

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