

ANALIZA

On Wednesday, 2nd February 2022 at 12:30¹ I ordered, online, printing ink and printing paper.² Then, this morning, 3rd February 2022 - Thursday, when tracking my order I was able to see the following appendixes: APPENDIX THREE, APPENDIX FOUR and... 3 DELIVERY MISSING. Then I sent an online request to the Fastway,³ and AFTER that at 13:09 there was an incoming call and COURIER/SORTER 475 delivered me the parcel. The talk lasted one minute and zero seconds.⁴ It is very important to have in mind, particularly, time of the incoming call⁵ as SEVENTEEN minutes later⁶ I received the Fastway official e-mail advising me to look for my parcel at “....closed porch’s, shed’s, behind side gates or with a neighbour...” as my parcel at that time, according to the Fastway official was at the “safe delivery location” and I was requested to “....check the area’s highlighted...” – In this way the Fastway official **ACKNOWLEDGED** that I did NOT receive my parcel on 3rd February 2022 at 09:05:11⁷ However, in this way the Fastway official fell into their own trap⁸ because he CONFIRMS that at 13:26⁹ I do not have my parcel at my hands and advises me to look for it,¹⁰ **IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACT that SEVENTEEN MINUTES EARLIER I WAS DELIVERED MY PARCEL.**¹¹

This is the very clear example how discordant accordion of not telling truth works! The Fastway official **IGNORED** what I wrote in APPENDIXES FIVE, SIX, SEVEN, EIGHT and he particularly **IGNORED** what is pointed to in nr 1...APPENDIX NINE. His e-mail is absolute insolence because I DID NOT REQUEST MY PARCEL TO BE “DELIVERED TO A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION”¹² and ONLY [REDACTED] (**NOBODY ELSE**) was authorized to allow COURIER/SORTER 475¹³ to deliver the parcel “TO A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION”¹⁴

¹ See nr 1....APPENDIX ONE

² See nr 2....APPENDIX ONE and see also nr 1....APPENDIX TWO

³ See APPENDIX FIVE...APPENDIX SIX...APPENDIX SEVEN...APPENDIX EIGHT...APPENDIX NINE...APPENDIX TEN..... IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO VERY CAREFULLY READ THROUGH THIS ONLINE REQUEST

⁴ See APPENDIX ELEVEN (IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO REACH THE CONTENT OF THE TALK AND ON THE COURT REQUEST “VODAFONE”-MY INTERNET PROVIDER MUST DO IT...IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO MENTION THAT VODAFONE KEEP THE RECORD, I BELIEVE, SIX MONTHS- THAT WOULD ABSOLUTELY CONFIRM WHAT I SPEAK ABOUT.)

⁵ See nr 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN

⁶ See nr 1....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁷ See nr 1....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁸ This will be pointed to again

⁹ See nr 1....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹⁰ See nrs 9 and 10....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹¹ See nr 2.....APPENDIX ELEVEN

¹² See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹³ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

¹⁴ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

In addition, in my request I pointed out that “...I was ALL the time at home...”¹⁵ waiting for the parcel. So, Mr Conlon¹⁶ **DID** know what were the actions¹⁷ of their COURIER/SORTER 475.¹⁸ Having this in mind their COURIER/SORTER 475¹⁹ **DID KNOW** that on 3rd February 2022 at 09:05:11²⁰ HE WAS NOT ALLOWED TO CAPTURE/RECEIVE SIGNATURE ON PAPER²¹.....HE DID KNOW THAT HE WAS NOT ALLOWED TO DELIBERATELY DELIVER MY PARCEL²² AND RECEIVE A SIGNATURE²³ AT THE WRONG PLACE “A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION”²⁴ BECAUSE on 3rd February 2022 at 09:05:11²⁵ HE HAD IN FRONT OF HIS EYES “LABEL: 3C1000242157”²⁶ AND MY VERY PRECISE POSTAL ADDRESS, ZIP CODE, MY CELL PHONE NUMBER AND THE FOREGOING LABEL: 3C1000242157.²⁷

Due to that COURIER/SORTER 475²⁸ CANNOT say “after raising the alarm I returned to the safe delivery location picked up the parcel and brought it to R142.” FACT: THE SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION DOES NOT EXIST AND MY PARCEL WAS ALL THE TIME IN POSSESSION OF COURIER/SORTER 475.²⁹

AT 13:09³⁰ I RECEIVED MY PARCEL FROM COURIER/SORTER 475.³¹ WHICH UNDENIABLY MEANS THAT NRS 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7....APPENDIX TWELVE ARE MISLEADING,³² FALSE³³ AND DECEPTIVE³⁴ BECAUSE, AS ALREADY POINTED TO, AT 13:09³⁵ I WAS DELIVERED THE PARCEL BY COURIER/SORTER 475³⁶ AND SEVENTEEN MINUTES LATER³⁷ MY PARCEL WAS AT “A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION”³⁸....”CLOSED PORCH’S”³⁹.....”SHED’S”⁴⁰....”BEHIND SIDE GATES”⁴¹ or with “A NAIGHBOUR”⁴² This is the undeniable evidence of a “discordant accordion of avoiding truth”⁴³ due to the following:

¹⁵ See nr 1....APPENDIX EIGHT

¹⁶ See nr 3....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹⁷ See nrs 1, 2, 3 and 4.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

¹⁸ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

¹⁹ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

²⁰ See nr 1....3 DELIVERY MISSING

²¹ See nr 2 and 3....3 DELIVERY MISSING

²² See nr 4....3 DELIVERY MISSING

²³ See nr 33 DELIVERY MISSING

²⁴ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

²⁵ See nr 1....3 DELIVERY MISSING

²⁶ See nr 4....3 DELIVERY MISSING and see also nr 1....APPENDIX FOURTEEN

²⁷ See nr 2 and nr 1....APPENDIX FOURTEEN and see also APPENDIX THIRTEEN and APPENDIX FIFTEEN

²⁸ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

²⁹ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

³⁰ See nr 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN

³¹ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

³² See APPENDIX MISLEADING

³³ See APPENDIX FALSE

³⁴ See APPENDIX DECEPTIVE

³⁵ See nr 2... APPENDIX ELEVEN

³⁶ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

³⁷ See nr 1....APPENDIX TWELVE

³⁸ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

³⁹ See nr 4....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴⁰ See nr 7....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴¹ See nr 5....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴² See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴³ see section 10.- (1) (c) hereunder - this is particularly brutal violation of section 10.- (c)

1. Mr Conlon MAY NOT HAVE WRITTEN THE ACCOUNT in number 2.....APPENDIX TWELVE because number 1....APPENDIX EIGHT and nrs 1 and 2APPENDIX FOURTEEN RESOLUTELY order Forrest Conlon⁴⁴ NOT TO WRITE what he wrote in number 2.....APPENDIX TWELVE. (This is the downright confession)
2. The Fastway DO NOT HAVE evidence that I have authorized them to deliver my parcel to a safe delivery location⁴⁵....such evidence DOSE NOT EXIST
3. The Fastway DO NOT HAVE evidence that they informed me about what is written in nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVEBEFORE....I repeat.....BEFORE I raised the alarm⁴⁶ Forrest Conlon⁴⁷ responded to⁴⁸ (SUCH EVIDENCE DOES NOT EXIST) which means if I did not raise the alarm, APPENDIX TWELVE would not have come into being

Again, principles of logical reasoning⁴⁹ as well as theory of probability^{50, 51} impose the following: If I had authorized the Fastway to deliver my parcel to a safe delivery location and if I had authorized the foregoing “a safe delivery location”....”closed porch’s”....”shed’s”....”behind side gates” and “a neighbour” TO TAKE (instead of me) my parcel then I would have been given it by them and NOT by COURIER/SORTER 475⁵² and I WOULD NOT HAVE RAISED THE ALARM⁵³ because “I have given the authorization”....So let the Fastway SHOW my “authorization” or my “request” for delivering my parcel to the “safe delivery location.”

⁴⁴ See nr 3...APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴⁵ See nr 2...APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴⁶ See APPENDIX FIVE, SIX, SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE and TEN

⁴⁷ See nr 3...APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴⁸ See nrs 1 and 8.....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁴⁹ Schneck, D. (2008) “Seven Basic Principles of Logical Reasoning”, *American Laboratory*, Volume 40, No 14, pp. 4-5

See also....APPENDIX LOGICAL REASONING

⁵⁰ de Finetti, B. (2017) *Theory of Probability: A Critical Introductory Treatment*, John Willey & Sons Ltd, Chichester-West Sussex

⁵¹ Gillies, D. (2000) *Philosophical Theories of Probability*, Routledge, London

⁵² See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁵³ See APPENDIX FIVE, SIX, SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE and TEN

THEY CANNOT DO IT BECAUSE THEY DO NOT HAVE IT AND THEY DO NOT HAVE IT BECAUSE IT DOES NOT EXIST- that is what renders nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE... MISLEADING,⁵⁴ FALSE⁵⁵ AND DECEPTIVE⁵⁶ violating section 10 of Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act, 2001 (see page 11) as follows:

- 10.- (1)
- 10.- (1) (a)
- 10.- (1) (c)
- 10.- (2)
- 10.- (2) (a)

HE (COURIER/SORTER 475⁵⁷ AND NOT “a safe delivery location”⁵⁸.....”closed porch’s”⁵⁹.....”shed’s”⁶⁰.....”behind side gates”⁶¹ and “a neighbour”⁶²) used the mobile phone number⁶³ to let me know that he brought my parcel.

Once more logical reasoning⁶⁴ , if I had authorized “a safe delivery location”⁶⁵.....”closed porch’s”⁶⁶.....”shed’s”⁶⁷.....”behind side gates”⁶⁸ and “a neighbour”⁶⁹ to take my parcel from COURIER/SORTER 475⁷⁰ then I would have complained to THEM and NOT to the Fastway⁷¹ who NOW MUST be legally forced to bring the investigation to “a safe delivery location”⁷².....”closed porch’s”⁷³.....”shed’s”⁷⁴.....”behind side gates”⁷⁵ and to “a neighbour”⁷⁶ WHOSE signature (see nrs 2 and 3.....3 DELIVERY MISSING) was captured (received) and who would have to confirm (or deny) whether they did sign the delivery.

⁵⁴ See APPENDIX MISLEADING

⁵⁵ See APPENDIX FALSE

⁵⁶ See APPENDIX DECEPTIVE

⁵⁷ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁵⁸ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁵⁹ See nr 4....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶⁰ See nr 7....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶¹ See nr 5....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶² See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE-WHO DELIVERED MY PARCEL IS NOT MY NEIGHBOUR

⁶³ See nr 1....APPENDIX ELEVEN

⁶⁴ Schneck, D. (2008) “Seven Basic Principles of Logical Reasoning”, *American Laboratory*, Volume 40, No 14, pp. 4-5

See also....APPENDIX LOGICAL REASONING

⁶⁵ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶⁶ See nr 4....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶⁷ See nr 7....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶⁸ See nr 5....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁶⁹ See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁷⁰ See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁷¹ See APPENDICES FIVE to TEN

⁷² See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁷³ See nr 4....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁷⁴ See nr 7....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁷⁵ See nr 5....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁷⁶ See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE

If they confirm they would also have to prove that I authorized⁷⁷ them to sign the delivery. This mysterious signature⁷⁸ obviously exists and the key is the OWNERSHIP of that signature. It is important to stress that courier/sorter 475⁷⁹ requested me to sign the reception of my parcel at 13:09 on Thursday, 3rd February 2022⁸⁰ and I did it. Knowing this it is necessary to check whether my signature at 13:09 still exists.

I did not authorize COURIER/SORTER 475⁸¹ to deliver my parcel to “a safe delivery location”⁸²,

I did not authorize COURIER/SORTER 475⁸³ to deliver my parcel to “closed porch’s”⁸⁴

I did not authorize COURIER/SORTER 475⁸⁵ to deliver my parcel to “shed’s”⁸⁶

I did not authorize COURIER/SORTER 475⁸⁷ to deliver my parcel to “behind side gates”⁸⁸

I did not authorize COURIER/SORTER 475⁸⁹ to deliver my parcel to “a neighbour”⁹⁰

I did not authorize “a safe delivery location”⁹¹ to take my parcel from COURIER/SORTER 475⁹²

I did not authorize “closed porch’s”⁹³ to take my parcel from COURIER/SORTER 475⁹⁴

I did not authorize “shed’s”⁹⁵ to take my parcel from COURIER/SORTER 475⁹⁶

I did not authorize “behind side gates”⁹⁷ to take my parcel from COURIER/SORTER 475⁹⁸

I did not authorize “a neighbour”⁹⁹ to take my parcel from COURIER/SORTER 475¹⁰⁰

I did not authorize ANYONE to sign the delivery on my behalf. Having this in mind entries nr 2 and nr 3.....3 DELIVERY MISSING violate section 10 of Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act, 2001 as follows:

⁷⁷ I DID NOT AUTHORIZE ANY THIRD PARTY TO RECEIVE/TAKE my parcel

⁷⁸ See nrs 2 and 3.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁷⁹ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁸⁰ See nr 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN

⁸¹ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁸² See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁸³ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁸⁴ See nr 4....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁸⁵ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁸⁶ See nr 7....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁸⁷ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁸⁸ See nr 5....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁸⁹ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁹⁰ See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁹¹ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁹² See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁹³ See nr 4....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁹⁴ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁹⁵ See nr 7....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁹⁶ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁹⁷ See nr 5....APPENDIX TWELVE

⁹⁸ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

⁹⁹ See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹⁰⁰ See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING

- 10.- (1)
- 10.- (1) (a)
- 10.- (1) (c)
- 10.- (2)
- 10.- (2) (a)

The foregoing factual condition is UNDENIABLE evidence that nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE IS MISLEADING,¹⁰¹ FALSE¹⁰² AND DECEPTIVE,¹⁰³ ALL at the same time. Another UNDENIABLE evidence that nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE IS MISLEADING, FALSE AND DECEPTIVE is the time difference of SEVENTEEN MINUTES, between 13:09¹⁰⁴ AND 13:26.¹⁰⁵ Namely, in nr 9...APPENDIX TWELVE ..Mr Conlon AFFIRMS that I have not reached my parcel by 13:26¹⁰⁶ ADVISING me to “CHECK THE AREA’S HIGHLIGHTED”¹⁰⁷ in order to reach my parcel AND THEN¹⁰⁸ IN THE SECOND PART OF HIS THOUGHT IF I DO NOT FIND MY PARCEL AT THE “SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION” Mr Conlon advises me to contact him again.¹⁰⁹ WHAT EXPOSED THE TERRIBLE AVOIDING TRUTH IS THE FACT THAT SEVENTEEN MINUTES BEFORE APPENDIX TWELVE CAME INTO BEING I ALREADY HAD MY PARCEL IN MY HANDS.¹¹⁰ ALL THIS IS THE UNDENIABLE EVIDENCE THAT Mr Conlon¹¹¹ and courier/sorter 475¹¹² (and NOT ME) accuse themselves of a horrible avoiding truth and criminal offence-THAT IS THE FACT!!! These circumstances have already been explained earlier in the analysis.

In this way APPENDIX TWELVE, as the whole, violates section 10 of Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act, 2001 as follows:

- 10.- (1)
- 10.- (1) (a)
- 10.- (1) (c)
- 10.- (2)
- 10.- (2) (a)

We see how ID of courier/sorter is changing....It is first 979 (see APPENDIX THREE), then NS2 (see APPENDIX FOUR), then EXTREMELY INTERESTING ID OF THE COURIER/SORTER....THE FINAL COURIER/SORTER ID.... 475 EMERGING TWO TIMES (see APPENDIX FOUR) So this ID (courier/sorter 475) is responsible for the following data (see APPENDIX FOUR)

¹⁰¹ See APPENDIX MISLEADING

¹⁰² See APPENDIX FALSE

¹⁰³ See APPENDIX DECEPTIVE

¹⁰⁴ See nr 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN (THIS IS TIME WHEN I CAME INTO POSSESSION OF MY PARCEL)

¹⁰⁵ See nr 1...APPENDIX TWELVE (THIS IS TIME WHEN MISLEADING, FALSE AND DECEPTIVE ACCOUNT IN NR 2....APPENDIX TWELVE CAME INTO BEING)

¹⁰⁶ See nr 1....APPENDIX TWELVE (nr 9....APPENDIX TWELVE in other words means “ [REDACTED] DID NOT receive the parcel by 13:26....see nr 1....APPENDIX TWELVE”)

¹⁰⁷ This is the place where the first part of Mr Conlon’s thought ends.

¹⁰⁸ AFTER CHECKING (in the second part of the thought)

¹⁰⁹ See nr 10....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹¹⁰ See APPENDIX ELEVEN

¹¹¹ See nr 3....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹¹² See nr 5....3 DELIVERY MISSING

2022-02-03 08:50:43

On Board with Courier

Your parcel is on the way! Our courier loaded it onto their van.

2022-02-03 09:05:11

Signature captured on paper.

Your parcel has been delivered and a signature received.

Knowing this, we are in circumstances in which theory of probability^{113, 114} and particularly principles of logical reasoning¹¹⁵ IMPOSE THE CONCLUSION THAT THE PERSON WHO PHONED ME AT 13:09 AND DELIVERED THE PARCEL¹¹⁶ IS IN FACT “COURIER/SORTER 475” BECAUSE “COURIER/SORTER 475” IS THE LAST IN THE LINE AND THE ONLY POSSIBLE COURIER/SORTER ID WHO COULD HAVE DELIVERED MY PARCEL AND WHO COULD HAVE USED THE CELL PHONE pointed to in nr 1....APPENDIX ELEVEN.

¹¹³ de Finetti, B. (2017) *Theory of Probability: A Critical Introductory Treatment*, John Willey & Sons Ltd, Chichester-West Sussex

¹¹⁴ Gillies, D. (2000) *Philosophical Theories of Probability*, Routledge, London

¹¹⁵ Schneck, D. (2008) “Seven Basic Principles of Logical Reasoning”, *American Laboratory*, Volume 40, No 14, pp. 4-5

See also....APPENDIX LOGICAL REASONING

¹¹⁶ See APPENDIX ELEVEN

One more point which confirms the foregoing:

The person who phoned me¹¹⁷ IS NOT MY NEIGHBOUR¹¹⁸ because I have been living at R14[REDACTED]2 for more than EIGHT years and DO KNOW ALL MY NEIGHBOURS WELL. So, WHO is the person who phoned me¹¹⁹he is the courier/sorter 475.¹²⁰ It is also important to point out that I would not have wanted to accept the parcel if the unknown person attempted to deliver the parcel. I would not have wanted to accept the delivery even from my neighbour BECAUSE (I repeat once again) I had not authorized THE FASTWAY to deliver my parcel to A THIRD PARTY or THE THIRD PARTY to receive my parcel from THE FASTWAY on my behalf. This is another evidence that the person who phoned me¹²¹ is the courier/sorter 475¹²²

Then we have the following fact that the same courier/sorter 475 claims the following¹²³

2022-02-03 09:05:11

Signature captured on paper.

Your parcel has been delivered and a signature received.

If the foregoing happened as the courier/sorter 475 claims then WHAT....WHAT.... was delivered to me at 13:09.¹²⁴

So courier/sorter 475 delivered my parcel to “a safe delivery location”¹²⁵ “a safe delivery location” is not [REDACTED] and one of the crucial points is that [REDACTED] DID NOT, I REPEAT, DID NOT REQUEST “A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION” SO WHY COURIER/SORTER 475 “DELIVERED” MY PARCEL TO “A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION” WHEN [REDACTED] DID NOT REQUEST IT AND DID NOT

¹¹⁷ See nrs 1 and 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN

¹¹⁸ See nr 6....APPENDIX TWELVE

¹¹⁹ See nrs 1 and 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN

¹²⁰ See nr 5...3 DELIVERY MISSING

¹²¹ See nrs 1 and 2....APPENDIX ELEVEN

¹²² See nr 5.....3 DELIVERY MISSING.

¹²³ See..... 3 DELIVERY MISSING

¹²⁴ See APPENDIX ELEVEN

¹²⁵ See nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE

AUTHORIZE FASTWAY TO DELIVER MY PARCEL TO A SAFE DELIVERY LOCATION.

COURIER/SORTER 475 DID NOT DELIVER MY PARCEL TO R14 [REDACTED] 2 WHERE [REDACTED] EXPLICITLY REQUESTED (see nr 2....APPENDIX FOURTEEN) AND COURIER/SORTER 475 WAS AWARE OF THIS R14 [REDACTED] 2¹²⁶ THESE CIRCUMSTANCES ARE VERY CLEAR....

COURIER/SORTER 475 HAS TO SHOW WHERE PHYSICALLY IS THE “Safe delivery location” (see nr 2....APPENDIX TWELVE), apart from it HE HAS TO SHOW (see nrs 2 and 3.....3 DELIVERY MISSING)

Signature captured on paper.

a signature received.

He also has to show both the signature and the person who signed the delivery at “Safe delivery location” because that signature is NOT mine.... I was NOT at “Safe delivery location”... I was and I am at R14 [REDACTED] 2 and that is NOT “Safe delivery location”

One thing is certain “safe delivery location” does not have code R14 [REDACTED] 2. THIS IS THE CODE THAT ONLY [REDACTED] HAS WHAT IS CONFIRMED BY THE PARCEL LABEL (see nr 2....APPENDIX FOURTEEN) WHICH FURTHER MEANS THAT THIS ENTRY (AS ALREADY EXPLAINED EARLIER)¹²⁷

Your goods are confirmed delivered to a safe delivery location , safe delivery locations are normally closed porch's , shed's , behind side gates or with a neighbour .

....IS MISLEADING, FALSE AND DECEPTIVE VIOLATING THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE (THEFT AND FRAUD OFFENCES) ASCT 2001 (see page 11)

- 10.- (1)
- 10.- (1) (a)
- 10.- (1) (c)
- 10.- (2)
- 10.- (2) (a)

¹²⁶ See nr 2....APPENDIX FOURTEEN

¹²⁷ See APPENDIX TWELVE

The facts is that the courier/sorter 475 phoned me at 13:09 what happened AFTER my alarm. HOWEVER there was NO incoming call at 09:05:11 – WHY???? BECAUSE THE COURIER/SORTER DID NOT HAVE ANY INTENTION TO DELIVER THE PARCEL TO R14[REDACTED]2. He could have easily done it because label on the parcel¹²⁸ prevents him to deny his rejecting to deliver my parcel to me. That label contains my very clear: POSTAL ADDRESS, ZIP CODE R14[REDACTED]2, MY CELL PHONE NR AND THE TRACKING NUMBER (see APPENDIX FOURTEEN)¹²⁹

2022-02-03 09:05:11

HOW COME THAT FIRST TIME AT 475 did not locate R14[REDACTED]2 and AFTER MY ALARM HE DID FIND R14[REDACTED]2 having in mind ONLY 3 HOURS 3 MINUTES AND 49 SECONDS TIME DIFFERENCE. courier/sorter

Questions: why to “a safe delivery location”

2022-02-03 09:05:11

Why I was not phoned at

AFTER ALL I DID NOT GET MY PARCEL FROM “a safe delivery location” but as proved above from courier/sorter 475

¹²⁸ See APPENDIX FOURTEEN

¹²⁹ See nrs 1 and 2....APPENDIX FOURTEEN

[2001.] *Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud [No. 50.]
Offences) Act, 2001.*

(6) A person who is arrested pursuant to this section by a person other than a member of the Garda Síochána shall be transferred by that person into the custody of the Garda Síochána as soon as practicable. Pr.2 S.8

(7) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine not exceeding £3,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years or both.

9.—(1) A person who dishonestly, whether within or outside the State, operates or causes to be operated a computer within the State with the intention of making a gain for himself or herself or another, or of causing loss to another, is guilty of an offence. Unlawful use of computer.

(2) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years or both.

10.—(1) A person is guilty of an offence if he or she dishonestly, with the intention of making a gain for himself or herself or another, or of causing loss to another— False accounting.

(a) destroys, defaces, conceals or falsifies any account or any document made or required for any accounting purpose,

(b) fails to make or complete any account or any such document, or

(c) in furnishing information for any purpose produces or makes use of any account, or any such document, which to his or her knowledge is or may be misleading, false or deceptive in a material particular.

(2) For the purposes of this section a person shall be treated as falsifying an account or other document if he or she—

(a) makes or concurs in making therein an entry which is or may be misleading, false or deceptive in a material particular, or

(b) omits or concurs in omitting a material particular therefrom.

(3) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine or imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years or both.

11.—(1) A person is guilty of an offence if he or she dishonestly, with the intention of making a gain for himself or herself or another, or of causing loss to another, destroys, defaces or conceals any valuable security, any will or other testamentary document or any original document of or belonging to, or filed or deposited in, any court or any government department or office. Suppression, etc., of documents.

(2) (a) A person who dishonestly, with the intention of making a gain for himself or herself or another, or of causing loss to another, by any deception procures the execution of a valuable security is guilty of an offence.

(b) Paragraph (a) shall apply in relation to—