

Re: Request to Check for Errors ~[OFFICIAL]~

From: [REDACTED]

To: alison.ross@cheshire.pnn.police.uk

Cc: david.bryan@cheshire.pnn.police.uk; darren.martland@cheshire.pnn.police.uk

Date: Wednesday, 8 January 2020, 12:52 GMT

I neglected to reply to your point that the chief constable successfully defended my claim for malicious prosecution.

I should point out that he only did so because of the perjury of criminals Eoin Anderson and Nicola Rimmer. And I lost the appeal because I did not know that to win the appeal I would have to prove that no honest and impartial judge would have made the same judgment on the basis of the (perjured) evidence presented. That would have been relatively easy to do, had I known that it was necessary. Obviously, although the appeal court judge believed my version of events, he is not going to say that the original judge is dishonest and biased without compelling evidence.

Anyway, at this point, after I have had more time to study the perjured evidence of criminals Eoin Anderson and Nicola Rimmer, I realise that there is no problem proving their criminality. Which is presumably why you won't investigate.

It is evident that you are all proud of the fact that Anderson's and Rimmer's criminality won in court. Normal people would be ashamed of that.

Are you also too stupid to understand that the fact that they changed their testimony during the trial adds weight to my original complaint that they made false statements for my prosecution for the motoring offence of which I was acquitted? They changed their testimony because what they originally stated could not possibly be true - something that escaped your brilliant investigator, inspector Hill, when he was "investigating" allegations that the statements were untrue. The judge had to jump through quite a few hoops and make things up in order to say that he believed their perjured testimony, for whatever reason, because that also was a pack of lies.

Let's face it, the Cheshire constabulary is rotten to the core. It is scarcely credible, but true, that the chief constable, head of professional standards and force solicitor are all on the side of criminality. I trust the force solicitor will notify me promptly if that is not so in his case, because it is only my judgment based on his office submitting a false statement of defence and false witness statements to the court and his pathetic support of the solicitor in his office who made the actual submissions.