

Phone (44) 01730829416
Mobile (44) 07717222459
e-mail irfrancis@onetel.com

Sunny Bank,
Church Lane
West Meon,
Petersfield,
Hampshire GU321LD

13th July 2012

The IPCC,
90 High Holborn
London

Att, Peter Hunt Esq.,

Your Rejection of my Complaint against Humberside Police

Dear Mr. Hunt,

If I understand correctly your letters, you advise me that your decision to reject my complaint against Humberside Police **does not relate in any way to the validity** or otherwise of my original complaint against **Safer Roads Humber** for publishing palpably false claims, has nothing to do with whether the decision by Humberside Police to reject that complaint was **right or wrong**, but relates only to Humberside Police followed the **correct procedures** in reaching their decision - even if it was the wrong decision.

In deciding that Humberside Police did follow the correct procedures you appear to believe that:

(a) it appropriate that my complaint against **civil servants** was assessed under Police Reform Act rules relating to the **conduct of police officers**, whose duties, rights, responsibilities and terms of employment are all significantly different.

(b) to the extent that Humberside Police was itself, as a member of Safer Roads Humber, implicated in the misconduct of which I complained, you consider it acceptable that they should - in direct breach of the ancient and important principle *Nemo iudex in causa sua* - that no one may be the judge in his own case - exonerate themselves in this way rather than refer my complaint to another Force not similarly tainted by association.

(c) that it is acceptable for the police officer who decided that there is no case to answer to tell me that

"There is no specific criminal offence for a generic breach of a statutory duty of care. I cannot envisage a scenario where the publication of an annual report can cause a breach of a statutory duty of care"

i.e. that he **cannot envisage any circumstances** whatever under which a **civil servant could ever commit a criminal offence by publishing false information in a an official report, however ludicrous, however dangerous that information might be**, and that it is acceptable for him to write that nonsense despite my having already brought to his attention the Perjury Act of 1911 that inter alia covers such conduct.

If my understanding is correct - I assume you will correct me if I am mistaken - it serves only to confirm again in my mind the opinion of many others with whom I am in contact, that **the terms of reference of your organisation are so narrowly drawn - arguably deliberately - as to make it a complete and utter waste of time and (taxpayers') money whose only purpose is to present to the country a facade of independent assessment of complaints that in reality does not exist, and that your organisation is in fact a mechanism for protecting the police from legitimate complaints by the public.**

Whether you find your work satisfying, and whether you will in due course look back over your time at the IPCC with satisfaction of a job well done is of course a matter entirely for you - but I would prefer to sweep the streets than waste my time and abandon my integrity in such an organisation.

I may be wrong, but I believe I read that the IPCC will soon be closed down. If so, the sooner the better for all concerned.

Finally, while I note that while there is no appeal against your decision I also note your comment that I remain free to take my complaint against Safer Roads Humber to the Home Office. I will do precisely that, having already informed every Humberside Councillor, MP and MEP of the fraud being perpetrated by that organisation. Somewhere in this country there must be **someone** who actually cares that public servants who are either grotesquely incompetent to the point of imbecility or otherwise can only be lying through their teeth - and is prepared to do something about it.

Yours faithfully,

Idris Francis