

From:

Ethical Approach UK

To:

Crown Prosecution Service

cc:

- (1)Independent Office for Police Conduct
- (2)Investigatory Powers Commissioner's Office
- (3)Ministry of Justice
- (4)UK Judicial Office

Date: 07/08/2025

Dear Crown Prosecution Service

PUBLIC INTEREST-RELATED SUBMISSION No. 2

Further to my email of 2nd August 2025, with which Submission No. 1 was attached, please now find attached a formal public interest submission titled:

“A Public Interest-Related Submission Re: Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and CRN: 6029679/21”

This submission presents an extensive assessment of the conduct of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) in relation to a crime report submitted on 20th December 2021 and evaluates

whether an investigation was lawfully undertaken in accordance with the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA).

The document details:

Clear indication that investigative actions were carried out by MPS officers, thereby triggering CPIA obligations.

Legal inconsistencies in the MPS's claim that "no investigation took place," including evidence of communications, officer activity and evidence management that meet the statutory definition of an investigation under CPIA 1996.

Potential legal breaches by the MPS, include nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance, and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice.

Concerns over the judicial process and the Metropolitan Police's representations during the Judicial Review (CO/2254/2023).

Recommendations for urgent action by the CPS, the IOPC, and other statutory authorities in the public interest.

Given the seriousness of the issues raised and the weight of corroborating evidence, we urge the Crown Prosecution Service to review this matter as a priority, and to consider the public interest threshold for prosecution.

We welcome an acknowledgment of receipt and any clarification you may require in relation to this submission.

Yours sincerely

Ian Clayton

Lead Investigator

Ethical Approach UK

ethics@ethicalapproach.co.uk

cc:

IOPC

IPCO

Ministry of Justice

UK Judicial Office

To: CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE (CPS)

**A PUBLIC INTEREST-RELATED SUBMISSION RE:
METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE (MPS) AND CRN:
6029679/21**

CPS SUBMISSION NO. 2

Subject: Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) – Crime Reference Number 6029679/21

Prepared by: Ethical Approach UK

Date of Submission: 7th August 2025

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This submission presents compelling evidence that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) did commence an investigation, but failed to properly investigate Crime Reference Number (CRN) 6029679/21, which was submitted to them on 20th December 2021.

The allegations in question which were reported to the MPS involved serious indictable offences including misconduct in public office and gross negligence manslaughter.

Despite receipt of detailed supporting evidence, including witness statements, expert witness reports and details of named suspects, the MPS maintained that *"no investigation took place."*

It is contended that this policing impropriety amounts to:

- Nonfeasance: failure to perform a public duty;
- Misfeasance: improper exercise of lawful authority;
- Malfeasance: deliberate abuse of office to conceal wrongdoing; and
- Conspiracy to Pervert the Course of Justice: coordinated suppression of criminal allegations.

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

On 20th December 2021, a formal crime report (allocated CRN 6029679/21) was submitted to the MPS, alleging criminal acts connected to the UK Government's COVID-19 vaccination programme.

Submissions included digital and hard copy evidence, various evidential documentation and witness statements - including statements from vaccine injured individuals, as well as expert witnesses.

Despite this, the MPS later asserted no investigation had occurred.

The severity of these claims and the nature of police inaction demand scrutiny under legal, ethical and professional standards.

2. MPS 'NO INVESTIGATION' CLAIM v COMPLAINANT EVIDENCE

2.1 Key Evidence from Complainant

CRN 6029679/21 was issued - indicating a crime was logged.

Email sent by Complainant on 20th December 2021 which detailed evidence and legal concerns.

An online Dropbox portal for uploading evidence was created by the MPS and utilised for 10 weeks for the complainants' use.

Up to 400 evidential documents were submitted.

Correspondence was issued by senior ranking MPS officers referring, in relation to this report, in a manner which indicated explicitly that an investigation was underway. These officers included, for example, Head of CID, Central West BCU, Detective Superintendent Tor Garnett, in his letter dated 18th May 2022 and Staff Officer to Commissioner Cressida Dick, Superintendent Jon Simpson, in his email dated 4th January 2022, to name but two.

Officers of various ranks within the MPS were actively engaged in issues relating to the reported allegations.

Officers reportedly confirmed an active investigation was underway (December 2021–February 2022).

2.2 Legal Thresholds

According to the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA):

A criminal investigation is defined as

“...an investigation conducted by police officers with a view to it being ascertained -

(a) whether a person should be charged with an offence, or

(b) whether a person charged with an offence is guilty of it."

By this standard, the activities undertaken by MPS staff, described above clearly constitute an investigation and should have triggered all applicable CPIA obligations.

2.3 Legal Consequences

The claim that "*no investigation took place*" is incompatible with:

- CRN issuance (in this instance);
- Receipt and processing of large volumes of evidence;
- Statements made by officers to complainants;
- Facilitation of an evidence submission platform (i.e. an online submissions dropbox);
- References to "investigation" by MPS officers in communications relating to the December 2021 report.

If the MPS knowingly misrepresented the nature of their actions, they may be guilty of:

- Nonfeasance (failure to act);
- Misfeasance (wrongful act);
- Malfeasance (deliberate abuse);
- Conspiracy to Pervert the Course of Justice.

3. MPS FAILURE TO INITIATE FULL AND PROPER INVESTIGATION UNDER CPIA 1996 - A STATUTORY VIOLATION

VIOLATION OF THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AND INVESTIGATIONS ACT 1996 (CPIA)

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) stand in breach of the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA), which imposes binding statutory obligations upon police forces undertaking criminal investigations.

It is now unequivocally demonstrated that the MPS did, in fact, initiate investigatory actions in relation to CRN 6029679/21, including, but not limited to, receipt of evidence, establishment of an evidence submission platform, referred related incoming evidence to a specific “*investigation team*” as referred to in Superintendent Simpson’s email of 4th January 2022, as well as verbal confirmation by officers of an active investigation and intimation of the same in other written correspondence.

These activities satisfy the legal definition of a criminal investigation under CPIA 1996.

CASE LAW POINT:

R (McKenzie) v Director of Public Prosecutions [2004] EWHC 2663 (Admin) - Held that once a report is made and police begin evaluating evidence to decide if a crime was committed, an investigation has commenced under CPIA.

Despite these facts, the MPS have publicly and repeatedly

asserted that no investigation took place. This claim is demonstrably false on the basis of clear and corroborated evidentiary actions and documentation/correspondence.

This misrepresentation appears not to be any form of misunderstanding, but a deliberate fabrication, intended to unlawfully evade the statutory responsibilities and legal scrutiny imposed by CPIA 1996 provisions.

Such conduct, if proven, constitutes a serious abuse of legal process, institutional deception, and a calculated attempt to obstruct lawful accountability. It therefore engages not only CPIA violations, but also common law offences including Misfeasance, Nonfeasance, Malfeasance, and Conspiracy to Pervert the Course of Justice.

These failures are not clerical – rather, they represent substantive breaches of CPIA 1996 requirements and possibly constitute misconduct in public office.

4. COMPARITOR ANALYSIS: SELECTIVE NON-INVESTIGATION

UK police forces routinely investigate allegations supported by far less evidence than CRN 6029679/21 was.

The refusal to proceed in this case, despite its gravity, appears motivated not by evidentiary insufficiency at all, but by:

- Political sensitivity;
- Institutional risk aversion;
- Pressure to suppress dissenting narratives.

This type of discretionary avoidance highlights systemic misfeasance or malfeasance and calls for appropriate oversight and possibly prosecutorial interventions.

5. JUDICIAL REVIEW (JR) (CO/2254/2023) – AN ANALYSIS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DEFENCE

5.1 Key MPS Legal Arguments

No blanket duty to investigate all reported crime

Submission was only reviewed, not investigated

Material submitted did not meet recording threshold

Cited R (Corner House) and R (Soma Oil) as precedent

Argued COVID Inquiry was more appropriate

5.2 Points of Forensic Concern in relation to the above

Inconsistent with conduct: Receipt of evidence and officer statements indicate investigation

Breach of CPIA: Triggered by actions taken

Mischaracterisation of precedent: Case law cited in support of defence involved acknowledged investigations

Dismissal of claimant status: Ignores public interest in accountability

6. JUDICIAL REVIEW – THE IMPLICATIONS

Judicial Review Impact

Upon judicial review, Judge Poole relied on MPS's assertion that no duty arose.

This present submission which we hereby present however, evidences that such assertions may have misled the Court.

The JR outcome may be legally unsafe and should be re-examined given that by police activity in relation to CRN 6029679/21 and operation of law, CPDA was triggered into effect. A miscarriage of justice appears therefore to have arisen and is yet to be remedied.

7. CONCLUSION AND PUBLIC INTEREST RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary of MPS Misconduct

A crime report alleging serious offences was submitted to MPS by the complainants

Extensive evidence was provided by the complainants and was acknowledged by MPS

MPS officers engaged in investigatory steps

MPS later denied any investigation took place

The actions undertaken by MPS, clearly illustrate that an investigation (by statutory definition) had been instituted. This conclusion is of course strengthened further in light of:

R (McKenzie) v Director of Public Prosecutions [2004] EWHC 2663 (Admin),

referred to previously.

7.2 Legal Characterisation

- Nonfeasance – failure to act on statutory duties
- Misfeasance – procedural wrongdoing
- Malfeasance – deliberate institutional suppression
- Conspiracy to Pervert the Course of Justice – coordinated denial of lawful complaint

7.3 Recommended Actions

- CPS: Investigate whether CPIA breaches and criminal misconduct occurred and consider taking appropriate prosecutorial action
- IOPC: Investigate senior officers for institutional abuse of process
- MoJ: Re-evaluate judicial findings in JR CO/2254/2023
- Judicial Office: Review systemic issues in the JR process
- MPS: Publicly disclose full timeline and internal records, if necessary by means of the enforcement of any Direction or Order made in such terms

8. FINAL COMMENTARY: SYSTEMIC FAILURE OR DELIBERATE SUPPRESSION?

The case of CRN 6029679/21 represents a dangerous precedent. The CPIA 1996 - meant to guarantee procedural fairness, was not upheld. The judicial system appears to have accepted flawed claims made by the MPS.

This constitutes a failure of:

- Institutional integrity
- Judicial scrutiny
- Public trust

It is now incumbent on oversight authorities to respond transparently, lawfully and urgently and for CPS to pursue prosecutory actions where found to be warranted, in order to restore credibility to the rule of law.

FOOTNOTE: *For Submission to: CPS, IOPC, MoJ, UK Judicial Office.*