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Miles S Dignam, Cheshire Police Staff Member

Miles S Dignam, Cheshire Police Staff Member.
Professional Standards Department, Cheshire Constabulary.
81 Northwich Road, Knutsford WA16 0AR. Cohabitant Helen J Dignam.

The Big Lie Principle - Dignam et alia

The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) has a statutory duty to secure and maintain public confidence in the police complaints system in England and Wales. It assists local policing bodies and forces to comply with their legal obligations and achieve high standards in the handling of complaints, conduct and death and serious injury (DSI) matters.

IPCC requires police officers and staff members to comply with Statutory Guidance to the Police Service on the Handling of Complaints (Amended May 2015) based upon Police Reform Act 2000 which Journalist uses as a basis for his arguments. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 introduced a number of changes to the police complaints system. Those changes have been incorporated into the latest guidance.

The following information identifies police officers who have no wish to have their particulars disclosed, a basic premise that allows them to ignore the law and IPCC guidelines. Instead, they use clandestine activity and anonymity, altered particulars, pseudonyms and lying to cover up alleged criminal activity which construes as misconduct in public office. Miles S Dignam demonstrates these illegal activities by non-compliance and arbitrary behaviour and decisions.

This case study exposes unsubstantiated, insolent, false and misleading statements by Bailey, Dignam and Fletcher which they neither substantiated nor provided documents. In fact, they have withheld documents necessary for IPCC to proceed with the issues described. They have failed to address or rebut any of the issues thoroughly explained and published by Journalist (also Victim) and have neither recorded the various issues raised nor answered the rebuttals of the false and misleading information that they have distributed. By that, they are jointly and severally complicit in misconduct in public office to pervert the course of justice by conspiring with other officers and employees of Cheshire Constabulary to deny due process of law.

The Journalist and Victim (term used interchangeably)

As an international journalist, Victim does not normally publish content like the Dignam "deadlock letter" (08 Mar 16) while preliminary discussions about investigations are in progress. However, machination by four Cheshire police officers, Bailey, Dignam (staff member), Fletcher and Forshaw classifies as outrageous, when one considers the legal aspects and damage to the public whom they are meant to serve. Journalist felt a duty of care to the public to let them know the seriousness of the charges and the fraud involved by Dignam in the elevation of the case to IPCC.
Basically, Cheshire Constabulary officers from the Chief Constable down have neglected to investigate charges of Misconduct in Public Office and a Death or Serious Injury Matter (DSI), then conspired to psychologically displace the issues onto the Victim. They fraudulently altered the legal context and continuum from that of a serious criminal charge that should have been referred by them to either IPCC and/or CPS 18 months ago to a simple slap-on-the-wrist affair of not recording a complaint.

*IPCC Statutory Guidance to the police service on handling of complaints (Amended 2015)*, defines the issue on which the complaint predicates as:

> A DSI matter means any circumstances (unless the circumstances are or have been the subject of a complaint or amount to a conduct matter) in, or as a result of which, a person has died or sustained serious injury and at or before the time of death or serious injury the person had contact of any kind, whether direct or indirect, with a person serving with the police who was acting in the execution of his or her duties and there is an indication that the contact may have caused, whether directly or indirectly, or contributed to the death or serious injury.

Cheshire Police and quangos have harassed Victim (an octogenarian) for several years by playing “the death game” and harassing his elderly neighbours at night: they have used the “you will be dead before we get to court scenario”. Dignam produced a “deadlock letter” so that the issues could be elevated to IPCC for investigation in which he used insolent statements and neither substantiates nor provides evidence. He has completely ignored the DSI complaint upon which the whole complaint predicates, then uses the in-house solicitor and other officers to create a catch-22.

A “catch-22” is a paradoxical situation from which an individual cannot escape because of contradictory rules. It often result from rules, regulations or procedures that govern the behaviour of officers or officials over which they have no control: to challenge a rule one accepts it. Creators of catch-22s use arbitrary rules in order to justify and conceal their own abuse of power.

Dignam has not addressed or rebutted any of the issues (thoroughly explained and published) or recorded or answered the rebuttals of the false and misleading information distributed by Fletcher and Bailey *et alia*. By that, Dignam is allegedly complicit with them in misconduct of public office to pervert the course of justice and conspiring to deny due process of law. Deadlock letters are usually the cut-off point for publication while negotiations with investigators progress; however, in this case Journalist felt a duty of care to the public to advise them of the seriousness of the charges and the machination by police officers in distorting evidence.

Journalist, first published in 1944, without any valid challenge work, has held an international press card and legal credentials since 1957. Since then he has investigated much corruption in both UK and US which he has reported. The current situation in Cheshire Police ranks beyond belief when one considers the conspiracy to defraud by evidence falsification in a consort with the Information Commissioner who wallows in excrement 20 miles away.

Dignam altered the context and continuum of the complaint by falsely stating that Victim had appealed against a complaint not being recorded then quotes a case number. He knows that the
complaint is far more serious and extensive than neglecting to record it. By that, he is again trying to reduce the severity of the damage that Cheshire Constabulary caused to elderly people in general and Victim in particular.

The bullying tactics can be determined from the language in the Dignam deadlock letter. He is now manipulating the in-house solicitor (with whom Victim has had contact since July 2015) to prevent Journalist obtaining copies of Part 31 disclosure documents. All Victim’s local medical surgeries and hospitals are withholding medical records, part of the subornation activity.

Cheshire Police, in a consort with MPs and bureaucrats, have accumulated complaints for ten years by abusing process to cover up crimes by police officers and government employees. The police consistently ignored three assaults upon Victim and two threats of GBH when he filed documented evidence and complaints. The last assault was with a deadly weapon that caused neurological and ophthalmological disablement which is fully documented by medical records (obtained abroad). When Cheshire refused Victim NHS services and a second opinion on the DSI injury, he used his international insurance to fly 4,000 miles for emergency treatment, evidence that police Dignam has hidden.

This case study covers the prime issues relevant to the IPCC complaint supported by the fact that they have denied Victim hot water and gas heat in his flat for five years during the coldest winters on record to coerce him into not exposing them. Gareth Lawrence, another Cheshire police officer had full details of the complaint about the housing carbon monoxide problems and he too reversed the continuum in a consort with the Information Commissioner to displace the problems onto the Victim. These life-threatening DSI issues should have been reported to IPCC and/or CPS two years ago; however, Dignam buried them to reduce the severity of the IPCC complaint and bully the Victim into submission.

Deadlock Letter - Miles S Dignam, Cheshire Police Staff Member

08 March 2016

Ref HQ M 1/00098/16

Complaint Against Police

I refer to the complaint you made in correspondence to the IPCC dated 3rd March 16 against Cheshire Constabulary.

It is my responsibility to assess your complaint and make a recording decision in accordance with the Police Reform Act 2002. Having reviewed the details of your complaint, I have made a decision not to record your complaint.

I consider under the IPCC statutory guidance that it meets the following criteria.

The complaint is vexatious, oppressive or otherwise an abuse of the procedures for dealing with complaints.

The complaint is repetitious.
The crux of your issues stem from your allegations that you were subject to a criminal assault by an optician and have been the victim of harassment by other public bodies and individuals. These were recorded under reference C0/263/15 and you appealed the outcome of this complaint. This was not upheld. It is apparent you remain deeply dissatisfied with this and are seeking to resurrect the matter by contacting different agencies and individuals.

You have sought to raise criminal allegations against all persons connected with your complaint by contacting Mrs Beth Heavey from the Force Solicitors Department. She had no dealings with you and appears to be just a name that you appear to have identified through the internet. This was not an appropriate course of action as the matter was dealt with through the Police Complaints process. Your emails were threatening and oppressive in nature and a means to try and influence the complaint process. It is not the policy of the Force Solicitors to engage with members of the public in such circumstances. Therefore a response to you was not deemed appropriate as the Force Solicitors Office were aware that you were being dealt with by Professional Standards.

The Freedom of Information Officer has no record of any formal requests from you although you have asked for personal information about officers that would not be supplied in any event.

If you believe that you have not been supplied with relevant information then you may contact the Information Commissioners Office. This is the correct mechanism for challenging FOI requests.

I consider that your continued contact with Cheshire Constabulary is vexatious and designed to cause annoyance and distress as there is no basis for further complaints or reason for further correspondence.

I have included a leaflet from the Independent Police Complaints Commission explaining your right of appeal against the decision not to record this matter as a complaint and how to embark on the process.

Please note that you must make your appeal to the IPCC within 28 days commencing the day after the date of this letter. Unless special circumstances are shown, the IPCC will not consider any appeal made after 28 days.

Miles Dignam, Complaint Manager
Professional Standards Department

A journalism background check shows Dignam as an uneducated, double-dipping lout: a description substantiated by the deadlock letter and information derived from several protected police sources. His behaviour in handling the subject complaints shows him to be self-serving and relying upon "ghost" information and arbitrary statements. Dignam withholds disclosure documents using Elizabeth Heavey, In-house Solicitor, (SRA ID# 359700) (an illegal gatekeeper) which her supervisor David James Bryan, In-house Solicitor (SRA #165253) and Monitoring Officer has condoned.
Journalist verified her particulars with Solicitors Regulation Authority not as Dignam claimed: "She had no dealings with you and appears to be just a name that you appear to have identified through the internet." This one statement illustrates the tone and arbitrary statements by Dignam in a consort with Bailey, Bryan, Fletcher and Forshaw designed to frustrate investigation. Heavey tacitly agreed to handle the legal aspect of the case six months before the denial by Dignam condoned by Bryan.

The preliminary investigation classified as nothing more than a catch-22 scam to cover up misconduct in public office by senior officers Janette McCormick, Deputy Chief Constable, Cheshire Constabulary et alia by trying to psychologically displace her behaviour onto the Victim. Dignam has never worked in the private sector and, consequently, does not understand or totally ignores legal and human rights.

Dignam Résumé (Not verified due to prior restraint imposed by Cheshire PSD)

Miles S Dignam (51-55±), 81 Northwich Road, Knutsford, WA16 0AR.
Cohabitant Helen J Dignam (46-50±)

Police Staff Member, Cheshire Constabulary. Complaints Manager, not verifiable. He was not a sergeant for 25 years as he claims.

Cheshire Constabulary - Cheshire Police
September 2013 - Present (2 years 7 months)

I assess and audit complaints and am the decision maker around appropriate resolutions and the outcome of investigations. I work with staff, officers and the public to ensure that complaints are dealt with fairly, proportionately and in a timely manner. I liaise with solicitors both Force and external and the Independent Police Complaints Commission

Police Sergeant, Cheshire Police - December 1987 - July 2013 (25 years 8 months).

I currently work as the Training and Development Sergeant for the Eastern BCU. I have the sole responsibility for managing a team that develops and delivers training to 400+ Officers and staff. The team also manages the development of officers and in particular Student Officers. I have covered all aspects of the Operational Police role and continue to do so when required. I have recently completed 6 months as a Temporary Inspector. I had the responsibility for 5 departments and saw 2 of these through organisational significant changes. I was also Area Duty Inspector responsible for incident management and resources.

Previously I have been a Detective Constable on the Dedicated Surveillance Unit, CID and Special Branch. It is possible that I shall be looking for a new challenge outside the Police Service in the next few months! I can evidence strong leadership skills and innovative thinking.

Intelligence Operator British Army
September 1981 - September 1987 (6 years 1 month)

Education
Knutsford County High 1974 - 1981