

**or favour'**

---

**From:** Newman Jamie M - HQ Directorate of Professional Standards

**Sent:** 16 August 2017 12:20

**To:** 'Lorraine Cordell' <[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto: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](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:** 07 August 2017 17:31

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