

ASSESSMENT OF ASSUALT TRIAL

Extract: Ref: CASE 01GN017761 - Stratford Magistrates Court March 2012

This is an assessment of the accounts given during the trial of Case Zamans vs Zaman that occurred according to criminal case ref: # 01GN017761 between February -March 2012 at Stratford Magistrates Court . This concerns the premeditated assaults that occurred on Friday 29th April 2011 when Mr. A and Mrs. B were assaulted by Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman , Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman and their Mother.

The following people are going to be mentioned in this document:

Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman and Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman and their Mother who is shown in the extracts as My Mother-In Law.

The late Mohammed Zaman (senior) father of Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman, Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman, Mrs. B. and his spouse my Mother-In Law.

Mr. A. and Mrs. B. are the plaintiffs in this legal criminal case.

Written *transcript* were taken from digital media source. No alternations have been applied to the *transcript* of the trial.

What follows are extracts of the account of events during the trial:

Page intentionally left blank

1. Perjury List by Defence witness - by Mother-In Law in court.

Evidence Type:		Question			
1.1 We are not asking what Mr. A. was saying, where asking where was Mr. A.?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Judge	When:	Transcript Line no. 314, [TI: 03m:55s]
What was reply:	<p>He was firstly in the kitchen, then he walked into the corridor and then my son said not to talk rubbish and leave. He was there, in the TV room.</p> <p>(Her exact words where, “Pichelay Kumara vich see na” which translates in English “He was in the back room” in this case the TV Room and not in the Kitchen or corridor as misleading evidence given by both defendants that Mr. A. was not in the TV Room. This proves otherwise.)</p>				
Proven:	<p>1. Mr. A. was in the TV Room before the assaults began both on his wife Mrs. B. and upon himself instigated by Mohammad Iftikhar Zaman (Defendant 2). That he witness the assaults to his wife and the assaults upon himself by Iftikhar Zaman. Iftikhar Zaman's position in Line No. 3192, Sketch 9: TV Room according to Mr Zulfiqar Zaman Qb Judge Line no. 1680-1894.jpg also proves his movements during the assaults.</p> <p>2. That my Mother-In Law and both defendants Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman and Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman Lied in court by their collective evidence that Mr. A. was not in the TV Room to witness the assault upon his wife Mrs. B. The fact that Mr. A. was in the TV Room shows to the extent the defendants tried to mislead the District Judge into believing that Mr. A's witness statement was untruthful, but it is later proved in this document after assessing the trial evidence of the defence only that both Mr. A's police witness statements¹ where a true account of the events that occurred during the evening of 29th April 2011.</p>				

Evidence Type:		Question			
1.2 Where or how do you know that she hit Zulfiqar?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defence Lawyer	When:	Transcript Line no. 354, [TI: 06n:00]
What was reply:	<p>Interpreter: How did Zulfiqar hit her?</p> <p>Zulfiqar said that you came here to hit us. He was angry, He was angry!, it wasn't Zulfiqar, they started the trouble. [TI: 06m:05s]</p> <p>Interpreter: He did not start any trouble; they started it, Mr. A. and Mrs. B.</p> <p>(Note#1: Translator ignored the first part of my Mother-In Law's answer and focused on the last part leaving important information from being heard by the court.)</p> <p>(Note#2: Here my Mother In-Law has shown that Zulfiqar was in a sense of confrontation, becoming angry and blames this on Mr. A who did not say anything that would provoke Zulfiqar to become angry. Zulfiqar did not say, “You came here to hit us”, this was a fabricated lie by my Mother In-Law, the argument was part of a plan they conspired to carry out that evening, instigated firstly by my mother In-Law².)</p>				

¹ First Witness statement taken by the Police two hours after the assaults on the night of 29th April 2011 and subsequently a Victim Personal Statement to the Police.

² Ref: Mr. A's Witness statement to the Police where in both his submitted statements his Mother In-Law said abruptly without provocation, “Why you want to hit my son's?”, Line No. 1095.

(Note#3: Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman has a violent past; he was convicted of GBH in 1991 and served a 5 year prison sentence in a UK prison³. In 2005 after two years of marriage he beat up his wife – her face was black and blue with bruises, she was seven months pregnant with his second child, and she ran barefoot semi-naked clinging on to her first child to Stoke Newington Police Station for help only to drop an assault charge against her husband later that day when Zulfiqar’s mother pleaded with her to drop the charge citing that she would be deported back to Pakistan in disgrace to her parents⁴. He used excessive force on a minor In 2007, he slapped a seven year old who was visiting the parental home that caused the child to faint and wake-up screaming five minutes later⁵. In 2009 he beat up his adult cousin, fifteen years younger than him again leaving him with a black eye⁶. Further allegations, he arranged a legal separation from his wife⁷ in 2008 to orchestrate benefit fraud by persuading his wife to claim housing benefit for a property she acquired by skipping to the front of the housing register, in addition claiming she was homeless with children to secure a large flat on 55 Kennighall Road, and then in 2010 to have called over his wife’s sister from Lahore, Pakistan disguised as a student to live there paying Zulfiqar rent and posing as his wife while her sister looked for a marriage partner to secure her stay in the UK. Maqsood then used the same scam in Hampstead⁸ and his wife applied for housing benefit their also while they lived at his parental home in Hackney⁹.)

(Note 4#: Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman has a violent past concerning his wife and children. In 2002 he beat up his wife senseless, her face was black and blue with bruises and she was pregnant at the time. She also ran to the local police station in Maldon only to drop the assault charge against her husband later when Iftikhar’s mother and father pleaded with her to drop the charge. He has been violent against his children (minor), especially his son, on one occasion lifting his son up from the ground and throwing him across a room¹⁰. Further allegation, In 2010 Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman defrauded his father Mohammed Zaman Senior and other family inheritors by removing his father’s name off a joint named property in Farleigh Road, Stoke Newington and further leased the flats in order to purchase two separate properties, one claiming that he was a first time buyer.)

Defence Lawyer: How do you know she hit Zulfiqar?

Interpreter: How did Zulfiqar hit her? [TI: 06m:29s]

She arrived and ran in and said you were thieves.

Interpreter: They said they were thieves.

(Note#2: The interpreter is not translating what my Mother-In Law said in her evidence.)

Defence Lawyer: Where were you in the room when that happened?

Interpreter: Where did this happen, in which room?

³ Citation: Prosecution submitted Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman’s prison history to the District Judge.

⁴ Citation: Many family members are aware of this Assault on a defenceless pregnant woman. Refer to Stoke Newington Police station in Hackney records.

⁵ Reference: The Child involved is known, Mr. A. & Mrs. B are witness to the appalling crime inflicted by Maqsood.

⁶ Reference: His cousin is willing to testify against him and immediately after the beating threatened Maqsood that he would call the Police. No attempt was made to contact the Police that we are aware of.

⁷ During the period of the separation and up to 2013, Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman continues to have conjugal relationship with his former wife and has been playing cat & mouse with the local authorities he is still defrauding.

⁸ Ref: Milton Road, TW12 2LJ (Maqsood owned ZARA Photography Ltd.) while claiming he was bankrupt.

⁹ Ref: Hackney Benefit Department, Housing Department and Council Tax dept. Hampstead/ Stains Local Benefit Agency. British Foreign Office for visitor information (Student division).

¹⁰ Citation: A Conversation between Mr. A & Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman’s wife in 2008.

	<p>It happened in the very same room where I was standing. Interpreter: Where were you? [TI: 07m:00s]</p> <p>I was standing next to Mrs. B., she came to hit someone. Zulfiqar's older brother was there, she hit Zulfiqar and Mrs. B. fell. {The defence asked the translator to translate her answer.} Interpreter: She said that she hit Zulfiqar and then she followed her. {At this point the judge requests clarification} Judge: Who followed who? Mrs. B. followed? [TI: 07m:36s]</p> <p>Interpreter: Who followed Mrs. B.?</p> <p>She fell backwards. Judge: Sorry, I don't understand, who followed who? [TI: 07m:40s] Interpreter: Who pushed who, was it Mrs. B., Zulfiqar or someone else?</p> <p>(In English) Zulfiqar started it, no Mrs. B. started it, then Zulfiqar started the trouble.</p> <p>(Note#3: My Mother-In Law responded in English emphasising that Mrs. B. had started it to try to cover up her mistake of using her sons name first as being the agitator of the argument. later on it is proven that Zulfiqar provoked Mrs. B. verbally and physically [Line No.787,2173].)</p> <p>Interpreter: and then? My son Zulfiqar pushed Mrs. B. and said you are smaller than me how dare you try to hit me. Interpreter: Zulfiqar pushed her. (Note#4: The interpreter has left out what Zulfiqar had said to Mrs. B.)</p> <p>Defence Lawyer: Where were you when Zulfiqar pushed her? Interpreter: Where were you when Zulfiqar pushed her? [TI: 08m:20s]</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My Mother-In Law's evidence in court proves that her son Zulfiqar Zaman (defendant) was also an agitator; the defendant purposely pushed Mrs. B.'s buttons and thought that this would give a desired response from Mrs. B. giving the defendant a self initiated reason to beat her up in the way the plaintiffs had both stated in their statements to the police. Mrs. B. was punched to the front of the face, twice in succession, firstly to the forehead followed by to the left of her mouth near the upper chin. The blows where so strong that she feel back to her left side she became unconscious and as she lie there on the floor in that state Moqsood Zulfiqar Zaman punched her a further three times more to her face. While his brother Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman assaulted Mr. B. from behind him, forcing him out of the TV Room into the corridor and then wilfully closed the door to the TV room, grinning and standing guard, allowing his brother to continue beating their sister Mrs. B while unconscious on the floor in the TV Room. 2. The defendant used unnecessary force on Mrs. B., stood directly in front of her in a intimidating way and as she stood her ground unable to move as the defendant was towering over her and invading her personal space the defendant assaulted her in the way the plaintiffs had written in their statements to the police. 3. It is clearly proven that the defendant Zulfiqar Zaman was not a peace keeper at all and that the defendant lied in court about his role, a proven fact that my Mother-In Law had supported her sons lies and perjured herself in that regard.

Evidence Type:	Question				
1.3 What happened to Mrs. B.?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defence Lawyer	When:	Transcript Line no. 397, [TI: 08m:42s]
What was reply:	<p>Mrs. B. fell over the table and hurt herself on the table. She hit the table and then Iftikhar said to Mr. A. out in the corridor to get out of the house. He said you came here to make trouble.</p> <p>I also fell to the ground and hurt myself. I did not mind that I had fallen.</p> <p>Mrs. B. fell over and then I followed her to the ground and got hurt in my eye. I did not mind that my children were fighting, I did not complain about my injury and I did not discipline them with a stick¹¹.</p> <p>When Mrs. B. fell backward and as I was next to her we both fell backward as was my son who pushed her as I fell to the ground. She Mrs. B. fell first then I fell.</p> <p>Defence Lawyer: Did you see Mr. A., anytime during that ensue? At that point he was in the room near the door..., then at the passageway.</p> <p>(Note: By my Mother-In Law's account, Mr. A. was in the TV Room (Line No.321,334,431) , which is written in both Mr. A.'s Police Witness Statements. Mrs. B. could not have fallen backwards onto the table which was far on her right and not directly in front of her. Refer to supporting document: Knitted Room picture and Mrs. B. facial injuries.pdf, also video evidence of the furniture in the room show that the table would have been too far away for Mrs. B. to fall over it as she was placed at the fireplace surrounded by her brother Zulfiqar and my Mother-In Law on either side. Mr. Zulfiqar Zaman (defendant) had punched Mrs. B. and in the ensue, my Mother-In Law tried to stop her son from continuing his barrage of punches and got injured by her son on his return punch, his elbow hitting his mother in the eye.)</p>				
Proven:	<p>1. For the second time my Mother-In Law has proven in her evidence in court that Mr. A. was in the TV Room before the assaults began both on his wife Mrs. B. and on himself by Mohammad Iftikhar Zaman (Defendant 2).</p> <p>2. It is proven that my Mother-In Law was hit in the eye by her sons elbow which was raised while he punched Mrs. B. squarely in the face.</p>				

Evidence Type:	Question				
1.4 Where was Iftikhar at that time?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defence Lawyer	When:	Transcript Line no. 455, [TI: 11m:39s]
What was reply:	<p>Iftikhar ..I think was in the smaller room, the TV room standing in the corner of the room.</p> <p>Judge: So Mr. A. was standing there as well? Interpreter: Was Mr. A. standing behind you?</p> <p>(Note#1: The Judge understood that Mr. A. was in the TV room near the door, he asked a further question to confirm this , but the interpreter knew that for her to give a yes or no answer from my Mother-In Law would lead to confirmation of this, the interpreter</p>				

¹¹ In the Yaseen Ege murder case, his mentally disturbed mother said, "I was getting very wild and I hit Yaseen with a stick on his back like a dog.". This has connotations to what my mother in-law said in Court in line no. 421 when she explained in her own words to the Judge how she saw her two sons Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman and Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman as animals that needed to be "..disciplined with a stick".

	<p>asked a different question to that asked by the judge to get a different answer which he again further made up to suit an incorrect response to the initial question raised by the judge.</p> <p>Note#2: My Mother-In Law confirms that Iftikhar her younger son was in the TV room standing in the corner of the room as shown in (Line 3028) Sketch 2: TV Room according to my Mother-In Law Qb Defence Lawyer Line no. 298-524.jpg. This is further proven by Mr. Zulfiqar Zaman's own accounts that prove that Iftikhar was indeed in the TV Room when questioned by the Judge on Line 1697.)</p>
--	--

Evidence Type:		Question			
1.5 What happened at that stage?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defence Lawyer	When:	Transcript Line no. 505, 899 [TI 13m:23s]
What was reply:	<p>He swore at us and then left. I did not care about his swearing, no police came that evening and we thought Mrs. B. has gone now. They left and no police came to our house, we thought the matter closed until two weeks later the police arrive at our doorstep, two! Weeks! later!</p> <p>No phone, No communication about what had happened, nothing from them, other than making an allegation that I hit him. (In English) "I no touching him".</p> <p>(Note: My Mother-In Law clearly states that she did not physically touch or hit Mr. A. But, in her own evidence in court, on line 898, my Mother-In Law clearly admits that she did physically assault Mr. A. Her evidence is shown below:</p> <p>Prosecutor: Your husband was not in good health at the time, was he?</p> <p>That's what I've been trying to say, (in English) I am a patients, my husband is a patient, I am also unwell as well as my husband,(Foreign) I hit him because he and my daughter had no right to speak to us about inheritance matters, she did not pay anything towards the properties. [TI: 30m:51s]</p>				
Proven:	<p>1. My Mother-In Law clearly states that she had not touched Mr. A., but it has been proven that her own evidence in court under oath on line 898, was that she had physically hit Mr. A. while trying to reason with him in her own way. This was proven by her own words¹² and further proven by the defendant Zulfiqar Zaman in his evidence in court¹³. My Mother-In Law lied in court concerning the assault upon Mr. A. in the kitchen and tried to cover up her actions as though it did not happen.</p>				

Evidence Type:		Question			
1.6 Right!, Mr. A.! was standing at the far end of the kitchen!					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defendant	When:	Transcript Line no. 552, [TI: 15m 18s]
What was reply:	<p>She confirms by grunting - Yes.</p> <p>Defendant: My mother was standing in front of Mr. A. And the one side was Mr. A. and the other-side was Mrs. B. near the kitchen sink.</p> <p>That's exactly how it was.</p>				

¹² Line No. 1149 (My Mother-In Law)

¹³ Line No. 2060, 2092 (defendant)

Defendant: You were standing near Mr. A. and near Mrs. B.?

Yes that's correct, I was standing in front of him. {Facing him}

Defendant: Yes! ..Right, before Iftikhar joined the kitchen; Mr. A. was saying in his statement that my mother had hit him. That my mother had hit him. Is that true? .. Mr. A. accused my mother of hitting Mr. A.!

No!, I did not hit him. –

Defendant: Mr. A. in his statement said that all he wanted to do was get out of the kitchen and leave. Did my mother, at anytime try and stop him from leaving the kitchen?

Listen, all I just said, that **you should not fight**. And that my son did not steal anything. He did not steal anything, these properties are mine and we can give these to anyone whom we please, you both had no right to anything. [TI: 17m: 26s]
(Her exact word used is "Quno", which means physical fighting.)

What do you think? Judge sir, what right did he have to come to my house and ask for rights to my properties and make arguments?

(Note#1: My Mother-In Law clearly confirms that her sons both Zulfiqar and Iftikhar did try, unsuccessfully to violently attack and assault Mr. A. in the kitchen, but were held back by Zulfiqar's older brother who was present in the kitchen the whole time.)

(Note#2: My Mother-In Law on line 596 addresses the Judge directly in court and asks him his opinion whether he (the judge) would have done any different, trying to explain her sons actions and reactions and their unsuccessful attempt in assaulting Mr. A. in the kitchen. None of this was translated to the judge by the interpreter but had been recorded.)

(Note#3: Mr. A. was not at the far end of the kitchen as stated by both the defendants and my Mother-In Law herself, that would make it impossible for Mrs. B. to be near Mr. A. when she was standing next to the sink which is at the middle of the kitchen located near the side door leading to the rear garden area (now an extension of the kitchen). By looking at the evidence and referring to sketch 8: Kitchen according to Mr Zulfiqar Zaman Qb Judge Line no. 1540-1679.jpg on line 3133 the true position of Mr. A. can be determined and this shows that both Iftikhar and Zulfiqar were in arms reach to Mr. A. than how they make out in court, to deceive the Judge into believing that Mr. A. was far away for that to have conceivably attempted to strike him. Also refer to picture of the kitchen line no. 3243, Kitchen in 2D and a plan drawing of the kitchen which clearly shows where the sink is in relation to people placement.)

(Note#4: Mr. A. wanted to collect his wife and children and drive them safely home. He and his wife Mrs. B. had no intention of causing an argument or plan a fight. These are absurdities that cannot be attributed to Mrs. B. or especially Mr. A. as he wanted to leave the moment he entered the property. My Mother-In Law along with her sons blatantly lied in court and skewed the judges understanding of the events that occurred that night, if the judge were to have read the transcript of both my Mother-In Law and the defendants evidence, he would have understood the severity of their actions against Mr. A. and Mrs. B. both in the kitchen and in the TV Room.)

(Note#5: It has already been established that my Mother In-Law did physically assault

	<p>Mr. A. In the kitchen, yet still when questioned of this by the defendant she replies that no assault took place and reaffirms that she did not touch Mr. A. This would suggest that Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman and his mother both tried to cover-up the truth and perverted the course of justice and in doing so should be charged with perjury.)</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My Mother-In Law clearly states that she had not touched Mr. A., saying " No!, I did not hit him ", but it has been proven that her own evidence in court under oath on line 898, was that she had physically hit Mr. A. while trying to reason with him in her own way. This is further proof that my Mother-In Law lied in court concerning the assault upon Mr. A. in the kitchen and tried to cover up her actions as though it did not happen. 2. My Mother-In Law clearly confirms that her sons both Zulfiqar and Iftikhar did try, unsuccessfully to, violently attack and assault Mr. A., but were held back by Zulfiqar's older brother who was present in the kitchen the whole time. She makes reference to this in her own words as she replies to a question from the defendant, " Listen, all I just said, that you should not fight. Also, my Mother-In Law's exact word used is "Quno", which means physical fighting.) 3. It has been proven the precise placement of Mr. A. in the Kitchen. His position shows that both defendants were in arms distance from the plaintiff and could have launched a physical attack upon Mr. A. as he had stated in his two statements to the police. Mr. A. was not at the FAR END of the kitchen as stated by both the defendants and my Mother-In Law herself, that would make it impossible for Mrs. B. to be near Mr. A. when she was standing next to the sink which is at the middle of the kitchen, located near the side door leading to the rear garden area (now an extension of the kitchen). By looking at the evidence and referring to sketch 8: Kitchen according to Mr Zulfiqar Zaman Qb Judge Line no. 1540-1679.jpg on line 3133 the true position of Mr. A. can be determined and this shows that both Iftikhar and Zulfiqar were in arms reach to Mr. A. compared to how they made it out in court, to deceive and lie to the Judge into believing that Mr. A. was far away for that to have conceivably attempted to strike him. Also refer to picture of the kitchen line no. 3243, Kitchen in 2D and a plan drawing of the kitchen which clearly shows where the sink is in relation to people placement. Both defendants lied in that respect and were supported by their Mother-In Law's acceptance that Mr. A. was at the FAR END of the kitchen shown in Line No. 552 which has been proven to be untrue.

Evidence Type:		Question			
1.7 Right, when I came down did I, When I was in the kitchen. Did I try to hit Mr. A. at anytime?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defendant	When:	Transcript Line no. 615, [TI: 18m 30s]
What was reply:	<p>No, not at anytime.</p> <p>Defendant: At anytime in the kitchen did I have any sort of verbal or physical harm upon my sister?</p> <p>No. no. no.</p> <p>Defendant: Was there any dialog between myself and my sister in the kitchen?</p> <p>No, no. I was the only one speaking aloud. (Exact words where "Us'a Akhir sey" which means I alone was speaking aloud.) [TI:19m 15s]</p>				

	(Note#1: My Mother-In Law has already confirmed that some fight had ensued in the kitchen and tried to get the Judge to understand their predicament. Here her son is suggesting in parrot fashion that No such attempted assault occurred in the kitchen to convince the judge that no impropriety had occurred and that Mr. A. had made up the story in his witness statement. This of course is untrue, Mr. A.'s witness statement clearly states that an unsuccessful assault by both defendants had been stopped by Zulfiqar's older brother and that my Mother-In Law had physically assault Mr. A. prior to her sons entering the kitchen to which she admits in court in having reason to do that on line No. 1147)
Proven:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My Mother-In Law has already proven that she had assaulted Mr. A. and that both defendants had unsuccessfully tried to physically harm Mr. A. in the kitchen. Here my Mother-In Law has lied again and her son Zulfiqar Zaman (Defendant 1) has also upheld the lie of his actions that he had undertaken alongside his brother Iftikhar (Defendant 2). 2. My Mother-In Law lies about her son Zulfiqar Zaman (Defendant) who did speak to both Mr. A. and Mrs. B. in the kitchen. Is it possible that he would have just remained silent throughout the time Mr. A. was in the kitchen? For a man who has come to court and has been very vocal in court, it is very unlikely he remained silent as my Mother-In Law had said in her evidence. She obviously lied to protect both her sons. 3. It is proven that my Mother-In Law had spoken aloud in the kitchen as explained in Mr. A. witness statements that his Mother-In Law had chanted aloud while hitting his chest more than three times¹⁴.

Evidence Type:	Question				
1.8 At that point, my mother was, a little bit, how can I say? Aware that she had done wrong. At that point my father entered the kitchen. He also came in the kitchen and was present there as well, is that not true?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defendant	When:	Transcript Line no. 655, [TI: 20m 25s]
What was reply:	<p>Defendant: Did Mr. A.! not say that my father's decision was not wrong? After my father made the remark, What your dad has done is wrong and should have left a {legal} will? Did not my father say that? I mean did Mr. A. not say that?</p> <p>Yes, this is what he had said, my son said what right have you got to ask for inheritance or a stake in our estate.—</p> <p>Defendant: Right!, sorry, before err, I wanted to say, while I was in the kitchen did I attempt to hit Mr. A. at anytime?</p> <p>No, he never hit anyone at anytime. He's lying.</p> <p>Defendant: My brother Iftikhar was also present in that same room?</p> <p>Yes we were all in the room. {Exact words were "Usee Sahrey Vera Sa", translate English "We were all in the Room".}</p> <p>Yes, he was in the passageway.</p>				

¹⁴ Line No. 280, 1073, 1114, 1149.

	<p>Defendant: Mr. A.! wasn't in the room and could not have seen what was happening in that room.</p> <p>(Note#1: How is it possible for Mr. A. to legally have a right to the inheritance of the late Mohammad Zaman (senior) when he was not a blood relative?)</p> <p>(Note#2: Mr. Zulfiqar Zaman wanted to emphasize again in court that he had not hit Mr. A., but this was not what Mr. A. had alleged, he said both defendants jumped toward him and that between the defendants and Mr. A. was their Mother and Zulfiqar's older brother holding them back from carrying out a full assault upon Mr. A.)</p> <p>(Note#3: Mr. Zulfiqar Zaman wanted to emphasize with a measure of guilt that Mr. A. could not have seen what had happened in that room. But my Mother-In Law's evidence clearly shows that Mr. A. was in the room with Iftikhar , that Mr. A. did see the assault upon Mrs. B. his wife and he, Mr. A. was assaulted from the rear by Iftikhar as stated in Mr. A.'s witness statement and police statement afterwards.)</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<p>1. My Mother-In Law for the second time accuses Mr. A. of lying in court when asked about whether the defendant had attempted to hit Mr. A. But it has been proven that both defendants had tried to launch themselves toward Mr. A. to physically assault him, so this answer from my Mother-In Law indicates that she wilfully perjured and lied as well as the defendants in an attempt to cover-up their guilty actions in the Kitchen¹⁵.</p> <p>2. My Mother-In Law has proven that her youngest son Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman (Defendant 2) was indeed in the TV Room and further states that "We were all in the room", indicating that Mr. A. was also present in the TV Room. This is the fourth time Mr. A. has been proven to be in the TV Room, whereas both defendants deny Mr. A. being in the TV Room at all. Obviously both defendants lied in court.</p>

Evidence Type:		Question			
1.9 What was Mr. A. doing in the room?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Defendant	When:	Transcript Line no. 753, [TI: 24m:36s]
What was reply:	<p>He was lying, he was standing in the passageway.</p> <p>Defendant: There was a coffee table, a heavy wooden coffee table was in front of my father.</p> <p>Yes, there was a coffee table, where my daughter fell over.</p> <p>Defendant: Zulfiqar's older brother was a person there as well, quite near Mrs. B.</p> <p>(Note#1: Mr Zaman uses the word "person", as though he wanted to emphasise and place doubt on whether he was there at all?)</p> <p>Defendant: And Mrs. B. after I had said to her, that you should calm the situation down and not instigate this fights every time you come round. That's what I said to her, that every time you come round and then you have an</p>				

¹⁵ Line No. 272 (My Mother-In Law), 1572 (Defendant)

	<p>argument relating to this.</p> <p>Yes, he said that to her, and her eyes were popping out.</p> <p>(Note#2: My Mother-In Law has provided clear evidence that her son Zulfiqar was provoking Mrs. B. verbally by making her angry.)</p> <p>Her eyes were popping out and she hit my son.</p> <p>We had worked on the sewing machines day and night {to pay for these properties.} [TI: 27m:43s]</p> <p>(Note#3: Mother, Father and Daughter Mrs. B. worked on the sewing machines day and night sometimes into the next morning to complete orders while her brothers danced in clubs and socialised , no other family members financially contributed toward the purchasing of the properties. The work was cash in hand and work from home).</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Mr. A.'s Witness statement he states that he was in the passageway tying up his children's shoes, making them ready to leave. He then wanted to know why there was a delay and walked into the TV Room with his two children on either hand to ask Mrs. B. to hurry up as he wanted his family to leave. My Mother-In Law was correct to having said that Mr. A. was in the passageway but lied about his whereabouts before, during and after the assault upon Mrs. B. by the defendants. She wilfully lied to cover-up what had happened to protect her sons, both defendants and herself who had instigated the whole argument in the kitchen in the first place? 2. It has been proven that the coffee table was situated and position ½ meter away from the fireplace and that Mrs. B. could not have fallen over, behind or toward the table as suggested by My Mother-In Law and both defendants. They collectively lied and made up a story of their father the late Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) to having his walking stick at her feet and she may have fallen over it, even citing new evidence in court that stacked chairs were nearby and Mrs. B. could have fallen upon these. Since no table was directly present, walking stick is clearly ruled out or stacked chairs to have caused the injuries, it is proven that Zulfiqar Zaman had indeed punched Mrs. B. in the face twice, thereafter three times more as she lay unconscious on the floor at the fireplace. The marks on her back prove she landed on the fireplace end. The walking stick scenario would be a problem for the defendant in that if Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) were to have survived his ill fated trip to Kashmir mountains he would have clearly proved that his stick was not the cause of Mrs. B.'s fall. It should also be noted that upon the death of Mohammed Zaman Senior, Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman had instructed by telephone his wife who lived at the very same address not to allow specifically Mr. A. into the parental house during the wake at the property, especially the room where the assaults took place in the event Mr. A. were to gather further information about furniture placements and take photographic evidence that would harm their defence. Maqsood Zulfiqar's wife was very verbal, citing strongly her husband's wishes and her views to have Mr. A. Removed from the property. 3. It has been proven that My Mother-In Law's son Zulfiqar Zaman was provoking Mrs. B. verbally by making her angry. " Yes, he said that to her, and her eyes were popping out.". Mrs. B.'s actions were provoked by Zulfiqar's badgering as Mr. A. had written in his witness statements to the police, an event he witnessed while he was inside the TV Room. This is the fifth time Mr. A. has been proven to have been in the TV Room.

	4. It is further proven that the defendant was angry and provoked Mrs. B. by saying that “..you came here to hit us” and “he {Zulfiqar} was angry!” , Line No. 356 .
--	--

Evidence Type: Question	
1.10 OK, emm When, when the incident happened between me and Mrs. B., Iftikhar was holding me, and Zulfiqar’s older brother was holding me. Wasn’t that correct?	
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law
By Whom:	Defendant
When:	Transcript Line no. 834, [TI: 28m 10s]
What was reply:	<p>Yes! that’s what happened – (Her exact words are “Ayhe Gul-hai” which translates - that’s what happened.)</p> <p>(Note#1: Mr Zaman is now confirming that both him and his mother saw Iftikhar in the room holding him, Mr Zaman later under cross examination stating that they all jumped in and they where a heap on the floor (Line No.1747), this would suggest that Iftikhar could not have been in the passageway as my Mother-In Law, Mr Zulfiqar and Mr Iftikhar had earlier stated in their evidence in court. This would also suggest that both their accounts of the events happening after the Assault on Mrs. B. were untrue by their own accounts as evidence.)</p> <p>Defendant: {shouts} MR. A.! was not present in the room at that time.</p> <p>This is your fault, he was in the passageway.</p> <p>(Note#2: The defendant Zulfiqar Zaman clearly states that at that particular time Mr. A. was not there, but this would suggest that later on he is in the room. His choice of words clearly indicates this.)</p> <p>(Note#3: My Mother-In Law in her own words states in the first part of her answer that she blamed Zulfiqar for the assault upon her daughter which is later proved, but in the second part of her answer informs the court where she believed Mr. A. was. Remember the mirror.)</p>
Proven:	<p>1. Here the defendant admits to having carried out an incident upon Mrs. B. Since the incident reported by both plaintiffs was disregarded by the Judge who summed the incident as a simple lunge without physical contact. A lunge is proven not have caused the injuries, there's no table in front of Mrs. B., No stacked chairs so what caused five multiple facial injuries at different places on the front of her face? Our opinion is that the district Judge was wrong, to having been unable to fit the Police & GP evidence, especially the physical injuries to Mrs. B., the truthfulness of the plaintiff’s statements that fit the evidence and the inconsistent banter by the evidence given by the defendants. It has been proven that a lunge was wrong, five fist punches squarely to Mrs. B.'s face would have been correct and a jail sentence more appropriately fitting the crime especially when the assaults where planned by Zulfiqar Zaman and his brother Iftikhar Zaman prior to entering the TV Room. We ask is there any reason why the Judge could not impose a jail sentence in the lower magistrates court? It does not take rocket science to realise why the sentences where watered down for both the defendants. Judges hiding behind guidelines is a poor excuse to apply the correct justice when clear perjury was undertaken by the defendants and their mother. The prosecution where unable to apply for the correct sentence and</p>

	<p>referred the sentencing to the Judge who under the adversarial laws took it upon himself to reduce the severity of the assaults to Mr. A. And Mrs. B under the guise of trying to fix a broken family. This was a pathetic reason to having watered down the correct application of the law on criminals. A review of the District judge's previous cases should be done as a matter of judicial procedure to see if the correct sentencing has been applied in other similar cases overseen by the very same Judge, taking into account the extent to which the defence in this criminal case had at every juncture presented poorly and sought the framework of the Judges opinion to lessen the sentences¹⁶.</p> <p>2. The defendant Zulfiqar Zaman clearly states while questioning his mother Mrs. Zaman that, "at that particular time Mr. A. was not there", but this would suggest that later on he is in the room. His choice of words clearly indicates this. It is therefore proven a sixth time that Mr. A. was in the TV Room before, during and after the assault had taken place upon his wife Mrs. B.</p>				
Evidence Type:	Question				
1.11 Mother-In Law, it quite clear that on the 29th April of last year there was various tension between on the one hand Iftikhar and Zulfiqar and on the other hand Mr A. & Mrs B.					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Prosecution	When:	Transcript Line no. 883, [Ti: 29m:58s]
What was reply:	<p>They were the ones that did the trouble not us; they my daughter and her husband fought me.</p> <p>(in English) I am a patient , my husband is a patient, we are both patients {reference made to their Hospital appointments}</p> <p>{At this point my Mother-In Law begins to shout aloud in court.}</p> <p>That's what I've been trying to say!, (in English) I am a patients, my husband is a patient, I am also unwell as well as my husband,(Foreign) I hit him because he and my daughter had no right to speak to us about inheritance matters, she did not pay anything towards the properties. [Ti: 30m:51s]</p> <p>(Note#1: Here my Mother-In Law clearly states that she physically hit Mr. A. in the manner described by Mr. A. in his witness statements to the Police in the Kitchen after she had clearly instigated the argument. She has clearly constantly lied in a court of law up to this point in the trial and has proven that she wilfully carried out perjury to support the criminal behaviour of her two sons whom had both also lied in court to matters material to a judicial proceeding. On Line 2107, Iftikhar (Defendant 2) is proven to have been in a state of being upset in the kitchen.)</p> <p>(Note#2: The interpreter has not translated the correct evidence given by my Mother-In Law, in her response my Mother-In Law clearly states that she physically hit Mr. A.)</p> <p>Prosecutor: The tension was due to your husband transferring of property to Iftikhar and Zulfiqar triggered your anger, isn't it?</p> <p>Yes. [Ti: 31m:10s]</p>				

¹⁶ The transcript clearly show the defence pleading with the Judge to lower the sentences and this was achieved by the Judges own summation at the end of the trial. Clearly Judges should not be shot gunned by the defence in this way when their clients have been found guilty and victims are clearly denied the full application of the law. At no point where the victims allowed to participate with the prosecution in the trial or indeed asked for any opinion. We propose that all cases involving bilingual interpreters in the Lower courts should be digitally recorded in future, recorded not just by the Judge who at one point during the trial had to run out of the court room to get a power lead for his notebook that was running out of battery, but also by recording by an electronic digital media device as a means to reviewing judicial fairness by the judiciary. A change in the law is requested.

Prosecutor: He said you were angered by the fact that your husband had transferred the properties, had been given to Iftikhar and Zulfiqar?

Because of that they became jealous, making us unhappy, she {Mrs. B.} asked why did you do that? ..Yes!

(Note#3: My Mother-In Law is explaining her reasons why she became angry and began her physical assault upon Mr. A. in the kitchen. Her son Zulfiqar also agrees that she did wrong (line No. 656). She blames both plaintiffs to have put her in that state and takes no responsibility for her actions, believing that it was her right to assault Mr. A. after her daughter had allegedly put her in a state of anger. Even going as far as to reasoning with the Judge in her own language. Both plaintiffs deny ever placing my Mother-In Law in that state, it is clearly understood that my Mother-In Law had motives, that go far beyond the night of 29th April 2011, that she was prepared for an argument that has been proven she had started and was supported by her two sons (defendants) whom had up till that point had orchestrated probate fraud and other illegal frauds whereby they were to become sole beneficiaries to their father £7.4million estate upon his death and subsequently upon their mothers death. This clear motive of greed dictated their behaviour and actions on the night of 29th April 2011.)

I was deeply affected by their jealousy. My sons did not hit anyone, my son did not hit my daughter, she hit my son, she lied to us all in court. [Ti:32m:01s]

(Note#4: My Mother-In Law was standing, facing her daughter Mrs. B. in the TV Room, with the mirror behind her daughter (Line No.1275) in close proximity to her(Line No.370.), facing her with her son Zulfiqar to her left shoulder (Sketch 7, Line 3115), witnessing her son Zulfiqar physically assaulting Mrs. B. by multiple punches to her face (facial bruising shown in Knitted Room picture and Mrs. B. facial Injuries, Line no. 3267 - 3294) according to Mrs. B. and Mr. A.'s witness statements, punching Mrs. B. at least two times and a further 3 times, the courts verdict was that the defendants assault was proven yet my Mother-In Law still continues to lie in court that her son did not do anything. That her son Zulfiqar was innocent of any wrong doing and had not hit Mrs. B. The courts deliberation was that of a lunge, that Mrs. B.'s injuries were a result of the coffee table and fall to the floor, but the evidence proves otherwise, that the coffee table was not in front of Mrs. B. or behind her, that there was not enough space for such a frontal fall to have occurred and that falling to the floor could not have sustained such injuries to her face. What about Mrs. B.'s injuries to her back from the corner of the fireplace? The defendant understanding the weakness of his evidence to explain Mrs. B.'s injuries goes further to place more doubt by stating that chairs were in proximity of her fall (line No. 1803), but this is clearly not true when looking at the evidence provided by my Mother-In Law and the historical video evidence and picture evidence of the TV Room floor plan. The judges understanding was flawed and riddled with hearsay to fit a lenient sentence, that of a lunge. This in contrast to the evidence provided to the court by the Police and GP was a ridiculous assumption that of a lunge without physical touch. It boggles belief that such a violent assault upon both plaintiffs was tried in the lower courts of the magistrates court when in retrospective review of the trial, this case should have been trailed in a crown court handing out prison sentences for both defendants. The CPS should review their accounts for their lack of professionalism.)

(Note#5: My Mother-In Law clearly lied about the position of the coffee table in relation to the position of herself, Mrs. B. and her son Zulfiqar in the TV Room prior, during and after the assault that she witnessed that took place. She saw Mr. A. through the mirror (Line No. 1275) and her evidence clearly proves that Mr. A. was in the TV Room (Line no. 314, 321), but later believes Mr. A. was in the passageway corridor. This was proven in Mr. A.'s statement of events as Mr. A. was initially in the passageway getting

his children ready and then entered the TV Room before the assaults took place upon Mrs. B., then for Mr. A. to be assaulted from behind by Mohammed Iftikhar (defendant 2) while holding in hand both his daughters¹⁷ (*A cowardly act by a pathetic man who attacked from behind while Mr. A. held his daughters on either hand*). The defendants evidence is that Mr. A. could not have witnessed what had occurred in the TV room as he was not present, however the defendants own evidence and choice of words keeping in mind that Mr Zulfiqar has been brought up in England from birth, the majority of his life in England and has been taught to primary and secondary school levels in English, clearly states that **at that particular moment** when Zulfiqar was agitating Mrs. B., Mr. A. was absent from the room (Line no.849) but does not negate the possibility that suggests that Mr. A. was present later on in the TV Room to witness the actual assault as written in Mr. A's statement to the Police.)

(Note#6: My Mother-In Law also explains that she becomes injured as she fell (Line no. 417), when asked by whom she points the finger at her son Zulfiqar, but explains that she did not mind being physically hit by her son¹⁸. If she was standing to Zulfiqar's right¹⁹, she must have been hit in the face, to have injured her eye by the corner of his raised right elbow during the assault on Mrs. B. This is by far, fair to say the correct outcome of my Mother-In Law's Injuries to her eye as Mr. Zaman is far taller than his mother and hit her by accident while physically assaulting his sister Mrs. B. . Where is Mr. A. while this is happening?, he is walking out of the room with his children in either hand as Iftikhar (Defendant 2) lunges toward Mr. A. and physically punches him twice squarely to his back, followed by his head and finally while Mr. A. stumbles to the corridor/passageway²⁰ through the door entrance, it is at this point in time that my Mother-In Law witnesses Mr. A. in the passageway as she states in her evidence. Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman(defendant 2) kicks Mr. A. in the back once more forcing him into the middle of the corridor outside the TV Room. Iftikhar then verbally challenges Mr. A. who is in no fit state to fight back, Iftikhar's final action involved closing the door to the TV Room to allow his brother Zulfiqar to continue his beating upon Mrs. B. Mr. A. called the police on his mobile phone. It would also be fair to say that my Mother-In Law could not have seen Mr. A. through a closed door calling the police on his mobile phone, that this information was provided to her in consultation with her son Iftikhar whom in his evidence gave an unconvincing story of Mr. A.'s brawl and Iftikhar's subsequent alleged injury to his arm, to which my Mother-In Law had referenced in her evidence (line No. 1367). This fabricated lie of a brawl occurring is one that the District Judge accepted in his summary and without provocation shed blame to the plaintiffs which was extremely unfair when all the plaintiffs had done was state the truth in court and that the defendants and their witnesses had clearly lied throughout their evidences to cover up the severity of what they had done, which prompted the Judge to give reason to hand down a lesser sentence to Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman who was found to have lied with exaggeration, unconvincingly while providing his evidence during the trial²¹.)

¹⁷ It is the most horrific act for a human to inflict upon another human being, less carrying out murder to having planned the physical assault upon another human-being who was in no fair position to fight back, with his back turned the plaintiff had both his hands tied to his children and having been attacked from behind by a coward, a pathetic degenerative piss-shit, culturally inept actions of a deranged criminal. Such individual's should have no place in a decent society and as a matter of course should be rehabilitated, not simply given time-off for carefully planning and executing human misery having been caught in the act (*an assault and perjury*).

¹⁸ A biased response and stance to take as though My Mother-In Law approved of witnessing her son Zulfiqar physically strike her daughter Mrs. B.. after My Mother-In Law's alleged anguish she had been experiencing up till that point. My Mother-In Law does get injured in her eye by her sons raised elbow as the defendant beats his sister Mrs. B.. directly in front of her.

¹⁹ Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman (defendant) is right handed.

²⁰ Corridor and passageway are interchangeable words; they mean the same thing in this context.

²¹ The District Judge orchestrated a dire level of stupidity to allow such a lair to get away with an assault of the type that Mr. A. had to firstly endure on the night of 29th April 2011 and then to have listened to the Judge in his summary that ignored the truth and create a version using his imagination aided by the defendants which has been proven

<p>Proven:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proven that my Mother-In Law clearly states that she physically hit Mr. A. in the manner described by Mr. A. in his witness statements to the Police in the Kitchen after she had clearly instigated the argument. She has clearly lied in court up to this point in the trial and has proven that she wilfully carried out perjury to support the criminal behaviour of her two sons whom had also both lied in court to matters material to a judicial proceeding. 2. It is proven that my Mother-In Law when asked by the prosecutor about her becoming angry is in line with Mr. A.'s witness statement that my Mother-In Law in her anger began physically assaulting him with both her hands, beating Mr. A. more than three times. My Mother-In Law goes on further to explain her motive for carrying out the assault upon Mr. A. in the kitchen, the prosecutor questions, " He said you were angered by the fact that your husband had transferred the properties, had been given to Iftikhar and Zulfiqar? ", and my Mother-In Law replies, " Because of that they became jealous, making us unhappy, she {Mrs. B.} asked why did you do that?". Mr. A. had nothing to be jealous about his in-laws, he owns five successful properties of his own and as stated at the trial that he had no designs on any of his father-in laws properties or assets, even citing that he was not entitled to anything his in-laws owned. 3. It is proven that each member of the Zaman family had a motive to harm the plaintiffs that evening. My Mother-In Law was in her own words, "... deeply affected by their jealousy. My sons did not hit anyone, my son did not hit my daughter, she hit my son, she lied to us all in court.", my Mother-In Law lied in court about her sons being innocent when they where proven guilty. The defendants where carrying out probate fraud and financial fraud while embezzling their fathers bank accounts. Iftikhar (Defendant 2) had removed his father's joint name off a 1.2 million pound property without the consensus of family members, taking advantage of a his ill father by borrowing £150K for payment for his residential property at Hale Road, South Woodford, knowing full well how ill his father was and financial unstable he was, also issuing property leases at the same address to sum of £250,000 to pay for two properties in Highbury and south London (lying to mortgage companies that he was a first time buyer). Zulfiqar Zaman had remortgaged his father's properties so that he could amass £350K to purchase a shop in Milton Road, Hampton TW12, then having his ill father who was with income troubles pay the remortgage costs while he rented out the shop and upper flat and lived with his father in Hackney, running a photography business without any form of return payment to his financially struggling father, keeping all the proceeds. He certainly did not hide that fact that he was financially bankrupt to avoid paying a large sum in compensation to Mrs. B. after being found guilty of the assault in court that the Judge reluctantly decided to impose a £100 compensation which equates to £20 per punch to Mrs. B face. He jumped in excitement in court when he heard the compensation value and quickly answered "Yes!" to paying the amount in full to the court before leaving that day. This accomplished while he was sitting on £2.5 million assets and incomes generated from rent and business leases estimated in the region of £2,500 a month, tax free²²!
-----------------------	---

by his Mother-In Law to have happened in contrary to the manner written down in Mr. A's two witness statements to the police.

²² It should be noted that such a disgraceful judgement on part of the judiciary to accept the word of a habitual bigot and compulsive liar as played out by Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman in court must be a reflection on why so many victims in many legal cases have felt let down by the British adversarial system of English Law. "Only in retrospect of a recorded trail can we truly understand the level to which mankind can digress to the level of human excrement and still stand tall believing they had done good."

	<p>(A disgusting culturally inept human being). A motive to assault Mr. A. as stated by Zulfiqar Zaman during the trial Line No. 2257 where Iftikhar had a spat with Mr. A. for the past two years. Iftikhar saw his opportunity and took it, thinking later that nothing will come of it and to prove it would be extremely difficult for the prosecutors, how right he was when he was handed a 12 month unconditional sentence. Also to have been both a Director and Secretary named slightly differently as; "Iftqhar Zaman, same address, director ref: C11252557" to his brothers Zulfiqar's company Videocraft Limited with a corporate debt of £55K. A further motive to carryout probate fraud having debts in excess of £55,000 between them. The law has been proven to be an ass, referring to guidelines that are extremely unfair to the crimes against victims, and designed to appease the criminal.</p> <p>4.It is proven that in Mr. A.'s statement to the police that Mr. A. saw the defendant raise his arm up to strike Mrs. B. and in the process my Mother-In Law was injured in her eye as the defendant had begin his multiple rounds of punches so quickly and with heavy precision that his mother was injured, a fact that is further supported by my Mother-In Law's own evidence in court that she forgave her son from injuring her (Line No. 1250) and even joked it off in Line No. 419. My Mother-In Law's manor unto which she stood and saw the assaults and lied in court is beyond belief. After swearing an oath on a religious book (The Holy Quran) and in witness of the Crown, having lied to the extent that she did is clearly proven perjury and cannot be dismissed.</p>
--	---

Evidence Type: Question	
1.12 The question was, since the arrests, Is it the case that you have discussed this matter with your two sons? That was the question.	
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law
By Whom:	Judge
When:	Transcript Line no. 987, [TI: 35m:00s]
What was reply:	<p>No, I did not discuss with anyone. What was I supposed to discuss with them? -- (Her exact words - "Kohyni Discuss Kehya" meaning, "No, I did not discuss with them.")</p> <p>Judge: So you never discussed it, this is your evidence to this court? all this time? [TI: 35m:30s]</p> <p>(Note#1: My Mother-In Law lied in court in making out that she had not discussed anything with the defendants during the time after the alleged assaults until the court trial. She has been responding to her sons questioning in scripted fashion, yet she absolves herself and her two sons from any wrong doing.)</p>
Proven:	<p>1. It is proven that my Mother-In Law clearly states that she did not discuss matters with both defendants, but this is proven to be a lie. Her testimony throughout the trial has been one of covering up the actions of her assault in the kitchen upon Mr. A. and that of her sons whom tried to assault Mr. A. in the Kitchen and then succeeded to assault Mr. A. and Mrs. B. in the TV Room of which the defendants and my Mother-In Law vehemently deny as shown in Line No. 2309-2320. This is further explained in Mr. A.'s witness statement to the police where Mr. A. states that after their failed attempt by the defendants and my Mother-In Law to cause a protracted fight in the Kitchen, they collectively planned to carry out their heinous assaults upon Mrs. B. and Mr. A. as they were leaving and it can be understood that such planning to confront Mr A. & Mrs. B. was planned in advance of the evening, that the Zaman family were waiting to carry out their heinous plan knowing that Mr. A's family would visit that evening after such a long gap being away. The fact that my Mother-In Law called by telephone her Son, witnessed by Mr. A. also proves that his Mother-In Law invited her Son Iftikhar (Defendant 2) who was not present that evening when Mr. A's</p>

Family had first arrived at 7.00pm to also be present as she was gearing up the Zaman family to carry out their plans for confrontation.

2. It is proven that each member of the Zaman family had a motive to harm the plaintiffs. Both defendants with the express knowledge of my Mother-In Law where carryout Probate Fraud, Zulfiqar was embezzling his father's finances and bank accounts , Iftikhar (Defendant 2) who gifted himself £1Million property which has jointly in his father's name and embezzled his father's accounts by loaning himself £150K for his purchase of 5 bedroom property at Hale End Road, Woodford Green, Essex IG8 in South Woodford. Iftikhar conspired with his brother Zulfiqar to place his father into further debt when properties where remortgaged and their father struggled to pay for a shop that Zulfiqar had purchased freehold with Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior's) money for £350K with the proceeds, leaving his father to pay for the remortgage monthly repayments while Zulfiqar rented out the Shop in Milton Road, Hampton, TW12 freely and obtained in addition an income from a 1 bedroom flat directly above the shop. No proceeds where provided to his father, the defendant pocketed the lot and left his father in a terrible financial mess. Iftikhar (Defendant 2) in his conspiracy with his brother Zulfiqar was allegedly promised a £125K sweetener after their father died as part of his silence, to which Iftikhar allegedly agreed in 2010. Both Iftikhar and Zulfiqar where Secretary and director of Videocraft Ltd which owed debts in excess of £55,000 to creditors. My Mother-In Law believed in protecting her two sons from threats that did not exist, but it is clear that my Mother-In Law gave her full support to her sons knowing the true facts of what they were doing as she is illiterate, ".. an uneducated woman", she cannot read nor write and has limited comprehension as stated by the defendant where it is proven that the defendants both took advantage of their mother on Line No. 2043.
3. In light of the alleged facts shown in 2. above, knowing that the outcome of the trial if found guilty would mean jail sentences and/or criminal records for the defendants and my Mother-In Law for aiding and abetting. Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) who during 2008-2011 had been suffering from bouts of depression and dementia, that included at times humiliating his wife for lack of care, my Mother-In Law who was directly in the care of him with his sons (defendants) Line No. 1979. Knowing the extent to which their fathers illness was affected their mother, the defendants devised a plan that (1) would alleviate their mother from the distress their father was placing upon her (proven by countless letters to the GP and NHS and use of specialised prescription drugs), (2) to allow Zulfiqar, his hands on money that he desperately needed as he was £55K+ bankrupt and owed money to creditors (proven line 2914) , the death of Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) would allow Zulfiqar to become the sole owner of St Marks Rise a freehold property and this he would use to payoff through a remortgage his and Iftikhar's debts and (3) Mr. Zaman's death²³ would remove him from giving evidence in court if he were to have been referenced in the trial and he was referenced by my Mother-In Law and the defendants many times, even giving evidence of what the late Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) might have said in court without proof from their own viewpoint to bolster their evidence in court Line No. 962, 981 ,1033 ,1118 ,1579 ,1590 ,1598 ,1613 ,1624 ,1629 ,1795, 1978,1979 ,2215 and 2222.

²³ Mohammed Zaman Senior was in shock over hearing that his two sons had removed his name off properties without his express knowledge or consent, his son's must have lied to him and in his ill state and under their care may have made him sign legal papers that was foremost a plan to defraud their father and family members. This fraud amongst others would have become known had Mohammed Zaman Senior where to have survived his trip to Kashmir and if summoned by the prosecution during the trial to prove the allegations made by my Mother In-Law and his son's over the events that took place on the night of 29th April 2011 would have led to prison sentences and complete ruin for them.

	<p>4. It is proven that it was the intention of the defendant to keep his mother away from the trial, to use the death of Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) to keep her in Kashmir as long as possible to corrupt the evidence even further on Line No. 2544.</p> <p>5. A further motive to do away with Mr Zaman Senior is by the actions of Mr Zaman Seniors alleged comment in response to the commotion the Zaman family where contemplating on Line No. 1616 as he favoured the plaintiffs over his own Sons. This must have enraged them all further to commit the assaults upon Mrs. B. and Mr. A. in the TV Room.</p> <p>6. My Mother-In Law was clearly a career of Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior), yet she blames his death solely on the plaintiffs as though passing the guilt to the actions of the plaintiffs to seek justice over what my Mother-In Law and her sons (defendants) had done on the night of 29th April 2011. This no doubt gives her relief knowing that after the death of Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) in Kashmir in 2012 and blaming the plaintiffs in a court of law, Mrs. Zaman feels redeemed of her crimes line no. 943.</p>
--	---

Evidence Type:	Question				
1.13 Addressing my Mother-In Law, as far as you were concerned the whole incident that took place on the 29th April, that involved Mr A. & Mrs B., that it was their attitude toward the way you and you're husband had given out these properties? or his property Is that right?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Prosecutor	When:	Transcript Line no. 943, [TI: 32m:46s]
What was reply:	<p>Yes!, They wanted to fight us, they made it difficult in our house, (In English) "my husband was very ill, he had a heart attack", they made trouble in the family, because of this my husband had a heart-attack, this worried him and he passed away.</p> <p>(Note#1: if the events of the 29th April 2011 where such a problem for Mr Mohammed Zaman Senior's health, why was Mr Zaman Senior of seventy five years old sent 4,600 miles away into the freezing temperatures of the Pakistani Kashmir mountains, without adequate heating and electricity, tens of miles away from hospitals and specialised medical facilities that he would have been in need of in the case of emergency? Why was it so urgent for him to leave with my Mother-In Law his wife before the trial? Was he medically fit to go on such a journey? Did his carers consult his GP before leaving? and why go now with the trial in February? Maybe to die? Being the only other person in the room who had a front row seat watching what really happened in the TV room, perhaps for him to deny that he used his walking stick or could clearly identifying those who were really in the room, or that he was angry at his two sons and his wife prior in the kitchen earlier? The late Mr Zaman (Senior) would be a liability in court for the defendants, he was too religious to lie for anyone and posed a clear threat to his sons and wife's lies if he were to appear in court. It is believed that Mr Zaman was sent to Kashmir to die and not to return to the UK. All the breadcrumbs follow this line of enquiry and the Police had been informed of foul play after Mr. A. alerted the Police a month after his death. It is a terrible idea that the spouse and her Son's had planned and undertaken such a horrid end for Mr. Zaman (Senior), knowing that a £7.5 million pound estate held in the balance, was being threatened by any evidence given by him, if he was asked in to court. All it required was a reference to him and the prosecution would have been in a position to ask for him to answer these allegations and the transcript shows clearly that Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) was referenced more than five times by my Mother-In Law and his son Zulfiqar the defendant in there evidence in court. Remember Mr. Mohammed Zaman's Seniors negative position toward his sons and wife when he spoke at them in the kitchen (line no. 1616).)</p> <p>(Note#2: Line No. 1616: Mr Zaman senior entered the kitchen to return his cup to the</p>				

	<p>sink.. He then heard the commotion that his sons and wife where undertaking. Then Mrs. B. then told her father Mohammed Zaman Senior what her brothers had done in placing their sole names on his properties. Mohammed Zaman Senior raised his voice, and while looking at his sons and wife said, his exact words where, " You mother fuckers, these properties are mine and after my death will be my wife's". He clearly was unaware that his sons had acquired the properties without his express knowledge or permission, before Mrs. B. could say anything further to her father both my Mother-In Law and both defendants started to shout aloud and Mr Zaman Senior left the kitchen unable to cope with the shouting by his sons who felt exposed at the thought that their father had favoured Mr. A. and Mrs. B. over them. This is further motive for both the defendants to assault the plaintiffs.)</p> <p>(Note#3: It should be understood that the defendant's statement that Mr. Zaman Senior had said quote, " Right, Okay, His exact words where was – No sister fucker has contributed any money toward my properties, these are my properties, and no one has any right interfere with my decision. That's, is he's exact words. [Pause] ". Line No. 1613, [TI: 1hr:14m:36s]) . Why the words "Sister fucker", I mean surely Mr. Mohammed Zaman (Senior) should know that Mr. A. is not an inheritor and he should be aware that Mr. A. is not related by blood, so why the term "Sister Fucker". This was a clear lie, the defendant changed his father's words from "Mother fucker " to "Sister fucker" and placed prominence and weight toward the dissatisfaction against Mr. A., again not true. Even my Mother-In Law did not testify to the court on what her husband had said if it was that important. It should be understood by Pari/Urdu linguists that "Mother fucker" is well known term used by males when angry toward aggressors, on the other hand "Sister fucker" has no connotation in Pari/Urdu when considering the situation in the kitchen, this term was made up by the defendant to fit his story.)</p>
Proven:	<p>1. My Mother-In Law has said that "They made it difficult in our house", is this not another motive to behave the way she did. What exposure did Mr. A. have in the few minutes that he was in the TV Room watching News at Ten, to have spoken to nobody during that time and my Mother-In Law felt that Mr. A. made it difficult for her in her house, so difficult that my Mother-In Law after offering Mr. A. food in a pleasant manner then resorted to assaulting Mr. A. to prove a point that she could assault someone and get away with it, believing that this was acceptable, lawful behaviour.</p> <p>2. This proves that my Mother-In Law acted on the bequest of her sons to leave the United Kingdom with Mr Zaman Senior, to go to Kashmir where she placed Mr Zaman Seniors health at risk and mysteriously died. My Mother-In Law in this sentence clearly passes the guilt of her dying husband upon the plaintiffs, while in reality she had her hands in her husband's death in Kashmir for reasons outlined before.</p>

Evidence Type:	Question				
1.14 Let us be clear of your evidence in court, today, Okay, its right isn't it to say that you have been speaking to your sons about the incident? Yes?					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Prosecutor	When:	Transcript Line no. 1006, [TI: 35m:51s]
What was reply:	<p>Yes!</p> <p>Prosecutor: That you where swearing in the kitchen?</p> <p>Interpreter: You where swearing in the Kitchen?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Prosecutor: You see Iftikhar regularly?</p> <p>Yes. He comes every Friday.</p>				

Interpreter: (In English) Every Friday they come to my home.

(Note#1: My Mother-In Law has confirmed that she was swearing in the kitchen. An action which she had earlier denied in court.)

Prosecutor: between the hours of 8 to 9 o'clock whatever it may be , you never discuss the incident that led to the argument?

Interpreter: Did you discuss with your family after the arrests after the incident.

We said that it was not nice what Mr. A. had done, for them to do what they were doing, my sons and I did not want any fighting, my son did not hit anyone. Our intention was not to fight.

(Note#2: Here my Mother-In Law clearly states that she had a prearranged meeting with her sons prior to the assaults that very same evening. She had originally said that she as well as her sons denies discussing the matter prior to the assaults and this is a clear lie that is proven. My Mother-In Law is explaining that even though the assaults had taken place, she tries to explain that this was not something that she had planned, however it is proven by the judge that it was executed by them later on that day.

Prosecutor: You are so angry, aren't you with Mr A. & Mrs B. that you come to court to lie on behalf of your two sons, haven't you? [TI: 37m:18s]

Interpreter: He is saying that you have come to court to lie about Mr A. & Mrs B.?

My husband died, I told my daughter over the phone that you must drop the case, that this case is affecting your father, I tried to convince her, is it right for her to do this knowing that he is unwell! [TI: 37m:50s]

(Note#3: My Mother-In Law under oath has stated that she intimidated her daughter Mrs. B. over the phone, this is clearly witness intimidation and was reported to the police. This is also further proof that Mr Iftikhar 's and Mr Zulfiqar's bail conditions had been breached a number of times by my Mother-In Law intimidating Mr A. & Mrs B. over the phone at least five times, especially after when she was warned by the police not to do so. Twice by long distance phone calls from Kashmir prior to Mr Zaman Seniors death. Notice how the translator ignores her evidence in his translation. Also, my Mother-In Law during her long distance phone calls pleads with her daughter Mrs. B. to drop the case and that her son Zulfiqar (Defendant) has agreed to split half the costs of his legal bill with her? This is astonishing???)

The last ditch attempt by my Mother-In Law was one week before Mohammed Zaman Seniors death, four days before he was to return to London. The plaintiffs believe that this was the last attempt by my Mother-In Law, by long distance telephone to save Mr. Mohammed Zaman Senior's life. My Mother-In Law pleaded with Mrs. B. to drop the case as this would have a dramatic affect on Mr Zaman's health citing Zulfiqar's acceptance to split legal costs, all untrue and was clearly witness intimidation and proof that Mr Mohammed Zaman Senior's life was in jeopardy. The defendants along with my Mother-In Law subsequently had a hand in Mr Mohammad Zaman Senior's death, which was overseen by my Mother-In Law and instructed by the defendants from London, England.)

Prosecutor: Well, I will ask the question to you directly my Mother-In Law, on the 29th of April that its right isn't it that Mr. A. came to your house to pickup Mrs B. your daughter isn't that right?

Interpreter: He is saying Is it correct that Mr A. came to your house on the 29th to

	<p>collect your daughter?</p> <p>Yes that's correct, but they made trouble.²⁴ [TI: 38m:40s]</p> <p>Prosecutor: That, when he came round he had a cup of tea which I think you've accepted?</p> <p>Interpreter: When Mr. A. arrived he was given tea, and drank this is that true?</p> <p>Yes, and I asked him whether he wanted food? He just wanted to make an argument.²⁵</p> <p>Prosecutor: You say that he started the trouble, but all he actually did was to go into the kitchen away from everybody else to wash his cup , its true isn't it that he went into the kitchen? [TI 39m:18s]</p> <p>Interpreter: Did he go into the kitchen?</p> <p>He went into the kitchen, and I followed him and asked him why he was unhappy with my two sons Zulfiqar and Iftikhar ?</p> <p>(Note#4: Her actual words used where "Nirazgeeh", which means "unhappy".)</p> <p>Interpreter: I followed him and I said, why are you not talking to my sons? Why are you blaming my sons to make trouble? --</p> <p>(Note#5: The Interpreter is again not translating correctly, he has added outside of the evidence provided by my Mother-In Law and allows my Mother-In Law to interrupt him with a resounding confirmation "yes" as he the interpreter gave evidence in court, an opinion he shouldn't have.)</p> <p>Prosecutor: He wasn't starting any trouble, he was trying to ease the situation by keeping away from the situation, walking into the kitchen --</p> <p>{My Mother-In Law now shouts out aloud in court}</p> <p>I spoke aloud in the kitchen to him and he started to fight me, I told him that we had not done any theft against you.</p> <p>(Note#6: My Mother-In Laws exact words were, "Khounah" which means in English, "Physically fight with the fist")</p> <p>Interpreter: In the kitchen I said that they came here for a fight. If we stole then we did this, we did not steal anything from you. Why are you concerned?</p> <p>(Note#7: The Interpreter is not translating what my Mother-In Law had said as evidence in court. Here my Mother-In Law is clearly stating that she and her sons intentions where to transfer properties that where in Mr. Mohammed Zaman Senior's name, solely into her sons names.)</p> <p>We did not steal anything it was ours to give, and that you had no right over them! (In English) "It was none of your business." [TI: 40m:01s]</p> <p>Interpreter: You have no right over the properties.</p>
--	--

²⁴ Line No. 1051 (My Mother-In Law)

²⁵ Line No. 1055 (My Mother-In Law)

Prosecutor: Addressing my Mother-In Law, - he was walking away from you from the TV room to enter the kitchen and it is you who are following him? As you have already said.

Interpreter: When he went into the kitchen, you walked and followed Mr. A. behind him? [TI: 40m:26s]

Yes, I went to explain to him, **at that time I did not fight him**²⁶, I tried to convince him that we made those properties. Why would I fight him?

(Note#8: Here my Mother-In Law is clearly stating that at that particular moment when she was following Mr. A. into the kitchen she did not fight him, that fighting Mr. A. came later on in the kitchen in relation to event time line. She then goes on to say that she went to explain to Mr. A. in her own way, an indication that she had done something that her son Zulfiqar disapproved of but she did indeed do.)

Interpreter: I followed him too, just to make him understand--

No, I did not say anything other than this is your brother! You have no right to call him a thief") [TI: 40:45s]

Interpreter: I was asking him not to say thief to my sons. They are thief's.

Prosecutor: He did not say that they where thieves, he was walking into the kitchen?

Interpreter: He did not say anything about you being thieves, he was going into the kitchen?

{My Mother-In Law now shouts out in court}

I went into the kitchen as well, and said to him that **he should not touch my children!**²⁷, That this is not your business, and I said that my husband may have a heart-attack. [TI: 41m:09s]

(Note#9: In Mr. A.'s witness statements to the police he said that his Mother-In Law while physically assaulting him had said prior to the assault, (In English) " Why you want to hit my son's ". My Mother-In Law confirms this was what she had said. It was at this point that my Mother-In Law had started her chanting to Mr. A. in the Kitchen, standing directly in front of his face while assaulting him physically with both her flat hands on his chest three times while chanting, her way of explaining at every hit. This was her acceptable way to explaining or convince Mr. A.?? As the defendant had pointed out under cross examination, his exact words where when referring to his mother concerning her assault on Mr. A. as typical of an: "...Asian woman"²⁸, hinting this is how we do things (Line No. 2074), "She is an uneducated person" (Line No.2041), "She knew she had done wrong!" (Line No. 656).)

Interpreter: I followed him into the kitchen, I just making him understand, not fight with my sons –

(Note: The Interpreter has left out The Mother-In Law's evidence)

²⁶ Line No. 1086 (My Mother-In Law)

²⁷ Line No. 1095 (My Mother-In Law)

²⁸ It should be noted that no religion or modern culture condones the use of assaults in a **positive** manor. If this is accepted as a positive then such people who accept this method should be rehabilitated before allowing them to live amongst civilised society. People who carry this warped understanding are a danger to society at large.

Yes

Prosecutor: You followed him into the kitchen, to shout at him, didn't you?
[TI:41m:25s]

Interpreter: You went into the kitchen to shout at him?

I did not shout at him, I shouted when my daughter was saying that we were thieves.
[TI: 41m:30s]

Prosecutor: You did shout, you've been shouting all the way through your evidence.
[TI: 41m:38s]

(Note#10: here my Mother-In Law is contradicting herself, she did not shout and then she clearly proves that she did. She now states for the record that her daughter had also said that both her brothers were thieves in having fraudulently signed over properties from her father to themselves. This is correct only in that it was said by her daughter Mrs. B. To her father Mohammed Zaman Senior when he entered the kitchen wanting to know what was going on later on.)

I said to him that he should not be doing this, I tried to explain that this is not good.

Interpreter: I just followed him to the kitchen to make him understand --

My husband said that these properties are his -- [TI: 41m:51s]

(Note#11: Firstly, her husband was not at the kitchen at that time she began her assault upon Mr. A. Here my Mother-In Law clearly states that her husband was unaware that his sons had misappropriated his properties, that their father believed that he owned the properties still and his estate would pass to all his children, which included his two daughters. Keep in mind that Mr Mohammed Zaman Senior was in need of care by his spouse and it is clear that my Mother-In Law and her two sons were in clear breach of that trust.)

Prosecutor: You were angry by the tension, he was trying to stay away from trouble, you followed him -- [TI: 41m:53s]

I went, No, I was happy, I was with the kids and I was enjoying their company. He left the kids and returned later, I said why don't you eat? He responds by saying that he had already eaten; I was not pleased with this and asked again.

Interpreter: When he returned we offered him food and then he started this trouble--

Yes!

{My Mother-In Law Shouts to the top of her voice}

I said that this is not your legal right to ask for anything, this is ours? [TI: 42m:27s]

Interpreter: I told him that that these are our properties and he has no rights --

Yes.

Prosecutor: Wow, well, in the kitchen is it then, is it your evidence that Mr. A. was shouting and being aggressive? Is that what you're saying?

{My Mother-In Law lifts up the Quran in her hand while shaking it at the Judge and speaks.}

Nobody shouted! No!, No! He is lying, I placed my hand on the Quran and telling the truth. [TI:42m:44s]

{In English my Mother-In Law addresses the Judge, waving the Quran in her hands.}

(In English) I am telling the truth, I took an oath, understand! this man is a very bad man you know, my daughter is lying. We have not been happy in our house. [TI: 43m:12s]

Interpreter: I am telling the truth, he is bad.

(Note#12: Here my Mother-In Law has clearly lying to the court constantly after she herself had repeatedly said that she had shouted, now her evidence is that nobody shouted??? The translator has omitted the end part of her evidence. The end part clearly shows that my Mother-In Law and her Sons where worried that their daughters where not toeing the line and accepting what they were doing to their father, both caring poorly for him and misappropriating his estate. That their collective actions that evening that includes the assault upon Mr. A. in the kitchen by my Mother-In Law (proven), the attempted assault by both her Sons, the defendants in the kitchen upon Mr. A. and then the multiple physical assaults upon Mrs. B. by Zulfiqar Zaman (proven but watered down by the Judge) and the Assault by Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman (Defendant 2) upon Mr. A. (proven in the way in Mr. A.'s statements) from behind while Mr. A. was leaving the TV room with his daughters on either hand). [TI: 43m:15s]

Prosecutor: He has been assaulted! Hasn't he?

Interpreter: He says that you assaulted him?

I explained in our way and explained to him that these properties where my husbands and mine and that you have no right to them! How could he have a right?

(Note#13: My Mother-In Law's reasoning is correct at the end of her evidence by asking the question, "How could he have a right?", this proves that she knows that Mr. A. has no stake or rights to her husband's estate. My Mother-In Law has proven clearly assaulting Mr. A., citing it was their method of explaining things in their way as though it was common place and acceptable to assault another adult. This reasoning was accepted by the Judge who felt that Mr. A. was indeed physically assaulted but said that the Crown was not hinging its case on this assault, even though Mr. A. had asked the CPS to prosecute his Mother-In Law for her assault prior to the trial. (Ref: Police Statements).

{My Mother-In Law is addressing the Judge}
He had no right to ask for a stake in our properties?

Interpreter: It is our property, that it does not belong to you, he cannot make any questions about the properties.

(Note#14: It is ironic that my Mother-In Law believes that Mr. A. has a stake or rights to the properties. It is quite absurd and can only come from a deranged mind, when Mr. A. is not blood related and has no legal claim to any of Mohammed Zaman Seniors assets or wealth? What legal recourse could Mr. A. take to award himself an estate that he was clearly not entitled to? It does not make sense? Unless, it was perceived by the Zaman family that Mrs. B. inheritance would fall into Mr. A.'s hands, so to stop this they were cutting Mrs. B. out of receiving nothing from her father's estate, fraudulently pocketing the whole estate for the defendants only, her sons.)

	<p>Prosecutor: So, you go in the kitchen, to tell him, basically -- [TI: 43m:50s]</p> <p>{At this point the line of questioning was stopped by the Judge.}</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That my Mother-In Law was swearing in the kitchen, a fact that she denied earlier in court. Also, my Mother-In Law lied to the judge when she had said that she witnessed Mr. A. swearing, this was also picked up by Mohammed Iftikhar (Defendant 2) who gave accounts of a struggle and further evidence that Mr. A. was swearing in the corridor/passageway. It is ironic that the Judge dismissed Iftikhar's evidence as ridiculous and yet failed to connect The Mother-In Law's lie which latter she admitted to have been swearing in the Kitchen. Does the Crown allow liars like my Mother-In Law to get away with wilful planning with the defendants her sons to concocted a story to cover up her and her sons criminal behaviour? 2. " We said that it was not nice what Mr. A. had done, for them to do what they were doing, my sons and I did not want any fighting, my son did not hit anyone. Our intention was not to fight." In this evidence my Mother-In Law tries to cover up the planning that went on in advance of the assaults by saying that she and the defendants had not planned to fight Mr A. & Mrs B. but this is what eventually happened. She further tries to explain that her sons, the defendants had not hit anyone that their intention was not to fight, but the outcome of the trial and my Mother-In Law's evidence clearly indicates that they had collectively planed to teach them a lesson, believing that since their mother was up for it, to make their mother happy, to forget what their father had said to them in the kitchen earlier favouring his daughter, they the defendants would instigate the assaults both upon Mr A. & Mrs B. When the initial assault upon Mr. A. in the kitchen failed to provide the launching pad for Zulfiqar Zaman and Mohammed Iftikhar's planned assault, the two brothers then planned with their mother to teach them a lesson in the TV Room as they overheard Mr A. Say to Mrs B in the kitchen that they should leave and go home. After carrying out the assaults they gloat about it with their mother who was in acceptance with their actions. This would please their mother who herself in line no. 507 finds it hard to believe that the Police contacted her and her sons two weeks later after the assaults believing that they had got away with it. my Mother-In Law was angered by this as she could not believe she and her Sons (the defendants) had carried out between them criminal offenses, believing they were right to having carried out the planned assaults. 3. "...I spoke aloud in the kitchen to him and he started to fight me, I told him that we had not done any theft against you". It has been proven that my Mother-In Law and her two sons the defendants where carrying out fraud against their father Mohammed Zaman Senior and probate fraud against Mrs. B. her daughter by saying that no theft was being carried out upon Mr. A., this leaves by deduction Mrs. B. who is an inheritor by blood. My Mother-In Law along with her two sons, the defendants had fraudulently placed the defendant's names upon Mr Mohammed Zaman Seniors property assets in the vile plan to carryout probate fraud and seize Mr Mohammed Zaman Senior's property assets from future inheritors. Inheritors that included six other members of Mr Mohammed Zaman Seniors children by blood. The interpreter then translated to the court: "...In the kitchen I said that they came here for a fight. If we stole then we did this, we did not steal anything from you. Why are you concerned?". Here my Mother In-Law is clearly proving that they had and where carrying out fraud against Mrs. B. and other inheritors to Mohammed Zaman Seniors Estate. 4. " I went into the kitchen as well, and said to him that he should not touch my children!". It is proven that in Mr. A.'s witness statements to the police, he said my Mother-In Law while physically assaulting him had said prior to the assault, (In English) " Why you want to hit my son's ". My Mother-In Law confirms this was what she had

said. It was at this point that my Mother-In Law had started her chanting to Mr. A. in the Kitchen, standing directly in front of his face while assaulting him physically with both her flat hands on his chest three times while chanting, her way of explaining at every hit. This was her way to explaining or convince Mr. A.?? As Zulfiqar Zaman had pointed out under cross examination, his exact words where when referring to his mother concerning her assault on Mr. A. as typical of an: "...Asian woman", hinting this is how we do things (Line No. 2074), "She is an uneducated person" (Line No.2041), "She knew she had done wrong!" (Line No. 656). It is proven that Mr. A.'s version of events indicated in his witness statements to the police concerning the events that occurred in the kitchen have been proven and confirmed by his Mother-In Law's evidence in court.

5. " I did not shout at him, I shouted when my daughter was saying that we where thieves. ". My Mother-In Law has now proven that in her earlier statement she said to Mr. A. that if we had stolen it wasn't from you, we deduce that the only other person in the room that was being robbed of any future inheritance was Mrs. B. to which she then responds facing her father and her mother in the kitchen that her two brothers Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman and Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman where proven thieves.

6. " My husband said that these properties are his". My Mother-In Law is clarifying that her husband was the owner of the properties he owned, but in reality the dates will show that over the past 7 years the defendants along with the blessing of their mother where in fact misappropriating Mr Zaman Senior financially, remortgaging properties into their own names and removing their fathers name and transferring of property title deeds into their own names to defraud future inheritors namely Mrs. B. , Mrs. B's Sister and four others. Later on in my Mother-In Law's evidence in court in Line No. 503 that Iftikhar (defendant 2) clearly shouted out that, " ..My son told him {Mr. A.} to get out of the house, that he was the owner of the house.". My Mother-In Law clearly accepted the notion that ownership of properties was to be passed on to her sons only, leaving her daughters and other inheritors with nothing.

7. " Nobody shouted! No!, No! He is lying, I placed my hand on the Quran and telling the truth. {In English my Mother-In Law addresses the Judge, waving the Quran in her hands.} (In English) I am telling the truth, I took an oath, understand! this man is a very bad man you know, my daughter is lying. We have not been happy in our house." My Mother-In Law has proven that she is a liar after she had shown her aggressive behaviour in court while giving evidence and admitting to have sworn at Mr. A., then changed her story saying that she shouted at Mrs. B. , then saying that Nobody shouted and this said by placing her hand on the religious book, the Holy Quran that she is believed to follow." Line No. 629 and as witnessed by the defendant on Line No. 2092. My Mother-In Law has clearly perjured herself in court and should be held to account for her actions on the night of 29th April 2011.

8. " I explained in our way and explained to him that these properties where my husbands and mine and that you have no right to them! How could he have a right?". Here my Mother-In Law admits and it is now proven that my Mother-In Law assaulted Mr. A. as she explains her reasons for assaulting Mr. A. She could have denied the allegation, but decides not to and tries to explain her reasons for her assault upon Mr. A. She also claims that the properties are now jointly her husband's and hers and then explains to Mr. A. that he has no inheritance rights? If the last statement is true, why would Mr. A. fight, brawl or say anything when he has no claim? My Mother-In Law then continues, " He had no right to ask for a stake in our properties?", how could Mr. A. get a stake in their properties if only through Mrs. B. who is an inheritor who was being cut out from her father's estate by the actions of my Mother-In Law and both defendants Zulfiqar Zaman and Iftikhar Zaman. It is proven that my Mother-In Law and the defendants had executed financial fraud on a grand scale without the knowledge of their father Mr Mohammed Zaman Senior who up till that night still believed that the

	<p>properties where in his sole name and wrongly believing that the only inheritor after his death would be his spouse. Under intestate laws in Islam blood inheritors cannot be disinherited unless they have died and left no siblings.</p> <p>9. It is understood that it may have been perceived by the Zaman family that Mrs. B's inheritance would fall into Mr. A.'s hands, so to stop this they believed that by cutting Mrs. B. out of receiving anything from her father's estate, fraudulently pocketing the whole estate for the defendants only would be one way to stop Mr. A from receiving any of their fathers estate. For the record , Mr. A. had no designs upon receiving any of his father-in laws wealth, that in court Mr. A. informed the judge that if Mohammed Zaman Senior was to give anything, it would be to Mrs. B. his daughter and it would be owned by Mrs. B.'s alone. Mr. A. also stated in court to the Judge that he "Loved his father-in law and never thought ill of him".</p>				
Evidence Type:	Question				
1.15 Outside the room. What you say happened is that Mrs B., pushes Zulfiqar.					
To Whom:	My Mother-In Law	By Whom:	Prosecutor	When:	Transcript Line no. 1189, [TI: 45m:28s]
What was reply:	<p>Interpreter: He is saying that when you where in the room you saw Mrs B. push Zulfiqar?</p> <p>No. (exact words – “Nay!”). which means “NO!”) [TI: 45m:32s]</p> <p>Interpreter: She hit him.</p> <p>(Note#1: The translator has not translated what she had really spoken. My Mother-In Law answered “NO”, but the interpreter said “She hit him”??)</p> <p>Iftikhar hit him, .. (exact words – “Iftikhar Nay Maryah kuba passah). Which translated in English “Iftikhar hit someone on the left side”) [TI: 45m:32s]</p> <p>(Note#2: My Mother-In Law has given evidence that her younger son Iftikhar (defendant) had hit someone on the left side, this person can only be Mr. A. as written in Mr. A.'s Police witness statements. It is now proven that Mr. A. was assaulted physically by Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman (defendant) and that my Mother-In Law and both defendants lied in court while under oath. This is clear perjury, recorded on media and cannot be refuted in court.)</p> <p>{Then my Mother-In Law continues...}</p> <p>Mrs. B. hit Zulfiqar.</p> <p>Prosecutor: She hit Zulfiqar?</p> <p>Mrs. B.</p> <p>Prosecutor: Yep. Mrs. B., Zulfiqar pushes her back -- [TI: 45m:46s]</p> <p>She fell backward across the table and hit the table.</p> <p>Interpreter: She fell on the table and was injured.</p> <p>(Note#3: My Mother-In Law states that Mrs. B. fell backward, yet the Interpreter translates fell on the table? In any case it is proven that the coffee table is not in front or behind Mrs. B., it is to the right of her and she could not have fallen onto it. The Interpreter is again giving evidence in court and is providing details not from the defence witness own words.)</p>				

Prosecutor: So she falls over backward over the table, that's your evidence, is it?
Interpreter: She falls over backwards over the table?

{My Mother-In Law is Silent, someone coughs in the Public gallery} [TI: 46m:06s]

Prosecutor: Mrs B., Mrs B., she must have been facing you?

Interpreter: He is saying that you must have seen Zulfiqar push her? [TI: 46m:18s]

(Note#4: Interpreter is not translating correctly questions from the prosecution. He has asked his own question, stopping my Mother-In Law from answering the prosecutor's line of questioning).

She started the trouble not Zulfiqar. (In English) "She, err started the trouble".

Interpreter: She started the trouble.

Prosecutor: You are not answering my question. [TI: 46m:24s]

Prosecutor: Mrs B., your daughter pushes Zulfiqar, while she's facing him while she's pushing him?

(In English) Yes, she like that. {My Mother-In Law extends her hands and indicates that her daughter is in front of her and she is facing her}. [TI: 46m:40s]

Prosecutor: Zulfiqar, facing her then pushes her back?

Interpreter: Zulfiqar pushes her back --

Zulfiqar was beside me and said how dare you try to hit me; you have no right to do that. A daughters place is behind his sons. [TI: 46m:55s]

(Note#5: My Mother-In Law is now stating that Mrs. B. tried to hit Zulfiqar and failed to hit him physically, her choice of words explain this and the defendant has already admitted in his testimony that he had provoked Mrs. B. at this point (line No. 2138) and that My Mother-In Law identified that after the defendant had spoken to Mrs. B., Mrs. B.'s eyes were popping out meaning she was driven to anger by the defendant (Line No. 787).

(Note#6: The defendant in Line 2139 states that he is not angry at this point, he clearly becomes angry and tries desperately to avoid answering the obvious that he became angry to have physically hit Mrs. B. If you read on, as the defendant is asked by the Judge to clarify what he had done, he clearly states that he is guilty to having assaulted his sister not buy push but by punch? (line No., 1754, 1760). This would mean that either Mrs. B. inflicted injuries to herself since the defendant is saying he had not pushed her which is absurd, and that my Mother In-Law has said that the defendant had pushed her and that no one was injured again absurd, yet later on the defendant admits to pushing her and admitting to having carried out the physical assaults upon Mrs. B. Line No. 2173 to 2175, yet the judge watered down the evidence to a simple lunge without physical touch which is unacceptable considering the injuries Mrs. B. sustained in the presence of Mr. A. as the defendant assaulted her with a total of five fist punches squarely to her face.)

Interpreter: (Translator chooses not to translate The Mother-In Law's evidence of where she was positioned in the TV Room.)

Prosecutor: You seem to be saying to me that behind her is a table which she tripped over? Is that what you're saying?

Interpreter: Was the table behind Mrs. B.?

The table was in front of her.
(exact words where "Table Aggay See" , which translates in English "The table was in front of her". [TI: 47m:02s]

Interpreter: The table was directly in front of her.

Yes.

Interpreter: Where was Mrs. B.?

She started the fight, she punched. She then fell onto the table, nobody really hit her. [TI:47m:16s]

Interpreter: She fell onto the table.

Prosecutor: Right, she's pushed, Zulfiqar was facing her and she somehow falls over the table? Is that your evidence to the court, is it? [TI: 47m:31s]

Interpreter: {Translator translates to my Mother-In Law}

Yes

(Note#7: My Mother-In Law has said that Mrs. B. was pushed while facing Zulfiqar (defendant) and her, then fall onto the table that was directly in front of her. It has been established that no such table was in front of Mrs. B. and that Mrs. B. could not have fallen onto the table since both the defendant and Mother In-Law where standing in front of Mrs. B, that would make them standing on top of the table? Mrs. B.'s injuries are facial bruising of the type exhibited by punches to the face and not cuts to face by a table or bruising due to a fall on a table to which she would have used her hands to protect her fall, we would not expect five bruises at different points on her face from a single table fall. In any case my Mother-In Law's evidence to the court was a fabricated planned lie and clearly she and her sons made up a story to fit the Police statements provided by the plaintiffs. The evidence of the assault upon Mrs. B., her facial injuries show clearly punches by fist to her face. My Mother-In Law is aware of this and has lied in court to cover-up her sons multiple assault upon Mrs. B. Then she goes on to say that nobody was injured, even forgetting that she herself had been injured in her eye by her sons raised elbow while physically punching Mrs. B., being in close proximity to him during his physical assault upon Mrs. B.)

Prosecutor: During this you say that nobody was injured? That's what you said wasn't it?

Interpreter: He's said that you said that no one had been injured by this fall?

Yes, no one was hurt. [TI: 47m:46s]

Interpreter: Yes

They have just made things up. [TI: 47m:53s]

Prosecutor: And, you say that somehow you fall over and somehow hurt your eye?

Interpreter: He is saying that you had fallen over and hurt your eye?

Yes, I did, I fell and my eye was hurt and I did not make a fuss.

Interpreter: Yes, she explains--

	<p>BY THE COURT:</p> <p>Judge: Can you explain?? What sorry?</p> <p>Interpreter: Sorry. (The translator again is not translating what my Mother-In Law had said in her evidence)</p> <p>OFFF – OHHH ! [TI: 48m:22s]</p> <p>(Note: My Mother-In Law is frustrated by the questioning.)</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<p>1. ".. Iftikhar hit him, .. (exact words – "Iftikhar Nay Maryah kuba passah). Which translated in English "Iftikhar hit someone on the left side")</p> <p>It is proven in my Mother-In Law's evidence that her younger son Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman (Defendant 2) had hit someone on the left side, this person can only be Mr. A. as written in Mr. A.'s police witness statements. Mr. A. stated that he was hit from Iftikhar from the back from the left side as Iftikhar jumped over the coffee table toward Mr. A. standing with his two children in the TV Room near the door. It is now proven that Mr. A. was assaulted physically by Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman (defendant) and that my Mother-In Law and both defendants lied in court while under oath. This is clear perjury, recorded on media and cannot be refuted in court.</p> <p>2. "She fell backward across the table and hit the table.". "The table was in front of her. (exact words where "Table Aggay See" , which translates in English "The table was in front of her". My Mother-In Law states that Mrs. B. fell backward across the table and hit the table. it is proven that the coffee table is not in front or behind Mrs. B., it is to the right of her in front of the larger sofa where Mohammed Zaman Senior was sitting at the nearest seat of the three piece sofa and she could not have fallen onto it as her father was on the sofa. My Mother-In Law has clearly lied in court over the placement of the coffee table which was not in front of Mrs. B. as my Mother-In Law clearly states in Line No. 399 the position of Mrs. B. being in front of her during Mrs. B.'s assaults by Zulfiqar the defendant.</p> <p>3. "..She started the trouble not Zulfiqar. (In English) "She, err started the trouble". It has been established that Zulfiqar the defendant had started to make trouble to Mrs. B. and this angered Mrs. B. as my Mother-In Law reported that while her son Zulfiqar was speaking to her, Mrs. B.'s eyes were popping out, Line No. 787, a reaction the defendant wanted so as to give reason to also get angry and begin his assaults upon Mrs. B. in front of his mother, Zulfiqar had spoke to Iftikhar about what he was going to do while they both remained solely in the kitchen standing together²⁹, whispering to each other as their father, mother and Mrs. B. left the kitchen for the TV Room, and Mr. A. left for the staircase and from that vantage point saw the defendants whispering to each other as though planning something near the entrance to the Kitchen, then Iftikhar (Defendant 2) took position at the end of the room near the sofas in the TV Room and readied himself to assault Mr. A. once Zulfiqar had begun his assaults upon Mrs. B. This is the main reason why the plaintiff Mr. A. cannot let those responsible of the severity of what happened that night get away with clear planned assaults upon himself and his wife. The instigator of the argument was my Mother-In Law, when her</p>

²⁹ Mr. A. brought to the attention of the Judge during the trial that he had remembered both defendants standing at the entrance to the kitchen door whispering to each other as making plans as Mrs. B.. had made her way into the TV Room and Mr. A. was in the passageway tying his daughters shoes at the staircase while facing the passageway leading to the kitchen. Mr. A. witnessed both defendants whispering, likely planning the assaults.

plan with her sons failed in the kitchen a new plan was created by both defendants with my Mother-In Law overlooking the assaults and lying that they ever took place. But how can you overlook the evidence of Mr. A's & Mrs. B.'s injuries???

4. "Yes, no one was hurt. They have just made things up.". My Mother-In Law is again lying to the court about what had happened, she has ignored the assault of her two sons and has accused the plaintiffs of lying in court. Since the court found both her sons guilty this makes my Mother-In Law a liar and she has again perjured herself in court.

5. " Yes, I did, I fell and my eye was hurt and I did not make a fuss.". Here my Mother-In Law proves that her son had in effect hit her in her eye as he began his barrage of punched to Mrs. B.'s face. She then goes on to say that she did not make a fuss when it concerned her Son hitting her in the eye. What a loving, deceitful, lying mother.

2. Perjury List by Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman (Defendant 2) in court.

Evidence Type:	Question				
2.1 The question is that when you, we use your words, you went for your sister, she slapped you and you said you went for her, where you doing that emm because you where angry because she had slapped you and you briefly lost your temper or is there another explanation to why you acted --					
To Whom:	Judge	By Whom:	Defendant	When:	
What was reply:	<p>I think there was a bit of selfish event, a reaction, okay err, err that I had and also , you know it's not just one thing right! At the end of the day, I didn't go into that kitchen to hurt my sister or hit my sister, okay, that was not my intention at all. right all I did was, somehow bring some sort of calm and at the end of the day, it's sort of like you know, make her right understand that this is not good every time she comes round , she's not doing our family any favours.</p> <p>(Note#1: On Line 2160 the defendant so far has made no attempt previously while giving evidence to suggest that he wanted to hurt his sister in the kitchen, the only attempt made to hurt anyone in the kitchen was to Mr. A., this evidence was from both plaintiffs statements and the defendant has said that it was not his intention yet it does prove that the defendant had tried to hurt someone in the kitchen even though it was not their initial intention to do so. He has been found to have lied about being a peace maker and admits his lie on line 2173 and 2175. My Mother-In Law also lies about both her sons (defendants) actions in the kitchen and this is proven.)</p> <p>(Note#2: The defendant (Mr Zulfiqar Zaman) clearly proves that in Mr. A.'s witness statements to the police he had stated that while in the kitchen, Iftikhar had said that he accused Mr. A. to have had taken his own mother to court over inheritance matters. This further proves Mr. A.'s version of events.)</p> <p>(Note#3: The defendant said that his younger brother Mohammed Iftikhar made an allegation to Mr. A. that he had taken his mother to court over inheritance, this for the record is false and is a lie, there are no such court records in England in which there has been any court cases about inheritance or other family matters. Mr Iftikhar has accused Mr. A. of something that was completely untrue. Why do this? Why make an accusation if not to aggravate the situation? Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman is not as innocent as he had made himself out to be in court. He deliberately tried to exaggerate an argument that has been proven his mother had started.)</p>				
Proven:	<p>1. On Line 2160 the defendant so far has made no attempt previously while giving evidence to suggest that he wanted to hurt his sister in the kitchen, the only attempt made to hurt anyone in the kitchen was to Mr. A., this evidence was from both plaintiffs statements and the defendant has said that it was not his intention yet it does prove that the defendant had tried to hurt someone in the kitchen even though it was not their initial intention to do so. He has been found to have lied about being a peace maker and admits his lie on line 2173 and 2175. My Mother-In Law also lies about both her sons (defendants) actions in the kitchen and this has been proven.</p> <p>2. The defendant (Mr Zulfiqar Zaman) clearly proves that in Mr. A.'s witness statements to the police he had said that while in the kitchen, Iftikhar had said that he accused Mr. A. to have had taken his own mother to court over inheritance matters. This further proves Mr. A.'s version of events.</p> <p>3. The defendant said that his younger brother Mohammed Iftikhar made an allegation to Mr. A. that he had taken his mother to court over inheritance, this for the record is false and is a lie, there are no such court records in England in which there has been any</p>				

	<p>court cases about inheritance or other family matters. Mr Iftikhar had accused Mr. A. of something that was completely untrue. Why do this? Why make an accusation if not to aggravate the situation? Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman is not as innocent as he had made himself out to be in court. He deliberately tried to exaggerate an argument that has been proven his mother had started.)</p>
--	--

Evidence Type: Question	
2.2 You said there was an argument; can you give me more details?	
To Whom: Judge	By Whom: Defendant
When:	
What was reply:	<p>This Sir obviously in fumed the argument more, everything was calm and now he has in fumed the argument, I believe at that particular moment in time, who brought it up there was err, err my mother, or Iftikhar might have said , he said you took your own mother to court about relating to property, his own father had passed away, or err, he's father passed away err, he took his own mother to court because of property, because he wasn't happy the way, you know err, assets where being divided, this was also brought up, so the argument was, became you know, and at no stage sir in that kitchen did I attack Mr. A.</p> <p>(Note#1: The defendant (Mr Zulfiqar Zaman) clearly proves that in Mr. A.'s witness statements to the police Mr. A. had said that while in the kitchen, Iftikhar had said that he accused Mr. A. to have had taken his own mother to court over inheritance matters. This proves Mr. A.'s version of events.)</p> <p>(Note#2: The defendant said that his younger brother Iftikhar made an allegation to Mr. A. that he had taken his mother to court over inheritance, this for the record is false and is a lie, there are no such court records in England in which there has been any court cases about inheritance or other family matters. Mr Iftikhar had accused Mr. A. of something that was completely untrue. Why do this? Why make an accusation if not to aggravate the situation? Mr Iftikhar Zaman is not as innocent as he has made himself out to be in court. He deliberately tried to exaggerate an argument that has been proven his mother had started.)</p>
Proven:	<p>1. " he {Mr. A.} wasn't happy the way, you know err, assets where being divided, this was also brought up, so the argument was, became you know, and at no stage sir in that kitchen did I attack Mr. A. ". It is proven that the argument in the kitchen was about the way Mohammed Zaman's Senior's assets where being divided between my Mother-In Law and her sons as indicated by my Mother-In Law's evidence on Line No. 978 & 982, that this was the defendants double negative, lying about Mr. A. arguing and then lying about the fact that the defendant had launched himself toward Mr. A. in the Kitchen and was in arms reach. Using the words "At the FAR END" or "a great distance" to hide his real position being in arms reach of Mr. A. This term to describe Mr. A.'s position is shown in Line No. 552, 566, 570, 1548, 1658, and 2023 with great effect, but it is all lies said in court under oath and upon a Religious book The Holy Quran.</p> <p>2. The defendant said that his younger brother Iftikhar made an allegation to Mr. A. that he had taken his mother to court over inheritance, this for the record is false and is a lie, there are no such court records in England in which there has been any court cases about inheritance or other family matters. Mr Iftikhar has accused Mr. A. of something that was completely untrue. Why do this? Why make an accusation if not to aggravate the situation? Mr Iftikhar Zaman is not as innocent as he has made himself</p>

	out to be in court. He deliberately tried to exaggerate an argument that has been proven his mother had started
--	---

Evidence Type: Question	
2.3 Did you come anywhere near him {Mr. A.} at all?	
To Whom:	Judge
By Whom:	Zulfiqar Zaman
When:	
What was reply:	<p>I did not launch at him, he was here in court and he put his hand on the Holy Quran and lied , yeah!, Sir whatever punishment you may place upon me, but I am not going to lie on the Holy Quran. [Pause]</p> <p>I did not sir, there was a great distance between myself and Mr. A. Mr. A.! was at the FAR-END! of the room, he said that ,and Mrs. B. verified this, her mother was standing there next to Mr. A., err , err you know Mrs. B. was at the kitchen sink and err, you know Zulfiqar’s older brother was between err, you know err –</p> <p>Judge: We already know this from the relatives--</p> <p>{in raised voice} ..I did not sir!, I was more concerned about calming Iftikhar down because, basically Mr. A. was, basically pushing his buttons at us and Iftikhar was getting annoyed, so I said to Iftikhar , one of the things I did say to him, I said look, why are you letting him work you up! Right, you know, dads made his decision, he’s done it, it’s done, right okay, let them say what they want to say, just leave it. [Pause]</p> <p>(Note#1: For the record Mr. A. did not at any time state that he remained at the far end of the kitchen for the complete period of time while in the kitchen. This was proven to be untrue by people placement using sketches 1, 3,5,8 &10.³⁰)</p> <p>(Note#2: It has been established that the defendant told a clear lie about Mr. A. being at the FAR-END! of the Kitchen as this was not true and can be proven. He accused Mr. A. of lying, but Mr. A. told the truth and the defendants accusation can be added to the list of lies said under oath by the defendant in court. For the record Mr Zulfiqar Zaman, his brother Iftikhar Zaman and mother all perjured themselves in court by wilfully lying in court and this has been established. In the case of pushing Iftikhar’s buttons as outlined in the defendants evidence in court, all Mr. A. had said to Iftikhar (Defendant 2) was, “..that by gifting the properties to you, it can be seen as an act of theft”, why would Iftikhar get so angered by that comment, unless it was a truthful comment to have been made or that Iftikhar felt threatened by the truth of having been exposed to the fraud that both brothers had and where still undertaking.)</p> <p>(Note#3: The defendant is clearly stating his and his brothers intentions to have successfully misguided their father by legally placing their names on their fathers properties, by removing their fathers name in joint to hand over his share {Mr Zaman Senior} of those properties³¹ over to themselves that includes Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman and his younger brother Mohammad Iftikhar Zaman prior to his death³² and that this had been done without the family consensus and there was nothing anyone could do about it. This is clearly planned fraud and possible reason for harming Mr. Mohammed Zaman Senior prior to the trial in February 2012.)</p>

³⁰ Line No. 3014, 3044, 3079, 3133 & 3170 respectively.

³¹ In 29.12.2003 Mr Mohammad Iftikhar Zaman had Farleigh Road Hackney, London (N16 7SU) remortgaged and had his name placed on the title deeds alongside his father’s name. His father was the originally the sole owner of the property. Then in 2010 he had his sole name put on the property, removing his father’s Mr. Mohammad Zaman Senior’s name off the title deeds citing it had been gifted to him.

³² This is what the defendants were doing in coup with their mother to carryout fraud before their father mysteriously died.

Proven:	<p>1. "I did not launch at him, he was here in court and he put his hand on the Holy Quran and lied , yeah!, Sir whatever punishment you may place upon me, but I am not going to lie on the Holy Quran. [Pause]". It is quite clear and proven that his mother wilfully lied in court and now the Son and defendants both also lied in court. It has been proven that Mr. A. told the truth about the defendants launching at him in the kitchen and that both defendants had perjured themselves by lying in Court in front of a Judge of the Crown.</p> <p>2. It has been further established that the defendant told a clear lie about Mr. A. being at the FAR-END! of the Kitchen as this was not true and can be proven. He accused Mr. A. of lying, but Mr. A. told the truth and the defendants accusation can be added to the list of lies said under oath by the defendant in court. For the record Mr Zulfiqar Zaman, his brother Iftikhar Zaman and mother Mrs. B.ibi Zaman all perjured themselves in court by wilfully lying in court and this has been established. In the case of pushing Iftikhar 's buttons as outlined in the defendants evidence in court, all Mr. A. had said to Iftikhar was, "...that by gifting the properties to you can be seen as an act of theft"³³, why would Iftikhar get so angered by that comment, unless it was a truthful comment to have been made or that Iftikhar felt threatened by the truth of having been exposed to the fraud that both brothers had and where still undertaking.</p>
----------------	---

Evidence Type:		Question		
2.4 There had been issues, tell me what was your positions in relation to each other and the coffee table--				
To Whom:	Judge	By Whom:	Defendant	When:
What was reply:	<p>The!, Coffee table is front facing Mrs. B., the coffee table is to the left of me and to the right of Mrs. B. My father is positioned on the sofa on the edge of the sofa because he usually lies down so he's there and he has his walking stick there. Err, you know in his hand. [pause]</p> <p>(Note#1: In his own evidence in court Zulfiqar Zaman has proven that the coffee table was not in front of Mrs. B., that she was standing near the fireplace, that the coffee table is to the right of her which makes Mrs. B. located near the fireplace. That his father's walking stick could not have tripped Mrs. B. as stated by defence witnesses. Their father was too far and historically is shown to have his walking stick over his right arm. (Ref: E113-VIDO1 Wedding day Oct 2009.wmv and knitted room picture and Mrs. B. facial injuries page 2.pdf))</p> <p>Then, err, when Mrs. B. struck me, and I'm not happy about my reaction, at that split moment I went for her your honour.</p> <p>I raised my hand and Zulfiqar's older brother has as soon as I went, okay, I may have pushed her , because obviously I did not make full contact, Zulfiqar's older brother grabbed me at the same moment Iftikhar grabbed me and at same time my mum also dived in. [Pause]</p> <p>I think, Zulfiqar's older brother and Iftikhar , it all happened at the same time your honour. It all, at the same time everybody dived in. Hence, my brother falling over. [Pause] [TI: 1hr:22m:46s]</p> <p>(Note#2: Is the defendant trying to account for his brother Iftikhar 's injury he sustained? Also, it is more correct to say that he may have sustained the injury to his arm when Zulfiqar's older brother ran passed him pushing him aside to get into the TV</p>			

³³ See footnote #20.

Room at the corridor while Iftikhar had a few moments earlier closed the door to the TV Room. Remember the evidence of photos shown during the trial to Mr. A. on 6th February? According to Mr. A. and Mrs. B., Mohammed Iftikhar had launched himself onto Mr. A. and physically punched him three times, twice at his upper back and once to the side of his head as he was leaving the room with his two children in hand. It is quite clear that both brothers, Mohammed Iftikhar and Maqsood Zulfiqar have tried to confuse the court by making out that the very jumps that they presented in court prior to the assault on Mrs. B. where without question a smoke screen for the events that they had made up to fit the plaintiffs Police witness statements.)

I can't remember your honour, err, to be honest err, I was overpowered by my two brothers, I can't remember my mum also dived in at the end, I can't remember.

Your honour, I went to hit her, I am not going to deny that fact. yeah! I went to hit her and Zulfiqar's older brother and Iftikhar jumped me and my mother also intervened, at that same moment, that's what happened. I know, you know Mr. A. and his.-- [TI: 1hr:23m:42s]

(Note#3: The last sentence is a clear indication that the defendant had used Mr. A.'s witness statement as a blue print to create a version of events that masked the assault of his brother Iftikhar had launched upon Mr. A. while he was holding his children while attempting to leave the TV Room.)

Judge: What you're saying was that there wasn't a push but you used your hands?

Yes there was no push sir, there was no push. [TI: 1hr:23m:49s]

(Note#4: The evidence given by the defence witnesses stating that the defendant had pushed his sister where all false and that by his own Evidence in court the defendant had indeed said that he had physically hit his sister by way of punch, making physical contact. How is it then that multiple fist punches to the face become a push by the judges understanding of the events? It does not make sense and the judge was clearly wrong in his understanding of the events that occurred on the 29th April 2011.)

{laughingly} I mean It may have ended up as a push but, you know, I went to. [TI: 1hr:23m:59s]

(Note#5: Mr Zaman made a mocking comment to a reply about his assault (proven) upon his sister Mrs. B., my wife as witnessed by Mr. A. who is already proven to have been in the TV room. This is clearly GBH, or wilful assault by Battery, a prison sentence and not what the Judge thought – "sustained ...some ... injuries" on Line No. 2584. The judges comment was just as despicable as the defendants mocking remarks.)

Judge: So sorry, so Zulfiqar's older brother and Iftikhar took hold of you?

They restrained me, from any other physical contact with Mrs. B.

(Note#6: Here Mr Zaman admits clearly confirming his physical attack upon Mrs. B. which means physical contact had occurred, this happened during his window of opportunity and that after he was restrained in his own words it happened only the one moment.)

Judge: Okay?

When my brother grabbed me at the same time Iftikhar had grabbed me and pushed me to the side. [TI: 1hr:24m:30s]

(Note#7: Referring to the room sketches of all evidences gathered from the defence witnesses, there does not seem to be the space for this dance to have happened in the room where Mrs. B. was located, where Iftikhar walked into the room and was standing at the other end of the coffee table, at the separating wooden doors, at the other end of the room, and their mother located near Mrs. B., surely they were too close to have the space to dive into Mr Zulfiqar Zaman and even had time to restrain a man who exceeds 6ft tall in height and of large build, and being able to move Zulfiqar to the side? This does not fit with the facts of the room.)

Judge: What happens to Mrs. B.?

[TI: 1hr:24m:36s]

I think Mrs. B. then drops, she fell over backwards because I remember dad's cane there, she fell over backwards, she hit err, err head on I think on the children's chair, beside the err, err, err, near the coffee table, and then my mother also err, err, err, you know err, there were three guys there, they also somehow came out, and ..err, you know falling over the coffee table.

[TI: 1hr:25m:05s]

(Note#8: The defendant is having trouble explaining how the world is revolving round him in the room, he knows the space restrictions and desperately tries to fit his story with (i) placing his brother away from Mr. A. at the door, (ii) being restrained by Zulfiqar's older brother who was not in the room by the accounts of the victims and (iii) trying to place doubt on what actually happened. One thing we are sure on is that both defendant and my Mother-in Law's vision and intentions were clearly on Mrs. B. standing in front of them before and during the defendant's physical assaults. That my Mother-in Law was hit in the face by Zulfiqar's raised elbow during his physical assault upon Mrs. B. and she my Mother In-Law fell to the ground alongside Mrs. B.)

Judge: What are you saying that Mrs. B. fell over backwards over the coffee table?

My father was sitting there, my father had a walking cane, right, so basically he is sitting down and his cane is across the floor, sort of thing, so what my belief is that she tripped over the cane and landed, you know err, she got quite allot of weight, she's quite a heavy girl.

[TI: 1hr:25m:33s]

(Note#9: Mr Zaman is trying desperately concoct a story that explains that Mrs. B. fell on her own accord, that their father's walking cane and Mrs. B.'s size was his alleged reason for her falling. The walking cane is proven to be nowhere near Mrs. B. . Notice how he does not answer the question of whether Mrs. B. fell over the coffee table.)

Judge: Ok, then so she, you think she hit her head on the table?

I think she hit the side of the head on the table and their where some chairs, children's chairs are normally stacked up, they went, err over as well. [Pause] [TI: 1hr:25m:52s]

(Note #10: The defendant is again struggling to account for her sisters facial injuries citing children's chairs that are "normally stacked up" but he infers in English that they were not. He also refers to the chairs being in the wrong location, nowhere near Mrs. B.)

(Note #11: There was no damage to the side of Mrs. B.'s head, visible physical injuries were sustained to the front of her face and an injury to her spinal back where she landed onto the side of the fireplace and where recorded by both the paramedics, Police officers and shown in Mr. A.'s phone pictures taken at 30/04/2012 02:08:05)

Judge: Then?

Then the whole situation died down, she got up, I saw my mum get up, right I wasn't happy about what just happened, it was luckily and unnecessary, and I think Iftikhar, err just in general said to get out, you came here to make trouble so get out.

Judge: Who actually said that?

Err, Iftikhar.

[TI: 1hr:26m:37s]

I think, just my mother also said, err to be honest the whole idea was to get them out of the house, you know, enough is enough.

Judge: And where was Mr. A.?

Mr. A. was in the corridor sir, he was not in the room at all. [Pause] [TI: 1hr:27m:02s]

(Note#12: The defendant after planning the assaults with his brother in the kitchen then decides after the assaults have taken place against Mrs. B. and Mr. A., that in his own words, " .. err to be honest **the whole idea** was to get them out of the house, you know, enough is enough ". Let's think of this logically, we have established that Mr. A. was in the TV Room, yet the defendant continues to say that he was not in the room at all? What would Iftikhar do to Mr. A. if Mr. A. where to have been standing behind Zulfiqar, near the door witnessing his wife being punched, would Mr. A. not intervene? So what did Iftikhar do?, standing behind Mr. A.? He went for Mr. A. in the way in Mr. A.'s has written in his two statements to the Police and by the evidence provided by My Mother In-Law where she clearly confirms that Mohammed Iftikhar, her son had physically hit Mr. A. on the left side (Transcript Line no. 1189, [TI:45m:28s]).

Judge: Then what happened?

I was in the room; I didn't see anything that took place outside the room.

Judge: How long was your brother Iftikhar in the room for?

Pardon sir?

Judge: How long was your brother Iftikhar in the room for?

Err as soon as basically Mrs. B. left the room that they were restraining me.³⁴

Judge: You mean they let her go?

They were holding me and after Mrs. B. left the room they let me go. [Pause]

[TI: 1hr:27m:41s]

(Note#13: The defendant is not answering the question put to him, he admits that Mrs. B. was let go, that he was still being restrained by his brothers and yet how did Iftikhar get from being on the floor and restraining Zulfiqar and be at the corridor being challenged by Mr. A. at the same time? How could Iftikhar have been at two locations at the same time as stated in Mohammed Iftikhar's evidence to the court? It is clear and proven that the defendants both lied. The Judge's account of what happened was wrong, was too simple and played to the tune of the defendants.)

³⁴ This evidence proved that Iftikhar Zaman (defendant 2) lied about the injury sustained allegedly by Mr. A. and a brawl occurring in the corridor.

	<p>Judge: Sorry, you where saying you had stayed in the room?</p> <p>I stayed in the room, obviously I did not feel happy about what had happened. What just happened, you know err, my parents where there and, you know we just couldn't figure out what the hell just happened. [TI: 1hr:28m:05s]</p> <p>(Note#14: Zulfiqar Zaman asserts that both his parents witnessed what happened making them key witnesses to the assault. Mohammed Zaman Senior had a front row seat to the assaults and would have become a key witness if called into court if referenced by any of the defendants or defence witnesses while giving evidence in court. But, Mohammed Zaman Senior's death was clearly not without foul play.</p> <p>It is known fact that when the accused has done a wrong there recollection, especially if to hide a fact of guilt is done in haste is considered impaired and this is what the defendant recalls happened after the gravity of the assault. It was definitely not a push as the defendant himself had stated (Line No.1754), it was a total of five fist punches to the face and she fell backwards landing on the fireplace corner as indicated by the bruising on her back (ref to picture IMG_2047B.jpg). This would prove that Mrs. B. fell toward the TV direction and not the direction of the Coffee table.</p>
<p>Proven:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In his own evidence in court Mr Zulfiqar Zaman (defendant) has proven that the coffee table was not in front of Mrs. B., that she was standing near the fireplace, that the coffee table is to the right of her which makes Mrs. B. located near the end of the fireplace near the TV. 2. It is proven that his father's walking stick could not have tripped Mrs. B. as stated by the defendant and defence witness my Mother-In Law. Their father was too far and historically is shown to have his walking stick over his right arm. (Ref: E113-VID01 Family Wedding day Oct 2009.wmv and knitted room picture and Mrs. B. facial injuries page 2.pdf) 2. " I think Mrs. B. then drops, she fell over backwards because I remember dads cane there, she fell over backwards, she hit err, err head on I think on the children's chair , beside the err, err, err, near the coffee table, and then my mother also err, err ,err, you know err, there were three guys there, they also somehow came out, and ..err, you know falling over the coffee table." It has been proven that Mrs. B. does not fall over backwards on the children's chair as these where not present near the fireplace or the coffee table which was not in front of Mrs. B. Here, the defendant is clearly lying to the court and his version of events cannot be considered to be the truth, yet the Judge nonetheless accepts his version of events and reduces the factual evidences to a mere lunge so to avoid the defendant receiving a custodial sentence. The Judge goes further and reassures the defendant that a custodial sentence will not be applicable³⁵. 3. The defendant is not answering the question put to him, he admits that Mrs. B. was let go, that he was still being restrained by his brothers and yet how did Iftikhar get from being on the floor and restraining Zulfiqar and be in the corridor being challenged by Mr. A. at the same time? This proves that Iftikhar's versions of events in the TV Room were a lie and Zulfiqar's versions of events were also lies. How could Iftikhar (Defendant 2) have been at two locations at the same time? It is clear and proven fact

³⁵ Line No. 2895 (defendant), note it has been proven that the defendant had provoked Mrs. B.. (Line No. 787, 791) and that a physical slap or contact did not occur as in My Mother-In Law's own statement where she said "My son Zulfiqar pushed Mrs. B.. and said you are smaller than me how dare you try to hit me."Line no. 385 as the defendant avoided any advance by his sister Mrs. B.. Also proven in Perjury List 1.2 Proven Point 1 & 2 & note #3.

that the defendants both lied and made up a story that did not collaborate each other and so the Judge had no right to accept their version of events, instead the Judge did wrong by accepting both the defendants versions and created a version of his own to water down the sentences. The Judge allowed the defendant Iftikhar to get away with assaulting Mr. A. in the manner that Mr. A. had written in his statements to the police and agreed with Iftikhar’s version of events while ignoring Mrs. B.'s multiple injuries and Mr. A.’s witness statements and accepted Zulfiqar's version of events. THE JUDGE IS WRONG AND HIS SENTENCING IS TOO LIENIENT!

4. When the defendant replies to the Judge when asked how long Iftikhar was in the room restraining him, the defendant says, “Err as soon as basically Mrs. B. left the room that they were restraining me “. This is clear evidence that proved that Iftikhar Zaman (defendant 2) and my Mother-In Law lied about Iftikhar being in the corridor and sustaining an injury allegedly by Mr. A. and a brawl occurring in the corridor. The brawl was denied by my Mother-In Law and Zulfiqar. The Judge believed Iftikhar’s false version of events.

5. It has been established that the defendant had assaulted Mrs. B. physically to the front of her face and she fell backwards landing on the fireplace corner as indicated by the bruising on her back (ref to picture IMG_2047B .jpg). This proves that Mrs. B. fell toward the TV direction and not the direction of the Coffee table. This again proves that both my Mother-In Law and the defendants lied and this is clear perjury.

Evidence Type: Question

2.5 Alright, Mr Zaman, what I’m going to suggest happened is that in the kitchen, you’re mum lost her temper and then assaulted Mr. A., okay, do you agree or disagree?

To Whom:	Defendant	By Whom:	Prosecutor	When:	
-----------------	-----------	-----------------	------------	--------------	--

What was reply:

I disagree sir.

Prosecutor: I am going to suggest that, you and your brother Iftikhar also lost your temper at what's happening to Mr. A. in the kitchen, do you agree or disagree?

I disagree sir.

Prosecutor: Okay, I’m going to suggest that you assaulted your sister? [TI: 19m:50s]

I disagree sir.

Prosecutor: That you lost your temper?

right.

Prosecutor: and your brother assaulted Mr. A., didn’t he?

I disagree.

Proven: 1. It has been proven by the defendants own evidence during the trial that Iftikhar

(Defendant 2) was angry in the Kitchen and this is shown on Line No. 1663 in the transcript document. This proves that his answer to the prosecutors question of " I am going to suggest that, you and your brother Iftikhar also lost your temper at what's happening to Mr. A. in the kitchen, do you agree or disagree?" was misleading the court and was a lie under oath to tell the truth in court. My Mother-In Law was instrumental in supporting her son's evidence by lying in court to cover up both her sons assaults that evening.

2. It has been proven that the defendant had assaulted his sister Mrs. B. and his answer to the prosecutor when asked, " Okay, I'm going to suggest that you assaulted your sister?" was misleading the court and was a further lie under oath to tell the truth in court. My Mother-In Law was instrumental in supporting her son's evidence by lying in court to cover up both her sons assaults that evening.

3. It has been proven that Iftikhar (Defendant 2) had assaulted Mr. A. and Zulfiqar's response to the prosecutor when asked, " and your brother assaulted Mr. A., didn't he?", was again misleading the court and was a lie under oath to tell the truth in court. My Mother-In Law was again instrumental in supporting her sons evidence by lying in court to cover up both her sons assaults that evening.

Mr. A's Witness Statement Re-Assessed.

The following is the witness statement that Mr. A. (plaintiff/Victim) had provided to the Police in May 2011 and a copy was given to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). It is re-assessed in light of new evidence gathered from the trial at Stratford Magistrates Court in February 2012 evidence given only by the defence and defence witnesses.

Page | 44

The original text content has not been alerted in any way, it is 100% as was first published to the CPS in May 2011. The only changes made are a change in the colour of the text, where **Red is the proven facts** by the evidence provided by My Mother In-Law and her two sons Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman (Defendant 1) and Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman (Defendant 2) from the trial and the relevant references shown as footnotes at the bottom of each page. The **text in blue is un-proven according to the statements made by the defendants and defence witnesses**. Also, you will find references to the proven facts as shown as footnotes accompanying key points mentioned and referencing the Transcript document.

Statement (submitted MAY 2011)

My name is Mr. A. and I live at an address known to police. This is a further statement regarding an incident that happened on Friday 29th April 2011 when my wife and I were assaulted by two of her brothers and their mother.

I am going to mention the following people in this statement:

I am going to mention the following people in this statement:

Maqsood Zulfiqar Zaman, Mohammed Iftikhar Zaman and their Mother my Mother In-Law.
Mohammed Zaman Senior (Late).

Mrs. B is my wife and Mr. A is me. {Dining Room or back room = TV Room}

What follows is a chronology of events:

- 3.00 pm Mr. A's family was shopping at Ilford Broadway.
- 7.35 pm At St. Marks Rise, Hackney E8 2NL, I hadn't been round to see my father in-law for 6 weeks. Been on holiday and very busy. I decided to go round just to drop the kids and Mrs. B., then later to pick them up to take home.³⁶
- 7.45 pm Said pleasantries to Mrs. B's mum and dad, no problems, everything was fine as I spoke to my father in-law for 15 minutes. A phone call was received as I got ready to leave and I overheard my mother in-law say to Iftikhar to come round, when she heard him say an excuse she emphasised to him in a more pointiest voice that she wanted him round.³⁷ This did not bother me as I was not going to be here very long. My father in-law then went to perform prayers and I had planned to go to Rectory Road and informed Mrs. B that I would be returning at 10 pm to pick them up, she

³⁶ References Line No. 166 (Mother In-Law),

³⁷ The phone call was to a land line number and can be checked from service provider logs.

mentioned that her sister (Mrs. B's Sister) would take the kids to get some KFC, I made it clear that I was not going to eat on my return, that I would be picking them up only, so instructed Mrs. B. to get the kids ready on my return.³⁸

10.05 pm I arrived back at St. Marks Rise³⁹ and upon entering walked into the kitchen, where I was greeted by Mrs. B and my mother in-law. They both asked whether I wanted to eat⁴⁰ of which I said that I had eaten already and was not hungry. My mother in-law wanted me to eat and I politely said No thank you⁴¹, but being understanding I said that I wouldn't mind some tea instead⁴². I asked Mrs. B if she could make the tea, the English way and if my mother in-law wouldn't mind to pack some of the food for me to take home. My mother in-law began to pack the food in a carrier bag⁴³. Then she went into the front reception room.

10.10 pm Mrs. B bought the tea to me in the dining room⁴⁴.

10.15 pm While finishing my tea⁴⁵ I asked Mrs. B to get the kids ready as we should go as originally planned. She called out to the kids who were playing as kids do in the hallway and stairs.

10.20 pm My mother in-law emerged from the front sitting room and asked why I did not drink my tea at the reception room so as to also shake hands with her son's. To which I replied that I wanted to drink my tea in the dining room while watching the tv of the royal wedding on news at ten. She then said whether I had a problem with her request. Since I had finished my tea the request was not necessary as I had began getting ready to go home.⁴⁶ She then raised her voice as though wanting others to hear, she said, "Why you want to hit my son's"?⁴⁷ to which i replied, "why are you saying this?⁴⁸, I have no intention to "hit" your son's". I then got up from where I was sitting to return my finished cup to the kitchen sink and to my surprise my mother in-law followed me into the kitchen⁴⁹, again chanting in a loud voice⁵⁰, "Why you want to hit my sons!?" I walked back into the dining room and my mother in law followed me⁵¹, she again raised her voice and repeated her earlier outburst, I ignored her and went to get a glass of water from the kitchen tap, again she followed behind me. At this point I repeated what I had said earlier and asked Mrs. B to get the kids were leaving. But as Mrs. B tried to leave the kitchen and as I asked politely to my mother in-law to move aside so that we could leave the kitchen, she

³⁸ Line No. 177, 1051 (Mother In-Law)

³⁹ Line No. 166, 1051 (Mother In-Law)

⁴⁰ Line No. 1055 (Mother In-Law)

⁴¹ Line No. 1125, 1128 (Mother In-Law)

⁴² Line No. 1055 (Mother In-Law)

⁴³ Line No. 860 (Mother In-Law & Defendant)

⁴⁴ Note the dining room is the TV Room which is in the rear of the property. Line No. 1055 (Mother In-Law)

⁴⁵ Line No. 177 (Mother In-Law)

⁴⁶ Line No. 181 (Mother In-Law)

⁴⁷ Line No. 1095 (Mother In-Law)

⁴⁸ Line No. 1006 (Mother In-Law), Notes on Line No. 220,

⁴⁹ Line No. 1061 (Mother In-Law)

⁵⁰ Line No. 1073 (Mother In-Law)

⁵¹ Line No. 1061 (Mother In-Law)

then for the fourth time raised her voice and repeated the same statement which at this time I did not reply and just asked that she allow us to leave. She blocked our path and refused to let us leave the kitchen. She pushed me into the corner of the kitchen and became very intimidating, with threatening behaviour and using verbally abusive language⁵², to which I did not respond. I told her that I wanted to leave now.⁵³

10.23 -35 pm At this point Iftikhar walked toward the kitchen from the reception room and stood at the hallway leading to the front entrance of the kitchen door⁵⁴. My mother in-law then began shouting at Mrs. B⁵⁵ and as Mrs. B explained to me that her mother was not listening to us, Iftikhar raised his voice⁵⁶ and wanted to know why Mrs. B was in disagreement with him, even though up till that point he was not involved in his mothers chanting. Mrs. B explained why she was in disagreement with their decision to gift a million pound property over to Iftikhar without properly consulting the whole family? It was at this point Iftikhar began accusing me of wanting the properties for myself; an accusation that I said was false and had no basis. I then explained to Iftikhar that by taking a gift from his father, circumventing the creation of a {legal} will and ignoring the rest of the family can be viewed as an act of theft⁵⁷. My mother in-law then said Something in Kashmiri that was a term used to target hatred towards me. It was at this point Zulfiqar walks in from the reception room and joins his brother at the door of the kitchen blocking our exit. Hearing the noise from the kitchen, Zulfiqar's older brother placed himself in between Mrs. B and Zulfiqar and held back Zulfiqar's intimidating advance to Mrs. B. My mother in law then began her entourage of verbal abuse that then went on to threatening behaviour, slapping both her hands with great ferocity at my chest three times⁵⁸, doing this while raising her voice throwing verbal abuse at me with her sons shouting at us from behind. It did feel that she was using a combination of trying to scare me, make me angry or was trying to invoke a response with her strikes. I tried to move but my mother in law pushed me into the corner of the kitchen while spitting on me and hitting me further⁵⁹. Iftikhar then launched himself at me in a threatening manner while Zulfiqar's older brother held him back⁶⁰. Iftikhar then shouted, "why is it that Mr. A. opposes the gifting of the property"⁶¹, Zulfiqar shouted "why is Mr. A. concerned while our father is alive and gifted the property over to his son"⁶², I replied, "even though your father is alive, I want to make sure the welfare of my Mother In-Law comes first, your father's actions of gifting the

⁵² Line No. 280, 1073, 1114 (Mother In-Law)

⁵³ Line No. 1086 (Mother In-Law)

⁵⁴ Line No. 541, 543 (Mother In-Law, Defendant)

⁵⁵ Line No. 1013, 1112 (Ms. Zaman), 2027, 2092 (Defendant)

⁵⁶ Line No. 266 (Mother In-Law), 2107 (Defendant)

⁵⁷ Line No. 266 (Mother In-Law), 1074, 1597 (Defendant)

⁵⁸ Line No. 1073, 1149 (Mother In-Law)

⁵⁹ Line No. 899 (Mother In-Law), The action by Mother In-Law has been proven by her own evidence in the trial.

⁶⁰ Perjury List 1.6 Proven point 3, Perjury List 2.2 Proven Point 1, Perjury List 2.4 Note#2, Line No. 272 (Mother In-Law), Line

No. 1572 (Defendant)

⁶¹ Line No. 2107 (Defendant), 181 (Mrs. Mrs. B),

⁶² Line No. 1597 (Defendant),

property to Iftikhar was avoiding the Islamic duty of the father to create an {Islamic} will as he is obliged to do so and that Zulfiqar did not want a will created as this would involve all the inheritors being listed"⁶³. While I replied to Zulfiqar's question, Iftikhar placed his two children in the next adjacent room and locked them in to stop them witnessing what was going to happen: {Both his children} could still see through the internal kitchen window. Iftikhar then chanted loudly, "don't you think we will take care of our mother!", I replied, " it is a matter of what is right and wrong and what they had done was wrong for all concerned". At this point Iftikhar launched himself at me in a threatening manner, with Zulfiqar's older brother holding both Iftikhar and Zulfiqar back⁶⁴. Iftikhar then accused me of taking my own mother to court over inheritance; I told him this allegation was false and untrue⁶⁵. Zulfiqar then cited that another one of this fathers properties at Nightingale Road was worth £500K, I replied, " all these properties have nothing to do with me, I am not an inheritor or have any personal interest in these properties". I reminded Zulfiqar in front of Iftikhar that when Zulfiqar arrived at my residence four months ago I had said that if Zulfiqar wanted St. Marks rise (£1m) then he could have it, the same with Iftikhar that if he wanted Farleigh Road (£1m) then he could have it as well, only if there shares allowed them. I asked Zulfiqar to explain this to Iftikhar but Zulfiqar was reluctant to do so as it did not serve his interest.

10.42pm Their father Mohammed Zaman {Senior} then barged his way through from the hallway and asked his wife my Mother In-Law to be quiet but she did not listen and continued hitting me and verbally abusing her husband in front of us all⁶⁶. Iftikhar then shouted that he wanted me out of the property citing the words "bastard" and other insulting words⁶⁷. I looked toward Zulfiqar's older brother who was standing next to Zulfiqar at the entrance door leading to the kitchen and told him that we wanted to leave, he was the only person I could trust to get us out safely⁶⁸. Both Zulfiqar and Iftikhar had quietened down and this looked like the opportunity to leave⁶⁹. I noticed that {Mohammed Iftikhar's children} where still locked in the adjacent room, so I opened the room and allowed them both to leave the kitchen.

10.45pm At this point as I gathered {my} children and got them ready to leave. Zulfiqar's older brother thought the argument had ended so he left to go upstairs. {I noticed both Zulfiqar and Iftikhar while at the kitchen door whispering to each other quietly, as I did-up shoe laces}.There was quiet and I round up the children and had helped them

⁶³ Since footnote 26 is true, the follow on reply should also be true.

⁶⁴ Perjury List 1.6 Proven point 3, Perjury List 2.1 Proven Point 1 (Defendant), Perjury List 2.2 Proven Point 1(Defendant), Perjury List 2.4 Note#2(Defendant), Line No. 272 (Mother In-Law), Line No. 1572 (Defendant), Line No. 1663 (Defendant),

Line No. 1304 (Mother In-Law does not disagree over her son Zulfiqar's attempt to hit Mr. A. in the Kitchen and cites the action of the plaintiffs a reason why her sons acted in that way. This proves both Iftikhar and Zulfiqar attempted to cause physical harm upon Mr. A. in the Kitchen as stated by Mr. A. in his two statements to the Police, events that both defendants deny took place in their statements and during the trial.)

⁶⁵ Line No. 1636 (Defendant)

⁶⁶ Line No. 1605 (Defendant), Line No. 1628 (Defendant), Line No. 1636 (defendant)

⁶⁷ Line No. 1628 (Defendant)

⁶⁸ Line No. 546, 602, 663 (Mother In-Law), 1552 (Defendant)

⁶⁹ Line No. 1677 (Defendant)

tie their shoes⁷⁰. Zulfiqar and Iftikhar then walked from the kitchen into the {TV} room and started to hound Mrs. B as she went to collect her purse from the {TV} room⁷¹. Zulfiqar and my mother in law continued to hound her and throw abuse at her waiting for a response, I told her to get her things and lets go⁷².

10.47-50pm As I held two of my children by the hand walking toward the {TV} room door leading to the hallway⁷³, I saw Zulfiqar and My mother in-law standing round Mrs. B throwing verbal abuse to her, she did not respond and then in a moment of quiet heard Zulfiqar and my mother in law say something that I could not clearly hear⁷⁴, I believe it to have been an insulting word⁷⁵ and as I looked down at the children making my way to the {TV} room door {exit} leading to the hallway. Zulfiqar began starting his rounds, I saw the first fist rise and punching Mrs. B on the face, followed by a second to her head and her falling to the ground behind her onto the edge of the TV stand⁷⁶, chanting that he wanted to kill her and before I could move, a barrage of fists from Iftikhar started hitting my back⁷⁷, shoulders and then to the side of my head⁷⁸, he then stamped his shoe onto my back and kicked me, I had concussion from the head blow and could not recollect where I was, the next thing I noticed was standing at the other end of the hallway near the main door surrounded by screaming children and hearing my wife being physically assaulted by Zulfiqar inside the dining room⁷⁹. I shouted to Iftikhar that you did this in front of children, ,Iftikhar then closed the door to the TV Room to stop me from entering to help Mrs. B, Zulfiqar's older brother ran down the stairs and held back Iftikhar who stood in front of the door blocking me from entering the room to help. In that moment Mrs. B was able to escape from Zulfiqar who was previously towering over her, punching her repeatedly to the face, chanting that he wanted to kill her⁸⁰. Zulfiqar's older brother held back Iftikhar, at this point Mr A., Mrs. B and the kids were able to get to the main entrance door leading outside. Followed by Zulfiqar who again was shouting that he wanted to kill Mrs. B. his sister. It was at this point I called 999 on my mobile and requested the police for assistance but knowing that the family where not safe I did not realise that one of my children was still in the hallway and confronted Zulfiqar who if it wasn't for Zulfiqar's older brother holding him back would have landed a fist to my son. He escaped from the hallway out onto the pavement and Zulfiqar's older brother was still holding both brothers back from the main gate, back into the house.⁸¹ . I was asked by the operator whether I required

⁷⁰ Line no. 1186 (Mother In-Law)

⁷¹ Line No. 1699 (Defendant),

⁷² Line No.787 (Mother In-Law), 2173 (Defendant), Perjury List 1.2 Proven Point 1 & 2 & note #3

⁷³ Line No. 3188, Sketch 11: TV Room according to Mr Zulfiqar Zaman Cross Examined Prosecution Line no. 2107-2319.jpg.

⁷⁴ Line No. 1222 (Mother In-Law)

⁷⁵ Perjury List 1.2 Proven Point 1 & 2 & note #3, Line No. 2139 (Defendant), Line No. 2159, 2170, 2173 (Defendant)

⁷⁶ Perjury List 1.3 Proven Point 2

⁷⁷ Line No. 1195, 1286 (Evidence of Iftikhar Physically hitting Mr. A.) (Mother In-Law)

⁷⁸ Line No. 1195, 1366 (Evidence that Mother In-Law saw her son Iftikhar hit Mr. A.) (Mother In-Law)

⁷⁹ Since Footnote 40 is proven, then we can assume the next resultant action also proven to be true.

⁸⁰ Line No. 1833 (Defendant)

⁸¹ Line No. 1886, 1871 (Defendant)

an ambulance, it was difficult to ascertain the injuries that we had suffered and I simply could not give a clear answer, having the ambulance there would have put them at risk of injury. Then, I saw Mrs. B's injuries to her face as she trembled before me, her head had a large protruding bruised bump and her lip was gushing blood. I spoke to the police operator and knowing it wasn't safe, got everyone into the car and drove the car to a location four roads away. Parked {on Sigdon Road} Hackney E8, I made a further call providing the police operator with details on where we were so the police could visit us at Sigdon Road. Either I called again or It was also during this same conversation that I asked for an ambulance both for myself and my wife. It was at this {location} that both my wife and I had our statements recorded by attending Police officers⁸².

⁸² Police Operator can certify what was said and actions taken that was recorded.

Statement Re-evaluation & overall Conclusion

It is proven beyond any measure of doubt that 98% of the statement provided by Mr. A. over the events that took place on the 29th April 2011 is true, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. That Mr. A. told the truth in court and that on many occasions during the trial both defendants and my Mother-In Law had repeatedly accused Mr. A. and his wife Mrs. B. both victims of lying and making up the events that occurred during the night of the 29th April 2011. These accusations were further highlighted to misrepresent the character of Mr. A. as being a person who exaggerates, a "bad man", is not telling the truth and making him out publicly as a liar. This document concludes the understanding of the events that took place on the 29th April 2011 and proves that Mr. A.'s statements were completely truthful and charges the Crown to apply perjury charges toward Mr. A.'s Mother-In Law and the two defendants. Further, that the story knitted together by the trial Judge was incorrect and clearly designed to fit the Magistrates limitations of applying sentences that did not represent and had fallen far short the crimes committed by both defendants and to their lying mother who along with her sons committed gross wilful perjury and must be held to account for this in a court of Law. Further, that my Mother-In Law did physically assault Mr. A. three times in the Kitchen along with the defendants who launched themselves toward Mr. A. and tried to assault Mr. A. in the kitchen.

The plaintiffs have worked extremely hard in bringing new evidence, this document and subsequent documents to the attention of both the Police and the Crime Prosecution Service. Much time and effort had gone into delivering the truth to the Police and the CPS and it is hoped that the Law courts understand the immense emotional distress and hardship experienced by the plaintiffs both after 29th April 2011, a ten month wait for the second trial date, during the two month trial and voicing their dismay on the outcome of trial with the Police and the CPS. A process which was both emotionally draining and a terrible time re-living the trial as much as over forty times while providing transcripts to appropriate colloquy format and proving documented evidence to support submitted Police Statements that were truthful and uncorrupted.

From the perspective of the plaintiffs, they still await Justice, as the consequences of the actions of the offenders and their mother form part of a larger criminal case involving the death of Mohammed Zaman Senior. The trial delivered the correct verdict, for the wrong type of crimes committed and subsequent lenient sentences given that appeased the defendants only.

Mr. A.

Mrs. B.

Plaintiffs

End of document.