Prior Restraint to Pervert the Course of Justice

The Blue Code of Silence describes corrupt police personnel conspiring to cover up each other’s unethical behaviour under a mafia code that defies anyone to speak out against a colleague. Such behaviour among police officers and staff members also bureaucrats entrusted with authority over members of the public should be a serious and understandable concern. This case study concludes that many instances of police unethical behaviour are not reported by colleagues significantly qualified by a number of factors identified after research.

The results show that police personnel place incidents of unethical behaviour by colleagues on a sliding scale in deciding whether or not to report it. It is concluded that serious and clearly corrupt behaviour, or behaviour that is suspected to be part of an underlying trend of unethical behaviour for political or financial benefit or self-agrandisement by fraudulent “temporary” appointments which should be universally condemned and reported on every occasion. However, in many cases the crime is displaced onto the victim using entrapment stratagems or psychopathic ploys.

Similarly behaviour that abuses the authority given to the police by harming the public trust in the police, widely condoned, is not reported by associates. By that, behaviour that police personnel consider to be politically sensitive is unlikely to be reported. Instead, it is covered up by expenditure of £-millions on fraudulent ombudsman propaganda and other dubious public protection stratagems which have underlying criminal purposes and have no foundation in law.

Investigation of crime has evolved from the use of criminal informants and highly experienced detectives into criminal database systems. Use of modus operandi (MO) and criminal databases to link cases has long ranked as an important investigative method available to law enforcement separate from the concept of offender signature. It forms an evidential pattern or practice to which law can be applied and a basis for legal action. modus operandi means a method of operating to discover a criminal’s pattern of behavior or way of committing crime. Understanding a criminal’s repeat behaviour allows those concerned with law enforcement to investigate and link criminal cases.

Ironically, modus operandi has become a means for the NW Mafia to consolidate serious crime using police officers as part of the problem not the solution. Police officers and staff members use modus operandi against informants and victims instead of bureaucratic criminals with whom they have formed a consort. It consists of layer upon layer of disinformation to cover up the real motive which one can only describe as a weird combination of oligarchy and anarchy - using mafia protocols.
**Definitions**

The term "cover-up" applies when a person in a position of authority abuses his/her power to avoid or silence criticism and/or to deflect guilt or wrongdoing. In a passive cover-up, the authority withholds information and documents to maintain silence; in an active cover-up, deception and prevarication create a dichotomy. General Optical Council in a consort with Cheshire Constabulary have used both stratagems and instructed police officers and staff to do the same by whitewashing illegal activity and stonewalling access to incriminatory evidence.

The term “organized crime” can be used in two very different senses. It can simply mean systematic and illegal activity for power or profit; however, the term has also become virtually synonymous with gangsters in general or mafia-type organisations, in particular rogue government agencies, quangos and police BCUs. By that, they have become, jointly and severally, accessories before and after the fact.

In law, an accessory defines as a person who, though not present at the commission of a crime or wrongdoing (ethically unacceptable acts or activity that transgress moral or civil law) becomes a participator either before or after the fact of commission. The distinction between an accessory and a principal relates to a question of fact and degree. An accessory before the fact relates to a person who counsels or instigates another to commit a crime or unlawful act. An accessory after the fact defines a person who, having knowledge of a crime or wrongdoing, aids or attempts to aid public officials to escape punishment.

An accomplice defines as any person open to prosecution for a crime or wrongdoing for which the principal stands accused. This includes principals and accessories before the fact; depending on the jurisdiction and the facts of the case it might also include conspirators to commit fraud and harassment through dereliction as accessories after the fact.

Perverting the course of justice is an English common law crime involving one of a number of actions which are designed to interfere with the administration of justice. This crime is triable on indictment only. Instances of other statutory crimes, such as perjury, fraud or witness tampering can also amount to perverting the course of justice. It is a serious criminal offence to pervert the course of justice by withholding evidence, suborning testimony and silencing witnesses.

**Conclusion**

In Cheshire, the Blue Code of Silence exerts influence over police personnel. However, that influence is not whether unethical behaviour should be reported, but more in terms of whether it should be reported openly or anonymously. Professional Standards Department influences willingness to process complaints using unethical behaviour and gagging for political purposes instead of law, in particular, withholding evidentiary documents itself and encouraging alleged criminal quangos to do the same; thereby, perverting the course of justice.

The police have legal and de facto discretion to decide on alternatives to prosecution such as a formal caution or an informal warning and words of advice. This discretion is based on factors such as the severity of the offence, the harm to the public, whether the offence is a unusual and whether the offender heeds warning or advice frequently used to benefit police officers and not the victims of crime they are paid to serve. Police personnel make frequent reference to their own
integrity and to the expectations placed upon them then do the opposite which this case exemplifies.

Based upon the results of this case study it is concluded that police personnel do not report their colleagues' unethical behaviour. It is also concluded that if police personnel consider the unethical behaviour to be serious, harmful, or repeated then it is very likely be covered up using psychological displacement onto to victims and the public. If it is not considered serious, harmful or repeated, then it is still very likely with gagging of peer challenges.