

Email dated 4 May 2020 sent to
Hannah Pilkington Solicitor at Capsticks acting for
the Solicitors Regulation Authority

Dear Ms Pilkington,

Noted.

However, in response to your letter:

1. You WERE trying it on and bullying me every step of the way by your refusal to simply agree an extra day for the High Court hearing. You put me to the trouble of having to write to the Court to detail why I needed two days. What is remiss of you is that you should have told me exactly why I did not need two days.
2. You should know, being the first class firm of Solicitors that you think you are, that reasons must be given for a decision - ECHR Article 6. You are obliged to give sufficient reasons for the SRA assertion that my claim[s] that Norwegian

criminal and civil legal procedures are defective in comparison to the British procedures '... are not accepted by the SRA'. Why are they not accepted by the SRA? The SRA and Capsticks have not the slightest idea of any aspect of Norwegian criminal or civil procedure. My book and website are full of it. And what happened in practice. But the bigots at the SRA and SDT refused to read a word of it. It was beneath them as they thought they knew better.

So a failure to give any Witness Statements in their prosecutions for my alleged 'harassment' is not a defect? To provide their evidence only the day before to my lawyer in 2001 and not to me? That a bent Police Officer in Torill Sorte cannot be cross-examined properly and gives no Witness Statement? That in my civil cases Heidi Schøne provides not one single Witness Statement; her lawyer then refuses to give me a particular Witness Statement about a very serious allegation because it "prejudices her case". Heidi Schøne then presents me with ambush evidence and the

judge refuses any cross-examination whatsoever? No transcripts of the hearing can be obtained in civil cases. To threaten and blackmail me to confess my guilt for my second conviction is not illegal? For Police Sergeant Torill Sorte to tell 250,000 readers of Dagbladet the fabrication that my mother sectioned me for two years in a mental hospital is not an exercise in state sponsored criminality is it? You and the SRA think there are no defects do you? You are liars!

3. I am NOT saying that a conflict of interest arises which prevents you acting for the SRA against me. I AM saying that Capsticks break the Rules if it suits them: as it did for the self-reporting obligation in the Claire Matthews case. I am alleging a lack of integrity and hypocrisy on the part of Capsticks. You accuse me of a lack of integrity when not self-reporting the fact of two convictions given by a xenophobic legal system when you yourselves fail to self-report as well. I say 'xenophobic' with full justification: after 15 years the Norwegian Police and Torill Sorte are STILL not

co-operating with the Essex Police or Interpol over the dozen or so 'Go fu*k Allah the Camel' emails sent to me thanks to Torill Sorte and Heidi Schøne. You may not give a damn about that filth but I do - as do the Essex Police.

Please take this as a formal complaint against Capsticks. The SRA will be obliged to give it to a third party adjudicator as they have a conflict of interest as you are the SRA's panel Solicitors.

Finally who exactly at the SRA is instructing you?

Regards,
Farid El Diwany