

Sheriff L. D,
Sheriff G.W,

I have received your emails sent the 21st July and the 7th august.

First, I had never been informed that there was an audience the 21st of July. I have discover that when I try to read the email of the 21 july.

However, I forewarned the lawyer of Miss N by sending an email the 13 June at 4:38 p.m. (Cf. annexe).

Why the lawyer of Miss N have just warned Sheriff W but not Sheriff D ?

I have also warned the sheriff W of my incapacity to travel because of my health problem. The sheriff W asked a traduction of my medical certificate.

So, I will can not be present for the next audiences the 22nd and 29th August, because of my health problem.

I apologize in advance.

1 - Indeed, I think I understand that the audience of Sheriff D is about the disproportional amount of the aliment and the request of Miss N to see me go to jail. Is it exactly ?

I underline you that I have made an appeal against the judgement of the 16th may 2016.

My appeal should have been accepted by Sheriff D the 10th June 2016.

I ask you to consider the case Gray - v - Fortune 2000 SCLR 178 in my case.

It concerns the vexed question of a solicitor withdrawing very close to a proof arose. The court could not ignore this situation and grant decree by default.

Furthermore, I have the right to benefit from the Legal Aid (12500£) because of my low incomes, but according to you I could pay aliment 1.000 £ per month.

This does not seem consistent, and this inconsistency couldn't have to result my imprisonment.

In order to avoid sending me to prison, I just ask of you to be fair.

So, why don't you consider that the cost of my many travels between France and Scotland (37) doesn't have to be take account ? Why don't you consider that if I just earn 1.250 € per month I can't pay aliment 1.000 £ per month ? Why do you refused to take account the earnings of Miss N ?

Finally, Is it possible that the same Sheriff can be fix the amount of the aliment and judge the request to grant warrant for imprisonment for failing to

make payment of the sums which isn't due, in the absence of application of the COUNCIL REGULATION N°7/2009 of 18 December 2008 ?

Unquestionably, there is a difficulty with the impartiality, guaranteed by the European Court.

I wish to inform you that an application for revision of the Judgment about the aliment have been made in accordance with the article 56 § 2 b of The COUNCIL REGULATION N°7/2009 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations.

2- The audience of Sheriff W is about the contacts.

So I hope that the difficulties I have crossed to maintain the links with my daughters, will be actually resolved even if I will be not present the 29th August.

Yours sincerely.

Arnold ROMAIN