

TAKE ACTION:

Keystone Law acting again for the same disruptive directors — despite prior judicial criticism



Is This an Abuse of Insolvency Law?

Could it be that Mark Coote and Mark Endersby, directors of Astroccer 4 U Ltd, Surrey Stadium Ltd, Formark Scaffolding (Holdings) Ltd, have given misleading information to the UK's best in insolvency and these licensed individuals have failed UK public?

- 1 Justice Coulson Findings**
Bernhards Sport Surfaces Ltd v Astroccer 4 U Ltd
• "No evidence of any actual insolvency"
• "What is unusual here, in my judgment, is the connivance of Keystone Law."
- 2 Lack of Due Diligence?**
Despite Herron Fisher notes & Companies House filings confirming Formark has no insolvency set-off claim, Alice Court, & Kunal Gadhwi of Irwin Mitchell continue harming IRAMA for 5+ years (ongoing)
- 3 Steven Illes of MHA & Surrey Stadium Ltd**
• Steven Illes of MHA (Baker Tilly) says he dealt with Mark Endersby of Surrey Stadium Ltd to wind up WFC.
• WFC trustee says no authorisation given to Mark Coote.
- 4 Trustee Identity Confusion**
Jan 2026: Chris Herron asks IRAMA who WFC trustees are; he later emails, "Obviously Mark Coote is a trustee."
Indemnity insurers are on notice.

Mark Coote & Mark Endersby
Our preliminary findings indicate much disturbance to Ian Rush and IRAMA in the tens of millions. Indemnity insurers are on notice.

Why this matters

A firm pursuing enforcement measures (including charging orders) must not become the vehicle for misleading material, procedural abuse, or "rubber-stamped" enforcement when put on notice of credible defects.

Key message: Keystone has now been put on notice. Any further enforcement steps should be paused pending checks and full candour to the court.

Campaign note: the quotation shown is presented as a graphic. For any formal filing, rely only on the exact transcript/sealed order reference.



What we are asking for

A practical "stop and check" protocol before Keystone progresses from interim steps to final enforcement.

- Confirm Keystone will **pause** any move to a **final** charging order pending determination of any live challenge to the DCC / entitlement (e.g., CPR 47.12).
- Confirm Keystone will ensure the court is told - clearly and fairly - that enforcement is **actively disputed** and Keystone has been placed on notice of alleged defects/misstatements.
- Disclose the **supervising solicitor** responsible for documents served and any statements relied upon (no "agent without right of audience" issue).
- Provide the **document chain** relied upon: sealed DCC, notice of commencement + service proof, interim order, and any witness statements used to obtain enforcement.
- Agree a short timetable for resolution, with costs reserved, and refrain from escalation while the dispute is before the court/tribunal/regulator.

Context (workforce pressure / billing culture)

Where enforcement is being driven by volume and targets, the risk of procedural corner-cutting increases. These screenshots are included as contextual material only.



Call to action

Compile Keystone correspondence, the interim order, and the DCC paperwork into a single bundle and serve a "notice to take care" letter requiring a pause and full disclosure before any final charging order hearing.

This is a business/campaign teaser. It is not legal advice.