

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
Before Senior Master Cook

Claim No. KB-2025-001991	Date: 8 April 2026
Related Appeal: CA-2025-002562	Status: Further supplemental note

BETWEEN
MAHIM KHAN
Claimant
and
ALKIVIADES DAVID
Defendant / Litigant in Person

DEFENDANT'S FURTHER SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE IN RESPONSE

Lawfare, disability weaponization, pressure on family, trust displacement, compassionate statement,
forensic review offer, and Swiss findings

This further supplemental note is intended to be read together with the Defendant's earlier supplemental note identified by its original filename, KB-2025-001991_Supplemental_Note_with_Exhibits_v2-1 (1)(1).pdf. That earlier note was deliberately narrow and addressed public indexing, discoverability, and freedom of expression. This further note addresses a different but equally narrow point: the coercive procedural environment in which the present enforcement proceedings sit.

A. Limited Purpose

1. This note is not tendered as a request that the Court accept as proved every broader allegation advanced elsewhere by the Defendant. Its immediate purpose is narrower: to record the Defendant's position that his disability was used against him procedurally and financially, that his elderly mother was subjected to pressure, that control of protective trust structures was removed from him without informed approval, and that the Swiss record contains objective findings and correspondence that materially qualify the enforcement picture.
2. The Defendant uses the phrase "lawfare and terror" descriptively, from his own perspective, to convey a sustained experience of legal intimidation, fear, pressure, and disabling procedural abuse. It is not used here as a final criminal classification sought from this Court.

B. Removal from the Trust and Loss of Control

3. The Defendant's position is that he was removed from the Harmonia trust structure without informed approval, while Douglas Mikkonen / Bridgeford assumed practical control over the accounting and administration and family actors, especially Alexander David, acted as though that displacement was justified and permanent.
4. The contemporaneous email record reflects repeated objections by the Defendant that he had been unjustly removed, denied the protector role, and forced to demand basic visibility into assets, liabilities, loans, cash, and money said to have returned to the trust. The Defendant says this was not a simple

family misunderstanding but a live struggle over control of assets, authority, and narrative.

C. Disability Weaponization

5. The Defendant is a disabled litigant. He says his vulnerability was not protected but used against him. His position is that medical and psychiatric materials, including Wexler-related reports and similar incapacity narratives, were used to recast vulnerability as unfitness and then used as a pretext to remove him from authority, override his decisions, and justify management of his affairs around him rather than by him.
6. The downstream use of that theme is already reflected in the later Harmonia correspondence, in which the Defendant expressly objected that his medical condition was being used as a reason to remove him. The Defendant says disability became a management tool.

D. Pressure on the Defendant's Mother

7. The Defendant says his elderly mother was drawn into the same coercive environment. He says she was exposed to fear, legal confusion, billing pressure, exclusion from decisions, and pressure connected to the handling of his affairs while trying to assist her son.
8. The family emails show Dimitra David expressing shock at settlement discussions, pressing Geoffrey Cone over unsettled legal administration, and directly reprimanding Alexander David for interference. The Defendant's June 2024 objection also records his position that Fred Heather had been fired, that imminent criminal consequences were allegedly invoked to induce payment from his elderly mother, and that matters nonetheless proceeded without proper notice or protection.

E. Fred Heather on the Sidelines

9. Fred Heather appears repeatedly around the edges of this environment. He was copied into parts of the Harmonia conflict, the family-control dispute, and related lawyer communications, but he does not appear in the reviewed material as the person actually administering the Harmonia accounts, restoring transparency, or curing the resulting disorder.
10. The Defendant's case is that Fred remained adjacent to the structure while control migrated away from the Defendant, without restoring order, clarity, or fairness.

F. Swiss Findings

11. The Swiss position is highly material. The Swiss proceedings correspondence expressly states that the Swiss position had already been communicated to and discussed with Glaser Weil. It records that Mahim Khan's Swiss application was rejected entirely, while Lauren Reeves' Swiss enforcement succeeded only in part, with the punitive component excluded and narrower attachment measures remaining against specified assets and sums.
12. That material is objective foreign-process evidence. The Defendant says it matters because Glaser Weil was not in the dark: they had already been informed of the true Swiss posture while the Defendant's wider financial and trust structure was being destabilized.

G. Same-Pot Swiss Enforcement Irregularity

13. Alban Shabani's later Swiss email to Themis and others identified what the Defendant says was an irregular same-asset-pool enforcement pattern. According to that email, the same Swiss attorney acted for both Reeves and Khan, first secured a Reeves writ of attachment of approximately CHF 2.637 million against the Gstaad chalet, then, after the chalet sale, operated against an escrow of approximately CHF 3.1 million, and later sought a further Khan-side attachment while also pursuing payout of the Reeves-secured amount.
14. Alban did not use the literal phrase "double dip," but the Defendant relies on that correspondence as describing, in substance, a same-pot double-recovery attempt against the same protected Swiss proceeds. The Defendant further says that, after using the Reeves-side recovery logic in Switzerland, the same campaign later moved into Greece with the same underlying Reeves order or enforcement theory; that Greece point remains the Defendant's position pending fuller Greek papers.

H. Compassionate Statement

15. The Defendant respectfully asks the Court to view the present matter not only as an enforcement dispute, but as a human case involving disability, family pressure, loss of control, and prolonged fear. He says that he is a disabled litigant whose vulnerability was not protected but used against him, and that his elderly mother was drawn into the same environment of distress, exclusion, legal confusion, and repeated financial pressure while trying to assist her son.
16. The Defendant does not ask the Court to substitute sympathy for evidence. He asks only that the Court recognise the human reality in which these events unfolded, and the damage said to have been done to both him and his mother by a process that, in his case, ceased to feel protective or fair.

I. Offer of Independent Forensic Review

17. Because the Defendant says the truth of that history lies in the written record, he formally offers his email accounts, associated correspondence, attachments, headers, metadata, and related digital records for independent forensic review under an appropriate neutral protocol.
18. That offer extends, if the Court considers it appropriate, to disciplined forensic AI interrogation and analysis for the limited purposes of reconstructing chronology, identifying patterns of pressure, threats, contradictions, references to disability, missing or sidelined evidence, financial demands, and the handling of his affairs. The Defendant makes that offer because he says the chronology is already in the written record, and that the truth of what happened can be tested most fairly by disciplined forensic examination rather than selective extraction.

J. Relevance and Relief Sought

19. The Court is not being asked in this note to decide every allegation. The Court is being asked to recognise the procedural significance of the environment: disability was used against the Defendant; control of protective structures was removed from him; his mother was pressured and destabilized; the books became opaque; Swiss counsel identified irregular same-pool enforcement behavior; and Glaser Weil was already aware of the true Swiss posture.
20. The Defendant respectfully asks that this further supplemental note be admitted to the record and read together with the earlier supplemental note and existing application / appeal materials; that the Swiss findings be treated as

material to the wider procedural and enforcement picture; and that the Court proceed on the basis that the present matter requires careful scrutiny of fairness, record integrity, proportionality, and the completeness of the material before it.

Exhibit and Reference Schedule (by original filename where available)

Ref.	Original filename / identifying reference	Purpose
A	KB-2025-001991_Supplemental_Note_with_Exhibits_v2-1 (1)(1).pdf	Earlier supplemental note on public indexing, discoverability, and freedom of expression; present note is intended to be read with it.
B	Alki David - proceedings in Switzerland [LALIVE-LIVE.FID91795] - filmonpersonal@gmail.com.pdf	Swiss proceedings summary: Khan rejected entirely; Reeves limited; attachment measures identified.
C	FRED - SWISS BEATRICE-1.pdf	Swiss-side summary describing cumulative irregularity / "masquerade-like proceedings" context.
D	Debt enforcement proceedings Switzerland - email from Alban Shabani to Alki / Themis / others, 14 May 2024 (forwarding 9 April 2024 developments email)	Same-asset-pool Swiss enforcement irregularity; Reeves writ, CHF 3.1m escrow, later Khan-side attachment attempt.
E	2026.03.24 - KB-2025-001991 - ICO - Adjourment order (REC 31.03.2026).pdf	Procedural anchor from earlier filing.
F	Email references by subject line and timestamp: "Trust work" (12 Jul 2023), "Harmonia lawsuit" (31 Aug 2023), "Damages" (5 Sep 2023), "Re Harmonia Trust" / replies (16 Oct 2023), Dimitra emails (11 Jan 2022; 26 Jan 2022; 3 Feb 2022; 3 Jun 2023)	Trust displacement, accounting opacity, disability objection, maternal complaints, and family pressure.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this further supplemental note are true to the best of my knowledge and belief, save where matters are stated as my position or understanding.

/s/ Alkiviades David
ALKIVIADES DAVID
Dated: 8 April 2026