

Subject: Re: Claim No: L00BP152 Mayo v Miss E
Date: Saturday, 10 January 2026 at 12:04:53 Indochina Time
From: Mr J
To: Miss E , Barnstaple County, Hearings
CC: Luke Cornwell - Seldons, Mark, CLOPlymouth
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png, image003.jpg, image004.png

Dear All,

I want to place on the record my respect for the clarity, honesty, and integrity with which Miss E has expressed her position. It is rare to see someone speak so plainly and authentically in proceedings of this nature, and I fully support the substance and spirit of what she has said.

Her response reflects lived experience rather than artifice, and it is precisely that authenticity which gives it weight. I have no hesitation in standing behind her position in full.

I also note, without embellishment, that Miss E , has agreed to speak publicly in due course about these matters in a recorded interview. I believe many members of the public will recognise aspects of their own experiences in what she has said and understand why she has chosen to speak as she has.

Long-since accustomed to environments in which safety, accountability, and procedural integrity are non-negotiable, I also record that I have been profoundly troubled by the procedural standards and failures of oversight I have witnessed in these proceedings. They fall far below what any system entrusted with public confidence should tolerate.

This correspondence is served to record my support and alignment with Miss E 's position.

All rights are reserved.

Mr J

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Miss E <[redacted]>
Sent: Friday, January 9, 2026 11:13:36 PM
To: Barnstaple County, Hearings <hearings.barnstaple.countycourt@justice.gov.uk>
Cc: Luke Cornwell - Seldons <lcornwell@seldons.co.uk>; [redacted] <[redacted]>; Mark <[redacted]>
Subject: Re: Claim No: L00BP152 Mayo v Miss E & Mr J

Dear All,

Mr Cornwell should not have been sent these documents as this once again rewards his dishonest tactics. It is blatantly obvious that he ceased acting for tactical purposes so it is therefore straightforward MISREPRESENTATION and Contempt of Court. He should be disciplined by the judge, not continually rewarded for his behaviour. The judge is his mentor , like a parent, and should be teaching him honesty and integrity in his profession, not the opposite.

However I have noticed that the Court allows him to bully them - even Judge Mitchell writes on his orders exactly what has been told to him in the letters conveyed from Seldons Solicitors through their representative Luke Oliver Keith Cornwell . Someone is acting behind the scenes , and we will eventually find out who it is, as it is not normal for a judge to do whatever a young solicitor asks him to do and it is not normal for a judge to overlook fraud, dishonesty, contempt of court and game play on the level witnessed in this case, whilst making unjust costs orders against me which are based on fraudulent evidence handed to the judge himself at hearings. It is not normal for a judge to not only overlook such dishonesty in the courts but to also assist in encouraging the dishonesty and preventing the solicitor from being disciplined by regulatory bodies .

The double standards applied in this case towards the parties are shocking and wholly unusual. The judge continues to show that he supports dishonesty and punishes honesty.

As Mr Cornwell has been given documents which were not deliberately or dishonestly held from him and would have been given if he had have behaved honestly and with integrity, the Court needs to send me via email the documents which Mr Cornwell deliberately and with intent to conceal POSTED to (allegedly) Exeter Court instead of filling in the normal transparent way. Obviously by POSTING one cannot know what was sent or to whom the documents were sent and THIS should NOT be allowed. I write the position formally below - and state as Mr Cornwell does to the court that the documents allegedly POSTED should not be withheld. However there is no guarantee that this will be done honestly. Mr

Cornwell has probably sent private communications to Judge Mitchell this way and we cannot trust that they will tell the truth or show us exactly what correspondence passed between them.

YET ANOTHER DISHONEST TACTICAL PLAY ON THE PART OF THIS SOLICITOR which a judge of integrity should NOT allow. If there was nothing to hide he would not have POSTED the documents but would have filed them in the normal way, and because of his sudden and unexplained decision to POST documents for an (unlawful) application rather than send ONE set of documents to all parties electronically as is standard practice, we can guarantee that what he posted was NOT what he sent to us.

Mr Cornwell's credibility has been called into question so many times throughout these proceedings that Mr Cornwell's unusual decision to POST documents to the Court instead of filing them cannot be regarded as without ulterior motive. It is NOT an innocent or benign action. The receipt of the recent notice of hearing is evidence that some private correspondence and communications have occurred between the solicitor and the Judge. These two actions - posting alleged documents to Exeter and the latest notice of Hearing suddenly emerging for his previous application are not unconnected. They are devising a plan in the wake of Mr J 's call for clarity and honesty about the financial representations made to the court and Mr Mayo's claim to have purchased a field for 120,000 pounds cash whilst having no visible employment. Clearly they are unable to answer these questions as they know they have made misrepresentations on a very large scale and thus this is the "new" strategy they have devised. It is all so obvious.

I have copied and pasted a portion of my response letter to the latest outrageous application and requests made of the judge sent by Luke Cornwell on 6th January as it fits in this letter -

Serious service and filing irregularities

It is necessary to place the following matters on the record.

The Claimant's solicitor, Mr Luke Cornwell of Seldons Solicitors in Bideford, asserts that the application has been sent by post to Exeter County Court, yet:

- no application has been filed by email with the court, which is the method consistently used throughout this litigation;
- no copy has been filed with Plymouth County Court, where this case has been managed and where the file is held;
- no explanation has been given for the sudden departure from established filing practice in this case.

Applications in this matter have always been filed with the court, not selectively posted. A unilateral attempt to rely on postal service alone—particularly in a case of this complexity and seriousness—undermines transparency and verifiability.

In circumstances where serious allegations of fraud and document manipulation are live, it is not acceptable for a party to create a situation in which there is no reliable assurance that the material allegedly posted to the court is identical to that served on the Defendant and Mr J .

There is also no reliable assurance as to where that material was sent. The application itself states that it is for the attention of His Honour Judge Mitchell. Given the nature of the application and the procedural history of this case, no other judge would reasonably be expected to receive, understand, or determine such an unusual and procedurally improper request.

Following this unilateral and opaque method of communication, a further application by the Claimant was suddenly accepted and listed through Barnstaple County Court to be heard by District Judge Griffiths. This is the same judge whose name was later placed on the amended Third Party Debt Order after I queried how enforcement could proceed when I had been told that the managing judge was unavailable, notwithstanding Circuit Judge allocation and the fact that the costs order relied upon has never been supported by a confirmed or disclosed costs schedule despite repeated requests.

This sequence of events demonstrates that the alleged postal route for correspondence created a procedural situation in which private or unrecorded judicial consideration cannot be excluded, while the Defendant was excluded from any ability to verify what material was before the Court, to whom it was provided, or on what basis subsequent procedural steps were taken.

It is further noted that the Claimant's solicitor now seeks the submissions I filed in relation to the unlawful TPDO hearing, before which he purported to cease acting, while asserting that he is entitled to send private correspondence to the Court.

3. Inconsistent and selective approach to service by email

The Claimant's solicitor has recently asserted that his firm "*does not accept service by email*". That position is irreconcilable with the factual history of this case, in which:

- the Claimant's solicitor has repeatedly served documents by email;
- documents have been emailed to Mr J as a matter of routine;
- and correspondence to the court has been conducted electronically for a prolonged period.

The sudden invocation of a purported refusal to accept email service, coupled with selective reliance on email where it suits the Claimant's solicitor, is procedurally irregular and contributes to a lack of transparency.

4. Routing of correspondence and lack of clarity as to the court recipient

It is further recorded that the email address used by the Claimant's solicitor for "*Exeter County Court*" correspondence has been proven to route to an address associated with Barnstaple court administration, rather than to a clearly identifiable Exeter County Court filing office.

This has previously caused confusion when the Defendant attempted to correspond with Exeter County Court in relation to defective Third Party Debt Orders.

In a case already affected by service failures, disputed orders, and missing audit trails, such ambiguity is unacceptable and further undermines confidence in the procedural integrity of the application.

The fact that Mr Cornwell is still struggling to "win" despite having SO much assistance, is testimony to his poor litigation skills and the weakness of his case against me. His latest application goes beyond what I have ever seen before and shows that he **knows** he has NO prospect of winning in a proper and fair trial. Hence he is asking the judge to decide on the issues for the trial PRIOR to the trial and without taking into account **anything to do with my position** or any of the evidence and submissions handed to the court by myself and Mr J . He is essentially asking - as he always does - for the judge to simply act as his servant and make orders and rulings about people that are akin to those made in totalitarian dictatorships where there is no rule of law and no human rights - just punishments, orders and rulings that suit the dominant party and have no basis in law or justice . This is what has been happening throughout this case in every order so far.

My response to the Claimant's latest application wherein he now seeks his entire case to be determined by a single judge at a one hour hearing, and exactly according to the claimant's wishes, will be sent shortly.

Yours sincerely,

Defendant .

On Fri, 9 Jan 2026 at 14:14, Barnstaple County, Hearings <hearings.barnstaple.countycourt@justice.gov.uk> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

CVP links will be sent out to all parties (whose emails address we already hold) at least 24 hours prior to the hearing.

The hearing is listed for 1 hour.

I cannot comment on number 3. This will need to be raised at the hearing. All correspondence from all parties will be on file.

The documents filed by the first Defendant in respect of the Third Party Debt order are attached herewith.

Regards

Jo Copp

Civil, Family and Tribunals Delivery Manager
Barnstaple and Exeter Courts

I HMCTS | The Law Courts | Barnstaple | EX31 1DH

I HMCTS | Southernhay Gardens | Exeter | EX1 1DU

www.gov.uk/hmcts

This e-mail and any attachments is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail. Internet e-mail is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by e-mail. This e-mail (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the Ministry of Justice. Monitoring / blocking software may be used, and e-mail content may be read at any time. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding e-mails and their contents.

From: Luke Cornwell - Seldons <lcornwell@seldons.co.uk>
Sent: 09 January 2026 12:11
To: Barnstaple County, Hearings <hearings.barnstaple.countycourt@justice.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted] ; [redacted]
Subject: Claim No: L00BP152 Mayo v Miss E & Mr J

Dear all,

We write further to the email sent by Jo Copp yesterday at 1:06pm which attached a Notice of Hearing. We have a few administrative enquiries regarding the same and would be grateful if you could clarify the following:-

1. We note the hearing is by CVP but there are no instructions for joining the hearing on the Notice of Hearing. Do we need to provide email addresses for attendees and if so, to what email address should this information be provided.
2. We note that the Notice of Hearing is silent on the duration of the hearing. Please could you confirm how long the hearing has been listed for?
3. Please can you confirm if the issue raised within our letter of 22 December 2025 (attached) will also be dealt with during this hearing, specifically, the Claimant requests that screenshots of the second Defendant's personal website (also attached) be admitted into evidence.

On a separate note, we have not received copies of the representations filed by the first Defendant in respect of the Third Party Debt Order application. We would be grateful to receive these documents which we understand are on record and

thus should not be withheld from us.

Yours faithfully,

Seldons LLP





Seldons Solicitors
18 The Quay, Bideford, Devon, EX39 2HF
www.seldons-solicitors.co.uk
T: 01237 479121 F: 01237 471902





WE ARE RECRUITING
Please see our website for further information.

Due to the high volume of e-mails which are received, all e-mails will be printed off and dealt with as incoming post so as to ensure that all clients are treated fairly. If you do not hear from us for a short time, we will still be progressing with your transaction, it will simply be that nothing material has happened since we last spoke or wrote.

Do not be a victim of cybercrime. Please be aware there is a significant risk posed by cyber fraud that affects email accounts and bank account details.

Please note that our bank account details WILL NOT CHANGE during the course of your transaction and we will NOT transmit our bank account details to you by email, neither will we act on bank account details sent to us by email. Seldons Solicitors will not be held responsible for your transfer of funds to an incorrect account

This email is sent on behalf of Seldons. Seldons is the trading name of Seldons LLP a Limited Liability Partnership Company No: OC359639. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return of email and then delete this email without making any copies or disclosing the contents to any other person. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or virus free. You should carry out your own virus check before opening any attachments.

We are authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA number 570661) <http://www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/code-of-conduct.page>

Electronic Service is not accepted.

This e-mail and any attachments is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail. Internet e-mail is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by e-mail. This e-mail (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the Ministry of

Justice. Monitoring / blocking software may be used, and e-mail content may be read at any time. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding e-mails and their contents.