

Judges & Irish Courts

This feedback from litigants in courts, with observations was posted on X and copied here for the public good¹

- Certain judges continue to adjudicate in respect of their former clients and certain - having shielded the banks in the sham Banking Inquiry - have been given free reign to “shield them” again from the bench?
- Some (judges²) are unable to ascertain that the Bank has defrauded their customers by unlawfully engineering loan (swap / mortgage) defaults - Ulster Bank and other banks
- Some allow credit servicers with no legal standing to enforce debts & execute repossessions orders
- Some accept heavily redacted evidence, thus allowing enforcement of a debt that is not proven
- Some openly mislead litigants about when redactions are permissible - limited/ justified becomes “open season”
- Some allow banks inordinate time when they are **unable to produce the documentation required** - that in some instances the banks do not have & logically **never could have had**
- Some permit banks & alleged assignees to enforce when they have not produced legitimate evidence of any debt
- Some disregard (and even ridicule) EU law - they do not take into consideration Unfair Terms & GDPR
- Some get unduly irked when a litigant refers to their constitutional & fundamental rights

- Some are unable to ascertain that there is a fraud concern when e.g.

¹¹ Ireland defrauded has changed the formatting and one or two words from the post we read on X to ensure this excellent post is formatted for ease of reading

- bank cannot produce legitimate bank statements
 - amounts are not reconciling & there are overcharging concerns in mortgages & other loans
 - there are multiple notes issued from different entities all backed by same collateral
 - a bank has two legal entities out of which they may **have securitised one loan twice**
-
- Some issue and have issued contrived judgements in which evidence is not adequately addressed and instead **the judge attacks the litigant's credibility** - rampant evidence of this
 - Some return to former law firm's office after daily court sittings - wholly incompatible with judicial office
 - Some are unable to decipher an unlawful receiver appointment
 - Certain law firms, senior & junior counsel slowly coming to conclusion that they are operating in a corrupt pipeline, or they have been aware & are now jumping ship, due to inability to sustain this fiction
 - Counsel under obligation not to mislead independent (or any) judges & in not advising the court that their instructing client has no standing, they are continually assisting judges in breaching their oath of office
 - Judges are essentially expected to get to the truth of the matter and diligently evaluate the available evidence - not simply tell a litigant that they "borrowed the money".
 - There is no confidence that DARs or transcripts are consistently accurate.
 - Many judges are refusing access to the DAR³ - why? What are they wishing to conceal?
 - Valid judicial complaints are routinely dismissed. It is not certain that they ever get past one particular gatekeeper.

³ See Ireland defrauded separate section on accessing Dar & Court Record

- In my view, cameras should be in our courtrooms to deal with these cases and justice should be administered in open court to avoid conflicted judges adjudicating in respect of matters affecting former clients & professional associates.
- Every single day, I am contacted by litigants calling out certain judges and/or court service employees for disrupting their right to file court documentation.
- It is hugely disruptive to litigants' rights to access justice and is a breach of Article 47 of the CFEU.
- Court monitors are now present in the Circuit Court; such is high level of concern about open & transparent administration of justice.
- Only certain judges delve into the detail and listen carefully to litigant in persons' arguments.
- If **all judges engaged in getting to the truth of the matter**, we expect that Barniville J. would soon note that respect for the authority of the court would begin to reemerge.