

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Case No: KB-2025-001991

FINAL CONSOLIDATED SUBMISSION

I. Overview

This is not a conventional enforcement case. It is a multi-jurisdictional matter involving proceedings across England, the United States, Antigua and Barbuda, and Greece, together with documented procedural irregularities, law enforcement engagement, and a vulnerable litigant in person with a neurological disability. The cumulative position establishes clear special circumstances under CPR 83.7.

II. Prior Judicial Outcome (United States)

The Appellant, alongside the Prime Minister of Antigua and Barbuda, successfully resisted claims connected to the same litigation network in proceedings involving entities associated with Boies Schiller Flexner. This demonstrates that similar claims have already been tested at a high judicial level.

III. Law Enforcement Engagement

Formal complaints have been submitted to the Criminal Investigations Department in Antigua and Barbuda and acknowledged within official systems. Additionally, the Metropolitan Police Service in the United Kingdom has confirmed internal handling and progression of related matters. These are not relied upon as proof of wrongdoing, but as confirmation that the issues raised are serious and have engaged official attention.

IV. Government Context

Public statements by the Prime Minister of Antigua and Barbuda have characterized the underlying litigation as a fabrication and a fishing expedition, demonstrating that the matter has reached sovereign-level concern.

V. Procedural Irregularities

The Appellant relies on a limited evidential matrix including witness statements, affidavits, and documentary inconsistencies. These materials are consistent and subject to external scrutiny.

VI. Medical Condition

The Appellant is a litigant in person with documented neurological impairment (TBI), creating heightened vulnerability and requiring procedural fairness and protection from injustice.

VII. Prior Adjournment

The Court previously adjourned the matter on 20 February 2026, demonstrating judicial caution. The factors justifying that adjournment have strengthened due to subsequent developments.

VIII. Risk of Injustice

Enforcement at this stage would occur before resolution of interconnected proceedings and would risk injustice to a vulnerable litigant.

IX. Relief Sought

The Appellant respectfully seeks continuation of the stay of enforcement and permission to rely on the identified materials.

X. Conclusion

The Appellant seeks judicial caution. Where multiple jurisdictions and law enforcement bodies are engaged, and where a vulnerable litigant faces enforcement, the interests of justice require restraint.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

I believe that the facts stated in this submission are true.

Alkiviades David

Appellant (Litigant in Person)

Dated: 1 April 2026