

10 Downing Street

London

SW1A 2AA

(date)

Dear Prime Minister

I write regarding the situation of Julian Assange- a journalist that has been detained here in the UK under house arrest for over 550 days and who, on the 14th June 2012, lost an appeal made to the UK Supreme Court against a European Arrest Warrant issued by the Swedish Judicial Authority. He is currently awaiting extradition to Sweden between the dates of June 29th and July 8th 2012. He has not been charged with any crime.

I am deeply troubled by the decision of the UK Supreme Court and am appealing to you to override the court's decision and halt the extradition process. In your role as Prime Minister of our country you have the means to assert parliamentary sovereignty in this instance and I urge you to exercise this right. You have further means to selectively bar the application of European Law in the UK.

I make this urgent request to you with numerous concerns about the ruling of the UK Supreme Court. I request that you take some time to consider the following resources in order to acquaint yourself with the controversy surrounding this case:

<http://wlcentral.org/node/2630>

http://www.craigmurray.org.uk/archives/2012/05/back-in-business/?utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter

I am aware Home Secretary Theresa May wishes to offload the legal and human rights responsibilities of her office as regards extradition entirely into the hands of the judiciary. This case is a perfect illustration of why that is such a bad idea; Ms May's plan too subverts the primacy of Parliament and "fails to understand the nature of extradition... Extradition is diplomatic in the first instance. It becomes judicial and ultimately it is political." Sir Menzies Campbell MP

<http://www.theyworkforyou.com/whall/?gid=2011-11-24a.165.1>

There are numerous instances where the case against Julian Assange has been in breach of the Human rights Act (1998). For example, under Article 6 (the right to a fair trial) Mr Assange should have been entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal. Julian Assange spent **5 weeks** in Sweden following the complaints made against

him and offered himself for questioning. He has also offered to speak with officials regarding the case from where he is now situated in the UK. Despite this, the Judicial Authority of Sweden has declined any opportunity to make reasonable contact with Mr Assange. Denying this has led to an unreasonable delay in the resolution of the case- a delay where the agitation against Julian (and sustained misreporting in the media) would make it impossible for any court to remain unbiased. Importantly, it also dismisses the rights of the two complainants involved; if their welfare was genuinely at the fore of this case every effort should have been made to question Julian Assange when he presented himself for these purposes while still in Sweden.

It is critical to note that the allegations against Mr Assange have NOT been brought by the female complainants; the allegations have been levelled by the Swedish State. That was the whole point of his Supreme Court appeal. The women are as much victims of the Swedish State as Mr Assange himself is, as they went to police for advice about HIV testing and have publicly stated that he is not violent and they did not wish to file a complaint. One of the women has stated she felt “railroaded” by police and did not sign her witness statement, which was later amended by a politician acting as the women’s lawyer (see <http://wlcentral.org/node/1418>). After reviewing the police file, a senior Stockholm prosecutor dismissed all the allegations bar one (non-extraditable) molestation offence for further investigation, then closed the case entirely.

There is a suspicion among people I’ve spoken to that long-promised extradition reform is being delayed until after Mr Assange has left these shores, perhaps because of this <http://www.scribd.com/doc/81571864/Feb12FOICase20979Reply> , which shows high-level US involvement in the Scott Baker extradition review – itself suffering from excessive secrecy (along with other FOI requests concerning Mr Assange, which have all been denied). What good will reform do at that stage if, thanks to the Supreme Court verdict in his case, anything Parliament enacts in future is deemed automatically superseded by the European Civil Law system?

I will be asking my local MP to sign Caroline Lucas’ Early Day Motion 128 (<http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2012-13/128>) calling for an end to these delays to urgent extradition reform, a halt to all US extraditions meanwhile, and the publication of the Baker Review evidence.

The Swedish investigating prosecutor Marianne Ny has publicly stated: “The detention time can itself be used as punishment if the offender subsequently is not convicted.” This is in clear breach of Article 7 of the Human rights Act- that there should be no punishment without law. I wish to draw your attention back to the fact that Mr Assange has been held under house arrest for over 550 days.

He has not been charged with any crime. He is wanting for questioning regarding allegations for which he had made numerous attempts to answer. Despite nearly two years of requests to be interviewed, the Swedish prosecutor refuses to use standard Mutual Legal Assistance channels to question Mr Assange in the UK, without giving any reason. The Swedish authorities say they are seeking to extradite him for questioning and yet it's the one thing they seem least keen on doing.

Swedish media are trying to assert that the reason Mr Assange must be extradited now is because Swedish law dictates that someone must be on Swedish soil in order for **formal charges** to be laid. But it is also true under Swedish law that a prosecutor **cannot take the decision to charge until the preliminary investigation and all questioning therein has been completed**. In having already taken the decision to charge Mr Assange, Marianne Ny is breaking Swedish law. It is intolerable that in a case such as this that an investigating prosecutor would decide to charge before even hearing one side's version of events. This is what the UK's Supreme Court has now allowed to be called an impartial 'judicial authority' and is a contradiction of intent on behalf of the investigating prosecutor. It cannot be allowed to stand.

It is time for Britain to formally request that Sweden does what it claims it wants to do: question him – here, on British soil – before we start dismantling Britain's Common Law justice system in order to facilitate the extradition of one man. I ask that this formal request be lodged with the Swedish Ambassador as a matter of urgency.

The shadow hanging over this whole case from the very beginning, of course, is the looming threat of Mr Assange's extradition to the US, which would like to see him prosecuted for espionage for his journalistic activities. This can be facilitated very easily through Sweden's "temporary surrender" arrangements in its bilateral treaty with the US, a clause not available in Britain's own US treaty.

Whatever your opinion towards the work of Julian Assange and that of his organisation WikiLeaks you, as our Prime Minister, are held in account to the ways in which this case reflects the vulnerabilities of our UK legal system. This case can be read as one highlighting the weakness of the UK to uphold the human rights of those that reside here. Not one of us residing in the UK should feel comfortable with these processes. Should you refuse to make a stand in this case you must hold yourself accountable in allowing for the provision of unjust and unconstitutional proceedings under your governmental term.

As the extradition of Mr Assange looms nearer I must insist on an urgent response from you on this matter. I request:

- a statement in response to the issues I raise, clearly indicating your position on this matter and intended response
- that you assert the right to parliamentary supremacy and override the decision of the UK Supreme Court in upholding the EAW issued by Sweden
- that you formally lodge a request with the Swedish Ambassador to question Mr Assange while he resides here in the UK
- that you initiate a review, as a matter of urgency, of UK extradition law

I await your response,

Yours sincerely

(Name)

(UK address)

cc Her Majesty The Queen

Her Majesty The Queen

Buckingham Palace

London SW1A 1AA

(date)

Madam

I write to draw your attention to a most urgent concern. I have enclosed a copy of a letter sent today to Prime Minister David Cameron. I feel the issues raised in my letter are of sufficient seriousness that they must be brought to your attention.

I thank you for your time and consideration regarding the enclosed letter.

Yours sincerely,

(Name)

(Address)

10 Downing Street

London

SW1A 2AA

(date)

Dear Prime Minister

I write regarding the situation of Julian Assange- a journalist that has been detained here in the UK under house arrest for over 550 days and who, on the 14th June 2012, lost an appeal made to the UK Supreme Court against a European Arrest Warrant issued by the Swedish Judicial Authority. He is currently awaiting extradition to Sweden between the dates of June 29th and July 8th 2012. He has not been charged with any crime.

I am deeply troubled by the decision of the UK Supreme Court and am appealing to you to override the court's decision and halt the extradition process. In your role as Prime Minister of our country you have the means to assert parliamentary sovereignty in this instance and I urge you to exercise this right. You have further means to selectively bar the application of European Law in the UK.

I make this urgent request to you with numerous concerns about the ruling of the UK Supreme Court. I request that you take some time to consider the following resources in order to acquaint yourself with the controversy surrounding this case:

<http://wlcentral.org/node/2630>

http://www.craigmurray.org.uk/archives/2012/05/back-inbusiness/?utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter

I am aware Home Secretary Theresa May wishes to offload the legal and human rights responsibilities of her office as regards extradition entirely into the hands of the judiciary. This case is a perfect illustration of why that is such a bad idea; Ms May's plan too subverts the primacy of Parliament and "fails to understand the nature of extradition... Extradition is diplomatic in the first instance. It becomes judicial and ultimately it is political." Sir Menzies Campbell MP

<http://www.theyworkforyou.com/whall/?gid=2011-11-24a.165.1>

There are numerous instances where the case against Julian Assange has been in breach of the Human rights Act (1998). For example, under Article 6 (the right to a fair trial) Mr Assange should have been entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal. Julian Assange spent 5 weeks in Sweden following the complaints made against

him and offered himself for questioning. He has also offered to speak with officials regarding the case from where he is now situated in the UK. Despite this, the Judicial Authority of Sweden has declined any opportunity to make reasonable contact with Mr Assange. Denying this has led to an unreasonable delay in the resolution of the case- a delay where the agitation against Julian (and sustained misreporting in the media) would make it impossible for any court to remain unbiased. Importantly, it also dismisses the rights of the two complainants involved; if their welfare was genuinely at the fore of this case every effort should have been made to question Julian Assange when he presented himself for these purposes while still in Sweden.

It is critical to note that the allegations against Mr Assange have NOT been brought by the female complainants; the allegations have been levelled by the Swedish State. That was the whole point of his Supreme Court appeal. The women are as much victims of the Swedish State as Mr Assange himself is, as they went to police for advice about HIV testing and have publicly stated that he is not violent and they did not wish to file a complaint. One of the women has stated she felt “railroaded” by police and did not sign her witness statement, which was later amended by a politician acting as the women’s lawyer (see <http://wlcentral.org/node/1418>). After reviewing the police file, a senior Stockholm prosecutor dismissed all the allegations bar one (non-extraditable) molestation offence for further investigation, then closed the case entirely.

There is a suspicion among people I’ve spoken to that long-promised extradition reform is being delayed until after Mr Assange has left these shores, perhaps because of this <http://www.scribd.com/doc/81571864/Feb12FOICase20979Reply> , which shows high-level US involvement in the Scott Baker extradition review – itself suffering from excessive secrecy (along with other FOI requests concerning Mr Assange, which have all been denied). What good will reform do at that stage if, thanks to the Supreme Court verdict in his case, anything Parliament enacts in future is deemed automatically superseded by the European Civil Law system?

I will be asking my local MP to sign Caroline Lucas’ Early Day Motion 128 (<http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2012-13/128>) calling for an end to these delays to urgent extradition reform, a halt to all US extraditions meanwhile, and the publication of the Baker Review evidence.

The Swedish investigating prosecutor Marianne Ny has publicly stated: “The detention time can itself be used as punishment if the offender subsequently is not convicted.” This is in clear breach of Article 7 of the Human rights Act- that there should be no punishment without law. I wish to draw your attention back to the fact that Mr Assange has been held under house arrest for over 550 days.

He has not been charged with any crime. He is wanting for questioning regarding allegations for which he had made numerous attempts to answer. Despite nearly two years of requests to be interviewed, the Swedish prosecutor refuses to use standard Mutual Legal Assistance channels to question Mr Assange in the UK, without giving any reason. The Swedish authorities say they are seeking to extradite him for questioning and yet it's the one thing they seem least keen on doing.

Swedish media are trying to assert that the reason Mr Assange must be extradited now is because Swedish law dictates that someone must be on Swedish soil in order for formal charges to be laid. But it is also true under Swedish law that a prosecutor cannot take the decision to charge until the preliminary investigation and all questioning therein has been completed. In having already taken the decision to charge Mr Assange, Marianne Ny is breaking Swedish law. It is intolerable that in a case such as this that an investigating prosecutor would decide to charge before even hearing one side's version of events. This is what the UK's Supreme Court has now allowed to be called an impartial 'judicial authority' and is a contradiction of intent on behalf of the investigating prosecutor. It cannot be allowed to stand.

It is time for Britain to formally request that Sweden does what it claims it wants to do: question him – here, on British soil – before we start dismantling Britain's Common Law justice system in order to facilitate the extradition of one man. I ask that this formal request be lodged with the Swedish Ambassador as a matter of urgency.

The shadow hanging over this whole case from the very beginning, of course, is the looming threat of Mr Assange's extradition to the US, which would like to see him prosecuted for espionage for his journalistic activities. This can be facilitated very easily through Sweden's "temporary surrender" arrangements in its bilateral treaty with the US, a clause not available in Britain's own US treaty.

Whatever your opinion towards the work of Julian Assange and that of his organisation WikiLeaks you, as our Prime Minister, are held in account to the ways in which this case reflects the vulnerabilities of our UK legal system. This case can be read as one highlighting the weakness of the UK to uphold the human rights of those that reside here. Not one of us residing in the UK should feel comfortable with these processes. Should you refuse to make a stand in this case you must hold yourself accountable in allowing for the provision of unjust and unconstitutional proceedings under your governmental term.

As the extradition of Mr Assange looms nearer I must insist on an urgent response from you on this matter. I request:

- a statement in response to the issues I raise, clearly indicating your position on this matter and intended response
- that you assert the right to parliamentary supremacy and override the decision of the UK Supreme Court in upholding the EAW issued by Sweden
- that you formally lodge a request with the Swedish Ambassador to question Mr Assange while he resides here in the UK
- that you initiate a review, as a matter of urgency, of UK extradition law

I await your response,

Yours sincerely

(Name)

(UK address)

cc Her Majesty The Queen