

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
EASTERN CARIBBEAN SUPREME COURT
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Claim No.: ANUHCV2025/0149

BETWEEN

ALKIVIADES DAVID
Claimant

-and-

UNITED PROGRESSIVE PARTY
(including executive officers, including Jamale Pringle)
Defendants

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF ACTUAL NOTICE
AND ELECTRONIC SERVICE BY DIRECT MESSAGE

This Supplemental Notice is filed to place on the record evidence of actual notice of these proceedings given directly to Jamale Pringle by means of direct electronic communication to his active Instagram account.

On 19 December 2025, the Claimant transmitted a direct message containing a hyperlink to a published article that included in full the original filed Statement of Claim in this matter. On 3 February 2026, a follow-up direct message was transmitted linking to a subsequent article reporting procedural developments.

The Defendant has filed no acknowledgment of service, no defence, and no challenge to jurisdiction. This evidence is relied upon in support of jurisdiction, default, and contempt.

DATED this 4th day of February 2026

ALKIVIADES DAVID
Claimant – Litigant in Person
Electronically signed

EXHIBIT A – PROOF OF ACTUAL NOTICE AND ELECTRONIC SERVICE

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
EASTERN CARIBBEAN SUPREME COURT
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Claim No.: ANUHCV2025/0149

BETWEEN
ALKIVIADES DAVID
Claimant

AND
UNITED PROGRESSIVE PARTY (including executive officers, including Jamale Pringle)
Defendants

This Exhibit consists of true and accurate screenshots evidencing direct electronic communications sent by the Claimant to the Defendant, Jamale Pringle, via his active and publicly identifiable Instagram account @hon.jamalepringle. The messages were transmitted from the Claimant's verified Instagram account, @alkidavid, which bears platform verification and is publicly associated with the Claimant. Annex A-1 (page following) is a screenshot evidencing the direct message transmitted on 19 December 2025 at approximately 7:51 a.m., containing a hyperlink to a publicly accessible article which reproduced in full the filed Statement of Claim in this matter. Annex A-2 (subsequent page) is a screenshot evidencing a further direct message transmitted on 2 February 2026 in the same communication thread, containing a hyperlink to a subsequent article reporting procedural developments including defaults and contempt consequences. The screenshots confirm successful delivery of both messages. No "Seen" indicator appears because the recipient has disabled Instagram's read receipt feature (a common privacy setting). The continued openness of the thread, absence of any delivery error, block, or restriction, and the absence of any acknowledgment, response, objection, or denial from the Defendant following either communication support the inference that the messages were received and deliberately ignored.

CERTIFICATION

I, ALKIVIADES DAVID, Claimant and Litigant in Person, certify that Exhibit A and the annexed screenshots (Annexes A-1 and A-2) are true and accurate reproductions of the direct electronic communications described herein.


DATED this 04 February 2026

ALKIVIADES DAVID
Claimant – Litigant in Person
Electronically signed

ANNEX A-1

Screenshot — Direct Message of 19 December 2025


Platform: Instagram (Direct Message). Recipient account: @hon.jamalepringle. Sender: @alkidavid (verified).



ANNEX A-2

Screenshot — Message Thread Showing Follow-Up of 2 February 2026

Platform: Instagram (same message thread). Recipient account: @hon.jamalepringle. Sender: @alkidavid (verified).



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
EASTERN CARIBBEAN SUPREME COURT
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA**

Claim No.: ANUHCV2025/0149

BETWEEN
ALKIVIADES DAVID – Claimant
-and-
UNITED PROGRESSIVE PARTY (including executive officers) – Defendants

**SHORT REQUEST FOR DIRECTIONS ON JURISDICTION
(WITH LIMITED EVIDENCE OF NOTICE)**

Pursuant to the Court's general case management powers under CPR 2000 Part 26, and in light of CPR Parts 7 (Service), 9 (Acknowledgment of Service), and 11 (Disputing Jurisdiction), the Claimant, as litigant in person, respectfully seeks short directions limited to the question of whether the Court's jurisdiction is engaged in respect of the United Progressive Party and its resident officers already identified on the record.

This application is made solely for procedural certainty and efficiency, to permit the proceedings to advance without unnecessary delay.

NOTICE AND SERVICE CONTEXT (LIMITED)

The Court already has before it evidence of formal service steps taken, allegations of actual notice, and public notice relied upon for procedural purposes.

For completeness, the Claimant files Exhibit A, which comprises dated screenshots of Google search results (taken on 03 February 2026) demonstrating that details of these proceedings are publicly indexed, accessible, and discoverable in the ordinary course.

The Claimant relies on Exhibit A solely as evidence of public and constructive notice of the proceedings. It is not relied upon as argument or proof of any pleaded fact.

PROPOSED DIRECTIONS

The Claimant invites the Court to give directions, for example:

- (a) confirming whether jurisdiction is engaged on the present record; and/or
- (b) setting a timetable for any application under CPR Part 11 should the Defendants wish to dispute jurisdiction.

DEFERENCE

No substantive relief is sought at this stage. The Claimant defers entirely to the Court as to the form and timing of any directions, and as to the weight (if any) to be given to Exhibit A.

DATED: 04 February 2026

/s/ Alkiviades David

ALKIVIADES DAVID


Claimant – Litigant in Person

Digitally signed pursuant to disability accommodation

ANNEX A

Evidence of Public and Constructive Notice

This exhibit comprises screenshots of Google search results dated 03 February 2026, filed solely as evidence of public and constructive notice of these proceedings (including discoverability through indexed search results and public accessibility of service-related information). The Claimant does not rely on this exhibit as argument or proof of any pleaded fact.



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
EASTERN CARIBBEAN SUPREME COURT
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA**

Claim No.: ANUHCV2025/0149

BETWEEN
ALKIVIADES DAVID
Claimant

-and-

[DEFENDANTS AS PLEADED]

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT

Jurisdiction, Material Omission, Removal of a Pleased Defendant, Parallel Sovereign Litigation, Cognitive Disability, and Prejudice to a Disabled Litigant

1. Jurisdictional Context and Sovereign Nexus

This matter arises within a jurisdiction central to disputes involving foreign assets, offshore financial structures, and internationally active legal actors. Multiple defendants pleaded in this action are resident in Antigua and Barbuda and/or maintain assets, banking relationships, or operational presence within the jurisdiction. These facts establish a substantial jurisdictional nexus under ordinary principles of presence, effects, and asset situs.

Antigua and Barbuda is simultaneously asserting sovereign jurisdiction in parallel proceedings arising from the Alpha Nero matter, in which the Government has publicly and legally defended its adjudicative authority, financial integrity, and international standing. Jurisdictional denial in the present matter must therefore be assessed consistently with that asserted sovereign posture.

2. Incorporation of the Original and Amended Claim Forms

The Claimant expressly incorporates by reference the Original Claim Form filed 17 April 2025 and the Amended Statement of Claim filed 24 September 2025. The complete defendant schedules as pleaded form part of the record for all purposes relating to jurisdiction, service, default, and contempt. Any jurisdictional analysis that fails to engage with the amended pleadings is necessarily incomplete.

3. Removal of a Pleased Defendant and Jurisdiction-Denying Submissions

Notwithstanding the pleadings on the record, the United Progressive Party (UPP) was removed from the case file order following submissions advanced by Mr. Philip of the Attorney General's Office, appearing in an amicus capacity. In those same submissions, it was asserted that this Honourable Court lacked jurisdiction. The procedural effect materially altered the Court's jurisdictional frame.

4. Omission of Parallel Sovereign Litigation by the Prime Minister

A further material omission was the failure to place before the Court the fact that Gaston Browne, in his capacity as Prime Minister, has commenced litigation-related steps against overlapping defendants pleaded in this action, including **Martyn DeLuca**, arising from the Alpha Nero matter, commencing with a formal pre-action demand dated 26 November 2025. The Claimant further notes that **Brian Stewart-Young of Global Bank of Commerce** has been subjected to actions and pressures arising from the same alleged network of actors, forming part of the wider factual matrix relevant to jurisdiction, effects, and parallel proceedings.

5. Expanded Defendant Network, Default and Contempt

The Amended Statement of Claim pleads a materially expanded defendant network including banks and offshore entities. Multiple defendants have failed to acknowledge service, giving rise to defaults and contemptuous non-participation. Default and contempt cannot negate jurisdiction.

6. Post-Hearing Engagement and Public Context

Following the hearing, the Claimant attended the Office of the Attorney General seeking clarification. The discussion occurred openly in the public lobby, in the presence of multiple persons, including staff and a senior police officer.

6.1 Clarification Sought and Position Taken

Mr. Philip stated, in substance and without equivocation, that any correction of the procedural position was a matter for the Court, not the Attorney General's Office. The Claimant understood that no corrective step would be initiated notwithstanding the material effect on jurisdiction.

7. Prejudice to a Disabled Litigant in Person

The Claimant is a disabled litigant in person with a recognised cognitive disability. The cumulative procedural omissions produced disproportionate prejudice undermining access to justice.

8. Institutional Inconsistency with Asserted Sovereign Authority

Jurisdiction-denying outcomes appear inconsistent with the Government's asserted sovereign posture in Alpha Nero-related litigation. This submission is based on outcome, not motive.

9. Relief Sought (Procedural)

The Claimant respectfully invites the Court to assess jurisdiction by reference to the Original and Amended Claim Forms, take account of parallel sovereign litigation, recognise that defaults and contempt cannot negate jurisdiction, and consider the prejudice to a disabled litigant.

Dated: 4 February 2026

Filed by:

ALKIVIADES DAVID

Claimant (Litigant in Person)