

## **PREFACE**

**This booklet is an extract only  
from the true story of the history of**

**the DUKE OF LANCASTER Ship  
being told on the website  
[www.dukeoflancaster.net](http://www.dukeoflancaster.net).**

It portrays the fierce battle endured by  
the Owners of the Funship  
with  
the Local Authority  
starting as far back as 1979.

This is the true representation of events  
as written by John Rowley  
© John Rowley 2010

## EXTRACT ONLY

### **The Councils contingency plan to scupper the Funship enterprise**

Without giving the story away, I can say at this stage, it only eventually became evident that a faction within the Council had been relentless in their efforts to stop the Funship venture from succeeding virtually from the start.

Despite the Councils own resolution in favor of the project back in 1979 which led to our financial commitment they subsequently refused numerous planning applications, even for signage; opposed the granting of bar licences; issued a magistrates summons over a lack of sufficient fire escapes; applied for a High Court injunction to close the ship on safety grounds; refused permission to trade on the car park area although the Coed Mawr market was allowed trading at the time without planning permission; required the Funship to charge an admission fee to supposedly protect the trade in Holywell Town Center although the Funship targeted tourism; threatened criminal action for blocking public access entering the site by charging admission although the adjacent public footpath did not run through the site; issued a petition to wind up the Funship's parent company for late payment of rates on the ship (later withdrawn as an abuse of process with the Council having to pay the costs.); reneged on a new initiative agreed through mediators in 1983; and even sabotaged a Welsh Development Agency Grant awarded for sea defence and landscaping purposes.

All this was followed by the serving of 13 separate enforcement notices, around 1985, blighting our site until 1990 when the

Council again lost on their actions at the hands of the Secretary of State for Wales. The Council were ordered to pay unprecedented costs at the end of this appeal process which had taken around 5 years to complete.

They had failed yet again.

(By way of contrast, during all of this time the Coed Mawr market was allowed to prosper unhindered despite it being much closer to Holywell Town Center.)

Unbeknown to us all along however a faction within the Council had been and were still working on a contingency plan.

That plan involved setting up a Council market under the Food Act within 6 2/3 miles radius of the Funship market in order to claim monopoly rights for the Council.

They even considered a Council Sunday market and left their options open. A market established under the Food Act had the same protection as a market set up by ancient charter.

In essence all the Council had to do was ratify a resolution authorizing their market to be set up under the Food Act, if that is what the public wanted and couple to it a lawful planning permission.

The town of Holywell, unfortunately for its shopkeepers was the ideal location for the Councils plan of attack as the Funship was well within a 6 2/3 mile radius.

Holywell was to become a ghost town due to a well orchestrated fraud carried out by the faction.

[As will become apparent later in the story that plan was fraught with complications if it was to scupper the Funship whilst allowing the Coed Mawr market to prosper.]

Just before the Secretary of State's decision in 1990, the Funship and the dock suffered considerable damage, from

freak storms and high sea levels at the time of the Towyn floods disaster. This set back our plans to reopen the venture.

[Link to video storms.]

These were traumatic times leading to heartbreak which a lesser woman would not have survived. Pat having not long recovered from injuries sustained in an armed robbery at our house, the following year she lost her son Trevor in a car accident.

Soon afterwards I was working in Syria and then setting up garment production in Romania, where I lived for a couple of years not long after the assassination of Ceausescu.

Hard times! You would not believe the conditions in Romania in that period, money in my pocket but no food to be bought anywhere. Shops were absolutely empty, the elderly were queuing huddled together throughout the night, in freezing temperatures, outside Government bread shops, praying for a delivery.

Despite everything the dock and the ships gangplanks and stairways were repaired and by 1994 we were ready to promote the market, with a view to gradually increasing the number of days of Solitaire's operation, and leading to the reopening of the ship. The car deck on the ship was already set up to accommodate Solitaire.

The Council had wind of this as they had been closely monitoring our every move. We had in fact, some months previously, opened up the car deck for trade on a few Sundays as a trial.

As soon as we advertised what we had renamed the "Solitaire Saturday market", in order to build up trade, the Council struck with their contingency plan, claiming monopoly rights in the High Court.

That attack in 1994, which culminated in 1996, was the death knell for the Funship venture.

What we discovered later led us to refer matters to North Wales police. What transpired is beyond belief but for the documentary evidence discovered. This in the main is a matter of public record.

In 1994 I was abroad, working in Romania at the time, when Pat still trying to put the trauma behind her, started to promote the Funship market again, under the name of Solitaire as the name had a huge following.

Within a couple of weeks the Council wrote claiming monopoly rights and claiming our Saturday market was in direct competition with their newly established Holywell Saturday market and therefore we must close.

We had planning permission to trade 7 days per week from the early 1980's and many stalls on the site had traded 7 days per week, virtually throughout, although in the main the Solitaire stall itself only traded Sundays and sporadically on Saturdays after 1985.

We instinctively knew the latest attack was again dirty tricks on behalf of the Council and despite past trauma, decided to resist their demands.

The Council applied to the High Court seeking an interlocutory injunction to force us to close the business on a Saturday whilst the case went to trial.

An interlocutory injunction stops the activity pending a full hearing on the merits of the case.

There were many anomalies in the Councils affidavit evidence coupled with lies but we needed substantive evidence to counter the Councils claims.

Mr. McGreevy, the chief executive of the Council, submitted affidavit evidence to the High Court. Annexed to the affidavit was a letter from Holywell Chamber of Commerce inferring it was the Chamber who wished for our market to be closed due to the damage to trade in Holywell.

Other officers affidavits stated the site at the Funship had never previously traded on Saturdays and even claimed we did not have planning permission.

The Councils market superintendent gave evidence backing up the other officers claims whilst making false claims of his own.

Despite our own witness evidence challenging the Councils claims, the Court decided in early 1995 to allow the Councils application for the interlocutory injunction, subject to cross undertakings being given by the Council, pending the outcome of a full hearing. The loss of Solitaire's Saturday trade was calculated at 3,500 pounds per week should the Council lose the case.

The Saturday trade ceased early 1995 and our intentions for the ship were again on hold.

We now had to prepare for the full hearing and investigate the best we could the many false and well orchestrated claims of the Council.

## Preparing for the Court case

I returned from Romania mid 1995 and started researching the history of the Council markets in Holywell via the Councils minutes held in the libraries at Flint and Mold.

At the outset I didn't really know what I was looking for and at best you could say I was looking for a needle in a hay stack to either verify the Councils evidence or disprove it. I was driven by past history and the knowledge some of the Councils claims were not true, therefore why should I rely on any of them.

I came across references to Council planning applications for markets in Holywell over and above a couple referred to in the Councils High Court evidence. Enquiries made at the Councils planning offices were met with deliberate obstruction compounding my belief matters were being hidden.

I was obstructed in getting to see the Planning Register. I brought in Planning Consultants Drivers Jonas but they too met with obstruction.

From the Councils minutes I started to understand how the Council system and decision making process worked, with in many cases matters starting at sub-committee level, passed up to full committee and decisions then being ratified at full Council.

I learnt that the Council had what they called a scheme of delegation which set out the duties of all committees as to what they could and couldn't do. Any committee acting outside of its powers would be acting unlawfully and the relevant decision would be "ultra-vires".

I was getting an education but the research was more than a fulltime job and I burnt midnight oil month after month analyzing



the chronology of events from photo copied minutes obtained almost daily from the libraries.

For the Council to succeed they had to show the Court that they had a lawfully established Saturday market in Holywell set up under the Food Act and that their market was established prior to the Funship market.

They did not have to prove damage on a same day market as the law concludes damage can be assumed on a same day. On other days loss or damage has to be proved.

I requested a copy of the Councils scheme of delegation to help me research whether the Councils market had been established lawfully (I.E. By proper procedure) but I was refused copy.

This only led me to smell an even bigger rat but where was it?

With time running out to the full hearing Court date I approached a Councillor Mr. Cattermoul from Mold, who I sensed from the reading of Council minutes was a fair minded man, asking him if he could assist in providing the Councils scheme of delegation.

He had no hesitation and handed to me his personal copy in a Council binder.

I was then able to track through the minutes to verify how the Councils planning permissions for there market in Holywell had been handled.

Markets were controlled by the Licensing Panel Sub-Committee who according to the scheme of delegation only had the power to recommend to a much larger Health Committee. The decision to set up a market under the Food Act had to be made at Health committee and a resolution passed to that affect recorded in the minutes.

For that decision to be ratified the minutes were laid before full Council for scrutiny or comment before full Council approval was given.

However by way of example, my research found that a prominent Councilor Mr. H.O. Clarke chaired the sub committee and coincidentally had declared at one stage an interest in the Coed Mawr market, begging the question, was he biased in controlling markets?

Further scrutiny revealed the Sub-Committee, made up of a handful of councilors, was actually taking the decisions to establish markets and not merely making recommendations, and they were also authorizing in those minutes the chief officers to make the planning applications.

The Health committee, again on which MR. H.O. Clarke sat, merely stated in their minutes that they approved the sub committee minutes without referring to the actual decision or resolution to establish a market under the Food Act, which in fact was ultra-vires.

The significance is that when the Health committee minutes were laid before full Council for ratification, even the most diligent councilor would not know of the plan for a council market under the Food Act, as the Licensing Panel sub-committee minutes were never laid before full Council.

Probably because the sub-committee only had the power to recommend and could not take decisions.

On the strength of the ultra-vires sub-committee decision, planning applications were submitted and granted under so called delegated powers.

With time running out and our suspicions growing we applied to the Court asking for full disclosure of all the planning applications for a Council market in Holywell between 1984 and

1994 as I had more than a hunch the Council did not have a lawful market.

Full disclosure was ordered for which we had to pay per copy per page costing a fortune as the Council eventually dumped on us a transit van load of files and documents in no particular order.

With the final hearing date looming it proved impossible to piece together all the documents in time to assemble a cohesive defence.

An application for an adjournment mid 1996 was denied and although Pat didn't want to, we were subsequently persuaded by our lawyers to consent to withdrawing from the case, and as a consequence we ended up paying all the Council's costs, in excess of 200.000 pounds, but we vowed to fight on and establish the truth.

Although I know Pat to this day has never recovered from the heartbreak I believe in a weird sort of way events and her work, at times, helped distract her from her grief. No woman should have to go through what she has suffered.

## There was more than the smell of a rat

Having to withdraw from the High Court case was the death knell for the Funship but I was convinced a fraud had taken place and continued to investigate.

After one year I had pieced together all the Council documents in chronological order and had a much clearer picture as to what had gone on. I had separated all the documents depicting the history of the Council's market, the Coed Mawr market and the Funship market for cross reference purposes.

In the Court case the Council's affidavit had referred to a couple of planning applications for a market in Holywell in 1984 and 1994 yet I now had documentary evidence of nine or ten. Why had these been concealed at the outset?

After long scrutiny of the documents a pattern emerged. Ultra-vires resolutions figured throughout in relation to the Council's market in Holywell and full Council would not have been aware as to precisely what was going on at the time.

I realized a short cut to finding out exactly how many applications had been made for a market in Holywell would be to view the much smaller Holywell Town Council minutes, as the Town Council was supposedly consulted on all matters relating to Holywell.

Many Town Councillors also sat on the then Delyn Borough Council which was superseded by Flintshire County Council in 1996.

Another rat! The town Council minutes had been removed from the libraries and a request to the town Council clerk to view the minutes was refused.

The town clerk's position was part-time but he had a full time job with the Borough Council.

We eventually gained access to the documents many months later but not before instructing solicitors to assist.

I found references to further planning applications for a Council market in Holywell that had been concealed despite the disclosure ordered in the Court case. The planning application and decision documents had been denied to us.

Why was there so many applications for a market in Holywell, I.E. around a dozen or so between 1984 and 1994? The planning application references being 568/84; 569/84; 233/86; 234/86; 235/86; 302/86; 250/89; 723/90; 1072/90; 1073/90; 41/91; 723/93.

On scrutiny of the planning application documents, that I did have copy of, it was obvious they were falsified referring to not just ultra vires resolutions but also in some cases to fictitious or bogus committee meetings, supposedly granting authority for the applications.

Another clear example of deception avoiding objections is in application No. 1073/90 which is for a market on Higher Tower Gardens car park Holywell, yet following the consultation period the decision document issued grants permission in Tower Gardens Street, a totally different location.

Everyone was deceived not just full Council. A letter on the planning file from a Mr. Goodman actually complains of no plan being available for inspection during the consultation period.

I recalled the fact that the Councils chief planning officer Mr. Mike Smith had resigned around 1991 with an outburst in the press, stating the Council was a rogue Planning Authority. I decided to visit him at Tynedale in the North East of England where he was working and asked him to explain why his planning applications for the Councils market in Holywell were falsified.

I showed him copies of applications purporting to carry his signature only to be told the signatures were false and they were not his.

The plot thickened as it was becoming obvious to me planning permissions were forged and it was not simple error.

Then there came another twist.

In the Evening Leader newspaper in North Wales I read about a lady, Mrs. Marlene Jordan, who had a pet shop in Holywell High Street. She was incensed about the fact the Council had closed the town to traffic some years before and as a result the town had become a ghost town with the majority of shopkeepers going out of business. She was forming an action group to protest.

I could smell another rat.

I contacted the Holywell action group to try and understand exactly what had gone on in Holywell during the period I was abroad.

Mrs. Jordan told me a traffic order had been imposed on Holywell closing the town centre to traffic which made way for the Councils market in Holywell High Street.

At a meeting with the Action Group I said, according to the Chamber of Commerce the shopkeepers wanted the market in the High Street. To a one they replied, no such thing, they said as a Chamber they were directly opposed to a market in the High Street.

I asked why therefore did the Chamber write a letter in 1994 for the High Court stating the market in Holywell was crucial for their lively hoods and they wanted the Funship market closed.

They denied any knowledge of such a letter and asked to see a copy. They were astonished, they quickly realized the letter was a forgery and furthermore there was no Holywell Chamber of

Commerce at the date of the letter, as it had by then disbanded. We obtained a statement from the chairman of the Chamber, named in the letter, confirming that it was a forgery. (Mr. Williams who had an electrical shop in the town.)

I was also handed the defunct Chambers minuted records kept by a ladies hairdresser in the town, Mrs. Pat Davies. J.P.

It was clear the Chamber had contested with the Council the traffic order imposed closing the town, and they had also opposed the market in the High Street.

Their meetings with chief executive McGreevy were minuted by the Chamber on the point. McGreevy's claims in the High Court were perverse.

They had queried why they had not been consulted by the Secretary of State for Wales during the making of the traffic order but they were further deceived.

Their objections are minuted in Council minutes which refer to a massive petition in 1993 deposited with a councilor.

I suggested to their astonishment that maybe the traffic order is a forgery as planning applications for a market are.

I decided to refer matters to North Wales Police based on the documentary evidence I had.

The Action Group subsequently wrote to the Secretary of State for Wales asking why he had consented to the 1992 Holywell traffic order without consulting the shopkeepers.

The traffic order clearly states it is made with the consent of the Secretary of State for Wales, his consent being a requirement in law.

Unbelievably the Secretary of State wrote back saying he had not given consent nor had he been asked to.

The 1992 Holywell traffic order was on the face of it a forgery, the Chamber of Commerce letter attached to McGreevy's

affidavit was a forgery, as were planning permissions for the Councils market.

The traffic order who signed it?

The signatures are Mr. H.O. Clarke and Andrew Loveridge, the County solicitor.

It still bothered me, why so many planning applications up until 1994?

This is the true representation of events  
as written by John Rowley  
© John Rowley 2010



### The answer was the contingency plan

Council documents showed that circa 1984 the Council suddenly did a “U” turn having just previously disposed of their market site behind the town hall in Holywell for supermarket use, sacrificing the market.

Coincidentally the Coed Mawr market was granted planning permission in 1984 Ref No. 400/84 despite access problems causing chaos on the main coast road, with tailbacks for miles upsetting not just tourists.

Now suddenly the Council wanted a market again, but this time established under the Food Act, in order to claim monopoly rights.

The initial applications met with objections from Clwyd County Council highways department and the market did not go ahead in the locations designated.

At the same time circa 1984/85 the Council wrote to the Funship suggesting a formal license agreement to regularize the Council’s position relating to monopoly rights.

They offered us a license to trade in the following terms.

Duration 2/3 years

for between 4 and 8 stalls

at a cost of no more than 5000 pounds per year.

This seemed a sick joke at the time and we declined the offer. It was our view that apart from the offer being ridiculously restrictive and of no commercial value, had we accepted the principle of a license they could easily refuse any renewal. We already had a planning permission for a market and were trading at the time and had been for several years 7 days per week.

Unbeknown to us the Coed Mawr, who had only just received their planning permission, were also offered a license.

Their license agreement, which came to light many years later was in the following terms:-

(i ) Sunday trade only (I.E. at a time when Sunday trading was illegal);

(ii ) Unlimited stallage (which at peak was around 500 stalls);

(iii ) 21 years;

(iv) 2000 pounds per annum linked to inflation.

Had we known of that offer and agreement at the time we would have had clear evidence of bias. We now know with hindsight the license was a device allowing the Coed Mawr to trade irrespective of any claim over monopoly rights or damage to trade in Holywell.

The Council continued trying to establish a market in Holywell with further applications on various sites, all of which for one reason or another either failed or were not suitable sites in respect of the Council being able to claim monopoly rights.

They made applications in the High Street, Tower Gardens, Upper Tower Gardens car park, Lower Tower Gardens car park, Albert Arcade, the Kings Head car park and so on.

As the Kings Head car park was not owned by the Council it was not suitable for carrying out their contingency plan and that site was later abandoned.

It seems the faction in the Council were not unduly worried regards setbacks to their contingency plan and at one stage allowed their spurious planning permission for a market in Holywell to lapse. As the Funship had closed due to the enforcement notices served on the site the contingency plan was just that.

However it was all to change. The day after the Council received notification from the Secretary of State that they had lost on the enforcement appeals the contingency plan was again kicked into action.

This time, the masterminds of the plot dispensed with long winded fiddling of committee resolutions authorizing planning applications, and instead someone simply took a form off the shelf and made out an application giving a bogus reference to a fictitious meeting for authorization purposes, and also forged the planning officers signature. A forged permission was then issued and placed on the Planning Register Reference 723/90. [ It took till 2004 for me to gain copy of this planning application and decision.]

Following on from the forged planning permission a Council Saturday market was started in Tower Gardens in 1991, but failed immediately through lack of support.

Despite that the faction within the Council then pushed for a bigger market, this time in the High Street, which led directly to the need for a traffic order closing the town to traffic to facilitate a market in the High Street.

What I have forgotten to mention is the existence of a confidential report submitted to the Licensing Panel Sub-Committee back in 1985. The sub-committee apparently had sought barristers opinion in relation to applying for an interlocutory injunction, at that time, on the merits of claiming monopoly rights for their market should they establish one.

We were alerted to a confidential report as it was listed on the Councils list of Court documents in 1996, but we did not know what it contained as the Council claimed privilege in the Court, and never let us see copy.

By an amazing quirk of fate, Mr. John Fowldes, who had had a fruit shop in Holywell, called "The Apple Tree", became a member of the Action Group and turned up at a meeting one evening clutching a large envelope of documents.

He said this was left today on my fruit shop counter in Flint. That shop was in fact situated directly under the Council offices. Why the envelope was left there remains a mystery.

He said he had brought the documents along to the meeting because they refer to market rights and Council markets but he did not quite understand the relevance.

Unbelievably, it was the 1985 confidential report on a barristers opinion that had been concealed in the High Court case. The reason for the concealment (which itself is fraud) was immediately obvious as the report spelt out the weakness in bringing a case against the Funship at that time as according to the barrister the Funship market had already been trading 7 days per week for several years as of 1985.

This smacked of perjury as it was claimed in the Councils affidavit evidence that the Funship market had never traded on Saturdays prior to 1994, obviously to get around the weakness in the Councils case.

This evidence was fed to North Wales Police together with a draft 141 page statement backed up in fine detail with 237 sets of documents.

As the evidence started to become overwhelming the police suddenly turned up at our house and Det Inspector Roberts handed back to me all the documents, and my draft statement, saying the matter was over as there was no evidence of wrongdoing.

He refused to discuss the matter, or answer questions, and refused to take a signed statement. We thought this was bizarre.

This is the true representation of events  
as written by John Rowley  
© John Rowley 2010

## Appearing to be above the law

I complained everywhere over a period of time, but it appears the establishment is sitting in seats of power, cosy jobs, good salary with guaranteed pensions but are not willing to raise their heads above the parapet for fear of rocking the boat and falling out.

I contacted the Welsh Office over the apparent forging of the Holywell traffic order in the name of the Secretary of State for Wales.

I was told they had no power to intervene in the matter, it was a matter for the police. Therefore why did they not refer the matter to the police?

A quote I have increasingly come across in my research is that of Einstein "The world is dangerous to live in not because of those who do evil but because of those who look on and let them do so."

The deputy prime minister and my local MP were not really interested. The local M.P. said: "Don't let it take over your life."

It was my life, so much so I stopped running for Solitaire with the endless journeys to mills in Germany, Austria, France, Italy etc looking for fashionable fabrics at the right price. We cut the business back.

The production in our factory in Romania was turned over, in the main, to making garments for the major high street stores in England.

Our factory was a God send for many Romanian families, and it made an enormous contribution to the economy of Romania when it was most needed, providing employment for over 500 people.

The quality of our production, perfected for our own “Katy Baker” brand, was excellent. It was in fact so good we made garments for Mark & Spencer, Debenhams and so on. (Our brand name “Katy Baker” was in fact Pat’s mothers name an inspirational woman. Pat followed in her footsteps.)

The H.M. Inspectorate of constabulary appeared to be concerned in the police’s handling of the evidence I had supplied but the Inspectorate only had a limited remit.

Body after body gave short shrift from the Ombudsman to the District Auditors office.

As Paul has said earlier in this story the Internet is a powerful thing it brings together a multitude of various views and commentary on millions of subjects.

For clarity the links posted on this site are just some of those.

Whilst we stand by what we say based on documentary evidence we cannot verify the accuracy of external links as the basis for the claims of others are best known to them.

We recognize some perceived links could be purely coincidental or not in reality linked at all and therefore we call upon the reader to come to their own conclusions, also if necessary research further the world wide web.

I found the establishments reaction in my case was a mirror image to that when [Alison Taylor](#) tried to raise awareness of child abuse in North Wales.

See link:

[http://www.bushywood.com/alison\\_taylor\\_whistleblower.htm](http://www.bushywood.com/alison_taylor_whistleblower.htm)

What I did not know at this time, just after the new millennium, was the turmoil within the Council, as their internal auditor had blown the whistle regards fraud within Flintshire, relating to

many issues some of which had implications regards the handling of the North Wales Child Abuse scandal.

See link:

[http://www.bushywood.com/andy\\_sutton\\_whistleblower.htm](http://www.bushywood.com/andy_sutton_whistleblower.htm)

Coincidentally **Andrew Loveridge** a signatory on the forged Holywell traffic order also handled all the paperwork submitted to the Child Abuse enquiry.

This turmoil is well documented on various websites as numerous links show.

I contacted solicitors in Chester “Walker Smith & Way” with a view to taking civil action against the Council for damages due to the unlawful interference with Solitaire’s business.

The solicitors took the case on, gradually compiling more and more evidence, whilst they were of the view that in order to effectively claim fraud against a Local Authority the burden of proof would be much greater than in normal civil cases. They gave reasons such as “The forging of the traffic order perhaps could be put down to simple mistake and therefore we need more evidence of intent.”

In early 2004, with the assistance of the Local Councilor Mr. Patrick Heesom, further documentation was traced and despite hostility from a Council solicitor (in fact the same solicitor who back in 1985 had written to us regards a license for our market and had also handled the High Court attack) I eventually received copy of the previously concealed Council planning application and permission for Holywell market, Application No. 723/90.

These documents, as suspected, were clearly forgeries.

This linked everything together, as the forged application was dated the day after the Council received notification they had lost on the 13 enforcement notices.



Regards the traffic order it bore the Councils seal and the seal had a number.

Application of the Council seal has to be authorized by full Council.

The sealing of the order would have to have been entered in the Councils Seal Register, in which the seal numbers are listed in chronological order, with columns stating which committee and on which date the sealing was authorized. I think this is called transparency.

I trawled through all the Councils minutes at the reference library in Mold but could not find any reference relating to the sealing of the traffic order.

With the assistance of the Local Councilor we traced the Councils 1992 Seal Register to the County archives in Harwarden and subsequently managed to take photocopies of the relevant pages.

True to form, the Register was falsified. Obviously the Register was never audited.

The Authority for sealing the traffic order was stated as a committee meeting that never existed, a fact cross referenced by Council minutes.

Just like the traffic order the Register was signed by Loveridge and Clarke. Put together how could this possibly be error and not an intentional act.

Our barrister perked up at this time which followed in the wake of a BBC Wales T.V. expose program and e' mailed our solicitors with words to the effect, we now have them on the run.

Amazingly, before I got to know of that e' mail, the solicitors wrote saying a conflict of interest had arisen and after nearly 3 years of being retained they could no longer act.

It was later established in a complaint to the Law Society that one of their clients was a certain Mr. McGreevy, the Councils chief executive, who had had annexed to his affidavit in the High Court case the forged Holywell Chamber of Commerce letter.

Not to be deterred, along with the shopkeepers from Holywell, we referred the new evidence to the North Wales Police to be considered in conjunction with there ongoing enquiries regards fraud within the Council following the whistleblowers revelations.

True to form again, the Police avoided a meeting or to discuss the matter or even take a statement.

The word on the street was we were heading towards a political whitewash because there were many sensitive areas within the handling of the North Wales Child Abuse scandal and those allegedly involved. I.E. "The Waterhouse Enquiry".

Again we have come across many links on the Internet that coincide with the subject although we cannot comment on the accuracy of those links. [www.jesus-is-savior.com](http://www.jesus-is-savior.com)

In late 2004 without taking a statement or interviewing us the Police delivered their decision, having supposedly referred all matters to the Crown Prosecution Service in Wrexham.

No evidence of wrongdoing. This was perverse.

The word on the street was ringing in our ears.

Was there any credibility in what we were hearing?

Is there any credibility in the content of the many websites relating to the subject?

E.G.

[www.cuthulan.wordpress.com/tag/operation-ore](http://www.cuthulan.wordpress.com/tag/operation-ore)

<http://www.tpuc.org/node/34>

<http://www.scandals.org/articles/sr00022a.html>

For any conspiracy theorists there is a plethora of information provided on the Internet by the British Library I.E. [www.ukwebarchive](http://www.ukwebarchive) preserving UK websites.

Once on the site click on 'Search the archive' and enter in the search box.

E.G. 'North Wales Child Abuse' or [clover.care@tesco.net](mailto:clover.care@tesco.net).

This is the true representation of events  
© John Rowley 2010  
Written by John Rowley

## **Would you believe?**

Disillusioned by solicitors I went to the Law Courts in the Strand London and filed an application for a judicial review of the joint decision of the Crown Prosecution Service and North Wales Police.

On the day, I turned up in the Law Courts, I was on my own for the hearing of my application which included a request for an outside Police force to investigate.

This was clearly no frivolous or vexatious application, the Law Court was packed with representatives from the Police, the Crown Prosecution Service in Wrexham, Flintshire County Council and so on. I saw the Councils barrister there who had handled the High Court case back in 1996.

Although I only had 20 minutes to state my case I held my nerve and did the best I could and aired my grievance in public. I had already presented the documentary evidence with a graph setting out clearly the modus operandi of the fraud to the Court. Unfortunately time ran out before I could elaborate orally on the matter of the falsified Seal Register but I knew I was battling against the odds as I knew there were discrepancies in the Police and CPS' s account of events.

The judges decided that whilst the events depicted, reflected little glory on those responsible it was down to error rather than criminality. They stated that that was the end of the matter in that Court.

Before I spoke, one of the judges had jokingly warned me to mind my back as there was an army of barristers and lawyers sitting behind me.

[See transcript of hearing].

On the way out of the Law Courts I crossed paths with the CPS barrister who I had seen some weeks before in a case in Warrington involving a young man called Stephen Messham a victim in the North Wales Child Abuse scandal, a case in which surprisingly Loveridge was a CPS witness.

[Stephen Messham's solicitor had contacted me researching the background to certain officers in Flintshire having become aware of my enquiries. The solicitor Mr. Michael Gray told me his life had been threatened because of his enquiries defending Mr, Messham. This claim is verified page 71 of the record of proceedings, National Assembly for Wales, Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> April 2005.]

Having come down different stairways from the Law Court our paths met crossing the main hall walking to the exit in the Strand.

Our eyes met as if transfixed and when I got close I said in a calm manner, looking directly at him, "You know don't you." He looked sharply left and right to check who maybe lurking. With a somber and admmissive, or submissive, expression on his face he said, "Yes, I know."

Where next for the Duke of Lancaster, left floundering in the corruption within the establishment in North Wales or maybe even further afield?

I continued with my complaint to the Law Society which in turn led me having to refer what I believed to be a deliberate pathetic decision, by the Law Society, to the Legal Services Ombudsman. The Ombudsman was not convinced either by the Law Society decision, I.E. "No evidence of negligence", on the

part of the solicitors, and referred the matter back for further investigation. This process was repeated and the investigation was reopened several times leading eventually to the Ombudsman declaring she was limited in her powers to take the matter further.

By 2007 I had returned to Romania, but not before instructing new solicitors to continue the battle. I had 6 years from knowledge, sufficient to prove the fraud, to bring an action in the Civil Court.

Whilst continuing the battle from Romania I became increasingly aware of the interest in the Duke of Lancaster on the Internet.

Having viewed for sometime the understandable criticism relating to the neglect to the Duke of Lancaster I thought, at the very least, I should allow the record to be set straight.

I contacted John Veal who in turn contacted Paul Williams and here we are the true story being told on [www.dukeoflancaster.net](http://www.dukeoflancaster.net).

Whilst the events I have referred to, represent only a snapshot for story purposes, regards the unlawful interference with the Funship business, there is an abundance of copy documentation, much of which being the Councils own records, which highlight the intricacies of the fraud in the most comprehensive detail.

Whilst it may be coincidence that many websites run parallel with some of my own experiences and beliefs, the overriding thought from all my research to date, reverberates around our so called democracy, the fettering of individual freedoms, misuse of power, or selective exemption from the rule of law. I suppose in a nutshell, corrupt Authority and a total disregard for human rights.

I would have thought we had moved on since the days of the Crimean War in 1854 and the quote attributed to Lord Tennyson when addressing soldiers before the Charge of the Light Brigade:

“Yours is not to reason why, just do or die.”

Apply that quote to the many abused children throughout Europe including North Wales or the Catholic Church, powerless to defend themselves.

Apply it also to;

The shopkeepers in Holywell deceived by Authority into losing not just their businesses but in some cases their homes;

Detective Inspector Roberts warning Flintshire auditor Mr. Andy Sutton to “beware of the Brotherhood” meaning the Freemasons;

The quote applies quite literally when considering the death threat to Stephen Messham’s solicitor.

This story is an “**independent**” account of events, stemming purely from a quest for justice, regarding the unlawful interference with our business. However, spare a thought, just maybe the catalogue of events in my case do impinge on what are the concerns of many, the possible monumental cover up of criminal acts by the establishment in our country.

However I can say the Duke of Lancaster at Llanerch-y-Mor dock, stands today as an epitaph to **undeniable corruption**.

The End or is it?

Footnote:

During my research of the story I have come across numerous quotes from many well known people. E.G.

“Public office is supposed to be public trust.” (Bob Etheridge).

“Then there is the worst part of Christianity, which is awful: power, corruption, manipulation... but then again, these feature are ever present in any organization.” (Bruce Kent).

“Corruption never has been compulsory.” (Anthony Eden).

One I can identify with personally is:

“The fight for justice against corruption is never easy. It never has been and it never will be. It exacts a toll on our self, our families, our friends, and especially our children. In the end, I believe, as in my case, the price we pay is well worth holding on to our dignity.” (Frank Serpico).

**But is it?**