



Case No: CC-2025-013

IN THE CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT

Date: 04/05/2025

Before :

Mr Justice Puppert

Between:

R v PolyKeith

**Lord Halvorsen of Lairg KC, Ognian0, EatFish24 and MaxwellMcKinnel for the Crown
Polydamo for the Defendant**

Hearing dates: Pre-trial 25/04/2025; Trial 1 01/05/2025; Trial 2 03/05/2025

Approved Judgment
.....

Mr Justice Puppet:

1. This case concerns the indictment of alleged criminal actions conducted by PolyKeith ('the defendant') during his tenure as Minister of State for the Foreign Office around the dates of 15-17th February 2025. After a lengthy two-stage trial, which the Court recognises as mildly acceptable, considering the nature of the case and the severity of the charges put forth by the Crown (hereafter referred to as 'the prosecution', including any mention of Lord Halvorsen of Lairg KC et al.).
2. The Court received the case on the application of the prosecution on the 15th of April 2025. The alleged charges committed by the defendant concerned those of purely indictable circumstances: PolyKeith was accused of Fraud by False Representation on 1 count for allegedly misleading Foreign Office officials by manipulating the truth about the presence of one PERSI4N in Canada's GAC (Global Affairs Canada; the FCDO equivalent of the country) group chat, and for making mendacious statements regarding his involvement in making a decision contrary to the United Kingdom's interests on the international level. The defendant was also indicted of Corruption on two counts for allegedly undermining the United Kingdom's interests by advocating for Canada to oppose and/or sabotage the United Kingdom's attempt at joining the 'Permanent Five' of the United Nations' Security Council. He did so while in the office of Minister of State for Foreign Affairs.
3. The defence, represented by Polydamos ('the defence') was prepared to argue that the prosecution did not meet the burden of proof by proving the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, citing speculation was in play with the evidence given and not pure fact. The defence argued that the defendant truthfully informed his colleagues at the Foreign Office that PERSI4N was not, in fact, in the GAC's group chat. In truth, he was present only in the GAC HQ's group chat and not the 'GAC gc' as shown in B12 of the prosecution's disclosure. Furthermore, the defence argued that MarcFremwell's statements are inconsistent considering the difference in timezones and the constant activity from one 'Brady'. In regards to the two counts of corruption, the defence argues that all of the prosecution's evidence falls into scrutiny, having shown little activity from the defendant and instead focusing on other personages not necessarily related to any of the current parties at hand.
4. Upon receiving the defence statement, I immediately gave way for scheduling a pre-trial, before which the defence insisted on waiving the right to a jury for indictable offences, which the Court accepted. The initial date of the pre-trial was set for Friday on the 25th of April, after which 3 PM EST (8 PM BST) was selected as the time. On the date itself, the prosecution submitted a 'timeline of events' document which the Court accepted, considering the extra information it provided, however I emphasised that anything omitted from that document during trial will be disregarded by the Court.

5. During the pre-trial, the defendant confirmed his plea of not guilty for all charges imposed on him, after which I gave instructions for the schedule of a physical trial, the consensus of which appeared to be Thursday at 8 PM BST. Shortly after the pre-trial's conclusion, the defence applied to amend their original disclosure. After carefully considering the need for such amendments, as well as the validity of the evidence provided, the Court accepted the application, but barred either side from disclosing more information beyond that point, considering the advanced stage of the case¹.
6. After receiving the amended disclosure, the case proceeded to wait for the 1st of May at 8 PM BST, which is when the first part of the trial took place.
7. The prosecution opened the trial by summarising their strategy, mentioning that the defendant was a trusted official having been an elected Minister of State. The prosecution alleged that the defendant made false statements regarding his participation in the discussion to remove Libya from the Permanent Five, whose seat the United Kingdom wished to take, and that he covered PERSI4N's presence in the GAC group chat.
8. The defence took the stance that the defendant was an 'easy target' for the Crown and others were to blame for the charges the defendant was indicted of.
9. During their arguments, the prosecution summoned former Prime Minister, the Lord Rothschild of Croydon, whose connection to the case was established as a 'confidant' of MarcFremwell, previous Prime Minister of Canada, as well as an eye witness to the GAC group chat's discussion, having seen it on stream from MarcFremwell. The important note the Court took from the witness' statements is that the conclusion of the former Prime Minister was that the activity shown from PERSI4N and PolyKeith was [either] politically motivated, considering GeorgeGodsent, a former Forward UK party official, posted in his party's channel the failure of the United Kingdom to acquire the Permanent Five seat, having seen the failed vote to remove Libya from it.
10. During their cross examination, the defence alleged that the witness was only speculating and that his participation in the trial was questionable, considering he was only a 'confidant' of MarcFremwell and 'not an expert' (to which the Court responded by acknowledging that this was an eye witness and not an expert one). The point of the defence was that the credibility of the witness was in question, and that he was more so giving speculative statements rather than factual information.
11. The prosecution next summoned MarcFremwell, former Canadian Prime Minister and active participator in the GAC HQ's group chat. MarcFremwell was called to give testimony on what went down in the group chat, as well as the vote of the UNSC itself. It was established that MarcFremwell was the one to attend the UNSC as Canada's

¹ See [Court's Determination on Application to Amend Defence](#)

representative, but he was told by PERSI4N not to ‘raise his hand’ [and vote] but to abstain, rather. The prosecution argued that this proved to be influence on the vote in consideration with the UK’s bid for the Permanent Five, as well as direct gain for him as the leader of the Forward UK party.

12. During their cross examination, the defence argued that PERSI4N’s presence in the GAC HQ’s group chat was irrelevant as he was [only] the Minister of Immigration [of Canada], to which point MarcFremwell mentioned his alleged appointment to National Security Advisor of Canada. The Court recognises both points but underlines MarcFremwell’s earlier statement that he still considered PERSI4N a close friend and advisor ‘at the time’, and insisted that the participation of the aforementioned in the group chat was the relevant fact, and not his role or capacity.
13. To that point it had got quite late and, having gone on for two hours, I was forced to abruptly adjourn the court as it was a weekday. Immediately the possibility of having a trial scheduled for Saturday at 7 PM BST was coined in the case channel, and that date was set for the trial’s continuation.
14. Upon re-convening, the Court established the previous point in time where MarcFremwell was being cross examined. The defence phrased only a few questions before sitting back down, most of which concerned once again the reason PERSI4N was in the group chat. After that, the witness was dismissed.
15. The prosecution finally summoned the Marquess Cholmondeley, wrightsonophobia, whose capacity of Second Permanent Secretary of the FCDO was the reason he was brought forth as a witness. He was the initial representative of the United Kingdom during the UNSC session, from the Court’s understanding, and he was the one to question PolyKeith when he realised he was starting to miss something. It was the Marquess Cholmondeley who asked the defendant of PERSI4N’s presence in the group chat, as well as his participation in the GAC ordeal to remove Libya. It was established here that the defendant was made a National Security Threat before his resignation statement was published, which the Court recognised further as a political statement, rather than a resignation, because of that fact.
16. The prosecution concluded their arguments by confirming the defendant’s words shown in their disclosure, having said to ‘put Brazil on the P5’ and that ‘Canada should not decide the fate of Libya’.
17. The defence was then allowed to make their arguments to the Court. They chose to summon one p_otatos1 (identified as Brady) who was summoned to re-establish the defence’s position that he alone controlled Canada’s vote as the Canadian Permanent Secretary equivalent to the GAC. The witness confirmed that he was the one to make the call for Canada to abstain, as it was at a crossroads: Canada was targeted as much as

Libya and was ‘next’ to Libya when it came to removal from the Permanent Five; as such, they chose to abstain to avoid critique. It came to be, however, that two nations abstained and the vote to remove Libya failed, to which Canada was afraid it would meet hostile remarks from the other nations.

18. Shortly after the prosecution’s cross examination and the closing remarks from both sides, the trial was concluded.

Court’s Conclusion:

19. It is clear to the Court that this is a very convoluted case, involving multiple perspectives and clear, and unclear, messages exchanged by two group chats of different nations, concerning the same situation: the United Kingdom’s bid for the Permanent Five.

20. It should be noted that the Court did not consider the unused material from the prosecution’s disclosure to create this judgment.

21. In order for the Court to pass verdict for either of the charges laid before the defendant, it had to consider multiple mitigating factors:

- a. Was the defendant aware of the United Kingdom’s bid for the Permanent Five?
- b. Did the defendant commit to the actions he did maliciously or was he unaware of the potential damages he could cause?
- c. Were the defendant’s actions illegal in nature?
- d. Was any political or personal gain involved in the process?
- e. Was the defendant working alongside PERSI4N or were their goals, if any, simply intertwined?

22. Those, and more, were the Court’s concern in drafting this judgment. The Court recognised the multiple perspectives, and chose to adhere to arguments from both sides on the matter, using the witness’ testimonies as a guide to shed more light on the otherwise terribly confusing matter.

23. Nevertheless, the Court drafts this judgment based on an impartial and completely unbiased stance:

24. Concerning the charge of Fraud by False Representation, to which the prosecution argued was because of the defendant misleading the Foreign Office by saying PERSI4N was not in fact in the GAC group chat, and that he misled the Foreign Office by untruthfully commenting on his participation in the discussion surrounding the Permanent Five in that same group chat, the Court had to establish whether or not there was a. gain or b. loss to a person or party.

25. Addressing the above, the Court found that gain was not necessarily applicable, but rather a loss. Specifically to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom at the time, the Permanent Secretary to the Foreign Office and the Foreign Office. While a loss to the Prime Minister's party was also in sight of the Court, it was deemed unlikely that the defendant, a minister from the same party, would aim towards sabotaging it as no such motive was seen anywhere, however the Court did not rule it out as a possibility.
26. The Court had to establish whether the defendant's 'attributes' to the Canadian abstention during the P5 vote were substantial. Of particular interest to the Court was exhibit B2 of the Crown's disclosure, where p_otatos1 is seen mentioning that he and 'everyone' were aware of the United Kingdom's bid for the Permanent Five².
27. The Court saw the possibility that the defendant could be prioritising Canada's relationships on the international level over those of the United Kingdom, but considers it unlikely.
28. The Court recognises that the defendant mentioned the possibility of adding Brazil to the P5 before the vote or the session took place. It also recognises the fact that 'Brady' was the one to majorly (or at least according to the evidence) make Canada's case that it should abstain. However, the Court deems that this was conducted despite being allegedly aware of the UK's ambitions to be on the Permanent Five. The Court rules that both the defendant and the GAC HQ group chat were aware of the United Kingdom's bid, the defendant being the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs at the time, whose political statement includes the Permanent Five bid, and the GAC HQ group chat mentioning the United Kingdom's wishes in the past tense. The Court takes this speech at face value, and concludes such.
29. That being said, however, the Court rules that while the defendant did participate in discussing foreign interests over the United Kingdom's, and that his opinion as an incumbent minister differed from the United Kingdom's, his participation in the group chat was not enough to attribute the act of abstaining the vote on his behalf. However, do make note of the above, as it will occur again in this judgment.
30. In consideration to the defendant's statements regarding PERSI4N's appearance in the group chat, the Court at first deemed it as a possibility of the defendant being simply unaware or confused, but upon further look it recognised it as a possibility of deceit.
31. The defence argued that the defendant was telling the truth - PERSI4N was in fact not in the 'GAC gc', which was made apparent by the Governor-General of Canada's remark to the Lord Rothschild in exhibit B12 of the Crown, but rather in the GAC HQ's group chat.

² 'of course i knew; everyone knows' [7-32] Global Affairs Canada Internal Communications

32. The Court, in response to that effect, rules that in accordance with the Marquess Cholmondeley's witness testimony that purely the GAC HQ group chat was discussed in the diplomat service group chat, and that in exhibit A1 of the Crown the defendant mentions the GAC HQ group chat (which was two days before the mention of PERSI4N), the knowledge of the 'other' GAC group chat was not apparent to the Foreign Office. Furthermore, the Court rules that the fact the defendant was 'telling the truth' and that 'PERSI4N was not in fact in the GAC gc but in the GAC HQ gc' is a dangerous play on double speak and, therefore, recognises that the defendant denied the existence of PERSI4N in the GAC HQ group chat, as discussed by the diplomatic service and the Marquess Cholmondeley.
33. In respect to the claim that the defendant denied activity from PERSI4N in the GAC HQ group chat in regards to the vote to abstain, the Court's stance is that it was unlikely. The Court recognises that PERSI4N, as the leader of an ambitious political party (at the time) would largely benefit from any scrutiny of the current government merely saw this as an attempt to seize the moment and exploit the decision for influence on the political scale. However, it would be ignorant to say that he did not contribute to the mindset that it would be best for Canada to abstain. What the Court does recognise as influence from PERSI4N were his messages to MarcFremwell, who himself confirmed that he was a close friend and an advisor at the time.
34. To this effect, the Court rules that the defendant did not lie about PERSI4N's influence over the vote, but did lie about his presence in the GAC HQ group chat.
35. In regards to the two counts of corruption, the Court had to establish:
- a. Did the defendant gain anything?
 - b. Was the United Kingdom prioritised over Canada and the personal stances of the defendant?
36. To this effect, the Court referred to the political statement of the defendant, who expressed his disconcert with the administration and claimed it to be a 'failure', mentioning the bid for the Permanent Five and calling politicians of the United Kingdom 'bureaucrats' and the government 'deteriorating'.
37. In the alternate version of the statement the Court noticed a line of particular interest, specifically '*Canada has forever had a longstanding relationship with the former OAS states in South America, which are some of Canada's closest allies. Between Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela, Canada has always put the interests of those states prior to those of any other country. It has been that way since 2023, than expanded during my tenure as Canadian Prime Minister, and in my humble opinion it will always be that way.*'
38. With regards to the definition of corruption, the Court rules that this is in direct conflict with the Oath the defendant swore upon being appointed as an MP and as a Minister of

the Crown. The Court rules that, by deviating from the United Kingdom's stance (which, as established earlier in this judgment was that they wished to be on the P5 and that the defendant was aware of this) is considered undermining the Kingdom in a public office.

39. Furthermore, the defendant advocated for such different stance in the GAC group chat, the Court recognised it as such. Whether it was substantial or not is irrelevant, as the act itself, defined by law, is the matter of illegality.
40. However, when it comes to gain, the Court could not find anything significant enough to consider it gain. Perhaps, upon success, the defendant would have committed himself to Forward UK, however, that is a very slight possibility that is not proved anywhere. The Court could find no decisive evidence of gain whatsoever, be it political, personal or other.
41. On that note, the Court, however, recognises that the defendant is making political gains by advocating for such within Canada and the Canadian government. The Court assumes the position that this was done in that regard considering the defendant's revised political statement.
42. As such, the Court hereby declares that, concerning Fraud by False Representation on the first count, the defendant is found guilty of the offence. Concerning Corruption on the first count, the defendant is found not guilty. Concerning Corruption on the second count, the defendant is found guilty.
43. The defendant, for his conviction, will now undergo sentencing, which will be conducted in Discord. Refer to CrimPR 10.14 'Procedure if the court convicts'.



The Hon. Mr Justice Puppert
Puisne Justice of the High Court
Central Criminal Court

Docketed 04/05/2025