**CO8072021 Grounds of Appeal**

1. There has been no opportunity to establish whether or not the presiding judge in this case is a dog-owner, a dog-walker or a dog-lover and thus prone to bias.
2. I am baffled by Judge Simon's verdict; much is made of the "lack of legal powers" of the Interested Party (the Council) in this area, but "Dog Control Orders", since 2005, and now "Public Spaces Protection Orders", since 2014, have been available for a while - even the Kennel Club concedes that a Local Authority "could impose a complete ban". Also in eloquent style, though wrong here, His Honour writes that my requests of the Interested Party are “utterly outwith the bounds of their statutory powers” – but the powers are readily available, to any Local Authority.
3. His Honour, strangely, does not appreciate the significance of the Interested Party as an Inner London Borough; I have had to stay close to Central London in order to lobby and engage with various institutions over the years, including, even, the Royal Courts – many of my campaigns might even require a future visit to the Courts and it is unreasonable that any civilised man should have to encounter the vile, unnecessary sight of defecating dogs as he ‘goes about his legitimate, important business’ in the Capital City.
4. I suspect that the Judge himself considers the matter of alleged breaches of protocol as peripheral; whilst ‘due process’ is of course important, in this case it matters not as to whether the Defendant received a “letter before trial” as the Ombudsman will know that its appeals process has been exhausted and that the next step is a Judicial Review – no number of “letters” can change its position.
5. Interestingly, whilst it may have been established that a “letter before trial” has not been received by the Defendant, Judge Simon has assumed that no such letter has been sent – an example of pre-judgement that abounds, it is said, within the provincial Courts, and specifically, in my experience, within the Birmingham High Court which is also prone to a touch of date-tampering; after the attempt at perversion had been exposed, Sir Steven Silber was asked to preside over a fresh hearing but rejected my application, even though no evidence of my alleged transgressions was presented! The relevant point is that Birmingham Justice Centre, issuing the current decision, cannot be trusted; indeed, it is possible that no Midland Court, civil or criminal, is trustworthy – Judge Michael Challinor, sitting at the Wolverhampton Crown Court, in another recent case brought by an alleged female, considered, quite rightly, that I had not harassed my dog-loving neighbour “about her pet” on the High Street, as charged, but still upheld the Magistrates’ conviction!
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