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Précis

Bureaucrats have traditionally used elaborate procedures and ceremonies to make their illegal exercise of power acceptable to the public. They manage the judicial system along lines generally not accepted in law. A closer look shows that they absolutely control them by simultaneously assuming the roles of prosecution, defense, judge and jury. They pervert the course of justice under he guise of "risk management protocols" to hide the “kangaroo court” stigma earned conducting their business with disregard for the rights of the individual.

Judicial decisions result from foregone conclusions made in secret and based upon political or other bias. Bureaucrats frequently convene them to deny due process of law and to cover up their own crimes that legitimate hearings would expose. The whole procedure characterizes dishonesty by violating established legal protocols which emulate Star Chamber practices used to enforce royal prerogatives in the seventeenth century. Truly democratic governments have since outlawed them.

Christopher S Graham uses blackmail and extortion against journalists and the public using a bizarre, unlawful procedure arbitrarily called "vexatious". That procedure denies legitimate access to information using a dubious court finding that allows gagging and abuse of process (arbitrary decisions and entrapment) by police officers and bureaucrats, in particular, Janette McCormick, Deputy Chief Constable, Cheshire Constabulary.

Fully referenced and published by the Author in US during 1999, this anglicized version of the original article has validity today substantiated by linked articles that cover recent abuse of process in Cheshire, one of the five counties known as North West England.

[Full Text - Justice Delayed: Justice Denied]  

Introduction

As Christopher Graham, Information Commissioner considers himself above the law, his three deputies become responsible and will be served jointly and severally. They continue to use wilful blindness as a defence to criminal activity, now rampant in ICO, by withholding information and sabotaging legitimate requests for documents.

ICO hacked web sites in an attempt to destroy or censor published information which construes as prior restraint. This investigation includes all open cases on ICO records that it has either ignored or processed disingenuously during the past three years. The three deputies (the disingenuous trio) have joint and several liability and will be reported for misconduct in public office in UK and web hacking in US.
Censorship by hacking ranks among Internet criminal functions defined as acts of terrorism. Alleged illegal Internet hacking by ICO, established by intent, points to a cover-up of misconduct by ICO and MoJ (ironically a week before a general election!) which forms a pattern or practice of contextomy. Documented blackmail and extortion by ICO and sabotage of a public inquiry by MoJ also forms part of the current criminal investigation.

[What Say the Reeds at Runnymede?]

[Graham - Misconduct in Public Office]

The Journalist lodged preliminary information with the Deputy Chief Constable which formed a pattern or practice connected with other issues. That information adjunctively addressed fraudulent filing of criminal complaints and the repeated harassment by police officers at the Journalist's home based upon unsubstantiated Communications Act 2003, Chapter 21 charges by Christopher Graham. By that, ICO maliciously submitted false information to police officers in violation of the human rights of an elderly Journalist (the Victim).

[Communications Act 2003, Chapter 21]

[CPS - Reporting a Crime - Victims and Witnesses]

**Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000) - Public Inquiry**

*The Charter on Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000)*

Insures everyone has the right of access to preventive health care and the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices (Article 35)

Prohibits discrimination on the grounds of age (Article 21)

Sets out the right to social security for older persons and the rights of the elderly "to lead a life of dignity and independence and to participate in social and cultural life" (Article 25).

**Participation**

Aims for older persons to actively participate in the formulation and implementation of policies that affect their well-being and to share their knowledge with younger generations. Furthermore, the elderly should have the right to form movements and associations.

**Care**

Entails that the elderly should benefit from family and health care and that when residing in care or treatment facilities their human rights and fundamental freedoms shall be respected.

**Self-fulfilment**

Entails that educational, cultural, spiritual and recreational resources should be available for older persons to be able to pursue opportunities for the full development of their potential.

**Dignity**

Aims for the elderly to live in dignity and security and be free of exploitation and physical or mental abuse; to be treated fairly, regardless of age, gender, racial or ethnic background,
disability, financial situation or any other status; and be valued independently of their economic contribution.

**Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union - 2000**

**Article 21. Non-discrimination.**

Any discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation shall be prohibited. Within the scope of application of the Treaty establishing the European Community and of the Treaty on European Union, and without prejudice to the special provisions of those Treaties, any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited.

**Article 23. Equality between Men and Women.**

Equality between men and women must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay. The principle of equality shall not prevent the maintenance or adoption of measures providing for specific advantages in favour of the under-represented sex.

**Article 25. The Rights of the Elderly.**

The Union recognizes and respects the rights of the elderly to lead a life of dignity and independence and to participate in social and cultural life.

**Article 26. Integration of Persons with Disabilities.**

The Union recognizes and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community.

**Article 35. Health Care.**

Everyone has the right of access to preventive health care and the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices. A high level of human health protection shall be ensured in the definition and implementation of all Union policies and activities.

**The Revised European Social Charter sets out the right to protection for the elderly.**

Revised Article 23. States that responsible parties must undertake to adopt measures.

To enable the elderly to remain full members of society for as long as possible by providing adequate resources and information about available services;

To enable the elderly to choose their life-style freely and live independently for as long as possible by providing adequate housing and services; and

To guarantee support for older persons living in institutions.

[Public Inquiry]
Cheshire Constabulary (Gareth Lawrence) acted upon unfounded complaints and harassed the Journalist without providing evidence to him as a potential defendant. All defendants are entitled to receive disclosure documents necessary to enable legal advisors to assess prosecution and give informed advice. Documents obtained under Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) show that Lawrence has not recorded the facts and proceeded to harass the Victim on four different nighttime occasions despite repeated requests to substantiate his claims of criminal activity as required by Criminal Procedure Rules.

[Criminal Procedure Rules - 2014]

Wilful blindness always results in disaster for its participants (especially when they are lawyers or police officers) as they will soon find out at an international level. The complaints span the past five years during which the Journalist has endured persistent harassment by frivolous and vexatious complaints from ICO staff members and Cheshire police officers.

Instead of doing the job that the law requires and for which the public pays them, they have sycophantically followed orders and committed crimes orchestrated by an allegedly psychopathic Information Commissioner. The deputy ICO commissioner trio will now have to account for their wilful blindness and assume responsibility for crimes committed by their "omnipotent" leader.

The damage to the web sites is estimated at £100,00.00. According to advanced technology investigators in US, presently examining the systems damage with a view to filing complaints with FBI, the cost will increase incrementally following the results of the forensic evaluation. Meanwhile, the publishing costs increase due to repairing and replacing data on the damaged web sites and using alternative applications to repair the contextually altered content (which ICO has used to distort meaning) and operating systems bastardized by the hacking.

The linked PDF file contains a copy of the deleted content that resulted from the hacking which clearly points to ICO and forms stage one of the forensic investigation. However, considerably more damage was effected to the other three Contra Cabal sites which will probably take several months/years to repair. Those sites are four of the largest non-profit web sites on the Internet and the hacking adversely affected all of them because they have a common server and linked databases.

[Hacked Web Pages - Guess who did it!]

ICO has ignored all warnings regarding previous interference with these sites and has disingenuously tried to use published material out-of-context to support "vexatious" claims against the Journalist when the correct procedure is to challenge any inaccuracy of content with the Editor to allow correction, if needed. Published material now forms part of vindictive attacks upon the Journalist by use of a non-binding "vexatious decision" now awaiting a court determination. FOIA/EIR/DPA request procedure and any contextomy (use out of context) by extracting content from published media to support legal argument under those Acts construes as a criminal prevarication. ICO did not include the Journalist in their published vexatious findings, instead it craftily used blackmail and extortion.

[Blackmail and Extortion]
Alan M Dransfield (an investigative building engineer specializing in violation of health and safety
lightening and other risks in public buildings, particularly The House of Lords) whom ICO
constantly harassed in attempts to gag him for several years. The hacking took place within hours
of publication of an update to an article containing a mention of Dransfield that had some
relevance in a general election context. It shows deliberate intent to silence (gag) the Journalist
and gives reason to the hacking as a result of publishing the Dransfield vexatious concerns.

[HackeWeb Pages]

See full text in appended PDF pages 29 through 40.

The Leveson Inquiry effectively questions the omnipotence of Graham as Information
Commissioner. In relation to the institutional status of the ICO, Leveson recommended that
Government consider amending DPA to reconstitute it as an Information Commission led by a
Board of Commissionerers with suitably broad expertise. He concluded that a number of significant
drawbacks exist in the single commissioner model which make organisation vulnerable to
pressure with profile and reputation focused on an individual, Christopher S Graham.

Leveson stressed that the absence of an effective senior executive board exposes the office to an
oligarchic style of leadership with insufficient internal checks and balances which results in
incoherent management of priorities, business risks, resources and performance. That proved
tue in the recent lack of proportionality and uncontrolled behaviour of Graham in processing
hundreds of FOIA/EIR/DPA "vexatious decisions" which gave cause for GIA/3037/2011
Dransfield v ICO and Devon County Council now awaiting appellate decision C3/2013/1855.

Proportionality, a general principle in law, covers several special (although related) concepts used
as a criterion of fairness and justice in statutory interpretation processes. It especially applies to
constitutional law as a logical method intended to assist in discerning the correct balance between
the restriction imposed by a corrective measure and the severity of the nature of the prohibited
act.

Within criminal law, it conveys the notion that the punishment of an offender should fit the crime.
A crime has to not only be clearly defined, but proven using statutes and valid legal precedents.
That means not only arbitrarily quoting laws, but also arguing in each case how they specifically
apply to each and every given circumstance.

The content of the PDF forms part of the allegations of misconduct in public office (an argument
supported by precedents in UK and US). Destroying specifically designated published evidence,
as can be seen in the PDF, also adds credibility to the claims of censorship and prior restraint.
It shows that the damage was not caused vicariously by rogue hackers, instead, it shows
deliberate criminal intent by ICO (in a consort with MoJ, HSE and HCA) to distort the continuum
prior to a general election.

The Journalist asked Forshaw to treat this information as a separate, second complaint in the
string of outstanding complaints against police officers during the past five years; however, he has
done absolutely nothing to follow up the documented complaint. Neither has he given a reason
for needing to meet with the Journalist personally while ignoring repeated requests for a lawyer
to monitor the conversation.
In a similar way, Forshaw must consult with his media experts or superior officer before meeting with the Journalist under recent police guidelines. If he needs protection from the Journalist by monitoring, then the Journalist is entitled to comparable protection by an independent lawyer.

[Proportionality]

Four public sector organizations et alia evaded their responsibilities to investigate both current and previous harassment using a pattern or practice of evasive behaviour in violation of Equality Act 2010 and other statutes in pari materia. In particular, articles address misconduct in public office by public sector officials who for self-aggrandizement have chosen not to address serious issues within their bailiwick using a plethora of contempt prior to investigation.

[Equality Act 2010 - Banning Age Discrimination in Services]

As both Cheshire Constabulary and the Information Commissioner have placed restrictions on the human rights of the Journalist he has a right not to hold conversations with police officers without legal representation, allow them to enter his home, or insist on meeting him personally unless they have a warrant.

This particularly relates to the alleged misconduct in public office by Janette McCormick who has for six months denied due process of law in a case of alleged serious assault with a deadly weapon which permanently disabled the Journalist after alleged ex parte communication with GOC officials to create a merry-go round that denied due process of law for six months.

The situation now relates first to mitigation of the non-compliance with police published procedures in criminal cases by interviewing the accused parties not in harassing the complainant and principal witness. Those procedures do not require the complainant to personally meet with police officers without his agreement unless they obtain a warrant, which in the case of journalists usually results in them being struck dumb for source confidentiality.

Mitigation requires Cheshire Constabulary to get their procedures back on track by studying the evidence provided and producing an interrogatory requesting clarification of information with a view to preparing a submission to CPS, not by harassing the Victim. Forshaw used wilful blindness and one-liners without substantiating the reason for meetings when the Journalist repeatedly stated that he would not attend meetings without legal representation due to his previous experience of UK police bullying and machination during the past ten years.

Cheshire police have attempted to gag an internationally qualified journalist who is fully documented by records obtained under Data Protection Act 1998 confirmed by police officers as confidential journalism sources.

Corrupt Bureaucracies and Police Districts (BCUs) - Victims of Crime - Case Studies

Police Investigation - Victim's Rights after Reporting a Crime
Victims's Personal Statement and Refutation of the Fletcher Decision

If they are victims of crime, then all members of the public have the right to contact the police and to be kept informed about all investigations related to that crime. The police must give them a crime reference number and contact details for the officer dealing with the case when they report
the crime. They also have the right to ask the police for updates about any investigation when they present the crime reference number. Victims of serious crimes persistently targeted or considered vulnerable or intimidated (as in this case) have preferential rights to speedy investigation and resolution.

The Victim in this case study has used surnames throughout this document due to the use of anonymity, proxies and suspect ranks by police officers and neglect to respond to requests for release of public information: number, rank and full name as required by Freedom of Information Act and other laws in pari materia. Elizabeth Heavey, SRA ID# 359700, Force Solicitors Office, Cheshire Constabulary Headquarters neglected to provide that information in a timely fashion after several requests, thereby creating an illegal catch-22. That condoned the straw pyramid McCormick/Peters/Lavin/Armstrong/Bailey/Dignam/Fletcher/Forshaw formed which comprises an even greater bureaucratic and government straw conglomerate.

Fletcher: The matter still appears not to have been concluded to your satisfaction and you have sort to engage with numerous persons and organisations to this end. This has resulted in you naming 14 individuals from different sectors and accusing them of harassment and corruption. You also name a further 13 persons as accessories, including Stephen Mosley MP, a councillor and Health and Safety Executives.

Author: That is what efficient investigative journalists (members of the fourth estate) do for the public good. If the cases subject to this study had been recorded and processed within the mandated five days instead of waiting five years, then there would have been fewer people involved. Mosley and Thompson (his councillor confederate) both lost their seats in the recent general election after exposure of misconduct in public office related to these cases.

[The Fifth Estate]

Ethos

The Victim, first published in 1944 with seventy years experience as an investigative journalist, publishing chief executive and communications professor, first apprenticed in a law publishers near Lincoln's Inn, London in law and graphic and visual communication. A life member of the Wig and Pen Club, Fleet Street he had 55 years contact with other journalists, lawyers and judges. In US he qualified for the Bar in two states, but chose to write rather than to preach.

He uses the pseudonym Nmesis and openly declares personal or conflicting interests. These conflicts may relate to topics or to opinion especially when the content draws upon advocacy, experience, conclusion, or interpretation. As an accredited journalist, he conforms with the code of conduct and ethics of the journalism profession, tested by courts in both EU and US.

Since 1947, he has worked as a typographer, graphic designer, journalist, editor (commercial and academic), professor (technical communication and rhetoric) also as a university administrator. He has held international press credentials since 1959. He holds two international baccalaureate degree equivalencies, an international graduate terminal degree equivalency also an earned masters and two PhD degrees in US. He holds two elected international fellowships within the communication industry.
Among other executive appointments, he formerly held the position of chief executive officer for a group of publishing and technical/graphic communication companies. He has won an international silver medal for his satire and a US city award for his self-funded educational programs for disadvantaged and minority people. In 1957 (London, Fleet Street), he founded and operated the first full-service technical communication organization to employ women and people of colour. In 1973 (Connecticut), he designed and marketed the first typesetting system driven by a minicomputer, the precursor for today's desktop publishing systems. In Connecticut, he restored a nineteenth century mill complex for which he received state recognition.

**Entrapment**

Entrapment means acts of government officials, police officers and people acting in an official capacity who induce a person to commit a crime he or she is not previously disposed to commit. Moreover, it is an indictable offence when it is established that a quango official or police officer originated the idea of the crime and induced a person of lesser rank to commit it. The rationale underlying legal action is to deter law enforcement officers from engaging in reprehensible conduct by inducing sycophantic employees to commit crimes or engage in criminal activity by mutual blackmail. In their efforts to obtain evidence and combat crime, officers are permitted to use some deception. However, an officer must not use chicanery or fraud to lure a person to commit a crime when the person is not previously willing to commit.

**During a Police Investigation**

While the police are investigating a crime, they must provide an update on the case at least once a month until it is closed. They must let Victim know within five days if someone is: arrested; charged; set free; released on bail; given a caution, reprimand, final warning or penalty notice. If they cannot investigate the crime within five days of the reporting, they must inform the Victim why they dropped the investigation. They must immediately inform victims of serious crime persistently targeted or who are considered vulnerable or intimidated.

On completion of investigation, the police must pass the information to Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) who will then decide if there’s enough evidence to take the case to court. If the CPS decide to drop or alter the charge, they will usually tell the Victim within five days and give them seven days to make a request for review.

**Victim’s Personal Statement**

Victims can provide the police with information on how the crime has affected them as a “victim personal statement” for use later when the court is deciding on a punishment. General Optical Council (GOC) and/or Cheshire Constabulary (CC) have not challenged the fact that an Assault with a Deadly Weapon which construes as a Death or Serious Injury Matter (DSI) defined by Section 12, Police Reform Act 2002, took place on 19 August 2014 as described in this Victim’s personal statement. Neither have they (or any other police authority) denied their liability; instead, Peters, Lavin and McCormick have, jointly and severally, committed wilful blindness and silent withholding of information to frustrate investigation and protected alleged criminals from prosecution. By that, they have denied due process of law and committed misconduct in public office.
**The Assailant**

Nina Catherine Houghton, Marketing Manager, Houghton Opticians, Chester (an unregistered trainee optometrist illegally performed public sector NHS services) allegedly committed assault with a deadly weapon which created a Death or Serious Injury (DSI) that included permanent ophthalmological, neurological and physical injuries to the Victim leaving him permanently visually impaired and physically disabled. Informed of the injuries within 24 hours, Houghton Opticians arbitrarily denied any responsibility and refused to reexamine Victim for a second opinion. Houghtons maintained absolute silence and denied Victim access to his personal and medical records, an offense under the Data Protection Act.

Samantha Peters, Chief Executive/Registrar and Gareth Morgan Hadley, Chair, General Optical Council (GOC) neglected to investigate the incident then orchestrated a cover-up by concealing evidence of wrongdoing, error, incompetence and other embarrassing information. Lisa Sparkes has since withheld documents necessary to frustrate due process of law and, in a consort with Peters and Hadley, arbitrarily determined not to investigate the issues. In a consort with Houghton Opticians they have denied access to documents and medical records although Victim has repeatedly requested their release under Data Protection and Freedom of Information Acts citing legislation and legal precedents *in pari materia.*

Gareth Morgan Hadley, Chair of the General Optical Council arbitrarily closed the case by using contempt prior to investigation, then sent the following deadlock letter (20 Nov 14) to the Victim:

> I would refer to the Council’s letter of 13 November 2014 which informed you, *inter alia,* that, insofar that your complaints concerning the conduct of Council officials applied to the Chief Executive and Registrar, they would be addressed by me. I have considered your submissions to the Council including those that you have emailed to me since you received the Council’s letter of 13 November 2014 and the Council’s responses to you. I am satisfied that they contain no evidence whatsoever of misconduct on the part of the Council’s Chief Executive and Registrar, rather they indicate that, despite the fact that the terms in which you have written to the Council’s officials have been both rambling and abusive, your complaints have received proper and courteous consideration and that you have been given full replies. I have concluded that your complaints are unfounded and vexatious; and that they do not require further investigation. The matter is therefore closed: I will neither acknowledge nor respond to any further correspondence that I receive from you.

By that, Houghton Opticians and GOC Officials, jointly and severally, committed misconduct in public office and a civil tort which makes them jointly and severally liable for indictment and damages. They have left Victim (who suffered a near death experience which permanently disabled him) in limbo by denying him his human and civil rights and medical treatment under NHS.

**Assault with a Deadly Weapon which interprets as a Death or Serious Injury (DSI)**

Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, contrary to section 47 Offences against the Person Act 1861 states that the offence is committed when a person assaults another, thereby causing Actual Bodily Harm (ABH). Bodily harm has its ordinary meaning and includes any hurt calculated to
interfere with the health or comfort of the victim: such hurt need not be permanent, but must be more than transient and trifling: Rex v Donovan 25 Cr. App. Rep. 1, CCA).

It is an either way offence, which carries a maximum penalty on indictment of five years’ imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine not exceeding the statutory maximum. As stated in the Common Assault section of the Charging Standard, the factors in law that distinguish a charge under section 39 from a charge under section 47 are the degree of injury resulting and the sentencing powers available to the sentencing court.

Where the injuries exceed those that can suitably be reflected by Common Assault (namely where the injuries are serious) a charge of ABH should normally be preferred. In determining whether or not the injuries are serious, relevant factors may include, for example, the fact that there has been significant medical intervention and/or permanent effects have resulted.

In UK law, the only factors that distinguish common assault from assault occasioning actual bodily harm relate to the degree of injury that results and the sentence available to a sentencing court.

[Offences against the Person Act 1861, Section 47]

**Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm**

The offence is committed when a person assaults another, thereby causing Actual Bodily Harm (ABH). Bodily harm has its ordinary meaning and includes any hurt calculated to interfere with the health or comfort of the victim: such hurt need not be permanent, but must be more than transient and trifling.

This definition is similar to the common law definition of actual bodily harm stated, at page 509, in Rex v. Donovan [1934] 2 KB 498 (also 25 Cr. App. Rep.1 CCA) and repeated, at 557D, in R v. Chan-Fook [1994] 2 All ER 552 where the reference to transient or trifling injuries is taken as applying to actual bodily harm rather than bodily harm. It is an offence which carries a maximum penalty on indictment of five years’ imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine not exceeding the statutory maximum.

As stated in the Common Assault section of this Charging Standard, the factors in law that distinguish a charge under section 39 from a charge under section 47 are the degree of injury resulting and the sentencing powers available to the sentencing court. Where the injuries exceed those that can suitably be reflected by Common Assault, namely where the injuries are serious, a charge of ABH should normally be preferred. In determining whether or not the injuries are serious, relevant factors may include the fact that there has been significant medical intervention and/or permanent effects have resulted.

**Practicing without General Optical Council (GOC) Registration**

Before joining the registers, all optometrists and dispensing opticians, including students, are required to have completed, or currently be studying for, a GOC-approved training course. They must meet certain standards of education and performance, and comply with the Code of Conduct for individual registrants. Registrants have to provide a health declaration, also details of any criminal convictions, cautions or investigations or disciplinary proceedings which have been taken.
against them or are currently pending. Full registrants must also hold professional indemnity insurance and show that they have completed the minimum required amount of Continuing Education and Training (CET).

**Death or Serious Injury (DSI)**

A DSI matter means any circumstances 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. The term "serious injury" means a fracture, a deep cut, a deep laceration or an injury causing damage to an internal organ or the impairment of any bodily function.

A DSI includes:

• at the time of death or serious injury the Victim had been arrested by a person serving with the police and had not been released or was otherwise detained in the custody of a person serving with the police; or

• at or before the time of death or serious injury the Victim 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.

[Police Reform Act 2002, Section 12 and Police Reform Act 2002, Section 29]

**Appointment of a Person to carry out the Investigation**

The appropriate authority is responsible for appointing the investigating officer in a local, supervised or managed investigation. In the case of a supervised or managed investigation, the IPCC has the power to require any proposed appointment to be subject to its approval or, where a person has already been appointed, it may require another investigating officer to be selected.

Once a matter has been referred, the IPCC will make a "mode of investigation" decision to determine how it should be dealt with. This is done by caseworkers or investigators who submit an assessment to a Commissioner. The assessment will involve judging the available information and may mean IPCC investigators are sent to the scene.

The four modes of investigation are:

1. Independent investigations carried out by the IPCC’s own investigators and overseen by an IPCC Commissioner or investigators with all the powers of the police.

2. Managed investigations carried out by police Professional Standards Departments (PSDs), under the direction and control of the IPCC.

3. Supervised investigations carried out by police PSDs, under their own direction and control. The IPCC will set the terms of reference for a supervised investigation and receive the
investigation report when it is complete. Complainants have a right of appeal to the IPCC following a supervised investigation.

4. Local investigations carried out entirely by police PSDs, or by other officers on their behalf. Complainants have a right of appeal to the IPCC following a local investigation.

Bailey ignored those mandates by appointing investigators in a DSI matter, with the relevant officer McCormick accused of misconduct in public office, as his chief officer: a direct conflict of interest. IPCC states that investigators must not be under their chief officer’s direction and control and that DSI cases must be investigated by another Basic Command Unit (BCU). Moreover, McCormick and Bailey neglected to record the complaint immediately they received it (26 Oct 14) and did not refer it to IPCC immediately as required by IPCC mandates.

If the police authority or chief officer decides not to take action the authority or chief officer shall notify the Victim of the following matters:

1. The decision to take no action and, if that decision relates to only part of what was received, the part in question;

2. The grounds on which the decision was made; and

3. Victim’s right to appeal against that decision.

McCormick, Anderson, Fletcher, Bailey and Dignam did not comply with any of those directives.

Fletcher quoted a decision by Anderson without disclosing either of their particulars, the investigation report or providing copies of documents, then Fletcher arbitrarily quashed it in favour of his own understanding of the complaint without any substantiation. This quintet has studiously denied the Victim his right to thorough investigation and an appeal to the Commission against neglect by the police authority and chief officer to make a determination on a series of complaints or to notify and record all decisions and provide copies of them.

**Privacy**

The police might give some information about the crime to the media to help with the investigation; however, they must ask permission of the Victim before they do so.

**Appointment of a Person to Investigate**

The appropriate authority is responsible for appointing the investigating officer in a local, supervised or managed investigation. In the case of a supervised or managed investigation, IPCC has the power to require any proposed appointment to be subject to its approval or, where a person has already been appointed, it may require another investigating officer to be selected.

[Police Reform Act 2002, Schedule 3, Paragraphs 16, 17 and 18]

Although repeatedly advised by Victim of Professional Standards responsibility to request opinions from both CPS and IPCC on who is the appropriate authority, Bailey decided to make that decision himself which has resulted in a fiasco. This is the second time that this has occurred with the same Victim during the past five years. Both cases are still open and covered by the following refutation.
Moreover, Bailey ignored the fact that in the case of investigation of a senior officer, any investigation of a DSI must be referred to both IPCC and/or CPS for an opinion. The present investigation and Fletcher decision are allegedly fraudulent because Deputy Chief Constable McCormick controls the investigation of her own serious misconduct in public office in a distinct conflict of interest. The appropriate authorities in this case are IPCC and/or CPS unless otherwise determined by regulators or a court.

**Straw-Man (or Woman) Stratagems**

Bailey, Head of Professional Standards has relied upon impunity and anonymity to completely disregard law by appointing straw men to investigate a DSI case that he should have immediately elevated to IPCC and/or CPS. He has allowed Fletcher, a straw man, to flaunt his power knowing that he can make arbitrary decisions without following established forensic procedures as required by law and keep his superior officers in his pocket by using unlimited straw-man resources at his disposal.

The term "straw man" (or woman) refers to a third party who acts as a "front" in a transaction (an agent for another) for the purpose of breaking a law or engaging in some other kind of transaction where the principal wishes to remain hidden and beyond criticism for illegal acts. In this case, misconduct in public office by Janette McCormick, Deputy Chief Constable, Cheshire Constabulary and her alleged bureaucratic conspirators Samantha Peters and Mandie Lavin.

Morally wrong in principle or practice, Bailey used three straw men as a front to cover his questionable investigation activities (Dignam, Forshaw and Fletcher). Straws have anonymity and impunity and straw lawyers usually help them evade their responsibilities and the law through deception, misrepresentation and arrest or incarceration of innocent people. Straw witnesses provide perjured testimony. They all know that evil people must remain anonymous and work to achieve that goal.

McCormick, Peters and Lavin at the highest or most powerful stratum of this straw pyramid have power that they can misuse to protect themselves. Those at the lowest stratum usually have no personal means which makes them "judgment proof". Hence the expression "a man of straw": a person of no substance like Fletcher used as a judge in forensic proceedings.

Straw men at the lowest stratum primarily perform illegal acts so that principals do not soil their hands and can remain anonymous with impunity. They deliberately accept liabilities without resources to fulfill them, usually as a front for an anonymous principal. In the case of suborned perjury, they offer false testimony or sign false declarations dictated by a third party principal. Straws act as nominal parties in name only and the principal rewards them either with money, promotion or in kind for their services or testimony.

Principals ultimately hold responsibility for discharging the public liability associated with the benefits that accrue. The law punishes principals as well as their straws with criminal penalties for perjury or for filing false documents with courts or other government authorities.

Police officers and bureaucrats generally rely upon censorship and propaganda to direct public attention away from dysfunctional behavior, elder abuse and misappropriation of government funds. They know that expression becomes meaningless without freedom to publish ideas and
opinion. Consequently, they silence dissenters and reporters with court orders, prior restraint or jail them.

Plato defined regulatory tyrants as people who live to do anything they please and create an aura of benevolence that gives more offense than the underlying evil. Cheshire Constabulary and their conspiratorial bureaucrats give a public appearance of benevolence, which coupled with their indifference and anonymity, gives more offense than the evil itself. They act as benevolent dictators by using neo-fascist policies to control elderly and other vulnerable people. They use elaborate underhand schemes by deceiving their victims and evading laws to achieve financial and promotional objectives. Those stratagems allow them effective control without responsibility.

Straw stratagems allow manipulation of Victims by strata or societal segregation: separating people with similar social, cultural or economic status into competing strata using politically correct criteria as control mechanisms. This helps principals to use straws as fronts to evade culpability and maintain anonymity with impunity.

Refutation of Fraudulent Fletcher Decision and Appeal in Complaint Against Police

27 September 2015

Elizabeth Heavey, SRA ID# 359700, Force Solicitors Office
Cheshire Constabulary Headquarters.

The linked documentation supports refutation of the allegedly fraudulent Fletcher Decision #3. It addresses the loaded statement by Fletcher that: "Clearly there was a difference of opinion. The Trust held a panel meeting in 2012 to try and resolve the matter with you, but you failed to attend. In your absence they found that they had complied with their responsibilities as a landlord".

There was no Stage One panel hearing; instead, Knight (in a consort with Finch, Doyle, Laird and Sands) orchestrated the gas capping scam and a kangaroo court to cover it up. The Victim declined to attend to avoid becoming an accessory after the fact to criminal activity or, as is the case with the Fletcher decision, an attempt to involve the Victim in abuse of process.

The Second Stage hearing, necessitated by the machination of Paul Knight, ended in another illegal farce involving Goacher, Mosley, Thompson and Knight. Knight was the originator of all that happened relative to the gas issues.

Knight was a prime mover in the near bankruptcy of Chester & District Housing Trust (Cosmopolitan) through his lack of due diligence and the loss of housing freeholds which cost the taxpayer £-millions which Sanctuary absorbed as a bonus. Knight now works as Head of Avenue Services, Sanctuary Housing Association (Avenue Services (NW) Ltd.). As Laurence J Peter described bureaucrats (The Peter Principle): they all reach their level of incompetence then do a lateral arabesque to more lucrative positions with greater accolades.

[Avenue Services (NW) Ltd. - Sanctuary Housing Association - Knight]
History

John Denny brought Paul Knight (a former debt collector) on board CDHT as Assistant Director of Performance and Income within two months of his appointment as chief executive (2005). Knight, a ravening psychopath, an opinion based upon his bizarre and dangerous administrative performance and pathological lying, constantly evades due process of law using abuse of process.

In essence, Denny organized a three-ring circus with Knight as ringmaster and Stuart Crosthwaite as the principal clown surrounded by a crowd of subliterate, sycophantic misfits singing and dancing in praise of a dysfunctional oligarchy. Denny used Knight as his personal “hit-man” to cover up his own inadequacy. That association frequently exists in psychopathic managerial relationships and usually predicates upon mutual blackmail.

Heavey has not responded to several issues and the Victim’s patience has been stretched to the limit by lack of gas heating and hot water for more than five years despite Sanctuary having received £125,000.00 in rent payments during that time. The relevant files for the Internal Review on those particular issues were lodged with Christopher S Graham, Information Commissioner three years ago which he fraudulently stalled using blackmail and extortion. The other issues arose during 2015 as a result of his wilful blindness.

ICO Blackmail and Extortion - Graham

Graham arbitrarily refused to process the internal reviews using blackmail and extortion in a consort with Judith Elizabeth Hackitt, Chair of the Board, Health and Safety Executive, former MP Stephen Mosley and former Chester Councillor Robert Thompson. That prevented elevation of the issues to a court. Both Mosley and Thompson lost their seats in the recent general election (to the public good) while Hackitt continues to publish Enid Blyton fairy tales about health and safety risks at great public expense which she has refused to disclose for more than two years.

ICO The Big Lie - House of Commons - Graham

HSE Misconduct in Public Office - Hackitt

HSE/Avenue Perverting the Course of Justice - Hackitt and Knight

Précis

The following statement also applies to the Cheshire PSD response to the Victim’s complaint. In other words, the Fletcher response is nothing more than a general denial which does not contain a reasoned argument to support the decision taking into account the legal continuum since 10 November 2011. The Victim is not, and never has been a customer of National Grid Gas although as an elderly Sanctuary Tenant he has been subjected to four years of abuse and machination by the parties involved.

Ian Doyle (NGG) committed gross misconduct in capping the gas to evade inspection of the carbon monoxide problems in the subject property which do not comply with Health and Safety Regulations. Sanctuary Housing Association (comprising Chester and District Housing Trust) admits that 1,000 properties in their Chester domain are liable to similar problems. In fact,
investigation shows that it is a UK wide problem which Stevenson, acting for NGG, has tried to cover up. The Victim described the criminal action by Ian Doyle NGG condoned by Andrew Hutchinson NGG in his report to the Independent Regulation Committee of the Homes and Communities Agency, Communities and Local Government Committee appointed by the House of Commons to examine the administration, expenditure and policy of the Department for Communities and Local Government and associated public bodies - Dangerous Carbon Monoxide and other Noxious Gas Emissions in Public Housing, fully explains the circumstances.

[House of Commons - Independent Regulation Committee]

Tweedledum and Tweedledee with Elizabeth in the Winsford Wonderland

They were standing under a tree, each with an arm round the other’s neck. Elizabeth (SRA ID #359700) knew which was which in a moment, because one of them had “DUM” embroidered on his collar, and the other “DEE”. I suppose they’ve each got “TWEEDLE” round at the back of the collar, she said to herself.

They stood so still that she quite forgot they were alive, and she was just going round to see if the word “TWEEDLE #??????” was written at the back of each collar when she was startled by a voice coming from the one marked “DUM” aka Andy.

If you think we’re wax-works, he said, you ought to pay, you know. Wax-works weren’t made to be looked at for nothing. Nohow. Contrariwise, added the one marked “DEE” aka Nick, if you think we’re alive, you ought to speak.

I’m sure I’m very sorry, was all Liz could say for the words of the old song kept ringing through her head like the ticking of a clock and she could hardly help saying them out loud:

Tweedledum and Tweedledee
Agreed to have a battle!
For Tweedledum said Tweedledee
Had spoiled his nice new rattle.

Just then flew down a monstrous crow,
As black as a tar-barrel!
Which frightened both the heroes so,
They quite forgot their quarrel.

With apologies to Lewis Carroll
[Through the Looking Glass]

Fraudulent Investigation and Decision - Cheshire BCU
Andrew (aka Andy) Fletcher, Detective Inspector, Cheshire Police (PSD)

During the past five years the Cheshire police have investigated nothing in accordance with their own protocols when faced with complaints by the Victim. When the Victim files a complaint, they use a disingenuous process of wilful blindness and arbitrary denial that a problem exists then create a catch-22. In Cheshire, the constabulary is rotten to the core with officers in two
categories: sub-literate yokels unable to understand their own rules and self-serving, social-climbing bureaucrats more interested in feathering their own nests than investigating and solving cases with integrity.

Cheshire police officers neither provide monthly reports required by protocols nor substantiate their arbitrary decisions as required by law. They ignore legitimate rebuttals and do not answer questions posed for clarification so that they can whitewash evidence to their own advantage. Chester Constabulary has blocked due process of law for six years which has allowed Nicholas Bailey to produce a document (12 Dec 15) containing false and misleading information by which he endeavours to arbitrarily close a case to cover up police neglect and corruption.

[Bailey]

Neither Fletcher nor Bailey have cited a single law or legal precedent to support their sub-literate, arbitrary statements. In a conflict of interest, they used general denial to reach their unlawful decisions on a Death or Serious Injury (DSI) case that they should have referred to Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) and/or Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) within 24 hours for an opinion prior to referring it to another BCU for investigation. Instead, they chose to investigate the behaviour of their "boss" Janette McCormick and arbitrarily find her not guilty of misconduct in public office.

**Verification and Validation**

Cheshire police officers consistently neglect properly to substantiate the content or to sign, verify and validate documents with their Warrant Number, Rank, First/Middle/Last Name and Job Title in direct violation of police regulations. Information obtained from other sources temporarily identifies them in this series of articles; however, the absence of verification and validation could adversely affect innocent namesakes especially when the perpetrators have common surnames and use nicknames or pseudonyms to hide their identity.

In the United Kingdom, a warrant card (or a signed and dated copy of the information that it contains) evidences a police officer's sworn attestation. Police force policy dictates that officers must identify themselves and produce their warrant card when they are performing police duties. Cheshire Constabulary police officers and civilian staff consistently hide their identity then conduct unlawful investigations which pervert the course of justice with impunity. By that, they prevent Victims obtaining due process of law. This case is an example of machination by Cheshire police officers to pervert the course of justice aided and abetted by Elizabeth Heavey.

Stonewalling by Heavey, a Cheshire police lawyer of record, deliberately delayed due process of law by neglecting to provide identification for police offices on her patch and withholding pretrial and medical documents which make her subject to impending complaints to the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) for misconduct in public office.

Elizabeth Heavey, Admitted as a Solicitor (18 Apr 06).
Employee at Cheshire Constabulary
Force Solicitors Office, Cheshire Constabulary Headquarters, Clemonds Hey, Oakmere Road, Winsford, Cheshire, CW7 2UA.
Telephone: 01606364592
Indented Responses to the Fraudulent Fletcher Decision

I [Fletcher] am writing to advise you of the outcome of the complaint you made against Unidentified Officers on 01 July 2015.

Fletcher has disingenuously altered the complaint continuum. The correct time frame of the investigation commenced on the date that McCormick was informed of the referral by General Optical Council (GOC) 26 October 2014 when the original complaint about abuse of process against McCormick/Peters/Lavin commenced through the present time not 01 July 2015 as Fletcher claims.

Complaint against identified police officers and staff members identified by sources Bailey, Dignam, Forshaw, Fletcher and Armstrong relates to breach of legal process in handling the McCormick/Peters/Lavin complaint.

Cheshire Constabulary has evaded its responsibility to investigate a DSI complaint in accordance with IPCC Statutory Guidance to the police service on the handling of complaints also previous complaints spanning five years in pari materia which share a common purpose or relate to the same subject construed together as one law, regardless of whether they contain any reference to one another.

Moreover, a related case referred to CPS by Metropolitan Police (Harrow) and subsequent arrest of the assailant was "disappeared" allegedly by her brother-in-law, a Harrow Police officer. Another assault in Hoole, Chester following forced entry without a warrant and restraint in a bedroom in a residence for two hours by a police officer has been "disappeared" by Cheshire Police who forged police records to cover up her misconduct and deny the Victim his rights. A police officer and journalism source confided to the Victim that she was a plague among other officers because her seniors did not restrain her repeatedly outrageous behaviour.

A part of this pattern or practice concerns threats of Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH) by Christopher Graham Wheal (NUJ Official) Metropolitan Police (Lewisham) referred back by IPCC to Lewisham Professional services then “buried”.

In addition, repeated harassment of the Victim and his elderly neighbours after dark by forced entry into residential premises by Lawrence (Cheshire Police) using false statements of non-compliance with ICO regulations by Christopher S Graham, Information Commissioner without substantiation of the complaint or documentation although Victim repeatedly requested copies. Lawrence was referred to Victim's solicitors, but evidently decided to “bury” the case after four night time visits in Victim’s absence when he entered the building without a warrant and harassed elderly neighbours.

The investigation of police complaints is an evidence based system, the aim of which is to ascertain whether there is sufficient evidence to uphold the complaint and if so, determine what action is required to resolve the matter. At times the Police Service must acknowledge that it could and should have done better. Whatever the outcome of a police complaint, we try to take the opportunity to learn lessons from what has happened so as to improve our service in the future.
Irrelevant and immaterial because Fletcher has shown contempt in not complying with those mandates. His statements amount to nothing more than arbitrary conjecture and bear no relation to procedures established in law. While police officers are investigating a crime, they must give Victim an update on the case at least once a month until it is closed.

On completion of investigation, the police must pass the information to Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) who will then decide if there's enough evidence to take the case to court. If CPS decides to drop or alter the charge, they will usually tell the victim within five days and give them seven days to make a request for review. Dignam has complied with none of these protocols.

The matter was forwarded to Cheshire Constabulary Professional Standards Department where it was formally recorded and allocated to Complaints Manager Mr Dignam to investigate. Mr Dignam has conducted an investigation into the circumstances surrounding your complaint(s), which are recorded as follows:-

Allegation One: The complainant alleges that no action was taken by the Deputy Chief Constable in relation to his report of an assault.

Allegation Two: The complainant alleges the Police have not thoroughly investigated his allegation of criminal assault.

Allegation Three: The complainant alleges the police have been negligent in failing to act against numerous public bodies for misconduct in a public office.

Allegation Four: The complainant alleges the police failed to provide a report from Inspector Adderley.

Having reviewed the investigation report I am satisfied Mr Dignam has completed a sufficiently thorough and proportionate investigation into your allegations.

Then, Dignam must prepare a detailed chronology with the reasons for his decisions and present it to the Victim for acceptance or refutation.

I have considered whether the allegations should be upheld and whether cases of misconduct or performance should be considered in respect of the actions (or omissions) by individual police officers or members of police staff.

By what authority and precedents does Fletcher make this arbitrary claim?

The following conclusions can be drawn in respect of this complaint.

Allegation One: The complaint is Upheld on the basis there is evidence to support the allegation.

The written evidence runs into thousands of words and is fully substantiated with validated facts.

You contacted the Deputy Chief Constables Office in November 14 to report an allegation of assault upon you by an optician in Chester.
Refuted. McCormick was first contacted (26 Oct 14) after referral by Peters about an assault with a deadly weapon by Nina Catherine Houghton (19 Aug 14) and provided with 16 pages of evidence plus an URL to substantiated information. McCormick neither acknowledged nor replied to that correspondence and six follow-up messages during the following six months contrary to the mandated requirement for her to respond within five days.

Date: Sun, 26 Oct 2014 09:55:23 +0100
To: Janette McCormick <janette.mccormick@cheshire.pnn.police.uk>
From: Paul Trummel <trummel@contracabal.org>
Subject: Assault with a Deadly Weapon - 880-07-14
Deputy Chief Constable Janette McCormick
Cheshire Constabulary

I have attached the latest correspondence from Samantha Peters, General Optical Council (GOC) who has neglected to process a criminal complaint by reporting this case to law enforcement authorities for more than two months, contrary to GOC rules. She now wants to start another merry-go-round by suggesting judicial review. The content of her correspondence prevaricates and has no relation to facts. She has taken words and phrases out of context and used general denial.

Please take whatever action you deem necessary to expedite due process of law. As you will see from the responses, GOC are now prevaricating and using incitement. They allegedly have a political or financial axe to grind based upon the way they have behaved which has left elderly people in Hoole, Chester at similar risk to myself for more than two months. I have appended two files which explain the present situation and clarification can be obtained by viewing the web site and downloading PDFs. I will answer an interrogatory if you need more information.


I am now classified as disabled as a result of this assault. I can only work 2/3 hours before my eyesight fails to a degree that precludes me from using a computer and I must now wear spectacles all the time and dark glasses when outside. I am pumped up with medication and have repeated headaches and balance problems. Consequently, it was as much as I could do to produce the attached documents. They take about six times the normal effort. I have another appointment with the ophthalmologist and neurologist at the end of January to see whether I need surgery.

I am away from Chester at the moment, so please reply by email.

Paul Trummel

PhD (RPI ABD), PhD (UW ABD), MS (RPI), MSc (UK), BSc (UK), FISTD, FIOP

Professor Emeritus, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.

While the police are investigating a crime, they must give the Victim an update on the case at least once a month until it is closed. They must let the Victim know within five days if
someone is: arrested; charged; set free; released on bail; given a caution, reprimand, final warning or penalty notice. If they cannot investigate the crime within five days of the reporting, then they must inform the Victim why they dropped the investigation. They must also immediately inform victims of serious crime persistently targeted or who are considered vulnerable or intimidated.

Administration support staff within the Deputy Chief Constable’s Office sought advice from Detective Superintendent Armstrong, Professional Standards Department, regarding the appropriate course of action. He advised that there was no requirement to take any action.

Which "Administration support staff within the Deputy Chief Constable's Office" sought advice?

On what grounds did Detective Superintendent Armstrong decide that there was no requirement to take any action?

Why was the Victim not informed of the referral and decision in accordance with mandates?

In April 2015 you sent further correspondence to the Deputy Chief Constable's Office which was then forwarded directly to the Professional Standards Department. It was acknowledged that a review of the criminal allegations should take place and that the assault allegation should have been crimed.

Why was it not "crimed"?

Who was responsible for not recording the decision and informing the Victim?

Detective Superintendent Armstrong accepted that he had not been fully aware of the circumstances of the case when he advised the Deputy Chief Constable’s Office to take no further action. This would appear to have been a genuine oversight and this is the point upon which this allegation is upheld.

Why was he not fully aware when the case had been fully documented?

Why did he not contact the Victim for clarification if he was confused?

You were subsequently notified in email correspondence from Mr Dignam on 22 April 2015 of the fact that the assault allegation had been recorded and would be duly considered and that he had liaised with Chief Inspector Derek Lockie in order for an officer to be allocated to investigate the case. Inspector John Forshaw was subsequently tasked with progressing the matter. An apology was also made to you at this time.

Date: Wed, 22 Apr 2015 11:03:28 +0000
From: Miles Dignam <miles.dignam21560@cheshire.pnn.police.uk>
To: Paul Trummel <trummel@contracabal.org>
Subject: Correspondence to ACC McCormick

Dear Professor Trummel,
I have been forwarded your correspondence and reviewed this case. Unfortunately your initial email in November 14 was not acknowledged due to a misunderstanding and for that I apologise. Your allegations of criminality should be duly considered and as such I have liaised with Chief Inspector Derek Lockie from the Command Team, Western BCU which covers Chester. He will allocate an officer to review the issues you have raised and you will be contacted in due course.

Miles Dignam
Complaints Manager
Professional Standards Department
Cheshire Constabulary

The appropriate authority is responsible for appointment of a person to investigate a local, supervised or managed investigation. In the case of a supervised or managed investigation, the IPCC has the power to require any proposed appointment to be subject to its approval or, where a person has already been appointed, it may require another investigating officer to be selected.

[Police Reform Act 2002, Schedule 3, Paragraphs 16, 17 and 18]

Detective Superintendent Armstrong is now retired; however, this would have been suitable for words of advice to be given to him regarding the rules of crime recording.

How very convenient! Another instance of a fox going to ground at the first sound of barking.

I do not find any cases of misconduct against the officer subject of this complaint or other individual officers or members of police staff. I have however identified any area for personal learning and had Detective Superintendent Armstrong still been a member of the Constabulary he would have received words of advice in relation to crime recording.

This statement defines as wilful blindness, an indictable offence. “Wilful blindness” is a term used in criminal law to refer to the acts of a person who intentionally fails to be informed about matters that would make a person criminally liable. It describes an attempt to avoid civil or criminal liability for a wrongful act by intentionally putting oneself in a position to be unaware of facts which create liability.

Allegation Two: The complaint is Not Upheld on the basis there is no evidence to support the allegation. The allegation of assault was crimed under reference 0715127247 and an Investigating Officer, Inspector Forshaw appointed. Inspector Forshaw contacted you to arrange a personal meeting with you; however you did not wish to do so without a legal advisor being present and you also did not wish to converse over the telephone.

The Victim was not copied into the appointment of Forshaw who has since orchestrated an illegal merry-go-round to evade his responsibility to investigate based upon the evidence provided by the Victim. He has sent a series of one-liners insisting upon a meeting to which the Victim agreed conditional upon the presence of an instructed lawyer which Forshaw ignored. He has done nothing to process the evidence for four months and has not reported to the Victim on progress each month regarding progress as mandated.
Inspector[?] Forshaw tasked an officer to make enquiries with the opticians.

Which officer?

Where is the Victim’s copy of the report of those enquiries?

Whom did he/she interview?

They confirmed that you had allegedly suffered a reaction to a laser eye test and were satisfied there was nothing wrong with the machine or its operation.

After one year, Houghton Opticians have finally admitted “a reaction to a laser eye test” which is automatically a criminal offense when the test was performed by a person not registered with General Optical Council (GOC). Moreover, as they claim “there was nothing wrong with the machine or its operation”, then the operator must have acted maliciously which the Victim has repeatedly alleged.

In this case, the action by Nina Catherine Houghton (who is not a registered optometrist) was a malicious assault with a deadly weapon allegedly with murderous intent with all its IPCC, DSI and CPS legal ramifications whom the police should have arrested twelve months ago for questioning. Taking into consideration other attempts on the Victim’s life and malicious threats within two blocks of Houghton Opticians (already recorded and covered up by police), a distinct pattern or practice of malicious intent exists.

By police (without a warrant) enforcing unlawful entry of the property by Hall and Kennedy without adequate investigation of the circumstances surrounding the malicious filing of a criminal complaint by Hall (Incident Report #335/19 Nov 09), PCs McEwan and Steward arguably participated without giving a warning in the harassment of the Victim, an elderly person protected under the Human Rights Act 1998 and other laws in pari materia they put the Victim at further risk which evidently materialized at Houghton Opticians (19 Aug 14).

The matter was subsequently referred to the opticians governing body, the General Optical council (GOC) and they found nothing amiss.

Who are “they”?

On what date were they interviewed?

Names of interviewers and interviewees required and a written report of the interrogation at Houghton Opticians have again not been provided to the Victim as mandated.

They therefore refused your request for £8,000 compensation.

To what request do they refer?

The Victim has no knowledge of any claim for £8,000.00 compensation and now requests written substantiation of that alleged claim. The costs over the past five years relating to issues in pari materia and annexed complaints amount to more than £500,000.00.
The current issues cannot be legally processed by altering the continuum without addressing previous complaints relating to the same issues. That which was recorded first must be processed first although all issues now form part of the same continuum.

You were further asked to meet with Inspector Forshaw to enable the full facts to be established and a witness statement to be taken if necessary. You did not respond to this correspondence but instead sought to question the credibility of the officer and his suitability to investigate the case.

The Victim repeatedly responded to Forshaw’s fatuous behaviour and fully cooperated with him by providing detailed witness statements. He has neither investigated nor responded; instead, he maliciously denied process for four months.

Every effort has been made to engage with you and without your full cooperation it is not possible to progress the allegation of assault any further.

On what grounds? This is an arbitrary judgment which has no place in a legal procedure. It must be verified and substantiated and legal precedents must be cited.

I do not find any cases of misconduct against the officer subject of this complaint or other individual officers or members of police staff. I have not identified any areas for personal or organisational learning stemming from this allegation.

Again, this is an arbitrary judgment and a reasoned argument needs to be submitted to the Victim with relevant citations that refer to legal precedents.

Allegation Three: The complaint is Not Upheld on the basis there is no evidence to support the allegation.

A false and misleading statement and a deliberate attempt to "bury" the investigation and fatuous arguments by Fletcher.

In 2011 you entered into a dispute, initially with the National Grid, following an inspection of the premises you were renting from Chester Housing Trust.

False and misleading.

The engineer had to disconnect an internal pipe as “immediately dangerous”.

False and misleading.

The gas was capped maliciously by a rogue National Grid employee (Ian Doyle) in a criminal consort with Banwell the Trust copper’s nark. GSR negligence by not following registration and qualification procedures for operatives left a loophole that allowed Sarah Banwell, Housing Officer (Anti-social Behaviour), Chester & District Housing Trust (CDHT) also rogue engineers Hamish Laird (CDHT) and Ian Doyle, National Grid Gas (NGG) to act in an illegal freelance capacity by not presenting searchable licences or personal ID when challenged.

Banwell, Laird and Doyle tried to fabricate an Antisocial Behaviour Order against the Victim who holds a lifetime lease that can only be challenged by an ASBO. They have since
hacked the web site to the tune of thousands of pounds to remove all reports of their illegal acts.

They used out-of-date CORGI registration cards to gain entry to premises then tried to use them to enter the Victim's flat in an intimidatory scam organized by Paul Knight, Assistant Director CDHT now with Avenue Services (NW) Ltd which Geoffrey Podger, Chief Executive and Judith E Hackitt, Board Chair, HSE also Andrew Hutchinson, Long Cycle Work Closure Manager, NGG have since unlawfully condoned with the help of Brunt, Stewart and Sands (HSE). This left the Victim without heat or hot water for more than four years during which time Sanctuary Housing fraudulently received about £25,000.00 to rent a polluted slum.

This brought further prolonged dispute with the housing trust over what appeared to be ownership of the repairs and whose responsibility this was.

False and misleading statement. The building (12 flats) is in violation of HSE building and carbon monoxide emission standards which had nothing to do with the gas supply.

Clearly there was a difference of opinion. The Trust held a panel meeting in 2012 to try and resolve the matter with you but you failed to attend. In your absence they found that they had complied with their responsibilities as a landlord.

There was no panel hearing; instead, the Trust held a kangaroo court which the Victim declined to attend to avoid becoming an accessory after the fact to criminal activity or, as is the case with this decision, an attempt to involve the Victim in abuse of process.

The matter still appears not to have been concluded to your satisfaction and you have sort to engage with numerous persons and organisations to this end. This has resulted in you naming 14 individuals from different sectors and accusing them of harassment and corruption. You also name a further 13 persons as accessories, including Stephen Mosley MP, a councillor and Health and Safety Executives.

That is correct, all substantiated by verified and validated evidence. The number of people involved and the enormity of the action have occurred by both bureaucrats and police evading their responsibility to act on complaints. When the "Cheshire ebola" is ignored the disease rapidly spreads.

You also seek to make allegations against the Information Commissioner's Office and refer to cover ups and the disappearance of cases. You also mention meeting with the FBI in June 15 to discuss these issues and internet hacking.

That is correct all substantiated by verified and validated evidence which forms part of the evidence in the annexed complaints.

There is nothing in any correspondence from you that supports any case of harassment or any misconduct by any person or public body. In any event you have been offered the opportunity to sit down with Inspector Forshaw and discuss them in more detail and have chosen not to do so.
That is because Fletcher has evidently not read the briefs and the referenced documents. This is an outrageous statement to which I will not respond at this stage except to say that it would form a good plot for an Oscar Wilde play. Perhaps, Fletcher and Forshaw would like to play themselves in the movie.

The Force crime registrar has reviewed a précis of the information from you and has said there is no requirement to record any crimes at this time. Clearly should you wish to meet with Inspector Forshaw then this could be re-evaluated.

What is the name of the "Force Crime Registrar"?

Where are the Victim’s copies of those reports which contain a précis of the information referenced "The Force crime registrar has reviewed a précis of the information"?

Every effort has been made to engage with you and without your full cooperation it is not possible to progress the allegation of Misconduct in a Public Office any further.

Of course not, Fletcher must refer it to IPCC and/or CPS which McCormick and Bailey should have done in the first place instead of orchestrating this disingenuous merry-go-round.

I do not find any cases of misconduct against the officer subject of this aspect of the complaint or other individual officers or members of police staff. I have not identified any areas for personal or organisational learning stemming from this allegation. There is no evidence the officer's performance has been unsatisfactory.

Of course not, Fletcher is one of a gang of corrupt plods that should be either committed or jailed!

Allegation Four: The complaint is Not Upheld on the basis there is no evidence to support the allegation.

Only hundreds of pages of documented evidence which the police used wilful blindness to ignore.

Your complaint allegation would appear to stem from an issue in 2010 which is recorded under Professional Standards Department reference number MI/279/10. You alleged you had asked numerous Western Area Officers for documentation pertaining to harassment that you perceived you were experiencing from your landlord and that officers had failed to provide the reports to you as requested.

In law, appearances are deceptive and form no part of evidence. I never use the term "numerous" which shows this statement to be false.

Detective Inspector Adderley was allocated to deal with this matter and she facilitated the information you required and agreed to waive the normal fee for such a disclosure.

Nonsense, she heard the sound of barking and like all vixens went to ground.

This appeared to satisfactorily conclude the matter with you and no further correspondence was received from you.
There can be no conclusion before Chester Constabulary refers the case and its annexes to IPCC and/or CPS.

It is not clear exactly what report you are referring to or expecting for matters relating to some five years ago and why you have not raised this matter previously. This is again something that you could discuss with Inspector [?] Forshaw.

These matters have been raised repeatedly and have reached these proportions because the police either neglected to act or alternatively illegally fudged the evidence.

Appropriate incident assessment and recording are a key part of an effective contact management process helping to identify repeat victims, vulnerable individuals and communities along with recurring environmental issues. NSIR will provide incident data to feed the NIM tasking process and facilitate effective deployment of resources. The opening of a record should not be delayed pending further enquiries.

1.4 When to record an incident report

For the purposes of NSIR an incident is defined as: “A single distinct event or occurrence which disturbs an individual’s, group’s or community’s quality of life or causes them concern” Incidents range from transport incidents such as RTCs through ASB to matters of public safety and welfare. Incident management is part of the process of restoring situations to normality with minimal adverse impact on the community. Incident management also involves:

• Initial support followed by investigation,
• Analysis and diagnosis,
• Resolution and recovery with, ultimately, incident log closure.

A key aspect of incident management is ownership of the incident: monitoring and tracking the progress of the resolution of the incident and keeping those who are affected by the incident up-to-date with the status of the investigation. NSIR supports this process by encouraging effective risk assessment and appropriate deployment of police or other resources as well as ensuring accurate recording and classification. A report of an NICL incident to the police will usually be recorded regardless of whether a deployment is or is not required. This does not mean that every call for service from the public will result in the opening of a record as this would result in needless bureaucracy. For example, if a call for service is received about a matter that is the sole preserve of another agency then the call and/or information should be passed to the lead agency which would be responsible for recording the full details appropriately.

Some forces may choose to have or already use information technology that records all contacts in one way or another. However, for NSIR the emphasis is on “incident” recording, something specific has happened, is happening or may happen, causing someone to contact the police. It should be used in conjunction with the ACPO National Contact Grades (2010). Historically NSIR has focused primarily on reports received via the telephone in control rooms and call-centres where the details are recorded at first contact.
Incident reports received via other channels, internet, front counters, face to face, etc should still be recorded in line with NSIR principles and guidance. This does not mean that every call or contact will result in the creation of a lengthy incident record.

1.5 Single Incident Rule

Incidents comprising a series of events involving the same individuals whether victims or perpetrators should be counted as one incident. If there is another incident involving the same people or behaviour this should be linked to the original report. Details of other victims and witnesses should be recorded on the log. If other incident logs are opened then they should be closed as "duplicate" ensuring that any details of interest are recorded on or referenced in the main log."

In this case, there are five incidents that come under the Single Incident Rule with details that can be accessed from the following URLs (from which PDFs can be downloaded that explain them in more detail). If you need more supporting documents, then please describe them with particularity. All linked published material is verified and validated.

1. Misconduct in public office by Deputy Chief Constable McCormick. DSI Complaint (also Samantha Peters (GOC) and Mandie Lavin (formerly GOC), jointly and severally).

2. Metropolitan Police (Harrow) resulted in the subsequent arrest of the assailant Eileen Kenny on the decision of CPS. The case was “disappeared” allegedly by her brother-in-law, a Harrow Police officer, Robert B Muldoon, 8 Argyle Road, Harrow, London HA2 7AJ. Victim was verbally and physically assaulted and abused including receipt of a demeaning birthday card sent with malicious intent that compared an elderly person (76 years of age) with a computer that had lost its memory. That defined as derogation: communication that belittled him by virtue of his age and had no bearing on his intellectual abilities. It partially took away the effectiveness of laws or rules governing agism. The number and frequency of harassing acts revealed an organized campaign or pattern or practice eligible for investigation under current statutes. Wrongful use of language evades a responsibility to investigate both current and previous circumstances exhaustively and without bias. A pattern or practice defines as, and manifests in, two or more organized acts or instances which indicate ensuant activity. To establish a pattern, laws generally require at least two acts within a ten year period which indicate ensuant activity and a distinctive pattern.

3. Cheshire police “disappeared” an assault in Hoole, Chester by Ann Edwina Hall following forced entry without a warrant and restraint in a bedroom in a residence for two hours. Fletcher has fabricated police evidence to “bury” this case.


4. A threat of Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH) by Christopher Graham Wheal (NUJ Official). Metropolitan Police (Lewisham) referred back by IPCC to Lewisham Professional Standards Department which "buried" the case: another instance of IPCC referring back an investigation to the perpetrators who naturally found themselves not guilty.


5. Repeated harassment of Victim and his elderly neighbours after dark by forced entry into residential premises by PC Gareth Lawrence (Cheshire Police) using false statements of non-compliance with ICO regulations filed by Christopher S Graham, Information Commissioner without substantiation of the complaint or documentation repeatedly requested. Lawrence was referred to Victim’s solicitors but evidently decided to “bury” the case after four night time visits in the Victim’s absence when Lawrence entered without a warrant and harassed elderly neighbours. ICO hacked the web sites before the recent general election to hide the public inquiry filed with Ministry of Justice

http://contracabal.com/880-46.testfile.html - Hacked

Every effort has been made to engage with you and without your full cooperation it is not possible to progress this allegation of complaint any further.

Of course not, Bailey has created a catch-22: a situation in which an action has consequences which make it impossible to pursue that action.

+I do not find any cases of misconduct against the officer subject of this aspect of the complaint or other individual officers or members of police staff. I have not identified any areas for personal or organisational learning stemming from this allegation. There is no evidence the officer’s performance has been unsatisfactory.

You have neither the rank nor the experience to find McCormick “not guilty” of misconduct in public office. The case must be referred to IPCC and/or CPS for investigation by another BCU.

There has been no requirement to refer this matter to the Crown Prosecution Service.

A false and misleading statement.

You do have a right of appeal to the Head of Professional Standards Department who has delegated authority from the Chief Officer against the outcome of your complaint and its resolution. I enclose an appeal form which explains the grounds on which an appeal can be made. You have 28 days from the day after the date of this letter to make any appeal. This appeal period can only be extended in exceptional circumstances.

I have already appealed by completing the form and sending this refutation. Bailey cannot investigate himself and make a judgment on his own behaviour that is why in a democracy we have laws and courts. However, after reading your corrupt diatribe, I doubt that Cheshire can claim itself as a democracy. It is more like the Stasi (Ministerium für Staatsicherheit), the secret police agency of the German “Democratic” Republic.
I am grateful to you for bringing this matter to my attention and it is regrettable you have felt the need to make this complaint. This matter has been recorded and finalized under the provisions of the Police Reform Act 2002.

Victim needs a copy of that finalization without further delay and evidence of mitigation of abuse of process by elevation to CPS and/or IPCC.

Nicholas (aka Nick) Bailey, Detective Superintendent, Head of Professional Standards

The following "appeal" disingenuously manufactured by Bailey was not the result of any appeal by the Victim. It purely serves as a quick and dirty means for Bailey to dismiss the case by authoring a false and misleading general denial to cover up his own dereliction.

The Victim asked for clarification and substantiation of the Fletcher decision. He did not file an appeal because without clarification there was nothing to appeal. One cannot appeal arbitrary, undocumented codswallop.

Fletcher did not deny any of the charges or cite the specific legislation under which he made his arbitrary statements. Moreover, he did not provide monthly reports to the Victim or report what he was intending to do with CPS or IPCC as required by law.

The following "decision" was knowingly sent to an unoccupied flat without sending an email copy, as requested for all correspondence. By that, Bailey delayed process for another month. Bailey and Dignam have tacitly admitted to the misconduct in public office complaint against Fletcher and Forshaw (30 August 2015) by not processing the rebuttal in accordance with law.

They have neither responded to a single comment in the Victim’s rebuttal nor clarified the content. Instead, they have manufactured the following document which contains an inadmissable general denial that does not require rebuttal due to deliberate machination in its construction. It construes as another attempt to deny due process of law using a single arbitrary statement by a person who has shown that he considers himself omnipotent.

Undefined Complaint Against Police

+An arbitrary "decision" which neither calls for a response nor a rebuttal as Bailey does not support any of his contentions with law and/or legal precedents.

Our ref HQ C0/00263/15
Date: 04 December 2015
Prof Paul Trummel

Appeal against the outcome of complaint investigation

Further to my correspondence, I am now able to advise you of your appeal against the outcome of the investigation into your complaint.

My role in the appeal process is not to re-investigate your complaint, but to review the investigation and the findings. After considering all the information available I have now made a decision about the appeal. I have not upheld your appeal.
The reasons for this decision are set out in the attached assessment report.

There is no further right of appeal against this assessment and determination.

Detective Superintendent
Head of Professional Standards Department
Professional Standards Department
Cheshire Constabulary Headquarters
Winsford, Cheshire, CW7 2UA
Tel: (01606) 362055. Fax: (01606) 362052

Restricted - Appeal against outcome of Local Investigation

Details of Appeal
Date of complaint: 02 July 2014
Date complaint finalised: 12 August 2015
Date decision sent to complainant: 12 August 2015
Date appeal received: 17 August 2015

Background to the Complaint

On November 14 you contacted the Deputy Chief Constable’s Office regarding an allegation of assault. You alleged an optician damaged your eye during laser treatment you were receiving. No response was initially given and subsequently you complained that the Police had failed to act on your allegation.

In your complaint you also cited other criminal allegations against the Information Commissioners Office and other individuals with whom you have come into conflict with.

The following allegations were recorded:

1. You complained that no action was taken by the Deputy Chief Constable in relation to your report of an assault.

2. You complained the Police had not thoroughly investigated your allegation of criminal assault.

3. You complained the Police have been negligent in failing to act against numerous public bodies for misconduct in a public office and harassment.

4. You say the Police failed to provide you with a report from Inspector Adderley.

Complaint manager Mr Dignam was allocated the matter to investigate.

Having investigated your complaints, on 12 August 2015 Detective Inspector Fletcher sent you a letter detailing the outcome of the investigation

In summary, allegation 1 was upheld, the others were not. I do not intend to replicate the contents of that letter or the content of Mr Dignam’s report.

Cheshire Police advised you that no further action was required.

On 17 August 2015, you submitted an appeal.
In fact, Victim never submitted an appeal against Fletcher’s decision; instead, Victim requested clarification. Bailey then fabricated the following general denial and found himself not guilty of the misconduct in public office that he committed which compounded the complaints against him. Then, PEEL published a general opinion that effectively claimed that the sun shines out of his ass. Ironically, IPCC has referred the latest complaint back to Bailey for another decision in this corrupt merry-go-round in which, as ringmaster, he completely lost control of his clowns.

This fiasco proves Victim correct when 35 years ago he qualified for the Bar in two US states and declined to accept on grounds that he had no wish to demean himself. Victim refuses to respond to the following unmitigated fabrication which classifies as a fraudulent means for Bailey to ignore legitimate complaints. The PSD in a truly independent BCU awaits him and will hopefully insure that Bailey eventually sings soprano. [PEELscam]

**The Appeal (ground given for the appeal)**

Your appeal is against the outcome of the local investigation of your complaint. The relevant appeal body for your complaint is with the police force and not the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC).

My role in the appeal process is not to re-investigate your complaint, but to review the investigation and its findings in accordance with the provisions governing appeals set out in the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012.

In your appeal correspondence you say you do not feel you were given enough information about the investigation into your complaint or the action the Appropriate Authority plan to take following the investigation. You also disagree with the decision the Appropriate Authority has made with regard to referring your complaint to the Crown Prosecution Service. You disagree with the decision the Appropriate Authority, has made about whether an officer you complained about has a case to answer or if there has been any unsatisfactory performance; you disagree with the proposed action resulting from the appropriate authority investigation into your complaint and you disagree with the findings of the appropriate authority’s investigation into your complaint.

**Appeal Assessment**

1. Are the findings of the police investigation appropriate/proportionate to the complaint?

Yes.

The level of investigation should be proportionate both to the seriousness of the allegation being investigated and the prospect of any criminal or disciplinary outcome. The purpose of this appeal assessment is not to re-investigate the complaint itself, but to review the investigation into the complaint to ensure that it was sufficiently thorough, proportionate and that it adequately addressed the issues raised in the complaint.

The allegations you raised were subject to an initial assessment where it was quite properly assessed the investigation could be locally handled and an investigation was duly conducted. The assessment was appropriate to the level of seriousness of the complaint made.
Your complaint was recorded and allocated to Mr Dignam who understood the issues you raised
in your complaint. During the investigation Mr Dignam reviewed the information you provided and
the actions taken by Cheshire Constabulary. He sought advice regarding crime recording from the
Force registrar and reviewed the crime occurrence regarding your assault allegation in order to
draw conclusions.

In the course of my review I have read Mr Dignam’s report and the subsequent outcome letter
sent to you by Detective Inspector Fletcher. I have also taken into account all the material and
documents considered by Mr Dignam.

In your appeal you say you disagree with the findings of the investigation, but give no basis for
this. I can therefore only determine the appeal based on the information I have seen.

Having reviewed that material, I am satisfied that Mr Dignam has undertaken a suitably thorough
and proportionate investigation. I am also satisfied with his conclusions which were explained to
you in a letter dated 12 August 20.15.

The Appeal point is not upheld.

2. Has adequate information been provided to the complainant following the investigation of their
complaint?

Yes.

In assessing your appeal, I have considered whether adequate information was provided to you
during and following the investigation into your complaint. I am satisfied you received sufficient
information about Mr Dignam’s investigation and consider that the explanation provided to you
by Detective Inspector Fletcher was sufficiently clear. You were also provided with a copy of Mr
Dignam’s investigation report.

In appeal you say Cheshire Constabulary has for 10 months evaded its responsibility to
investigate a DSI complaint in accordance with the IPCC statutory guidance.

A DSI matter arises where there has been no complaint or recordable conduct matter but the
circumstances are such that a person has died or sustained serious injury and the police are
involved in one or more of the ways defined in the Police Reform Act.

The statutory provisions are as follows: (a) at or before the time of death or serious injury the
person had contact (of whatever kind, and whether direct or indirect) with a person serving with
the police who was acting in the execution of his duties; and (b) there is an indication that the
contact may have caused (whether directly or indirectly) or contributed to the death or serious
injury.

The circumstances of your complaint do not fall within the criteria of a DSI and therefore it does
not need to be investigated in accordance with the IPCC statutory guidance relating to OSI
matters.

The appeal point is not upheld.
3. Is the decision that the police have made about whether an officer has a case to answer for misconduct, gross misconduct or unsatisfactory performance appropriate?

Yes.

In appeal you say you can neither agree nor disagree without a description of the incident with particularity and the names of the officers to whom the question refers. What decision? What unsatisfactory performance?

Allegation 1 was directed at the Deputy Chief Constable and you are aware Inspector Forshaw was the person responsible for investigating the alleged assault. I am therefore satisfied you (k)now which officers your complaint relates to.

Unsatisfactory performance is defined as the inability of the police officer to perform their duties adequately at any given rank. The inability to perform their duty is dealt with formally under the Unsatisfactory Performance Process (UPC). Prior to embarking on that formal process the officer who is deemed to be under performing must be subject of management action. This is designed to seek an improvement in performance without the need for a formal process.

Having reviewed the material, the appropriate authority has quite properly established that there was no case to answer for any misconduct or gross misconduct on the part of any Constabulary members of staff. The Appropriate Authority has also correctly established there is no evidence of any unsatisfactory performance requiring a formal UPC.

That said, Allegation 1 was upheld. I am satisfied the issues arising from that allegation would have been suitable to be dealt with by management action had the officer concerned still been employed by Cheshire Constabulary.

The appeal point is not upheld.

4. Are the Force's proposed actions following the investigation adequate?

Yes.

In appeal you say you disagree, but provide no basis for me to consider.

In assessing this appeal I am satisfied the force’s proposed actions were adequate. Allegation one was upheld whereas allegations two, three and four were appropriately not upheld on the basis of the available evidence.

You state in your appeal that you disagree with the decision; however, I have not identified anything within your appeal that persuades me otherwise.

The appeal point is not upheld.

5. Has the investigation been referred to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). If not, is this decision appropriate?

There has been no requirement to refer the matter to the Crown Prosecution Service as Mr Dignam’s investigation has not identified the commission of any criminal offences by the officer subject of your complaint. The same is true of my assessment of your appeal.
You make reference to a number of criminal cases, which have no bearing on your complaint or appeal and have no bearing on whether this complaint is forwarded to the CPS.

The appeal point is not upheld.

6. Are there any additional points raised by the complainant not subject of the appeal assessment?

No additional points have been raised in appeal.

The appeal point is not upheld.

**Summary Appeal Assessment**

I am grateful to you for bringing this matter to my attention, and I would like to assure you that the Constabulary takes every opportunity to reflect and learn from any expressions of dissatisfaction with service or complaint about the conduct of officers or members of staff.

In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to offer an apology to you for the length of time it has taken to assess and determine this appeal. This is due to priority of workload. I should point out that the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 do not allow any further avenue of appeal against my findings.

On the basis of this assessment I have decided not to uphold the appeal.

Name: Detective Superintendent Bailey. Date: 03 December 2015

**Actions Required**

No further work is required.

---

*Miles Dignam, Complaint Manager*

*Professional Standards Department, Cheshire Constabulary*

08 March 2016

Our ref HQ M 1/00098/16

Your ref 880-07-18

Professor Paul Trummel

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 opticians 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

---

**The Big Lie Principle - Dignam et alia**

An uneducated, double-dipping lout who has never worked in the private sector and, consequently, does not understand legal and human rights.
As an international journalist, Victim does not normally publish content like the Dignam "deadlock letter" while preliminary discussions about investigations are in progress. However, machinations by three Cheshire police officers, Bailey/Dignam/Fletcher, Professional Standards Department classify as outrageous, when one considers the legal aspects of them and damage to the public whom they are meant to serve. Victim felt a duty of care to the public to let them know the seriousness of the charges and the fraud involved by Dignam in his 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 continuum and scheme from that of a serious criminal charge that should have been referred by them to either IPCC and/or CPS 18 months before 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 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 evidence nor provides evidence. He has completely ignored the DSI complaint upon which the whole case predicates then uses the force solicitor and officers to create a catch-22.

Dignam has neither addressed or rebutted any of the issues thoroughly explained and published nor recorded the various issues raised or answered the rebuttals of the false and misleading information distributed by Fletcher and Bailey et alia. By that, Dignam is 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 Victim 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. Cheshire Police and quangos have been harassing Victim for several years by playing the death game and harassing his elderly neighbours at night using the "you will be dead before we get to court scenario".
Victim, first published in 1944, without any challenge to his validity, 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 20 miles away.

Dignam has altered the continuum of the complaint by falsely stating that Victim had appealed against a complaint not being recorded. 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 has caused to elderly people in general and Victim in particular.

The bullying tactics can be determined from the language in the Dignam letter. He is now manipulating the police solicitor (with whom Victim has had contact since July 2016) to prevent obtaining copies of Part 31 disclosure documents. All Victim’s local medical surgeries and hospitals are withholding medical records, part of 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 permanent part disablement which is fully documented by medical records (obtained abroad). When Cheshire refused Victim NHS services and a second opinion on the DSI injury, Victim used his international insurance to fly 4,000 miles for emergency treatment, evidence police have tried to hide.

This *nota bene* 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 Thomas, 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 issues should have been reported to IPCC and/or CPS two years ago; however, Dignam buried them and to reduce the severity of the IPCC complaint and bully the Victim into submission.

Paul Trummel, Professor Emeritus.

*Breaking News that says it all!*

**Parking Ticket Mess for Cheshire Police**

*Cheshire Today - Friday, March 11, 2016*

Parking tickets issued by PCSOs in Cheshire may not be valid it emerged this week.

John Dwyer, Cheshire’s Police & Crime Commissioner, has responded to the Constabulary’s statement on the employment conditions of some of Cheshire’s Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and their power to issue non-endorsable parking tickets.
"I'm very disappointed that this mistake has been made.

"Having learned of this issue, and being mindful that other forces have had issues with some employment contracts, the Chief Constable has reviewed all of the contracts of our PCSOs and ceased issuing tickets while this review was undertaken.

"I have now been fully briefed on the results of the review. It is clear that previous chief constables wished PCSOs to have the power, but that an administrative error meant that this wasn't implemented. This pre-dates both myself and the current Chief Constable.

"While I remain unhappy that this issue has arisen, the Constabulary has acted to ensure all PCSO employment contracts now contain the necessary powers.

"PCSOs, who do fantastic work in our communities, were acting in good faith and were properly trained. This was an organisational issue for the Constabulary which I am confident they have resolved."

The information contained in this case study has been submitted as part of an impending request in an open letter with supporting documentation to Theresa May MP, UK Home Secretary for parliamentary consideration and investigation of the corruption extant in Cheshire Constabulary 2010 through 2015 which contradicts the findings in:

PEEL: Police Effectiveness 2015: an inspection of Cheshire Constabulary. [PEELscam]

References specific to Assault with a Deadly Weapon

[General Optical Council - The Quango Quacks]

[The Hypocritical Oaf - Alleged Malpractice]

[Corruption and the Racist Mafia]

[EAD Solicitors LLP, Liverpool and Citizens Advice Bureau]

[Cheshire Police Corruption - Collusion with Information Commissioner's Office]

[Impending Professional Services Authority (PSA) Complaint]

[Independent Police Complaints Commission - Murderous Machiavellians]

[Justice Delayed: Justice Denied]

[Ministry of Justice - Petition for Public Inquiry]

[College of Policing - Code of Ethics]