

**A SPECIAL REPORT OFFERED TO**  
**THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE**  
**&**  
**THE SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER**

**THE CORRUPT WAYS OF KEITH VAZ,**  
**HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH SIR GEOFFREY BINDMAN IN THE**  
**ONGOING MONSTROUS COVER-UP OF MS. SEVEN'S CASE**

**Author:** Tony Farrell

**Sponsor:** JAH

**Date:** 14<sup>th</sup> September 2014

**Distribution:**

Shaun Wright, South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner  
David Crompton, Chief Constable

**PART ONE – INTRODUCTION**

---

**1.0 RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the contents of this report are noted and that the Chief Constable and the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner urgently meet up with the author and sponsor of the report to consider an action plan to break the chain of corruption associated with the national cover-up of Child Sexual Exploitation networks extending way beyond Rotherham and the Asian Community.

---

**2.0 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this report is as follows:

- (1) to alert recipients to some historical but potential criminal issues concerning Keith Vaz, MP (VAZ) in his position of the Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee .
- (2) To provide a strategic assessment on the suitability of Keith Vaz to sit in judgment as the chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee Meetings which concerned media coverage of a high profile incident and issues arising from Professor Alexis Jay's Rotherham report.
- (3) To offer assistance in fighting-back at the high level corruption and to minimise the possibility of scapegoating and further miscarriages of justice occurring.

### **3.0 SCOPE OR REPORT**

- 4) In taking a critical position against the chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee, Keith Vaz, this report does not seek to diminish the seriousness of the Child Sexual Exploitation issues and the need for public bodies and public servants to be brought to account over the Rotherham scandal as outlined in Professor Jay's report.
- 5) Neither does this report seek to scrutinize the roles of any officers who have been subjected to the inquiry. That said, both intended recipients should be aware that well before the hearing started, I wrote separately to Professor Alexis Jay offering up comments on some of the issues from my own vantage point as a former Principal Intelligence Analyst who had worked with Matt Jukes in his role as Director of Intelligence. I have already written to Keith Vaz and all the other members of the Home Affairs Select Committee via email. I have let Keith Vaz know of my willingness to be called as a future witness. It followed a call from David Pidcock to Keith Vaz for me to be called before the committee. In my email to Keith Vaz, I outlined my reasons for accusing former Chief Constable Meredydd Hughes of committing perjury on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2014.
- 6) No such allegations are made against the conduct of any other officer with respect to the televised and publicly reported proceedings in the media. I have nothing directly relevant to say about either of your roles with respect to the Child Sexual Exploitation issue. When the Rotherham report was first published, I wrote to Professor Alexis Jay expressing some personal comments in relation to police culture, my strategic knowledge and conceptual models of some of the issues covered in her report when I was in post as the Principal Intelligence Analyst. They refer to a period in time when I knew neither of you. Mr. Vaz does not know about the existence of this report.

### **ASSUMPTIONS**

- 7) It is assumed that both recipients have knowledge of my background and previous employment with the South Yorkshire Police as the Principal Intelligence Analyst and are aware of the reasons for its controversial and high profile termination on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010.
- 8) It is assumed that both recipients spoke truthfully on oath before Keith Vaz in their respective appearances before the committee.

## **PART TWO - BACKGROUND**

- 9) Following the Home Affairs Select Committee meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> September, the historical conduct of Keith Vaz, MP has come to my attention. From the viewpoint of a former trained strategic intelligence analyst, the information available to me via open source material, when strategically assessed, compels me to make very serious allegations against Keith Vaz.
- 10) In addition, and this is not just coincidence, my involvement with Ms. Seven's court case, the report of which, you have both been given, places me with a unique vantage point on the extent to which cover-ups unfold and Keith Vaz has been involved in the cover-up of this one.
- 11) As a high profile politician, who chairs the Home Affairs Select Committee, Keith Vaz has regularly engaged in malfeasance of public office, and has attained his position inappropriately, where his abuses of power and criminal actions are ignored and covered up by his peer politicians and the police alike.
- 12) This assessment is based upon the following three sources of data.
  - a) Data available from Ms. Seven regarding her well-documented case which has been considered by the Chief Constable and the South Yorkshire Police Crime Commissioner.
  - b) Open source data directly concerning Keith Vaz and his history of misconduct in office.
  - c) My own observations of the Home Affairs Committee meetings on both 2<sup>nd</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> September 2014.

## **PART THREE – THE ABUSE OF OFFICE - KEITH VAZ**

- 13) The political career of Keith Vaz is littered with scandals, dishonesty, duplicity and corruption as can be seen from an excellent article copied into the section below. The author is Hugh Fitzgerald and the full article appears in the New English Review.  
[http://www.newenglishreview.org/blog\\_email.cfm/blog\\_id/23281](http://www.newenglishreview.org/blog_email.cfm/blog_id/23281)

### **Political career**

- 14) Vaz first stood for Parliament in 1983, when he contested the Conservative safe seat of Richmond and Barnes in the 1983 general election, which he failed to win. For the 1987 election he was chosen to stand for the seat of Leicester East, which had 16,000 British Asian voters. He won the election, defeating the right-wing Conservative candidate Peter Bruinvels, and became a popular

constituency MP, the first Asian MP since Shapurji Saklatvala lost his seat in 1929. From 1987 to 1992 he was a member of the Home Affairs Select Committee. In March 1989, he led a protest in Leicester against Salman Rushdie's novel *The Satanic Verses*.<sup>[1]</sup> At this event, Vaz addressed 3,000 Muslim demonstrators, stating "today we celebrate one of the great days in the history of Islam and Great Britain".<sup>[2]</sup> In February 1990, he wrote in *The Guardian* newspaper urging Salman Rushdie not to publish the book in paperback because "there is no such thing as absolute freedom of speech". That month, he caused outrage when he suggested that an IRA bomb detonated at Leicester Army Recruiting Office might have been planted by the British army. Vaz became a frontbench spokesman on the Environment for the Official Opposition in 1992 and between 1993 and 1994 was a Member of the Executive Committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. On Labour winning power in 1997, he became a Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Government's Law Officers. In 1999 he was promoted, becoming Minister for Europe in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and was tipped to become a Cabinet Minister. Vaz is a member of the All Party Parliamentary Flag Group <sup>[3]</sup>

### **Filkin inquiry**

- 15) In February 2000 the Parliamentary standards watchdog Elizabeth Filkin began an investigation after allegations that Vaz had accepted several thousand pounds from a solicitor, Sarosh Zaiwalla, which he had failed to declare. The allegations were made by Andrew Milne, a former partner of Zaiwalla and were denied by both Vaz and Zaiwalla. Additional allegations were made that Vaz had accepted money from other businessmen.<sup>[4]</sup>
- 16) Vaz wrote to Filkin on 7 February 2000 to deny the allegations, and Filkin and Vaz went on to exchange letters until April 2000 in which Vaz responded to Filkin's queries. **Geoffrey Bindman**, who was acting as Vaz's solicitor, wrote to Filkin on 18 May to ask how much longer her inquiry was to take and Filkin produced a list of 48 questions she wanted answered on 29 June.
- 17) On 19 October Filkin wrote and asked for details about properties owned by Vaz, who replied that he owned three properties. However, evidence was later found by BBC Radio 4's *Today* programme that Vaz failed to disclose all his property interests to Filkin, and that documents showed that he owned four rather than three properties at the time. It was also discovered that he had transferred the ownership of a fifth property in London to his mother on 27 October, eight days after Filkin requested details of all his properties. Vaz said that the timing was a coincidence

and the property was put on the market by Mrs Vaz 6 months after the transfer. Land Registry documents showed that Vaz had become the owner of the property on 5 August 1988, and the Electoral Register showed that it had been Vaz's address in 1988 and 1999. Between February 1992 and February 1996 the property was the address of Reza Shahbandeh, who Vaz denied all knowledge of when asked.[5]

- 18) On 2 November **Geoffrey Bindman** warned Filkin that her inquiry could be in breach of the European Convention on Human Rights. Filkin sent a final list of questions for Vaz to answer on 27 November, following which **Bindman** wrote to Filkin on 4 December that Vaz would not answer any more of her questions, but would co-operate with the Standards and Privileges Committee. Filkin told the Standards and Privileges Committee on 20 December that she had been unable to reach a conclusion on eight of the 18 allegations she had investigated.
- 19) On 12 March 2001, the Filkin report cleared Vaz of nine of the 28 allegations of various financial wrongdoings, but Elizabeth Filkin accused Mr Vaz of blocking her investigation into eighteen of the allegations. He was censured for a single allegation - that he had failed to register two payments worth £4,500 in total from solicitor Sarosh Zaiwalla, whom he recommended for a peerage several years later. Mrs Filkin announced in the same month a new inquiry which would focus on whether or not a company connected to Vaz received a donation from a charitable foundation run by the Hinduja brothers.
- 20) Filkin was reported on 18 March as angered by the way in which Vaz had "spun" her report, saying that he had been representing the report as clearing him when in fact she failed to reach conclusions on several complaints because he obstructed the inquiry. Filkin declined to comment, saying she felt her position on Vaz was set out in her report.

### **Hinduja affair**

- 21) In January 2001, immigration minister Barbara Roche revealed in a written Commons reply that Vaz, along with Peter Mandelson and other MPs, had contacted the Home Office about the Hinduja brothers. She said that Vaz had made inquiries about when a decision on their application for citizenship could be expected.[6]
- 22) On January 25, Vaz had become the focus of Opposition questions about the Hinduja affair and

many parliamentary questions were tabled, demanding that he fully disclose his role. Vaz said via a Foreign Office spokesman that he would be "fully prepared" to answer questions put to him by Sir Anthony Hammond QC who had been asked by the Prime Minister to carry out an inquiry into the affair.

23) Vaz had known the Hinduja brothers for some time; he had been present when the charitable Hinduja Foundation was set up in 1993, and also delivered a speech in 1998 when the brothers invited Tony and Cherie Blair to a Diwali celebration.[7]

24) On 26 January 2001, Prime Minister Tony Blair was accused of prejudicing the independent inquiry into the Hinduja passport affair, after he declared that the Foreign Office minister Keith Vaz had not done "anything wrong". On the same day, Vaz told reporters that they would "regret" their behaviour once the facts of the case were revealed. "Some of you are going to look very foolish when this report comes out. Some of the stuff you said about Peter, and about others and me, you'll regret very much when the facts come out," he said. When asked why the passport application of one of the Hinduja brothers had been processed more quickly than normal, being processed and sanctioned in six months when the process can take up to two years, he replied, "It is not unusual." [8]

25) On 29 January, the government confirmed that the Hinduja Foundation had held a reception for Vaz in September 1999 to celebrate his appointment as the first Asian Minister in recent times. The party was not listed by Vaz in House of Commons register of Members' Interests and John Redwood, then head of the Conservative Parliamentary Campaigns Unit, questioned Vaz's judgment in accepting the hospitality.[9]

26) In March Vaz was ordered to fully co-operate with a new inquiry launched into his financial affairs by Elizabeth Filkin. Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, Vaz's superior, also urged him to fully answer allegations about his links with the Hinduja brothers. Mr Vaz met Mrs Filkin on 20 March to discuss a complaint that the Hinduja Foundation had given the sum of £1,200 to Mapesbury Communications, a company run by his wife, in return for helping to organise a Hinduja-sponsored reception at the House of Commons. Vaz had previously denied receiving money from the Hindujas, but insisted that he made no personal gain from the transaction in question.[10][11]

- 27) In June 2001 Vaz said that he had made representations during the Hinduja brothers' applications for British citizenship while a backbench MP. Tony Blair also admitted that Vaz had "made representations" on behalf of other Asians.[12]
- 28) On 11 June 2001 Vaz was officially dismissed from his post as Europe Minister, to be replaced by Peter Hain. The Prime Minister's office said that Vaz had written to Tony Blair stating his wish to stand down for health reasons.[13]
- 29) In December 2001 Elizabeth Filkin cleared Vaz of failing to register payments to his wife's law firm by the Hinduja brothers, but said that he had colluded with his wife to conceal the payments. Filkin's report said that the payments had been given to his wife for legal advice on immigration issues and concluded that Vaz had gained no direct personal benefit, and that Commons rules did not require him to disclose payments made to his wife. She did, however, criticise him for his secrecy, saying, "It is clear to me there has been deliberate collusion over many months between Mr Vaz and his wife to conceal this fact and to prevent me from obtaining accurate information about his possible financial relationship with the Hinduja family". [14]

### **The Suspension of Vaz from House of Commons**

- 30) In 2002 Vaz was suspended from the House of Commons for one month after a Committee on Standards and Privileges inquiry found that he had made false allegations against Eileen Eggington, a former policewoman. The committee concluded that "Mr Vaz recklessly made a damaging allegation against Miss Eggington to the Commissioner, which was not true, and which could have intimidated Miss Eggington or undermined her credibility".[15]
- 31) Eileen Eggington, a retired police officer who had served 34 years in the Metropolitan Police, including a period as deputy head of Special Branch, wanted to help a friend, Mary Grestny, who had worked as personal assistant to Vaz's wife. After leaving the job in May 2000, Grestny dictated a seven-page statement about Mrs Vaz to Eggington in March 2001, who sent it to Elizabeth Filkin. Grestny's statement included allegations that Mr and Mrs Vaz had employed an illegal immigrant as their nanny and that they had been receiving gifts from Asian businessmen such as Hinduja brothers. The allegations were denied by Mr Vaz and the Committee found no evidence to support them.[15]

32) In late 2001, Vaz complained to Leicestershire police that his mother had been upset by a telephone call from "a woman named Mrs Egginton", who claimed to be a police officer. The accusations led to Ms. Egginton being questioned by police.[16] Vaz also wrote a letter of complaint to Elizabeth Filkin, but when she tried to make inquiries Vaz accused her of interfering with a police inquiry and threatened to report her to the Speaker of the House of Commons. Egginton denied that she had ever telephoned Vaz's mother and offered her home and mobile telephone records as evidence. The Commons committee decided that she was telling the truth. They added: "Mr Vaz recklessly made a damaging allegation against Miss Egginton, which was not true and which could have intimidated Miss Egginton and undermined her credibility."

33) A letter to Elizabeth Filkin from **Detective Superintendent Nick Gargan** made it plain that the police did not believe Vaz's mother ever received the phone call and the person who came closest to being prosecuted was not Egginton but Vaz. Gargan said that the police had considered a range of possible offences, including wasteful employment of the police, and an attempt to pervert the course of justice. Leicestershire police eventually decided not to prosecute. "We cannot rule out a tactical motivation for Mr Vaz's contact with Leicestershire Constabulary but the evidence does not support further investigation of any attempt to pervert the course of justice." [15] The complaints the committee upheld against Mr Vaz were:[17] That he had given misleading information to the Standards and Privileges Committee and Elizabeth Filkin about his financial relationship to the Hinduja brothers. That he had failed to register his paid employment at the Leicester Law Centre when he first entered Parliament in 1987. That he had failed to register a donation from the Caparo group in 1993. It was concluded that Vaz had "committed serious breaches of the Code of Conduct and showed contempt for the House" and it was recommended that he be suspended from the House of Commons for one month.[18]

### **Nadhmi Auchi**

34) In 2001 the revelation that Vaz had assisted Anglo-Iraqi billionaire Nadhmi Auchi in his attempts to avoid extradition to France raised doubts about Vaz's suitability for high office and led to charges that rich businessmen had received privileged access to Labour government Ministers. Opposition MPs called for an investigation into what one dubbed "Hinduja Mark II".[19]

35) Anglo-Iraqi billionaire Nadhmi Auchi was wanted for questioning by French police for his alleged role in the notorious **Elf Aquitaine fraud scandal** which led to the arrest of a former French



Foreign Minister. The warrant issued by French authorities in July 2000 Auchi of "complicity in the misuse of company assets and receiving embezzled company assets". It also covered Auchi's associate Nasir Abid and stated that if found guilty of the alleged offences both men could face 109 years in jail.[19]

36) Vaz was a director of the British arm of Auchi's corporation, General Mediterranean Holdings, whose previous directors had included Lords Steel and Lamont, and Jacques Santer. Vaz used his political influence on GMH's behalf; this included a party in the Park Lane Hilton to celebrate the 20th anniversary of GMH on 23 April 1999, where Lord Sainsbury presented Auchi with a painting of the House of Commons signed by Tony Blair, the Opposition leaders, and over 100 other leading British politicians. Lord Sainsbury later told The Observer that he did this "as a favour for Keith Vaz". In May 1999 Vaz resigned his post as a director after he was appointed a Minister. In a statement to The Observer, a GMH spokesman said that Vaz had been invited to become a GMH director in January 1999, yet company accounts showed Vaz as a director for the financial year ending December 1998.[19]

37) Labour confirmed in May 2001 that Auchi had called Vaz at home about the arrest warrant to ask him for advice. A spokesman said that Vaz "made some factual inquiries to the Home Office about the [extradition] procedure." This included advising Auchi to consult his local MP. The spokesman stressed that Vaz acted properly at all times and was often contacted by members of Britain's ethnic communities for help. In a Commons answer to Liberal Democrat **MP Norman Baker** earlier the same month Vaz confirmed that "details of enquiries by Mr Auchi have been passed to the Home Office".[19] Since 2003 he has been a Member of the Constitutional Affairs Select Committee. In this post, he was criticised for unparliamentary language after he called Alan Milburn a "prick." [20]

### **Day Rule Vote**

38) Keith Vaz was again brought to public attention when the Daily Telegraph printed a hand written letter [21] suggesting that Vaz had, or was due to receive, some sort of reward for voting for the Government under the 42 Day Rule Vote in June 2008. In a letter to Vaz, written on 12 June], a day after the key vote, Geoff Hoon wrote:

*"Dear Keith... Just a quick note to thank you for all your help during the period leading up to last Wednesday's vote. I wanted you to know how much I appreciated all your help. I trust that it will be appropriately rewarded!... With thanks and best wishes, Geoff."*

39) Vaz was originally against the idea of holding suspects for 42 days without charge, but he changed his mind a few days before the key vote. Although Prime Minister Gordon Brown was accused of offering rebel backbenchers a series of deals in exchange of their votes, Brown denied that any such deals were made.

### **Black Socialist Society**

40) Labour's National Executive Committee (NEC) voted to resurrect the defunct Black Socialist Society (BSS) in 2006. As part of this, the party set up an Ethnic Minority Taskforce. Tony Blair appointed Vaz to chair this taskforce. When membership of the BSS exceeded 2,500 in early 2007, the society qualified for its own seat on the NEC.[22] Vaz was elected to this post on March 10 2007.[23]

### **Home Affairs Select Committee**

41) Vaz was elected Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee, replacing John Denham, on 26 July 2007. He was unusually nominated to the Committee by the Government, rather than by the quasi-independent Committee of Selection which, under the Standing Orders of the House, nominates members to select committees. The Leader of the House argued that this was because there was not sufficient time to go through the usual procedure before the impending summer recess. The Chairman of the Committee of Selection told the House that the Committee had been ready to meet earlier that week, but had been advised by the Government that there was no business for it to transact.

### **Conflict of interest**

42) In September 2008 Vaz faced pressure to explain why he failed to declare an interest when he intervened in an official investigation into the business dealings of a close friend, solicitor Shahrokh Mireskandari, who has played a role in several racial discrimination cases against the Metropolitan Police, and who was representing Assistant Commissioner Tarique Ghaffur in his racial discrimination case against Scotland Yard Commissioner Sir Ian Blair.

43) The Solicitors Regulation Authority began an investigation into Mireskandari's legal firm, Dean and Dean, in January 2008 after a number of complaints about its conduct. Vaz wrote a joint letter with fellow Labour MP Virendra Sharma to the authority's chief executive, Anthony Townsend, in February 2008 on official House of Commons stationery. He cited a complaint he had received

from Mireskandari and alleged "discriminatory conduct" in its investigation into Dean and Dean. The Authority was forced to set up an independent working party to look into whether it had disproportionately targeted non-white lawyers for investigation.

- 44) Liberal Democrat deputy leader Vince Cable said that Vaz should make a public statement to clear up his role in the affair. *"It is quite unreasonable that an independent regulator should have been undermined in this way. I would hope that the chairman of the home affairs select committee will give a full public statement."*[24]

### **28 day query**

- 45) In July 2007 Vaz was appointed chairman of the Home Affairs Select Committee. The appointment caused an outcry at the time since select committee members are usually proposed by the committee of selection, but Vaz was the only nomination made by Commons leader Harriet Harman.

- 46) In September 2008, Vaz came under pressure when it was revealed that he had sought the private views of Prime Minister Gordon Brown in connection with the Committee's independent report into government plans to extend the detention of terror suspects beyond 28 days. The Guardian reported that emails suggested that Vaz had secretly contacted the Prime Minister about the committee's draft report and proposed a meeting because "we need to get his [Brown's] suggestions".

- 47) An email was sent in November 2007 to Ian Austin, Gordon Brown's parliamentary private secretary, and copied to Fiona Gordon, at the time Brown's political adviser. Another leaked email showed that Vaz had also sent extracts of the committee's draft report to the former Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer, for his comments; according to Parliament's standing orders, the chairman of the Select Committee cannot take evidence from a witness without at least two other committee members being present.

- 48) The disclosure caused concern both among committee members and civil liberties campaigners, as the Select Committee's reports are supposed to be compiled independently of government influence. Shami Chakrabarti, director of human rights group Liberty, compared it to a judge deciding a case privately emailing one of the parties to seek their suggestions. Vaz denied that he invited Brown to contribute, except as a witness to the committee.[25]

## Parliamentary Expenses Scandal

49) Mr Vaz was implicated in the Parliamentary Expenses Scandal. As reported by the Daily Telegraph, Vaz claimed £75,000 in expenses for a second home just 12 miles from his main home[26]. His main home is declared to be in the North-west London suburb of Stanmore, and was purchased with his wife Maria for £1.15 million in 2005, and is around 40 minutes from Westminster by Tube, raising questions as to whether billing for a second home (a £545,000 Westminster flat) was essential for his work as an MP. He also flipped property: claiming for the Westminster flat's service charge and council tax (£2,073, and £1,022), then renting this flat out, switching his second home to a house in his Leicester East constituency, fitting it with around £16,000 of furniture and soft furnishings, as well as £600 month of un-receipted cleaning, service, and repair bills, then flipping back to the Westminster flat again, allowing mortgage interest to be claimed on the flat once more[26]. That is the end of the copied article.

50) A small selection of other useful articles confirming this systematic and routine misconduct in office which has been ignored is enclosed below in table 1 The list is far from exhaustive.

## ORDER, ORDER!



<b>TABLE 1- KEITH VAZ</b>	<b>A Selection of Articles Exposing Keith Vaz</b>
Hugh Fitzgerald, New English Review Editor	<a href="http://www.newenglishreview.org/blog_email.cfm/blog_id/23281">http://www.newenglishreview.org/blog_email.cfm/blog_id/23281</a>
Stephen Wright and Richard Pendlebury. Daily Mail	<a href="http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1058575/Labour-MP-Keith-Vaz-faces-sleaze-inquiry-outrageous-bid-sway-judge-behalf-crooked-lawyer-friend.html">http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1058575/Labour-MP-Keith-Vaz-faces-sleaze-inquiry-outrageous-bid-sway-judge-behalf-crooked-lawyer-friend.html</a>
Stephen Wright and Richard Pendlebury	<a href="http://centurean2.wordpress.com/2010/06/08/early-90s-vaz-was-proven-a-sleazy-git-truth-about-keith-vaz-and-crooked-lawyer-sleaze-scandal-as-labour-mp-tries-to-take-charge-of-crucial-committee/">http://centurean2.wordpress.com/2010/06/08/early-90s-vaz-was-proven-a-sleazy-git-truth-about-keith-vaz-and-crooked-lawyer-sleaze-scandal-as-labour-mp-tries-to-take-charge-of-crucial-committee/</a>
The Telegraph	<a href="http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/labour/9577876/Keith-Vaz-Secret-police-probe-into-Labour-MPs-500000.html">http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/labour/9577876/Keith-Vaz-Secret-police-probe-into-Labour-MPs-500000.html</a>
Kevin Boyle, The Truthseeker	<a href="http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/?p=61961">http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/?p=61961</a>
The Free Library	<a href="http://www.thefreelibrary.com/KEITH+VAZ+%3A+WHAT+IS+ALLEGED+AND+WHAT+MR+VAZ+SAYS.-a069950054">http://www.thefreelibrary.com/KEITH+VAZ+%3A+WHAT+IS+ALLEGED+AND+WHAT+MR+VAZ+SAYS.-a069950054</a>
The BBC	<a href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1217670.stm">http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/1217670.stm</a>
The Guardian	<a href="http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2001/mar/17/houseofcommons.labour">http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2001/mar/17/houseofcommons.labour</a>

## **PART FOUR – VAZ - HIS PART IN THE COVER-UP OF MS. SEVEN'S CASE**

- 51) I am in receipt of a very recent but significant email from Ms. Seven. She claims she was in communication with the Home Affairs Select Committee about her case. Further details can be provided upon request. This aspect is not covered in my initial reports, although I have recollections of Ms. Seven mentioning it to me. It now assumes importance. Given what Ms. Seven claims, it is alleged that in 2012, Keith Vaz in his role as Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee played a part in furthering the cover-up of the case of Ms. Seven with respect to her ongoing incidents of victimisation and her legal case. This case is referred to here as Seven versus Gossage and Nine Others.
- 52) It is alleged that Vaz did that in part to protect the reputation of high profile figures. Two of the ten defendants were from Bindman and Partners Solicitors, namely Sir Geoffrey Bindman and a “super lawyer” from Bindman and Partners of Leveson inquiry fame named Tamsin Allen.
- 53) Both the Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner were alerted to these details of Ms. Seven's case via an extensive dossier. The background to which is detailed as follows.
- 54) On 5<sup>th</sup> July 2013, a detailed report of Ms. Seven's case was handed into Barnsley Police Station and passed to the Senior Command Team for consideration. I, along with Ms. Seven the victim and complainant, was the joint author of that report. That report was not a complaint against South Yorkshire Police, but it did contain among many things, serious allegations against the Metropolitan police and the IPCC to name just a few.
- 55) That day, JAH was present in a team of seven. That day we blew the Shofar (ram's horn) both inside and outside the offices on Regent Street. The day before that (4<sup>th</sup> July), we blew the shofar outside the old SYP Police Headquarters where I got dismissed for telling the truth about the terror threats.
- 56) For similar reasons, the next day (7<sup>th</sup> July) we blew the shofar in London outside various locations which included the offices of New Scotland Yard, Paddington Green Police Station, the IPCC, the Hyde Park 7/7 memorials, the 7/7 bomb blast locations, the Royal Courts of Justice, Canary Wharf and last but not least Buckingham Palace.

- 57) Continuing with Vaz, in a separate report of mine, handed in personally to Sally Parkin for Mr. Wright's attention, dated 12<sup>th</sup> August 2013, I highlighted seven different complaints concerning issues related to the Chief Constable. One of these issues concerned the case of Ms. Seven and the alleged failure of the Chief Constable to respond to a request for police help in the ongoing victimisation and cover-up of the case of Ms. Seven versus Gossage and nine others. The ongoing case is extra-ordinary and the victimisation continues unabated while you both seemingly wash your hands of the problem and leave it in limbo.
- 58) In a letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013, Sally Parkin responded to my report by stating that information supplied about Ms. Seven's case to the Chief Constable had been passed to DCS Martyn Bates to review and it was his decision in relation to whether this issue was investigated (Appendix A) or not. Nothing further was said about DCS Bates' decision so we were disappointingly kept in the dark.
- 59) After a number of subsequent prompts to the Chief Constable, most notably in person on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2014, Ms. Seven and I, eventually received a formal response to that report from Deputy Chief Constable Andy Holt. That occurred on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2014 (Appendix B).
- 60) Mr Holt's letter on behalf of the Chief Constable, as related back to me, stated that due to the nature of the allegations, several departments and a number of staff, including senior officers had independently considered the extensive dossier. After careful review it was determined that, there are no matters relevant for the force and we will not be taking any further action at this time.
- 61) One special feature of this joint report of Ms. Seven's case concerns very serious criminal allegations made directly against Bindman and Partners and the lawyers Tamsin Allen and Sir Geoffrey Bindman. The evidence against Super Lawyer, Tamsin Allen in Ms Seven's case, as presented in this report and on the Farrell Report website is overwhelming. It is an utter disgrace that Tamsin Allen has never been arrested, charged and prosecuted for serious criminal offences as detailed in the hard copy reports handed-in, and also in the supplementary witness statements that zoomed in on this corrupt lawyer as signposted on the Farrell Report website.
- 62) I am in touch with other witnesses who have experienced first-hand, the utter corruption regarding Bindmans and Partners. They have shocking cases but overwhelming evidence that shows the

levels of corruption within that organisation. I have in my possession a great deal of film material which will also help to expose their criminal ways and their abuse of office.

63) The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) was alerted to Ms. Seven's case by way of it being one of seven complaints I made on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2013. The hand-over of my 77 page report to the PCC followed a brief encounter during the PCC's attendance at a summer gala held in Low Edges Park whereupon I introduced myself, wished the PCC well in his relatively new post, and mentioned my intentions to send him a very important report. If the PCC reads the section below, it ought to become clear just how important that report could be to survival and reputation.

64) Our repeated requests to meet with both the PCC and the Chief Constable, have been repeatedly ignored, but perhaps now that the position has become critical in South Yorkshire Police and where the PCC's position looks more untenable by the day, there remains a hope with us, that at last there might be a realisation, that some greater force is at work here and that our requests have merit after all.

65) Which side are you really fighting for? The time has come to decide. This is a defining moments in the history of South Yorkshire Police and policing in general. Of that, I am certain.

#### **PART 5 – MY OWN OBSERVATIONS AND ACTIONS**

66) The validity of Vaz's inquisition is predicated not so much on the fluency and style of his committee's robust questioning, but rather on the integrity, sincerity of the inquisitors and the fairness of the questions and the listening skills. From what I observed of this committee, there was a whiff of “staged managed theatre” but it is good in one sense that at least, that these things are being brought out into the open at long last. Who can be trusted though?

67) The obvious risk here is that some may be scapegoated unfairly and its possible that the PCC has become one such target to that end. It's also possible that the Chief Constable is also being set up as a target too, but the crisis there, is less intensive in an immediate context of job survival.

68) I know from experience what it's like to be in this kind of position. The force wanted me to resign or alternatively throw a “sickie” with occupational health when I spoke out bravely in truth over



the 7/7 false flag attacks. I refused to buckle and bend to the “sacred cows” and obeyed God's calling and stuck to my principles and I am mightily glad I did. It's been an extra-ordinary ride.

69) I have reasonable cause to suspect Vaz has been, and still is acting out a hidden agenda here and the cover-up of the true dimensions of Child Sexual Exploitation, which extend beyond the Asian community in Rotherham as the PCC correctly tried to infer. The real truth tells a far more serious story and points towards networks of high profile politicians, top judges, senior police, and high profile celebrities. It points towards the likes of Vaz. Often the sticky glue which binds the corruption all together is Freemasonry and you have to look at who actually heads up that Luciferian construct which allows something as evil as Child Sexual Exploitation to flourish for so long before a leak gets it exposed.

70) What I don't know yet, is whether either one or both of you are in on the cover-up act. There is little reassurance that you are not, but equally, no concrete evidence that you are. Offering this report , shows that I am at least prepared to still give the benefit of the doubt and try to help. I hope that it is accepted as a gift in the true “spirit” in which it has been compiled. I think it was Aesop who once said ***"We jail the petty thieves and elevate the big ones to high office."*** Those in high office, covering up the true underlying, and as yet, largely unspoken dimensions of Child Sexual Exploitation, need removing from their offices forthwith. Some of those most anxious to scapegoat the Police and Crime Commissioner may well be the real targets here.

71) This report is offered up to you to serve that end. If it was within my gift, I would personally waste no time and start to fight back against Keith Vaz. He is corrupt. He is a criminal.

72) The achilles-heel of Keith Vaz may well be his long-term relationship with the darling solicitor of the Labour Party, namely Geoffrey Bindman. The labour party are corrupt, just like every political party and back then on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010, the police service nobbled the wrong Tony and South Yorkshire Police and the Police Authority under Rotherham Councillor Reg Littleboy played their part in the act.

73) May be four years on, it's possible to contemplate that the Chief Constable made a courageous step in the right direction as the first sign that the police service are about to nail the right Tony and South Yorkshire Police will lead the charge and the fightback. I hope so.

- 74) The fact that you both have in your possession a 240 page report and additional witness statements on reports on Bindman and Partners means that South Yorkshire Police have abundant evidence to strike back at the corruption which Vaz in his position of authority is helping to protect by targeting the wrong people and by asking the wrong questions.
- 75) Bindman's Super-Lawyer Tamsin Allen, Sir Geoffrey Bindman and Keith Vaz are within your sights as targets. You must pull the trigger first, because clearly by the looks of it, you are most certainly within their sights-screen and they are almost ready and willing to fire the PCC without any mercy whatsoever.
- 76) I suggest you need to fight fire with fire. You are both at a crossroads in a momentous period in history. How do you want to be remembered? As corrupt cowards, or as brave public servants who stood, withstood, and stood firm against this corruption and turned around the face of British policing for good? South Yorkshire Police can become the best in the country but it will only become that if you call upon a higher power. Act wisely gentleman, please.
- 77) If you genuinely want to be a force for good and not evil, then agree to meet with JAH and myself and may the Force will be with you.

Tony Farrell

Dear Ms. Parkin,,

I hope this finds you well, in good spirit and well-rested, after having had a break from being at your desk last week while all the flack was flying.

I write to you once more, in the hope that you are attuned to our motives and that you might have some influence with Mr. Shaun Wright upon your return. Muad' Dib and myself have closely followed events of the last two weeks with considerable interest. As things stand, we are not among the vast majority of interested parties who are clamouring for Mr Wright's resignation. If Mr. Wright's motives are genuine, and if he is speaking truthfully, and I have no evidence that he is lying, then we applaud him for not resigning and caving in to pressure from all sides. That is a big if though and we say this despite the fact that Mr Wright has not exactly done anything tangible to help us, at least not in so far as we can see. We have been trying to help him in ways he may not yet be understanding.

We know that we are uniquely placed to help Mr. Wright and assist South Yorkshire Police to become a considerable force for good. I am also aware that you may have been the officer assigned to study my previous material sent for his consideration in August 2013. If that was indeed the case, you are probably well attuned to the nature of the corruption and may have a better vantage point than Mr. Wright on some of the real issues that rise above Child Sexual Exploitation. If I am correct in that assumption, then I am confident that you will appreciate that something is very different and unique about our request.

Yesterday, I wrote to Keith Vaz, stating my reasons for saying that former Chief Constable Meredydd Hughes has committed perjury on 9<sup>th</sup> September. I have notified David Crompton that I have taken this serious step against his predecessor. I could not find fault with Mr. Wright's conduct and contrary to the views of many, I actually thought Mr. Wright conducted himself with dignity under enormous pressure. In my time in South Yorkshire Police, I worked under the likes of Matt Jukes and had some dealings with Angie Heal. I had responsibilities for producing Strategic Assessments for Senior Command Team. I was the one analyst in the country that was prepared to risk everything rather than lie about the bogus terror threat construct. I recall interviewing Matt Jukes while he was District Commander of Rotherham, having previously worked under him as the Director of Intelligence.

I possess invaluable insight of intelligence processes and the cultural problems with working with senior police officers. I interviewed many heads of department and District Commanders and networked with Strategic Analysts both inside and outside the force. I had a two year secondment in the Government Office between 2003-2005 as a Senior Research Officer. I am well educated and I am not afraid of going against the flow and standing for truth and justice. Last but not least, I know I have been given a very special calling from God.

My qualifications are as nothing compared with my good friend Muad' Dib and Mr. Wright needs to appreciate that fact. Our request to Mr. Wright is simple. Grant us a meeting for a day. I suggest that the four of us meet up. We are prepared to travel from afar to meet with him / and you. Muad' Dib and myself, both have our roots very much in South Yorkshire and we want to help Mr. Wright turn this situation around for the good of humanity.

Yours sincerely  
Tony Farrell


, Managing Editor of the NER blog, *The Iconoclast*, and board member of World Encounter Institute. Mr. Fitzgerald is a formerly the Sr. Analyst for Jihadwatch. His articles are archived [here](#).

**Labour MP Keith Vaz faces sleaze inquiry over his outrageous bid to sway judge on behalf of crooked lawyer friend**

By

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1058575/Labour-MP-Keith-Vaz-faces-sleaze-inquiry-outrageous-bid-sway-judge-behalf-crooked-lawyer-friend.html>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/labour/9577876/Keith-Vaz-Secret-police-probe-into-Labour-MPs-500000.html>

**By Robert Winnett, Holly Watt and Claire Newell**

<http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/?p=61961>

Kevin Boyle – Truthseeker

<http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2001/mar/17/houseofcommons.labour>

**David Hencke**, Westminster correspondent

•The Guardian, Saturday 17 March 2001 18.14 GMT

## The MP and the unanswered questions

Vaz letters: in correspondence lasting a year, the tone became increasingly abusive as lawyer

battled with standards watchdog

## **Vaz rejects 'obstruction' claim**

Tuesday, 13 March, 2001, 11:03 GMT

<http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-75311116.html>

## **AMAZING EVASION OF KEITH VAZ; Dossier over Sleaze Inquiry Reveals How Minister Launched a Campaign against His Inquisitor, and How He Was Accused of a 'Double Wage' Scandal**

<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/KEITH+VAZ>

[%3A+WHAT+IS+ALLEGED+AND+WHAT+MR+VAZ+SAYS.-a069950054](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/KEITH+VAZ+%3A+WHAT+IS+ALLEGED+AND+WHAT+MR+VAZ+SAYS.-a069950054)