

Did this victim complain in Irish about crimes in Portugal?

[Yes.]

Did the Chief Guard of the National Republic in Taveiro say that there is an onus on the 2nd Republic of Portugal to permit this victim to litigate with Irish?

[Yes.]

Does this victim behave correctly?

[Yes. The judge Rosa Pinto ordered him to frequently present himself to me. He always behaves correctly.]

Is this victim violent?

[No.]

Is this victim aggressive?

[No.]

On 04/08/2014, did this victim:

* politely request the orientadora to partially make amends but instead she continued to provoke him by perpetrating difamação and by refusing to confess that she prejudiced him,
or

* did this victim speak disrespectfully and did he raise his voice and did the orientadora therefore request this victim to leave and to close this door and did this victim immediately commence to cut the orientadora?

[On 04/08/2014, this victim politely requested the orientadora to partially make amends. The orientadora disrespectfully said:

"This is not your country. Go to your country."

The orientadora disrespectfully said:

"That's your problem. That's your problem. That's your problem. I don't care about it."

The orientadora continued to provoke him by perpetrating difamação. She dishonestly said:

"you've been institutionalized because you were ill".

The orientadora refused to confess that she prejudiced this victim. This victim said with flawed English:

"How many, how much of the social security for my first contract was paid?"

She refused to answer.

This victim did not speak disrespectfully. Instead of being motivated by his voice, the orientadora immediately (< 23 seconds after the commencement of that conversation) unsuccessfully attempted to close the door without requesting him to leave, therefore she then ordered him to close the door. This victim took out the ax > 2 minutes after the orientadora said:

"Close the door".]

How do you know such details of what happened on 04/08/2014?

[For example, an advocate of an assistente submitted a recording to this process. Such a recording is also available at other tribunals and on the Internet etc.

Such a recording proves that testimonies; judges; advocates; these assistentes; and "Inspectora" Sandra Roxo of the Polícia Judiciária perpetrated perjúrios against this victim. Cf.

[HTTP://users.NinthFloor.org/~de_ghloucester/This_is_not_your_country!_Go_back_to_Ireland!_filename_Recording_20140804_101602.3gpp](http://users.NinthFloor.org/~de_ghloucester/This_is_not_your_country!_Go_back_to_Ireland!_filename_Recording_20140804_101602.3gpp)

at circa 4 hours and 47 minutes and 12 seconds after its commencement.]

How did "Inspectora" Sandra Roxo of the Polícia Judiciária perpetrate perjúrios against this victim?

[Cf. for example Lines 70 and 71 of fls. 247 on 15/12/2014:

"70 Questionado objectivamente nesse sentido disse desconhecer o que esteve na

71 origem da suspensão da bolsa de doutoramento que estava atribuída ao Colin."

That testimony (namely Sharif Hasan Mahmoud Ghithan) did not hear this victim and the orientadora talking about a bolsa de doutoramento on 04/08/2014 because they did not talk about a bolsa de doutoramento on 04/08/2014. They talked about the illegal internamento compulsivo that she remorselessly inflicted upon this victim. The orientadora and the assistente University of Coimbra and the Ministério Público and testimonies and quacks (putative psychiatrists) of a hospital of this putative university are cúmplices of this internamento compulsivo.

Curiously "Inspectora" Sandra Roxo of the Polícia Judiciária and judges and advocates of these assistentes connive at the inconsistencies of the testimonies upon which they rely. It is also curious that they rely on false facts which they know to be false.

"Inspectora" Sandra Roxo of the Polícia Judiciária and quacks and the orientadora falsely imputed mental illness to me because I criticized incompetence of the European Space Agency. During March 2005 the European Space Agency created a document that it then requested me to sign during February 2005! Such time travel is impossible.]

Is this victim guilty?

[This victim is not guilty. The orientadora and the assistente University of Coimbra and the Ministério Público and testimonies and quacks (putative psychiatrists) of a hospital of this putative university are guilty.]

Does the 2nd Republic of Portugal prejudice this victim?

[The 2nd Republic of Portugal provides merely an illusion of justice. The 2nd Republic of Portugal prejudices this victim because of his nationality since 2008, therefore it would be illegal to convict this victim.]

Would this victim have cut the orientadora if she would not have been a cúmplice of this internamento compulsivo; and if the orientadora would not have perpetrated difamação against him during 2013 and 2014; and if the orientadora would not continue to withhold his social security; and if this victim would not have wanted to eat food in prison instead of die without social security; and if this victim would not have known that the DIAP (Deliberate Ignorance Avoiding Prosecution!) would protect criminals again instead of obeying its legal obligations?

[No.]

Did this victim say on 05/08/2014 (during the first morning of this process) that a person who does not speak Gaelic is not an interpreter?

[Yes. He complains since before 2018 to the Conselho Superior da Magistratura about English being utilized against him during this process.]

Did this victim repeatedly complain about English being utilized against him during this process?

[Yes, therefore it is unjust that the Juízo Central Criminal de Coimbra professed on 09/01/2018 the lame excuse "atenta a proximidade da data designada para audiência de julgamento" to refuse to utilize an interpreter.]

Is this the only reason that it is unjust that this victim is being forced to utilize English?

[No.]

This victim is being victimized because of his nationality therefore it is unjust to deprive him of the right to utilize the language of his nationality. This deprivation of an interpreter aggravates this prejudice.

A psychiatrist stated that this victim was hospitalized because of misunderstanding caused by problems of English. Psychologists confirmed that this victim has issues with English. A tribunal has such documentation since before the commencement of this process.

This victim failed examinations about English. Translations are not cheap and this process and these assistentes and the Ministério Público deprive this victim of money, therefore he was not able to buy translations of results of examinations sooner.

Working and studying with English are not the same as being the arguido of a farce of justice with English.

In the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 2 male judges; 1 female judge; another female functionary of a tribunal; a female functionary of a legal charity; and many lawyers criticized the English of this victim.

The judge Rosa Pinto contradicted answers with English of this victim about names of parents even with microphones and an Anglophone!]

Is this victim prosecuting in Gaelic the Ministério Público; the assistente University of Coimbra; an advocate (A. Novais Teixeira) of an assistente; and connected persons for perpetrating difamação against him?

[Yes. They perpetrate difamação in Gaelic jurisdictions. It is legal to prosecute them there. He did write to the Ministério Público in Gaelic and the Ministério Público did not plead a defense.]

Do you communicate with him in English?

[Yes. Ireland is a small place. English is a common lingua franca in every country. His English is not perfect. My English is not perfect. I would not be comfortable testifying in English.]