

**From: "Miller, Stewart 5500" <Stewart.Miller@humberside.pnn.police.uk>
To: "'IDRIS.FRANCIS@BTINTERNET.COM'" <IDRIS.FRANCIS@BTINTERNET.COM>
Subject: RE: Your ref IX 306/12/SM Your reply is unacceptable UPDATED (NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED - NO DESCRIPTOR)**

Mr Francis,

Your request for the allegations you have made to be referred to another force was considered but we feel there is no justification for a referral to another force to be made.

I am sorry if you do not agree with the response provided to you by letter detailing why your complaint will not be recorded. You have the right of appeal to the Independent Police Complaints Commission on the recording decision.

No further correspondence will be entered into with you over this matter until I receive a decision from the IPCC regarding your appeal.

Regards

Stu Miller

Detective Inspector 5500

Professional Standards Branch

Humberside Police

Police Headquarters

Priory Road

Hull, HU5 5SF

Tel: 01482 578333

Fax: 01482 305004

Stewart.Miller@humberside.pnn.police.uk

**To: "Miller, Stewart 5500" <Stewart.Miller@humberside.pnn.police.uk>
From: Idris Francis <idris.francis@btinternet.com>
Subject: RE: Your ref IX 306/12/SM Your reply is unacceptable UPDATED (NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED - NO DESCRIPTOR)
Cc:**

Dear Mr. Miller,

Very well then - it's the IPCC and your Police Authority - and I will also file my complaint with another force.

Your first reply, saying in effect that it is merely my opinion that SRH's claims are false, strongly suggests that you have either not read the analysis I provided or if you have done, you prefer to ignore it. The facts are simply these - and they are not my opinion but recorded fact:

1/ Accident and casualty numbers across the country and in Humberside fell substantially throughout the period in question for a wide variety of reasons that have nothing whatever to do with speed cameras, which in any case cover no more than 1% of rural roads. (I show that wide variety of reasons in the other documents I refer to so there is no need to repeat them here)

2/ As the 4th National Report, the 2010 RAC Report and other reports recognise, falls in accident numbers at camera sites must be adjusted for this "trend" - i.e. the extent to which those numbers would have been expected to fall, as they did elsewhere, had no cameras been installed.

3/ While over this period national traffic volume changed very little (except perhaps in 2011) SRH's own data shows an overall fall of the order of 5% at their sites. As Appendix H of the 4th Report admitted, changes in accidents and casualties must also be adjusted for changes in traffic volume. (Whether, as seems likely, the 5% fall at SRH's sites was due to drivers changing their routes to avoid cameras or not is however irrelevant - what matters is that they did fall and that this fall must be allowed for.)

4/ Because cameras are normally installed at sites with a recent history of high accident levels, "selection bias" become a factor because it is likely that even if nothing were done, those accident numbers would then fall back to normal lower levels. Appendix H estimates this "regression to the mean" effect, for KSI accidents, as accounting for some 60% of the observed fall, with "trend" accounting for another 20%, leaving only 20% for camera effect. It also pointed out that had data been available showing falls in traffic, that too would have eaten into camera effect. As we know that in Humberside the figure was 5%, reducing the possible camera effect to 15% of the observed falls in KSI accidents.

The significance of points 1 to 4, as I have pointed out repeatedly to SRH and more recently to you, is that SRH fail to make any of these necessary adjustments, and instead claim the whole of the observed falls as having been due to their cameras and nothing else.

Their claims therefore amount either to extraordinary incompetence, or deliberate intention to deceive - there is no other possible explanation. Further, given their repeated refusal to withdraw these false claims, the latter explanation seems increasingly likely.

I know nothing of your CV, DI Miller, or your understanding or arithmetic, statistics or probability theory, but I say to you as clearly as I can, that if you are unable to understand the above you are unfit to assess my complaint - and that I will make this point forcefully when I write to the Police Authority and the IPCC over the weekend not only to appeal your perverse decision, but also to complain about your part in it.

There is another aspect of the SRH's claims that I must include here, though I need not repeat the detail available elsewhere, and that is their fatuous and preposterous conversion of accidents and casualties supposedly prevented into cash saved for society.

a/ They present the purely notional and theoretical "values" of those accidents as if they are cash - which they are not, and never will be.

b/ They also claim as cash savings the "lost output" or "lost wages" of casualties when no such losses occur. All that happens when A is unable to work is that B does the work instead.

These are two matters about which I am in contact with the DfT and Transcom, but the fact that the DfT gets it so badly wrong is little or no excuse for SRH to repeat such nonsense in their fantasies about the benefits they claim to provide.

One other point - Perjury Act 1911. Your first reply claimed that this Act applies only to false claims made in criminal proceedings - it does not. My complaint specifically stated that it relates also to false statements made in public documents, and that it can and does is confirmed by the following:

Perjury Act 1911 (c.6) Main body

5.

False statutory declarations and other false statements without oath.

If any person knowingly and wilfully makes (otherwise than on oath) a statement false in a material particular, and the statement is made

(a) in a statutory declaration; or

(b) in an abstract, account, balance sheet, book, certificate, declaration, entry, estimate, inventory, notice, report, return, or other document which he is authorised or required to make, attest, or verify, by any public general Act of Parliament for the time being in force; or

(c) in any oral declaration or oral answer which he is required to make by, under, or in pursuance of any public general Act of Parliament for the time being in force, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour and shall be liable on conviction thereof on indictment to imprisonment, . . . [F1](#) , for any term not exceeding two years, or to a fine or to both such imprisonment and fine.

Whether or not the annual reports in question are required by an Act of Parliament I do not yet know, but I trust that you will now accept that you were mistaken. In any case, your suggestion that, in effect, civil servants may publish whatever nonsense and drivel in public documents without fear of retribution cannot possibly be correct, and I repeat my earlier point that, whatever rules or laws apply, these claims are false and must be withdrawn. And if you have not yet found anyone in Humberside Police who understands that, it is high time that you do.

My complaints will not now be posted before 4pm on Wednesday 6th June

Yours faithfully,

Idris Francis

Malfesance in Public Office.

Dear Mr. Miller,

It has just been pointed out to me that those in Safer Roads Humber and East Riding Council - including it would seem Humberside Police - who have colluded in these false claims of benefits provided by speed cameras should be charged with malfeasance. The definition of malfeasance is:

"A term used in both civil and Criminal Law to describe any act that is wrongful. It is not a distinct crime or tort, but may be used generally to describe any act that is criminal or that is wrongful and gives rise to, or somehow contributes to, the injury of another person."

Please think again.

Idris Francis

Mr Francis,

Your comments are noted. I am satisfied that my original decision is correct. Please feel free to pursue your complaint via the IPCC, Police Authority or another force as you deem appropriate.

If the IPCC considers your complaint should be recorded then it would be investigated within the terms of the Police Reform Act 2002 which means the investigation would not relate to criminal matters.

I will wait to hear from the IPCC.

Regards

Stu Miller

Detective Inspector 5500

Professional Standards Branch

Humberside Police

Police Headquarters

Priory Road

Hull, HU5 5SF

Tel: 01482 578333

Fax: 01482 305004

Stewart.Miller@humberside.pnn.police.uk

Dear Mr Francis,

Your comments have been noted.

No further action will be taken unless instructed by the IPCC.

Regards

Stu Miller

Detective Inspector 5500

Professional Standards Branch

Humberside Police

Police Headquarters

Priory Road

Hull, HU5 5SF

Tel: 01482 578333

Fax: 01482 305004

Stewart.Miller@humberside.pnn.police.uk

Dear Mr. Miller,

My appeal to the IPCC has been delayed by unrelated factors but will be posted today.

I have only just noticed your second paragraph (below) but fail to understand your reasoning. As I have already pointed out, my complaint was not against Humberside Police or any police officer, but against civilian public servants in Safer Roads Humber - and it was about their criminal misconduct, and nothing whatever to do with the Police Reform Act. For the same reason and again as I have already pointed out, this matter should have been handled as a criminal investigation of those people and that organisation, not under Professional Standards of Humberside Police.

Yours sincerely,

Idris Francis