

Thanks for the response.

It is somewhat fitting in this whole sorry situation that the person who deals with an appeal against a decision is the same person who made the decision in the first place!

Therefore, I will briefly respond to the points but I will wait a while before appealing directly to Upper Tribunal. **Could you please let me know, if this goes to Upper Tribunal, will it also be Judge Farrer who deals with it then?**

2. "error of law" was not claimed as the reason for appeal. "Inadequate reasons for the decision" was the reason for the appeal, as described in section D of the guidance notes. The appeal therefore incorrectly failed at the first step. It declined to review this decision for the wrong reason.

3. As explained in 2, permission to appeal should not have been refused.

4. As has been explained, the requests have become repetitive and heated **AS A RESULT** of failure of Dorset Police to be transparent and honest. Multiple serious failures have been demonstrated and it has also been shown that when the same request came from Annette Brooke MP Dorset Police did not properly answer it either. It is therefore clear that DP have used vexatious as an excuse to avoid providing answers to information that would damage it as it has behaved against the public interest **AND AGAINST THE LAW.**

5. I note again the total disinterest the Judge demonstrates about dishonesty in DP. Of course the letter sent on the 19th Jan 2013 post-dates the decision, the letter was in relation to the request for appeal – how on earth could it pre-date the decision? Did the judge even read it? Did he see the unavoidable conclusion of fraud by DP at the end? Was it only at that point that he decided to disregard it?

6. He gave the impression that he had not read the letter of the 19th Jan. If he had, it would be quite obvious that asking about course costs was indeed "to obtain information relevant to arguments which may induce a change of policy by persuading the public authority of, or awakening public opinion to the merits of the Appellant's case." Regardless of the technicalities, why on earth would a competent judge not want to be in possession of all the facts and refuse to read a short document relating to a case that has been going on for nearly 2 years?

7. The flow of requests on this and any other issues would be "stanching" in an instant if Dorset Police just gave proper answers, in this case how they are spending £522,000 for staffing, £153,000 on premises, £71,000 on IS services, and £100,000 on "back office / sees", and where the £548,000 "contribution to DRS" is going.

8. "The plain implications of impropriety, indeed dishonesty in his e mails, quite unsupported by credible evidence". I'm almost lost for words. Try reading anything I have written, particularly the letter of the 19th. EVERY SINGLE ONE of the indications of FRAUD described on the SFO website are fulfilled in plenty by Dorset Police.

9. I do not remember discussing the issue of speed cameras with the tribunal, if it was, it would have been to add background to the case. I am not expecting the tribunal to deal with the issue of speed cameras, only the issue of information.

10. Anyone properly reviewing the evidence of this case will be horrified at the behaviour of Dorset Police, the Information Commissioner AND now the tribunal and appeal judge. The only reason that

this issue is continuing to be hushed up is that, as I have explained in the letter of the 19th Jan, the problem is TOO BIG TO FAIL, but I can assure you it will.

SO SERIOUS HAVE BEEN THE FAILINGS OF JUDGE FARREER in this case that I now request that this is reviewed by another judge.

My concerns are confirmed by looking at the "Guide to Judicial Conduct", <http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/Resources/JCO/Documents/Guidance/guide-judicial-conduct-aug2011.pdf>

I quote (and I **highlight** some areas where I believe he has failed):

1.4 The principles are succinctly stated as six "values" and their stated intention is: "To establish standards **for ethical conduct of judges**. They are designed to provide guidance to judges and to afford the judiciary a framework for regulating judicial conduct. They are also intended to assist members of the Executive and Legislature, and lawyers and the public in general, to better understand and support the judiciary". The principles are:

- (i) Judicial **independence** is a prerequisite to the rule of law and a fundamental guarantee of a **fair** trial. A judge shall therefore uphold and exemplify judicial independence in both its individual and institutional aspects.
- (ii) **Impartiality** is essential to the **proper** discharge of the judicial office. It applies not only to the decision itself but also to the **process by which the decision is made**.
- (iii) **Integrity** is essential to the **proper** discharge of the judicial office.
- (iv) Propriety, and the appearance of propriety, are essential to the performance of all of the activities of the judge.
- (v) Ensuring equality of treatment to all before the courts is essential to the due performance of the judicial office.
- (vi) **Competence and diligence** are prerequisites to the due **performance of judicial office**.

Ian Belchamber