

I can confirm I have made contact with Mr Jenkins and can also confirm according to Mr Jenkin's recollection the officer did not mention their being tools in Simon's van.

Regarding the officer's notebook, as you're aware the officer did make use of one on the day in question, of course its content will form part of my investigation.

Going forward, I note that in their appeal findings the IPCC made direct reference to a transcript in your possession concerning a phone call between Broadsure Direct and KGM. Can you please send me a copy?

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](mailto: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 January 2017 10:37

**To:** Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards <[Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: PC/6804/13

Dear Jamie Newman,

Thank you for the below email.

I believe you have spoken to Martin Jenkins and he has confirmed with you that when Mr Cordell was spoken to by the police officer, Mr Cordell used his phone to call Martin Jenkins and Martin Jenkins confirmed he told the police officer Mr Cordell was insured to drive, and also the police officer never said anything about any tools to him on that phone call.

I also made calls that day as my son also called me what was going on.

I have asked many times to see a copy of the police officer note book, as until I saw the report from Jeanette Reilly, and it was confirmed the police officer did in fact have a note book, Mr Cordell always said he took notes but the police officer even said in court he never and it was only the ticket he had used that day.

The reason for asking for a copy is due to the fact of the name my son give and it is stated in his note book a name was given, then it seemed to change to Mr Cordell saying he was homeless, but the police officer would have done checks of the name given, which I believe the note book proves my son give his correct name as there was no reason for him not to have done as he never done any thing wrong. and this would have been confirmed when the police officer done his police checks.

There is also one other issue and that is when Mr Cordell asked for an inspector to be called due to what the police officer had said to the insurance company. Mr Cordell was telling the inspector that the police officer had lied to his insurance company about tools being in the vane, all it would have took was for the inspector to check the van at that time, he would have then seen something was really wrong as there was no tools and would have seen this, and this could have been addressed there and then without the need for my son to have been arrested.

If there is anything you need for me please let me know.

Regards

Lorraine Cordell

---

**From:** [Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk](mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk) [<mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk>]

**Sent:** 30 January 2017 12:56

**To:** [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)