Wednesday, 11 November 2026 11/11/2026 17:17:21

FORMAL RESPONSE FOR THE COURT RECORD

R v Derrick Emmanuel Lynch — Case No. 01GD1160226

To:
The Crown Court at Wood Green
For the attention of HHJ Deacon KC
Woodall House
Lordship Lane
Wood Green
London N22 5LF
United Kingdom

From:
Derrick Emmanuel Lynch
23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield EN3 5UY
United Kingdom

Email: derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk

Date: 11 November 2026

Subject: FORMAL RESPONSE TO COURT CORRESPONDENCE DATED 11 NOVEMBER 2026 — OUTSTANDING JUDICIAL SAFEGUARDING QUESTIONS, STRONG SUSPICION OF BIAS, PROSECUTION DISCLOSURE, PROCEDURAL UNCERTAINTIES AND PRESERVATION OF THE OFFICIAL RECORD

1.1 Purpose of this correspondence

I write in response to the email issued by Wood Green Crown Court on 11 November 2026, signed by Kevin Curry, concerning my correspondence dated 28 October 2026 and 2 November 2026.

I acknowledge that my correspondence has been brought to the attention of HHJ Deacon KC and uploaded to the Digital Case System.

I also acknowledge the court's statement that:

"The judge explained at the last hearing on 15 October 2026 why she took the view that your pleas could be taken to the charges."

The court further stated:

"The judge will not engage in correspondence with you about that hearing."

I am placing this formal response on the record because I do not consider that these statements resolve the substantial questions I have repeatedly raised concerning judicial safeguards, the exercise of judicial authority, prosecution conduct, disclosure, procedural fairness and my ability to participate safely and effectively in criminal proceedings.

I do not accept that the fact that a judge has responded to a question necessarily establishes that the question has been answered.

I distinguish between an explanation, an assurance, a refusal to answer, an answer supported by documentary evidence, and a question that remains unanswered.

These distinctions are fundamental to my position.

1.2 My position concerning accusations, allegations and conclusions

For the avoidance of doubt, I repeat my established position without qualification:

"No accusations, no allegations, no assumptions, no assertions, and I have come to no conclusions."

I require my questions, concerns, fears, suspicions and requests for clarification to be recorded accurately.

They must not be converted into allegations, accusations, findings or conclusions that I have not made.

Equally, my stated suspicions must not be weakened, diluted, omitted or represented as something less than I have expressly stated.

1.3 My strong suspicion of bias

I am an IC3 Black defendant.

During the proceedings, HHJ Deacon KC identified herself as a White person and subsequently as a White woman.

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

I require this strong suspicion to be recorded accurately and without dilution.

I have not concluded that bias has been established.

However, I do not consider that my strong suspicion can be adequately addressed by personal assurances or general statements about equality and fairness.

I require facts.

I require documentary evidence.

I require the identification of the actual safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism that apply to judicial decision-making in my case.

I require an explanation of how those safeguards operate, who is responsible for their implementation, how compliance is monitored, how failures are identified, and what effective remedies are available.

I also require clarification of how those safeguards applied to the decisions already taken in my proceedings.

Personal assurances that are not supported by identifiable, documented and verifiable safeguards are of no evidential value to me.

This is my position, and I require it to be preserved accurately.

1.4 My position concerning the pleas entered on 15 October 2026

I have repeatedly sought clarification and evidence of the safeguards applicable to my proceedings.

I have not stated that I will never enter a plea.

My position has been that I am willing to enter a plea following the provision of the safeguarding information and evidence I have requested.

Nevertheless, on 15 October 2026, HHJ Deacon KC directed that two not-guilty pleas be entered on my behalf.

Those pleas were not personally entered by me.

The central question raised in my correspondence dated 28 October 2026 therefore remains:

WHY DID HHJ DEACON KC DIRECT THAT TWO NOT-GUILTY PLEAS BE ENTERED ON MY BEHALF ON 15 OCTOBER 2026 WITHOUT FIRST PROVIDING THE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE OF SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ANTI-BLACK RACISM AND INSTITUTIONAL RACISM THAT I HAD REPEATEDLY REQUESTED?

I require the distinction between the legal authority to direct a plea and the reasons for exercising that authority in my particular circumstances to be preserved.

An explanation that the court possessed the authority to proceed does not, by itself, answer every question concerning why that authority was exercised before my outstanding safeguarding requests had been addressed.

1.5 Purpose of preserving this correspondence for future examination

I am preparing and preserving a documentary record of these proceedings for future examination by my family, friends, community, any legal representatives who may

subsequently assist me, and any other persons or bodies lawfully entitled to examine the material.

I want those examining the record to be able to distinguish:

- What I actually said and requested.
- What the judge actually said and decided.
- What the prosecution actually did or did not do, insofar as established by evidence.
- What documentary evidence was provided.
- What questions were answered.
- What questions were expressly declined.
- What questions remain unanswered.
- What procedural directions and deadlines were made.
- What subsequent correspondence clarified or failed to clarify.

I do not want future readers to be left with an inaccurate impression that all my questions were answered simply because the court has stated that the judge explained why she considered that pleas could be taken.

I require the record to reflect the actual substance of the exchanges.

I am not asking the court to accept my suspicions as established facts.

I am asking for the facts, the evidence, the decisions, the reasons and the unresolved questions to be accurately recorded and distinguishable.

1.6 Request for inclusion on the official case record

I respectfully request that this correspondence, including all subsequent sections, be uploaded in full to the Digital Case System under case reference **01GD1160226** and retained as part of the correspondence record.

I request written confirmation that the complete document has been received and uploaded, identifying the date of receipt and upload.

This correspondence is not intended to substitute for any formal application that the Criminal Procedure Rules may require, nor is it intended to waive or abandon any procedural right or issue available to me.

END OF SECTION 1

2.1 The central distinction: judicial responses are not necessarily answers supported by evidence

I have examined the certified transcripts of the hearings on 26 August, 16 September, 24 September and 15 October 2026.

I acknowledge that HHJ Deacon KC responded to certain questions and provided explanations concerning the criminal proceedings.

However, I distinguish those responses from the specific documentary evidence of safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism that I requested.

I require the record to preserve this distinction.

I do not accept that general assurances, references to guidance or explanations of procedural authority should be represented as having supplied documentary evidence that was not actually provided.

2.2 Hearing of 26 August 2026 — initial safeguarding questions

At the hearing on 26 August 2026, I requested identification of the legal framework, the court's jurisdiction and the safeguards applicable to me as a Black defendant.

HHJ Deacon KC referred to principles of equality, transparency and fair trial rights.

The judge also referred to the presence of Black defendants, witnesses, jurors and judges within the courts.

I then asked whether the judge was a White person.

The certified transcript, page 3, records:

THE DEFENDANT: "Are you a white person?"

JUDGE DEACON KC: "I am."

I subsequently asked the court to identify the safeguards, where they were established in legislation, court rules, judicial guidance or official policy, and how they addressed anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism.

The judge referred me to the *Equal Treatment Bench Book*.

I acknowledged that reference and the assurances provided.

However, I continued asking for the actual safeguards and how compliance with them was measured.

On page 5, the transcript records:

THE DEFENDANT: "All right, and how is it judged that the Judges are following the guidance? How is it measured?"

JUDGE DEACON KC: "Well, we are all the judge of that, are we not?"

The judge subsequently stated that she had noted my concerns, provided assurances, identified a publicly available resource and did not think she could take the matter further.

My outstanding question: What identifiable documentary evidence demonstrates how compliance with safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism is independently assessed, monitored and verified in my proceedings?

I have not identified an answer supplying that evidence in the transcript of 26 August 2026.

2.3 Hearing of 16 September 2026 — absence and procedural uncertainty

I was absent from the hearing on 16 September 2026.

The certified transcript records discussion concerning my absence and apparent uncertainty arising from hearing documentation, including a date in September 2028.

The matter was adjourned to 24 September 2026.

The transcript does not record a substantive determination of my outstanding safeguarding questions.

I require the circumstances surrounding the notification of this hearing, the accuracy of the hearing documentation and the consequences of my absence to remain separately identifiable in the record.

I do not consider those matters resolved merely because the proceedings subsequently continued.

2.4 Hearing of 24 September 2026 — express refusal to provide a comprehensive explanation

At the hearing on 24 September 2026, I continued requesting clarification of the safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism applicable to the criminal proceedings.

The judge characterised the request as wide-ranging.

On page 7 of the certified transcript, HHJ Deacon KC stated:

"I am not about to engage in that sort of exposition with you."

The judge explained that there were many safeguards within criminal proceedings, suggested that I investigate the relevant stages myself or obtain legal advice, and stated that providing the comprehensive explanation requested was not possible within the hearing.

During the same hearing, I again asked the judge to confirm her racial identification.

The transcript records:

THE DEFENDANT: "are you a white woman?"

JUDGE DEACON: "Yes, well we went through that last time, yes."

I require both statements to remain accurately recorded.

I am an IC3 Black defendant.

HHJ Deacon KC confirmed that she is a White woman.

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

I have not concluded that bias has been established.

Nevertheless, I require the actual safeguards applicable to judicial decision-making to be identified and evidenced.

The judge's statement declining to provide the comprehensive explanation requested is materially relevant when assessing whether my questions were answered.

I require that distinction to remain clear.

2.5 Hearing of 15 October 2026 — outstanding safeguarding questions and judicial direction of pleas

At the hearing on 15 October 2026, I again raised my safeguarding questions.

I acknowledged the judge's previous assurances and reference to the *Equal Treatment Bench Book*.

I expressly requested that the safeguarding questions remain recorded and outstanding.

The judge provided explanations concerning the arraignment process and her assessment that the proceedings could continue.

The judge also addressed certain matters concerning the three videos uploaded to the Digital Case System.

However, the transcript does not establish that the judge supplied the specific documentary evidence of operational safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism that I had requested.

The judge subsequently directed that two not-guilty pleas be entered on my behalf.

I did not personally enter either plea.

My request for safeguarding evidence had not been withdrawn.

My strong suspicion of bias had not been resolved to my satisfaction.

The central question therefore remained outstanding and was formally repeated in my correspondence dated 28 October 2026.

2.6 Court email of 11 November 2026 — distinction requiring preservation

The court's email dated 11 November 2026 states that the judge explained why she considered that pleas could be taken on 15 October 2026.

I acknowledge that the transcript contains an explanation of the judge's decision to proceed with arraignment.

However, I require the record to distinguish that explanation from the separate question of whether the specific safeguarding evidence I requested was supplied.

These are not identical questions.

The first concerns why the judge considered that arraignment could proceed.

The second concerns what identifiable, documented and verifiable safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism applied to the exercise of judicial authority in my particular circumstances.

I require the record to show whether the second question was answered, partially answered, expressly declined or remains unanswered.

The court's email does not itself identify the documentary evidence requested.

2.7 Outstanding safeguarding information

For the purpose of maintaining a clear and accurate record, I continue to seek the following information:

1. Identification of the specific safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism applicable to judicial decision-making in my proceedings.
2. Identification of the legislation, procedural rules, judicial guidance or official policies establishing those safeguards.
3. Identification of the persons or institutions responsible for implementing those safeguards.
4. Documentary information explaining how compliance is assessed, monitored and verified.
5. Identification of the procedures through which suspected failures are examined and addressed.
6. Identification of the remedies available where safeguards are not followed.

7. Clarification of how the relevant safeguards applied to the decision taken on 15 October 2026 to direct two not-guilty pleas on my behalf.
8. Identification of any existing judicial reasons, orders, records or other documents that address these questions.

I request that each matter be answered by reference to identifiable evidence where available.

Where the court considers a question already answered, I request identification of the relevant hearing date, transcript page and passage, together with any supporting document.

Where the court considers that it cannot or will not provide an answer, I request that this position and its reason be recorded expressly.

I recognise that the judge has stated she will not engage in correspondence concerning the hearing. I nevertheless request that these outstanding matters remain accurately recorded and capable of being raised through the appropriate procedure.

2.8 Preservation of my position

I reiterate:

"No accusations, no allegations, no assumptions, no assertions, and I have come to no conclusions."

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

I require safeguards and facts.

I do not regard undocumented personal assurances as sufficient evidence that safeguards have been implemented, monitored or verified.

I require my position, the judicial responses and all outstanding questions to remain accurately distinguishable in the official record for future examination by my family, friends, community and any legal representatives.

END OF SECTION 2

3.1 Purpose of this section

I require the prosecution's conduct, compliance with judicial directions, handling of evidence and disclosure obligations to be recorded accurately.

I am presently unrepresented.

I require facts supported by identifiable records rather than assumptions about what would ordinarily have happened.

I distinguish between evidence received, evidence accessed, evidence examined, evidence disclosed and evidence relied upon.

These are separate matters.

3.2 The three videos — what the prosecution confirmed

At the hearing on 15 October 2026, the prosecution was represented by Mr Carmichael.

The certified transcript records that the prosecution confirmed the presence of three videos on the Digital Case System, under **UND1, entries five, six and seven**.

The prosecution also confirmed receipt and access.

I acknowledge those confirmations.

However, receipt and access do not necessarily establish that the material was examined in its entirety by the investigating officers or reviewing prosecutor.

I therefore asked whether the prosecution had viewed all three videos.

The judge explained that she expected the material to have been viewed before uploading but could not confirm that this had happened.

The judge specifically asked Mr Carmichael whether the reviewing lawyer or officer had viewed the videos.

The transcript, page 6, records his answer:

"Not specifically"

Mr Carmichael subsequently referred to ordinary prosecution practice and confirmed that he had undertaken a quick examination of the material for the purpose of assessing readiness for arraignment.

I require the distinction between expected practice and verified action to be preserved.

3.3 The court's examination of the videos

During the same hearing, HHJ Deacon KC examined portions of all three videos.

I acknowledge this.

The judge expressly confirmed that she had not watched the entirety of the footage but considered that she had examined sufficient material to determine whether arraignment could proceed.

I also explained that the endings of the videos were important because, according to my account, they showed the police concluding their interactions without taking further action against me.

The judge acknowledged my explanation.

However, I require the record to distinguish between:

- The judge examining footage for the purpose of deciding whether arraignment could proceed.
- The prosecution examining the footage for evidential and disclosure purposes.
- The investigating officers examining the footage.
- The complete footage being evaluated in relation to the prosecution's allegations and my defence.

The transcript does not establish that all these separate processes were completed.

3.4 Outstanding questions concerning the videos

I continue to seek documentary clarification of the following matters:

1. Did the investigating officer examine all three videos in their entirety?
2. Did the reviewing CPS lawyer examine all three videos in their entirety?
3. On what dates did those examinations take place?
4. Are there existing records identifying who examined the videos and what decisions were made concerning their relevance?
5. Were the complete videos considered when assessing the prosecution case, including the recorded outcomes of the police interactions?
6. Have all three original videos been preserved without alteration?
7. Are the prosecution and defence working from complete and identical copies?
8. Have any technical discrepancies concerning the videos' dates, metadata, file formats or upload history been investigated?

I request documentary confirmation where records exist.

I do not ask that an examination be represented as completed merely because it would ordinarily be expected.

3.5 Video dates and metadata — a specific unresolved discrepancy

During the hearing on 15 October 2026, the judge referred to metadata indicating that the videos had been recorded on 29 August 2026.

I did not confirm that date.

I expressly stated that I would need to consult my documents rather than risk providing an incorrect date.

I require this distinction to be preserved.

The date indicated by file metadata is not necessarily proof of the date on which the recorded events occurred.

The correct recording dates, the origin of the metadata and any discrepancy between the two remain matters requiring verification.

I request that no unverified date be adopted as an established fact.

3.6 The prosecution disclosure direction of 15 October 2026

At the hearing on 15 October 2026, HHJ Deacon KC gave directions concerning Stage One prosecution disclosure.

The certified transcript records the judge identifying **4 November 2026** as the relevant deadline.

The judge also directed that the material be served at my home address because I was unrepresented.

My address for service was:

Derrick Emmanuel Lynch
23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield EN3 5UY
United Kingdom

I require the exact terms of the judicial direction to be preserved and compliance assessed against those terms.

3.7 My formal notification dated 5 November 2026

On 5 November 2026, I sent formal correspondence to Wood Green Crown Court concerning apparent non-compliance with the prosecution disclosure directions.

I reported that I had not received the required disclosure by the deadline.

I raised concerns about the consequences for my ability to prepare my defence while unrepresented.

I also raised my continuing safeguarding concerns concerning anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism.

I require that correspondence to be retained and considered as part of the chronological record.

My report of non-receipt is a statement of my position.

Whether the prosecution served the required material, when it was served, by what method and whether that service complied with the judicial direction must be established from evidence.

I do not ask that non-compliance be presumed without examining the relevant records.

Equally, I do not accept that compliance should be presumed without evidence.

3.8 Outstanding prosecution disclosure questions

I require clarification of the following:

1. Did the prosecution comply with the Stage One disclosure direction requiring service by 4 November 2026?
2. What specific documents and materials were required to be served under that direction?
3. What documents and materials does the prosecution state were actually served?
4. On what date was each item dispatched or otherwise served?
5. By what method was service effected?
6. To what postal or electronic address was the material sent?
7. What documentary evidence of dispatch, delivery or service exists?
8. If any material was not served by the deadline, what was outstanding and why?
9. Was the court informed of any difficulty or delay?
10. Has any subsequent direction varied the original disclosure obligations or deadline?
11. If disclosure remains outstanding, what steps and timetable are proposed to resolve the position?

I request specific answers supported by the relevant records.

Where information is unavailable, I request that its unavailability be stated expressly rather than replaced by an assumption.

3.9 Consequences for defence preparation

The prosecution disclosure position is directly relevant to my ability to prepare my defence.

I remain unrepresented and have been attempting to obtain legal representation.

I require clarity concerning the material on which the prosecution relies, the material disclosed, the material still outstanding and the dates on which I actually received it.

The defence statement deadline identified during the proceedings was **2 December 2026**.

I require confirmation of the current status of that deadline and whether any subsequent judicial direction has altered it.

I do not assume that the listing of a further hearing on 18 December 2026 automatically extends the deadline.

I am not a qualified criminal defence lawyer.

I do not accept that I should be represented as having the professional knowledge, resources or expertise of a solicitor or barrister.

I require the record to reflect the practical difficulties of preparing my defence while attempting to obtain legal representation and establish the prosecution disclosure position.

3.10 My strong suspicion and the requirement for safeguards

I am an IC3 Black defendant.

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

I continue to require documented, verifiable safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism in the relevant decision-making processes.

These safeguarding questions apply to the factual examination of prosecution conduct and disclosure, as well as to the judicial decisions addressed in Section 2.

I require the identification of the safeguards applicable to the handling, assessment and disclosure of evidence.

I also require clarification of how compliance with those safeguards is verified and how any failure may be examined and remedied.

I am not asserting that the prosecution has acted with discriminatory intent.

I am requiring the relevant facts to be established.

3.11 Preservation of the record and outstanding questions

I request that the court retain my correspondence dated 5 November 2026 alongside the judicial directions, the prosecution's responses, any disclosure records and this correspondence.

I further request that the outstanding questions be recorded accurately and not treated as resolved merely because a procedural hearing has taken place.

For the avoidance of doubt, my position remains:

"No accusations, no allegations, no assumptions, no assertions, and I have come to no conclusions."

My purpose is to establish an accurate and independently verifiable record for my defence and for future examination by my family, friends, community and any legal representatives.

I require the distinction between established facts, prosecution explanations, my strong suspicions and unresolved questions to be maintained throughout.

END OF SECTION 3

4.1 Purpose of this section

I require an accurate and verifiable record of the hearing dates, notices, judicial directions, legal representation arrangements and procedural deadlines in my criminal proceedings.

These matters are particularly important because I am an unrepresented defendant who has repeatedly requested written clarification and documentary safeguards.

I require the record to distinguish between dates stated orally, dates appearing on court notices, dates subsequently changed and dates currently in force.

I do not accept that uncertainties should be silently corrected, reconciled or disregarded without reference to the relevant documents.

4.2 Hearing of 16 September 2026 — absence and notification

I did not attend the hearing on 16 September 2026.

My position is that I had not received adequate postal notification of that hearing.

The certified transcript records that HHJ Deacon KC considered the possibility of confusion arising from court documentation, including a bail notice containing a later date.

The judge did not proceed against me for my absence on that occasion.

The hearing was adjourned to 24 September 2026.

The transcript records the judge acknowledging that notifying me of the rearranged hearing was the court's responsibility.

I require the following matters to remain identifiable:

1. The date on which notice of the 16 September 2026 hearing was prepared.
2. The date and method by which that notice was sent to me.
3. The address used.
4. Any available documentary evidence of dispatch or service.
5. The date on which the relevant bail notice was issued.
6. The explanation for the different dates appearing in court documentation.
7. The steps taken to ensure that I received accurate notification of the rearranged hearing.

I request identification of any existing records that establish these facts.

I am not alleging that any person deliberately withheld notification.

I require the factual position to be established.

4.3 Hearing of 24 September 2026 — courtroom arrangements

I attended Wood Green Crown Court on 24 September 2026.

I experienced uncertainty concerning the courtroom arrangements, including the movement of the proceedings from Courtroom 1 to Courtroom 8.

I obtained stamped correspondence concerning the courtroom change.

I require that correspondence to be preserved alongside the hearing notice and the certified transcript.

I request clarification of whether any official administrative record identifies the change, when it was made and how attendees were informed.

My purpose is to ensure that future examination of the proceedings is based on accurate records rather than incomplete recollections.

4.4 Legal representation — my continuing position

I have repeatedly informed the court that I wish to obtain legal representation.

I have not abandoned my efforts to secure representation.

I do not intend my present lack of representation to be interpreted as a settled preference to conduct my own criminal defence without professional assistance.

At the hearing on 15 October 2026, HHJ Deacon KC instructed me to continue contacting solicitors and to write to the court if I remained unable to secure representation.

The judge indicated that a further hearing could be arranged to consider the position.

On 2 November 2026, I submitted written correspondence confirming that I remained actively engaged in seeking representation.

That correspondence identified my continuing enquiries, written responses received and outstanding replies.

I also supplied documentary evidence of unsuccessful attempts to obtain representation.

I require the court record to distinguish between:

1. Solicitors whom I have identified as potential contacts.
2. Solicitors whom I have actually contacted.
3. Solicitors who have responded.

4. Solicitors who have declined to act.
5. The reasons given for any refusal.
6. Solicitors whose replies remain outstanding.

An unanswered enquiry must not be represented as a refusal.

A list of potential solicitors must not be represented as proof that every solicitor listed has been contacted.

I require the record to reflect my actual efforts and the documentary evidence supporting them.

4.5 Court response dated 11 November 2026

The email issued by Wood Green Crown Court on 11 November 2026 acknowledges my correspondence dated 2 November 2026.

The court confirmed that the correspondence had been brought to the attention of HHJ Deacon KC and uploaded to the Digital Case System.

The email instructed me to continue seeking legal representation and stated that I could explain my position at the next hearing.

I acknowledge this response.

However, I remain unrepresented.

I continue to await replies from solicitors.

I require my efforts to obtain representation and the resulting difficulties to remain on the record.

I also require clarification of whether the court intends to consider the difficulties I have reported before the expiry of the defence statement deadline.

4.6 Prosecution disclosure deadline — 4 November 2026

The certified transcript of 15 October 2026 records that the prosecution was required to serve its Stage One material by 4 November 2026.

The judge directed service to my home address.

As explained in Section 3, I reported apparent non-compliance in correspondence dated 5 November 2026.

The court's email dated 11 November 2026 addresses my correspondence of 28 October and 2 November 2026.

It does not expressly address my correspondence of 5 November 2026.

I therefore require clarification of whether my correspondence dated 5 November 2026 has been received, uploaded to the Digital Case System and brought to the attention of the appropriate judicial officer.

I also require clarification of the current prosecution disclosure position.

4.7 Defence statement deadline — 2 December 2026

At the hearing on 15 October 2026, HHJ Deacon KC expressly identified **2 December 2026** as the deadline for service of my defence statement.

The judge explained that the deadline applied whether or not I had secured legal representation.

The judge also explained that failure to serve a defence statement, late service without obtaining additional time, or deficiencies in its contents could have consequences at trial.

I acknowledge that explanation.

However, I remain concerned about my ability to prepare a defence statement while:

- I remain unrepresented and continue seeking a criminal defence solicitor.
- The prosecution disclosure position remains unresolved.
- I am attempting to establish what evidence has been supplied and examined.
- My safeguarding questions remain outstanding.
- I am attempting to establish the correct procedural position from the court's records.

I am not a qualified criminal defence solicitor or barrister.

I do not claim to possess professional legal expertise.

I require the record to reflect these circumstances accurately.

I request written confirmation of whether the deadline of 2 December 2026 remains in force or has been varied by a subsequent judicial direction.

If it remains in force, I request that the court identify the appropriate procedure by which an unrepresented defendant may seek additional time, including the relevant filing requirements.

I do not represent this correspondence as an application that has already been granted.

I do not assume that any extension has been made.

4.8 Next hearing — 18 December 2026

The court's email dated 11 November 2026 identifies the next hearing as **18 December 2026**.

The certified transcript of 15 October 2026 also records the judge considering that date for a further hearing.

I acknowledge the date.

However, the next hearing falls after the defence statement deadline of 2 December 2026.

This creates an important procedural question.

How am I expected to obtain clarification of outstanding disclosure, representation and defence-preparation matters before 2 December 2026 if the next listed hearing is not until 18 December 2026?

I request that this question be recorded and that the applicable procedure for obtaining a timely determination be identified.

I am not asking the court to assume that the hearing date automatically extends any deadline.

I require an accurate statement of the current position.

4.9 Trial date and other procedural dates

The certified transcript of 15 October 2026 records HHJ Deacon KC referring to an original trial date of **25 September 2028** and directing that the trial be brought forward to **4 January 2028**.

The transcript also refers to **7 December 2027** in connection with a certificate of trial readiness.

I require the current trial date and all associated procedural deadlines to be confirmed by reference to the latest operative court order.

I do not wish to rely upon conflicting notices, informal recollections or assumptions about dates.

Where a date has been changed, I require the record to identify the original date, the revised date, the authority for the change and the date on which notification was issued.

4.10 Outstanding procedural questions

For the avoidance of doubt, I request clarification of the following:

1. What is the current, officially recorded date and time of my next hearing?
2. What is the current, officially recorded trial date?

3. What is the complete list of outstanding procedural deadlines?
4. Does the defence statement deadline of 2 December 2026 remain in force?
5. Has my correspondence dated 5 November 2026 been placed before the court?
6. What is the current position concerning prosecution disclosure?
7. What procedure is available for obtaining a determination concerning additional time before the defence statement deadline?
8. What procedure is available for obtaining further consideration of my difficulties securing legal representation?
9. What documentary records establish the dates and methods of service of the relevant hearing notices?
10. Where existing records contain discrepancies, what is the court's official explanation or correction?

I request that the answers be supported by identifiable court records where available.

Where the court is unable or unwilling to provide particular information, I request that this be stated expressly, with the reason where appropriate.

4.11 Preservation of my position and procedural rights

I repeat my established position:

"No accusations, no allegations, no assumptions, no assertions, and I have come to no conclusions."

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

I require safeguards and facts.

I do not wish my questions to be converted into allegations or my strong suspicions to be diluted.

I also do not wish my continuing attempts to obtain legal representation, my questions concerning disclosure or my requests for procedural clarification to be represented as a refusal to participate in the criminal proceedings.

I require these matters to remain accurately documented for my defence and for future examination by my family, friends, community and any legal representatives.

Nothing in this correspondence is intended to abandon an outstanding question, waive an available procedural right or imply that an unresolved matter has been resolved.

END OF SECTION 4

5.1 Purpose of the concluding requests

I have set out in Sections 1–4 the factual matters, judicial decisions, prosecution conduct, safeguarding concerns, procedural uncertainties and outstanding questions that I consider material to my position as an unrepresented IC3 Black defendant.

I require these matters to be accurately preserved on the official court record.

My purpose is not to replace established criminal procedure with correspondence, nor to require the court to determine matters outside its jurisdiction.

My purpose is to establish a clear, reliable and verifiable documentary record of what has occurred, what has been requested, what has been answered, what remains unresolved and what procedural steps are available.

I require that record for my defence and for future examination by my family, friends, community and any legal representatives.

5.2 Formal request for documentary answers

I request that the court and prosecution, within their respective responsibilities, identify and provide the information and records requested in the preceding sections, insofar as they are available and may properly be disclosed.

For each outstanding question, I request one of the following responses:

A. ANSWERED: A substantive answer identifying the relevant facts and supporting documentary evidence.

B. PARTIALLY ANSWERED: Identification of the matters answered and those remaining unresolved.

C. PREVIOUSLY ANSWERED: Identification of the precise earlier answer, including the hearing date, transcript page, court order or correspondence reference.

D. UNABLE TO ANSWER: An express statement explaining what information is unavailable and why.

E. UNWILLING OR DECLINING TO ANSWER: An express statement identifying the decision not to answer and the reason, where appropriate.

F. NOT APPROPRIATE FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Identification of the appropriate procedural mechanism through which the matter may be raised.

I request that no question be treated as answered merely because a general response has been given to a related subject.

I also request that no question be silently omitted.

I recognise that the court may not be obliged to answer every question in correspondence. I nevertheless require an accurate record of the responses actually provided and the matters remaining outstanding.

5.3 Safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism

I repeat that I am an IC3 Black defendant.

HHJ Deacon KC confirmed during the proceedings that she is a White woman.

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

I have not concluded that bias has been established.

I continue to request specific documentary identification of the safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism applicable to the judicial and prosecutorial decision-making processes affecting my case.

I require facts concerning the legal basis, implementation, monitoring, verification, enforcement and remedies associated with those safeguards.

I acknowledge the judge's reference to the *Equal Treatment Bench Book* and her assurances concerning equality and fairness.

However, those responses have not provided the complete operational and documentary information I requested.

Personal assurances that are not supported by identifiable, documented and verifiable safeguards are of no evidential value to me.

I require that position to be preserved accurately.

5.4 Preservation of evidence and documentary records

I request preservation, in accordance with applicable record-retention, disclosure and procedural obligations, of the material relevant to the matters raised in this correspondence.

This includes:

1. The official recordings and certified transcripts of the hearings on 26 August, 16 September, 24 September and 15 October 2026.
2. The judicial orders, directions, hearing notices and administrative records relating to those hearings.
3. The correspondence submitted by me on 28 October, 2 November and 5 November 2026.
4. The court's email response dated 11 November 2026.

5. The three videos identified on the Digital Case System under UND1, entries five, six and seven.
6. Available records identifying the receipt, uploading, access, examination and handling of those videos.
7. Relevant prosecution disclosure records, schedules and evidence of service.
8. Correspondence and documents concerning my attempts to obtain legal representation.
9. Relevant records explaining changes to hearing dates, courtroom arrangements and procedural deadlines.
10. Any existing written judicial reasons or administrative records directly addressing the questions raised.

I am not asserting that every category of record necessarily exists.

Where a requested record does not exist, I request confirmation of that fact where the relevant authority is able and required to provide it.

I do not request disclosure of material that the law prohibits from being disclosed. Where access is restricted, I request identification of the applicable procedure for seeking access or a determination.

5.5 Prosecution disclosure and the approaching defence deadline

I particularly draw attention to the relationship between the prosecution disclosure deadline of **4 November 2026** and the defence statement deadline of **2 December 2026**.

I reported apparent non-compliance with the prosecution disclosure direction in my correspondence dated 5 November 2026.

I require clarification of the factual position.

I remain unrepresented and continue attempting to obtain legal representation.

I am concerned about the consequences of preparing or serving a defence statement without having established what material the prosecution has served and without professional legal assistance.

I do not assume that the defence statement deadline has been extended.

I therefore request prompt administrative confirmation of the current operative directions and identification of the appropriate procedure for seeking any necessary variation or extension.

If a formal application is required, I request that the applicable procedure be identified without delay.

I recognise that this request for procedural information does not itself suspend or extend the deadline.

5.6 The next hearing and outstanding matters

The court's email dated 11 November 2026 identifies the next hearing as **18 December 2026**.

That date falls after the defence statement deadline presently identified as 2 December 2026.

I require clarification of how any matter requiring judicial consideration before 2 December 2026 may be brought before the court in time.

I do not consider it appropriate to assume that an outstanding procedural issue can safely await the next listed hearing where an earlier deadline may have consequences for my defence.

I request that the court identify the applicable procedure for seeking an earlier determination where necessary.

5.7 Preservation of the distinction between suspicion and established fact

For the avoidance of doubt, I repeat my position:

"No accusations, no allegations, no assumptions, no assertions, and I have come to no conclusions."

I **"strongly suspect" bias**.

My strong suspicion is my stated position.

It must not be diluted, weakened, omitted or misrepresented.

It must also not be converted into a finding that bias has been proved.

I require the record to distinguish clearly between:

- My own statements and questions.
- Statements made by the judge.
- Statements made by the prosecution.
- Facts established by documentary evidence.
- Matters that remain disputed or unverified.
- Questions that have not received substantive answers.

- Legal and procedural decisions actually made.

This distinction is essential to the integrity of the record.

5.8 Court correspondence and judicial decisions

I acknowledge that the court's email dated 11 November 2026 states that HHJ Deacon KC will not engage in correspondence concerning the hearing of 15 October 2026.

I do not seek to represent this correspondence as a substitute for a formal application, appeal or other procedure prescribed by law.

However, I require my outstanding questions and my disagreement with the sufficiency of the explanations and evidence supplied to remain accurately recorded.

A refusal to engage in further correspondence does not establish that every question previously raised has received the specific documentary answer requested.

Equally, I recognise that the court may have procedural or jurisdictional reasons for declining to address particular matters by correspondence.

I request that the record preserve those distinctions.

5.9 Formal requests for acknowledgement and confirmation

I respectfully request written confirmation of the following:

1. That this complete correspondence, comprising Sections 1–5, has been received.
2. That the complete correspondence has been uploaded to the Digital Case System under case number 01GD1160226.
3. That my correspondence dated 5 November 2026 has been received and uploaded, or an explanation if this cannot be confirmed.
4. That the current operative prosecution disclosure and defence statement deadlines have been identified accurately.
5. That the next hearing date and current trial date are confirmed from the operative court record.
6. That the appropriate procedure for obtaining consideration of urgent outstanding matters before 2 December 2026 has been identified.
7. That the prosecution has been supplied with this correspondence through the appropriate channel, or that I am informed if separate service is required.

I request acknowledgement as soon as practicable, particularly because of the approaching defence statement deadline.

Where a substantive response cannot be provided immediately, I request that receipt and the current procedural position be confirmed separately.

5.10 Public accountability and future examination

I intend to maintain an accurate documentary record of these proceedings for future examination by my family, friends, community and any legal representatives.

I consider transparency, documentary accuracy and the preservation of unanswered questions essential to that purpose.

I do not wish future readers to be presented with an incomplete account suggesting that all matters were resolved simply because the proceedings continued.

I require the record to show what actually occurred.

Any future publication or disclosure of material from these proceedings will need to comply with applicable reporting restrictions, privacy requirements, copyright conditions and other legal obligations.

I do not request that the court authorise public dissemination of material merely by acknowledging receipt of this correspondence.

5.11 Final statement

I remain willing to participate in the criminal proceedings.

I continue seeking legal representation.

I continue seeking clarification of prosecution disclosure, judicial directions, procedural deadlines and safeguards against anti-Black racism and Institutional Racism.

I have not withdrawn my outstanding questions.

I have not abandoned my concerns.

I have not concluded that bias, discrimination or misconduct has been established.

I **"strongly suspect" bias** and require the relevant facts and safeguards to be identified and evidenced.

I require an accurate record capable of independent examination.

I respectfully request that this correspondence be retained in full and that the matters requiring action before the defence statement deadline receive timely procedural consideration.

Nothing in this correspondence is intended to waive any right or remedy available to me under the applicable law.

Wednesday, 11 November 2026 11/11/2026 17:17:21

Yours faithfully,



Derrick Emmanuel Lynch



Also known as John Canoe
Defendant in Person

23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield EN3 5UY
United Kingdom

Email: derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk

Case: R v Derrick Emmanuel Lynch
Case number: 01GD1160226
Court: Wood Green Crown Court

END OF SECTION 5

END OF FORMAL RESPONSE — SECTIONS 1–5

REPARATIONS POLICE CODES FOR REPARATIONS POLICE CODES FOR REPARATIONS



IC1	**W1 UK White W2 White European W9 Other White**	QUESTION: White skin, Caucasoid, highest life value, pure blood, Aryan, Japhetic, Celtic, Nordic, Viking, Norse, Germanic, Slavic, Baltic, straight red/ginger or blond/blonde hair, blue, grey, green or pale eyes, not visibly contaminated with non-white blood but freckles are acceptable? **UK RACE TAX 0-6%?**	**FAMILY:** Absolute Nuclear, Egalitarian Nuclear –Low intergenerational cohabitation, early home-leaving, privacy-valued.
IC2	**W9 Other White Dark European**	QUESTION: Darkened skin, Sallow, Swarthy, Tawny, Olive skin, Melanochroid, Iberian Peninsula, Mediterranean, Balkan, straight dark hair (no curls), slightly lower life value, Dark eyes, visibly contaminated with non-white blood? **UK RACE TAX 6-13%?**	**FAMILY:** Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Patriarchal extended families, high respect for elders, strong honour culture.
IC3	**B1 Caribbean B2 African B9 Other Black**	QUESTION: Black Skin Negroid, Hamitic, Moor, Bantu, Cushite, Kaffir, Kinky/Curly Dark hair, Dark eyes? **UK RACE TAX 33-66%?**	**FAMILY:** Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Arranged marriages, multigenerational homes, patriarchal authority, family honour central.
IC4	**A1 Indian A2 Pakistani A3 Bangladeshi A9 Other Asian**	QUESTION: Brown/Dark Skin Asianoid, South Asian, Hindutva, Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Straight hair, Dark eyes? **UK RACE TAX 22-33%?**	**FAMILY:** Endogamous Communitarian, Asymmetric –Arranged marriages, multigenerational homes, patriarchal authority, family honour central.
IC5	**O1 Chinese O9 Any Other Oriental**	QUESTION: Yellow Skin Mongoloid, Epicanthic fold, Slit eyes, Neotenic, Sinodonty, Straight hair that never curls, Dark eyes? **UK RACE TAX 22-33%?**	**FAMILY:** Absolute Nuclear, Filial-Flexible –Confucian values, filial piety, elder care in private home, education-centred.
IC6	**M1 White & Black Caribbean M2 White & Black African M3 White & Asian M9 Any Other Mixed**	QUESTION: Semitic, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Arab, Israeli, North American, South American, Mixed Lineage, Mixed Race, Mongrel, North African, Stateless, visibly contaminated with Black blood? **UK RACE TAX 0-66%?**	**FAMILY:** Flexible System, Chosen Support –Mixed identity negotiation, hybrid parenting, often fluid structures, blended cultures.
IC7	**NS Not Stated**	QUESTION: Unseen, Unrecognised, Unhuman, Unknown, Alien, Computer, Robot, Artificial Intelligence, Humanoid? **TAX FREE?**	**FAMILY:** Anomic, Unknown or Chosen –Fragmented or concealed systems; may reflect institutional upbringing or systemic exclusion.

UK Government Race and Ethnicity Codes. Are you a Racist?

IC1 — W1 UK White, W2 White European, W9 Other White

1	White Race	WBRI	White British
1	White Race	WCOR	White British - Cornish
1	White Race	WENG	White British - English
1	White Race	WSCO	White British - Scottish
1	White Race	WWEL	White British - Welsh
1	White Race	WOWB	White British Other
1	White Race	WIRI	White - Irish
1	White Race	WIRT	White - Traveller of Irish Heritage
1	White Race	WEEU	White Eastern European
1	White Race	WEUR	White European
1	White Race	WOTW	White Other
1	White Race	WWEU	White Western European

IC2 — W9 Other White (Dark European)

2	White Race	WALB	Albanian
2	White Race	WOTH	Any Other White Background
2	White Race	WBOS	Bosnian- Herzegovinian
2	White Race	WCRO	Croatian
2	White Race	WGRK	Greek
2	White Race	WGRC	Greek Cypriot
2	White Race	WGRE	Greek/ Greek Cypriot
2	White Race	WROM	Gypsy / Roma
2	White Race	WITA	Italian
2	White Race	WKOS	Kosovan
2	White Race	WPOR	Portuguese
2	White Race	WSER	Serbian
2	White Race	WTUK	Turkish
2	White Race	WTUC	Turkish Cypriot
2	White Race	WTUR	Turkish/ Turkish Cypriot

IC3 — B1 Caribbean, B2 African, B9 Other Black

3	Black Race	BAFR	Black - African
3	Black Race	BANN	Black - Angolan
3	Black Race	BAOF	Other Black African
3	Black Race	BCON	Black - Congolese
3	Black Race	BCRB	Black Caribbean
3	Black Race	BEUR	Black European
3	Black Race	BGHA	Black - Ghanaian
3	Black Race	BNAM	Black North American
3	Black Race	BNGN	Black - Nigerian
3	Black Race	BOTB	Other Black
3	Black Race	BOTH	Any Other Black Background
3	Black Race	BSLN	Black - Sierra Leonean
3	Black Race	BSOM	Black - Somali
3	Black Race	BSUD	Black - Sudanese

IC4 — A1 Indian, A2 Pakistani, A3 Bangladeshi, A9 Other Asian

4	Asian Race	AAFR	African Asian
4	Asian Race	ABAN	Bangladeshi
4	Asian Race	AIND	Indian
4	Asian Race	AKAO	Kashmiri Other
4	Asian Race	AKPA	Kashmiri Pakistani
4	Asian Race	AMPK	Mirpuri Pakistani
4	Asian Race	ANEP	Nepali
4	Asian Race	AOPK	Other Pakistani
4	Asian Race	AOTA	Other Asian
4	Asian Race	AOTH	Any Other Asian Background
4	Asian Race	APKN	Pakistani
4	Asian Race	ASLT	Sri Lankan Tamil
4	Asian Race	ASNL	Sri Lankan Sinhalese
4	Asian Race	ASRO	Sri Lankan Other

IC5 — O1 Chinese, O9 Any Other Oriental

5	Chinese Race	CHKC	Hong Kong Chinese
5	Chinese Race	CHNE	Chinese
5	Chinese Race	CMAL	Malaysian Chinese
5	Chinese Race	COCH	Other Chinese
5	Chinese Race	CSNG	Singaporean Chinese
5	Chinese Race	CTWN	Taiwanese

IC6 — M1 White & Black Caribbean, M2 White & Black African, M3 White & Asian, M9 Any Other Mixed

6	Mixed Race	MABL	Asian and Black
6	Mixed Race	MACH	Asian and Chinese
6	Mixed Race	MAOE	Asian and Any Other Ethnic Group
6	Mixed Race	MBCH	Black and Chinese
6	Mixed Race	MBOE	Black and Any Other Ethnic Group
6	Mixed Race	MCOE	Chinese and Any Other Ethnic Group
6	Mixed Race	MOTH	Any Other Mixed Background
6	Mixed Race	MOTM	Other Mixed Background
6	Mixed Race	MWAI	White and Indian
6	Mixed Race	MWAO	White and Any Other Asian Background
6	Mixed Race	MWAP	White and Pakistani
6	Mixed Race	MWAS	White and Asian
6	Mixed Race	MWBA	White and Black African
6	Mixed Race	MWBC	White and Black Caribbean
6	Mixed Race	MWCH	White and Chinese
6	Mixed Race	MWOE	White and Any Other Ethnic Group
6	Other Race	OAFG	Afghan
6	Other Race	OARA	Arab Other
6	Other Race	OEGY	Egyptian
6	Other Race	OFIL	Filipino
6	Other Race	OIRN	Iranian
6	Other Race	OIRQ	Iraqi
6	Other Race	OJPN	Japanese
6	Other Race	OKOR	Korean
6	Other Race	OKRD	Kurdish
6	Other Race	OLAM	Latin/ South/ Central American
6	Other Race	OLEB	Lebanese
6	Other Race	OLIB	Libyan
6	Other Race	OMAL	Malay
6	Other Race	OMRC	Moroccan
6	Other Race	OOEG	Other Ethnic Group
6	Other Race	OOTH	Any Other Ethnic Group
6	Other Race	OPOL	Polynesian
6	Other Race	OTHA	Thai
6	Other Race	OVIE	Vietnamese
6	Other Race	OYEM	Yemeni

IC7 — NS Not Stated

7	Not Known Yet	NOBT	Information Not Yet Obtained
7	Rebel Race	REFU	Refused