

The Email of 12 January 2022 from Detective Inspector Akshay Chibber (Staff Officer to Commissioner Cressida Dick)

**A Forensic Examination of a Metropolitan Police
Explanation for Declining Further Investigation of Crime
Reference Number 6029679/21**

Author: Ian Clayton

Date: 24 July 2026

Introduction

The administration of criminal justice depends not merely upon decisions, but upon the reasons advanced in support of those decisions.

Public confidence is maintained when those reasons are coherent, legally intelligible and capable of being reconciled with the documentary record.

On 12 January 2022, Detective Inspector Akshay Chibber, Staff Officer to the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police,

responded to correspondence concerning Crime Reference Number (CRN) 6029679/21.

The email predates the Metropolitan Police's formal closure letter of 21 February 2022 by almost six weeks.

Standing alone, it is simply one contemporaneous document. Read alongside the wider documentary chronology, however, it assumes considerably greater significance.

This paper's purpose is strictly disciplined.

It is to examine precisely what was said, to compare the 12 January explanation with the Metropolitan Police's subsequent formal reasoning in the 21 February correspondence and to consider whether those differing explanations are capable of being comfortably reconciled at all.

The Correspondence

On 10 January 2022 Mark Sexton wrote to Detective Chief Superintendent Treena Fleming and Detective Inspector Akshay Chibber.

He explained that medical practitioners, scientists and other experts wished to attend the Metropolitan Police in order to provide first-hand evidence relevant to CRN 6029679/21.

The request was neither complex nor political. It was procedural.

He requested that an appointment be arranged so that evidence could be received.

Two days later Detective Inspector Chibber replied.

He confirmed:

"I can see that your allegation was recorded and initially assessed through the relevant office at the Central West Command Unit. It has subsequently been closed and will not be investigated any further."

Had the email ended there, it would have represented a straightforward notification that the Metropolitan Police had concluded their consideration of the matter.

However, it did not end there.

Instead, it continued:

"I'm afraid allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programs are not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence."

The significance of this sentence lies not in its tone, but in its scope.

What Was Being Said?

This paper is concerned with what the words themselves in the email appear to convey.

The email does not simply state that the evidence then available failed to disclose a criminal offence.

It does not explain that the evidential threshold for further investigation had not been met.

Nor does it identify any deficiency within the material offered by those seeking to provide further evidence.

Instead, the explanation appears to be framed by reference to the subject matter of the allegations themselves.

Read logically, the email appears to communicate that allegations concerning the Government's COVID regulations and vaccine programmes were not regarded as matters for criminal investigation by the Metropolitan Police.

The constitutional implications are therefore immediately apparent.

The document raises questions which cannot simply be ignored.

The Constitutional Significance

The constitutional principle of equality before the law is neither novel nor controversial.

Public authorities, ministers, officials and institutions do not, by virtue of their office, fall outside of the reach of the criminal law.

Whether particular conduct gives rise to criminal liability depends upon evidence and law. It does not depend upon whether allegations concern governmental policy, actions or procedures.

Against that background, the wording of the email assumes very obvious significance.

The 12 January email identifies no statutory limitation upon Metropolitan Police jurisdiction.

It cites no legal authority.

It refers to no constitutional principle.

It offers no explanation as to why allegations concerning Government COVID regulations and vaccine programmes were said not to be matters for criminal investigation.

The actual absence of reasoning is itself significant - A constitutional proposition has apparently been advanced, but no constitutional basis for it has been provided.

That is an objective observation arising from the document itself.

The Emerging Documentary Tension

The significance of the email becomes more pronounced when it is read alongside the Metropolitan Police's subsequent correspondence.

On 21 February 2022 the Metropolitan Police issued a formal closure letter explaining why CRN 6029679/21 would proceed no further.

The basis of that letter is materially different to the relevant content of the 12 January email.

Rather than suggesting that allegations concerning Government action fall outside the scope of criminal investigation, the closure letter proceeds by reference to evidence.

It indicates that available material has been analysed.

It attempts to explain why criminal offences were considered not to be disclosed.

It attempts to advance an evidential explanation.

The email of 12 January 2022 appears to explain the decision by reference to the nature of the allegations, whereas the closure letter of 21 February seeks to explain the decision by reference to the state of the evidence.

These are not the same proposition. Nor are they interchangeable.

One asks whether allegations of a particular kind are capable of criminal investigation - The other asks whether sufficient evidence existed to justify one.

Viewed side-by-side, these items of correspondence are not self-evidently reconcilable.

That naturally gives rise to an entirely legitimate forensic question.

Which explanation, if either, represents the Metropolitan Police's true reasoning?

If the explanation contained within the email accurately reflected the Metropolitan Police's legal position on 12 January 2022, why does the subsequent closure letter adopt what appears to be a materially different analytical approach?

Conversely, if the closure letter represents the Metropolitan Police's true reasoning, why was that reasoning not communicated on 12 January?

These are not questions generated by hindsight. They arise directly from the Metropolitan Police's own contemporaneous documents.

A Further Observation

One further aspect of the correspondence deserves attention.

Mark Sexton's email sought an opportunity for experts to provide evidence.

The response did not explain why such evidence would be unnecessary. Nor did it indicate that the Metropolitan Police had sufficient material already before them. Nor indeed, did it invite further information capable of affecting the assessment.

Instead, the response redirected the complainants towards litigation against Government or engagement with their Member of Parliament.

Why This Matters

Public confidence in policing depends upon decisions being capable of rational explanation.

Where contemporaneous documents appear to articulate materially different explanations for the same outcome, careful scrutiny is not only legitimate but absolutely necessary.

The purpose of such scrutiny is to determine whether inconsistency exists.

If the documents are entirely consistent, that consistency should be capable of explanation. If however, they are not, that too is capable of explanation.

Conclusion

The email of 12 January 2022 is significant because it records, contemporaneously, an explanation for bringing CRN 6029679/21 to an end.

When that explanation is compared with the reasoning later advanced in the Metropolitan Police's formal closure letter of 21 February 2022, a clear difficulty emerges.

That difficulty is not a matter capable of resolution by assertion. It requires explanation and an explanation has not, thus far, been provided within the documentary record.

The purpose of this paper is to identify a constitutional and evidential question arising from the Metropolitan Police's own contemporaneous documents and to invite those documents to be read together, rather than in isolation.

It is only by reading them together that one can ask the question which ultimately matters:

Was the Metropolitan Police explaining one decision in two materially different ways, or do these documents reveal a single line of reasoning that has yet to be fully articulated?

That is a question arising directly from the documentary record and until it is answered, the difficulty presented by a simple comparison of these contemporaneous Metropolitan Police documents will, no doubt, remain an issue of entirely legitimate public interest.

From: Akshay.J.Chibber – Metropolitan Police

Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 8:35 pm

To: Mark Sexton

Subject: RE: 6029679/21

Dear Mr Sexton

Thank you for your email, received in the Commissioner's office.

I'm afraid this office is not directly involved in local investigations and certainly has no bearing into the above mentioned crime report.

I can see that your allegation was recorded and initially assessed through the relevant office at the Central West Command Unit. It has subsequently been closed and will not be investigated any further. I'm afraid allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programs are not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence.

Should you have specific information, and medical evidence, with regards to the national delivery of vaccines, I would advise you to

seek appropriate legal advice on the best means to progress any litigation you seek to bring against the government, or indeed contact your local MP.

Further emails into the Commissioner's office on this matter, will be read and logged, but not responded to.

Kind regards

Akshay Chibber

Detective Inspector

Staff Officer to Commissioner Cressida Dick

New Scotland Yard, Victoria Embankment, London. SW1A 2JL

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Sexton

Sent: 10 January 2022 13:48

To: Fleming Treena - NA-CU

Cc: Chibber Akshay J - HQ Commissioners Private Office

Subject: 6029679/21

Dear Detective Chief Superintendent Fleming and Detective Inspector Chibber.

On instruction from Superintendent Jon Simpson I have been advised you are now the lead senior investigators into the criminal complaint 6029679/21.

A number of renowned experts from around the world are making contact with The Metropolitan Police on a daily basis. (Doctors, professors, virologists, immunologist, scientists, data experts and psychiatrists).

Due to the very serious nature of the crimes alleged and those involved, a number of the UK doctors and professors are now asking to attend the Metropolitan police in person to provide their first accounts. The evidence they possess, its significance, what it shows and proves, the vaccines are causing serious injury, harm and death and must be stopped as a matter of urgency.

Can you please arrange an urgent appointment/meeting for us to attend to allow the initial accounts to be obtained?

Yours sincerely

Mark Sexton.

Our ref: 6029679/21

Mr Mark Sexton

Via Email: [REDACTED]

Metropolitan Police Service

226 Shepherds Bush Road,
London W6 7NX,

Email:

AWMailbox.CID@met.police.uk

21/2/2022

Re: Allegations relating to the suppression of information regarding the severity of health implications from the Covid 19 vaccine by persons in parliament and other organisations.

Dear Mr Sexton,

I am writing regarding the allegations of crime made by yourself and others against a number of people in roles within Parliament and other organisations concerning COVID 19 vaccines.

The relevant vaccines have been approved by the World Health Organisation, the European Medicines Agency and the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. The vaccines underwent multiple trials, involving a considerable number of people. The vaccines were subject to stringent safety approval processes before being used in the community. The vaccines are used in over 100 different countries, all of which have carefully considered the safety of the vaccines.

The allegations you have made suggest that a number of people are responsible for suppressing information regarding the severity of health implications from the COVID 19 vaccines. In particular crimes of Gross Negligent Manslaughter and Misconduct in a Public Office have been alleged. The allegations you have made out have no basis in the available evidence. It is clear that there are no criminal offences apparent.

As a result, the MPS does not consider that there is sufficient evidence to pursue an investigation regarding the offences alleged. Therefore no further action will be taken by the MPS in relation to this matter.

For your records this allegation has been recorded as an incident under reference 6029679/21, in line with the National Standard for Incident Reporting. In accordance with the National Crime Reporting Standard and the Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime your complaint has not been recorded as a crime.

Yours sincerely,



Detective Superintendent Tor Garnett
Head of CID, Central West BCU