Gmail

Michael Jones <[redacted]>

Your PHSO complaint C-2184831

Michael Jones <[redacted]> 17 August 2026 at 08:00
Reply-To: [redacted]
To: Vicki Mitchell <Vicki.Mitchell@ombudsman.org.uk>

Dear Ms Mitchell,

Further to my email to you of 7 August, I have comments to add which I hope will give greater clarity to the justification for my referring this complaint to the PHSO.

As a correction to my last email, the reference to "October 2025" in its penultimate paragraph should of course have read as: "October 2024".

In my response to your first question in that email, I had referred to my attempt to make a second crime report to MPS on 09/01/2025 (I had actually made two separate attempts to report the crime online during October 2024, so technically the January attempt was my third). The material in relation to this third crime report had not been included in my initial review request to MOPAC of 03/06/2025, but had been subsequently supplied to MOPAC attached to my email of 09/06/2025 (re: item 05 of the MOPAC folio). That email explains the reasoning and the urgency behind the third crime report – i.e., that it followed Kerry James' email to me of 06/01/2025, which had signalled to me that I would be unlikely to get a satisfactory response from the CRU to my complaint before the critical date of 04/02/2025, at which point the suspect would be at liberty to dispose with the evidence of my defence case file (for more detail see: s.5(iii) & (iv), and s.6(2) & (3) of my letter to MOPAC requesting a review – item 03 of the MOPAC folio; as well as my email to the CRU of 08/01/2025 – item 13 of the COMPLAINT folio).

Strictly speaking, the material of the third crime report falls outside my correspondence with the CRU in relation to the complaint of 12/11/2024 (although the crime report had been emailed to the CRU at feedback@met.police.uk on 09/01/2025 during the process of the report itself), and for this reason I had not included it in my submission to the PHSO of 20/11/2025. Should you require the material however, please let me know in response.

As described in my email to MOPAC of 09/06/2025, the responses from the MetCC Digital Contact Centre to the third crime report were an almost exact duplication of the sequence of its earlier responses in October 2024 – the first that: "this is a civil matter and as such, not something that can be investigated by the police"; followed, after my objections to that response, with the advice referring me to Action Fraud. For MPS to issue such a duplication of responses, with clear contempt for all the representations made within my complaint and in the crime reports themselves, only reinforced my complaint that those particular responses were being employed as cynical diversions in order to resist MPS's obligation to issue a crime reference number. However, I was not aware at that time of the crime recording rules as quoted in my previous email to yourself – I was only alerted to the source of the rules by MOPAC's outcome letter following its review of my complaint.

On p. 7 of his outcome letter Mr Broad had quoted from p. 17 of the *Home Office Crime Recording Rules for Front line Officers and Staff* with regard to the role of "other investigatory bodies", in order to conclude that the CRU's outcome to my complaint had been "reasonable". His reading of that document was highly selective however and his comments are misleading if one consults the policy in its entirety, with respect to more relevant inclusions within it. After all, the offence I was trying to report was not merely one of civil malpractice, but of criminal dishonesty involving fraud, collusion, and ultimately perverting the course of justice. Moreover, I possessed clear documentary evidence of the fraud, if only the police were prepared to receive it from me; and to have relied upon a civil investigatory body would not have addressed the urgency of the situation with respect to the preservation of evidence still held by the suspect.

The crime recording rules make it clear that in the case of a victim's report of a notifiable offence defined by law, the belief by a victim that a crime has been committed is usually sufficient to justify its recording. The crime I had attempted to report – *Fraud by False Representation* – is such a notifiable offence as it appears under item 374 (HO code: 053/40) in the *Home Office List of Notifiable Offences,* with a maximum sentence of 10 years imprisonment.

In the case that the victim provides information relating to named local suspects in the crime, p. 91 of the *Home Office Crime Recording Rules…* states that this constitutes a call for service requiring police to record the crime

locally and deal with as any reported crime (i.e., including the issue of a crime reference, which would then enable the collection/investigation of evidence). As each of my reports had identified local suspects, as well as the issue of outstanding evidence which required preserving from the risk of disposal, the *only* appropriate response to my crime report was for MPS to make its own report to Action Fraud in addition to recording the crime locally and issuing a crime reference number. I would then have had the opportunity to provide the full evidence to MPS to assist with any investigation.

There can be no doubt therefore that the MetCC Digital Contact Centre had knowingly disregarded the Home Office rules for the recording of crime in its persistent refusal to record a crime and issue a crime reference number in response to my three crime reports. There can be little doubt either that MPS's Complaints Resolution Unit acted with equal disregard to those rules in trivialising my well-founded complaint over that failure, declining to uphold that complaint, and thereby continuing to resist the appropriate recording of a crime. That the rules had been knowingly disregarded, implying that the substance of Kerry James' outcome letter to my complaint would be indefensible under legal scrutiny, is without doubt the reason why the CRU had prevaricated for three months since Ms James first wrote that outcome letter on 24/02/2025, before finally issuing the letter to me 84 days later on 19/05/2025 (re: s.5 (vii) & (viii) of my review request to MOPAC, with reference to items 16, 18, & 19 of the COMPLAINT folio).

Best wishes,

Michael Jones

[redacted]

[Quoted text hidden]