

7 June 2008

Mr HJ Comben
Truro County Court
Edward Street
TRURO
Cornwall TR1 2PB (by hand delivery 8 June 2008)

Dear Mr Comben

Arthur v Layte PZ200604

In reply to your 3 June 2008 letter received today.

I can find no rule that mentions bill of costs are not allowed highlighted text. Please supply me with a copy of such a rule. In the meantime and in order to save time I enclose a copy of my bill with highlights removed. I will charge for this copy / hand delivery of same if you fail to provide me with a copy of the "no highlights allowed CPR rule".

I can find no rule that mentions bill of costs are not allowed "comments in red". Please supply me with a copy of such a rule. In the meantime and in order to save time I enclose a copy of my bill with "comments in red" removed. I will charge for this copy / hand delivery of same if you fail to provide me with a copy of the "no comments in red allowed CPR rule".

This is the fourth time I have supplied my bill to the Court. The form of it has not changed since first lodged 16 months ago.

I believe 16 months is more than enough time for any comment regarding any non CPR compliance of form to be made but no Judge or Court official has done so in any Order or any other way.

It is 15 months since the bill was first served on Mr & Mrs Arthur. It has not changed in form since then but a small amount of the content has been amended in the light of DJ Wainwright's criticism of it. The amended content bill has been served on Mr & Mrs Arthur.

Mr & Mrs Arthur have had 15 months to raise any points of dispute as regards items 69 to 256 but have chosen not to and to lie to the Court regarding service of this part of my bill. These items have not changed in content or form since first served (and lodged at Court for approval before serving).

Mr & Mrs Arthur have had 15 months to raise any points of dispute as regards items 1 to 68 (the Chronology of Hearings etc) but have chosen not to and to lie to the Court regarding service of this part of my bill. The value of a few of these items has been changed to zero in light of DJ Wainwright's criticisms of the content of my bill but the form has not changed since first served (and lodged at Court for approval before serving).

For the third time the Court's attention is drawn to page 22 of the "Documents produced" annexed to my bill. I enclose another photo of the tapes mentioned in "2". Do the Court wish that I commence transcribing the conversations? If so

then I will require a Court Order requiring Mr & Mrs Arthur to pay £20k up front before I commence. I know of no rule that requires self litigant Defendants to keep records or a file in the same way as a solicitor would presumably do. If there is such a rule please supply me with a copy.

I confirm that neither Mr nor Mrs Arthur have responded to my letter of 2 May 2008 (cc DJ Middleton) requesting co-operation / agreement as regards my solicitors costs. I have not as yet started preparing them to CPR standard and again will require a Court Order that Mr & Mrs Arthur pay £5k up front before I commence.

I confirm that of the four RD items posted to Mr & Mrs Arthur since April three are still "lost" according to Royal Mail. They are DH 7541 4319 6GB, DH 7541 4308 5GB ANDDH 7541 4343 0GB.

I again ask .. Which one (of the two) Default Costs Certificates DJ Mitchell set aside a year ago? I confirm Mr & Mrs Arthur have not paid within the time allowed.

It can be proved that Mr Arthur is a liar, not only to the Court and the Defendants but also the police. I have to say that I am not impressed with a justice system that appears to turn a blind eye to his lies and will be making my views very public if this nonsense continues.

The second Defendant is abroad at the moment and will doubtless respond to your 3 June 2008 letter to her when she returns later in the week.

Yours sincerely

J H Layte

cc DJ & A Arthur (RD DH 7541 4318 2GB 9 June 2008)

Uploaded to www.arthur-v-layte.co.uk 8 June 2008

