

NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR THE REFORM OF THE OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS ACTS

NCROPA

FIGHTING SEXUAL CENSORSHIP

HONORARY DIRECTOR - David Webb, R.A.D.A. Dip., 15 Sloane Court West, Chelsea, London, SW3 4TD - Tel: 071-730 9537

NO/DAW/DP

1st August 1992

His Honour Judge Francis Petre, Chairman, Police Complaints Authority, 10 Great George Street, London, SW1P 3AE.

RECORDED DELIVERY

Can Jung Rotre,

Complaints Against Sir Peter Imbert, the Chief Commissioner, and Superintendent Michael Hames, of the Metropolitan Police

Thank you for your letter of 30th June in response to mine of 22nd June concerning the above-named matter,

With regard to my complaint against Superintendent Michael Hames and which you forwarded on to the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, Sir Peter Imbert, I have received a reply on his behalf from Assistant Commissioner Peter Winship, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

I have now written to the Commissioner, Sir Peter Imbert, informing him that the appointment of an investigating officer (whether technically a police officer or not) from the same force as the officer who is the subject of the complaint, is quite unacceptable to myself, especially since the chief officer of that force (viz himself) is also the subject of a similar and/or related complaint, and I have therefore requested him to appoint a senior officer from another police force to carry out the investigation of my complaint. I trust that you will ensure that this request is complied with and that the Authority, in accordance with its powers under Section 89(2) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, will supervise the investigation, which is, as you have already agreed, very much in the public interest.

It is also very much in the public interest that my complaint against Sir Peter Imbert, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner himself, is properly investigated. You stated in your letter that the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police is not a 'police officer'. With respect, I would question that.

According to "Halsbury's Laws of England", "The Commissioner of the Metropolis is the chief officer of the Metropolitan Police.", and, indeed, in Schedule 8 of the Police Act 1964 the Commissioner of

continuation/.....

Police of the Metropolis is listed as the "Chief Officer of Police" in the metropolitan police district. If he is the chief officer of a police force (viz the Metropolitan Police Force), he is, surely, a 'police officer'. He is I grant you, and again according to 'Halsbury's', not 'attested as a constable', and nor is he 'a member of the Metropolitan Police' per se. Nevertheless he is a 'police officer' (and, of course, wears a police officer's uniform), albeit a very special one. I can find no reference in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 to specific exclusion of the Commissioner of the Metropolis from its provisions regarding the Police Complaints Authority procedures which, as far as I am aware, apply equally to all serving police officers. I would contend that the Commissioner is a serving police officer.

I have asked my solicitor to look into this matter further but would very much welcome your own comments on what I regard as an extraordinarily bizarre situation (several colleagues of mine have described it as pure 'Gilbert and Sullivan'!) before I pursue my complaint against Sir Peter through the channels of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, as you suggested in your letter.

Yours sincerely,

David Webb, Honorary Director,

National Campaign for the Reform of the Obscene Publications Acts

Enclosure.

