

Supplement to Evidence Pack No. 3

**The Metropolitan Police Service and CRN 6029679/21
Refusal to Answer CPIA Compliance Queries**

Date: September 2025

Published by Ethical Approach UK

1. Context

Crime Reference Number 6029679/21 was issued by the MPS in December 2021 following submission of extensive evidence and over 400 witness/expert statements.

By early 2022, officers confirmed to complainants that the matter was “under active investigation.”

In 2025, the MPS Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) admitted the case had been reviewed and that evidential material was still retained.

This amounts to investigative activity under s.23(1) Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA), which legally triggers retention and disclosure duties.

2. The Core Contradiction

On one hand, MPS acknowledges it has retained and reviewed evidential material in 2025.

On the other, MPS insists the case was “never investigated” and has refused to answer direct questions about investigative activity between December 2021 and February 2022.

This contradiction sits at the heart of the complaint. If material was reviewed and handled at a national level, investigative steps were undertaken, and CPIA duties unquestionably apply.

3. The Refusal to Answer

On 12 August 2025, queries were put to the MPS asking whether it accepts or denies investigative activity took place

and if denied, how this reconciles with officers' 2022 statements and NPCC coordination.

On 3 September 2025, a follow-up reminded the MPS of its statutory CPIA obligations.

On 5 September 2025, the MPS replied:

“I will not be responding to your questions... You can make a subject access request via the Met Police website.”

This diversion to Subject Access Request (SAR) procedures is inappropriate. The questions concern statutory compliance and public-interest accountability, not disclosure of personal data.

4. Why This Matters

The CPIA 1996 provides that once investigative steps occur, material must be properly retained and available for disclosure.

Failure to comply risks breach of due process, undermines judicial oversight and damages public confidence.

The refusal to answer statutory compliance questions creates a closed accountability loop:

- The MPS claims no investigation occurred.
- Oversight bodies (such as the IOPC) defer to the MPS.

The result: no scrutiny of potential investigative failure or misconduct.

5. Escalation to HMICFRS

On 5 September 2025, the matter was escalated to HMICFRS for independent inspection.

The escalation request asks HMICFRS to:

1. Require MPS to clarify whether investigative steps took place.
2. Confirm how CPIA retention and review duties are being fulfilled.
3. Assess whether diversion into SAR constitutes maladministration.
4. Ensure systemic lessons are drawn and published.

6. The Public Interest

This is not about one complainant. It is about whether the largest police force in the UK can refuse to answer statutory governance questions while simultaneously admitting it retains evidential material in a case of major public concern.

When the executive both holds the evidence and controls whether questions can be asked about it, the rule of law is imperilled.

7. Conclusion

The refusal by the MPS to answer basic CPIA compliance queries illustrates the constitutional imbalance highlighted in our recently published Evidence Pack Edition No. 3:

- Police and CPS, as parts of the executive, shield the executive.
- The judiciary remains blind to cases never allowed to reach them.
- The public is left without remedy.

This supplement documents the issue for the public record and places it squarely before oversight bodies.