

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Neutral Citation No: [2026] NICA 1</p> <p><i>Judgment: approved by the court for handing down (subject to editorial corrections)*</i></p> | <p>Ref: McC12947</p> <p>ICOS No: 19/41954/A01 & 19/41954/05</p> <p>Delivered: 13/01/2026</p> |
|---|---|

IN HIS MAJESTY’S COURT OF APPEAL IN NORTHERN IRELAND

AIB GROUP (UK) PLC

v

MICHAEL MOONEY

**The appellant appeared as a Litigant in Person
Mr Fletcher (A&L Goodbody Solicitors) for the Respondent**

Before: McCloskey LJ and Colton LJ

McCLOSKEY LJ (*delivering the ex tempore judgment of the court*)

Introduction

[1] The court is in a position to give judgment on this appeal and I will do so in brief terms.

[2] The court is seized of a notice of appeal on behalf of Michael Mooney, the appellant, which in its amended form challenges three orders:

- (i) a possession order made by the Chancery Master on 3 July 2019;
- (ii) a so-called substitution order made on 8 February 2022, again in the Chancery Division; and
- (iii) an order of the Chancery Court dated 6 July 2023 which dismissed an application brought by the appellant.

[3] Following the customary case management of the appeal, the court is alert to the grounds of appeal which have been rehearsed with admirable clarity by Mr Mooney in his amended notice of appeal. I am paraphrasing these grounds as follows:

- (i) lack of jurisdiction and void order;
- (ii) irregular amendment of a sealed order;
- (iii) ineffective notice of assignment;
- (iv) fraudulent misrepresentation;
- (v) time does not run in void or fraudulent matters and, finally;
- (vi) breach of article 6 of the Human Rights Convention and fundamental fairness.

[4] Those are, in headline terms, essence of each of the grounds of appeal. The court has, of course, considered the more detailed formulation of each of the grounds, secondly, the supporting written submissions and arguments of Mr Mooney and, thirdly, all of the other information about the appeal and the history of these proceedings which has been brought to our attention and which has also been available on the court website, namely the ICOS source.

Conclusion

[5] Having considered all of this material, we have come to the view that there is no merit or substance in any of the grounds of appeal. They are a combination of the speculative, the misconceived, the barely assertive and the entirely lacking in merit and foundation. They disclose no coherent challenge to any of the orders under appeal. This impels inexorably to the conclusion that the appeal must be dismissed. Thus, the court is affirming in full, without qualification, the three orders under appeal as set forth in the opening section of the amended notice of appeal.