

7 - 12 Cases - Effected in Logic & Language – Truth in Court.

Logic Law	2000 + FREE BOOKS >> Shakespeare's plays	Force of Destiny
Shakespeare Concordance	Forest of Rhetoric - Silva Rhetoricae	Fallacies of Logic

Click on pictures or text for each of 6 free sites.

Cabot Financial Ltd, with >>> [Hassle – professionally negligent Wright & Hassall LLP relying on alleged Sainsbury's Credit card](#)

[12 Cases - Preamble – Their Self PRAISE – Non-CPR Claim – The Law](#)

Index of Sections, citing from separate bundles

7 -12 Cases - Effected in Logic & Language – Truth in Court.....	50
W v BCM Ltd. CLCC – Justice Centre.....	52
Sworn testimony defeated by 1 question using contradictio in adiecto.....	52
contradictio in adiecto, variously known as contradiction of what has been added, parts, adjectives, terms.....	52
Defendant's cost for day, Witness, Solicitor & Barrister, estimated £5k.....	53
W v A World Bank, signed Non-Disclosure out of court.....	53
Automated telephone Harassment for £50.....	53
Claim not issued, Settled for about £1600.....	53
W v TfL . Discontinued out of court. PCN cancelled.....	53
Using the understatement 'NOT' with a self-defeating periphrastic.....	53
Subsequently using the 3 rd conditional to avoid apologising.....	53
W v Lloyds Bank: High Court.....	53
Basing conclusions on evidence <i>MADE</i> available, behind corporate veil.....	53
W v Camden. CLCC, Sworn testimony masking whole truth by anacoluthon.....	53
In the procedure. Possession of the Town Hall was Ordered to the Claimant.....	53
Meiosis to make continuous mens rea & actus reus, into A procedural error.....	53
W v Met Police & CPS. Central London Magistrates Court.....	53
Bending facts to fit an inculpatory rule. Ordered to pay my costs.....	53
W v Npower Ltd . CLCC Lost 1 years energy supplies.....	53
Another sworn truth with contradictio in adiecto / part / terminis & time-lining.....	53
W v Rob. Highbury Magistrates Court, 6 months custodial.....	53
W v Amtrak. £8 Privity Case, lost £1200 costs, for £8, & ceased trading	53
Failed to prevent a class action Privity rule defence defeated.....	53
W v LGO . They Discontinued out of court.....	53
Using anhypophora as a misdirect.....	53
W v Telewest, Cable London. CCBC, £1 case dismissed.....	53
W v Hotpoint / Spratt Endicott. They Withdrew in pre-action after 3 days.....	54
Attempted Charge for warranty repair inside warranty after expiry.....	54
CABOT – with HASSLE & SAINSBURY'S BANK v WINTER.....	54

W v BCM Ltd. CLCC – Justice Centre, An early example.

Sworn testimony for TRUTH defeated by 1 question:

Using LOGICAL LANGUAGE in the form of a CONTRADICTION IN ADIECTO.

5 **A *contradictio in adiecto*, variously known as contradiction of what has been added, of the parts, adjectives, or terms.**

If you express your question in the form of an impossibility or similar, then your questions proves FALSE sworn for truth testimony., perjury & the Attorney is shown to be suborning perjury with both attorney & client manifesting contempt of court.

10 In U.K. Law this is CPR 32.14. That is your objective whether you follow through with proceedings for contempt is your next decision.

A BRIEF description of how it works, where a contradiction NECESSARILY renders one of the alternatives / disjuncts FALSE or vice versa.

15 This is NOT the simple form of (P or not P.) it is perhaps better represented in symbolic form as (aP or not ap) where P is the Genus or class, and p is species or member of the class and a is a defining adjective or term being used for both.

Remember the principle of Genus et Differentia expresses the idea that for every class, a member or species has some difference, even if only that where the law of identity confirms that NO two objects, however similar in form or substance, can ever occupy the same space at the same time. That is self-destruction or fusion.

20 It uses the basic idea of Genus et Differentia – general class or species / member of class – where it is IMPOSSIBLE for a GENERAL expression or phrase to defeat any differences found in the species / specific example of the class member.

25 The idea of two IDENTICAL twins has to be falsified by the mere FACT that they cannot BOTH occupy the SAME point in space at the SAME time – as such events are usually the result of a crash in the case of two cars, or Nuclear fission at the particle level. Aristotle’s LAW OF IDENTITY.

A thing is identical with ITSELF ONLY, in the case of two SIMILAR things, they necessarily occupy two locations in space at the same time.

30 In My first case, a CEO was served by myself with a court order to DO – reconnect my electricity supply – he Ignored it, & I returned with a committal order for him to DO it within 30 minutes OR face a custodial sentence. The electricity was re-connected within 10 minutes of service.

Later in Court, attending a hearing for the result, he swore for TRUTH – in conformity with fact:

“The board was unaware that W... had any problem with his electricity supplies.”

After his solicitor & barrister finished their preamble of sophistry my turn came & I asked the Judge: May I ask the Defendant ONE question please? He said YES of OF COURSE!

35 I momentarily blanked then it came to me in language formulated from logic.

There are TWO matters to consider: – but BEFORE examining the answers. See if you can think of them, as a test of your innate logic, in articulating the question in your language of daily use.

1. Think what question you would ask, and then

2. What he should have testified, BUT that would have inculpated himself?

40 The Defence team fell apart in disarray for the SIMPLE question I asked.

THE QUESTION:

5 **HOW is it POSSIBLE for the BOARD to be UNAWARE of the electricity supply when the CEO (Chief Executive of the Board) IS / WAS aware by service of TWO court orders?**

The board – The company of persons – constituted by all its members, is unaware / not-aware was contradicted by one member being aware. You can observe by this comparison that the scope of attributes possessed by each member of the class, has one member class in contrariety.

10 What he should have said for TRUTH, in the sense where the language conforms to / corresponds with the facts - correspondence theory - should be like:

The REST OF THE BOARD [of directors] was unaware....

Meaning he would have been admitting being aware & hence guilty of interfering with a supply that never involved his being the Electricity supplier – LEB.

15 The contradiction above is both that of the adjective – unaware – which cannot belong to the board ONLY an individual, and the individual in question WAS aware twice by Court order.

Equally, the contradiction is between a part of a whole and the whole, where only the part can perform the function of awareness. The whole board of directors being a collective noun. Compare for, **I am aware** [of the electricity problem...] , and also my foot is aware, is the latter possible.

20 The part specified – foot – does **not** have the same attributes as the head. The hide-in-the-crowd syndrome figuratively, is all too often used for lack of articulating those properties which meet the defining conditions of the specific part or thing under focus, and this is often done by the use of metaphor, general or extended language.

Defendant's cost for day, Witness, Solicitor & Barrister, estimated £5k.

25

Compare for [H. Sweet's clarification in the language primer provided here para §3 pointing to §513.](#)

30 **For example if one adds an adjective belonging to a specific part, to the whole, genus or collective terms then the parts added are in contradiction This is because attributes belonging to parts of a whole are only found in the parts, by the 1st law of thought, the law of identity.**

This case has the part added being an adjective to a specific part, then the collective noun that is thereby personified, which of course is an impossibility in fact.

The fuller case is on the older site, but this new section is work in progress, sorry for typos etc. draft mode.

W v A World Bank, signed Non-Disclosure out of court.

Automated telephone Harassment for £50.

Claim not issued, Settled for about £1600

5 **W v TfL . Discontinued out of court. PCN cancelled.**

Using the understatement 'NOT' with a self-defeating periphrastic.

Subsequently using the 3rd conditional to avoid apologising.

W v Lloyds Bank: High Court

10 **Basing conclusions on evidence MADE available, behind corporate veil.**

W v Camden. CLCC, Sworn testimony masking whole truth by anacoluthon.

In the procedure. Possession of the Town Hall was Ordered to the Claimant.

Meiosis to make continuous mens rea & actus reus, into A procedural error.

15

W v Met Police & CPS. Central London Magistrates Court.

Bending facts to fit an inculcating rule. Ordered to pay my costs.

W v Npower Ltd . CLCC Lost 1 years energy supplies.

20 **Another sworn truth with contradictio in adiecto / part / terminis & time-lining.**

W v Rob. Highbury Magistrates Court, 6 months custodial.

W v Amtrak. £8 Privity Case, lost £1200 costs, for £8, & ceased trading ..

25 **Failed to prevent a class action Privity rule defence defeated,**

W v LGO . They Discontinued out of court.

Using anthypophora as a misdirect.

30 **W v Telewest, Cable London. CCBC, £1 case dismissed.**

W v Hotpoint / Spratt Endicott. They Withdrew in pre-action after 3 days.

Attempted Charge for warranty repair inside warranty after expiry.

ALL THE CLAIMS ABOVE WERE with WINTER AS THE CLAIMANT.

CABOT – with HASSLE & SAINSBURY’S BANK v WINTER

- 5 Cabot Financial Ltd., Wright & Hassall LLP & Sainsbury's Bank v Defendant’s ATTORNEY – Winter.

This case attempted to USURP the Court’s powers with a Claim outside it’s Rules.

TWO significant properties, breached, are essential to a **LEGAL** Claim:

- 10 1. **TRUTH 22.1 (1)** The following documents **must** be verified by a **statement of truth** – (a) a statement of case;
2. **DISCLOSURE 31.2** A party **discloses** a document by **stating** that the document exists or has existed. AND
- 15 1. **31.3 (1)** A party to whom a document has been disclosed has a right to inspect that document.

The Claimant & Legal Representative (LR) pursued a strategy of practised continuous conduct despite Notices to rectify in CPR compliance:

The LR avoided verification by filling in the form, and signing it with the name which is NOT that of a person hence, **IT** CANNOT attend court.

- 20 **SIMPLY:** SIGNING “I AM” followed by the name of an ENTITY, NOT a person, CONTRARY TO THE RULE **PD 22. 3.10. 3.10** A legal representative who signs a statement of truth **must sign in his own name and not** that of his firm or employer.

- 25 **RESULTS IN: 22.2 (1)** If a party fails to verify his statement of case by a statement of truth – (b) the party **may not rely on the statement** of case **as evidence of any** of the matters set out in it.

DO exactly the contrary, and ignore Notices to correct it by **similar** obtuseness.

Look-over, then OVERLOOK this simple rule, & sign “**I AM**”, **not myself**.

- 30 Disclose that the documents exists but do NOT DISCLOSE them, ensuring the **right to inspect**, remains in the infinitive mood – **to inspect**– where the **logical** centre of gravity & nucleus – See [Sweet – language §122](#) – is shifted from ‘**inspect this!**’

Entitling one to merely the **right**. The common dissimulation of ‘shifting’. Simply declare the thought form, with the fact form in the infinite mood without a tense, making one’s adversary tense.

- 35 Example: W. v TFL, challenged on their second attempt to serve a PCN,

But Mr. W. we apologised to you previously.

Mr. W. Here is what you stated: ‘**We would like to apologise...**’ You told me what you ‘**would like to do**’ BUT I am still waiting for you to DO IT! Everlasting silence followed.

See Sainsbury's like usage, ‘**We place paramount importance on customer service and aim to**

meet your expectations on every occasion. Observe they are only *AIMING*, not *meeting*. Change **every** to *no*, to agree with **conduct**. Observe what they DID – contrary to legal duties - from the CEO down, as I disclose in stages what are facts, but **not** corresponding thought forms.

5

THE NEXT: WINTER - ATTORNEY, defending a claim involving 3 parties. By common Disparate Predication with Scientific Classification Systems totally replaced by Agenda Mislabelling. Where **Customer Care is an **ANTONYM** for CUSTOMER DETRIMENTS called AWARDS.**

10

In fact customer! Couldn't care less.

A SELF-DESCRIBED / CALLED 1 - Debt Collector,

& 2 - Legal Firm of 296 Professional Negligence Experts

[Experts in being Professionally Negligent] all RELYING on

3 - Sainsbury's Bank.

15

Whose Self stated policy is

A service of quality

We place paramount importance on customer service and aim to meet your expectations on every occasion. Note their **aim** – is carefully missed & misdirected. All by antonyms.

All claims defeated by simple Logical fallacies of Irrelevant refutation & Self Contradictions, in front of an upright honourable Judge.

20

List of FACTS 'STATED as TRUE' controverted by the FACTS themselves.

Issuing unverified Claim for truth, by an abstract entity that cannot verify.

Their games of WORDS in fact mood that consists of meanings in thought mood, modified by being sworn by NEUTER ENTITIES, Personified as IF they had hands to sign a SWORN STATEMENT of TRUTH by dissimulation.

25

Cabot Financial Ltd, Wright & Hassall LLP relying on alleged Sainsbury's Credit card So-called agreement all by pre-supposition language, unverified for truth without any evidence, initially ruled in default Judgement by self-contradiction, set aside, then struck out. A traversal of FALSITIES re-presented as TRUTH.

30

This is an insight as to HOW 'Professional Negligence Legal Experts' are Professionally Negligent & Experts in dissimulating unverified claims without evidence all presented as IF THEY BE facts simply by fact mood language.

35

Circular argument forms disambiguated 2350 years ago as **one of three simple laws of thought.**

THIS SIMPLE LAW OF THOUGHT, DISCLOSES PERJURY UNDER OATH, IT IS DISCLOSED LOGIC, AND ANTI-LOGICAL LANGUAGE THE SIMPLE LAW OF NON-CONTRADICTION. ITS USE HERE WAS AN ATTEMPT TO USURP THE POWERS OF A COURT, DELIVERING MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE AS *IF THEY BE JUST.*

Examine their self representations, and observed their thoughts lying behind their expressions. In a short space of time, where:

TIME SHALL UNFOLD WHAT PLIGHTED CUNNING HIDES, WHO **COVERS** FAULTS AT LAST WITH SHAME DERIDES. King Lear.

After disclosing 2 preliminaries, Winter had some 20 Contradictions proving perjured statements, and only needed ONE to disclose to the Judges extreme disgust, after which the case was **struck out**.

After ten months of Professional Negligence in producing a **so-called** Witness Statement of false truth, served on parties a few days before the hearing, the 20 contradictions virtually doubled.

The complete DISCLOSURE of ONE LINE of the defence Page 1, was to be disclosed in stages **AFTER** they discharged what they called their burden of **Proof – without Truth** or disclosures, in their **simulation** of TRUTH, contrary to the CPR rules with their pun on on *swearing*.

[12 Cases - Preamble – Their Self PRAISE – Non-CPR Claim – The Law](#)

Claim Non-CPR

53-59