

Defence Statement:

I will not plead because it is unjust, inequitable, and not morally possible to admit to any alleged crime when:

1. There is no crime, there is no evidence that cannabis meets the criteria for a schedule 1 substance or that it is a controlled substance,
2. There is no victim of the alleged crime,
3. There is no harm caused by alleged crime,
4. There is no Mens Rea (intent to cause harm or injury), Actus Reus (action of causing harm or injury), or Corpus Delicti (actual harm or injury caused),
5. It can and will be shown that the legislation against cannabis is unjust, unjustifiable, inequitable, unlawful and based on fraud and deception. It is motivated and sponsored by vested corporate interests, the collusive interests of the State, and by foreign influence upon the State.

These vested interests include the pharmaceutical, fossil fuel, alcohol, tobacco, logging, and biotech industries, and the State itself, which levies duties and taxes on many of the toxic and environmentally destructive products produced by these industries.

As is my right, I therefore refuse to enter a plea of 'guilty' and of 'not guilty'; and instead claim 'political persecution'.

I, without reservation inform this court that the law against cannabis is in violation of the rights of living men and women who claim the recognition and protection under the UN Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR), European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), our own Human Rights Act 1998 which is binding to the ECHR, the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The legislation against cannabis violates rights expressed in sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of the UNDHR. (See Appendix A)

The legislation also violates Articles 3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17 and 18 of the ECHR and Human Rights Act 2001 which is binding to ECHR (see Appendix B). Articles 1 and 2 of ICCPR and Articles 1,2,3,5 and 12 of ICESCR (see Appendix C).

In view of the references to the violations of human rights and Constitutional rights by the legislation against cannabis, any process that denies these rights, or which declares an individual guilty without a free and fair public hearing is effectively defending an illegal legislation.

The violation of the rights of people by the legislation against cannabis has the result that all criminal procedures and proceedings, when applied to cannabis are effectively criminal procedures by the State against its own public, and any court which blindly applies the criminal proceedings in relation to cannabis is guilty of perjury and aiding and abetting State tyranny against its people.

The prosecution and State bears the burden of justifying any limitation on a human right that it is legally bound to respect.

These inalienable fundamental human rights have been recognised in countries and continents across the world for a number of years with multiple Supreme Courts ruling that cannabis cultivation and use is a fundamental human right, acknowledged by both the UN and ECHR. A fundamental human right which has been recognised for one person is therefore a fundamental human right for the whole of the human family as per the international treaties which the UK has ratified. Are we in the UK less human than those in other countries throughout the world? A limitation to any of the fundamental human rights must be evidenced to pass the necessity test, is necessary and proportionate within a democratic society. I therefore call for the justification and evidence of necessity to be provided for each of the fundamental human rights.

See Appendix D: Extract from the International Guidelines on Human Rights and Drug Policy; and Appendix E: Notable Human Rights cases.

Furthermore the UN Single Convention of Narcotic Drugs paragraph 1 of Article 36 makes it clear that possession of drugs for personal use is not to be considered a “punishable offence” by a party to the Single Convention.

Quote from the UN Bulletin on Narcotics 1977 Issue 4:

“It is a fact that “use” (or “personal consumption”) is not enumerated amongst the punishable offences in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 36 of the Single Convention. Although, as mentioned above, Parties are required to limit the use of drugs exclusively to medical and scientific purposes, the Single Convention does not require them to attain the goal by providing penal sanctions for unauthorized “use” or “personal consumption” of drugs.

Unauthorized “possession” of drugs is mentioned in paragraph 1 of Article 36, but from the context it is clear that, as stated in the Official Commentary by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, “possession” of drugs for personal consumption is not to be considered a “punishable offence” by a Party to the Single Convention. The whole international drug control system envisages in its penal provisions the illicit traffic in drugs; this also holds true for the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention and for the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances.”

It is also relevant that Article 14(2) of the Illicit Traffic Convention explicitly states that measures against illicit cannabis cultivation “shall respect fundamental human rights”. Moreover, the preparatory work for both the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and the Illicit Traffic Convention contains several references to human rights that implicitly or explicitly suggest state’s awareness of the importance that obligations under the drugs conventions should not violate human rights. Accordingly, pursuant to Article 103 of the UN Charter, “In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail”.

It’s clear that through the various charters, treaties and international laws, human rights laws are supreme, all parties to the treaties are obligated by international human rights law to uphold human rights above all other treaties or laws. This was recognised by Uruguay when legalising personal cannabis cultivation and use who stated *“The obligations that our State, as well as other States Parties, have assumed under other Conventions, must be taken into account, in particular those related to the protection of human rights, since they constitute jus cogens (“compelling law”) and cannot be ignored”*.

I Reference "THE REPORT. Cannabis: The Facts, Human Rights and the Law", published by SCR Publishing, ISBN No 978-1902848303. A publication which is an essential read in full will be provided to the court as evidence.

"THE REPORT" evidences that the legislation against Cannabis violates the rights not just of medicinal users like myself but all users of cannabis. "THE REPORT" also evidences how cannabis was unfairly vilified and prohibited, based on ideological, illogical and racist reasoning for the benefit of corporate interests. Which by today's legislation the actions leading to the scheduling of cannabis in the Misuse of Drugs Act (MoDA) 1971 and the MDR 2001, is fraud by false representation.

Quote: "THE REPORT", pg 14:

Scientific FINDINGS OF FACT regarding Cannabis

Reproduced and collated from the Data and Conclusions of the Official Empirical Studies into long and short-term use and smoking of Cannabis, the following are:

THE FINDINGS OF FACT OF THE REPORT CANNABIS: THE FACTS, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND THE LAW.

Cannabis....

1. Is not toxic in any possible quantity: i.e. it is incapable itself of inducing fatality in a human,
2. Is not addictive, physically or psychologically: i.e. it does not induce physical or psychological dependence;
3. Is not pathogenic, does not cause physical or mental deterioration, has no adverse effect on mental or physical health;
4. Does not cause skill impairments;
5. Is benign;
6. Has no potential for abuse, or maltreatment of the user; cannabis has no potential for harm or danger;
7. Does not cause crime;
8. Does not lead to the use of drugs;
9. Mitigates, reduces, and can preclude the use of drugs;
10. Cannabis as a preventative measure/preventive medicine is health enhancing: all use of benign cannabis is medical, whether by the sick or hale: the fallacious arbitrary fictitious 'distinction' between 'medical' and 'recreational' use is exceedingly damaging.

Where cannabis is concerned, the legislation of its prohibition:

1. Is in its entirety, without factual foundation;
2. Is based on mendacity;
3. Is itself illegal on numerous grounds by Common, Substantive and International Law;
4. Is perjurious in prosecution; perjury by the state is both implicit and overt in every cannabis trial;
5. The acts of its enforcement are crime per se; people persecuted thereby qualify for Amnesty and Restitution (as for other wrongful penalisation);
6. The ignoring of these foregoing Findings of Fact by courts and legislators is ex parte, the crude and criminal denial of Justice.

7. In its replacement of the use of drugs alcohol, tobacco, etc. By young people and adults, cannabis promotes health. All private cultivation, trade, possession and use are vindicated.
8. In regard to cannabis legislation of substance control is damaging, lethal and unlawful; all special regulatory control of cannabis produces negative, damaging and/or lethal results, and is per se unlawful.
9. Cannabis related prosecutions are legally malicious, i.e. premeditated crime against the person.
10. Cannabis Relegalisation is legally mandatory, that is legislative amendment for the return to the normal status of cannabis which obtained before the introduction on any controls.

(End of quotation)

These findings of fact are collated from the official Empirical Studies of over 150 years of scientific research in to the use of cannabis in its raw form by human beings. These Findings of Fact are not to be confused with the man made substitutes and derivatives, produced for profit by big pharmaceutical companies, which scientific research shows are by far an inferior product which can cause harm. Findings from the man made substitutes are all too often cited alongside raw cannabis research to misrepresent the true benefits of raw cannabis. Causing misinformation and disinformation to be circulated by those with a vested interest.

THC is not cannabis. To equate with cannabis, the natural plant, the findings of research into a laboratory synthesised or isolated, concentrated chemical compounds such as THC, is erroneous, technically impertinent and profoundly misleading. Properties of compounds are unique, and are not a sum of the properties of the individual elements and compounds from which they are made. In the Science of Chemistry, the properties of substances, elemental and compound are seen to alter, and are affected by interaction and combination. By the binding of atoms and molecules, one 'thing' can and does become another. Completeness of the difference of individual substances from the product of their combination. Is exemplified by the elements hydrogen and oxygen, which combined give the safe and vital liquid, water. Hydrogen compounded into water is safe to consume; however, hydrogen extracted from water is fatal to humans if consumed. If you were to add an extra Oxygen molecule to water (H^2O^2), it becomes Hydrogen Peroxide, a powerful oxidising agent. Similarly, within cannabis, THC ceases to be only THC, as the THC is compounded into the disparate single entity that is the safe herb. THC, and all isolated cannabinoid compounds and the cannabis herb are disparate (different things or species; too unlike to be compared).

Another common form of research conducted into the potential harms of cannabis are in the form of surveys. Surveys carried out to assess whether a causal link exists of cannabis use leading to 'harder drugs' (the gateway theory), causing schizophrenia, respiratory disease, impaired driving and addictiveness is all inconclusive, biased and unsubstantiated.

To date, the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) have been unable to ascertain any clear scientific evidence of harm to individuals from the use of herbal cannabis, contrary to the Home Office's insistence that such evidence exists. This equates to premeditated perjury. Harms to society are exclusively related to the enforcement of prohibition.

Furthermore, there is no foundation evidence to validate the charges, validation which is required before any proceedings or charges can be brought. There is no evidence that cannabis meets the criteria for a schedule 1 drug, that cannabis is a controlled substance or that it is misused. The

medico-scientific empirical studies and modern scientific studies evidence that cannabis does not meet the criteria for a schedule 1 drug.

UK Police forces have confirmed they do not hold this foundation evidence and refer only to political policy. *(Note that these FOI request are in themselves evidence that the police constables are in breach of their Oath of Allegiance to the Crown, which is their contract of employment; in breach of the code of conduct for the Office of Constable and their duty to the public. Quote from the Office of Constable: "Police officers must be apolitical, impartial and accountable for their actions. If not what we police will become subject to political whim and electioneering", "Police officers cannot legally be instructed to arrest a person"; without evidence to substantiate the alleged harm, scheduling, control and misuse of cannabis the legislation is a political instruction for arrest, resulting in unlawful arrest by the constables, who are a sworn servant of the Crown).*

A total of 45 FOI requests have been sent to various UK Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC's), Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), the Advisory Council of the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) and the Home Office (HO). None have provided the foundation evidence for any of the claims of scheduling, control or misuse as set out in MoDA 1971.

For reference, Mold Crown Court: R v Scott, August 2020. The defendant was acquitted of all matters as the CPS could not validate that cannabis was a controlled drug. The CPS offered no evidence as they said "there was no realistic prospect of a conviction as they couldn't prove that the drugs were controlled drugs".

Further reference, Belfast Laganside Crown Court: R v Glover. The Court Judge has ruled that the prosecution must provide the foundation evidence to validate the charge that cannabis is a schedule 1 controlled drug with class B penalty within 14 days; the prosecution are yet to provide this evidence.

These above cases and 2 further ongoing cases (one in Northern Ireland and one in Durham) set precedence and confirm that the prosecution must validate the charges and claim of cannabis being a schedule 1 drug and controlled substance before any further proceedings.

Referencing cannabis as a schedule 1 controlled drug with class B penalty, without evidence to substantiate the claims is misrepresentation of the facts and misleading the court, leading to perverting the course of justice.

Foundation evidence has been requested from the prosecution, thus far they have failed to provide this evidence, as such I request an order for this evidence to be provided. Evidence of no evidence to substantiate the claim of scheduling and control is evidence there is no crime, as per the maxim in law:

'Quamvis lex generaliter loquitur restringenda tamen est, ut cessante ratione et ipsa cessat.'

"Though the law speaks generally, it must be limited, as, where the reason ceases to apply, the law itself ceases"

In 1988 DEA Chief Administrative Law Judge, Francis Young ruled that Marijuana is safe, has recognised medicinal value and does not meet the criteria for a schedule 1 drug.

To quote Judge Francis Young:

"In strict medical terms marijuana is far safer than many foods we commonly consume. For example, eating ten raw potatoes can result in a toxic response. By comparison, it is physically impossible to eat enough marijuana to induce death."

"Marijuana, in its natural form, is one of the safest therapeutically active substances known to man. By any measure of rational analysis marijuana can be safely used within a supervised routine of medical care."

"It would be unreasonable, arbitrary and capricious for DEA to continue to stand between those sufferers and the benefits of this substance in light of the evidence in this record."

Today the Government, Home Office, Prosecution Service, Police, and organisations and individuals who support controls which have numerous and far-reaching detrimental effects on individuals and society, perjuringly avoid the definitive Empirical Evidence of the official medico-scientific studies of the last hundred and fifty years, and right up to date. By which cannabis use as a medication and personal relaxant is and always has been vindicated. There are no existing conclusive studies into the empirical use of cannabis herb which find notable harm. Modern medical case histories and the official Empirical studies' findings of fact unanimously conclude the wholesomeness of cannabis, its safety and its benefits to humankind.

In addition to the fundamental human rights and lack of evidence for cannabis being a schedule 1 and controlled drug, the legislation also violates the British Constitutional laws, ancient laws which to this day protect the rights, freedoms and liberties of the British people.

The British Constitution is ratified by Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth II as part of the Royal coronation, sworn to uphold and protect the law of the land and protect the natural birth rights, freedoms and liberties of all men and women. Every public official who makes an oath to the Queen is lawfully bound to uphold and protect the Constitutional Law of the land (*legem terrae*). Not only is it protected by the rule of law, it is the rule of law, the law of the land. Magna Carta (1215) is the original written constitution. A treaty between the people of the realm and the Crown, agreed and sealed to protect the people from the tyranny and injustice of the arbitrary authority of the despot, protecting the rights and liberties for ever and in perpetuity, which excludes all statutes made by governments. *"Magna Carta is as binding upon the Crown today as it was the day it was sealed at Runnymede"* (*Halsbury's Laws of England, Vol 44*).

The 1215 Great Charter may not be subjected to statutory interventions, editing, and still less to excisions by legislatures. The many government amended versions, arbitrary perversions and usurpations by the monarchical edict such as those of 1216 and 1225, and subsequently by statutes in 1297 and 1830, and the truthless fragmental vestige remaining to date, are all legally invalid; the statutes of transient politicians are *ultra vires*. Magna Carta cannot be deleted or altered in the smallest way by parliament or judiciary, but only by the active participation of the great mass of the people. The executive, legislature, judiciary, police, state bureaucracy and all employees of the state comprise the very people whose *modus operandi* the Constitution and Common Law subject to scrutiny.

Halsbury's Laws of England Vol 44:

“(iii) Particular Types of Act

CONSTITUTIONAL, TREATY AND FINANCIAL ACTS

Constitutional Acts.

*The British Constitution is said to be ‘unwritten’. This only means that, unlike most countries, the United Kingdom does not possess a single comprehensive constitution and much of its constitutional principle is embodied in the common law. There are nevertheless a number of historic statutes regarded as embodying and setting forth the state’s constitutional principles 1. Any modern Act which amends or adds to these may also be regarded as a constitutional Act 2. The main significance of classing an Act as a constitutional Act lies in the nature of the interpretative criteria which then apply to it. In particular, the rights the Act confers, **having the quality of constitutional rights, will be regarded by the courts as fundamental and not to be displaced . . .”***

3.

1 See eg Magna Carta (1215); the Bill of Rights (1689); the Act of Settlement (1700); the Septennial Act 1715.”

Winston Churchill, A History of the English Speaking Peoples:

“Here is a law which is above the King and Parliament, and which even He and They must not and may not legally break. And in the event they or anyone else were to try to abrogate it, such attempt at abrogation shall have no force nor effect and can be safely ignored with no legal ill effect. In addition, in the event of successful attempts at abrogation of such liberties, customs, or rights, the King has commanded and do hereby compel any and all subjects to swear oath to join the barons to assail the properties and persons and families of those [. . .] who had successfully completed such abrogation, including but not limited to that of the individual Members of Parliament who had voted in favour of any such successful attempts at abrogation. This reaffirmation of a supreme law and its expression in a general charter is the great work of Magna Carta; and this alone justifies the respect in which men have held it.”

Further evidence of the validity of Magna Carta (1215) see attached: The Validity of Magna Carta 1215 Volume 6.

The Constitutional Common Law of Magna Carta (1215) is the supreme law of the land which legally must be upheld by all, the original Human Rights law based on natural justice and God’s law, protecting the birth rights of all British people. No statute can legally deny or abrogate any of the liberties, customs or rights of men and women. A statute which aims at denying any of these rights is illegal and lawfully cannot be enforced (*“such attempt at abrogation shall have no force nor effect and can be safely ignored with no legal ill effect.”*). To enforce such a statute is not only unlawful, it is against the sworn oath of all public officials and holders of public office, it brings the law in to disrepute and is misconduct in public office. Our Constitutional rights are fundamental and not to be displaced. MoDA 1971 is political persecution aimed at the abrogation of our inalienable Constitutional rights, our God given birth rights.

The Constitutional Common law requires that for a criminal act, or crime, to be committed there must be evidence of a malicious aforethought to commit harm or injury to another (Mens Rea), evidence of the act of committing harm or injury to another (Actus Reas) and there must be evidence of the harm or injury itself (Corpus Delecti). The act of cultivating a benign herb for one’s own medicinal use does not carry any of these requirements of harm or injury to another, there is no criminal intent, no harm, no crime committed. It is the inalienable natural birth right of all men and women to provide one’s own subsistence and self-determination to choose the most beneficial medicine.

Magna Carta (1215) Clause 39:

No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land.

MODA 1976 is an unlawful statute which attempts to deny the birth rights of free men and women, and has resulted in the unlawful detention and removing of possessions without the judgement of peers or the Constitutional Common Law of the land.

This clause 39 also makes it clear that an individual can only be judged by his equals, trial by jury, no government employee or appointed officer can lawfully pass judgement on any man or woman. Protection against the tyranny of governments who have a vested interest in denying the constitution. It is the peoples right and duty to judge the legislation as much as the action, and decide if the legislation is just, fair and equitable.

Reference R v Blythe 1998. The defendant was charged with production of cannabis and supply. In reality he grew cannabis for his dying wife (supply), he argued duress, but the judge told the jury that the defence was not available. If the jury had listened to the judge and relied entirely on the facts of the case and the letter of the law (which would have seen Blythe spend a possible 14 years in prison whilst also denying his wife potentially life-saving treatment not to mention her caring husband) the jury would have surely failed the Blythe family, and supported the continuation of abuse of power and injustice which has led to tens of thousands of people currently serving time at her majesties pleasure for similar non-crimes relating to the non-toxic, non-harmful medicinal herb cannabis. Luckily for Blythe, the jury unanimously exercised their power of 'jury equity' (acquittal) by presenting the court with a not guilty verdict against the advice and instruction of the judge. The karmic responsibility is such that the same jurors might one day find themselves in the doc, charged with the same crime for trying to support their own life or the life of a loved one. This is clear evidence that in 1998 the public sought nullification of the legislation as it is not fair or just to prosecute a medicinal cannabis user for exercising their inalienable right to the highest standard of health, self-determination and subsistence in the privacy of their own home, with no malicious aforethought to commit harm to another, or harm caused.

Bushells Case: Jury independence is important as established in the Bushell's Case (1670) where the Chief Justice noted .. the right of juries to give their verdict by their conscience.... **"The judge may try to open the eyes of the jurors, but not to lead them by the nose."**

Quote: Harlan F. Stone, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Harvard Law Review:

"If a juror feels that the statute involved in any criminal offence is unfair, or that it infringes upon the defendant's natural God-Given unalienable or Constitutional rights, then it is his duty to affirm that the offending statute is really no law at all and that the violation of it is no crime at all, for no one is bound to obey an unjust law."

Further reference Belhaj and Boudchar v Straw. In a case of 2014 which followed on until 2017, former foreign Secretary Jack Straw and former senior MI6 officer, Sir Mark Allen had a case brought against them under Magna Carta for being unlawfully involved in the illegal rendition of a Libyan man and his pregnant wife to Gaddafi's Libya in 2004.

In November 2015 an appeal was made in defence of their actions and why the case shouldn't be heard. In this case Lord Mance, quoting from Magna Carta, said: *"No free man shall be taken, or imprisoned, or dispossessed, of his ... liberties ... or be outlawed, or exiled, or in any way destroyed ... excepting by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the laws of the land."*

In the following case heard on the 17th of January 2017 the seven Supreme Court judges unanimously dismissed the Government's appeal, concluding to the claims both men were unlawfully involved.

Magna Carta (1215) Clause 40:

To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice.

Clause 40 further protects our fundamental rights and ensures our right to fair and equitable justice.

Magna Carta (1215) Clause 45:

We will appoint as justices, constables, sheriffs, or other officials, only men that know the law of the realm and are minded to keep it well.

All officials are bound by the Constitution to know and uphold the Constitutional Common Law above all statute law. Courts are not in place only to judge people, it is their obligation and duty under oath to judge the legislation itself according to the rights, freedoms and liberties within the Constitution.

Magna Carta (1215) Clause 61:

Leolin Price Q.C. sanctioned the Peers Petition of Grievances to the Queen which was delivered on behalf of the 25 peers on 07 February 2001, following the proper Constitutional processes under Clause 61 of Magna Carta (1215), leading to the Clause being triggered on 23 March 2001. This was reported on by Caoline Davies for The Telegraph on 24 March 2001. The invocation of this most important clause requires that all subjects, compelled by Royal command, take an oath to obey the commands of the twenty-five barons to distrain upon and assail the Crown. Under this clause it is unlawful for the Crown, either by their own efforts or those of a third party to procure from anyone, anything by which any part of the concessions or liberties might be revoked or diminished. If such a thing be procured it shall be null and void.

The relevance of Clause 61 is evident in 2016 Yeovil Magistrates Court; case 16/0000/00/35409V R v Davidson. The prosecution dropped all charges relating to cultivation of 35 cannabis plants as the Crown and all Crown agents had no lawful authority to proceed whilst Clause 61 is still in effect.

To this day redress has not been provided to the people and Clause 61 of Magna Carta (1215) is still in effect. This clause makes it unlawful to procure from anyone anything by which any part of the concessions or liberties might be revoked.

State interference, controls and their enforcement constitute crimes per se at Constitutional, Common and International laws; however, complete vindication of cultivation, possession and use also derives from other legal consideration. On grounds of Justice and Equity, all controls of

cannabis are illegal. To be legal any criterion of 'harm' or 'danger' must be uniformly applied, without inequity or caprice. If harm were truly the basis for prohibition then under the uncompromising requirements of legal equity, all substances and activities which do harm people must be subjected to the harm criteria equally, i.e. equitably. Including alcohol, tobacco, coffee etc.

Just is defined as: fair; righteous; true; equitable; upright; lawful. [From Latin, iustus-just]

Justice is the quality of being just: integrity; impartiality; retribution. [From Latin, iustitia.]

Equity is: fairness; moral justice, of which legitimate laws are the imperfect expression; the spirit of natural justice which enables the interpretation of laws rightly. [From French, *équité* and Latin, *æquus equal*.]

By moral obligation and under existing constitutional, civil and Human Rights laws, both national and international, the legislation must be fair and just. De jure, to pick out one activity or group in an unfair way is illegal and perfectly meets the definition of terrorism as per the Terrorism Act 2000. In a democratic society, governments and judiciaries have the moral human obligation and the paramount lawful duty of preventing enforcement of any measure taken by parliamentary legislation which is unjust and inequitable.

Alcohol is a powerful drug of inescapable physical dependence, inducing degeneration of the physical and mental condition. In addition to damaging health, extreme use of alcohol is so frequent it is commonplace, causing widespread social problems and grievous behaviour. Tobacco mortalities apart, of all drug habits alcohol is the worst. Its use being a special generator of many forms of socially destructive behaviour.

Alcohol and tobacco are deadly, toxic and addictive, capable of inducing acute physical dependence. Alcohol and tobacco are without significant medical or therapeutic use. By any legal, medical, social or logical criteria tobacco and alcohol are the most harmful drugs with the highest potential for abuse and maltreatment of the user; producing large-scale disease and death. Their production, sale and use are legal. Their legality demonstrates the claim that prohibition is installed to protect health is a fraud. Harm is not the reason for prohibition on selected tradeable substances.

As an objective comparison, the use of cannabis as a medication or personal relaxant induces no anti-social behaviour, is not capable of inducing acute physical dependence, has recognised medical and therapeutic benefits, and in recorded history has not produced a single fatality, it being non-toxic.

This comparison highlights the inequity in the persecution of individuals who choose to use cannabis either for medical benefit or as an alternative to the dangerous substance of alcohol, confirming the inequity and illegality of selecting one activity or group in an unfair way.

Further inequity can be seen with the ability to obtain counsel. It is recognised that everyone is entitled to legal counsel, however, it is a fact that the private oath, in conflict with the public oath, is a government-contrived legal obligation which bans attorneys from presenting a defence or evidence which exonerates a defendant if it disputes the legislation. Advocates cannot present a defence if it challenges the legality of the law. Making it impossible for an individual to obtain counsel if they wish to exercise their birth rights. This government obligation denies and perverts the course of justice and provide the government the opportunity to enact legislation which create tyranny and oppression upon its people and is thus a gateway to despotism.

The individuals of the UK Constabulary have overstepped the powers afforded to them by the Crown, breached their Oath of Allegiance and attestation, failed to comply with their public duty and failed to complete their due diligence with regards to the scheduling and control of cannabis. All resulting in an unlawful arrest, violation of their contract of employment and misconduct in public office.

See attached: Seed Our Future campaign document 'Cannabis and the Law – No Evidence, No Crime (2020)', Section 4.

Furthermore they have failed to follow procedures, failed to complete full investigation and due diligence, and provided written statements which have inaccurate, false information. Misinformation aimed at misleading the court and resulting in perjury and attempt to pervert the course of justice.

Cannabis is a recognised medicine and has been recognised in pharmacopeia as medication for over 100 ailments, with the first known record of medicinal and therapeutic use dating back over 5000 years. Until 1973 over half of all medicines contained cannabis, either as the main therapeutic ingredient or as a secondary ingredient to alleviate the side effects of other harmful ingredients. The UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs has rescheduled cannabis, recognising that there are medicinal and therapeutic values of this benign herb, and removing it from schedule IV. **Chronic pain** is one of the many ailments for which cannabis is a recognised medical treatment, and is the most effective treatment for this ailment. Cannabis being non-toxic, free from adverse side effects and addiction. Modern scientific studies confirm that cannabis is of substantial medicinal efficiency for the treatment of **chronic pain**, is more effective and less harmful than pharmaceutical alternatives.

The fact that cannabis laws are entirely political (electoral votes) opposed to evidenced based is absurd. Recent surveys show the UK general public is almost twice as likely to support the legalisation of cannabis in the UK than they are to oppose. 59% strongly support or tend to support the legalisation of cannabis, compared to 31% who strongly oppose or tend to oppose. There has been a 37% increase in support since the May 2018 YouGov survey was conducted (from 43% to 59%), and accordingly opposition has fallen by 32% (from 41% to 31%). This is clear evidence that the public interest is not to persecute individuals for exercising their right to the highest attainable standard of health. Persecution and prosecution is against the public interest for this benign herb. The prosecution and judiciary are failing to fulfil their duty to the public, and their contractual obligation of all members of public office, which is to act only in the public interest.

The UK Government are obligated under human rights law to make all medicines available to the UK public, an obligation which they have failed to uphold. Any claim that relevant human rights laws are in opposition with the UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, established fraudulently and using selective, ideological and racist disinformation (see: 'WHO: The Physical and Mental effects of Cannabis (1955)' and 'The case of cannabis and the single convention on narcotic drugs 1961: Prof James H Mills' below) to which the inclusion of cannabis within 1971 MoDA was based, proves without doubt that International cannabis laws are entirely political and not based on evidence, therefore illegal.

Individuals like myself are left with no alternative other than to exercise our fundamental natural God-given, Constitutional, human rights of self-determination and self-autonomy, in our own private homes in order as to achieve our right to the highest attainable standard of health.

Accompanying Evidence:

Seed Our Future campaign, 'Cannabis and the Law – No Evidence – No Crime' report (Oct 2020)
<https://www.seedourfuture.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2020/10/Cannabis-and-the-Law-No-Evidence-No-Crime-MASTER-v1.3.pdf>

We the Undersigned (WTU) case outline which is the base for their legal challenge against the UK government for the unlawful prohibition of cannabis:
<https://www.wtuhq.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/WTU-Case-Outline-with-reference-links-FINAL-DOCUMENT-FOR-CASE.pdf>

WHO: The Physical and Mental effects of Cannabis (1955):
https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/104457/WHO_APD_56_1955_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

The case of cannabis and the single convention on narcotic drugs 1961: Prof James H Mills:
https://ep.liu.se/ej/hygiea/v13/i1/a07/hygiea16v13i1a07.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3J1asH1SYCQudhIFReRKpqrVAzY9zd-bnXaVbZ_GXooCTBP4LHKqYUhKI

[Cannabis: The Facts, Human Rights and the Law, THE REPORT](#)

[Cannabis: A Study of its History, Prohibition and Use](#)

Appendix A

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Following is the complete text of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The UDHR was adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A(III) of 10th December 1948.

PREAMBLE

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations, Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, therefore, The General Assembly Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11

1. Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.
2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offense was committed.

Article 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation.
Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State.
2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14

1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.
2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.
2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16

- 1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.**
- 2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.**
- 3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.**

Article 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21

- 1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.**
- 2. Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country.**

3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27

1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29

1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

End

Appendix B
Extract from ECHR

Article 3

Prohibition of torture

No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

Article 5

Right to liberty and security

1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be deprived of his liberty save in the following cases and in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law:

Article 8

Right to respect for private and family life

1. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.
2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Article 9

Freedom of thought, conscience and religion

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.
2. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Article 14

Prohibition of discrimination

The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.

Article 17

Prohibition of abuse of rights

Nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in the Convention.

Article 18

Limitation on use of restrictions on rights

The restrictions permitted under this Convention to the said rights and freedoms shall not be applied for any purpose other than those for which they have been prescribed.

End

Appendix C
Extract from ICCPR & ICESCR

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Preamble

The States Parties to the present Covenant,

Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Recognizing that these rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person,

Recognizing that, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ideal of free human beings enjoying civil and political freedom and freedom from fear and want can only be achieved if conditions are created whereby everyone may enjoy his civil and political rights, as well as his economic, social and cultural rights,

Considering the obligation of States under the Charter of the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and freedoms,

Realizing that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance of the rights recognized in the present Covenant,

Agree upon the following articles:

PART I

Article 1

1. All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.
2. All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence.
3. The States Parties to the present Covenant, including those having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, shall promote the realization of the right of self-determination, and shall respect that right, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

PART II

Article 2

1. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.
2. Where not already provided for by existing legislative or other measures, each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take the necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provisions of the present Covenant, to adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present Covenant.
3. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes:
 - (a) To ensure that any person whose rights or freedoms as herein recognized are violated shall have an effective remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity;
 - (b) To ensure that any person claiming such a remedy shall have his right thereto determined by competent judicial, administrative or legislative authorities, or by any other competent authority provided for by the legal system of the State, and to develop the possibilities of judicial remedy;
 - (c) To ensure that the competent authorities shall enforce such remedies when granted.

Extract from ISESCR

Preamble

The States Parties to the present Covenant, Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Recognizing that these rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person,

Recognizing that, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ideal of free human beings enjoying freedom from fear and want can only be achieved if conditions are created whereby everyone may enjoy his economic, social and cultural rights, as well as his civil and political rights,

Considering the obligation of States under the Charter of the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and freedoms,

Realizing that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance of the rights recognized in the present Covenant,

Agree upon the following articles:

PART I

Article 1

1. All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.
2. All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence.
3. The States Parties to the present Covenant, including those having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, shall promote the realization of the right of self-determination, and shall respect that right, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

PART II

Article 2

1. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take steps, individually and through international assistance and co-operation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant by all appropriate means, including particularly the adoption of legislative measures.
2. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to guarantee that the rights enunciated in the present Covenant will be exercised without discrimination of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.
3. Developing countries, with due regard to human rights and their national economy, may determine to what extent they would guarantee the economic rights recognized in the present Covenant to non-nationals.

Article 5

1. Nothing in the present Covenant may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights or freedoms recognized herein, or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in the present Covenant.

2. No restriction upon or derogation from any of the fundamental human rights recognized or existing in any country in virtue of law, conventions, regulations or custom shall be admitted on the pretext that the present Covenant does not recognize such rights or that it recognizes them to a lesser extent.

Article 12

1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

2. The steps to be taken by the States Parties to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right shall include those necessary for:

(a) The provision for the reduction of the stillbirth-rate and of infant mortality and for the healthy development of the child;

(b) The improvement of all aspects of environmental and industrial hygiene;

(c) The prevention, treatment and control of epidemic, endemic, occupational and other diseases;

(d) The creation of conditions which would assure to all medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

Appendix D
Extract from
The International Guidelines on Human Rights and Drug Policy

Part II:

1. Right to the highest attainable standard of health.

Everyone has the right to enjoy the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. This right applies equally in the context of drug laws, policies, and practices.

- iv. Repeal, amend, or discontinue laws, policies, and practices that inhibit access to controlled substances for medical purposes and to health goods, services, and facilities for the prevention of harmful drug use, harm reduction among those who use drugs, and drug dependence treatment.*
- v. utilise the available flexibilities in the UN drug control conventions to decriminalise the possession, purchase, or cultivation of controlled substances for personal consumption.*

6. Freedom from torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or Punishment.

*Torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment are absolutely prohibited, in all circumstances. This includes during the arrest, questioning, and detention of persons alleged to have committed drug-related crimes or otherwise implicated during an investigation. **The withholding of drugs from those who need them for medical purposes, including for drug dependence treatment and pain relief, is considered a form of torture.***

- i. Take effective legislative, administrative, judicial, and other measures to prohibit, prevent, and redress all acts of torture and ill-treatment in their jurisdiction and in all settings under their custody or control, including in the context of drug dependence treatment, whether administered in public or private facilities.*
- ii. Promptly investigate allegations of torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment by State agents, as well as acts that occur in their territory or under their jurisdiction (whether carried out by State or non-State actors), and prosecute and punish those responsible, including when victims are persons alleged to have committed drug-related offences or who are dependent on drugs.*

9. Right to privacy.

Everyone has the right to privacy, including people who use drugs.

- v. Utilise the available flexibilities in the UN drug control conventions to decriminalise the possession, purchase, or cultivation of controlled substances for personal consumption.*

10. Freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, which includes the freedom to manifest one's religion or belief, either individually or in community with others, in public or private. This right applies to those for whom such manifestations may involve the use of drugs for religious or spiritual purposes.

- i. Utilise the available flexibilities in the UN drug control conventions to decriminalise the possession, purchase, or cultivation of controlled substances for personal consumption.*

11. Right to enjoy cultural life

Everyone has the right to enjoy cultural life. This right applies equally to all without discrimination, including people who use drugs recreationally, people who use drugs for cultural, spiritual, or religious purposes, people who need controlled substances for medical purposes, and people who cultivate illicit drug crops as a traditional way of life.

i. Refrain from discriminatory and otherwise unnecessary or disproportionate interference with the exercise of cultural practices and with access to cultural goods and services on grounds of drug control law and policy.

ii. Take necessary measures to ensure the preconditions for participation in, facilitation of, and promotion of cultural life without discrimination, including access to and preservation of cultural goods where these involve controlled plants and substances.

iii. Foster a rich and diverse cultural life through the conservation, development, and diffusion of culture and by ensuring the participation of relevant communities in the governance of cultural heritage, including where these involve controlled plants and substances.

Appendix E

Notable Human Rights Cases

Given the supremacy of Human Rights Laws it is no surprise that an international consensus is developing that recognises it is unlawful to criminalise cannabis. Recent notable cases recognising the fundamental human rights include the following:

R v Parker (2000) 188 DLR (4th) 385, the Ontario Court of Appeal held under the Canadian Charter that an absolute prohibition on possession of cannabis without any medical exemption violated the accused's right to liberty in a manner not according with principles of fundamental justice, and declared the prohibition illegal, while suspending the declaration for a year.

Ravin v State of Alaska 537 P.2d 494, the Supreme Court of Alaska found that a statute prohibiting possession of marijuana in Alaska was in breach of the right to sanctity of the home in the United States constitution.

2015 SMART brought a case before Mexico's Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled that prohibition on the cultivation, possession, transportation and use of marijuana represents a violation of fundamental human rights for the right to the free development of one's personality.

31/10/2018 No.140/2018: Mexico gave its fifth judgement in the Supreme Court stating that penalising private cultivation, possession and use of marijuana, cannabis and tetrahydrocannabinol was unconstitutional and against the principle of free development of the personality.

30/06/2018 Georgia's Constitutional Court ruled that punishment of the use of marijuana and cannabis in private without a doctor's prescription was in breach of the right to development of their personality, privacy and right to self-determination.

18/10/2018 CCT 108/17: 10 judges of the Constitutional Court in South Africa ruled that it was not reasonable to penalise an adult who cultivates, uses, or possesses marijuana or cannabis for personal consumption is unconstitutional as it was incompatible with their right to privacy.

In addition to these clear Court rulings, a number of legislatures around the world have taken steps to legalise the possession, consumption and cultivation of cannabis for personal use. Including but not limited to: Canada, Australian Capital Territory, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Uruguay, 36 states in USA have legalised marijuana for medical use whilst 15 states have legalised it for recreational use.

US Senate have vowed to reform Federal cannabis legislation in 2021. Democratic Senators Chuck Schumer, Cory Booker and Ron Wyden released a joint statement on 01 February 2021 confirming the following comments:

"The War on Drugs has been a war on people, particularly people of colour".

"Ending the federal marijuana prohibition is necessary to right the wrongs of this failed war and end decades of harm inflicted on communities"

"To ensure restorative justice and protect public health".

“But that alone is not enough. As states continue to legalize marijuana we must also enact measures that will lift up people who were unfairly targeted in the War on Drugs”.

“We are committed to working together to put forward and advance comprehensive cannabis reform legislation that will not only turn the page on this sad chapter in American history, but also undo the devastating consequences of these discriminatory policies”.