
Re: Acolad Document -

From Derrick Lynch <derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk>

Date Sat 10/10/2026 21:29

To qualityuk@acolad.com <qualityuk@acolad.com>; courttranscripts@acolad.com
<courttranscripts@acolad.com>

Cc qualityuk@acolad.com <qualityuk@acolad.com>; woodgreencrowncourt
<woodgreencrowncourt@justice.gov.uk>; ivegn@yahoo.co.uk <ivegn@yahoo.co.uk>; paralegalservices
<paralegalservices@gmail.com>

To: courttranscripts@acolad.com

Cc: qualityuk@acolad.com; woodgreencrowncourt@justice.gov.uk

Dear Lorraine Cleaver and Charlotte Dobbs,

RE: R v DERRICK LYNCH

Case Reference: 01GD1160226

Court: Wood Green Crown Court

Acolad Reference: 1 738 688 — Hearing of 26 August 2026

Acolad Reference: 1742056 — Hearing of 16 September 2026

Third Transcript: Hearing of 24 September 2026 — Reference to be confirmed

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND THANKS

Thank you for your email of 9 October 2026, sent by Lorraine Cleaver, and for providing the complete hearing transcript of 26 August 2026.

I acknowledge receipt and appreciate the work undertaken to prepare and deliver this document.

I also confirm that payment of £162.72 was successfully completed through Stripe in respect of Acolad Job Number 1 738 688.

I am grateful that the transcript has now been supplied.

However, my examination of the document has identified several matters requiring verification. In addition, **two further transcripts remain outstanding**, and their urgent delivery is now my immediate priority.

My next hearing at Wood Green Crown Court is scheduled for **Thursday, 15 October 2026**.

2. URGENT DELIVERY OF THE TWO OUTSTANDING TRANSCRIPTS

I continue to require the complete official transcripts of the following hearings:

A. Wednesday, 16 September 2026

- Court: Wood Green Crown Court
- Case: R v Derrick Lynch
- Case Reference: 01GD1160226

- Transcript required: Whole hearing
- Acolad Reference: 1742056

B. Thursday, 24 September 2026

- Court: Wood Green Crown Court
- Case: R v Derrick Lynch
- Case Reference: 01GD1160226
- Transcript required: Whole hearing
- Acolad Reference: Please confirm
- Transcript status: Outstanding

These are not new requests. Both hearings have already been identified in my previous correspondence concerning the three transcripts required for these criminal proceedings.

I therefore require Acolad to confirm separately for each of these two outstanding transcripts:

1. Has Acolad received my request? YES or NO.
2. Has the Court authorised transcription? YES or NO.
3. Has Acolad received the necessary Court authorisation? YES or NO.
4. Has Acolad received the original hearing recording? YES or NO.
5. Has transcription commenced? YES or NO.
6. Has transcription been completed? YES or NO.
7. What is the current production stage?
8. What is the agreed or estimated price?
9. Has a payment link been issued? YES or NO.
10. What payment, if any, remains outstanding from me?
11. What further action, if any, is required from me?
12. What is the earliest date on which each complete transcript can be delivered?
13. Can either or both transcripts be supplied through an expedited service before 15 October 2026?

Where an answer is unknown or awaits action by another organisation, please identify precisely what is outstanding and who is responsible for the next step.

I do not want either request delayed because responsibility between Acolad and the Court has not been clearly established.

If any Court authorisation or recording remains outstanding, I ask Acolad and Wood Green Crown Court to liaise urgently and identify the action necessary to complete the process.

3. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE 15 OCTOBER 2026 HEARING

I am the defendant in ongoing criminal proceedings and am presently acting as a litigant in person while seeking legal representation.

I require the transcripts to establish accurately what took place at the hearings of 16 and 24 September 2026, including any representations, judicial statements, procedural decisions and directions.

Receipt of a transcript immediately before the next hearing may not give me sufficient time to examine it, compare it against my records and prepare appropriately.

I therefore request urgent action to make both transcripts available as early as possible.

If delivery cannot be achieved in sufficient time, please confirm this expressly so that the position can be brought to the Court's attention.

My immediate priority is delivery of the two outstanding transcripts. The ongoing formal complaint and accuracy review must not delay their production.

4. ACCURACY CONCERN — INCORRECT SPELLING OF MY NAME

Having examined the transcript of 26 August 2026, I have identified an important inconsistency concerning my name.

My correct name is:

DERRICK EMMANUEL LYNCH

I am also known as John Canoe.

Acolad's quotation, payment correspondence, delivery email and the formal heading of the completed transcript correctly identify the case as:

R v Derrick Lynch

However, page 2 of the transcript records my name using the spelling:

Derek Lynch

It also records words attributed to me identifying myself as:

Derek Emmanuel Lynch

These spellings differ from my correct name.

I require Acolad to examine the original courtroom recording and establish whether these differences arose from the spoken words or from the transcription process.

Please confirm:

1. Was my name checked against the official case information before certification?
2. Was the original audio checked to establish the exact pronunciation and identification spoken in court?
3. Were the discrepancies detected during proofreading or quality control?

4. If detected, what decision was taken concerning them?
5. If not detected, what procedure exists for investigating and correcting such discrepancies?
6. Can Acolad provide a corrected or formally annotated version where an actual transcription error is established?

I am not requesting that Acolad alter the historical record of what was spoken. I am requesting verification of its accuracy.

5. ADDITIONAL DISCREPANCY — RESIDENTIAL POSTCODE

Page 14 of the transcript also records a residential postcode that differs from the postcode used in my formal correspondence.

I request verification of this passage against the courtroom recording.

Please also explain whether identifying information such as names, addresses and postcodes is independently checked against the relevant case documentation, or whether the transcription process is confined to what is understood from the audio.

The transcript contains personal information, and I would appreciate confirmation of the safeguards applicable to its handling and distribution.

6. ADDITIONAL DISCREPANCY — COURTROOM IDENTIFICATION

The transcript's opening page identifies:

Courtroom No. 8

However, on page 2 the clerk is recorded referring to:

“court one”

Please verify whether the clerk actually used those words or whether the passage contains a transcription error.

I recognise that a transcript must reproduce words actually spoken, even when they appear inconsistent with other information.

Nevertheless, the inconsistency requires examination rather than assumption.

7. INAUDIBLE PASSAGES, WORDING AND QUALITY CONTROL

The transcript also contains passages marked “[inaudible]”, together with apparent grammatical irregularities and other wording requiring consideration.

I recognise that courtroom speech naturally contains interruptions, unfinished sentences, corrections and grammatical inconsistencies.

Such features should not be silently rewritten merely to improve readability.

However, I request confirmation of the following:

1. Were all passages marked inaudible subjected to additional listening or review?
2. Was the complete recording reviewed for transcription accuracy?

3. What proofreading and editorial checks were undertaken?
4. Were material statements by the judge checked before certification?
5. What procedure is available where a customer identifies a possible transcription error after delivery?
6. Can Acolad provide a written schedule of any corrections made following review?

These questions concern the reliability and auditability of the record rather than an assumption that every apparent irregularity represents an error.

8. ACCURACY OF THE JUDGE'S STATEMENTS AND PROCEDURAL DECISIONS

The transcript records discussions concerning safeguards against anti-Black racism and institutional racism, legal representation, the entering of a plea, video evidence, disclosure, hearing dates and bail conditions.

These exchanges are significant to my understanding of the proceedings.

In particular, on page 13 the judge expressly states:

“First of all, I do not consider that you have refused to enter a plea.”

The transcript also records changes to hearing dates and the proposed trial date during the proceedings.

I require assurance that these materially significant passages have been accurately transcribed from the original recording.

I am not asking Acolad to interpret the legal meaning of the statements. I am asking it to verify that the words and procedural exchanges have been faithfully recorded.

9. PRESERVATION OF RECORDINGS AND TRANSCRIPTION RECORDS

I have previously requested preservation of relevant evidence and records concerning the three Crown Court hearings.

I repeat my request for confirmation that the original recordings of 26 August, 16 September and 24 September 2026 are preserved in accordance with the applicable retention arrangements.

I also request preservation of relevant transcription records, including available quality-control records, amendments and correspondence concerning any disputed passages.

If Acolad does not hold or control particular records, please identify the relevant custodian so that a preservation request can be directed appropriately.

I am not asserting that any recording or transcript has been altered improperly.

My purpose is to ensure the integrity and availability of the evidence.

10. PREVIOUS FORMAL COMPLAINTS AND OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

I have previously submitted formal correspondence concerning the handling of these transcript requests, including communication difficulties, administrative uncertainty, payment arrangements, delays, record preservation and safeguards against anti-Black racism and institutional racism.

The delivery of the 26 August transcript is a welcome development.

I thank Acolad for that delivery.

However, it does not resolve every outstanding matter raised in my earlier correspondence, particularly while the transcripts of 16 and 24 September remain unavailable to me.

Please confirm whether my previous formal complaints and requests for investigation remain under consideration.

Please also identify the department or responsible officer dealing with those matters and the expected date of a substantive written response.

I request that the complaint process proceed separately from, and without delaying, the urgent production of the remaining transcripts.

11. SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ANTI-BLACK RACISM AND INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

I am a Black person.

I have previously explained that my experiences within the criminal justice process and my concerns about anti-Black racism and institutional racism make the accuracy and preservation of official records particularly important to me.

I continue to require identifiable evidence of the safeguards applicable to Acolad's administrative, editorial, quality-control and customer-service processes.

Specifically, please explain:

1. What safeguards exist against racial discrimination and unequal treatment in the provision of court transcription services?
2. What safeguards exist against anti-Black racism and institutional racism?
3. Are these safeguards documented in written policies or procedures?
4. Did the relevant safeguards apply to the handling of my transcript requests?
5. What checks or records, if any, can establish whether they were applied?
6. What review or complaint procedure is available where a customer raises concerns about discriminatory treatment or unequal administrative outcomes?

I require evidence and identifiable procedures rather than general assurances alone.

For the avoidance of doubt, I am making no accusations, no allegations, no assumptions, no assertions of wrongdoing, and have come to no conclusions concerning Acolad, its employees, Wood Green Crown Court, HMCTS or any other person or organisation.

These are genuine questions requiring answers.

12. REQUEST FOR URGENT RESPONSE

Given that my next Crown Court hearing is on Thursday, 15 October 2026, I request an urgent written response, preferably **no later than Monday, 12 October 2026**, addressing the immediate status of the two outstanding transcripts.

Please prioritise the information necessary to secure their production and delivery.

The fuller examination of transcription discrepancies, quality-control procedures, safeguards and earlier complaints may proceed alongside the urgent delivery arrangements.

Where further time is necessary to complete an accuracy investigation, please acknowledge the matter and specify when the substantive response can reasonably be expected.

I request that all responses be provided in writing so that an accurate and auditable record can be maintained.

13. CONCLUSION

I again thank Lorraine Cleaver, Charlotte Dobbs and Acolad UK Ltd for supplying the transcript of 26 August 2026.

I recognise that its delivery represents progress.

However, two complete official hearing transcripts remain outstanding, and the deadline imposed by my next court appearance makes their production an urgent matter.

I also require the discrepancies identified in the transcript already delivered to be examined objectively against the original recording.

My purpose is to establish the facts, preserve the evidence, secure an accurate court record and participate effectively in the proceedings.

I look forward to your urgent written response and cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Derrick Emmanuel Lynch

Also known as John Canoe

Defendant / Litigant in Person

R v Derrick Lynch

Case Reference: 01GD1160226

Documents referred to:

- Acolad email dated 9 October 2026 supplying the hearing transcript of 26 August 2026.
- Acolad transcript — 26 August 2026 — Reference 1 738 688.
- Stripe payment confirmation — £162.72.
- Previous formal complaints and correspondence concerning the three hearing transcripts.

From: qualityuk@acolad.com <qualityuk@acolad.com>

Sent: 09 October 2026 13:19

To: derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk <derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk>

Subject: Acolad Document

Dear Derrick

Please find attached the following document:

Acolad ref: 1 738 688

Type(s) of transcripts: Whole hearing - Date heard: 26/08/26

Defendant's Names: R v Derrick Lynch

Court Center: Wood Green Crown Court

Client reference number: 01GD1160226

Indictment number: 01GD1160226

Judge: n/k

Do not hesitate to contact Charlotte Dobbs(courttranscripts@acolad.com) with any queries.

Best regards

Lorraine Cleaver

Editor

Acolad