



## **Endorsed and Proven**

On 13/09/2019 Dad explained to you that his family's legal action against Bexley Council was delivering good results. But the family with special needs had become hugely dependant on having this child live with them i.e. they are still living in the home that Bexley Council had already formally deemed as unsafe for them to live. You said to Dad, "You feel that you have been let down by the council and I share that view". You agreed that you were misled by the council over a year ago back in 2018. You also agreed that the 1 sole action that you took on behalf of this child in May 2019, that we have proudly called "[From Pier to Prom](#)", delivered immediate positive results. It is now public record that your 1 sole action effectively endorsed how Bexley Council is using minorities to the benefit of their problematic residents and to reduce their workload. During this same meeting, you appeared to be more concerned with covering yourself as opposed to helping this family. You did not display any remorse for any of the excruciating pain that this family has endured.

On 21/10/2019 Mum asked you to repeat the 1 sole action that you did for her family. But instead of proving how the school must stop conspiring against her family, Mum asked you to prove this to Bexley Children's Social Care Services. Although this request is extremely fair and reasonable, and essential to help Mum and Dad's child, we have understood that you decided to not do this. We are sure that you will agree that you not doing this makes you look guilty to others. It would appear to some that you have again turned your back on this family as you did back in 2018. Your 1 sole action in May 2019 delivered so much remarkable success. But you are preventing this child from living with their Mum and Dad. Are you not doing this just to avoid the risk that your previous entire year of inaction will make you look bad? Or are you not doing this because you are helping Bexley Council defend this case?

## **Discrimination**

It is extremely plain to see for anyone looking into this case for the wellbeing of Mum and Dad's child, that this is purely motivated by race discrimination. As you have already proven and endorsed, there can be no other reason how this case has come about.

## **Teenagers Fighting Mental Health**

You are very aware of the high death rate for teenagers of the same age as Mum and Dad's child. Those who are fighting mental health, but who have not been forced into a situation as bad as Mum and Dad's child. This is astonishing, and as you also know, Mum and Dad's child has considered suicide on several occasions throughout this last year. We know that you are aware that you could have prevented this. Also, our solicitors specialising in mental health show how all of the perpetrators in this case, are already aware that Mum and Dad's child is fighting with their mental health. Not because there are any underlining mental health issues, but purely because of how Bexley Council is using them to their benefit. You have already endorsed and proven this fact. Now, ironically, this corruption appears to also have been adopted by your office.

To be clear, your action in May 2019 has proven Mum and Dad's claims against Bexley Council as valid. **Bexley Council has destroyed this child's chance to have a normal life, and has destroyed this whole family's right to have a family life together.** Put another way, whoever chooses to ignore Mum and Dad's calls for help, is doing so not for their child's wellbeing, but they are doing this to avoid being held to account.

The risk of Mum and Dad's child attempting to commit suicide is constantly high until all of this manipulation and use of them stops. Mum and Dad are living each day knowing that we could all have catastrophic news at any moment. Please stop this pain for Mum and Dad's child. You have already proven that you know exactly how you can do this. The irony is that you have already endorsed and proved, that if you contest this you are just going to create the same risk of the child attempting to commit suicide.

We have the following direct questions which simply require a short and direct answer from you:

1. Is there anything incorrect in these publications with reference to your involvement?

<https://economy.viseum.co.uk/abuse-of-power/human-rights/>

<https://economy.viseum.co.uk/abuse-of-power/corrupt-politician/>

2. Are any of these following statements incorrect?

- a. You first said to Dad on 06/07/2018, “Tell your wife you have both done what you can, you have worked very hard and this is now in my hands to help your child”.
- b. When you next met Dad on 07/09/2018 you said, “I refuse to believe this is racism”, and, “I may be wrong and your child is no longer living with you because they have not had the treatment they need”.
- c. You are aware that your lack of action left the family with nowhere else to call for help.
- d. The only action that you have taken to support this child was in May 2019, when you sent Haberdashers' Aske's Crayford Academy Mum and Dad's legal evidence of their case. Note, Mum and Dad have evidence that directly following their child seeing you do this, their child realised that they do not have autism, they started going to school, passed their exams, went to live back home and [celebrated their future at their school prom](#).
- e. On 13/09/2019 you said to Dad, “You feel that you have been let down by the council and I share that view”. You also agreed that you were misled by Bexley Council back in 2018. You agreed that you would say this to Bexley Council so that this family could get the support they need.
- f. On 21/10/2019 Mum thanked you for your 1 sole action of May 2019 expressing how crucial it was to save her child's life, (point d). Mum also asked you to repeat this 1 action, but instead of sending the school their legal evidence, Mum asked you to send it to Bexley Children's Social Care Services to stop them negatively influencing her child. Although this request was essential to help this child, you did not do this.
- g. The fact that you did not deliver Mum's request (point f) made you look guilty. It looked like you turned your back on this family as you did back in 2018. Your 1 sole action in May 2019 inadvertently delivered so much remarkable success, you are preventing this child from living with their Mum and Dad, just to avoid the risk that your entire year of inaction will make you look bad. You very clearly could have prevented this child from considering suicide throughout the previous year.

As you know, Mum and Dad have the court-quality evidence to prove each point so there is no ambiguity. If you do not reply, you respond with ambiguity, or pretend not to understand, then by [02/12/2019](#) we will publish this evidence. If you do not respond with anything to the contrary then you are proving that all the above is correct with reference to your involvement.

Mum and Dad have decided to give you the option to formally apologise. We are sure that you are aware that this apology will deliver similar results as did your 1 sole action in May 2019 and this family's pain will stop.

Yours sincerely,

Community SafetyWatch Legal Department

## UK Authorities

These 3 regulatory bodies are following this case in support of this family's human rights:

- On 20/01/2020 the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards advised us, we will need to pursue the legal remedy available for that breach. If a court finding is made against this MP, then they could open an inquiry into a potential breach of the Code of Conduct.
- On 31/01/2020 the investigating officer for Conservative Party Complaints advised us to seek legal action for what is a complex matter.
- On 28/05/2020 the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman published, "This matter would need to be addressed by a court". Mum and Dad were advised how this publication usually delivers success imminently in these cases. We then followed meetings between several UK Government senior civil servants, Bexley Council and members of the wider community involved in this case. We are confident that all perpetrators were instructed to correct the harm they have done. This [family](#) took advantage of this noticeable change to begin getting their lives back on track. This will be used in court to show how this [corrupt politician](#) has admitted their guilt.

## Family's Strategy

This family's legal support network unanimously agreed on the strategy, that their complaint would encourage this council's next big mistake. As predicted, this MP did not deny, defend or even respond to this complaint. Proving the strength of this family's case, instead, they set about joining Bexley Council to also destroy this family's livelihood. Astonishingly, a scathing attack followed on this family AND their business. This was using the Metropolitan Police twice and then once with the BBC:

1. Proving how [this corrupt MP](#) knows that this family has evidence against him. As an attempt to prevent it from being published. On 28/11/2019 this MP instructed the Metropolitan Police to serve a prevention of harassment letter onto this family. It is **illegal to serve this letter in response to a complaint**. We refer to The Equality Act 2010, which places a duty on the service provider to ensure they do not subject another person to a detriment because they have made a complaint.

We have witnesses that many individuals inside Bexley Council and the local police stations are aware of, and are talking about, this family's case. This is because we have had several meetings with high ranking individuals inside the Metropolitan Police who are in support of this family. They have advised this family to record audio and video of each encounter relating to this case.

### **Record of serving the prevention of harassment letter**

This encounter appears to show similar remorse as from individuals from all of Bexley Public services following our legal action against them. Where they say they blindly followed Bexley Council by mistake.

Three Metropolitan Police officers came to this family's home. One of these officers was this family's ward officer. Throughout this encounter, each of these police officers displayed expressions of guilt, regret and apology. This family asked the ward officer what grounds the Metropolitan Police has to serve this letter. The response from each policeman was they did not know other than saying, "This MP feels harassed because of your recent communications with them". When this family explained there were no communications other than their complaint, and it is corrupt for the Metropolitan Police to do this, each police officer nodded their heads in agreement.



## Prevention of Harassment Letter

**To:**

Name: [REDACTED]

Date of birth: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

**An allegation of harassment has been made against you:**

**Details of alleged conduct** (specific actions that are cause for complaint):

Allegation of malicious communications has been made by The Right Honorable [REDACTED], in that you have made threats via email to his office that amounts to harassment causing him harassment alarm or distress.

**HARASSMENT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE** under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

*"A person must not pursue a course of conduct which amounts to harassment of another and which he/she knows, or ought to know, amounts to harassment of the other."*

Harassment can take many forms and examples can include: wilful damage to property, assault, unwarranted verbal or physical threats, abusive communication or repeated attempts to talk to or approach a person who is opposed to this.

It is important that you understand that should you commit any act or acts either directly or indirectly that amount to harassment, you may be liable to arrest and prosecution. A copy of this letter which has been served on you will be retained by police but will not be disclosed now to the alleged victim. However a copy could be disclosed in any subsequent criminal proceedings against you as proof that police have spoken to you about this allegation.

This does not in any way constitute a criminal record and will only be referred to should further allegations of harassment be received.

Signature of recipient of form:.....

**(This is not an admission or acceptance of the allegation)**

Officer issuing: [REDACTED]

(Rank, surname, warrant number, station attached, contact telephone number)

Bexley Council and this MP knew that it was illegal to serve any of this family with a prevention of harassment letter. The Equality Act 2010 includes the following laws on discrimination:

- It is unlawful to directly, or indirectly, discriminate against a person who is accessing a service by treating them less favourably because of their protected characteristics, in this case, their race.
- Places a duty on the service provider to ensure they do not subject another person to a detriment because they have made a formal complaint.

This clearly shows how breaking the law proves this family's case and how the perpetrators are desperate to get the time to distance themselves from their involvement. We highlight some select reasons that this MP taking advice from Bexley Council and serving the prevention of harassment letter is illegal:

1. This MP knew that Bexley Council is awaiting the date for this family's case to be heard in court.
2. This MP had already proved that Bexley Council could not defend this family's legal case.

2. Just a few days after this MP served this letter. This family's business received a call from the Metropolitan Police. This call was aggressively targeting this family's business and it was recorded. This email then followed:

**From:** SANITISED@met.police.uk [mailto: SANITISED@met.police.uk]

**Sent:** 04 December 2019 16:55

**To:** SANITISED

**Subject:** Metropolitan Police Service

**Importance:** High

Mr SANITISED

Thanks for taking my call earlier in relation to any previous/ongoing Metropolitan Police contact. As agreed I have emailed you the questions I would like you clarify for me please. I would be very grateful if you were able to respond to these questions by midday on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019.

- 1) Do you currently have any ongoing contract(s) of any kind with the Metropolitan Police Service – especially in relation to CCTV or any kind of facial recognition?
- 2) If you do please can I have the contract number(s) and the name of anyone who you deal with at the MPS or the Mayor's Office of Policing and Crime (MOPAC)?
- 3) What members of MPS/MOPAC staff have you previously been engaged with – especially in relation to CCTV or any kind of facial recognition?
- 4) What members of MPS/MOPAC staff, if any, are you currently engaged with – especially in relation to CCTV or any kind of facial recognition?
- 5) Are you currently engaged with any MPS/MOPAC staff member in relation to any product your company supplies?
- 6) In a marketing video titled "National Security Anti-terror CCTV training" you currently use the MPS logo, which is a registered trademark, at the beginning of the video and again close to the end – Who gave you permission to use this please? Do you have a copy of any written agreements?
- 7) In the video you show 6 of your CCTV of cameras in central London locations (Buckingham Palace, Parliament Square, Westminster Bridge, London Eye, Trafalgar Square and Piccadilly Circus) are those cameras currently in place?
- 8) You use the MPS trademarked logo in several other of your company documents, videos, website narrative and presentations – Again who gave you permission to use this trademarked logo please? Do you have a copy of any written agreements for this?

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions for me. If there is anything else you think would help me please could you let me know.

There may of course be some further questions. If that is the case then I will call you first before again sending them on email to ensure clarity for all.

Regards

**DI SANITISED | Met |**

New Scotland Yard Victoria Embankment London SW1A 2JL

Email: [SANITISED@met.police.uk](mailto:SANITISED@met.police.uk)

Mobile: SANITISED

This person said they were acting under the instructions of the Metropolitan Police legal team and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). But, when Dad asked the names of these individuals, there was no more contact. It is to be noted that this is very telling given the content of the email, and that Bexley Council and this MP work closely with MOPAC being a London Borough.

3. Just a few days after receiving this email from the Metropolitan Police, one of the supporters of this family's case received a call from a BBC journalist, asking to speak with this family's business. It is impossible to associate this family's supporter with this family's business. **This means that this BBC journalist could have only contacted them because of Bexley Council or this family's MP.** This family's business then received this email from the BBC:

From: SANITISED [mailto:SANITISED@bbc.co.uk]  
Sent: 21 January 2020 11:15  
To: SANITISED  
Subject: RE: SANITISED

Hello SANITISED,

Looking at your website, you make several claims we would ask you to respond to.

They are the following:

- 1) When you monitor by facial recognition camera systems - how long do you retain the imagery?
- 2) Given facial recognition technology enables almost immediate cross referencing to a database - why is there any need to retain imagery of half a million people. How can that be legitimate and proportionate?
- 3) Use of new technology - where there is a risk of serious privacy invasion - requires the submission of a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) if those risks haven't been mitigated. When will you submit your dpia to ICO?
- 4) If this programme is in conjunction with police - they are a Relevant Authority - have the police complied with Protection of Freedom Act requirements in relation to this technology?
- 5) How is cross referencing against social media compliant with regulation?
- 6) Where do your databases come from? Have you bought them? Where from? Who has oversight over them?
- 6) Have you provided FR cameras to the following organisations quoted on your site? Olympics Development Agency (ODA).
  - World Cup Stadiums.
  - MFO (Multinational Force & Observers) – Supervising the implementation of the security of the Peace Treaty between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel.
  - Brazilian Military Police.
  - South African International Hotels.
  - Elbit Systems.
- 7) You say your system is automated and therefore avoids the need for compliance with GDPR and the DPA. Can you please explain how and why this is the case, as our understanding is that this does not exempt you from compliance.

Do please let me know if you can respond.

If you can, we would require either an email response or a phone interview, by 5pm today.

Best wishes,

SANITISED  
Journalist  
BBC

Dad then called the BBC to advise the BBC of his family's case against Bexley Council and this MP, and that the BBC's true agenda was to pressure his family to drop their case. **We have an excruciating call recording of the BBC attempting to deny this. They used convoluted rationale of how it could have been possible for them to have contacted his family's case supporters.**

## **Court action made possible because of COVID-19**

Neither Bexley Council, this MP, the Metropolitan Police, nor the BBC had taken into account the untimely social distancing measures caused by COVID-19. If it weren't for this pandemic, then this attack on this family and their business could have completely destroyed them beyond repair. But thanks to coronavirus, the BBC and the Metropolitan Police have had to focus on more important issues. So, the tables have turned and we are exposing this corruption for what it is.

The senders of these emails are sanitised because we are using them as witnesses. Also, they will likely cease working for the BBC and the Metropolitan Police when they are known. Each email appears to be from the same source referring to the same agenda i.e. "get the contact details of their customers so that we can destroy their business." It was obvious that neither the Metropolitan Police nor the BBC knew the true agenda was an attempt to damage this family's business. It was another attempt to intimidate this family and make them drop their case.

It was envisaged that the Metropolitan Police and the BBC would not get involved in a case of institutional race discrimination. Proving this, we wrote to each of these individuals to inform them that they are now part of this family's legal action against Bexley Council and the MP. And that they will be required to attend the court hearing. Neither of these individuals has answered our calls, or replied to our letters and emails. Also, neither the Metropolitan Police nor the BBC has contacted this family's business since.