

From
**EASY TOUCH - THE OMERTA OF THE
ENGLISH LEGAL ESTABLISHMENT**

Simon Kaberry
2006

CHAPTER TWO

A Medico -Legal Scandal – and still it continues

“One day we will look back and wonder how our society can have been so barbaric... to our citizens.”

“They re-routed my mind... everyone was running rings round me....”

“They stole my life...”

At this point, I must digress. This is my personal story of the blind faith we are expected to keep in life-changing systems over which we have no control - the legal and medical systems. This story also illustrates why we must always keep faith with ordinary people - you meet then each day, and the inherent dangers of unaccountable power. Lawyers won't accept this true story - it whistleblows.

You probably know nothing of the true story of the lawyers who spent 35 million pounds of taxpayers' money, paying themselves, in a civil claim for many thousands who claimed to have been injured by a generic group of prescribed drugs. Effectively their own lawyers blocked the claim, leaving thousands with lives in tatters - ruined careers, families destroyed and ongoing ill-health for life. No evidence was ever heard. It is a continuing scandal.

Pose this question - why are you as you are, and what right do you have to remain, the person you are? Silly question - the right to your own working mind is always there. No one can rob you of your mind – or can they? We live in a society with inflated ideas of 'rights,' but the right to your own mind and to be yourself must surely be unquestioned.

Remember the words of one of the world's best-known philosophers Renee Descartes - *“I think, so I am”* (*cogito, ergo sum*). A few years ago, a Neurosurgeon Prof. Antonio Damasio published a book *“Descartes Error”* - *‘you may have a brain all right, but you're certainly not all there!’* And I'm sure we have all

jested whether some people, even ourselves, have any brain at all sometimes.

Damasio reviewed a few old cases starting with the tragic story of Phineas Gage. He was a nineteenth century navy working on railway construction when gunpowder blew a bolt through the front of his head. Miraculously he survived, but had lost a large section of his forehead. He still was human; his physical injuries were visible and obvious. The injury also robbed him of the ability to think and reason. He lived on, becoming a circus freak, robotically exhibited alongside the bearded woman. 'C' was a commercial lawyer in his thirties in New York State. He developed a brain tumour the size of an orange. Surgical skills saved, cured, and injured him all in one operation. All appeared well at first. But during the operation, it seems the surgeon cut a tiny part of his frontal lobes, possibly within the limbic system, which deals with emotion and impulse. Even now, neurosurgeons, psycho-pharmacologists, and psychiatrists don't fully understand all the causes of damaged minds, or the consequences. 'C' was left a man incapable of emotion - devoid of feelings for himself or anyone. But that was not all; he lost all ability to make any decision. He could give options, but make no decision, whilst responding to instruction, hold detailed conversations about life and politics, but make no decision. From a clever and successful lawyer, he was now a man with no feeling for anyone. Unable to rationalise, he was unemployable, ending up living in a relative's attic bedroom. The professor nearly cries for the patient who had no feeling for what had befallen him in life.

Their destinies were controlled by what happened to them. We can readily understand a body can't work properly until a broken bone or physical injury is repaired – when the computer hardware is damaged. But, what happens if the 'way we think' and the ability to hold emotion is damaged internally? - when the software is damaged. We don't readily or really understand that.

Over the last century, a multi-national, international global industry of pharmacy and pharmacology has grown, far more powerful than here-today-gone-tomorrow governments, unaccountable and with very considerable wealth, which brings power and influence. These are the truly wealthy - colossal, with access to and control of global experts, and power over our daily

lives in so many respects. One successful drug can earn them billions. Yet, just one error can break a company, so they don't admit it, and we can't prove it because it is rarely an exact science. Some say it's the most corrupt business possible - too powerful. Remember thalidomide? They denied responsibility until eventually one would have to lack common sense to deny the connection between the drug given to pregnant women to calm them, and the injuries sustained by the newborn child. That said, the lawyers advised settling at 40% of potential liability, as they feared being unable to persuade a Judge that the supplier of the drugs breached the duties of care. So, decades on, the consequences are still lived by many, and more money is sought for second and third generation victims. 'Lawyers and foresight?'

Prescribed psychoactive drugs - by simple definition 'mind altering' drugs - are controlled by a regulation system. On a simple level that is why it's a criminal offence to drive a car when under the influence of the drug alcohol, that slows the brain and can make the driver reckless, negligent, and downright stupid. When it comes to the prescribing and usage of drugs, our doctors have to rely upon guidance from the data sheets and from lectures they attend - usually put on by the Industry which supplies the drugs - i.e. they rely on the very people who have a vested interest to make money from the product, for its efficacy.

The generic Benzodiazepines scandal

This story does not concern recreational and abused drugs or amphetamines and steroids, nor the anti-depressants about which you receive so much misleading information in the media. 'Anti-depressants' in today's terminology and pharmacy are generally the SSRI's (selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitors) - they target serotonin levels. Things like Prozac.

The scandal concerns tranquillisers, known generically as Benzodiazepines, still regularly prescribed by our GPs.

Benzos are both common tranquillisers and sleeping pills. Many media writers confuse anti-depressants and tranquillisers, calling them all 'happy pills.' Happiness is a consequence of fulfillment or an anticipation of good times, and you don't get either when sedated.

Simon Kaberry

Generic Name	Brand Name	Manufacturer	Introduced	half-life	UK Usage
chlordiazepam	Librium	Roche	1960	5-30 hours	anxiety
Diazepam	Valium	Roche	1963	20-100 hrs	Anxiety /insomnia
Nitrazepam	Mogodon	Roche	1965	15-38 hrs	insomnia
Oxazepam	Serenid	Wyeth	1969	4-15 hrs	anxiety
Medazepam	Nobrium	Roche	1971	36-200 hrs	anxiety
Lorazepam	Ativan	Wyeth	1972	10-20 hrs	anxiety/insomnia
Clorazepam	Tranxene	Boehringer	1973	[36-200 active]	anxiety
Flurazepam	Dalmane	Roche	1974	[40-250 active]	insomnia
Temazepam	Normison	Wyeth	1977	8-22 hrs	insomnia
Triazolam	Halcion	Upjohn	1979	2 hrs	insomnia
Clobazolam	Frisium	Hocchst	1979	12-60 hrs	anxiety
Flunitrazepa	Rohypnol	Roche	1982	18-26 hrs	insomnia
Bromazepam	Lexotan	Roche	1982	10-20 hrs	anxiety
Prazepam	Centrax	Warner	1982	[36-200 active]	anxiety
Alprazolam	Xanax	Upjohn	1983	6-12 hrs	anxiety
Ketazolam	Anxon	Beecham	1980	2 hrs	anxiety

I list some of the most common benzodiazepines over page

All benzodiazepines have these **five** pharmacological actions

(i) Anti-anxiety; - (ii) anti-convulsant - (iii) muscle relaxant - (iv) sedative/hypnotic, and (v) amnesic (enabling the user to forget what's troubling them - *and other things too!*)

This generic benzo group was foisted on us in the late 1960's; the doctors were told they were safe, as opposed to the highly toxic barbiturate sedatives, which they replaced. Remember the tragic blonde, overdosed and died from sleeping pills; those were the barbiturates. It's much more difficult to top yourself on Benzos.

'Benzos' are central nervous system depressants, which means they slow the activities of a variety of nerve cells in the brain. Apparently, they increase activity of a natural chemical in the brain called gamma-amino acid (GABA), which then suppresses nerve cell activity. Put another way, Benzos block some of the brain receptors thus preventing the transfer of information -

Easy Touch

including warnings that danger is afoot, which would otherwise enable you to take evasive action; the user's brain is 'sedated' - unable to work things out as before. By 1970's they were referred to by one distinguished psychiatrist as 'the opium of the masses' - 'here's a patient complaining of something - here try one of these; Valium - it'll make you feel better.' Some GPs prescribed willy-nilly. But, they were only intended for short-term use (2-3 weeks).

Ignorance remains widespread. A good friend of mine suffered a bad back for years; in the mid 1980's, he was prescribed Ativan, as a muscle relaxant, to ease the pain. So he ingested a drug for anxiety, convulsion and to cause amnesia and sedate his working brain for over a year - for a bad back! His feisty wife relates that divorce was on the cards - 'I can't begin to tell you how impossible he became,' said she - but in the nick of time, information came to hand, the prescribing stopped and they were saved. The mother of another friend is charming but has a reputation of being eccentric and difficult, even aggressive and readily drunk. It transpires, she cannot live without mogodon - which she still thinks is 'just a sleeping pill'. Thousands of lives have been ruined - and the users thought they were the problem.

Following initial use, the user feels better or sleeps better as they work well; so they become dependent. The user has 'a belief' he needs them - addicted. And the longer you have been taking them, then, generally, the longer it takes for your mind and body to recover, or kick the habit. None of them saw or sees themselves as drug addicts. They were taking harmless pills as prescribed - and stopping is horrible.

However, the real truth, masked by these disbeliefs and misplaced faith, was that horrendous damage was being done to thousands who kept 'taking the tablets', beyond two or three weeks - their intended term. Patients were 'so ready to accept that the pill was doing them good.' Common sense tells us now that a brain which is physically sedated, cannot work as well as one that is not. Insidiously, they had been robbed of their own working mind and the right to be themselves - *the computer software damaged*.

Let me explain the effects. Imagine you're a reasonable chess player. Sedated, you still know and understand the mechanics of the game, but you can't plan a game, or see what your opponent

has in store for you. You're there to be had in a Fool's Mate. Transfer that to daily professional, social and commercial life; the consequence will be utter chaos, and gullibility. And your normal family life – without emotion? Worse still, anyone taking any benzo must abstain from all alcohol. The two synergize' doubling at least the effect of each drugs. Hence the 'date-rape' with rohypnol (flunitrazepam) but you'll get a similar result with many benzos.

The consequences will and do vary from one person to the next. Some of the effects *include* (and I take all this from pharmacologists reports):

- Poor concentration: an inability to sit down - find a solution to a problem; or do something non-routine. Daytime confusion: mild or severe. Daytime drowsiness: Lightheadedness; muscular problems (including diarrhea or constipation.). Impaired short-term memory (the chemicals are intended to cause amnesia e.g. the date-rape experiences.). Emotional anesthesia (you no longer feel for people *or yourself*). Depression: suicidal desires; and agoraphobia (you avoid mixing by 'fear of the market place.'). Obsessive conduct: Aggressive and bizarre behaviour, including lack of inhibition (a sort of 'couldn't care less' attitude.); and violent outbursts: Slurred speech and drunkenness, especially if alcohol is taken before the chemical has been excreted, which could be days after ingested. There is more; the list is near endless. You live divorced from the real world, unable to see things as you normally would.
- All this and more from apparently 'harmless' pills.

It doesn't end there. Many thousands are left **permanently injured** from long-term exposure to the drugs, but here the evidence has to be anecdotal. To do otherwise would require taking an individual, exposing him to the drugs for years, then waiting to see how much harm had been done: 'utterly unethical.' Nevertheless, that anecdotal evidence is whopping.

There are *thousands* of horror stories from real people living with those problems in England and all over the world. Look at

website www.benzo.org.uk. under ‘stories’ or ‘media’ and read comments of the site of ‘petition’.

It took the Committee for the Safety of Medicines (CSM – now NICE) to January 1988 before it formally warned prescribers to limit the prescribing of all Benzos, to those who really needed them for daytime sedation or help with disabling sleeplessness. They warned of the consequences of *over-prescribing* including addiction, confusion, amnesia and suicide, and that in any event, all prescribing should be for short-term only. Moreover, in 1990 Roche issued a similar warning to prescribers – ‘these drugs are for short-term usage only.’ But it did little good.

Sleeping Pills

Sleeping pills are probably more dangerous than ‘tranquillisers’ because the user thinks he/she has just taken something to help him sleep. When up, showered and about he assumes the effect is over. Try to come off them after a while and you can’t sleep; if you cannot sleep, you can’t function properly, and feel dreadful and worse – although that is also withdrawal. So, you ‘keep taking the tablets.’ Many people, even today, don’t know a sleeping pill is virtually the same as a daytime tranquilliser.

By the early 1980’s the experts knew these drugs were causing problems. Well-known types such as actor Burt Reynolds and the infamous case of Richard and Karen Carpenter’s addiction to dalmane. So the pharmaceutical industry pushed shorter acting pills, excreted from the body more quickly - Temazepam, Flunitrazepam (rohypnol) and Triazolam (halcion). But there are terrible horror stories about Halcion - “*Sweet Dreams or Nightmares*” is one of the newspaper headlines. Things reached a climax in late 1980s with the Grundberg case; after taking Halcion for over a year she became paranoid and killed her mother. She sued Upjohn - that they had marketed a drug responsible for her bizarre conduct. On the eve of trial, the towel was thrown in and although secret, it is thought they paid her \$6 million to settle. They were not going to admit fault readily, and they have the power and money. There was no judgment against them and they said – ‘you’ve got to rely on science, anecdotal evidence doesn’t cut.’ That means common sense plays little part.

The Legal Benzo Scandal – lawyers

In the mid-late 1980's, people started to consult solicitors about the effects of Benzos generally. One lawyer tried to sue the regulator CSM for acting too little and too late (in 1988), but you can't win against such power – unless perhaps you can find a judge who has been affected personally or within his family. Unaccountable Judges like to protect the Establishment of which they feel a central part.

Legal Aid funded a 'Group Claim.' Thousands came forward and a central committee was set up with Nottingham lawyers Freethcartright, headed by a young man called Paul Balen. The clients wanted compensation for ruined lives, families destroyed, careers and businesses lost, and ongoing ill health. They had been robbed of the right to be themselves, and often with terrible consequences.

Lawyers were getting stories of differing effects of different drugs from a variety within the generic group. Ativan seems to have been severely criticised. Sometimes it can't have been easy to distinguish what was causing the problems – something in them, or the treatment and duration of it. Against that, many never needed any mind-changing drugs, so with them at least it was fairly simple - if the lawyers could grasp that. And of course many who could have come forward knew nothing about the claims and litigation, and were still taking the drugs, oblivious to the cause of their problems – or that they even had a problem; that only comes clear when they try to stop. Some are still taking them – oblivious to the truth, and with GPs ignoring their trust and duties.

The solicitors passed the facts and supporting medical evidence to barristers to advise how best to proceed. That's the way our messy system has evolved; you get two men to do one man's job, and 'falling between two stools' is not a meaningless saying. Lawyers and judges defend this system by saying you get a specialist second opinion; but they would, wouldn't they? Judges are endemically trained to protect their system. Solicitors charge as if they are experts - then say 'now you need an expert' - buck-passing. These were big claims of real loss and serious injury. *But - against whom?* - the prescriber or manufacturer? If you were in their powerful shoes of Wyeth, Upjohn and Roche – what would

Easy Touch

be the easiest way to block the litigation? Think on that as you read to the very end of this story, then reflect – how sinister?

This was a huge claim worth many millions of pounds. How do you value a life? What is it like to be confused for years, and left permanently unwell? What about the housewives who weren't working anyway? Barristers included one Oliver Thorold, who advised and drafted one of the claims, filed at court – i.e. he 'pleaded' the claim, which set out the allegations of breach of duty of care, injury caused, and losses arising. They issued two 'Group' Claims – one against each BOTH the prescribers, and manufacturers. Of the GP's they claimed they had wrongly prescribed addictive drugs constantly. That was largely the claim drafted by the barristers - that they had failed to 'wean' the addicted patient from the drug – nothing of poor diagnosis or treatment, nor the terrible effects on a working mind, and nothing about the long-term injuries for those who never recovered. The real consequences of addiction and drugs effects were never pleaded - the turmoil that will cause to daily life, or what it is like to live with a sedated mind, that can't work things out any more, devoid of real feelings ('tranquillised'). It was never 'pleaded.'

I suggest the lawyers got it hopelessly wrong; the investigations and pleadings were poor, possibly incompetent. Another problem would be that their own experts agree there is a place in medicine for the generic drugs – generically they are not dangerous. The problem is in overuse, and wrongful prescribing. First, to apply to strike out the 'pleaded claim' before any evidence was heard were the doctors' insurers. In the claim against the manufacturers, the barristers pleaded the doctors hadn't been told the drugs were addictive - so, what was there for them to answer? They had prescribed what the Regulator licensed, and they were still prescribing them. They had nothing to defend on the claim the lawyers had pleaded. It was struck-out by the High Court.

The lawyers were surrounded by problems largely of their making for failing to investigate the facts, issues, and effects thoroughly, and gather the evidence from the experts – *and* defendants' own records and research, and plead a powerful case. The problem was the length of time many patients had been prescribed them – and some should never have been prescribed mind-changing drugs at all. The real case wasn't pleaded.

Not then actively engaged in litigation, I knew none of this, but reading the events later, it seems to me it was inevitable that the pleaded Group Manufacturer claim would also be struck out. The lawyers must have known that as inevitable. Yet, *millions* of pounds of public money had already been paid over to these lawyers - on their advice to the Legal Aid Board to fund what they had done. How would you react as advising barrister in such situation? Hold your hands up and say 'I got it wrong' – and go unpaid. Or is it more sinister than that? As I say, 'keep an open mind'.... I hold one of the 'Reviews' for the Legal Aid Board Audit purposes of barrister Thorold on the merits of proceeding with more money on his pleaded case. He said people talked of their 'Lost Years' when 'life was barren.' Little is said of the ongoing injuries and the hell they still lived whilst trying to rebuild their shattered lives, or how long this would continue (some never recovered). But the ongoing defendants – the pharmaceutical industry - hadn't 'diagnosed and treated' any claimant; doctors had done that. Thorold then proceeded to put a monetary value on a 'Lost Year', and compared it to living in a damp house – a figure of about £1,500 for each year. You get that for a cricked neck in a good whiplash case. That Opinion and other Advice was submitted by the lawyers in Nottingham to the Legal Aid Board with the *inevitable* consequence – the LAB decided that the group claim was 'not financially viable,' when you set that level of compensation against the millions lawyers had already taken for their fees, and would yet take.

Accordingly LAB withdrew funding. Media got hold of the story in early 1994 – "**Sad Story of the Happy Pills**" – '*six years on and the legal system cannot cope with a group compensation claim for tranquilliser addiction... after 30 million pounds had been paid over to the lawyers.*' (Others say 35 million.)

The very lawyers who held themselves as champions of the claimants had effectively advised the LAB to pull the plug. That media report recorded that '*lawyers are bitter.*' Paul Balen said the decision 'called into question the entire English system.' But he had filed the Opinions, which made that decision inevitable. The solicitors and barristers 'withdrew' leaving the claimants without lawyers. One man wrote directly to the judge setting out his losses at a million pounds - and he wasn't alone. Many of the

group claimants never recovered and never returned to work – some were put on Incapacity and Disability Benefit for life; others just accepted their lot in life – we are powerless. One of their number ** later remarked to me - ‘yes, you can live, but it’s a different life, and go to work – the problem is what happens when you get there’ (you can’t work or understand reality). Thousands will agree with him. They were all denied access to justice – on their own lawyer’s advice (but they didn’t know that).

** - he removed himself completely from the ‘Group Claim’, and continued alone in Scottish (no strike-out) courts. He had been prescribed the sleeping pill mogodon, when a successful businessman. His world and business fell apart with his mind. He claimed millions from the manufacturers for not telling his GP what the pills really were and did (*a different Pleading*) and was due finally to come to trial in 2007. But those years in litigation took an enormous toll, and, at the court door, he settled - ‘a secret deal struck’ - no trial or admission.’

Frighteningly, lawyers Balen and Thorold continue to hold themselves out as experts on the effects of Benzodiazepines. Imagine a heart surgeon, and all his patients died, still held out as an expert. Lawyers would skin such a doctor alive! But there is no similar control over lawyers. Quite the reverse - judges to the very top in the House of Lords will protect them, as this account relates. It’s the Legal Omerta.

A group continued the claim without lawyers. Their appeal against strike-out without trial came before Lords Justices Stewart-Smith, Brooke and Aldous. Sir William Aldous is prominent later in this account, protecting the lawyers. The three judges said the lawyer’s advice to LAB left them ‘dead in the water,’ and saying it was ‘flawed ab initio.’

Thousands have had their lives ruined - forever; it’s about responsibilities; nothing to do with a compensation culture; this was no accident. Well, if Boots gave you the wrong prescription with disastrous consequences – you’d sue for the losses so caused.

Modern Medicine – the position post 1994

- *The problem continues*

Most doctors have heard the horror stories, but not all of them by any means, and the problem continues. It's terribly sad and a waste of life. There are some non-benzo sleeping pills but NICE have confirmed they work on the brain just the same way as Benzos.

Doctors who ignore the Benzo warnings and expose their patients to these drugs long-term should be sued and disciplined. That would end the scandal – *simple as that*. But it hasn't happened, despite the Regulator repeating the 1988 Warning to GPs in 2004. The trouble arises from the group action – lawyers and Judges have been told the Claim was 'lost.' Wrong - it was never heard..

The knock-on effect of the wasted 35 million runs much deeper. Recently, in USA victims of an arthritis drug were awarded \$2billion for their injuries. In UK funding isn't now allowed for such group claims so they got - nothing for their injuries.

I offer just a tiny few of the *thousands* of comments found on the website of individual's remarks:

- "It was as if my mind had been re-routed, as sure as if the points had been changed; *everyone was running rings round me...*
- "Taking these drugs *ruined my life....*
- "*I went through mental hell....*
- "These drugs are deadly – they should be banned...
- "**Someday I can only hope that the truth will be told** of what these benzodiazepine drugs have done. We will look back and wonder how our society could have been *so barbaric to have prescribed these to millions of unsuspecting citizens*.
- "We all need to come together and find a solution and inform people... this must stop
- "**I have suffered years in recovery – please do something now.**
- "**5 years on Benzos ruined my life, and so far it's been 5 years in recovery...**
- "**They stole my life....**
- "These unnecessary and irresponsibly prescribed drugs have devastated **not only my life, but of those around me who had to face this with me**

I could continue another five pages and more....

- *Can they all be so wrong?*

Save this is fact; not everyone was adversely affected, as we each respond differently to psychoactive drugs. Some recovered and some did not – rather like gulf-war syndrome.

Pressure groups petition Parliament to stop this scandal. But Parliament doesn't 'diagnose and treat' patients. The issues are medico-legal - and for the courts..... men like Lords Bingham, Phillips, Scott and Brown, who will allow no evidence. Read on

This Story

You will have guessed: I was prescribed the sleeping pill Dalmane for four years. Dalmane (flurazepam) 'puts and keeps' the working mind to sleep - far longer acting than its brother flunitrazepam (rohypnol, used also to sedate before sexual attack). The prescribing was 'top-end' negligence by my GP. I led a full life as a lawyer with my own practice. Over those years, my social, domestic, professional, and economic life gradually fell apart along with my mental faculties. I had no idea I was ingesting a psychoactive daytime sedative drug, and no need for one. As I lost the ability to think-straight and concentrate, I sat on work I could no longer do, and my practice fell apart. Simultaneously Law Society failed to regulate me, as I filed and kept no accounts, and fraudsters took advantage of my impaired condition; I was cleaned out - my signature was forged to cheques. Eventually rendered suicidal, in despair for what seemed to have happened when I was in charge, I took personal blame for all 'missing money,' and, as directed, wrote admissions, which could not be true when set against the facts. You've just heard them in chapter 1. I was arrested, and as police investigated (one man arrested told police in Interview I became an 'Easy Touch' for money), I discovered the cause of my woes, and was referred to Balen and Thorold, who were immediately granted legal aid to sue the negligent prescriber.

Aware of all this, Law Society published in a ten-minute sitting of it's Kangaroo Court (Tribunal), that I had stolen millions from clients to gamble. They knew it wasn't true, but they are well protected by our Judges. With police investigations ruined, and in chaos - for I could be no witness after that, I was charged and you have just read the start of my trial. How would you cope?

In the first part of this account, I explain what it is like to be doped up, defrauded and deceived, then set up by Establishment - and put

on trial. The second part is more worrying - our unaccountable legal system, and two questions - how sinister is all this? - and what can we do with unaccountable and bent judges who breach their oath to do justice without fear or favour, protecting their own first (chaps 16-18). It's pretty sordid. We have no sanction (chap 19) on them at all – in our democracy.

Supported as I was by the facts, a jury ruling in a press-gagged trial, and all medical experts, my own lawyers then blocked the best prescriber claim, which would have made up for the wasted 35 million. Why and how? Read on... I ask you to keep an open mind throughout, then judge the lawyers and judges. I explain how readily they do it, and name the names.

The Legal Omerta – the judicial cover-up

With essential funding to sue the negligent doctor lost on my lawyer's bad advice, and in an impossible position in law, I had to sue the negligent lawyers, funded by taxpayers money. Here I was confronted by the Omerta of legal protectionism. That 'Silent Code of the Closed Shop' that you look after your own first. The Hearing of any claim would expose serious wrongdoing, criminality, and deceptions by Law Society staff, on the public, and plain bad lawyers; our judges wouldn't allow that, for it kicks their closed shop.

The jury had met me and wished me well getting back to work and re-building a very shattered life. Events which follow make one want to re-write those old school essays - '*Power Corrupts, Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely?*' - for judicial power is absolute and unaccountable, entrusted to unelected jobs-for-life types. Any claim by me, and publication of the truth, would reveal how Law Society, by its top lawyers had committed criminal offences for which others are sent to prison – our judges wouldn't allow the dangers of their closed shop exposed.

Lords Bingham (then LCJ) and Phillips (then MR) led the line of cover-up, that no evidence be allowed of what Law Society had done, so no career or life could be restored, and I live out my days condemned a dishonest thief. That would blight anyone, and no compensation claim heard – so the scandal continues. My pension was taken by law, offering poverty for life, and both Bingham and Phillips ruled no evidence could be given of how Law Society had

Easy Touch

set me up to media, and left three crooks laughing like extras from a smash advert with millions from their frauds. I give you the detail of these men of honour and chivalry. Two High Court and five Appeal Court judges (two you may find to be blatantly dishonest) followed their lead, striking out all civil cases from proceeding. Three highly duplicitous law lords (chap 18) followed suit – “*we find there is nothing for us to consider*” – to hell with justice without fear or favour. Sadly, they are too unaccountable for me (or you) - Lords Bingham, Phillips, Nicholls, Scott and Brown all ruled - no evidence in any trial involving me. Sordid or corrupt? Serious public interest and legal issues were blocked by these men. You read the evidence and consider if I’m right.

I petitioned Lord Bingham (as senior law lord) ten times to review this, as he had started it (see Epilogue). He viewed all thru Nelson’s eye, saw nought, then travelled to Windsor to accept the highest honour of chivalry (a courageous defender of the weak). This is the Legal Omerta. He knows, as they all do, that there is absolutely no accountability to the public they serve.

A lady was wrongly prescribed dalmane at the same time as me. She suffered similarly. She used ‘non-expert’ lawyers to sue the prescriber and was awarded a six figure sum to ‘settle.’ So it can be done with half-competent lawyers.

They had made us subject to European Courts to protect ‘human rights’. But I’m not a homo-sexual, crook, prisoner, or asylum-seeker; did the Convention have anything for a native anglo-saxon seeking an ounce of justice? Was it not my ‘human right’ to have a trial before losing my career, home, family, capital, reputation and pension? It’s ruling (chap 18) would surely make a radical Muslim extremist chuckle like a mellow Christian.

One person who read this book in draft said – “*you keep reading, believing... surely... this couldn’t happen in England... then you vote... and fifteen minutes later you’re smiling.*”

Doped up, tomorrow when you can sort everything out can never come. But most lawyers and judges simply do not understand which is not surprising, because until this happens to you – you don’t understand either and it take syears to grasp what has

Simon Kaberry

happened to your life. So this is my personal story.... And until it happened, I would have said it was impossible. You judge...

Easy Touch The Omerta of The English Legal System
by Simon Kaberry is available from
[Chipmunkpublishing](#)