



Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>

Queen of Sods

Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>

26 April 2021 at 14:01

To: lawhohl@nus.edu.sg

Ode to Nitish V. Thakor (with apologies to Mary Queen of Scots)

Thakor, Thakor,
Quite the bore,
How do your publications grow?
With American AND Singaporean money,
And science kinda funny,
And IEEE conferences all lined up in a row.

Please see attached for more information.

Sorry I've been out of touch, I'd been looking for the right word to describe my experience with Singapore lawyers and Judiciary thus far. It is *farical*. I've been wondering...does Singapore Judiciary get *paid* for their prostitution? Or do they *enjoy* getting gang-banged? It appears there is something *exhibitionist* about it, like they are *proud*, they *parade* their pimped pussy.

What makes them think I won't facilitate this *show*, share it with my fellow beings? Not now of course, I'm not *that* stupid. But what would stop me from hanging the whole lot of their profoundly laughable pronouncements on the shed? Such as "It is not about justice." And that's not even the punchline.

Ta ta,
Helmy

www.nanyangscandal.com
helmy.m@gmail.com
helmy.m@protonmail.com
+65 83 555 817
10 Jurong Lake Link, #15-39
Singapore 648131

On Fri, 19 Feb 2021 at 12:39, Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com> wrote:

There was once a Uni called N - U - S,
Who did give its faculty the caress,
Of sugar and spice,
And publications nice,
...Bah! This monkey came along and made a mess.

On Sat, 30 Jan 2021 at 00:38, Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Professor Ho,

The first time I met the Magistrate she told me: 'there is no crime defined in the police report submitted with the complaint, I disregard all other police reports, and so I am dismissing the case...and the CEO of the Institution cannot and will not be held responsible for crimes allegedly committed.' I asked if stealing 20 million Singaporean dollars was not a crime. I did not receive a reply. I did want to ask for what purpose is the CEO clearly stated as a responsible person in the NACLAR Guidelines (henceforth, Fairy tales) if he ain't, but I didn't.

The second time I met the Magistrate the crime of forgery was defined and the CEO was nowhere to be mentioned. She dismissed the case because....I'm not sure. My complaint was about employment but the police report was about forgery...related to the employment....And the forgery is about research but my complaint is about employment....in research? The most coherent thing she said which she screeched was: 'I must ask you to leave the room.'

I happen to have a lot of judges in the family, paternal and maternal cousins and the husbands and wives of those, and so I meet their friends and so on. One point of contact is a judge at the Economic Court, he talks to the Ministers who talk to the President. Another point of contact was his colleague, but to move closer to home and practice law rather than reinvent it at the Egyptian Economic Court, he accepted a seat at the Supreme Court.

They are my cousins, I played with them as a child. I tell them to their face and to their colleagues: you are whores. That is because their unusually unanimous conclusion regarding the comical farce called Mubarak's trial is: (i) there is no evidence (notably regarding 'killing protestors', the security footage was replaced by a particularly odious movie from a particularly odious production company founded and probably still run by ex-Secret Service officers); and (ii) corruption is not a crime. I said to these Your Honours, as we sat in a traditional street in Cairo over hot drinks and a hubbly-bubbly (apple or plain tobacco only, no peach and bubble-gum or cantaloupe or raspberry on that street, thank you), served by a wali who knows full well Their Honours (they are regulars) and pretends he doesn't and treats them with the best service and just a little more disrespect he can afford the average citizen (as if to say: 'Are you not Justice? So how are you not my equal?' Street justice is also justice, I am coming to learn), I said to these Yours Honours: if you cannot see, hear, feel, and smell the evidence, nay curse it on many moments on most days of your life in this armpit of the world, then you are insensible. If corruption is not a crime, make it one.

And so: Your Honours are whores. Mubarak and Co. are your pimps.

These are good Judges, correct. The closest friend of one is fighting, in the most quiet and matter-of-fact way, the most corrupt judges in Egypt. It is a fascinating game, I enjoy very much listening to him and his discussions with my cousin. The details of the twists and turns are almost mundane, and one would think should have been trivial, but that is how it is.

The reason why I am in Singapore and not, say, Cambodia or Aruba, is because in Singapore there is rule of law such that I can live with a modicum of dignity – until I upset a powerful pimp. Or is it a madam?

Tally ho, or whatever it is they say down at Oxford.

Please find attached *MOE2.pdf*.

Warm regards,
Mohamed Helmy
MD, PhD

helmy.m@gmail.com
+65 83 555 817
10 Jurong Lake Link, #15-39
Singapore 648131

On Wed, 2 Dec 2020 at 19:13, Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Professor Ho,

I'm a physiology researcher at a local institute. I am writing to ask you for help.

Thank you for explaining difficult things so I understand them.

"... Imagine the court telling the defendant in *The Popi M*: 'I don't know if you are in fact liable. I don't even believe, and I don't think I would be justified in believing, that you are in fact liable. Actually, I find the hypothesis against you very lacking in plausibility. But I am going to make you liable anyway because the expected utility is greater in a verdict against you than in a verdict against the plaintiff.' Surely something has gone wrong here..." (Ho, 2018, page 195).

This is kind of the position I'm in, for now in an internal court, within the institute. Except additional somethings had gone wrong earlier. I'm pretty sure I started off being the claimant, it's on paper, but it looks like I'm the defendant now. And it wasn't a mysterious submarine I was claiming, it was a class five (5) hurricane. Abundant hard data show the trail of destruction, the paper reads 'fine and sunny'.

I guess the bowsprit got mixed with the rudder sometimes.

One supposedly reputable law firm said they'll represent me, took lots of money, then said sorry, no, they're too busy now. Another supposedly reputable law firm said it's very sad but ain't nothing to do, just roll over. Others have a conflict of interest, others quietly inform me they won't touch it with a ten-foot pole.

May you help?

Kind regards,
Mohamed Helmy
MD, PhD

helmy.m@gmail.com

+65 83 555 817

10 Jurong Lake Link, #15-39

Singapore 648131



Thakor_misconduct.pdf

1082K