

Extract from the application notice to set aside & transfer to local CC.

If necessary, please continue on a separate sheet.  
PLEASE set this order (EX2) aside as I believe the default judgement was wrongly issued, for reasons of self contradiction between TWO court documents EX1 & EX2 attached.

The court order (*It is therefore ordered...*) is supported in EX2 by the statement:  
'You have not replied to the claim form.'


The above quoted statement is contradicted in EX1 by the statement:  
'I acknowledge receipt of your defence.'

Both statements cannot be true as the contradiction between one falsifies the other.


... Continued & attached to the two documents from the court, with the court fees form also.

Exh 1, of 3 before the very Upright Judge at CC Willesden who dismissed their claim.

**Case C5AU????**  
Cabot / Wright Hassall / Sainsburys Bank v Win????



XXIX - We will sell to no man,  
we will not deny or defer to any  
man either Justice or Right.



**SUBJECT MATTER – ORDER –**  
Default Judgement, **EX2** June 30<sup>th</sup> Received 5th July, Replied 6<sup>th</sup>, delivered 7<sup>th</sup> Inst

***It is therefore ordered...***  
based on  
***You have not replied to the claim form.***

**CONTRADICTED BY**  
Court Letter **EX1** April 11<sup>th</sup>  
***I acknowledge receipt of your defence. A copy is being served on the claimant...***  
Followed by about 75 recorded replies,  
**and courteous request with N244 & fees to set aside the order...**

Please examine the attached exhibits, and traversal since March 10<sup>th</sup> recorded, & auto-acknowledged by CCBC CCAQ & named court staff acknowledging & replying.  
Please refer this to the COURT MANAGER, who authorised **EX1**, & the unsigned orderer **EX2**?)  
I believe judgement has been entered wrongly.

Please verify by your own records & kindly set aside order.

The above self-contradiction is a simple example of disparate predication at work in a larger organisation where what should be shared information, not only fails to be shared, but is also made only available to agents at difference administrative clearance levels. What is normal cognitive continuity for one person, is dislocated between several persons, rendering diverse conclusions – based on limited data – being inconsistent or contradictory with others. Similar causes are when the judgement is made based on the evidence ‘made available’ rather than ALL the evidence, or the judgement is made with insufficient time to debrief the situation.

In this claim, the Claimant & legal representatives misled the court. Some of their methods shall be disclosed.