

3rd May 2018

Freedom of Information Request Reference N°: FOI 001203-18

I write in connection with your request for information received by Suffolk Constabulary on the 3rd April 2018 in which you sought access to the following information:

Please disclose Suffolk Police record re application for records disclosure in the 1993/94 legal aid funded actions related to corticosteroid research in the county. Legal aid funded action against two police surgeons 1971 72 and late Stowmarket GP Dr Alan Lower (In retirement Chair of Suffolk County Council and Social Services Cttee) and Ipswich consultant the late John Paulley.

If you locate that record you will have located the first allegation re Stowmarket (where we now know "Darren" of Operation Midland was fostered to a single paedophile) of a GP prescribing being criminal separate from the prescribing subject of civil negligence action.

In the Ipswich Prostitutes case in which "Darren" is reported as having made false confessions you should find that the Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre Cambridge Uni contracted secret research from 1950s had labelled many Suffolk children and adults as "Psychopath". This was to do with research that now appears to have been linked to the now notorious Aston Hall Derby/Home Office research via the then Royal Medico Psychological Society. Suffolk psychopath labelling relates to a misunderstanding of "Psychopathology" (psychosomatics how many asthmatics did you want to put on a profile list of suspects and swamp your inquiry?)

Could you check the records for Chief constable visit to Lord Henniker re paedophile Peter Righton 1992 please? There you should find and disclose records related to concerns around death of Sir John Stradling Thomas MP at his Dolphin Square Home between the two final readings of Greville Janners War Crimes Bill 1991.

And could you disclose the record after Sept 8th 2016 crime complaint, after IICSA classified Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre research as historical abuse, that should have caused the above records review?

Clarification received 6th April 2018

- 1. 1982 Letters and interview with Head of Force CID in which steroid prescribing in county was discussed
- 2. Correspondence from 1989 in which matters were raised again in context of 1972 death of a Welsh Regional Crime Squad Det sgt.
- 3. 1993 legal aid awarded to sue two Suffolk Police surgeon GPs 1971 1972 late Doctor ALAN LOWER Stowmarket GP 1970 et seq and Ipswich consultant John Paulley who emerged to have been a researcher in steroids and life event stress. This is when my Suffolk Police service records were requested by my solicitors. You should have a request for disclosure. At this point you should have a record that some aspects of the medical history were classified as criminal beyond the scope of legal aid civil funding
- 4. 1995 discussion with me when a Supt GS RICHARDSON phoned and you have a copy of my affidavit after this telephone conversation



- 5. Henniker Estate and Dolphin Square Child Abuse Inquiries 2015 when lines of inquiry re Oakwood School and Stowmarket GPs should have been reported to such as Operation Midland
- 6. 2016 when the Aston Hall Connections via Royal Medical Psychological Society to Ipswich Hospital and Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre from 1950s emerged and IICSA classified activity at IFPC as within category of child sexual abuse.
- 7. In 2006 IIRC year of War Crimes Inquiry re Galician SS in county the records to that point must have been collated for tort legal defence of Chief constable MacWhirter. It was necessary then to go along the timeline and basically carry out a standard police check "Any offences revealed" for criminal actions by doctors in Suffolk.

There should also be records for HM Coroner approach to Chief constable circa 1992 when Chief visited Henniker Estate re Islington safeguarding concerns about Paedophile Information Exchange. This would include about 43 Islington and Hackney cerebral palsy child care deaths at The Beeches Ixworth 1954 to 1972 that remain non investigated to this day. Wales Regional Crime Squad 1972 72 were investigating identity theft via GP death registration malpractice. A good question is why did Suffolk Chief constables or rather how did they avoid extending those RCS suspicions to related matters in Suffolk.

So there should be a collated file 2006. Then records for your CSA dealings with Op Midland etc. Then crime complaint after Aston Hall was linked research wise with Ipswich Hospital (That is 8th Sept 2016)

At the point along the 1971 to present timeline Suffolk Police acknowledged (or stopped covering up) criminal medical activity in the county that would be a point a massive cases review should have triggered.

What I suspect happened is that to avoid that massive review and all its implications your force misled Operation Midland and Henriques Inquiry.

Has that explained the FOI?

Follow-up email received 7th April

The reason I know a file was collated in 2006 is because Suffolk Chief constable barrister, Matthew Holdcroft, prepared for a prior determination I requested and which was listed for hearing. I was seeking to compel Chief constable defence on the facts. In the event the hearing did not happen and it would be for your force to ask their own barrister what view he took in court about this and his own position as an officer of the court.

In that file will be correspondence re the first war crimes unit deployment which was to Gwent early 90s when a bizarre burglary stole all Newport births marriages deaths records. When Suffolk Chief constable was asked to liaise with Gwent re document burglary of a retired RCS Dc. When EADT generated information to Suffolk Chief constable that Leonard Cheshire prognosis was at least four more years. Hence when Cheshire died 3 months later (Two months before Chief constable visit to Lord Henniker) this was yet another example of Suffolk Police failing in the common law duty to report facts to an HM Coroner which may lead to or inform an inquest. The same common law failure as 43 child care deaths Ixworth. And others. These common law



failures should have been declared to civil court under Civil Procedure Rules of adverse disclosure. A very topical issue in criminal courts at this time.

The question is for a record with dates when the research was recognised and when crime complaint was accepted as justified beyond the privilege civil defence for consultants then called "Bolam Defence" and when broader implications of this research were recognised and that generated lines of inquiry essential to explore in the county child sudden death and child sexual abuse inquiries. Inquiries we know (Operation Winter Key IICSA) were not pursued and not accounted to Henriques Inquiry.

I am happy for you to answer or explore this in writing to me.

Further email 7th April

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/war crimes act home secretary st#incoming-1138027

I hope this helps to explain too

Further email 7th April

https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/elsevier/steroid-research-at-organon-in-the-golden-1950s-and-the-following-X8fsyLoGos

It occurs to me to provide this published matter of Organon steroid research. I do not know if late consultant Van Zwanenberg Ipswich Hospital was or was not related to the Van Zwanenbergs who owned Organon of the European Hormone Cartel.

The late Van Zwanenberg was certainly asking for patients at Ipswich early 70s to be taken off the undoubted steroid researcher the late John W Paulley. Ipswich Van Zwanenberg looks like the good guy here TBH. But when legal aid funded in the 1990s against Paulley, Lower and two police surgeon GPs not only did Suffolk Police refuse disclosure and claim records did not exist .. Ipswich Hospital refused to disclose records in 94 then later slipped up by admitting they destroyed ALL PAULLEY records in 1998. A massive theft and perversion of justice offence Suffolk Police handily did not record.

Also all records destruction at that time Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre. Actually set up post war contracted to Cambridge Unit to research on unwitting Suffolk families four days a week. The centre had a grandiose mission. To explore the creation of "Salutiferous Society". But now this historical Ipswich Institution is subject if Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse.

Cambridge Uni lighthouse of academia seem to also have destroyed their records.

In the steroid action 1990s it emerged that the late Dr Alan LOWER allegedly stole GP records to deny them to GPs for patients moving out of Suffolk. If Inquiries had properly been made by Suffolk Police at Heath Road Wing you would have found that in the 70s senior nurses were advising patients to leave Suffolk

Email of 8th April



I also hope this helps you understand the FOI

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/operation_winter_key_jurisdictio

Email of 9th April

On the 2006 file you should find a screening for issues under Human Rights Act/ECHR

Under Freedom from Cruel and Inhuman Treatment you should find inmate "Old Commander" aged 85 Sue Ryder HQ Cavendish. And reference to the Matron McGill Decd case file .. a letter Matron wrote 9th December 1971 to a Quaker Health visitor friend expressing concerns that the Muslim Old Commander had been tranquillised and on instructions of Sue Ryder and Leonard Cheshire a Roman Catholic service held converting the old Muslim to Roman Catholicism.

On the denial to rights of freedom of association and movement you should find this linked to the plight of Suzi Knight the widow of Head of MI5 Maxwell Knight at another Sue Ryder Home.

You should find the death of Old Commander early January 1972 and London Gazette registration of death in Polish Catholic identity

One week after that death volunteer Matron Mary McGill died purportedly having drowned herself in the Sue Ryder HQ lake.

Then you should reach death of Sue Ryder inmate Mr BRONK some weeks after the death of Matron McGill.

It was a GP certified death. But the Sue Ryder inmate widow Stefania BRONK was accusing the doctor of causing her husbands death by prescription.

You should then find the suicide verdict for the death of Stefania BRONK facedown in her Sue Ryder HQ bath. July 1972.

In the midst of that timeline you should find April 1972 when Chief constable was misleading Matron McGill's New Zealand Govt who wanted inquiry and inquest re-opened.

And there you should find whether Suffolk Police paid private psychiatrist James Beresford Davies for an opinion related to steroid prescribing in Suffolk.

Beresford Davies was an NHS consultant at Fulbourne a research asset of Cambridge Uni just as J G Howells Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre was a research asset of Cambridge Uni.

It was in fact a Fulbourn patient who gave evidence at the January 1972 McGill Decd inquest.

If you interrogate the file further 1997 you should find information via Christs Cambridge suggesting joint line of inquiry Sue Ryder deaths and Beeches child care deaths ... which imply inquiry starting with Bishop Mervyn Stockwood should be fruitful

In 1997 the above Fulbourn witness at January 1972 McGill inquest admitted he had misled inquest and in accordance with Common Law contacted Functus Officio HM Coroner Bury St



Edmunds to clarify the body was never identified or seen in the lake. So you should find that on record.

If you then move to more recent crime complaints made independent of my concern you should find MELLARIL prescribing complaint linked to child abuse complaint Haverhill 1960s 70s.

And you should find crime complaint 1960s re Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre and fostering a child to paedophiles at Haringey.

That should assist you towards helpfully answering this FOI in public interest.

You should find some reference to Brodrick Inquiry into shortcomings of death registration system (Reported 1972) which was relevant to HM Coroner early 90s approach to Chief constable re the Beeches non investigated child care deaths (The 43 child care deaths in Islington and Hackney care at Beeches Ixworth 1954 to 1972)

The record of what Beresford Davies reported to Chief constable 1972 would be helpful at this stage.

https://www.elsevier.com/books/psychosomatic-disorders-in-adolescents-and-young-adults/hambling/978-1-4831-9814-9

Here for interest is Ipswich Hospital educationalist and steroid researcher PAULLEY chairing a research conference 1960 ... a research interest totally from his patients as at Ipswich Hospital he presented as a "Consultant of Pure Medicine".

Email 12th April

Professor Liz Davies (who raised Chief constable visit to Lord Henniker 1992) excellent Islington safeguarding whistleblower has a copy of the Keith Joseph report 1973 re Beeches child deaths. My understanding is there is no mention at all of child care deaths. It is a sociology theory report on difficulties of child care far from their homes!

It is my impression the Fulbourne (Cambridge Uni research asset) linked Ida Darwin Hospital may have been conducting cerebral palsy research including outreach research. As you have read the other Cambridge Uni research such as Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre is impenetrable as they got away with records destruction at Ipswich and Cambridge as did associated Ipswich steroid researcher John Paulley.

Indeed as did William Sargent at St Thomas get away with records theft and destruction.

Paulley was a founding member of independent uni of Buckingham with Max BELOFF. In time the independent uni was joined by BELOFFs sister chair of biochemical research imperial and her imperial staff I think. The Institute of Economic Affairs links continue as Richard D NORTH was Leonard Cheshires aide at Sue Ryder HQ Cavendish early 1970s. He is a free thinker and published endorsement of Richard Websters book which appeared aimed at discrediting child abuse victims and the North Wales abuse social worker whistleblower Alyson Taylor.



I don't know whether this was before or after Jillings report. But it was Michael Beloff QC who advised Clwyd County Council not to publish the report declaring extensive abuse and the council insurers refused to pay up if they published and were sued ..

The medical research being impenetrable (But you have to know it is there to know it is impenetrable) I would take the approach on two fronts re Ida Darwin and James Beresford Davies who I have already mentioned. Common Law duty to report facts to HM Coroner .. hands on as vicarious expert.

If you know the Chillenden Murders case Kent.. pretty much psychiatrist put a man away. I think it is coming to appeal. Yet in 1972 Beresford Davies was it seems stitching up the copper under a Police Act medical request while failing to report to HM Coroner or to Police that the inquest witness who copper was after for perjury was his Fulbourn patient! Beresford Davies in private practice then gained the co-operation of Paulley's steroid research team member GP Dr Lower Stowmarket to try to chemical cosh the resigned copper!! All happened.

When you look at Oakwood at St Georges at Henniker Estate at Operation Midland and Dolphin Square inquiry is insufficient unless the above matters have been clarified and accounted. Knowing the question marks over Darren at Stowmarket re unreliability of medical records and research agenda .. I also think it could be identified as a failure to make adverse disclosure to a defence at prosecution.

IF it turns out Marquis of Bristol was investor behind Beeches then you are aware he funded the Harvey Proctor produced political programmes on Radio 270? Company where Roger Gale MP was investor and DJ and that Roger went on to become Head of BBC Children TV. Dame Janet Smith in her conduct of Shipman Inquiry ruled the Beeches child deaths death certing gaps (HM Coroner search known to Chief constable Coe 1992/93) as beyond her terms of ref. But she did learn that Sue Ryder Homes was an organisation benefitting from Special Branch protection from lawful police inquiry. By the time she conducted Savile review at BBC she knew his abuse included at Sue Ryder Child Hospice Leeds. It would not be just Operation Midland etc affected as a consequence of this FOI.

This IMO is the most important FOI you will handle. The issue between Attorney Generals and me is this.

We have to honour our Constable Oaths. A constable is sworn to HM the Queen who wed her people and became sole fount of justice in mercy by Coronation Oath. And the oath of the true constable is binding unto death. It is part of the essential balance of powers of our Realm Crown and Parliament. Crown has Constables and Judiciary and Admin of Justice. I do not give one tuppny damn if the attorney general finds it convenient to throw a shroud over deaths due to their inconvenience as it suits his SECRET public interest custodianship I am sworn and I bend my knee to no man in the discharge of duty save judge in open court.

Let me answer to a Judge for the discharge of my duty and let the attorney general do the same.

This is opined by a barrister to be most important police constitutional case since 1829. But it will not be so unless Suffolk Police start being Suffolk CONSTABULARY. Be CONSTABLES.



Email 13th April

https://ballint.co.uk/about/introduction/

This is the Balint Group and you will notice that patients were unaware they were being discussed by a network.

This seems a model for the "Ipswich Vocational Training Initiative" for GPs run by John and Deirdre Paulley of Ipswich Hospital. But at Ipswich prescribing decisions seem to have been taken in the group which did not go on either Ipswich Hospital or GP Lloyd George card record.

For corticosteroids as your police first aid training taught there is a blue steroid medicalert card to look for. The patient own record of doses and drugs. John Paulley at Ipswich forbade blue steroid cards to be issued. Patients did not get their own record of steroid treatment. They just got steroids!

For asthma Paulley had a self admission scheme under his care. So his patients could admit themselves as inpatients under his care. But is also ensured no other consultant got a second guess at his self admission patients?

Email 21st April

http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/13176430.Notorious paedophile headed scottish care home_inquiry/

I post this as it would relate to Chief constable visit to Henniker 1992, your force liaison with Cayacos and the implications for unsafety of DHSS and Home Office handling of Beeches child care deaths and Sue Ryder HQ care deaths 1972 et seq.

Email 24th April

https://criminal.media/men-who-are-attracted-to-13-year-old-boys-make-the-best-teachers-director-of-kent-social-services-74-85

As you know I mentioned 1997 information relating to Nick Staceys C of E mentor Mervyn Stockwood.

So this could be helpful information as Stacey forbade all reports to police of child abuse in Kent. Including when chemical coshing research and abuse were happening at Kendall House.

I think Stacey links to Barbara Kahan and Peter Righton whose learning programme for residential social workers (Alternative route for paedophiles to gain social work qualies?) was a tad conveniently absorbed into OU before Chief constable visit to Henniker 1992.

Email 25th April

The FOI site is a public record and I have added a lot of explanation. I have now drawn attention of Amber Rudd Home Secretary and Independent Inquiry Child Sexual Abuse to this FOI. This is



associated with some questions I put to IICSA and complaint that their handling of Greville Janner stage is incomplete.

I have made some mention of Common Law Duty to Report Facts to HM Coroner and the 43 child care deaths at Ixworth in which that duty at law seems to have been widely breached to the current day.

I must now refer to another Common Law Misprision of Felony which Labour Govt purportedly moved into statute 1967.

Even if Suffolk Police accept that the misprision offence applied only till 1967 it would apply to nigh twenty years of the initial operation of Cambrigde Uni contracted Ipswich Family Psychiatric Centre.

Did they target for family research parents who had been in institutionalised care and tortured or otherwise abused therein. I think the answer is YES. And I wonder if the social services records for such parents (To be maintained 100 years?) went missing when called by the IFPC liaison with child welfare in Suffolk.

On that basis in studies (involving 1000 unwitting Suffolk Families) the centre was researching abuse history whilst also covering it up on a probable breathtaking scale contrary to Common Law.

Email 26th April

Because I have drawn attention of Home Secretary and IICSA to this FOI I add another link

https://www.thelondoneconomic.com/news/will-theresa-mays-child-abuse-inquiry-explain-how-so-many-abuse-survivors-records-have-disappeared/24/04/

Records destruction. Off the record medical research. And a determination it seems to avoid cross reference of the activity. Aston Hall Derby was made the BBC Prima Donna seemingly to sell the public the dummy that Aston Hall was isolated work of one medical madman.

I think we are not being told the number of victims who have withdrawn from Independent inquiry child sexual abuse. There are voices calling for more to abandon it.

In Suffolk we see the obscene history of 43 child care deaths at Ixworth still denied inquiry and inquest. We see an indifference to and cover up of medical and psychological experimentation of the populace which was on an industrial and criminal scale in my view.

Since 1972 we have seen Suffolk Police sustain lies to New Zealand Govt and insufficiency of inquiry in the 1972 four sudden deaths at Sue Ryder HQ Cavendish. Who were the women's still birth group from West Country renting at Cavendish observing Sue Ryder activity? For example.

Since 1997 we have seen Suffolk Police refuse to pursue C of E information about the 43 Ixworth child care deaths.



When Chief constable MacWhirter was being sued circa 2006 I wonder how long he knew he would get a nice little Ipswich NHS part time sinecure for his retirement? And I have to tell you there was no adverse disclosure of such a fact to the court as required by law.

Email 28th April

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/common_law_duties_to_report_fact

You must be made aware of this FOI to Attorney General.

The Suffolk deaths mentioned need no further explanation re relevance to the FOI you are examining

The Guys child death during hospital power failure 1995 may be more obscure for Suffolk relevance. In the 2006 file for Chief constable preparation for defence on facts you should encounter that Chief constable FULLER of Kent was challenged to sign a High Court statement of truth that no sabotage or fraud in the supply of NHS backup generators occurred at a Kent manufacturer. And you should find that Mr FULLER refused to sign. You should find this related to Common Law duties to report facts to HM Coroner. Which are duties on us all including Chief constables.

You should find this related to an "OIRA asset acquiring information of use to Soviet Union" in Suffolk and apart from association with a renowned Sizewell protestor no mention of the sabotage plan of OIRA other than Chief constable overriding duty re Sizewell and NHS. At a time your Chief constable was lining up his retirement job with Ipswich NHS and Ipswich NHS invested millions in an upgrade to its electrical and backup power systems (Suffolk never sent me a thankyou card). I forget whether this was before or after Tony Blair brought in new security of electrical supply regs for NHS Hospitals 2007 after I had been reporting direct to him since 2005 and I can only wonder at what influence Downing Street may have had on a listed hearing against your Chief constable never happening?

But as I told you at outset that would be for you to check with your barrister Matthew Holdcroft and what position he took in court when a listed hearing did not happen. .

Response to your Request

Suffolk Constabulary has considered your request for information and our response is below.

This response is correct as of 1st May 2018.

Having considered the information requested I have decided not to provide the information, as the Constabulary considers the requests to be vexatious.

In accordance with Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), this response serves as a formal notification of refusal for your request.

This refusal notice relies on the application of Section 14(1) of the Freedom of Information Act – Vexatious Requests:

Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious.



Section 14(1) may be used in a variety of circumstances where a request, or its impact on a public authority, cannot be justified.

In order for a public authority to engage this section, the following must be considered:

- Whether compliance would create a significant burden in terms of expense and distraction;
- Whether the request is designed to cause disruption or annoyance;
- Whether the request has the effect of harassing the public authority or its staff;
- Whether the request can otherwise fairly be characterised as obsessive or manifestly unreasonable; and
- Whether the request has any serious purpose or value.

I have considered the frequency and content of the emails received, following the initial request, which appear to be asking for additional research to be undertaken. Also, parts of the request have been answered previously, for example, in October 2016, we advised that research had been undertake and no information was held regarding the "reports Chief constable made to the attorney general about his case compromised visit to Lord Henniker. If it is the case that Chief constable made the visit without informing attorney general or HM Coroner please make that your FOI response".

Additionally, we also advised in June 2015, that no information was held concerning Sue Ryder and the context of the deaths of Matron McGill Cavendish in 1972 as these pre-dated current systems.

Whilst I appreciate that this is an area which you hold particular interest to, when we research requests for information we do consider the ICO guidance and previous case law, which states:

"...that in considering whether a request is vexatious, the number of requests or previous requests and the demands they place on the public authorities time and resource may be a relevant factor."

The FOI Act was created so that public authorities could be open and accountable to the general public, so that the public are better informed, encouraging public debate. It was not created to fuel long running issues, which directly contradict those fundamental principles.

Having carefully considered this request, balancing the purpose of the request and the affect any response may have on future correspondence, I have determined that the request does fall under the section 14(1) vexatious exemption.

Should you have any further queries concerning this request, please contact Amanda Gibson, FOI Decision Maker, quoting the reference number shown above.



A full copy of the Freedom of Information Act (2000) can be viewed on the 'Office of Public Sector Information' web-site;

http://www.opsi.gov.uk/

Suffolk Constabulary is not responsible for the content, or the reliability, of the website referenced. The Constabulary cannot guarantee that this link will work all of the time, and we have no control over the availability of the linked pages.



Your Right to Request a Review of Decisions Made Under the Terms of the Freedom of Information Act (2000).

If you are unhappy with how your request has been handled, or if you think the decision is incorrect, you have the right to ask Suffolk Constabulary to review their decision.

Ask Suffolk Constabulary to look at the decision again.

If you are dissatisfied with the decision made by Suffolk Constabulary under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), regarding access to information, you must notify Suffolk Constabulary that you are requesting a review within 20 days of the date of its response to your Freedom of Information request. Requests for a review should be made in writing and addressed to:

Freedom of Information Decision Maker Information Management Department Suffolk Constabulary Police Headquarters Martlesham Heath Ipswich Suffolk IP5 3QS OR

Email: information@suffolk.pnn.police.uk

In all possible circumstances Suffolk Constabulary will aim to respond to your request for us to look at our decision again within 20 working days of receipt of your request for an internal review.

The Information Commissioner.

After lodging a request for a review with Suffolk Constabulary, if you are still dissatisfied with the decision, you can apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision on whether the request for information has been dealt with in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

For information on how to make application to the Information Commissioner please visit their website at www.ico.org.uk or contact them at the address shown below:

The Information Commissioner's Office Wycliffe House Water Lane Wilmslow Cheshire SK9 5AF

Telephone: 01625 545 700