

Proposed Litigants' Bill of Rights

The Parties

- 1) A person (with or without legal qualifications) has the right to represent themselves in a Court of Law.
- 2) A person (with or without legal qualifications) has equal rights of representation.
- 3) A person (with or without legal qualifications) is equal before the Law as defined in the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of 10th December 1948).
- 4) A person (with or without legal qualifications) has the right, with legal means, to obtain evidence that is relevant to the presentation of their Case.

In Court - The Judge (Assessment of Evidence)

- 5) Only a Judge who is trained to assess technically complex evidence can sit on a trial where evidence of a technically complex nature is heard.
- 6) The Judge must be able to assess evidence in a technically competent manner.
- 7) The Judge must examine evidence in a technically competent manner.
- 8) For a Judgement to be valid the assessment of evidence by the Judge must be legally correct, technically correct and logically consistent - and must be shown to be so.

In Court - Expert Witnesses

- 9) When an expert witness gives opinion on evidence, both parties have the right to check and validate the technical facts that the expert used when formulating the professed opinion.
- 10) When an expert witness gives opinion on evidence, both parties have the right to determine and validate the technical basis that the expert used when the expert professed that the presence of one condition indicates that another condition must exist.
- 11) When an expert presents opinion as "**being true**" then the expert must be able to show on balance of probabilities that the opinion is highly likely to be true.
- 12) When a psychiatrist or psychologist is involved, **mind rape** needs to be prevented. The person being assessed has the right to highlight areas of evidence which the psychiatrist or psychologist has altered, ignored or suppressed.
- 13) A party has the right to question an expert on evidence the expert has altered, ignored or suppressed if this evidence affects the outcome.

In Court - Evidential Conflict

- 14) All parties involved must be allowed to give evidence in a full and complete manner.
- 15) Where a person's evidence appears to conflict, the person who gave the conflicting evidence must be given an opportunity to explain the reason for the appearance of conflict.
- 16) Where evidence between different people appears to conflict, the people present at the occasions of evidential conflict must be given an opportunity to explain the reason for this evidential conflict.

Post Court

- 17) There should be a body, answerable to Parliament but independent of both Government and Judiciary, who can investigate Judicial cases where relevant evidence has been altered, ignored or misinterpreted.
- 18) There should be a body, answerable to Parliament but independent of both Government and Judiciary, who can investigate cases of Judicial corruption.
- 19) Judges who are guilty of corrupt practices should be subjected to disciplinary action by a body which is answerable to Parliament but independent of both Government and Judiciary.
- 20) Litigants must be able to have legally recognisable copies at affordable cost of all oral, written and visual evidence given in a Court of Law. There can be an exception to this in cases involving National Security and sexual matters.