IPCC
90 High Holborn
London
WC1V 6BH

Michael Jones
[Address]

DPS ref: QU/01325/11 (08/09/2011) **11 October 2011**

Dear Sir or Madam,

Appeal against an outcome of complaint against the police:

I am unsatisfied with the DPS treatment of the above complaint. The officer dealing with the complaint has made a very glib précis of some of the items contained in my complaint, while omitting most of the important details. The synopsis he gives also contains serious errors. It seems he has referred principally to the incident log which it is claimed was made at the time of the two officers' [622LX, 829LX] visit to my flat in December 2010, and then redacted the contents of my complaint in order to make the incident log appear representative.

Referring to p.5§2 of my complaint (enclosed), the first major omission is that, although he refers to an incident log, this log has only materialised subsequent to my registering the complaint. Prior to my registering the complaint, I was told on at least *four* separate occasions (two at Kennington police station, and two at Brixton), that no such log existed, and that there was no reference on the police computer to the police officers' visit to my flat on 12/12/2010, or to my subsequent visit to Kennington police station several days afterwards. It was even suggested to me at Brixton police station that it was possible that the items were 'restricted' (for whatever reason), and not available to routine police access. So, either the log *was* restricted (if so, why?), or it appears to have been produced *retrospectively,* i.e., in response to my registering this complaint.

To try to deal with the inadequacies of the officer's response point-by-point, his letter states, in paragraph 2:

You state that the police refused to take a statement from you in relation to this matter despite initially stating that they would.

What I actually said (p.4§3 of my complaint) was that the officers refused to take a statement, giving no explanation, and one of them even lied claiming that he had

never discussed taking a statement in the first place; at which point I informed him that I wished to make a formal complaint, this appearing to me as a distinct perversion of conduct. My purpose in requesting to give a statement, after having first declined the offer, was that I realised that in our initial discussion on 12/12/2010 I had not made it clear enough to the police officers the precise sequence of events involving my communications with my mother and my sister, and the particular character of those communications, the awareness of which would have added essential evidential weight to my allegation that they had conspired to send two men to murder me.

The allegation you made to the officers initially stated that in 1967 you had been the victim of a medical conspiracy involving a fraudulent tonsillectomy whereby you had something implanted into your head. You stated that your mother benefited financially from this.

Here (§3) the officer's response does not give adequate attention to the central importance of the details of my medical and family case-history to the events in question, nor to the amount of documentary evidence previously published and quoted (linked on p.1 of my complaint). Neither does he represent the relevance of previous police attention paid to these items (in 2003-4), or to the question of the possible continuity of an investigation (see p.1§3 of my complaint). The events which occurred in December 2010, and which I allege constitute a conspiracy to murder, can only be fully appreciated in the context of the fullness of this evidence - it is glib and unrepresentative to bracket-out this material in this fashion. It has been the default behaviour of the police to treat each of my allegations since December 2010 in isolation from this expository process, so that these allegations inevitably appear facetious, or 'delusional'.

You state that you had an MRI scan in 2008 and that a doctor stated that nothing anomalous was revealed in the scan. You then describe how subsequently you have had an acrimonious relationship with you mother and sister. You then describe how someone rang the external and internal doorbell to your flat and draw a conclusion that the people attending your flat did so to murder you.

The reference to my MRI scan relates to p.2§2 of my complaint. The issue here is that of the reliability of the consulting neurologist's failure to report anything anomalous to be revealed in the scan. The officer's response does not address the implication in my complaint that the neurologist was reticent about anomalies in the scan. The explanation for this reticence is that the anomalies clearly revealed in the scan (http://somr.info/report) are *incommunicable* within the terms of conventional neurological diagnosis, originating as they do from a clandestine medical experiment.

In consideration of the extent of responsibility for this undertaking, the neurologist would have only exposed *herself* to the same vulnerability and threats to her life that I have experienced by disclosing such information.

In the second sentence of the paragraph quoted above he refers to how I 'subsequently' developed an acrimonious relationship with my mother and sister, but this inference is erroneous – there is no implication in my complaint of any sequential connection between these items. This results from his undue contraction of too many important details within the same paragraph, details which deserve to be dealt with separately, and which essentially elides the substance of my complaint. Without respecting the nuances of the sequence of events involving communications with my mother and sister immediately preceding the *two* visits to my flat by two complete strangers (described in p.2§4 – p.3§2 of my complaint), my allegation that they were sent to murder me inevitably appears ridiculous.

You then go on to say that various food products you purchased were poisoned in particular you state that you believe that a bottle of water you purchased contains Polonium –210.

This paragraph relates to p.4§4 of my complaint. It seems that the officer here is implying (although he doesn't explicitly say so) that he assumes these claims are also ridiculous, or 'fantastical', in line with his previous assumptions. Again, in view of the substantiality of the evidence, and the persistence of my allegations over time, one might at least expect a measure of 'suspension of disbelief' from the police, if only to attend to any potential evidence with the concern it deserves. Instead the police have consistently opted for the facile explanation that my allegations are the result of delusional thinking, in spite of the fact that I have never been diagnosed with any mental illness in the UK which might support such a conclusion. My complaint mentions the fact (p.4§1) that during the police visit to my flat on 12/12/2010 I had referred the police to contact the START Team for confirmation of the fact that I was not suffering, or prone to suffer, from any delusional symptoms. It also mentions (p.4§3) that upon my visit to the police station several days later I had produced a letter from my social worker at the START Team to confirm this opinion. In the absence of any mental-illness which might justify the police's ignorance of the material evidence that I have reported, the police's refusal to take seriously my reports of attempted poisoning, and at least to attempt to analyse the extant evidence, amounts to nothing less than complicity in a conspiracy to murder by default.

You subsequently state that you believe that your flat is being broken into and on one occasion you state that an unopened bottle of vitamin pills has been replaced with an identical product, which contained poison. You state that you have tried to report these occurrences to police but that the police have "stonewalled" you by not reporting these matters.

This relates to p.4§5 of my complaint. I stated there that after having vacated my flat for six weeks because of the evident threats to my life if I remained there, I returned to find the locks had been tampered with, and my flat had been entered. To my knowledge this has only happened *once*, and which I attempted to report to the police as soon as I discovered it. The officer's assertion that "you believe your flat *is being broken into and on one occasion*.." indicates *repeated* break-ins and is a clear misunderstanding of the facts, and of any report I have made of them. It is clear that the officer has caricatured my complaint in line with his general assumption that my claims are delusional. Had the police duly recorded my complaint of illegal-entry when I reported it in February 2011, and made a proper investigation, the officer would not have been led into this confusion. As I have stated in p.5§2, there was no report logged on the police computer about this incident, or the previous incident in December 2010, when I enquired *four times* at Brixton and Kennington police stations, in August this year, i.e., before this complaint was registered. Neither did the police make any kind of response or investigation of the incident of the illegal entry to my flat. My allegation that I have been stonewalled by the police in respect of these complaints is therefore entirely accurate and justified.

The officer concludes the outcome of my complaint that, in accordance with national crime reporting standards, no crime had been recorded because 'on the balance of probabilities' there was no evidence that any crime had been committed. Firstly, my complaint concerned the fact, not only that no crime had been recorded, but that no incident log (for *either* of the reported incidents) was available at the time of my several enquiries during August this year – the incident log (for the first incident only) transpired only following my submission of a complaint. There remains no incident log relating to the second reported incident. Secondly, what is meant by 'the balance of probabilities' here is rather 'the balance of assumptions', and the overriding assumption employed by the police is that my allegations are the result of delusional thinking, i.e., in spite of any evidence provided to the contrary. The police have chosen this assumption wilfully therefore, in deliberate ignorance and refusal of all other evidence. The outcome of my complaint only reinforces this assumption.

The evidence in the form of my medical and family case-history (*Special Operations in Medical Research*) has existed since 2003, when it was submitted to the Metropolitan and Staffordshire police forces. At that time, and in the absence of *prima facie* evidence, it was sufficient to provoke Scotland Yard to begin an investigation, albeit perhaps reluctantly. The extent of responsibility, implicating diverse state and corporate institutions, would explain such reluctance in the absence of *prima facie* evidence. *Prima facie* evidence in the form of my MRI scan has existed since 2008, and is now available on the Internet. The evidence is clear and distinct, even to an untrained eye. The absence so far (to my knowledge at least) of any corroboration of this evidence from the medical profession, I assert is only due to reticence – the medical profession as a whole, including the NHS, cannot reasonably be considered an independent party in this matter, and it is a perversion of justice for the police to depend upon its corroboration before pursuing further action and investigation.

Since December 2010 I have experienced repeated threats to my life as a consequence of my efforts to expose a medical conspiracy. In addition to the incidents already mentioned, I have experienced routine attempts to poison me (of which there are several items of material evidence in my possession) from various sources, such that I am unable to use my flat, and must maintain constant secrecy regarding my whereabouts. The police have refused to take these allegations seriously, and have intentionally ignored evidence. The resolution of my complaint offers me no redress against the police's continuing failure to protect my life and my liberty.

Yours sincerely,

Michael S. Jones