

Subject: RESTRICTED – CLIFF RICHARDS – NO COMPLAINT



Subject: Re: FW: RESTRICTED – CLIFF RICHARDS - NO COMPLAINT
From: "Tony" <Tony@JAHTruth.net>
Date: Mon, August 18, 2014 11:28 pm
To: Complaints and Discipline@southyorks.pnn.police.uk Mark.Foster@southyorks.pnn.police.uk
Cc: David.Crompton@southyorks.pnn.police.uk Andy.Holt@southyorks.pnn.police.uk
Nigel.Hiller@southyorks.pnn.police.uk Christopher.Moran@southyorks.pnn.police.uk
Leo.Hawker@southyorks.pnn.police.uk Terry.Mann@southyorks.pnn.police.uk
Richard.Tweed@southyorks.pnn.police.uk Scott.Green@southyorks.pnn.police.uk
Rachel.Barber@southyorks.pnn.police.uk Martyn.Bates@southyorks.pnn.police.uk

Dear Mr. Foster,

Thank-you for the email sent on your behalf today, in which you state that you have not recorded my complaint involving Sir Cliff Richards. I am glad about that, because I have at no stage lodged a complaint to anyone in South Yorkshire Police about the Cliff Richards' incident. Nevertheless, the contents of your reply are noted. Thank-you.

However, I do wish to re-iterate to you, that contrary to what you have written in your letter, no complaint about South Yorkshire Police over the incident in Berkshire occurred. You are badly misguided and in error to treat my email to the Chief Constable as a complaint, and you owe me an apology for doing so.

If you had actually taken the trouble to read my email, which was actually addressed to the Chief Constable and not to you, you ought to have understood that the email I sent was anything but a complaint. It is a fact that on this occasion, I chose to copy-in you and several other senior officers, but in no way should my email about the Berkshire incident be misconstrued as a complaint against South Yorkshire Police. The exact opposite should be inferred from its proper reading.

Actually, I was somewhat warmed to hear of South Yorkshire Police's new-found courage in taking action like this against a so-called high profile celebrity. My brief message was one of support, but with the inclusion of a carefully worded caveat.

My one concern here is that in your position of authority, as a Detective Chief Inspector based in the Professional Standards Department, you have demonstrated by the contents of your reply, a level of basic incompetence. You have badly blundered. I state this, because it is clear that you can't possibly have actually read the content of my email, before wrongly classifying it as a complaint. Had you read my email to the Chief Constable, you would have seen clearly that there was no ambiguity - it was plainly not a complaint - that much should have been obvious.

If this is the standard of complaint investigation and ill-discipline in your department, that you can't even be bothered to properly read what you categorise as a non-recordable complaint, then I'm afraid the aspiration for South Yorkshire Police to become the best force in the country is clearly, at best some considerable way off, or at worst downright delusional.

Owing to the key role you personally have in your organisation, and given it coincides with a time when public confidence

and trust in the police needs to be restored like never before, I have decided to copy this reply to you to certain Senior Command Team members and the head of your department Detective Superintendent Mann, so that they too are alerted to this unacceptable blunder and incompetence. If this is the "standard" response by the Professional "Standards" Department, which appears to be a damage-limitation department rather than upholding professional standards, and this is how you go about dealing with complaints, then you are doing a great disservice to both the public and SYP.

If it is a case that you are simply too lazy to do your job properly; by actually investigating complaints thoroughly, looking at all of the facts; then you should be removed from your position, and it should be given to someone who will actually do the job properly. I have evidence from others, who have had similar experiences with you, that demonstrate this is not an isolated occurrence. There can be only three possibilities for your actions, and they are that you are either, lazy, incompetent, or corrupt. Any one of which should have you removed from your position.

Naturally, I will not be appealing to the IPCC against your decision not to record a non-existent complaint of mine, but I will however be using this elementary blunder of yours, to illustrate a very serious point in relation to your previous decision making process, which was based on a refusal by South Yorkshire Police to look at the facts of the case, following my wrongful arrest and charge.

On that altogether separate complaint, I have today received acknowledgment from the IPCC of my appeal against your decision, outlined in your letter of 30th July 2014. Because my previous email directed to you went unanswered after seven days had elapsed, I appealed against your decision to the IPPC. Detective Superintendent Mann was kind enough to notify me of you period of leave, but I nevertheless had to take the decision to escalate, so as to not risk being out of time with the IPCC.

As a result of the email received today from the IPCC, I will be sending them the entire contents of the 162 page bundle, which South Yorkshire Police declined to look at before you reached your premature and wrong decision not to record my complaint. You were given an opportunity to revise your decision based on an offer to meet, but my offer was not accepted.

Yours Sincerely

Tony Farrell

> Thank you for your correspondence regarding the above.

>

> Please find attached my recording decision letter

>

>

> Sent on behalf of

>

> DCI Foster

> Complaints & Discipline Section

> Professional Standards Department

>

>>

> SYP has re-launched the FIRST principles. In conjunction with the College of Policing's Code of Ethics, they have been introduced to promote high standards of professional behaviour while delivering a quality service.

>

> Visit the FIRST intranet site for further details.