



Private Ecclesiastical Counsel
United States & International

SYSTEMIC EXCLUSION AND JURISDICTIONAL NULLITY IN

R V IAIN CLIFFORD STAMP

31 December 2025

Executive Summary: The Anatomy of "Systemic Exclusion"

This report analyses the political and procedural "railroading" of Iain Clifford STAMP. What appears on the surface to be a regulatory enforcement action is, upon forensic audit, a documented case of "**Systemic Exclusion**". By utilizing a closed loop of administrative rejections, the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) and lower courts have substituted substantive evidence of a crime with a procedural "Entrapment by Design".

1. Political Nature and "Entrapment by Design" (Order 34/2023)

The matter shifted from a standard inquiry into a political "railroad" through the deployment of **Order 34/2023**.

- **Speculative Foundation:** The FCA obtained this restraint order based on "suspicion" of unlicensed activity rather than particularized proof of a crime.
- **The Constraint Mechanism:** A General Civil Restraint Order in 2024 was used to strip the Appellant of ordinary domestic remedies.
- **The 2024 Judicial Review:** Conducted by Justice Sweeting, this review proceeded without the Appellant's presence or a substantive hearing, reinforcing a pattern of exclusion.



2. Jurisdictional Nullity: Pillar 1 and Pillar 2

The foundation of the entire prosecution is a **nullity** due to structural failures in authority and service.

- **The "Alistair Mackenzie" Verification Gap:** Despite repeated demands, the FCA has failed to produce an instrument of delegation under **FSMA 2000 s.401** proving that Mackenzie holds the legal right to prosecute. Without this, the proceedings are *ultra vires*.
- **Factual Impossibility of Service:** Purported service was fixed to iain@mtrxf.org, a mailbox **neither owned nor controlled** by the Appellant.
- **The Digital Void:** This address was wholly inoperative with active **Email Non-Delivery Responses (NDRs)** prior to the July 2025 hearings, meaning notice was a technical impossibility.

3. Evidential Misattribution: Pillar 3 and the "Sentence of Nullity"

The FCA and Southwark Crown Court ignored overwhelming exculpatory evidence to maintain the "railroad".

- **The "43,000 Records" Hoax:** These transactions belong to **authorized third-party firms** (Strax Capital, Lightside Financial) and have no legal nexus to the Appellant.
- **Ignored Affidavits:** The Court failed to grapple with approximately **500 member statements** and affidavits confirming the administrative-only PMA model.
- **Sentence for Non-Regulated Acts:** The 30 July 2025 sentence for "breach" was based on spending from **non-UK bank accounts**. Order 34/2023 did not apply to these accounts as it failed to identify them as "realizable property" or establish worldwide jurisdiction.

4. The "Crown Conspiracy" of Administrative Rejection

When the Appellant attempted to challenge these defects, the "procedural machinery" worked in a closed loop to deny him access.

- **FCA & JCIO Rejections:** Complaints regarding Mackenzie's authority and the lack of regulated services were dismissed without investigation.
- **ECHR "Excessive Formalism":** Five rejections from the ECHR on "spurious" procedural grounds suggest the Registry is ignoring the fact that domestic rejections are being used to block the "Exhaustion of Remedies".



- **The Registrar's Final Ploy:** On 30 December 2025, the CAO Registrar rejected the appeal as "ineffective" by falsely claiming it was filed by an "unqualified third party," ignoring the Appellant's **Litigant in Person** status.
-

The 5 January 2026 Strategy: The "Final Test" for Justice

The strategy employed on 5 January 2026 is a high-stakes "procedural pincer movement" designed to collapse the FCA's case in the UK Court of Appeal or, failing that, to finalize the evidentiary foundation for a successful appeal to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) .

The "Anisminic Sledgehammer" Strategy

The core of the strategy is to force the Court to address the **Three Pillars of Défense**—authority, service, and nexus—which demonstrate that the entire proceeding is a **jurisdictional nullity**.

1. Re-asserting Standing (The Gatekeeper)

By filing a **Formal Protest** and re-submitting in person, **Iain Clifford** strips the Registrar of the administrative excuse that the case was "ineffective".

- **Action:** **Iain Clifford** is formally recording his status as a **Litigant in Person** (pursuant to Sections E and G of Form NG).
- **Outcome:** This forces the Court to either accept the filing or commit a documented breach of **Article 6 ECHR** by denying access to a court on spurious administrative grounds.

2. The Affidavit of Non-Ownership (The Service Trap)

The **Affidavit of Non-Ownership and Service Failure** is the most critical tactical update.

- **Factual Basis:** **Iain Clifford** is swearing that he did not own or control iain@mtrxf.org and that it was **non-operational** (bouncing emails) before the July 2025 hearings .
- **The Rebuttal Challenge:** This places the burden on the FCA to produce **RFC-822 headers** . If they cannot (which they haven't as of the January 3rd deadline), the Court must draw an **adverse inference** that service was never effected.



3. Invoking Jurisdictional Nullity (The Legal "Kill-Switch")

Using the principle in *Anisminic [1969]*, **Iain Clifford** is arguing that if the foundation is rotten, the whole structure must fall.

No Prosecutor: Without proof of delegation for "Alistair Mackenzie" under **FSMA s.401**, the prosecution is *ultra vires*.

- **No Service:** Without valid service to a vector owned by **Iain Clifford**, the Court never acquired jurisdiction.
- **Result: Order 34/2023** and the **12-month sentence** are *void ab initio* (void from the beginning).

Why this Strategy Quashes Order 34/2023

This approach provides the Single Judge with a clear, orthodox path to grant relief without needing to "trust" the defense's version of events. The FCA's **silence** following the **Consolidated Notice to Produce** acts as a confession of no authority and no service. The Court cannot lawfully uphold a prison sentence for "breach" of an order that was served to a third-party's broken email account by an unverified prosecutor.

Why this Strategy Restores the ECHR Pathway

If the UK Court of Appeal refuses to hear the case or the Registrar refuses to place the papers before a judge, **Iain Clifford** has created the **ultimate proof of "exhaustion"**.

- **Article 35(1) Compliance:** **Iain Clifford** has attempted to utilize every domestic mechanism (Skeleton, Application for Directions, Formal Protest, Affidavit).
- **Inaccessible Remedies:** If the UK courts continue to reject **Iain Clifford** on administrative grounds (claiming he is "untraceable" or "unrepresented"), the ECHR must recognize that the UK remedy is **officially exhausted and inaccessible**.
- **Strasbourg Focus:** The case in Strasbourg would then move from a "procedural rejection" to a substantive **Article 6 challenge** for "denial of access to a court" and "inequality of arms".



Relief Sought: Quash Order 34/2023 and the resulting 12-month sentence as **void ab initio**.