



Attorney General's Office

Attorney General's Office
20 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0NF

T 020 7271 2492
F 020 7271 2453
www.gov.uk/ago

Richard Card
By email only

Dear Mr Card,

I am writing in response to the two emails you sent to this office on 4th June, in response to our reply of 3 June to your request of 1 May.

The detail of these two emails is set out below

Email 1 – received at 17:48 4 June

The question of Attorney General being Judge in his own cause arises upon the history since 1972 of the Matron McGILL Decd case. The fact is Matron McGILL's New Zealand Govt asked to re-open inquest in Suffolk and they asked within 3 months of the inquest.

They were then misled by reports written jointly by Suffolk Chief constable and Home Office. This was part of a pattern of lies which had already included concealing the holding of an inquest and conning cremation consents to destroy the body before the New Zealand family and New Zealand Govt found out.

With new evidence the first application for a Section 13 Quash of Suicide verdict was from Roger Evans MP 1990s (A barrister). It is clear that in the history since then of AG public interest decisions the AG has never weighed that the NZ Govt supreme judicial authority was HM the Queens Judicial Cttee of Privy Council.

Clearly if the NZ Govt thought it was in their public interest to conceal the facts of the McGILL death then they wouldn't have requested a new inquest in 1972 would they? And their authority for such justice was HM the Queen sole fount of justice in mercy.

In deciding to conceal treason (undermining the monarch as font of justice) the AGs over many years have exceeded any authority they can have in the constitutional monarchy. This is another branch of the Constable Oath argument you have already treated as being within the power of an AG to spurn.

The Attorney General in breaking Treason Law and in the same breath exempting himself from answerability is a case of being judge in his own cause. Surely you have a constitutional guideline for such a situation?

So could you disclose it please or if you don't have one then disclose that fact, write one in proper consultation with the Privy Council and then disclose it. Thank you. Shall we deal with this by way of internal review?

Email 2 – received at 18:17 4 June

The oath and duties of Attorney General to HM the Queen impose a duty on him to ensure that govt does not break the law.

In McGILL Decd clearly Home Office did conspire to pervert justice in the cover up (The lies reported to New Zealand Govt) but there is evidence (Welsh Regional Crime Squad) that there was Home Office creation of an unlawful police no go area favouring Sue Ryder and Leonard Cheshire and their charity founders.

Since the Chief constable of Suffolk participated with Home Office in lying and conspiring in McGILL Decd there is a CROWN oath aspect to. That of the Chief constable Oath to the Queen.

Hence Attorneys General since the first application under Section 13 in McGILL Decd have had a sworn duty to address Home Office breaking the law and s constitutional sworn duty not to allow a Chief constable to lie and conspire under the cover of a constable oath.

Once the double betrayal of sworn Attorney General duties was made then thereafter any AG protecting the secrecy decision did so in breach of his oath and in breach of the principle no man shall be judge in his own cause.

That is another way of looking at it.

Your second e-mail above appears to be raising concerns about the decision by previous Attornies General not to grant a fiat under section 13 of the Coroners Act 1988 authorising an application to re-open the inquest in respect of Mary McGill. As you know, the current Solicitor General has reviewed that decision in response to a request form yourself and you have been informed of the outcome of that review. I am afraid that there is nothing that I can add to that.

I will now consider your first email.

This e-mail, again, appears to raise concerns about the inquest in respect of Mary McGill. I have addressed that issue above.

I note that you comment at the end of this e-mail: *"Shall we deal with this by way of internal review?"* As I understand your e-mail, you are not seeking an internal review at this stage and you are instead, asking above the rules governing the role of the Attorney General. In particular, you state:

"The Attorney General in breaking Treason Law and in the same breath exempting himself from answerability is a case of being judge in his own cause. Surely you have a constitutional guideline for such a situation ?

So could you disclose it please or if you don't have one then disclose that fact, write one in proper consultation with the Privy Council and then disclose it"

Again, the request above does not appear to be a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act. However, in the interests of providing you with advice and assistance, you can find further information on the role of the Attorney General on our website at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/attorney-generals-office> and in the Cabinet Manual which is available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cabinet-manual>

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Guy Flitton', written in a cursive style.

Guy Flitton
Correspondence Unit

D 020 7271 2492
E Guy.Flitton@attorneygeneral.gsi.gov.uk