Gmail

Michael Jones <[redacted]>

Your PHSO complaint C-2184831

Michael Jones <[redacted]> 7 August 2026 at 13:47
Reply-To: [redacted]
To: Vicki Mitchell <Vicki.Mitchell@ombudsman.org.uk>

Vicki.Mitchell@ombudsman.org.uk

Dear Ms Mitchell,

Thank you for your yesterday's email in relation to my complaint.

To clarify in response to the questions in your email:

1. There has been no change in MPS's position with regard to recording a crime and issuing a crime reference number in response to my crime report made on 14/10/2024 (and repeated on 09/01/2025). This is in spite of my complaint to MPS, its referral to MOPAC, and in spite of MPS's duty under the Victims' Code and under the Home Office crime recording rules to do so. You will appreciate that this is the entire justification for my referral of the complaint to the PHSO.

2. I appreciate that this detail of my correspondence with MPS between 17 & 18 October 2024 requires clarification. The correspondence is found on pp. 20-23 of the binder listed as attachment 4 in my original email to the PHSO of 20/11/2025.

I had issued an update to my crime report on 18/10/2024 (p. 21 of the binder) which followed the email from MPS of 17/10/2024 offering to make the appointment for an officer to visit me (p. 20). The update also followed my attempts earlier on 18th (in response to that email) to telephone the 101 service in order to make the suggested appointment. Incidentally, it was not feasible that an officer should visit me as I was homeless and did not know from one day to the next at which particular hostel address I might be staying. For this reason I had telephoned 101 in order to arrange an appointment that I should visit a named police station in order to discuss the evidence in person and to submit it by hand.

I made numerous attempts on 18/10/2024 to call 101 to arrange my visit at a named police station. During the first two of those calls, after waiting 20-30 minutes on each call before speaking to a call-handler, and after giving my personal details and stating the purpose of the call, the calls were each abruptly terminated before any arrangement could be made. As these were free calls from a landline, it seemed that the most likely explanation was that 101 had deliberately terminated the calls in order to frustrate my attempts to arrange the appointment. I then tried the CMS contact number on 02074846700 but was told they couldn't assist me and that I must use the 101 service. I tried several more times on 18/10/2024 to call 101 to arrange the appointment (using the same landline), but was unable to get through further to a human agent on any of those attempts. It therefore proved impossible to make the arrangement using the 101 service, as had been suggested in MPS's email to me of 17/10/2024.

The update to my report made on 18/10/2024 was therefore made tinged with my frustration over what seemed clear to me was MPS's overt resistance to issuing a crime reference number, bearing in mind that the *Home Office Crime Recording Rules for Front line Officers and Staff* states (on p. 7) that a belief by a victim that a crime has occurred is normally sufficient to justify its recording. Had MPS observed that rule and appropriately issued a crime reference, I would then have had an opportunity to submit the evidence online. As it did not observe that rule, the only option I had for submitting the evidence was to include it with my complaint to MPS made on 12/11/2024.

The manner in which my response to MPS in the form of my update of 18/10/2024 is presented in MOPAC's Outcome to its review of my complaint (pp. 5-6 of that document – item 07 of the MOPAC folio) is to take it out of context and to falsely construe it as a sign of my lack of compliance with MPS's procedure, which is unfair and an indication of MOPAC's own bias in its conduct of the review. After all, the details related above describing my frustrations using the 101 service on 18/10/2024 had also featured in my correspondence with

the CRU in relation to my complaint (re: pp. 1-2 of my email to the CRU of 16/12/2024 – item 08 of *Complaint_IOPC_MPS_folio*), this item of course being in MOPAC's possession.

The response from MPS to my update of 18/10/2024 had been its email of the same date (p.23 of the binder referenced above) in which it had referred me to Action Fraud. With regard to that response in particular, the *Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime* states, on p. 2:

> *"Where victims contact police to report a fraud, police may, unless a police CALL FOR SERVICE exists [...], advise the victim that they can report fraud to Action Fraud directly via the contact centre by telephone or on-line reporting tool. If this advice is taken, then there is no need for police to record a crime or record a CRI. Where victims decline this facility and ask police to record a fraud, then police should take full details of the fraud and pass the details to NFIB."*

The rule makes it clear that, even in the absence of a call for service, it is the prerogative of the victim to decide, either to follow the advice and make a referral to Action Fraud, or instead to insist that the police record a crime locally and for police to make their own referral to AF. Moreover, I had made it clear in my crime report that a call for service existed in view of the fact that there was suspect-held evidence that was under imminent threat of disposal by the suspect. The quoted rule dictates therefore that MPS was obliged to record a fraud in response to my report, issue a crime reference number, and accept the full evidence I had referred to, all without unjustified delay during October 2025, each of which it resisted to do at the time and continues to resist.

For your information, both of the documents: *Home Office Crime Recording Rules for Front line Officers and Staff* and *Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime* are available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/counting-rules-for-recorded-crime.

Best wishes,

Michael Jones

[Quoted text hidden]