



Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>

All Along the Watchtower

3 messages

Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>
To: lawhohl@nus.edu.sg

8 October 2021 at 20:01

"There must be some way out of here"
Said the joker to the thief
"There's too much confusion
I can't get no relief
...
"No reason to get excited"
The thief, he kindly spoke
"There are many here among us
Who feel that life is but a joke
...
So let us not talk falsely now
The hour is getting late"

Robert Allen Zimmerman AKA Bob Dylan

Dear Professor Ho,

I'm disappointed. I cannot help thinking that there *must* have been a more *sophisticated*, a more *subtle* approach.

So now what, dig deeper into a puerile deceit that would have been pathetic had it not been so cowardly it does not qualify as yellow?

Professor, how may we interpret this from an academic perspective? 'Access to justice at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Singapore appears to be determined by two overweight middle-age paper pushers in a dinky office in a corner of the same, on the payroll of an unusually stupid and slimy monkey in a suit passing off as a businessman with lofty aspirations and connections.' Hmm. Doesn't quite roll off the tongue. Will you come up with something? Or will Pinsler as he expounds forth on the beauteous grandeur and impeccability of the nature and construction of Singapore legislature, under the circumstances, in, cough, common law. Or will it make its way into the White Book....*ever*.

You know, for a while in that...uh....chambre with Kenneth, I had thought: What an upright and admirable man. So clean-cut. So assertive. Certainly, in his capable hands, with such ruthless intolerance of anything less than the letter of the, cough, law, justice will prevail. Instead: '*Even if Timothy Ang and Wilson Zhu have no capacity to represent NTU, and even if the affidavit deponed by Kevin Goh is forged, I would still strike out your case.*' Why did he ask me to find legislation under which to pray for relief, and in the one hour of his blessedness' lunch break? Another hypothetical hoop for me to jump through? Curiosity? Uncathected Oedipal neuroses (e.g. a destructive envy or sadistic perversion)? Well, well done. Good show old chep.

Kenneth was very upset I mentioned Egypt at some point. 'This is not Egypt!' he almost squealed. I only mentioned Egypt in the context of law to you and Ng Lip Chih, never in that miracle of design opposite Funan.

Anyways. Linguistically. A whore in Arabic can be a *kah-ba*, with a sharp haitch. As in 'she who goes *kah kah kah*' or 'coughs to passersby to advertise her ware and availability'. Egyptians say: Speak to the *ahba* and she will waste your time and make up her own flaws as if your own. It's true, you know.

'I have actually been very lenient with you.' concluded, as he instructed I should address him, his honour. I wonder if he had not been lenient.

Sorry, I am not in limerick-writing mood, you will understand.

Shalom,
MH

On Wed, 21 Jul 2021 at 12:15, Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com> wrote:

Subra Suresh,
Sat on a mesh,
Of crooked and swindling PI's,

Along came this runt,
To call out the cunt,
And its swarm of professors cum flies.

Dear Professor Ho,

So may it not displease the court:
PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL. For now.

I dislike Americanisms, but.... Really? I mean..... Reeeeeaaaaallyyy???

Defendant in default of defence, Plaintiff's claim struck out in a trial of a hearing that's half special in the mode of O 33 r 2, ordered in a summons for directions moved, apparently, by an act of God, and all under O 18 r 19.

Oh. The Defendants held Defence in abeyance until the action is struck out AND AFTER under O 18 r 19(1)(a), (b), **and/or** (d). Endorsed by an unaffirmed affidavit deponed by an unnatural person of unknown capacity and dubious standing.

His (ahem) Honour struck out under O 18 r 19 1(a) - and why not, it's just the Employment Act after all, fraud and illegality is another jurisdiction (the cunt's, is it?), fraudulent affidavit notwithstanding. And, get this. His (ahem) Honour will strike it also out under O 18 r 19 (1)(c). No wait. The cunt gets what the cunt asked for, not more. Take it back. Withdraw. EXIT stage centre.

Yo, m'lud, whadja call that, ah? *Coitus interruptus*?

Would have been incredulous, but for the.... umm.... 'data', I shall call it.

And of course. Little is more Crimson than the Logic of the Cunt. `A nice muddle their slates'll be in before the trial's over [**and/or** begun]!' thought Alice.

Sigh.

Usually the report comes with the limerick. Sorry to break with tradition. The thing is, everywhere I look where Suresh has been, *and/or* is, there's shit. Not regular, well-formed, offensive shit. I'm talking Bengal sewer meets Chinese pig farm manure swamp with a healthy dose of American radioactive waste.

The lot shall be dumped, may it please the Court....I mean....Cunt.

Ta

Mohamed Helmy
MD, PhD

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

On Apr 26, 2021, at 8:01 PM, Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com> wrote:

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 *farcical*. 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>

Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>
To: lawhohl@nus.edu.sg

14 October 2021 at 09:18

Without prejudice


yeah right.

Thought you might enjoy these while I'm passing them around. Toodles.

MH

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **3rd_HC_S_413_2021.pdf**
12619K

 **Helmy_WS.pdf**
765K

Mohamed Helmy <helmy.m@gmail.com>
To: lawhohl@nus.edu.sg

21 January 2022 at 00:47

I was writing to tell you 'I'm disappointed', only to find out I've already done that, below.

Won't you say something? Anything? I promise to keep it between the two of us.

Have a look at www.nanyangscandal.com. For example, let me know what you think.

Bye,
Helmy

Mohamed Helmy
MD, PhD

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

[Quoted text hidden]