Public Accountability Report
Evidence Pack
(Edition 3 - September 2025)

Legal, Constitutional and Public-Interest Analysis

Ethical Approach UK - September 2025

"Protecting the Public Interest and Constitutional Integrity"

Executive Summary

This pack evidences a systemic failure of UK justice safeguards across policing, prosecution, regulation and judicial administration during and since the COVID-19 period. It demonstrates that:

The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) denied conducting an investigation in formal litigation while performing acts which,

in law, constitute investigation, thus triggering CPIA retention/disclosure duties.

The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) has adopted a gatekeeping stance that unlawfully fetters discretion, refusing to consider direct material from the public even where police may be conflicted.

The Judiciary has been left doubly blind - blind to cases filtered out by executive actors and blind to being used as an executive mask.

PSNI / Operation Talla practices subordinated evidence-handling to policy preference, undermining CPIA and public confidence (as documented in our master file).

The Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) has exhibited regulatory capture and statutory injustice, including a high-profile disciplinary case where the SDT imposed only a modest fine despite years of punitive process and heavy costs - exposing regulatory overreach which chills public-interest advocacy.

Conclusion: This is a structural constitutional problem, not a collection of isolated errors. Urgent parliamentary scrutiny, independent inquiry and replacement of the SRA are required to restore public trust and the rule of law.

Section 1 - Sources, Scope & Method

This pack consolidates documentary evidence from court filings, regulatory notices/letters, tribunal judgments, FOI responses and official correspondence. Where legal authorities are analysed (e.g., CPIA triggers, investigation thresholds), the treatment aligns with the documentary record already compiled in our Evidence Pack No. 2 and subsequent materials.

Section 2 - MPS, CPIA, and the “No Investigation” Claim

2.1 What the documents show

Positive acts of investigation occurred: issuing a CRN (6029679/21), receiving and reviewing 400 witness/expert statements, communicating that an investigation was underway and later reclassifying to “incident not crime.” Each is a positive investigative step that triggers CPIA duties (record/retain/disclose).

Yet in Summary Grounds of Resistance in Sexton & Hyland v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis (CO/2254/2023), the MPS stated the decision “not to investigate” had been taken and maintained (e.g., 21 Feb 2022 and 18 May 2022),

characterising later work as mere “review” and no criminal investigation.

Illustrative passages (SGR):

- Notified claimants “insufficient evidence... to pursue a criminal investigation” (21 Feb 2022).
- Maintained “no criminal investigation was warranted” (18 May 2022).

2.2 Why this matters in law

CPIA Code of Practice (s.23(1)): the duty to record, retain, and disclose arises the moment investigators handle material potentially relevant to an offence - not when a force later chooses to call it a “crime.”

Our Evidence Pack No. 2 collects supporting authorities and analysis, including Corner House (SFO evidence-gathering treated as “investigation in law”). The effect is that gathering/reviewing material is an investigation and CPIA obligations bite even if later relabelled.

Result: The MPS’s litigation narrative is at odds with the operative CPIA position evidenced by the record.

Section 3 - CPS Gatekeeping and the Unlawful Fettering of Discretion

3.1 The CPS stance

In correspondence/FOI, CPS states it cannot consider material directly from the public and will only consider what police choose to send up - even where the police are themselves the subject of alleged CPIA breaches. (Cited previously and incorporated here.)

3.2 Challenge Argument: CPS Refusal to Accept Direct Evidence

1. Statutory Framework

The Prosecution of Offences Act 1985 (POA 1985) establishes the CPS.

Section 3(2)(a) provides that the CPS must “take over the conduct of all criminal proceedings instituted on behalf of a police force” - but this does not exclude other sources of proceedings.

Section 6(1) expressly preserves the right of private individuals to institute criminal proceedings. This shows Parliament did not intend to grant the police a monopoly over criminal referrals.

Point: The CPS cannot claim a statutory bar on accepting direct evidence from the public, when Parliament has explicitly preserved public access to the criminal courts.

2. CPS Practice vs. Statutory Duty

The CPS often states it is “not an investigative body.” While correct, this does not prevent it from receiving material and assessing whether a proper referral to investigators (police, NCA, etc.) should be made.

To refuse outright to receive or consider material amounts to an unlawful fettering of discretion. The DPP’s discretion under s.3 POA 1985 must be exercised in accordance with constitutional principle and the rule of law.

3. Disclosure & Investigative Duties

The Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA) imposes disclosure obligations on investigators and prosecutors alike.

If credible evidence of police or state misconduct is supplied, the CPS has at minimum a duty to ensure it is preserved, logged and where necessary investigated.

A refusal to even accept such material risks placing the CPS in breach of CPIA duties, undermining the integrity of disclosure and criminal justice.

4. Access to Justice (Article 6 ECHR)

Under Article 6 ECHR, individuals have a right of access to justice.

If the CPS insists that evidence of crime can only be routed through police and police are themselves implicated or

conflicted, then victims and the public are left without an independent prosecutorial safeguard.

This breaches the fundamental constitutional expectation that the CPS is an independent authority, not a mere "echo" of police discretion.

5. Comparative Precedent

CPS already accepts and reviews private prosecution files (s.6 POA 1985).

It also liaises directly with regulators (SFO, FCA, HSE, etc.) and victims under the Victims' Code.

To claim it cannot accept material from the public is inconsistent with established practice.

6. Conclusion

The CPS's position that it cannot receive evidence directly from non-police sources has no statutory basis. It is an internal convention which, when applied rigidly, risks:

1. Fettering statutory discretion under POA 1985.
2. Breaching duties under CPIA 1996.
3. Denying citizens' Article 6 right of access to justice.

Accordingly, the CPS should either:

   a. accept the material and decide whether to act upon it, or

b. formally refer it to the appropriate investigative authority, ensuring proper logging and oversight.

A refusal to do either would be ultra vires.

Section 4 - Judicial “Double Blindness” and Administrative Obstruction

4.1 The problem

Executive gatekeeping (police/CPS/regulators) prevents cases from reaching judges; judicial decisions are then made on incomplete landscapes. Administrative filtering by the Judicial Office (security policies on links/attachments) further risks manufacturing judicial blindness to credible evidence offered in good faith.

Our file records that the Judicial Office has now forwarded our Open Letter and Evidence Pack to the Lady Chief Justice and to a High Court Judge who presided over key proceedings - a necessary corrective step we acknowledge.

4.2 Background

In August 2025, an Open Letter accompanied by a comprehensive Evidence Pack was submitted to the Judicial Office, raising issues of constitutional significance concerning police, CPS and regulatory failures in the

handling of COVID-19–related complaints and evidence. Following initial correspondence, the Judicial Communications Officer confirmed on 29 August 2025 that the material had been formally forwarded to:

- The Office of the Lady Chief Justice, as Head of the Judiciary in England and Wales; and
- The Office of a High Court Judge who presided in proceedings of direct relevance to the matters raised.

This act of transmission means the judiciary is now formally on notice of the substance of the concerns raised.

4.3 Constitutional Importance of Judicial Notification.

The significance of this development cannot be overstated. Judicial independence is not only about the freedom of judges from improper influence, but also about the judiciary's role in upholding constitutional balance. Where serious concerns are raised about disclosure failures, statutory breaches, or systemic obstruction of justice, it is essential that the judiciary is made aware of such material.

By confirming receipt and onward transmission of the Open Letter and Evidence Pack, the Judicial Office has ensured that members of the senior judiciary are now informed of these constitutional questions. This has several consequences:

1. Integrity of Past Proceedings

Judges who presided over cases where disclosure may have been compromised are now on notice that relevant evidence and arguments exist which were not properly before them.

This is not a re-litigation of cases but a matter of safeguarding the integrity of the judicial process.

2. Duty of Awareness

Once placed on notice, the judiciary cannot plead ignorance of systemic failures affecting the fairness of proceedings.

The constitutional principle of open justice requires that such awareness be taken into account in future adjudication and oversight.

3. Public Confidence

The public has a legitimate expectation that judges are not unwittingly deployed as an “executive mask” to legitimise defective processes.

Judicial notice of these concerns ensures that the public interest is engaged at the highest level.

4.4 Obligation for Meaningful Action

Notification is not merely symbolic. Judicial awareness carries with it an obligation:

- To consider whether systemic failures undermine the administration of justice;
- To act where necessary to protect constitutional principles, including by raising matters with relevant oversight bodies;
- To ensure that the courts are not used as instruments to rubber-stamp executive or policing misconduct.

The judiciary now possesses informed knowledge of the content of the Open Letter and the supporting evidence. Constitutional responsibility requires more than passive acknowledgment: it requires meaningful attention to the issues raised.

4.5 Conclusion

The forwarding of the Open Letter and Evidence Pack marks a constitutional milestone:

The judiciary is now formally on record as being notified of systemic statutory breaches.

The matters raised are not private grievances but questions of constitutional law, public interest and judicial integrity.

From this point onward, the senior judiciary cannot be said to be “blind” to the issues. They have been placed on notice and with notice comes responsibility.

4.6 Article 6 ECHR

Two structural breaches - delay asymmetry (state delays tolerated; citizen delays punished) and double blindness - undermine equality of arms and access to a court.

Section

5 - PSNI and the Northern Ireland Dimension

5.1 Background

The Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI), like all UK forces, was tied into the NPCC's Operation Talla framework. What makes PSNI significant is that Northern Ireland operates under distinct policing legislation (Police (NI) Act 2000) and constitutional structures, yet the same pattern of blanket refusal to investigate vaccine-related harms is plainly visible.

The correspondence disclosed between 2021 and 2025 confirms that PSNI officers, senior commanders and oversight bodies (including the Police Ombudsman for NI) repeatedly diverted, downgraded, or outright rejected criminal complaints about COVID-19 vaccine harms and related misconduct.

5.2 Evidence Trail

(a) Letter from ACC Alan Todd, 8 November 2022

States explicitly that “deaths from Covid-19, or any due to adverse reactions to vaccinations, is not investigated as a criminal matter, so would not involve the PSNI at this time, in line with national policing decisions across the UK.”

Confirms that PSNI was acting in conformity with national directions under Operation Talla.

References the Coroner’s Office as responsible for cause of death determinations, thereby side-stepping criminal liability considerations.

(b) Letter from Detective Superintendent Barry Hamilton, 16 July 2024

Rejects allegations of malfeasance in public office against NI Health Minister Robyn Swann, despite receipt of extensive documentation.

States PSNI had sought “legal advice” and determined it was “not a matter for the PSNI to investigate.”

Directs complainants instead to the UK COVID-19 Inquiry, while admitting the Inquiry “will not be investigating alleged crimes.”

Effect: complainants are trapped in a circular referral system where no authority accepts jurisdiction.

(c) Police Ombudsman for NI response, 3 December 2021

Complaint alleged PSNI officers refused to investigate reports of public health risk and even threatened to “shred” evidence presented.

Ombudsman declined to act, arguing that the matter was for the Department of Health, not policing.

Demonstrates abdication of the Ombudsman’s statutory role, which is to investigate misconduct by officers.

(d) Department of Health (NI) FOI response, 23 June 2025

Confirms NI’s adoption of NICE COVID-19 rapid guideline NG163 (including end-of-life protocols).

Demonstrates that policy implementation, rather than evidential analysis of harm was driving responses to public complaints, including PSNI’s reliance on “national directions.”

5.3 Legal Analysis

1. Breach of CPIA 1996 (Disclosure Duties)

As soon as a complainant provides potentially relevant evidence (statements, documents, medical records), PSNI has a statutory duty to log, retain and preserve it.

By refusing to accept complaints, or threatening destruction (“shredding”), PSNI officers are in clear breach of CPIA duties.

2. Breach of Police (NI) Act 2000

Section 32 requires PSNI to “protect life and property, preserve order, prevent offences and bring offenders to justice.”

A blanket refusal to investigate vaccine-related deaths or injuries is ultra vires and inconsistent with statutory policing duties.

3. Breach of Article 2 ECHR (Right to Life)

The state has a positive obligation to carry out effective investigations into deaths where state responsibility may be implicated.

By relegating deaths to “policy” or coronial routes only, PSNI failed its Article 2 duty.

4. Breach of Article 6 ECHR (Access to Justice)

By deferring complainants to the COVID-19 Inquiry, which expressly has no remit to determine guilt or investigate crimes, PSNI denied victims the ability to access judicial remedies.

This constitutes a denial of the Article 6 right to a fair and effective hearing.

5.4 Systemic Suppression

The pattern of responses (Todd, Hamilton, Ombudsman) proves this was not an isolated operational decision but a structural policy of exclusion, echoing Scotland (ACC Speirs) and the MPS.

Oversight bodies (Ombudsman, Department of Health) reinforced the suppression by bouncing complainants between institutions.

5.5 Constitutional Implications

PSNI's conduct demonstrates that Operation Talla was binding in Northern Ireland, overriding devolved structures and statutory obligations. This undermines both:

The constitutional independence of Northern Ireland's policing institutions, and

Public trust in the UK-wide system of accountability.

By admitting (in Todd's 2022 letter) that PSNI's stance was "in line with national policing decisions," the paper trail establishes direct linkage to Operation Talla's central command. This is prima facie evidence of a UK-wide coordinated obstruction of justice in relation to vaccine-related harms.

5.6 Conclusion

The PSNI material provides some of the clearest written admissions yet that police forces were acting on national

directives to refuse vaccine-related crime reports. The consequence was wholesale denial of justice in Northern Ireland, compounding the UK-wide pattern.

Section 6 - The SRA: Regulatory Capture and Statutory Injustice

6.1 The paper trail

SRA letters/notices (2022) explicitly relied on MPS denials and framed a solicitor's references to CRN 6029679/21 as "misleading," pushing toward SDT referral.

The notice records 19 complaints, mass mailing to 245 schools and the SRA's reliance on its own guidance to characterise "unsupported" legal assertions and "threatening" tone.

6.2 The tribunal outcome (what it really shows)

The SDT imposed a £2,500 fine and £30,000 costs, no suspension/strike-off - after years of SRA pursuit. This exposes regulatory overreach: no dishonesty, no personal gain, long unblemished practice, yet punitive costs that chill future public-interest advocacy.

6.3 Why this discredits the SRA

Independence failure: importing untested police denials (on "no investigation") into regulatory decisions contradicts CPIA reality evidenced elsewhere in the record.

Transparency failure: repeated reliance on process (Transparency Code), hedged denials ("as far as I am aware"), and "systems don't capture this" non-answers over months. (The correspondence trail is evident)

Chilling effect: costs+process communicate a clear message - "challenge the state and pay for it" - undermining Article 6 access to representation and Article 10 discussion of public-interest harms.

Case Study: The SRA and the Bulldozing of Dissent

The Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) has shown itself not as a neutral guardian of professional ethics, but as an enforcer of political orthodoxy during the COVID-19 era.

An experienced solicitor of 18 years' unblemished standing signed letters to schools and GP surgeries, warning them of liability risks if they coerced children into experimental vaccination, mask mandates, or testing without proper consent. The motive was clear: protection of children, not profit. Public support for the solicitor dwarfed the complaints received against her.

Yet the SRA drove the case all the way to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT), importing unverified police assurances to justify action and pressing charges of misconduct. The SDT itself rejected most of the allegations, imposed only a modest fine, and explicitly recognised there was no dishonesty, no financial motive and no bad faith. But the SRA still saddled the solicitor with a punitive £30,000 costs order - a financial wrecking ball designed to deter anyone tempted to step out of line.

This is not regulation. This is bulldozing. And the phrase is not accidental: in 2021 Dominic Cummings testified in Parliament to the effect that the government's ethos was to **bulldoze lawyers out of the way if they stood in the path of the vaccination programme**. The SRA's conduct looks indistinguishable from that ethos in practice.

What we see here is regulatory capture - a body meant to uphold independence and access to justice instead parroting police denials, evading direct questions and disciplining lawyers for exercising rights protected under Articles 6 and 10 of the Human Rights Act. In substance it is the legal profession's version of Operation Talla: an institutional suppression of dissent, engineered by narrowing the scope of debate and punishing those who challenged the state line.

The outcome is chilling: lawyers are taught that if they dare to advise clients against the prevailing narrative, they risk their careers and financial ruin. Far from protecting the public, the SRA's actions have undermined public trust, sullied the reputation of the legal profession and exposed the fragility of constitutional safeguards in the UK.

This case should not be dismissed as an isolated disciplinary matter. It is a flashing warning light of how a regulator can overreach, bend to executive pressure and bulldoze lawyers out of the way. Parliament and the public are owed answers and urgent reform.

Bottom line: The SRA's conduct has brought the legal profession into disrepute and cannot be repaired by guidance tweaks. This regulatory body must be disbanded and replaced with a regulator structurally insulated from policy capture, with hard-wired transparency duties and Article 6/10 proportionality tests.

Section 7 - "The Other Night": Judicial Impropriety Signals

The Hunt & Gather documentary "The Other Night", raises allegations of judicial impropriety (covert contacts, inflated

costs) and a muted Ministry of Justice response, which compounds perceptions of capture and lack of transparent remediation.

There are three videos currently in this series – here are links to each of them:

Episode 1

https://youtu.be/KUzaTRK8slI?si=_Cztul5IamUnxUp0

Episode 2 (preview)

https://youtu.be/Uvv0JDMMFQE?si=qed-sy5NxlTf-Ffh

Episode 2

https://youtu.be/dw3ef8P5Vc4?si=3QkbSIFfQ1Sskrcx

Section 8 - Constitutional Consequences

8.1 The Rule of Law in Principle

The cornerstone of the United Kingdom's constitutional settlement is the principle that the rule of law applies equally to all. No individual, no corporation, no regulator, no public body, no minister, no judge and no constabulary is exempt. From the humblest citizen to the highest office-holder, the same legal framework is meant to bind all.

It is this universality that gives the constitution its legitimacy. The public tolerates regulation, scrutiny and even sanction only because they believe, or are told, that the same standards apply to everyone without exception.

8.2 The Rule of Law in Practice

Yet the evidence contained in this Pack demonstrates a starkly different reality. In practice, institutions repeatedly exempt themselves from the very obligations they impose upon others. What exists is a two-tier system:

- For citizens and professionals: relentless enforcement of regulation, sanction for perceived non-compliance, and demands for transparency.
- For institutions themselves: silence, evasion, delay, and outright refusal to answer direct allegations of misconduct.

When asked to justify their positions, institutions do not anchor themselves in law. Instead, they rely on internal codes, discretionary policies, or opaque “processes” - devices which allow them to avoid the hard edges of accountability that they insist upon for others.

8.3 The Plain Appreciation of the Public

What is crucial and constitutionally dangerous, is that this hypocrisy is no longer hidden. The public can see it plainly.

Citizens understand that when they are late in responding to a regulatory deadline, sanction is swift. Yet when the same regulator misses a statutory deadline, there are no consequences. Lawyers are struck off for lack of candour; regulators face no equivalent penalty for evasive responses. The CPS demands exhaustive disclosure from defendants, while refusing even to look at evidence submitted against state actors.

It is the everyday lived experience of this disparity - not as theory, but as visible, tangible reality which is driving a profound collapse in public confidence. The people see that the constitution operates only in one direction. They know that in practice, the "equal application of the law" is a myth.

8.4 Mockery of Constitutional Principle

By setting themselves above the standards they enforce, institutions have crossed the line from incompetence into mockery of the constitution itself. Their conduct ridicules the very principles they claim to uphold:

- Accountability is demanded downwards but denied upwards.
- Transparency is imposed on the regulated but refused by the regulator.

- Due process is cited to justify decisions against citizens, but discarded when institutions are asked to explain their own actions.

This is not constitutional continuity; it is constitutional collapse.

8.5 Constitutional Collapse in Real Time

The United Kingdom now stands at a critical juncture. What we are witnessing is not an abstract or future risk - it is the active unravelling of constitutional order in real time. The structures still exist; the rhetoric is still repeated; but in practice, the institutions responsible for safeguarding the constitution are themselves its chief violators.

The rule of law in principle: binding on all, without exception.

The rule of law in practice: binding on citizens, optional for institutions.

This widening gap between principle and practice has become so obvious, so undeniable, that it is producing a crisis of legitimacy. Citizens no longer believe the constitution protects them. Instead, they see it as a shield for the powerful and a weapon against the powerless.

8.6 Conclusion

Unless reversed, this hypocrisy will finish the work that decades of constitutional neglect began. The United Kingdom cannot sustain a constitutional settlement in which the institutions of state are both judge and exempt party, both enforcer and violator.

To preserve any semblance of lawful order, the principle of equality before the law must be restored, not as rhetoric, but as lived reality. The present trajectory is nothing short of constitutional collapse.

Section 9 - Required Remedies

1. Parliamentary inquiry (Justice Committee & PACAC):

CPIA compliance across MPS/PSNI/NPCC; CPS gatekeeping; Judicial Office filtering.

Obtain underlying communications/assurance chains; audit disclosure failures.

2. Independent review & replacement of the SRA:

Dissolve the current SRA.

Establish a regulator with statutory transparency and independence safeguards, mandatory Article 6/10 proportionality analysis and external oversight.

3. Judicial safeguards:

Protocols to ensure evidence offered in good faith is seen by judges (secure portals / designated addresses for third-party material), with reasons recorded where declined.

4. CPS policy correction:

Accept and log direct public material or formally refer it - no blanket refusals.

Publish a discretion policy consistent with POA 1985 and CPIA.

Closing Statement

This is not a story of isolated mistakes. It is a pattern: executive filtering, prosecutorial abdication, regulatory zealotry and judicial blindness. If uncorrected, the rule of law is performative, not protective.

The public interest requires sunlight, structural reform, and a regulator worthy of the name.

Warning to All

We close with a warning, not only to institutions but to every citizen

The path upon which we are all now walking, side by side, government and governed alike, is dangerously fragile.

Institutions may believe they can exempt themselves from scrutiny, or bend principles to their own convenience. Citizens may believe they can simply endure, hoping that impropriety will correct itself. But both positions are unsustainable.

The truth is unalterable: we are all one, all equal. No court, no regulator, no office of state can alter the fundamental fact of our equality as a species. When institutions pretend otherwise, they do not elevate themselves; they corrode the very ground upon which they too must stand.

If the rule of law is mocked, it is mocked for all. If accountability collapses, it collapses for all. If trust in institutions is destroyed, those institutions will find they are no longer believed, no longer obeyed, no longer capable of command. Even courts, when stripped of the public's confidence, are rendered powerless in real-world terms.

We warn, therefore, that the integrity of the constitution is not a matter of academic concern. It is the condition upon which our shared life depends. And it is failing, here and now. If this trajectory is not reversed, we face not merely institutional scandal, but the dissolution of the bond

between people and state. That dissolution will leave no one untouched.

Footnote: Ethical Approach has possession of all documents referenced in this report.