

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