

THIS IS NO LONGER ABOUT COVID. IT IS ABOUT THE RULE OF LAW.

Read the documentary record and consider what it actually says.

Dominic Cummings told Parliament that those running the Vaccine Taskforce were told:

“Treat this like a wartime thing. Ignore rules.”

And then:

“If lawyers get in your way, come to us and we'll find ways of bulldozing them out of your way.”

Years later, his evidence to the Covid Inquiry supplied considerably more detail about what sat behind those extraordinary words.

The Vaccine Taskforce was deliberately conceived outside ordinary DHSC control.

Cummings described telling the Cabinet Secretary that it should be *“not subject to normal Whitehall processes.”*

Kate Bingham was to possess exceptional authority.

The Taskforce *“must be free of normal bureaucracy including procurement rules.”*

And perhaps most extraordinarily:

the Prime Minister would take responsibility for any resulting judicial reviews.

Think about what that means.

The possibility of judicial review - the constitutional mechanism by which executive action can be tested against law was not presented as an absolute brake upon executive action.

The operating philosophy described by Cummings was effectively:

Act now.

Override the obstruction.

Accept the legal risk. Fight the judicial review afterwards.

And lawyers?

Cummings subsequently described an actual mechanism by which obstructive legal advice could be escalated to Prime Ministerial authority and the decision taken regardless.

Now move forward.

December 2021.

Four people attended a Metropolitan Police station and made allegations concerning Covid-related matters.

A crime reference was created.

The police record subsequently said:

“Screened In”

The matter was transferred to CID.

A Detective Constable became the investigating officer.

There was detective supervision.

On 5 January 2022, the Staff Officer to the Commissioner referred expressly to:

“the relevant investigation team.”

And while all this was happening, the matter had reached the national policing environment.

Chief Constables were informed that:

“...a crime report was made to the Met...”

and that:

“...the final assessment should be complete next week when a clearer steer can be communicated.”

Then comes one of the most disturbing pieces of language anywhere in this documentary history.

Internal national policing correspondence subsequently recorded:

“...the guidance to not record has been a success.”

Read those words again.

“THE GUIDANCE TO NOT RECORD HAS BEEN A SUCCESS.”

Meanwhile, the Metropolitan Police's own subsequently disclosed records reveal screening decisions, investigative allocation, supervisory involvement, review of evidence, specialist involvement and continuing internal decision-making.

Then, immediately before closure, something else happened.

The proposed “*no crime*” letter went through the Metropolitan Police Directorate of Legal Services.

At the same time, preparations were being made for the media response and proposed press lines were circulated for senior approval.

The eventual closure letter said there was insufficient evidence to pursue an investigation and that the matter would be recorded as an incident rather than a crime.

Yet the underlying complaint contained eight evidential modules.

The subsequent forensic examination found that the closure letter was framed almost entirely around the vaccine

allegations and did not explain how the other seven modules had been addressed. Nor did it identify which evidence was determinative, which evidence had been rejected, how the principal allegations had been analysed, or why further enquiry was unnecessary.

And there is another rather important detail.

Some of the material illuminating this history emerged only after judicial review proceedings had concluded - including internal crime-management records, Chief Constables' Council material, NPCC operational communications, Police Scotland disclosures and internal communications concerning nationally issued guidance on recording reports.

Now stand back from the individual documents.

Government:

“Ignore rules”

Government:

If lawyers obstruct you, come back to the centre and they can be *“bulldozed”* out of the way.

Government:

Operate outside normal Whitehall processes.

Government:

Escape normal procurement bureaucracy.

Prime Minister (Boris):

Accept the judicial-review risk.

National policing:

Run the Covid response through coordinated command structures.

Police chiefs:

Discuss the Metropolitan Police crime report while its handling remained live.

Internal policing correspondence:

“the guidance to not record has been a success”

Metropolitan Police records:

“Screened In”

CID.

Detective investigating officer.

Detective supervision.

“the relevant investigation team.”

Directorate of Legal Services.

Media planning.

Then:

No Crime!

Nobody needs to invent a conspiracy.

Nobody needs to exaggerate a single fact.

Nobody even needs to reach a conclusion.

The documents are quite capable of making the case for scrutiny themselves.

The question is now considerably more serious:

What happens to the rule of law when Government treats legal constraint as friction to be overcome, lawyers as obstacles capable of being “bulldozed”, judicial review as a risk to be absorbed afterwards - whilst, within the policing response to the same national emergency, internal correspondence celebrates “guidance to not record” as “a success”?

That question should trouble every lawyer, every police officer, every judge, every parliamentarian and every citizen who still believes that constitutional government means something.

Because the rule of law is not a game in which the object is to discover how efficiently the rules can be circumvented.

And the police station door must never become the place where politically inconvenient allegations disappear before the criminal justice system is permitted even to examine them.

This documentary record now demands answers.

Not reassurance.

Not another carefully drafted press line.

Answers.