

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION**

**Claim No. KB-2025-001991
Appeal No. CA-2025-002562**

BETWEEN:

**MAHIM KHAN
Claimant / Respondent**

- and -

**ALKIVIADES DAVID
Defendant / Applicant in Person**

**DEFENDANT'S FINAL EXPANDED SUPPLEMENTAL
SUBMISSION**

**(LAWFARE, RECORD INTEGRITY, OMITTED EVIDENCE, FAMILY INFILTRATION,
INTIMIDATION, PUBLIC NOTICE, AND THRESHOLD CASE MANAGEMENT)**

To: Senior Master Cook

Dated: 8 April 2026

This filing is advanced on a narrow procedural basis. It asks the Court to determine threshold case-management issues before coercive enforcement is permitted to outrun procedural legitimacy.

I. INTRODUCTION

This submission is narrow and procedural.

The Defendant uses the word "lawfare" here as shorthand for the use of litigation and enforcement machinery as instruments of pressure, asymmetry, dependency, and practical coercion, rather than as an ordinary and transparent route to adjudication.

The Defendant does not ask the Court, by this submission alone, to determine every wider allegation or contextual matter raised elsewhere. The immediate point is narrower:

(a) coercive enforcement is being pursued by charging order; (b) the service history has already produced procedural irregularity and adjournment; (c) threshold objections remain unresolved; (d) the Defendant has placed limited public-source and publication materials directly into the live case chain to the Court side and to the Claimant's solicitors; (e) the underlying California record is, on the Defendant's case, materially incomplete; and (f) the combination of enforcement pressure, incomplete record, delayed or defective service, non-engagement with threshold issues, known but undeployed disability evidence, and broader patterns of confidence-building, dependency, intimidation, and non-delivery is precisely the kind of lawfare sequence to which the Court should respond by active case management.

The Defendant's submission is therefore not rhetorical. It is procedural. The Court is asked to stop coercive enforcement from outrunning legitimacy.

II. PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK

The overriding objective requires the Court to deal with cases justly and at proportionate cost, including ensuring that parties are on an equal footing, can participate fully, and that cases are dealt with expeditiously and fairly.

The Court has broad case-management powers, including the power to stay the whole or part of proceedings, isolate issues, determine the sequence in which issues are decided, and prevent a coercive remedy from proceeding while the procedural legitimacy of that remedy remains unresolved.

In charging-order proceedings, compliance with service requirements is not a formality. Where coercive enforcement against property is sought, procedural regularity is foundational.

III. THE PRESENT PATTERN

The sealed order dated 24 March 2026 records that the hearing listed on 7 April 2026 was adjourned because the Interim Charging Order had not been sent to the Claimant's solicitors until 20 March 2026, leaving insufficient time for the hearing to proceed.

That matters because the Claimant seeks a coercive property remedy, yet the procedural foundation for that enforcement has already shown weakness or irregularity sufficient to derail the listed hearing.

On 8 April 2026, the Defendant transmitted a Supplemental Note and Public-Source Exhibits into the live KB-2025-001991 / CA-2025-002562 chain to the Court side and to the Claimant's solicitors. Later the same day, the Defendant transmitted a Notice of Publication Exhibit together with CHECK-MATE.pdf, again on a limited public-notice basis only.

The forensic significance is straightforward: (a) the materials were not merely online somewhere in the abstract; (b) they were affirmatively transmitted into the live case-management chain; (c) they were not

confined to the Court side; and (d) on the Defendant's reviewed record, no substantive engagement with those later limited public-source and publication filings has presently been identified.

The Defendant is careful in the formulation of that point. He does not say, on this submission alone, that the Claimant's solicitors were obliged to agree with the materials. He does say that the materials were not hidden, inaccessible, or unknown, and were directly placed before both the Court-facing channel and the Claimant's solicitors.

IV. WHY THIS IS LAWFARE IN PROCEDURAL TERMS

A court process becomes lawfare-like, on the Defendant's case, when: (a) the coercive effect of the process is front-loaded; (b) the burden and pressure fall immediately on the opposing party; (c) threshold defects or fairness issues are postponed or sidelined; and (d) the moving party can continue to benefit from pressure even while foundational questions remain unresolved.

That is the Defendant's complaint here. The charging-order process is not neutral in effect. It is coercive by design. It reaches property. It creates urgency, reputational pressure, and practical burden. Where such a process is advanced while the Court has not yet determined threshold issues concerning service, transparency, true party in interest, and the safety of proceeding on the underlying record, the process risks becoming an instrument of pressure rather than orderly adjudication.

The Defendant does not say the mere making of a charging-order application is abusive. The narrower submission is that continuing to drive enforcement first and ask fairness questions later is inconsistent with the overriding objective where the procedural history already shows irregularity and where the Defendant has squarely raised threshold objections.

V. THE THRESHOLD ISSUES

The Defendant respectfully submits that the following issues are logically anterior to any further enforcement step:

First, whether the charging-order process has been advanced on a procedurally sound footing.

Second, whether the proceedings are being transparently advanced by the true party in interest.

Third, whether the Court should treat the Defendant's public-source and publication materials as limited contextual / public-notice material and, if so, whether the Claimant can fairly proceed as though those materials were hidden, irrelevant, or unknown once they were served directly into the live case chain.

Fourth, whether the California record on which the present enforcement pathway ultimately rests is sufficiently reliable to support coercive enforcement, given the Defendant's case that material evidence existed, was known, was requested, and was not properly deployed.

Fifth, whether, taking the above together, the proper exercise of case management requires a pause, sequencing order, or stay so that coercive enforcement does not outrun procedural legitimacy.

VI. OMITTED EVIDENCE AND THE UNSAFE UNDERLYING RECORD

The Defendant's central submission is simple. Material evidence existed at the time of the California proceedings. It was known to counsel. It was requested by the Defendant. It was capable of being advanced. It was not properly placed before the relevant court.

The omitted categories include contradictory witness material, contemporaneous communications, medical and ADA-related evidence, Dr Wexler's reports and scans, client-file material held by former counsel, and additional evidential pathways identified in the Defendant's files. The issue is not one of weight. It is one of absence. A record that is materially incomplete at formation is unsafe as a foundation for coercive enforcement.

The Defendant is a disabled litigant with a documented traumatic brain injury. The medical material already assembled states in substance that he suffered a major TBI causing permanent frontal-lobe injury, severe executive dysfunction, and permanent disability, and that he should be afforded reasonable accommodations including shorter sessions and more frequent breaks. That material existed, was known, and yet was not properly made central where fairness and enforcement safety required it.

The effect on fairness is direct: if a litigant's capacity, fatigue threshold, and need for accommodation were known but not properly advanced, the safety of the underlying record is called into question.

VII. FRED HEATHER: ASSURANCES, DEPENDENCY, AND NON-DELIVERY

The Defendant's case is that former counsel Fred Heather did not merely fail to deploy isolated pieces of evidence. Rather, critical matters were left in a posture of expected future delivery through him, while the actual evidential record remained materially incomplete.

The Defendant does not, by this submission alone, ask the Court to make findings of fraud or dishonesty against Mr Heather. The narrower point is evidential: that critical medical, ADA, investigative, and case-file materials were known to exist, were understood to be in or through Mr Heather's control, were repeatedly expected or requested, and were nonetheless not deployed or not fully produced.

The Defendant further states that Mr Heather also used the Defendant's e-cig patent as part of the same pattern of confidence-building assurances and dependency creation, holding it out as having substantial recoverable value if properly pursued, while the expected legal or commercial recovery did not in fact materialise.

The Defendant further states that Fred Heather did not enter his affairs through an ordinary cold professional channel. On the Defendant's case, Mr Heather was introduced through the Dani Peretz / Louis Freeh pathway. The narrower point is contextual and evidential: the Heather episode did not arise in isolation, but within the same wider network of family infiltration, confidence-building, and strategic dependency already identified elsewhere in the Defendant's materials.

The Andreas Karonis David deposition is relevant in that regard because it independently places Dani Peretz and Louis Freeh on the same pathway and describes Peretz as an embedded operator whose access matured over time into upstream targeting of the Defendant's affairs.

VIII. GAROFALO / RECORD-INTEGRITY INSTABILITY

The danger is reinforced by record-integrity instability in the underlying California matters.

The Mahim Khan materials include the Venable filing in which Ellyn Garofalo's position is that the exhibit list filed with the court was not the exhibit list she signed, that her signature page appears to have been detached and attached to a different version, and that the filed version added or removed material in a way she had not authorised.

Whatever findings this Court may or may not make about that episode, it is directly relevant to whether the underlying California record can safely be treated as procedurally clean and complete.

IX. FAMILY INFILTRATION, LEVENTIS PROXIMITY, AND COMMERCIAL ACCESS

The Defendant further states that the wider pressure architecture did not arise from strangers colliding by chance at a late stage. On his case, it emerged from long-standing family, office, and dealmaking proximity.

The Defendant states from personal knowledge that Mike Pappas worked very closely with the Defendant's father until the father's death in Greece in 2000 from brain cancer, and that Pappas functioned as one of the deal-brokers for the Leventis side.

The Defendant also states that Dani Peretz entered the broader family sphere during the period surrounding the terminal decline and death of the Defendant's father, and that he later became embedded within the Alexia David household. The Defendant further states that Peretz came from the Christo Leventis office / orbit rather than as a stranger.

The Defendant further states that his cousin Louisa, herself related to Christo Leventis, and Louisa's former husband were involved in dealmaking for the wider Leventis group.

The Defendant further states from personal knowledge that his former agent, Duncan Heath, was in partnership or close business alignment with Christo Leventis, and that this too formed part of the same broader commercial environment out of which later pressures emerged.

The Court is not asked, on this submission alone, to determine the complete truth of every commercial relationship in that wider sphere. The narrower point is contextual and historical: the later lawfare did not arise from strangers colliding by chance, but from a pre-existing network of family, office, finance, representation, and dealmaking proximity that had long surrounded the family's affairs.

X. DANI PERETZ, ALEXIA DAVID, AND THE LIVE FINANCIAL DISPUTE

The Defendant further relies on the January 2025 Greek extrajudicial declaration / reservation of rights as independent confirmation that the Dani Peretz / Alexia David pathway is not speculative or trivial.

That material shows Dimitra Fanny David proceeding against Dani Peretz and Alexia David and demanding return of the alleged unpaid EUR11,000,000 balance, while also referring to criminal complaint proceedings for attempted fraud in court.

The relevance is that the Peretz pathway is not merely anecdotal. It is already crystallised in formal legal conflict elsewhere.

XI. ANDREAS KARONIS DAVID: SEPARATE FAMILY DEPOSITION PATHWAY

The Defendant further relies on the deposition material of Andreas Karonis David as separate family witness context for the Peretz infiltration pathway.

Andreas states that Dani Peretz entered the family household in 2005 as a driver and assistant during a period of family vulnerability, embedded himself through control over Alexia David and her household, and later extended that access toward the Defendant's assets, communications, and vulnerabilities.

Andreas further alleges that Louis Freeh was integral to the wider operation and that Peretz spent two private weeks with Freeh in Sardinia in 2024.

The same deposition also places the Yatol family, Ehud Barak, and Daphne Barak within the same broader influence narrative around Peretz. The Defendant does not ask this Court on this submission alone to determine every external allegation in that deposition wrapper. The narrower point is that the Peretz / Freeh pathway, and the broader pressure architecture around it, are not advanced only by the Defendant himself. They also appear in separate family witness material describing long-term infiltration, control, and upstream targeting of the Defendant's affairs.

XII. INTIMIDATION: SWITZERLAND AND THE "MARKED MAN" INCIDENT

The Defendant further states that, in Switzerland in or about 2022, Dani Peretz physically jumped on him in an angry confrontation and said words to the effect that the Defendant was "a marked man."

The Defendant states that Alexia David and Nissrine Qrib witnessed that incident.

The Defendant further states that he did not then fully understand why Peretz acted in that way, but now believes the incident is consistent with the wider intimidation and pressure environment described in this submission and may have reflected the effect his litigation and exposure efforts were already having.

The Defendant further states that he reported the matter to the Metropolitan Police. The presently exhibited Met Police email screenshot is relevant because it provides partial corroboration that a Met Police case existed and had been handed onward internally, stating in substance that another officer would be in contact following a team move.

The Defendant further states that Dani Peretz repeatedly mentioned David Boies in exalted or near-mythic terms, as though Mr Boies were a figure of overwhelming legal power before whom ordinary resistance was futile. The Defendant relies on that evidence not to prove, by this paragraph alone, that Mr Boies personally directed Dani Peretz, but to show the atmosphere of intimidation and psychological conditioning in which elite legal names were invoked as instruments of pressure.

In other words, threat was not conveyed only physically or financially, but also symbolically, through the repeated invocation of supposedly unanswerable legal power.

XIII. SERIAL LEGAL FUNDING AND FAMILY BURDEN

The burden imposed on the Defendant's family was not confined to a single action or isolated invoice. It was serial, cumulative, and structured across several fronts at once.

By early 2024, the Defendant's mother, Dimitra David, was being pressed to fund multiple separate legal matter tracks, including Jane Doe, litigation monitoring, judgment enforcement, ADA medical accommodation work, and separate Dana Cole bills connected to Jane Doe and the Elisabeth Taylor matter.

She wrote, while in poor health, that she did not wish to make decisions involving such large sums and that nothing was to be paid until she was well enough to decide for herself. She later wrote that she was being pressed for payment, that the fees were "enormous," and that "over the years a vast sum has been payed over this unfinished business."

On the Defendant's case, that is not ordinary legal administration. It is attritional lawfare financed through family and trust resources. The significance is not merely financial. It shows that pressure was externalised onto family and trust structures while the underlying record remained incomplete.

XIV. IMPACT ON MOTHER, SISTERS, SONS, AND FATHER'S LEGACY

The pressure did not stop with the Defendant.

It reached his mother, who was pressed for payment while in poor health. It reached both his sisters' worlds. It reached his sons and contributed, on the Defendant's case, to the fracture of those relationships. It reached even the legacy of the Defendant's late father.

This is not decorative background. It is part of the human footprint of the process by which the record was formed. The Defendant's position is that lawfare is not merely the multiplication of claims. It is the multiplication of harm: financial, psychological, familial, reputational, and intergenerational.

XV. FREEH, PUBLICATION PRESSURE, AND THE WIDER SUPPRESSION ENVIRONMENT

The pressure environment also included a publication and suppression conflict surrounding Louis Freeh. The Defendant published multiple articles naming Louis Freeh prominently. The Freeh side responded with a cease-and-desist. The Defendant then continued publishing.

The significance of those materials on this application is not that this Court must determine every allegation in those articles. The significance is that the record around the Defendant was being formed in the same period in which he was experiencing direct takedown pressure and counter-publication pressure.

That environment becomes more important when read alongside the public alliance material connecting Glaser Weil and Louis Freeh's organisations, with Fred Heather identified as the Glaser Weil-side partner working alongside the Freeh Group.

XVI. ALPHA NERO AS EXTERNAL CONFIRMATION OF THE PATTERN

The clearest external manifestation of the same pattern is Alpha Nero.

The Defendant was not merely watching Alpha Nero from the sidelines. On his case, he was dragged into it.

The Antigua public materials identify the Defendant as having been drawn into that litigation environment alongside Prime Minister Gaston Browne and others, while the Browne transcript characterises the Alpha Nero campaign as a "total fabrication" designed to "undermine our country" and "certainly to defame me," and as part of a strategy to throw "as much mud as possible" in order to "extort."

The Defendant relies on Alpha Nero here not because this Court must decide all of its merits, but because it shows that the pattern described in this submission is not private fantasy. It is reflected externally in a major cross-jurisdictional dispute that Antigua itself publicly framed as lawfare.

The Defendant further states that Prime Minister Gaston Browne supports him and that Antigua and Barbuda has not treated these concerns as fanciful. The Alpha Nero materials show public and governmental recognition that the wider pattern is one of fabrication, defamation, mud-throwing, and extortionate pressure.

XVII. BREADTH OF EMAIL MATERIAL EXAMINED

The forensic account advanced in this submission is not derived from a single email in isolation.

It is based on a review of the live KB-2025-001991 / CA-2025-002562 email chain and related case-management emails across 7 April 2026 and 8 April 2026, including outgoing transmissions by the Defendant and incoming service material from the Claimant's solicitors.

The Defendant's point is not merely that a filing was sent once. It is that the Court and the Claimant's solicitors were presented, across a sequence of related emails, with: (a) a threshold proper-party challenge; (b) a consolidated supplemental application; (c) the service and adjournment chronology; (d) the limited public-source note; and (e) the publication exhibit.

In other words, the reviewed email record shows a stepwise, cumulative procedural presentation, not a single stray transmission.

XVIII. WHY THIS COURT NEED NOT FIND EVERY WIDER ALLEGATION TO ACT

The Court does not need to determine every wider allegation in order to decide this application.

It need only answer the question before it:

Can coercive enforcement safely proceed where: (a) the service history has already misfired; (b) threshold objections remain unresolved; (c) the underlying record is challenged as materially incomplete; (d) known medical and ADA material was not properly advanced; (e) former counsel's conduct is said to have created dependency and non-delivery; (f) intimidation and threat reporting form part of the surrounding environment; and (g) the combination of pressure, dependency, public attack, and family infiltration is, on the Defendant's case, precisely what made the record unsafe in the first place?

Respectfully, the Defendant submits that it cannot.

XIX. RELIEF SOUGHT

The Defendant respectfully asks the Court to treat this as a threshold procedural submission and to make one or more of the following directions:

- (1) A direction that no further enforcement step be taken until the Court has first determined: (a) the procedural sufficiency of the charging-order pathway; (b) the true-party-in-interest issue; (c) the proper limited status of the public-source / publication exhibits; and (d) whether the present record is sufficiently procedurally safe to support coercive enforcement.
- (2) A stay of the charging-order / enforcement process pending determination of those threshold issues.
- (3) A direction that the parties address, in short written submissions if necessary, whether the Claimant contends that the public-source and publication materials served on 8 April 2026 were irrelevant, unknown, or procedurally improper, and if so on what basis.
- (4) A direction that the parties address, in short written submissions if necessary, whether the Defendant's omitted-evidence / record-integrity objections should be sequenced before any renewed coercive enforcement step.
- (5) Such further sequencing or case-management directions as the Court considers necessary to prevent coercive enforcement pressure from outrunning procedural fairness and the overriding objective.

XX. CONCLUSION

The Defendant's submission is not that public indexing proves the case. Nor is it that a charging-order application is automatically abusive.

It is that the combination of: (a) coercive enforcement pressure, (b) defective or delayed procedural handling, (c) unresolved threshold objections, (d) direct service of limited public-source / publication material into the live case chain, (e) the absence, on the reviewed record, of identified substantive engagement with those later materials, (f) the wider pattern of known but non-deployed evidence, (g) the broader pattern of promised recovery pathways that yielded dependency and non-delivery, (h) the family infiltration and intimidation pathways now identified, and (i) the external Alpha Nero / Browne materials reflecting the same broader lawfare architecture, creates a classic lawfare pattern in procedural terms: pressure first, legitimacy later.

The Court's answer to that pattern is not rhetoric. It is case management.

The Defendant therefore respectfully invites the Court to stop the sequence at the threshold, determine the anterior issues first, and ensure that enforcement does not proceed on a footing that is coercive in effect before it is secure in procedure.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

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

Dated: 8 April 2026

/s/ Alkiviades David

Alkiviades David

Defendant / Applicant in Person

SCHEDULE A - REQUEST FOR REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS

The Defendant respectfully requests that the Court take note that he is a disabled litigant with documented traumatic brain injury and executive-function impairment.

For any hearing, review, or live procedural step, the Defendant respectfully requests:

1. shorter hearing segments, with breaks at reasonable intervals;
2. permission to rely on written structure and notes during oral submissions;
3. tolerance for slower pace of response where medical condition affects processing speed;
4. clear sequencing of issues so that threshold questions are determined before merits-adjacent matters;
and
5. liberty to supplement briefly in writing after hearing if a point is missed due to disability-related fatigue or cognitive overload.

The Defendant relies on this schedule not to obtain unfair advantage, but to participate effectively and fairly.

SCHEDULE B - EVIDENCE SCHEDULE

Use the original uploaded filenames exactly as listed below.

1. **Pasted text.txt** - Core 8 April procedural / lawfare / threshold case-management draft.
2. **Pasted text(1).txt** - Structured review of the expanded submission and targeted filing recommendations.
3. **ANTIGUA BOIES LAWFARE.pdf** - Antigua public lawfare framing; Boies-linked offensive; Mr David identified as one of the targets.
4. **transcript-AGgatsonTV.txt** - Gaston Browne broadcast transcript; 'total fabrication,' 'undermine our country,' 'defame me,' and 'extort.'
5. **FREEH.pdf** - Glaser Weil / Freeh strategic alliance material placing Fred Heather alongside the Freeh Group.
6. **LOUIS FREEH.pdf** - Freeh publication exhibit showing ongoing public-facing pressure context.
7. **FREEH SHOCKYA.pdf** - ShockYa Freeh-related publication-pressure exhibit.
8. **FREEH FREAK OFF.pdf** - ShockYa publication exhibit tying Freeh into the wider intimidation / publication environment.
9. **CHECK-MATE.pdf** - Notice of publication exhibit publicly setting out the Defendant's position on the proceedings.
10. **EXHIBIT K Treatment Report fr Dr. Wexler.eml** - Primary Wexler treatment-report email exhibit.
11. **EXHIBIT L Important information for Wexler.eml** - Wexler-related email exhibit evidencing known medical / disability information.
12. **EXHIBIT I Alkiviades Treatmetn Plan v1_230528_082821.pdf** - Treatment-plan exhibit supporting TBI / ADA / accommodation issues.
13. **EXHIBIT J - Alkiviades v2.pdf** - Supporting medical / neurological exhibit for disability and fairness issues.
14. **peretz20250115172816799.pdf** - Greek declaration / reservation of rights against Dani Peretz and Alexia David; EUR11,000,000 dispute.
15. **Fugitive Alert! Public Deposition of Andreas Karonis David on Dani Peretz Louis Freeh & MOSSAD agent infiltrators.pdf** - Andreas deposition material on Peretz infiltration, Freeh pathway, and broader family-control narrative.
16. **CHRISTO.pdf** - Christo Leventis / wider Leventis scrutiny context.
17. **MET POLICE.pdf** - Met Police handoff / case-existence screenshot supporting threat-reporting pathway.
18. **WME PELLICANO.pdf** - Context exhibit concerning wider overlap / influence environment.
19. **LUI54.pdf** - Supporting contextual exhibit for wider Judge Lui / suppression narrative, if relied upon.
20. **23768 Malibu.pdf** - Property / Malibu exhibit - include if used specifically to show evidence loss, seizure, or coercive pressure.
21. **MALIBU TIMES.pdf** - Context exhibit - include if used specifically to show evidence loss, seizure, or coercive pressure.
22. **10110-0003 Medical Condition O-S Invoices.pdf** - Medical / ADA billing trail from the March 2024 invoice chain.
23. **10110-0001 Litigation Monitoring O-S Invoices.pdf** - Litigation monitoring billing trail from the March 2024 invoice chain.
24. **09532-0017 Jones Taylor v David O-S Invoices.pdf** - Jones / Taylor billing strand from the March 2024 invoice chain.
25. **09532-0014 Doe v. Alkiviades O-S Invoice.pdf** - Jane Doe billing strand from the March 2024 invoice chain.
26. **Alkiviades 09532-0014 Discount Stmt# 283101.pdf** - Discounted Jane Doe invoice statement from the January 2024 chain.
27. **Dimitra 10110-0001 Litigation Inv# 283060 - 12-28-23.pdf** - Dimitra litigation invoice.

28. **Dimitra 10110-0002 Judgment Inv# 283059 12-28-23.pdf** - Dimitra judgment-enforcement invoice.
29. **Dimitra 10110-0003 Medical Inv# 283061 12-28-23.pdf** - Dimitra medical / ADA invoice.
30. **Original Garofalo / Venable filing and declaration PDFs** - Use the exact original uploaded filenames for the Venable filing and Ellyn Garofalo declaration.
31. **Original TBI / Wexler / ADA exhibit PDFs** - Use the exact original uploaded filenames for the core TBI, Dr Wexler, and accommodation exhibits.
32. **Exported Gmail PDFs** - 15 July 2024 file demand; Veronica confirmations; Caleb Pinkham / Met Police thread; Met Police bounce-backs; Dimitra / Troller / Sofos / Cone invoice chain.

SCHEDULE C - RECOMMENDED BUNDLE ORDER

1. Cover note and short threshold summary.
2. Main supplemental submission.
3. Schedule A - reasonable adjustments.
4. Charging-order / adjournment / service papers.
5. Medical / TBI / ADA exhibits (K, L, I, J and supporting originals).
6. Fred Heather file-demand email and related emails.
7. Garofalo / Venable record-integrity exhibits.
8. Dimitra invoice / family-burden exhibits.
9. Freeh alliance and publication-pressure exhibits.
10. Peretz / Andreas / Met Police exhibits.
11. Alpha Nero / Gaston Browne / Antigua lawfare exhibits.
12. Optional contextual exhibits only if directly tied to threshold relief.