IPCC
PO BOX 473
Sale
M33 0BW

Michael Jones
[Address]

17 December 2012

Dear Sir or Madam,

Complaint against Metropolitan Police officers 622LX, 829LX (Brixton):

This complaint relates to a previous complaint made on 08/09/2011, with DPS reference: QU/01325/11, over which no action was taken. This complaint is a new complaint relating to events on 12/12/2010 and 28/12/2010 – the first of which dates is referred to in the previous complaint. The reason for making a new complaint is that further indication of the police officers' failure to appropriately address evidence supporting allegations I made to them in December 2010, has arisen since I made a Subject Access Request to the MPS Public Access Office, for data recorded at that time. The reason for the lateness of this second complaint is the delay in receiving information from the Public Access Office, who didn't eventually comply with my Subject Access Request until 22/11/2012. However, the Public Access Office has not completely fulfilled my request, as certain items of evidence (which I had submitted to the officers on 28/12/2010) and which I requested copies of, have not been forthcoming. The indication is therefore that these items may be lost or mislaid, due to the fact that inadequate attention was paid to them at the time they were submitted. This, along with the lateness of the Public Access Office's response, is the subject of a complaint currently being considered by the Information Commissioner's Office.

The present complaint relates to the failure of the two officers – 622LX and 829LX – to act with honesty and integrity, fairness and impartiality, in refusing to pay appropriate attention to the evidence which I tried to present to them on 12/12/2010 and 28/12/2010.

I am only now in possession of the CRIMINT PLUS - INFORMATION REPORT ref: LXRT00584213 created by Cy Phipps on 12/12/2010, and an update to this report, ref: LXRT00584927 created by Nicholas Cornelius on 28/12/2010, as well as the printed incident log. Only now therefore I am able to judge the adequacy of these reports with respect to what was discussed between the two officers and myself on their visit to my flat on 12/12/2010, and with respect to the relevance of the further evidence I supplied at Kennington Police Station on 28/12/2010.

There is little in the Crimint reports or the incident log which corresponds to a factual description of what was actually discussed between the two officers and myself during their visit to my flat, for the following reasons:

1. The officers had spent some considerable time (40mins or more) at my address, during which time we discussed in some depth the substance of my allegations, and the reasons

behind those allegations. The contents of this discussion are inadequately represented in the Crimint report, or the incident log, so that certain crucial details of my circumstances, which should have deterred the police from their evident assumption that my allegations were the result of delusional thinking, have been conveniently omitted. The report mentions my assessment by the South London & Maudsley START Team, but fails to mention that I had challenged the officers' assumptions about my mental-health during the meeting, and had specifically asked that they should contact my social worker at the START Team for confirmation that I was not currently suffering, nor likely to suffer, from any delusional illness (I had never been diagnosed with any mental-health condition by them, and had originally self-referred to them only for help with homelessness). The entry on the incident log which follows the police visit to my flat (at 1:21:36 on 13/12/2010), which begins: "Male admitted he has MH issues..", is simply a misrepresentation.

2. The first paragraph of the Crimint report refers to my elaborating on a 'conspiracy theory'. I had discussed with the officers my earlier allegations (from 2003 onwards) about my family's involvement in a medical affair in which I had been involved as a victim at age six, and which formed the background to the events occurring in December 2010. I pointed out to the two officers that there was considerable evidence in support of those allegations, and that it was unfair for them to jump to conclusions about the validity of that evidence without even seeing it. It should be treated therefore as an *allegation of conspiracy*, rather than caricatured as a 'conspiracy theory'. I also pointed out that I had submitted some of this evidence to the Scotland Yard and Staffordshire Police forces in 2003, and that this was sufficient for Scotland Yard to initiate (at least) some form of investigation at that time (they had visited and questioned my sister), but that I had no information about the conclusion or the possible continuity of that investigation. The onus was therefore upon the officers to make enquiries regarding Scotland Yard's earlier involvement.

3. The officers had explicitly offered me the option of making a statement about the current allegations – i.e. that members of my family had conspired to send two men to my address with the intention of harming me. However, as I was conscious of the fact that there was no explicit evidence of this conspiracy, pending further investigations of possible CCTV evidence etc., I deferred the option of making a statement at my flat, and agreed with them that I could visit the station to make a statement later. I had the reasonable expectation that the officers would take my allegations seriously, and would make further enquiries, in particular with Scotland Yard regarding the outcome of the earlier investigation, after which my statement would have had more significance. It would have been premature for the police to visit my family in response to my statement, before such enquiries could be made.

When the officers left my flat I was left with the false impression that they would contact me in due course. I waited about two weeks for the police to contact me, before deciding to go to Kennington Police Station with the intention of making a formal statement. During this period my sister had sent me an email to say that if I continued to send her threatening emails and phone-calls, she would report me to the police. I knew that she would not report me however,

as she had good reasons to fear the involvement of the police, and so I continued to send her emails and make phone-calls, by way of provocation. As predicted, she did not report me to the police.

I took with me to the police station copies of two email exchanges between my sister and myself, dated 21 & 23/12/2010 (one of which contained her threat to call the police), and upon which I wrote a brief signed statement to the effect that I had continued to send her email threats and phone-calls, but that she had not reported me. I also took a copy of a letter from Jane Hughes, my social worker at the START Team, dated 23/09/2010, confirming that I was not liable to suffer from any delusional mental-illness. I saw the same two officers as previously, and was astonished when they refused to accept a formal statement from me, giving me no explanation – it appeared that their earlier offer to take a statement had been made disingenuously, in the expectation that I would refuse (which in itself amounts to misconduct). In addition to this, it was clear that the officers had failed to make any attempt to follow up on police intelligence with respect to the earlier Scotland Yard investigation, which they ought to have done as a matter of course.

The evidence that I gave the officers on 28/12/2012 should have:

a) Undermined their casual assumption that my allegations were delusional in nature (in view of Jane Hughes' letter), and at least encouraged them to refer to the START Team itself for clarification, as they might have done also following their visit to my flat.

b) Alerted them to the possibility that my sister may have had abnormal reasons for not reporting me to the police in view of my continued email and telephone threats to her and my mother, and that this might have exposed her to incrimination, with respect to the (quite reasonable) allegations I had made about her, her partner, and my mother.

The allegations I had made were very serious, and if there was sufficient indication to the police that they might not be delusional (which there was), then they were duty bound to treat them seriously, as my life was in danger. Had the police attended appropriately to this evidence, it should have given grounds for them to revise their earlier assumptions. However, the officers were highly reluctant to accept these documents from me, and I had to insist that they did. I do not know if they have been retained. The police clearly had their own reasons for adopting their preferred interpretation that my allegations were delusional, and were wilfully blind towards any evidence I offered to them to the contrary, either on 12/12/2010, or on 28/12/2010. In view of these remarks, I submit that the officers failed to act with honesty and integrity, fairness and impartiality, with respect to the allegations I made to them in December 2010.

Lastly, I should point out that in your decision on my earlier complaint, you had failed to appreciate the complexity of the circumstances which led up to me making the allegation that my family had conspired to send two men to my flat to harm me. It is only by appreciating in detail the intricate sequence of communications between myself and members of my family immediately prior to the *two* visits to my flat by two complete strangers, that one could possibly

understand the rationale behind the conclusion that they were sent to harm me. Paragraph 2 of page 2 of your Outcome to that complaint states: "*Having looked at the incident log relating to your initial report and considering the nature of your allegations it is clear that your crime was not recorded because on the balance of probabilities there is no evidence to indicate that a crime has been committed."* For the reasons explained above, neither the incident log nor the Crimint report are at all representative, and do not give any representation at all of my verbal report to the police of the sequence of events leading up to the two visits. Therefore the extant police documentation does not reflect a reasonable judgement on 'the balance of probabilities'. In fact the only way that I could have represented those details explicitly and unambiguously is if I had been allowed to make a formal statement. Part of my reason for attending the police station to make a statement on 28/12/2010, was that I sensed the officers had not gained an adequate understanding of these details when they had visited me. Had I been allowed to make a statement, the statement itself, of course, would have formed the principle evidence. In refusing to allow me make a statement, the police have prevented the collection of relevant evidence. Their conduct over the issue of the statement indicates that it was their intention *per se* to prevent this.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Jones

I enclose copies of three letters relating to my complaint with the ICO:

1. My email to Abigail Akano at the Public Access Office, dated 26/11/2012, referring to my original SARequest, and the missing documents from their submission to me, being the three documents I handed to police on 28/12/2010.
2. Letter from the ICO to me, dated 11/12/2012, advising of their referral of the second part of my complaint (re: the three missing documents) to the Complaints Resolution Team.
3. Letter from Abigail Akano to me, dated 19/11/2012, which accompanied their submission to me. This letter makes no mention of the documents from the second part of my request being unavailable.