



BULK BATCH PROCESSING RE: COUNCIL TAX

Prosecuting a group of people together in a single case and court, rather than individually, can raise serious legal and ethical issues because it will violate principles of fairness and justice.

Listed below are some reasons why it is considered unlawful and illegal:

Right to a Fair Trial

Each individual has the right to a fair trial, which includes the right to be tried separately, regardless whether or not their defences or circumstances differ significantly from the “*group*”.

Ens Legis: a citizen or person has the “*constitutional right*” to a fair trial within the administrative court system of the corporate country they operate within. Re: commerce.

Prosecuting multiple people together without proper consideration can compromise this right.

A court can only group people together for the same offence if they were all involved in it together, and not if they committed separate offences that happen to be of the same kind.

Risk of Prejudice

When multiple defendants are tried together, there is a risk that the judge or jury might be prejudiced against one or more defendants, especially if their actions or defences are different.

This can lead to unfair judgments, and violations of legislation regarding discrimination and prejudice.

Differences in Evidence and Defence

Different defendants may have different evidence applicable to them or different defences.

Combining cases can make it difficult, if not impossible, to ensure that each person’s individual rights are protected and that they receive a fair trial.

Within commerce, each respondent has the right to see the “*Case*” or “*Bundle*” of documentation that supports the claimant in respect of their alleged claim.

Placing the respondent within a group would make this impossible, rendering the respondent unable to speak on the matter at hand or the alleged claim, which is clearly legal entrapment.

Not providing the written evidence supporting the alleged claim violates both contract law and commerce, rendering the court at best null and void, and at worst, illegal and unlawful—as law has collapsed. ***Curia est documenta***; “*The court is the paperwork*” and without it there is no court.

Legal Requirements for Joinder

Many legal systems may request that all defendants be joined in a single trial only, if their cases are sufficiently connected.

For example: being part of the same crime or scheme, like a bank robbery.

However, even within this scenario, each respondent has the right to be tried separately.

If their cases are separate, and not part of the same “*crime*”, then trying them together may violate procedural rules, and create legal conflicts.

Potential for Double Jeopardy

Prosecuting and punishing individuals in a joint trial, when they should have been tried separately, can lead to violations of double jeopardy protections, especially if it results in unfair convictions.

Potential for “double jeopardy” and repeat enforcement in bulk listings in England and Wales

In bulk-listed proceedings (e.g., council tax liability orders, committal applications, and energy rights-of-entry warrant lists), poor case separation and weak record-keeping can create a “repeat jeopardy” problem.

This means the same person may be subjected to multiple applications, repeated hearings, or duplicated enforcement steps for the same underlying debt or alleged default.

Where a matter has already been finally determined (or should have been determined on a properly constituted, case-specific record), re-listing it or pursuing it again risks infringing the core finality protections—*in criminal proceedings, the double-jeopardy principle*, and *in civil/enforcement contexts, res judicata / issue estoppel and abuse of process*—and can lead to unfair outcomes grounded more in administrative throughput than lawful adjudication.

Criminal (England & Wales)

“*Double jeopardy*” is the long-standing rule that, once a person has been *finally acquitted or convicted* of an offence, they *cannot be tried again for the same offence* (traditionally raised by the pleas of *autrefois acquit / autrefois convict*).

A key modern *exception* is in *Part 10 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003*, which (for a defined list of very serious “*qualifying offences*”) allows the *Court of Appeal* to *quash an acquittal and order a retrial* where there is *new and compelling evidence* and it is in the *interests of justice*; this “*lifting*” can only happen *once per qualifying offence*.

Civil (England & Wales)

Civil proceedings do not usually use the label “*double jeopardy*”, but the *equivalent finality principle* is that parties should not be vexed twice over the same matter: *res judicata* (including *cause of action estoppel* and *issue estoppel*) and the *Henderson v Henderson / abuse of process* doctrine can prevent *re-litigation* of claims or issues that were, or properly should have been, determined in earlier proceedings.

Procedurally, this is commonly enforced by *strike-out for abuse of process* under the CPR.

Due Process Violations

Due process guarantees fairness in legal proceedings—not trying individuals separately when circumstances warrant it can be seen as a denial of due process.

In summary:

Trying multiple defendants together in one case and court, rather than individually, can undermine their legal rights, lead to unfair outcomes and violate established legal procedures, making such practice both unlawful and illegal in many, if not all, jurisdictions.

Legal and Statutory Concerns

1. **Violation of the Right to a Fair Trial** (Article 6, European Convention on Human Rights / Human Rights Act 1998):

The practice of attempting to claim against or prosecute multiple defendants collectively without proper individual notice, examination and opportunity to defend, infringes upon the fundamental right to a fair trial.

2. **Breach of the Criminal Procedure Rules 2020** (CPR):

The CPR mandates that proceedings must be conducted fairly and with respect to individual rights. Conducting trials in a manner that compromises these principles may render such proceedings unlawful under Rule 1.1 and Rule 2.1.

3. **Contravention of the Courts Act 2003, Section 55:**

This Act requires that court proceedings be conducted in accordance with statutes, rules, and principles of justice. Group trials that do not adhere to these provisions may be deemed invalid.

4. **Violation of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) and related statutes:**

These Acts stipulate that evidence and proceedings must be individualised and that procedural fairness be maintained throughout.

5. **Potential Breach of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO):**

Composite or group trials may deny defendants access to proper legal representation and procedural safeguards, potentially violating their statutory rights.

6. **Breach of the Equality Act 2010:**

Group proceedings that treat individuals differently without justification may constitute discrimination.

Body of Notice:

NOTICE OF ILLEGAL COURT PROCEEDINGS AND POTENTIAL VIOLATION OF STATUTES

To claimant

It has come to our attention that certain individuals and entities within the United Kingdom court system have engaged in the practice of trying individuals in court via group or bulk listings, rather than individual proceedings.

Such practices are highly irregular and may constitute violations of established legal standards and statutory requirements.

Legal Concerns

Violation of the Right to a Fair Trial:

The practice of grouping multiple defendants or cases into a single trial without proper individual assessment may infringe upon the right to a fair trial as protected under English common law principles and the Human Rights Act 1998, specifically Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Link: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/42/schedule/1/part/I/chapter/5>

Breach of the Criminal Procedure Rules

The Criminal Procedure Rules (CPR) and related statutes stipulate that trials must be conducted fairly, with individual notice and opportunity to defend oneself.

Potential Contravention of the Courts Act 2003:

Link: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/39/contents>

Procedures must comply with statutory requirements for court proceedings; any deviation may be unlawful.

Violation of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO):

Link: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/10/contents>

When legal representation or proper notice is compromised, proceedings may be deemed invalid.

Legal Recourse

Individuals affected by such illegal proceedings have the right to seek legal counsel and consider initiating litigation to challenge the validity of these processes.

Such actions may include, but are not limited to, applications to quash the proceedings or seek damages for violations of procedural rights.

This notice serves as a formal warning to all parties involved that such practices are subject to review, investigation and potential legal action for breaches of statutory duties and rights.

RE: council tax

The local government finance Act 1992 evidences no mandatory obligation to make payments towards the council.

The council is under legal obligation to prove that the individual is under an obligation to comply with the legislation.