Let us go further. Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[1] in Section 10.- (2) (b) stresses the concept of omission[2] which in verb form means "….to leave out or leave unmentioned.." while omission one[3] similarly defines the meaning as "to fail to include or do something". So, according to section (2) (b) a person is….

treated as falsifying an account or other document if he

….. omits or leaves out (nr 1 – appendix 1), leaves unmentioned (nr 2 – appendix 1) or fails to include or do something (appendix 2) and "something" in this case is a material particular - Section 2.- (b).

This is explained in the dictionary as a specific…..detail of information[4] having an important effect[5]

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, in his document dated 26th September 2023[6] writes…..

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

This is all heavily misleading[7], false[8] and deceptive[9] because the incident did not arise "…on the 12th of April 2012…." but on 2nd August 2012 and Leo Fay was fully aware of this[10] –

….its highness: evidence…

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received[11] the parcel of documents weighing 5115 grams[12] and the parcel looked like this.[13]

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

1.1 In this appendix page nine[14] confirms that the accident took place on 2nd August 2012 and not on 12th April 2012.

[1] See appendix 9
[2] See appendix 1
[3] See appendix 2
[4] See appendix 3
[5] See appendix 4
[6] See appendix 5
[7] See appendix 6
[8] See appendix 7
[9] See appendix 8
[10] See appendix 9
[11] See appendix 10
[12] See appendix 11
[13] See appendix 114 showing also date of posting and the delivery date.
[14] See appendix 12

2. In that parcel Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received file SEPTEMBER 2020 and in its ANALYSIS ONE REVISED VERSION page 43[15] testifies TWO TIMES that the accident at work happened on 2nd August 2012.

3. In that parcel Fay Leo received file MAY 2022 and in number 12 in its APPENDIX SIX Eileen Loughlin[16] confirms that the accident at work took place on 2nd August and not on 12th April 2012.

4. In that parcel Leo Fay received file SEPTEMBER 2021; in its APPENDIX THE FILE document 66[17] 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 31[18] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[19] 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 32[20] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[21] which confirms TWO times (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

4.1.3..…page 49[22] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[23] 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 54[24] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[25] 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 58[26] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[27] 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 13
[16] See appendix 14
[17] See appendix 15
[18] See APPENDIX 98
[19] See APPENDIX 99
[20] See APPENDIX 100
[21] See APPENDIX 99
[22] See APPENDIX 101
[23] See APPENDIX 99
[24] See APPENDIX 102
[25] See APPENDIX 99
[26] See APPENDIX 103
[27] See APPENDIX 99

4.1.6.…page 59[28] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[29] 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 28[30] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[31] 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 Fay Leo received file MAY 2022 and its appendix newbridge[32] 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 TEN[33] 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 4[34] TWO times refers to APPENDIX TEN and "Chief Appeals Officer in his decision"[35] which confirms TWO TIMES (highlighted in green) that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12 April 2012.

5.2.2. …page 10[36] FOUR times refers to APPENDIX TEN[37] 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 17[38] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[39] 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 20[40] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[41] 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.

[28] See APPENDIX 104
[29] See APPENDIX 99
[30] See APPENDIX 105
[31] See APPENDIX 99
[32] See appendix 16
[33] See appendix 17
[34] See APPENDIX 106
[35] See APPENDIX 107
[36] See APPENDIX 108
[37] See APPENDIX 107
[38] See APPENDIX 109
[39] See APPENDIX 107
[40] See APPENDIX 110
[41] See APPENDIX 107

5.2.5. …page 25[42] ONE time refers to APPENDIX TEN[43] 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.

The foregoing facts testify that Leo Fay omitted the material particular that the incident arose on 2nd August 2012 and fraudulently replaced it with 12th April 2012….After all pointed to above it is notable that this gentleman heavily and brutally violated sections 10.- (2) (b); 10[44].- (1) (a)…10.- (1) (c) and 10.- (2) (a) Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 – pointed to earlier in this analysis. We particularly refer to nature of what Leo Fay perpetrated as documented above – having in mind…

1. Concept of *actus reus* - see:

Campbell, L. *et. al.* (2021) "Actus Reus", *Criminal Law in Ireland: Cases and Commentary*, Clarus Press Ltd, Dublin 8, pp. 71 – 107

Mc Auley, F. and McCutcheon, J. P. (2022) "Actus Reus", *Criminal Liability*, Thomsin Reuters (Professional) Ireland Limited, Dublin 1, pp. 209 – 305

2. Concept of *mens rea* – see:

Campbell, L. *et. al.* (2021) "Mens Rea", *Criminal Law in Ireland: Cases and Commentary*, Clarus Press Ltd, Dublin 8, pp. 109 – 175

Mc Auley, F. and McCutcheon, J. P. (2022) "Mens Rea", *Criminal Liability*, Thomsin Reuters (Professional) Ireland Limited, Dublin 1, pp. 473 – 551

Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority ignored the handwork of this individual which is not legally acceptable particularly having in mind what is evidenced in the analysis. Such conduct of this employee the Legal Services Regulatory Authority produced this Request for Access to Personal Information.[45] Brian Doherty – Chief Executive Officer in Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the request on 4th December.[46] However, the most horrific in all this are roles of the two prominent figures: Helen McEntee, minister for justice and Catherine Pierse, director of public prosecutions who conceal this crime and protect the perpetrators. Evidence – see post: Director of Public Prosecutions – https://questforjustice.net/director-of-public-prosecutions-update-19-1-24/ .

We suggest that Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy look closer at the Solicitor's Guide to Professional Conduct issued by the Guidance and Ethics Committee of the Law Society. There they will find words of wisdom[47] of the Honourable Ms Justice Mary Irvine, President of the High Court 2022….We suggest them to very, very carefully read the guide through.

This Guide, in first chapter (page 13), says…..

[42] See APPENDIX 111
[43] See APPENDIX 107
[44] See appendix 18
[45] See appendix 19
[46] See appendix 20
[47] See appendix 21

Solicitors must serve the interests of justice. Barron J set out the obligation of the solicitor in *Doran v Delaney*, Supreme Court [1998] 2IR 61 as follows:

"The solicitor is not a conduit pipe. Once he is acting professionally, he warrants that so far as his own acts are concerned, he has taken the care and applied the skill and knowledge expected of a member of his profession.

The solicitor's function, therefore, imposes a variety of legal and moral obligations on the solicitor

(page 14)

Rules of professional conduct are designed to assist the proper performance by a solicitor of their duties and functions in practice. Solicitors, whether in private practice or the in-house and public sector, share the same professional standards of conduct.

Solicitors should also be mindful of the statutory duties provided for under the *General Data Protection Regulation*

.....then interesting notes can be found on pages 15 and 16.[48] All that deserves to be thoroughly analysed and compared with what Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy have committed. Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, in document dated 26th September 2023[49], continues…..

Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

"contacted US"….WHOM?????.....we will explain this somewhat later when clarifying "We wish" in the assertion hereunder….

We wish to point out that at all times

It is indeed important to point to what really stands behind this assertion.

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

From 12th April through 2nd August 2012 one hundred and eleven days exist. First Leo Fay must show the evidence that ……

[48] See appendix 22
[49] See appendix 5

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

…..because the incident CANNOT arise BOTH on 12th April and on 2nd August 2012. We have carefully analysed the principles of logical reasoning[50] and concluded that this assertion…

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

….was moved backwords 111 days for some reason. Even a shallow look at 26th September 2023[51] easily reveals what really stands behind moving 111 days backwards. Then in the second part Leo Fay asserts that the victim…..

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

The question remaining why…..**2.5 years**

Very interesting formulation Mr Fay gave in the fifth paragraph[52] from above…..

he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

After this the eyes immediately fall on whether this assertion explains moving the foregoing one hundred and eleven days backwards or not. Let us now see what is exactly…..

the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

We have already mentioned in the beginning of 3rd page that Mr Brian Doherty – Chief Executive Officer received on 4th December[53] the Request for Access to Personal Information.[54] Following it on 7th December 2023[55] Orla Corcoran, data protection officer of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority responded and acknowledged the reception. She confirmed that they will provide the victim with the requested information within one month or if an extension is needed they, she writes, will notify about that. We include the response of Orla Corcoran so that everyone can very carefully compare[56] content of her letter[57] with the content of the foregoing Request for Access to Personal Information.[58] What will happen remains to be seen and we will, certainly, notify the Court of International Public in due course.

---

[50] See appendix 23
[51] See appendix 5
[52] See appendix 24
[53] See appendix 20
[54] See appendix 19
[55] See appendix 26
[56] This is very important
[57] See appendix 26
[58] See appendix 19

According to Personal Law Solicitors – Coleman Legal Partners…..

the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

….is two years less than one day.[59] Apart from that this law office clearly state that the period in which a person can bring a claim for Breach of Contract is six years.[60] Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors can you find connection between what this law office says and your law office? That point might make Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority disappointed. Why? This is why….The second set of documents that the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[61] gives evidence that Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors breached TWO contracts and Paul Comerford (as expert in law field) nowhere in his review[62] points to that. Paul Comerford…..NOW WHAT????????????? PAUL COMERFORD WHY DID YOU FAIL TO POINT TO THIS??????? Let us now see what Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 says in its section 10.[63] Important is a closer look at meaning of 'material particular' because section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with section 10.- (2) (b) point to these two words. Dictionary recognizes them as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[64] "…having an important effect…" (material)[65] We now return to the second set of documents which Paul Comerford had in front of his eyes because the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the file on 17th October 2023.[66] Apart from the second set Paul Comerford (it is very important to stress) had also the first set of documents in front of his eyes as the Authority received it on 25th August 2023.[67] The second set clearly evidenced that law office Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors breached the TWO Agreement Letters and that "…specific…. detail of information.." (particular)[68] …."…having an important effect…" (material)[69] cannot be found in review[70] of Mr Paul Comerford. Hence, section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with section 10.- (2) (b) applies.

Once more, Colleman Legal Partners clearly state that a person can file a claim, for breaching contract, within six years.[71]


The victim, in this way – publicly, is filing a claim against Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, before the Court of International Public, for breaching the TWO Agreement Letters. As we have already mentioned breaching these two contracts is explained and evidenced in the second set of documents we pointed to above. We will publish both the first[72] and the second[73] set that

[59] See appendix 25
[60] See appendix 25
[61] See appendix 27
[62] See appendix 28
[63] See appendix 30
[64] See appendix 31
[65] See appendix 32
[66] See appendix 27
[67] See appendix 29….see also appendix 54
[68] See appendix 31
[69] See appendix 32
[70] See appendix 28
[71] See appendix 25
[72] See appendix 29
[73] See appendix 27


the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received as soon as possible, irrespective of whether and when they respond to the Request for Access to Personal Information.

After all evidence we pointed to so far it is easily notable that review[74] of Paul Comerford is chock-full of criminal offences. The Court of International Public will bring the verdict.


Returning to criminal offences evidenced in document of Leo Fay which came into being on 26th September 2023[75] we point to another question remaining: on which day would the 2.5 years period end having in mind 12th April 2012 and on which day would the 2.5 years period end having in mind 2nd August 2012. We again stress the one hundred and eleven days (we spoke about on pages 5 and 6) PARTICULARLY, we repeat, PARTICULARLY focusing on APPROXIMATELY in this excerpt (second paragraph – appendix 24)…



How can we, Leo Fay or anyone, know whether the victim contacted Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors within the rule of "two years less than one day"[76] if Leo Fay writes ……APPROXIMATELY and on top of everything else he moves the incident one hundred and eleven days backwards. Ergo, who would be believed if for instance the victim says that he contacted them APPROXIMATELLY fourteen months and fifteen days after the incident. What will happen if we reach (and publish on this website) the evidence of fourteen months and fifteen days. Would that evidence be stronger than Leo Fay's deliberate avoiding the truth……



….which is NOT the evidence….Why should anyone take ……



…..for granted particularly having in mind Leo Fay's deliberate violation of law in words…..

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

….that are not tolerable as said in section 10.- (1) Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001.

[74] See appendix 28
[75] See appendix 24
[76] See appendix 25

Dictionary.com clearly defines dishonesty as "lack of honesty; a disposition to lie, cheat, or steal" [77]

The foregoing entry is all misleading[78], false[79] and deceptive[80] and pages 1, 2 and 3 of this analysis are undeniable example in real life what the foregoing definition in dictionary.com points to.

approximately along with one hundred and eleven days (explained above on pages 5 and 6) renders this assertion of Kenedy Solicitors employee …..

he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…..inacceptable and ineffective because Leo Fay DID NOT PROVE IN ANY WAY that the victim…..

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

We now enter more interesting setting. Even if Leo Fay proved this period of 2.5 years after the incident (WHICH HE DID NOT) it would be absolutely IRRELEVANT in these circumstances and he was and is aware of it. Namely, McMahon Goldrick Solicitors write that the "two year less one day" time limit DOES NOT apply in cases in which "…the injured party is mentally impaired as a result of sustaining their injury"[81]

Even Leo Fay, himself, seven years earlier writes in document nr 25 he and Michael J. Kennedy[82] concealed…

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

Comparing what Leo Fay writes in the fifth paragraph[83] from above…..

he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

---

[77] See appendix 33
[78] See appendix 6
[79] See appendix 7
[80] See appendix 8
[81] See appendix 34
[82] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[83] See appendix 24

…..and what he writes in appendix 43

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

…..testifies of not only his character of personality and the horrific criminal offence he perpetrated but these circumstances do confirm that behaviour of Leo Fay is not acceptable. Appendix 93 says…..

If you've got a brain but you don't use it, you might be a bit *stupid*.

However we do not say that Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors is stupid; this analysis only points to his criminal offences and his unacceptable behaviour.

Irrespective of such character of personality Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors holds his practicing certificate since 1997.[84] What knowledge did he demonstrate at the examination?! However, having in mind evidenced criminal activity of Law Society of Ireland and its director Mark Garrett it is not a surprise, at all, that they have awarded him approval to perform legal services. See post *Law Society of Ireland* (regularly updated). We will look more closely at certificates for legal practitioners and Solicitors Act 1954 somewhat later in the analysis.

Ergo, these individuals and institutions…..

1. Helen McEntee – Minister for Justice
2. Nial Colgan[85] – Department for Justice
3. Catherine Pierse – Director for Public Prosecutions
4. Michael J. Kennedy – Solicitor
5. Leo Fay – Solicitor
6. Brian Doherty – Legal Services Regulatory Authority
7. Michael Doran – Legal Services regulatory Authority
8. Shannon Hallisey – Legal Services Regulatory Authority
9. Paul Comerford – Legal Services Regulatory Authority
10. Mark Garrett – Law Society of Ireland
11. Des Hogan – Data Protection Commission
12. Dale Sunderland – Data Protection Commission
13. Gemma Walsh – Data Protection Commission

[84] See appendix 76

[85] Testimony of what this criminal perpetrated will be published at a later phase. In March 2017 Nial Colgan was private secretary to then Justice Minister Frances Fitzgerald

14. John Z. Cowap – Data Protection Commission

….. as only one part of this organized crime network "protect" justice in the Republic of Ireland today?! How they do that *Quest for Justice* testify…..

Clarifying concealing document nr 25 we refer to Data Protection Commission who received[86] the file pointing to all documents that Leo Fay failed to provide the victim with and never posted the reminder of the documents.[87] In the 64 – page list[88] which Ms Gemma Walsh of Data Protection Commission received[89] what exists is page 61 and on it yellow-highlighted document nr 25.[90] We now show content of that document.[91]

Apart from Data Protection Commission the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received[92] the file enumerating all documents which Leo Fay failed to provide the victim with and never sent the reminder of the documents.[93] In analysis of that file what exists is page 74 and on it yellow-highlighted document nr 25[94] This is document 25.[95]

We have in mind psychological injury and we will explain it more in the further text of this analysis. Let us return to second paragraph in appendix 24. At this place Leo Fay writes that the victim….

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

---

[86] See appendix 37
[87] See appendix 35

[88] ….and appendixes:

13-page Appendix cell phone
1- page Appendix deceptive
1- page Appendix eight one
1- page Appendix eight two
10-page Appendix eleven
1- page Appendix false
1- page Appendix five
1- page Appendix four
1- page Appendix material
1- page Appendix misleading
1- page Appendix one
1- page Appendix particular
1- page Appendix seven
1- page Appendix six
1- page Appendix three
1- page Appendix two

[89] See appendix 37
[90] See appendix 42
[91] See appendix 43
[92] See appendix 27
[93] See appendix 35
[94] See appendix 44
[95] See appendix 43

It is, indeed, important to point out that Legal Services Regulatory Authority received[96] the file enumerating all documents which Leo Fay failed to provide the victim with and never sent the reminder of the documents.[97] In analysis of that file what exists is page 73 and on it yellow-highlighted document nr thirty one.[98]

Apart from it Data Protection Commission received[99] similar file pointing to all documents that Leo Fay concealed from the victim and never posted reminder of the documents.[100] In the list which Gemma Walsh of Data Protection Commission received[101] what exists is page 60 and on it yellow-highlighted document nr thirty one.[102]

Document nr 31 is the very important exhibit and on this occasion we show it.[103]

Let us now, carefully, compare:

- content and particularly dates of appendix 39 showing when the victim contacted law office Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors

- content of pages 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 of this analysis and…

- second paragraph of appendix 24….. (see hereunder)

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

In appendix 39 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 the victim 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.

That is another evidence absolutely excluding Leo Fay's assertion that the victim…..

contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.
(see second paragraph of appendix 24)

[96] See appendix 27
[97] See appendix 35
[98] See appendix 36
[99] See appendix 37
[100] See appendix 35
[101] See appendix 37
[102] See appendix 38
[103] See appendix 39

All this undeniably proves that BOTH material particulars of the foregoing entry….

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

……and…..

Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

…..are the two criminal offences violating section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with 10.- (2) (a) and also section 10.- (1) (c) …Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001.[104]

None of the two material particulars:

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

…..and…..

Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

…..could have come into being had it not been for concealing….

- document nr thirty one as explained on page 12…. and

- the reminder of the documents[105] containing evidence that the accident took place on 2nd August 2012 as proved on pages 1, 2 and 3 of this analysis and not on 12th April 2012 as Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, deliberately avoiding the truth, writes in second paragraph of appendix 24.

Concealing document nr thirty one and concealing reminder of the documents was the precondition of advancing to the next phase of these two criminal offences and that phase appears in form of the second paragraph of appendix 24…..

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

According to Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors the victim contacted them around 12th October 2014. Namely,……

[104] See appendix 30
[105] See appendix 35

approximately 2.5 years after the incident. which as he writes[106] ….

arose on the 12th of April 2012

…falls around 12th October 2014. If we compare the dates of appendix 39[107] and 12th October 2014 we note difference of approximately fifteen months and fifteen days and that difference testifies of the size of this horrific criminal offence.

However, if we have a look at the real date of accident (2nd August 2012) as explained on pages 1, 2 and 3 of this analysis and dates of appendix 39[108] of this analysis we note the time frame of 10 months and 15 days which falls WELL WITHIN two years less than one day.[109, 110, 111] This is the evidence that the victim was NOT……

outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

….as Leo Fay writes in 5th paragraph of appendix 24. Even if (as Leo Fay, violating the law, writes) the accident[112] …..

arose on the 12th of April 2012

….only 14 months and 15 days can be accommodated from that date to 27th June 2013[113] when the victim contacted Leo Fay.

"only 14 months and 15 days" after the incident is not the same as……

approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

"only 14 months and 15 days" also fall WELL WITHIN two years less than one day.[114, 115, 116]

We already spoke of these fourteen months and fifteen days on page 8 of this analysis. It is now apprehensible why Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors moved arising of the accident 111 days backward – from 2nd August to 12th April 2012.

We go further.

---

[106] See second paragraph of appendix 24
[107] (27th June 2013-when the victim really contacted Leo Fay)
[108] (27th June 2013 – when the victim really contacted Leo Fay)
[109] See appendix 34…yellow highlighted
[110] See appendix 25 ….yellow highlighted
[111] See also appendix 40 …..yellow highlighted
[112] See second paragraph…appendix 24
[113] See dates of appendix 39
[114] See appendix 34…yellow highlighted
[115] See appendix 25 ….yellow highlighted
[116] See also appendix 40 …..yellow highlighted

This assertion (hereunder) of Leo Fay in his document of 26th September 2023[117] really violates law and all moral norms……

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

The key point and the most horrific one in the foregoing excerpt[118] and IN THE OVERALL CASE is this part of the entry above……



This, further, means that irrespective of the fact that (as this analysis undeniably proved) the victim was NOT…..

outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

….Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors were determined to perpetrate what they perpetrated. We do not say that this is monstrous[119] We only say that this is not moral and acceptable because Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors from the very signing the Agreement Letter (30th December 2015)[120] through 26th September 2023[121, 122] were persistently and deliberately….



….keeping the victim in the dark being simultaneously aware that what they do is deliberate perpetration of criminal offences "at all times." On top of everything else criminal Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority (irrespective of being aware that Leo Fay in his document of 26th September 2023 deliberately avoids the truth) supported it….unbelievable!!!

In these circumstances law office Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors and Legal Services Regulatory Authority suffocated both law and justice. Apart from that, Law Society of Ireland fully ignored the victim's letter they received on 9th August 2023.[123] They are still silent …doing nothing about what is happening.[124] It is not all yet…..Helen McEntee, Minister for Justice in Republic of Ireland on the same day received the same letter[125] as Law Society[126] and Legal Services

[117] See appendix 5
[118] See 5th paragraph of appendix 5
[119] See appendix 71
[120] See page 5 of appendix 72 – signature belongs to Michael J. Kennedy (managing partner)
[121] See the date on first page of appendix 5
[122] …almost seven years and nine months
[123] See pages 22 and 23….appendix 69
[124] See post "Law Society of Ireland – update….." – updated regularly
[125] Pages 20 and 21….appendix 69
[126] See appendix 69….pages 22 and 23

Regulatory Authority.[127] Five days later, Minister for Justice acknowledged the reception, opened the investigation[128] and since that time NOTHING…..only silence and ignorance. In this way Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland, Law Society of Ireland and Minister for Justice in Ireland clearly defined what is happening in Ireland….

However, this is only a very small part of undeniable documentation we have and that documentation tells the horrific story about this Organized Crime Network.

Everything, literally everything, will come to light..

Before we continue dismantling what Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors has perpetrated we wish to draw attention to another important point.

Namely, responding to the victim's Request for access to personal information[129] Ms Orla[130] Corcoran, data protection officer at Legal Services Regulatory Authority writes[131]….

Ordinarily, a response to this Subject Access Request would issue within the 1 month timeframe. If an extension is required to this period, I will write to you further, informing you of this and reasons for such an extension.

Yours faithfully,

Orla Corcoran
Data Protection Officer

The key information that the victim requested in his letter is pointed to on page 1[132]…..

This request relates, particularly, to the content of the correspondence Mr Paul Comerford sent to Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors. Namely, on first page of his decision Mr Comerford writes (see page 3)

I have written to Mr Leo Fay to advise him of the decision.

It is very important for us to know what Mr Comerford has written to Mr Leo Fay and Article 15 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) entitles me to that correspondence.

[127] See page 19….appendix 69
[128] See appendix 70
[129] See appendix 19
[130] Meaning in Irish: golden queen (https://www.mamanatural.com/baby-names/girls/orla/)
[131] See appendix 26 – second page
[132] See appendix 19….first page

Somewhat later we will publish evidence confirming that someone became very nervous! We once more point out importance of this correspondence criminal Paul Comerford posted to another criminal - Leo Fay and request it so that international public could see the content. In addition we point to section 10.- Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 which is very clear[133].....

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—

(*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.

As promised: the evidence of nervousness - this figure testifies that some have unsuccessfully attempted to login one thousand six hundred and forty one times - they are still persistently attempting – however no success and that makes them very nervous…..

[133] See appendix 30



Let us, now, continue. On 1st page of APPENDIX 26 Ms Corcoran confirms that they did receive the victim's Request on 4th December 2023. Today is 24th January 2024 and the Legal Services regulatory Authority have not issued any response although 51 days have passed[134] since 4th December 2023[135]….

I refer to your Subject Access Request (SAR) under (GDPR) the Data Protection Acts which was received by the LSRA on 4th December 2023.

Apart from it Ms Corcoran did NOT write, anything, to the victim and she says she will[136]

Ordinarily, a response to this Subject Access Request would issue within the 1 month timeframe. If an extension is required to this period, I will write to you further, informing you of this and reasons for such an extension.

Yours faithfully,

Orla Corcoran
Data Protection Officer

[134] …irrespective of Orla Corcoran who talks about "the 1 month timeframe" – see second page …appendix 26

a response to this Subject Access Request would issue within the 1 month timeframe.

Yours faithfully,

Orla Corcoran
Data Protection Officer

[135] See first page….appendix 26
[136] See second page….appendix 26

Ergo, what is coming out of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority is LOUD SILENCE. The jigsaws are slowly clicking into their places….

Ms Corcoran, in the foregoing excerpt, points to "…the 1 month…" and "…an extension…"

Let us now see how long that extension could be….

Data Protection Commission explains these circumstances and says that the controllers of information….

must respond to the request **without undue delay** and at the **latest within one month** of receiving the request. Controllers can **extend the time** to respond by a further **two months** if the request is **complex** or they have received a **number of requests** from the **same individual**, but they must still let the individual know within one month of receiving their access request and **explain to them** why the extension is necessary.

As already pointed to above Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the victim's request on 4th December 2023.[137]

I refer to your Subject Access Request (SAR) under (GDPR) the Data Protection Acts which was received by the LSRA on 4th December 2023.

Having in mind the foregoing rule of Data Protection Commission Ms Orla Corcoran HAS TO provide the victim with the requested letter[138] and the remaining information by 4th March 2024.

We are paying close attention to all what surrounds the victim's Personal data request. If Ms Orla Corcoran provides the victim with the requested letter pointed to on pages 1 and 3[139] (see also the excerpt hereunder)……

[137] See first page….appendix 26 (highlighted in yellow)

[138] …which Paul Comerford posted to Leo Fay (see appendix 19…first page – highlighted in red and see also third page – highlighted in red)

This request relates, particularly, to the content of the correspondence Mr Paul Comerford sent to Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors. Namely, on first page of his decision Mr Comerford writes (see page 3)

I have written to Mr Leo Fay to advise him of the decision.

It is very important for us to know what Mr Comerford has written to Mr Leo Fay and Article 15 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) entitles me to that correspondence.

[139] See appendix 19….first and third page

This request relates, particularly, to the content of the correspondence Mr Paul Comerford sent to Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors. Namely, on first page of his decision Mr Comerford writes (see page 3)

I have written to Mr Leo Fay to advise him of the decision.

It is very important for us to know what Mr Comerford has written to Mr Leo Fay and Article 15 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) entitles me to that correspondence.

…..and to other documents by 4th March 2024. More important, we will compare what they send to the victim with what he provided them with[140] – that is one of the crucial moments.

However, if Ms Orla Corcoran ignores this request[141] and does not provide the victim with the requested by 4th March 2024 we will inform international public, on 5th March immediately, that section 10.- (1) (a) …Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 was violated.

Let us, now return to criminal offences Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors perpetrated in his document of 26th September 2023[142] ….. On page 15 of this analysis we TWO TIMES pointed to….

at all times…… in document of 26th September 2023[143] that shows the true nature of personality and moral of Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy because

….5th paragraph on 1st page of this document says…….

We wish to point out that at all times…

Who WE?????????

Very simple "WE" are….criminals:

1. Leo Fay …..partner and…
2. Michael J. Kennedy…..managing partner who signed[144] and then completely breached the Agreement Letter.

[140] ….as postal receipts testify
[141] See appendix 19
[142] See appendix 5
[143] See appendix 5
[144] See page 5…..Appendix 72

Document of 26th September 2023[145] in 5th paragraph on 1st page….

We wish to point out that at all times…….


….proves that the foregoing two people working in collusion with one another wrote document of 26th September 2023.[146] Having in mind this law office the huge documentation points to only two names (Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy)….. …..hence the assertion….

We wish to point out that at all times

"WE"….Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy!

On top of everything else, Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland unacceptably writes…..

A small digression…On 28th January 2024 page 16 pointed to the figure hereunder which testifies that some have unsuccessfully attempted to login one thousand six hundred and forty one times - they are still persistently attempting – however no success and that makes them very nervous…..



After publishing this information the traffic to our site notably increased. Having realised that their numerous and illegal attempts to log in failed 1641 times some, in panic, reported our x (twitter) account and 10 days after publishing the foregoing evidence we were told that the reach of our account on x is restricted…..

[145] See appendix 5
[146] See appendix 5



After all *Quest for Justice*, irrespective of numerous and undeniable proofs of horrific crimes, was expelled from the X platform, LinkedIn, Instagram, Youtube….

What for?

This quote brilliantly explains….

"We tell lies when we are afraid... afraid of what we don't know, afraid of what others will think, afraid of what will be found out about us. But every time we tell a lie, the thing that we fear grows stronger."

Tad Williams

- Having in mind numerous criminal offences this Criminal Organization in Ireland perpetrated…

- …having in mind that this Criminal Organization in Ireland were the cause of PERMANENT mental illness the victim suffers from…

- …having in mind that this Criminal Organization in Ireland exposed the victim to both mental and physical torture[147]…

- …having in mind that this Criminal Organization in Ireland several times deliberately inflicted physical pain and laceration of the victim's skin causing so each time bleeding of the victim's lower legs[148]….

- …having in mind humiliation these people exposed the victim to, firm determination of *Quest for Justice* is going forward and telling the world about huge mud of this huge injustice in Ireland.

We, numerous times, drew attention of the perpetrators to what was going to happen, but all the warnings were ignored…hence, they reap what they saw!

Before we continue where we stopped on page 21, for a reason, we have to return to the title of this post…..

[147] We have evidence which we will publish at the opportune time, along with all the details…
[148] We have evidence which we will publish at the opportune time, along with all the details…

…..and draw attention to document which Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors created on 24th October 2016 at 12:57…. This is one of the most important points in all the issue explaining (or more appropriately proving) that Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors went to extreme lengths to deprive the victim of what he (the victim) is undeniably entitled to.

Even more horrible is that this individual is not alone. Let us, now dismantle this part step by step.

On 24th October 2016 the victim forwarded findings of the Chief Appeals Officer along with his appeal against decision of Eileen Loughlin[149] of Department for Social Protection.

On the same day at 12:57 in his response to the victim Leo Fay clearly writes that…..

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

(see Appendix 43)

Why, he writes this??? He does it because he does know the truth. He writes this because he is aware that this is law and he writes this for the same reason which Coleman Legal LLP Solicitors had in mind as they write…..

[149] Content of this section, which includes Eileen Loughlin and doctor Gavin - medical assessor of Department for Social Protection, is horrific and will be shown to international public in a separate analysis at the appropriate time. The paper covers multiple criminal offences perpetrated by this monstrous duo pointing to, for instance, how doctor Gavin applied the Hippocratic Oath in praxis which is not apprehensible to common sense. All this is connected to what Joan Burton, former minister of Department for Social Protection is zealously concealing. Madam Burton all it is in vain – We have everything and We will publish everything – when the right time comes…..literally everything…..

Statute of Limitations for personal injury

The period in which a person can bring a claim for personal injury is two years less than one day. The clock starts running from the date of knowledge. The date of knowledge is the date on which the injured person became aware they were injured; it was a significant injury, and it was caused by the negligence of the party at fault. Often this date will be the day of the actual accident, however, in some cases, an injury does not manifest itself immediately after the relevant incident.

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


(see Appendix 25)

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors writes this……..

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

(see Appendix 43)

…..because he is aware that this is law and he writes this for the same reason which McMahon Goldrick Solicitors had in mind as they (in Appendix 34) write…..



Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors writes this……..

In the Statute of Limitations time limit does not apply to your psychological-mental injury.
(see Appendix 43)

…..because he is aware that this is law and he writes this for the same reason which Augustus Cullen Law Solicitors had in mind as they (in Appendix 40) write…..

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.

Then, seven years later[150] Leo Fay's correct and legal assertion……..

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


(see Appendix 43)…

…evaporated into thin air and he, deliberately avoiding the truth, writes that the victim…..

was outside the time pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(see fifth paragraph from top in Appendix 24 – highlighted in red).

Horror is too weak an expression to define this crime as only one of the reasons explaining 47 attacks on *Quest for Justice* in only one day…



It is, indeed, of essential importance to have a look at these circumstances. Namely, on 14th July 2023 at 06:21[151] Michael J. Kennedy (managing partner of this law office) received the victim's Request for access to personal information. This request (pay particular attention to page 1) included also Appendix 43. It is notable that on 26th September 2023[152] (74 days after

[150] Leo Fay created Appendix 43 on 24th October 2016
[151] See page 10 of Appendix 74
[152] This date (26th September 2023) is pointed to in the top area of the first (front) page of appendixes 5 and 24

14th July 2023[153]) - Leo Fay[154] of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, deliberately avoiding the truth, writes that the victim……

was outside the time pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(see fifth paragraph from top in Appendix 24 – highlighted in red). Ergo, on 26th September 2023[155] Leo Fay WAS ABSOLUTELY AWARE OF……

1. content of the victim's Request for access to personal information[156] and particularly what is written on its first page and…

2. content of his own document (Appendix 43)

Having in mind the victim's Personal data request it is important to point out that Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[157] concealed[158] Appendix 43[159] which is criminal offence that was the precondition of the next phase in which Leo Fay perpetrated another criminal offence[160] in form of this assertion in which he writes that the victim…..

was outside the time pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(see fifth paragraph from top in Appendix 24 – highlighted in red).

All this is undeniable evidence of both *mens rea* and *actus reus* brilliantly explained in….

1. Concept of *actus reus* - see:

Campbell, L. *et. al.* (2021) "Actus Reus", *Criminal Law in Ireland: Cases and Commentary*, Clarus Press Ltd, Dublin 8, pp. 71 – 107

[153] See page 10 of Appendix 74 (on 14th July 2023 Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received the victim's request.)
[154] Irrespective of being aware of his own document (Appendix 43)
[155] See first page of appendixes 5 and 24
[156] See Appendix 74
[157] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[158] Section 10.- (1) (a) Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 – see Appendix 18
[159] ….Appendix 43 is the composing part of …..

The remainder of the documents (see Appendix 35) and the victim has NEVER received this reminder.

[160] Section 10.- (1) (a); 10.- (1) (c) and 10.- (2) (a) Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 – see Appendix 18.

Mc Auley, F. and McCutcheon, J. P. (2022) "Actus Reus", *Criminal Liability*, Thomsin Reuters (Professional) Ireland Limited, Dublin 1, pp. 209 – 305

2. Concept of *mens rea* – see:

Campbell, L. *et. al.* (2021) "Mens Rea", *Criminal Law in Ireland: Cases and Commentary*, Clarus Press Ltd, Dublin 8, pp. 109 – 175

Mc Auley, F. and McCutcheon, J. P. (2022) "Mens Rea", *Criminal Liability*, Thomsin Reuters (Professional) Ireland Limited, Dublin 1, pp. 473 – 551

This document (appendixes 5 and 24) when compared with section 10.- Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001, imposes a horrific conclusion. Appendix 43, then Appendixes 5 and 24 are documents Leo Fay created….NOBODY ELSE. As already pointed to above…it is only necessary to compare these documents with the foregoing section 10.- Criminal Justice (Theft and fraud Offences) Act 2001 and the circumstances become instantly crystal clear.


This is undeniable *mens rea* – however, what Leo Fay perpetrated in these circumstances belongs to subtype of the fourth (the worst) degree of *mens rea* (intent). Ergo, this is not negligence, recklessness or knowledge but, as we just pointed to, Leo Fay's criminal offence belongs to intent. On top of everything else solicitor Leo Fay acted not just intentionally but with his intent to humiliate the victim!

Quest for Justice disagree with that behaviour!!!



We do not say that Leo Fay is malevolent[161] solicitor of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors.
We only disagree with numerous criminal offences he perpetrated.
Source: https://www.mjksolicitors.ie/about-us/
Accessed on 26th May 2024

[161] For malevolent – see appendix 88



We do not say that Michale Kennedy is malevolent[162] solicitor of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors. We only disagree with numerous criminal offences he perpetrated.
Source: https://www.mjksolicitors.ie/about-us/
Accessed on 26th May 2024

[162] For malevolent – see appendix 88

mjksolicitors.ie/about-us/

mjksolicitors.ie/about-us/

About Us

Our clients rely on us to provide a comprehensive and efficient service on a range of legal matters. Our objective is to ensure that our clients receive a tailored, individual service in a friendly and prompt manner.

We invite you to give us a call or drop into the office to discuss any matter, without obligation.



Michael J. Kennedy

Managing Partner

Following graduating from Trinity College Dublin with a Masters, Michael qualified as a Solicitor in 1979 and immediately commenced practising in Sutton. Michael has over thirty years experience in managing a general legal practice and represents clients in many diverse areas of law. With his wealth of experience Michael can guide clients through the most complex legal issues.

Outside of the office Michael enjoys looking after his horses, hunting in winter and the odd round of golf in summer.



Leo Fay

Partner

Graduated from UCD in 1994 with a BCL and Diploma in Business Studies. Leo qualified as a Solicitor in 1997. Having initially worked in the area of criminal defence he joined the practice in 1999 and concentrates on general litigation matters including Personal Injury cases, employment law and commercial litigation.

He completed a Diploma in Commercial Litigation in 2009 and is in a position to advise if you have a commercial dispute that is suitable for hearing in the Commercial Court.

He also works in the area of residential conveyancing.

In his spare time Leo enjoys playing and coaching in Na Fianna GAA Club as well as cycling and travel.

Accessed on 26th May 2024

PRACTICING CERTIFICATE,
STRIKING OFF THE ROLL
SOLICITORS ACT 1954,[163]
LEGAL SERVICES REGULATION ACT 2015,[164]
CRIMINAL JUSTICE (THEFT AND FRAUD OFFENCES) ACT 2001[165]
CRIMINAL LAW ACT 1997[166]
CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 2006 - Part 7 – Organized Crime[167]

….AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITY



[163] See appendix 84
[164] See appendix 95
[165] See appendix 30
[166] See appendix 73
[167] See appendix 115

We do not say that Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy are the scoundrels[168] Court of International Public will determine it!!!

Profession of these perpetrators of criminal offences (solicitor – what an irony) imposes return to what we have already pointed to on page 3 of this analysis - the Solicitor's Guide to Professional Conduct issued by the Guidance and Ethics Committee of the Law Society. There Fay Leo and Michael J. Kennedy can find words of wisdom[169] of the Honourable Ms Justice Mary Irvine, President of the High Court 2022….We suggest these two individuals to very, very carefully read them through.

This Guide, in first chapter (page 13), says…..

> Solicitors must serve the interests of justice. Barron J set out the obligation of the solicitor in *Doran v Delaney*, Supreme Court [1998] 2IR 61 as follows:
>
> "*The solicitor is not a conduit pipe. Once he is acting professionally, he warrants that so far as his own acts are concerned, he has taken the care and applied the skill and knowledge expected of a member of his profession.*
>
> The solicitor's function, therefore, imposes a variety of legal and moral obligations on the solicitor

(page 14)

> Rules of professional conduct are designed to assist the proper performance by a solicitor of their duties and functions in practice. Solicitors, whether in private practice or the in-house and public sector, share the same professional standards of conduct.
>
> Solicitors should also be mindful of the statutory duties provided for under the *General Data Protection Regulation*

Having the above in mind and having in mind what[170] Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy had to go through to reach their practicing certificates as solicitors we refer to this analysis testifying: they can "rightly and proudly" state that irrespective of all criminal offences they perpetrated[171] Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy still hold practicing certificates as solicitors. In appendix 75 we could not find any instruction or advice of how a solicitor can commit a criminal offence. However, these two people demonstrated in real life that they in the course of education

---

[168] See appendix 87
[169] See appendix 21
[170] See appendix 75
(it is very important to painstakingly analyze literally each word and each letter of appendix 75)
[171] ….as evidenced so far in this analysis and *Quest for Justice* which is almost nothing in comparison with what awaits publishing.

(before admitting in 1997[172] and 1980[173]) mastered that programme and graduated with "the highest mark." During very long "specialization" after admitting Leo Fay (27 years) and Michael J. Kennedy (44 years) have really perfected "production" of criminal offences.

Helen McEntee (justice minister)[174], Catherine Pierse (director of public prosecutions)[175] ….HOW ARE YOU KEEPING?????

Ergo, who has issued Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy with the practicing certificate – Law Society of Ireland - the same institution that (irrespective of numerous calls)[176] brutally reject to take any legal steps against them for perpetrating horrific crimes. In that way Law Society of Ireland deliberately violated Sections 7 and 8 – Criminal Law Act 1997.[177] After all, this is only one more (in a series)[178] of undeniable proofs of organized crime network.

Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland….HOW ARE YOU KEEPING?????

Legal Services Regulatory Authority point out….in complaints about legal practitioners – solicitors and barristers they handle three types of complaints. One of those types refers to misconduct. Clarifying this LSRA say that misconduct is understood as "…a range of conduct which includes fraud, dishonesty, criminal activity and other acts." They, further, say that "there is no time limit on complaints about misconduct."[179]

…..we (legal advisors of the victim) refer to another definition of "misconduct"[180] which determines the notion as "improper and/or illegal acts by a public official which violate his/her duty to follow the law and act on behalf of the public good. Often such conduct is under the guise or "color" of official authority."

…..we (legal advisors to the victim) also refer to this analysis which is choke-full of criminal offences Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy have perpetrated.

We would now return to the two files Legal Services Regulatory Authority received.

The first parcel of documents weighing 1446 grams[181] they received on 25th August 2023[182] and the parcel looked like this.[183]

---

[172] See appendix 76
[173] See appendix 86
[174] See post: Director of Public Prosecutions https://questforjustice.net/director-of-public-prosecutions-update-19-1-24/
[175] See post: Director of Public Prosecutions https://questforjustice.net/director-of-public-prosecutions-update-19-1-24/
[176] See post: Law Society of Ireland https://questforjustice.net/law-society-of-ireland/
[177] See appendix 73
[178] Names of all perpetrators involved in this organized crime network will be given in the chart and published at the opportune time - crimes that some individuals, pointed to in this chart, perpetrated have already been proven and others will also be evidenced…..step by step.
[179] See appendix 77
[180] See appendix 94
[181] See appendix 78
[182] See appendix 79
[183] See appendix 80

The second set of documents weighing 1441 grams[184] Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[185] and the parcel looked like this.[186]

Those two parcels along with this analysis undeniably proved misconducts[187] (not only misconducts but particularly heavy misconducts) of Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy. Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland point out, that they handle complaints about misconduct which, further, exclude time limit.[188]

It is notable that Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland are concealing from the public the foregoing two sets of documents. It is also notable that Law Society of Ireland are concealing from the public the first set of documents Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 25th August 2023[189] BECAUSE Michael Doran of Legal Services Regulatory Authority…..

(five days later – see appendix 85)

30 August 2023

clearly writes….

A copy has been sent to the Law Society of Ireland, as required by law.

See appendix 85

Unfortunately for all them, we also have everything these two institutions received and we have evidence confirming that they did receive the documentation. We will certainly upload everything at the right time and their concealing is absolutely futile.

We will, of course, start uploading both sets of documents as soon as possible since they, along with other exhibits, prove that Paul Comerford, Shannon Hallissey, Orla Corcoran and their Ringleader Brian Doherty wrought horrific criminal offences.[190]


[184] See appendix 81
[185] See appendix 82
[186] See appendix 83
[187] This is not error – plural form is deliberately used
[188] See appendix 77
[189] See appendix 79
[190] See, for instance, appendix 28, 30 (section 10) and 73 (sections 7 and 8)

Having in mind publishing these two sets of documents we point out that Orla Corcoran did respond[191] and provided the victim with the requested documentation.[192] After *Quest for Justice* end uploading list[193] of the documents criminals Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy concealed (as already pointed to) we will start publishing these two sets AND the 65-page analysis which refers to these two sets and which brings to light all breaching of law perpetrated by these two institutions…

- Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland and…
- Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors

Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy have a look at this….

Section 14.- (1) Solicitors Act 1954[194] says….


Applications to Disciplinary Committee.

14.—(1) The following applications shall be made to the Disciplinary Committee:

(*a*) an application by a solicitor to procure the removal of his name from the roll,

(*b*) an application by another person or the Society to strike the name of a solicitor off the roll on any of the following grounds:

https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/1954/act/36/enacted/en/print.html 9/49

30.04.2024, 23:14 Solicitors Act, 1954

(i) that the solicitor has been guilty of misconduct, including conduct tending to bring the solicitors' profession into disrepute,

We particularly point to what Legal Services Regulation Act 2015 says in its section 50[195]

Comparing….

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[196]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[197]…
Sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[198]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[199]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[200]

[191] See appendix 97
[192] See appendix 19
[193] See concealed docs (uploading in progress) available at the bottom of post: Criminal Scoundrels protect Criminal Scoundrels
https://questforjustice.net/criminal-scoundrels-protect-criminal-scoundrels/
[194] See appendix 84
[195] See appendix 95
[196] See appendix 84
[197] See appendix 95
[198] See appendix 73
[199] See appendix 30
[200] See appendix 115

…with what Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy (as a section of this Criminal Organization in Ireland) perpetrated testifies of the huge crime! *Quest for Justice* have already brought to light a small part of what this duo perpetrated. However, the series of their criminal offences, that we have not yet published, is much more longer – *Quest for Justice* will, of course, upload ALL – we repeat – ALL these exhibits and documents…..

… proving that Michael J. Kennedy and Leo Fay, as members of the Criminal Organization, are a huge shame of the Irish nation.

The two sets of documents[201], we pointed to earlier, along with this analysis and along with….

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[202]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[203]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[204]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[205]
Appendix 77

……undeniably prove that both solicitors Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy (as members of the Criminal Organization in Ireland) perpetrated not only misconduct but very heavy misconduct…Instead of sentence for perpetrating numerous and horrific crimes this duo still "protect" justice in Ireland's society.

Ms Walsh[206] of Data Protection Commission[207] received the correspondence on 5th December 2023[208] and the file she received contained…

…64-page…

…list of all the FILES which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[209] concealed from the victim.

---

[201] First set of documents weighing 1446 grams (see appendix 78) Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland received on 25th August 2023 at 09:18 (see appendix 79) and the parcel looked like this (see appendix 80)

Second set of documents weighing 1441 grams (see appendix 81) Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland received on 17th October 2023 at 10:28 (see appendix 82) and the parcel looked like this (see appendix 83).

[202] See appendix 84
[203] See appendix 95
[204] See appendix 30
[205] See appendix 115
[206] Apart from Ms Walsh of Data Protection Commission, Paul Comerford of Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland had in front of his eyes the 116-page analysis which includes this 64-page list. We will, of course, publish this analysis and its appendixes at some later phase including image of the parcel and postal receipt confirming weight, date and time of reception .

[207] …criminal institution who protect criminals Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy https://questforjustice.net/protector-of-the-criminals/
[208] See appendix 37
[209] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request

In post *They work in collusion….*

https://questforjustice.net/they-work-in-collusion/

…we have already uploaded the foregoing 64-page list showing precisely……

……how many pages EACH of the files is made up of.

At this moment we have to return to Section 10.- (1) (a) ….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[210] which says….

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— **loss of information to the victim**

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

Having this in mind the Court of International Public will have the clear evidence how many documents were concealed and concealing each single page of each file is violation of sections:

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[211]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[212]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[213]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[214]

Some of the documents are one-page information while others are made up of, for instance, forty two, forty eight, eighty four pages…….

This, further, explains HOW MANY TIMES Michael J. Kennedy and Leo Fay violated the foregoing sections ONLY IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, apart from other violations of law as this analysis and *Quest for Justice* testify.

Hence, the subtitle we placed somewhat earlier……

(see pages: 1, 9 and 10…appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.

[210] See appendix 30
[211] See appendix 84
[212] See appendix 95
[213] See appendix 30
[214] See appendix 115

PRACTICING CERTIFICATE,
STRIKING OFF THE ROLL
SOLICITORS ACT 1954,[215]
LEGAL SERVICES REGULATION ACT 2015,[216]
CRIMINAL JUSTICE (THEFT AND FRAUD OFFENCES) ACT 2001[217]
CRIMINAL LAW ACT 1997[218] ….
CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 2006 - Part 7 – Organized Crime[219]

….AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITY



[215] See appendix 84
[216] See appendix 95
[217] See appendix 30
[218] See appendix 73
[219] See appendix 115

Section 10.- (1) (a) is crystal clear….

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—

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

This HUGE NUMBER of concealed documents imposes BOTH – see highlighted section of the image hereunder (for EACH of the concealed documents) in section 10.- (3) - Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001

(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.

Having in mind that Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy are SOLICITORS we refer to their particular determination in perpetrating crimes and we also stress what we have already pointed to earlier in this analysis….
Leo Fay, while committing thee acts, demonstrated strong will to materialize subtype of the fourth (the worst) degree of *mens rea* (intent). As an expert at law field he knowingly excluded negligence, recklessness or knowledge and resorted to not only intent but intent to humiliate the victim. Although we have already explained those circumstances we have to return to them to prove huge motivation of Leo Fay in drawing upon this worst subtype of *mens rea* (intent) – his intention is clear …..putting the victim to shame and dishonor….

Namely in appendix 24[220] Leo Fay fraudulently writes…..

he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…..BEING SIMULTANEOUSLY AWARE that this excerpt is simultaneously extremely misleading[221], false[222] and deceptive[223]….


B EE C A U S E……..seven years earlier he wrote…

[220] …highlighted in red
[221] See appendix 6
[222] See appendix 7
[223] See appendix 8

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."[224]

Leo Fay perpetrated this although aware that he is doing that against a person suffering from mental illness the Irish Wheelchair Association by force caused.[225] On top of everything else Paul Comerford an employee of Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland unacceptably writes…..


Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

(the figure is taken from the bottom of third page of appendix 28)

This is "rule of law in Ireland" today!!!


Evidences the website points to are imposing are unrelenting. The huge file, *Quest for Justice* have, is their nightmare - we have the insider information!

We go further….

The parcel of documents weighing 5115 grams[226] which Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors first received[227] and then concealed ….see the two figures hereunder… is a very small part of what we have.

[224] See appendix 43….it is, also, essentially important to carefully analyse appendixes 25, 34 and 40
[225] …we will publish huge documentation about torture (literally) the victim has gone and is still going through.
[226] See appendix 11
[227] See appendix 10


Leo Fay,
Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors,
Baldoyle,
Dublin 13.



Leo Fay,
Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors,

Baldoyle,
Dublin 13.

Hi Leo,

Please, ignore the files…

- RL 542 168 884 IE – received on 2nd November 2022 and….
- RL 528 460 368 IE – received on 8th June 2022…..

……because some of their parts are transferred across other folders and some are dropped as irrelevant.

To save paper text is printed on both sides of each sheet.

Further, enclosed are the refined files I referred to in my e-mail of 29th November 2022.

- APRIL 2021 –

…and its…..

1. ANALYSIS APRIL 2021 – number of pages.....27
2. APPENDIX EIGHT – number of pages 1
3. APPENDIX EIGHTEEN – number of pages 1
4. APPENDIX ELEVEN – number of pages 1
5. APPENDIX FIFTEEN – number of pages 1
6. APPENDIX FIVE – number of pages 1
7. APPENDIX FOUR (A) – number of pages 1
8. APPENDIX FOUR - number of pages 1
9. APPENDIX FOURTEEN – number of pages 1
10. APPENDIX FOURTY EIGHT – number of pages 22
11. APPENDIX FOURTY FIVE – number of pages 1
12. APPENDIX FOURTY FOUR – number of pages.....3
13. APPENDIX FOURTY ONE – number of pages 1
14. APPENDIX FOURTY SEVEN – number of pages 42
15. APPENDIX FOURTY SIX – number of pages.....48
16. APPENDIX FOURTY THREE – number of pages 1

Page 1 of 24

All this is undeniable and explains the huge extent of horrific crime of Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy in violating the law and what we just explained is ONLY one part of their awful impudence…..

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

(see also appendixes 9 and 18)

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—

(*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.

Careful scrutiny of this section and this analysis clearly clarifies what happened. We have to mention that the victim several times drew Leo Fay's attention to our Law Office and he ignored it.

After completing and publishing this analysis we will publish content of the parcel weighing 1446 grams[228] Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 25th August 2023[229] and the parcel looked like this.[230]

We will also publish content of the parcel weighing 1441 grams[231] Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17the October 2023[232] and the parcel looked like this.[233]

After that, analytical section of our office, will publish a paper undeniably proving, in real life, what criminal legislation in Ireland defines "criminal organisation."

Namely, the Ireland's legislative bodies say that….

"criminal organisation" means a structured group, however organised, that—

(*a*) is composed of 3 or more persons acting in concert,

(*b*) is established over a period of time,

(*c*) has as its main purpose or main activity the commission or facilitation of one or more serious offences in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit;

Criminal Justice Act 2006 – Part 7 – Organized Crime – Section 70.- (1)[234]

This paper is dismantling interior structure of this Criminal Organization in Ieland. Our investigation refers particularly to the collusion between Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland and Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors and to the revolting criminal offences these two institutions perpetrated. That analysis will be the real treat for international public. *Quest for Justice* will, of course, publish findings of this investigation immediately after bringing to light content of the foregoing two parcels.

[228] See appendix 78
[229] See appendix 79
[230] See appendix 80
[231] See appendix 81
[232] See appendix 82
[233] See appendix 83
[234] See appendix 115

It is not all yet as…..

- Minister for Justice of Ireland Helen McEntee,
- Director of Public Prosecutions in Ireland Catherine Pierse,
- Director of Law Society Mark Garett and
- Data Protection Commissioners Des Hogan and Dale Sunderland…

….live in delusion that they are not legally touchable

see posts:

- Director of Public Prosecutions,
  https://questforjustice.net/director-of-public-prosecutions-update- 19-1-24/
- Law Society of Ireland,
  https://questforjustice.net/law-society-of-ireland/
- They work in collusion
  https://questforjustice.net/they-work-in-collusion/

This is Ireland today!!!

We suggest all them to thoroughly examine criminal legislation.

However, institutions these people lead are not the only ones involved. It is, indeed, important to point to the role of….

1. Department for Social Protection,
2. Legal Services Regulatory Authority,
3. Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors,
4. Fitzwilliam Medical Center and….
5. Fidelma Barry – solicitor and notary public from Kildare

https://www.fbsol.ie/ and her client Maura O'Mahoney both of whom demonstrated particularly high level of determination while perpetrating numerous criminal offences. *Quest for Justice* will, of course, publish everything at the opportune time.)

The foregoing institutions are only a small part of the 22-page list of criminals we are publishing –

see page Cases: https://questforjustice.net/cases/

Connecting what these institutions have wrought into one whole leads to a horrific conclusion. Having that in mind our section for scientific research are working on a special paper (organized crime) which will be uploaded at a later phase.

Let us go further….

Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[235] concealed all the exhibits proving all criminal offences this criminal network (they belong to) perpetrated. Unfortunately for them and their accomplices we have the detailed record too and what they do not even imagine that we have. Stay with us, follow this analysis, this post and www.questforjustice.net and you will see evidences of what is hard to believe….

Bringing crimes to light[236] cannot be insolent. Unacceptable personal character have those[237]

……who protect Leo Fay,[238] Paul Comerford,[239] Eileen McLoughlin,[240] doctor Gavin – medical assessor of Department for Social Protection and other perpetrators and who are persistently doing futile work - going to extreme lengths to conceal both crimes and the perpetrators.

We have in mind particularly the former (protectors) who are still guarding, aiding, abetting and counselling Leo Fay,[241] Paul Comerford,[242] Eileen McLoughlin,[243] villainous[244, 245] "doctor" Gavin - medical assessor of Department for Social Protection and other monsters.

We have undeniable evidence against all (literally all) of them!

---

[235] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.

[236] …..and also those crimes that are still waiting to be brought to light

[237] There are many of them (not only Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland and Leo Fay) and each criminal offence is backed by undeniable evidence.

[238] ….of Michale J. Kennedy Solicotors

[239] .....of Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland

[240] ….of Department for Social Protection

[241] ….of Michael J. Kennedy Solicotors

[242] .....of Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland

[243] ….of Department for Social Protection

[244] See APPENDIX 96 – The Hippocratic Oath….
G. P. Goold (1984) *Hippocrates*, vol. I, Harvard University Press, London, pp 299 - 301

[245] *Quest for Justice* have a special analysis about disgusting depravity of "doctor" Gavin – Medical Assessor of Department for Social Protection who heinously breached the Hippocratic Oath apart from multiple criminal offences he perpetrated along with Eileen McLoughlin of the Department for Social Protection. We will publish all their criminal offences at a later phase. Doctor Gavin is not a doctor…he is a MONSTER.

Their minds have only one wish….to demonize the victim and so conceal what rests under the tip of the huge and murky iceberg……

Quest for Justice will painstakingly dismantle everything….to the last and most tiny fraction of this murky iceberg of crimes and names involved and show findings to the world public.

Our investigation experts, in the beginning, expected to complete the collection of exhibits in November or December this year (2024). However, the ongoing inquiry is producing more and more material and we have to refrain from any further prediction when uploading of evidence about this analysis could end.

We briefly return to the insolence we mentioned on the last page…


"Insolence" of www.questforjustice.net for bringing evidence of the horrific crimes to light is not tolerable and due to that "insolence" the site is completely banned on X, Linkedin, Instagram…

Every single medium in the Republic of Ireland we offered the file to rejected even to see evidences of what www.questforjustice.net testifies about. Irrespective of that people from Alaska to New Zealand are reading this testimony….

"The truth may be stretched thin, but it never breaks, and it always surfaces above lies, as oil floats on water."

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (Don Quixote)

Let us, now, continue where we ended on page 21 ….. (on page 21 we printed in blue … On top of everything else, Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland insolently writes….. and now we continue..


Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

(the figure is taken from the bottom of third page of appendix 28)

This analysis contains many undeniable evidences of Paul Comerford's unacceptable character of personality.


seeking to negotiate some form of settlement

(see 5th paragraph….appendix 5)

..is the malicious determination of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors staged to defraud the victim and save the Irish Wheelchair Association. However, what they thought they have done in an

excellent manner is completely dismantled in this analysis. Their story simply does not hold water since this material[246] particular[247]……

given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(See this excerpt highlighted in red in appendix 24)

….is extremely misleading[248], false[249] and deceptive[250] and points to the huge amount of crime Leo Fay perpetrated..

Namely, he writes that time allowed for starting personal injury proceedings must be …..

pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(see the last words in fifth paragraph[251] - highlighted in red) However, according to the Statute of Limitations, Leo Fay Fay refers to, the exceptions to the two-year rule do exist (which he conceales). For instance Colleman Legal LLP[252] Law Office claim that the exception applies "….where the injured party has suffered a mental impairment as a result of their injury." Augustus Cullen Law Law Office asserting the same write that the exception applies "if the injured person was incapacitated in some way, such as being in a coma or lacking the mental capacity to manage their affairs."[253] Apart from these two law offices McMahon Goldrick Solicitors law firm is clear when writing that the exceptions to the time limit apply "…when the injured party is mentally impaired as a result of sustaining their injury…"[254]

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors was and is fully aware that the victim suffers from psychological-mental injury[255, 256]…..

Apart from appendix 43 and as already pointed to earlier criminal Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received[257] the parcel of documents weighing 5115 grams[258] (see the figure hereunder)

---

[246] See appendix 32
[247] See appendix 31
[248] See appendix 6
[249] See appendix 7
[250] See appendix 8
[251] See appendix 24
[252] See appendix 25
[253] See appendix 40
[254] See appendix 34
[255] …Irish Wheelchair Association criminally and viciously caused in the course of eight years. Nonetheless, *Quest for Justice* will painstakingly publish every detail of this crime this nefarious network are attempting to conceal from international public.
[256] See appendix 43
[257] See appendix 10
[258] See appendix 11



In that parcel Mr Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received a file SEPTEMBER 2020 and in its ANALYSIS ONE REVISED VERSION page 43[259] testifies that…

an incident occurred on 2nd August, 2012, which led to his psychological injury.

Apart from that evidence, in the same parcel Fay Leo received file MAY 2022, ANALYSIS MAY 2022 and its appendix newbridge[260] testifies that…..

an incident occurred on 2nd August, 2012, which led to his psychological injury.


These two documents point out that the victim's psychological injury came into being……

in the workplace


[259] See appendix 13
[260] See appendix 16

(see appendix 13 – highlighted in green and appendix 16 – highlighted in green)…..


….and the official contract determines more precisely that the victim's work place was in private home[261] of Line Manager of the Irish Wheelchair Association in which the victim, in the course of almost eight years, was exposed to the horrific mental and physical torture.[262] Once more, appendix 45 confirms that the victim's working place was in this private home..



Further, as already mentioned Chief Appeals Officer in appendix 13 (see highlighted in green) and appendix 16 (see highlighted in green) confirms that what was happening was happening "over a number of years…..in the workplace"



However, what was happening "over a number of years…..in the workplace" is NOT…..



….but the horrific form of both mental and physical torture…..In the course of almost eight years, while working in Irish Wheelchair Association, the victim was exposed continuously to mental and physical torture and other atrocities unheard of. We want to point out that these deliberate inflictions of physical pain caused bleedings of the victim's lower legs. Both Irish Wheelchair Association and Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors concealed the documentary evidences – we can prove it. Nonetheless, we have all what they concealed and prepare a separate paper which we will publish at the opportune time.

Gerard Thomas Phelan, director of Human Resources section of Irish Wheelchair Association and appendixes 16 and 39 mutually do confirm that who caused the victim's psychological injury is Peter Moore - Line Manager[263] of Irish Wheelchair Association. However, Gerard Thomas Phelan, "accidentally" nowhere in any documentation refers to the series of horrific documents which came into being within Irish Wheelchair Association. We will, of course, publish all them (with the reception stamps) in one of the posts in category In flagrante delicto. All these documents have reception stamp of office of President of Irish Wheelchair Association Eileen O'Mahony.[264] We have evidence that both Jane Cameron, human resources manager of Irish Wheelchair Association and Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, respectively, concealed these documents – *Quest for Justice* will publish all that at a later phase. One small remark before we continue: It is not all about Gerard Phelan….we have a lot more about him.

A state with the basis of existing in form of bare physical force and in form of monopoly of mental erudition and intelligence is not a state. The state is that form of social organization

[261] See appendix 45
[262] *Quest for Justice* have the exhibits which will be published as a part of a separate analysis at the opportune time.
[263] See appendix 41
[264] President of Irish Wheelchair Association at that time – see appendix 116

whose fundaments rest in firm belief of its citizens in reliability of the legal system within boundaries of the fatherland. Numerous barbaric atrocities of the hoodlums in the Criminal Organization, *Quest for Justice* point to, are attributes decorating Ireland today. Abominations happen in every country. On the other hand, incompetence of the Irish Republic to resolve this twenty-year huge shame is what deprives her of right to call herself the state.

To avoid any misunderstanding of meaning of "mental" law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[265] Augustus Cullen Law[266] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[267] speak about and meaning of "psychological injury" page 43[268] and appendix newbridge[269] point to we refer to California Work Injury Law Center (cwilc) who clearly say that ….

"A psychological injury is when the person has suffered mental trauma as a result of an accident, sudden shock, or a traumatic event. Examples of psychiatric injuries are Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Adjustment Disorder, and depression."[270]

Having in mind the second part of the foregoing definition…

WHAT IS A PSYCHOLOGICAL INJURY?

A psychological injury is when the person has suffered mental trauma as a result of an accident, sudden shock, or a traumatic event. Examples of psychiatric injuries are Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Adjustment Disorder, and depression.

…we refer to what two doctors, independent of one another,[271, 272] say. Having all the foregoing in mind the circumstances are very clear!

One, now, may request the falsification to be pinpointed. Very easily…everything revolves around "entry" and we see that the notion refers to "….a separate piece of information that is recorded in a book, computer, etc."[273] Section 2 (a) of the Act also points out conceptions of: misleading,[274] false,[275] deceptive,[276] material[277] and particular.[278]
Ergo, what applies here: section 10.- (1) (a)…. Falsification in connection with section 10.- (2) (a); section 10.- (1) (c) because Leo Fay did know[279] (as proved above) that the victim

[265] See appendix 25
[266] See appendix 40
[267] See appendix 34
[268] See appendix 13…yellow highlighted
[269] See appendix 16…yellow highlighted
[270] See appendix 46
[271] See appendix 47…highlighted in yellow
[272] See appendix 12…highlighted in green
[273] See appendix 48
[274] See appendix 6
[275] See appendix 7
[276] See appendix 8
[277] See appendix 32
[278] See appendix 31
[279] See appendix 43

suffers from the psychological injury and he also did know that, having that in mind, the two-year rule from the Statute of Limitations is not applicable in these circumstances.[280]

At this point we refer to the document which Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors wrought on 27th July 2023.[281] That is the document we often return to. In it Fay Leo stressed that the remainder of the documents which the victim requested was going to be released. However, it never happened. That was why the victim posted (1st December 2023)[282] a file to Ms Gemma Walsh, Information officer of Data Protection Commission. Ms Walsh received the correspondence on 5th December[283] and the file she received[284] contained:

64-page list of all documents which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[285] concealed from the victim violating so section 10.- (1) (a)[286]….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences Act) 2001. In his letter of 27th July 2023[287] criminal Fay Leo named these documents as….

The remainder of the documents

Apart from the list Ms Walsh received a number of appendixes clarifying content of the list:

- 13-page APPENDIX CELL PHONE
- 1 page APPENDIX DECEPTIVE
- 1 page APPENDIX EIGHT ONE
- 1 page APPENDIX EIGHT TWO
- 10 page APPENDIX ELEVEN
- 1 page APPENDIX FALSE
- 1 page APPENDIX FIVE
- 1 page APPENDIX FOUR
- 1 page APPENDIX MATERIAL
- 1 page APPENDIX MISLEADING
- 1 page APPENDIX ONE
- 1 page APPENDIX PARTICULAR
- 1 page APPENDIX SEVEN
- 1 page APPENDIX SIX
- 1 page APPENDIX THREE
- 1 page APPENDIX TWO

[280] See appendix 43
[281] See appendix 35
[282] See appendix 37
[283] See appendix 37
[284] We will certainly publish this 64-page list as soon as possible.
[285] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[286] See appendix 30
[287] See appendix 35

Why we refer to all this? Well, we now point to page 61[288] of that 64 page list enumerating documents which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[289] concealed. Very interesting document 25 on this page (highlighted in yellow) is only one of really many other documents which the duo concealed from the victim….and (how Leo Fay apprehends it) there is a very good reason for concealing this document, violation of section 10.- (1) (a) ..Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001. We show here content of that document 25[290] It is notable in this document that seven years earlier Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors spoke the truth. In second document (also appendix 43) the victim points to "the Appeals Officer decision of 31st August last year…." which officially established that psychological injury affects the victim.[291]

In document of 26th September 2023[292] (which is as the whole a huge criminal offence) Leo Fay, expert at law field, accused himself of perpetrating criminal offence. It is only necessary to carefully examine his document of 26th September 2023, this analysis and appendix 43 in this analysis and circumstances become crystal clear. They, in only seven years[293] show metamorphosis of the truth in 2016 into untruth made with deliberate intent to deceive as his document of 26th September 2023 testifies.[294] This will be the real treat for international public.

We, now refer to another document that Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[295] concealed and so violated section 10.- (1) (a)..Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[296] That is 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020.

Clarifying concealing this document we refer to Data Protection Commission who received[297] the file pointing to all documents that Leo Fay along with Michael J. Kennedy[298] concealed from the victim and never provided him with the reminder of the documents.[299]

See post They work in collusion…
https://questforjustice.net/they-work-in-collusion/

[288] See appendix 42
[289] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[290] See appendix 43
[291] See appendix 13, 16 and 17
[292] See appendix 5
[293] From 24th October 2016 (date when appendix 43 came into being) to 26th September 2023 (date when appendix 5 came into being)
[294] See appendix 5
[295] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[296] See appendix 30
[297] See appendix 37
[298] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[299] See appendix 35

In the 64 – page list[300] which Gemma Walsh of Data Protection Commission received[301] what exists is page 62 and on it yellow-highlighted 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020.[302] We now show content of that document.[303]

Apart from Data Protection Commission the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received[304] the file enumerating all documents which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[305] concealed from the victim and never provided him with the reminder of the documents.[306] Weight of this parcel which Ms Shannon Hallisey of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received was 1441 grams[307] and it looked like this.[308] In analysis of that file what exists is page 76 and on it yellow-highlighted 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020.[309] This is 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020.[310]

The foregoing two paragraphs undeniably testify that all these perpetrators:

Des Hogan – Commissioner of Data Protection Commission
Dale Sunderland – Commissioner of Data Protection Commission
Gemma Walsh – Information officer of Data Protection Commission
Shannon Hallisey – Clerical officer of Legal Services Regulatory Authority
Paul Comerford – Complaints and Resolutions Officer of Legal Services Regulatory Authority
Brian Doherty – Chief Executive Officer of Legal Services Regulatory Authority…

---

[300] ….and appendixes:

13-page Appendix cell phone
1-page Appendix deceptive
1-page Appendix eight one
1-page Appendix eight two
10-page Appendix eleven
1-page Appendix false
1-page Appendix five
1-page Appendix four
1-page Appendix material
1-page Appendix misleading
1-page Appendix one
1-page Appendix particular
1-page Appendix seven
1-page Appendix six
1-page Appendix three
1-page Appendix two

[301] See appendix 37
[302] See appendix 50
[303] See appendix 49
[304] See appendix 27
[305] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[306] See appendix 35
[307] See appendix 27
[308] See appendix 53
[309] See appendix 51
[310] See appendix 49

….were absolutely and undeniably aware that Leo Fay rejected to disclose content of 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020. In this document that came into being in December 2020, Leo Fay was preparing for trial in the court because he clearly writes[311]…..

until a

compensation is actually paid by an Insurer

…..and…..

Hopefully things get back to normal in the courts in 2021 and we can push on.

Officials of Data Protection Commission and Legal Services Regulatory Authority pointed to above rejected to legally force Leo Fay to comply with the TWO, we repeat, TWO victim's data requests as explained in post:

They work in collusion…
https://questforjustice.net/they-work-in-collusion/

In that way Data Protection Commission and Legal Services Regulatory Authority rejected to legally force Leo Fay to disclose the content of 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020.[312, 313] In that way Data Protection Commission, Legal Services Regulatory Authority, Law Society of Ireland, Director of Public Prosecutions of Ireland, Minister for Justice of Ireland, Minister for Social Protection of Ireland were and are aware that their acting in concert with one another protect rejection of Leo Fay to disclose the content of the reminder of the documents[314]

The remainder of the documents

(which includes 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020[315, 316] then appendix 24 and appendix 43)…means brutal and deliberate violation of……

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[317]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[318]…
Sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[319]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[320]
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[321]

We particularly point out that, apart from this analysis and post *In flagrante-1* posts….

[311] See appendix 49
[312] See appendix 50
[313] See appendix 49
[314] See appendix 35
[315] See appendix 50
[316] See appendix 49
[317] See second and third page of appendix 84
[318] See appendix 95
[319] See appendix 73
[320] See appendix 30
[321] See appendix 115

Director of Public Prosecutions
https://questforjustice.net/director-of-public-prosecutions-update-19-1-24/

Law Society of Ireland
https://questforjustice.net/law-society-of-ireland/

Regulatory Authority
https://questforjustice.net/regulatory-authority-update/

They work in collusion…
https://questforjustice.net/they-work-in-collusion/

…undeniably testify, we repeat, undeniably testify of the crimes of ONLY ONE PART of the Criminal Organization in the Republic of Ireland who brutally violated….

Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[322]defining that the……

"criminal organisation" means a structured group, however organised, that—

(*a*) is composed of 3 or more persons acting in concert,

(*b*) is established over a period of time,

(*c*) has as its main purpose or main activity the commission or facilitation of one or more serious offences in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit;

It is, indeed, essentially important to return, once more, to the untruth of Leo Fay who writes that the victim "…was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations"[323]

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…..because on 4th October 2023[324] Hallissey Shannon writes…

I enclose a copy of correspondence from Mr Fay dated 26 September 2023. If you have any comments you wish to make, I would be obliged to have these within the next 21 days.

[322] See appendix 115
[323] See appendix 24
[324] See appendix 52

She did enclose Leo Fay's document of 26th September 2023.[325]

On top of everything else, Leo Fay in appendix 43 confirms that he is deliberately avoiding the truth in appendix 24 where he writes that the victim "…was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations"[326]

Leo Fay is determined in avoiding the truth when writing, in appendix 24, that…..

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement

Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors from Baldoyle were NOT seeking to negotiate some form of settlement but they were preparing for the court hearing because Leo Fay[327], in appendix 49, writes….

Hopefully things get back to normal in the courts in 2021 and we can push on.

…and in the same appendix (appendix 49) this thief continues…..

until a compensation is actually paid by an Insurer

Ergo, undeniable certainty of the compensation made Michael J. Kennedy sign the Agreement Letter.[328]

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors in appendixes 43 and 49 does confirm that Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors deliberately avoids the truth in appendix 24 when saying that the victim "was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations." We have already proved that earlier in this analysis.

That is the testimony - personal and moral character of Leo Fay is hard to understand.

[325] See appendix 24
[326] See appendix 24
[327] NOT we…NOT Quest for Justice
[328] See page 5 of appendix 72



We do not say that Leo Fay is malevolent[329] solicitor of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors.
We only disagree with numerous criminal offences he perpetrated.
Source: https://www.mjksolicitors.ie/about-us/
Accessed on 26th May 2024

[329] For malevolent – see appendix 88

After all this explains why Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[330] concealed 9 (A) Document dated 1st December 2020.[331]

Being a match for the task can occasionally involve too complex intellectual circumstances.

What Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors perpetrated in this case is for academic research materials…..let him be patient….. we did not even start to publish all what we know about and all what we have the evidence for.

On top of everything else Leo Fay did know that the Statute of Limitations he points to in the fifth paragraph[332] contains exceptions Colleman Legal LLP,[333] Augustus Cullen Law[334] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[335]speak about. He also did know (because he is a law expert), having all this in mind, that his assertion…..

given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

….he writes about in the fifth paragraph[336] SIMULTANEOUSLY violates…

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[337]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[338]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[339]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[340]

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.

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

the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

We also have the following fact that the Statute of Limitations AT THE SAME PLACE talks about EXCEPTIONS….Leo Fay turns the blind eye to. However, THREE we repeat THREE

[330] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[331] See appendix 49
[332] See appendix 24
[333] See appendix 25
[334] See appendix 40
[335] See appendix 34
[336] See appendix 24
[337] See appendix 84
[338] See appendix 95
[339] See appendix 30
[340] See appendix 115

law offices: Colleman Legal LLP,[341] Augustus Cullen Law[342] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[343] DO NOT ignore them (exceptions). This is what proves that SIMULTANEOUS application of...

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[344]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[345]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[346]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[347]

…CANNOT be denied and CANNOT be avoided!

These words of Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors…..

the time allowed
pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…are his open acknowledgment that he is very familiar with the Statute of Limitations and particularly with what time is allowed and what time is not allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations. That further means that Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors does know what is frame of…

the time allowed
pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…..in the case involving mental (psychological) injury as such kind of injuries do exist. Law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[348] Augustus Cullen Law[349] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[350] do confirm it. Apart from it, the Statute of Limitations in PART I – Preliminary and General is clear…..

"personal injuries" includes any disease and any impairment of a person's physical or mental condition;

[341] See appendix 25
[342] See appendix 40
[343] See appendix 34
[344] See appendix 84
[345] See appendix 95
[346] See appendix 30
[347] See appendix 115
[348] See appendix 25
[349] See appendix 40
[350] See appendix 34

At this point we enter very interesting circumstances. Namely, on 4th October 2023[351] Ms Hallissey Shannon writes…

I enclose a copy of correspondence from Mr Fay dated 26 September 2023. If you have any comments you wish to make, I would be obliged to have these within the next 21 days.

She did enclose Leo Fay's document of 26th September 2023.[352] The victim then responded……

within the next 21 days.

…..and the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the second set of documents on 17th October 2023 at 10:28.[353] Weight of this parcel which Ms Shannon Hallisey received was 1441 grams[354] and it looked like this.[355] Ergo, that were the victim's…..

any comments

We have to return, now to the Leo Fay's document of 26th September 2023.[356] In it, he writes (front page - second paragraph)….

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

…..and (front page – fifth paragraph)…..

given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

Analysts of our section for psychological and psychiatric research have thoroughly examined both letters 26th September 2023[357] and 4th October 2023[358] and decided to set the trap[359] for Paul Comerford[360] and all his accomplices.

-at that point the two foregoing passages "did not exist" and were not going to be discussed due to the horrific findings they reached. As the result, the victim in…..

---

[351] See appendix 52
[352] See appendix 24
[353] See appendix 27
[354] See appendix 27
[355] See appendix 53
[356] See appendix 24
[357] See appendix 24
[358] See appendix 52
[359] "Helen McEntee – the Henchwoman" is the working title of a separate analysis of (currently) 73 pages giving more details about these criminals. We will start publishing the analysis immediately on completion of the investigation.
[360] Complaints and Resolutions Officer in Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland

any comments

…that Shannon Hallisey received on 17th October 2023[361] did not write even one single word referring to these two criminal offences…..

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.


…..and…..

given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

….the entries which Leo Fay included in his document of 26th September 2023.[362] Paul Comerford of Legal Services Regulatory Authority and Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors were extremely happy. They thought what Leo Fay perpetrated in document of 26th September 2023[363] was not noted and Paul Comerford was free to proceed to the second phase of the plot in form of his review[364]……


Their happiness produced his review[365] and his review produced this analysis which proves who is intellectually superior to whom.

The dates are key points in all this masquerade; neither writer of the scenario nor director of the masquerade were match for the task before them. Reception stamp of Legal Services Regulatory Authority testifies that they received Leo Fay's correspondence of 26th September 2023[366]… (see top of the front page)



…three days after it came into being (see bottom of the front page)

[361] See appendix 27
[362] See appendix 24
[363] See appendix 24
[364] See appendix 28
[365] See appendix 28
[366] See appendix 24



Ergo, Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority became absolutely aware that Leo Fay's assertion[367]…..

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

……is the criminal offence as documented in the beginning of this analysis. Paul Comerford became aware (this is undeniable) that Leo Fay's assertion…

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

…..is the criminal offence in time of considering all the documentation[368] which both Leo Fay and the victim provided him with.

How???

Here is how……

Michael Doran of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the parcel on 25th August 2023 at 09:18[369] and, as the composing part, the file LSRA containing appendix fourteen (in this file – appendix 55) clearly confirming…..

- (highlighted in yellow) TWO times that the accident at work took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12th April 2012 as Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors insolently lies ….

[367] See appendix 24 – second paragraph
[368] See appendix 28 – first paragraph (yellow highlighted)
[369] See appendix 54

The

incident arose on the 12th April 2012

(see second paragraph of appendix 24)

Apart from that the foregoing appendix fourteen (in this file – appendix 55) (highlighted in green) clarifies nature of the victim's illness…..

psychological injury.

This appendix fourteen (in this file – appendix 55) is THE SAME DOCUMENT which Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors received on 24th October 2016 (see appendix 43). Compare dates of appendix fourteen (in this file – appendix 55) and date the victim points to in his email in appendix 43.

In addition, as we have already pointed to earlier in this analysis, Michael Doran of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received the parcel on 25th August 2023 at 09:18[370] and, as the composing part, LSRA file containing appendix fourteen (in this file – appendix 55) clearly confirming…..

- (highlighted in yellow) TWO times that the accident at work took place on 2nd August 2012 and NOT on 12th April 2012 as Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, deliberately avoiding the truth, writes…

The

incident arose on the 12th April 2012

(see second paragraph of appendix 24)

…and clearly confirming (highlighted in green) that the victim suffers from psychological illness.

It is notable that Michael Doran received the parcel (this is the crucial moment) THIRTY FIVE DAYS BEFORE Legal Services Regulatory Authority received (29th September 2023)[371] Leo Fay's correspondence of 26th September 2023[372]

That, further, means Paul X. Comerford on 29th September 2023 WAS AWARE that Leo Fay deliberately avoids the truth in his document of 26th September 2023.[373]

That, further, means Paul X. Comerford on 29th September 2023 WAS AWARE that Leo Fay in his document of 26th September 2023[374] perpetrated terrific criminal offences…..

[370] See appendix 54
[371] See the stamp – bottom of the front page – appendix 24
[372] See top of the front page – appendix 24
[373] See top of the front page – appendix 24
[374] See top of the front page – appendix 24

….as for instance on page 9[375] of this analysis we wrote…

Even if Leo Fay proved this period of 2.5 years after the incident (WHICH HE DID NOT) it would be absolutely IRRELEVANT in these circumstances and he was and is aware of it. Namely, McMahon Goldrick Solicitors write that the "two year less one day" time limit DOES NOT apply in cases in which "…the injured party is mentally impaired as a result of sustaining their injury"[376]

Apart from it, as we pointed to earlier…

Colleman Legal LLP[377] Law Office claim that the exception applies "….where the injured party has suffered a mental impairment as a result of their injury." Augustus Cullen Law Law Office asserting the same write that the exception applies "if the injured person was incapacitated in some way, such as being in a coma or lacking the mental capacity to manage their affairs."[378] McMahon Goldrick Solicitors once more confirm what the two foregoing law offices wrote about. They say that one of the exceptions to the time limit is "…when the injured party is mentally impaired as a result of sustaining their injury."[379]

As evidenced on the previous page, Paul X. Comerford WAS AWARE of the victim's psychological injury and he also was aware of WHAT is written in the Statute of Limitations and WHAT law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[380] Augustus Cullen Law[381] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[382] speak about because he[383] acknowledges his familiarity with this Statute (see the figure hereunder which is taken from the bottom of third page of appendix 28)

---

[375] See pages 8 and 9 for a more detailed look into all this
[376] See appendix 34
[377] See appendix 25
[378] See appendix 40
[379] See appendix 34
[380] See appendix 25
[381] See appendix 40
[382] See appendix 34
[383] Paul X. Comerford is an officer of the Authority who REGULATE LEGAL SERVICES IN IRELAND. That, further means Paul X. Comerford REGULATES and CONTROLS services of Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors. Leo Fay in appendix 43 confirmed that time limit in the Statute of Limitations does not apply to the psychological-mental injury. Having that in mind it is very clear that Paul X. Comerford, as an officer superior to Leo Fay and as an officer of the Regulatory Authority that controls the services of Leo Fay and his firm, also was aware that time limit in the Statute of Limitations does not apply to a psychological-mental injury. Irrespective of that fact Paul X. Comerford NOWHERE in appendix 28 refers to these circumstances. On the contrary he (Paul X. Comerford) on third page of appendix 28 writes….

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters.

This is really horrific!!!

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

HORRIFIC…

…because Leo Fay, himself, seven years earlier writes in appendix 43 he and Michael J. Kennedy[384] concealed…

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

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

Leo

AWARENESS of Paul X. Comerford in these circumstances is UNDENIABLE EVIDENCE imposing application of…

Sections 7 and 8 – Criminal Law Act, 1997,[385]
Section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with Section 10.- (2) (b)….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[386] and…
Part 7 (Organized Crime) – Criminal Justice Act 2006[387] …

…BECAUSE Paul X. Comerford DID NOT INCLUDE HIS AWARENESS OF LEO FAY'S CRIMINAL OFFENCE IN HIS REVIEW[388] irrespective of the foregoing section which clearly says…….

[384] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.
[385] See appendix 73
[386] See appendix 9
[387] See appendix 115
[388] See appendix 28

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— loss of information to the victim

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

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

(*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.

Hence inevitable application of Part 7 (Organized Crime) – Criminal Justice Act 2006[389] …

Section 10.- (1) (a) refers to the very interesting notions: dishonesty[390] intention[391]

…..Section (2) (b) stresses the concept of omission which in verb form means "….to leave out or leave unmentioned.."[392] while omission one similarly defines the meaning as "to fail to include or do something".[393] So, according to section (2) (b) a person is….

[389] See appendix 115
[390] See appendix 33
[391] See appendix 89
[392] See appendix 1
[393] See appendix 2

treated as

falsifying an account or other document if he

….. omits or leaves out[394], leaves unmentioned[395] or fails to include or do something[396] and "something" in this case is

a material particular - Section 2.- (b)….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001

This is explained in the dictionary as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[397] "…having an important effect…" (material)[398]

Material particular in these circumstances, as evidenced, is the criminal offence Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors perpetrated and even more horrific it is Paul X. Comerford's awareness of, and firm determination to leave, that criminal offence unmentioned.

It is notable that section 10.- (1) points to *dishonesty* and *intention*…

In Dictionary.com "dishonesty" is defined as "lack of honesty; a disposition to lie, cheat or steal"[399] while in Cambridge dictionary "intention" refers to "something that you want and plan to do…"[400]

Why has Paul X. Comerford of Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland omitted (in his review)[401] the material particular (that Leo Fay perpetrated criminal offences)???????

……due to his "lack of honesty; a disposition to lie, cheat or steal"[402] intention to cause loss of information to the victim and more importantly due to insane personality of his supreme ringleader.

What happens then…..thief Paul Comerford (expert in law field who is supposed to protect justice and fairness) NOWHERE in his review[403] points to and out that this material particular….

The incident arose on

the 12th of April 2012

….is THE CRIMINAL OFFENCE Leo Fay (another expert at law field) perpetrated without hesitation.

---

[394] See nr 1… appendix 1
[395] See nr 2…appendix 1
[396] See appendix 2
[397] See appendix 31
[398] See appendix 32
[399] See appendix 33
[400] See appendix 89
[401] See appendix 28
[402] See appendix 33
[403] See appendix 28

In his reaction to this CRIMINAL OFFENCE Leo Fay perpetrated (documented in the beginning of this analysis), Paul Comerford perpetrates another criminal offence "justifying" this criminal offence Leo Fay committed….

The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012

Namely, Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority writes[404]…..

Point 1

'- They have done nothing"

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

…."We wish to point out that that all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

In this excerpt Paul Comerford quotes the TWO[405, 406] criminal offences Leo Fay perpetrated. However, NOWHERE in his review[407] he writes, admits or indicates that the two foregoing excerpts he quoted are criminal offences irrespective of being absolutely aware of it. (as evidenced in this analysis)

Hence his words……


Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

[404] See third page…appendix 28
[405] One criminal offence as evidenced on pages 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this analysis
[406] Another criminal offence as evidenced on pages 9, 49, 53, 58, 60, 61, 62 and 67 of this analysis
[407] See appendix 28

….heavily violate section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with 10.- (2) (a), section 10.- (1) (c)….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001,[408] sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[409] and Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006.[410] …

…BECAUSE…

…Paul X. Comerford received the file, we repeat, the file on 18th October 2023 at 10:20 …



…and, as a composing part of that file, the e-mail[411] in which Leo Fay writes…

[408] See appendix 30
[409] See appendix 73
[410] See appendix 115
[411] See appendix 43

26/10/2016, 17:22 Mail - Microsoft Service - Outlook

RE: [redacted]

Leo Fay

Mon 24/10/2016 12:57

To: [redacted]

Thanks for documents [redacted]

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


Leo

Irrespective of that Paul X. Comerford, on third page of appendix 28, writes…

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

…UNBELIEVABLE AND HORRIFIC CRIMINAL OFFENCE PAUL X. COMERFORD KNOWINGLY PERPETRATED.

Apart from all it Paul X. Comerford – Complaints and Resolutions Officer CONCEALED the entire file he received on 18th October 2023 at 10:20 (see the figure hereunder)



Namely, Orla Corcoran of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland responding[412] to the victim's personal data request[413] failed to provide the victim with this file Paul X. Comerford received on 18th October 2023 at 10:20 …

However, at the opportune time we will publish that file and international public will see what Paul X. Comerford and Brian Doherty Chief Executive Officer of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland concealed.

Apart from being the criminal offence what Paul Comerford wrote on third page of appendix 28

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

… is the faithful image of his improper behaviour.

[412] See appendix 97
[413] See appendix 19

Ergo, this is how Legal Services Regulatory Authority "protects" law and justice in the Republic of Ireland. People around the world will see not only this, but the overall file which is really huge and shocking.

Paul Comerford in this passage refers to the Statute of Limitations and defends undefendable. Somewhat later in this analysis we will return to another criminal offence Paul Comerford perpetrated in relation to the two-year limit of personal injury and the exception to this rule. In his review[414] Paul Comerford BROUGHT CHARGES AGAINST HIMSELF – UNBELIEVABLE!!!

Returning to…..

the time allowed


pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

….we point out… had it not been for concealing exception to the two-year rule[415] in document of 26th September 2023[416] it[417] COULD NOT HAVE COME INTO BEING!!! This is, literally, the same case as the one involving Eileen Loughlin, medical assessor of Department for Social Protection and also Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors.[418] All this belongs to the remainder of the documents[419] (huge number of documents) which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy as experts at law field concealed from the victim and so violated section 10.- (1) (a) ….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[420] and entire Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006.[421] However, that is a part of our special investigation and the findings will be published at the opportune time.

[414] See appendix 28
[415] See appendix 25, 34 and 40
[416] See appendix 24
[417] Appendix 24
[418] This is a part of the special analysis awaiting proper time for uploading.
[419] See appendix 35
[420] See appendix 30
[421] See appendix 115

BRIAN DOHERTY – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER IN LEGAL SERVICES REGULATORY AUTHORITY





Crimes perpetrated within this branch could not have come into being had it not been for approval, order or concurrence of……

Brian Doherty

Let us now have a closer look at what his subordinates have committed.


We will have to analyse the four-page document of Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland.

In the beginning it is really important to see and hear how this institution describe themselves[422] in theory. We, once more refer to moral character of personality required for the role of a

[422] See appendix 56

Complaints and Resolutions Officer in Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland (relevant text…pages 4 - 13).[423]

We see that in appendix 56 Legal Services Regulatory Authority write……



We are the independent regulator for legal services providers. We work to maintain and improve standards in legal services and ensure value for money in the interest of consumers.

We are the first point of contact for complaints about solicitors and barristers. We will be impartial when we consider any complaint. Our complaints service is free.

It is notable how in real life Paul Comerford, their Complaints and Resolutions Officer, demonstrates their independency, maintaining and improving standards in legal services and what it looks like in praxis when they say "We will be impartial when we consider any complaint."

Apart from it, we once more point to and out in which way Paul Comerford apprehends and defines moral character of personality required for the role of complaints and resolutions officer in Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland (relevant text…pages 4 - 13).[424]

On 3rd page of his review[425] Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority writes…..


On 9th August 2023 Mr [redacted] made the following allegations against Mr William O Connor, a solicitor:

- '- They have done nothing"
- *Raised issues with non-compliance with GDPR*
- *Gave instructions for the case to be closed by end of July 2023*

In the foregoing excerpt "Mr William O Connor" appears nowhere in the files[426]… only in Paul Comerford's mind.

Paul Comerford then (on the same page – see the excerpt hereunder) explains point by point that Leo Fay replied to the allegations about "Mr William O Connor"….

Such a person (Paul Comerford) works as a Complaints and Resolutions Officer in the Irish Legal Services Regulatory Authority…unbelievable!

Ergo, Paul Comerford explains…

---

[423] See appendix 57
[424] See appendix 57
[425] See appendix 28
[426] The victim has NEVER heard, has NEVER seen and has NEVER had anything to do with "Mr William O Connor" if such a person exists.

On the 26th of September Leo Fay provided a reply to the allegations

Point 1

'- They have done nothing"

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

...."We wish to point out that that all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

What really deserves attention is explication of Paul Comerford in relation to point 1. It is, indeed, important to note that (3rd page of his review[427]) focused on and even quoted these words of Leo Fay….

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

What should be kept, firmly, in mind is that the foregoing excerpt are words of Leo Fay which Paul Comerford DID NOTE AND QUOTE.

The focus of our attention is this…..

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012

…..which, we repeat again we will repeat it one thousand times, means that Paul Comerford HAD THIS MATERIAL PARTICULAR IN FRONT OF HIS EYES – FACT – UNDENIABLE ONE!

[427] See appendix 28

Apart from it Paul Comerford HAD IN FRONT OF HIS EYES appendix 55[428] too. Irrespective of everything evidenced he writes in his review[429]….

I have determined that your complaint is inadmissible.

Further, Paul Comerford writes…..

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr

We now focus on very interesting intellectual circumstances in which Mr Paul Comerford set a trap he fell into himself – UNBELIEVABLE! This is a story for academic research materials….

Namely, Mr Michael Doran received the parcel on 25th August 2023 at 09:18[430] and, as the composing part, the file LSRA containing appendix fourteen[431] clearly showing (highlighted in yellow) TWO times that the accident at work took place on 2nd August 2012. Knowing this, at the moment of having appendix fourteen[432] in front of his eyes Paul Comerford, as a law expert, (this is undeniable) became fully aware that this assertion of Leo Fay…..

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012

…is absolutely all… misleading,[433] false[434] and deceptive[435] in the material particular. Apart from it pages 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Analysis undeniably prove numerous times that Leo Fay deliberately said what he knew was inaccurate…

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012

(see second paragraph…front page…appendix 24)

"Material particular" dictionary defines as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[436] "…having an important effect…" (material)[437]

[428] …explained in more details on pages 65 and 66
[429] ….front page …appendix 28
[430] See appendix 54
[431] See appendix 55 in this file (pages 65, 66 and 80 point to more details about insolent and disgusting concealing appendix fourteen – in this file appendix fourteen is referred to as appendix 55)
[432] See appendix 55 in this file
[433] See appendix 6
[434] See appendix 7
[435] See appendix 8
[436] See appendix 31
[437] See appendix 32

Irrespective of such the conviction he gives the following comment also all: … misleading, false and deceptive in the material particular…(see third page of appendix 28)

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

…because he and Michael J. Kennedy[438] concealed appendix fourteen[439] which revokes Leo Fay's illegal assertion of 26th September 2023[440]….

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012

…..given in the passage hereunder. Apart from it Leo Fay concealed appendix 43 (his own document) which demolishes himself, all his accomplices and the entire plot. Ergo, Paul Comerford writes…..

[438] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence – Section 10.- (1) (a) Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001) – see appendix 30.

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—

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

Irrespective of that huge number of documents contained in the remainder of the documents (see more about this in appendix 35) never reached the victim.

[439] See appendix 55 in this file (pages 65, 66 and 80 point to more details about insolent and disgusting concealing appendix fourteen – in this file appendix fourteen is referred to as appendix 55)

[440] See appendix 24

On the 26th of September Leo Fay provided a reply to the allegations

Point 1

'- They have done nothing"

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

...."We wish to point out that that all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

Hence Paul Comerford's passage violates section 10.- (2) (b) ….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences Act) 2001, Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[441] and also Sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[442]…

What Leo Fay says hereunder is unheard of….

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

Irrespective of numerous pieces of evidence in this analysis Legal Services Regulatory Authority demonstrated intellectual power and accepted the foregoing excerpt of Leo Fay…unheard of!!!

As already mentioned above Paul Comerford concealed appendix fourteen (as a part of LSRA file received on 25th August 2023[443] - in this file appendix fourteen is marked as appendix 55). This appendix TWO times confirms that the accident at work took place on 2nd August 2012 revoking so Leo Fay's illegal and insolent assertion of 26th September 2023[444]…. that ….

[441] See appendix 115
[442] See appendix 73
[443] See appendix 29 …see PARTICULARLY appendix 54 which gives more details and on tis fourth page photo of the parcel.
[444] See appendix 24

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012
(see second paragraph – front page – appendix 24)

Ignoring the fact that appendix fourteen does exist was really against all fundamental principles of logical reasoning.[445]

Why?

This is why…

To receive the parcel (weighing 1446 grams)[446] LSRA employee HAD TO give their signature. That signature[447] on the postal receipt testifies that we can prove every period, semi-colon or colon, let alone a document, the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received. Further, that signature is our proof that Paul Comerford DID SEE appendix fourteen.[448] This appendix TWO times confirms that the accident at work took place on 2nd August 2012. This appendix TWO TIMES confirms that Leo Fay's assertion…..

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012
(see second paragraph…front page….appendix 24)

……is the criminal offence Leo Fay perpetrated violating in that way…

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[449]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[450]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[451]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[452]

Irrespective of ALL FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPELS OF LOGICAL REASONING[453] in his review[454] Paul Comerford concealed appendix fourteen[455] violating so…

Sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[456]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[457]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[458]

[445] See appendix 23
[446] See first page of appendix 54
[447] See third page…appendix 54
[448] See appendix 55
[449] See appendix 84
[450] See appendix 95
[451] See appendix 30
[452] See appendix 115
[453] See appendix 23
[454] See appendix 28
[455] See appendix 55
[456] See appendix 73
[457] See appendix 30
[458] See appendix 115

Apart from it Paul Comerford, in these circumstances ignored common sense confirming that the postal receipt[459] does exist and does prevent concealing appendix fourteen.[460]

However, the climax of unintellectual reasoning is the fact that the Legal Services Regulatory Authority posted[461] Leo Fay's document[462] to the victim. Ergo, in these circumstances, the foregoing appendix fourteen[463] would mean nothing without Leo Fay's document[464] BECAUSE we would not have the evidence (undeniable one)…

That evidence in form of appendix fourteen[465, 466] proves Paul Comerford's awareness of Leo Fay's criminal offence in form of……

The

incident arose on the 12th April 2012

The Legal Services Regulatory Authority, first, "kindly" provided us with the most precious (one of a kind) evidence[467] testifying so against Paul Comerford and his review[468] because he, as we have already proved earlier, had in front of his eyes the foregoing appendix fourteen. Appendix fourteen (in this file appendix 55) and appendix 5 are the two pieces of evidence confirming that Paul Comerford was aware of Leo Fay's criminal offence. From perspective of Legal Services Regulatory Authority their "wisdom" is reflected in posting appendix 5[469] to the victim. That was the document we needed and we were waiting for. Our experts, then, compared the two documents[470] and instantly saw the criminal offences Leo Fay perpetrated. Paul Comerford had the same two documents in front of his eyes BEFORE, we repeat BEFORE us. However, in his review[471] he failed to refer to it. Hence, section 10….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[472] and entire Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[473] apply.

Instead of pointing to the criminal offences Leo Fay perpetrated in appendix 5 Paul Comerford perpetrated another criminal offence[474] and decided that the victim's complaint was inadmissible. That illegal act of Legal Services Regulatory Authority and Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors produced launching of www.questforjustice.net that will testify permanently of what happened in Ireland.

---

[459] See appendix 54
[460] See appendix 55
[461] See appendix 52

I enclose a copy of correspondence from Mr Fay dated 26 September 2023.

[462] See appendix 5
[463] See appendix 55
[464] See appendix 5
[465] See appendix 55….which Legal Services Regulatory Authority received (see appendix 54)
[466] ….which TWO times points to 2nd August 2012 as the real date when the accident took place
[467] See appendix 5
[468] See appendix 28
[469] Evidence of Leo Fay's criminal offences
[470] See appendix 5 and appendix 55
[471] Appendix 28
[472] See appendix 30
[473] See appendix 115
[474] See appendix 28

In this moment we return to meaning of several notions Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001, in its section 10, speaks about….

We have already had a look at these concepts earlier in the analysis and due to the horror of what Paul Comerford perpetrated we have to refer to them again. What is relevant, very relevant having in mind review[475] Paul Comerford wrought is an action simultaneously misleading,[476] false[477] and deceptive[478] in the material particular. The last two concepts dictionary defines as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[479] "…having an important effect…" (material)[480]

This Complaints and Resolutions Officer[481] of Legal Services Regulatory Authority writes (page 3….appendix 28)….

On 9th August 2023 Mr [redacted] made the following allegations against Mr William O Connor, a solicitor:

9th August 2023 is the file that Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 9th August 2023.[482] It is notable that name of "Mr William O Connor" is mentioned NOWHERE in file

9th August 2023 (appendix 58) and Paul Comerford is aware of it….Having in mind that fact we should carefully look at what Stephen G. Rodriguez & Partners say.[483]

Comerford Paul continues……

- *Gave instructions for the case to be closed by end of July 2023*

(appendix 28…third page)

On page 3 of appendix 58 the following text is notable….

Michael J. Kennedy, if the case does not be closed within the 14-day period the foregoing paragraph points to (by 28th July 2023 - Friday) this 15-page letter will be posted immediately on Saturday morning (29th July 2023)…Apart from it, more steps are being prepared ….but, all in its time!

---

[475] See appendix 28
[476] See appendix 6
[477] See appendix 7
[478] See appendix 8
[479] See appendix 31
[480] See appendix 32
[481] …what an irony …resolutions officer Paul Comerford
[482] See appendix 58 – page 19
[483] See appendix 59

…..and on page 6 (appendix 58) this excerpt can be seen…..

"…. If the case is closed within fourteen days after reception of this letter (that will be confirmed by the An Post receipt) – this request for access to personal information can be ignored **providing** that no new evidence is reached as the inquiry is continuing and any new exhibit will change the circumstances. However, if the case is closed within fourteen days (not in accordance with the power of undeniable exhibits) or if the case is not closed within fourteen days this request for access to personal information **remains in effect** and 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. Any potential communication after that may happen but ONLY IN QUITE DIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCES.

…and last but not the least….we would not advise anyone to hurt the victim in any way!!!"

According to Cambridge dictionary instruction is "something that someone tells you to do"[484] In these two passages or anywhere in this file the victim does not tell Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors to do anything. These two passages only explain our steps if the case does not be closed as Leo Fay promised on page 7 of this file (page 7 of appendix 58) "Further, Leo I also understood you that we will have my case closed in July 2023." …..THAT IS NOT THE VICTIM'S INSTRUCTION!

Further, on page 112 of 116-page document that the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023 at 10:28[485] the victim clearly wrote what he said…..

"This material particular of the foregoing excerpt is, in fact, the reformulated emotional plea by the victim "….would it be possible to close the case by end of July this year….." and THAT IS WHAT THE VICTIM PRONOUNCED…" ….it is clear that the victim did not give an instruction.

Then, on page 113 of the same document the victim wrote….

….although Mr Leo Fay was very clear that Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors were going to close the case by end of July 2023 and Mr Leo Fay responding to the victim's plea "would it be possible to close the case by end of July this year?" repeated it two times having in mind, he said, very long time that passed after signing the agreement. ----Paul Comerford turned the blind eye to all this. He does not want to see and hear anything if it comes from the victim.

The victim's "would it be possible to close the case by end of July this year?" – IS NOT AN INSTRUCTION!!!

All pointed to above Paul Comerford had in front of his eyes because the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received this seventeen-page document on 9th August 2023[486] – see page 19

[484] See appendix 60
[485] See appendix 27
[486] See appendix 58

Irrespective of that on page 4 of his review[487] Paul Comerford writes…..

Gave instructions for the case to be closed by end of July 2023

Mr Fay replied "..I last met Mr [redacted] on the day of June 2023 he was very clear he wanted his case closed, which I understand to mean settled by the end of July 2023. His instructions were that if the case could not be closed by that date he would rely upon legal advice that he was receiving from Lawyers whom he became acquainted..

It is clear from the documentation that this instruction was provided by Mr [redacted] that he was relying on advice from other lawyers and that certain ultimatums were issued as a result. Once this one month deadline passed and Mr Fay (as he perceived it) didn't "settle" the case. Mr [redacted] lodged his complaint to the LSRA. It is far beyond the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month, however a case can be closed where the complainant simply instructs that no further action be made. As such it is the responsibility of the complainant, (in this case Mr [redacted]) to close a case by instruction. There is no evidence to suggest that Mr Fay did not follow this instruction.

Comerford Paul rejected to accept even undeniable facts the victim provided him with and what we pointed to in this analysis. He only accepted what Leo Fay sticks with. The climax of Paul Comerford's improper behaviour is his assertion[488]…

It is far beyond the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,


We have to say, at this point, that these words of Mr Paul Comerford are one big sarcasm. Let us explain…..

The Legal Services regulatory Authority received the first set of documents on 25th August 2023.[489] Within that set they received file under name LSRA that contained the five-page Agreement Letter between Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors and the victim marked as: appendix nineteen – a, appendix nineteen – b, appendix nineteen – c, appendix nineteen – d, and appendix nineteen - e.[490] This last appendix (fifth page of the Agreement Letter – fifth page of appendix 61 in this file) testifies that the victim and managing partner Michael J. Kennedy (criminal) signed the Agreement Letter on on 30th December 2015. This information Paul Comerford did have in front of his eyes. That fact is what defines Paul Comerford's assertion[491]…..

It is far beyond the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,

[487] See appendix 28
[488] See 4th page of appendix 28
[489] See appendixes 29 and 54
[490] See appendix 61
[491] See 4th page of appendix 28

….as determined, deliberate and clear avoiding the truth, because from signing the Agreement Letter on 30th December 2015[492]…



Yours sincerely,

Michael J Kennedy TO


MICHAEL J KENNEDY & COMPANY

I [redacted] hereby acknowledge having read the foregoing fee agreement letter and terms and conditions and accept on that basis the legal representation of Michael J. Kennedy & Company Solicitors as described above and agree to be bound by the terms of this letter.

Dated : 30.12.2015

Signed : [redacted]


…through 8th November 2023 when collection of Paul Comerford's criminal offences came into being,[493] 2869 days can be accommodated. This number of days is "slightly" longer than Paul Comerford's …..



a month


[492] See fifth page of appendix 61

[493] Date 8th November 2023 is pointed to both on front…



08 November 2023

… and on fourth page…



Signed:	**Paul Comerford**
Position:	**Complaints and Resolutions Officer**
Date:	**8th November 2023**

… of appendix 28

It is far beyond
the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,

(see page 4 of appendix 28)

On both first and fourth page of his review[494] Paul Comerford testifies that the document came into being on 8th November 2023. We see that after signing the Agreement Letter on 30th December 2015[495] through 8th November 2023 two thousand eight hundred and sixty nine days exist….

2016 had 366 days (leap year)
2017 had 365 days
2018 had 365 days
2019 had 365 days
2020 had 366 days (leap year)
2021 had 365 days
2022 had 365 days
Eight November in 2023 was 312th day in that year.

Ergo, 366 (2016) + 365 (2017) + 365 (2018) + 365 (2019) + 366 (2020) + 365 (2021) + 365 (2022) + 312 (2023) = 2869 days

Let us return to this assertion of Paul Comerford in which he points to "a month" and that amounts to thirty days……

It is far beyond
the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,

(see page 4 of appendix 28)

We do agree with what he said in this excerpt. However, we have proved, in bottom paragraph on page 87, that Paul Comerford was fully aware of 30th December 2015. If we subtract Comerford's "a month" (30 days) from 2869 days we get result of 2839 days and this number of days very fairly and very precisely defines volume of immorality of Paul Comerford.

We have already said above…..we agree with Mr Paul Comerford that settling…..

a case with in a month ……is very hard. However, 2869 days certainly do not pose any problem to settle a case.

This is what Paul Comerford of Legal Services Regulatory Authority really wrote…..

It is far beyond
the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in

[494] See appendix 28
[495] See fifth page of appendix 61

……2869 days wishing to humiliate the victim in that way. On the contrary he only demonstrated his inability. As we have proved above he did know that……

a month is simultaneously all all misleading,[496] false[497] and deceptive.[498]

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO LOGICALLY, DISCONNECT THE FOREGOING EVIDENCE AND WHAT FOLLOWS HEREUNDER…

Stephen G. Rodriguez and Partners in appendix 59 very clearly explain tampering with evidence.

Further….

Section 10.- (1) (a)….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[499] says…

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—

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

…..and section 10.- (2) (a) further clarifies…..

[496] See appendix 6
[497] See appendix 7
[498] See appendix 8
[499] See appendix 30

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,

(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

Everything in section 10.- (2) (a) revolves around "entry" and we see that the notion refers to "….a separate piece of information that is recorded in a book, computer, etc."[500] We find, precisely, such "…a separate piece of information…" in this excerpt of Paul Comerford……

It is far beyond the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,

It is notable that section 10.- (2) (a) speaks also of …..

a material particular

….explained in the dictionary as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[501] "…having an important effect…" (material)[502]

Ergo, what describes immoral ……

[500] See appendix 48
[501] See appendix 31
[502] See appendix 32

a material particular

…..in this assertion of Paul Comerford….

It is far beyond the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,

….is…..

with in a month

…..as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[503] "…having an important effect…" (material)[504] which is all (simultaneously) misleading,[505] false[506] and deceptive.[507]

As already proved above Paul Comerford fraudulently[508] replaced 2869 days with….

a month

Hence, section 10.- (1) (c) Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[509] applies as well as, having in mind findings of this analysis,…

…Sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[510]…
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[511]

[503] See appendix 31
[504] See appendix 32
[505] See appendix 6
[506] See appendix 7
[507] See appendix 8
[508] See appendix 59
[509] See appendix 30
[510] See appendix 73
[511] See appendix 115

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—

(*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.

Further, having still in mind this passage

It is far beyond the remit of a Legal Practitioner to solely settle a case with in a month,

….we refer to correspondence of 9th August 2023[512] which Legal Services Regulatory Authority received at 08:14. Paul Comerford, does acknowledge that he did see this letter as in his review[513] on third page he writes……

On 9th August 2023 Mr [redacted] made the following allegations against Mr William O Connor, a solicitor:

On bottom of page 4 of the letter dated 9th August 2023[514] it is clearly written….

> It is important to point out that **the Agreement Letter was signed on 30th December 2015** (see the two excerpts on page 15 - however, all the 5-page Agreement Letter is available) and what I have now **after 5681 (five thousand six hundred and eighty one days and nights** ..30/12/2015 through 17th July 2023) is presented hereunder. **That is not acceptable and that will be tried by the Court of International Public!!!** Now, please have a look at the eight-page letter….

This is another point proving that Paul Comerford fraudulently replaced 5681 days and nights with …..

[512] See appendix 58….page 19
[513] See appendix 28
[514] See appendix 58….page 19

a month

In such a way Paul Comerford perpetrated everything that is documented above.

- see Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[515]
- see Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[516]

- see also tampering or planting evidence as explained in appendix 59. At this point we have to return to this excerpt (page 3 – appendix 28)……

On the 26th of September Leo Fay provided a reply to the allegations

Point 1

'- They have done nothing"

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

…."We wish to point out that that all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

Namely, Paul Comerford of the Legal Services regulatory Authority stresses several interesting points….

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.


Let us, first, have a look at meaning of "review" Paul Comerford refers to. According to Britannica Dictionary the verb means "to look at or examine (something) carefully especially before making a decision or judgment"[517]

[515] See appendix 30
[516] See appendix 115
[517] See appendix 62

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that


…Admissibility Decision[518] Paul X. Comerford brought is only a collection of criminal offences because he perpetrated his crime[519]…

….having not reviewed and having completely ignored….an analysis and its 37 appendixes[520] which he and his boss Brian Doherty received on the same day…



Delivered to Brian Doherty

[518] See appendix 28
[519] See appendix 28
[520] See appendix 118



In this way both Paul X. Comerford and Brian Doherty heavily violated Sections 7 and 8 – Criminal Law Act 1997[521] and, what is horrific, Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006.[522]

On page 3 – appendix 28 disgusting criminal Paul X. Comerford writes….

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

…and points to constrain which literature defines as forcing "…someone to do something or behave in a particular way."[523] Having these definitions in mind it is notable that after "careful examining"[524] the documentation Legal Services Regulatory Authority received from the

[521] See appendix 73
[522] See appendix 115
[523] See appendix 63
[524] Read…not examining at all

victim for Paul Comerford "…it is clear that…….the requirements of the Statute of Limitations…" forced Leo Fay to assert that the victim…….

was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

(page 3 – appendix 28)…horrific!!!

Appendixes 43, 49 and 118 testify that Paul X. Comerford breached all known moral and legal norms.

The key word in this passage that Paul Comerford used is adjective "clear" which is evidence that he is very familiar with the Statute of Limitations and it is commendable. However, having firmly in mind Paul Comerford's familiarity with this Statute, we must return to…..

…..Section (2) (b)[525] which stresses the concept of omission that in verb form means "….to leave out (see nr 1)[526], or leave unmentioned (see nr 2)[527] and similarly defines meaning of the verb as "to fail to include or do something."[528] Ergo, according to section (2) (b) a person is….

treated as falsifying an account or other document if he

….. omits or in other words leaves out (see nr 1)[529], leaves unmentioned (see nr 2)[530] or fails to include or do something[531] and "something" in this case is…

a material particular - Section 2.- (b)….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[532]

This is explained in the dictionary as "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[533] "…having an important effect…" (material)[534]

Namely, sections 10.- (1) (a); 10.- (2) (a) (b) …Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[535] are very clear - Paul Comerford, explaining the Statute of Limitations and asserting on third page of appendix 28 that Leo Fay was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations brutally, violated the foregoing sections. On top of everything else, Paul X. Comerford – Complaints and Resolutions Officer of Legal Services Regulatory Authority in


[525] Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001….see appendix 9
[526] See appendix 1
[527] See appendix 1
[528] See appendix 2
[529] See appendix 1
[530] See appendix 1
[531] See appendix 2
[532] See appendix 9
[533] See appendix 31
[534] See appendix 32
[535] See appendix 9

his Admissibility Decision[536] left out (see nr 1), left unmentioned (see nr 2)[537] and failed to include[538] not only…

a material particular - Section 2.- (b)[539] speaks about BUT THE ENTIRE ANALYSIS AND ITS 37 APPENDIXES.[540]

This is horrific!!!

At this point we have to refer to the fact that Paul Comerford has "successfully" fulfilled all the moral and legal requirements set out in the Candidate Information Booklet – It is indeed extremely important to painstakingly analyse appendix 57. In such a way Paul Comerford demonstrated in practice a very "high"[541] reputation of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland. In these circumstances the foregoing sections apply to what Paul Comerford perpetrated in this passage on third page of appendix 28.


Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

How?

This is how!

Section 10.- (2) (a) in connection with section 10.- (1) (a)[542] are applied because the passage is all misleading,[543] false[544] and deceptive[545] and because what Paul Comerford writes in the foregoing passage is the crime against common sense – evidence...appendix 118

Section 10.- (2) (b) in connection with section 10.- (1) (a)[546] because Paul Comerford did accept (third page…appendix 28) the false Leo Fay's "a specific…..detail of information.." (particular)[547] "…having an important effect…" (material)[548]


[536] See appendix 28
[537] See appendix 1
[538] See appendix 2
[539] Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001… See appendix 9
[540] See appendix 118
[541] See appendix 56
[542] Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001….see appendix 9
[543] See appendix 6
[544] See appendix 7
[545] See appendix 8
[546] Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001….see appendix 9
[547] See appendix 31
[548] See appendix 32

….“We wish to point out that that all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations”.

Paul Comerford accepted this false material particular although the Statute of Limitations (both Leo Fay and Paul Comerford are very familiar with) refers to the exceptions to the two- year rule and irrespective of the fact that Leo Fay, himself, only seven years earlier writes “In the Statute of Limitations time limit does not apply to your psychological-mental injury.”[549]


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

As the icing on the cake we have the following… both perpetrators Paul X. Comerford and Brian Doherty received an analysis and its 37 appendixes[550] on the same day…



Delivered to Brian Doherty

[549] See appendix 43
[550] See appendix 118



…and on page 16 of this analysis both criminals Brian Doherty and Paul X. Comerford did see that Leo fay writes…

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

…these two criminals also did see APPENDIX 28 this excerpt on page 16 of the Analysis refers to and this analysis and its 37 appendixes[551] legally break Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy, Paul X. Comerford and Brian Doherty of Legal Services Regulatory Authority and all the disgusting gang into legal smithereens.

However, none of numerous security services in Ireland are interested in this website (https://questforjustice.net/).

However, Irish Police Commissioner, Justin Kelly, is not interested in this website… (https://questforjustice.net/).

[551] See appendix 118

An Garda Síochána
Ireland's National Police and Security Service

(/)

Commissioner



Title: Garda Commissioner

Name: Justin Kelly

Native Of: Dublin

Appointed: September 2025

Career Highlights:

Garda Commissioner Justin Kelly has 33 years policing experience. Commissioner Kelly was appointed by Government as Garda Commissioner from 1 September 2025. He was previously Deputy Commissioner Security, Strategy and Governance. Previous to that, as Assistant Commissioner, Serious and Organised Crime, he was responsible for leading the national policing response in areas of drugs and organised crime, cybercrime, economic crime, immigration and crimes against vulnerable persons. He was the strategic lead for the development of capacity and organisational policy in a number of areas connected with serious crime investigation.

Prior to that he was Detective Chief Superintendent, in the Organisation's Operational Counter-Terrorism Unit, the Special Detective Unit. He was previously Detective Superintendent, Garda National Protective Services Bureau, as well as a Detective Inspector, Drugs and Organised Crime Bureau, and a frontline Inspector in the Blanchardstown and Clondalkin areas of Dublin.

In 2001, he was seconded to work for the United Nations in Bosnia Herzegovina, where he worked monitoring and building the capacity of local Law Enforcement.

ACCESSIBILITY HELP?


Qualifications:

- Bachelor in Civil Law (BCL) from University College Dublin,
- Master of Criminal Justice from John Jay College in New York, (Recipient of the McCabe fellowship in 2009 to undertake a year long period of study and research at John Jay College)
- Master of Business Administration (MBA) from Dublin City University
- Master of Serious Crime Investigation from the University of Limerick.
- Strategic Command Course, College of Policing, U.K.

Violation of section 10.- (2) (b)….Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[552] is brutal and horrific because Paul X. Comerford, in appendix 28, omitted referring to…


- exceptions law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[553] Augustus Cullen Law[554] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[555] speak about. It is very important to carefully analyse what these law offices write of the mental impairment.

- an analysis and its 37 appendixes[556] which he and his boss Brian Doherty received on the same day…



Delivered to Brian Doherty

[552] See appendix 30
[553] See appendix 25
[554] See appendix 40
[555] See appendix 34
[556] See appendix 118



It is, indeed, important to mention that this analysis and its 37 appendixes[557] which these two criminals received on the same day is only the first part. The second part Paul X. Comerford and Brian Doherty received on October 18, 2023 in the same parcel is much more horrific and we will upload it at the appropriate time. Ergo that is also the evidence material that Paul X. Comerford rejected to refer to in appendix 28. Unacceptable and horrific.

As we have already mentioned earlier in the analysis section (2) (b)[558] stresses the concept of omission[559] which in verb form verb means "….to leave out or leave unmentioned.." while omission one[560] similarly defines the meaning as "to fail to include or do something". So, according to section (2) (b) a person is….

treated as

falsifying an account or other document if he

[557] See appendix 118
[558] Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 – see appendix 9
[559] See appendix 1
[560] See appendix 2

….. omits or leaves out (nr 1 – appendix 1), leaves unmentioned (nr 2 – appendix 1) or fails to include or do something (appendix 2) and "something" in this case is a material particular - Section 2.- (b).

This is explained in the dictionary as a specific…..detail of information[561] having an important effect[562]

To exclude any misunderstanding of meaning of the "mental" these law offices speak about and meaning of psychological injury appendix Newbridge[563] for instance, points to we refer to California Work Injury Law Center (cwilc) who clearly say that ….

"A psychological injury is when the person has suffered mental trauma as a result of an accident, sudden shock, or a traumatic event. Examples of psychiatric injuries are Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Adjustment Disorder, and depression."[564]

Let us now have a look at the examples of this injury….

> A psychological injury is when the person has suffered mental trauma as a result of an accident, sudden shock, or a traumatic event. Examples of psychiatric injuries are Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Adjustment Disorder, and depression.

Having been exposed to the horrific trauma on 2nd August 2012 next morning the victim had to see his GP. It is notable on the doctor's receipt that the victim saw his GP on 3rd August 2012[565] which would not be possible if the accident took place on 12th April 2012 as Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors insolently lies ….

The incident arose on the 12th April 2012

(see second paragraph of appendix 24)

The victim's GP immediately, on 3rd August 2012, recognized the stress which was subsequently diagnosed as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder[566] and depression.[567] Both of these conditions are pointed to as examples of psychological-psychiatric injury in how California Injury Law Center defines it[568]……

> A psychological injury is when the person has suffered mental trauma as a result of an accident, sudden shock, or a traumatic event. Examples of psychiatric injuries are Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Adjustment Disorder, and depression.

[561] See appendix 3
[562] See appendix 4
[563] See appendix 16
[564] See appendix 46
[565] See appendix 64
[566] See appendix 12
[567] See appendix 47
[568] See appendix 46

Why we point to the concept of psychological injury. Simply because Paul Comerford became aware, TWO TIMES AT TWO DIFFERENT PLACES, that the victim suffers from this injury…. However, he ignored that fact and omitted this psychological injury in his review.[569]

Namely, Mr Michael Doran received the parcel on 25th August 2023 at 09:18[570] and, as the composing part, the file LSRA containing……

appendix fourteen (in this file – appendix 55) which clearly proves (highlighted in green) that the victim suffers from "psychological injury"

appendix four (in this file – appendix 65) in which pages 1 – 25 of this 38-page document also clearly prove that the victim suffers from the mental illness.

It is, indeed, important to point out that this appendix four (in this file – appendix 65) Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors, received under name appendix ten of file MAY 2022 on 17th January 2023 at 06:22.[571] On page 6[572] of this appendix ten Leo Fay DID SEE that IRISH WHEELCHAIR ASSOCIATION was the cause of the victim's mental illness. This file, MAY 2022 which Fay Leo received, was the part of a parcel, of A4 documents printed on both sides of paper, weighing five thousand one hundred and fifteen grams.[573] As we have already pointed to on 17th January 2023 at 06:22 Leo Fay received the parcel of A4 sheet documents printed on both sides of paper, weighing five thousand one hundred and fifteen grams; the parcel looked like this.[574] In it (in the parcel) Leo Fay received, also, file DECEMBER 2021 ONE and its ANALYSIS DECEMBER 2021 ONE. APPENDIX TWENTY TWO[575] of this analysis clearly points out that IRISH WHEELCHAIR ASSOCIATION was the cause of the victim's mental illness.

Ergo, on 17th January 2023 Leo Fay DID SEE TWO TIMES ON TWO DIFFERENT OCCASIONS that the victim suffers from mental illness. Apart from that, as early as 24th October 2016 Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors acknowledges himself (having seen the evidence) that the victim suffers from psychological injury.[576]

This illness belongs to the exceptions law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[577] Augustus Cullen Law[578] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[579] speak about.

Irrespective of that and irrespective of HIS OWN acknowledgement[580] Leo Fay in his document of 26th September 2023 writes[581]…….

[569] See appendix 28
[570] See appendix 54
[571] See appendix 114
[572] See appendix 112
[573] See appendix 11 (for more details about this see…appendix 114)
[574] See appendix 114
[575] See appendix 113
[576] See appendix 43
[577] See appendix 25
[578] See appendix 40
[579] See appendix 34
[580] See appendix 43
[581] See appendix 24

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

The world has never seen such form of humiliating moral and ethics.

Having firmly in mind that Leo Fay, being absolutely aware of what we just proved above, did all this this to the person permanently suffering from mental illness which Irish Wheelchair Association in firm determination[582] caused *Quest for Justice*, bring all this that is causing stomach upset to light….

We continue the testimony and return, once more, to psychological injury as Paul Comerford became aware, TWO MORE TIMES AT TWO DIFFERENT PLACES, that the victim suffers from this injury….

Apart from appendix fourteen and appendix four explained on the previous page Mr Michael Doran received the parcel on 25th August 2023[583] and, as the composing part, the file LSRA containing appendix nine[584] and file ANALYSIS FEB 2021 NINE PAGES containing appendix mark buckley.[585] Both these appendixes testify that the victim suffers from mental illness the Statute of Limitations sees as the exception to the two year rule limitation and which law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[586] Augustus Cullen Law[587] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[588] speak about. Apart from Paul Comerford, Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors also was aware

---

[582] At a later stage we will start uploading evidence material of mental and physical torture which several times caused bleeding of the victim's limbs. It is not all as Quest for Justice have documentation testifying of indeed horrific and real nature of Irish Wheelchair Association. This torture which began in 2005 and which the victim was exposed to in the IRISH WHEELCHAIR ASSOCIATION, could have been seen only in the Middle Ages. From August 2012 this Criminal Organization in Ireland joined IRISH WHEELCHAIR ASSOCIATION and they mutually continued inflicting severe mental pains on the victim. Along with this evidence material we will publish the relevant Ireland's Criminal Justice legislation and the document of an international organization. The purpose of all this is that international public see what this Criminal Organization in Ireland is attempting to conceal at any price. We have documentation testifying of deriving gratification from systematic inflicting the horrific mental pain on the victim….

THE WORLD MUST SEE THIS!!!

…we repeat…

THE WORLD MUST SEE THIS!!!

[583] See appendix 29….see also appendix 54
[584] See appendix 66
[585] See appendix 67
[586] See appendix 25
[587] See appendix 40
[588] See appendix 34

of appendix mark buckley[589] since he received it in the file FEBRUARY 2021 on 17th January 2023 at 06:22 in the parcel which looked like this.[590] This file which Fay Leo received, was the part of a parcel, of A4 sheet documents printed on both sides of paper, weighing five thousand one hundred and fifteen grams.[591] Ergo, on 17th January 2023 Mr Leo Fay was aware that the victim suffers from mental illness. However, we have already pointed to in this analysis that Leo Fay, himself, only seven years earlier writes "In the Statute of Limitations time limit does not apply to your psychological-mental injury."[592]
We have repeated numerous times and we will repeat numerous times that this illness belongs to the exceptions law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[593] Augustus Cullen Law[594] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[595] speak about.

However, Paul Comerford ignored and omitted that fact and he even omitted (in his review)[596] that the victim's psychological injury even exists

Hence, Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 – Section 10.- (1) (a) falsification and Section 10.- (2) (b) – see also Tampering or planting evidence brilliantly explained in appendix 59.

It is proved above that Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority FOUR DIFFERENT TIMES had, in front of his eyes, documents that the victim suffers from psychological injury.

Then it is, indeed, important to point to 3rd page of his review[597] where he points to the Statute of Limitations and points falsely out that the Legal Practitioner was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations…..simultaneously, consciously and insolently concealing that the Statute of Limitations contains the exception law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[598] Augustus Cullen Law[599] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[600] speak about. What these three law offices say does prove that the Legal Practitioner (Leo Fay) WAS NOT CONSTRAINED by requirements of the Statute of Limitations. Both Leo Fay and Paul Comerford are aware of this. However, they perpetrated what they perpetrated.

THIS IS INSOLENCE OF ALL INSOLENCES

[589] See appendix 67
[590] See appendix 114
[591] See appendix 11 and 114
[592] See appendix 43
[593] See appendix 25
[594] See appendix 40
[595] See appendix 34
[596] See appendix 28
[597] See appendix 28
[598] See appendix 25
[599] See appendix 40
[600] See appendix 34

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

(see page 3 of appendix 28)

Comerford Paul of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority further stresses…

It is clear that the Legal Practitioner……was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations….

In this way Paul Comerford undeniably proves that he is fully familiar with…..

the

requirements of the Statute of Limitations

In this way Paul Comerford proves that he is fully familiar with the exceptions (psychological injury) law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[601] Augustus Cullen Law[602] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[603] BECAUSE…….

the


requirements of the Statute of Limitations

embrace the exception of psychological injury as the foregoing law offices point to.

Now what….Paul Comerford???

All this is a part of the first set of documents Michael Doran received on 25th August 2023[604] at 09:18. The second set of documents Shannon Hallissey of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[605] at 10:28. We will start uploading documentation of both sets immediately after publishing this post. Apart from it[606] Paul Comerford and Brian Doherty[607] received respectively…


[601] See appendix 25
[602] See appendix 40
[603] See appendix 34
[604] See appendix 29….see also appendix 54
[605] See appendix 27
[606] …as we have already pointed to on homepage
[607] Chief Executive Officer in Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland





Delivered to Paul X. Comerford





Delivered to Brian Doherty

…an extensive and detailed file in which some documents are very disturbing. They ignored completely all that and concealed this third file proving horrific and disturbing events. Quest for Justice will, of course, publish this (third) file however at the appropriate time. After that, when every, literally every fact comes to light, when people see what Paul Comerford had in front of his eyes before he perpetrated horrific criminal offences in form of his review[608] the Court of International Public will bring the verdict and define this assertion of Mr Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority in Ireland…..

I have conducted a preliminary review of your complaint and considered all the documentation provided by you and Mr Leo Fay. Having done so, I have determined that your complaint is inadmissible.

(see first page of his review – appendix 28)

Return to the second set of documents which Shannon Hallissey of the Legal Services regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[609] at 10:28 leads to another evidence….

…..testifying that Paul Comerford did see appendix 55. Ergo, Comerford Paul again was fully aware that the document confirms TWO times that the incident took place on 2nd August 2012[610] and not as Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors on 12th April 2012. (highlighted in yellow).[611] In addition, having seen appendix 55 Paul Comerford was again fully aware that the victim suffers from psychological injury (highlighted in green) which is seen in the Statute of Limitations as an exception to the two- year rule Leo Fay fraudulently points to lying that the victim

was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

(see 5th paragraph from top…..appendix 5)

Irrespective of law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[612] Augustus Cullen Law[613] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[614] who do speak about mental illness exception. However, Comerford Paul ignored these facts which cannot be found anywhere in his review[615] although in this document Paul Comerford does point to the Statute of Limitations (appendix 28 - 3rd page – highlighted in red) which refers to the mental illness as the exception to the two-year rule the foregoing law offices speak about. He does refer to the Statute of Limitations but conceals the exception as its main part in these circumstances.

Hence, Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001… section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with 10.- (2) (b)[616]

---

608 See appendix 28
609 See appendix 27
610 This is explained on pages 64, 65 and 81 - see also appendix 55 which, apart from it, points out that the victim suffers from psychological injury Paul Comerford concealed in appendix 28.
611 See appendix 5 – second paragraph from top – highlighted in yellow.
612 See appendix 25
613 See appendix 40
614 See appendix 34
615 See appendix 28
616 See appendix 9

On page 4 of his review[617] Paul Comerford writes……

Mr Fay did not address the issue of non-compliance with requirements in relation to GDPR requests.

…..and then explains…..

Issues pertaining to the requirements of Legal Practitioners to comply with GDPR requests fall under the auspices of the Data Protection Commissioners. Any findings of the Data Protection Commissioners should then be forwarded to the LSRA to assist in substantiating complaints. I could not find any reference to any correspondence to or from the Data Protection Commissioners in any of the documentation provided.

Paul Comerford turned the blind eye to page 4 of the file that the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[618] at 10:28. On that page the victim placed this excerpt, from document of Data Protection Commission, saying that the controllers…….

must respond to the request **without undue delay** and at the **latest within one month** of receiving the request. Controllers can **extend the time** to respond by a further **two months** if the request is **complex** or they have received a **number of requests** from the **same individual**, but they must still let the individual know within one month of receiving their access request and **explain to them** why the extension is necessary.

Apart from turning the blind eye to page 4 of the file that the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[619] at 10:28 Paul Comerford turned the blind eye to page 3 of the same file. On that page the victim placed appendix 35 in which Leo Fay writes (…and the victim acknowledges) that a part of the necessary documentation is submitted promising, however, that…..

The remainder of the documents which you have requested will be released as part of our response within twenty-eight days of your original request dated the 7th of July 2023.

Today, on 25th November 2026 (updating of this post) "the remainder of the documents" is not released yet.

Paul Comerford is aware of Section 10.- Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[620] the victim pointed to on several pages of the analysis and of the file that the Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17th October 2023[621] at 10:28. Paul Comerford is

[617] See appendix 28
[618] See appendix 27
[619] See appendix 27
[620] See appendix 30
[621] See appendix 27

also aware of Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006.[622] Irrespective of all that he stuck to his membership in this criminal organization.

Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001….Section 10.- (1) (a) IS VERY CLEAR

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—

(*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.

The Court of International Public will assess everything that Paul Comerford wrote in his review[623] after publishing ALL the documentation which Legal Services Regulatory Authority received and which Paul Comerford had in front of his eyes. Let us return once more to third page of appendix 28 on which Paul Comerford wrote….

[622] See appendix 115
[623] See appendix 28

On the 26th of September Leo Fay provided a reply to the allegations

Point 1

'- They have done nothing"

"Mr [redacted] initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th April 2012 and Mr [redacted] contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident"

…."We wish to point out that that all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

Having reviewed the documentation provided by Mr [redacted] it is clear that the Legal Practitioner made efforts to progress this case but was constrained by the requirements of the Statute of Limitations in such matters. Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

Including these two passages of Leo Fay into his review Paul Comerford demonstrated his intellectual capacity….really. Referring to the Statute of Limitations and particularly referring to …..

the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

….. Fay Leo proves that he is fully aware of all the details surrounding the foregoing excerpt and these details contain the exception to the two – year rule law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[624] Augustus Cullen Law,[625] and McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[626] and even he, Leo Fay himself,[627] speak about. Having undeniably established that Leo Fay is fully aware of the exception to the two-year rule we point out… his words (see front page in appendix 24)……

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…..are all heavily misleading[628], false[629] and deceptive[630] and violate…

[624] See appendix 25
[625] See appendix 40
[626] See appendix 34
[627] See appendix 43
[628] See appendix 6
[629] See appendix 7
[630] See appendix 8

- Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences Act) 2001 in section 10.- (1) (a) in connection with 10.- (2) (a) and section 10.- (1) (c)[631]

- Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[632]…..
- Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[633]… and….
- Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[634]

Ergo what was happening is not this…….

(see front page in appendix 24)……

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

…..but this….

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of

……violating the Statute of Limitations given that the victim was NOT …….

outside the time allowed pursuant to the statute of limitations".

…..(as evidenced earlier in this analysis) and given undeniable application of the exception to the two-year rule law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[635] Augustus Cullen Law,[636] McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[637] and even he, Leo Fay himself,[638] speak about.. This analysis is seen as evidence of how Leo Fay and Paul Comerford accuse themselves.

What is indeed against all seven principles of logical reasoning[639]…..

1. Modus Ponens
2. Modus Tollens
3. Two Modus Ponens arguments forming a conjunction
4. Destructive Dilemma
5. Hypothetical Syllogism
6. Disjunctive Syllogism and..
7. Proof by Contradiction

[631] See appendix 30
[632] See appendix 84
[633] See appendix 95
[634] See appendix 115
[635] See appendix 25
[636] See appendix 40
[637] See appendix 34
[638] See appendix 43
[639] See appendix 23

……is that Paul Comerford of the Legal Services regulatory Authority proudly put forward the facts heavily accusing both himself and Leo Fay….unbelievable!

Another important point, very important point[640]……

In the course of…..all times ….when…..the approaches

…..were….

made to the Irish Wheelchair Association

……the exception (to the two-year rule law offices Colleman Legal LLP,[641] Augustus Cullen Law,[642] McMahon Goldrick Solicitors[643] and Leo Fay himself[644] speak about) DID EXIST, DO EXIST AND IS STILL THE INEVITABLE PART OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

After all documented above we have downright acknowledgment of Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors in form of 26th September 2023[645] in which he clearly accuses himself and his office Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors of perpetrating criminal offence…..

at all times …….when…..the approaches ……

……were….

made to the Irish Wheelchair Association

After all documented above what happened is NOT THIS[646]……

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

[640] See fifth paragraph from the top in appendix 24
[641] See appendix 25
[642] See appendix 40
[643] See appendix 34
[644] See appendix 43
[645] See appendix 24
[646] See fifth paragraph…appendix 24

BUT THIS[647]……

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of

……CONCEALING 2ND AUGUST 2012, FRAUDULENTLY REPLACING IT WITH 12TH APRIL 2012 (documented in the very beginning of this analysis) AND PERPETRATING MULTIPLE CRIMIMNAL OFFENCES AS DOCUMENTED IN THIS ANALYSIS…..

given that he was …NOT…

outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

What characterizes this passage of Leo Fay is the particular insolence in form of….

We wish to point out

Namely in Cambridge Essential American Dictionary 'point something out'[648] refers to telling someone a fact and criminal Leo Fay writes that Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors wish to tell others "a fact" (key point here are the quotation marks) …..

that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

Leo Fay's "fact" is his horrific criminal offence he is fully aware of. In this way Leo Fay insolently violated….

Section 14.- (1) (i)…Solicitors Act 1954[649]…..
Section 50…Legal Services Regulation Act 2015[650]…
Sections 7 and 8…Criminal Law Act 1997[651]…
Section 10…Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001[652]…and
Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[653]

Unbelievable insolence!

[647] See fifth paragraph from top in appendix 24
[648] See appendix 68
[649] See appendix 84
[650] See appendix 95
[651] See appendix 73
[652] See appendix 30
[653] See appendix 115

On top of everything else we have the criminal offence under name "….12th April…..2nd August 2012" which Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors perpetrated and which is documented earlier in this analysis.

We also have criminal offences which Paul Comerford of Legal Services Regulatory Authority perpetrated and which we documented in this analysis apprehended as the unique evidence of how Paul Comerford and Leo Fay accuse themselves. Publishing this material on this website is a real treat for the Court of International Public.

The image hereunder shows only one of many stacks (duplexed sheets) that we have about this criminal organization



We would now return once more to sarcasm of Paul Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority. After all squalid work of Paul Comerford this analysis evidenced he demonstrated a particularly filthy insolence on first page of his review.[654]

Namely, he writes….

The LSRA appreciates that you are likely to be disappointed with our decision, but please be assured that your complaint was given full consideration.

We have already pointed to the circumstances hereunder earlier in the analysis but the extreme insolence of both the perpetrators and their protectors impose the need to point out and to what the victim has gone and is still going through….. https://questforjustice.net/ is already, now, a precious source of academic research material let alone when the overall file will have been uploaded….

Ergo…..

……let us have a look, once more, at……

IN FLAGRANTE DELICTO IN DUBLIN – IRELAND

…..and draw attention to document which Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors created on 24th October 2016 at 12:57….

Namely, in his response to the victim Leo Fay clearly writes that…..

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

(see Appendix 43)

[654] See first page ….appendix 28

Why, he writes this??? He writes this because he does know that this is truth. He writes this because he is aware that this is law and he writes this for the same reason which Coleman Legal LLP Solicitors had in mind when they wrote…..

Statute of Limitations for personal injury

The period in which a person can bring a claim for personal injury is two years less than one day. The clock starts running from the date of knowledge. The date of knowledge is the date on which the injured person became aware they were injured; it was a significant injury, and it was caused by the negligence of the party at fault. Often this date will be the day of the actual accident, however, in some cases, an injury does not manifest itself immediately after the relevant incident.

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

(see Appendix 25)

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors writes this……..

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

…..because he is aware that this is law and he writes this for the same reason which McMahon Goldrick Solicitors had in mind as they (in Appendix 34) speak…..

The Statute of Limitations Act 1957 requires that your court proceedings are issued **2 years less 1 day** from the date of injury.

If the injured party is a child, a parent or guardian can issue proceedings on the child's behalf at **any point in time up until the child's 18th birthday.** After which, the young adult can issue their court proceedings in their own right 2 years less 1 day from the date of their 18th birthday.

Exceptions to the time limit:

- Date of knowledge

  Sometimes, an injury or illness may not become noticeable until a while after the incident occurred. This is when the date of knowledge can become the start date for the timeline for issuing proceedings. The date of knowledge is the date on which you were aware of the following:

  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

Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors writes this……..

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

…..because he is aware that this is law and he writes this for the same reason which Augustus Cullen Law Solicitors had in mind as they (in Appendix 40) write…..

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.

Then, seven years later, Leo Fay of Michael J. Kennedy Solicitors writes…..

MJK | MICHAEL J. KENNEDY & CO. SOLICITORS

The Parochial House, Baldoyle, Dublin 13
Tel: 01-832 0230
Fax: 01-8393663
DX: 107005 Malahide

LSRA
PO Box 12906,
DUBLIN 7.

Our Ref: LF/HB/PEU101/7278 You Ref23/9389 **Date: 26th September 2023**

Re: Dusko Peulic

Dear Sirs,

We refer to the above and letter received on the 31st of August 2023 were we note the content of Mr Peulic's letter and in relation to the points raised therein we would say as follows:

Mr Peulic initially made contact with us in relation to issues with his employer. The incident arose on the 12th of April 2012 and Mr Peulic contacted us approximately 2.5 years after the incident.

We agreed to raise the issue with his employer given that he had numerous grievances against his then employer in relation to sick pay.

Thereafter the issues developed with regard to injuries, sustained by Mr Peulic, as a result of his treatment at the hands the person he was assigned to care for, which took place in his client's house in 2012.

We wish to point out that at all times the approaches made to the Irish Wheelchair Association were on the basis of seeking to negotiate some form of settlement given that he was outside the time allowed pursuant to the Statute of Limitations.

We have dealt with all aspect of Mr Peulic's claim in a fairhanded manner and made him aware his limited entitlements, which will be at the sole discretion of his former employer.


In relation to the letter of complaint dated the 7th day of July 2023, I can say that when I last met with Mr Peulic on the day of June 2023 he was very clear that he wanted his case closed, which I understand to mean settled by the end of July 2023. His instructions were that if the case could not be closed by that date he would rely upon legal advice that he is receiving from Lawyers whom he became acquainted with while working for the United Nations. I told Mr Peulic that I could not give him any guarantees in

Partners: Michael J. Kennedy, Leo Fay, Fiona Cullivan
Solicitor: Aileen Mollahan
www.mjksolicitors.ie | info@mjksolicitors.ie VAT Reg No. 9561244O

29 SEP 2023
Received

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

Yours Faithfully,



Leo Fay

Partners: Michael J. Kennedy, Leo Fay, Fiona Cullivan
Solicitor: Aileen Mollahan
www.mjksolicitors.ie | info@mjksolicitors.ie
VAT Reg No. 9561244O

.....and……

Where Paul X. Comerford disgustingly lies…..

Paul X. Comerford of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority, defending the foregoing crime of Leo Fay, disgustingly lies….

Namely, in his review this criminal writes….

Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

See appendix 28 – bottom of 3rd page.

We will now return to Section 10.- Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 that says…..

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—

(*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.

See also appendixes 9 and 18

Cection 10.- (1) (a) – Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 says…..

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—

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

Let us now more closely look at what the concepts pointed to in the foregoing excerpt could refer to..

In Dictionary.com "dishonesty" is defined as "lack of honesty; a disposition to lie, cheat or steal"[655] while in Cambridge dictionary "intention" refers to "something that you want and plan to do…"[656] Lying to the victim Paul Comerford says….

Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

See appendix 28 – bottom of 3rd page. In these circumstances it is the classical example of dishonest intention to cause….

loss to another— or in other words loss of information to the victim (concealing the facts disclosed in the documents). One may now ask for clarification or the evidence that concealing was caused by dishonest intention which can be very easily proved. However, we will, in the first place, reach the very precise determination of "concealing." Appendix 90 says "…if you conceal something, you cover it or hide it carefully…" and "….if you conceal a piece of information……you do not let other people know about it…" WHY YOU DO NOT LET OTHER PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT:

Everything revolves around "an entry" and, in the first place, we must understand what exactly "an entry" refers to. Appendix 91 is not questionable when saying that the notion refers to "….a separate piece of information that is recorded in a book, computer, etc." We find, precisely, such "…a separate piece of information…" in the excerpt this criminal Paul Comerford wrought….

Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

See appendix 28 – bottom of 3rd page.

[655] See appendix 33
[656] See appendix 89

We, in turn, have to clarify "misleading"…."false" …"deceptive"…."material" and "particular" as sections 10.- (1) (c) and 10.- (2) (a) refer to these notions

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—

(*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.

Cambridge dictionary describes *misleading* as "…causing someone to believe something that is not true…"[657] while *false*, in the same reference source, means "…not true, but made to seem true in order to deceive people."[658] Apart from these notions, Merriam-Webster book of alphabetically listed words defines *deceptive* as "…tending or having power to cause someone to accept as true or valid what is false or invalid: tending or having power to deceive."

[657] See appendix 6
[658] See appendix 7

These two reference sources say that *a material particular* is "a specific…..detail of information" (particular)[659] "…having an important effect…" (material)[660]

On page 4 in appendix 69 the victim writes….

> It is important to point out that **the Agreement Letter was signed on 30th December 2015** (see the two excerpts on page 15 - however, all the 5-page Agreement Letter is available) and what I have now **after 5681 (five thousand six hundred and eighty one days and nights** ..30/12/2015 through 17th July 2023) is presented hereunder. **That is not acceptable and that will be tried by the Court of International Public!!!** Now, please have a look at the eight-page letter….

It is important to point out that Legal Services regulatory Authority received appendix 69 on 9th August 2023 at 08:14 (see also page 19 of this appendix)

an post

For your world

Proof of Delivery

Name: THE LSRA
Delivery Date: 09 Aug 2023, 08:14
Signature:



Barcode(s):



RL542177722IE



Page 19 of 23

[659] See appendix 31
[660] See appendix 32

Responding to what the victim wrote on page 4 in appendix 69…..

It is important to point out that **the Agreement Letter was signed on 30th December 2015** (see the two excerpts on page 15 - however, all the 5-page Agreement Letter is available) and what I have now **after 5681 (five thousand six hundred and eighty one days and nights** ..30/12/2015 through 17th July 2023) is presented hereunder. **That is not acceptable and that will be tried by the Court of International Public!!!** Now, please have a look at the eight-page letter….

This criminal (Paul X. Comerford) writes….

Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

See appendix 28 – bottom of 3rd page.

Let us go further.

The set of documents weighing 1441 grams[661] Legal Services Regulatory Authority received on 17the October 2023[662] and the parcel looked like this.[663] Enclosed with this parcel was 116-page ANALYSIS and in these circumstances we single out page 73.[664] On that page, enumerating documents which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy concealed, the victim pointed to document nr 31 dated 27th June 2013.[665] The victim also pointed out, on the same page, that this document is "directly linked to name of Leo Fay"

[661] See appendix 81
[662] See appendix 82
[663] See appendix 83
[664] See appendix 92
[665] See appendix 39

It is notable that the delay of TEN YEARS we repeat TEN YEARS[666] a part of which the victim writes about on page 4 in appendix 69…

It is important to point out that **the Agreement Letter was signed on 30th December 2015** (see the two excerpts on page 15 - however, all the 5-page Agreement Letter is available) and what I have now **after 5681 (five thousand six hundred and eighty one days and nights** ..30/12/2015 through 17th July 2023) is presented hereunder. **That is not acceptable and that will be tried by the Court of International Public!!!** Now, please have a look at the eight-page letter….

…..came into being AFTER 27th June 2013….which means AFTER…..

the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

….and NOT….

prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

[666] See time frame between date of the document nr 31 in appendix 92

(31) Document dated 27th June 2013

and see also date of the same document in appendix 39

Thu 27/06/2013 16:49

…. and then measure time between the foregoing date and ….

08 November 2023

On 8th November 2023 (see first page of appendix 28) this criminal offence….

Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

….came into being.

See bottom of third page of appendix 28


We mentioned above that on page 73 enumerating documents which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy concealed, the victim pointed to document nr 31 dated 27th June 2013.[667] To clarify this enumeration we say that Ms Walsh of Data Protection Commission received the correspondence on 5th December 2023[668] and the file she received contained 64-page list of all the FILES which Leo Fay and Michael J. Kennedy[669] concealed from the victim. (see post Data Protection Commission – regularly updated)

This further means that criminal (Paul X. Comerford) at the moment of writing the excerpt hereunder….

Delays caused in progressing the case occurred prior to the involvement of the Legal Practitioner.

See appendix 28 – bottom of 3rd page.

…..WAS FULLY AWARE that he is disgustingly lying. Having in mind that he is an employee of the Legal Services Regulatory Authority of Ireland responsible for complaints and resolutions…..



See appendix 28 – second page

….it is notable that he WAS AND IS FULY AWARE OF HIS BRUTAL VIOLATION OF THE FOLLOWING PARTS IN SECTION 10.- Criminal Justice (Theft and Fraud Offences) Act 2001 ….

[667] See appendix 39
[668] See appendix 37
[669] It is managing partner Michael J. Kennedy who received the victim's extremely clear Personal data request (see appendix 74) and who as a law expert did know that concealing any document is a criminal offence. Irrespective of that the remainder of the documents (see appendix 35) never reached the victim.

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—

(*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.

See also appendixes 9 and 18

Apart from this ….it is notable that he (criminal Paul Comerford) WAS AND IS FULY AWARE OF HIS BRUTAL VIOLATION OF….Part 7 – Organized Crime – Criminal Justice Act 2006[670]

BRIAN DOHERTY – LEGAL SERVICES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
CHIEF OF BRANCH OF THE GANG…

….cannot even be trusted to look after a flock of lamas let alone an institution expected to protect law….

[670] See appendix 115