

Elements of Fiscal Fraud

1. Fraud must be considered by the ExA to determine the UK's compliance with EU law protecting citizens from corporate dictatorship of technologies affecting their long term health and well being. The issue could not be more urgent, entailing as it does the application of best technical knowledge for implementing solutions to Global Warming, climate change, energy supply, population increase and all the consequent subsets of problems their interactions produce; such as best solutions for compliance with the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive.
2. For crime to be committed at an international scale against a nation, as distinct from warfare, control of information is the most effective means; it is possible to control at decision making level through small numbers of people in power. Section 1(1) of the Fraud Act 2006 states 'a person is guilty of fraud if he is in breach of any of the sections listed in subsection (2) (which provide for different ways of committing the offence).' s.1(2) continues: ' The sections are-
 - (a) section 2 (fraud by false representation)
 - (b) section 3 (fraud by failing to disclose information), and
 - (c) section 4 (fraud by abuse of position)
3. The submission to the ExA at the Hearing of 5 February 2014 pointed to :
 - (a) TWUL's Application containing representations on alternative solutions that, the Applicant, CDMSmith, Thamesbank, BGIET and many others had agreed, were known to be false.
 - (b) TWUL had consistently failed to disclose information to government and it's agencies that they knew would show alternative solutions with far greater benefits to water bill payers, and at lower costs than their Tunnel Application.
 - (c) TWUL had abused its position in relations with government and its agencies to the extent that they considered the Application was being made for the only solution capable of bringing the UK into timely compliance with the UWWT Directive.
4. The Under Secretary of State, in his letter of 28 November 2013, refusing to reconsider the NPS on water of March 2012 on the grounds that he did ' not consider there had been a significant change in circumstances' in the water industry, is evidence in support of him being unaware of the falsehood of (a) in his consideration or assessment, of (b) in his failure of comprehension and understanding, and of (c) in his maintaining there had been no significance in the change of circumstance in the water industry.
5. Since the Hearing, the Met Office has issued a report (9.2.2014) on the evidence for the present wide scale floods being linked to Global Warming. The Communities Secretary of State has observed "We made a mistake, there's no doubt about that and we perhaps relied too much on the Environment Agency's advice.", pointing to the EA also not understanding the significance of the change in circumstances of the water industry.
6. The submission suggested to the ExA that it considers government assessment, comprehension, understanding of information and its control and manipulation by the Applicant and their lawyers in the context of the Fraud Act 2006 in the alternative to fraud by deception.

Graham Stevens

Elements of Fiscal Fraud