

From: Lorraine Cordell [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 21 November 2017 17:12
To: 'Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk'
Subject: RE: Our meeting today.
Dear Jamie Newman

I was just wondering if you were still on track to have the report ready by the end of Nov 2017 to send to me.

Regards

Lorraine

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 27 October 2017 21:26
To: 'Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk'
Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Dear Jamie Newman

Thank you for the update I hope you are well.

I was wondering if there is any update, I think you have given PC G enough time in order to address this and work with you in this matter which it seems so far he has failed to do so.

It has been 3 months since you sent the recorded letter and you have not heard anything and I believe that in it self shows he is not willing to address this.

I know by past the DPS would not have given us so long to reply they would have just went ahead without us to complete there report.

I know a lot of years was spent on the 1st investigation and overall this has now been ongoing since 2013 when this started, it is now 5 years in Nov 2017 this case has been on going I know some of this was due to the DPS not being able to do anything as court action was ongoing, but this court action should have never started in the 1st place. In fact this whole thing should never have happened if PC G had done his job correctly.

Could I please get an update as to were we are and how long this is going to take as you did state I should have the report by October 2017 but I cant see this happening now due to the time you have waited for PC G, which I do not think is fair.

Regards

Lorraine

From: Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk]
Sent: 26 October 2017 13:43
To: lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk
Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Hello Lorraine,

I hope this email finds you well.

I apologise for the delay in providing you with an update.

Over the past few days I have been discussing this matter with my supervisor, we hope to conclude our discussions tomorrow upon which I'll be able to provide you with a more meaningful update.

Kind regards

Jamie Newman | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |

MetPhone 786675 | Telephone 0207 161 6675 | Email Jamie.newman@met.pnn.police.uk

Address Empress State Building, 22nd Floor, Lillie Road, London, SW6 1TR

'Setting the bar and upholding standards without fear or favour'

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]

Sent: 24 September 2017 15:52

To: Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards <Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk>

Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Hello Jamie

Maybe you can send to his work email I believe this is his work email address

roy.geoghegan@centreforsocialjustice.org.uk well that's what it says when I do a Google search on his name.

Maybe you could also get a phone number for him there not sure; but if you sent to his work email you would know he got it or if you called and was able to talk to him you would know if he even wanted to help in this, Maybe he has had the letters but know he does not need to help if he does not want to, maybe send someone round to the address you have. This is just some ideas not sure if you can use them.

Regards

Lorraine Cordell

From: Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk]

Sent: 22 September 2017 16:35

To: lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk

Subject: Our meeting today.

Hello Lorraine,

I hope this email finds you well.

Alas I've heard nothing from PC G, now I am entertaining the possibility that he may have moved.

As such, I will briefly examines ways in which to confirm any potential new address before going on to write the report, in my view you've waited long enough.

What are your thoughts?

Kind regards

Jamie Newman | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |

MetPhone 786675 | Telephone 0207 161 6675 | Email Jamie.newman@met.pnn.police.uk

Address Empress State Building, 22nd Floor, Lillie Road, London, SW6 1TR

'Setting the bar and upholding standards without fear or favour'

From: Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards

Sent: 16 August 2017 12:20

To: 'Lorraine Cordell' <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Hello Lorraine,

Many apologies again for my delayed reply, it's been a busy week or so.

I've had no response from PC G, the letter was sent recorded delivery. So far, there's nothing to say he no longer resides at the address etc. I'll keep you updated on that front. As it stands, should PC G choose to not assist then presently there is little we could do to compel him to provide an account in the furtherance of the investigation.

I note all of your comments in your email, I can assure you they will be taken into account when I come to write my report.

Re PC G's current occupation, I note your views. All I can say is that my review of the evidence will be objective and governed by the information available to me.

If you've any questions for me at this stage, as ever, please do put them to me.

Kind regards

Jamie Newman | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |

MetPhone 786675 | Telephone 0207 161 6675 | Email Jamie.newman@met.pnn.police.uk

Address Empress State Building, 22nd Floor, Lillie Road, London, SW6 1TR

'Setting the bar and upholding standards without fear or favour'

From: Lorraine Cordell [<mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>]

Sent: 07 August 2017 17:31

To: Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards <Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk>

Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Dear Jamie

Thank you for the update reply.

Due to never seeing PC G statement written after what happened on the day, and never having access to any documents since, I rely on what was said in court from PC G and also the 1st report after the 1st investigation that the DPS did, which you are now redoing due to what the IPCC said.

PC G stated there was no notebook in court; he stated Mr Cordell was arrested due to him not giving his details so they could be confirmed he stated Mr Cordell had said he was homeless. But Mr Cordell knew there was a notebook he saw PC G writing in it on the day he was arrested, and knew he had given his details as if he had not how would PC G have been able to speak to the insurance companies.

In the Crown Court Appeal in went a lot deeper my son had a barrister and he knew what to ask.

When PC G got into trouble after the audio tapes was played and the judge got really upset due to knowing that PC G had not told the truth the Judge asked for all documents the police office had replied on in this case. PC G passed a statement to the judge he had in his hand that he had been using in court. The judge was not happy with the statement as there was no date and timed marked, PC G said to the Judge that the statement he was using was a copy, it was my son barrister said there seemed to be a time on the back. My son's barrister had also PC G about the ticket issues and PC G said he did not have it in court, the judge stated at the start of the hearing he was on the understanding the notebook had been used.

The judge was really not happy and told PC G to leave the court room but not the court building, and that he wanted all the original document in court for him to see regarding this case.

The judges heard the summing up and went out to decide. The CPS went outside in this time I believe to speak to PC G. As when the Judges came back in and said my son had won his appeal and that he

was not happy with what had gone on in this case, the CPS stated to the judge this was a paper based file case and things get mislaid in this sort of files. The judge asked if the audio could be kept and placed on file in case it needed to be used later. Which we agreed to, and we then left the court.

It was not until we got the 1st report from the DPS and the notebook was in there that it was confirmed there was in fact a notebook all a long so why did PC G lie to us and the judges saying it was only a proformer and the statement he wrote when he got back to the police station.

Until we got the DPS report the only word we had that PC G used his notebook on that day was my son.

And I am sorry but it does not cut it that PC G could get away with saying his arrest was needed due to uncertainty as to the address provided. When a person is stopped or spoken to the police like my son was a radio check would be carried out to check to see if the person was wanted or anything else. The police have my son's address on there system so the address my son gave would have been checked and shown as correct on the police system.

My son did not need to lie he give PC G his insurance cert with no problem he had done nothing wrong, so would have had no need to give a wrong address as he would know it would have shown on the police system, why would my son say he was homeless? It was not my son that lied it was PC G and I believe that has already been proven.

I believe 3 weeks is enough time for PC G to come forward and is acceptable.

If the inspector had done his job when he come to the road side when my son asked if one could have been called this could have all been avoided, but instead he just went with what the police officer said and did not bother to check what my son was saying.

Something always come to mind here and that is what was written in the subject access request I got back from my son's insurance company, This was after the time we spent trying to stop the insurance company cancelling my son's insurance and going to courts. When I saw this it hurt as we knew the police had not told the truth and in the subject access request there was nothing to say my son was not in the wrong. There was no sorry there was nothing and this is just wrong. My son was the one that had the bad mark against his name for a long time until it was proven in the appeal court, not the police officer and this is still the case to this day the police officer has done nothing wrong in everyone's eyes when he did do wrong. He has been allowed to move on in his life, my son was the one spending all the time to clear his name not the police officer when my son had done nothing wrong.

"[...] Which is obviously ... we're in an awkward situation as well because [Data Subject] and [Data Subject] mum are constantly ringing us up. They don't understand that obviously we are going to take a police officer's views over obviously one of our policyholders because obviously a police officer's job is obviously to tell the truth and not to lie."

This is the action of most peoples view but in this case the police officer was not telling the truth my son was. And my son was the one being made to suffer when he had not done anything wrong. But yet people believe the police in everything they say.

I know you have said PC G's current occupation; I can assure you it would have no bearing on this matter whatsoever.

Maybe I see it another way his occupation is Head of Criminal Justice, Centre for Social Justice, cant you see the irony in this he is trying to find justice for people, but what he did in this case was never justice at his own hands, the DPS never served justice for my son, yet they knew PC G had lied in this whole case, and that PC G took it to the courts and again never told the truth and perjury himself two times in a court of law. PC G seems to think this is acceptable he still applied for his job roll where he is working to make sure justice is fair for all. I am sure if he had admitted to breaking the law in what he did he would not be in the position he is in now I do find this very relevant that is how I feel and my son does.

Best Regards

Lorraine Cordell

From: Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk]
Sent: 07 August 2017 09:44
To: lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk
Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Morning Lorraine,

Firstly, apologies for my delayed reply! I had intended to reply much sooner.

I think I'm correct in saying that the necessity for your son's arrest was associated with PC G's uncertainty as to the address provided. This is something I'll discuss in the report.

Can I ask, from where did you get the impression that your son's name was not in PC G's pocketbook?

To reiterate, I'd be more than happy share documents with you at the end of the investigation. As per the Police Reform Act, subject to the harm test. Was there any particular reason you'd want them sooner? I expect the investigation to conclude in October incidentally.

I was intending on giving PC G three weeks, what are your thoughts on that?

Re PC G's current occupation, I can assure you it would have no bearing on this matter whatsoever.

Kind regards

Jamie Newman | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |

MetPhone 786675 | Telephone 0207 161 6675 | Email Jamie.newman@met.pnn.police.uk
Address Empress State Building, 22nd Floor, Lillie Road, London, SW6 1TR

'Setting the bar and upholding standards without fear or favour'

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 31 July 2017 17:43
To: Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards <Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk>
Subject: RE: Our meeting today.

Dear Jamie Newman

Thank you for the update email and I also hope you are well, can I ask a few things please now that you have had time to go over the documents and information.

Regarding PC G notebook is my son's name at the top and has it been checked if a radio check was done on my son on that day, I find it hard to believe that my son's name is not in PC G notebook as and my son refused to give his name and that is why he was arrested, how would he have had my son's details to talk to the insurance companies which there is no dispute that he did and he would have needed my son's details to be able to give them to the insurance companies, which would mean he unlawfully arrested my son.

I know you said you would have no problem giving us the notebook and his statement and other information, does this mean we can not get this information until after the investigation is completed?

What will happen if PC G does not want to assist in this investigation, how long will you give him to reply to your letter before you decide he is not willing to assist in the investigation?

I know this time we will have the right to appeal to the IPCC, if we are not happy, but I do believe there is enough information and I can not see why the CPS would not want to take this further, the only reason I can see

them not wanting to take this on is due to PC G is now Head of Criminal Justice, Centre for Social Justice.

How long do you think it will take you to complete the investigation?

Regards

Lorraine Cordell

From: Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk]

Sent: 31 July 2017 14:14

To: lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk

Subject: Our meeting today.

Good Afternoon Lorraine,

I hope this email finds you well.

Further to our meeting last month I have written to PC G to give him the opportunity to participate in the re-investigation, I await his reply. When and if he replies I shall of course let you know.

Regarding a CPS referral, having reviewed the evidence I am currently of the view that such a referral should be left to the determination of our Appropriate Authority (A.A. - senior officer who reviews my report) upon the conclusion of the investigation. As it stands, I see nothing to prohibit such a referral, should the A.A. think it appropriate.

As you know, should the A.A. elect not to refer the matter to the CPS, you would of course have a right of appeal to the IPCC along those lines.

If you have any questions for me please do let me know.

Kind regards

Jamie Newman | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |

MetPhone 786675 | Telephone 0207 161 6675 | Email Jamie.newman@met.pnn.police.uk

Address Empress State Building, 22nd Floor, Lillie Road, London, SW6 1TR

'Setting the bar and upholding standards without fear or favour'

From: Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards

Sent: 30 June 2017 17:23

To: 'Lorraine Cordell' <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>

Subject: Our meeting today.

Good Afternoon Lorraine,

Thank you for taking the team to meet with this afternoon, I found our meeting very useful in enabling me to better understand your complaint.

To confirm, the first thing I shall consider is a referral to the CPS. I shall begin by examining what consideration was given to such a referral by the previous investigator, Jeannette Riley.

Under the legislation that governs police complaints it is possible to seek guidance from the CPS where there is an indication that a criminal offence may have been committed, it is this test that I shall apply.

Leaving the CPS issue aside for a moment and the possibility of criminal charges, I acknowledge your request to have sight of the PC Geoghegan's MG11 and notebook. Such a disclosure can be made under Schedule 3 of

the Police Reform Act 2002. I shall revisit this request once the possibility of a CPS referral has been addressed. However, I fully intend to comply with such a request, subject to necessary redactions.

Going forward, In addition the your original points of complaint I shall also attempt to provide a clear explanation for the issues surrounding the misconduct meeting occurring before you had the opportunity to appeal to the IPCC. As I stated to you earlier today, the MPS can only apologise for this oversight.

Additionally, as agreed, if you could send me Dean's details, or forward mine to him, that would be very much appreciated.

Of course, I'll keep you updated every step of the way.

If you've any questions in the meantime please do get in touch.

Kind regards

Jamie Newman | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |

MetPhone 786675 | Telephone 0207 161 6675 | Email Jamie.newman@met.pnn.police.uk

Address Empress State Building, 22nd Floor, Lillie Road, London, SW6 1TR

'Setting the bar and upholding standards without fear or favour'

Total Policing is the Met's commitment to be on the streets and in your communities to catch offenders, prevent crime and support victims. We are here for London, working with you to make our capital safer.

Consider our environment - please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

NOTICE - This email and any attachments may be confidential, subject to copyright and/or legal privilege and are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the permission of the sender. MPS communication systems are monitored to the extent permitted by law. Consequently, any email and/or attachments may be read by monitoring staff. Only specified personnel are authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of the MPS by email. The MPS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. Email messages are routinely scanned but malicious software infection and corruption of content can still occur during transmission over the Internet. Any views or opinions expressed in this communication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

Find us at:

Facebook: [Facebook.com/metpoliceuk](https://www.facebook.com/metpoliceuk)

Twitter: [@metpoliceuk](https://twitter.com/metpoliceuk)

Total Policing is the Met's commitment to be on the streets and in your communities to catch offenders, prevent crime and support victims. We are here for London, working with you to make our capital safer.

Consider our environment - please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

NOTICE - This email and any attachments may be confidential, subject to copyright and/or legal privilege and are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the permission of the sender. MPS communication systems are monitored to the extent permitted by law. Consequently, any email and/or attachments may be read by monitoring staff. Only specified personnel are authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of the MPS by email. The MPS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. Email messages are routinely scanned but malicious software infection and corruption of content can still occur during transmission over the Internet. Any views or opinions expressed in this communication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

Find us at:

Facebook: [Facebook.com/metpoliceuk](https://www.facebook.com/metpoliceuk)

Twitter: [@metpoliceuk](https://twitter.com/metpoliceuk)

Total Policing is the Met's commitment to be on the streets and in your communities to catch offenders, prevent crime and support victims. We are here for London, working with you to make our capital safer.

Consider our environment - please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

NOTICE - This email and any attachments may be confidential, subject to copyright and/or legal privilege and are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the permission of the sender. MPS communication systems are monitored to the extent permitted by law. Consequently, any email and/or attachments may be read by monitoring staff. Only specified personnel are authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of the MPS by email. The MPS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. Email messages are routinely scanned but malicious software infection and corruption of content can still occur during transmission over the Internet. Any views or opinions expressed in this communication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

Find us at:

Facebook: [Facebook.com/metpoliceuk](https://www.facebook.com/metpoliceuk)

Twitter: [@metpoliceuk](https://twitter.com/metpoliceuk)

Consider our environment - please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

NOTICE - This email and any attachments may be confidential, subject to copyright and/or legal privilege and are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the permission of the sender. MPS communication systems are monitored to the extent permitted by law. Consequently, any email and/or attachments may be read by monitoring staff. Only specified personnel are authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of the MPS by email. The MPS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. Email messages are routinely scanned but malicious software infection and corruption of content can still occur during transmission over the Internet. Any views or opinions expressed in this communication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

Find us at:

Facebook: [Facebook.com/metpoliceuk](https://www.facebook.com/metpoliceuk)

Twitter: [@metpoliceuk](https://twitter.com/metpoliceuk)