

Particulars of Claim

Claim No. (to be assigned) IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE KING'S BENCH DIVISION
ADMINISTRATIVE COURT / QUEEN'S BENCH LIST

Between: Humanity — Claimant and Institutional Law System (and interested institutional
defendants to be identified) — Defendant(s)

PARTICULARS OF CLAIM

1. The parties 1.1 The Claimant

The Claimant is advanced as “Humanity” — a representative claimant asserting the rights and interests of persons subject to or affected by institutional legal systems in England & Wales and worldwide where appropriate. The Claimant relies on representative plaintiffs and representative evidence, and seeks to bring systemic common law and public law challenges on behalf of people affected by the Defendant System.

1.2 The Defendant(s)

The Defendant(s) (“the System”) comprise institutions, public authorities, governmental bodies, courts and agencies exercising legal power and authority in England & Wales and internationally where relevant, including their officers, servants and agents. The Claimant will particularise responsible institutional defendants in disclosure and will seek disclosure to identify relevant officers and decision-makers.

2. Jurisdiction and procedural posture 2.1 This Court has jurisdiction under the Senior Courts Act 1981, the Civil Procedure Rules, and applicable public law jurisdiction. The claim is issued under Part 8 CPR seeking declarations and injunctive relief, with reserved rights to seek Group Litigation Order procedures (CPR Part 19) and judicial review style remedies (CPR Practice Direction PD54A), where required. 2.2 The Claimant relies on the Court's jurisdiction to grant declaratory and injunctive remedies where public bodies' actions or systemic practices are inconsistent with fundamental legal principles and human rights.

3. Central admissible question and overarching legal thesis 3.1 The single admissible question is: “Under what conditions does authority override consent?” 3.2 The Claimant's case is that the System routinely assumes or imputes consent (by birth, registration, necessity, administrative default or technical formality) rather than securing informed, voluntary consent where human autonomy and bodily, informational or legal integrity are implicated. Where law or legitimacy requires consent, the systemic assumption of consent undermines the legitimacy of institutional acts.

4. Legal principles relied upon 4.1 The Claimant relies upon principal doctrines including: Duty of care (tort law); Procedural fairness and natural justice; Informed consent, protection from coercion and undue influence (medical law, contract, tort); Constitutional and human rights protections under the Human Rights Act 1998 (Articles 2, 3, 6, 8);

The courts' power to grant declarations, preservation and disclosure orders, and injunctive relief (Senior Courts Act 1981; CPR Parts 7 & 8; judicial review remedies and equitable jurisdiction). 4.2 The Claimant submits domestic doctrines of capacity, mental state (mens rea), undue influence and informed consent already recognise non-physical elements relevant to consent and responsibility; those doctrines must be applied consistently to institutional acts.

5. Summary of facts and how they link to the legal issues
 - 5.1 Systemic assumption of consent
 - 5.1.1 The System frequently treats birth registration, mere survival, participation in social institutions and administrative default as constituting consent to subordinate legal and institutional arrangements.
 - 5.1.2 Examples (to be evidenced) include registration systems, mandatory administrative enrolments, welfare conditionalities, and regulatory frameworks that presuppose assent without demonstrable informed agreement.
 - 5.2 Inconsistent application of legal rules and immunity doctrines
 - 5.2.1 The System selectively applies legal doctrines (including sovereign, crown or institutional immunity; procedural restrictions; and narrow interpretations of consent) to protect institutional authority while insisting on strict standards of consent and liability when individuals are involved.
 - 5.2.2 Contradictory case law and administrative practice (to be exhibited) demonstrate a pattern of inconsistency that permits institutional self-protection.
 - 5.3 Ongoing and continuous harm; evidence risk
 - 5.3.1 The harms alleged are ongoing and continuous rather than fixed to discrete events. As such, limitation defences are displaced or must be adapted to the continuing character of the wrongs.
 - 5.3.2 There is a real risk that material evidence will be destroyed, deleted, or modified — including internet material and electronic records. The Claimant has served pre-action preservation letters and prenotice communications on custodians and platforms; silence or non-response to those communications is relied upon as evidence of refusal or intent to withhold.
 - 5.4 Particular factual allegations by the Claimant
 - 5.4.1 The Claimant (Susan Ndinga Wright) is the person who instructs these proceedings and is the author of a confidential witness statement in which personal blog material (the Claimant's "life's statement") is treated as confidential, privileged and necessary to the claim.
 - 5.4.2 The Claimant contends that her Universal Credit account and related welfare administration have been hijacked or interfered with by institutional actors contacted in relation to raising metaphysical law arguments into jurisdictional discourse. The Claimant alleges the hijack is ongoing and is linked to the same institutional practices of assumed authority and non-consensual subordination.
 - 5.4.3 The Claimant has saved all initial communications (emails, timestamps and metadata) and has issued preservation communications to multiple custodians including parliamentary offices, Crown offices, academic correspondents, intelligence agencies (MI5, MI6), foreign agencies (CIA, FBI), international organisations (UNESCO, UNICEF, United Nations), and others. Evidence of these communications and any responses (or lack of response) will be produced.
 - 5.4.4 The Claimant believes the only realistic risk to the totality of preserved evidence would be a widespread global or national blackout or systemic deletion; while unlikely, the Claimant submits this is not logically excluded given the scope of the institutions implicated.

6. Causes of action and relief sought
 - 6.1 Declaratory relief (primary)
 - 6.1.1 A declaration that the exercise of institutional authority which affects fundamental human autonomy, bodily integrity, privacy or liberty is lawful only where informed, voluntary consent is present or where a lawful, proportionate and necessary statutory or common law justification exists.
 - 6.1.2 A declaration that the institutional System's inconsistent application of law and selective invocation of immunity or procedural defences violates equality before the law, procedural fairness and constitutional legitimacy.
 - 6.2 Injunctive relief (interim and final)
 - 6.2.1 An interim preservation order preventing the deletion, destruction, alteration or spoliation of documents, emails, social-media postings, metadata and electronic records relevant to this claim, including copies held by custodians, platforms, governmental departments and third parties.
 - 6.2.2 An order for disclosure of internal communications, policies, retention/deletion rules, decision records and custodial metadata relevant to the matters in issue, and production of a disclosure methodology (search terms, custodians and date ranges) to be agreed or determined by the Court.
 - 6.2.3 Interim mandatory injunctions halting ongoing practices that amount to coerced participation or interference with individual rights where immediate harm to the Claimant (or to identified representative plaintiffs) is established.
 - 6.2.4 An urgent interim order for preservation and, where reasonably necessary and proportionate, interim relief relating to the Claimant's Universal Credit (for example, interim payment or protection of entitlements) pending resolution of the issues on the balance of convenience, to avoid irreparable harm to the Claimant's livelihood.
 - 6.3 Group litigation and representative relief
 - 6.3.1 Directions for case management to enable a Group Litigation Order (GLO) or other mass claim procedures (CPR Part 19), with permission for representative plaintiffs to provide central witness evidence on systemic patterns.
 - 6.4 Further relief
 - 6.4.1 Costs and such further relief as the Court deems fit, including liberty to apply for additional or substituted orders.
7. Legal grounds and authority (headings)
 - 7.1 Consent and legitimacy
 - 7.1.1 Established authorities recognise the centrality of informed consent in contexts where autonomy is engaged (medical law: *Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board* [2015] UKSC 11; contract and tort doctrines on duress and undue influence). The Claimant's case: institutional practice of assumption of consent is contrary to these doctrines.
 - 7.2 Statutory interpretation, meaning and semantic fairness
 - 7.2.1 The courts should interpret statutory and administrative language in light of purpose and context (*Pepper v Hart*; *Investors Compensation Scheme Ltd v West Bromwich Building Society*). The Claimant submits that semantic obfuscation should not protect inconsistent institutional practice.
 - 7.3 Continuing harm and limitation
 - 7.3.1 Where harm is continuous, limitation defences must be applied with caution and the courts may grant equitable or public law relief notwithstanding elapsed periods (see Limitation Act 1980 principles and case authorities on continuing wrongs).
 - 7.4 Standing, public legitimacy and representative action
 - 7.4.1 The systemic nature of the claim, and the fact that institutional authority is premised on mass participation, are relevant to standing and to the appropriateness of representative class remedies (CPR Part 19).
 - 7.5 Self-review, conflict and oversight
 - 7.5.1 Where institutional actors assess their own compliance without adequate external oversight, concepts of apparent bias and conflict of interest arise (*Pinochet (No. 2)*; *Porter v Magill*),

supporting the need for independent scrutiny and declarations. 7.6 Consciousness, capacity and admissible non-physical evidence 7.6.1 Legal doctrines accept non-physical elements (intention, capacity, awareness); the Claimant seeks to rely on these doctrines to permit the Court to consider consciousness-related evidence where probative.

8. Systemic contradictions and use of precedent as evidence 8.1 The Claimant will place apparently contradictory authorities and administrative decisions into evidential juxtaposition to demonstrate systemic inconsistency in the application of consent and related doctrines. 8.2 Such demonstrable divergence will be used as evidence that institutional practice has become self-protective, and not as a shield against scrutiny.
9. Pre-action conduct and notice 9.1 The Claimant has complied with pre-action requirements to the extent possible in a global systemic claim. The Claimant has served prenotices, preservation letters and pre-action communications on multiple custodians and institutional recipients. Copies of these communications, receipt evidence and any responses (or absence of response) will be exhibited. Silence or non-response is relied upon as an evidential fact in this claim.
10. Evidence and schedule 10.1 The Claimant relies upon: (a) the Particulars of Claim previously filed and appended materials; (b) an evidence bundle of case law and precedent showing inconsistent application of consent doctrines (to be exhibited); (c) preserved social-media posts, public statements, institutional communications and metadata certified by forensic methods (to be exhibited); (d) verified witness statements from representative plaintiffs (to follow), including the Claimant's confidential witness statement (blog/life's statement) for which confidentiality directions are sought; (e) preservation and spoliation letters sent to custodians/platforms, with chain-of-custody documentation, and evidence of any deletion or destruction (to be exhibited); (f) email communications and first contact records with parliamentary offices, Crown offices, academics, intelligence and international organisations (preserved and to be produced). 10.2 The Claimant seeks immediate preservation orders to ensure the integrity of the evidence above.
11. Urgency, balance of convenience and necessity for interim relief 11.1 The Claimant's case for immediate interim preservation and disclosure is that there is a real risk of spoliation and loss of evidence, and that ongoing harm will continue absent Court intervention. 11.2 On balance, preservation of evidence and prompt disclosure are proportionate, necessary and in the public interest to allow adjudication of the central admissible question.
12. Human rights and public interest 12.1 The Claimant advances public law grounds of illegality, irrationality and procedural impropriety, together with human rights claims under the Human Rights Act 1998, Articles 2, 3, 6 and 8, insofar as institutional practices affect bodily integrity, privacy and fair process. 12.2 The State's obligations (positive and negative) are engaged where institutional practices fail to secure informed consent in matters affecting fundamental rights.
13. Declaratory proposition 13.1 The Claimant asks the Court to apply the following declaratory rule: "No system may be the final arbiter of the legality of harms it produces where that system refuses to apply to itself the standards it imposes on others." 13.2 The

Claimant says this rule is consistent with principles of recusal, oversight and the rule of law.

14. Particular relief sought (summary)
 - 14.1 Declarations in the terms set out above (see para 6.1).
 - 14.2 Interim preservation and disclosure orders in the terms set out above (see para 6.2).
 - 14.3 Directions for management and permission for Group Litigation Order procedures and representative witness evidence (see para 6.3).
 - 14.4 An urgent interim injunction appropriate to the Claimant's circumstances, including interim protective measures for the Claimant's Universal Credit account and related welfare entitlements pending full resolution or further order.
 - 14.5 Costs and such further or alternative relief as the Court deems fit, including liberty to apply.
15. Draft interim orders requested on issue of preservation and disclosure (examples)
 - 15.1 Immediate preservation order
The Defendant(s), and any person or organisation served with the order, must preserve all documents and electronic data within their custody or control which relate to: institutional consent practices; record-keeping, decision-making, registration practices; retention/deletion policies; communications with parliamentary, Crown, academic, intelligence or international bodies concerning the Claimant or subject matters in this claim; and any social-media or public posts identified in the evidence schedule. The preservation order should include a prohibition on deletion, destruction, alteration, wiping, or intentional loss of data and require preservation of metadata, backups and logs.
 - 15.2 Disclosure order
The Defendant(s) must disclose (in agreed or court-determined stages) internal communications, policy documents, retention/deletion policies, custodial lists, search terms and a description of electronic systems in use, in a form to be agreed or such other form as the Court orders.
 - 15.3 Confidentiality / protective order
Confidential witness material (including the Claimant's blog and life's statement) should be treated as confidential and subject to a protective order limiting access to the parties, their legal representatives and the Court, with redaction/closed-material procedure protections where necessary.
 - 15.4 Interim welfare relief
If the Court is satisfied on evidence the Claimant faces irreparable harm from suspension, interference or hijack of Universal Credit, the Court may make interim orders preserving the Claimant's entitlement or providing interim payment pending fuller determination on the balance of convenience.
16. Limitation and continuing wrongs
 - 16.1 The Claimant pleads that limitation defences are inappropriate in the present context because the alleged wrongs are continuing, systemic and ongoing. The Claimant relies on equitable and public law principles to obtain relief notwithstanding elapsed periods.
17. Remedies and costs
 - 17.1 The Claimant seeks costs in the event of success, and such further or alternative relief as the Court considers just.

Statement of truth: The Claimant believes that the facts stated in these Particulars of Claim are true.

Signed: SusanNdingaWright

Date: 13 January 2026

