essex Police and sent to Interpol in 2006, 2013 and 2019. You will see from part D, page D17 in Bundle B, my family doctor's letter stating I had never been in receipt of any psychiatric treatment and you will see from the following page D18 a letter from my employer the Port of London Authority, where I was their Commercial Property Solicitor from 1989-1998, stating that I was continuously employed for a decade with no two year break for incarceration. You will see letters from my mother to Judge Anders Stilloff in Norway and later Torill Sorte calling her a liar and an abuser. But the senders of those emails believed Torill Sorte, that I'd been locked up for two years at the insistence of my mother. See Bundle A, part B, pages B21, B24, B28 and B30. The interviewing journalist at Dagbladet newspaper, one Morten Øverbye, in a recorded conversation of 12 May 2007, see pages B336-B337 in Bundle B confirmed that Police Sergeant Torill Sorte was the source for his writing “two years in a mental hospital” and added: “If she says you have been in a mental hospital and you have not been in a mental hospital, then she's lying. That's a no-brainer”. A no-brainer. It was the fabricated “two years in a mental hospital” allegation by Torill Sorte that led directly to me leaving condemnatory emails on her voicemail and which allegation was the catalyst for my 2010 litigation. But there were many emails from Norway in support of my website: see pages 338-355, written by well-informed people. Let me read some of them. The 2003 prosecution was a malicious prosecution. There is nothing on my website that is against ECHR Articles. **BIGOTRY masquerading as the rule of law**. The SRA should have withdrawn their charges once they had read my defence. After all where is the equal treatment in SRA policy when it came to Charles Russell Solicitors vile accusations that I was seriously mentally ill for litigating in Norway and here? See pages.... in Bundle ... Nazi behaviour, ironically condoned by the Jewess Victoria Sharp. Why were Charles Russell not charged with bringing the profession into disrepute for alleging that I am seriously mentally ill for denying I am a potential killer and potential killer of others? This implies I am a potential child-killer; a psychopath. **Is that right my Lord** – were the SRA right last year to refuse charging Charles Russell with bringing the profession into disrepute?
- So, if my offending website that got me a conviction for harassment in 2003 was alleged to be illegal in Norway it certainly wasn't illegal in the rest of the world by December 2005: I had a complete right under ECHR Article 10 to defend my good name and call Torill Sorte and Heidi Schøne abusers, liars and cheats. And put Heidi Schøne's life history into the public domain as it was most certainly in the public interest: I am not a potential child-killer. Indeed, even as at the time of my 2003 conviction under ECHR Articles my website and attendant documentation was not illegal considering what was written about me in the Norwegian Press from 1995-2003. But more of that argument later. **My Lord**, as it is established beyond any doubt that I was not

sectioned for two years or at all in a mental hospital can you confirm for the Court record that Police Sergeant Torill Sorte, in alleging that I was sectioned for two years, is a liar?

- So, next I turn to page 10 of Bundle A, and paragraph 12. This part of the Honourable Mrs Justice Sharp's judgment is most instructive. You will see my condemnatory emails: five of them left on Police Sergeant Torill Sorte's phone voicemail. After two years trying to get Torill Sorte to apologise for her perverted allegation I felt completely within my rights to reprimand her in the strongest terms. Pure frustration on my part. Negligently, Mrs Justice Sharp writes on the sixth line : "The Claimant's explanation for this was that he was angry". Omitting to say WHY I was angry: a vital piece of evidence was deliberately covered up by Mrs Justice Sharp. Torill Sorte and her Ministry, writes Mrs Justice Sharp, are alleging unsolicited 'harassment' on my part of Torill Sorte in leaving those phone messages and harassment for bringing my claim against her when she writes in Eiker Bladet newspaper on 11 January 2006 that I am "clearly mentally unstable" for calling her a liar, cheat and abuser on social media for her fabrication 20 days earlier in Dagbladet newspaper that I had been sectioned by my mother for two years. Mrs Justice Sharp in her judgment found in Bundle A, part A, page 24, disgracefully agrees that I am guilty of harassment of Torill Sorte in leaving the phone messages and declares me to be "clearly mentally unstable" and that I had not brought the proceedings in order to "vindicate" my reputation. I will read out the honourable judge's paragraphs 72 and 74. I say "disgracefully" because the honourable judge knew perfectly well from the transcript of the hearing that I was completely justified in severely reprimanding Torill Sorte. See page 69 in Bundle A: the transcript of the hearing on 16 March 2011 and paragraphs E to G, which I will read out
- Please, for the Court record, **my Lord**, confirm that I had sufficient reason to leave those messages on Torill Sorte's voicemail. For a Police Sergeant to falsely accuse someone of being sectioned for two years in a national newspaper is beyond disgraceful. If this happened in England, the police officer would be sacked. Anyone so libelled would be completely entitled to take legal proceedings against that police officer. Yet when I take legal proceedings, I am accused by Charles Russell Law firm and 5RB Chambers of harassment and being mentally ill for taking those very proceedings. My Lord, objectively speaking, did I deserve those emails? Or the opprobrium expressed in them? I read those emails out to Mrs Justice Sharp fully expecting her to condemn them. Any judge with a shred of humanity would do so, unless the judge agreed with the sentiments expressed in them. **See pages B114, B115 in Bundle A, part B** of the transcript. Mrs Justice Sharp said nothing in Court or in her judgment. Disgraceful conduct from Sharp. A definitive Islamophobe. She'd seen that Bergens Tidende newspaper article dated 24 May 1995 called me 'Muslim' nineteen times; an "insane" Muslim at that! An article which if printed in England, Detective Inspector Alex Mallen of the Metropolitan Police told me in 2019, would be prosecuted for a religious hate-crime. I expect that my additional impediment, which I related in Court to Mrs Justice Sharp, that of my being the grandson of a German soldier killed in Stalingrad in 1942 counted heavily against me. As you may well know, Victoria Sharp is Jewish. But my mother and I hated Hitler with a passion. The Germans were not *all* Nazis or Jew-haters. Soldiers who refused the draft in Germany were imprisoned or shot.
- Police Sergeant Torill Sorte had never before gone on the record to allege I had been sectioned for two years. Two years is a long time to be, effectively, locked up in a psychiatric unit. But she had lied before. In 1997 she made a Witness Statement saying I had on 'one occasion' been sectioned by my mother. But I did not see that Witness Statement until 2002 when I was suing for

libel in Norway. And even then I had to pay for it to be translated into English. On 'one occasion' can by no stretch of the imagination be taken to mean 'two years'. Still, that is why I immediately asked my family doctor to confirm I had never been incarcerated. He did so in 2003. He confirmed his opinion in 2013 as you can see. Torill Sorte was a liar and my mother wrote to the judge in my libel prosecution. See the attached correspondence. There is no doubt whatsoever that Torill Sorte is a liar. My Lord, will you therefore confirm, for the record that Torill Sorte is a liar regarding her separate allegations that I was a sectioned mental patient?

- In early 2005 I had had quite enough of Torill Sorte still getting away with her deceit and malicious fabrication over telling the Drammen District Court in my libel case against Heidi Schøne in 2003 that I had been put into a mental hospital on one occasion. My website had been running since 2000. So I blogged on the Norwegian newspaper websites my disgust that Torill Sorte had escaped censure and a sacking for her perjury and bringing the Norwegian Police Service into disrepute. I also expressed my condemnation regarding Heidi Schøne's very unwholesome conduct and accusations and advertised my website. I had been vilified in the Press, so I was entitled to a right of reply. The Norwegians then got their revenge via Dagbladet newspaper's two articles on 20 & 21 December 2005. Shall we say 500,000 readers in all. The hate-emails arrived immediately. After I read in Dagbladet that I was a two year sectioned mental patient and one who wanted a young child to die as well as being a 23 year sex pest – as damaging a set accusations as one can get – not unnaturally I had to deny these fabrications immediately, and so I went back onto social media, being all the Norwegian newspaper websites Comment sections and also my own website to attack Torill Sorte, when I called her a "liar, cheat and abuser" and I attacked Heidi Schøne too. Justified comment. Article 10 ECHR. My comments got a large readership in Norway. Immediately, Police Sergeant Torill Sorte goes back to her Press to deny she has done anything wrong and that my attacks on her are pure unsolicited harassment. See page 56 of Part 5 in Bundle A, when in the second paragraph Sorte says on 11 January 2006 in High Court defendant Roy Hansen's Eiker Bladet newspaper: *'I deal with it and know that I did not do anything wrong in the matter.'* Nothing wrong eh? Pull the other one! In Dagbladet 20 days earlier she tells the nation I was sectioned in a mental hospital for two years. In the last paragraph she says in Eiker Bladet: *'The man is obviously mentally unstable ...'* I can hardly go over to Norway and sue Dagbladet and Eiker Bladet and Torill Sorte, in the circumstances. The proximity of my calling Torill Sorte a hundred times "a liar, cheat and abuser" on Norwegian newspaper websites and my own website immediately after her 20/21 December 2005 Dagbladet fabrication and her response in denying any wrongdoing and calling me "obviously mentally unstable" is crucial. A period of 20 days. I was "clearly mentally unstable" because, according to Torill Sorte, she was not a liar, cheat and abuser as she had done nothing wrong. She knew perfectly well that her calling me "obviously mental unstable" related solely to the matter of my reprimand for her fabrication in Dagbladet of my being locked up for two years in a mental hospital. She knew full well too that she had lied in a 22 January 1997 Witness Statement and again in the Drammen District Court in 2002 and 2003, when stating that my mother had sectioned me on one occasion. The hate-emails and Dagbladet articles and Eiker Bladet article and my family doctor's letter were sent to the Norwegian Police Complaints Bureau in 2006. A civilian complaints handler called Johan Martin Welhaven was assigned to the matter. He refused to give a copy of my complaint to Torill Sorte. Only she would know why she called me "obviously mentally unstable". It was essential she be made to participate in the complaints process. When Mr Welhaven made his decision, he overlooks the

fabrication that I was sectioned for two years and in June 2007 concludes that Torill Sorte's allegation that I was "clearly mentally unstable" was, and I quote: "neither negligent nor defamatory due to the contents of Mr El Diwany's website and other facts". Natural justice dictates that I be told what exactly on the website and which "other facts" indicated I was "clearly mentally unstable". But Mr Welhaven, when asked this, refused to say. No medical or other evidence was supplied by Mr Welhaven to indicate why I was "clearly mentally unstable". So his evidence is clearly inadmissible as to the matter of proof of the allegation. Yet perversely Mrs Justice Sharp, ignoring the fact that Torill Sorte had lied about me being sectioned for two years, declares Johan Martin Welhaven's report to be sufficient evidence of my alleged mental illness, exonerates Torill Sorte in full, and rules that Mr Welhaven's report was the litigation that meant I could not litigate on the same point here in the U.K as it was *res judicata*: which means a matter has been adjudicated by a competent court and therefore may not be pursued further by the same parties. There must be no re-litigation. But Sharp J. was completely wrong in her assessment as I did not engage in any litigation with Torill Sorte or the Police Complaints Bureau in Norway. The Bureau was not a court of law. By analogy in England when suing for libel in the High Court you are not prevented from doing so just because a complaint has been lodged with the Police on the matter. In judicial review one can still go to the Administrative Court here against the Police even if the Police have considered the matter themselves by way of their internal complaints procedure. Besides which the adjudicator in Norway was not competent or impartial. Mr Welhaven refused to blame the emails being sent to me on Torill Sorte's comments in Dagbladet that I was a sectioned mental patient; he refused to give a copy of my complaint to Torill Sorte and refused to tell me what exactly on my website and which 'other facts' indicated I was 'clearly mentally unstable. Four years later in 2011 he became a Police Chief and a colleague of Torill Sorte. A suspicion of bias arises.

- Witness Statements given to High Court in 2011 by Torill Sorte and Ministry of Justice lawyer, Christian Reusch, are perjured and certainly designed to mislead the Court in a material fashion. See page B205 in Bundle B and paragraph 8 of Ministry of Justice lawyer, Christian Reusch's Witness Statement dated 2 December 2010. Mr Reusch says:

'The Norwegian Police Service are not prevented by domestic law, or their own codes of conduct from making statements to the media. There is a public interest in the Norwegian public understanding better the work of the police service in the investigation of criminal offences (including harassment). Police guidelines governing the provision of information to the public make it clear that information and statements may be given to the media in order to:

- (a) Encourage factual and impartial reporting and descriptions in the media concerning criminal proceedings and the conduct of cases.*
- (b) Correct errors or false rumours and information that could harm the reputation of an individual, organisation, institution, enterprise etc. and to contribute to balanced reporting.*
- (c) Warn the public of danger and clear up a case.*
- (d) Promote general respect for the law.*

When she spoke to Mr Hansen Ms Sorte in 2006 was acting in accordance with the above principles when responding to legitimate media enquiries concerning public allegations against a police officer and harassment and verbal abuse in general.

So, what Mr Reusch is saying is that a police officer when speaking to the Press must tell the truth and basically act with utmost integrity. So Torill Sorte in telling Roy Hansen that '*I deal with it and know that I did not do anything wrong in the matter*' is telling the truth is she? When only 20 days earlier one of those 'truths' was that I was sectioned for two years in a mental hospital in 1992 and when I came out I was "worse than ever". Sorte then goes on to say that in my calling her a liar and corrupt I am "obviously mentally unstable". On what medical evidence? It wasn't for another year or so that Johan Martin Welhaven's *ex post facto* and unsubstantiated, therefore inadmissible, reasoning came forth. Johan Martin Welhaven's explanation to justify Torill Sorte labelling me "clearly or obviously mentally unstable" - that my website and 'other facts' indicates this, strains credulity. Frankly it is total bullshit. What on my website? Which 'other facts'? How dare Mrs Justice Sharp endorse this Nazi and Soviet approach to psychiatric assessment. What is so appalling in Mrs Justice Sharp's approach to this case is that during the hearing she gave no indication whatsoever what her thinking or reasoning was going to be: if she had told me that I should have had the insight or integrity to accept that I must be "clearly mentally unstable" because Johan Martin Welhaven said so then I would have emphasised and reminded Mrs Justice Sharp that unless Welhaven could tell me what on my website and which other facts indicated I was "clearly mentally unstable" then his evidence was inadmissible and also in breach of Article 6 of the ECHR: the right to a fair trial process when reasons for a decision must be sufficient to substantiate the argument/ruling. I did not get the chance to do this during the hearing and subsequent Lord Justices ignored this very point. So my Lord, are you with me on this one? Is any medical evidence needed to justify a finding of mental illness? Or will mere wishful thinking and speculation suffice? Will you my Lord declare that the *res judicata* point of Sharp J. was wrong?

Further, let us look at Torill Sorte's own Witness Statement dated 2 February 2011 and her paragraph 20, when she says on page B202: '*As the guidelines envisage, there is public interest in the media being able to obtain reliable information on criminal matters, which may sometimes serve to correct false rumour*'. She then promises the facts in her Witness Statement are true. So, 'reliable information' she says she gives to the Press in order 'to correct false rumour'. Sorte knows perfectly well that I would be furious to read the Dagbladet libel that I was a two year sectioned mental patient; a complete fabrication. She must have known that the newspaper were highly likely to call me Muslim, given that the Norwegian Press had been so doing for the last decade. I myself had to send Torill Sorte in 1998 the 1995-1998 newspaper articles on me, as she had not read any of them. The duplicity of Torill Sorte is about as low as you can get, especially when one reads the transcripts of my 1996-1998 phone conversations with her. I sent Mr Johal a Witness Statement dated ... regarding Torill Sorte's and Christian Reusch's High Court Witness Statements. See pages ... in Bundle ... Mr Johal had ample evidence to conclude that Torill Sorte was a liar and therefore should have concluded she was not a reliable witness. My Lord, have Torill Sorte and Christian Reusch attempted to mislead the Court by their materially false Witness Statements?

See pages 117, 118 and onwards until page 183 in my book 'Norway – A Triumph in Bigotry' for the recorded conversations with Norwegian Police officers Torill Sorte and her colleague Svein Jensen. From this you will gain further evidence that Sorte is a liar. She had investigated very little of Heidi Schøne. She said Heidi Schøne may well be a liar. That she was closing the case against me in 1998, as per page 220. You will see it was I who kept on at Sorte to get Schøne in to the

Police Station. I didn't want the case closed. At one stage, you will see Heidi Schøne wanted to drop the case: page 118. Despicably, Torill Sorte puts in a Witness Statement dated 22 January 1997 in the midst of my 1996-1998 conversations with her in which she says my mother had told her I was admitted for treatment into a psychiatric hospital. A complete fabrication by Torill Sorte, who in my 1998 conversations with her makes no reference to my 'elderly' mother (she was 62, as I am now, hardly 'elderly') telling her that I was admitted for treatment on 'one occasion'. My mother spoke to Sorte once which I recorded, unknown to Torill Sorte. Any police officer with integrity would put it to me that she has just been told by my mother that I was admitted for treatment, whereupon I would naturally then bring my mother to the phone who would confront Sorte with her lies. I did not see that Witness Statement until 2002 when it was submitted, in Norwegian only, to the Drammen District Court in my civil libel case. Even then I had to pay for it to be translated into English when I returned to England. If my mother had called Torill Sorte in January 1997 we'd have a record of it on our phone bill. We did not. I lived with my mother and was in 1997 the Commercial Property Solicitor with the Port of London Authority, so I was away from the house from 8 a.m. in the morning to 7 p.m. in the evening; plenty of time for my mother to call Torill Sorte. However, my mother did not have Sorte's number in any case. I never gave it to her and she would not know where to look for it. If Sorte had phoned my mother, she would have to take the risk that I was not having a day off from work when she phoned, whereupon I might answer the phone. Later I asked Torill Sorte to provide me with the evidence of exactly when she spoke to my mother for a second time. A phone record; an attendance note on her file; the Police Station phone bill record. Sorte's response in the Drammen District Court in 2003 was that there was no attendance note and she "could not remember" when she spoke to my mother for a second time. She then told my lawyer Stig Lunde that if she were called back to Court next day she would say that my mother made a complete U-turn to say that, after all, she had forced me to have psychiatric treatment. I had to wait another year before cross-examining Sorte. As I had never had any treatment in a hospital, then Sorte was a liar. It stretches incredulity that Sorte did not record that alleged second call with my mother or even make an attendance note on her file or even remember what day, which week the call took place. When I stated before Judge Agnar Nilsen Jr. in 2003 the obvious: "You, Torill Sorte are a liar" the judge told me as soon as Sorte had left the Courtroom that if I called anyone else a liar he would stop me taking my case. I told him that in England, if we have reasonable grounds we can call a Witness "a liar". The judge retorted: "You are not in England now". This the judge who refused any cross-examination of Heidi Schøne: as her evidence in the civil case could not be tested then that trial was unfair. Torill Sorte's evidence two years earlier at my 2001 criminal prosecution could not therefore be relied on as the truth at all. It was conducted in Norwegian and I was not given a transcript. Same for 2003 as the prosecution was based wholly on Torill Sorte's case file. She had form for being a liar: see her 1998 conversation with me on page 221 of my book as per the 8th paragraph, when she says: "*But she [Heidi] says also for some years ago she liked you very much ...*" compared to her statement on page 55 of part 5 in Bundle A in Eiker Bladet newspaper on 11 January 2006 when she says in the 3rd paragraph: "*The man has plagued Heidi Schøne and her family since 1982*", in other words 'plagued' Heidi from the very moment she returned to Norway in June 1982. In 1982 she was only 18 so the only 'family' she had were her parents and siblings none of whom I knew at all or had any contact with. Torill Sorte was sent copies of Heidi Schøne's 1982-1985 letters to me so she knew what she was saying was untrue. An unfair trial in the 2001 and 2003 Magistrates

Courts hearings is a distinct possibility due to the likelihood of untrue evidence being submitted by Torill Sorte. Renvoi Rules 44 & 45 allows these overseas verdicts to be ignored in the interests of natural justice. The first time my mother spoke to Torill Sorte was in 1996 when I told my mother to tell Sorte that Heidi Schøne was a liar for telling the Norwegian Press in 1995 that my mother had "wanted" to commit me for treatment. As per the transcript I shall read out exactly what was said: [.....] . Sorte even tells my mother (on page 135 of my book in the 10th paragraph) that she completely understood why I could not forgive Heidi Schøne and that she does not have a case to bring against me. In other words Heidi Schøne's alleged '13 years of sex-terror' was not believed. If you have been harassing someone for 13 years in a row then surely you will be charged, if the evidence is there. The Court will note that my April-May 1995 leaflets and my letters in 1995 to Heidi Schøne as referred to by the 2001 magistrate were not in themselves sufficient to warrant a charge of criminal harassment, as per Police Sergeant Torill Sorte's recorded comment in the 10th paragraph on page 135 of my book, to my mother that: '... I don't have a case to bring against Farid. Not here in Norway'. **For the record my Lord** please confirm that you accept this point.

So let me turn to my evidence to the SRA's Mr Johal and the SDT Panel that both my convictions were unfair and appealing either of them was hopeless as my lawyer, Harald Wibye, told me that any appeal would be hopeless and result in an automatic prison sentence as under Section 390 (a) of the Norwegian Penal Code there was no defence of justified comment as provided for in Section 390 of the Penal Code. In other words the offences were one of strict liability: the mere sending of the information sheets was an offence as was the mere ownership of a website with personal information. **Strict liability** exists when a defendant is liable for committing an action regardless of what his intent or mental state was when committing the action. But note the comment of the magistrate Marianne Djupesland on page 49 of Bundle A, part A, when she says: '**Admittedly**, parts of the correspondence for which the defendant has been responsible can also be regarded as being in the nature of **public information**, but in the court's view the totality of the offence is best encompassed by the description of the offence in *Straffeloven*, section 390 (a)'. So, clearly there is some doubt in the mind of the magistrate as to the suitability of a charge under Section 390 (a), as opposed to Section 390 which is what my lawyer Harald Wibye told the magistrate I should have been charged under. Only one letter is actually quoted in full in this 2001 judgment: the one post-stamped 7 April 1995. I sent that only after learning about Heidi Schøne's false 1986 accusation of attempted rape from my lawyer Helge Wesenberg's letter of 28 February 1995 and facing a barrage of sexually explicit taunts by Heidi Schøne on the phone. Similarly mention is made of a March 1995 communication, again sent after Mr Wesenberg's letter and Heidi Schøne's sexualised talk to me when I called her up to confront her with her false allegation. The fact is that the magistrate was not told by Heidi Schøne that she had given the Bergen Police a Witness Statement alleging attempted rape in 1986 (reported to the Police a whole 18 months after I last stayed with her BUT which report was made only 2 weeks after I told her father his daughter was associating with a heroin taker) and then another Witness Statement given to the Drammen Police in 1997 alleging actual rape, which her lawyer Vegaard Aaløkken told the Drammen District Court in 2003 would not be disclosed to me as it was "against his client's interests". As for my 2003 conviction no one can deny on the facts that the trial was unfair. After 2001 there followed the continued Press abuse from Norway, including Torill Sorte's 2005 allegation that I had been sectioned in an asylum for two years, wanted a young child to die and

my receipt of those hate-emails - until July 2011 when I was mentioned in association with Anders Breivik in Oppland Abeiderblad newspaper. Let us look at the facts surrounding my 2003 conviction. See my Witness Statement sent to the SRA dated 14 November 2019 in Bundle B, part D, page D1 submitted to the Court which is very clear as to why the two criminal trials were unfair and my communications to Mr Johal dated 16 October 2019 in Bundle B, part M, page M9 regarding the exceptional circumstances to enable them to look behind the convictions.

As for appealing these 2 convictions I had made it quite clear time and again that there was no effective remedy in going for an appeal. Both convictions were under a Section 390 (a) of the Norwegian Penal Code and were for strict liability offences. There was no defence available of public interest publication of my communications as there was under Section 390. **See Norwegian Civil Penal Code. Article 13 of the ECHR – Right to an Effective Remedy** – is not available in Norway. This Convention right is breached by the Norwegians. As it says in **Taking a Case to the European Court of Human Rights** by Philip Leach, 4th Edition, published by Oxford University Press on page 149: *‘However, it is not necessary for applicants to pursue a potential form of redress or an appeal process that would not in fact provide a remedy. (See e.g. Hilton v U.K No. 5613/72 Dec 5.3.76 (1976) 4 DR 177), for example where it is clear on settled legal opinion, or in view of the consistent practice of the domestic courts, that it has no prospects of success. For the record my Lord, please confirm that the 2003 trial was unfair.* Again, my lawyer Harald Wibye told me appealing would be hopeless for this strict liability offence and if I did appeal I would receive a prison sentence. What kind of magistrates can these two people be to think that those racist, Islamophobic newspaper articles from 1995, 1998, 2001, 2002 and 2003 with their vile accusations would not provoke me into telling my side of the story and disclosing my accusers past history and from 2000 setting up a website and advertising it? The Norwegian Press were obliged by their self-regulatory rules to call me up before going to print. They were also obliged to print my response to their story. They failed to do this. So after waiting a year, from 1996-1998 I sent out my leaflets. From 1998 onwards no leaflets were faxed out. There is a definite conflict of laws as here in the U.K I am allowed a right of reply to as large an audience as I can muster. I did these xenophobic, Islamophobic, deceitful newspapers jobs for them.

- Does anyone seriously expect me to tell the SRA of my 2 convictions after all that? Two convictions from a country whose Press write articles that if done here would be prosecuted in the criminal courts. Confirmed by Detective Inspector Alex Mallen of the Met Police. A country who allows a hate-crime referred to Interpol by the Essex Police to pass as freedom of speech? A Norwegian Police Service who refuse to co-operate with the Essex Police in tracing the senders of the emails and who cover up for one of their own, Torill Sorte, in not prosecuting her for bringing the Norwegian Police Service into disrepute for her stupendous lie that I was a two year sectioned mental patient and a woman whose fabricated comments caused the hate emails to be sent to me? All that abuse from Norway. Tell the SRA? Considering what the SRA have put me through this past year, I am doubly glad I stayed quiet? They couldn't even read my book or website to see the huge efforts I had made to combat Norwegian racism and Islamophobia in the Norwegian Courts. Relying on the goodwill of the SRA when charging me with bringing the profession into disrepute was, in retrospect, a forlorn hope. In any event, it was only in 2007 that I got word from the ECHR in Strasbourg that my case against Norway was rejected. My case at the ECHR concerned the civil litigation in Norway and their Press Complaints Bureau's involvement in sabotaging my

claim and the fact of my lawyer Stig Lunde missing the time limits to go to the Supreme Court by seven days, who then dismissed my appeal to allow the newspapers to be included in my litigation as I was out of time - that this was a breach of Convention rights at the ECHR. The Norwegian judge at Strasbourg, Sverre Erik Jebens, a former Police Prosecutor in Norway at the time of the 1995 Press articles, voted against me. The ECHR wrote to tell me he was not biased in favour of Norway. Writing the word 'Muslim' nineteen times in Bergens Tidende on 24 May 1995 and the hate-emails was OK then was it? I had included in my ECHR Application mention of the ambush trials in Norway in 2001 and 2003, albeit as a secondary issue, hoping it would be commented on. But the ECHR gave no reasons for rejecting my main claim. So 2007 was the first time the appeals process was over regarding my 2 Norwegian convictions. Only then was I obliged to tell the SRA, but even then I had fully expected Sir Richard Buxton in 2012 to rule that the two Magistrates Court convictions were obtained in breach of natural justice – but he refused to consider the issue at all, as did Lord Justice Hooper in my half hour hearing before him and Lord Justice Jackson in 2017. Shouldn't you, the U.K judiciary, be setting a good example for the rest of society and condemn the racist and Islamophobic hate-speech directed at me? After all it was declared a hate-crime by the Essex Police and referred to Interpol. No, after Mrs Justice Sharp's disgraceful performance when she condoned that filth directed at me, four Lord Justices followed suit at the Court of Appeal. I specifically asked each time for the emails to be condemned and for Torill Sorte's part in them being sent to me to be condemned them too. I asked that it be recognised that Torill Sorte was a liar for saying that I was a 2 year sectioned mental patient and that I could hardly be ruled as clearly mentally unstable and as harassing Torill Sorte for calling her a liar, cheat and abuser. All I got was: appeal dismissed, abuse of process. WITH NO REASONS GIVEN. No reasons: in breach of Article 6 ECHR. Immediately in 2011, after my High Court case, the CPR were changed to ensure that in future an overseas litigant could give an address in her home country as an address for service. But no amendment was made to the CPR to allow an overseas litigant to be subpoenaed to compel attendance for cross-examination here in the U.K. It was Master Leslie who in 2010 refused my application for the Norwegian Ministry's lawyer to be compelled to attend. What a world of difference it would have made to be able to cross-examine him.

- With regard to Mrs Justice Sharp condoning the hate-crime emails, with the support of Lord Pickles, I wrote to Sir Ian Burnett on 11.10.19 asking for a meeting to change the Judicial Conduct Rules to prevent a judge like Mrs Justice Sharp being allowed to condone hate-speech with impunity and on 25.10.19 phoned his Private Office up merely to ask if they had got my letter. They told me they had got it and will reply. Later that day 2 Essex Police officers turned up at my door saying the Met Police had received a call from Sir Ian's Private Office to report that I had allegedly threatened to "commit suicide and on your heads be it". A malicious hoax call made to make me appear mentally unstable. A smear. A non-actionable slander as I cannot show special damage. I complained in writing for the next 12 months to Sir Ian, but Michelle Souris, his P.A, told me my letters were not being passed on to him. She put the phone down on me when I asked her for the name of the hoax caller. The Met Police will not tell me. The Essex Police Incident Report stated that I had also written to 'Dame Victoria Sharp threatening to commit suicide. Another lie. I asked the Met Police Solicitor for that letter to be produced if it was true. I have not heard back.
- So, after 10 years are you, **my Lord**, going to apologise for Mrs Justice Sharp's errors? Will you now condemn those emails? Will you recognise Torill Sorte to be an abject liar for her allegation

of two years incarceration in a mental hospital? Will you declare that I was never "clearly mentally unstable" for calling Sorte "a liar, cheat and abuser"?

- Mr Johal argued that as the United States was a 'safe' jurisdiction, then so is Norway. Presumably on the grounds that they are both members of NATO. Western nations. With a common law legal system. But the U.S has the death penalty, so it would not be safe in some circumstances for a British citizen charged with murder to be extradited to America. Take also the recent case of Julian Assange where on 4 January 2021 a County Court judge here refused the American request for his extradition on the grounds that its prison regime was not safe enough to guarantee Julian Assange would not be tempted to commit suicide. In Norway no Witness Statements of either Heidi Schøne or Torill Sorte were provided for the 2001 or 2003 trials; ambush evidence was provided in the 2001 trial: an accusation of rape from Heidi Schøne. That there was allegedly no romance possible because I told her I wanted to marry a virgin; a Muslim. Utter rubbish. I saw Heidi Schøne in England some 20 times and sometimes stayed at her place overnight; we went to see Spurs twice: against Sunderland and Birmingham City. We watched the 1982 Cup Final together. Our association was not just to discuss poetry and Shakespeare and listen to her personal problems. There was tons of romance. My being a Muslim mattered not one jot to Heidi. We spent most of our time kissing and cuddling. Can't you get a sense of this from the letters she sent me in the years that followed? In Norway we slept in the same bed. I saw for myself that she had two large birthmarks on her back which she later had removed. In 1987 she told me she worked in a photographic studio in Bergen and the owner paid for her to go with his family to America to Disneyland Florida and they stopped off in Copenhagen. That the parents to the father of her child gave her a car to drive and they had a tuck shop. In 1988 she begged me and my best friend for help in rescuing her from her abuser boyfriend after he had told both her AND their son to 'Fuck off' and admitted this in the Drammen Court in 2002 and to Torill Sorte. 1990 she let me spend the day with her and her son and told me her 4 year old son needed an operation on his nose. I sent him several presents. She then sent me this book 'I Dared to Call Him Father' which she had ordered from England in an attempt to 'Witness' me she said, or convert me to Christianity after her exorcism from demons whereupon her foot "grew" by quarter of an inch, she said. All this information imparted and contact with to me when I had already raped her and threatened to murder her son?! Her address in Drammen was secret from the father of her child following her move from Bergen following her suicide attempt in summer 1988 after falling out with this man. He nevertheless found her and knocked her to the ground in 1990 on her doorstep. The Police were called. From 1991 to 1994 there was no contact all between us at all. From 1988 to 1993 she had no phone. Yet she alleges in the 1995 Press 13 years of continuous obscene phone calls. So why not record just one or two of them? Why not keep just a small selection of the '400 obscene letters' she said I sent her? Instead of throwing them all away. Where was her later alleged 13 continuous years of sex-terror? Ironic coming from a girl whose only purpose in life was to have sex with as many men as she took a fancy to. She'd had sex with 21 different men by the time she was 21, with more to follow. Many just casual encounters on holiday: two Greek men on the beach in Rhodes; drunken encounters at all-night parties. Having unprotected sex with two men at once in 1985/6 getting pregnant to one of them. It was she who talked constantly about sex and her encounters; her abortions; her step-mother being a 'whore' in America where she was a model. Her step-mother's father asking her sex and sexually abusing her. Her being raped by a Bergen shopkeeper; attempted rape at knife point on holiday in Greece. Attempted

rape by me, with a change of mind ten years later to actual rape, having insisted a month earlier to Drammens Tidende journalist Ingunn Røren that it was 'attempted rape. That when she worked in a hospital in Bergen all the patients "just wanted to play with my breasts". In Drammen District Court in 2003 she alleged that I told her: "If you don't let me kiss you and touch your breasts I will tell your whole family that you were abused by your step-mother's (elderly) father"; a man she intimated to me she felt obliged to masturbate; and that I used to "phone her up asking what colour underwear she was wearing". That I wrote to her saying her "breasts will fall off". That I told her in writing that I would kill her two-year old son. That I told her that her son was a bastard and that "bastards don't deserve to live". That I'd written 400 "obscene letters to her" all of which she had "thrown away". All this, or most of it, came to my knowledge for the very first time in the Drammen District Court in 2003 – ambush evidence – none of which was put in a Witness Statement and for which no cross-examination was allowed at all. Four hours had been agreed with her lawyer for cross-examination when I was in England. When I got there the judge refused all cross-examination on the grounds that she was mentally ill as she was on a 100% disability pension for mental disorder initiated in her adolescence, and instead asked a few questions of her himself in the next half-hour. She put in no Witness Statements at any time or any Skeleton Argument. I was arrested at the door of the Courtroom the moment the case finished and taken straight to the Drammen Police Station cells due to my website.

- I was given only 19 days notice to prepare for the 2001 trial. Unfair under Article 6 (3) (b) of the ECHR. No grounds for the charge was disclosed in my Summons. A conviction would automatically scupper my own criminal and civil cases and that is exactly what happened. The Prosecutions evidence was only handed to my lawyer the day before the hearing. My own data post bundle only reached my lawyer's office after he had departed for the Courthouse. I was told by my lawyer that if I turned up Heidi Schøne would not go. And that is exactly what happened: when my lawyer got to court the magistrate had to order Heidi to come to court in order for the hearing to proceed. But I thought to myself, what is the point in my turning up if she won't be there to cross-examine. A complete waste of time. I can hardly achieve anything cross-examining the Prosecuting lawyer. The fact also is that as I did not turn up the Magistrate could not impose a sentence of imprisonment. If I did turn up she could. **Would you agree my Lord that this was an unfair trial?**
- Would somebody explain to me why the SDT Panel members who made the decision to strike me off have not made any input into responding to my Grounds of Appeal? The SDT Panel are not the SRA, who will not be able to answer for the motives and reasoning of the SDT. THE SRA cannot answer for them. They can only second guess. And criticise. But not justify.
- My mother spent the last 14 years of her life battling the lies of Torill Sorte. It affected her badly being used so despicably by this bent copper. Plus seeing me so distressed. So abused. So manipulated by Mrs Justice Sharp. Does anyone here give a damn? Thought not. Just interested in cheating further I guess and getting your fee. You bigots hate it when a creative thinker like myself teaches a whole country a damn good lesson don't you? Assisted by some divine intervention. You think my reprimands to the Norwegians for their criminality and deceit is evidence of bringing the profession into disrepute. I lacked insight is the SDT's pseudo-psychiatric assessment of my state of mind. How exactly did I lack insight? And for what misdemeanour? **So,**

on the subject of state of mind, would you my Lord be kind enough to point to the medical evidence that allowed Mrs Justice Sharp to agree with Mr Welhaven that I am "clearly mentally unstable"?

- Let us look at what was said about me in the newspapers. Front page stories with large photos of Heidi Schøne, as indicated here, in two of the three 1995 newspapers and here in Dagbladet in 2005. Same in 1998, 2000 and 2001. Heidi Schøne had readily agreed to waive her anonymity. She clearly wanted huge publicity to tell the nation what a nasty piece of work the Muslim man was and what a good girl she was. She read and approved the 1995 and 1998 articles before they were published. But they hadn't reckoned on me finding out. By chance I did. Some of the newspaper stories it took me years to find out about. Imagine if the Daily Mail did a story in the U.K and put "the Jew" 19 times in the article. I am sure Mrs Justice Sharp would have condemned that. In the U.K such an approach automatically opens up Heidi Shone to full exposure from the opposition: her victim, myself, to put his side of the story into the public domain under Article 10 ECHR. The public will want to know my side of the story, which is in the public interest to know. So I supplied the public in Norway with my story via my fact sheets. I have committed no offence under ECHR Article 10, which rules the matter. If I am described in the Press as a sex-terrorist, a potential killer of three different sets of people and as "insane" then every single aspect of my accuser's past history is allowed under British Press ethics to be disclosed. On a website too. If necessary the civil libel courts can decide on the rights and wrongs of the issues. Not the criminal courts.
- The Equality Act 2010 comes to my aid. One cannot be discriminated against on the grounds of one's sex by a public body, like the SRA. Because I was a man I was treated worse in Norway by the prosecuting authorities than Heidi Schøne, a woman who was in a similar situation. She clearly harassed me by her fabricated comments to the Norwegian Police that I had attempted to rape her and threatened to kill her son and to the Norwegian Press a myriad of degrading allegations and yet she was not charged by the prosecuting authorities with harassment or attempting to pervert the course of justice. Her false accusation of attempted rape and her later false accusation of rape with conflicting Witness Statements neither of which were given to me were acts of criminal sexual harassment. The SRA should have recognised this and not prosecuted me for those two convictions. The SRA were discriminatory on the grounds of my sex – and religion as well under the Equality Act 2010. The SRA exercised double-standards. They must be equally fair in their appraisal of and reaction to both men's and women's actions and reactions; they were not. They only saw Heidi Schøne as a victim and not me as the original victim of her.
- Besides which, if I am supposed to be "clearly mentally unstable" according to Police Complaints handler Johan Martin Welhaven in 2007 and Police Sergeant Torill Sorte in 2006 and ruled as such by Mrs Justice Sharp in 2011; and according to Police Sergeant Torill Sorte "sectioned for 2 years in a mental hospital in 1992 by my mother", condoned by Mrs Justice Sharp, and classed as "insane" by the Norwegian Press then I cannot be responsible for my actions which led to my 2 convictions, can I? The convictions MUST therefore be ignored by the SRA. One cannot be discriminated against when one is mentally ill. **Would you agree my Lord?** You do believe Torill Sorte was telling the truth when she said in her national newspaper Dagbladet that I was locked up for 2 years by mummy? And that in her 2010 Witness Statement submitted to this court in her declaring that she was allowed to tell the truth to the Press to let the public better understand

the workings of the police, it was therefore completely true that I was a 2 year sectioned mental patient? **Is Police Sergeant Torill Sorte a liar my Lord?**

- **Safe jurisdiction?** Sindre Bangstad. Let me turn to this Norwegian academic's article dated 25 January 2019. In part 1 of Bundle A you will see reference to a 2015 book published in Norway called 'Islam: the Eleventh Plague'. Published by, would you believe, the Norwegian Human Rights Service, funded by Government. Bergens Tidende 24 May 1995 – Muslim man 19 times. No condemnation of that by the Magistrate in Norway. **See page 2 of Part 5 in Bundle A.** No cross-examination allowed in civil courts. No Witness Statements supplied in civil case. Witness Statements withheld as not in best interests of client. Cross-examination not allowed in magistrates Court in Norway: too mentally ill to face me. She was a registered mental patient and an unreliable witness. No transcripts available in civil cases as no recordings done. No co-operation by Norwegian Police with Essex Police for the last 15 years in investigating senders of hate-emails to me, or the person who incited the senders to send them to me. **NOT a safe jurisdiction. See page 10 onwards in Skeleton Argument in Bundle A, part 4.**
- **Charles Russell and barrister David Hirst.** You will see from the 2011 Court transcript at page B80 and B81, Part A in Bundle A that they argued that in merely litigating in Norway and here in London this was a symptom of my alleged serious mental illness. When David Hirst said in paragraph H on page B80: *"... the Court is of course free to form its own view as to whether the hallmarks of persistent and obsessive harassment conducted over the decade or more, including the present proceedings, do not carry the stigma at the very least of a mental obsession or a conduct which reasonable persons would hold to be abnormal or highly unusual"*. So in my reading that I am a potential child-killer in the Norwegian Press, and a potential killer of others, I am seriously mentally ill for initiating legal proceedings for libel in Norway am I? In calling Torill Sorte, "a liar, cheat and abuser" for her ludicrous fabrication that my mother sectioned me in a mental hospital for two years in 1992, I am "harassing" her and am seriously mentally ill eh?
- **Office of Lord Chief Justice. Another despicable act of treachery.** Re Judicial Conduct Rules. 11 October 2019 letter. 25 October 2019 incident. Commit suicide fabricated allegation. Letter to Dame Victoria Sharp – Essex Police Incident Report.