

**NOTES OF MEETING HELD AT ALVERBANK COUNTRY HOUSE HOTEL
ALVERSTOKE, GOSPORT – 9.30 AM – 23 FEBRUARY 2006**

Present: **Ian Wilson** Complainant
Rebecca Marsh Commissioner, IPCC

Code A

RM introduced herself as Commissioner with responsibility for Hampshire.

RM explained the purpose of the meeting, to explain the role of the IPCC in this case, to inform the Mr Wilson of what is happening and where the IPCC were in providing a conclusion, to explain the options for new complaints and to listen to any information, view, representations and comments or concerns.

RM explained that this case was a misconduct review case under the Police Act 1996, originally handled by the PCA. The PCA's responsibility under the Police Act or misconduct review cases was to consider the recommendations on discipline made by the police force, based on an investigation the force had conducted themselves. It is unusual for the PCA to see the investigation detail prior to receiving the full file and the recommendations from the force. This PCA role is now undertaken by the IPCC in relation to Police Act 1996 misconduct review cases. RM explained IPCC current powers.

RM explained that there was no power to become engaged in criminal investigation or prosecution under the Police Act 1996 rules. She also explained that discipline is based on breach of the Code of Conduct as distinct from issues around competence or mistake.

RM acknowledged that Mr Wilson would be unhappy with the outcome of the complaint and expressed her understanding of this. She also acknowledged that this had been compounded by the IPCC performance on the timeliness of the decision and communication with Mr Wilson.

RM explained that any new complaints would be dealt with separately and offered the opportunity to use the IPCC as a route for raising new matters. She distinguished between what would be Police Act 1996 complaints and what would come under the Police Reform Act 2002.

RM then invited response.

IW stated that he felt there had been a police cover-up and that he felt the IPCC could not get to the bottom of it.

~~ItRM said the law was explained that the complaint was investigated underwritten on the old Act which said there would be a cut-off point.~~

Mr Wilson said that Superintendent John James kept him and Mrs Bulbeck apart from the other complainants. After meeting with them, he then went on to tell the other complainants that he and Mrs Bulbeck were only interested in receiving an apology and did not want to take their complaints further. He was guilty of lying, perjury and perverting the course of justice.

It was Code A explained what the caseworkers do on receipt of complaints.

Mr Wilson said there was a new investigation happening.

Code A said that the subject of a new complaint could arise from this new investigation.

Mr Wilson said he had been fobbed off for eight years and they would do it again because it was exactly the same police officers carrying out the investigation. The Family Liaison Officer did not like to liaise. The Deputy Chief Constable did not know what he was saying half the time. It was a complete shambles. He believed the police are putting the cases to the CPS bit by bit and not letting them see the full picture. DCC Readhead is 'completely off his rocker'. He hadn't a clue what he was saying, and goes back on what he has said. IW last spoke to the FLO in 2004 at Police Headquarters.

Mr Wilson was Code A asked if that was the only way he received updates.

IW said there were 110 deaths being investigated! Because the numbers have now dropped, they wrote and told them they would get personalised updates on what was going on. He had yet to receive one.

He said the complainants were all looking for closure. Every time he talked about it, it dragged it all back up all the time. His father's last words to him were "Help me, son. They're killing me."

He said their original complaint was against John James. However, the people above him were clearly at fault.

~~RM said there was nothing in the discipline sanctions that disadvantaged the officers to the extent that Mr Wilson would want as an outcome. It was an emotional issue explained that~~ RM explained that this issue for them. The discipline system at the moment under the old legislation would not provide Mr Wilson with the satisfaction he would want and that.

~~RM added if there are criminal issues, the officer's retirement is halted. The IPCC would have no power to stop someone retiring regarding discipline. The discipline system is changing.~~

~~There was nothing stopping the IPCC dealing with that aspect of the investigation very quickly if there was a hint of an officer retiring, and the criminal matters would be looked at urgently.~~

There were are two points further stressed things:

- 1) let the IPCC collect any new complaints under the PRA so they can be dealt with;
- 2) The PCA's work in relation to this case still has to be finished.

The view of the IPCC would be based on the evidence they had and any supplementary evidence IW had. It would only become a criminal matter if malicious intent could be proved in relation to poor performance as opposed to incompetence, which comes under performance issues for the force.

Mr Wilson claimed that John James did not chase the doctors as he needed to get referrals from them to open a nursing home which he and his wife were planning to do following his retirement.

~~Code A said the IPCC would take into consideration the policies and procedures the force and Investigating Officers would have had to follow at the time. Every aspect of the investigation would be considered over all.~~

~~RM said she needed to find if IW was questioned regarding had any further physical evidence he may hold.~~

Mr Wilson said the IPCC were wasting taxpayers' money and this was just a rubber-stamping exercise.

~~Code A said that was not true. It was explained that -i- If something new came to light now that IW did not know about before, the IPCC could look at it as a criminal allegation against the police officer who had retired.~~

RM explained that she had only just taken over responsibility for the Hampshire force and was looking at the officer's treatment of complainants. She offered to send someone out to talk to Mr Wilson and to take a statement regarding new complaints from him, if he wished.

Mr Wilson explained that he was a taxi driver and expected to be 'pulled' after he has gone to the police with his allegations of criminality. He said RM had no idea of the complainants' frustration. They had other investigations going on with the General Medical Council and the Midwifery Council. They were all on hold waiting for the results of the police investigation. Every time the investigation was brought up, it brought everything back up again.

~~RM said she would. It was explained that the Commission would wait until they she had held the last meeting and then see if there was anything else that had come forward. After the old case had been completed, they could look at any new issues and get them dealt with quickly.~~

Mr Wilson said that, during the first investigation he spoke to Code A when he made his first complaint. The next contact was when John James told him he had decided not to investigate further. He said they would keep in contact. He almost blackmailed them into staying away from the Press. They got some good Press coverage, which kick-started this last investigation. He still does not know whether

all the cases have been passed over to the CPS. His father's death was categorised almost three years ago.

Meeting ended