

Official Residence  
Ocraquoy  
Cunningsburgh  
Shetland  
Outwith, but near UK

28 July 2017

By Royal Mail Signed For  
No. KP494798653GB

Lindsay Tulloch  
c/o Police Station  
Lerwick  
Shetland

Dear Sir,

**Complaints**  
**Notice of Understanding and Intent**

**Notice to agent is Notice to principal. Notice to principal is Notice to agent.**

This Notice is addressed to you in your personal capacity.

Thank you for your letter of 25 July. My understanding of your position is as follows:

1. I made a number of complaints dated 20 July 2017 against various individuals and organisations, making allegations of criminal activity.
2. Each of the individuals and organisations had previously been warned that their actions would be illegal if they carried out their intentions with regard to the UK general election. Evidence was provided to you of those warnings.
3. Although given the opportunity, none of the accused decided to waver from that intention.
4. None of those involved denies that they carried out the acts described.
5. From the above information alone, you have a duty to carry out investigations.
6. You give no reasons for your conclusion that there is no evidence of a criminal act.

Further, the factor that makes all the above acts illegal and unlawful is that Shetland is not part of Scotland. To my knowledge, no evidence exists that would prove otherwise. In order to come to the conclusion that no criminal acts have taken place, I would suggest you either:

1. have information that proves Shetland is part of Scotland, or
2. made a gross presumption that is not supported in any court of law.

Please let me know how you came to your considered conclusion. Mere assertion is not enough. If you have made an arbitrary decision unsupported by any evidence or court decision and based on mere presumption, you must accept personal liability for acting outside your authority in making a decision not to investigate clear and serious breaches of the law.

“I was just following orders” is not good enough. Neither is it good enough to say you are not entering into any discussion about Shetland's constitutional position. These allegations revolve around that question and it cannot be ducked. Neither you, nor anyone else is above the law and anyone making arbitrary decision on this matter without proof places themselves above the law.

In case you should wish to use the case RBS v, Stuart Hill in your defence, I must warn you this will not be acceptable. In making his decision, Lord Pentland, in common with all other judges, had avoided his duty to hear, from the party bringing the case, proof that the court had jurisdiction. The Court of Session does not dispute that his decision is void. In any case, his remarks about jurisdiction were made as an aside and not part of his judgement.

I believe what I have stated to be true in every respect and I make this statement under full commercial liability and under penalty of perjury.

If you do not accept any of the foregoing as true, you must rebut each point with full supporting evidence, under full commercial liability and under penalty of perjury. Rebuttal of single points will not affect the validity of the whole.

You say you have given my allegations due consideration, so it is reasonable for me to expect a response within seven days of your receipt of this Notice. Failure to make a substantive response within that time will mean that you agree with these allegations. If such time period is insufficient, please advise. Failure to respond within time will make you subject to personal bar preventing your future denial of the allegations.

All callings not answered will be founded upon.

Under Our hand and seal

Stuart: Hill, Sovereign without the states of Scotland or the United Kingdom.