

Last updated 11th May 2010
This powerpoint derived website requires Internet Explorer v6 or later.

Welcome, Willkommen, Välkommen, Welkom, مرحبا بكم,
Bienvenue, Bienvenido, Benvenuti, Tervetuloa, Witamy,
ようこそ Добро пожаловать, Hoş geldiniz, Привітання, 欢迎

benversus.com



Hello and welcome to benversus.com.

- This is a reference resource for all those involved in the legal cases involving Ben Collins.
- When one silly thing happens life is difficult, when three happen it becomes ridiculous.
- This site discusses multiple cases fighting against powerful bureaucratic institutions.
- I am claiming these institutions have deliberately unfair protocol amounting to malpractice.
- There are many people out there bullying "little people".
- The investment of time in case preparation is complete, now to apply justice mechanisms.
- I am fighting 7 legally minded institutions of infinite resources and time in four law regions.
- I have no; legal expertise, time and cannot afford legal representation.
- Will these cases be won or lost? Who knows? It is not going to be quick or easy!
- Still, step by step things are now starting to happen.
- Idle browsers are recommended to stick to the intro's and cartoons as the detail is lengthy.



Salus populi suprema lex esto

The welfare of the people is to be the highest law

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Introduction




There are three main cases;

- a) BC vs DIUS (2003)
- b) BC vs KF & SV Göteborg (2006)
- c) BC vs QLTR Edinburgh (2008)

There are four other lesser cases.

The cases are detailed herein, together with cartoons for easy understanding of the problems.



In 2003, 2006 and 2008 some very boring and stupid things happened which have significantly delayed my carbon-down ecotech projects and negatively effected my life. This was for a while ignored, but eventually had to be addressed. Most of 2008 was spent preparing and organising eight cases. Using positive philosophy perhaps these things were meant to be, and can provide finance for the low carbon technologies. Nevertheless these events have dominated my; life, lifestyle, home and some personal relationships. It is no use whining into a beer mug, if there are cases to answer, actions can be brought and perhaps won. *Acta non Verba*.

a) BC vs DTI EM Small Business Service Now Department of Innovation and Universities (2003)

The UK Dept of Industry refused part funding under their SMART scheme for the world's first one stroke engine on the basis; it had no market, could not be assembled, was not new and time given was overvalued. In fact the engine is perfect for recharging EV's, was built and shown as a model that could assembled, was approved for a world patent (was new) and our time was paid at the quoted rate paid out in 1998, 1999 and 2003. Malpractice is claimed.

b) BC vs KF & SV Göteborg (2006)

SV & KF removed all finances (car, finance, possessions, credit) April 6th, 67 days after an incorrect tax estimate for January was issued. Everybody was informed the tax bill was wrong, I had paid taxes already for 5 years without issues. All the tax money originally "owed" was returned in December, though I had to exist penniless for 8 months. Very silly, destabilising and pointless. Malpractice is claimed: harassment/extortion.

c) BC vs QLTR Edinburgh / Scottish Office (2008)

In 1998 I moved abroad in order to repay my loan and grant back to *the Scottish Office*. Thereafter I overpaid my VAT and saved up extra money for a new project (£21k). When this money was claimed under Bono Vacantia, only £3k was repaid not £21k. UK Government website stated a £50k maximum but I was later informed "that was only for England and Wales, just £3k in Scotland!" according to the QLTR (part of *the Scottish Office*). If I had wound up the company in 1998, I would have been £36,000 richer ten years ago! Strange reward for repaying my loans to *the Scottish Office*! Malpractice is again claimed: failure to make fair payout set out in UK guidelines and operating a department of justice with unjust practices.

Lustitia omni auro carior

Justice is more precious than all gold

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



















Results

Life

Quick Guide

Ben Collins Versus Various David V Goliath Active Legal Challenges 10th May 2010

Ref #	Law	Year	Versus 10th May 'Action	Regarding	Show n Here In
DvG 1	 	2003	Dept Innov & Uni's Malpractice	Incompetent project assessment.	Dept IUS
DvG 2	 	2008	QLTR Edinburgh	Malpractice Failure to make a fair BV payout.	QLTR
DvG A	 	2006	BC vs SV	Harassment Two o years of pointless fiscal assault.	SV&KF
DvG B	 	2006	BC vs KF	Theft Illegal sequestration of all assets.	SV&KF
DvG C	 	2006	BC vs AK	Malpractice Slow processing of claim (four months).	Other Cases
DvG D	 	2006	BC vs VV	Malpractice Failure to build smooth roads & SUVs.	Other Cases
DvG E	 	2007	TFF vs BC	Extortion Resolution avoidance and overcharging.	Other Cases
DvG F	 	2006	BC vs KF&J	Extortion Illegal rates of interest, 2000%.	Other Cases

Whilst pursuing my Carbon-Down program on extreme low income for five years, some very strange situations have occurred. Fighting and dealing with injustices is energy sapping and tedious, unfortunately I have been pretty much triggered into these actions in respect of TFF's court action against me and the QLTR non payment of my carefully saved funds. Once you start on those you might as well take all the others on as well.

Cartoons are used herein as an easy reading summary of the cases. Let's see what happens in 2010.

This document details several agencies that I would like to legally challenge, in either the UK, Swedish or the European court. In my opinion these agencies have abused their privileges and position of power and failed in keeping to standards that protect individuals from clumsy or poor administration. Their handling of these situations have been excessive and generated spiralling or cyclical additional problems way beyond the original issue. This creates a cycle of paperwork and time wastage increasing the tax burden.

Whining or genuine social injustice?

I would like courts to decide each case on merit, whether the case list does or does not constitute impedance of natural social justice and whether these mechanisms that have acted against me are either in control or are excessive. In singular cases the damage might seem modest, but collectively this has created a load of unnecessary misery and paralysed my lifestyle.

Considering the wider social implications, this could mean much misery is being unnecessarily distributed.

Corruptissima re publica plurimae leges

The more laws, the greater the corruption

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Intent and Goals

I intend to win these cases and prove that citizens rights to fairness in the EU are alive and well in 2010. Naturally a mix of frustration, boredom, bitterness, anger and financial recuperation are the motives behind this collective action. There is a point where trampling or trespass into peoples rights and private areas really begins to rankle and not sit easy with day to day existence, until that trampling has been corrected. Despite the overwhelming wave of negativity revisiting all of this generates, a response must be made in order to eventually move on. Financial compensation is not cancellation however when left with lifetime mental baggage, best illustrated by the highly motivating r.i.p. Mum page.

There are three goals here;

- 1) To be financially compensated for the wastage of time, misery and damages of these unnecessary procedures.
- 2) To wake up civil officers to their responsibilities in fairness of process and accuracy in communication.
- 3) To avoid these situations happening to other people.

Change of procedures can be achieved by;

- Punitive damages herein only but leading to a wider modification of protocol.
- Punitive damages meaning payments due may be widespread to other people.
- Publicising this case.
- An EU court directive to moderate processes.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizenship_of_the_European_Union

There are legions of people talking and researching climate crisis and oil depletion, but very few providing practical resolutions. In a world of empty talking and missed targets, my technology can make something real happen. Life is short, it is a pity time has to be wasted on negative unproductive endeavours such as "benversus.com" 2008 was supposed to be launch year for the combined Carbon-Down projects. Hopefully that will be 2010.

It is time to fight the eco-blahblah of pamphlet makers, gaggles of quangos and those measuring ice melting. Only doing stuff in technology and building it gets results. There are twenty "green" quangos in the North West of England discussing the environment. If you tell them you have invented a high yield wind turbine that is cheap to build and maintain and can eliminate carbon production, oil reliance, they cannot help you. Pathetic. When giving up a very well paid contract to work on the eco projects I was bankrupted by idiotic SV&KF actions. When I tried to launch this technology with self earned funds, the funds are unfairly sequestered by QLTR.

From my perspective it is odd that so many unfair and stupid things can happen to one person trying to achieve a useful philanthropic result, however open any newspaper on any day and you will find tales of equal absurdity. Problems are compounded when they are multiplied, one issue can be tolerated, several issues quickly intertwine creating a greater problem. The financial rug was pulled out three times, 2003 (DIUS), 2006 (SV) and 2008 (QLTR). Frankly, enough is enough!

carbon-down

Tu ne cede malis

Yield not to misfortunes

bencc

[Spero](#)[Status](#)[Notes](#)[RIP Mum](#)[Case List](#)[Introduction](#)[benversus.com](#)[ben@bencc.com](#)[Quick Guide](#)[Intent & Goals](#)[Dept IUS Intro](#)[d1](#)[d2](#)[d3](#)[Dept IUS Detail](#)[d4](#)[d5](#)[d6](#)[KF&SV Intro](#)[k1](#)[k2](#)[k3](#)[KF&SV Detail](#)[k4](#)[k5](#)[k6](#)[QLTR Intro](#)[q1](#)[q2](#)[q3](#)[QLTR Detail](#)[q4](#)[q5](#)[q6](#)[Other Cases](#)[o1](#)[o2](#)[o3](#)[Summary](#)[Results](#)[Life](#)[R.I.P. Mum](#)

Photo Taken 1990, Aged 54

Mum 1936-2009

Six of the eight cases were brought in Sept 2008. If those agencies had made settlement, when very favourable terms were offered e.g. to QLTR without damages, a reconciliation could have been established before Jan 2nd 2009.

Cicatrix manet

The scar remains

Behind the bureaucratic incompetences, peoples lives are drastically effected. Incompetent actions do have multiple knock-on consequences, sometimes very severe ones. Having said goodbye to my Mother at Barrow Crematorium, I am considerably motivated to take action against this malpractice. These cases raised herein are unavoidably entwined with my deteriorated relationship with my Mother which was very happy for the first 35 years. Before she died she requested that I never would contact her again. In the last year she despised me and had no single photograph of me in her house, despite tens of other photos of her other children and grandchildren.

My Mother felt I had abandoned her and Britain, which was not so as I tried to move home in 2003, 2006 and 2008 and was stopped on each occasions by the malpractices detailed herein, having only originally moved abroad to do "the right thing" and pay off a debt (that could have been more easily cancelled by limited company winding up). Later the same Scottish Office that I had repaid by hourly contracted work in Germany, refused to pay out the excess saved into the exact same limited company account from which I repaid them.

My Mother felt most abandoned in late May 2006 when suffering another massive asthma attack, I was unable to fly home to care for her due to KF & SV removing all my finances at that time for money that was never actually owed in the first place. My sister and her four children had to fly in from Paris when it was my turn to do so. This led to a breakdown in relations, I doubt she ever believed my incredible tale "the Swedish tax office have taken all my money that wasnt even owed after only two months notice!".

It is a pity that my Mother died thinking her youngest son wasted his life on daydreams and that she had pointlessly made such career sacrifices bringing me up as a full time working Mother. The one stroke engine should have been funded in 2003, to provide the backbone for future electric vehicles, as a specialist vehicle range extender engine. That could have been the move back to the UK and made her proud.

The final ignomony was provided by QLTR, who failed to pay out fairly (£21k) or promptly (April) paying out only a miserly £3k in late December. This left me owing my Mother £2k when she died Jan 2nd, after she lent me £2k in good faith in March with myself assuring her then that QLTR were bound to pay out soon. I tried to explain that QLTR had not payed out fairly, summer 2008, but a 72 year old lady is not receptive to wierd sounding tales.

A sad end to what had been a brilliant and close relationship for the first 35 years.

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

For Full Detail of Each Case Follow Websites Links

click to
open link

Date Comms	Pages	About	Website
2009-04-14	36	Formal website of all the cases	www.benversus.com
2009-11-20	22	Easy Reading Summary of the cases	www.summary.benversus.com
Dept of Inn & Uni's		Dept of Innovation & Uni's Full Details	Website
2009-09-08	24	2009 Negligence of Dept of Innovation & Uni's	www.writ.dti.benversus.com
2008-11-21	55	2008 Notice of Reasons of DIUS Negligence	www.detail.dti.benversus.com
2003-07-08	48	2003 Orig Research Application & Website	www.app.dti.benversus.com
QLTR Edinbur		QLTR Full Details	Website
2009-03-20	14	Writ for QLTR Malpractice & 2009 Comms	www.writ qltr.benversus.com
2008-09-12	42	Notice of Reasons for QLTR Malpractice	www.detail qltr.benversus.com
2008-09-12	10	UK Government BV Guidelines and Notes	www.law qltr.benversus.com
2009-04-22	145	Communications : Letters, Calls and Emails	www.comms qltr.benversus.com
2008-03-15	43	Original BV Application	www.app qltr.benversus.com
Skatteverket		SV & KF Full Details	Website
2009-03-20	70	Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.svkf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	49	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.svkf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	124	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.svkf.benversus.com
Kronofogdymndigheten			Website
		Complaint combined with SV case	websites shared with sv see above
Alfakassan		AK Full Details	Website
2009-04-23	12	Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.ak.benversus.com
2008-09-12	25	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.ak.benversus.com
2008-09-12	27	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.ak.benversus.com
Vägverket		VV Full Details	Website
2008-09-11	10	Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.vv.benversus.com
2008-09-12	31	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.vv.benversus.com
2008-09-12	13	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.vv.benversus.com
Trafikförsäkringsför TFF		TFF Full Details	Website
2008-09-12	40	Communications and Court Action	www.comms.tf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	27	Main Complaint	www.detail.tf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	60	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.tf.benversus.com
KF & Intrum Justitia		IJ & KF Full Details	Website
2009-04-24	16	Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.ijkf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	41	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.ijkf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	47	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.ijkf.benversus.com

Fortiter in re, suaviter in modo : Resolutely in deed, sweetly in manner

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Benversus Summary


Being realistic, Ben Collins versus; the UK Department of Innovation, the Swedish Tax Office and the Scottish Department of Justice, is going to be an interesting, lengthy and difficult struggle. Luckily, eventually we have European law as the top level in the UK and Sweden so they cannot do whatever they they want, even though they seem to be under the impression of ultimate power with no one to answer to.

Things have to be fair, just and right otherwise we are living in a clandestine dictatorship. When I eventually win these cases, the compensation paid out means yet more burden on the tax payer, whilst the arrogance and indifference of these public agencies and employees will no doubt continue unabated to bully little people, but perhaps just a fraction less.

While this is a massive waste of time for my part, I am sick of being harassed for reasons caused by other peoples failings and finally resolved to fight back. Challenging this in court and the other problems so that people on fringe incomes (after donating five years to developing eco-technology) like myself are not bullied by such agencies. The most surprising aspect of this experience is it has not been the result of administrative error, rather *fundamental systemic problems*. When I have made a mistake or a delay, a ton of bricks drops, when the agencies make a mistake or delay, nothing happens. There is a lack of balance. With my hard earned savings sequestrated without reason, I have been unable to launch five years important eco technology development.

I also suspect some of this money collected was profiteering and exploitation of people at the fringe of society on low income without legal expertise, also generating unnecessary paper mountains and clerical non-jobs to administrate them. Not everyone is legally minded enough or have enough time or energy to expend challenging state mechanisms, hence we can be pretty sure these instances explained herein are not isolated to myself or extreme by way of example.

Social freedoms can be earned with; a gun by violent revolution, stoic and honourable protest or more preferably by courtcase, depending on the scenario. These cases put faith into the various justice systems, so let us see if they function. In the end, staring at your belly button bemoaning your plight does not resolve anything, something has to be done, hence this document. Dum spiro spero, acta non verba!



The Bruce & the Spider

- Carbon-Down project to eliminate carbon burning, how long will it stall?
- 5 years unpaid development and 42 delayed technologies.
- Can the AWP Ltd hard earned money be recovered?
- Is it really legal in the EU to take all an EU citizens possessions for an incorrect and estimated tax bill after just 67 days?
- Can the endless blather of hundreds eco-quangos be converted to usefully fund genuine eco-technology projects to resolve the energy crisis?
- Is 1000% state sponsored interest on delayed bill payments fair?

Vivere liberi aut mori

Live free or die

Spero**Status****Notes****RIP Mum****Case List****Introduction**

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide**Intent & Goals****Dept IUS Intro**

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary**Results****Life****BC and AWP Ltd Story So Far****1996** Move to Scotland to try eco-tech project, get £5k moving grant & £10k loan, start Ltd Co.**1998** Project runs out of time at Centre for Sustainable Technology : Owe loan money.

Try to repay while based in Borders (Mainetti Ltd) but not well enough payed to dent debt.

Jump to hourly paid design work In Germany : now owe loan *and moving grant*.

Pay off all debts - to sister and Scottish Office.

Take on accounts processing for the guy who helped me get job in JCI Germany.

But he demands to be paid offshore, I refuse.

He turns nasty, takes my pc and wipes accounts, also blackmail at my work place.

Continue working long hours, flood AWP Ltd with extra money and overpay VAT.

2000 Late submission of accounts to Edinburgh means ltd co. unexpectedly dissolved.

Switch JCI consultant work to Squarise Design Limited & become director there.

Keep working abroad and switch to JCI Sweden.

2003 Take two years out to continue eco work. Finish CLP engine, but no funding.**DIUS
2003**

Tidy up AWP Ltd account but restoration impossible as now based abroad.

2004 Receive VAT overpayment payable order but cannot cash it.**2004** Keep working abroad and shore up funds with a years work.**2005** Take three years out to continue eco projects, finish eco projects.**2008** Enter QLTR BV process (March 15th) to generate launch cash for eco projects**SV/KF
2006****QLTR
2008**

Six month wait no pay out, downgraded to a max £3,000 from a £20,740 pot

No payout as Sept 8th, 2008, postpone eco tech launch.

2009 Go back to consult work to save up to launch finished eco projects**2010** Launch ecotech projects (2010?)*Dum Spiro Spero*

I breathe, I hope

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3



Summary

Results



Life

Latest Status of the Cases

Ben Collins Versus Various David V Goliath Active Legal Challenges 10th May 2010

Ref #	Law	Year	Versus	10th May	Action	Regarding	Show n Here In
DvG 1	 	2003	Dept Innov & Uni's	Malpractice	Incompetent project assessment.	Dept IUS	

DIUS have refused settlement by independent arbitrator and denied negligence. The only legal option apparently is a Judicial Review, which only applies to unlawful decision making, not incompetent or negligent process. Therefore case details are now with professional negligence solicitors to see if any of them wish to take the case.

DvG 2	 	2008	QLTR Edinburgh	Malpractice	Failure to make a fair BV payout.	QLTR
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	----------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	------



Seeking legal representation in Scotland. QLTR have denied malpractice.

DvG A	 	2006	BC vs SV	Harassment	Two years of pointless fiscal assault.	SV&KF
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	----------	------------	----------------------------------------	-------



I have now been investigated for all eight years by the Swedish tax office following my action against them, without issue. The case is awaiting judgement at the JustitieKanslern (The Justice Ministry), expected soon!

DvG B	 	2006	BC vs KF	Theft	Illegal sequestration of all assets.	SV&KF
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	----------	-------	--------------------------------------	-------

Case awaiting judgement at the JustitieKanslern (Justice Ministry), expected soon!

DvG C	 	2006	BC vs AK	Malpractice	Slow processing of claim (four months).	Other Cases
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	----------	-------------	-----------------------------------------	-------------

Case awaiting judgement at the Inspector of Insurance, result expected next year.

DvG D	 	2006	BC vs VV	Malpractice	Failure to build smooth roads & SUVs.	Other Cases
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	----------	-------------	---------------------------------------	-------------

Notice served on Vägverket, who claim this is responsibility of Göteborg Stad. Lowest priority, not yet pursued.

DvG E	 	2007	TFF vs BC	Extortion	Resolution avoidance and overcharging.	Other Cases
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	-----------	-----------	----------------------------------------	-------------

The case by TFF against BC has been appealed, at Göteborg Tingsrätten (district court).

DvG F	 	2006	BC vs KF&J	Extortion	Illegal rates of interest, 2000%.	Other Cases
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------	------------	-----------	-----------------------------------	-------------

BC is challenging the charges applied at Göteborg Tingsrätten and the case is moving to Hovrätten.

Fortitudine vincimus

By endurance we conquer

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com

Quick Guide

ben@bencc.com

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary

Results

Life

Notes

So far only the Swedish cases have made it to proper handling, currently lying at JustitiaKanslern (the justice chancellor) and are supposed to have been judged in March 2010 (18 month standard deliberation).

This does not reflect well on British justice mechanisms which are clumsy, expensive and complicated, making them inaccessible and thus irrelevant to the average person. A society without access to justice is a weak one.

A good example of this is the SPSO (Scottish Public Services Ombudsman) process because that process requires surrendering of all legal rights before the case can be judged by the SPSO. This means in order to pursue an SPSO judgment, you must put your faith in the (paid for and organised by the Scottish Office) body to judge against the Scottish Office, the same Scottish Office that has already cheated you. A bankrupt philosophy and a long way from the original Swedish definition of "Ombudsman".

The SPSO should be a stepping stone between direct communication (between protagonists) and court. The notion of surrendering legal rights before engagement is ludicrous. Any judgment of the SPSO is not above the law of the land or Europe. This level of swaggering arrogance in the UK civil government only leads to one inevitable result, incompetence and indifference when that incompetence is exposed. Even when the Scottish Office is trying to establish a fair SPSO system there is stupidity that defies basic logic, enough to make their process irrelevant in this case and probably many other cases.

6 Has this matter been considered in Court or do you plan to raise the matter in Court?

YES ☐

Unfortunately, it is unlikely that we will be able to look into your complaint. To discuss further please contact us on 0800 377 7330.

NO ☐

Please continue completing this form.

SPSO Scottish Public Services Ombudsman
4 Melville Street
Edinburgh EH3 7NS
or
SPSO Freepost EH641
Edinburgh EH3 0BR
www.spsa.org.uk

The philosophical bankruptcy is repeated at the DTI (now DIUS) where there was no means for challenging grant decisions, outwith a Judicial Review (that rouet only notified to me in 2009) and all the complexity that involves. What a fundamentally weak system that does not have decision reviewing capacity. These are basic instruments that must be available to catch the inevitable bad decisions. The denial that such processes are needed or implemented highlights a very bad culture of unanswerable private decision making where billions of pounds are distributed behind veiled screens, inevitably leading to favour and corruption. The DIUS stinks. The people at the top of these organisations are to blame for creating such a weak and clandestine structure.

Diligite justitiam
Cherish justice

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

BC vs DIUS : Cartoon Explanation Part 1 of 2

June 2003.....

It is easy to assemble, I built and showed you the model and photographed assembly stage by stage in the grant application and website published a year earlier.

Erm, your other expert, the UK patent office said it was new, so someone is telling porkies. The PCT authority in the Hague also agreed it was new and granted a world patent.

This means your expert has not read my application, technical info or website?

???

You're supposed to get three opinions, in case one of the opinions is a bit silly, like this one.

Erm, in the application the market was clearly defined as electricity generation, static and remote on electric vehicles.

But looking forwards In 2010 there will be low carbon electric vehicles and the CLP range extender engine will mean their battery weight, cost and storage can be smaller, with infinite range.

We wont back your carbon reducing project for several important reasons, mainly it is not technically feasible because it can't be assembled.

Well our expert says it can't be assembled, he also says it is an old concept, even though he didnt find any examples to reference

That is ok we still trust our expert who didnt review your tech info or website and reject your project based on his single opinion.

SBS DTI

This is just sour grapes!

Well he also says it has no clearly defined market

There are no electric vehicles yet!

???

fiat justitia, ruat caelum

justice be done, even though the heavens fall

Spero Status

Notes RIP Mum Case List

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide 

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3



QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary ← →

Results Life

BC vs DIUS : Cartoon Explanation Part 2 of 2 and Problem Diagram




Establishing The New and Original CLP Innovation

[Spero](#) [Status](#)
[Notes](#) [RIP Mum](#) [Case List](#)
[Introduction](#) [benversus.com](#)

[Quick Guide](#)
[Intent & Goals](#) [ben@bencc.com](#)
[Dept IUS Intro](#) [d1](#) [d2](#) [d3](#)
[Dept IUS Detail](#) [d4](#) [d5](#) [d6](#)
[KF&SV Intro](#) [k1](#) [k2](#) [k3](#)
[KF&SV Detail](#) [k4](#) [k5](#) [k6](#)
[QLTR Intro](#) [q1](#) [q2](#) [q3](#)
[QLTR Detail](#) [q4](#) [q5](#) [q6](#)
[Other Cases](#) [o1](#) [o2](#) [o3](#)
[Summary](#) [Results](#) [Life](#)

Development Stages Completed CLP		
Year	#	Main Points
1994	1	Basic Idea
1999	2	Idea Refinement
2000	3	Project Kick Off Decision
2001	4	Concept Investigations
2001	5	Refinement and Paper Models
2001	6	Existing Technology Revue
	7	3D Concept Model & Detail
	8	Definition & Patent Application
2002	9	Production BOM & Costings
	10	Patent Filed
	11	Funding Applications
	12	Industry Consultation
	13	Technical Documentation
	14	Patent Claims Filed
	15	Patent Professionally Searched
2003	16	Patent Professionally Reviewed
	17	Graphics and Websites
	18	Publication of Development
	19	PCT Patent Process Entered
	20	Exact Size Models
	21	Public Demo & Indy Review
	22	Funding Applications
2004	23	Direct Marketing to People
	24	PCT European Office Searched
	25	PCT Patent Approved
	26	Administrating Enquiries



When the cleanly defined CLP patent was created and searched by the PCT adopted European patent office as novel, from the chart left we see that the CLP project had jumped some massive hurdles. Establishing something original and practical in the 21st century in the field of engines is no mean feat. Having achieved all this at great expense of donated time, risk of failure and some hard cash to build the models, no grant assistance was given for reasons questioned herein.

This represents 2 years of risked capital without guarantee of any result, giving up the chance to be lead engineer at Johnson Controls. In the end a new engine was created. How often does a new engine concept come around using realistic round based technology? This should be the beginning of a fantastic engineering achievement and mass employment exercise in the East Midlands.

With the Kyoto agreement signed in 2000, the EU desperately exposed to fluctuations in oil price and climate crisis in full swing, how on earth was the CLP project not part funded by SBS DTI? IMO if SBS DTI (now DIUS) and cohorts across the UK get their budgets slashed due to paying punitive damages in this action, they might take future applications more seriously and wake up to the opportunity small team inventors represent.

The CLP engine will be relaunched at the end of 2010.
www.regengen.com www.linkedpiston.com www.1strok.com



Occasio aegre offertur, facile amittitur

Creating opportunity is difficult, but easy to lose

Accepting a Flawed Technical Evaluation is NOT Acceptable

Status

RIP Mum

Introduction

ben@bencc.com

d1

d2

d3

d4

d5

d6

k1

k2

k3

k4

k5

k6

q1

q2

q3

g4

q5

q6

01

o2

03



Life



A document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

[illegible]

After carefully developing assembly, then building a full size model and website posting clear assembly technique – extremely close to a contemporary engine by the way – it was particularly infuriating to have an "expert" say that the engine is difficult to assemble.

If the expert missed this, it is logical to assume that he also failed to properly consider the project before jumping to strange and unworthy assumptions.

The unacceptable part is not that the expert was mistaken or incompetent, but after these fundamental mistakes were highlighted to SBS DTI, the expert analysis was not recommissioned or discarded. When consulting Volvo, Ford and Audi, none of their experts had opinions similar to the DTI Expert and all recognised the ease of assembly.

Only class "A" references were identified, which means the patent is novel. Despite this declaration, the single DTI expert report claimed the idea was not new and just a rehash. Even when the DTI sourced patent research repeated the twice previous independent patent search conclusions of originality, thereby making a nonsense of the "expert" claim of a rehash, they refused any further technical investigations.

Nor was any "old idea" supposedly related identified by that expert. Yet the CLP project was rejected on the single opinion of that discredited expert. ***Malpractice is claimed.***

SBS DTI are obligated as a publicly funded office to :

- Treat each proposal fairly.
- Make proper consideration of each proposal,
- Encourage technology that tackles climate change (re Kyoto).

SBS DTI are obligated as a publicly funded public office to :

- Avoid patronising and bullying when using their discretionary power.
- Not favour University projects (have historically produced very little).
- Fairly value professional engineering time donated to projects.
- Be open in communications without closed shop practices.
- Look at and consider websites as sources of information.

All of which SBS DTI failed to execute in this case.

Quot homines, tot sententiae

As many men, as many opinions.

Spero Status

Notes RIP Mum Case List

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide 

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3

QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary ◀ ▶

Results Life

030817 Salient Letter Refs [Reply to Dewi Hughes Letter \(030815\)](#)

DH "whilst we have received one tentative support from technical experts consulted we have also received one clear rejection. I include some of the experts comments below that will hopefully be of use to you. "

No technological advance offered by proposed work. Concept is an old one. Proposed work differs in detail only There has been a piston, there has been a linked piston. There has never been a **compact linked piston**. The invention has been searched and deemed novel by both the PCT (world) and UK patent authority.
Concept is impractical due to costs of manufacture and difficulty in assembly. Assembly follows the same process as a current engine. Costs will increase and decrease in areas, and there will be a new technology cost penalty.
Use of concept will offer no environmental or social benefits. May reduce fuel consumption, electricity cost, CO2 output, therefore very beneficial.

Applicant is applying for funding of a design study examining the repackaging of an old concept. The concept is likely to be expensive to produce and even more expensive to assemble in an engine design. These negative aspects overwhelm minor space saving offered by the concept and savings would be minimal if not negligible.

It is a new concept (hence the granted PCT world patent). Assembly costs do not increase.

Space saving is a side benefit, not one of the principal goals.

There are many technical risks in the development of a new layout of internal combustion engine. Major concerns are achieving sufficient rigidity in the crankshaft and connecting rod assembly (the crankshaft of necessity must be split at a bearing journal to facilitate assembly). Lubrication may also be problematic.

There will indeed be technical risks, it is a development project. **The crankshaft does not need to be split.**

Commercial Potential - *Our feeling is that the concept can be proved to work, but in these days of increasing emphasis on fuel efficiency there may not be anyone willing to exploit a new engine configuration, and hence there is a risk that it remains an engineering curiosity.* The concept **improves fuel economy**.

The project is an improved combustion engine. The single biggest contributor to greenhouse gases. Must be worth investigating even if there is a risk it "might not work"??!

Another key issue of concern was the high salary levels that were to be paid to you whilst working on the project. In appraising projects we need to be satisfied that all labour costs are reasonable and fully justified in relation to the work being done and are consistent with established labour charges within a respective business. One of the effects of reducing the salary rate for yourself would be on the financial viability of the project, and should you decide to re-apply we would need revised cash flow forecasts and evidence of where your share of the project funding would be coming from.

The salary rate is the one I will receive in mid September. I will not take a reduction in **valuation** of my salary. My proposal suggests to **reinvest a 70% proportion of my salary into the project**. I earn £28 per hour. I have just given up two years salary to work on this project, which is a considerable investment, and spent a considerable amount of personal savings, both of which unfortunately aren't recognised in the terms of the scheme.

2008 comment. All of this letter is still 100% relevant. All the documents contained many pictures of the crankshafts and models, all unitary (unsplit), yet the expert decided upon himself "they must be split". Wrong! Also meaning he had not consulted the documents or website.

Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.

False in one thing, false in all.

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Complaint Notified 20th November 2008

DIUS Legal Team, Apex Court, City Link, Nottingham, NG2 4LA, UK
20th November 2008

Malpractice action against SBS DTI for failure to provide a SMART award for the CLP Engine in 2003

Dear Director,

55 2008 Notice of Reasons of DIUS Negligence www.detail.dti.benversus.com

In November 2003 SBS DTI rejected the CLP SMART application without due cause, failing to support a carbon reducing technology and misapplying rules of SMART consideration during this rejection amounting to malpractice.

- SBS DTI failed to apportion value for the engineering development time already applied to the project
- SBS DTI failed to apportion adequate value for the time to be applied during the project.
- SBS DTI failed to ascertain a credible technical evaluation of the CLP engine.
- SBS DTI failed to reorder a flawed technical evaluation even after the flaws of that evaluation were explained.
- The CLP Engine is a carbon reducing technology which should have been supported according to the Kyoto protocol, obligations and agreement.
- SBS DTI rejected detailed and justified reappraisal requests made on behalf of the project in 2003.

You are invited to consider this document (full 54 pages on CD attached) which discusses the malpractice at length and agree to take part in an independently set compensation tribunal or offer a settlement before the added expense of lawyers are involved from December 30th 2008. Please refer to the document attached.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Collins (collinsben@hotmail.com) (printed and posted pages; 2,3,4,5,6,34,11,12,35,E)

If a scheme is offered, it must be fairly administrated, otherwise offering the scheme is a fraud. IMO the SMART award claims to support the small team inventor but fails to do so and is a charade to fool central government and extract funding. The UK has failed to produce any significant inventions in the last forty years, despite RDA "providing support" and extracting billions of pounds of treasury funds. IMO this support has not reached the right people and has been frittered away on; university research, machinery and production equipment purchases containing very little; innovation, risk or altruistic gain for wider society.

In contrast, all those elements were contained within the *rejected* CLP engine project.
The last major UK invention was the hovercraft in 1956, inefficient transport with no commercial relevance.

Errare humanum est, in errore perservare stultum

It is human to make a mistake, it is stupid to persist in it.

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

More and More ECO-GREEN Quangos But No End Results

The RDAs innovation schemes are not supporting the right projects and are duplicating the function of existing risk capital. These agencies are also very poorly geared, with huge costs of administration balanced against very modest distribution of public money. The suspicion is that this money does not go on altruistic "benefit all" projects, but to safe projects that could easily be financed by; bank, risk or equity. There are thousands penguins running around attending conferences and producing meaningless brochures full of the latest ecobabble keywords. This is not an end product or a result, just an ecocharade costing billions in penguin nonjobs, pensions and overheads. There is little end product in the form of technologies that results in increased quality of life and prosperity, or even carbon reducing technology. There remains a massive untapped resource of independent inventors waiting for part-assistance to eliminate climate change, yet they are ignored.



Flashback to the 1970's



The world is in a serious mess. Running low on affordable carbon energy and facing possible climate change. In North West England there are twenty eco-quangos but almost no funding for inventors to develop improved high yield wind turbines. Any funding that is available requires intermiably slow processing and ridiculous deformation of the project to squeeze into whichever ideal project model the particular quango is running.

- There should be only one criteria; is it a good value project with some promise of producing useful technology?
- This case herein is proof that even good and advanced projects do not get funding.

A second goal of this case is to divert the funding away from greeny quangos into real research and development of technology. These quangos, including the regional DTI's in this case, extract huge piles of money from the treasury on the premise of supporting eco technology. Ecobabble and measuring ice melting resolves nothing. The ecotalk is always made to sound like new information, when really this stuff has been promoted in tv and magazine adverts since the 1970's, with very little result.

I will also agree any compensation figure that requires 100% application to my other altruistic eco projects.

Acta non Verba

Action Not Words

BC vs DTI (Now DIUS) Case Summary

The immediate best application function of the CLP engine proposed in 2002-3 has now come of age in the crucial predicted role of the recharge engine within an electric vehicle. Battery technology has improved to make the EV the most likely form of future transport. Internal combustion engines will not be used as direct drives but high power density regenerator engines to extend the range of EVs and also to keep battery weight, cost and size small. The CLP engine in one stroke format, acting as a regengine can become the basis of all medium and large regengines for; vans, trucks, buses, trams and light trains.

The CLP engine as a regengine can form an integral role in the future low or zero carbon vehicle matrix.

Since the time of the SBS DTI SMART application for the CLP, all the market conditions have moved in favour of the CLP 1 stroke engine, i.e. flygensets to recharge on the move home charged EV's. Today, had the CLP been funded in 2003, the CLP could be marketed as the ultimate Regengine. Denuded of patent protection, its commercial value is largely eliminated, though that will not prevent application eventually in heavier transport regengines in due course.

- The EM DTI unfairly (unrealistically) valued engineering labour costs against in the market paid out values.
- The EM DTI failed to recognise £3,400 of donated time to the project per month from underpaid salary for Ben Collins (changed to £1700 per month from previous years £5,100 per month (2000 and 2001)).
- The EM DTI failed to get a single proper technical evaluation of the project when they were obligated to obtain three, despite correspondence creating an opportunity to re-evaluate their mistakes and invalid tech appraisals.
- The DTI rejected the project based on a single expert opinion, an opinion that was discredited in correspondence.
- The EM DTI failed to acknowledge two years already invested in the project worth £150,000.
- A carbon reducing project that had already jumped some massive hurdles and incumbent costs was not supported when the EM DTI was obligated to do so by the Kyoto agreement.
- The DTI failed to meet their obligations, acting arrogantly and incompetently in consideration of this application.
- Not financially contributing by modest proportion, has commercially undermined the value and potential of the project for investment, because next stage of development could not be completed.
- Failure to provide the SMART award to this project has irreparably damaged it commercially given that the PCT (world) patent was granted but unable to be funded.
- The way the SMART application was adjudged in 2003 was prejudicial and unfair amounting to negligence and or malpractice by SBS EM DTI in consideration of this carbon reducing technology.

Dept of Inn & Uni's	Dept of Innovation & Uni's Full Details	Website
2009-09-08 24	2009 Negligence of Dept of Innovation & Uni's	www.writ.dti.benversus.com
2008-11-21 55	2008 Notice of Reasons of DIUS Negligence	www.detail.dti.benversus.com
2003-07-08 48	2003 Orig Research Application & Website	www.app.dti.benversus.com

Mihi cura futuri

My concern is the future

click to
open link

Spero **Status**

Notes **RIP Mum** **Case List**

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide 

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro **d1** **d2** **d3**

Dept IUS Detail **d4** **d5** **d6**

KF&SV Intro **k1** **k2** **k3**

KF&SV Detail **k4** **k5** **k6**

QLTR Intro **q1** **q2** **q3**

QLTR Detail **q4** **q5** **q6**

Other Cases **o1** **o2** **o3**

Summary  

Results **Life**

Ben Collins Vs Skatteverket Göteborg : Cartoon Explanation

January 26th 2006.....

I got your bill but I havent earned anything yet, my income is sporadic, like it was the last six years which I carefully communicated to you by letter every time.



We insist on being paid every month, it is how we do things here.

April 6th 2006.....

Erm, I haven't earned anything yet, it seems odd that i have to pay income tax on that, or? I gave up my well paid job to create eco inventions to eliminate carbon burning. Like I informed you many times.



It has been six weeks now (feb and jan bill combined)!!! You owe us €3400 from our estimate. Pay up or we take everything today! Cars, cash, credit rating, reputation, computers, the lot.

June 1st 2006.....

Erm, its June, my Mum may be dying and you've made me unemployed, please can I have that money you took from me for what wasnt owed anyway so I can fly home.



Ask us again in December.

skatteverket

November 26th 2006..

???



Here is your money you overpaid...????..blimey dont look so sad, show a bit of gratitude!

Spero Status

Notes RIP Mum Case List

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3

QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary

Results Life

Ben Collins Vs Kronofogdmyndigheten : Cartoon Explanation

Late March 2006.....

Erm, that is not very long. I haven't earned anything yet so i can't pay yet. I have taken sabbatical to develop eco technology.

It has been nearly five weeks that you havent paid your tax estimate.
We are just doing our job.



April 6th 2006.....

Erm, dont you think it is odd that you are collecting for estimated income tax, even though I have told you i haven't earned anything yet and therefore cannot pay you.


We are taking everything you own for an estimated bill of €3,400 of Jan/Feb. It has been six weeks now. We are just doing our job.



April 6th 2006.....

Erm, I need that PC to write letters and create spreadsheets to explain that I dont owe the money that you are taking my PC for.

We're taking your car and PC, that is ours now.
We are just doing our job.



Oh my! it has only been six weeks since that bill was first received!!!

April 6th 2006.....

Are you sure I owe this to your customer? I need this stuff to eat, work and live. It is the the EU 2006, not Dusseldorf 1937.

We have waited nearly three weeks now. We are just doing our job. Give me those car keys.



Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Robust But Fair Tax Collection

Most of us believe in robust and fair tax collection in order to provide social provision in society.

In the QLTR-AWP Ltd case I had my computer stolen by a trading partner after I insisted on only onshore trading with him as I did not want to be involved in any tax issues and in that case I also overpaid my tax first then reclaimed the excess after in order to be sure not to be short. That background gives added irony to this case.

Unfortunately for SV and KF, my financial affairs have always been and remain *clean*.

They decided together in their infinite wisdom, that after a 67 day delay on paying their (later rescinded) Feb & Jan tax bill issued, based on a strangely arrived at estimate, that KF had the right to take all my possessions and empty my bank account, i.e. a full scale fiscal assault which was financially paralysing and labelled me a debtor. Here is the news SV & KF, it was not Düsseldorf 1937, but fair and socially responsible European Union 2006. SV and especially KF acted illegally, with undue haste, on tax estimates that were plainly wrong.

All the tax "owed" was repaid in December 2006 of a traumatic year for me personally.

Laughably they almost tried the same thing the previous year in 2005, with the money returned in November 2005. What a stupid way to conduct their affairs creating hundreds of non jobs as a tax burden. Between 2005 and 2006 I received visits, stalking phone calls, hundreds of papers in letters trying to collect tiny amounts of money, all getting the same response from me, "I am not earning money this year, I am on sabbatical developing practical technology solutions to eliminate the climate and energy crisis."

While I am aware some British consultants in Sweden are not honest with their tax dealings, that is not my problem, I am not them, and they are not me. What happened is rather like the police arriving late at a bank robbery and arresting one of the customers in the lobby, who was already coshed on the head by the robbers!

A pathetic situation for which SV and KF are unrepentant, despite numerous opportunities to settle.

I find it very frustrating quick settlements have been declined. We can accept mistakes are made by such institutions and people. They are not robots and fallible. In all cases these institutions have declined the chance of a quick hassle free low cost settlement. I have had to waste another five months preparing all this SVKF stuff unpaid with no guarantee of legal victory and without any prior expertise, i.e. more financial hardship. Again.

By removing excess tax prematurely and by force, both years were lived in financial turmoil, with personal problems that could have been avoided; shattered elbow, depression, deteriorated relations with my family, delayed rent payments and the period of unemployment. It really is that simple.

You cannot tax people before they have earned money, and you cannot forcibly collect on tax estimates, especially after a laughable 37 day / 67 day period of notification in a fair EU. Wake up to EU citizens charter.

Amat victoria curam

Victory favours those who take pains

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3


Summary

Results

Life

Case Basics A : Collins Versus Skatterverket Göteborg

- SV cannot assume people with low and or variable incomes will earn the same every month, then authorise removal on that basis after only six weeks.
- SV should only collect tax by force on what they are *certain has been* earned, not on what they *estimate*.
- **SV extracted all my finances via KF to satisfy a claim from 37 days earlier.**
- **SV's claim for that period was later reduced to zero and all money refunded eight months later.**
- Authorising forced sequestration of funds should be a last, not first resort.
- SV infringed my basic citizens rights by; withdrawing personal survival funds, not providing adequate time to to pay sums claimed, not offering payments terms balanced versus income and prospective income, not considering earnings levels current and historical, not considering previous tax history and full co-operation, not providing adequate time to prepare a tax calculation counter claim and not considering the size of the moderate sums demanded balanced versus history and risk to SV of non payment.
- It cannot be worthwhile to turn upside down the life of a citizen to recover the sum of €3400 that has not been paid for 37 days, whether owed or not.
- The sum was never owed or due and invented by SV due to poor process.
- SV were far outside the balance of fair but robust tax collection.
- I informed SV & KF many times this sum was not owed and could not be paid as nothing had been earned.



Verba volant, scripta manent

Words fly away, writings remain

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3


Summary

Results

Life

Case Basics B : Ben Collins Versus Kronofogdemyndigheten

- KF took all my property, cash and harassed me for a sum not owed after 8 weeks.
- KF removed my property too quickly, for a tax estimation a few days previously.
- KF failed to provide fair repayment terms or timing conditions.
- KF should wait a fair period for a citizen to prepare tax counter calculations.
- KF acted on an tax estimation not on tax earned or proven owed.
- KF publicly labelled me a debtor for a non existent debt and has acted amorally with undue haste .
- KF extorted fees and interest for a sum not owed and has not respected EU citizen rights..
- **My financial and personal life was destabilised by this KF action.**
- **When KF collect on bills that are not owed, KF are stealing funds.**
- KF must take this issue with their customer who is inventing bills, not me.
- "Just doing our job" is not a satisfactory response if this job results in illegal and or amoral collection from low income individuals resulting in life destabilisation.
- When you humiliate someone and take away all their worldly goods, you should be *very sure they actually owe something* to your customer and not act blindly.
- KF practices need to improve until adequate response moralities are standard.
- KF harassment for invented SV bills continued throughout 2005 and 2006.
- Two years of misery for non existent, unproven and *estimated* tax debt that was later retracted both years.



A posse ad esse

From possibility to actuality

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Finding the Balance for Fair but Robust Tax Collection

Robust collection of taxes is a complicated issue of balance necessary for the successful function of a socially responsible state. Tax collection can sometimes make mistakes or over estimations in calculations, in fact this is inevitable during normal processes by humans.

What is not acceptable in my opinion (IMO) is the extorting / bullying / stripping of assets and essential finances needed to pay food, rent and continue business operation, after only a few weeks notice and especially for a tax bill that is later reduced and during a period of zero income, making payment virtually impossible. Finance stripping can result in drastic personal and personality consequences.

*IMO Finance stripping should only be applied with **ALL** the following conditions applying:*

1. Large sums owed.
2. Historically bad payer.
3. Risk of non payment and loss to the state.
4. Long term defaulting.
5. Breakdown in contact process with defaulter.
6. Cynical avoidance of taxation.
7. 100% sure money is owed
8. Tax and earnings have been declared.
9. The tax year end has been reached
10. Reasonable time has been given to prepare accounts

*In this case **none of the above conditions were met** with the following conditions occurring:*

1. Sum claimed owed @€3,200, actual sum owed was €0.
2. Six weeks "defaulting" although in reality nothing actually owed.
3. Historical full payment for five years.
4. Small sum involved and low risk to the state, low income individual.
5. Frequent KF obliging phone calls and interviews conducted at KF.
6. Historical full cooperation and information with SV.
7. Income tax charged where there had been no income.

IMO SV and KF were far outside the balance they need to maintain fair but robust tax collection. They created personal and financial problems to me and counter productive to their core aims of harvesting wealth for social provision. In fact their actions delayed a commercially valuable to Sweden project by four years and manufactured social and health problems that were paid for from the social system.

If there has been no income, there can be no tax.

Sequestration for money not owed must be illegal in the EU.

Concordia res parvae crescent

Work together to accomplish more

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3


Summary

Results

Life



All finance and possessions removed April 6th, 90 days after estimated bill. Real tax owed : ZERO



- For 20 months of the 24 I was under action and legal threats by KF.
- Only a two of months of this I was actually behind with "real" tax (early 2005).
- KF collect on estimated pro rata year "pretax". Why? What possible justification is there?
- For 18 months I was being threatened for something not owed.
- Throughout this time I maintained communications saying tax was being overestimated!
- A lot of unnecessary stress.

Irresponsible Tax Collection

All this hysterical response generated through impatience to collect the rather modest sum of €3,500 in the short space of three months time, with the €3,500 later returned. In what insane world does this make any sense? KF and SV are abusing their legal might and are out of control. If you don't get a monthly salary, you can't pay income tax every month, and income tax is not due every month, it is only due when income has been earned.

Asinus asinum fricat

The donkey scratches the donkey

Spero Status

Notes RIP Mum Case List

Introduction [benversus.com](#)

Quick Guide 

Intent & Goals [ben@bencc.com](#)

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3

QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary  

Results Life

The Legal Challenge

Kronofogdemyndigheten
SERVITETAMET
Sune Brunzell
031-634369

**Underrättelse om hämtning/
Försäljning av utmätt egendom**
Datum: 2006-04-25
Förklaringsnummer: 690309-5096
Mål nr: L-65-06

Sökande: STATEN/KRONOFGDEMYNDIGHETEN
Collins, Benjamin Christopher
Signalgatan 4 B
413 18 Göteborg

Utmätning har tidigare skett för nedanstående skuld. Eftersom skulden inte har betalats kommer den utmätta egendomen att säljas

☒ på offentlig auktion. ☐ under hand efter anbudsförfrågan.

Skuld för vilken utmätning skett: 32 818
Varav återstår: 32 852

Reason for seizure: 2006-04-06
Utmätt egendom: 1 st personbil Fiat Barchetta, Årsmodell 1996, med reg nr SHS 730

N.B. Income in 2006 = Zero
N.B. Actual Income Tax Due = Zero

Den utmätta egendomen hämtas [datum] [klockan] [tidpunkt för hämtningen] [meddelas senare]
Kronofogdemyndigheten har omhändertagit bilen

Kronofogdemyndigheten kan ta sig in med hjälp av lössmed.

För att undvika hämtning av egendomen måste ni betala skulden till kronofogdemyndigheten eller visa att skulden har betalats.

Hämtningen medför extra kostnader för er. För att undvika dessa kan ni själv senast dagen före hämtningen lämna egendomen till [adress]

För att undvika försäljning av egendomen måste ni betala skulden och eventuella kostnader till kronofogdemyndigheten eller visa att ni har betalt. Ansländ med försäljningen kan i vissa fall medges.

För ytterligare upplysningar kan ni vända er till kronofogdemyndigheten.

Sune Brunzell
Kronofogdemyndigheten i Göteborg, Göteborgskontoret
Förskräddare: Rönnebygatan 8
Telefon: 031 43 43 69
E-postadress: sune.brunzell@kronofogden.se

Comments : BC V Kronofogdemyndigheten

Notification re car, owned for ten years, to be sold because €3000 "owed", though no income had been received. It is pretty difficult to pay income tax without any income or time to prepare accounts to convince SV. I actually thought at the time this was somehow for tax due to previous years etc, I had never dreamed it could be for tax owed from late February 26th of the same year, it was only April 6th when my car was taken!

That is only 37 and 67 days after the estimation was due to SV! (Jan and Feb Tax).

This level of aggression from KF so soon in dealings develops incredible stress for powerless citizens.

Legal Statement

I would like to legally challenge the right of SV to remove my property within such a short timespan and set against a later proven over estimated tax demand.

I would like to see SV rules changed so that more reasonable time delay is made before such action and that action may only be made when non payment has occurred **according to the income per full year rather than partial year pro rata**, because self employed people receive money in spikes not monthly. I think this is a basic human right to have tax collected fairly, according to actual income, responsibly and in consideration of modest and sporadic income.

Skatteverket	SV & KF Full Details	Website
2009-03-20 70	Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.sv.kf.benversus.com
2008-09-12 49	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.sv.kf.benversus.com
2008-09-12 124	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.sv.kf.benversus.com
Kronofogdemyndigheten		Website
	Complaint combined w ith SV case	websites shared w ith sv see above

Cuivis dolori remedium est patientia

Patience is the cure for all suffering

click to
open link

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary

Results

Life

QLTR Cartoon

March 15th 2008.....

Erm, Here is my BV claim.
I followed exactly what to do
on the UK Govt website.

I had to move abroad to pay off
the loan to the Scottish Office. I
am still abroad so no office.

What!!! I spent 3 months
preparing my application. It says
£50k on the web.

But it doesnt mention the £50k is
for England and Wales only, I've
wasted months preparing this stuff,
why no website?

What is the reason for this policy of
limiting payout sixteen times less than
the rest of the UK?

That £21k was saved up in case of unexpected bills and was overpaid tax,
after paying back my loan and grant from the Scottish Office £15k

If I had sneaked the money
out before tidying accounts
and overpaying tax would
be 21k richer! 8 years ago!
or £36k 10 years ago!!

But my data was
criminally corrupted!

Guidelines stipulate a
fair payout!

But that means you
have unjust prejudicial
procedures! You're
supposed to be the
Dept of Justice!

Scottish
Justice

QLTR Edinb.

June 2nd
2008....

???

July
2008....

Scottish Dept
of Justice
them us

QLTR Edinburgh

Dec 2008..

???

Ok!

Why not restart the
company in Scotland?

Ok!

Och, dae ye ken the payout
limit in Scotland is £3k.

Nae, that's just England & Wales.

Och, tae bad, that is our policy.
We're *thinking* about a website.

The reason is, because
that is our policy.

Pity, max is £3k.

Och aye. Still £3k.

Och, tae bad, still £3k max.

We dont consider cases in
Scotland, thats only in England
and Wales, here we set a
blanket ceiling of £3k whatever
the circumstances.

Look pal, we're the Procurator Fiscal & do
what we like, limit is £3k, take it or leave it.

Here is £3k from your
£21k...???? ..hoots, dont look
so sad, show a bit of gratitude!

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

**Complaint Against QLTR Edinburgh For Malpractice and Writ for Damages
For the Matter of Bono Vacantia in Dissolved Company Albatross Wulf
Products Limited 154825 From Ben Collins : Failure to Make a Fair Payout**

The UK's financial dreamland culture of; limited liability, giving credit to idiots, national property pyramid schemes and collapsed insolvent banks with deliberately unauditable spaghetti accounts, has finally come home to roost with the recent Zimbabwe-style £900,000,000,000 printing of pounds by the Bank of England to support Scotlands corrupt and insolvent banking culture at the Bank of Scotland and Royal Bank of Scotland. www.nonetarism.com. In the old days taxes raised went to hospitals and schools!

That financial culture is particularly frustrating for a person who left his country in 1998 to pay off his debt to the *Scottish Office*, battled to ensure a trading partner would trade onshore leading to mafiosa style threats and the criminal destruction of the account by that trading partner, overpaid my VAT taxes and saved for a new project. If I had wound up my company 10 years ago I would have been £36,000 richer ten years ago. Instead I worked off my debts by changing countries, saved up and overpaid my taxes and tried to do it the "right way".

After ploughing through the legal hoops of Bono Vacantia to extract the clean money leftover, the *Scottish Office* Department of Justice (Procurator Fiscal) has given me their prejudicial maximum payout of £3,000 as a "fair settlement" from total funds of £20,740. The maximum payout web published was £50,000 on the UK government website. That £50k turns out to be *just for England and Wales not Scotland*. There was no Scottish specific website, nor was there any mention on the UK website of a difference in ceiling value.

I have begun proceedings against QLTR and the *Scottish Office* for malpractice, i.e. failure to make a fair settlement according UK government Bono Vacantia guidelines. QLTR have been offered numerous damageless settlement opportunities, all declined. The issues have been clarified to them with diagrams and detail to no avail.

Not receiving the £17,740 extra that would have been given had a genuine fair payout been made, has caused extreme hardship including losing a home shared with two other people and delayed the launch of important high yield wind turbine concepts www.aerohydrogen.com and engine concepts www.variablecompression.com. The biggest hardship was having a £2,000 loan given in March 2008 left outstanding to my terminally ill Mother, who died January 2nd, 2009. **A pathetic and distressing situation for all concerned.** The Procurator Fiscal did not provide fair settlement due to prejudiced automatic protocol. A department of Justice that believes in sham-justice, by philosophically embracing prejudging mechanisms.

UK Government BV Website February 2008 <http://www.bonavacantia.gov.uk/default.asp?pageid=1312>

35. We need the specific consent from the Treasury before we can make a grant of more than £50,000. In these cases, the Treasury may also require a proportion of the fund to be kept by the Crown as the "Crown's Share", although in certain circumstances the Treasury may agree to waive this. **The only ceiling discussed.**

A fronte praecipitium a tergo lupi

A precipice in front, wolves behind

Spero Status

Notes RIP Mum Case List

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3

QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary

Results Life

Complaint : Ben Collins Versus QLTR Unit Edinburgh 19th November 2008

Ben Collins, N Gubberogatan 3 (5tr), Göteborg, Sverige. collinsben@hotmail.com
Bono Vacantia : Albatross Wulf Products Limited (Former Scottish Company 154825)

Ms Isla Mcloed, Assistant to Solicitor to the QLTR, Crown Office, 25 Chambers Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1LA, **UK**
 Your Ref BV/1219/07 19th November, 2008

Complaint Against QLTR Edinburgh For Malpractice and Writ for Damages

Dear Ms Mcloed,

Due to the effect of delays in processing and in the main the surprising, web unpublished and late notified £3,000 BV blanket limit administered by Edinburgh QLTR torpedoing the entire reason for grant application, **as per many previous mails**, here is the specific complaint against QLTR for malpractice for the reasons detailed herein this document (full 41 pages on CD), principally failing to remit a fair BV payout according to UK government guidelines.

A) Unpublished Payment Limit

The net published limit for BV in the UK is £50,000 on the UK govt website, yet the limit in Scotland (net unpublished) is £3,000, why? I am still waiting for a reasoned answer other than that "is our (net unpublished) policy in Scotland".

B) Unfair Prejudicial Payment Limit

The net published UK government assessment criteria is "a fair payout" yet Edinburgh QLTR automatically administers a £3,000 limit which is prejudicial protocol and means in some cases a fair payout is not made, certainly not in this case. Such prejudicial philosophy is not appropriate at the Scottish Justice Administration.

C) Fair Payout Not Offered

QLTR Edinburgh were given plenty of time and information from which to make a fair payout in the case of involuntarily dissolved company Albatross Wulf Products Limited 154825, but have failed to do so, constituting malpractice and contradicting UK BV guidelines. *This is the main complaint.*

D) Excessive BV Payout Delays, Complications and Inefficiencies

A comprehensive BV application was made in March, no payment has been made as yet in Nov 2008.

Two out of court settlement routes are offered, legal representation is sought:

S1) Full BV Grant and reparation damages payout according to the table supplied.


S2) Full BV Grant and reparation damages (if any) according to an arbitrator.

Either route is acceptable and will lead to an immediate settlement.

There seems no other course of action available to me in order to recover the money saved through hourly paid work in Germany and needed to launch my carbon reducing technology, following on from my debt clearance to the Scottish Office and overpayment of VAT in 2000.

Yours sincerely,
 Ben Collins. Former Director.

N.B. Settlement without damages was offered many times until September 18th, 2008, whereafter I lost my home.



With crossbow I shot the albatross.
 "God save thee ancient mariner!
 From the fiends, that plague thust!"

[Spero](#) [Status](#)
[Notes](#) [RIP Mum](#) [Case List](#)
[Introduction](#) [benversus.com](#)

[Quick Guide](#) [ben@bencc.com](#)
[Intent & Goals](#)
[Dept IUS Intro](#) [d1](#) [d2](#) [d3](#)
[Dept IUS Detail](#) [d4](#) [d5](#) [d6](#)
[KF&SV Intro](#) [k1](#) [k2](#) [k3](#)
[KF&SV Detail](#) [k4](#) [k5](#) [k6](#)
[QLTR Intro](#) [q1](#) [q2](#) [q3](#)
[QLTR Detail](#) [q4](#) [q5](#) [q6](#)
[Other Cases](#) [o1](#) [o2](#) [o3](#)
[Summary](#) [Results](#) [Life](#)

Ceiling Outwith Bono Vacantia Guidelines

- 1) Scots law seems to have no satisfactory process for administering dissolved company funds outwith the QLTR mechanism or company restoration. Outwith restoration (which requires a serviced and stable office in Scotland, not a realistic option when living abroad), QLTR Edinburgh has fixed a maximum of £3,000 to any payouts, no matter what the circumstances, even though this limit was not documented in the web guideline information which contradicts that amount stating a "£50,000 maximum payout".
- 2) This means every BV case is prejudged outwith another guideline to make a "fair payout", as there must be cases where a fair payout needs to be more than £3,000. This means QLTR is contravening the government guidelines for their own scheme. By way of reference, in England and Wales the maximum payout is £50,000. This sixteen fold difference between UK countries should be justified in court. *(February 2008 web published)*
- 3) In my opinion there were acceptable reasons why the company was dissolved (third party criminal interference destroying accounts / working long hours abroad) and why the company cannot be restored (now non resident of the UK after staying abroad following leaving to pay off a grant and loan received from **the Scottish Office**). IMO there are also compelling background moral reasons why full BV reimbursement is due discussed at length.
- 4) QLTR Edinburgh did not then publish guidelines or information online. The information that provided by the UK government website did not stipulate the information is for England and Wales only, merely that the BV process in administered in Scotland by QLTR Edinburgh, leaving the applicant lured into making a pointless and time consuming application (£3,000 can not recover the time lost to the application).
- 5) Discretionary powers have been not been applied wisely, my application was comprehensive and meticulous according to published guidelines, payment could have been expedited much sooner. Instead these discretionary powers have been abused to introduce a blanket payment ceiling of a paltry £3000.
- 6) The guidelines recommend use of a solicitor, but that suggestion is contradictory on consideration of the arbitrary (Scotland only) £3,000 limit which would eliminate any financial yield and purpose to the application. In respect of the lack of availability of solicitor advice, the process is overly complicated, and discretion was not been applied when a bona fide and comprehensive grant application was made, albeit missing a couple of minor items from a 1% shareholder.
- 7) Communications regarding those missing items have been protracted and better administration could have curtailed that process and delivered the missing items sooner, for example using standard forms, thereby expediting grant payment and closure of this issue for all concerned. Slow processing has not produced a payout after seven months. This must fall well below even pessimistic targets and ISO standards for the performance of public office. Letter copied to Email has only been used in September, prior to that six weeks were wasted during letter transit delays. QLTR has backward processes and needs to start using internet publication for communication, it is 2008 not 1988.

Money saved in the AWP Ltd account was in case i got any unexpected bills, new projects, likewise the overpayment in VAT was made to make sure I would not be behind, i.e. in credit not in debt. Now I seem to be getting punished for this prudency, very strange and unfair in my opinion.

Stultorum infinitus est numerus

There are endless numbers of fools

BV Reference Guide – No Mention of a £3,000 Ceiling - Just a Fair Payout

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Salient Pts extracted: Form BVC 3

February 2006 Edition Version 4 **TREASURY SOLICITOR BONA VACANTIA DIVISION**

Guidelines about Discretionary Grants where the Dissolved Company cannot be restored:

4. Although bona vacantia assets belong to the Crown, the Crown can give part or all of them away by a grant from the Treasury Solicitor. This power is discretionary. No one has any right to a grant. However, **the power must be exercised fairly** and it is up to the Treasury Solicitor to decide whether to make a grant.

5. These Guidelines only deal with cases where it is not possible to restore the company. You can obtain guidance from Companies House, Crown Way, Maindy, Cardiff CF14 3U (www.companieshouse.gov.uk) on whether or not a company can be restored to the Register.

6. Our policy is to make such grants only where

- **it would alleviate hardship, (NEED THIS MONEY I EARNED TO PREVENT LOSS OF HOME)**
- **it would otherwise be unreasonable or unconscionable for the Crown to keep the assets, or (IT WAS HARD WORK EARNING THIS)**
- **there is a compelling public interest in making the grant. (ECO TECHNOLOGY FUNDING)**

7. We will consider each case on its own merits and we will make only one grant in each case.

8. We will usually only consider applications for discretionary grants from the following people:

a former liquidator, to distribute as if s/he were still the liquidator of the company, or **former members, provided that the company was solvent when it was dissolved. (IT WAS)**

9. In exceptional circumstances we may consider applications from other people.

10. We will usually only consider making grants out of money that we have received. Grants will not usually be made of other types of assets themselves, or from the proceeds of sale of other types of assets. **(£20,740 RECEIVED)**

11. The factors that we may consider include:

- the size and nature of the bona vacantia asset
- the extent to which the applicant has contributed to the asset becoming bona vacantia **(RECORDS WERE TAMPERED WITH BY A THIRD PARTY, SEVERAL WITNESSES)**
- the length and nature of the relationship between the applicant and the dissolved company **(BC WHOLE TIME)**
- **any legal obligations that the company had towards the applicant before it was dissolved**
- **any hardship to the applicant caused by the asset (BC OWED EXPENSES)**
- **other grounds that would make it unreasonable for the Crown to keep the asset**
- **any public interest issues (FIVE YEARS ECO TECH WORK TO BE LAUNCHED)**
- **whether there would have been any tax payable, either by the applicant or the company, if the asset had been distributed or dealt with in the course of either trading by the company or in the course of a winding up of the company (THE SMALL TAX DUE WAS PAID BY BC IN 2004)**
- any rights to the asset that someone else may have or may be acquiring; and
- who (if anyone) is in possession of the asset.

UK Gov Website Sourced Information 1 of 5, Feb 2008
<http://www.bonavacantia.gov.uk/default.asp?pageid=1312>
 No separate Scottish BV guide published.

Verba, Acta
 Do as you say, say as you do

Spero **Status**

Notes **RIP Mum** **Case List**

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3


QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary  

Results **Life**

Strange Rewards for "Doing the Right Thing"



Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Legal Arguments

QLTR Edinburgh failed me legally because;

- QLTR Edinburgh failed to carry out Bono Vacantia according to UK government published guidelines.
- QLTR Edinburgh failed to publish their own completely different BV process up until late 2008 / 2009.
- The UK government guidelines failed to mention there was a difference in policy in Scotland (only that it was administered by QLTR Edinburgh).
- The UK system has failed me, after I followed the exact process according to the only published source of information at the time from both the UK government or Scottish Office. That is a contract with citizens.
- QLTR themselves must follow the published process, or publish an alternative themselves, they do not have the right to unilaterally invent their own process in private, entirely different from the published process which they then hold back unpublished.
- QLTR should understand that fundamental basics in governmental obligations mean that changes in processes can only be actioned after they have been communicated to the public, not any time before when they have been developed in private. QLTR did not recognise their lack of published material as a key failing.
- QLTR moved the goalposts six months in to my application by changes notified/received June 2nd, 2008.
- QLTR ignored settlement opportunities without damages from June to September 2008
- QLTR failed in a breach of trust, duty of care, duty of fairness and moral duty according to the UK government published guidelines.
- QLTR dumped their own failings of information provision into my lap, basically saying "tough deal with it". Six months work and delay created by their non publication was their problem and issue not mine, yet I paid the price of their incompetences.
- These problem and likely resulting consequences were explained in detail and minutiae to QLTR from June to September prior to the problems occurring, where normal BV payout was requested without damages several times which would have eliminated all the subsequent problems.
- These predicted problems were communicated and thereafter duly occurred, principally constituting;
 - i) Non repayment to my terminally ill mother (March 2008 loan of £2000, died January 2nd 2009).
 - ii) Loss of home and homelessness for three months September to December 2008).
 - iii) Delays to launching important carbon eliminating technology.
 - iv) Removal of finances for living, including for visiting my dying Mother.
 - v) Broken relations with my Mother when she died leading to unhappiness all round. My Mother did not deserve to be unhappy when she died because QLTR do not administer themselves properly.
- QLTR have shown a total disinterest in resolving this matter then or since.
- QLTR have treated me with contempt and abused their privileged position of power.
- I am unable to enter the SPS Ombudsman process because that process requires surrendering of all legal rights in order to allow consideration of the case. That means I must trust the SPSO, paid for and organised by the Scottish Office, to judge against the Scottish Office, the same Scottish Office that has already cheated me.
- **Government agencies must treat citizens fairly and stick to what is publicly communicated.**
- **This is what QLTR Edinburgh failed to do, on both counts.**

Verba, Acta

Do as you say, say as you do

[Spero](#)[Status](#)[Notes](#)[RIP Mum](#)[Case List](#)[Introduction](#)[benversus.com](#)[ben@bencc.com](#)[Quick Guide](#)[Intent & Goals](#)[Dept IUS Intro](#)[d1](#)[d2](#)[d3](#)[Dept IUS Detail](#)[d4](#)[d5](#)[d6](#)[KF&SV Intro](#)[k1](#)[k2](#)[k3](#)[KF&SV Detail](#)[k4](#)[k5](#)[k6](#)[QLTR Intro](#)[q1](#)[q2](#)[q3](#)[QLTR Detail](#)[q4](#)[q5](#)[q6](#)[Other Cases](#)[o1](#)[o2](#)[o3](#)[Summary](#)[Results](#)[Life](#)


Something Is Rotten in the State of Scotland



Insolvent Scottish banks get multi billion tax funds to lend even more for their property pyramid scheme and perpetuate their mortgage slavery of citizens. see [www.nonetarism.com](#).



Solvent trading green technology company AWP Ltd repays its debt then has surplus funds taken without reason by the Scottish Office.



Something is badly wrong with a system that is financially penalising honest trading and debt repayment, but that is the situation I have faced this year. No doubt Companies House in Edinburgh has to put up with numerous fraudsters exploiting legal loopholes in the company law system. That situation does not excuse a balancing of the rough with the smooth using honest companies liquidity as the ballast. If you take the time to read the background to this case you will see that I completely changed my lifestyle and country to clear the debt of the company and to save up extra funds as contingency. It is immoral for QLTR to have sequestered those funds so carefully saved.

I was paying back **the Scottish Office** from a relocation grant and loan, something unlikely to have been encountered many times before by them. Yet the same organisation is now keeping the extra saved money that does not belong to them. The main reason this mess was created was to ensure the company traded onshore, which led to a dissatisfied offshore trading third party destroying the accounts meaning the account submission deadline was missed and the company involuntarily dissolved.

QLTR unnecessarily withholding funds has led to the destruction of my credit rating in Sweden and the loss of my home. Non payment means I am unable to honour my debts leading to strained personal relationships. Finally this also delays the launch of important altruistic carbon reducing technology. [www.carbon-down.com](#)

This action aims to recover those funds and seek reparation of damages in order to encourage QLTR to improve their processes in the future and make fair payouts as intended with the spirit of the Bono Vacantia process.

I cannot understand how a process has to be so complicated, which generates huge administration costs to be dumped on either or both the taxpayer or company members. QLTR Edinburgh needs to start making fair payouts and streamline its working procedures. I will not yield until I have received fair treatment.

QLTR Edinbur Pages	QLTR Full Details	Website
2009-03-20 14	Writ for QLTR Malpractice & 2009 Comms	www.writ qltr.benversus.com
2008-09-12 42	Notice of Reasons for QLTR Malpractice	www.detail qltr.benversus.com
2008-09-12 10	UK Government BV Guidelines and Notes	www.law qltr.benversus.com
2009-04-22 145	Communications : Letters, Calls and Emails	www.comms qltr.benversus.com
2008-03-15 43	Original BV Application	www.app qltr.benversus.com

Pede poena claudo

Retribution comes slowly

click to
open links

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3


Summary

Results

Life

Case Basics F : Collins Versus KF & Intrum Justitia (KF/IJ)

- Extortion by illegal charges have been applied by KF and IJ for original bills that were paid within three months of the due date, which though not ideal, is fast enough in a fair and civilised society.
- The charges are identified as illegal and extortionate as they represent more than 1000% per annum which is unacceptable in a fair EU society. This extortion has contributed to suicides.**
- KF and IJ have invented spiralling charges to pay for their non-jobs and fees.
- KF double, triple or quadruple every bill within two months of the due date.
- Once this tripling mechanism is applied to several bills, the person falls behind into a poverty trap.
- KF and IJ create a cyclical trap and unnecessary misery by acting with unnatural haste using their superior legal position to exploit the poor. They are bullies pure and simple.



- JA To Public Debt Registration.
- JA To Fair Extra Charges Max 30% PA.
- JA To Fair Legal Debt Recovery.
- NEJ To 100%to 2100% PA Gross Charges.
- NEJ To KF & IJ Debt Cyclones in the EU.
- NEJ To Low Self Esteem and Suicide.



A responsible and fair society requires responsible and fair debt collection, with adequate time given to the debtor without wild and accelerating fees at over 1000%+.

I aim to change the timelines of this corrupt and exploitative practice, recover my legal costs and extract damages. Whether those damages are then due to be repaid to vast swathes of the public is something for the courts and the publication mechanisms of this case.

KF & Intrum Justitia	IJ & KF Full Details	Website
2009-04-24	16 Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.ijkf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	41 Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.ijkf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	47 All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.ijkf.benversus.com

sedit qui timuit ne non succederet

He who feared he would not succeed sat still

click to
open links

Spero Status

Notes RIP Mum Case List

Introduction benversus.com

Quick Guide 

Intent & Goals ben@bencc.com

Dept IUS Intro d1 d2 d3

Dept IUS Detail d4 d5 d6

KF&SV Intro k1 k2 k3

KF&SV Detail k4 k5 k6

QLTR Intro q1 q2 q3

QLTR Detail q4 q5 q6

Other Cases o1 o2 o3

Summary Results Life

Case Basics E : Ben Collins Versus Trafiksförsäkringsföreningen (TFF)

- TFF bills are an excessive, cynical and corrupt collection and extortion exercise of the unwary.
- The uninsured vehicle issue is easily avoidable with better administration practices by TFF and VV.
- TFF are extorting eight times the previous on road insurance for an unusable car.
- TFF should not be able to charge for an unused, off road and mechanically disabled car.
- TFF should be obliged to prove that the owner is using their vehicle uninsured or that it is possible to be stolen before charging penalty fees.
- The car is offroad due to sequestration and damage by KF in 2006 for tax, later rescinded.
- The company deciding the fine is also the beneficiary – a foolish system destined for corrupt abuse.

My Previous Years Insurance

Car theoretically driving daily on the roads presenting considerable risk, which can also be stolen at any time, annual insurance **SKr4622** (although wasn't driven at all in 06/07 due to damage by a third party.)

Insurance quoted by IF for off road vehicle

544

4,622

33,446

TrafiksFörsäkringsFöreningen
Immobilised car, privately parked, cannot move, cannot be stolen annual insurance **SKr 33,446**.

I have;

- Driven 21 years and never had an accident.
- Never a speeding ticket or any driving offence.
- Claimed only once on insurance in twenty years (addict slashed roof stereo theft Köln 1999) cost €3,000.
- Always pay insurance for cars drivable.

- 1) Question not asked..Your vehicle is now uninsured, Is your vehicle to be on or off road?
- 2) Why do I need a wierd number to avställ when I have supplied the registration plate.?
- 3) Is this process deliberately difficult to exploit the unknowing?
- 4) Is money being cynically extorted using knowledge of the law, or fairly charged?

Criminalised in a year, or is money being extorted by "legal" yet unfair means?

I will serve a custodial sentence in lieu of payment. I will never pay this amount.

What a waste of the courts time. This case and non payment by QLTR was the catalyst for all these court cases.

Trafiksförsäkringsför TFF Full Details

			Website
2008-09-12	40	Communications and Court Action	www.comms.tf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	27	Main Complaint	www.detail.tf.benversus.com
2008-09-12	60	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.tf.benversus.com

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?

Who watches the watchmen?

click to
open link

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com

ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary

←


→

Results

Life

Case Basics C : Ben Collins Versus Alfakassan (AK)

- In 2006 I was forced into unemployment after KF took all my money for sums not owed.
- AK processed my claim too slowly to be acceptable, 4.5 months.
- **Basic human rights demand a form of social payment when unemployed, targets should mean a 4.5 month turnaround is not acceptable.**
- This delay created a whole load of personal misery for myself and humiliation of borrowing money from my circle of people, straining personal relationships.
- The issue herein is: What is an acceptable response time for AK?
- Slow response prevented me accessing alternative social support (i.e. in UK).
- No other benefit was made available to me at the time, I was told deal with AK.



Vi har följande uppgifter. Ditt företag är inregistrerat i England. Skatt är betald I Sverige sedan 5 år och sociala avgifter sedan april 2005. Dock har vi inte fått svar på var du arbetat, alltså I vilket land. Vi har inte heller fått kopia på aktuell skattsedel. Vi behöver också intyg från Skattemyndigheterna på att de sociala avgifterna är inbetalda I Sverige sedan april 2005.

- The questions "var du arbetat" and "i vilket land" were answered in my first form filling and letter.
- Why were basic questions still being asked 16 weeks after my unemployment declaration?
- How is anybody supposed to survive that long unpaid? I received no social payments for five months.
- Dont AK have response timing standards? Nobody mentioned social welfare from other sources were available.
- Is this normal to have the agency responsible for survival income without local human reps, based 1000km away?

Alfakassan	AK Full Details	Website
2009-04-23 12	Communications Since the Complaint	w w w .comms.ak.benversus.com
2008-09-12 25	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	w w w .detail.ak.benversus.com
2008-09-12 27	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	w w w .refs.ak.benversus.com

Homo homini lupus
Man is a wolf to man

click to
open link

Case Basics D : Ben Collins Versus Vägverket (VV)


- Poor road building by Vägverket through poorly constructed speed bumps have prematurely damaged and scrapped my low to the ground and safer for pedestrian impact vehicle.
- These traffic calming measures have created a market in EU for city SUV's, dangerous to pedestrian and lightweight passenger cars - exactly the opposite result of the target of creating safer roads by traffic calming.
- Vägverket must modify practices until they build roads suitable for low to the ground and lightweight (environmentally and pedestrian friendly) transport.
- Vägverket should use alternative traffic calming or improve speed bump quality.
- Why is every speed bump different and built to varying and low standards?
- Why have road features that also damage cars when carefully driven?

New for 2008 BMW X6 versus a 1996 VW Golf. Progress?
Safe? Low CO₂? No, no and no. Speed bump defeating?
Yes. Rolls over kerbs making pavements part of the road?
Yes. Heavy? 2.5t Yes. Hits child thorax in impact? Yes.



Speed Bump References

PEDESTRIAN FATALITIES



Ref	Where	ion								
SB (A)	Djurgårdgatan	Sunken approach, severe impact angle.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes 2007	Yes		
SB (B)	Kjellmansgatan	Ok when driven at a modest speed.	Mod	No	Yes	No	No	NO		
SB (C)	Repslagaragatan	Sunken, severe concrete pyramid.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
SB (D)	Fjällg/Repslagarag	Probably ok, but very worn.	Mod	Yes	Yes	No	No	Mod		
SB (E)	Fjällgatan/Fjällskolan	Very high ramp and exit problems. R*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes 2006	Yes		
SB (F)	Fjällgatan/Paradiseg	Very noisy for residents, was bad.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes 2007	Mod		
SB (G)	Jungmansgatan	High ramp and impact problems. R*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes 2007	Yes		

*Mod = moderate

*Rhomboid.

Vägverket	VV Full Details	Website
2008-09-11 10	Communications Since the Complaint	www.comms.vv.benversus.com
2008-09-12 31	Sept 3rd, 2008 : Complaint in Detail	www.detail.vv.benversus.com
2008-09-12 13	All complaint references (pre Sept 3rd 2008)	www.refs.vv.benversus.com

Melius frangi quam flecti

Better to break than to bend

click to
open link

Life and Justice

Meet Nguyen Muoi, 37 years old, a 2003 victim of the cold war in Tay Gia, Quang Nam province. While digging a field, both his hands were blown off by munitions dating back from a war in Vietnam sponsored by China and the USA forty years earlier.

- Surgical expenses incurred for his injuries put his family into horrendous debt.
- Life is not easy at the best of times, but try providing for a family **as a rice farmer with no hands**.
<http://www.clearpathinternational.org/casestudies/archives/000267.php>



Life is spent in quiet desperation for most people, long yet short, a struggle but sometimes a joy. Key values making life better are fairness and justice. Societies without these are weak and create misery. Campaigning for fairness and justice is not whining or stirring trouble but useful where and when appropriate. When you see someone pushing in a queue, what do you do?

- A) say something and risked getting stabbed or
B) keep quiet and accept it as part of life.

- If it is always (A) you will uphold values of society but have a miserable life of tension.
- If everyone does (B) then chaos will descend, yet if everybody did (A) there would be no queue jumpers at all.
- The best answer is; usually do (B) but occasionally do (A), i.e. "doing your bit". ***This website is my (A).***

We live in a strange world with lots of injustice, so this little website and campaign in this small area of fairness and justice is important in a little but big way. Those of us with some brains have to keep the clumsy big organisations and their big sticks on their toes so the little people have a chance.

My "suffering" has to be viewed in context when considering the likes of Nguyen above, but nevertheless this stuff did create suicidal thoughts and traumas. Because of the idiocy of these institutions, my Mother, the biggest influence in my life, died extremely disappointed with me which is something I will have to bear for the rest of my life. People suffer unimaginable injustice across the world, but that is no reason to belittle this injustice herein or get complacent about fairness and justice for ordinary citizens in the EU, which can be quickly eroded.

Ad astra per aspera

To the stars through difficulty

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary



Results

Life

Spero

Status

Notes

RIP Mum

Case List

Introduction

benversus.com



ben@bencc.com

Quick Guide

Intent & Goals

Dept IUS Intro

d1

d2

d3

Dept IUS Detail

d4

d5

d6

KF&SV Intro

k1

k2

k3

KF&SV Detail

k4

k5

k6

QLTR Intro

q1

q2

q3

QLTR Detail

q4

q5

q6

Other Cases

o1

o2

o3

Summary

←

















→


Results

Life

Next Steps and Results

Right now there are no results. Realistically, Ben Collins versus; the UK Department of Innovation, the Swedish Tax Office and the Scottish Department of Justice, et al, is going to be an long and difficult struggle. I have no; legal expertise, time and cannot afford legal representation yet am fighting seven various legally minded institutions of infinite resources and time in four different law jurisdictions. Uh-Oh, wish me luck!. However there is motivation having; lost my home, my life's work launch delayed, made my best friends homeless, my life savings removed, a nervous breakdown, and lost the respect of my now dead Mother. *Results will be published on this page in due course, let us see how justice performs for the man in the street.*

Law	Year	Versus	1st May 05 Action
		2003	Dept Innov & Uni's Malpractice
		2008	QLTR Edinburgh Malpractice
		2006	BC vs SV Harassment
		2006	BC vs KF Theft
		2006	BC vs AK Malpractice
		2006	BC vs VV Malpractice
		2007	TFF vs BC Extortion
		2006	BC vs KF&J Extortion



Nemo me impune lacessit

No one strikes me with impunity