01GD1160226 – Formal Judicial Question – Safeguards Before Pleas Entered

1 message

ic3csi Crime Scene Investigators <thereparationnation@gmail.com> 28 October 2026 at 21:45
To: woodgreencrowncourt <woodgreencrowncourt@justice.gov.uk>
Cc: "Cc:" <London.CrownCourt@cps.gov.uk>, Kevin.curry@justice.gov.uk, Derrick Lynch <derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk>, "ivegn@yahoo.co.uk" <ivegn@yahoo.co.uk>, paralegalservices <paralegalservices@gmail.com>, wendell daniel <streetmicpod@gmail.com>

Dear Court Officer,

FOR THE PERSONAL ATTENTION OF HER HONOUR JUDGE DEACON KC

Wood Green Crown Court
Case No. 01GD1160226
R v Derrick Emmanuel Lynch

FORMAL QUESTION CONCERNING THE JUDICIAL DECISION OF 15 OCTOBER 2026 – REQUEST FOR WRITTEN EXPLANATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE OFFICIAL RECORD

I respectfully request that this correspondence be placed before Her Honour Judge Deacon KC, retained on the official case record, and answered in writing.

This is a formal request for clarification of a specific judicial decision already made.

It is not a complaint alleging misconduct, an application to remove the judge, or an allegation of discrimination.

The purpose is to establish a clear, accurate and permanent documentary record of the question, the circumstances giving rise to it, and the explanation provided.

1. THE ESTABLISHED FACTS

I am a Black person.

Her Honour Judge Deacon KC personally confirmed on the court record that she is a White woman.

At the hearings on 26 August, 24 September and 15 October 2026, I repeatedly requested identification and evidence of safeguards against anti-Black racism and institutional racism.

I asked how those safeguards operate, who applies them, how compliance is verified and what happens if they fail.

The judge referred me to the Equal Treatment Bench Book and gave assurances concerning fairness and equality.

I acknowledged those assurances.

However, I did not receive the specific documentary identification and explanation of operational safeguards that I requested.

On 26 August 2026, the judge expressly acknowledged that she did not consider me to have refused to enter a plea.

On 15 October 2026, I again explained that I was not refusing permanently to enter a plea, but that I did not consider myself able to make an informed plea decision while my safeguarding concerns remained unresolved.

Nevertheless, Her Honour Judge Deacon KC personally directed that two not-guilty pleas be entered on my behalf.

I did not personally enter either plea.

2. THE ONE CENTRAL QUESTION

Her Honour Judge Deacon KC:

WHY DID YOU 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?

3. THE PRECISE EXPLANATION REQUESTED

For the avoidance of doubt, I am not merely asking whether the Court possesses legal authority to direct that a not-guilty plea be entered.

I understand that there are procedural provisions concerning defendants who do not personally enter pleas.

My question concerns the exercise of that authority in my particular circumstances.

I therefore request that the judge's written explanation identify:

(a) Why the decision was made before my outstanding safeguarding enquiries had been answered to the specificity requested.

(b) Whether my expressed concerns about anti-Black racism, institutional racism, personal safety and effective participation were considered before the decision.

(c) If they were considered, how they were considered and what conclusion was reached concerning their relevance to proceeding with arraignment.

(d) What specific safeguards against anti-Black racism and institutional racism applied to the decision to direct pleas on my behalf.

(e) Where those safeguards are documented and how their operation and compliance can be verified.

(f) The legal and procedural authority relied upon, and why the judge concluded that proceeding was appropriate notwithstanding my outstanding concerns.

These requests concern one decision and must not be treated as separate or unrelated investigations.

4. PREVENTING MISUNDERSTANDING OR DRIFT

I respectfully request that the following distinctions be preserved.

Explaining that the Court has statutory or procedural authority to enter a not-guilty plea does not, by itself, answer why that authority was exercised before my specific safeguarding questions had been addressed.

Referring to general equality principles does not, by itself, identify which safeguards applied to the particular decision.

Providing a personal assurance of impartiality does not, by itself, demonstrate how compliance with the applicable safeguards was verified.

Explaining that I had been given additional time to seek legal representation does not, by itself, answer the question concerning the safeguarding position when the pleas were entered.

Stating that the decision was intended to progress the proceedings does not, by itself, explain how my expressed safety concerns were assessed.

I am not asking the judge to guarantee that discrimination could never occur.

I am asking for identification of the applicable safeguards and the reasoning by which the judge considered it appropriate to proceed without first providing the evidence I had requested.

5. MY CONCERN CONCERNING SAFETY

I had expressly explained my concerns about anti-Black racism and institutional racism before the pleas were directed.

I remain concerned that the decision appears to demonstrate disregard for my expressed concerns about my safety.

That is my present concern and interpretation of the circumstances, not an established finding concerning the judge's conduct or motives.

I request an explanation so that the factual and legal position can be examined rather than assumed.

6. THE INDIVIDUAL DECISION-MAKER

For accuracy, I request that the record identify Her Honour Judge Deacon KC as the individual judicial officeholder who directed the pleas.

I recognise that she was exercising the authority of the Crown Court.

However, the Court as an institution has no personal racial or ethnic identity.

The individual judge who made the decision has personally identified herself as a White woman.

I am a Black person.

I consider this distinction relevant to the accurate recording of my safeguarding enquiries.

I do not suggest that the judge's racial identity, by itself, establishes bias or wrongdoing.

7. PRESERVATION FOR FUTURE REFERENCE

This correspondence is intended to establish a transparent and accurate contemporaneous record.

It may become relevant to future legal advice, procedural applications, complaints, appeals or other lawful proceedings, should those become necessary and legally available.

I therefore request that the correspondence, any substantive judicial response, and any decision not to provide a substantive response be accurately recorded and retained in accordance with applicable court record-retention requirements.

If the judge considers that the question has already been answered, I request identification of the precise hearing date, transcript passage, written order or other record containing the substantive answer.

If the judge declines to provide a further explanation, I request written confirmation of that position and, if available, the reasons.

If the Court considers that the matter must instead be raised through a formal application or other legal procedure, please identify the appropriate procedure.

I do not ask the Court to treat this correspondence as a formal appeal or application unless I expressly make one.

8. PRESERVATION OF MY POSITION

I make no accusations, allegations, assertions or assumptions concerning discrimination, racism, misconduct or anybody's motives.

I have reached no conclusions concerning these matters.

Any expression of concern, appearance, possibility or suspicion must be preserved as such and must not be converted into an allegation or conclusion.

My purpose is to obtain factual clarification and evidence.

This enquiry is separate from my ongoing independent search for legal representation, the prosecution's disclosure obligations, and the preparation of my defence statement.

It must not be conflated with those matters.

9. REQUEST FOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Please confirm:

(a) Receipt of this correspondence.

(b) That it has been placed before Her Honour Judge Deacon KC.

(c) That it has been retained on the official case record.

(d) Whether a written judicial response will be provided or whether another procedure must be followed.

I respectfully request that my central question be answered directly, without replacing it with a different question.

Yours faithfully,

Derrick Emmanuel Lynch
Defendant in person

28 October 2026