

**THE HIGH COURT**

[2024] IEHC 400  
**Record No. 2023/3530 P**

**BETWEEN:-**

**PAUL REID**

**PLAINTIFF**

**AND**

**CATHERINE PIERSE**

**DEFENDANT**

**JUDGMENT of Mr Justice Barr delivered electronically on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July 2024.**

- 1.** The plaintiff is a gentleman. He resides in Dublin.
- 2.** The defendant is the Director of Public Prosecutions.
- 3.** In this application, the defendant seeks an order pursuant to O.19, r.28 of the Rules of the Superior Courts, dismissing the plaintiff's proceedings against her, for failure to disclose any reasonable cause of action. In the alternative, the defendant seeks an order on the same basis, pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the court.
- 4.** The court has read the pleadings in the case, being the plaintiff's plenary summons issued on 19 July 2023, and his statement of claim dated 15 March 2024. The court has also read the plaintiff's replying affidavit in this application, together with the substantial volume of documentation referred to therein. The court has also read all the documentation which the plaintiff handed in to the court at the hearing of this application on 26 June 2024.
- 5.** It is fair to say that in his voluminous documentation, the plaintiff has a great many complaints against a vast number of people. However, the DPP is the only defendant in this action.
- 6.** It will suffice to give a brief summary of the plaintiff's complaints, as set out in his statement of claim and in his supporting documentation. The plaintiff begins his statement of claim by stating that he is being distressed, humiliated and harassed by all the people named in the statement of claim. He goes on to request that he be provided with, what he terms "a legal interpreter". He also requested that the Chief Justice of Ireland be present at the hearing of his application. He goes on to request that two named individuals, who appear to be tenants of a property that he owns in Dublin, be fully investigated. He has a complaint against the Legal Aid Board, to the effect that while they came across as being friendly initially, they did not deal with his requests in a way that he thought acceptable. He stated that

he was being distressed and humiliated by employees of the Legal Aid Board. He goes on to state that some unidentified people had interfered with the locks on the front door of his property, with a view to poisoning him and his dog.

**7.** The plaintiff has a complaint against GSOC, for failure to investigate his complaint about poisoned food products. He makes a complaint against the Gardaí at Clondalkin garda station, for failure to take a statement of complaint from him. The plaintiff also makes a complaint against a firm of solicitors, on a basis that is not clearly established in the statement of claim. He also makes a complaint in relation to the conduct of certain ambulance personnel, for failing to provide the plaintiff with his name and for failure to call the gardaí when requested by the plaintiff to do so.

**8.** The plaintiff goes on in the statement of claim to make further complaints in relation to named gardaí at Tallaght garda station. These gardaí appear to have been called to the plaintiff's property in relation to difficulties that he was having with his tenants of the adjoining property. The plaintiff alleges that he was distressed, humiliated and harassed by the named gardaí. The plaintiff also has complaints about Mars Capital Finance Ireland DAC. It is not exactly clear what his complaint is in relation to this entity. The plaintiff goes on to set out a number of complaints against the two tenants of his property in Dublin. He also makes complaint about how he was treated by certain personnel employed by Allied Irish Banks. The plaintiff also complains that he was badly treated by staff in the offices of the Educational Building Society. He asserts that certain named individuals were acting with EY Parthenon/Ernst & Young, with a view to causing him distress, humiliation and harassment. He states that the employees of EY were vexing him on the telephone. The plaintiff also has a similar complaint of being distressed, and humiliated by employees of BNP Paribas.

**9.** The plaintiff goes on in his statement of claim to make reference to a heart attack that he suffered in 2020. He has various complaints against the ambulance personnel. The plaintiff also has complaints in relation to events that were alleged to have been held in Croke Park. There is some claim in relation to royalty rights and illicit activities and communications against him and his family in connection with this. He states that he was distressed, humiliated and harassed by some Croke Park personnel.

**10.** The plaintiff goes on to state that it is his belief that his former partner is being manipulated by unnamed third parties. The plaintiff makes complaints about the conduct of certain gardaí stationed at Clondalkin garda station and Tallaght garda station. The plaintiff goes on to make complaints in relation

to an involuntary admission to Tallaght Hospital in 2010. He requested that a polygraph test be carried out on a particular doctor and that a consultant psychiatrist be investigated. He stated that it was his belief that his vehicle had been bugged. He has complaints about the accuracy of the wording in the mental state examination report that was completed on that occasion.

**11.** The plaintiff also has a complaint about certain people employed at Tallaght library, who he alleged were carrying personal information about him out of the library. He also had a complaint about employees of the Revenue Commissioners, who he alleged were withholding information from him in relation to local property tax. The plaintiff concluded his statement of claim by stating that a full investigation should be carried out into all of the government bodies, companies and people named in the statement of claim. He stated that the defendant should be at the hearing, as he believed that personnel in the office of the DPP were hiding something.

**12.** Finally, among the documents handed in to the court, but not specifically raised in the plaintiff's statement of claim, was a letter sent by the plaintiff to the President of the European Commission, Ursula Von der Leyen, dated 16 October 2022, in which he furnished information to her in relation to the internal implantation of microchips in the human body. By letter dated 23 November 2022, a member of the staff of the Commission responded on behalf of the President of the Commission, stating that they did not address that topic in their European research programs or activities. Therefore, they could not provide any information beyond that which was already publicly available.

**13.** The only complaints in the statement of claim which relate to the defendant, are as follows: the plaintiff referred to the hearing of a motion brought by him seeking judgment in default of appearance, whereat the view had been expressed by a representative of the defendant, that it was hard to discern what complaint was actually being made against the defendant in the plenary summons. The plaintiff also complained that he had sent certain communications to the office of the DPP, but had not received any response thereto. He alleged that when he had telephoned the defendant's office, he had spoken to a person called "Carl" in the Victim Support Unit, who had apparently assured him that he would respond by email. The plaintiff stated that he had not received any response. He stated that he had spoken with another member of the office of the DPP, who was a woman, but had been left frustrated by this encounter.

**14.** The plaintiff alleged that he had furnished a number of documents on a USB stick to the defendant, as he wanted the advice of the DPP on the subject matter of the documents contained

therein. He accepted that he received a response from the defendant's office by letter dated 16 May 2023. Notwithstanding that, he complains that the personnel in the office of the DPP had not responded to him in a normal fashion. He alleged that the defendant, or her staff, were trying to "hoodwink" him. He pleaded that it was necessary that the reason for this hoodwinking behaviour, be ascertained. He also alleged that misleading information had been disseminated by the office of the DPP. He stated that he was being distressed and humiliated by the actions of the defendant and her staff. He stated that this required a satisfactory explanation for all the questions that had been raised in relation to their behaviour.

**Conclusions.**

**15.** It is appropriate to begin by setting out the relevant provisions of the Rules of the Superior Courts, under which the defendant moves her application herein, being Order 19, rule 28:

*The Court may order any pleading to be struck out, on the ground that it discloses no reasonable cause of action or answer and in any such case or in case of the action or defence being shown by the pleadings to be frivolous or vexatious, the Court may order the action to be stayed or dismissed, or judgment to be entered accordingly, as may be just.*

**16.** The court has carefully read all the documentation submitted by the plaintiff. The plaintiff feels that he has not been listened to by the defendant, or her staff. In this regard, the defendant wrote to the plaintiff on two occasions. The first occasion was by letter dated 16 May 2023, which was in the following terms:

*"Dear Mr Reid,*

*I acknowledge receipt of your letter received in this office on 10 May 2023.*

*This office does not have a file in relation to the matter you mention. If you consider a criminal offence has been committed, please contact An Garda Síochána.*

*Yours sincerely*

*Private Secretary's Office."*

**17.** The second letter was sent on 23 August 2023. It stated as follows:

*"Dear Mr Reid,*

*I acknowledge receipt of your letter and attachments received in this office.*

*This office does not have a file and investigative function [sic]. If you consider a criminal offence has been committed, please contact An Garda Síochána.*

*Yours sincerely,*

*Private Secretary's Office."*

**18.** Even allowing for the fact that the plaintiff is a lay litigant, there is nothing in the pleadings, or in the documentation submitted, which, if proven, would amount to a cause of action at law against the defendant.

**19.** The Director of Public Prosecutions is a statutory office established to prosecute crime pursuant to the Prosecution of Offenders Act 1974. The DPP does not have any role in investigating suspected criminal offences. That is done by An Garda Síochána. Insofar as the plaintiff complains that the defendant, in her role as DPP, did not investigate some, or all, of the large number of people against whom he has made complaints, that does not constitute a stateable cause of action at law, as the DPP does not have any role in investigating such complaints.

**20.** Insofar as the plaintiff feels that he was not communicated with adequately, or in an appropriate manner, by the defendant or her staff; this does not constitute a cause of action at law against the defendant. Similarly, a vague allegation that the plaintiff was in some way "hoodwinked" by the defendant, or her staff, does not constitute a stateable cause of action.

**21.** While the plaintiff's statement of claim contained a vague allegation that misleading information had been disseminated by the office of the DPP; he did not state what this information was; or to whom it related; or by whom it had been published; or to whom it had been published. Such a vague allegation does not constitute the pleading of a reasonable or stateable cause of action against the defendant.

**22.** The court is satisfied that the defendant is entitled to an order pursuant to para. 1 of her notice of motion dated 10 May 2024, dismissing the plaintiff's proceedings against her, as disclosing no reasonable cause of action, pursuant to O.19, r.28 of the Rules of the Superior Courts or, in the alternative, pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the court. Accordingly, the plaintiff's proceedings herein against the defendant are dismissed as disclosing no reasonable cause of action against the defendant.

**23.** As this judgment is being delivered electronically, the parties shall have two weeks within which to furnish brief written submissions of not greater than 1000 words, by email to the registrar, on the issue of costs.

**24.** The matter will be listed for mention at 10.30 hours on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2024 for the purpose of making final orders.

