

URGENT FORMAL INQUIRY

TO:

data.access@justice.gov.uk

CC:

woodgreencrowncourt@justice.gov.uk

website.enquiries@judiciary.uk

thereparationnation@gmail.com

derrick_lynch@hotmail.co.uk

FOR THE COURT FILE AND FOR THE URGENT ATTENTION OF HHJ DEACON KC

Subject: URGENT – HEARING 25 SEPTEMBER 2026 – R v DERRICK LYNCH – CASE 01GD1160226 – PROVENANCE, AUTHORSHIP AND SAFEGUARDS INQUIRY – “NOTES FOR DEFENDANTS REPRESENTING THEMSELVES IN THE CROWN COURT”

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write concerning the document entitled:

“Notes for Defendants Representing Themselves in the Crown Court.”

I respectfully request that **Wood Green Crown Court place this correspondence on the court file and bring it urgently to the attention of HHJ Deacon KC before my hearing on 25 September 2026.**

My next hearing is on **25 September 2026**, and I therefore require the information requested below urgently.

1. BACKGROUND

I am **Derrick Emmanuel Lynch, also known as John Canoe.**

I am the defendant in:

R v Derrick Lynch

Case Reference: 01GD1160226

I am a Black person.

At the previous hearing, I raised concerns regarding safeguards against **anti-Black racism and institutional racism** within the decision-making processes affecting my case.

My written position specifically asked the Court to identify the legal framework, jurisdiction and safeguards ensuring that anti-Black racism and institutional racism do not affect decisions in my case. I also asked that, if the Court relied upon ordinary

safeguards, those safeguards be identified and their location in legislation, court rules, judicial guidance or official policy be explained.

The Judge directed me to read certain material, including **“Notes for Defendants Representing Themselves in the Crown Court.”**

I have complied with the Judge's direction and read the document.

I am now seeking to establish the **provenance of that information** and the safeguards governing the processes by which it was created, reviewed, approved and selected for use.

2. IMPORTANT STATEMENT

For the avoidance of doubt:

I make no accusations.

I make no allegations.

I make no assumptions.

I make no assertions.

I reach no conclusions.

I am conducting an inquiry in order to establish facts and documentary evidence.

I expressly make no allegation or conclusion that anti-Black racism or institutional racism affected:

- the preparation of the Notes;
- the people responsible for the Notes;
- HMCTS;
- the Ministry of Justice;
- the Judicial Office;
- HHJ Deacon KC;
- or any other person or organisation.

I am asking questions precisely because I do **not** wish to make assumptions.

3. SERIOUS SAFEGUARDING CONTEXT

I am a Black person.

I have serious concerns about my personal safety within the criminal justice process.

The number and circumstances of reported deaths of Black people in police custody form part of the context in which I have raised my safeguarding concerns.

I am in fear for my life.

I previously put this concern expressly before the Court while making clear that I was making no allegation that such conduct had occurred in my own case.

Accordingly, the questions I am asking about safeguards against anti-Black racism and institutional racism are serious questions for me.

4. WHY THE PROVENANCE OF THE NOTES MATTERS

The Judge directed me to read these Notes in response to concerns I had raised.

Having read them, I therefore need to know:

Who produced this information?

Who decided what information should and should not be included?

Who reviewed it?

Who approved it?

What safeguards governed those decision-making processes?

Were there safeguards specifically against anti-Black racism and institutional racism?

How did this particular document come to be provided to the Judge and subsequently directed to my attention?

The existence or absence of such safeguards is potentially relevant to my assessment of the **provenance, reliability, completeness and quality** of the information I was directed to consider.

I repeat: I have reached **no conclusion** concerning what this inquiry will establish.

5. AUTHORSHIP AND PROVENANCE

Please answer each question separately.

1. What organisation originally created or commissioned “*Notes for Defendants Representing Themselves in the Crown Court*”?

2. Who authored, drafted or compiled the Notes?

3. If individual names cannot properly be disclosed, what were the positions, offices, departments or professional functions of the persons responsible?

4. When were the Notes originally created?

5. Which version was provided to me?
6. When was that version produced?
7. When was it last reviewed?
8. When was it last revised?
9. Please provide or identify the document's version/revision history.
10. Which organisation owns or is responsible for maintaining the Notes?
11. Who authorised their publication or use?
12. Who approved them for use with defendants representing themselves in the Crown Court?

6. INFORMATION USED TO COMPILE THE NOTES

13. What legislation was considered when preparing the Notes?
14. What Criminal Procedure Rules were considered?
15. What Criminal Practice Directions were considered?
16. What case law was considered?
17. What judicial guidance was considered?
18. What HMCTS or Ministry of Justice policies were considered?
19. What other authoritative material was relied upon?

7. CONSULTATION AND REVIEW

20. Which organisations, committees, professional bodies or individuals were consulted during the drafting or review process?
21. Were judges consulted?
22. Were barristers or solicitors consulted?
23. Were defendants or former defendants consulted?
24. Were litigants in person or organisations representing unrepresented defendants consulted?
25. Were any race-equality specialists consulted?
26. Were any persons or organisations with specific expertise concerning **anti-Black racism** consulted?

27. Were any persons or organisations with specific expertise concerning **institutional racism consulted?**

If YES to Questions 20–27, please identify the relevant organisations or professional functions and provide or identify the recorded information concerning that consultation.

8. SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ANTI-BLACK RACISM

This is a central part of my inquiry.

28. Were there specific safeguards against anti-Black racism within the decision-making processes used to draft, compile, review and approve these Notes?

Please answer:

YES or NO.

If YES, please identify those safeguards precisely.

Please identify where they are recorded.

Please explain who was responsible for applying them.

9. SAFEGUARDS AGAINST INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

29. Were there specific safeguards against institutional racism within the decision-making processes used to draft, compile, review and approve these Notes?

Please answer:

YES or NO.

If YES, please identify those safeguards precisely.

Please identify where they are recorded.

Please explain who was responsible for applying them.

10. EQUALITY AND RACE ASSESSMENT

30. Was an Equality Impact Assessment undertaken in relation to these Notes?

YES or NO.

31. Was any race equality assessment undertaken?

YES or NO.

32. Was any assessment undertaken specifically addressing anti-Black racism?

YES or NO.

33. Was any assessment undertaken specifically addressing institutional racism?

YES or NO.

If YES to any of Questions 30–33, please provide or identify the relevant assessment.

If NO, please state that clearly for the record.

I am **not asking for generic diversity or equality policies as a substitute for answering these questions.**

11. ACTUAL APPLICATION OF THE SAFEGUARDS

If safeguards existed, I also need to establish whether there is evidence of their operation.

34. What recorded information demonstrates that safeguards against anti-Black racism were actually considered or applied during preparation or approval of these Notes?

35. What recorded information demonstrates that safeguards against institutional racism were actually considered or applied?

If no such recorded information exists, please state that clearly.

12. PURPOSE OF THE NOTES

36. What is the formally defined purpose of “*Notes for Defendants Representing Themselves in the Crown Court*”?

37. What matters are the Notes intended to explain to defendants?

38. Are the Notes intended to address concerns about racial discrimination?

YES or NO.

39. Are the Notes intended to explain safeguards against anti-Black racism?

YES or NO.

40. Are the Notes intended to explain safeguards against institutional racism?

YES or NO.

If YES to Questions 38–40, please identify the relevant passages.

13. HOW THESE NOTES REACH JUDGES

This is a separate but important part of my inquiry.

41. Are these Notes routinely available to Crown Court judges?

42. Are they routinely provided to defendants representing themselves?

43. Are they contained in an official HMCTS, Ministry of Justice, Judicial Office, Judicial College or other court resource?

44. Who determines whether the Notes should be provided to an individual defendant?

45. Is there official guidance telling judges when these Notes should be provided?

46. Is there official guidance explaining what concerns or questions the Notes are intended to address?

If such guidance exists, please provide or identify it.

14. HOW THE DOCUMENT CAME TO BE USED IN MY CASE

I require factual clarification concerning:

R v Derrick Lynch – 01GD1160226.

47. Who identified these particular Notes for provision to me?

48. Did HHJ Deacon KC independently select the document?

49. Was the document supplied or recommended to the Judge by an HMCTS employee?

50. Was it supplied or recommended by another judge or judicial office holder?

51. Was it supplied or recommended by the Judicial Office or Judicial College?

52. Was it contained in a standard information pack or resource already available to the Judge?

53. Was it identified through some other process?

If so, please explain that process.

54. What administrative records, correspondence, emails, instructions, file notes or other recorded information exist concerning the identification, selection or provision of these Notes in my case?

I recognise the distinction between administrative information and protected judicial deliberation.

I am not requesting disclosure of private judicial deliberations.

If particular information cannot properly be disclosed because of judicial independence, confidentiality, statutory exemption or another lawful reason, please identify the information being withheld and the applicable basis.

15. WHO GAVE THE INFORMATION TO THE JUDGE?

For absolute clarity, one of the central questions in this inquiry is:

Who, if anybody, provided, recommended, identified or made these Notes available to HHJ Deacon KC in connection with my case?

If the answer is that nobody did and the Judge independently obtained or selected them, please state that, insofar as the information held permits that answer.

If another person or organisation was involved, please identify that person's official role and/or organisation, subject to any lawful restrictions upon disclosure.

16. URGENCY — HEARING 25 SEPTEMBER 2026

My next hearing is:

25 September 2026.

I therefore respectfully request an **urgent response before the hearing wherever reasonably possible.**

I recognise that any part formally processed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 may be subject to the applicable statutory timetable.

I nevertheless ask that information which can be provided administratively before the hearing be supplied without waiting unnecessarily for the completion of any separate statutory information request.

If a complete response cannot be provided before 25 September 2026, please:

1. provide whatever information can presently be supplied;
2. identify which questions remain outstanding;
3. confirm which organisation or department is considering those questions;
4. identify any questions which have been transferred or should be directed elsewhere; and
5. preserve all relevant records concerning the provenance, production, approval and provision of the Notes pending determination of this inquiry.

17. REQUEST FOR RECORDED INFORMATION

To the extent that any of the information requested above constitutes recorded information held by the Ministry of Justice, HMCTS or another relevant public authority, please additionally treat this correspondence as a request for that recorded information under the **Freedom of Information Act 2000**, where applicable.

If another public authority holds particular information, please identify that authority.

18. COURT RECORD

Wood Green Crown Court: I respectfully request that this correspondence be:

(a) placed on the court file for **01GD1160226**; and

(b) brought to the attention of **HHJ Deacon KC before the hearing on 25 September 2026**.

I am not asking court administrative staff to answer questions which fall outside their responsibilities.

I am asking that the existence of this inquiry, and any response received before the hearing, be properly recorded.

19. FINAL POSITION

I repeat:

I am a Black person.

I make no accusations.

I make no allegations.

I make no assumptions.

I make no assertions.

I reach no conclusions.

I am seeking factual information and documentary evidence.

The Judge directed me to read these Notes following concerns that I had raised. I have complied with that direction.

I now need to establish **where that information came from, who was responsible for it, how its contents were determined, what safeguards governed those decisions, and whether safeguards against anti-Black racism and institutional racism formed part of those processes.**

Given my hearing on **25 September 2026**, I respectfully request urgent written acknowledgement and as much substantive information as can reasonably be provided before that date.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, featuring a large, stylized initial 'D' followed by a series of loops and a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Derrick Emmanuel Lynch
also known as John Canoe

23 Jersey House
2 Eastfield Road
Enfield
EN3 5UY

Defendant / Litigant in Person
R v Derrick Lynch
Case Reference: 01GD1160226