



Neutral Citation Number: [2024] EWHC 1530 (KB)

Case No: QB-2021-002660

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS LIST

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 19 June 2024

Before :

MRS JUSTICE HILL DBE

Between :

DAVID UYI

Claimant

- and -

Defendant

**OSAMUDIAMEN ABRAHAM (a.k.a JOHN
IMADE a.k.a PASTOR OSAS OSAKUE of LIGHT
of LIFE CHURCH)**

The **Claimant** in person
Harry Stratton (pro bono counsel) for the **Defendant**

Submissions: 23 February and 22 March 2024

Approved Judgment

This judgment was handed down remotely at 10.30am on 19 June 2024 by circulation to the parties or their representatives by e-mail and by release to the National Archives.

.....
MRS JUSTICE HILL

Mrs Justice Hill DBE:

Introduction

1. By this claim, issued on 2 July 2021, the Claimant alleges that the Defendant made statements that were defamatory of him in a video posted on the Defendant's Facebook and You Tube channels on 18 August 2020.
2. The Claimant is a pastor of the Gospel Church, Benin, Nigeria. The Defendant is a former member of the Gospel Church, London branch. From 2018 he has been a Pastor in the Light of Life Church, London SE13 7BN. The video features the Defendant giving a speech in the style of a sermon, including making various references to parts of the Bible.
3. On 25 January 2024 Senior Master Cook order a trial on the papers of the following preliminary issues: (i) the meaning of each of the four statements complained of in paragraph 4 of the Particulars of Claim ("POC"); (ii) whether each of those meanings is a statement of fact or opinion; and (iii) whether each of those meanings was defamatory at common law.
4. It is well established that a judge seeking to determine meaning should "capture an initial reaction, before reading or hearing argument..." see, for example, *Hijazi v Yaxley-Lennon* [2020] EWHC 934 (QB) at [8] and *Millett v Corbyn* [2021] EWCA Civ 567, [2021] EMLR 19 at [8]. I performed this task by reading the words complained of in the Particulars of Claim and watching the video, without reading the competing cases or submissions on meaning, thereby forming some initial views on meaning. I then read the statements of case and considered the written submissions made by both parties.

Amendment to the statements of case and the transcript of the video

5. As well as conducting the trial, by order of Mrs Justice Steyn dated 7 May 2024 I was required to consider whether the Claimant should be granted permission to amend his POC in the form he had served in draft on 5 February 2021, if required.
6. The Claimant does not need such permission because on 16 May 2024 correspondence was received indicating that the Defendant consented to the amendments. Accordingly CPR 17.1(2)(a) applies.
7. However I direct under CPR PD 17, paragraphs 2.2-2.4 that the Claimant provide a fresh version of the Amended Particulars of Claim ("APOC") showing the amendments in red, underlined text so that they can be more easily identified. The original text need not be shown.
8. At paragraph 4 of the APOC the Claimant complains that four statements made by the Defendant were defamatory. He numbers them I, II, III and IV. The statements were made during the course of a video that runs for just over 1½ hours. The content of the video is very discursive, repetitive and at times hard to decipher.
9. At paragraph 3 of the APOC the Claimant cites 16 extracts from the video, from which the four statements are drawn. These extracts are set out at Appendix A to this judgment.

10. After filing the bundle for the preliminary issue trial, the Claimant provided a full transcript of the video. I am conscious that this has not been agreed by the Defendant.
11. Without the transcript it would have been impossible to identify where in the video the statements complained of occurred, not least because (i) neither paragraph 3 nor paragraph 4 of the APOC contain any time markings for the passages referred to therein; and (ii) paragraph 3 of the APOC does not set out the extracts relied on entirely chronologically, in that the 16th pleaded extract in fact occurs on the video between the 11th and 12th pleaded extracts.
12. For these reasons I order the Claimant to amend the APOC further, to add in to paragraphs 3 and 4 the precise time markings in the video where each of the statements occur. These amendments should also be made in red, underlined text.
13. The Defendant should also indicate whether the transcript of the video is agreed and if not in what respects he disputes the Claimant's version. If there are disputes as to what has been said, I direct that the parties provide a composite version of the transcript setting out the competing versions.
14. Finally, the APOC should be endorsed with the statement required by PD 17, paragraph 2.1, to the effect that they have been amended under CPR 17.1(2)(a).
15. The Defendant has permission to file an Amended Defence in light of the APOC if so advised.
16. The amendments do not relate to the issues for the preliminary issues trial such that they can be determined without sight of any Amended Defence.

Issue (i): The meaning of each of the four statements complained of in paragraph 4 of the APOC

The legal principles

17. The Court is not determining what the statements relied upon could plausibly mean, or the range of meanings that different people might take from them, but their single true meaning: *Stocker v Stocker* [2019] UKSC 17, [2020] AC 593 at [34]; see also *Neville v Fine Art and General Insurance Co* [1897] AC 68 at [73].
18. The single natural and ordinary meaning of the words complained of is the meaning that the hypothetical reasonable reader would understand the words bear: *Slim v Daily Telegraph Ltd* [1968] 2 QB 157, 173D–E, per Lord Diplock.
19. In *Koutsogiannis v The Random House Group Ltd* [2019] EWHC 48 (QB), [2020] 4 WLR 25 at [12], Nicklin J distilled the principles from the caselaw as follows:
 - “i) The governing principle is reasonableness.
 - ii) The intention of the publisher is irrelevant.
 - iii) The hypothetical reasonable reader is not naïve but he is not unduly suspicious. He can read between the lines. He can read in an implication more readily than a lawyer and may indulge in a certain amount of

loose thinking but he must be treated as being a man who is not avid for scandal and someone who does not, and should not, select one bad meaning where other non-defamatory meanings are available. A reader who always adopts a bad meaning where a less serious or non-defamatory meaning is available is not reasonable: s/he is avid for scandal. But always to adopt the less derogatory meaning would also be unreasonable: it would be naïve.

iv) Over-elaborate analysis should be avoided and the Court should certainly not take a too literal approach to the task.

v) Consequently, a judge providing written reasons for conclusions on meaning should not fall into the trap of conducting too detailed an analysis of the various passages relied on by the respective parties.

vi) Any meaning that emerges as the produce of some strained, or forced, or utterly unreasonable interpretation should be rejected.

vii) It follows that it is not enough to say that by some person or another the words might be understood in a defamatory sense.

viii) The publication must be read as a whole, and any ‘bane and antidote’ taken together. Sometimes, the context will clothe the words in a more serious defamatory meaning (for example the classic “rogues’ gallery” case). In other cases, the context will weaken (even extinguish altogether) the defamatory meaning that the words would bear if they were read in isolation (e.g. bane and antidote cases).

ix) In order to determine the natural and ordinary meaning of the statement of which the claimant complains, it is necessary to take into account the context in which it appeared and the mode of publication.

x) No evidence, beyond publication complained of, is admissible in determining the natural and ordinary meaning.

xi) The hypothetical reader is taken to be representative of those who would read the publication in question. The Court can take judicial notice of facts which are common knowledge, but should beware of reliance on impressionistic assessments of the characteristics of a publication’s readership.

xii) Judges should have regard to the impression the article has made upon them themselves in considering what impact it would have made on the hypothetical reasonable reader.

xiii) In determining the single meaning, the Court is free to choose the correct meaning; it is not bound by the meanings advanced by the parties (save that it cannot find a meaning that is more injurious than the claimant’s pleaded meaning)” (and see *Millett* at [8] for the Court of Appeal’s approval of this summary).

20. Counsel for the Defendant emphasised the following further principles, which I have borne in mind:
- (i) The ordinary reasonable reader assesses the statement in the context and circumstances of its publication: *Bukovsky v Crown Prosecution Service* [2017] EWCA Civ 1529, [2018] 4 WLR 13 at [13];
 - (ii) Where a statement uses particular unusual words, it may be that it does not convey anything in particular to an ordinary reasonable reader at all – unless the Claimant can plead and prove that it was communicated to a person who understood what those words mean; and
 - (iii) In the case of a video recording, the viewer is taken only to view the recording once, and “the casual viewer of a television show is forced to form quick impressions”: Collins on Defamation at [6.71].

The video as a whole

21. The Defendant submitted that before analysing each of the four statements of which the Claimant complains, I should consider the publication as a whole and to read the extracts from the transcript pleaded at paragraph 3 of the APOC. I have done so.
22. The Defendant contended that to the ordinary reasonable reader, casually watching the whole publication once, it is frankly incomprehensible. It is full of Biblical and culturally-specific references that an ordinary reasonable reader would find difficult to understand. The speaker uses so much metaphorical language that it is often difficult to tell which parts are metaphorical, and which parts are intended literally. The speaker refers to so many different people and past events so quickly, with so little context, that the story is hard to follow. The speaker speaks very angrily, and very quickly. The rhetoric and tone is so overblown, and so extreme, that it is difficult to take any of it seriously.
23. He argued that in that context, all the ordinary reasonable reader would take from the publication as a whole is that (i) the speaker clearly hates the person he is talking about and (ii) the speaker and the other person have religious differences. Neither of those imputations are defamatory, and indeed both are true. Beyond that, the ordinary reasonable reader would struggle to say what, exactly, the speaker is talking about.
24. He submitted that the Claimant is effectively inviting the Court to take particular phrases from the video out of context, and “finely-parse” their words in the calm and quiet of the courtroom, in a manner that is artificial. It is simply not how the ordinary reasonable reader would view the publication.
25. I cannot accept that submission. It is true that the video contains many Biblical references and metaphors and that the Defendant speaks angrily and quickly at times. On occasion it is not clear when a Biblical reference has ended and when conventional rhetoric has resumed. However in my judgment an ordinary reasonable person watching the video would understand that one of its central messages was to be highly critical of the conduct of a particular person, identified later in the video as the Claimant (by reference to his church) and to make a series of serious allegations about him. While the language is, at times, repetitive and florid, I conclude that an ordinary reasonable person would understand the broad thrust of what the Defendant

was saying. That was the provisional view I had formed when watching the video during the process set out at [4] above.

Statement I

26. The first statement relied on is that the Claimant “came forth as Elder David but he’s a false pastor he’s a false pastor of the seed of Belial”.
27. The Claimant’s case is that the meaning of these words is that he “was intentionally and/or recklessly, grossly manipulating his congregation and the public in general, and employed the use of voodoo and fetish powers to charm and mislead his congregation, take advantage of them, and at the same time suppressing them by virtue of his rule”.
28. I agree with the Defendant that it is not reasonable to derive reference to manipulating or supressing people or using “voodoo” or “fetish powers” from Statement I: none of these words feature in, or can be readily understood from, it.
29. I also accept the Defendant’s submission that an ordinary reasonable reader would be unlikely to understand what “Belial” means. The Defendant contends that this is a Hebrew word for the devil, but that the Claimant has not pleaded and proved that the statement was communicated to someone who understood Hebrew or the Old Testament references.
30. Further, I agree that describing the Claimant as “the seed of Belial” - presumably the son of the devil - does not convey that he is literally the son of the devil: it is simply a generalised assertion that he is some kind of bad person without asserting in what way he is. On that basis I accept the Defendant’s submission that this element of Statement I is vulgar abuse and not a defamatory imputation of fact.
31. In respect of the description of the Claimant as a “false pastor”, the Defendant suggests that to a pastor of one religious belief, a pastor of another different religious belief is a “false pastor”, in the sense that the first pastor believes the second’s religious belief is false. That is not necessarily defamatory of itself – simply having religious differences (which the speaker believes are “false”) would not necessarily disparage the Claimant in the eyes of an ordinary reasonable reader in a modern, multi-religious society.
32. I do not accept that this is what an ordinary reasonable person would conclude was the meaning of “false pastor” in this video. This description of the Claimant is repeated throughout the video. The Defendant repeatedly says that the Claimant has worn “sheep’s clothing”, presumably a reference to the “wolf in sheep’s clothing” expression. This generally means someone whose pleasant and friendly appearance conceals the fact that they are evil. Throughout the video the Defendant makes a series of specific and very serious allegations about the Claimant with respect to his conduct towards his wife, and people within his congregation, notably women and young girls.
33. Bearing in mind that context, in my judgment the ordinary reasonable reader would understand the Defendant’s description of the Claimant as a “false pastor” to relate to

a suggestion that his conduct was not what one would expect of a genuine pastor, properly conducting themselves.

34. Specifically, I find that the meaning of the first statement was that “the Claimant was intentionally and/or recklessly misleading his congregation and the wider public”. This was part of the Claimant’s case on the meaning of this statement, and the Defendant’s alternative case on the issue, and I accept it.

Statement II

35. The second statement relied on by the Claimant is that “we are saying an anti-Christ now in a sheep clothing in the name of David to deceive God’s children”.
36. The Claimant’s case is that the meaning of these words is “that the Claimant was intentionally and/or recklessly, grossly manipulating his congregation and the public in general, and employed the use of fraudulent and crafty means to disguise himself in order to derive some favours from the congregation and portray himself in a way that he is not”.
37. The Defendant’s primary case is that the statement conveys no defamatory meaning of fact at all: calling a person the “anti-Christ” is, to an ordinary reasonable reader, simply vulgar abuse that amounts to a suggestion that they are generally immoral, rather than literally suggesting they are the Biblical Antichrist. I accept this submission insofar as it relates to the word “anti-Christ” in isolation.
38. The Defendant suggests that the phrase “deceiv[ing] God’s children” when said by a preacher of different religious beliefs could be an expression of religious difference and thus not defamatory: a Catholic priest might similarly regard an imam who converts one of their congregation as “deceiving God’s children”. As the Court cannot decide which religious belief is objectively correct, such a statement would necessarily be a matter of opinion.
39. Seen in context, I do not consider that an ordinary reasonable reader would understand the meaning of this phrase to reflect religious differences between the Defendant and the Claimant.
40. Rather, given the contextual matters referred to at [32] above, I accept the Defendant’s alternative case that this statement is an imputation that the Claimant was acting in a dishonest fashion. In the context of the remainder of the video, I conclude that an ordinary reasonable reader would understand that the meaning was that the Claimant was behaving in this fashion towards members his own congregation.

Statement III

41. The third statement relied on by the Claimant is as follows:

“To start with even how did that church gospel came about he also stole the church from someone who was raising a ministry. so the church then was called gospel church mission when he went there only God knows what happened to the pastor that was there he drove the pastor away that was how the seed start manifesting unknowing to no one then

he now quickly changed it to gospel church he called himself David, his name is not David, his name is Atoh Uyi. That's his name.”

42. The Claimant pleads that the meaning of these words is “that the church which the Claimant founded from scratch was stolen property, and consequently, the Claimant, who was the founder, a thief” and that the Claimant is “equally crafty and not straightforward”.
43. The Defendant submits that the Claimant is interpreting the reference to having “stole[n] the church” too literally. Insofar as any meaning can be taken from this statement, he contends that it is effectively describing a power struggle between two rival pastors for the following of a religious congregation. The “church”, in this context, is not the physical bricks and mortar of a church building: it is the belief of the congregation. It therefore simply means that the Claimant has supplanted the existing pastor; and to say that a person has won such a power struggle is not necessarily defamatory.
44. I agree that an ordinary reasonable reader would not understand the meaning of this statement to be that the Claimant had dishonestly appropriating moveable property belonging to another. However, seen in the context of the video as a whole, I consider that an ordinary reasonable reader would understand its meaning to refer to something more than an uncontroversial transition of power between two pastors: I accept the Defendant’s alternative case, to the effect that this passage means that the Claimant had “supplanted the previous pastor by discreditable means”.

Statement IV

45. The fourth statement relied on by the Claimant is as follows:

“So, I’m gonna question him now. You are listening to me now, David, the Almighty God, even the God that made the heavens and the earth, His judgment now is now upon you. The blood of all those that died in that ministry: we are talking about sister Irabor, we are talking about Amoroghie, we are talking about Omoreghie’s son Igbohosan, we are talking about brother Sator, we are talking about brother Anere, we are talking about every other one that followed. What happened to them? How did they pass on? Because they challenged you....That blood is found on your hands...”

46. The Claimant pleads that the meaning of these words is that that he is a “murderer and a serial killer known for employing several means to kill his members with whom he might have some conflict or dispute”.
47. However this is an extreme allegation that is simply not in the text. I do not consider that the ordinary reasonable reader would elicit it from the words of the statement.
48. The Defendant contends that such a reader would likely find the combination of references to people who they have never heard of, and metaphorical language of “blood...on your hands”, in the context of an invocation of “the God that made the heavens and the earth”, totally incomprehensible. Accordingly, it conveys no defamatory imputations of fact at all.

49. I cannot accept this submission. Seen in the context of the other allegations made about the Claimant's conduct, I accept the Defendant's alternative case that an ordinary reasonable reader would understand the meaning of this statement to be that the Claimant had moral responsibility for the safety of his congregation, and had questions to answer about whether he failed in that moral responsibility by allowing members of the congregation to come to harm (not necessarily fatally).
50. I accept the Defendant's submission that this is the meaning of the fourth statement because (i) the words refer to moral judgment by "Almighty God", not legal judgment; (ii) having "blood...on your hands" is not only consistent with murder in the legal sense, but also with moral responsibility for harm coming to people in other ways; (iii) the speaker does not say in terms that the Claimant is responsible in this sense but merely asks the question "What happened to them? How did they pass on?"; (iv) to say that the Claimant has "questions to answer" is not the same as positively asserting that he has failed in his moral responsibility; and (v) having a person's blood on one's hands is not only consistent with the person being dead but can refer to harm short of death.

Issue (ii): Whether each of those meanings is a statement of fact or opinion

51. In *Koutsogiannis* at [16], Nicklin J held that when determining whether the words complained of contain allegations of fact or opinion, the Court will be guided by the following points:

"i) The statement must be recognisable as comment, as distinct from an imputation of fact.

ii) Opinion is something which is or can reasonably be inferred to be a deduction, inference, conclusion, criticism, remark, observation, etc.

iii) The ultimate question is how the word would strike the ordinary reasonable reader. The subject matter and context of the words may be an important indicator of whether they are fact or opinion.

iv) Some statements which are, by their nature and appearance opinion, are nevertheless treated as statements of fact where, for instance, the opinion implies that a claimant has done something but does not indicate what that something is, i.e. the statement is a bare comment.

v) Whether an allegation that someone has acted "dishonestly" or "criminally" is an allegation of fact or expression of opinion will very much depend upon context. There is no fixed rule that a statement that someone has been dishonest must be treated as an allegation of fact".

52. Further, as Warby LJ explained in *Blake and others v Fox* [2023] EWCA Civ 1000:

"22...Section 3 of the Defamation Act 2013 ["the 2013 Act"] provides for a defence of "honest opinion" which is relatively generous. But the first condition for the availability of this defence is that the statement was one of opinion: see s 3(2) of the 2013 Act. A statement will only be defensible under s 3, therefore, if it is recognisable as a comment or

opinion as distinct from an imputation of fact. If it is not, the defendant will need to prove that it is substantially true (s 2 of the 2013 Act) or that it was a reasonable publication on a matter of public interest (s 4 of the Act).

23. Opinion is synonymous with “comment”. It is something which is or can reasonably be inferred to be a deduction, inference, conclusion, criticism, remark, observation or the like. As with meaning, the Court deciding whether a statement is one of fact or opinion looks only at the words complained of and their immediate context, and the ultimate question for the Court is the objective question of “how the words would strike the ordinary reasonable reader”. This question may be considered after the meaning has been decided, or at the same time, or in the reverse order, which is common practice.

24. This is a highly fact-sensitive process that focuses on the particular statement at issue. One factor for consideration is whether the statement contains any indication of the basis on which it is made. At common law a statement that contains no indication of or reference to any supporting facts is liable to be treated as a statement of fact. The second condition for the statutory defence of honest opinion is “that the statement complained of indicated whether in general or specific terms the basis of the opinion”: s 3(3) of the 2013 Act. Beyond these extreme cases, “[t]he more clearly a statement indicates that it is based on some extraneous material, the more likely it is to strike the reader as an expression of opinion”.

53. Counsel for the Defendant contended that while the line between fact and opinion is sometimes difficult to draw, one helpful indicator is whether the issue is ultimately a value judgment, about which reasonable minds may differ: see *British Chiropractic Association v Singh* [2010] EWCA Civ 350, [2011] 1 WLR 133 at [26].
54. Statement I to the effect that the Claimant was intentionally and/or recklessly misleading his congregation and the wider public is, in my judgment, one that the ordinary reasonable reader would understand to be a statement of fact: it is a bare comment that indicates that the Claimant has acted in a certain way but does not give details of the allegations (see *Koutsogiannis* at [16]iv) and it gives no indication of or reference to any supporting facts (see *Blake* at [24]).
55. I reach the same conclusion, for the same reasons, in respect of Statement II to the effect that the Claimant had acted in a dishonest fashion towards members his own congregation; and Statement III, to the effect that Claimant had supplanted the previous pastor by discreditable means.
56. I take a different view in respect of Statement IV, to the effect that the Claimant had moral responsibility for the safety of his congregation, and had questions to answer about whether he failed in that moral responsibility by allowing members of the congregation to come to harm (not necessarily fatally). I consider that this is a matter of deduction and inference, akin to a value judgment, and would thus be understood by the ordinary reasonable reader as a statement of opinion, rather than fact.

Issue (iii): Whether each of those meanings were defamatory at common law

57. At common law, an imputation will be treated as defamatory if “the words complained of fall within one, or more, of the several tests that have, at various times, been offered by the Courts. That is to say the imputation must be to the claimant’s discredit; or to tend to lower him in the estimation of others; or cause him to be shunned or avoided; or expose him to hatred, contempt or ridicule”: Gatley at 2-001.
58. In *Blake* at [26], Warby LJ reiterated that a statement is defamatory if it (a) attributes to the claimant behaviour or views that are “contrary to common shared views of our society” and (b) would tend to have a “substantially adverse effect” on the way that people would treat the Claimant: see also *Millett* at [9]
59. Counsel for the Defendant emphasised that whether the true meaning is defamatory depends on whether it tends to lower the claimant in the estimation of members of society generally; and a statement will not be defamatory “merely because it tends to disparage the claimant in the eyes of a particular class or group of persons”: *Sim v Stretch* [1936] 2 All ER 1237 at 1240 and Winfield & Jolowicz on Tort (20th ed) at [13-007]. Further, “vituperation” of the claimant (so-called “vulgar abuse”) is not actionable: *Thorp v Fox* [2023] EWCA Civ 1000, [2024] EMLR 2 at [27].
60. In my judgment the meanings of all four of the statements was defamatory of the Claimant at common law. They alleged, respectively, that he was intentionally and/or recklessly misleading his congregation and the wider public; was acting in a dishonest fashion towards members his own congregation; had supplanted the previous pastor by discreditable means; and had questions to answer about whether he failed in his moral responsibility for the safety of his congregation by allowing members of the congregation to come to harm (not necessarily fatally).
61. These were all attributed behaviours that were to the Claimant’s discredit; would tend to lower him in the estimation of others; were contrary to the common shared views of our society; and would tend to have a substantially adverse effect on the way that people would treat him. I did not understand the Defendant’s alternative case with respect to each of the meanings, which I have accepted, to suggest otherwise.

Conclusion

62. For all these reasons I conclude that:
 - (i) The meaning of Statement I is that the Claimant was intentionally and/or recklessly misleading his congregation and the wider public.
 - (ii) The meaning of Statement III is that the Claimant was acting in a dishonest fashion towards members of his own congregation.
 - (iii) The meaning of Statement III is that Claimant had supplanted the previous pastor by discreditable means.
 - (iv) Statements I, II and III were statements of fact.
 - (v) The meaning of Statement IV is that the Claimant had moral responsibility for the safety of his congregation, and had questions to answer about whether he

failed in that moral responsibility by allowing members of the congregation to come to harm (not necessarily fatally).

- (vi) Statement IV was a statement of opinion.
- (vii) All four statements bore a meaning which was defamatory of the Claimant at common law.

Appendix A: Extracts from video as pleaded at paragraph 3 of the APOC

[numbering added by the Court for ease of reference]

[1] “So, friends of the Lord, like I said, if you are taking down my topic this afternoon, it is Elder David The Beloved a false pastor of the Seed of Belial and that’s what I want to talk about this afternoon but I want you to know, when we talk about Belial brothers and sisters, we are talking about an evil that comes in a man to use a man as against the will of the Lord and we saw that the devil becomes that, because he was the one who wanted to become the Most High God.”

[2] “I’m talking about physical nation now, are ruling the people in the office of a leader to lead the nation and to subject the people under his suppressiveness to subject the people under abuses to subject the people to all kinds of pain or undue pain we now begin to see that something is wrong...”

[3] “...but we now see a tyrant coming in sheep clothing as we have seen “inaudible 22:20” in the so-called Elder David the first pastor coming forth in a platform in a way of a message and say that he has received the message of God and then try to deviate the people that drive the people away from the true God and the true nature of who he was now begin to reveal we will not begin to trace now that a man does not do anything on earth except he’s being led by spirit if that spirit has got to be either of God or it has got to be of the devil. so, when in our come forth as a tyrant as against God’s children we now begin to see where that seed is coming from as we’re going to look into that seed more in detail but we needed to travel on this way now to bring onto your understanding what I’m trying to talk about.”

[4] “It takes God to come to deliver them out, because they now see their pastors as everything and that is what we have found in this man that have come by the image of a sheep clothing called Elder David. He came forth as Elder David but he’s a false pastor he’s a false pastor of the seed of Belial...”

[5] “...A ruler a dictator that have come in as a pastor to destroy God’s heritage but I stand for truth I stand for I stand for the heavens we will not allow that we shall keep exposing them even as Josiah did in the bible. Praise the name of the Lord. So, we find here now my brothers and sisters, we said that we have to look to this man I’m talking about who has come with a title as an Elder David he’s a beautiful title with the name it attracted this David but behind that name we saw that he’s a seed of Belial who possesses the characteristics of the sons of Belials in the bible. In a form of a tyrant the spirit uses against God’s children who thought to serve God who thought they have come to serve the almighty God but unknowing to them that they have been entrapped in the bondage of a man of a tyrant called Elder David a false pastor, who is of the seed of Belial what is my prayer for those sons and daughters of God that the Lord delivered them so when they hear my voice this afternoon, I pray that the Lord delivered you praise the name of the Lord. So, who is this person we are talking about the so-called Elder David who called himself beloved...”

[6] “So, he came in as a sheep clothing said that oh he’s believing message, he’s hunting for God but at the point in time we’re now going to see the true nature of begin to come out. What was that nature he said he was David of old, that he has come forth in this day as the

son of God he said he is Christ. please I want you to hear so that when you see such message going on when you see such deviate from that...”

[7] “We also see that he move ahead okay and David what did he do he now began to take women that he “inaudible 31:43” begin to abuse the members of the church...”

[8] “...Until the wife caught him sleeping with members of the church when he’s been confronted while doing this and you call yourself a pastor. he began the tyranism and spirit that is in him began to come out the next thing we see if we’re gonna he began abusing the wife we’re talking about physical abuse and mentally abuse, torture, mental torture and physical torture beating the wife all in all such way until that seed began to push more and more...”

[9] “...because he’s David so he can do whatever he feel likes when he drove the wife away what do we find brothers and sisters, then that seed of Belial now began to unleash against the members of the church who thought they come to seek God, who thought oh they are heading for salvation. what we find on the members of the church was now sleeping with members of the church, what do we find then he began strengthening the abuses that anyone just say anything out he’s David I’ve got money he could do all things. he now subjected people in oppression in all physical abuse in all repressiveness in all manners of all abuses that you think about, my brothers and sisters who are we talking about now, “inaudible 0:57” he’s a pastor he says David...”

[10] “What is that prophecy oh that I saw that you are a witch I saw that you are a wizard and turn families against each other and break those family that same woman that he has gotten to say okay, i want to use her to prophesy so they see uh that precious sister what do we find until he got her precious sister pregnated are you following why? I’m David, after all David married many many many wives so as I’ve come back now as David I have to go that way, that’s how he has been deceiving people, are you following he got her pregnant many many occasions aborted when it came to this one the Lord exposed him out. Seven months pregnant what happened, he aborted it. Then after he told the church, “now look the church is in a valley, now the church will be praying, that church have sinned, knowing that he has sinned against almighty God until God exposed him, when he’s been exposed many left the way he still left with some and what happened he tried to lie to them, to try to sustain them. not too long again that same seed must bring after its nature. we saw here brothers and sister moving against keep moving against them keep moving moving against them until a married couple in that same church by the name of Sister Ebene he moved against that woman and destroyed her marriage.”

[11] “Anyone he raises as his minister is abused and subjected under him castings spell upon them. a David who will go to what, a native doctors place to seek what, an enchantment, after he has seek that enchantment, he will now let people see I’ve got powers now, I’ve got powers now. using that against those girls, using that against underage girls and took their virginities away. underage girls and keeps them in his home, subjected them in bondage, now they have no sense of their own anymore. destroyed families, written prophecies to say this family is a witch, their children are not to go closer to them, and scattered the family for many years and told the children their mother is a witch, their father is a wizard, don’t go near them and broke families for many years. why because his errors have been made known to the church...”

[12] “So we are saying an anti-Christ now in a sheep clothing in the name of David to deceive God’s children. what we find brothers and sisters we are moving on. That you are to chant my name whatever you do at home in anywhere, as i said so long you could pay your dues back and he subjected the people, people keep on carrying on that until he so subjected the people and took their lands from them...”

[13] “...as long as you can give David money so this will be devil so this devil we are talking about where does he locate we are talking about he is he’s located in Edo state in Nigeria on Number one, first gospel avenue and his church is called gospel church. To start with even how did that church gospel came about he also stole the church from someone who was raising a ministry. so the church then was called gospel church mission when he went there only God knows what happened to the pastor that was there he drove the pastor away that was how the seed starts manifesting unknowing to no one then he now quickly changed it to gospel church he called himself David, his name is not David, his name is Atoh Uyi. That’s his name. So when you see that name David the beloved he is in Edo state...”

[14] “...so-called pastor that calls himself David the beloved? No. He has taken God’s children taking the daughters of God and abusing them, laying with them, sleeping with all sorts of them did you see that until he got them pregnant and aborts the baby and go and bury it. abusing in all forms mentally and physically abuse here did you see that. so a spirit, a man that can do that, what does that seed came from, how did it came in so it has got to be of Belial to be able to carry that out...”

[15] “He went to give a medication to the sister she got pregnant to flush to abort that seven months baby out that’s the evil that he committed the evil act that he did. This is somebody who married and drove his wife away and as a pastor bible said when you marry do not drive your wife without no reason...”

[16] “So I’m gonna question him now. You are listening to me now, David, the Almighty God, even the God that made the heavens and the earth, His judgement now is mow upon you. The blood of all those that died in that ministry: we are talking about sister Erhabor, we are talking about Amoroghie, we are talking about Omoreghie’s son Igbohosan, we are talking about brother Sator, we are talking about brother Anere, we are talking about every other one that followed. What happened to them? How did they pass on? Because they challenged you.... That blood is found on your hands.”