

Dear Judge Warren,

Thanks for your letter of the 6th March 2013.

On point 1, I would suggest that lack of impartiality / being selective with evidence is in fact in conflict with the judicial code of conduct and therefore that this is a legitimate point of complaint against Judge Farrer.

On point 2, I do believe that Dorset Police have acted fraudulently and have tried to cover up, not only about the information request but also complaints now in progress with the IPCC, and that the information commissioner and tribunal have now assisted that cover up. Lack of impartiality has played a major part in this – so points 1 and 2 are not entirely unrelated.

On point 3, thanks for your explanation, I can see that if it is a genuinely difficult case the Judge making the original decision might agree to an appeal – although it does seem to provide an additional level of protection for a judge who might have knowingly decided unfairly.

You have asked what the judge did, not large numbers of documents or websites. But because:

1. my simple search for the truth is being met with such resistance,
2. the simple, short proof is locked up in exactly the answers that are being refused,
3. the allegations and implications are so serious

... I must present a strong and detailed case with plenty of evidence and this is exactly what I have done, in fact, I think I have done well to summarise the whole case in just 6 sides. You do not need to read the other “documents and websites”, they are there to provide evidence for the points made in the main 6 page description, if evidence is needed.

The main body of my complaint explains the lack of impartiality in great detail. It sets out my background and the origins of the information request, the apparent conflicts with the aims of the Freedom of Information and the questions which have been refused, the background of the complaint and the motivation Dorset Police have to withhold information. It proves that Annette Brooke MP has asked the same questions and been refused answers . It provides a copy of the Information Commissioner contributions and my replies, also the contributions and replies to the Tribunal. It gives a list of the facts available to Judge Farrer at the point of the decision – these weighing overwhelmingly against DP & IC. It details the points in the Judicial code of conduct where Judge Farrer has failed.

Under the circumstances, a case to show lack of impartiality cannot be anything less. I cannot see how this can “not be sufficient” – if anything, it is over-sufficient.

On point 2 I believe that my letter of the 19th Jan 2013 demonstrates fraud and cover up in Dorset Police. I agree that this was produced after Judge Farrers initial decision but it was intended at the time to support the request for appeal – and could have been derived anyway if the judge had put a fraction of the effort into properly considering my information as he did into steering this whole thing in the direction of DP and IC.

Therefore, it cannot be more clear that there has been fraud, and cover up assisted by lack of impartiality.

I will attach again only these 2 documents, only 8 sides total, I really cannot make it any less.

I will let you know that the new Dorset Police Commissioner seems to agree with me. He has recently written to me explaining that he will ask a Chief Constable from another force to investigate both the apparent lack of financial integrity / transparency Dorset Police have shown, and the fact that they appear to have tried to cover this up by refusing to communicate about it.

I strongly believe that all those involved in this now know the truth but are in denial. I assure you, my confidence and determination in this grows stronger with every effort I see to wriggle out of it, and the truth will out.

Regards, Ian Belchamber