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MINUTES AND RULING

OF THE THREE-MEMBER COURT OF APPEAL FOR FELONIES CRETE

In session 27th September 2013 and thereafter
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| COMPOSITION OF THE COURT | DEFENDANTS | OFFENCES |
| Konstantia Angelaki (Presiding Appeal Judge)  Epameinondia Kouskouki (Appeal Judge)  Foteini Mitraka  (Appeal Judge)  Petros Bosios  Deputy Prosecutor of the Court of Appeal  (the Prosecutor is indisposed)  Aikaterini Tsichlaki  Secretary | 1. (surname) CRISTIE (names) RALPH JOHN son of JAMES and STELLA, born 05-05-1961 in Leeds Great Britain and resident at Kokkino Chorio Apokoronas Chania, detained at “KRITI 1” Detention Centre Chania   Present   1. (surname) SNOWBALL (name) JANE daughter of KENNETH, wife of RALPH JOHN CRISTIE born 30-03-1966 in Great Britain, resident at 4 Kensington Mews, North Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG1 1JR, Great Britain   Represented through empowered lawyer | 1. Fraud committed jointly and repeatedly the pecuniary advantage of which and the damages caused thereby exceeding the total amount of 73.000 Euros.   2) Money laundering |

COURT MINUTES REPORT AND RULING

During the Court hearing today which was held in public session, the Presiding Appeals Judge called out the names of the defendants amongst which the 1st appeared and took his place, whereas the 2nd defendant did not appear.

At this point the Public Prosecutor, after being given by the floor by the Presiding Judge said that the defendant who appeared was a foreigner, he did not speak the Greek language but he spoke

the English language and therefore, in order that everything said during the proceedings could be interpreted accurately Theodoros Bouhelos son of Konstantinos and Fotini who speaks the English language was called to act and be present as an interpreter and she proposed he be sworn in as an interpreter during this case.

The Presiding Judge then called the above interpreter and after he was questioned about his identity and he responded that his name is as recorded above, he continued that he was born on 30-06-1974 in Athens and that he also lives in Athens at no. 52 Ag. Varvara Street, Halandri and that his religious denomination is Christian Orthodox, that he knows the defendant and that he is not related to him (without being impeded by article 188 points a-d 210, 211 and 212 of the Code of Criminal Procedure[[1]](#footnote-1)), that he knows the Greek and English language well and that accepted to interpret faithfully and accurately the proceedings from the Greek language to English and vice-versa, he took an oath on the Holy Bible in accordance with article 235 of the Code of Criminal Procedure that he will faithfully and accurately interpret all that is being said during the hearing.

The Presiding Judge then asked the 1st defendant through his interpreter to identify himself etc. he replied that his name is as above and that he appoints as his defence lawyers the Athenian lawyer Themistoklis Sofos and the Cretan lawyers from Chania Ioannis Sfakiotakis and Georgios Vergakis, who accepted their appointment.

At this point in the proceedings the Athenian lawyer Themistoklis Sofos and the lawyer from Chania Ioannis Sfakiotakis appeared, they declared that the 2nd defendant had appointed them through her power of attorney dated 18-09-2013, which was in good legal order, to represent her during the proceedings, in accordance with article 340 of the Code of Criminal Procedure as amended by law 3346/2005, the power of attorney was handed over to the Court and was read audibly to the public gallery.

The Public Prosecutor, after receiving the floor from the Presiding Judge proposed accepting that the 2nd defendant’s be represented through the lawyers present from Athens Themistoklis Sofos and from Chania Ioannis Sfakiotakis.

AFTER DELIBERATING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW

In accordance with article 340 paragraph 2 points a, b, c, d of the Code of Criminal Procedure[[2]](#footnote-2), paragraph 2 replaced by article 13 of Law 3346/2005 in relation to indictable crimes

it is permissible for the defendant to be represented by a lawyer, appointed by means of a written declaration. The declaration is made in accordance with the content of sub-paragraph 3, paragraph 2 of article 42 and must, under penalty of inadmissibility, accurately bear the permanent or temporary address of the defendant. Under these circumstances the defendant is considered to be present and the appointed lawyer undertakes all procedural matters on his/her behalf. In any case, the court may order that the defendant appear in person, if it considers this necessary in order to get to the truth. From the provisions to hand it is clear that the defendant may be represented in the criminal proceedings by a defence lawyer, whom s/he appoints through a declaration in accordance with the provisions of article 42 paragraph 2 sub-paragraph c of the Code of Criminal Procedure, under penalty of inadmissibility the declaration must accurately bear the permanent address or current address of the defendant, the only condition being that the court does not consider her/his presence to be necessary, on order to get to the truth. In the criminal case to hand it emerges that the written declaration dated 18-09-2013 by the 2nd defendant, and the authenticity of her signature being verified in accordance with article 42 paragraph 2, sub-paragraph c of the Code of Criminal Procedure by a solicitor member of the Athens Bar, Themistoklis Sofos, and which was read to the public gallery and which is now in the case file, the 2nd defendant empowered the Athenian and Cretan lawyers respectively members of the Athens and Chania Law Society, who are today present to act on her behalf in this criminal trial. Consequently in view of the fact that the power of attorney registers the address of the 2nd defendant accurately and that her presence is not considered necessary by the court to arrive at the truth, her representation by the lawyers Themistoklis Sofos and Ioannis Sfakiotakis must be permitted.

FOR THESE REASONS

Representation of the 2nd defendant (surname) SNOWBALL (name) JANE daughter of KENNETH, wife of RALPH JOHN CHRISTIE, born 30-03-1966 in Great Britain, resident at 4 Kensington Mews, North Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG1 1JR by the Athenian lawyer Themistoklis Sofos and the Cretan Chania lawyer Ioannis Sfakiotakis is permitted.

Determined, ruled and immediately published during the court hearing in open session.

Chania 27 September 2013

The Presiding Appeals Judge The Secretary

[Signature] [Signature]

At this point the Athenian lawyer Andreas Voltis and the Chania lawyer Nikolaos Giakoumakis came forward, requesting permission to speak and receiving the same from the Presiding judge, they declared that they represent the victim-plaintiff Stephen Andrew Thomas who intends to file a civil action and that he, along with witnesses for the prosecution, after an incident which had taken place the previous day at the house where they were staying in the area of Akrotiri Chania, had left Crete, and are therefore unable to attend Court during today’s hearing and that they request a brief suspension of the trial, to enable them to attend and give their witness statements. They also brought in relevant documents dated 11-03-2011, 16-09-2011 and 27-09-2-13, which were read to the public gallery, alleging that on the basis of the first document in conjunction with the power of attorney dated 03-11-2010 which is in the case file and which was read to the public gallery, they have the legal means in order to file a civil case on behalf of the plaintiff.

The Presiding judge then gave the Prosecutor the floor and he suggested that the trial be suspended till the 14th October 2013 at 09:00 am, so that the prosecution witnesses may attend.

The defence lawyers were then given permission to speak by the Presiding Judge and they disagreed that the documents which had been read provided a legal basis for the above lawyers to declare the filing of a civil case and they requested that their request for suspension of the trial be rejected.

Thereafter the Court, sat in closed chambers in the presence of the Secretary, drew up and the Presiding Judge immediately thereafter published in public session the decision which has the same docket number as the previous decision, and is as follows:

AFTER DELIBERATING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW

The plaintiff, the witness Neil Richard Waite who was served by his document dated 16-09-2013 and the first subpoenaed witness for the prosecution Suzan Jill Watt, could not appear in front of the jury during today’s hearing and consequently, in accordance with article 349 of the Code of Criminal Procedure the trial must be suspended until 14-10-2013, so that the above witnesses may attend and be cross-examined. The court finds that the suspension of the trial to a later date does not further assist the process but on the contrary it will unnecessarily defer the procedure, indeed at a time when the first defendant has been temporarily detained since 17-02-2013. Moreover, there is sufficient time until 14-10-2013 for the lifting of the impediment brought forward by the plaintiff and the witnesses.

FOR THESE REASONS

The Court suspends the hearing until 14th October 2013 at 09:00 am, so that the plaintiff and the witnesses for the prosecution may attend.

Determined, ruled and immediately published in the public gallery during the open session.

Chania 27 September 2013

The Presiding Appeal Judge The Secretary

[Signature] [Signature]

HEARING of 14th October 2013

During the public session of this Court, the date of which had been set during the session of 27th September 2013, the Court convened and was composed of the same Judges, the same Public Prosecutor and the same Secretary and after they were all seated the Presiding Judge called out the names of the defendant amongst which only the first appeared.

At this point the aforementioned empowered lawyers declared that they were present in order to defend the defendant hereby present and they also declared that they are representing the second defendant, the lawyers are the Athenian lawyer Themistoklis Sofos and the Cretan lawyer from Chania Ioannis Sfakiotakis. The interpreter who was appointed during the last session was also present. The lawyers Andreas Voltis and Nikolaos Giakoumakis who were present at the suspending hearing as representing the plaintiff, were not present to declare the filing of a civil action.

Thereafter the Presiding Judge ordered the defendant, hereby present through his interpreter, as well as the defence lawyers to pay attention to the complaint and the discussion arising from it, simultaneously she also reminded them that they have the right to counter the complaint with a full report of their allegations and to submit their comments after each witness had been examined or the examination of any other evidence.

Thereafter the Public Prosecutor, after receiving permission to speak from the Presiding Judge, read the complaint with summary accuracy and said that the case is entered under ruling no. 163/2011 of the Chania Judicial Council and he added that in order to defend the accusation he has called the witnesses on the known list, which has been legally served on the defendants according to article 326 Code of Criminal Procedure, as evidenced by the relevant legal document in the case file, he proposed that the documents which are registered on the indictment be read.

Thereafter, the Presiding Judge requested general information from the defendant who was present through his interpreter and from the defence lawyers about the offences, with which he has been charged and she reminded them that the defendant’s response as well as the defence lawyer’s speeches would be heard, after the submission of evidence had been completed. The defendant as well as the defence lawyers responded that they will reserve the right to put forward their opinions and that they do not have anything to say at this time.

The Presiding Judge then called out the names of the prosecution witnesses which were subpoenaed; the second witness was present, but the first and third were absent.

Thereafter the Presiding Judge asked the respondent through his interpreter and the defence lawyers if they had called defence witnesses, and they responded positively and handed over the defence witness list to the Presiding Judge.

The Presiding Judge read out the names of the defence witnesses and they were all present.

At this point the defence lawyer, the Athenian Themistoklis Sofos, after requesting and receiving permission to speak from the Presiding Judge put forward negative allegations as to the complaint, which were also made in writing and requested that these be entered into the minutes, which are as follows:

BEFORE THE THREE-MEMBER COURT OF APPEAL FOR FELONIES CHANIA

Summary notes on the documents brought forward for reading

1. Presentation, in chronological order – from June 2008 to June 2011, of the facts, on the basis of which the English authorities had conducted an investigation into Cedric Christie. Investment involvement of Cedric in Zakro in June 2008. Once Stephen Thomas had made a complaint to WYP, the following commenced, a) in absentia of WYP an investigation against Ralph Christie and b) Cedric was investigated by the Economic Crime Command. Finally, following investigation of Cedric’s financial history (from 1991) no issues emerged.
2. Announcement of formation of “Monte Crete” on 03/12/2007, in which Stephen Thomas is a 50% partner (30.000 Euros), company registration no.: 64786773/B/07/27. This is corroborated both by evidentiary document no. 3 in the file (see content), as well as document no. 47. Attention! 3 pages missing from the Greek text of document no. 47.
3. 17/03/2010: The response of the Société Anonyme[[3]](#footnote-3) Division (Directorate of Trade Chania) to Ralph Christie and Stephen Thomas on the application that they had both submitted as shareholders. The reply was sent to both.
4. On a total of 12 character references, nos.1-9 and 11 are praiseworthy of Ralph Christie.

On 10 (Mario Cerchione) and 12 (Bill Morris) clear reference is made to Stephen Thomas and the role he played as partner in “Monte Crete”.

1. On Evidentiary Document no. 13 (see Neil Waite’s e-mail dated 02/11/2007 to Nikolidaki) it emerges that Stephen Thomas was elected Vice President of “Monte Crete”. It also strictly refers that “Monte Crete” would purchase property goods from Ralph Christie & Stephen Thomas in exchange for shares in “Monte Crete”.
2. Evidentiary Document 14 (Monte Crete Capital) clearly shows that Stephen Thomas in a partner capacity, as his name is expressly referenced in the information brochure.
3. Evidentiary Document 15 (Monte Crete Operational Manual) makes reference to Ralph Christie’s and Stephen Thomas’s primary company objective which is to purchase land and to develop it. Developing by either building on the land or making a commercial plan to market it.
4. In evidentiary document 15 (Monte Crete Draft) Stephen Thomas is referred to as a founding shareholder and UK Director. It also contains the clear agreement dated 25/02/2009 between Diamantaki (New Century) and Ralph Christie for St George’s Retreat and for a (100 bedroom) hotel in Kokkino Chorio.
5. Evidentiary Document 20: Of particular importance is Stephen Thomas’s email to Ralph Christie, in which their joint investment plans are clear. In fact, in combination with evidentiary Document 19 (the statement depositing cash in the Bank of Piraeus – loan repayment - dated 06/08/2008), it appears that Ralph Christie was conscientious on all matters in his agreements with Stephen Thomas, given that the very next day he deposited the exact amount agreed in the above Bank.
6. Of particular importance David Cockshott’s email dated 30/11/2009 to Ralph, whereby a money stream of €145.000 is evidenced from David Cockshott to Stephen Thomas. Funds that Ralph had paid David for a property in Monaco.
7. Evidentiary Document 25 shows the purchase of shares in VARON S.A. by Ralph Christie. On 20/08/08 by Georgio Niavradaki, on 24/11/2008 by Stefanos Varidakis and on 20/02/2009 by his wife Jane Snowball.

12. Evidentiary Document 30: Planning Permission (DIAMANTAKIS S.A.) (five star) furnished flats with swimming pool in the Municipality of Vamos (Kokkino Chorio) Chania.

13. Evidentiary Document 31: Shows that Ralph Christie paid €17.086 Euros for electrical items (in Almyrida) to the company “Rombolaki”.

14. Evidentiary Document 32: Evidencing: 1) total money transfers from January to October 2007 in the amount of €342.750. 2) On 5/12/06 and 06/08/09, deposits €34.478 and €2.720 respectively. 3) Cash withdrawals (by Stephen Thomas) on 7/06/07 (€56.326) and on 6/12/07 (€15.100).

15. Evidentiary Document 39: A thank you message from Ralph Christie to all shareholders - co-investors.

16. Evidentiary Document 44: In his email dated 31/08/06 Mario Nikolidakis mentions to Stephen Thomas that he has received all the necessary documents, so that he may proceed with the contracts for a mortgage and that Stephen Thomas should pay him legal fees amounting to €49.600.

17. Evidentiary Document 45 on 30/10/2007 a transfer of 54,761.72 from Stephen Thomas from Barclays Bank to Bank of Piraeus (Banking between Manfred Dull and Stephen Thomas).

18. Evidentiary Document 46: Paper trail, 3/10/07 refers to Kambia (Stephen and Ralph a share of 125.000 Euros each), Plakias Hotel (€50.000 Ralph, €50.000 Stephen), Safe House (reference is made that although it belongs to Ralph and Stephen, it will be in Ralph’s name), New Build (paid for by both Ralph and Stephen), Listeros (reference is made that both have paid €116.500 and that Manfred Dull will give them the receipt), South Land (reference is made, that the contract would be translated to English by Manfred), KEPA (Stephen’s idea, a single instalment of €42.000 remained in November 07), Almyrida 8 (€100.000 left outstanding to New Centuries, from which Stephen and Ralph owe €50.000. €20.000 of which is commission, therefore the sum due is €30.000). The Trail makes reference that Neillie proposed Monte Crete Investments. Ralph clearly makes reference in the Trail that the property acquired by them, within the framework of the company which will be formed,

will constitute a “common basis”. Reference is also made of a “gift” of 12.000 Swiss Francs that Ralph had sent to him.

19. Evidentiary document 48: 2007, Stephen Thomas Business Card (Phoenix Villas) and Monte Crete card (as UK DIRECTOR).

20. Evidentiary document 48: HMRC (Refusal letter dated 05/02/08) addressed to Stephen Thomas, reference is made to the fact that establishing a company in Crete is in no way related to being self-employed in England, and therefore, he shall have “dual liability” and tax payments will need to be made in 2 countries (Obviously this demonstrates Stephen’s desire to avoid double contributions, that is why he made a local application).

21. Evidentiary document 49: Ralph’s Plea Letter dated 09/06/09, whereby Ralph declares that he jointly owns property with Stephen. That Kera was Stephen’s idea, therefore any resultant investment loss is Stephen’s responsibility. In the document, Ralph expressly mentions that he wished to come to an out of court settlement. That he does not have to hand the funds that Stephen is demanding. And that, at the end of the day, there are sufficient documents that prove their collaboration. There are also many handwritten financial calculations in respect of what has been paid for and what should have been paid, as well as an order from Stephen Thomas in June 2007 to Mario Nikolidaki to pay Ralph €56.333. There is also a list of Plakias Hotel shareholders in 2007.

22. Evidentiary document 50: Bogus Email. Not to Ralph or Jane Christie’s benefit, as it attributes “fraudulent business” activities to them. It also states that the only way to reimburse investors money is through legal process. Attention to evidentiary Document 56, Ralph states that it was false, and actually fabricated by Michael Tomson!)

23. Evidentiary document 51: Private agreement Sitia / August 2008 (between Geoff Brown, Mario Cerchione, Stephen Thomas and Darren Brown) makes reference to the sums of money paid by that date by the above: Mario €320.000, Geoff €160.000, Darren €160.000, Ralph €840.000 and Stephen Thomas €407.0006. Total: €1.887 million paid. In his email of 31/08/2009 Stephen Thomas proposes that the above investors should take control of their money and reinvest it in something more manageable

from an investment standpoint. In his email Stephen explicitly declares that Ralph has done an exceptional job. Despite this, the above agree with Stephen that they should withdraw from the investment. Pay attention to Stephen’s email of the 1st September 2008, in which he says that they should continue with the investment, given that there is a pledge regarding the return of funds.

24. Evidentiary document 52: A very important document! Lofos Frouras meeting with Invest in Greece (14/4/2009). Referral planned by Susan Watt: Direct quote: “because Ralph is the Only shareholder in VARON, funding is more likely”. So please keep VARON S.A. as it is. Amongst others in this document, Ralph, Stephen and Simon Thomas are referred to as Plot Holders.

25. Evidentiary document 53: Sue Watt’s resignation (28/09/09)

26. Evidentiary document 54: February ‘08/ Kera receipt Phoenix Villas (€570) received by Thomas on behalf of Stephen Thomas, Mario Cerchione and Andrian Clarke. The purchase was made by Ioannis Fronimakis.

27. Evidentiary document 55: 25 February 2009, St George’s Retreat agreement between Ralph Christie and Diamantaki

28. Evidentiary document 56. Letter to Thomsons (20/1/10). Whereby Ralph states both that it was they who had burgled his home, as only they knew where the cash was hidden, and that a fraudulent message had been sent[[4]](#footnote-4) on 28/9/09, as Jessop. Which Jessop also mentioned to Skidmore as being fraudulent. It also mentions receipts in respect of Michael and Kimberly’s expenses €32.880

29. Evidentiary document 57: The Deal: Concerning Matthew and Benedict Clarke’s investment in respect of St George.

30. Evidentiary document 58: (01/04/2011) A letter from Beetenson & Gibbon solicitors.

Following the above the Presiding Judge declared the opening of the procedure for taking evidence and, after she ordered the witnesses to leave the courtroom and not have contact with anyone having an interest in the proceedings, she invited the second prosecution witness to come forward in order to be examined.

The second witness came forward and after the Presiding Judge asked him to identify himself, he said that he was Geoffrey Stewart BROWN, resident in

Kokkino Chorio, Apokoronas Chania, self-employed by profession, Christian Orthodox, he knows the defendants and that he is not related to them. The witness then swore on the Holy Bible in accordance with article 218 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and under examination gave the following testimony: “*I have known Ralf John Gristie for fifteen years both in England and in Greece and through Ralf I met Stephen Andrew Thomas, as partners in the company. The company is called “VΑRΟΝ S.A.” and it is seated in Greece. In England the company is a limited liability company, with regards the participation of investments in the purchase of land I also had a share in this purchase. In some instances they bought fields and in other instances they bought plots of land with properties. In my case, many investors had been called to purchase a large area called Zakro. As far as I know, both defendants had participated in this. I met both of them at the time. There were two different investment opportunities that I had participated in. On many occasions I was in the audience in conferences between Ralf and Thomas. As a successful investor Ralf knew about and presented on how things worked in Crete. I participated in an investment company and I went along to get the funds from Zakro half of the money together with the plaintiff. He kept on changing his mind and saying that he would leave the funds in the investment and I don’t think that Ralf got the money either. I didn’t get the money either. I used this money for Zakro in order to buy Plakies. All of the defendants assets have been frozen and that’s why nothing could be moved. It’s the same and all assets are frozen in the UK when a complaint has been filed. Thomas was offered property but he wanted cash. All of the funds have been invested in Zakro, Plakies, some properties in Almyrida about ten to fifteen and I don’t know them. From what I know they belong to “VARON S. A.”. From what I know the company belongs to the defendant and his wife, they are the shareholders, and the plaintiff had asked them many times so that he could be a shareholder, but they[[5]](#footnote-5) refused. From what I know, it’s a Greek company seated in Greece. I live in the UK. I have bought a property in Almyrida and I visit with my family during the holidays. The defendants had no intention of defrauding the plaintiff. I have sustained damages of €50.000 in Plakies, €85.000 in Zakro and the total damages amount to €320.000, from which Thomas wants the entire amount.*

*This is not due to deceitful or culpable behaviour from the defendants. The 2nd defendant is the wife of the 1st defendant. I believe that the first defendant is exclusively responsible for running the business. Mr Thomas intended to make substantial investments in Crete and not simply buy a little house. I believe that Mr Thomas wanted a quick return on his investment, he therefore came to Greece saying that he wanted his money the following week and the defendant continually made him change his mind. First of all the plaintiff knew that Ralf was an impeccable and upright professional and in my opinion he was serious and honest. I know people here in Greece who have the same opinion of him as I do and in a third case which was an investment that threw up some problems, no problem, he reimbursed the money. I knew that the defendant had gone through a difficult divorce in England. My understanding is that he wanted to invest his money in Crete, so that it wouldn’t be found in his bank accounts in England and he wanted to transfer it to Crete, because of the divorce. I wouldn’t say that I know Hugh Clarke William. I am not sure but I don’t know him personally, but he was up for purchasing too. I am not aware of the other agreements that the defendant had made with Thomas, he used to explain to him. In fact I had a financial return on a small investment and I am waiting to receive the rest of the money.*

*At this point the witness was shown by the defence lawyer, a document dated 31 August 2008, which was submitted to the Court and read to the public gallery. Thereafter the defence lawyer (Themistoklis Sofos) asked the witness if minutes of the meetings between the defendant and investors were kept and who participated in the meetings and the witness answered as follows:*

*“I wouldn’t say that minutes were kept, I just took notes and I sent them formatted as minutes to Thomas, Brown and Mario Cerchione, by email. These people were also present during the meetings. I don’t know if he is accused of anything similar by anyone else. As far as I know Thomas owns property in “VARON S. A.”. His brother Simon is a property owner and also owns a parcel of land which is in the name of the plaintiff. In England it’s not common practice for the property not to be written into the name of the investor*”.

After the witness examination the documents which are referred to in the indictment were read publicly, i.e.:

* 1. Decision no. 163/11 of the Chania Judicial Council.
  2. Order no. 10/11 for the arrest of JANE SNOWBALL issued by the Chania Investigating Judge.
  3. Order no. 9/11 for the arrest of RALF JOHN CRISTIE issued by the Chania Investigating Judge.
  4. Research material concerning bank transactions of the persons implicated.
  5. Decision dated 25-2-2009 of the Prefect of Chania establishing and approving the Articles of Association no. EM1957/00 published in Government Gazette no. 6859/00 (S.A.).
  6. Two (2) photographs.
  7. Ten (10) receipt vouchers.
  8. Eight (8) copies of money transfers.
  9. Copy of cash withdrawal.
  10. An agreement in respect of which language the contract was to be signed in and who would be responsible for organizing the necessary permits and approvals.
  11. Document dated 4-5-11 issued by the Vamos Police Station for breach of restrictive conditions by RALF JOHN CRISTIE.
  12. Investigating Judge Order no. ΑΝ/Δ/68/11.
  13. (2) Medical opinions concerning RALF JOHN CRISTIE issued by the Psychiatric clinic of the University of Athens.
  14. Nikolaos Symeonidis letter (Director of the Association for Regional Development and Mental Health), which refers to RALF JOHN CRISTIE.
  15. BARCLAYS BANK payment form.
  16. NAIGEL SMALES letter dated 30-11-09.
  17. KATRYN FREEMAN letter dated 25-11-09.
  18. ALLEN THOMPSON letter dated December 2009.
  19. CHARLES XENAKIS-CHARALAMPOUS letter dated 10-12-09.
  20. Payments or exchanges made with STEPHEN THOMAS.
  21. How STEPHEN THOMAS made his money.
  22. Property and land owned by STEPHEN THOMAS to date 13/4/2011.
  23. All the deposits made to STEPHEN THOMAS for acquisitions in Crete.
  24. Total joint ownership in Crete today.
  25. An unsigned document setting out financial sums that STEPHEN THOMAS owed to his wife and her tax office.
  26. RALF CRISTIE’s letter dated 2-12-10 to DC SKIDMORE.
  27. RALF CRISTIE’s letter dated 9-6-2009 to STEPHEN THOMAS.
  28. RALF CRISTIE letter.
  29. ARCADIA FINE Homes (HELLAS) advertisement.
  30. “KRISRALLOS CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.

Upon the proposal of the Public Prosecutor, the following documents were also read to the public gallery, without objections from the defence lawyers or the plaintiff’s lawyers.:

1. Arrest warrant dated 10-04-2011.
2. Arrest warrant dated 17-02-2013.
3. Arrest warrant dated 18-02-2013.
4. Decision no. 58/2012 of the Appeals Council Crete.

Finally the following documents which were brought to Court by the defence lawyers were also read to the public gallery:

1. Copy of the One-Member Court of First Instance of Chania no. 43/2010.
2. Copy of decision no. 122/4-4-2013 of the Multi-Member Court of First Instance Chania.
3. True copy of announcement no. 4884/3-12-2007 to the National Printer’s of the establishment of “KRITIKES EPENDYSEIS A.E.[[6]](#footnote-6)” and registration of the company into Companies Registry[[7]](#footnote-7).
4. Copy of medical report dated 10-10-2013 by Dr Jessica Keeble of “Saltaire Medical Practice” concerning the patient Stephen Thomas.
5. Copy of medical report dated 4-10-2013 by Dr S. Chadwick concerning the patient Stephen Thomas.
6. Copy of Government Gazette 1823/11-3-2009 (Issue of Sociétés Anonymes and Limited Liability Companies[[8]](#footnote-8)).
7. True and accurate translation of the attached email correspondence between Stephen Thomas, Darren Browne, Mario Cerchione and Geoff Brown from English to Greek.
8. Translation of the attached email correspondence between Ioannis Papatsakonas and Ralph Christie from English to Greek.
9. Copy of Government Gazette no. 1829/11-3-2009 (Issue of Sociétés Anonymes and Limited Liability Companies).
10. Copy of announcement no. 4884/3-12-2007 to the National Printer on the establishment of “KRITIKES EPENDYSEIS A.E.” and registration of the company into Companies Registry and attached document protocol no. 218/23-1-2009 to carry out a check on the payment of Raising Share Capital.
11. List of documents read in front of the Three-Member Court of Appeal for Felonies Chania.
12. Head of the Detention Centre Crete 1 in-service attestation no. 6948/27-9-2013 on the behaviour of the prisoner Cristie Ralph John son of James.
13. True copy of written reply no. 3395/24-9-2013 from Kassiani Tsiraki Head of the Regional Development Agency Chania/ Department of Trade with attached document no. 952/13-4-2010 to strike off the company from the Registry of Companies as well as the articles of association no. 25270/30-10-2007 of the company “KRITIKES EPENDYSEIS A.E.”.
14. Copy of power of attorney no 26755/17-02-2009.
15. Copy of buy/sell contract no. 7407/24-2-2009.
16. Copy of contract of sale of a horizontal property no. 26432/24-10-2008.
17. Copy of contract of sale of urban properties no, 26481/24-10-2008.
18. Copy of contract of sale of urban property no. 26480/24-10-2008.
19. Copy of contract of sale of urban property no. 26479/24-10-2008.

No objection was brought forward in respect of the reading of all of the above documents.

Examination of defence witnesses followed reading of the documents.

The witness for the defence of the 1st defendant came forward, after the Presiding Judge asked him to identify himself, he replied that his name is Iasonas Stamos son of Antonios, born in Trikala on 19-05-1970 and resident in Rethymnon Crete, a Greek citizen and Christian Orthodox. He also declared that he knows the 1st defendant and that he is related to him. Thereafter the witness took an oath on the Holy Bible in accordance with article 218 of the Criminal Code and gave his testimony as follows: “*The defendant is my first cousin. My mother is English. I know him from when he first came to Greece. What I know is that he started by purchasing a flat and after ten years of activity this was created. He had separate agreements for every person. It was dangerous with what happened. A reason for his success is that he was a risk taker. I am aware that there were many investors and that his investments were successful. I don’t know why he turned against him, because he used to work for him. When he was working for them, they[[9]](#footnote-9) seemed happy with him, I don’t know why he changed his mind afterwards. Mr Christie took out a bank loan and was paying it by instalments, Mr Thomas owns four or five houses. He and Mr Christie bought them together and then each one of them had his own put into his own name. I know Hugh Clarke Hughman, they were partners and I helped them with the translations and Mr Thomas bought out Hugh Clarke’s share. Mr Thomas was resentful because he had a schedule and he probably panicked. He knew that he didn’t appear as the owner on some properties. In the conference about Zakro, Mario Cerchione, Darren Browne … … five people have the minutes, it was November 2008 … I don’t remember and they had paid the deposit and he paid up because I was present and Mr Alimakis didn’t speak Greek and I was the translator, he had taken a deposit of about one million Euros from the four of them and CHRISTIE had given it. I think he panicked. About three months would have to pass before they paid up the second deposit instalment and I don’t remember what the amount would have been. If I remember correctly in total it was ten thousand. The others didn’t make any objections. There was interest from Russia in this project. Mr Thomas seemed clever to me and I don’t think anybody could have cheated him. There are*

*funds but they have been frozen. The funds were invested, he couldn’t return them immediately, the properties had to be sold. He requested the entire amount and they made several proposes to him, three if my memory serves me correctly and he rejected them all, he wanted the money*”.

Thereafter the Presiding Judge called the 2nd defence witness and asked him through his interpreter to identify himself, and he replied that his name is CHARLES XENAKIS son of CHARALAMBOUS, born in London on 27-10-1964 and resident at Xirosterni Apokoronas Chania, Christian Orthodox. Thereafter the witness took an oath on the Holy Bible in accordance with article 218 of the Criminal Code and through his interpreter gave his witness statement: “*My relationship with the defendant is of a professional nature, of architectural content. I know him from about the end of 2008 going forward. I do not know the second defendant. I was never aware of any falsehood*”.

Reference is made that the Presiding Judge, after examining every witness, gave permission to the Public Prosecutor, the Judges and defence lawyers, in turn, to put their questions to them, if they had any. Each witness answered as above in his witness statement. Reference is also made that the Presiding Judge after examining every witness, gave permission to the Pubic Prosecutor, the Judges and defence lawyers, in turn, to put forward comments on the witness statements, if they had any. Finally, reference is made that each witness, after being examined remained in the public gallery until the end of the taking of evidence.

Further, the Presiding Judge invited the defendant present to give account, which he gave through his interpreter as follows: “*I have remained speechless so that justice may be served and that’s why I am here. I first came here in 2001, when I made a purchase in Kokkino Chorio Apokoronas Chania and then I immediately sold up and immediately deposited for another three properties. I went to England with these three properties and sold them on and then an avalanche was created. In 2001 I bought a property, then three and then eight, like an avalanche. I therefore made a purchase of eight properties and Hugh wanted to copy the investment action and introduced me to Thomas and specifically his brother. Hugh and I were involved with the other company and we had an exceptional relationship right up until he died. Hugh had a different way of doing business and that’s why*

*he wanted to leave. I stayed here in Crete and did my business and Hugh was in England and did his business from there and then Thomas appeared and wanted to buy him out. In March 2009 we made another agreement to buy another property in Kokkino Chorio and the money had to be paid by 20th April and I don’t know why SNOWBALL was suspicious that s/he[[10]](#footnote-10) turned against him and all of this started. It is very difficult to conclude what it was that I did that made him turn against me, it’s difficult to conclude why. I can’t know the reason, the conflict with the plaintiff took place on the 20th May and I can’t know what happened with my employee[[11]](#footnote-11). I think that with so much money going backwards and forwards they probably panicked. I don’t know why this lady turned against me. I was called in front of the lawyer and I was put under pressure. I don’t want to make a complaint about her; I don’t want to turn against her. I sent him a letter on 09-06-2006 to which I haven’t received a reply. He wanted his money. The result being that I am in prison without knowing why. I would say that the meaning of fraud is international. There is a difference between the Greek and English system, the difference being that here in Greece they depend a lot more on trust. I can think of a thousand things concerning the Court case, but I want to be freed and I want to continue my work. The excuse of the economic crisis was too easy. However the properties are in my possession and in the company. Afterwards because of the divorce she changed her attitude. I was in England at the beginning of 2011. This happened in April 2011. I was represented by a lawyer who wasn’t a specialist in criminal law and he didn’t inform me. He only informed me when there was a warrant and he told me not to worry, I came over in Easter and appeared and they told me to pay an amount and to appear. As I couldn’t pay the amount, I went to my lawyer and asked for legal advice and I left. I shouldn’t have left. My wife was not financially involved and she supported me, she accompanied me to the discussions*[[12]](#footnote-12)”.

After the defendant’s account the Presiding Judge put questions to him. She also gave permission to the Public Prosecutor and the judges to question him if they wanted to and the defendant answered as above through his interpreter in his account.

Afterwards the Presiding Judge asked the Pubic Prosecutor and the defence lawyers if they needed supplementary examination or clarification. They replied that they did not.

Consequently the Presiding Judge declared that the taking of evidence has ended and gave the floor to the Public Prosecutor who further clarified the charge and proposed that the defendants be acquitted.

Furthermore the Presiding Judge asked the defence lawyers if they wished to add anything further to the defence. They replied that they did not.

After the foregoing the Presiding Judge declared the hearing closed, and the Court after meeting in secret session in the presence of the Secretary, drew up and the Presiding Judge announced in public session to the public gallery, Court Decision no. 566/2013, as follows:

AFTER DELIBERATING IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW

From the taking of evidence in the Court’s public session and more specifically from the documents, which were read in public session, from the witness statements both from the prosecution and the defence witnesses, from the account of the first defendant and generally from all the hearing of the case it has not been proven that the defendants deceived the plaintiff Stephen Andrew Thomas son of Brian, as per referred decision no. 163/2011 of the Judicial Council of First Instance Chania. On the contrary, it has been proven that the first defendant over the course of over twenty years was an associate and close friend of the brother of the plaintiff, Simon Thomas, who was so impressed by the excellent collaboration he had with the first defendant that he recommended him to his brother, so that he could also collaborate with him in order to invest money in property markets in Crete, the properties would be sold on to third parties at a higher price than the initial purchase price, they would make a profit or they would develop the properties by refurbishment and then sell them on thereby making a greater profit. This business activity

rested on the understanding of both parties that property values in Crete were rising very quickly. The defendant met the plaintiff in February 2006 in England and since then the pair of them collaborated until the spring of 2009, when the plaintiff started making financial claims which were a blow to their relationship. After that, their collaboration was suspended and on 16-07-2009 the plaintiff brought a complaint against the first defendant and included his wife in the complaint – the second defendant, despite the fact that she was not involved in the business plans and in the dealings that her husband had with the plaintiff. It has also been proven that the complainant, throughout the period of his collaboration with the first defendant, was aware of all of his actions and all of the circumstances involving the properties that they held an interest in, given that actually, the two were partners in each investment venture and they incurred the risk of every investment that they made. In fact, the plaintiff himself, because he concealed his true asset situation from this ex-wife, who had made financial claims against him, didn’t wish to appear as owner of the properties that he invested in and that’s why he didn’t want them transferred into his name. In conclusion, nowhere was it proven, in the referred decision that the defendants knowingly made false representations to the plaintiff, in order to convince him to pay funds that they then withheld, thereby causing damages to his estate. Now, in respect of the claims of the plaintiff against the first defendant which likely came about during their collaboration, the civil courts are the competent courts to rule on. Besides, it goes against the teachings of common experience and logic for the plaintiff to be repeatedly deceived by the defendant from September 2006 and despite that fact, without making a profit on his investments, to continue paying large sums of money until the end of 2007, in order to purchase more properties. Subsequent to all of the above, the defendants must be declared innocent of the offence attributed to them of jointly committing fraud repeatedly with a total benefit and damage over 73.000 Euros (by now, over 120.00 Euros)

and money laundering which is attributed to the first defendant, as these offences are described in the substantive part of the present ruling.

FOR THIS REASON

Judging in the presence of the first defendant (surname) CRISTIE (names) RALPH JOHN son of JAMES and STELLA, born 05-05-1961 in Leeds Britain and resident in Kokkino Chorio Apokoronas Chania, detained at Chania Detention Centre “CRETE 1” and the second defendant represented by her attorneys (surname) SNOWBALL (name) JANE daughter of KENNETH, wife of RALF JOHN CHRISTIE, born 30-03-1966 in Great Britain, resident in Great Britain at 4 Kensington Mews, North Road, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG1 1JR.

Declares them innocent of [[13]](#footnote-13)in Kokkino Chorio in the Municipality of Vamos the Prefecture of Chania, during particular dates which were not determined specifically during the questioning, in any event during the period September 2006 to March 2008, acting jointly and with intent and with more acts that constitute a repetition of the same crime, in order to make illegal material gain, caused damage to another’s property, convincing somebody to act by knowingly presenting false events as true, the total gain from the above act which they benefitted from and the corresponding damage caused exceeding 73.000 Euros. More specifically, during the month of August 2006, when they met with the plaintiff Stephen Andrew Thomas son of Brian and were informed that the latter disposed of large sums of money that he was looking to invest, acting after a joint decision and with joint deceit with intent to make illegal financial gain at the expense of the plaintiff’s estate, presented themselves to him as supposed businessmen who ran a successful operation in Crete and alleged that they operated a serious and profitable investment and real estate business, that the wider region of Crete lent itself to property investment and that they were in a position to advise him in respect of profitable and particularly beneficial investments, because they knew of many instances of properties that constituted an opportunity (to purchase, sell on, construct, tourist development, etc.) and their value would multiply in the future and further they then visited with the plaintiff and

showed him a great number of properties in Crete (coastal areas, new and refurbished properties etc.), alleging to the latter that they supposedly were available, for sale to them or third parties, pointing these out as alleged big opportunities for development, exploitation and utilization, following their assistance. However, the above facts that they represented to the plaintiff were knowingly false, given that they were aware that in reality their real estate-investment business which they presented to the latter was not operational, it was a virtual operational, meant to cover up their illegal activities in order to deceive third parties, they knew that in reality they did not intend, on the one hand, to advise the plaintiff on property investments, showing him impressive opportunities which would have increased his estate and on the other hand, to sell properties to the plaintiff or mediate on his behalf so that he could buy properties from third parties, on the contrary, their aim was not to observe any agreement and to deceive the plaintiff, so that they could make illegal financial gain thereby damaging his estate, withholding and appropriating all financial sums that he could be convinced to pay for the supposed purchase of property or participation in investments, given that they knew that every property that they presented to the plaintiff as representing opportunity for purchase and utilization, in reality either belonged to a third party who was unaware of their contact with the latter, or wasn’t up for sale. Through the above false events that they presented to the plaintiff they deceived him in respect of their supposed intentions to advise in property investment and they convinced the latter to pay various sums of money, totalling 1.165.554 Euros, which they then appropriated, given that they integrated the funds into their own estate and used them for their own needs. More specifically, during the month of September 2006 until the month of March 2008, having the above purpose, they jointly engaged in the following actions: a) During the month of September 2006, they made a representation to the plaintiff that an investment opportunity of 1/3 undivided ownership existed in a plot of land which was in the exclusive possession of the former, measuring 1.235sqm approx, situated in the area “Listeros” near Matalon in the Prefecture of Herakleion, on which three self-contained dwellings were to be constructed (two of which were already at the stage of construction).

They alleged to the plaintiff that they offered the aforementioned undivided percentage of joint ownership for a sale price of 60.000 Euros, that this was a substantial investment, because there was an opportunity to sell on the property to third parties for a high profit, as well as that completion of transfer of the above percentage of joint ownership would not be effected immediately, but in the future, to serve his own benefit, so as to avoid successive transfers and the corresponding expenses. The above events, however, that they presented to the plaintiff were knowingly false, given that they knew that in reality they didn’t intend to sell and transfer the aforementioned percentage of joint ownership on the above property to the latter, given that the property had already been sold and completely transferred to Manfred Dull, a German citizen, given that in reality their intention was to withhold the price that the plaintiff paid for the supposed purchase, without giving him anything in return. Through the above false facts that they presented to the plaintiff they convinced the latter to pay them on the 17-10-2006 the financial sum of 60.000 Euros, which they then kept and integrated into their own estate. B[[14]](#footnote-14)) During the month of December in the year 2006, they made representation to the plaintiff that supposedly there were six sequential self-contained plots of land[[15]](#footnote-15) available for sale at an advantageous price, each one measuring 1.000 sqm approx. situated in an ideal location in the real estate region of Kokkino Chorio in the Municipality of Vamos, Chania, that these properties belonged to various owners at various percentages of ownership, whom they would mediate with in order to buy them, that the above purchase was an advantageous investment opportunity, that immediately after payment of the price (totalling 310.000 Euros) on his behalf the transfer of ownership to him was guaranteed and secure, also that completion of transfer of title on the above properties to the plaintiff would not take place immediately, but in the future, for his own benefit, so as to avoid tax payments and the corresponding purchase expenses, given that there was an opportunity to resell the property to third parties for a large profit. The above facts however, that they presented to the plaintiff were knowingly false, given that they knew that

in reality the aforementioned properties were not up for sale and the owners of the same on the one hand did not wish to transfer them, and on the other hand, were unaware of their agreements with the plaintiff, and in reality they did not intend to mediate in any sale on behalf of the plaintiff, on the contrary, their intention was to withhold the price that the plaintiff would have paid them for the supposed purchase, without giving him anything in exchange. Convinced by the above facts that they presented to him, the plaintiff gradually paid (from 5-12-2006 to 29-6-2007), through transfer of capital from England) the price of the supposed sale price of 310.804 Euros (including expenses for the supposed transfer of the properties), which they went on to withhold and integrate into their own estate. C) On 25-7-2007, they made representation to the plaintiff that supposedly there was a plot of land going for 113.333 Euros measuring 4.500 sqm approx., situated in an ideal location in the area “Kambia” within the Municipal Constituency of Drapanos in the Municipality of Vamos Chania, that they would mediate with its owner for its sale, that the above purchase was an advantageous investment opportunity, that immediately after the sale price was paid on his behalf that transfer of title to him was guaranteed and secure, also that completion of transfer of title on the above property to the plaintiff would not take place immediately, but in the future, for his own benefit, so that he could avoid tax payments and the corresponding expenses of purchasing the property, given that there was the prospect of immediate reconstruction and resale of the property to third parties for a large profit for the plaintiff. However, the above facts, which they presented to the plaintiff were knowingly false, given that in reality the aforementioned property had already been transferred to the first defendant in full ownership and he wasn’t offering it for sale to the plaintiff, given that he did not wish it to be transferred to the latter, and in reality they didn’t intend to observe any agreement with the plaintiff nor did they intend to take any action that would give him ownership of the above property, on the contrary, their intention was to withhold the price that the plaintiff paid to them for this supposed sale, without giving him

anything in exchange. The plaintiff, convinced by the above facts that they presented to him, paid them on 27-7-2007 (through a transfer of capital from England) against the sale price of the supposed sale the amount of 113.33 Euros, which they went on to withhold and integrate into their own estate. D) On 24-8-2007, they made representation to the plaintiff that allegedly there was a new house on the market with a sale price of 91.500 Euros, measuring 73sqm approx., situated in the coastal settlement “Almyrida” in the Municipality of Vamos Chania, that they would mediate with the property owner for its purchase, that the above purchase represented an advantageous investment opportunity, that immediately after paying the price on his behalf that the transaction of sale would be almost complete as per the official part and that the transfer of title to him was guaranteed and secure, also that completion of the transfer of ownership to the plaintiff would not take effect immediately but in the future, for his own benefit, so that he could avoid tax payments and the corresponding purchase expenses, given that there was the prospect of immediate resale of the property to third parties for a large profit to the plaintiff. The above facts however, that they presented to the plaintiff, were knowingly false, given that they knew that in reality the above mentioned property was not on the market and that its owner (the company styled VARON S.A.), on the one hand did not wish to transfer it, and on the other wasn’t aware of their agreements with the plaintiff, and in reality they had no intention of mediating in any sale on behalf of the plaintiff, on the contrary, their aim was to withhold the price that the plaintiff would have paid them for the supposed sale, without giving him anything in exchange. Convinced by the facts that they presented to him, the plaintiff gradually paid them (from 24-8-2007 to 31-8-2007, through transfer of capital from England) against the price of the supposed sale the total amount of 91.500 Euros (including expenses for the supposed transfer of the property), which they went on to withhold and integrate into their own estate. E) On 3-9-2007, they made representation to the plaintiff that a new house was on the market for 88.000 Euros measuring 95sqm approx., situated in the coastal settlement

“Almyrida” in the Municipality of Vamos Chania, that they would mediate with the owner of the property for its purchase, and that the above purchase was an advantageous investment opportunity, that immediately after the payment of the price on his behalf the procedure of sale would be almost completed in as far as its official part is concerned and that transfer of ownership to him was guaranteed and secure, also that completion of the transfer of title on the above property to the plaintiff would not take effect immediately, but in the future, for his own benefit, so that tax payments and the corresponding purchase expenses could be avoided, given that there was the prospect of immediate resale of the property to third parties for a large profit to the plaintiff. However, the above facts that they presented to the plaintiff, were knowingly false, given that in reality the aforementioned property was not up for sale and its owner (the company styled VARON S.A.), on the one hand did not wish to transfer it, and on the other wasn’t aware of their agreements with the plaintiff, also in reality they did not intend to observe any agreement with the plaintiff nor did they intend to take any action so that he could acquire ownership of the above property, however on the contrary, their aim was to withhold the price which the plaintiff would pay them for this supposed sale, without giving him anything in exchange. Convinced by the above facts presented to him, the plaintiff gradually paid (from 3-9-2007 to 2-10-2007), through transfers of capital from England) against the price of the supposed sale the total amount of 88.917 Euros (including expenses for the supposed transfer of property and the cost of the supposed instalment of an air conditioning unit), which they went on to withhold and integrate into their own estate. F) Towards the end of 2007, they made representation to the plaintiff that there was a very advantageous investment opportunity, which was the purchase of land 3.000 stremmata[[16]](#footnote-16) in the wider region of Kato Zakrou Siteia and the prospect of immediate resale of the same (at a much higher price and, consequently, at a very large profit) to third party investors who already expressed an interest in the purchase of the same land. They alleged that the plaintiff’s percentage of participation in this investment would amount to 500.000 Euros,

which he could pay gradually, whilst further in October 2009 he could withdraw from the investment receiving 700.000 Euros as the value of his participating share. Finally they alleged that the profit to him from the investment was guaranteed and secure, given that there were already many parties interested in the further purchase of the aforementioned land (such as the Russian company styled “SANCOM” as well as the government of Oman). However, the above facts that they presented to the plaintiff were knowingly false, given that they knew that in reality they weren’t planning any such investment in the aforementioned area, that the 3.000 stremmata which was the supposed investment was not up for sale and the owners were unaware of their agreements with the plaintiff, that there were no third party investors who were interested in buying the specific land, also they did not intend to observe any agreement with the plaintiff nor take any action so that he could participate in the relevant investment, on the contrary, their intention was to withhold the above sum that he would have paid them as his participating share for the supposed investment, without giving him anything in return and without reinstating the value of his participating investment share to him. Convinced by the above facts that they presented to him, the plaintiff gradually paid (from 21-3-2008 to 7-5-2009), either though transfer of capital from England, or through bank payments into third party bank accounts – their debtors) against his share in the supposed investment, the total amount of 501.000 Euros, which they went on to withhold and integrate into their own estate. Their intention through this act was, by exploiting the trust that the plaintiff showed them, to make illegal asset gain, which exceeds the total sum of 73.000 Euros and amounts to the referred sum of 1.165.554, corresponding to the sum of damages to the plaintiff’s estate, and 2) the first defendant RALF JOHN CHRISTIE son of JAMES, at the above place, on particular dates which were not precisely determined, however within the period September 2006 up until October 2009, laundered money

through acquisition, possession and use of property, knowing at the time of its acquisition that it originated from criminal activity, as well as by using the financial sector by placing within it and moving through it income which originated from his criminal activities, the aim being to give the semblance of legality to the above income. More specifically, at the above place and time, by committing the offence of fraud against the plaintiff Stephen Andrew Thomas son of Brian (as this is analytically described under point 1 above), the total sum of 1.165.554 Euros came into his possession illegally, which he integrated into his own estate and gradually placed it into various bank accounts that he held at the Pancretan Cooperative Bank as beneficiary and specifically, he either put it into bank account numbers 206049, 117197 and 117754 that the company styled VARON S. A. held at the above bank (he was Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive and legal representative of the same) or into bank account no. 714140 that he himself held at the above bank. Further, he gradually took the above amount from the above accounts and, after transferring it using various methods (transfers etc.) to other bank accounts in Greece and abroad, which have not yet been named, he used it and managed it in a way that is still unknown, the result being that in October 2009 the balance on the accounts which were referred to stood at 411.600,10 Euros (debit), 3,51 Euros, 61,16 Euros and 3.65 Euros respectively. At the point in time of acquiring, possessing, managing and depositing into the bank accounts the above sum of 1.165.554 Euros, he was aware that this originated from his aforementioned criminal activity, whereas he committed the acts that were mentioned with an aim to give the semblance of legality to his illegal income, in other words that it supposedly originated from legal business (investment-real estate) activity.

Judged, decided and published immediately in the public gallery of the public hearing.
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Α.Β.Ε.

Τhis is a true and accurate translation of the attached original done by the certified translator Androulla Veliotou.  
Ακριβής μετάφραση από το πρωτότυπο συνημμένο ελληνικό κείμενο

Η μεταφράστρια Α Βελιώτου

Θεωρήθηκε το γνήσιο της υπογραφής της μεταφράστριας στο προξενικό γραφείο της πρεσβείας της Ελλάδος στο Λονδίνο

The authenticity of the translator’s signature was legalised by the Head of the Consular Office of the Embassy of Greece in London

Τόπος: Λονδίνο

Ημερομηνία:

Ο Διευθύνων/ κ.α.α.

1. Greek Code of Criminal Procedure (GCCP) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Greek A. E. Anonymi Etaireia which is structured like an S.A. Société Anonyme (and commonly translated as such), or a UK Corporation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The source text may have a typo as it states “I sent” but the translator believes that there is a typing error with a letter missing on the end of the word, and that it should read “they sent”. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The source text states “he refused” but the translator believes that there is a typing error with the final letter on the word, and that it should read “they refused”. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. “CRETAN INVESTMENTS S.A.” [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Companies House. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Etaireia Periorismenis Efthynis (EPE), Limited Liability Company. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Source text reads “she” but the translator surmises that this is a spelling mistake Χαρούμενη/ Χαρούμενοι (both sound the same she was happy/ they were happy. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The gender of the person is unclear as it has been omitted. The verb is “turn against”. Given previous possible errors in the source text when referring to pronouns, it is possible that this sentence reads: “I don’t know why SNOWBALL was suspicious that he turned against me and all of this started”. The source text is ambiguous. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Female gender. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. May also mean “court discussions”. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The translator believes that Alpha A) should be inserted here, as a list ensues. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. See footnote 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Later (top of page 25), referred to as “properties”. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. 1 stremma = 1000 metres ; online conversion calculator from stremma to acres = 741.316144401 acres [↑](#footnote-ref-16)