

Blaise Tchoula
request-519830-9ba961f7@whatdotheyknow.com

data.access@justice.gov.uk

19 November 2018

Dear Blaise Tchoula

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Outcome of Internal Review – 181022003

Thank you for your Internal Review request received on 22 October 2018 regarding FOI request 180914015, in which you asked for the following information from the Ministry of Justice (MoJ):

Dear Ministry of Justice,

Would you please provide to the public the following information.

1) Would you please tell the public your definition of the following words or title and what is the role and the jurisdiction of the holder of this title and who are they pay by?

- 1)(a) A "Magistrate"**
- 1)(b) A "County Court Judge" ("Circuit judge" "District judge" "Deputy District Judge")**
- 1)(c) A High Court "Master".**
- 1)(d) A High Court Judge**
- 1)(e) A "Recorder"**
- 1)(f) A "Delivery Manager" has he got any judicial power regarding default judgement?**
- 1)(g) A "Prosecutor"**
- 1)(h) A "Office Clerk"**
- 1)(i) A "Court Clerk"**
- 1)(j) A "Court"**
- 1)(k) A "Commercial Court" "Commerce"**
- 1)(l) Queen Bench division**

2) When in official business which ones the above are required to hold and operate under their Oath of Office and Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II in respect of her covenant (contract) with the people?

2)(a) When in official business are they always require to operate under their Oath of Office and Allegiance to Her Majesty?

2)(b) Are there any known circumstances when there are not during a court proceeding or when dealing with the business regarding court, where they are not obliged to respect their official oath and allegiance?

3) Would any court order or/and a decision made without this authority being on the file or record of the case be void ab initio?

4) What information are they obliged to provide to members of the public in showing that they are operating under their oath of office and allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II covenant with the people?

4)(a) Which information should we the people expect to find into the "CASEMAN" or Computerised Court Record or Court Record (from HMCTS) documents that show that when they were making their order or/and decision, this/these was/were done under an within such authority?

5) Would you please provide us with a copy of a sample of Oath of Office and Allegiance to Her Majesty for each one of the position in paragraph 1.?

6) Would you please tell the public where they can find the details and all the necessary information regarding the signed oath of office and allegiance to Her Majesty for the following individuals who have presented and acted under their alleged Oath of Office and have failed to show proof such oath and allegiance?

6)(a) or just because they are occupying the alleged sit or office are we supposed to just accept that they have the authority and are operating under it?

Acting and making decisions and orders at the Queen Bench Division of the High Court in London, i: would like for you to tell the public how to make arrangement to verify that these people are who they say they are and have the authority to do what they are doing or/and what they have done.

- a) Master Eastman**
- b) Master McCloud**
- c) Master Fountain**
- d) Master Kay**

- e) Mr Justice Steward**
- f) Mrs Justice Cox**
- g) Mr Justice Edis**

- h) District judge Zimmels (Lambeth County Court)**
- i) Deputy District Judge Rea Clerkenwell and Shoreditch**
- j) District Judge Sterlini Clerkenwell and Shoreditch**

7) Are "Magistrate" or/and "Judge" people supposed to put their oath of office and allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II into the record as the testimony of their authority before dealing with the file or any case?

7)(a) What is the procedure in place for finding out about this.

Please note that you must provide me with a wet ink signed response posted to my given address (which must is not to be published) and email here for the public to be also informed.

The purpose of an Internal Review is to assess how your FOI request was handled in the first instance and to determine whether the original decision given to you was correct. This is an independent review: I was not involved in the original decision.

The MoJ considered your request 180914015 to be vexatious and, in accordance with section 14(1) of the FOIA, it was decided that we would not be taking it any further.

In determining your request to be vexatious, the MoJ has considered your request against the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) guidance on vexatious requests. A copy of this guidance can be found on the ICO website, via the following link:

<https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1198/dealing-with-vexatious-requests.pdf>

After careful consideration I have concluded that this response was **compliant** with the requirements of the FOIA. The MoJ considered the following criteria to determine your request to be vexatious:

- Burden on the authority – this request, (taking into account a number of other requests of similar length and nature), has lead us to believe that the effort required to meet the request will be so grossly oppressive in terms of the strain on time and resources, that the MoJ cannot reasonably be expected to comply.
- Frequent or overlapping requests - you submit frequent correspondence about the same issue or send in new requests before we have had an opportunity to address earlier enquiries.
- Scattergun approach - the request appears to be part of a completely random approach, lacks any clear focus, or seems to have been solely designed for the purpose of 'fishing' for information without any idea of what might be revealed.
- No obvious intent to obtain recorded information – we believe you are abusing your rights of access to information by using the legislation as a means to pursue an agenda of which the MoJ is unaware. Many questions are general in nature (questions 1, 6, 7). Questions asked also relate to information in the public domain and not held by the MoJ. Some questions ask the MoJ to comment on processes, roles, legal matters, and so are also not requests for recorded data. Some questions are closed 'yes/no' type questions; these are not requests for recorded information.
- Frivolous requests - the subject matter is often inane or extremely trivial and the request appears to lack any serious purpose – for example, the requests for the MoJ to supply definitions to commonly understood words and phrases (see question 1).

Statutory deadline

The statutory deadline for your request was 12 October 2018 and the response was provided on 12 October 2018. The response was therefore compliant with the requirements of the FOIA.

Outcome

In conclusion I am satisfied that the response you received on 12 October 2018 was correct.

Appeal Rights

If you are not satisfied with this response you have the right to apply to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). The Commissioner is an independent regulator who has the power to direct us to respond to your request differently, if she considers that we have handled it incorrectly.

You can contact the ICO at the following address:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

<https://ico.org.uk/Global/contact-us>

Yours sincerely

Communications and Information Services