




TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Madam or Sir...

My signature hereunder authorizes my Legal Advisors I worked with in United Nations to represent me wherever they believe it is necessary.

In  14th July 2025

Respectfully,



Paul X. Comerford - Complaints and Resolutions Officer,
Brian Doherty – Chief Executive Officer,
An tÚdarás Rialála
Seirbhísí Dlí
Legal Services
Regulatory Authority
[redacted]
Dublin 7

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty,

We are the Prosecuting Attorney Office in the US and the legal advisors to Mr [redacted]
He lives in apartment [redacted] county [redacted] Postal code:
[redacted] We forward our comments¹ about the “..correspondence from Mr Fay dated 26
September 2023”^{2, 3} and enclose the letter in which Mr [redacted] authorizes our office to
represent him. In case of any response, feel free to write directly to mister [redacted]

Table of Contents

1. See number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2 1
2. See number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2 4

1. See number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2

Mr Leo Fay, in number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2, writes “Dear Sirs.....The incident
arose on the 12th of April 2012...”



It is notable and evidenced that Mr Leo Fay, **deliberately**, is not saying the truth to “Dear Sirs”

¹ See number 1...APPENDIX 1

² See number 2...APPENDIX 1

³ See number 3...APPENDIX 2

Evidence...

Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received⁴ the parcel of documents weighing 5115 grams⁵ and the parcel looked like this.⁶

1. In this parcel Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received file APRIL 2021 containing APPENDIX SIX.

1.1 In this appendix page nine⁷ confirms that the accident took place on 2nd August 2012 and not on 12th April 2012.

2. In that parcel Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received file SEPTEMBER 2020 and in its ANALYSIS ONE REVISED VERSION page 43⁸ testifies **TWO TIMES** that the accident at work happened on 2nd August 2012.

3. In that parcel Mr Fay Leo received file MAY 2022 and in number 12 in its APPENDIX SIX Eileen Loughlin⁹ **confirms** that the accident at work took place on 2nd August and not on 12th April 2012.

4. In that parcel, Mr Leo Fay received file SEPTEMBER 2021; in its APPENDIX THE FILE document 66¹⁰ **TWO TIMES** confirms that the incident took place on 2nd August and not on 12 April 2012.

4.1. This file (SEPTEMBER 2021) contains ANALYSIS SEPTEMBER THIRD 2021 that on its....

4.1.1....page 31¹¹ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN¹² which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4.1.2....page 32¹³ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN¹⁴ which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

⁴ See page 2 and page 3... APPENDIX 3

⁵ See page 1...APPENDIX 3

⁶ See page 4...APPENDIX 3

⁷ See appendix 4

⁸ See APPENDIX 5

⁹ See APPENDIX 6

¹⁰ See APPENDIX 7

¹¹ See APPENDIX 8

¹² See APPENDIX 9

¹³ See APPENDIX 10

¹⁴ See APPENDIX 9

4.1.3.....page 49¹⁵ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN¹⁶ which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4.1.4.....page 54¹⁷ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN¹⁸ which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4.1.5.....page 58¹⁹ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN²⁰ which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4.1.6.....page 59²¹ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN²² which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4.1.7.....page 28²³ ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN²⁴ which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4. In that parcel Mr Fay Leo received file MAY 2022 and its appendix newbridge²⁵ testifies again **TWO TIMES** that the accident at work happened on 2nd August 2012 and not on 12th April 2012

5. In that parcel he received file APRIL 2021 and this file contained

5.1. APPENDIX TEN²⁶ testifying **TWO TIMES** that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012. and...

5.2.analysis which on its.....

5.2.1. ...page 4²⁷ **TWO TIMES** refers to APPENDIX TEN and “Chief Appeals Officer in his decision”²⁸ which confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

¹⁵ See APPENDIX 11

¹⁶ See APPENDIX 9

¹⁷ See APPENDIX 12

¹⁸ See APPENDIX 9

¹⁹ See APPENDIX 13

²⁰ See APPENDIX 9

²¹ See APPENDIX 14

²² See APPENDIX 9

²³ See APPENDIX 15

²⁴ See APPENDIX 9

²⁵ See APPENDIX 16

²⁶ See APPENDIX 17

²⁷ See APPENDIX 18

²⁸ See APPENDIX 19

5.2.2. ...page 10²⁹ **FOUR TIMES** refers to APPENDIX TEN³⁰ and this APPENDIX TEN confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

5.2.3. ...page 17³¹ **ONE TIME** refers to APPENDIX TEN³² and this APPENDIX TEN confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

5.2.4. ...page 20³³ **ONE TIME** refers to APPENDIX TEN³⁴ and this APPENDIX TEN confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

5.2.5. ...page 25³⁵ **ONE TIME** refers to APPENDIX TEN³⁶ and this APPENDIX TEN confirms **TWO TIMES** (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty what is pointed to above (under subtitle **1. See number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2**) is undeniable evidence that Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors from Baldoyle deliberately violated...

Section 14.- (1) (i)...Solicitors Act 1954³⁷.....

Section 50...Legal Services Regulation Act 2015³⁸...

Section 10...Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001³⁹

2. See number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2

Mr Leo Fay, in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2, writes..

²⁹ See APPENDIX 20

³⁰ See APPENDIX 9

³¹ See APPENDIX 21

³² See APPENDIX 9

³³ See APPENDIX 22

³⁴ See APPENDIX 9

³⁵ See APPENDIX 23

³⁶ See APPENDIX 9

³⁷ See APPENDIX 33

³⁸ See APPENDIX 35

³⁹ See APPENDIX 34

2

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

It is, indeed, important to once more point out that subtitle... **1. See number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2** undeniably proves **41 (forty one) times that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and that Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors deliberately is not saying the truth when pointing out that the incident took place on 12th April 2012.** Let us, now return to Mr Fay's words that "...Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident." It is really important to clarify the assertion hereunder...

1

Dear Sirs,

the 12th of April 2012

The incident arose on

Namely, from 12th April through 2nd August 2012 one hundred and eleven days exist. Findings of the study of both unconscious and conscious mental processes and motives^{40, 41, 42} as well as

⁴⁰ Cherry, K. (2021) "The Influence of Psychoanalysis on the Field of Psychology," *Verywellmind*, Available at: <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-psychoanalysis-2795246>, Accessed on 19th July 2021

⁴¹ Freud, S. (2012) *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, Wordsworth Editions Ltd, Stansted

⁴² Bateman, A. and Holmeds J. (1995) *Introduction to Psychoanalysis: Contemporary Theory and Practice*, Routledge, New York

those of theory of probability^{43, 44} and all seven⁴⁵ basic principles of logical reasoning⁴⁶ are relentless.

This assertion...

the 12th of April 2012

The incident arose on

....was moved backwards 111 days for some reason. A closer look at all this **immediately** points to this assertion of Leo Fay...

2

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

See number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2

The question remaining **why** **2.5 years**

why not less???

⁴³ de Finetti, B. (2017) *Theory of Probability: A Critical Introductory Treatment*, John Willey & Sons Ltd, Chichester-West Sussex

⁴⁴Gillies, D. (2000) *Philosophical Theories of Probability*, Routledge, London

⁴⁵ Modus Ponens,
Modus Tollens,
Two Modus Ponens arguments forming a conjunction
Destructive Dilemma,
Hypothetical Syllogism,
Disjunctive Syllogism,
Proof by Contradiction

⁴⁶ Schneck, D. (2008) "Seven Basic Principles of Logical Reasoning", *American Laboratory*, Volume 40, No 14, pp. 4-5

Very interesting formulation Mr Fay gave in number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2 when writing that Mr [REDACTED]

4

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

was outside the time allowed

Moving the date of incident from 2nd August to 12th April 2012 along with this assertion...

2

[REDACTED] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

(see number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

...was the precondition of the assertion that [REDACTED]

4

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

was outside the time allowed

(see number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

If the incident took place on 12th April 2012 (as Mr Leo Fay writes in number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

1

Dear Sirs,

the 12th of April 2012

The incident arose on

...then according to what Leo Fay writes in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

Mr [REDACTED] contacted them around 12th October 2014” and this date, of course, falls around...
thirty months after Leo Fay’s incident (12th April 2012) and time around 12th October 2014
does place [REDACTED]

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

outside the time allowed

However, the events in reality happened in a “slightly” different way...

Evidence...

The crucial point is that Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors refers to the Statute of Limitations as he says himself.....

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(see number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

....and that is the evidence confirming he does know where, within the Statute, to look for....

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

the time allowed

The Statute of Limitations **AT THE SAME PLACE** talks about **EXCEPTIONS**.... Leo Fay NOWHERE refers to in APPENDIX 2. On the other hand, **THREE** we repeat **THREE** law offices: Coleman Legal LLP,⁴⁷ Augustus Cullen Law⁴⁸ and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors⁴⁹ DO NOT ignore them (exceptions).

Coleman Legal LLP....

⁴⁷ See appendix 24

⁴⁸ See appendix 25

⁴⁹ See appendix 26

1.1 Exceptions

There are some circumstances in which the applicable time limit may be altered, such as:

- Where the injured party has suffered a mental impairment as a result of their injury

Augustus Cullen Law

The general rule is that you have a two-year period from the date of the accident or injury to initiate legal proceedings. However, there are specific situations that might affect this starting point:

- Minor at the time of the injury: If the injured party was under 18 at the time of the accident, the two-year period begins on their 18th birthday.
- Delayed knowledge of the injury: Sometimes, the full extent or nature of the injury might not be immediately apparent.
- Incapacity: If the injured person was incapacitated in some way, such as being in a coma or lacking the mental capacity to manage their affairs.

...and...

McMahon Goldrick Solicitors

Exceptions to the time limit:

- Date of knowledge

Sometimes, an injury or illness may not become noticeable until a while after the incident, which may affect the timeline for issuing proceedings. The date of knowledge is the date on which you

1. You had been injured
2. The injury was significant
3. The injury was caused by the negligence of another person or party
4. You were able to identify who that person or party was

- When the injured party is mentally impaired as a result of sustaining their injury

APPENDIX 4, number 1...APPENDIX 5, nr 1..APPENDIX 9 officially confirm, nature of Mr [REDACTED] illness.

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty, EVEN LEO FAY HIMSELF in APPENDIX 32 CONFIRMED what the three legal offices stress....

I note nature of the injury. In the Statute of Limitations time limit does not apply to your psychological-mental injury.

“...In the Statute of Limitations time limit does not apply to your psychological-mental injury”

However, several years later, on 26th September 2023 Leo Fay writes that [REDACTED]

4

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

was outside the time allowed

(see number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty this is unbelievable and this is not acceptable at all. **What is happening here?????**

According to Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors Mr [REDACTED] contacted them around 12th October 2014. Namely, Mr Fay, in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2, says...

2

[REDACTED] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

...and this incident, Mr Fay writes in number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2, "...arose on the 12th of April 2012..."



Ergo...

2.5 years after the incident.

...falls around 12th October 2014. What first happened is Leo Fay's date of incident "the 12th April 2012" then **441 days (14 months and 21 days) after** "the 12th April 2012" the real date of when Mr [redacted] contacted them - see dates of APPENDIX 27⁵⁰

Thu 27/06/2013 16:49

Sent: 27 June 2013 14:17

...what takes place then, **fifteen months and fifteen days**, AFTER 27th June 2013 is Leo Fay's...

2.5 years after the incident.

...or in other words, 12th October 2014. It is interesting to do a little more of simple mathematics. If we add 441 days (14 months and 21 days) and the foregoing 15 months and 15 days we get 30 months and five days which is PRECISELY Leo Fay's...

⁵⁰ (27th June 2013-when Mr [redacted] really contacted Leo Fay)

In appendix 27 Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, on 27th June 2013, writes....

"I added this to **the file** and would need more details in which way line manager put you out of his house and took his key from you"

I added this to **the file** and would need more details in which way line manager put you out of his house and took his key from you.

This, further, means that Mr [redacted] contacted Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors **EVEN BEFORE** 27th June 2013 as on this day Leo Fay **ALREADY HAD THE FILE** which came into being **BEFORE** 27th June 2013.

approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

This, further means that Leo Fay moved the real date when Mr [REDACTED] contacted them from..

Sent: 27 June 2013 14:17

(see APPENDIX 27)

...to

approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

(around 12th October 2014)

All this was the precondition of placing Mr [REDACTED] where he did not belong to i.e....

4

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

outside the time allowed

(see number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

Even if Leo Fay's assertions...

1

Dear Sirs,

the 12th of April 2012

The incident arose on

(see number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

2

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

(see number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

...and another assertion of Leo Fay that

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

was outside the time allowed

(see number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2)

...are correct – which are not – it is ABSOLUTELY IRRELEVANT because **THREE** we repeat **THREE** law offices: Coleman Legal LLP,⁵¹ Augustus Cullen Law⁵² and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors⁵³ talk about exceptions referring to mental-psychological injury which for instance APPENDIX 4, number 1...APPENDIX 5, nr 1..APPENDIX 9 officially testify about.

Even Leo Fay, himself, in APPENDIX 28 writes...

I note nature of the injury. In the Statute of Limitations time limit does not apply to your psychological-mental injury.

Leo

If we compare what the foregoing **THREE** legal offices and Leo Fay, himself, point to with what Leo Fay writes in number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2...

⁵¹ See appendix 24

⁵² See appendix 25

⁵³ See appendix 26

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

was outside the time allowed

...we open complex circumstances...

In the end, dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Brian Doherty, we would point out that we absolutely disagree with what Mr Leo Fay writes in number 5 of APPENDIX 2. He does not give **any evidence** supporting what he writes at this place. Mr Fay points out “His instructions” and according to Cambridge dictionary “Instruction”⁵⁴ refers to a...

“**WRITTEN** advice and information about how to do or use something”

written advice and information about how to do or use something:

Mr [REDACTED] has never given any (written or verbal) advice and information about how Leo Fay should do or use something and Mr Leo Fay does not give any evidence of “His instructions” he refers to in number 5 of APPENDIX 2.

Mr [REDACTED] only said that he would love to hear Leo Fay’s opinion⁵⁵ whether the case could be closed in a near future having in mind the fact that the Agreement Letter was signed on 30th

⁵⁴ See APPENDIX 30

⁵⁵ ...because **WE** have instructed Mr [REDACTED] to say so...

December 2015⁵⁶ - 90 (ninety) months or in other words TWO THOUSAND AND SEVEN HUNDRED DAYS before...

the day of June 2023

...Mr Fay refers to in number 5 of APPENDIX 2 and according to Cambridge dictionary that is not ‘instruction.’

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty, let us return to Cambridge dictionary and reiterate “Instruction”⁵⁷ refers to a...

“WRITTEN advice and information about how to do or use something”

written advice and information about how to do or use something:

We will give you a classical example of instruction in real life. Namely, in number 5...second page...APPENDIX 2 Mr Leo Fay writes...

APPENDIX 2

Page 2 of 2

it may be more beneficial to pursue the alternate route as suggested by his alternate legal advisers.

Yours Faithfully,

Leo Fay

5

Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors in the foregoing excerpt points to “suggestion” in verb form and the notion according to Cambridge dictionary means mentioning “...an action for other people to consider.”⁵⁸

On July 14, 2023 at 06:21 Mr Leo Fay received the correspondence...

⁵⁶ See fifth page of APPENDIX 29

⁵⁷ See APPENDIX 30

⁵⁸ See APPENDIX 36

an post

Proof of Delivery

For your world

Name: MJK
Delivery Date: 14 Jul 2023, 06:21
Signature:



Barcode(s) : RL542175718IE



On second page of this letter we (the victim's legal advisors) addressed directly to Leo Fay and mentioned.... "...an....action for other people [Leo Fay] to consider..."⁵⁹

we start, in phases, uploading ALL the material to internet as soon as possible. First, as we have already pointed out, the theoretical approach and then story of the exhibits in which one of central places belongs to the file of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors.

74 days after receiving this letter, on September 26, 2023⁶⁰

⁵⁹ See APPENDIX 37

⁶⁰ See nr 3...page 1...APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 2

Page 1 of 2



Baldoyle, Dublin 13

LSRA

DUBLIN 7.

Our Ref: LF/HB/PEU101/7278 You Ref23/9389

Date: 26th September 2023

...Leo Fay, in number 5...second page...APPENDIX 2, writes...

APPENDIX 2

Page 2 of 2

it may be more beneficial to pursue the alternate route as suggested by his alternate legal advisers.

Yours Faithfully,

Leo Fay

Let us, now, return to meaning of “Instruction”⁶¹ which according to Cambridge dictionary refers to a...

“**WRITTEN** advice and information about how to do or use something”

written advice and information about how to do or use something:

...this precisely and exactly refers to what Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors writes in number 5...second page...APPENDIX 2. Mr Leo Fay brilliantly demonstrated in practice what “instruction” looks like. We are grateful to Mr Fay and we have already followed his instruction and launched the website <https://questforjustice.net/>

⁶¹ See APPENDIX 30

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty that is the “instruction”Instruction is not what Mr Leo Fay refers to.

After all evidenced above it becomes clear that Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors from Baldoyle, in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2...



contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

...deliberately violated...

Section 14.- (1) (i)...Solicitors Act 1954⁶².....

Section 50...Legal Services Regulation Act 2015⁶³...

Section 10...Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001⁶⁴

After all evidenced above it becomes clear that Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors from Baldoyle, in number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2...

⁶² See APPENDIX 33

⁶³ See APPENDIX 35

⁶⁴ See APPENDIX 34

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

was outside the time allowed

...deliberately violated...

Section 14.- (1) (i)...Solicitors Act 1954⁶⁵.....

Section 50...Legal Services Regulation Act 2015⁶⁶...

Section 10...Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001⁶⁷

Dear Mr Paul X. Comerford and dear Mr Brian Doherty, it is clearly notable that Mr Leo Fay deliberately violated...

⁶⁵ See APPENDIX 33

⁶⁶ See APPENDIX 35

⁶⁷ See APPENDIX 34

Section 14.- (1) (i)...Solicitors Act 1954 THREE TIMES...

- in number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2
- in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2 and..
- in number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2

Section 50...Legal Services Regulation Act 2015 THREE TIMES...

- in number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2
- in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2 and..
- in number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2

Section 10...Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 THREE TIMES

- in number 1 on front page of APPENDIX 2
- in number 2 on front page of APPENDIX 2 and..
- in number 4 on front page of APPENDIX 2

October 17, 2023

Respectfully,

The Legal Advisors to Mr 



RL532770223IE

10:20 on 18 October 2023

We delivered your post

Delivered to Paul X. Comerford

an
post



RL532770230IE

10:20 on 18 October 2023

We delivered your post

Delivered to Brian Doherty

We, the legal advisors to Mr [REDACTED] point to these two postal receipts which testify that Paul X. Comerford – Complaints and Resolutions Officer and Brian Doherty – Chief Executive Officer, both of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the same file and when they received it. On 21st day **AFTER** the reception Paul X. Comerford brought his decision in form of the collection of criminal offences⁶⁸ and completely ignored undeniable facts and findings of this file – from the first to the last letter – literally everything. That is not acceptable!!!

⁶⁸ See number 1...front page...APPENDIX 31