

Dear IPCC Internal Investigation Unit

I would like to raise serious concerns about a case worker within the IPCC named Kathryn Lawcock.

My allegation is that she is dealing with my cases with a clear and intentional bias towards the police which is against the Police and reform Act 2002 in that the IPCC should be independent.

I understand that any complaints I make about police are given a 'final decision' by the IPCC but I allege that I am not being given a fair right of appeal or true independent investigation by the IPCC. I believe this is because I have been targeted and victimised by Lancashire Constabulary at a very high level for the past 4 years. The IPCC are showing a clear bias towards the Constabulary when in fact they are supposed to be totally independent and impartial.

I will show that on the balance of probabilities, this has not been the case for a number of my complaints. Only complaints where there is NO possibility of defending the police have the IPCC upheld my complaints. It is almost as if the IPCC are using the criminal conviction threshold of beyond reasonable doubt which is not the threshold you must work to.

I will show that the IPCC appear to defend the Police whenever they possibly can, rather than take an objective view and apply rationale based on the balance of probabilities. I will also show that the IPCC take a police officer's word as fact when they cannot provide ANY evidence to prove what they say (lies).

Rosie Cooper, MP of West Lancashire has followed my issues with Lancashire Constabulary and as a result, has written to the Chief Constable, Andy Rhodes and Rt Hon, Home Secretary Amber Rudd, MP, calling for an **urgent investigation** into allegations of corruption and misconduct within Lancashire police from my reports, I have provided evidence. The letter is attached. Surely the IPCC should take note of this and investigate thoroughly?

I am asking the IPCC to review the decisions of this caseworker. Her 'decisions' have been based on her apparent belief of an officer's **blatant lies** with no supporting evidence. The officer has shown NO evidence to verify his lies yet Kathryn Lawcock has decided the officer was telling the truth. It is **not** for Kathryn Lawcock to decide this. This should be brought up at a Misconduct Hearing. Kathryn Lawcock's decisions only further damages the public's view of the IPCC which should be an independent organisation to hold the minority of police officers to account for their actions. A number of forces within the UK have shown that corruption is rife and reaches senior positions. I do hope this does not transfer to the IPCC themselves.

I am also calling for the IPCC to look at my cases over the past 3 to 4 years. This demonstrates a course of conduct from Lancashire police against me. Whilst some of my complaints may in isolation look minimal, my interaction with the constabulary has been anything other than normal and this has been triggered by their intentional defence of a police informer from committing crimes against my family and I.

The following complaints have been dealt with by Kathryn Lawcock in a clearly biased manner.

# Chief Constable deleting evidence

**Background:** A man named Darren Hogan, from Wolverhampton, had continued a malicious course of conduct against me, online, since October 2016. One incident occurred when Darren Hogan publically tweeted to The Chief Constable, Andy Rhodes, calling me '**Paul Pussy Ponting**'. By the time I was made aware of the post it had been removed from The Chief Constable's twitter feed.

To deal with this, the following should have been considered.

- Was the complaint correctly recorded as a LR?
- Does the tweet reflect a criminal offence?
- Would Lancashire police have believe it to be harassment?
- Did Lancashire police pursue the offence?
- Could it, on the balance of probabilities, be deleted by the Chief Constable?
- Was the tweet evidence?

## **Was the complaint correctly recorded as a LR?**

This complaint was an allegation of evidence tampering & perverting the course of justice. Under IPCC guidelines, this complaint, 'on face value' alleges conduct that could, if proven, result in criminal or misconduct proceedings and therefore must be recorded as a local investigation. Under IPCC guidelines, the decision must be made based on the allegation alone and evidence must not be considered at this stage.

**NO – This complaint was not recorded correctly and no investigation took place.**

## **Does the tweet reflect a potential criminal offence?**

Yes, under Section 2 of the Harassment Act 1997 and as explained in the following paragraph this is a criminal offence. While it would constitute a 'course of conduct' and possibly not criminal on its own, this was, in fact a '*further course of conduct*' by the same offender. Lancashire police are aware of the offender and his prior course of conduct. The case work should be fully aware of this as she has experience the same harassment that she reported as criminal!

**YES - the words do reflect a potential criminal offence**

## **Would Lancashire police have believed the post to be harassment?**

Yes. In 2014, I sent an email to DS Andy Langton. In it, I referred to him as an 'evil shit'. This email was a private email. This was my honest opinion of him. Lancashire police believed that this comment was harassment and brought charges and a prosecution against me. I was acquitted, but, on face value, Lancashire police said they believed this **is an offence**.

Darren HOGAN called me '**paul pussy ponting**'. This was done in public, on a high profile Twitter page viewed by many thousands of twitter followers. He was doing this publically for the sole intention of damaging my name and causing me harassment, alarm and distress. His message was not sent to me, it was sent to the Chief Constable of Lancashire Police publically. Police were aware HOGAN was continuing a course of conduct and was under investigation by another force.

**YES – Lancashire police would be aware this is harassment**

## **Did police pursue the offence?**

No, the offensive tweet was removed and not reported. The Chief Constable has in fact blocked me from his Twitter account. This is evidence of discrimination. The Chief Constable

is responsible for his Twitter account. However it was removed, the fact is, it was removed without being gathered as evidence and recorded as a crime.

**Could it, on the balance of probabilities, be removed by the Chief Constable?**

Yes. My allegation was that the Chief Constable removed it and have proven he has full access to his account which is in his own personal name. The account is not a clear role based account i.e. @CCLancashire' but is '@CCARhodes' clearly linking him personally to the account. It would be 'reasonable' to believe he has or had full access to this account and no evidence has been provided to show he did not remove the evidence. Simply blocking the offender has the ability of removing the evidence that was not retained and reported.

Notwithstanding this, he is responsible for the account and therefore responsible for any actions performed on account by any authorised user.

**YES – it could be deleted by the Chief Constable 'on the balance of probabilities'.**

**Was the tweet evidence?**

As outlined, the tweet has been confirmed that it constitutes part of a course of conduct. On this basis, it was evidence to support a criminal case.

**YES – The tweet was evidence**

When I was made aware of the post, by a friend, the post had already been removed. I was only able to bring the post to the attention of West Midlands Police from a screenshot, however the actual post had been removed by Lancashire police without informing me or West Midlands Police. The allegation is that Lancashire Police deleted evidence relating to a criminal offence and an ongoing criminal investigation, this allegation IS made out.

**The IPCC Rationale to IPCC Ref: 2017092750**

The case worker stated:

*After considering all the information available, I have decided to not uphold your appeal as I am satisfied that, based on the available information and evidence, the outcome of the local resolution was a proper outcome and I am of the opinion that the complaints were suitable for local resolution.*

This is contradiction to the IPCC guidelines which make it perfectly clear that the complaint, based on the allegation alone **should not** have been classified as a Local Resolution

Under the **complaint** section

The casework seems to waffle and repeats paragraphs. I am not clear what she is actually saying, but think she is saying the complaint was deemed more serious than what it is? This is a ludicrous rationale. For example, Lancashire Police prosecuted me for saying in an email that the officer (DS Langton) was an 'evil shit'. This was immediately classified as a criminal offence and I was prosecuted (although acquitted). This was in a private email. Calling me '**paul pussy ponting**' is harassment without a doubt and malicious as calling me a 'pussy' is grossly offensive and untrue. I am neither a cat nor am I female genitalia in which I believe Hogan was referring to me which is grossly offensive. I am aware that this caseworker has herself been the victim of harassing comments online '*broomstick riding witch*' and also being accused of '*having an improper relationship with a senior cop*'. I see this as no difference and her 'opinion' is **extremely biased**. Her expressed opinion towards my case is proven not to be her real opinion as declared in the high court!

Details of this are documented on this website: <http://www.examiner.co.uk/news/west-yorkshire-news/malicious-blogger-neil-wilby-banned-7972575>

The Casework infers that the Chief Constable cannot delete tweets as per the guidance on the twitter support page.

This does not make any sense. There is no denying the tweet was removed and must have been removed by someone. My complaint alleges that it was the Chief Constable. I see no evidence presented proving otherwise, only a bizarre reference to a Twitter support page! It is possible to remove tweets from your feed by permission control. I feel this is 'mincing words'.

I understand that the tweet cannot be physically deleted from the Chief Constable's timeline, but it was removed and this could be via various methods. The point being, evidence of a crime **was removed/deleted and not retained or presented as evidence**. Ultimately, the evidence was 'withheld/removed/hidden/deleted' without being forwarded to the investigation team.

*The offence of Perverting the Course of Justice is committed when an accused:*

- *does an act or series of acts;*
- *which has or have a tendency to pervert; and*
- *which is or are intended to pervert;*
- *the course of public justice.*

*The course of justice must be in existence at the time of the act(s). The course of justice starts when:*

- *an event has occurred, from which it can reasonably be expected that an investigation will follow; or*
- *investigations which could/might bring proceedings have actually started; or*
- *proceedings have started or are about to start.*

The prima facie crime is present and the offence is made out. The only obstacle I see is the burden of proof being that it was intentional. This **is not for a case worker to decide!** There is a significant amount of circumstantial evidence to support my complaint that it was 'more likely than not' done intentionally as Lancashire police were or are supporting Darren Hogan in an unfounded investigation against me.

The case worker states:

*The OPCC has explained that the Chief Constable (or anyone else) cannot delete or remove another person's Tweet as per the guidance obtained directly from the Twitter support page. Given the clear and straightforward response to this allegation, as the Chief Constable cannot have carried out the action claimed, I am satisfied that this complaint was suitable for local resolution and the outcome appropriate, The appeal is not upheld"*

This **proves** that the choice of a Local Resolution was **taken after investigation**. This is strictly against the IPCC guidelines for the LR suitability test. This alone should be cause for an immediate investigation.

The OPCC did not explain anything. The OPCC asked to chief Constables office if he deleted the Tweet, they said he couldn't, that was it, end of investigation.

The burning question is, who removed the Tweet? It will not just vanish without a positive action? Why didn't the OPCC investigate the cause of the tweet removal? There has been no explanation how it was removed or why it **was not collated as evidence**. There has been no denial of knowledge it existed showing the police did see the offensive tweet and that they did nothing about it.

The fact is, the IPCC caseworker overlooked this wishy washy investigation by the OPCC which is ludicrous.

In section 2. Failed to record it as a crime, the caseworker says this is not a crime, in isolation. This is most likely true, but it is and has been confirmed to be a course of conduct which **is a crime**. Lancashire constabulary are fully aware of the ongoing investigation and previous conduct and therefore this is paramount to an ongoing crime.

Most annoyingly, Kathryn Lawcock, the caseworker states that

*"Hogan is expressing a view, like any member of the public is entitled to do?"*

I would ask the caseworker, is this not the same argument for the person that stated his opinion that she was a '**broomstick-riding witch**'. Lawcock reported this to police and this was crimed and dealt with in the high court's wholly **supported by the IPCC!** She clearly believed these words to be more than a personal opinion and the support of the IPCC indicates it also should disagree with her expressed opinion on my case.

The case worker appears to be using anything to divert attention away from the allegation which still stands.

# CO/666/15

Partially UPHELD.

The upheld part of this complaint where DS Langton disclosed extremely sensitive and personal information about my son to Paul TURNER was beyond defence, and that is why it was UPHELD by the IPCC. There was no way to offer any justification. This being said, I believe the IPCC have taken a biased view of Part 1A (which was **not upheld**), regarding the issuing of a Personal Safety Warning which is clearly a pack of lies by the officer involved and failure to follow clearly defined policies as per a defining result of a case in the Europe Courts of Human Rights.

To deal with Part 1 of the complaint, the following should have been considered.

- Was there EVEN a threat to kill?
- Is there a process for threats to kill?
- Was the procedure followed for threats to kill?
- Can an officer tell someone that a mention of action (not killing) has been made?
- On the balance of probabilities, does DS Langton appear to be lying?

## **Was there even a threat to kill?**

No, absolutely not. A comment was made, **before** the offender was identified. The comment was not a threat to kill and is a common phrase used by people dissatisfied with police action and made in the heat of the moment. This would **never** satisfy the criteria for a personal safety warning. At no time prior to the offender being caught was a personal safety warning considered, why? Either way, I was more than happy when the offender was caught and made this clear to DS Langton while I was in Birmingham, over 90 miles away. DS Langton has presented **no evidence** to suggest any threats to Paul TURNER or even the actual offender, never mind any threats to kill (take a life) **AFTER** the actual offender had been apprehended.

Under the circumstances and looking at the bigger picture, it is obvious that DS Langton has concocted this false 'belief' to cover for his misconduct. This should be for a judiciary to decide or a misconduct hearing, **not a caseworker in the IPCC**.

The personal safety warnings are issued based on the following:

*As a result of a case at the European Court of Human Rights, the police now issue 'threat to life warnings' to people at serious risk of being killed, including people suspected of being violent criminals themselves. These are called Osman warnings.*

For a personal safety warning to be issued, there must be a serious risk that the person **will** be killed. Imagine the number of personal safety warnings that would be issued for every heat of the moment comment.

**No, there was no threat to kill.**

## **Is there a process for threats to kill?**

Yes. I contacted Lancashire constabulary under the FOI and requested their threats to life policy (Osman warnings, or the official title, 'Personal Safety Warnings'). The FOI response is attached, (albeit a minimal cut down version, they did not send the full version)

**The decisive authority to grant such a warning.**

All Personal Safety Warnings, formerly known as 'Osman warnings' are reviewed/quality assured by an officer of **at least Inspector rank** to ensure that the PSW achieves the desired effect of conveying a warning whilst minimising any compromise effect. The criteria for service of a PSW is: a) **A live Threat Assessment Document is in place** b) The AO reasonably believes that the recipient has ignored or will ignore police advice regarding their personal safety. The assessment is based on evidence and is documented within the Threat Assessment Document (recorded on police system).

The response makes it quite clear that there is a strict policy and this was in no way followed and that DS Langton is not and was not authorised to make such a decision whatever his view may have been. There was no documentation whatsoever by DS Langton, never mind a live threat assessment document!

**Was the procedure followed for threats to kill?**

No. The Personal Safety Warning policy clearly states:

**The format the warning must be presented.**

The warning is presented in a written format and is ordinarily left with the recipient unless the delivering officer deems that it is not appropriate to leave a copy with the recipient and rationale for such occasions is recorded. The warning is intended to address three things:

1. To ensure that the person at risk is fully aware of the threat and from where/how it might take place
2. To ensure that the person at risk fully understands the steps that the police are taking and/or suggesting
3. To record the information and document what has been agreed by each party - recipient and police.

DS Langton by his own admission failed to document the incident and in fact coincidentally cannot recall what he said. There was absolutely no documentation as per the strict policy which DS Langton admits he did not do.

As you will see from the FOI response, Lancashire constabulary have confirmed that only a rank of at least Inspector can make this decision. DS Langton has alleged that he made a decision that he is not authorised to make resulting in a serious data breach and a Sergeant making decisions he is not authorised to do.

Therefore, DS Langton failed to seek advice from a senior ranked officer, he also made a decision that he is not authorised to make and fails to document the personal safety warning. **NO, the process was not followed**

**Can an officer tell someone that a mention of action (not killing) has been made?**

No, absolutely not, this could result in a revenge attack or stir anger. This would be completely irresponsible and against Police standards for professional behaviour. Notwithstanding the fact that I did not threaten to kill anyone, telling Turner what I said, which was said in the heat of the moment, at a time when my 13 year old child was being groomed online and I was of the belief (at that time) that it 'could' relate to Turner. Providing this information to Turner is only likely to stir more hatred which was proven when Turner went on to publish this confidential information publicly on the internet. This is a **direct result** of the misconduct of DS Langton. Incidentally, Turner made **NO mention** of any threat from me on his hate website. He only made reference to the private information about our son, strengthening the fact that DS Langton had NOT warned Turner about any 'threat' at all and this was a fabricated story.

I have also noticed, that the FOI released from Lancashire differs somewhat from other constabularies. I have referred to the published document from Surrey Police at the following address

<https://www.surrey.police.uk/policies-and-procedures/threats-to-life-handling-intelligence-procedure/>

Key points from the document:

3.2 *Immediate action is to be taken by any police officer receiving notification of a threat to life. On receipt of such information, an **immediate** referral must be made to the duty Inspector/Detective Inspector who will be responsible for the risk assessment process.*

**There was no such 'immediate' referral.**

3.3 *Intelligence checks will be made immediately to obtain further information about the threat. Access to HC4 and HC5 intelligence will be via the Divisional Intelligence Unit (DIU) during office hours, or the 24-7 Intel Team*

**No such intelligence threats were made.**

3.7 *Threat to life warning notices and threat to life disruption notices must be considered where the threat is **real** and **immediate**, and must be given unless there are reasonable grounds not to do so.*

DS Langton's alleged warning to Turner was given, almost in passing and only served to antagonise Turner to publish the personal information.

DS Langton also states in his comments that he gave the warning to Paul Turner when he met on '*other business!*' This clarifies that the delivery of the alleged personal safety warning was not 'planned' and was brought up in passing which is a breach of the policy.

This 'other business' should be recorded giving the time and date of the meeting.

On the balance of probabilities it is more likely than not that DS Langton did not believe there was a risk to Paul Turner. DS Langton was meeting Turner regarding other matters unknown to us and during this time DS Langton blabbed to Paul Turner about things he should not be blabbing about. Turner subsequently posted this information to the internet. Only after this was brought to our attention and a complaint was raised did DS Langton formulate what can only be describes as a pack of lies in an attempt to justify his unlawful disclosure of information about me and my family to Turner.

DS Langton has **no right at all** to discuss me or my family with anyone, least of all Paul Turner. If DS Langton felt there was a threat to life, he should have reported it via the correct channels which **he did not do**. These correct channels would have determined that there was no threat to life and there was no justification.

**DS Langton has repeatedly lied and he should be held fully accountable for his actions.**

**On the balance of probabilities, does DS Langton appear to be lying?**

Yes, I believe this is the case and is a serious misconduct issue which should be dealt with by no less than a misconduct hearing open to dismissal and or the judiciary. I believe on the balance of probabilities, DS Langton has tried to lie his way out of a serious misconduct and criminal incident and is using a concocted '*lack of memory*' excuse to protect himself and Turner. The comments written by Paul Turner on his malicious website are '*more likely than*

*not* a true reflection of what DS Langton discussed unless they can otherwise be disproved. The content of my email to DS Langton telling him he cannot interview my son was published by Paul Turner, this could not be guessed so is '*more likely than not*' to be true that DS Langton gave this information to Turner. The fact that Turner then states DS Langton told him he was considering bringing in social services is, also more likely than not a comment made by DS Langton. Adding further weight to my complaint.

### **The IPCC Rationale to CO/666/15:**

Under the **background** section, the caseworker makes a point that I contacted DS Langton '*rather than police as I had been advised to do*'.

This shows an immediate intentional distaste towards me, implying I did not follow a procedure (quite ironic really). DS Langton was our SPOC and was dealing with a case whereby he was supposedly investigating Paul Turner, I believed DS Langton was a reasonable person to report the incident too you the IPCC appear critical of this?

The case worker concludes this section saying "*Mr Ponting still remained of the opinion that Mr Turner was still involved, albeit not the actual offender*"

What evidence has Kathryn Lawcock seen to come to this conclusion? This is absolute rubbish as I did not believe Turner was responsible at all after the offender (a boy in my son's school) was caught. Why would I possibly think Paul Turner was responsible for the actions of a 14 year old boy in St Bede's School's actions?

Kathryn Lawcock goes on to further defend the actions of DS Langton by quoting the data protection act, saying that

*"55(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person **who shows** (a) that obtaining, disclosing or procuring (i) was necessary for the purpose of preventing or detecting a crime."*

What the caseworker omits is that the burden of proof is on DS Langton '**to show**'. DS Langton has **not done this**, in fact, he has only given a wishy washy statement that even he admits that he does not recall what he said.

I feel that this shows a bias towards police or against me in the background summary by the caseworker.

Under the analysis section, the caseworker further reiterates a comment that I made **prior** to the offender being caught, said in the heat of the moment. After the offender was caught I was relieved that the incident was concluded.

The caseworker further makes the comment **BOLD** to emphasise the comment and reiterates that at this point Mr Ponting was still alleging Turner was responsible.

This is incorrect and intentionally misinterpreted. This comment was made at the time **of first reporting the crime** which was solved within 24 hours. After the crime was solved, DS Langton called me on my mobile phone, I was at the Gadget Show in Birmingham with my wife and children. We expressed how happy we were that he had found the offender.

The caseworker then states that DS Langton interpretation of this being a credible risk, appears reasonable. – **This is utter rubbish.**

If DS Langton thought, at the time of the comment that it was a credible threat, then why didn't he report it via correct strict policy as defined in their own policy! Why did DS Langton wait a period of time, possibly up to a couple of weeks depending who you believe (Turner or DS Langton)

The caseworker then continues to say

*“having examined the evidence relating to Mr Ponting and Mr Turner’s history....”*

Who provided this evidence to the IPCC? If it was police, was it selective? There are vast amounts of evidence I have showing vexation from DS Langton to me which I could provide as evidence to support my complaint, so shouldn't the IPCC examine any evidence relating to DS Langton and my family? This will show DS Langton's attitude towards us. DS Langton, at this time, was the subject of complaint and would not have been pleased to be assisting my family.

The casework is looking for anything to assist police and using nothing to support me. The caseworker even has the timeline of events wrong, as no comments were made to suggest I ever thought Turner was involved AFTER the offender had been identified.

The caseworker says DS Langton was '*justified*' for informing Turner about the incident and '**possible risk Mr Ponting posed**'. NO HE WASN'T JUSTIFIED AT ALL. This is a million miles from risk assessment within the Personal Protection Warning Policy for speaking to a person about a threat and DS Langton's actions cause us a lot of harm and distress.

Surely an IPCC caseworker cannot overrule a policy that was created based on a case in the European Courts of Human Rights!

## **Timeline**

### **Day 1, MON 07/04/2014**

**18:55** - Email to Langton informing him of the grooming incident.

### **Day 2 - TUE 08/04/2014**

**08:02** - Langton response to my email

**08:07** – My reply to Langton declining he speaks to my son.

**PM** – Anna and I met with officers at my business address. The officers were informed by their radio that the offender had been apprehended and was a boy from Daniel's school. We expressed our relief to both of these officers at receiving the news. This is evidence that shows I had no belief I thought it was Turner.

### **Day 03 - 09/04/2014**

**PM** – DS Langton called me, informing me he had spoken to the offending boy's parents and the boy had admitted what he had done. We were in Birmingham at the time with my family. We expressed our thanks. This is evidence that I was extremely satisfied with the police investigation, why would DS Langton think otherwise.

### **Day 15 - 22/04/2014**

**19:02** – I sent an email to DS Langton “*How come you can find and 'bring in' a 14 year old kid who essentially was playing a school yard prank on my son*”. This email to DS Langton 2 weeks later **clearly proves** my understanding that this was a 14 year old kid, not Turner.

Meeting between Langton and Turner. This can easily be ascertained by checking police logs for when Langton met with Turner **which must be on record**.

DS Langton, although he cannot remember at all what he discussed with Turner and made NO notes of this meeting or discussion but say/recalls the meeting was a few days later? This is a convenient recollection of a specific date yet no recollection of the meeting in question. This should raise significant questions on the reliability of DS Langton.

Even if it was on day 3, this has been confirmed to two independent officers and DS Langton himself that we were happy with the resolution.

If, however it was a few weeks later, as per Paul Turners website inference, the further proof shows that I even refer to this as a school yard prank from a boy in Daniels school!

Notwithstanding this, if we take DS Langton’s date, he did not act upon the alleged threat until 3 days after the ‘threat’ was made.

From the above timeline, on DAY 1, I had a belief the offender was Turner. On day 2, I no longer had this belief and all evidence proves this with NO evidence to suggest otherwise other than an apparent ‘belief’ from DS Langton who seems to remember that but NOTHING of the meeting with TURNER.

### **What Paul Turner wrote on his hate website**

This must be considered as evidence. For the following reason.

#### **FACTS:**

DS Langton clearly states he cannot recall what was said.

Turner has refused to cooperate. (\*criminal allegations)

Comments made about our son on Turners website have been proven to be correct. No comments have been proven to be incorrect. Unless there is evidence to prove that any comments are false, then it would be reasonable to assume they are all are correct on the balance of probabilities and therefore must be credible evidence.

Turner did NOT make any comment **at all** about threats to life but freely commented on all aspects of DS Langton’s disclosure about our son. If DS Langton did not speak to Turner about alleged threats, then this is fabricated. DS Langton has specifically disclosed personal Information about our son and fabricated the threats warning to somehow justify a meeting.

Turner stated in his malicious website comments that the meeting with DS Langton was official in that he was giving evidence relating to another police report. Police failed to ascertain this date which would have given the exact time and date of the incident under investigation. Why?

*\*Criminal Allegations - Turners comments amount to Malicious Communications and harassment. He stated a number of grossly offensive and untrue comments. Why didn't police investigate and charge him?*

It is believed that **IF** Police did investigate Turner for his offence, this would infuriate Turner and he would then most likely speak out of DS Langton's data breach.

**This would appear on the face of it to be a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice.**

What Paul Turner wrote is 'more likely than not' a full disclosure from DS Langton. The fact DS Langton says he cannot recall and Turner says he will not co-operate is a sign of the two of them conspiring to pervert the course of justice.

As Paul Turner mentioned 'Social services', I believe DS Langton also divulged this information which was never mentioned to us so I believe that DS Langton stated this to make my family look bad.

# CO/27/17 – Unlawful arrest & assault

This should really be a simple case to investigate but the Police and the IPCC have put obstacles in my way throughout this entire complaint which is a complaint of extremely serious criminal allegations which has supporting evidence by a magistrate's court.

I will not go into full details as the IPCC have all documents.

The point of this complaint, irrespective of the obstacles, allegations of vexatious complaints & repetitive complaints etc, is that an **alleged serious crime was committed** by police and blatantly an investigation **did not take place**.

Police have confirmed they did not investigate, they did not question any witnesses. They simply declared (against a magistrates ruling) that they did nothing wrong even though there is supporting CCTV evidence of numerous assaults by police officers.

It is utterly ridiculous that a complaint of such serious criminal allegations can go without any investigation and without any interaction by the very organisation that should investigate police. This has been intentionally blocked from any form of investigation.

## Summary

I believe that on the balance of probabilities these three complaints have not been dealt with correctly and to any reasonable person it looks extremely biased in favour of the police which is against the IPCC role as set out in the Police Reform Act 2002.

I believe this IPCC Caseworker has come to the wrong decision (intentionally or otherwise)

I am asking that not only these cases be **fully and independently reviewed**, I also ask that the IPCC look at the big picture with my previous not upheld complaints in that there is an intentional vendetta against my family by Lancashire police. Only looking at the big picture will reveal this alleged corruption. Failure to look at the big picture would go against the basis for the IPCC to exist. Hillsborough is a classic example.