

**BETWEEN**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY**

**Applicant**

**and**

**GLORIA MUSA (1)**

**CHIWAR MUSA (2)**

**Respondants**

**AFFIDAVIT**

**Introduction**

1. We, Gloria and Chiwar Musa are writing this statement as the Nigerian parents of our six children Favour, Tabitha, Abraham, Blessing, Sarah and Queen Elizabeth. A 105-page document with all details about our involvement with Haringey Council has been before the Court since October 2010. This is a summary of events since our five children were taken on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2010 and our sixth baby first after birth and again on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010.
2. Our traumatising, victimisation and intimidation by Haringey Council stem from the collusion between Social Services and Police and have resulted in criminal activities outside and beyond Family Courts. This has been highlighted by our witness and McKenzie Friend Maurice J Kirk BVSc who accompanied us to the office of our last solicitors Powell Spencer & Partners in 290 Kilburn High Road, in order to request documents that they have been withholding.
3. In fact, their legal representation was one of many disasters suffered from the legal profession so that we are deeply concerned not only about how to get our children back but also how best to obtain legal representation, given our terrible experiences.
4. Just as we have been threatened and exposed to being sectioned by Haringey Police, Mr Kirk runs the same risk now and we are extremely concerned about the Rule of Law in this country.
5. Due to our obvious innocence and the nature of our professional activities as evangelical bishop and multi-media producer, we have had a lot of public support, both in Africa and Europe. E.g. Christopher Booker has published 12 articles in The Telegraph, two articles appeared in the Nigerian national paper Leadership and a press release of the Nigerian Society for the Rule of Law was published by numerous websites.
6. Instead of offering a chronological history of events, we group our grievances into the following categories:
  - a. **The Need for New Directions of Judgements made in our Absence**
  - b. **Traumatisation by Haringey Police**

- c. Victimisation by Haringey's Social and Legal Services**
- d. Unfair Hearings in the Secrecy of Family Courts**
- e. Allegations against Haringey Council**
- f. The Damaging Representation by "Solicitors from Hell"**
- g. The Serious Intimidation of Witnesses and Supporters**
- h. The List of Allegations Fabricated by Haringey Council against us**

## **7. The Need for New Directions of Judgements made in our Absence**

- a. First of all, we are appealing to Sir Nicholas Wall to appreciate that, as non-citizens of the UK, we have had no knowledge and understanding of court procedures. In particular, with English not being our native language, we have had great difficulty learning the significance of the version of events that Haringey Council reported about a 'fact finding' hearing that took place in February 2011.
- b. The reason for not having legal representation was most unfortunate: solicitor Jennifer Baseki introduced us to Ian Peddie QC who said that Haringey cannot be wrong on all accounts and that I should accept being a prostitute. Only then, as everybody accepts that we are good parents, would we see our children again. As a Christian, I found this position non-acceptable.
- c. According to our memory, the issue of perjury by Social Worker Joyce Agyekum was not addressed appropriately by Judge Brasse. After our McKenzie Friend commented on this, the judge sent him out and terminated the hearing. After the termination of the hearing, our McKenzie Friend sent a notice to all parties which, unbeknown to us, resulted in a judgement in our absence. Similarly, other such documents were produced in our absence and require new directions for ensuring that our children return to their biological parents.

## **8. Traumatization by Haringey's Police**

- a. The most traumatising experience was the break-in of eight police officers on 8 April 2010 at our home who took our five children – clearly against their will – without any documentation or justification.
- b. After dialling 999 for help we spoke to the Nevil Watson who aspired to become an MP and phoned a Police Commandant "asking about this operation". But he was not aware of anything and we had no idea what kind of experiences were going to replace our happy family life.
- c. The next most violent experience was the arrival of nine police officers in Norwich Park hospital after the birth of Queen Elizabeth on 12 June 2010, at night, when there were no lights on the ward. While the baby was sucking, it was grabbed off me, other men strangled me, pulled my arms and legs such that I am still limping today and eventually pulled the bed into a single room, where manhandling continued. Inspector Webb said

“If you are not quiet, we will section you and you will never see your children again.”  
Eventually I gave up because I was bleeding and in too much pain, and I believe that the police thought I was dead.

- d. On 28 June 2011 we took our baby to St Thomas Hospital as she had a temperature. When entering the name into the computer, the nurse noticed it flashing and called the Social Services Manager at Haringey Council, Peter Lee. He told her that we are supposedly drug takers and that we had drugged the baby. When he arrived with five police men they arrested us with handcuffs and took us to Hornsey Police station where we were greeted with *“you black criminals, you are going in and not coming out again.”* To have a witness, we had taken a family friend with us and left the crying baby with her at the hospital. While we were gone, the baby was taken from her and she was told *“tell the community that the Musas are gone for life.”* We have not seen our baby since.
- e. For 27 hours we remained in police custody, until a doctor came to take hair, blood and urine tests. The Police confiscated my bags with my friend’s phone. We were not allowed any phone calls or contact with a solicitor. Furthermore we were not given any water or food because officers were *“acting upon orders from above.”*
- f. On 19<sup>th</sup> September 2011 we went to Tottenham Police Station to enquire about the whereabouts of our children, especially our eldest daughter. Instead of getting information, we were arrested for *“conspiracy to abduct our children”*, following the arrest of Maurice J Kirk BVSc for criminal damage. This was changed to the same charge of conspiracy to abduct children, even though none of us have any idea where the children are. On that occasion we were not only held in cold cells, but I was also stripped by a male officer. Instead of being heard before a Magistrates Court, we were sent to a hospital for psychiatric assessments.
- g. The most humiliating infringement on our time consists of bail conditions that require our presentation to Tottenham Police Station three times a week since 29<sup>th</sup> June 2011, as if we were criminals, when, in fact, Haringey Council are covering up their criminal activities.

## **9. Victimisation by Haringey’s Social and Legal Services**

- a. The initial snatch of our children was covered up by a faked letter supposedly written by our eldest daughter Favour, supposedly suffering by her mother. An Order to get the report of a handwriting expert has never been complied with.
- b. The allegations invented against us varied from the mother being a sex worker, prostitute, drug user and child trafficker with Chiwar not being the father to us letting our children dangle from a balcony. A full list of rather ridiculous allegations is listed at the end.
- c. The delay of communicating the DNA results regarding Chiwar’s paternity in our favour took an undue 4 months.
- d. Similarly, the delay of communicating the negative results of supposed opiates in our baby took 4 months.

- e. Contact orders by Judges Adamson, Jones, Brasse, Coleridge, Atkinson and Mostyn were not complied with: over 40 times we travelled to Kent in vain and Haringey Council did not produce the children, even during my high pregnancy.
- f. Haringey Council's fears of a repeat of the Baby P case resulted in unfair and unjustified Reporting Restriction Orders and an injunction not to make applications to the Court via third parties. In fact, Christopher Booker's article *"Does this family have human rights?"*<sup>1</sup> quotes a Council whistleblower who has said that, *at a recent case conference, the social workers admitted that maybe they had made a mistake, and that the mother they had falsely accused was in fact devoted and blameless. But apparently, because of "press interest" in the case, the officials agreed that the council could not afford the very damaging publicity which might follow, if the unhappy children were reunited with their parents. It was therefore vital that the council should continue to justify its actions.*

#### **10. Unjust Decisions due to Haringey Council's Malice misleading Judges and Family Courts**

- a. As Nigerian citizens we have never had any dealings with any court, let alone in the UK. The Children's Solicitor Jonquil Houghton of Creighton & Partners has continually and consistently omitted to explain the judicial process or the documentation presented to us. Instead of acting in our children's interests, she has colluded with Haringey Council's solicitor Ms Rosita Moise, to cover up activities based on false allegations.
- b. This cover up included the pretence of the baby having been given opiates and ignoring the fact that we were registered as a family unit with our GP. Furthermore, our letter of complaint against Social Worker Alexandra Constantinou of 25 January 2010 who, instead of supporting our family, destroyed it, was not acted upon, even though it had also been sent to Haringey's Mayor as well as MPs.
- c. The major 'fact finding' hearing in February 2010 was conducted by Haringey Council with extreme bias against us: Michelle Collins who was central to the referral to Social Services was not summoned to Court for cross-examining. The Local Authority Social Worker Joyce Agyekum was committing perjury and perverting the course of justice under oath, but the Children's Solicitor did not challenge her statements, as she is a personal friend of Haringey's solicitor Ms Rosita Moise.
- d. While our children have been described as "articulate and intelligent", our 11-year-old daughter has not been given a voice in any of the proceedings. This is of particular importance as we and her siblings have not seen Favour since 24 August 2010, and no one will confirm whether she is dead or alive.
- e. Haringey Council produced court documentation that was visibly faked: without Court seal and date stamp or case number(s) and dates of hearings.
- f. A false non-molestation order was used to serve as injunction or reporting restriction order.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/8211955/Does-this-family-have-human-rights.html>

- g. Expert Reports produced by Haringey Council were never sworn nor verified by Statements of Truth.
- h. We believe that the Children's Solicitor has not considered how the placement in foster care would contribute to meeting the children's needs nor has she visited our children in care as she is supposed to.
- i. A family friend who is an Ambassador has been refused as a carer.
- j. Besides having had to change school due to the falsely enforced placement, three of our children have reported abuse while in foster care.
- k. Court Orders have not been complied with by Haringey Council; e.g. the first Judges Adamson & Jones of the Inner London and City Family Proceedings Court said that the children should be returned to London and their schools. But Haringey moved proceedings to Holborn hoping to cut contact completely.
- l. Judge Brasse was concerned and ordered contact 4 times a week for all the children, which was ignored; Justice Coleridge said that the best place for children is with their biological parents; other contact orders were also ignored and the children were not produced at agreed contact times.

#### **11. Allegations against Haringey Council**

- a. Instead of closing the case and returning the children, they are creating more and more lies to cover up their wrong-doings and justify their actions, as the whistleblower had said to Christopher Booker.
- b. One of the more serious examples of inventing allegations as cover-up took place on 8<sup>th</sup> September in Court: Maurice J Kirk who acted as our McKenzie Friend was supposedly recording the proceedings which was a straight forward lie. Furthermore, when Judge Atkinson assumed that Mr Kirk was somebody who had acted as McKenzie Friend before, neither Haringey's solicitor nor their barrister corrected her, even though they knew the person in question.
- c. Haringey Council seems to employ social workers who are not qualified to assess the needs of families and their children. By way of example, Suzanne Moore said to us that all of our children want to come home and that we are good parents. However, she failed to put this into her "expert report". Furthermore, she is not registered with GSCC, just like Alexandra Constantinou who works as social worker in the First Response Team.

#### **12. The Damaging Representation by "Solicitors from Hell"**

- a. "Solicitors from Hell" is a website that exposes the bad experiences victims have had. Our experiences with solicitors and barristers comprise the following:
  - i. Some solicitors have tried to persuade us to admit to the allegations by Haringey in order to get our children back.

- ii. One solicitor who was paid privately saw how greatly abused by Haringey we are, but after a phone briefing by Jonquil Houghton she changed her mind to represent the interests of Haringey rather than ours.
- iii. So far, all parties involved in our case have assumed Haringey's position of making sure the family is destroyed instead of working towards unification.
- iv. One solicitor who at first said "you've got a very good case against Haringey" withdrew after he said "accept all Haringey's allegations or else we can't represent you. We will freeze Legal Aid and there's nothing you can do about it." He then refused to release our case files for several months until we visited him with Maurice J Kirk. Judge Coleridge stated on 17th August that he had not the authority to restart it.
- v. One firm of solicitors sought to obtain a certificate but was refused by the Legal Services Commission.

### **13. The Serious Intimidation of Witnesses and Supporters**

- a. Publications in Africa are asking for the Nigerian Government to step in, and other victims of child snatching in the UK are coming forward in Africa.
- b. But the High Commission of Nigeria has been refused Consular Visits on the basis that the children are not Nigerian which is blatantly wrong and that Commissioners are strangers to the children which is not true either.
- c. Nigerian family and friends have been refused visits to the children and the alienation of our children from their parents and their culture grows with every day of separation.
- d. Worst of all, the person who used to be our driver was imprisoned for four months for helping us and six different women who consoled and supported us had their children taken by Haringey Council as well.

### **14. The List of Allegations Fabricated by Haringey Council against us**

- a. that the Musas had a 'child missing'
- b. that the children did not belong to the Musas
- c. that all the children have different fathers
- d. that the children were being trafficked
- e. that the children are not fed
- f. that Favour is sometimes locked in the garden at night wearing only her nightie
- g. that Mrs. Musa had been raped by her stepfather in Sheffield when she was fifteen and that he administered her opium. Alexandra Constantinou also claimed that Mrs. Musa has no living biological parents.

- h. that Mrs. Musa was a trafficked sex worker 'performing special services to members of the church'
- i. that Mrs. Musa had had brain surgery for epilepsy
- j. that both Mrs. Musa had been trafficked by Mr. Musa for sexual exploitation
- k. that Mrs. Musa carries Sexually Transmitted Diseases, specifically syphilis
- l. that the Musas were 'destitute and homeless'
- m. that Mrs Musa presented a baby to a Northern hospital covered in faeces
- n. that Mrs Musa was the subject of domestic violence from Mr. Musa
- o. that the Musas 'moved twice from their accommodation' 186 West Green Road (the insinuation being that their moving around was unstable for the children or that they were avoiding proceedings)
- p. that Mrs Musa has mental health problems
- q. that Mrs Musa's baby in the womb had Down Syndrome
- r. that Mrs Musa beats her children with a broomstick
- s. that Mr. Musa stole church equipment in Haringey
- t. that Mr. Musa was inappropriately touching female staff at the children's St Patrick's School in Manchester
- u. that the Musas were 'not cooperating'
- v. that the Musas beat their children with a cable
- w. that the Musas smack their children
- x. that the Musas tie their children's ankles to dangle them over balconies.

## **15. Conclusion**

- a. Given the above list of traumas and allegations, we believe that the fair and just way forward is to dismiss Haringey's case and to return the children to us as soon as possible.