

in the wrong. There was no sorry there was nothing and this is just wrong. My son was the one that had the bad mark against his name for a long time until it was proven in the appeal court, not the police officer and this is still the case to this day the police officer has done nothing wrong in everyone's eyes when he did do wrong. He has been allowed to move on in his life, my son was the one spending all the time to clear his name not the police officer when my son had done nothing wrong.

"[ ... ] Which is obviously ... we're in an awkward situation as well because [Data Subject] and [Data Subject] mum are constantly ringing us up. They don't understand that obviously we are going to take a police officer's views over obviously one of our policyholders because obviously a police officer's job is obviously to tell the truth and not to lie."

This is the action of most peoples view but in this case the police officer was not telling the truth my son was. And my son was the one being made to suffer when he had not done anything wrong. But yet people believe the police in everything they say.

I know you have said PC G's current occupation; I can assure you it would have no bearing on this matter whatsoever.

Maybe I see it another way his occupation is Head of Criminal Justice, Centre for Social Justice, cant you see the irony in this he is trying to find justice for people, but what he did in this case was never justice at his own hands, the DPS never served justice for my son, yet they knew PC G had lied in this whole case, and that PC G took it to the courts and again never told the truth and perjury himself two times in a court of law. PC G seems to think this is acceptable he still applied for his job roll where he is working to make sure justice is fair for all. I am sure if he had admitted to breaking the law in what he did he would not be in the position he is in now I do find this very relevant that is how I feel and my son does.

Best Regards

Lorraine Cordell

---

**From:** Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Jamie.Newman@met.pnn.police.uk]  
**Sent:** 07 August 2017 09:44  
**To:** lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk  
**Subject:** RE: Our meeting today.

Morning Lorraine,

Firstly, apologies for my delayed reply! I had intended to reply much sooner.

I think I'm correct in saying that the necessity for your son's arrest was associated with PC G's uncertainty as to the address provided. This is something I'll discuss in the report.

Can I ask, from where did you get the impression that your son's name was not in PC G's pocketbook?

To reiterate, I'd be more than happy share documents with you at the end of the investigation. As per the Police Reform Act, subject to the harm test. Was there any particular reason you'd want them sooner? I expect the investigation to conclude in October incidentally.

I was intending on giving PC G three weeks, what are your thoughts on that?

Re PC G's current occupation, I can assure you it would have no bearing on this matter whatsoever.

Kind regards

**Jamie Newman** | Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU) | Directorate of Professional Standards |