

# Opening the Matter to the Court of Public Opinion

A concise public note on why this evidential bias complaint should be openly heard, after the administrative route appears to have closed the door.

---

## Our position

This is not a complaint born of disappointment with an outcome. It is, in our case, a serious concern about apparent bias, undisclosed relationships, and the refusal of administrative bodies to engage fully with evidential material that, in our respectful view, merited proper investigation.

We now place this matter before the court of public opinion because the administrative courts and related complaint channels appear to have rejected, sidelined, or procedurally exhausted what we say is a clear bias case. Where institutions close ranks, transparency becomes the only remaining forum in which serious public concerns can still be tested.

### Why this matters beyond one litigant

Judicial independence depends not only on actual fairness, but on visible fairness. If a credible appearance of bias can be dismissed without full engagement, then public confidence is weakened not only in one case, but in the integrity of the process itself.

## What the public should ask

1. Were the bias concerns examined on their evidential merits, or filtered out as procedural inconvenience?
2. Were follow-up letters, explanations, and supporting documents meaningfully considered?
3. If the case was administratively delayed, misdirected, or left without response, should that now count against the complainant?
4. In a matter touching public confidence in judicial neutrality, should substance yield to silence?

**“When formal routes stop listening, the public has a legitimate interest in asking whether fairness was truly done - and whether it was seen to be done.”**

This teaser is not a final pleading. It is an opening statement to the public: the evidence should be heard, the delays should be understood in context, and the merits should not be buried under administrative non-engagement.

All factual allegations should be judged against the underlying documents, correspondence, and exhibits. The public case being advanced is simple: serious bias concerns deserve a fair hearing, not a procedural disappearance.

# Why the matter should be reopened in the public interest

A second page for broadcasters, journalists, campaigners, and fair-minded observers.

## The wider concern

If an arguable bias complaint supported by documents can be reframed as mere dissatisfaction and then allowed to stall, the danger is institutional: the appearance of accountability remains, but the reality of scrutiny falls away. Public confidence does not survive on assurances alone. It survives when difficult cases are actually examined.

This is why the matter should now be looked at in the open. Not to inflame, but to clarify. Not to attack the judiciary as a whole, but to insist that fairness, transparency, and equal treatment must apply especially where questions of judicial neutrality arise.

### Public-interest proposition

Where a complaint raises a credible issue of apparent bias and the complainant can show sustained efforts to pursue the matter through official channels, delay should be understood in context. Silence, confusion, or redirection by institutions should not be used to extinguish scrutiny.

## Call for fair hearing

We therefore invite journalists, public-interest lawyers, accountability campaigners, and the broader public to consider the documentary record with care. The central question is not whether institutions are comfortable with scrutiny. The question is whether justice is better served by daylight than by administrative closure.

In the name of justice, and in the public interest, this evidential matter should be heard fairly. If the formal system has rejected or narrowed the case before its substance was properly confronted, then public examination is not a substitute for justice - it is the pressure that may yet restore it.

*For any public release, the safer formulation is to present the case as “our position,” “apparent bias,” and “documents said to support the complaint,” while inviting independent review of the bundle.*