

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 15 May 2013 11:11
To: SP SO
Subject: : *RESTRICTED*
Attachments: 13.05.13 CC Creedon Operations Pendeford & Sanctio.doc; 13.05.13 IPCC [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Operations Pendeford & Sanctio.doc; pic12164.jpg; pic25542.jpg;
pic07619.jpg; pic20913.jpg; pic07591.jpg

(See attached file: 13.05.13 CC Creedon Operations Pendeford & Sanctio.doc) (See attached file: 13.05.13 IPCC [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Operations Pendeford &
Sanctio.doc)

Kind regards,
[REDACTED]

PA to Chief Constable Mike Cunningham
Staffordshire Police Headquarters
P O Box 3167
Stafford
ST16 9JZ
Sat Nav : Weston Road ST18 0YY
t: 01785 [REDACTED]
e: [REDACTED]@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk

(Embedded image moved to file: pic12164.jpg) Find us on...

(Embedded image moved to file: pic25542.jpg)(Embedded image moved to file:
pic07619.jpg)(Embedded image moved to file: pic20913.jpg)(Embedded image moved to file: pic07591.jpg)



**Keeping our communities
safe and reassured**



From the Office of
Chief Constable Cunningham
Executive Dept, PO Box 3167
Stafford ST16 9JZ

Independent Police Complaints Commission
Eastern Business Park
Wern Fawr Lane, St Mellons
Cardiff CF3 5EA

Direct Line: 01785 [REDACTED]
Fax: 01785 232412
Our Ref: MC/[REDACTED]
Date: 13 May 2013

Dear [REDACTED]

**Re: Independent assessment of matters raised by former Inspector [REDACTED]
of Staffordshire Police that fall outside of the terms of reference of *Operation Kalmia***

You may recall former Staffordshire Police Inspector [REDACTED] originally raised concerns over the conduct of individual officers and improper practices within the (then) Sensitive Policing Unit of Staffordshire Police in 2006 and that [REDACTED] continued to raise these and allied issues at various times up to and beyond [REDACTED] retirement from the police service in [REDACTED] prior to the establishment of *Operation Kalmia*. [REDACTED] did so as [REDACTED] believed these matters had not been properly investigated, and moreover, [REDACTED] believed there to be a lack of willingness on the part of Staffordshire Police to challenge the integrity of certain senior detectives.

Having been formally notified of *Operation Kalmia's* terms of reference, on 03 January 2012 [REDACTED] wrote to you expressing [REDACTED] concern over the omission from the terms of reference of any scrutiny of two high profile Staffordshire Police investigations; *Operation Pendeford* (the drug related murder of Floyd Dodson in 1999 which resulted in a conviction for manslaughter in 2003); and *Operation Sanctio*, (a high value robbery at a cash holding depot in Tamworth in 2006 which led to convictions in 2007).

In each case, [REDACTED] cited concerns over the management of a [REDACTED] witness, the potential non-disclosure of relevant material, and a potential for improper reward payments; matters having some parallel with the concerns [REDACTED] had raised in the Nunes case. On 23 January 2012 you referred these matters to me as the Appropriate Authority for Staffordshire Police to consider as they fell outside the remit of *Operation Kalmia*.

At that time, in the IPCC managed investigation under your oversight, Chief Constable Mick Creedon was formally investigating a number of current and former Staffordshire officers at all ranks from constable through to a serving chief constable in another force area as well as a number of retired senior officers over their respective actions (or omissions to act) and decisions. Then as now, I am conscious of the sensitivities and complexities of *Operation Kalmia*, particularly as Chief

Constable Creedon's investigation includes allegations of serious criminality as well as breaches of standards of professional behaviour assessed as gross misconduct.

It was therefore of imperative importance that any steps I took to determine the extent to which I should investigate the matters raised by former Inspector [REDACTED] that fell outside of the terms of reference of *Operation Kalmia* should in no way impinge upon the integrity of *Operation Kalmia* which remains ongoing and has yet to report.

To assist my determination in these matters as to the nature and extent of any formal investigation into the concerns raised by [REDACTED] might be necessary, I commissioned an independent assessment by Detective Superintendent John Armstrong, Head of Professional Standards in Cheshire Constabulary. Detective Superintendent Armstrong has previously assisted me in recording decisions and other aspects relating to *Operation Kalmia*.

In his scoping work, Detective Superintendent Armstrong has ensured that no aspect of his review could in any way compromise the work of *Operation Kalmia*. He has not sought to interview or seek an account from any officer - serving or retired - who has been subject of any attention during the course of Chief Constable Creedon's investigation. His assessment has benefited from extensive liaison and cooperation with *Operation Kalmia*, and he has observed the clear sensitivities apparent over certain aspects of material held in pursuance of that investigation.

Detective Superintendent Armstrong has been afforded access to material held by *Operation Kalmia* relevant to his review, and has been able to examine elements of material gathered in pursuance of *Operation Kalmia* which have included relevant excerpts of statements and accounts of those giving evidence or accounts to that investigation only to the extent which has allowed him to make considered and evidenced assessments of that material to determine the propriety or otherwise of either or both *Pendeford* and *Sanctio* enquiries in light of [REDACTED] allegations.

I have attached here Detective Superintendent Armstrong's report to me in which he outlines his findings, his analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

It has been firmly established in both Operations *Pendeford* and *Sanctio* that the respective investigating officers undertook significant work to secure the evidence of a protected witness. In *Operation Pendeford*, the trial judge ruled that evidence to be inadmissible and the Crown could not therefore rely upon it at trial. In *Operation Sanctio*, the Crown withdrew the evidence of the protected witness as it did not need to rely upon that evidence as there were foreseeable successful challenges to anonymity and to motivation.

In both cases, the prospect of the respective protected witness receiving a financial reward proved a difficulty for the prosecution, and may well have been an influencing factor in the subsequent acquittal of one defendant in either case.

I am completely satisfied from Detective Superintendent Armstrong's independent review that there is tangible and cohesive evidence that payments were made to a witness in each investigation, and that auditable records exist of the payments and the supporting rationale. Crucially and importantly, these payments were properly disclosed to the prosecution team and to the trial judge. The prospect of each witness being significantly motivated by financial reward was identified, reported upon and was properly considered in the disclosure process and in respective [REDACTED] applications. There is no evidence to support [REDACTED] consistently expressed concern there may have been a miscarriage of justice from improper inducements of protected witnesses to provide evidence in these cases.

Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review cannot and should not be held to be an investigation capable of answering all the specific allegations raised by [REDACTED] (most notably in respect of the allegation that a [REDACTED] book' had been re-written at the behest of the senior investigating officers). His report details a significant weight of evidence that demonstrates the protected witness concerned was [REDACTED] and that records were made with associated rationale which were properly disclosed to the prosecution team and were duly considered by the trial judge in a [REDACTED] application. To that extent, even if it were accepted an early formal record had in fact been altered to purport to conceal any payment or any improper offer or inducement, or the motivation of the witness to seek financial reward for cooperating with the investigation, such an act was well and truly overtaken by comprehensive records and disclosure of such payments and motivation.

Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review found no grounds to question the propriety of the handling of the witness subject of concern in *Operation Sanctio*.

I am satisfied Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review has produced reasonable grounds for me to conclude there has now been a sufficiently thorough and proportionate examination of [REDACTED] concerns over *Operation Pendeford* and *Operation Sanctio* to satisfy any interested party there is no evidence of material impropriety in the handling or management of a protected witness in either investigation. I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that there are no grounds to consider either *Operation Pendeford* or *Sanctio* to have led to any miscarriage of justice; there is no evidence of any criminal conduct on the part of any officer; nor is there any prospect of a case to answer for any breach of standard of professional behaviour on the part of any officer involved in either investigation.

I have noted that Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review has purposefully not addressed any question of any previous decision over the prior handling of [REDACTED] concerns over Operations *Pendeford* and *Sanctio*. *Operation Kalmia* is holding serving and retired officers involved in the Nunes investigation to account over matters which are inextricably linked to decisions made on the handling of [REDACTED] wider concerns. Whilst his review would clearly have benefited from direct information or evidence from those personally involved in the allegations or in the material decisions made in either operation, it was nonetheless imperative that the integrity of *Operation Kalmia* should not be compromised and it would be wholly inappropriate to comment on the justification or otherwise of any earlier decision, act or omissions in any matter concerning both Operations *Pendeford* and *Sanctio*, as those are integral aspects of the terms of reference of *Operation Kalmia*.

I have also provided a copy of this review report to Chief Constable Creedon, and I have asked Assistant Chief Constable Nick Baker to write on my behalf to [REDACTED] to outline the steps I have taken to address the concerns [REDACTED] raised with you as referred to me. Whilst I have agreed the review findings can be discussed with [REDACTED] in some detail, I have determined the review report should not be disclosed in its unredacted form whilst the investigations of *Operation Kalmia* remain ongoing.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

Mike Cunningham QPM
Chief Constable, Staffordshire Police



**Keeping our communities
safe and reassured**



From the Office of
Chief Constable Cunningham
Executive Dept, PO Box 3167
Stafford ST16 9JZ

Chief Constable M Creedon
c/o Operation Kalmia
Loughborough Police Station
Southfields Road
Loughborough
LE11 2XF

Direct Line: 01785 [REDACTED]
Fax: 01785 232412
Our Ref: MC [REDACTED]
Date: 13 May 2013

Dear Mick

**Re: Independent assessment of matters raised by former Inspector [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] of Staffordshire Police that fall outside of the terms of
reference of Operation Kalmia**

You may recall former Staffordshire Police Inspector [REDACTED] originally raised concerns over the conduct of individual officers and improper practices within the (then) Sensitive Policing Unit of Staffordshire Police in 2006 and that [REDACTED] continued to raise these and allied issues at various times up to and beyond [REDACTED] retirement from the police service in [REDACTED] prior to the establishment of *Operation Kalmia*. [REDACTED] did so as [REDACTED] believed these matters had not been properly investigated, and moreover, [REDACTED] believed there to be a lack of willingness on the part of Staffordshire Police to challenge the integrity of certain senior detectives.

Having been formally notified of *Operation Kalmia*'s terms of reference, on 03 January 2012 [REDACTED] wrote to IPCC Commissioner [REDACTED] expressing [REDACTED] concern over the omission from the terms of reference of any scrutiny of two high profile Staffordshire Police investigations; *Operation Pendeford* (the drug related murder of Floyd Dodson in 1999 which resulted in a conviction for manslaughter in 2003); and *Operation Sanctio*, (a high value robbery at a cash holding depot in Tamworth in 2006 which led to convictions in 2007).

In each case, [REDACTED] cited concerns over the management of a [REDACTED] witness, the potential non-disclosure of relevant material, and a potential for improper reward payments; matters having some parallel with the concerns [REDACTED] had raised in the Nunes case. On 23 January 2012 [REDACTED] referred these matters to me as the Appropriate Authority for Staffordshire Police to consider as they fell outside the remit of *Operation Kalmia*.

At that time, *Operation Kalmia* was formally investigating a number of current and former Staffordshire officers at all ranks from constable through to a serving chief constable in another force area as well as a number of retired

senior officers over their respective actions (or omissions to act) and decisions. Then as now, I am conscious of the sensitivities and complexities of *Operation Kalmia*, particularly as your investigation includes allegations of serious criminality as well as breaches of standards of professional behaviour assessed as gross misconduct.

It was therefore of imperative importance that any steps I took to determine the extent to which I should investigate the matters raised by former Inspector [REDACTED] that fell outside of the terms of reference of *Operation Kalmia* should in no way impinge upon the integrity of *Operation Kalmia* which remains ongoing and has yet to report.

To assist my determination in these matters as to the nature and extent of any formal investigation into the concerns raised by [REDACTED] might be necessary, I commissioned an independent assessment by Detective Superintendent John Armstrong, Head of Professional Standards in Cheshire Constabulary. Detective Superintendent Armstrong has previously assisted me in recording decisions and other aspects relating to *Operation Kalmia*.

In his scoping work, Detective Superintendent Armstrong has ensured that no aspect of his review could in any way compromise the work of *Operation Kalmia*. He has not sought to interview or seek an account from any officer - serving or retired - who has been subject of any attention during the course of your investigation. His assessment has benefited from extensive cooperation from Detective Inspector [REDACTED] of *Operation Kalmia*, and he has observed the clear sensitivities apparent over certain aspects of material held in pursuance of that investigation.

In particular, I am grateful that Detective Superintendent Armstrong has been afforded access to material held by *Operation Kalmia* relevant to his review, and has been able to examine elements of material gathered in pursuance of *Operation Kalmia* which have included relevant excerpts of statements and accounts of those giving evidence or accounts to that investigation only to the extent which has allowed him to make considered and evidenced assessments of that material to determine the propriety or otherwise of either or both *Pendeford* and *Sanctio* enquiries in light of [REDACTED] allegations.

I have attached here Detective Superintendent Armstrong's report to me in which he outlines his findings, his analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

It has been firmly established in both Operations *Pendeford* and *Sanctio* that the respective investigating officers undertook significant work to secure the evidence of a protected witness. In *Operation Pendeford*, the trial judge ruled that evidence to be inadmissible and the Crown could not therefore rely upon it at trial. In *Operation Sanctio*, the Crown withdrew the evidence of the protected witness as it did not need to rely upon that evidence as there were foreseeable successful challenges to anonymity and to motivation.

In both cases, the prospect of the respective protected witness receiving a financial reward proved a difficulty for the prosecution, and may well have been an influencing factor in the subsequent acquittal of one defendant in either case.

I am completely satisfied from Detective Superintendent Armstrong's independent review that there is tangible and cohesive evidence that payments were made to a witness in each investigation, and that auditable records exist of the payments and the supporting rationale. Crucially and importantly, these payments were properly disclosed to the prosecution team and to the trial judge. The prospect of each witness being significantly motivated by financial reward was identified, reported upon and was properly considered in the disclosure process and in respective [REDACTED] applications. There is no evidence to support [REDACTED] consistently expressed concern there may have been a miscarriage of justice from improper inducements of protected witnesses to provide evidence in these cases.

Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review cannot and should not be held to be an investigation capable of answering all the specific allegations raised by [REDACTED] (most notably in respect of the allegation that a [REDACTED] book' had been re-written at the behest of the senior investigating officers). His report details a significant weight of evidence that demonstrates the protected witness concerned was [REDACTED] and that records were made with associated rationale which were properly disclosed to the prosecution team and were duly considered by the trial judge in a [REDACTED] application. To that extent, even if it were accepted an early formal record had in fact been altered to purport to conceal any payment or any improper offer or inducement, or the motivation of the witness to seek financial reward for cooperating with the investigation, such an act was well and truly overtaken by comprehensive records and disclosure of such payments and motivation.

Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review found no grounds to question the propriety of the handling of the witness subject of concern in *Operation Sanctio*.

I am satisfied Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review has produced reasonable grounds for me to conclude there has now been a sufficiently thorough and proportionate examination of [REDACTED] concerns over *Operation Pendeford* and *Operation Sanctio* to satisfy any interested party there is no evidence of material impropriety in the handling or management of a protected witness in either investigation. I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that there are no grounds to consider either *Operation Pendeford* or *Sanctio* to have led to any miscarriage of justice; there is no evidence of any criminal conduct on the part of any officer; nor is there any prospect of a case to answer for any breach of standard of professional behaviour on the part of any officer involved in either investigation.

I have noted that Detective Superintendent Armstrong's review has purposefully not addressed any question of any previous decision over the prior handling of [REDACTED] concerns over Operations *Pendeford* and *Sanctio*. *Operation Kalmia* is holding serving and retired officers involved in the Nunes investigation to account over matters which are inextricably linked to decisions made on the handling of [REDACTED] wider concerns. Whilst his review would clearly have benefited from direct information or evidence from those personally involved in the allegations or in the material decisions made in either operation, it was nonetheless imperative that the integrity of *Operation Kalmia* should not be compromised and it would be wholly inappropriate to comment on the justification or otherwise of any earlier decision, act or omissions in any matter concerning both Operations

Pendeford and Sanctio, as those are integral aspects of the terms of reference of *Operation Kalmia*.

I am grateful to you and your colleagues on *Operation Kalmia* for facilitating this review and affording access to relevant material to enable me to address these matters raised by former Inspector [REDACTED]

I have also provided a copy of this review report to overseeing IPCC Commissioner [REDACTED] and I have asked Assistant Chief Constable Nick Baker to write on my behalf to [REDACTED] to outline the steps I have taken to address the concerns [REDACTED] raised with [REDACTED] as referred to me. Whilst I have agreed the review findings can be discussed with [REDACTED] in some detail, I have determined the review report should not be disclosed in its unredacted form whilst the investigations of *Operation Kalmia* remain ongoing.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

Mike Cunningham QPM
Chief Constable, Staffordshire Police

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk on behalf of
Michael.Cunningham@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 24 July 2013 09:12
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED:- RE: D Supt ARMSTRONGS report re OP
SANCTIO & PENDEFORD: *RESTRICTED*

Printed for bfwd

Mike Cunningham
Chief Constable
Staffordshire Police

Tel: 01785 [REDACTED]
Fax: 01785 23 2412
E-mail: michael.cunningham@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
Staffordshire Police Headquarters, PO Box 3167, Stafford ST16 9JZ Sat-Nav postcode: ST18 0YY
----- Forwarded by [REDACTED]/Executive Team/Executive/staffspol on
24/07/2013 09:11 -----

From: Nicholas Baker/Executive Team/Executive/staffspol
To: Michael Cunningham/Executive
Team/Executive/staffspol@staffspol,
john.armstrong@cheshire.pnn.police.uk,
Date: 24/07/2013 09:02
Subject:Fw: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED:- RE: D Supt ARMSTRONGS report re
OP SANCTIO & PENDEFORD: *RESTRICTED*

Chief

For your consideration prior to our meeting Thurs

John

Views would be welcome

----- Forwarded by Nicholas Baker/Executive Team/Executive/staffspol on
24/07/2013 08:58 -----

From: [REDACTED]@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk>
To: "Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk"
<Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>,
Date: 24/07/2013 08:09
Subject:NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED:- RE: D Supt ARMSTRONGS report re OP
SANCTIO & PENDEFORD: *RESTRICTED*

Mr Baker,

Sir,

Can I firstly thank you for sharing with me your intended approach to [REDACTED] and giving me an opportunity to comment.

As we have previously discussed it is a matter for yourselves in Staffordshire how you wish to address this issue to a satisfactory conclusion as any investigation into the areas Superintendent ARMSTRONG looked at did not fall within our terms of reference.

I have reviewed the report produced by Superintendent Armstrong and have considered it with my deputy SIO with regard to the 2012 IPCC Revised Statutory Guidance in conjunction with Para 24, Schedule 3 of the Police Reform Act (2002) and Regulation 13 of the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regs 2012. All of these are relevant when considering giving a complainant or other interested party a copy of the investigators report.

Whilst [REDACTED] is clearly not a complainant under the provisions of the PRA, [REDACTED] is an interested party. I have paid particular heed to Reg 13

(1)(a) which states non disclosure if information is 'necessary to prevent the premature or inappropriate disclosure of information that is relevant to, or may be used in any actual or prospective criminal proceedings'. I have also considered Reg 13(2)(a) &(b) in that there must be a real risk of disclosure causing an adverse effect and that this adverse effect must be significant.

Taking this into account in terms of allowing [REDACTED] to either have a copy of the report, or view it. I see no issue with that in terms of the potential impact on Operation Kalmia.

The fact that the report from Superintendent Armstrong exists is something that is relevant to our operation and may undermine our case and as such is clearly a disclosable document for our investigation. Whether or not this document is revealed in some format to [REDACTED] does not change that and I don't consider that having [REDACTED] informed of the report causes us any particular issue as the matters, whilst linked to Kalmia, do not fall within our terms of reference.

Having said all the above and I hope you don't think this is inappropriate I would just like to add a couple of observations to your decision making process.

Firstly allowing [REDACTED] a copy of the report will mean the document is in the public domain and you will have little control of it if [REDACTED] is given a copy? I feel that even though [REDACTED] is aware of some of the sensitivities created in the document it maybe appropriate to ensure that if you take this course of action the document has some clear redactions. I know that we are trying to be open, honest and transparent and ultimately it is a matter for your selves. However if you were to give [REDACTED] an unredacted copy this may create some potential jeopardy for Staffordshire with regard to police tactics and identifying protected persons who were never used at trial as the document will be out of your control.

Rationalising a policy decision, with regard to the issues in the previous paragraph with a view to trying to satisfy the interested party, by allowing [REDACTED] an opportunity to read the document in full in a controlled environment with time to digest it properly would ensure that any sensitive issues may be managed more appropriately?

[REDACTED]

I believe providing an unredacted report to [REDACTED] at any stage has potential issues, but again this is a matter for Staffordshire to consider.

Kind regards and look forward to seeing you on the 6th.

[REDACTED]

From: Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk[mailto:Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk]
Sent: 23 July 2013 10:21
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: D Supt ARMSTRONGS report re OP SANCTIO & PENDEFORD: *RESTRICTED*

[REDACTED]

As we discussed can you read the above subject document and assess the following from the perspective of OP KALMIA;

Would allowing [REDACTED] a copy of D Supt ARMSTRONG's report now undermine OP KALMIA?

Would allowing [REDACTED] to read the document now (but not have a copy) undermine OP KALMIA?

If both of the above would be an issue would there be any issue in allowing [REDACTED] a copy of the report after the completion of your investigation?

I would welcome a quick assessment as I am anxious to make contact with [REDACTED] as soon as possible

Nick Baker
ACC

"Keeping our Communities Safe and Reassured"

The information contained in this e-mail and attachments is confidential and is intended only for the named person or organisation to which it is addressed. It is protected by copyright law and may be legally privileged. If you have received it in error please disregard and advise me immediately.

Any unauthorised disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality. Staffordshire Police cannot accept liability for any loss or damage arising from this e-mail or attachments, from incompatible scripts or from any virus transmitted.

E-mails sent and received from and by members of staff and officers of Staffordshire Police may be monitored for purposes including virus scanning, unauthorised e-mail usage and obscene or inappropriate material.

Staffordshire Police reserves the right to read all such material and to reject and return any material which is considered either to be a security risk or unsuitable. Any monitoring will comply with the legislation currently in force and in particular the Human Rights Act 1998.

To find out more about our work visit www.staffordshire.police.uk

Been subject to a crime? Or want to prevent one from happening? Go to www.leics.police.uk/support

Internet email is not to be treated as a secure means of communication.
Leicestershire Police monitors all internet email activity and content.

This communication is intended for the addressee(s) only. Please notify the sender if received in error. Unauthorised use or disclosure of the content may be unlawful. Opinions expressed in this document may not be official policy.

Thank you for your co-operation.

(c) Leicestershire Police

[REDACTED]

From: John Armstrong <john.armstrong@cheshire.pnn.police.uk>
Sent: 24 July 2013 11:31
To: Nicholas Baker
Subject: RE: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED:- RE: D Supt ARMSTRONGS report re OP SANCTIO & PENDEFORD: *RESTRICTED*

Hello Nick

Thanks for sight of this response.

The views of [REDACTED] pretty much coincide with the views expressed during the course of our conversation yesterday.

Turning first to the points raised by [REDACTED] in correspondence of 16 July 2013 (reproduced below)

- Were significant witnesses improperly promised substantial rewards as an inducement to make a statement? (PENDEFORD and SANCTIO)
- Were significant witnesses given advance payments of the promised rewards to ensure their continued cooperation? (PENDEFORD and SANCTIO)
- Were the details of any promised rewards or advance payments made properly disclosed to the prosecution and defence?
- Did senior officers cause witness protection officers to edit/rewrite disclosure records to conceal demands from a witness for cash payments as a condition of making a statement? (PENDEFORD)
- Did senior officers effectively condone or cover up the ongoing wrongdoing of an individual officer previously involved in fabricating disclosure records. (PENDEFORD)

Were [REDACTED] able to read the review report for [REDACTED] would understand the answer to all five points is no, with supporting evidence and rationale notwithstanding that the review work undertaken cannot - and is not - described as a full investigation.

I daresay one can understand [REDACTED] continuing belief that these matters have not been properly scrutinised had the benefit of reading the review report. Were [REDACTED] a complainant (which [REDACTED] is not) [REDACTED] would be entitled to a copy of the investigating officer's report 9or at least, a redacted version thereof).

I appreciate Kalmia's clear stance that any disclosure of the report is a matter for Staffordshire and, in the view of the deputy SIO, such disclosure will not service to undermine Kalmia. Nonetheless, as we discussed yesterday, I remain concerned that whilst Kalmia remains ongoing and has not reached a conclusion, any public airing of the subject matter of inextricably linked previous operations involving the same individuals (both serving and former officers) and the (albeit limited) exposure of two sensitive and protected operations may lead to at least inadvertent undermined of Kalmia on a number of levels.

First of all, it may also lead to perhaps a false sense of security of those subject of Kalmia in that as there has been no finding of inappropriate conduct in either Pendeford or Sanctio, then Kalmia will likely find the same in Nunes, and that may not be the case.

Secondly, and appreciating that [REDACTED] is formally declaring the release of the review report will not undermine Kalmia, I would be concerned that the limited reference to excerpts of the evidence that investigation [REDACTED] has relied upon [REDACTED] is taken out of context and may lead to unreliable or incorrect inferences being drawn as to the veracity or credibility of certain of Kalmia's witnesses. Redacting those references significantly alters the tone and content of the review report.

It can of course be argued that there is already sufficient transparency and rigour over Staffordshire's approach to [REDACTED] reiteration of concerns over Pendeford and Sanctio. Kalmia itself has looked at these in the early stages, determined there to be no criminal concern, and the IPCC Commissioner has referred these back to Staffordshire to consider how to investigate. There has been openness with the IPCC, with Kalmia and with [REDACTED] on what that investigation looked like, including the over-riding concern to not undermine Kalmia. The review report has been forwarded to the IPCC and to Kalmia, but not to [REDACTED] and the letter [REDACTED] has been sent has not persuaded [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] concerns have been finally addressed.

Whilst we are unclear on timescales for Kalmia, given [REDACTED] has waited some considerable time for [REDACTED] concerns to be investigated, to a certain extent it may be prudent to respond to [REDACTED] that the five points [REDACTED] has raised in response are, in fact, all accounted for in the review, and that it is evident that some of [REDACTED] concerns articulated in [REDACTED] letter of 16 July are, in fact, unfounded, one example being [REDACTED] belief that in at least one case, the evidence of a protected witness was used. The review report can be made available to [REDACTED] in the fullness of time, and that will take place at a time when Kalmia has completed its investigation.

I am not particularly attracted to the option of allowing [REDACTED] sight of the report in controlled conditions, as that is unsatisfactory to a certain extent. There are practicalities to consider over the steps to be taken to prevent [REDACTED] for seeking to copy all or excerpts by use of mobile telephony; [REDACTED] will be appraised of what has been said and may further report to other parties inaccurate aspects or elements taken out of context.

The difficulty now faced is that Kalmia has formally advised that dissemination of this report will not undermine Kalmia, so if Staffordshire tries to use that as a rationale for non-disclosure at this time, in the event [REDACTED] takes issue with Kalmia on this point, they will simply respond that the decision is that of Staffordshire and for their part, they have assured Staffordshire that disclosure is non-contentious and a matter for Staffordshire, which will of course further undermine Staffordshire in the eyes of [REDACTED]

It may be therefore that supplying [REDACTED] with a redacted report is the best option in the longer term.

More than happy to discuss this further when we meet on Thursday, and to do some work to redact accordingly, and run past Kalmia before making a final decision.

Probably best in the short term to respond to [REDACTED] to note [REDACTED] view, assure [REDACTED] the points [REDACTED] has raised can all be answered and that careful consideration is being given as to the extent to which it is prudent to allow [REDACTED] sight of the review report upon which the conclusions have been drawn at a point prior to the completion of Kalmia.

The only viable alternative is to respond to [REDACTED] thank [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] letter, note [REDACTED] concerns and remind [REDACTED] that Staffordshire has reported in full to the IPCC (and to Kalmia) there is no basis for any concern [REDACTED] has expressed over any impropriety on either Pendeford or Sanctio and simply leave it at that.

No doubt speak further on Thursday.

Regards

John

From: Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk]
Sent: 24 July 2013 09:03

[REDACTED]

From: Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 12 September 2013 14:02
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: Redacted Report re Operations Pendeford & Sanctio ~[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]~; *RESTRICTED*
Attachments: 11 09 13 [REDACTED] Pendeford Sanctio Redacted.pdf; 201307220939.pdf; 201307220940.pdf

[REDACTED]

Can we discuss

Thanks

Nick

----- Forwarded by Nicholas Baker/Executive Team/Executive/staffspol on 12/09/2013 13:59 -----

From: John Armstrong <john.armstrong@cheshire.pnn.police.uk>
To: "Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk"
<Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>,
Date: 11/09/2013 17:42
Subject: Redacted Report re Operations Pendeford & Sanctio: *RESTRICTED*
~[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]~

Hello Nick

As promised, please find attached a redacted version of my report to Mr Cunningham for consideration of provision to [REDACTED]. Apologies for the delay in attending to this.

I have also re-reviewed our previous discussion and emails, relating to the five matters raised by [REDACTED] in correspondence of 16 July 2013 (relevant excerpt reproduced below) in response to your letter to [REDACTED] of 08 July 2013 in which you outlined to [REDACTED] in comprehensive detail the broad outcome of my review into the matters [REDACTED] raised about Operations Pendeford and Sanctio

Description: cid:image002.png@01CE8861.41DCD5C0

I remain of the view that had [REDACTED] been able to read the full review report for [REDACTED] at the time of your correspondence, there is sufficient additional detail in that report to ensure those questions were all answered satisfactorily and that there is no evidence that significant witnesses improperly promised substantial reward to ensure their continued cooperation in either operation. My review makes clear that five matters have been addressed and no evidence of any impropriety or wrongdoing in these specific matters had been uncovered.

There is also full transparency over the rationale for my review not being a full investigation, and I remain satisfied there are wholly defensible grounds upon which to have based the scope of that review, given the matters had been referred back from Operation Kalmia and the decision of the IPCC to refer this back to Staffordshire to deal with as they saw fit, without determining a mode of investigation.

Without the benefit of reading the review report, I daresay one can understand [redacted] continuing belief that these matters have still not been properly scrutinised. Were [redacted] a complainant (which [redacted] is not [redacted] would be entitled to a copy of the investigating officer's report (or at least, a redacted version thereof).

I appreciate Kalmia's clear considered stance that any disclosure of the report is a matter for Staffordshire and, in the view of the deputy SIO [redacted] such disclosure will not undermine the yet to be concluded criminal investigation.

The matter not addressed by Kalmia however is any adverse consequence for any potential misconduct proceedings that might arise at the conclusion of Operation Kalmia - irrespective of whether criminal proceedings take place. I daresay if asked, Operation Kalmia would simply revert this matter back to Staffordshire, citing (quite properly) that the Chief Constable of Staffordshire would be the appropriate authority.

Notwithstanding [redacted] response, I remain concerned that whilst Kalmia remains on-going and has not reached a conclusion, any public airing of the subject matter of inextricably linked previous operations involving the same individuals (both serving and former officers) and the (albeit limited) exposure of two sensitive and protected operations may lead to at least inadvertent undermined of Kalmia on a number of levels.

First of all, it may also lead to perhaps a false sense of security of those subject of Kalmia in that as there has been no finding of inappropriate conduct in either Pendeford or Sanctio, then Kalmia will likely find the same in Nunes, and that may not be the case.

Secondly, and appreciating that [redacted] is formally declaring the release of the review report will not undermine Kalmia, I would be concerned that the limited reference to excerpts of the evidence that investigation has relied upon [redacted] is taken out of context and may lead to unreliable or incorrect inferences being drawn as to the veracity or credibility of certain of Kalmia's witnesses. Redacting those references in full would significantly alter the tone and content of the review report. I have therefore been less cautious than perhaps I would ordinarily be in redacting some of what is clearly operationally sensitive material, albeit in respect of operations several years ago.

I do consider that it would be sensible for Staffordshire to take a view as to whether any further redactions should be necessary. It would be wrong of me to impose my perspective on matters which were - and still are - to some extent, particularly sensitive, not least in exposure of operational detail. I am fully conscious that once forwarded to [redacted] there can be no expectation of any control placed on any onward transmission or disclosure to any other party.

It can of course be argued that there is already sufficient transparency and rigour over Staffordshire's approach to [redacted] reiteration of concerns over Pendeford and Sanctio. Kalmia itself has looked at these in the early stages, determined there to be no criminal concern, and the IPCC Commissioner has referred these back to Staffordshire to consider how to investigate. There has been openness with the IPCC, with Kalmia and with [redacted] on what that investigation looked like, including the over-riding concern to not undermine Kalmia. The review report has been forwarded to the IPCC and to Kalmia, but not to [redacted] and the letter [redacted] has been sent has not persuaded [redacted] that [redacted] concerns have been finally addressed.

We are still unclear on timescales for Kalmia, and given [redacted] has waited some considerable time for [redacted] concerns to be investigated, it may be prudent to respond to [redacted] that the five points [redacted] has raised in response are, in fact, all accounted for in the review, and that it is evident that some of [redacted] concerns articulated in [redacted] letter of 16 July are, in fact, unfounded, one example being [redacted] belief that in at least one case, the evidence of a protected witness was used. The review report (as redacted) can be made available to [redacted] in the fullness of time, and that will take place at a time when Kalmia has completed its investigation and after the contemplation of any misconduct proceedings that may be recommended for consideration..

I remain of the view that it is an unattractive and unsatisfactory option to afford [redacted] sight of the report in controlled conditions. There are practicalities to consider over the steps to be taken to prevent [redacted] for seeking to

copy all or excerpts by use of mobile telephony; [REDACTED] will be appraised of what has been said and may further report to other parties inaccurate aspects or elements taken out of context.

The difficulty now faced is that Kalmia has formally advised that dissemination of this report will not undermine Kalmia, so if Staffordshire tries to use that as a rationale for non-disclosure at this time, in the event [REDACTED] takes issue with Kalmia on this point, they will simply respond that the decision is that of Staffordshire and for their part, they have assured Staffordshire that disclosure is non-contentious and a matter for Staffordshire, which will of course further undermine Staffordshire in the eyes of [REDACTED]

However, in my view, it is reasonable to refrain from forwarding any report (redacted or otherwise) to [REDACTED] until such time Staffordshire is clear on whether Kalmia recommend there are misconduct proceedings to contemplate in respect of any still serving officer.

It may be therefore that supplying [REDACTED] with a redacted report is the best option in the longer term but in the short term, to respond to [REDACTED] to note [REDACTED] view, assure [REDACTED] the points [REDACTED] has raised have, in fact, all been answered in the review and that careful consideration is being given as to the extent to which it is prudent to allow [REDACTED] sight of the review report upon which the conclusions have been drawn at a point prior to the completion of Kalmia, and that this report will be released to [REDACTED] once Kalmia has concluded and Staffordshire is sighted on whether any criminal or misconduct matter in respect of either retired or serving officers has been determined.

The only viable alternative is to respond to [REDACTED] thank [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] letter, note [REDACTED] concerns and remind [REDACTED] that Staffordshire has reported in full to the IPCC (and to Kalmia) there is no basis for any concern [REDACTED] has expressed over any impropriety on either Pendeford or Sanctio and simply leave it at that. That will probably not be attractive as it lacks transparency.

Finally, whilst it is clear from Kalmia's response that they see no issue in disclosure, I would perhaps argue that Staffordshire should give careful consideration to alerting [REDACTED] that a specific excerpt of the statement [REDACTED] has provided to Kalmia has been a substantial part of the evidence to suggest that [REDACTED] concerns over any impropriety in dealing with protected witnesses in Operation Pendeford are without substance. I appreciate there is no compunction to take this step, but it may well be considered a reasonable and courteous matter. I do not know [REDACTED] and have never met [REDACTED] nor could I contemplate any view [REDACTED] may articulate or position [REDACTED] may take, but it may be you wish to bring this matter to [REDACTED] attention before considering the release of any report to [REDACTED]

I hope this assists. Again, apologies for not having had the time to attend to this in the weeks since we spoke.

Regards

John

John

Views would be welcome

----- Forwarded by Nicholas Baker/Executive Team/Executive/staffspol on 24/07/2013 08:58 -----


From: [REDACTED]@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk>

To: "'Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk'" <

Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>,


Date: 24/07/2013 08:09

Subject: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED:- RE: D Supt ARMSTRONGS report re OP SANCTIO & PENDEFORD: *RESTRICTED*



16th July 2013

A.C.C. Baker
Executive Suite
Staffordshire Police Headquarters
P.O. Box 3167
Stafford
ST16 9JZ

Re: Your Letter Dated 8 July 2013, Ref: NB, 

Dear A.C.C. Baker,

Thank you for your letter concerning the review of my concerns regarding the investigations known as 'Operation Pendeford' and 'Operation Sanctio'. Please note that I no longer live at the address that your letter was sent to, my new address is shown above.

In your letter you quite correctly point out that Operation KALMIA is an extensive investigation looking into the conduct of Staffordshire Police and certain individuals involved in investigation of the murder of Kevin NUNES, and the court case that followed. A number of the officer's under investigation played key roles in both Operation PENDEFORD and Operation SANCTIO. I fully understand the importance of ensuring that any action or enquiries into other matters falling outside the remit of Operation KALMIA need to be carefully managed so they do not compromise or otherwise undermine that long running investigation.

You also quite rightly identify my belief and frustration that Staffordshire Police were reluctant to challenge or investigate the integrity and actions of certain individuals including senior detective officers. There is little point in repeating in detail the reasons behind my belief and frustration other than to highlight that for three years whilst still a serving police officer I repeatedly voiced my concerns to a series of senior officers including the present Chief Constable Mr Cunningham and his predecessor Mr Sims; all declined to look any further into my concerns.

I am grateful for your update concerning the appointment of Detective Superintendent John Armstrong as the reviewing officer. I also note that in carrying out his review Mr Armstrong did not have an opportunity to question the individuals that may have had personal knowledge relevant to my concerns. Your letter quite rightly points out that Mr Armstrong's review 'should not be held to be an investigation capable of answering all the specific allegations'; This acknowledgement is a disappointment as it tend to confirm that my concerns have not been thoroughly investigated.

The reviewing officer's first conclusion that Staffordshire Police did not receive any public complaint concerning the conduct of Operation PENDEFORD and Operation SANCTIO, comes at no surprise to me considering the nature of these investigations.

The concerns I raised in connection with all three investigations (NUNES, PENDEFORD and SANCTIO), related to sensitive and covert areas of police work to which the general public would have no knowledge of. There is an understandable need to protect sensitive and covert police techniques, however there is a danger that the required secrecy can be abused to cover up inappropriate or criminal actions:

Your letter appears to suggest that the Mr Armstrong has reviewed the prosecution material for both remaining cases and is satisfied that all relevant material and payments were properly disclosed to the prosecution and trial judge. I am not in a position to fairly comment on whether that judgement is correct, however that was the starting position for the NUNES case up until Operation KALMIA carried a detailed investigation.

I note with interest the finding of the reviewing officer that in both cases the protected witnesses were [REDACTED] unfortunately it is unclear when those payments were made i.e. prior to making of witness statement or prior to any court case. My concern was, and still is that in both cases that the witnesses may have been promised a [REDACTED] in return for making a statement and that advance payments from those rewards may have been made improperly made before the conclusion of the trial.

In respect of the use of the evidence provided by each protected witness; your letter states that in one cases the trial judge ruled the evidence inadmissible and in the other the CPS withdrew the evidence. Given that there were multiple witnesses in each case I am unsure which witness the reviewing officer is referring to, I was under the impression that in at least one of the cases the evidence of the protected witness was used.


Prior to my retirement from Staffordshire Police my concerns in respect of Operation PENDEFORD and Operation SANCTIO were as follows:

- Were significant witnesses improperly promised substantial rewards as an inducement to make a statement? (PENDEFORD and SANCTIO)
- Were significant witnesses given advance payments of the promised rewards to ensure their continued cooperation? (PENDEFORD and SANCTIO)
- Were the details of any promised rewards or advance payments made properly disclosed to the prosecution and defence?
- Did senior officers cause witness protection officers to edit/rewrite disclosure records to conceal demands from a witness for cash payments as a condition of making a statement? (PENDEFORD)
- Did senior officers effectively condone or cover up the ongoing wrongdoing of an individual officer previously involved in fabricating disclosure records. (PENDEFORD)

Sadly I still do not feel that the above points have been sufficiently investigated or answered, for that reason I am considering what further action to take to resolve my concerns. I have in past considered writing to my Member of Parliament or to the Home Secretary concerning this matter, I would welcome your views on this possible course of action.

Yours Sincerely,



Copy to: IPCC Commissioner 
Eastern Business Park
Wern Fawr Lane
St Mellons
Cardiff
CF3 5EA



**Keeping our communities
safe and reassured**



From the office of Assistant Chief Constable Investigative Services

Direct Line: 01785 [REDACTED]
Fax: 01785 232412
Our Ref: NB [REDACTED]

Date: 8 July 2013

Dear [REDACTED]

I write to advise you of the steps taken by Chief Constable Michael Cunningham to determine what action should be taken to address matters falling outside the terms of reference of Operation KALMIA; namely the scrutiny of two high profile Staffordshire Police investigations, Operation PENDEFORD (drug related murder of Floyd Dodson in 1999 which resulted in a conviction for manslaughter in 2003) and Operation SANCTIO (a high profile robbery at a cash holding depot in Tamworth in 2006 which led to convictions in 2007). For each case you sighted concerns over the management of a significant witness and the potential non-disclosure material and competency for improper reward payment matters that had some parallel with the concerns you had raised in the NUNES case. I am aware you believe these matters had not been appropriately investigated and you believed there to be a lack of willingness on the part of Staffordshire Police to challenge the integrity of certain senior detectives.

Operation KALMIA is a significantly resourced external Force investigation managed by the IPCC which has led to the formal investigation of current and former Staffordshire Police Officers and has focused on their respective actions, omissions to act, concerning the NUNES case. The enquiry is investigating allegations of serious criminality as well as breaches of standards of professional behaviour assessed as gross misconduct. It was therefore of importance that any steps Chief Constable Cunningham took to determine the extent to which he should investigate the matters you raised that fell outside the terms of reference of Operation KALMIA should in no way impinge on the integrity of that operation, as it remains ongoing and has yet to report. To assist the Chief Constable in his determination as to the extent of any formal investigation into the concerns you have raised he commissioned an independent assessment by Detective Superintendent John Armstrong, Head of Professional Standards, Cheshire Constabulary (reviewing officer). In his scoping work this officer has ensured that no aspect of his review could in any way compromise the work of Operation KALMIA. He has not sought to interview or seek account from any Officer serving or retired who has been subject to any attention during the course of that investigation. His assessment, however, has benefited from extensive cooperation from Operation KALMIA.

I have now had the opportunity of receiving a detailed report from the reviewing officer in which he outlines his findings, analysis, conclusions and recommendations and it is the basis of this review I can outline to you the outcome of his work.

The reviewing officer's first conclusion is that Staffordshire Police did not receive any

public complaint over the manner in which either Operation PENDEFORD or SANCTIO was conducted other than the concerns raised by yourself. No other record exists that shows that either investigation was subject of any internal or external formal concern either at the time or since in respect of impropriety, the manner in which either was conducted, or issues of integrity over the disclosure process.

In each case significant work was undertaken to secure the evidence of a protected witness. In Operation PENDEFORD the trial judge ruled the evidence to be inadmissible and the Crown could not therefore rely upon it at trial. In Operation SANCTIO the Crown withdrew the evidence of the protected witness as it did not need to rely upon the evidence and there were foreseeable challenges to anonymity and motivation. In both cases the prospect of the respective protected witness receiving a financial reward proved a difficulty for the prosecution and may well have been an influencing factor in the subsequent acquittal of one defendant in each case.

From the reviewing officer's report I am completely satisfied that there is tangible and cohesive evidence that payments to each witness was made. Auditable records exist of these payments and the rationale. These payments were duly disclosed to the prosecution team and to the trial judge. The prospect of each witness being significantly motivated by financial reward was identified, reported upon and was properly considered in the disclosure process and in respective applications. There is no evidence to support your concern that there may have been a miscarriage of justice from improper inducements of protected witnesses to provide evidence in these cases.

The reviewing officer's work cannot and should not be held to be an investigation capable of answering all the specific allegations you raised. Most notably in respect of the allegation that a 'book' had been re-written at the behest of the senior investigating officers. His report details a significant weight of evidence that demonstrates the protected witness concerned was [REDACTED] and that records were made with associated rationale which were properly disclosed to the prosecution and were duly considered by the trial judge in a [REDACTED] application. To that extent even if it were accepted an early formal record had in fact been altered to conceal any payment or any improper offer or inducement or the motivation of the witness to seek financial reward for cooperating with the investigation, such an act was well and truly overtaken by comprehensive records and disclosure of such payments and motivation.

I am satisfied the independent reviewing officer has produced reasonable grounds for the Chief Constable to conclude that there has now been a sufficiently thorough and proportionate examination of your concerns over Operation PENDEFORD and Operation SANCTIO to satisfy any interested party. There is no evidence of material impropriety in the handling or management of a protected witness in either investigation. I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that there are no grounds to consider either Operation PENDEFORD or SANCTIO to have led to any miscarriage of justice. There is no evidence of any criminal conduct on the part of any officer, nor is there any prospect of a case to answer for any breach of standards of professional behaviour on the part of any officers involved in either investigation.

The reviewing officer has purposefully not addressed any questions of any previous decision over the prior handling of your concerns over Operation PENDEFORD and SANCTIO. Operation KALMIA is holding serving and retired Officers involved in the NUNES investigation to account over matters which are inextricably linked to decisions made on the handling of your wider concerns. Whilst his review would clearly have benefited from direct information or evidence from those personally involved in the allegations or in the material decisions made in either operation, it was nonetheless imperative that the integrity of Operation KALMIA should not be compromised and it would be wholly inappropriate to comment on the justification or otherwise of any earlier decision, act or omission in any matter concerning both Operation PENDEFORD and SANCTIO, as those are integral aspects of the terms of reference of Operation KALMIA.

The Chief Constable has informed Chief Constable Creedon, Investigating Officer of Operation KALMIA, and IPCC Commissioner [REDACTED] of the findings of this review.

I very much hope that this correspondence answers the questions you raised to Chief Constable Cunningham over your concerns about other aspects of impropriety that fell outside of the terms of reference of Operation KALMIA. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to address these important matters with you.

Yours sincerely

Nicholas Baker
Assistant Chief Constable

Executive Suite, Staffordshire Police HQ, PO Box 3167, Stafford ST16 9JZ

[REDACTED]

From: Caroline.Coombe@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 26 June 2014 17:42
To: Nicholas Baker
Subject: [REDACTED] *RESTRICTED*
Attachments: pic09051.jpg; pic15672.jpg

Nick

[REDACTED]

Caroline

Caroline Coombe
Senior HR Manager, People Services
HR HQ
Telephone: 01785 [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded by Caroline Coombe/Corporate Positions/Additional Functions/staffspol on 26/06/2014 17:39 -----

From: Caroline Coombe/Corporate Positions/Additional
Functions/staffspol
To: Timothy Martin/People Services/Resource
Directorate/staffspol@Staffspol,
Date: 26/06/2014 17:33

[REDACTED] *RESTRICTED*

Tim,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

John Armstrong report

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Look forward to hearing from you,

many thanks, Caroline

Caroline Coombe
Senior HR Manager, People Services
HR HQ
Telephone: 01785 [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]

From: Timothy Martin/People Services/Resource Directorate/staffspol
To: Caroline Coombe/OrgSupport/staffspol@Staffspol,
Date: 26/06/2014 14:04

[REDACTED] *RESTRICTED*

Caroline,

Is this copied to me just for information ?

Tim Martin
Det Supt 4283

Public Protection
Staffordshire Police.

PA, [REDACTED] ext [REDACTED]

Office No : 01785 [REDACTED]
Mobile No : [REDACTED]
E- mail : timothy.martin@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk

----- Forwarded by Timothy Martin/People Services/Resource Directorate/staffspol on 26/06/2014 13:55 -----

From: [REDACTED]@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk>
To: "Caroline.Coombe@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk"
<Caroline.Coombe@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>,
Cc: "Timothy.Martin@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk"
<Timothy.Martin@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>,
"Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk"
<Nicholas.Baker@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk>,
[REDACTED]@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk"
[REDACTED]@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk>
Date: 26/06/2014 10:08



11:30 Thursday 8 May 2014
Conference Room 5,
Staffordshire Police HQ



RESTRICTED	
Contents may be seen by : Restricted	
Author: ACC N Baker	Organisation : Staffordshire Police
Date created: 8 May 2014	Telephone: 01785 [REDACTED]

Present :

ACC N Baker, Chair
DCS [REDACTED]
Caroline Coombe, People Services
D/Supt [REDACTED]
PC [REDACTED] Federation
[REDACTED] Occupational Health
[REDACTED] Comms

Apologies :

[REDACTED] Head Legal Services
D/Supt [REDACTED] Investigative Services
[REDACTED] People Services
D/Supt T Martin, PAU

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 8 May 2014

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

RESTRICTED

5. Process

ACC Baker said the focus of Kalmia is the Nunes murder. [REDACTED] also raised concerns around protected persons within Operation Pendeford and Operation Sanctio which have both had convictions. [REDACTED] has said these are linked and point to corruption. The IPCC took the Nunes murder and referred Pendeford and Sanctio back to the Chief Constable. Supt John Armstrong has reviewed these independently via a paper review. He was happy there was no legitimacy to the points raised by [REDACTED] ACC Baker said he has had correspondence with [REDACTED] around this and has agreed that if he could share with [REDACTED] the document written by Supt Armstrong he would but he has to ensure this does not compromise Kalmia from a criminal point. This has been communicated to [REDACTED] Kalmia and the IPCC both had copies the Armstrong report.

Action 03/05.14 : Risk assess around vulnerable individuals linked to Operation Sanctio and Pendeford to be undertaken by D/Supt [REDACTED]

Action 04/05.14 : Operation Sanctio/Pendeford to become a standing agenda item

6. Corporate Communications

7. Any Other Business

• [REDACTED]

Date of Next Meeting :

10.30am-12midday	Monday 7 July 2014	Conf Rm 5
10.30am-12midday	Tuesday 9 September 2014	Conf Rm 5
10.30am-12midday	Wednesday 5 November 2014	Conf Rm 5