

**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.

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)