

Dear Haseeb Awan,

Thanks for your letter dated 12th November, 2014, explaining that the IPCC is not upholding my complaint against Hampshire Police, for failing to record my complaint against Colin Smith and Sally French. Let me demonstrate to you how you have now added your name to the list which one day I am going to attempt to compile with all those who have contributed to this corruption, fraud and cover-up named and shamed. It's going to be quite a lengthy task and I am sure it will one day be of great interest to whoever finally deals with this properly.

To properly explain I need to detail some of the factors leading up to the appeal, so as briefly as possible:

Recent Background:

The full analysis and all the evidence is extensively documented at www.dorsetspeed.org.uk:

1. Dorset Police / Road "Safe" (headed up by the Chief Constable Martin Baker) made £1million from a fraudulent speed camera (by lying about the reasons for installation, for safety, and therefore also misrepresenting the safety benefit of the camera) and lied again, and again and lied about top level course costs so although there are many other issues this alone shows that the primary terms of the original complaint, misrepresentation of finances and misrepresentation of safety benefit, were completely met.
2. IN ADDITION TO THIS Colin Smith agreed with me that top level costings I was given "did not stack up". Also "the KSI improvements COULD NOT be totally reflective of the action taken .. that hasn't been properly reflected in the communication at all these levels, and we will say that" and I have even provided audio evidence of this. So there is not only concrete evidence but the Chief Investigator agreed as well and there is concrete evidence of that!
3. However the written report CS produced was in total conflict with the knowledge and beliefs Colin Smith understood and expressed in our meetings. So the simple reality is that Colin Smith put in writing a report that he KNEW MISREPRESENTED THE TRUTH and that is a shocking failure for a "Head of Professional Standards" and this must have been obvious to Sally French (of the "Anti corruption unit, that's a laugh!) who did NOTHING about it.
4. Although there were a massive number of other issues Martyn Underhill keenly accepted this report which cleared Dorset Police carefully ensuring that I had no opportunity to point out to him any of the blatant and numerous weaknesses, errors, omissions and inconsistencies.
5. Despite this appalling background which I explained in total clarity the IPCC did not uphold my resulting appeal. The weakness in the response was blatant – Matthew Johnson said in his letter that he had "decided" not to uphold the appeal but when pushed tried to suggest that he would not have been allowed to do otherwise, and certainly could not look at any detail of what had gone before.

So I raised a complaint directly against Colin Smith and Sally French, a perfectly legitimate standalone complaint for badly misrepresenting what they knew and believed in an important report to a PCC of another force containing serious allegations including fraud. Obviously, if the report had been corrupted, anything happening as a result of it, Martyn Underhill's acceptance, and the IPCC's

refusal to uphold appeal, would be very questionable so given the strength and simplicity the issues should most certainly have been properly considered.

However, Hampshire only made a technical consideration based on whether the complaint was against the “conduct” or against the “findings” and without any explanation only concluded it was against the “findings”. The next spectacular step in avoidance was to say that as there had already been an appeal which was not upheld, I was attempting to “circumvent the procedures” which was “vexatious”. Great, complaint dodged, issues ignored, everyone is safe.

But:

1. My complaint was against the conduct! Misrepresenting the facts in an important police report is serious misconduct. And in my summary I had written “It could not be more obvious that CS and SF have distorted the report so that it protects Dorset Police and MB, rather than acting in the public interest and reporting the facts as they know them to be. Not only does this make a mockery of their job titles and bring further shame and mistrust to the police in general” And Mark Chatterton conveniently considered that this was not a complaint concerning conduct! So by Mark Chatterton’s logic, if a senior police officer creates an important report in which they deliberately misrepresent the truth, enabling the wrong findings to be concluded, it is an issue of the findings, there is no misconduct!!!!
2. The previous appeal which was not upheld and even Martyn Underhill’s decision are totally dependent on there being a completely honest report from Colin Smith. These subsequent decisions are null and void while there is a question over Colin Smith’s report. There is not even a question. There is no relationship between what Colin Smith said and what he wrote. The report is corrupted. The evidence is black and white and Colin Smith agreed with it!!

Refusal to uphold complaint:

Now to point 3 in the refusal of the IPCC to uphold the complaint against Hampshire about refusing to record the complaint of CONDUCT of Colin Smith:

“... I have taken into consideration the complaint and decisions made and have not upheld your appeal.”

The only “substance” (I use the term generously) I can find is “You were given the opportunity, upon completion of the investigation into your complaint when you exercised your right of appeal, to voice your concerns regarding the alleged misconduct of Mr Colin Smith, Miss Sally French, and the report. However, you chose not to do so.”

WWWHHHAAATTTT???? My original text can be seen here:

<http://www.dorsetspeed.org.uk/2014/mh.aspx>

See the paragraph headed “The Hampshire Investigation”, it includes for example: *“I clearly remember Colin Smith saying in our first meeting that he could see why I was asking those questions as the numbers simply did not stack up. This was during the process of agreeing the terms on the complaint. How could he possibly then have concluded the case without answering that concern??*

But although we now have pages of figures on expenses over many years, he has failed to comment any further about this (this is typical of the rest of the report). This inconsistency alone provides the “smoking gun” that Colin Smith knew that there was a problem but chose, or perhaps was encouraged, to sweep it under the carpet. He has chosen to ignore perhaps the crucial point that would have started to unlock the entire truth. This is the second point indicating that Colin Smith has favoured Dorset Police in this investigation.”

I followed up this extensive objection with further items, a link to clips from a radio program in which Martyn Underhill and I spoke, a further article in response to the IPCC and analysis of the recoding of the meeting.

And I chose “NOT TO VOICE MY CONCERNS”????????????????? Have you actually read anything at all about any of this????

“As you have already submitted an appeal which was not upheld, this complaint is deemed as an abuse of the complaints procedure” Good grief. So, to put this schematically, if we consider A to be Colin Smiths report, B Martyn Underhill’s acceptance of it, and C IPCCs refusal to uphold the appeal against Martyn Underhill’s decision, we have:

A results in B, B results in C, A cannot be wrong and cannot be questioned because of C!!!!!! And A was as I have explained a report which the author knew was corrupted!! B and C HAVE BEEN CORRUPTED by A!! Do you understand??

“(if) it is thought that there had been any issue with regard to the conduct of Miss French, Mr Smith, and the report, it would have been identified by the casework manager who reviewed your appeal”

That might have been what he was meant to do but he dodged it. “it is not my role to reinvestigate matters that Mr Belchamber raises but to reflect on whether the police investigation has been appropriate and the Dorset PCC has arrived at the correct conclusions on the evidence [except of course Mr Belchamber’s evidence!!!!]” “I appreciate that you feel there is a reluctance to look at your evidence and provide a straight response however I am confined by law as to what matters I can make decisions on”

“I’m sorry that you consider my response to be absurd. I was only trying to explain what decisions I can and can’t make and the ambit of the IPCC.”

My reply:

Your introductory letter stated “I have today decided not to uphold your appeal. In short the reason for this is because I can see no evidence of misconduct by the former Chief Constable of Dorset Police”

So is this or is this not your decision? Were you or were you not allowed to reach this decision? Was it within the ambit of the IPCC? Could you in fact have decided to uphold the appeal because you could see evidence of misconduct?

And how could you not have seen any evidence when it has been put in front of you in black and white? It can only be that your eyes were closed to it, or perhaps you were told to close your eyes to it.

Perhaps you were not allowed to disagree with the “findings” (perhaps “losings” would be more accurate) of Hampshire and Martyn Underhill’s acceptance of them in which case WHAT ON EARTH is the point in the appeal process?

Conclusion

I struggled hard to find only 2 points worthy of response, and have shown that on both of them you are spectacularly wrong, misguided or just plain blissfully unaware of what is going on. You appear to have absolutely no grasp whatsoever about what any of this is about. Even if your decision had been correct it is so weak and substanceless that it is of no credibility. How could such an abysmal report be produced on such a serious matter?

I am now forced to conclude that there is wholesale institutional systematic corruption not just in Dorset Police but also Hampshire and probably all over the country, and the IPCC is not in the slightest bit independent, it is either incompetent beyond belief or simply another layer protecting corrupt policing and I think it is the latter.

As I read the last paragraph, “We are committed to providing the highest possible standard...” and reconsider Dorset Police’s Code of Ethics “There is clearly more work to be done to ensure that we are as transparent and open as possible, so that the public can have confidence in their police service and we can demonstrate that we deal robustly with breaches of our professional standards and constantly seek to learn and improve” I am only saddened. How on earth has policing in a civilised society come to this?

How on earth have such a large number of such serious failings been persistently dodged by the police and their complaints system over such a long time? By refusing to face facts, withholding information, and bending the rules so that they protect rather than guide.

I just came across an interesting article which is well worth a read:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/9839944/200-officers-a-year-retire-or-resign-to-avoid-disciplinary-proceedings.html>

And the Chief and assistant of Dorset Police retired just as my complaints were registered against them and I understand that Colin Smith has vanished from his position.

Absolutely, completely shocking.

Ian Belchamber