



# Attorney General's Office

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

T +44 (0)20 7271 2492  
F +44 (0)20 7271 2433  
[www.gov.uk/ago](http://www.gov.uk/ago)

Ismail Abdulhai Bhamjee  
By email only

23 May 2016

Dear Mr Bhamjee

**Re: Your request for an internal review of our response to your Freedom of Information request – our ref: FOI**

1. Thank you for your email to the Attorney General's Office ("AGO") of 22 April 2016 in which you asked for an internal review of our response to your request dated 17 March 2016 under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 ("the Act"). I have undertaken a review as requested and this letter is to inform you of my conclusions.

**Your request**

2. In your email you made the following request for information:

*"1. There is a Judgment given in the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg which has been published on the Bailii Web Site.  
<http://www.bailii.org/eu/cases/ECHR/2016/272.html>*

*The Transcript of the Judgment does contain 38 Pages*

*This Case differs with my Complaint as Fraud Authentication of Document.*

*2. There are Judgments given in the United Kingdom of Vicarious Liability- Since the HM Attorney General is responsible for the CPS, The Serious Fraud Office and The Treasury Solicitors now the Government Legal Services Department. Does the HM Attorney General has given any directions to revoke the Town and Country Planning {use classes} Order 1987 No 764 (As amended).*

*3. You do have the High Court and County Court Jurisdiction Order 1991 which has been amended in the Year 2014.  
There is the Crime and Courts Act 2013 Schedule 9 and Schedule 10.  
Can you give consent that Permission of the High Court Judge is not required to take and defend proceedings in the County Court where the amount doesn't exceed the County Court Limits.  
Since the High Court Judge Mr Justice Mitting in the CO/2689/2004 had made an Order that Permission of the High Court is not required.*

*4. You do have Section 38 of the Public Order Act 1986 as you under the meaning of PUBLIC ALARM, DISTRESS AND ANXIETY Since it is your Office who is causing Anxiety to members of the Public who are on Low Income.*

*4. The Law Commission has published a consultation Paper for the Offence of Official Misconduct in Public Office where you do have a copy."*

3. On 18 April 2016 Craig Hollands responded to your request. He informed you that the AGO does not hold any information in respect of your request *"Does the HM Attorney General has given any directions to revoke the Town and Country Planning {Use Classes} Order 1987 No 764 (As amended)"*. Mr Hollands also informed you that, to the extent it was a request for recorded information, the AGO does not hold the information you requested regarding *"Can you give consent that Permission of the High Court is not required to take and defend proceedings in the County Court where the amount doesn't exceed the County Court Limits"*. Mr Hollands then informed you that the remaining matters set out in your email did not constitute a valid request for information under the Act.

#### **Your request for an internal review**

4. Your request for an internal review is in the following terms:

*"We, Ismail Abdulhai Bhamjee and Mrs Saherabanu Ismail Bhamjee of ..., do hereby make a complaint and request for an Internal Review of the decision made the FOI Officer.*

*1. There is the Data Protection Act 1998, where we have the Legal Right to request for Information for all the correspondence letters which had been sent to the Attorney General's Office between 1988 and the present time. Since the Petitions Number 9974 of 1987 and 5634 of 1988 had been served on the HM Attorney General's Chamber, when the HM Attorney General's Office was at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL. There is a Transcript of the Judgment before His Hon Judge Monnier Williams where the High Court Judge had given permission that I could obtain copies of the Court Documents and send them to the Attorney General's Office.*

*2. The HM Attorney General does have the Power to issue Contempt of Court Proceedings, as Contempt of Court can be committed before the Planning Inspectorate Appeals Office, Any Tribunal and Before any Court of Law Civil or Criminal Court.*

*3. There had been many reports made to the Metropolitan Police, but they don't record the Crime, carry out the Investigations and report to the DPP for the Crown Prosecution Services.*

*4. We are not seeking any Legal Advice from any Law Officer from the HM Attorney General Chambers, Since the Law Officers can't force us that we shouldn't exercise our Freedom of Religion and Conscience.*

*5. You are aware which was the Highest Court in the United Kingdom on the 27th January 2003, 14th May 2003, 25th July 2003, 31st July 2003, 13th August 2003 and on the 8th December 2003, Was it the Judgment given in the Court of Appeal on the 27th May 1999, or the House of Lords Judgment given on the 20th July 2000 where it was ordered that Advocates Have No Immunity Whether Civil or Criminal Proceedings.*

*6. You do have a copy of the Parliament Act- The Civil Jurisdiction and Judgments Act 1982, whilst we are not liable and responsible for publishing on the White Book Service, since some of the Sections are not published; and we can't afford to pay higher amount of Subscription on the West Law and Encyclopedia of Planning Law and Practice. There are many Volumes on Encyclopedia of Planning Law and Practice-*

*We are requesting that you provide copies made under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) 1987 No 764 (As amended)*

*There are time Limits to make a challenge against the Statutory Instrument 1987 No 764 and Statutory Instrument 1995 No 297 Class B1, B2 and B8 Storage. What is the time Limit, Six Weeks, Three Months or Six Years?*

*When a Law Officer who had signed on behalf of the HM Solicitor General Harriet Harman at the time on the 19th June 2003, The Period of Six Years had expired.*

*7. The Solicitors for the Former Wife, Howard Pallis & CO (A Firm) They did write Letters to the HM Attorney General in the Year 1988, that the HM Attorney General should authorise an application for a Vexatious Litigants Order against Ismail Abdulhai Bhamjee after the Judgment given before Mr Justice Hollis in the Family Division High Court of Justice Case Number 9974 of 1987 and 5634 of 1988, This was made under the Repeal Act, The Supreme Court of Jurisdiction and Consolidation Act 1925, without an Affidavit signed by the Former Wife.*

*How Many Years did the HM Attorney General require from the 26th August 1988?*

*8. The Constitutional Reform Act 2005, This has made some changes to the Legislation, Where it is for the HM Attorney General to advice the Prime Minister as some of the Court Officers and Judges have been ignoring the Parliament Act.*

*I am aware of the Family Law Act 1986 Part 3 Declaration of Marital Status since there had been some delay in bringing this Act into force from the 7th November 1986, as this Act came into force on the 4th April 1988 by Statutory Instrument 1988 No 226 Rules 109 and 111 (4) to (7).*

*9. There is a Legal Right for any Person to take Proceedings under the Crown Proceedings Act 1947 against the HM Attorney General, The Law Officers, The HM Attorney General who are also members of the Bar Council, There is a Professional Rules of Code of Conduct on Barristers, where the Barristers should not mislead the Court, and they have to inform the Court of New Legislation, This rule have been breached..*

*The Claim Number CO/2101/2003 and HQ 01 X 5001 In the High Court of Justice Even if the HM Attorney General hadn't been named personally, He is included in that Claim Form.*

*By Taking Legal Proceedings against the Bar Council, than this doesn't mean a Person is a Vexatious Litigant, It is a Report about Breach of the Professional Rules of Code of Conduct on Barrister.*

*10. The Former Home Secretary of State had stated that persons from abroad should learn to Speak English- The Persons who are having Law Degrees, they don't understand the meaning of the Word "Except Traffic Contravention Debt as mentioned in Section 82 and 83 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, This does amount to Blackmail, Harassment and Intimidation.*

*11. The Former Lord Chief Justice Lord Judge had stated before that there are just to many Parliaments Acts which does cause some problems,*

*We thank you in advance and wait to hear from you, whilst you should take into consideration of the Data Protection Act 1998, The Senior Courts Act 1981, The Crown Proceedings Act 1947, and the Civil Jurisdiction and Judgments Act 1982."*

### **Your right to information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000**

5. Where information is held by a government department and is requested under the Act the department is obliged to consider whether it is required to disclose that information. The outcome of that consideration is then subject to an internal review if the applicant is dissatisfied by the decision taken as to whether to disclose the information held.
6. I have concluded that Mr Holland correctly identified those passages in your request which amount to valid requests for information under the Act. Furthermore, I have also considered whether there were any further searches which he might have carried out in determining whether the information you had requested was held by the AGO. I have concluded that

there are not. It is therefore clear to me that the information you are seeking is not information which was held by the AGO.

### **Data Protection Act 1998**

7. In your request for an internal review you referred to the Data Protection Act 1998. However, I have concluded that nothing in your email constituted a request for your personal data and therefore a valid Subject Access Request.

### **Other issues**

8. Your request for an internal review contains a large number of passages which, so far as I can tell, are unconnected to your original request. These have not, therefore, affected the substance of this internal review. I have considered whether any of these passages might amount to new, valid requests for information under the Act, unconnected to your original request. I have concluded that, for the most part, these passages amount to a series of statements about cases, statutes and your understanding of the law. They are not, therefore, valid requests for recorded information falling within the Act. To the extent that your request for an internal review does contain questions which amount to valid requests for information under the Act, these requests are refused on the basis that they are vexatious (see section 14(1) of the Act). This is for the same reasons as were set out in the response sent to you on 13 May 2016 in respect of your separate requests to this office under the Act dated 14 April 2016.

### **Conclusion**

9. The conclusion of this internal review is therefore to confirm entirely the response conveyed to you by Mr Hollands in his letter of 18 April 2016.
10. If you are not content with the outcome of this internal review then you have the right, under section 50 of the Act, to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner recommends that applications are made within two months of the public authority's determination in relation to the internal review (i.e. the date on this letter). The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

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

Yours sincerely



James Gerard  
Deputy Director