

Court Clerk  
Employment Appeal Tribunal  
Fifth Floor  
Rolls Building  
7 Rolls Building Fetter Lane  
London  
EC4A 1NL

Twenty-Second-of-February-Two-Thousand-and-Twenty-Three



**NOTICE: TO BE FILED ON COURT RECORD**

**NOTICE OF VOID ORDER**

Notice to agent is notice to principal ~ Notice to principal is notice to agent.

This document does not form part of an appeal. It is presented to the court as a declaration of a Void Order for reasons explained herein.

You are hereby required to record this annulment:

In the matter of:

**Michael Furlong v Jaguar Land Rover Limited Case: 2402150/2021 / EA-2023-000004-NLD**

Plain English and counting systems.

**Psalm 23**

**A psalm of David.**

- 1 *The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.*
- 2 *He makes me lie down in green pastures, he leads me beside quiet waters,*
- 3 *he refreshes my soul. He guides me along the right paths for his name's sake.*
- 4 *Even though I walk through the darkest valley, I will fear no evil, for you are with me; your rod and your staff, they comfort me.*
- 5 *You prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies. You anoint my head with oil; my cup overflows.*
- 6 *Surely your goodness and love will follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.*



The Keeper of Records, Cosmic Gazette, do hereby certify the foregoing document is a true and correct copy of the original of the document recorded in public at cosmicessencepma.com

Witness my hand and official seal this 10 day of December, 2025

Keeper of Records Cosmic Gazette,  
By CERK, TRUSTEE  
Trustee

Public servants, trustees, guardians, respondents, et al;

I would like to lawfully command again redresse and for the removal of the title "MR" from any correspondence and to refrain of using DOG LATIN GLOSSA as I am neither a TRUST, CORPORATION nor AKRONYM.

Please respect my faith as a God-fearing Christian Man and your Obligation to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This is in addition to my application of void order. I lawfully command trial by jury.

Thank you.

***Job 32:21***

*Let me not, I pray you, accept any man's person, neither let me give flattering titles to man.*

Due to Anna De Buisseret's ill health and my lack of Legal process knowledge, my appeal was filed to Manchester at approx.; 15:40pm on the 5<sup>th</sup> Jan 2023, the other required documents were sent upon request with me being rather frantic as its such a monolithic fraud spanning several corporate entities and several agents. I feel the extension application is reasonable given the size and scope of the case and the fraud documented by several third-party corporation agents, however;

**The Master of the Rolls, Lord Denning, famously said the following:**

*"A void order is incurably void, and all proceedings based on the invalid claim or void act are also void. Even a decision of the higher courts (High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court) will be void if the decision is founded on an invalid claim or void act, because something cannot be founded on nothing." (Lord Denning in MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd. [1961].*

Therefore I am again citing the verdict as a void order pursuant to the following, here are my reasoning and motives for the documented fraud of Ian Holohan's mandate of a garment that turns cells hypoxic through oxygen deprivation causing illness, his motives will be including but not limited to:

- Financial

All UK Government agents have knowingly or unknowingly been aiding and abetting fraud (birth registration corporate conversion not disclosed on registration), trust fraud and high treason/aiding and abetting as second offender since the late Edward Heath a known child murdering paedophile committed treason by joining the E.E.C by stealth and suppressing the Federal Commission Order 30/1048 in 1973. Ignorance of the law is no excuse.

The private for-profit Crown Corporation serves King Charles who is a proud advocate of the World Economic Forum, which compromises the oath he is yet to take as; "Defender of THE faith". The current democide we are witnessing, is unlawfully coercing an unsuspecting public to surrender their inalienable right to bodily integrity and take an alleged "vaccine" which is a medical experiment until this year breaching the Nuremburg code, and will now attempt to remove our freedom of travel with; 15 minute city's, under the climate change hoax and freedom of speech, with the proposed central bank digital currency (CBDC), set to harmonise with WO2020/060606, universal income and Online harms bill.

King Charles was the late Paedophile Jimmy Saville's best friend, and his brother Andrew was really close friends with paedophile Jeffrey Epstein who was running the blackmail and child trafficking operation on Little St. James, they don't call them the Virgin Islands for nothing. Andrew's other good friend, Ghislaine Maxwell, is the only child trafficker to serve time for trafficking children to NOBODY!

Klaus Schwab, of the World Economic Forum, openly boasts of his young global leaders programme infiltrating governments, unions, judiciary's etc.

- Cestui Qui Vie Trust fraud/Criminal Conversion: Both my mother and father are appalled they were deceived into my criminal conversion upon BIRTH REGISTRATION. I forgive them, many a poor soul has perished not knowing who they truly were. The Cestui Que Vie is the most pernicious fraud and violation of fiduciary duty.

#### Denial of due process:

Did; David: Franey, the man acting as Regional Employment Judge and Jane: Aspinall, the lady acting as Judge have a legal excuse for ignoring my lawful commands for redress and a trial by a jury of my peers in line with the Bill of Rights? Subjecting myself to personage, barratry and breaching constitutional law whilst aiding and abetting treason as a secondary offender;

Monarch deposed on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1773. (See: Treason act 1795), Transfer of title from Monarch to HEAD OF STATE, 1773 (F.C.O: 30/1048).

The Bill of Rights 1688 stands for ALL TIME and every Monarch will abide by that.

ALL TIME = in perpetuity.

*perpetuity (n.)*

*"quality or state of endless duration, continued uninterrupted existence for an indefinite period of time," late 14c., perpetuite, from Old French perpetuité "permanence, duration" (13c., Modern French perpétuité) and directly from Latin perpetuitatem (nominative perpetuitas) "uninterrupted duration, continuity, continuous succession," from perpetuus (see perpetual).*

If there is a Standing Monarch, every other Monarch from 1688 has to abide by the Bill of Rights.

To dispose the Monarch is Treason: it constitutes Treason.

*depose (v.) c. 1300, "to remove from office, especially from royalty," from Old French deposer (12c.), from de- "down" (see de-) + poser "put, place" (see pose (v.1)). Meaning "testify to, attest," especially "give testimony on oath" is from early 15c.; sense of "take testimony from or examine under oath" is from 1560s. Literal sense of "lay down, let fall" (early 15c.) is obsolete. Related: Deposed; deposing.*

In 1971, an FCO memorandum known as FCO 30/1048 was drafted. This document details how the UK would surrender sovereignty if it were to join the E.E.C/EU. However, this document was classified as Confidential, and not released into the public domain until 2002.

<http://www.acasefortreason.co.uk/fco-30-1048/>

The surrender of sovereign powers, as a consequence of signing the Treaty of Rome, Maastricht, and Lisbon, is in breach of the British constitution, as detailed in the Bill of Rights 1688.

This Bill has never been repealed, and as such was, and is still in force. The contents of FCO 30/1048, and the effect to UK sovereignty, were not made available to the British public during the 1975 referendum.

(Petition was available for 6 months and got 1, 165 signatures).

References:

Bill of Rights 1688

FCO 30/1048

Treaty of Rome

Maastricht Treaty

Lisbon Treaty

The Werner Report 1968 proves their intent was to take away full Sovereignty of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Edward Heath and Margaret Thatcher buried the CRIME they were committing – TREASON ; HIGH TREASON.

Any act and statute since are null and void, once a party in a position of trust breaks the law, they lose all authority and jurisdiction.

From 1973, = "Colour of Law" = Without Legal Right because they stepped OUTSIDE the Constitution and created the Corporate and engaged with a Foreign, Federal State known as; The EU, intent on destroying our Sovereignty.

The 'UK' is a CORPORATION which the Monarch is the Head of. Her real name is Elizabeth Saxe Coburg, which is German. She changed her title to Windsor.

The Queen swore an Oath in 1953 to govern us by the Laws of God and the Gospel.

<https://www.royal.uk/coronation-oath-2-june-1953>. There is a lot of criminal deception involved in that document, when you know about Contract Law, it's signed at the Top.

Anything AFTER where she signed, she is NOT admitting to. Contract law is signed at the BOTTOM, not the top.

The fraud was going on in 1952/3.

She signed at the Top = NOT a contract regarding her Oath.

Elizabeth gave up her position as Monarch, which she never really had, and she became the Head of a Corporation. (Treason act 1795).

This is a CRIMINAL FRAUD AND DECEPTION. See: Halsbury's Laws of Parliament:

*"No Administrative court can be legitimized because of the constrains of the monarchs."*

ADMINISTRATIVE COURTS ARE FRAUDULENT = NOT LEGITIMATE.

Archbold criminal pleading and practice: Chapter 1:6 To disobey a statute is an indictable offence.

2008 Clearfield doctrine: Any corporate mandate requires the individual's consent.

**Canon 2721**

*Any guild, society or association of men and women that seeks to deliberately corrupt the Living Law for their own ends and abrogate the rights of other men and women through trickery and dishonesty are an enemy of the Living Law and have no right to claim superior status before the law.*

I would very much like, and Lawfully Command, the presence of the following incumbents ; Steve McGravey, Ian Holohan, Grant Mcpherson, Thierry Bollore, Trevor Leeks and Richard Mann via subpoena in any future trial; Habeas Corpus, or alternatively payment.

David : Franey claimed that my witness order for Steve McGravey required me to provide his home address. He was a paid Union rep not a drinking buddy.

UNITE THE UNION; Steve McGravey failed to respond to several emails requesting his presence as a witness in court: available upon request due to hi, being aware the face mask was not covered by indemnity due to risk/impact assessment;

**Cf. ; Fraud by false representation (2006)**

*(1)A person is in breach of this section if he—*

*(a)dishonestly makes a false representation, and*

*(b)intends, by making the representation—*

*(i)to make a gain for himself or another, or*

*(ii)to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.*

*(2)A representation is false if—*

*(a)it is untrue or misleading, and*

*(b)the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading.*

***The Contract makes the law - maxim***

Personal Protective Equipment must first be Risk and Impact assessed to adhere to Corporation Indemnity Insurance and the agents of the corporation are both legally and morally obligated to provide this upon request, Failure to do so is a breach of the; Cf; Fraud act 2006 and a fundamental breach of contract. (Cf: Fraud act 2006).

***It is a fraud to conceal a fraud – Maxim***

**Canon 2256**

*Failure to perform an obligation without legal excuse gives the other party the right to seek legal remedy.*

Jane : Aspinall said "I could have just left", which would defeat the object of the contract and would have removed me of the opportunity to expose this Great Reset, Global fraud, democide, and given corporate entities the legitimacy to usurp mans inalienable rights which are protected by superior statute enshrined in the constitution in perpetuity, upheld by my public servants sworn oath of office, even in the event of an alleged medical emergency.

I would never have been able to look people in the eye again had I agreed to self-harm at the behest of these narcissistic cultists and their love of mammon, I quite possibly would have been misdiagnosed with the alleged COVID-19 which remains un-isolated, yet it has variants, which I find rather absurd. Moreover, I would have given credence to the fraud, thereby validating the trespass of my rights and the medical rape to which I was subject and was a clear breach of including but not limited to, the Nuremburg code and the crimes listed on my closing submissions.

**Deuteronomy 25:4**

*"You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain.*

Kate Dodd of Pinsent masons fraudulently altered my commercial instruments in breach of:

**Canon 1541**

*The physical alteration of any Document, whether it is valid or invalid, without the permission of the original author is an Injury that shifts any liability to the party who altered the document without permission.*

Pauline A. Feeney claimed Dodd had "lost" the documents despite an open confession from Dodd on the preliminary phone call: "Because he recorded it", when asked why she discarded it.

Dodd also fraudulently edited documents included in Exhibit MHF1.

- **Biological mRNA death shot/ WO2020/060606 - CRYPTOCURRENCY SYSTEM USING BODY ACTIVITY DATA:** – no information on contents removes informed consent, breaches Nuremburg code, Event 201 Clinical trial until 2023.

patented = manmade bioweapon, self-assembling nano technology, Graphene oxide,

I opened developer options on my phone and activated; *Show un-named Bluetooth devices;* It looks like the inoculated are all having their own individual (kind of) IP address which appears on the screen when bluetooth is being activated and scans the surrounding for reachable bluetooth devices.

I did this every day for ten minutes at my hotel last week and the digits change with the ongoing stream of clients. The addresses all have the same format.

Twelve digits separated by colon, a mix of numbers and alphabetic characters.

Example; **4A:CC:4E:84:62:D2**

Device name will appear when device is connected, you need an app to connect, I'm still trying to source the app.

This is not how a reachable bluetooth device looks like on the screen. Normally you get the name of the device and a symbol that shows what kind of device, e.g. headset, phone, car radio name etc.

The more people are around the more numbers appear and the list changes from second to second provided there is movement of people.

I'm not an expert but I know a little bit about computers, and I have never seen anything like that before.

My web research resulted in absolutely nothing except some others who noticed the same phenomenon. The fact that the numbers change with the people passing by only makes sense when these people themselves are the devices.

Even the most avid of Branch Covidian's with a smartphone (except iPhone) can see with his own eyes know what the whole COVID agenda is about. Everybody can check this by themselves. Even the inoculated non-believers can go to the woods or elsewhere where they are alone and try it out. The same number they always see on their screen no matter when they look at it is their own mark-of-the-beast-number. They are now a product owned by Bill Gates as he who creates owns and the people consented. A fraud of satanic proportions with a side of global democide.

The alleged vaccine for the alleged virus was created to depopulate and/or genetically modify. Eventually all would all carry the mark of the beast to get everybody injected with a jab that contains graphene oxide and that self-assembles (this ability is one of graphene oxides characteristics) in the body to some kind of artificial nervous system which connects the person to the smart grid either directly via 5G or via the person's smartphone.

Those who understand the background to this discovery – including Transhumanism and the Operation Coronavirus-nanotech connection – will perceive that this is another clue that the COVID "vaccines" are injecting some kind of biosensor into people, to begin the process of turning people into nodes on the Smart Grid and Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC).

Yuval Noah Harari, of the World Economic Forum openly states that humans are hackable animals.

Also, Microsoft patented this on March 26<sup>th</sup>

The full patent id is WO/2020/060606.

From the Patent:

"Human body activity associated with a task provided to a user may be used in a mining process of a cryptocurrency system. A server may provide a task to a device of a user which is communicatively coupled to the server. A sensor communicatively coupled to or comprised in the device of the user may sense body activity of the user. Body activity data may be generated based on the sensed body activity of the user. The cryptocurrency system communicatively coupled to the device of the user may verify if the body activity data satisfies one or more conditions set by the cryptocurrency system, and award cryptocurrency to the user whose body activity data is verified."

Make no mistake Satanic Cult members are in the process of eviscerating mankind and chipping, genetically modifying and patenting the rest. In line with the late Georgia Guidestones and The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.

***Revelation 13:17***

*and that no one may buy or sell except one who has the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.*

***Revelation 14:11***

*And the smoke of their torment ascends forever and ever; and they have no rest day or night, who worship the beast and his image, and whoever receives the mark of his name."*

The enforcement of the unlawful, illegal, immoral, and unethical facemasks was required to increase the number of sick people to influence the uptake of the mRNA shots, some designed to kill, others for gene modification and implementing nano technology for the Microsoft cryptocurrency patent: #060606 mark of the beast system.

***Revelation 2:9***

*"I know your works, tribulation, and poverty (but you are rich); and I know the blasphemy of those who say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan.*

The author of the Protocols writes that if any state objects to Rothschild domination, "it is only pro-forma, at our discretion, and by our direction, for their antisemitism is indispensable to us for the management of our lesser brethren." (Protocols of Zion 9)

- **War on covid** – World War Two was a charade, just like Covid. The war was not between the Allies and the Axis but rather between the Illuminati and humanity. The war was a pretext to destroy the genetic elite: the natural leaders, the patriots and the idealists. It was a genocide of the Best, who in future might resist their plans for Luciferian one-world government. Here The Protocols of Zion explain that the Nazis were controlled opposition.

*The 'Secret Masonry' is setting up "an off position, [i.e. the Nazis] which ... will present what looks like the very antipodes to us. Our real opponents at heart will accept this simulated opposition as their own and will show us their cards." (Protocols of Zion 12.11)*

The secret of freedom lies in educating the people, whereas the secret of tyranny is in keeping them ignorant – *Maximillien Robespierre*

Case Law History:

### THE VOID ORDER

by

*Shirley Lewald*

*Solicitor Advocate Higher Rights (Civil and Criminal Courts),*

*MSc (Psych), PGDip (SocSc), PGCPSE, LLB (Hons)*

The interesting and important nature of a 'void' order of a Court is not fully understood and appreciated in England and this article is written to assist the understanding of a 'void' order and to assist legal professionals in any concerns they may have in submitting to a Court that its order is void, if indeed it is void.

In *Anlaby v. Praetorius* (1888) 20 Q.B.D. 764 at 769 Fry L.J. stated on the issue of void proceedings that: "A plaintiff has no right to obtain any judgement at all".

A void order does not have to be obeyed because, for example, in *Crane v Director of Public Prosecutions* [1921] it was stated that if an order is void ab initio (from the beginning) then there is no real order of the Court.

In *Fry v. Moore* (1889), 23 Q.B.D. 395 Lindley, L.J. said of void and irregular proceedings that it may be difficult to draw the exact line between nullity and irregularity. If a procedure is irregular it can be waived by the defendant but if it is null it cannot be waived and all that is done afterwards is void; in general, one can easily see on which side of the line the particular case falls.

A void order results from a 'fundamental defect' in proceedings (Upjohn LJ in *Re Pritchard* (deceased) [1963] 1 Ch 502 and Lord Denning in *Firman v Ellis* [1978] 3 WLR 1) or from a 'without jurisdiction'/ultra vires act of a public body or judicial office holder (Lord Denning in *Pearlman v Governors of Harrow School* [1978] 3 WLR 736).

A 'fundamental defect' includes a failure to serve process where service of process is required (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen* *Craig v Kanssen* [1943] 1 KB 256); or where service of proceedings never came to the notice of the defendant at all (e.g. he was abroad and was unaware of the service of proceedings); or where there is a fundamental defect in the issuing of proceedings so that in effect the proceedings have never started; or where proceedings appear to be duly issued but fail to

comply with a statutory requirement (Upjohn LJ in *Re Pritchard* [1963]). Failure to comply with a statutory requirement includes rules made pursuant to a statute (*Smurthwaite v Hannay* [1894] A.C. 494). A 'without jurisdiction'/ultra vires act is any act which a Court did not have power to do (Lord Denning in *Firman v Ellis* [1978]).

In *Peacock v Bell and Kendal* [1667] 85 E.R. 81, pp.87:88 it was held that nothing shall be intended to be out of the jurisdiction of a Superior Court, but that which specially appears to be so; and nothing shall be intended to be within the jurisdiction of an Inferior Court but that which is so expressly stated.

It is important to note therefore that in the case of orders of Courts with unlimited jurisdiction, an order can never be void unless the 'unlimited jurisdiction' is 'limited' in situations where it is expressly shown to be so. In the case of orders of the Courts of unlimited jurisdiction where the jurisdiction is not expressly shown to be limited, the orders are either irregular or regular. If irregular, it can be set aside by the Court that made it upon application to that Court and a person affected by the irregular order has a right –*ex debito justitiae* – to have it set aside. If it is regular, it can only be set aside by an appellate Court upon appeal if there is one to which an appeal lies (Lord Diplock in *Isaacs v Robertson* (1984) 43 W.I.R. PC at 128-130).

However, where the Court's unlimited jurisdiction is shown to be limited (for example: a restriction on the Court's power by an Act of Parliament or Civil or Criminal Procedure Rule) (*Peacock v Bell and Kendal* [1667]; *Halsbury's Laws of England*) then the doctrine of nullity will apply.

Similarly, if the higher Court's order is founded on a lower Court's void act or invalid claim then the higher Court's decision will also be void (Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.* [1961] 3 All ER).

The main differences between a 'void' and 'voidable' order or claim is that:

(i) a 'void' order or claim has no legal effect *ab initio* (from the beginning/outset) and therefore does not need to be appealed, although for convenience it may sometimes be necessary to have it set aside (Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.* [1961] and *Firman v Ellis* [1978]) whereas a 'voidable' order or claim has legal effect unless and until it is set aside. Therefore, while a void order or claim does not have to be obeyed and can be ignored and its nullity can be relied on as a defence when necessary (*Wandsworth London Borough Council v. Winder* [1985] A.C. 461), a voidable order or claim has to be obeyed and cannot be ignored unless and until it is set aside; and

(ii) a 'void' order can be set aside by the Court which made the order because the Court has inherent jurisdiction to set aside its own void order (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen* [1943]) whereas a 'voidable' order can only be set aside by appeal to an appellate Court.

A person affected by both a void or voidable order has the right – *ex debito justitiae* – to have the order set aside (which means that the Court does not have discretion to refuse to set aside the order or to go into the merits of the case) (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen* [1943]).

The procedure for setting aside a void order is by application to the Court which made the void order, although it can also be set aside by appeal although an appeal is not necessary (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen* [1943]) or it can be quashed or declared invalid by Judicial Review (where available) and where damages may also be claimed.

Although an appeal is not necessary to set aside a void order, if permission to appeal is requested and if out of time the Court should grant permission because time does not run because the order is void and the person affected by it has the right to have it set aside (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen*).

A void order is incurably void, and all proceedings based on the invalid claim or void act are also void. Even a decision of the higher Courts (High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court) will be void if the decision is founded on an invalid claim or void act, because something cannot be founded on nothing (Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.* [1961]).

A void order is void even if it results in a failure of natural justice or injustice to an innocent third party (Lord Denning in *Wiseman v Wiseman* [1953] 1 All ER 601).

It is never too late to raise the issue of nullity and a person can ignore the void order or claim and raise it as a defence when necessary (*Wandsworth London Borough Council v. Winder* [1985] A.C. 461; *Smurthwaite v Hannay* [1894] A.C. 494; *Upjohn LJ in Re Pritchard (deceased)* [1963]; Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.* [1961]).

In *R v. Clarke and McDaid* [2008] UKHL8 the House of Lords confirmed that there is no valid trial if the bill/Indictment has not been signed by an appropriate officer of the Court because Parliament intended that the Indictment be signed by a proper officer of the Court.

In *Bellinger v Bellinger* [2003] UKHL 21 the House of Lords confirmed that a void act is void from the outset and no Court – not even the House of Lords (now the Supreme Court) – has jurisdiction to give legal effect to a void act no matter how unreasonable that may seem, because doing so would mean reforming the law which no Court has power to do because such power rests only with Parliament. The duty of the Court is to interpret and apply the law not reform or create it.

It is important to note that if a claim is invalid the plaintiff can start all over again unless he is prevented from doing so due to limitation as in the case of *Re Pritchard (deceased)* [1963] or estoppel – for example; where the Claimant applied to the Court for permission to correct/amend the claim and permission was refused; or the plaintiff or his solicitor had been negligent in ignoring a material fact when filing the invalid claim so that the plaintiff is estopped by the principle that he should not be allowed a 'second bite at the cherry'; and in the case of a criminal trial if there has been a fundamental technical defect the Court can order a new trial (*venire de novo* – may you cause to come anew).

Chronology of some case laws relating to void orders:

1888:

In *Anlaby v. Praetorius* (1888) Fry L.J. stated on the issue of void proceedings that:

(I) a plaintiff has no right to obtain any judgement at all.

1889:

In *Fry v. Moore* (1889) Lindley, L.J. said that:

(I) it might be difficult to draw the exact line between nullity and irregularity. If an order is irregular it can be waived by the defendant but if it is null then it renders all that is done afterwards void. In general one can easily see on which side of the line the particular case falls.

1921:

*Crane v Director of Public Prosecutions* [1921]:

(I) if an order is void ab initio (from the beginning) then there is no real order of the Court.

1943:

In *Craig v Kanssen* [1943] Lord Greene confirmed that:

(I) an order which can properly be described as a nullity is something which the person affected by it is entitled ex debito justitiae to have set aside;

(ii) so far as procedure is concerned the Court in its 'inherent jurisdiction' can set aside its own order and an appeal from the order is not necessary; and

(iii) if permission to appeal is requested and if out of time the Court should grant permission because time does not run because the point is that the order is invalid and the person affected by it has the right to have it set aside.

1953:

In *Wiseman v Wiseman* [1953] 1 All ER 601 – Lord Denning confirmed that:

(I) The issue of natural justice does not arise in a void order because it is void whether it causes a failure of natural justice or not;

(ii) a claimant or defendant should not be allowed to abuse the process of Court by failing to comply with a statutory procedure and yet keep the benefit of it and for that reason also a void act is void even if it affects the rights of an innocent third party.

1961:

In *MacFoy v United Africa Co Ltd.* [1961] Lord Denning confirmed that:

(I) a void order is automatically void without more ado;

(ii) a void order does not have to be set aside by a Court to render it void although for convenience it may sometimes be necessary to have the Court set the void order aside;

(iii) a void order is incurably void, and all proceedings based on the void order/invalid claim are also void.

1963:

In *Re Pritchard* (deceased) [1963] Upjohn LJ confirmed that:

(i) a fundamental defect in proceedings will make the whole proceedings a nullity;

(ii) a nullity cannot be waived;

(iii) it is never too late to raise the issue of nullity; and

(iv) a person affected by a void order has the right – *ex debito justitiae* – to have it set aside.

1978:

In *Firman v Ellis* [1978] Lord Denning confirmed that:

(i) a void act is void *ab initio*

1979:

Lord Denning, in his book 'The Discipline of Law' – Butterworths 1979 – page 77, states:

(i) although a void order has no legal effect from the outset it may sometimes be necessary to have it set aside because as Lord Radcliffe once said: "It bears no brand of invalidity on its forehead".

1985:

*Wandsworth London Borough Council v. Winder* [1985] A.C. 461:

(i) a person may ignore a void claim and rely on it as a defence when necessary.

2003:

In *Bellinger v Bellinger* [2003] the House of Lords confirmed that:

(i) a void act is void from the outset; and

(ii) no Court – not even the House of Lords (now the Supreme Court) has jurisdiction to give legal effect to a void act no matter how unreasonable that may seem because doing so would mean reforming the laws which no Court has power to do because such power rests only with Parliament. The duty of the Court is to interpret and apply the law not reform it.

Conclusion based on the case laws referred to above:

- (I) an application to have a void order set aside can be made to the Court which made the void order;
- (ii) the setting aside must be done under the Court's inherent power to set aside its own void order;
- (iii) the Court does not have discretion to refuse the application because the person affected by the void order has a right to have it set aside;
- (iv) an appeal is not necessary because the order is already void;
- (v) if permission to appeal is sought and if sought out of time, permission should be given because as the order is void time does not run; it is never too late to raise the issue of nullity; and the person affected by the void order has a right to have it set aside;
- (vi) a void order can be quashed or declared unlawful by Judicial Review where available and where damages may also be claimed;
- (vii) the whole proceedings is void if it was based on a void act;
- (viii) a void order does not have to be obeyed because it has no legal effect from the beginning;
- (ix) as it is never too late to raise the issue of nullity a person can ignore the void order and rely on nullity as a defence when necessary;
- (x) a void order is void even if the nullity is unjust or injustice occurs to an innocent third party;
- (xi) an order of a Court of unlimited jurisdiction is only void if it can be expressly be shown that the unlimited jurisdiction is limited in that situation, or the order is founded on an invalid claim or void act;
- (xii) no Court (not even the Supreme Court) has jurisdiction to give effect to a void act and the duty of the Court is only to interpret and apply the law not to reform or create it as such power rests only with Parliament.

© Shirley Lewald, – 10 July 2010

Updated: 6 February 2011

Sworn by: Michael-Henry

On the Second-of-March-Year-of-Our-Lord-Two-Thousand-and-Twenty-Three.

Deponent

C/o: [29] Karonga road

Fazakerley

Near: Liverpool

[L10 9LN]

#### GENERAL FORM OF AFFIDAVIT

In the matter between:

Michael Furlong v Jaguar Land Rover Limited

Case Ref: EA-2023-000004-DA, case: 2402150/2021

Tribunal Hearing, on the 18th November 2022

at the Liverpool Family Court

35 Vernon St

Liverpool, L2 2AY

England

I, Michael-Henry, a living sentient being of body mind and soul, sojourn on the land mass commonly known as Great Britain [England].

i do solemnly, sincerely, truly affirm and declare with good faith in Jesus' name and without prejudice.

I am of sound mind and reason, I am over the age of consent and do sincerely and honestly swear the present instrument to be my own words, written by me, given freely, and without duress and expressing accurately to the best of my knowledge:

1. i say that, in 1973 Edward Heath committed Treason by deposing the monarch to head of state (Treason act 1795) joining the E.E.C and signing away British people's sovereignty and suppressing the details for 30 years. All Government agents since have been aiding and abetting treason as secondary offenders. (See Federal commission order 30/1048).
2. i say that, i hereby exercise my constitutional right to invoke the Bill of Rights 1688.
3. i say that, we the people have never agreed to corporate governance.

4. i say that, It would be unconstitutional to have a judge reside on a case whilst acting in treason as a secondary offender pursuant to; Federal Commission Order: 30/1048 and denying the plaintiff justice by disobeying the Bill of Rights 1688.
5. i say that, the 1974 Jurys act is void as are all acts implemented under a treasonous government, once a government is in criminality it loses all authority and jurisdiction.
6. I say that, constitutional common law superior statutes, supersede statute law.
7. i say that, the Bill of Rights 1688, Coronation Oath 1688, Treason Act 1795 and the Act of Settlement 1700, still stand in Britain and cannot be repealed by a corporate government. The Clearfield Doctrine arises from a 1943 Supreme Court Case, Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States, 318 US 363-371.
8. i say that, to disobey a statute is an indictable offence – Treason; Archbold criminal pleading and practice.
9. i say that, administrative courts are odious at law; The law is absolutely clear on this subject. There is NO authority for administrative courts in this country and no Act can be passed to legitimise them because of the constitutional restraints placed upon her Majesty at her coronation - Halsbury's law
10. i say that, "Invito beneficium non datur- No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent." Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1914), "Maxim," p, 2140)
11. i say that, the contract makes the law – there was no contractual obligation to take part in any medical experiment.
12. i say that, contracts are negotiated by mutual consent and the proper way to negotiate is with a meeting of the minds and mutual consent, my contract renegotiation terms were ignored and deemed vexatious.
13. i say that, my renegotiation notice terms were notarised into affidavits, un rebutted.
14. i say that, AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGMENT IN COMMERCE. (Heb. 6:16-17;). There is nothing left to resolve. Any proceeding in a court, tribunal, or arbitration forum consists of a contest, or duel, of commercial affidavits wherein the points remaining un rebutted in the end stand as truth and matters to which the judgment of the law is applied.– I did send the respondents then acting C.E.O: Thierry Bollore; three (3) commercial affidavits, all in commercial default, all three were: notice to agent notice to principal, notice to principal notice to agent. (Exhibitions MHF1, MHF2 and MHF3).
15. i say that, no response was received after 90 days perfecting the commercial lien. (Exhibitions MHF1, MHF2)
16. i say that, A LIEN OR CLAIM CAN BE SATISFIED ONLY THROUGH REBUTTABLE BY AFFIDAVIT POINT BY POINT, RESOLUTION BY JURY, OR PAYMENT.

17. i say that, my right to bodily integrity is protected by the constitutional superior statutes in perpetuity and cannot be derogated from even in an alleged health emergency.
18. i say that, he who makes the claim carries the burden of proof.
19. i say that, both my Affidavit of Status, mail No: NY 4884 5928 0GB mailed on 31<sup>st</sup> August Two-Thousand-and-Twenty-Two, and my Ecclesiastical Asseveration of Faith and Fact, mail No's: Private; NY 4884 5925 9GB and witnessed tacit mail no: NY 4884 6105 9GB were unrebutted by the Crown agents and stand as truth in commerce.
20. i say that, as a person or corporation is unable to obtain parity with that of a living, man/woman, statutory legislation is unenforceable without consent, a valid contract, authority and jurisdiction. To force compliance, is both criminal coercion and a breach. of our inherent birth rights, this is confirmed and established by the Magna Carta 1215 (<https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mckechnie-magna-carta-a-commentary>), and the; Cf: United Nations Declaration of Human Rights 1948.
21. i say that, pursuant to points 19 and 20 above; all Crown agents have acted in the colour of law, without legal right; McCain v De Moines; 174 U.S. 168 (1899).
22. i say that, in relation to the Order issued, :Jane :Aspinall had used the presumptions of law to assist. Even though she had no authority or jurisdiction to deal with this issue this is why she could not address the crimes in my final submissions, I also confirm that these presumptions were not accepted, and I refer you to the following document to confirm mail No: NY 4885 4255 7GB dated 22/02/22. (Exhibition MHF7)

i :Michael-Henry: Furlong

Authorised Representative for MICHAEL FURLONG (Lien Claimant), hereby affirm upon my own unlimited commercial liability and under penalty of perjury, that I have read all of the contents of this affidavit, and to the very best of my knowledge, I believe the facts expressed herein are true, correct and complete.

:Michael-Henry  
Sworn at [29] Karonga [L10 9LN]

Seal:

:Michael-henry

Witness and Acknowledgement

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on this second day of March in the year of our lord and saviour, two thousand and twenty-three, Living Soul Author :Michael-Henry : of the House Furlong™ Family, personally appeared before me party to this document, known to me to be this man and acknowledge this document to be his act and deed.

in the city of Liverpool Date: Second-of-March-Two-Thousand-and-Twenty-Three

Witnessed before me :Darren: Meddings Seal:  
Address [6] Grosmont road [L32 6AE]

*Darren Meddings*  


James-William: Robinson  
Witnessed before me ..... Seal:  
Address [42] Swainson road [L10 9NF]

*James-William Robinson*  


Witnessed before me :Anthony: Brown Seal:  
Address [9] Long Avenue [L9 9bd]

*Anthony Brown*  


Witness my hand and official seal this 10 day of December 2025

Back page.



The Keeper of Records, Cosmic Gazette, do hereby certify the foregoing document is a true and correct copy of the original of the document recorded in public at cosmicessencepma.com

Witness my hand and official seal this 10 day of December 2025

Keeper of Records Cosmic Gazette.  
By CERK, TRUSTEE  
Trustee



Michael Henry