

AFFIDAVIT OF  
23 / SEPT. PETER CAMILLO <sup>(1)</sup>  
AFTER JUDGE SEAN ARKWRIGHT FRENCHETTE  
ABANDONDED THE TWICE BECAUSE  
I REFUSE GIVING HIM AUTHORITY  
OR JURISDICTION OVER I WAS  
TAKE TO THE COURT CELL AND  
LOCK-UP, AND WAS EVENTUAL  
DRIVEN TO PETERBOROUGH PRISON  
AROUND 17:45 APPROX. DURING  
MY TIME IN THE COURT HOUSE  
CELL I WAS ASKED ABOUT THREE  
TIME TO GO UPSTAIRS INTO THE  
DOCK - EACH TIME I DECLINED,  
SAYING I HAVE NO CONTRACT WITH  
THE CROWN & <sup>NO</sup> CONTRACT WITH THE  
ADMIRALTY. 1ST TIME I WAS  
TOLD THE TRIAL WAS GOING START,  
AND I SAID "NOTHING TO WITH,  
START WHAT EVER YOU WANT TO  
START" - ABOUT 20 MINS LATER  
THE CELL DOOR WAS OPENED I  
I WAS ASKED TO GO UPSTAIRS  
24/9/2015 PJF

AGAIN INTO THE DOCK... AND (2)  
AGAIN I REPEATED I WAS  
NOT CONTRACTED WITH EITHER  
THE CROWN OR WITH THE  
ADMIRALTY. THE THIRD TIME  
WAS MUCH THE SAME AS  
THE FIRST TWO INVITES TO VISIT  
THE DOCK, — LATER IN THE  
DAY ~~IT WAS~~ THE CELL DOOR  
WAS OPENED ~~IT~~ TWICE TO  
BE AGAIN INVITED TO ATTEND  
MY — AND AGAIN I REFUSE,  
CITING THE SAME REASONS FOR  
MY REFUSAL. AN ASIDE:  
DURING ONE OF THESE INVITES  
I MADE PLAIN THAT FORCED  
STATUTORY JURISDICTION IS  
A CRIMINAL OFFENCE.

24 SEPT

② 06:45 I WAS TAKEN OUT  
OF MY CELL, WAS GIVEN SOME  
CORNFLAKES, AND WITH OTHER

24/9/2015 PET

PRISONERS I WAS DRIVEN ③  
TO PETERBOROUGH CROWN COURT,  
AND LOCKED IN A CELL UNDER  
THE COURT. IN SHORT ORDER  
I WAS VISITED TWICE, THE  
SECOND TIME BY A COUPLE OF  
WOMEN, ONE DRESSED IN A  
BLACK COURT GOWN. - BOTH  
TIMES I WAS ASKED TO GO UP  
INTO THE DOCK - BOTH TIMES  
I REFUSED, ON THE GROUNDS  
THE CROWN COURT WAS OPERATING  
IN ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION, AND  
I WAS NOT CONTRACTED TO THE  
ADMIRALTY. THEN, AROUND  
10:30, MY CELL DOOR WAS  
UNLOCKED AND I SAW ABOUT  
FIVE WOMEN STANDING AND  
FACING ME - ONE OF THE  
WOMEN WAS DRESSED IN BLACK  
Q.C. CLOTHING, WEARING GLOVES  
AND WAS SPEAKING WITH

24/9/2015 PJS

BARELY CONTAINABLE RAGE<sup>(4)</sup>  
THIS Q.C. WOMAN, SAID IF I  
SIGNED BAIL CONDITIONS TO  
RETURN TO COURT, I WOULD  
BE ALLOWED TO GO HOME.  
I TOLD HER BLUNTLY I  
WAS NOT INTERESTED, AND  
I WANTED TO GO BACK TO  
PRISON; THE WOMAN WAS NOW  
ALMOST APOPLETTIC, AND  
SAID "WHAT? YOU WANT TO GO  
BACK TO PRISON AND NOT GO  
HOME?" I SAID "EITHER  
LET ME GO HOME A FREE MAN  
OR SEND ME BACK TO PRISON,  
THE CHOICE IS YOURS." I  
DID MENTION I WANTED FULL  
DISCLOSURES OF <sup>THE</sup> JUDGE JUDICIAL  
BOND AND OTHER LEGAL  
INSTRUMENTS/INSURANCE, AND IF  
THE JUDGE WANTS TO SEE ME  
HE CAN VISIT ME IN THE CELL.

24/9/2015 PBT

WITH THAT THE FIVE WOMEN (5)  
LEFT, AND THE CELL DOOR WAS  
LOCKED. THEN AROUND 14:00  
(APPROX.) THE CELL DOOR OPENED  
~~AND~~ BY ONE OF THE CELLS  
STAFF, A PESITE POLISH GIRL,  
SHE SAID I WAS FREE TO GO. I  
SAID "GO WHERE?" SHE SAID  
"HOME". SMELLING A BIG  
CROWN ADMIRALTY RAT ~~HE~~ ASKED  
HER THE SAME QUESTION ABOUT  
FIVE MORE TIMES, AND EACH  
TIME SHE SAID I WAS FREE TO  
GO HOME. SO I THOUGHT  
"WHAT THE HELL, LETS SEE  
WHERE THIS GOES". I SAID  
"OK LETS GO" AND WALKED  
TO MY RIGHT, TO GO OUT THE  
WAY I WAS LET OUT ON 17 MARCH  
2015. BUT THE GIRL SAID TO  
GO TO MY LEFT. THINKING SHE  
WAS GOING TO TRICK ME INTO

24/9/2015

PS

GOING UP INTO THE DOOR, <sup>(6)</sup> I SAID "IF YOU THINK I'M GOING UPSTAIRS INTO THE DOOR, I WAS GOING BACK TO THE CELL" - SHE ASSURED ME I WAS GOING TO BE LET FREE TO GO HOME, BUT FIRST SHE WANTED ME TO SPEAK TO A MAN IN AN OFFICE. THE MAN WAS FILLING IN SEVERAL FORMS, AND I SAID I WOULD BE SIGNING NOTHING NOR TOUCHING ANYTHING. ~~REPEATEDLY~~ I ASKED HIM, TOO, A NUMBER OF TIMES IF I WAS FREE TO GO HOME; AND EACH TIME HE SAID "YES". HE THEN GAVE ME TWO SEALED POLYTHENE BAGS CONTAINING ALL MY BELONGINGS. I SAID I WANTED TO OPEN THEM FIRST BEFORE I LEFT HIS OFFICE, BUT HE WAS ADVICEMENT I COULD ONLY OPEN THEM WHEN HE LET

29/9/2015 PEST

ME OUT OF THE CELL COMPLEX. <sup>(7)</sup>  
I SAID IF "YOU WON'T ALLOW ME  
TO OPEN THE TWO BAGS WHILE  
I ~~WAS~~ <sup>I'M</sup> IN THE COMPLEX, I WAS  
LEAVING BOTH BAGS WITH HIM."  
ADDING "NOW LET ME GO  
HOME." I WAS TAKEN TO A  
DOOR EXITING INTO THE MAIN  
ENTRANCE OF THE COURT, AND  
THROUGH I WENT WITHOUT THE  
TWO BAGS & NO CASH, (AS THE CASH  
~~WAS~~ <sup>WAS</sup> IN THE SEALED BAG). AS I  
APPROACHED THE MAIN ENTRANCE  
TWO POLICE OFFICERS BLOCKED  
MY WAY AND SAID THEY WERE  
ARRESTING ME FOR BREACHING  
BAIL CONDITIONS <sup>I SIGNED</sup> ~~SET~~ ON THE  
PREVIOUS EVENING. THE ONLY  
DOCUMENTS I SIGNED FOR WAS  
FOR A URINE SAMPLE AND  
TOILETRY, AND EACH TIME I  
MADE AN ECLIPSE AND AN X ~~OOOX~~  
29/9/2015 PPS

THE TWO OFFICERS WERE LOUISE<sup>(8)</sup>  
TUDMAN & PAUL CHADWICK.  
THEY DROVE ME TO THORPEWOOD  
POLICE STATION, WAS ALLOWED  
ONE PHONE CALL TO MY WIFE,  
THEN LED OUT BACK TO  
MESSRS TUDMAN & CHADWICKS  
VEHICLE AND DRIVEN BACK TO  
PETERBOROUGH CROWN COURT  
AND PUT BACK INTO A CELL.  
I WAS VISITED A FEW MORE  
TIMES TO BE ASKED TO GO INTO  
THE DOCK BUT EACH TIME I  
REFUSE, CITING THE SAME REASON  
OF BEING NON-CROWN & NON-AD-  
MIRALTY. THE COURT CLOSSES @  
16:30. ~~AT~~ AT 16:20 ONE OF  
THE YOUNG FEMALE CELL STAFF  
RELEASE A FEW PEOPLE FROM THE  
CELLS THEN SAID ~~THAT~~ I WOULD  
BE GOING BACK TO PRISON IN  
TEN MINUTES. AT 16:30 THE  
FES 24/9/2015



SHORT PAGE

(9)

SAME GIRL SAID IT WOULD  
BE ANOTHER TWENTY MINUTES  
BEFORE I WOULD BE GOING BACK  
(16:50 APPROX) - 16:50 CAME  
AND WENT, AND EVENTUALLY I  
WITH ANOTHER MAN, WERE LET  
OUT OF OUR CELLS @ 18:00.

I SPENT ABOUT 10 HOURS  
SITTING ON A HARD, UNPROTECTED  
CELL BENCH, OTHER THAN THE SHORT  
TIME I WAS ARRESTED BY TUDMAN

CHADWICK @ <sup>SEP 24/91 2015</sup>  
~~W/OUT DOUBT~~  
~~AND THE LIGHTS FOR THE DAY~~  
~~ON~~

(11) 550 THIRTY (10)  
WITHOUT DOUBT THE BIZARRE  
EVENTS OF THE DAY AND THE  
LONG HOURS I WAS SITTING  
ON A HARD, UNPROTECTED  
CELL BENCH WERE DELIBERATE,  
WITH THE OBVIOUS VIEW OF  
BREAKING MY RESISTANCE, TO  
YIELD TO ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION

FORCE ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION  
AMOUNTS TO NAVY PRESS GANGING  
(AS ADMITTED BY A POLICE OFFICER  
REF. MY AFFIDAVIT DATED 3/9/2015)  
AND IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE  
PROPERLY COMING UNDER THE  
HEADING: MALFEASANCE IN  
PUBLIC OFFICE - IF ANY HARM  
OR 'ACCIDENT' BEFALLS ME  
WHILE I AM UNDER CROWN  
RESTRAINT, IT IN ALL LIKELYHOOD  
WILL BE ENGINEERED TO GET <sup>RES</sup> 24/9/15  
JUDGES PETER MURPHY AND PTO.

SEAN ARLKWRIGHT OFF (11)  
THE HOOK REGARDING  
THEIR CRIMES AGAINST ME,  
AND THE PROSPECT OF  
BEING RUINED BY COMMERCIAL  
MARITIME LIENS,

~~LEGAL~~ MAXIM OF LAW:  
A CLAIM CANNOT BE GIVEN  
TO SOMEONE WHO HAS  
RECEIVED NO HARM.

2014  
ON 23 DECEMBER MAGISTRATES  
HEARING IN HUNTINGDONSHIRE  
MAGISTRATES COURT, MAGISTRATE  
WARBOYS TOLD ME (PETER FRENETT)  
THAT "THERE WAS NO VICTIM"  
MEANING THE CROWN PROSECUTION  
HAVE NO CASE AGAINST ME,  
BUT ARE USING AN ARTIFICE  
KNOWN AS A FICTICIOUS PET  
PLAINTIFF WHICH IS 24/9/2015  
STRICTLY FORBIDDEN IN LAW

BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY (12)  
6TH EDITION  
STATES:

FICTITIOUS PLAINTIFF: A  
PERSON APPEARING IN A  
WRIT, COMPLAINT, OR RECORD  
AS A PLAINTIFF IN A SUIT,  
BUT WHO IN REALITY DOES  
NOT EXIST, OR IS IGNORANT  
OF THE SUIT AND OF THE  
USE OF HIS NAME IN IT.  
IT IS A CONTEMPT OF  
COURT TO SUE IN THE  
NAME OF A FICTITIOUS  
PERSON. REF 24/9/2015

