

GENERATED UNABRIDGED PDF EDITION

The Policing of Child Sexual Abuse Reports Made by Fenn Hugo Jester

A cross-force evidential report concerning the Metropolitan Police Service, North Yorkshire Police, Gloucestershire Constabulary and Northamptonshire Police.

Report period: April 2023 to July 2026

Revision date: 10 August 2026

Canonical source SHA-256: 76646098cb20403b14419fac93b5770d36d68ee8f2af8268c60729a2657c3614

This PDF is a generated print edition from the unchanged canonical Markdown file. It is not the original 49-page PDF.

CROSS-FORCE INVESTIGATIVE CASE FILE

North Yorkshire Police · Metropolitan Police Service

Gloucestershire Constabulary · Northamptonshire Police

April 2023 to July 2026

Prepared 5 July 2026; revised 21 July 2026 to incorporate the complainant's audio recording of the Gloucestershire Constabulary telephone call of 25 September 2025; revised 10 August 2026 to incorporate the Northamptonshire Police correspondence of 4 to 6 December 2024. For legal and journalistic review

This is a consolidated evidential case file. Every material assertion is sourced to a dated primary record identified in Section 2. Quotations are verbatim. Matters resting solely on the subject's contemporaneous accounts

are flagged as such and are mapped to the outstanding records that would confirm or refute them.

Contents

- 1. Purpose and status of this document
- 2. Sources and evidential conventions
- 3. Persons, forces and references
- 4. Principal findings
- 5. Context established on the public record
- 6. The allegations as recorded in police records
- 7. Chronology of the policing, April 2023 to July 2026
- 8. The central finding: Ann Edwards, the witness no force has interviewed
- 9. Force-by-force findings
- 10. Cross-force patterns
- 11. Statutory, code and procedural breaches
- 12. The undisclosed records and what each would establish
- 13. Corroboration register and accuracy safeguards
- 14. Procedural posture and available routes, as at 4 July 2026
- Appendix A. Key record extracts
- Appendix B. Reference index

1. Purpose and status of this document

This case file consolidates the evidential record of how four English police forces handled reports of non-recent child sexual abuse and related offences made by Fenn Hugo Jester between April 2023 and July 2026. It is written for an instructed solicitor, for the Independent Office for Police Conduct, for the Information Commissioner's Office, and for any journalist undertaking verification. It is designed to be read and checked without access to its author: each material claim identifies the record, the date and, where relevant, the officer responsible, and the quotations reproduced here are exact.

The file answers two questions. First, what happened: a continuous chronology of the reports, the investigations, the closures, the complaints and the statutory disclosure processes across North Yorkshire Police, the Metropolitan Police Service, Gloucestershire Constabulary and Northamptonshire Police. Second, what is proven: which findings rest entirely on the forces' own documents, which rest on the subject's contemporaneous accounts pending corroboration, and which records, still withheld, would resolve the remainder.

The discipline applied throughout is deliberately conservative. Nothing is asserted beyond what the documents support. Where the record shows independent failures of identical shape in every force, always operating in the same direction, that is what is stated; coordination between forces is not asserted, because the records that would distinguish coincidence from intent are precisely the records the forces have not

disclosed. That framing is not a weakness of this file. It is its strength: every load-bearing statement in it survives adversarial scrutiny, because every load-bearing statement is drawn from a document a police force wrote.

Readers pressed for time should take Section 4 (principal findings), Section 8 (the central finding) and Appendix A (verbatim extracts). The remainder is the proof.

2. Sources and evidential conventions

2.1 Primary records held in this file

- North Yorkshire Police subject access disclosure, ref CDU/CXB/SAR/85463, dated 2 June 2026, signed by Carly Busfield, Legal Officer, Civil Disclosure Unit, Evolve Legal Services, under cover of Xanthe Tait, Director of Evolve Legal Services. Contents: covering letter; STORM incident report NYP-02052023-0181; Niche occurrence enquiry log for occurrence 12230078064 (entries 2 May 2023 to 2 January 2024); MG15 record of interview dated 19 May 2023 (5 pages); ISVA referral form dated 2 May 2023.
- SurvivorsUK ISVA subject access print record, report date 21 December 2023, case references 8818 and 9586, CRN 12230078064.
- Metropolitan Police Service email archive, September 2022 to April 2026, 226 items, including all correspondence with DS Gemma Fraser, TDC Tasselli, DI Mark Head, PC Rita Panteli and the Met Data Rights Team. Crime references CR:2710712/23 and 2700409/24; complaint PC/03332/24; right-of-access references 01/ROA/25/114868/M, 01/ROA/26/123648/U and 01/ROA/26/123653/R.
- Metropolitan Police Directorate of Professional Standards complaint report and covering letter, ref PC/03332/24, dated 25 June 2024 and issued 27 June 2024 by PC Rita Panteli, DPS Professional Standards Unit Central North, together with the complainant's written rebuttal of 27 June 2024.
- Gloucestershire Constabulary email archive, July 2025 to April 2026, 87 items. Crime reference CR/23708/25; complaints CO/1268/25 and CO/443/26; subject access references W1123/25, SAR_26_011 and SAR_26_019; including the Information Disclosure Unit email of 19 February 2026 (Mr J Turner, 245590).

- The complainant's contemporaneous audio recording of the Gloucestershire Constabulary telephone call of 25 September 2025, 19:21 to 19:50 BST (28 minutes), between the subject, DI Rory Ainslie and DS Gareth Morgan, whose presence Ainslie announces at the outset, together with a machine transcript. The audio is the primary record. The transcript carries recognised speech-to-text defects, garbles proper names and in places misattributes lines between the two officers; quotations in this file are taken from the transcript, are used only where the content is unambiguous, and are each to be verified against the audio before formal deployment (Section 13.3).
- Northamptonshire Police email archive, January 2024 to June 2026, 262 items. Occurrence 24000017113; complaint CO/540/26; subject access references 16261/25, AD 17589-25 and AD26334/26; including DI Ben Howe's no-further-action email of 12 June 2026 (17:02) and its attached rationale letter of the same date ("NFA Letter Fenn Jester.docx", 10 pages, OIC DC Caitlan Dempsey, signed DI Ben Howe X0232, carrying crime reference 25000316894).
- Correspondence status record, June 2026, documenting the preservation notices served on the Metropolitan Police, Northamptonshire Police and Gloucestershire Constabulary on 15 June 2026, the final-deadline notices of 17 and 18 June 2026, and the forces' replies of 18 and 24 June 2026.
- Mailbox exhibit: screenshot of the complainant's email client showing search results for correspondence from Gemma.Fraser@met.police.uk, March to May 2024, corroborating the existence, dates and subject lines of the Fraser correspondence ("Investigation update", "RE: The files", "RE: My sister", "Update", automatic reply "Suspicious Files for Review").
- The subject's contemporaneous voice-recorded account, used in this file only for items expressly flagged as uncorroborated (see convention [A] below).
- Public court reporting of the convictions of David Hope (Bradford Crown Court, verdict December 2021, sentence 28 February 2022) and Peter Holmes (sentence September 2022; appeal dismissed February 2023), cited for context in Section 5 only. The North Yorkshire disclosure itself cites the BBC report of the Hope case (bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-york-north-yorkshire-60560689).

2.2 Conventions

[R] marks a statement documented in a primary record listed above: it can be quoted with a date and an author, and in most cases is quoted in this file. [A] marks a statement resting, at present, only on the subject's contemporaneous accounts; every [A] item in this file is mapped in Section 13 to the specific outstanding record, already the subject of subject access requests and preservation notices, that would confirm or refute it. Quotation marks indicate exact transcription from the record, including original spelling and grammar; [sic] is used where an error in the original could otherwise be mistaken for a transcription error. Statements without a marker are [R].

Dates are given as they appear in the records. Where two records give different dates for the same event, both are stated, because the divergence is itself a finding (see Sections 9 and 10).

3. Persons, forces and references

3.1 Principal persons

Person	Role in the record
Fenn Hugo Jester	The complainant and victim. Formerly Fenn Jacques; birth name Benjamin Thomas Jacks; born 6 September 1981. A pupil at Malsis School, North Yorkshire, from approximately age 8 to 13 (circa 1989/90 to 1994/95). Diagnosed complex post-traumatic stress disorder, documented in force correspondence. Referred to in quoted records variously as Fenn Jester, Fenn Jacques, "Senn JACQUES" and Benjamin Jacks.

Person	Role in the record
David Hope	Music teacher at Malsis School. Convicted at Bradford Crown Court in December 2021 of three counts of buggery, three of indecent assault and one of indecency with a child against a Malsis pupil; sentenced 28 February 2022 to 17 years' custody with a one-year extended licence as an offender of particular concern; sex offenders register for life; previously imprisoned in the 1990s for offences against other boys. The suspect in the North Yorkshire strand of this case.
Ann Edwards	The subject's mother. Recorded by North Yorkshire Police in 2023 as a "disclosure witness" (the person to whom the subject disclosed the abuse contemporaneously, as a child); recorded in the subject's police interview as having "taken a deal with the school"; spoken to by the Metropolitan Police in 2024 as a witness; spoken to by Northamptonshire Police by December 2024 as the source of its description of "Big Roy", with the content withheld in writing on 5 December 2024 ("I cannot discuss the exact details of the conversation had with your mother as she is a witness"); the suspect in Northamptonshire occurrence 24000017113; spoken to informally by the Northamptonshire officer in the case in 2026. Never interviewed under caution by any force. See Section 8.

Person	Role in the record
Alison Jacks	The subject's step-mother. Named suspect in Gloucestershire crime CR/23708/25. Never interviewed. Author of the email described in the record as the "Admission" email ("Tom and Emily were being abused"). Rendered "Alison JAKUES" in Northamptonshire's own summary of 21 May 2026.
Emily Jacks	The subject's sister, born 1997. Witness in the Metropolitan Police investigation (provider of access to the father's digital material); recipient, from police, of the police-set password to the BT email account; subject of the unresolved paternity question in the Gloucestershire strand (a DNA result excluding Tom Jacks Sr as her father is documented in the subject's disclosure list of 3 October 2025).
Brian Larkman	Third party who submitted childhood letters, school documents and photographs to Northamptonshire Police, including a photograph marked on the reverse "orgy at number 10"; the material was later hand-returned to the complainant (Section 9.5).
"Big Roy"	Person identified by the subject as a principal orchestrator. The only Northamptonshire line of enquiry before 2025; closed on the basis that he was "probably dead" following a witness statement taken from Ann Edwards.
Peter Holmes	Second Malsis School teacher (1976 to 1991), jailed for 12 years in September 2022 for offences against 18 boys at the school; appeal dismissed February 2023. Cited for context: complaints against him were first made in the 1990s. The school closed in 2014.

3.2 Officers and staff appearing in the record

Name	Force	Role in the record
DC Alison Morris	North Yorkshire (NRAIT)	Officer in the case, occurrence 12230078064 (2023). Publicly the North Yorkshire officer quoted on the Hope conviction; the occurrence log records that "the boxes of unused material in the last case" involving the suspect were to be reviewed for disclosure involving the subject.
PC J Hesketh (257430)	Metropolitan Police	Author of the 2 May 2023 "skeleton report created at the request of CN OPS" transferring the first report to North Yorkshire.
DS Gemma Fraser (P258296)	Metropolitan Police, CAIT, Central North BCU	Supervising officer, crime 2700409/24 (2024). Author of the closure email of 27 March 2024, the password disclosure, and the 19 April 2024 admission concerning the conversation with Ann Edwards.

Name	Force	Role in the record
TDC Tasselli (P257282)	Metropolitan Police, Central North	Officer in the case, 2700409/24; control officer at the visually recorded interview of 15 February 2024.

Name	Force	Role in the record
TDC Briedova (P259540)	Metropolitan Police, Central North	Interviewing officer at the 15 February 2024 visually recorded interview.
DI Mark Head	Metropolitan Police, Central North	Reviewing officer. Refused force transfer, 19 March 2024; wrote on 28 March 2024, before the complaint was recorded, "I will say in advance that I am supportive of the decision to close the investigation."
PC Rita Panteli	Metropolitan Police, DPS PSU Central North	Complaint handler, PC/03332/24. Same command suffix (CN) as the subject officers and the reviewing DI.
Sgt Philip Stubbs	Metropolitan Police, CRU	Author of the response to the Turkey disclosure, 11 July 2024.
DC Caitlan Dempsey	Northamptonshire, SOLAR Team 3	Officer in the case, occurrence 24000017113.
DI Ben Howe (X0232)	Northamptonshire, SOLAR	Supervising officer from January 2026; author of the 28-day reset doctrine (23 February 2026), the contact-suppression email (27 April 2026) and the no-further-action decision (12 June 2026).
DS Gareth Morgan (1844)	Gloucestershire	Officer in the case, CR/23708/25; author of the 28 August 2025 closure and the 3 October 2025 NFA letter now the subject of complaint CO/443/26; present on the recorded call of 25 September 2025.
DI Rory Ainslie	Gloucestershire	Reviewing officer; author of the 8 September 2025 call summary; principal speaker on the recorded call of 25 September 2025.
DCI David Shore-Nye	Gloucestershire	Senior reviewer; characterised the allegation on 21 November 2025 as "based on feeling and not evidence"; requested the "Admission" email on 18 November 2025, six days after PSD had finalised the related complaint.
Mr J Turner (245590)	Gloucestershire, Information Disclosure Unit	Author of the written admission of statutory breach, 17 and 19 February 2026.
Carly Busfield / Xanthe Tait	North Yorkshire, Civil Disclosure / Evolve Legal Services	Authors of the 2 June 2026 subject access disclosure and covering letter.

3.3 Reference index (summary; full index at Appendix B)

Force	Crime / occurrence	Complaints and subject access
Metropolitan Police	CR:2710712/23 (reported 19 April 2023, transferred); 2700409/24 (January 2024)	Complaint PC/03332/24. SAR/ROA: 01/ROA/25/114868/M; 01/ROA/26/123648/U; 01/ROA/26/123653/R
North Yorkshire	Occurrence 12230078064; STORM NYP-02052023-0181	SAR CDU/CXB/SAR/85463 (response 2 June 2026)
Gloucestershire	CR/23708/25	Complaints CO/1268/25; CO/443/26. SAR W1123/25 / SAR_26_011 / SAR_26_019
Northamptonshire	Occurrence 24000017113; crime ref 25000316894 (per the NFA letter)	Complaint CO/540/26. SAR 16261/25; AD 17589-25; AD26334/26

4. Principal findings

Each finding below is developed, with its documentary basis, in the section indicated. All are [R] unless stated.

Finding 1. The decisive witness has never been interviewed, and the final closure rests expressly on that failure.

North Yorkshire Police recorded in 2023 that the subject disclosed the abuse to his mother contemporaneously as a child, that she is a "disclosure witness", and that with her evidence "it is likely the CPS will charge" a convicted serial child abuser; its finalisation record states the mother enquiry is one "the CPS would be likely to ask for to consider charges". The Metropolitan Police spoke to her in 2024 and has withheld the content ever since. Northamptonshire's own officer confirmed in writing in December 2024 that the force too had spoken to her, relied on that conversation to conclude that a suspect was "likely to be deceased", and declined to disclose its content "as she is a witness".

Northamptonshire promised a formal interview in writing in November 2025, spoke to her informally in 2026, presented her mental capacity as the sole obstacle to a formal interview without disclosing any assessment, and on 12 June 2026 closed the case with the words "We have been unable to interview your mother, and having reviewed the evidence in this case, I have decided to take no further action." The rationale letter of the same date particularises the obstacle for the first time: she is subject to Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, and "Having sought advice from a Custody Sergeant on this matter, this means that your mother is not fit to be interviewed", a fitness-for-interview determination made against the wrong legal test, by the wrong assessor. Sections 8 and 9.5.8.

Finding 2. On the record as now disclosed, either the delay consumed the decisive evidence, or the stated obstacle does not survive its own history.

A Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards authorisation is a dated, documented decision of a supervisory body. The rationale letter does not date it, and the date decides the matter either way. If the first authorisation postdates the Metropolitan Police's 2024 conversation with Ann Edwards, Northamptonshire's own conversation with her by December 2024, and Northamptonshire's written promise of a formal interview in November 2025, then her account was obtainable during the two years the forces did not act on the victim's written demands, and the closure rests on evidence the delay itself consumed. If it predates them, then police forces have already assessed her as "fit to be spoken to" and obtained accounts from her, the Metropolitan Police in 2024 and Northamptonshire itself by December 2024, while she was under the very status now treated as categorically preclusive, and the inference from status to unfitness collapses. Both forks converge on two records, the authorisation date and the Metropolitan Police contact record; both are undisclosed. Sections 8.3 and 9.5.8.

Finding 3. Across three years and four forces, no suspect in any strand opened since January 2024 has been interviewed under caution.

The only suspect interview in the entire record is David Hope's, on 10 October 2023, at which he provided a pre-prepared statement denying the offences; the subject withdrew five weeks later. The Metropolitan Police declined to arrest or interview the mother ("no necessity"); Gloucestershire closed without interviewing the named suspect, treating interview as contingent on prior evidence rather than a means of obtaining it; Northamptonshire, two and a half years in, interviewed no one. Sections 9 and 10.2.

Finding 4. In every force, closure or finalisation preceded the completion of the enquiry it rested on.

The Met closed on 27 March 2024 while the mother enquiries its own officer had announced on 14 March were unresolved and while the

force could not particularise what its file review had examined. Gloucestershire's Professional Standards Department finalised complaint CO/1268/25 on 12 November 2025, six days before the reviewing DCI requested the central evidential document. Northamptonshire issued its no-further-action decision on 12 June 2026 in the same email in which it commissioned work "to clearly establish which crimes that you have reported", so that the closure preceded even the completion of crime recording. Sections 9 and 10.3.

Finding 5. The first record of the case inverted the victim's identity, and the official record has never, in any force, accurately reflected the allegation as made.

The Metropolitan Police transfer of 2 May 2023 recorded "Offence:

Sexual Assault on a Female", "Victim: Senn JACQUES", "Suspect: Unknown", and that "she was abused by her school teacher", although the caller was a man reporting abuse by a named male teacher at a boys' boarding school whose convictions the operator had located in the same log. North Yorkshire carried the error for nine days. Thereafter: Northamptonshire recorded the offence period as 1988 to 1993 against a reported period of 1981 to 1997, corrected only on request; the same North Yorkshire file records the suspect's sentence as 17, 18 and 16 years in three different entries; Northamptonshire's own May 2026 summary garbled the names of the suspect, a witness and a third party; and in June 2026 the lead force stated in writing that it was still working out "exactly what crimes are recorded, against which suspect, and within which force". Sections 9 and 10.6.

Finding 6. The Metropolitan Police evidential interview was steered away from the subject's own unprosecuted abuse, and the steered product was then assessed as containing "no clear allegations of sexual assault". The force's own complaint report records the control officer's account: "I just wanted to avoid speaking on incidents which had already led to the trial and conviction of others." The incidents in question, the subject's abuse at Malsis, had led to the conviction of others for offences against other victims; as against this subject they were unprosecuted, he having withdrawn three months earlier. The same report then records the closure review's conclusion that the interview account contained "no clear allegations of sexual assault". Section 9.3.

Finding 7. The single most consequential undisclosed record in the case is the content of the Metropolitan Police's 2024 conversation with Ann Edwards. DS Fraser, 19 April 2024: "As confirmed previously, I have spoken to your mother, she did not provide any further information that assisted me in progressing the investigation. I do not intend to detail the content of our conversation." The content was withheld through the investigation, withheld by name through the complaint process ("Certain aspects of this report will not be disclosed to you... in particular what was spoken between your mother and DS Fraser", 8 July 2024), and remains withheld behind a subject access request in admitted, repeated statutory breach. Sections 8 and 12.

Finding 8. All four forces breached statutory subject access duties on the records of this case. Gloucestershire admitted its breach in writing on 19 February 2026 and had made no disclosure four months later. The Met issued two erroneous refusals, admitted both in writing, mis-stated its own extended deadline, admitted that too, and then missed the corrected deadline of 14 April 2026; on 24 June 2026 it stated it could give no timescale. Northamptonshire's request, identity-verified on 17 February 2026, remained undisclosed past even the maximum lawful extension.

North Yorkshire responded late, with an apology, and declined to review 383 identified emails on the basis of an asserted cap ("we are only required to review up to 350 emails") that has no statutory existence. Sections 9, 11.1 and 12.

Finding 9. The Metropolitan Police complaint system examined itself. The subject officers, the reviewing DI who declared support for the closure in advance and in writing, and the complaint handler all sat within the same Central North command. The complaint was recorded under Schedule 3 of the Police Reform Act 2002 as "handled proportionately otherwise than by investigation". Its determination on the password head rests on a factual premise (that the sister was "the provider of the BT email account... and password") which the complainant rebutted in writing two days after the report issued, and which was never revisited; the outcome head was determined by adopting the pre-declared review. Section 9.3.

Finding 10. A 28-day administrative cycle operated in every active force and always against the victim. It functioned as an update ceiling (Met, March 2024; Northamptonshire, February 2026), a destruction threat (Northamptonshire property store, June 2025: material "may be destroyed" if not collected within 28 days), a reset doctrine ("every time we contact you our 28 day cycle resets", DI Howe, 23 February 2026), and a limitation trap (Gloucestershire, April 2026: the review window had "expired" on a complaint the force had finalised before seeking the evidence). Section 10.4.

Finding 11. The forces' own 2023 records rebut the closure rationale later deployed against the victim. Gloucestershire's NFA letter of 3 October 2025 asserted that the subject's account "may have been shaped by therapeutic

suggestion". The North Yorkshire MG15 of 19 May 2023, recording the same underlying account, states: "He had never had therapy in his life. The first time he had therapy was this year". The account therefore predates, or at latest is contemporaneous with, the first therapeutic contact of the subject's life, and the police knew it, because they wrote it down. The complainant's recording of the force's own call of 25 September 2025, eight days before the letter issued, adds the assertion's provenance: challenged to identify its documentary basis, the reviewing officer's account shifted three times in one conversation and ended in the admission that it rested on nothing more than attendance at survivors' peer-support meetings ("memories may have surfaced"), alongside his concession on a separate contested point: "I misunderstood that and misrepresented it". Sections 9.4 and 13.3.

Finding 12. What the record does not show is coordination; what it shows is worse for the forces than coincidence. Independent failures of identical shape occurred in every force, always in the same direction, and the records that would distinguish incompetence from intent, the contact logs, the decision logs, the call recordings, the complaint audit trails, are exactly the records that remain undisclosed in breach of statute. The refusals are now themselves evidence, and preservation notices covering all of them were served on 15 June 2026. Sections 10, 12 and 14.

5. Context established on the public record

Malsis School was an independent preparatory boarding school for boys at Cross Hills, Glusburn, near Keighley, North Yorkshire. It closed in 2014. Two of its former teachers have been convicted of sexually abusing pupils there during the period the subject attended.

David Hope, the school's music teacher, was convicted at Bradford Crown Court in December 2021 of three counts of buggery, three counts of indecent assault and one count of indecency with a child, committed against a Malsis pupil in the 1980s. On 28 February 2022 he was sentenced to 17 years' custody with an additional one-year extended licence, the judge designating him an offender of particular concern, and placed on the sex offenders register for life. The court heard he had previously served a 20-month sentence in the 1990s for offences against other boys. The sentencing judge found he had a "deep-rooted" sexual interest in young boys. The North Yorkshire officer quoted publicly on the conviction, describing Hope as "a monstrous child abuser", was Detective Constable Alison Morris of the force's Non-Recent Abuse Investigation Team, the same officer who in 2023 became the officer in the case on the subject's report.

Peter Holmes, a Malsis teacher between 1976 and 1991, was jailed for 12 years in September 2022 for 13 counts of indecent assault and 16 counts of gross indecency against 18 boys at the school; his appeal was dismissed in February 2023. North Yorkshire Police stated publicly that complaints against Holmes were first made in the 1990s but that he could not then be reached, having moved abroad, and that the investigation was reopened in 2018.

The relevance of this context is threefold. First, the environment the subject describes is judicially established: the same school, the same era, the same named offender, convicted on the evidence of other boys. Second, the police records in this file acknowledge it in terms: North Yorkshire's investigation plan of 24 May 2023 records that "The suspect in the case is currently serving a sentence for historical sexual abuse at the school", and its ISVA referral of 2 May 2023 records the "offender convicted of like offences against numerous other male pupils at school", citing the BBC report of the Hope case. Third, institutional knowledge of offending at Malsis long predates 2023: complaints about Holmes date to the 1990s, Hope was imprisoned in the 1990s, and the subject's own police interview records a contemporaneous police presence at the school (Section 6.3). None of what follows, in other words, concerns an implausible allegation against an unblemished environment. It concerns the policing of a corroborated environment's additional victim.

6. The allegations as recorded in police records

This section sets out what the subject reported, not from his private recollection but as captured in the police's own documents: the STORM incident report and call narrative of 2 May 2023, the MG15 record of interview of 19 May 2023 (Stoke Newington Police Station, 14:42 to 16:28), the North Yorkshire initial investigation plan of 24 May 2023, and the recorded subject matter of the later strands.

6.1 The Malsis abuse (North Yorkshire strand)

The investigation plan records the complaint as sexual abuse by the school's music teacher while the subject was a pupil aged approximately 8 to 13, circa September 1989 to summer 1995 (the ISVA referral records "circa 1989-1994" and classifies the matter as "Non-Recent CSA upon school pupil (8 - 13 yrs) by adult male in Position of Trust (Teacher)... Type of Sexual Assault - Sexual / Penetrative").

The MG15 records, in summary: repeated assaults in the dormitories during evening story-reading, the teacher masturbating the subject and other boys under the bedcovers, using a hard-backed book to screen the activity, and showing the subject "what to do"; escalation to assaults in the piano practice rooms, where the teacher would put his hand into the subject's shorts and underwear and, on three to four occasions, have the subject put his penis in the teacher's mouth ("just pop it in"); the teacher standing in the shower area after rugby "all the time" and taking photographs of the naked boys with a camera worn around his neck, which the subject described as "horrific, the worse experience of his life" [sic]; being given wine kept in the teacher's office; a meal out with a small group of boys at which the subject, then about 12, drank alcohol; and a fragmentary memory of the teacher's flat. The plan records that the teacher "would do the same to other boys" and names the dormitory locations by which the subject dated the incidents.

6.2 The contemporaneous disclosures, recorded by police in 2023

Three contemporaneous disclosure events are recorded in the MG15 and occurrence log, each made when the subject was a child, and each of which failed:

- Childline. The MG15 records that the subject and a friend called Childline from a phone box; "Fenn called Childline about what had happened"; the friend "didn't seem shocked to hear, it was like it was well known what was going on"; and "Childline never made contact or followed it up."
- The police. The MG15 records that another Malsis teacher was "caught coming back from the airport with lots of pornography" and left the school; that "the police were involved in the investigation re the images because a police officer came to speak to him"; and that "At the time the police spoke to Fenn when the initial investigation went on... he did not mention to the police what had happened to him." A police officer therefore spoke to this child, at this school, during a live indecent-images investigation, in the relevant period.
- His mother. The MG15 records: "He spoke to his mum, and something happened there. His mum was his best friend, but he hasn't seen her since he was 13. He told her and he found out she had taken a deal with the school, something happened." The occurrence log confirms and operationalises this on 12 October 2023: "He did however disclose to his mum around that time what happened and it has been stressed to Fenn that we do really need to make contact with her." This entry is the documentary root of everything in Section 8.

The MG15 also records: "He had never had therapy in his life. The first time he had therapy was this year, a charity called Gallop- Sexual Assault Charity- sees them every week" (the reference is to Galop, the LGBT+ anti-abuse charity). The evidential significance of that sentence is set out at Sections 9.4 and 13.3.

6.3 The later strands, as recorded

- Metropolitan Police, crime 2700409/24 (January 2024). Non-recent child sexual abuse and related allegations extending beyond the Malsis strand, centring on the role of the subject's mother and on material connected with his late father: a BT email account associated with Jim Simpson, and encrypted devices for which the sister held the hardware. The subject asked in writing what was needed for an arrest of his mother and supplied his sister's details so police could obtain the father's laptop (4 March 2024).
- Northamptonshire Police, occurrence 24000017113 (2024). The mother's role and wider abuse in Northamptonshire across a reported period of 1981 to 1997 (initially misrecorded as 1988 to 1993); the previously closed "Big Roy" line; and third-party material submitted by Brian Larkman, including childhood letters, school documents and a photograph marked "orgy at number 10" on the reverse. The force's own rationale letter of 12 June 2026 records the visually recorded interview account as covering "rape facilitated by your mother, Ann Edwards", the school abuse, "the abuse from the Freemasons, and the abuse from your family": the first force-authored confirmation that the organised dimension sits within the formal evidential record.
- Gloucestershire Constabulary, CR/23708/25 (reported 24 June 2025). Non-recent offences naming the step-mother, Alison Jacks. DI Ainslie's own call summary of 8 September 2025 records the allegation as involving forced impregnation and drugging, and a request for a consensual DNA test concerning Emily Jacks (born 1997), which bears on whether she was conceived through the rape of a 14- or 15-year-old. A DNA result excluding Tom Jacks Sr as Emily's father is documented in the subject's disclosure list of 3 October 2025. The requested consensual test was never sought.
- The Turkey disclosure (11 July 2024). A written disclosure to the Metropolitan Police of having been taken to Turkey as a child, drugged and raped, with evidence the trip was organised by his grandfather. No crime reference was issued from this disclosure in the thread; the response was signposting (Section 9.2, item 6).

7. Chronology of the policing, April 2023 to July 2026

7.1 Phase I: first report, transfer, North Yorkshire investigation and withdrawal (April 2023 to January 2024)

Date	Record	What the record shows
19 Apr 2023	ISVA referral form	First report, made to the Metropolitan Police: crime reference CR:2710712/23, "reported 19/04/23". Skeleton report created by PC J Hesketh (257430) "at the request of CN OPS" (Central North).
2 May 2023, 11:40	STORM NYP-02052023-0181	Met transfer email received by North Yorkshire: "Offence: Sexual Assault on a Female... Victim: Senn JACQUES... Suspect: Unknown... Victim alleging that she was abused by her school teacher 21 years ago. This incident is transferred to you for recording (as per HOCR)...". STORM persons record: "Classification: AGGRIEVED Gender: FEMALE Name: JACQUES, SENN". The call narrative in the same log names the teacher and records the operator locating press coverage of his convictions; the transfer nonetheless recorded the suspect as unknown.
2 May 2023	STORM; ISVA form	Occurrence 12230078064 recorded; routed to the Non-Recent Abuse Investigation Team (NRAIT); local qualifiers "Child abuse" and "Vulnerable child/young person"; ISVA referral made the same day.

Date	Record	What the record shows
11 May 2023	Occurrence log	Identity corrected on the victim's own information: "confirming correct name for victim is Fenn JACQUES and their gender is male". The inverted record had stood for nine days.
19 May 2023	MG15	Visually recorded interview, Stoke Newington Police Station, 14:42 to 16:28. Full account as summarised at Section 6, including the Childline call, the contemporaneous police contact, the disclosure to the mother and the "deal with the school", and the statement that the subject had never had therapy before that year.
24 May 2023	Occurrence log	Initial investigation plan. Safeguarding view: "The suspect in the case is currently serving a sentence for historical sexual abuse at the school." Actions include: "Therapy and Medical Records to be obtained"; referral to Rape Crisis in London for ISVA support; VPS deferred pending charge.
25 May 2023	SurvivorsUK record	ISVA referral received by SurvivorsUK (case 8818).
20 Jul to 10 Aug 2023	SurvivorsUK record	OIC reports staffing delays; suspect not yet interviewed; mother not located ("not been able to locate of speak to mother yet" [sic], 10 August). OIC fails to attend the arranged Teams meeting of 24 July; the ISVA telephones 101 mid-meeting.
5 Sep to 3 Oct 2023	SurvivorsUK record;	Prison interview of the suspect postponed from 6 September, then 28 September (solicitor availability), then confirmed for 10

Date	Record	What the record shows
	occurrence log	October. The log records difficulty obtaining a two-hour prison slot.
10 Oct 2023	Occurrence log (12 Oct); supervisor review (2 Jan 2024)	Suspect interviewed in prison. The OIC told the victim "he gave no comment in interview"; the supervisor's review records that he "gave a pre prepared statement and denied the offences". The narrative of the 12 October entry misdates itself "12/10/2024".
12 Oct 2023	Occurrence log	Outstanding actions recorded: "Need to speak to Fenn's mother"; review of "the boxes of unused material in the last case involving [the suspect]... for any disclosure involving Fenn"; review of "the previous investigation paperwork... with regards to Benjamin JACKS"; letters to former pupils. "Fenn states he does not want his mum being contacted... He did however disclose to his mum around that time what happened and it has been stressed to Fenn that we do really need to make contact with her."
26 Oct 2023	Occurrence log	Teams meeting. OIC "spoke again about the importance of speaking with his mum due to the fact he has said he disclosed to her when he was a child"; any contact would concern only the subject's time at Malsis; the subject asks to think about it.

Date	Record	What the record shows
8 Nov 2023	Occurrence log	The subject's written questions, via his ISVA, including: "To put it bluntly, the emotional strain of this process increases the risk of me having suicidal thoughts" and "If I don't give permission for you to contact my mother, will this prevent the case from moving to the next stage?" The OIC's recorded reply: "if we are able to speak to his mum and obtain as much evidence as possibly [sic], it is likely the CPS will charge, especially as he has bad character... The suspect is already serving a 18 year sentence and is elderly. It is likely if convicted he would get a further sentence as the offences are serious."
13 to 15 Nov 2023	SurvivorsUK record; occurrence log	Withdrawal. The ISVA record dates the decision 13 November; the occurrence log records receipt of the withdrawal email of 15 November and a Right 6 discussion on 15 November. The ISVA simultaneously warned that the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority "may see this as non-cooperation". The withdrawal letter cites the emotional and mental toll and the existing conviction of the suspect.
26 Nov 2023	Supervisor review	"The main issues here are the victim's vulnerability and the impact the investigation is having on his MH and wellbeing and the fact that he does not want the police to speak to his mum who is a disclosure witness." The same review records the suspect "currently in prison serving 16 years for similar offences" (the sentence was 17 years plus a one-year licence).
13 Dec 2023	Occurrence log	Final Teams meeting. "The suspect will be made aware that this could be the case and therefore it is not no further action because there is insufficient evidence to prosecute": the case may be re-opened if the victim returns. ISVA support extended three months. NFA letter to issue.

Date	Record	What the record shows
31 Dec 2023	Finalisation request	Case summary: the victim "does not want her contacting and understands this would be an enquiry the CPS would be likely to ask for to consider charges." Suspect updated "by letter to prison".
2 Jan 2024	Supervisor review	Disposal recorded: "Sexual assault on a male child under 13", Outcome 16 (evidential difficulties, victim does not support; suspect identified).

Note on Phase I. The 2023 non-contact with the mother was at the victim's documented request; the cost of that position was equally documented by the force itself, twice, in the two quotations above. From January 2024 the position inverted: the victim demanded, in writing and repeatedly, that the mother be investigated and interviewed. Every subsequent failure occurred against that demand. See Section 8.2.

7.2 Phase II: the Metropolitan Police investigation and complaint (January 2024 to July 2024)

Date	Record	What the record shows
1 or 6 Jan 2024	Met archive	Report made to the Metropolitan Police, crime reference 2700409/24. The force's own records give two dates: DS Fraser's closure email cites "the report you made to police on 01/01/2024"; DI Head's 19 March email cites "allegations of crime that you made on 6th January 2024".
8 to 30 Jan 2024	Met archive	OIC confirmed as DC Tasselli (8 January). DS Fraser, 30 January: "I will get back to you as soon as possible with a date for your interview to take place." First VRI appointment cancelled for "live risk" prioritisation.
15 Feb 2024	DPS complaint report	Visually recorded interview, Holborn Police Station, two hours twenty-three minutes. TDC Briedova interviewing; TDC Tasselli as control officer in the observation room. Free recall ends at approximately 53 minutes; past the hour Tasselli enters and imposes a break, on his own account "so TDC Tasselli could spend some time developing a structure for the interview as he was unable to complete this in the planning phase". The report records the subject's distress in the second half: he refers to Tasselli being "there with a buzzer saying 'NO'", describes the lift journey with Tasselli as "horrible", says "We don't gel" and describes being made to feel like a "twat". Tasselli's later account: "I just wanted to avoid speaking on incidents which had already led to the trial and conviction of others."
4 to 14 Mar 2024	Met archive	The subject provides Emily Jacks's details for the father's laptop and digital assets and asks what is needed for an arrest (4 March). Fraser: mother assessment "in the capacity of being a witness at this stage" (8 March); "I will not be arresting your mother because there is no necessity to do so" and "I will be making enquiries next week in relation to your mother" (14 March).
15 Mar	Met archive	Formal complaint email naming DS Fraser and DC Tasselli,

Date	Record	What the record shows
2024		contemporaneously documenting Fraser's remark: "Oh, so shall I cancel the entire police investigation then? You don't want any of it?" and the interview restrictions ("explicit instructions on what I could and couldn't say... the abrupt end to the video interview because of DC Tasselli's need of a break" [sic]).
19 Mar 2024	Met archive	DI Head refuses force transfer and change of OIC or supervisor: "I have not found any breaches in the best practice that police are required to follow when obtaining evidential accounts."
27 Mar 2024	Met archive	Closure, under twelve weeks after report: "we have completed all reasonable lines of enquiry in this investigation and we are not able to progress this any further." "A specialist trained officer has reviewed all of the e-mails in this folder and the attachments... found no evidence of indecent images." "The password to that e-mail account has been changed to 'Greentree71' I have updated Emily with this information."
28 Mar 2024	Met archive	DI Head, before any complaint is recorded: "I will say in advance that I am supportive of the decision to close the investigation." He advises the subject to "limit further contact with DS Fraser".

Date	Record	What the record shows
18 to 23 Apr 2024	Met archive	Subject, 18 April: "What was said to my mother? What did she say? I also have not got access to the email account because you gave away the password." Fraser, 19 April: "As confirmed previously, I have spoken to your mother, she did not provide any further information that assisted me in progressing the investigation. I do not intend to detail the content of our conversation"; and "I will not be responding to any questions about how you feel my conduct can be interpreted." Fraser, 23 April: privacy (DPA/ECHR) cited for non-disclosure; the reviewing officer "hasn't been able to provide me with full details" of what was examined; lines of enquiry "extremely limited due to the passage of time".
8 Apr / 25 Apr / 30 Apr 2024	DPS report; Met archive	Complaint PC/03332/24. The DPS report records the complaint as made "on 8th April 2024" (the archive contains the complaint email of 15 March). Recorded 25 April under a single head, "Dissatisfaction at the overall outcome of your crime allegation reference 270049/24" [sic]; five concerns subsequently "agreed via email on the 30th April 2024". Handler: PC Rita Panteli, DPS PSU Central North, the same command as the subject officers and reviewing DI.
20 May 2024	Met archive	Panteli confirms she holds the subject's "visually recorded account"; on query (he sent no video) she clarifies it is the police VRI.
25 to 27 Jun 2024	DPS report; rebuttal	Complaint report issued: recorded under Schedule 3, Police Reform Act 2002, "Handled proportionately otherwise than by investigation". Concern 1 (Fraser's attitude): "not been able to determine whether the service provided was acceptable". Concerns 2 to 5: service acceptable. The subject's same-day

Date	Record	What the record shows
		written rebuttal, 27 June: "Miss Jacks never had the password to the BT email/data account. The password was solely in my possession until the police took my Mac computer away... the police changed the password in front of me, on my computer... This newly set password by the police was then given to Miss Jacks, not by my consent, but by the police."
8 Jul 2024	Met archive	Panteli: "Certain aspects of this report will not be disclosed to you... in particular what was spoken between your mother and DS Fraser." Further correspondence declined outside formal appeal.
11 Jul 2024	Met archive	The Turkey disclosure (drugged and raped as a child abroad; grandfather as organiser). CRU (Sgt Stubbs): "please attend your local police station... which may involve contact with the Turkish police or Interpol." No crime reference issued from this disclosure in the thread.

7.3 Phase III: Northamptonshire opens; Gloucestershire opens and closes (2024 to December 2025)

Date	Record	What the record shows
Early 2024	Northants archive	Occurrence 24000017113 opened (2024-series reference).
14 Mar 2024	NYP SAR covering letter	North Yorkshire discloses its file (initial report, investigation notes, ISVA referral, officer's statement, interview copy) to Leigh Day solicitors under Schedule 2, Part 1, paragraph 5(3) of the Data Protection Act 2018, "necessary for the purpose of, or in connection with, legal proceedings (which includes prospective legal proceedings)". Prospective civil proceedings therefore existed by March 2024.
29 Sep 2024	Northants archive	First substantive OIC questions (DC Dempsey), with the warning: "without these enquiries, we will have no further investigative enquiries and will need to file the crime."
8 to 13 Nov 2024	Northants archive	"VRI available dates" discussed. The interview then does not take place for approximately thirteen months.
4 Dec 2024	Northants archive	Dempsey, 16:09: enquiries with "the witnesses you have provided" given as the basis for "Roy may be deceased... With this information, it is not possible to convict him- unless you are able to provide further information regarding him"; the same email reproduces a Met-supplied list of the topics of the 15 February 2024 interview and concludes "there is little gain for speaking on these topics again". At 17:38 the stated source becomes the mother: "When we have spoken to your mother, she has provided us with the description of Roy... It was through this conversation that we have thought that he is likely to be deceased." The subject, 17:43: "My mother was the one who organised this... Has she admitted to this? What has she actually said about Roy?"
5 Dec 2024	Northants archive	Dempsey, 10:40: "Regarding the description, it was brief- just stating that he was elderly at the time. I cannot discuss the exact details of the conversation had with your mother as she is a witness." The same email records the force awaiting Adult Social Services records concerning the mother's reported comments to care staff [A].
6 Dec 2024	Northants archive	The subject's written reply documents the care-staff account that the mother "admitted she 'took the blame for everything'" [A as to the staff statement] and rejects the witness classification. Dempsey, 15:10: "I have now received the documents from Social Services and will be reviewing these in the next week"; "With reference to your mother- I will need to speak with my supervisor regarding the concerns you have raised." The subject asked twice in writing (9 and 10 December) whether the documents contained any acknowledgment by his mother; no answer to that question, and no product of the review, appears in the later disclosed record.
21 Dec 2024	Northants archive	Dempsey: "the crime will be filed pending upon the information we have discussed over the phone", before the victim's evidential account had been taken.
9 Jun 2025	Northants archive	Evidential Property Team: "If you do not contact us within 28 days as per Force policy the property may be destroyed."
13 to 29 Jun 2025	Northants archive	Subject: "I need written confirmation that an investigation into my mother's role is now open." The record documents that the only prior line, "Big Roy", was closed on the basis he was "probably dead", following a witness statement from the mother.
24 Jun	Glos archive	Parallel Gloucestershire report naming Alison Jacks

Date	Record	What the record shows
2025		(CR/23708/25).
7 Jul 2025	Northants archive	Crime number provided; Dempsey: "I'll send an email to the MET for the video interview."
28 Aug 2025	Glos archive	DS Morgan closes CR/23708/25: "In the absence of any specific recollection of Alison JACKS committing a sexual act upon you and dearth of evidence... no reasonable grounds to suspect... the case will now be closed." The named suspect was never interviewed; Morgan's stated position was that "we must have reasonable grounds to suspect a criminal offence has been committed in order to interview a person".
4 to 5 Sep 2025	Met archive	Met subject access request submitted 4 September; Refusal of Right of Access issued the next day, 5 September.
8 Sep 2025	Glos archive	DI Ainslie's call summary confirms the allegation (forced impregnation, drugging, the DNA test request concerning Emily) and the complaint route; contains internal date confusion ("Thursday 25th September... call you again on Thursday 22nd"); records "you raised some points around the therapy you were receiving" (see Section 13.3).
25 Sep 2025	Recorded call	The follow-up call promised in the 8 September summary, audio-recorded by the subject (19:21 to 19:50 BST; DI Ainslie speaking, DS Morgan present). Challenged on the summary's inaccuracies, Ainslie concedes on the DNA point: "I misunderstood that and misrepresented it." His stated basis for the therapeutic-suggestion assertion shifts three times in the one call, ending in the admission that it rested on the subject's attendance at SurvivorsUK peer-support meetings: "memories may have surfaced" (Section 9.4.5). He confirms Alison Jacks will not be questioned ("That's not going to happen"), and the officers decline to say what "new and compelling evidence" would look like ("Well, I'm not going to suggest that"). The subject states he was never given the opportunity to make a formal statement; the counter, "long conversations with Gareth Morgan", is corrected on the recording to a single casual conversation while the subject walked his dog. The NFA letter issues eight days later.
3 to 6 Oct 2025	Glos archive	Subject formally demands the NFA letter and review rights, noting: "the decision appears to have been made without questioning the named individuals or taking the simple step of asking whether Emily would consent to a DNA test. That is the most direct way to resolve whether a serious offence occurred." The NFA letter dated 3 October, later the subject of the fabrication complaint CO/443/26, is provided on 6 October.
21 to 24 Oct 2025	Northants archive	The Met DI "does not want to say yes" to facilitating the VRI in London; Dempsey suggests Northampton; the subject (complex PTSD, cannot travel): "I have been trying to get this interview arranged for almost a year now", and offers three London venues available "24 hours a day".
3 Nov 2025	Glos archive	Complaint CO/1268/25 recorded (DS Townsend).
11 to 21 Nov 2025	Glos archive	DCI Shore-Nye reviews and upholds the closure: the allegation "has no evidential basis... based on feeling and not evidence." On 18 November he asks the subject to provide the "Admission" email (Alison Jacks: "Tom and Emily were being abused"); on 21 November he confirms the closure.

Date	Record	What the record shows
12 Nov 2025	Glos archive	PSD finalisation letter for CO/1268/25 issues, six days before the reviewing DCI's request of 18 November for the central evidential document.
26 Nov 2025	Northants archive	VRI booked for 3 December, Brixton Police Station. Dempsey: "We gathered your evidential account first, and will look to speak with your mother formally afterwards - usually by an interview. You'll be updated on this process and when this is likely to occur."

Date	Record	What the record shows
5 Dec 2025	Northants archive	VRI completed (booked for the 3rd; the subject's later correspondence records the 5th; the force never disputes it). Approximately thirteen months after "VRI available dates" and nearly two years after the occurrence opened.

7.4 Phase IV: subject access breaches, the capacity gate, and the Northamptonshire closure (January to July 2026)

Date	Record	What the record shows
2 Jan 2026	Northants archive	Dempsey: "the national database has been searched and there are no identifiable images of you on there" (CAID/VID search).
12 Jan 2026	All three archives	Fresh subject access requests to the Met, Gloucestershire and Northamptonshire on the same day.
13 Jan 2026	Glos archive	Gloucestershire ID initially rejected; accepted the same day after challenge ("I was probably a little over cautious on this occasion", Mr Turner). Response due "on or before 13/02/2026".
15 to 19 Jan 2026	Northants archive	DI Howe: case file recorded offence dates as 1988 to 1993 against a reported period of 1981 to 1997; "I have amended the dates of the reported offences as requested." Also: "enquiries are being undertaken into your mother... We are seeking to interview her regarding her involvement."
16 Jan to 17 Feb 2026	Northants archive	Serial ID demands on SAR AD26334/26 despite the force holding the subject's deed poll; request closed, then reopened; 17 February: ID accepted "despite initial verification not quite meeting our usual process standards"; "I am currently unable to give an expected date of disclosure."
21 Jan 2026	Met archive	Second Met refusal issued, then admitted wrong: "the refusal was issued in error due an administrative oversight" [sic]. Extension issued with the wrong deadline displayed.
17 to 19 Feb 2026	Glos archive	Gloucestershire, in writing, twice: "we acknowledge that we have been unable to meet our statutory duty in relation to your request"; complainants directed to the ICO and expressly away from the force's own Professional Standards and PCC routes.

Date	Record	What the record shows
23 to 25 Feb 2026	Northants archive	Howe: "every time we contact you our 28 day cycle resets, therefore please consider this when you are seeking further updates." Dempsey: "I am sent a reminder when 28 days pass, this is when you will be contacted." The subject's unrebutted same-day record: no substantive written update since the 5 December VRI.
19 Mar 2026	Met archive	Second Met written admission: "A system issue prevented the updated deadline date from displaying correctly, and a member of staff should have spotted this before the letter was sent... The deadline you have is not the extended one." Corrected deadline: 14 April 2026.

Date	Record	What the record shows
3 to 9 Apr 2026	Glos archive	Fabrication complaint concerning the 3 October 2025 NFA letter: (1) the "powder in my tea" mischaracterisation of an active self-protective account as passive delusion; (2) the claim the account "may have been shaped by therapeutic suggestion". PSD first misroutes it as an out-of-time review (8 April: the review date "has now expired"), then accepts it as a new conduct complaint (9 April). IOPC submission acknowledged 8 April (code 7693245), routed back to the force. New reference CO/443/26 issued 30 April.
13 to 15 Apr 2026	Northants archive; status record	Complaint CO/540/26 recorded (failure to investigate, chronic delay, evidence mishandling, Victims' Code breaches, the handling of Ann Edwards). OPFCC acknowledges 14 April and passes the concerns to a Detective Chief Inspector as relating to "a live and sensitive investigation"; PSD, 15 April: backlog "approximately 4-5 months", possibly longer.
14 Apr 2026	Northants and Met archives	Dempsey: Howe "has returned some actions regarding the mental capacity of your mothers" [sic]. The same day, the Met's corrected SAR deadline expires; the subject flags it within hours.
15 Apr 2026	NYP SAR covering letter	Subject access request made to North Yorkshire Police.
27 to 29 Apr 2026	Northants archive	Telephone call with Dempsey; the subject's contemporaneous, unrebutted record of 29 April: "she has spoken to my mother informally, and that the only reason a formal interview has not taken place is the question of capacity. That is the first time that information has been put to me directly." Twenty-seven minutes after the call, Howe emails: "I have asked DC Dempsey not to respond directly at this stage", declines the requested call, and gates any further evidence behind "An explanation of why it has not previously been provided (...you appear to have held this material for some time...)". The subject's 29 April reply demonstrates from Howe's own inbox that the material (Larkman voice transcripts) was offered on 2 April with an explicit request for secure-handling guidance, which went unanswered. Howe acknowledges the subject's intention to challenge any capacity-based decision.
13 to 21 May 2026	Northants archive	Call and written summary. Capacity enquiries via "colleagues in our Custody Suite as well as professionals in the Care Home". Howe: "it appears there is some uncertainty regarding which force is owning which investigation." The summary garbles "Briam LARKHAM", "Alison JAQUES" and "Steve JAQUES"; corrected by the subject on 22 May.

Date	Record	What the record shows
2 Jun 2026	NYP SAR	North Yorkshire responds to the 15 April request, late, with an apology; discloses the records in Section 2.1; confirms the 14 March 2024 Leigh Day disclosure; declines to review 383 identified emails: "Under Subject Access we are only required to review up to 350 emails. As this search exceeds this amount I have not reviewed the results."

Date	Record	What the record shows
4 Jun 2026	Northants archive	Howe, twenty-nine months in: working on "ensuring we can understand exactly what crimes are recorded, against which suspect, and within which force."
12 Jun 2026	Northants NFA email; rationale letter	DI Howe, 17:02: "We have been unable to interview your mother, and having reviewed the evidence in this case, I have decided to take no further action." And, in the same email: "I have also asked DC Dempsey to continue to seek further information from colleagues around the country to clearly establish which crimes that you have reported. This is to ensure that they are all accurately recorded and so that we can provide you with any reference numbers for your own records." The attached rationale letter (10 pages, crime reference 25000316894) discloses the basis of the non-interview: Ann Edwards "is subject to Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)" and, "Having sought advice from a Custody Sergeant on this matter, this means that your mother is not fit to be interviewed". It answers the subject's Section 4A Criminal Procedure (Insanity) Act 1964 point by restating the evidential threshold; rests the evidential shortfall on the need for "a complete and coherent explanation" and on "your age at the time of the alleged offences, and the passage of time"; and sets the Victims' Right to Review deadline at 12 September 2026. Dissected at Sections 8.3 and 9.5.8.
15 Jun 2026	Status record	Preservation notices served on the Met, Northamptonshire and Gloucestershire, covering call recordings, 999/101 calls and metadata, VRI material, CRIS and occurrence records, offence-date correction records, records of contact with Ann Edwards and the capacity enquiries, the Larkman material, NFA decision logs and drafts, complaint files and internal correspondence.
17 to 18 Jun 2026	Status record	Final-deadline notices: Northamptonshire (17 June: ID accepted 17 February; four months overdue; even the maximum three-month extension would have expired 17 May); the Met and Gloucestershire (18 June). Northamptonshire replies 18 June citing backlog and the right to complain to the ICO.
24 Jun 2026	Status record	The Met, on 01/ROA/26/123653/R: no new information, no timescale for completion, high demand and limited resources cited, and "the Information Commissioner was aware of its position".

8. The central finding: Ann Edwards, the witness no force has interviewed

8.1 The chain, in the forces' own words

Nine record extracts, spanning three years and three forces, establish the position. Nothing in this section rests on the subject's account alone.

"He spoke to his mum, and something happened there. His mum was his best friend, but he hasn't seen her since he was 13. He told her and he found out she had taken a deal with the school, something happened." *Link 1. North Yorkshire Police MG15 record of interview, 19 May 2023 (pages 4 to 5).*

"Fenn states he does not want his mum being contacted, he hasn't had contact with her since he was 13. He did however disclose to his mum around that time what happened and it has been stressed to Fenn that we do really need to make contact with her." *Link 2. North Yorkshire occurrence enquiry log, investigator action, 12 October 2023.*

"I replied to Fenn stating that if we are able to speak to his mum and obtain as much evidence as possibly [sic], it is likely the CPS will charge, especially as he has bad character." *Link 3. North Yorkshire occurrence enquiry log, victim contact, 8 November 2023 (officer in the case, on the prospect of charging David Hope).*

"The main issues here are the victim's vulnerability and the impact the investigation is having on his MH and wellbeing and the fact that he does not want the police to speak to his mum who is a disclosure witness."... "He does not want her contacting and understands this would be an enquiry the CPS would be likely to ask for to consider charges." *Link 4. North Yorkshire supervisor review, 26 November 2023, and finalisation request, 31 December 2023.*

"As confirmed previously, I have spoken to your mother, she did not provide any further information that assisted me in progressing the investigation. I do not intend to detail the content of our conversation." *Link 5. DS Gemma Fraser, Metropolitan Police, email of 19 April 2024.*

"Certain aspects of this report will not be disclosed to you... in particular what was spoken between your mother and DS Fraser." *Link 6. PC Rita Panteli, Metropolitan Police DPS, email of 8 July 2024.*

"When we have spoken to your mother, she has provided us with the description of Roy as we did not have a thorough description of him. It was through this conversation that we have thought that he is likely to be deceased."... "I cannot discuss the exact details of the conversation had with your mother as she is a witness." *Link 7. PC Caitlan Dempsey, Northamptonshire Police, emails of 4 December 2024 (17:38) and 5 December 2024 (10:40).*

"We gathered your evidential account first, and will look to speak with your mother formally afterwards - usually by an interview. You'll be updated on this process and when this is likely to occur."... "she has spoken to my mother informally, and that the only reason a formal interview has not taken place is the question of capacity." *Link 8. DC Caitlan Dempsey, Northamptonshire Police, email of 26 November 2025; and the subject's contemporaneous, un rebutted record of 29 April 2026 of Dempsey's account by telephone on 27 April 2026.*

"We have been unable to interview your mother, and having reviewed the evidence in this case, I have decided to take no further action."

Link 9. DI Ben Howe, Northamptonshire Police, no-further-action email, 12 June 2026, 17:02.

Read together: the subject disclosed the abuse to his mother contemporaneously, as a child. The first investigating force identified her as a disclosure witness, assessed in writing that with her evidence a CPS charge against a convicted serial child abuser was likely, and recorded that hers was an enquiry the CPS would be likely to require. The second force

located her, spoke to her, relied on the product in support of closure, and has withheld the content of that conversation from the victim through the investigation, through the complaint process by name, and through a subject access process now in admitted, repeated statutory breach. The third force had spoken to her by December 2024, relied on the product to close its only prior line of enquiry and withheld the content in writing; it then promised a formal interview in writing, had its officer speak to her informally again in 2026, presented mental capacity as the sole obstacle to a formal interview without disclosing any assessment, and then closed the case on the express ground that it had been "unable to interview" her. No force, at any point in three years, has interviewed Ann Edwards under caution, and no force has disclosed what she said when spoken to.

8.2 The consent inversion

Any institutional response to this section will begin with the 2023 records: the victim withheld consent to his mother being contacted. That is true, documented, and answered by the same documents. In 2023 the subject was a newly disclosing victim in the strand concerning David Hope, the mother was needed as a witness in that strand, and the force, properly, treated his consent as determinative; the cost of his position was put to him honestly and he withdrew rather than have her approached. That posture ended in January 2024 at the latest. From then on, the subject's documented position was the opposite and was expressed relentlessly: on 4 March 2024 he asked the Metropolitan Police in writing what was needed for an arrest; on 4 December 2024 he put his mother's role to Northamptonshire in writing and demanded to know what she had said ("My mother was the one who organised this... Has she admitted to this?"); in June 2025 he demanded of Northamptonshire "written confirmation that an investigation into my mother's role is now open"; in January 2026 Northamptonshire confirmed "We are seeking to interview her regarding her involvement." Every failure documented in this section occurred not despite the victim's wishes but against his express, written and repeated demand. The 2023 consent position explains nothing after it.

8.3 The capacity gate, now particularised: Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards

Northamptonshire's stated obstacle, generalised as "capacity" through the spring of 2026, is particularised for the first time in the rationale letter of 12 June 2026:

"As per our e-mails exchanged and conversation on 13th May 2026 the investigating officer had concerns regarding the capacity of your mother to be interviewed about her involvement in these offences. We have now been able to establish that she is subject to Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)... Having sought advice from a Custody Sergeant on this matter, this means that your mother is not fit to be interviewed." *Northamptonshire Police no-further-action rationale letter, 12 June 2026.*

The wrong test. The paragraph runs distinct legal frameworks into a single conclusion. Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, under the Mental Capacity Act 2005, authorise the care arrangements of a person who lacks capacity to consent to those arrangements; capacity under that Act is decision-specific and time-specific by statute, and a finding about consent to residence and care is not a finding about

anything else. Fitness for interview is a different question under a different instrument: an individualised assessment, made with an appropriate healthcare professional against the PACE Code C Annex G criteria, of whether this person can be interviewed about this matter without harm and with reliable answers; and for a vulnerable interviewee the Code's response is safeguards, an appropriate adult and an adapted process, not automatic exclusion. The letter moves from care-arrangements status to "not fit to be interviewed" in one sentence, a conclusion neither framework supplies on these facts. DoLS status is evidence of significant impairment; it is not, in law or in logic, a determination of unfitness for interview.

The wrong assessor. The determination was made "Having sought advice from a Custody Sergeant on this matter". A custody sergeant is not a healthcare professional and does not conduct fitness-for-interview assessments. The record discloses no individualised assessment of Ann Edwards, by anyone qualified to make one, at any point: only DI Howe's "returned some actions regarding the mental capacity of your mothers" [sic] (14 April 2026) and enquiries to "colleagues in our Custody Suite as well as professionals in the Care Home" (May 2026). The custody-suite routing shows the force knew the correct frame existed; the letter shows it was not applied.

The undated status: a fork with no third branch. A DoLS authorisation is a dated, documented decision of a supervisory body, renewed at fixed intervals and supported by written capacity and best-interests assessments. The letter does not date it, and the date decides the matter either way. If the first authorisation postdates the Metropolitan Police's 2024 conversation, Northamptonshire's own conversation with her by December 2024, and the November 2025 written promise of a formal interview, then Ann Edwards was engageable during the two years of documented delay, and the closure rests on evidence the delay itself consumed. If it predates them, then the Metropolitan Police assessed her as "fit to be spoken to" and obtained an account from her, and Northamptonshire itself obtained and relied on an account from her by December 2024, while she was under the very status Northamptonshire now treats as categorically preclusive, and the inference from status to unfitness is contradicted by the record. The subject demanded, in writing on 20 April 2026, reconciliation with the "prior MPS capacity determination" of 2024; the rationale letter does not mention the 2024 contact at all.

The letter's own concession. The Section 4A paragraph concedes the remaining ground. The subject had put the trial-of-the-facts framework to the force before closure; the letter's answer, that the provision "does not negate the requirement for the prosecution to establish a realistic prospect of conviction", is correct as far as it goes, and it is an admission that inability to interview is not dispositive: an interview under caution is not a legal precondition of a charging decision, and a statutory route exists precisely for accused persons who cannot participate in proceedings. The closure therefore stands or falls on the quality of its evidential analysis alone, which is examined at Section 9.5.8 and is generic.

Three further facts frame the paragraph. The force's own officer spoke to Ann Edwards informally in 2026, and capacity was presented as "the only reason a formal interview has not taken place" (the unrebutted contemporaneous record of 29 April 2026); a person capable of an informal police conversation is not self-evidently incapable of a formal one attended by the Code's safeguards. The status itself is a matter of local-authority record, obtainable in days; it took the force from the written interview promise of November 2025 until June 2026 to "establish" it. And this is the third successive mechanism by which the same person has avoided interview under caution: the Metropolitan Police's "no necessity" (14 March 2024), Gloucestershire's

"no reasonable grounds" as applied to its own suspect (28 August 2025), and now a categorical unfitness inference drawn from care-arrangements status on custody-sergeant advice. Each is individually arguable; the sequence, applied to the one person whose evidence a police force assessed as likely decisive, is the finding.

8.4 The control document and the demand that wins either way

DS Fraser's email of 19 April 2024 (Link 5) is the control document of the entire case. It proves the mother was locatable and conversable in 2024, destroying any future claim that she could not be found or engaged. The rationale letter of 12 June 2026, the force's fullest statement of why she could not be interviewed, does not mention the 2024 contact at all: the non-reconciliation is no longer an inference from silence in correspondence but a documented omission in the closure document itself. It establishes that the content of the only police conversation with her is a record the Metropolitan Police holds and has chosen to withhold at every level. And it anchors a demand that succeeds whichever way it is answered: Northamptonshire (and any reviewing body) must obtain and consider the 2024 contact record before any capacity-based conclusion can stand; the Metropolitan Police must disclose it through the subject access process it is already in admitted breach of. If the forces comply, the case moves. If they do not, the refusals, each now documented against a served preservation notice, are themselves the evidence before the ICO, the IOPC and any court.

9. Force-by-force findings

9.1 North Yorkshire Police

North Yorkshire is the comparator force. Its record contains real failures, set out below, but it also demonstrates, on the same victim and the same underlying matter, that the standard of communication and supervision the subject later demanded of three other forces is not exotic: scheduled reviews, advance notice of the suspect interview, honest written advice on charging prospects, a welfare-led closure that expressly preserved re-opening ("it is not no further action because there is insufficient evidence to prosecute"), and extended ISVA support. That contrast is admissible context in every Victims' Code complaint that follows.

9.1.1 The inverted first record. The force received, recorded and carried for nine days a report describing the victim as female, under the wrong name, with the suspect recorded as unknown, although the transferring material named the teacher and the operator had located coverage of his convictions. The correction of 11 May 2023 was made on the victim's own information, not by internal audit. The origin of the error was the Metropolitan Police transfer (Section 9.2.1); the carriage of it was North Yorkshire's.

9.1.2 Delay and non-attendance. The officer in the case failed to attend the arranged meeting of 24 July 2023, requiring the ISVA to telephone 101 mid-meeting; the suspect interview slipped from 6 September to 28 September to 10 October 2023; the mother had not been located as at 10 August 2023. The withdrawal of November 2023 followed months of this, and the ISVA's simultaneous warning that the compensation authority "may see this as non-cooperation" framed the cost of the system's delay as a risk to the victim.

9.1.3 Internal record errors. Within one force file the suspect's sentence is recorded as 17 years (the transfer remark, which itself misdates the sentencing to February 2023), 18 years (the OIC and the victim, consistent with the 17-plus-1 structure actually imposed) and 16 years (the supervisor's review of 26 November 2023); and the 12 October 2023 log entry misdates its own narrative "12/10/2024". Individually trivial; collectively the first instances of the record-accuracy pattern at Section 10.6.

9.1.4 The ISVA structural bar. The ISVA record of 31 July 2023 documents the support worker reminding the subject not to copy her into correspondence because "I am unable to hear details of the offence or evidence." The one consistent support figure was procedurally barred from the substance, leaving the victim the only person holding the full picture, a position later forces then relied on by making his collation work the engine of their investigations (Section 9.5.2).

9.1.5 Subject access conduct, 2026. The response to the 15 April 2026 request issued on 2 June 2026, beyond the statutory month, with an apology. It declined to review 383 identified emails on the stated basis that "Under Subject

Access we are only required to review up to 350 emails." No such numerical cap exists in Part 3 of the Data Protection Act 2018; proportionality falls to be assessed case by case, and the practical effect here was that every force email mentioning the subject remained

unreviewed and undisclosed, with the burden of narrowing shifted to the data subject. The same letter performed one substantial service: it confirmed, in writing, the 14 March 2024 disclosure of the force's file to Leigh Day solicitors for the purpose of actual or prospective legal proceedings, and it applied no restrictions to the subject's personal data.

9.2 Metropolitan Police Service: the investigations

9.2.1 The origin failure, April to May 2023. The first report in the entire case was made to the Metropolitan Police on 19 April 2023 (CR:2710712/23). The force's transfer of 2 May 2023, a "skeleton report created at the request of CN OPS", recorded the offence as "Sexual Assault on a Female", the victim as "Senn JACQUES", the suspect as "Unknown", and the allegation as that "she was abused by her school teacher", although the caller was a man, reporting abuse by a named male teacher, at a boys' boarding school, whose convictions for raping male pupils there the operator had located within the same log. The victim's sex was inverted, his name corrupted, and a recently imprisoned, publicly identified suspect recorded as unknown, in the founding document of the case. Central North, the command that produced this record, is the same command that received the January 2024 report, conducted the 2024 investigation, reviewed it, and handled the complaint about it.

9.2.2 Closure at speed; disclosure withheld. Crime 2700409/24 was reported on 1 or 6 January 2024 (the force's own documents disagree) and closed on 27 March 2024, under twelve weeks for non-recent organised child sexual abuse allegations. On 14 March DS Fraser had announced "I will be making enquiries next week in relation to your mother"; the victim was not told the mother had been located and spoken to until he asked directly on 18 April, and the content has never been disclosed: not in the investigation, not in the complaint (withheld by name, 8 July 2024), and not through a subject access process now in admitted, repeated breach. Either the conversation occurred before closure and the closure communication was materially incomplete, or it occurred after and the case was closed before an announced line of enquiry was complete. The withheld record resolves which.

9.2.3 Contradiction on what was reviewed. 27 March 2024: "A specialist trained officer has reviewed all of the e-mails in this folder and the attachments... found no evidence of indecent images." 23 April 2024, the same DS about the same officer: he "hasn't been able to provide me with full details as he does this type of enquiry on a daily basis and does not recall each individual matter." A definitive negative finding was relied on to close the case; four weeks later the force could not particularise what had been examined.

9.2.4 The password. Fraser, 27 March 2024, in writing: "The password to that e-mail account has been changed to 'Greentree71' I have updated Emily with this information." The subject's rebuttal of 27 June 2024 sets out the fact pattern the complaint report never engaged with: the password was solely his until police attended his home, changed it on his computer, in his presence, for the investigation, and then disclosed the police-set credential to a third party without his consent. Whatever the civil position on the underlying account, the disclosure of a police-generated credential to a third party is a discrete data-protection and property-interference issue, independent of the investigation's merits, and it has never been substantively answered (Section 9.3.4).

9.2.5 The review pre-declared. DI Head, 28 March 2024, before any complaint was recorded: "I will say in advance that I am supportive of the decision to close the investigation." The complaint's outcome head was later determined by adopting that review (Section 9.3.5).

9.2.6 The Turkey disclosure deflected. On 11 July 2024 the subject disclosed in writing that he had been taken to Turkey as a child, drugged and raped, with evidence the trip was organised by his grandfather. The response (Sgt Stubbs, CRU) was: "please attend your local police station... which may involve contact with the Turkish police or Interpol." A

written disclosure of the organised rape of a British child taken abroad was answered with signposting; no crime reference issued from the disclosure in the thread. This engages the recording obligation directly (Section 11.3).

9.2.7 Subject access conduct: three failures, two written admissions, one request chain. (a) 5 September 2025: refusal issued one day after submission. (b) 21 January 2026: second refusal, then in writing, "the refusal was issued in error due an administrative oversight" [sic]. (c) 19 March 2026: "A system issue prevented the updated deadline date from displaying correctly, and a member of staff should have spotted this before the letter was sent." The corrected deadline of 14 April 2026 then passed without disclosure; on 24 June 2026 the force stated it could give no timescale and that "the Information Commissioner was aware of its position."

9.3 Metropolitan Police Service: complaint PC/03332/24 dissected

The Directorate of Professional Standards report of 25 June 2024 is in this file in full. It is analysed here head by head because it is simultaneously the force's formal answer and, on its face, a further exhibit.

9.3.1 Recording pathway and classification. The report records the complaint as made "on 8th April 2024"; the archive contains the complaint email of 15 March 2024 naming the officers. The complaint was recorded on 25 April 2024 under a single head, "Dissatisfaction at the overall outcome", with five concerns agreed only on 30 April after correspondence. It was then "Recorded under Schedule 3 Police Reform Act 2002 - Handled proportionately otherwise than by investigation": a multi-head complaint against named officers concerning a child sexual abuse investigation was resolved without an investigation, by an officer of the same command (DPS PSU Central North) as the subject officers and the reviewing DI, with Mr Jay Chapman as appropriate authority.

9.3.2 Concern 1 (Fraser's conduct): indeterminate, on a contested record. The determination was that the handler had "not been able to determine whether the service provided was acceptable", telephone interactions being "your word against DS Fraser". The report reproduces Fraser's account, including that the subject "threatened to kill yourself" on 30 January 2024, a claim the report itself records the subject denies, and that she ended calls by announcing "I am ending the call". The archive separately contains the subject's contemporaneous documentation of her remark, "Oh, so shall I cancel the entire police investigation then? You don't want any of it?", which the report does not address at all. Every disputed element of this head is resolvable by the telephone recordings and CRIS entries covered by the 15 June 2026 preservation notice; the head was closed instead as undeterminable.

9.3.3 Concern 3 (sequence of outcome notification): determined on the officer's account. Found acceptable on Fraser's statement that she updated Emily

Jacks and the subject the same day, the slight delay to the subject arising from his ISVA's request to prepare him first. Noted for completeness; this head is not pressed.

9.3.4 Concern 2 (the password): a determination resting on a rebutted premise. The report's rationale is explicit: "it is apparent that your sister, Emily is the provider of the BT email account. She is contacted by DS Fraser on your behalf and willingly provides the BT email account and password", and Fraser "shared the password equally with your sister and by your sister's permission afterwards". The premise is internally strained (if the sister supplied the password, she would not need to be informed of it; the report elsewhere accepts the password was changed by police in the course of the investigation) and it was rebutted in writing, precisely and immediately, on 27 June 2024: the password was solely the subject's until police changed it on his computer, in his presence, and police then gave the new, police-set credential to the sister. The rebuttal was answered only with a direction to the appeals process (8 July 2024). A determination whose central factual premise was contradicted in writing within forty-eight hours, and never revisited, is not a resolved complaint; it is an open one with a closed file.

9.3.5 Concern 4 (the outcome): the pre-declared review, adopted. The rationale records that Fraser reviewed the interview and "details there are no clear allegations of sexual assault"; that time passage removed forensic value from the

identified addresses; and concludes "I agree with Detective Inspector Mark Head that a thorough investigation has taken place and there are no line of enquiries outstanding" [sic]. DI Head is the officer who had declared support for the closure in advance and in writing on 28 March 2024. The outcome head of the complaint was therefore determined by adopting a review whose author had prejudged it, and the announced-but-unresolved mother enquiries of 14 March, the unparticularised file review of 9.2.3 and the encrypted-laptop question fall nowhere within it.

9.3.6 Concern 5 (the interview): the report's own admissions. This head, found acceptable, contains the most consequential material in the report. It establishes: the interview took place on 15 February 2024 and ran two hours twenty-three minutes; free recall ended at approximately 53 minutes; TDC Tasselli, the control officer, imposed the break in order to construct an interview plan "as he was unable to complete this in the planning phase", an Achieving Best Evidence planning deficiency recorded in the force's own words; and, decisively, Tasselli's account of the steering: "I accept that I should have taken more steps to ensure I communicated what a focused interview was, as I understand that Mr. Jester interpreted it to mean he was not 'allowed' to speak when in actuality I just wanted to avoid speaking on incidents which had already led to the trial and conviction of others." The incidents that had "led to the trial and conviction of others" are the subject's own abuse at Malsis: prosecuted in respect of other victims, unprosecuted in respect of him, his North Yorkshire case having closed as Outcome 16 three months earlier with the door expressly left open. The Metropolitan Police therefore confined the subject's evidential account away from his own unprosecuted abuse, and the same report records the closure review's conclusion that the confined account contained "no clear allegations of sexual assault". The report also preserves the subject's in-interview distress verbatim (Tasselli "there with a buzzer saying 'NO'"; the "horrible" lift journey; "We don't gel"; being made to feel like a "twat") and Tasselli's acknowledgment of "several miscommunications". What the recording itself shows, including whether specific matters (Malsis School, David Hope, and others) were

named as excluded, is an [A] item resolvable only by the VRI recording, which is preserved by notice and undisclosed (Sections 12 and 13).

9.3.7 What the report never addressed. The "shall I cancel the entire police investigation then?" remark; the content of the Fraser conversation with the mother (expressly withheld on 8 July 2024); and the substance of the 27 June rebuttal. The review window (IOPC, by 6 August 2024) closed with these unexamined.

9.4 Gloucestershire Constabulary

9.4.1 Closure without the suspect or the decisive enquiry. CR/23708/25 was closed on 28 August 2025 ("no reasonable grounds to suspect... the case will now be closed") without the named suspect being interviewed and without the single most probative available step being taken: asking Emily Jacks whether she would consent to a DNA test. The officer's stated position, that "we must have reasonable grounds to suspect a criminal offence has been committed in order to interview a person", treats interview as a reward for evidence rather than a means of obtaining it. The subject's formulation of 3 October 2025 was never answered on its substance: "the decision appears to have been made without questioning the named individuals or taking the simple step of asking whether Emily would consent to a DNA test. That is the most direct way to resolve whether a serious offence occurred." The unresolved question, whether a living person was conceived through the rape of a 14- or 15-year-old, has present-day welfare implications and remains open by the force's choice.

9.4.2 The complaint finalised before the evidence was requested. The Professional Standards finalisation letter for CO/1268/25 is dated 12 November 2025. On 18 November 2025 the reviewing DCI, Shore-Nye, asked the subject to provide the "Admission" email; on 21 November he confirmed the closure. A complaint cannot be reasonably determined before the decision-maker has sought the evidence he himself identified as necessary. When the subject returned in April 2026, the force's first response was that "the date for you to request a review regarding the result has now expired."

9.4.3 "Feeling and not evidence", against the held material. Shore-Nye's characterisation of 21 November 2025, an allegation "based on feeling and not evidence", was made when the record before the force included the alleged written admission ("Tom and Emily were being abused"), the documented DNA result excluding Tom Jacks Sr as Emily's father (in the subject's disclosure list of 3 October 2025), and an outstanding request for the consensual test that would have resolved the matter. Whatever the ultimate evidential merits, "no evidence" was not an accurate description of the file.

9.4.4 The contested statements in the NFA letter, and the 2023 record that rebuts one of them. Complaint CO/443/26 (recorded 30 April 2026 after initial misrouting; IOPC submission acknowledged 8 April 2026, code 7693245) concerns two statements in the 3 October 2025 NFA letter: the recasting of the subject's account of deliberate self-protective behaviour as a passive delusion ("powder in my tea"), and the assertion that his account "may have been shaped by therapeutic suggestion". On the second, the police's own contemporaneous record answers it: the North Yorkshire MG15 of 19 May 2023, taken when the underlying account was given, states "He had never had therapy in his life. The first time he had therapy was this year". The account therefore existed before, or at the very inception of, the first therapeutic contact of the subject's life. A closure rationale attributing the account to

therapeutic suggestion is contradicted by a police record predating the closure by twenty-nine months. The precise formulation to be maintained, and the one absolute phrasing to be corrected in the complainant's own papers, is set out at Section 13.3.

9.4.5 The recorded call of 25 September 2025: the contested assertions, witnessed in construction. The subject audio-recorded the follow-up call promised in the 8 September summary: 25 September 2025, 19:21 to 19:50 BST, DI Ainslie speaking, DS Morgan present by Ainslie's own announcement. The recording, held with a machine transcript (Section 2.1), documents four things in the officers' own words, eight days before the NFA letter issued.

First, an admission of misrepresentation. Challenged on the summary's claim that the subject had asked Alison Jacks for a DNA test and been refused, Ainslie conceded: "I misunderstood that and misrepresented it. So you discussed the situation with Allison, but you haven't actually asked her for DNA."

Second, the provenance of the therapeutic-suggestion assertion, shifting three times within the one call. Ainslie's stated basis moved from Morgan's written report ("Gareth has written a report saying that you had therapy... My interpretation of what he had written is that memories have been implanted on you"), to interpretation alone ("That was my interpretation"), to, when pressed to identify the passage of the report that supported it, a final formulation resting on nothing but the subject's attendance at SurvivorsUK peer-support meetings: "the information came from you... you've had Zoom meetings, group meetings. So in my report, I would have just alluded to the fact that... abuse is being discussed. And as a result of that, memories may have surfaced." The subject stated on the call that the meetings were facilitated survivor peer support, not therapy, and that he was actively seeking therapy against a waiting list; the accuracy safeguard at Section 13.3 governs the absolute phrasing. Eight days later the NFA letter asserted that his account "may have been shaped by therapeutic suggestion". The recording therefore captures the assertion being constructed from a fact that does not support it, by an author who, asked directly, could not locate its documentary basis.

Third, the interview refusal and the undefined threshold. "I'm not going to go and question Allison in relation to the investigation"; "That's not going to happen. If you could come up with some new and compelling evidence for me to consider, I'll reconsider my decision." Asked what form new and compelling evidence would take: "Well, I'm not going to suggest that." Ainslie's description of his own posture, adopting the subject's word: "I doubled down in saying... we've completed our investigation." A threshold the force will neither define nor exemplify is one the complainant cannot be shown to have failed.

Fourth, closure without a statement. The subject, on the recording: "I've never been able to give a statement... I haven't made a statement." Ainslie's answer, "You've had long conversations with Gareth Morgan", was corrected immediately: "I had a conversation with him when I was walking my dog, like a very casual conversation." Neither officer asserts on the recording that any formal statement, ABE interview or visually recorded interview was taken in this strand; the

investigation closed on 28 August 2025, and its NFA letter issued, without one.

9.4.6 Subject access: the self-proving breach. Deadline 13 February 2026. In writing, 17 and 19 February 2026 (Mr J Turner, 245590): "we acknowledge that we have been unable to meet our statutory duty in relation to your request." No disclosure had been made more than four months later. The same email directed complaints exclusively to the ICO, "and not internal Public Feedback Team, Professional Standards Team or Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner": the force declaring itself the wrong door for its own breach.

9.5 Northamptonshire Police

9.5.1 Two years from report to evidential account; three years to nothing. Occurrence 24000017113 carries a 2024-series reference. First substantive officer questions: 29 September 2024. "VRI available dates": 8 November 2024. Interview actually conducted: 5 December 2025. Formal suspect interview promised in writing on 26 November 2025: never held. Closure: 12 June 2026.

9.5.2 The burden inverted. The investigative burden was placed on the complainant's collation work from the outset: "without these enquiries, we will have no further investigative enquiries and will need to file the crime" (29 September 2024); "the crime will be filed pending upon the information we have discussed over the phone" (21 December 2024), before the victim's evidential account had even been taken.

9.5.2A The December 2024 correspondence: the witness shield, the shifting source, and the imported interview. Four days of correspondence in early December 2024 document the force's posture in its own words (the officer in the case signs as PC 1866 Caitlan Dempsey in this period; later correspondence styles her DC). First, contact, reliance and withholding: the officer confirmed in writing that the force had spoken to Ann Edwards and that she supplied the description of "Big Roy" the force did not otherwise hold: "When we have spoken to your mother, she has provided us with the description of Roy as we did not have a thorough description of him. It was through this conversation that we have thought that he is likely to be deceased" (4 December 2024, 17:38). Asked directly what she had said, the officer declined: "I cannot discuss the exact details of the conversation had with your mother as she is a witness" (5 December 2024, 10:40). The classification arc is therefore fully dated: witness (December 2024); suspect the force was seeking to interview (January 2026); person "not fit to be interviewed" (12 June 2026); interviewed at no stage. Second, the shifting source: at 16:09 on 4 December the "elderly" description was attributed to "the witnesses you have provided"; at 17:38, to the mother. Both cannot be complete, and the underlying witness statement is undisclosed (Section 12). Third, the evidential reasoning of 16:09 stands on its own terms: "it is not possible to convict him- unless you are able to provide further information regarding him", a conclusion of impossibility resting on an inference that a man described as elderly decades earlier "may be deceased now", with the burden of displacing it placed on the victim. Fourth, the imported interview: the same email reproduces a Metropolitan Police list of the topics of the 15 February 2024 interview and concludes "there is little gain for speaking on these topics again", so that an interview this force had been told, contemporaneously and in writing, was improperly restricted ("I wasn't allowed to talk about certain things, I was shouted at before we even began, and it was stopped before we'd finished", the subject, 4 December 2024, 17:24) was used to bound the scope of the interview Northamptonshire had yet to conduct (Section 9.3.6). Fifth, the records received without a product: on 5 December the officer was "waiting for Adult Social Services to get back to me" concerning the mother's reported statement to care staff that she "took the blame for everything" [A]; on 6 December she confirmed "I have now received the documents from Social Services and will be reviewing these in the next week", adding "With reference to your mother- I will need to speak with my supervisor regarding the concerns you have raised." The subject asked twice in writing, on 9 and 10 December, whether the documents contained any acknowledgment by his mother. Neither an answer to that question, nor the outcome of the review, nor the supervisor's response appears anywhere in the later disclosed record.

9.5.3 Evidence handling. The Evidential Property Team's written position of 9 June 2025 was that submitted material "may be destroyed" if not collected within 28 days. Complaint CO/540/26 documents the linked event: a package of

childhood letters, school documents and photographs submitted by Brian Larkman, a third party, was hand-returned to the complainant "with a blank compliments slip, no cover letter, no exhibits log, and no chain of custody documentation", including "a photograph explicitly marked 'orgy at number 10' on the reverse". Returning third-party-submitted material of potential evidential significance to the complainant, without exhibit documentation, engages retention and continuity obligations (Section 11.5); the force has not rebutted the account anywhere in the archive.

9.5.4 The 28-day reset doctrine. DI Howe, 23 February 2026, in writing: "every time we contact you our 28 day cycle resets, therefore please consider this when you are seeking further updates." DC Dempsey, 25 February 2026: "I am sent a reminder when 28 days pass, this is when you will be contacted." The Victims' Code entitlement to be informed of developments is thereby inverted: victim-initiated contact becomes a reason to delay updates, and the administrative cycle becomes a ceiling rather than a floor. The documented result: no substantive written update between the 5 December 2025 interview and late April 2026.

9.5.5 Suppression at the decision point. Twenty-seven minutes after the subject finally reached the officer in the case by telephone on 27 April 2026, DI Howe wrote: "I have asked DC Dempsey not to respond directly at this stage", declined the requested call, and imposed, as a condition of receiving further evidence, "An explanation of why it has not previously been provided (...you appear to have held this material for some time...)". The subject's reply of 29 April demonstrated from Howe's

own inbox that the material had been offered on 2 April with an explicit request for secure-handling guidance which went unanswered. The "held for some time" framing was contradicted by the force's own correspondence, and the evidential gate was never withdrawn.

9.5.6 The record the force cannot state. Offence dates recorded as 1988 to 1993 against a reported period of 1981 to 1997, corrected only on the victim's request (19 January 2026). Names garbled in the force's own written summary of 21 May 2026 ("Briam LARKHAM", "Alison JAKUES", "Steve JAKUES"), corrected by the victim on 22 May. Howe, 21 May 2026: "it appears there is some uncertainty regarding which force is owning which investigation." Howe, 4 June 2026: working on "ensuring we can understand exactly what crimes are recorded, against which suspect, and within which force." That is the supervising officer's own description of the state of the record twenty-nine months after the occurrence opened.

9.5.7 The closure of 12 June 2026. The no-further-action email rests on a single operative ground: "We have been unable to interview your mother." It arrives with no disclosed capacity assessment, no indication that the Metropolitan Police's 2024 contact record was obtained or considered, and no engagement with the alternatives to interview (Section 8.3). Its companion sentence is its own commentary: the officer in the case is simultaneously tasked "to continue to seek further information from colleagues around the country to clearly establish which crimes that you have reported... to ensure that they are all accurately recorded". The case was closed before the force had finished establishing what the case was. The rationale letter attached to that email is in this file and is dissected below; the Gloucestershire precedent (Section 9.4.4) demonstrates why NFA letters in this case history must be checked sentence by sentence against the contemporaneous documents, and this one does not survive the check.

9.5.8 The rationale letter of 12 June 2026, dissected. In form this is the most Victims' Code-compliant document any force has produced in the case: ten pages, plain-language structure, named support services including Galop and SurvivorsUK, compensation and civil-order information, complaint routes, and full Victims' Right to Review mechanics with a stated deadline of 12 September 2026. The failures that follow are substantive, and the competent form makes them easier to see.

(a) The acknowledged evidence, and the word doing the work. The letter lists "some useful evidence": "you provided a helpful account of what happened in a visually recorded interview", summarised by the force as covering "rape facilitated by your mother, Ann Edwards", the school abuse, "the abuse from the Freemasons, and the abuse from your

family". Two consequences. First, the organised dimension is confirmed, in a force-authored document, to sit within the formal evidential record. Second, the letter frames the account as "your belief that you had been victim to rape": an epistemic downgrade from account to belief, of a piece with the characterisations under live complaint in Gloucestershire (Section 9.4.4). One word does not make a finding; the continuity is recorded because the pattern is.

(b) The evidential rationale misstates the standard. The operative paragraph rests on two propositions: that the force must "be able to show a complete and coherent explanation of the offences", and that "your age at the time of the alleged offences, and the passage of time since then" cause the difficulty. "A complete and coherent explanation" is not the evidential test; the test is a realistic prospect of conviction on the evidence as a whole, and the Crown Prosecution Service's own

guidance on child sexual abuse cases has, since 2013, directed investigators and prosecutors away from exactly this reasoning: fragmentary recall in adults reporting childhood abuse is expected, is not inherently fatal, and falls to be assessed on overall credibility rather than on assumptions about how memory should behave. The second proposition, that the victim's youth at the time itself weakens the case, inverts the protective purpose of the law: on that logic, the younger the child, the safer the offender. And the standing refutation sits inside this case: David Hope was convicted at trial on accounts of events at the same school, in the same era, decades old. The passage of time did not prevent Bradford Crown Court convicting; it prevented Northamptonshire referring.

(c) The analysis engages no line of corroboration. Nowhere does the letter address a specific investigative avenue: not the contemporaneous disclosure to the suspect recorded in a 2023 police interview; not the "deal with the school" recorded in the same document; not the Metropolitan Police's 2024 account from the suspect herself; not the Larkman material, hand-returned rather than analysed; not the siblings, whom the 2023 record notes were told of the abuse; not school, social-services or medical records. A closure letter that lists "useful evidence" and then finds insufficiency without engaging one concrete avenue is a template conclusion, not an evidential analysis, and it travelled as an attachment to the very email commissioning the work to establish which crimes were recorded at all.

(d) The capacity paragraph. Analysed in full at Section 8.3: the wrong test, the wrong assessor, an undated status, and a fork in which either possible date defeats the closure.

(e) The crime reference. The letter carries crime reference 25000316894, a 2025-series number, for an occurrence (24000017113) opened in early 2024, consistent with the crime number first being provided to the victim on 7 July 2025. On its face, the numbering indicates the crime record was not created until the investigation's second year; the recording audit trail (Section 12) will date it definitively.

(f) The undertakings. The letter undertakes that "we will keep a record of what you have told us" and closes the case "unless new evidence becomes available". Both undertakings fall to be read against the same force's documented recording position (Section 9.5.6) and against the evidential gate of Section 9.5.5, which was never withdrawn.

10. Cross-force patterns

10.1 The mother

Fully set out at Section 8. Every active force has spoken to her or promised to; no force has interviewed her; the two forces holding the content of conversations with her, the Metropolitan Police and Northamptonshire, both withhold it, each having declined in writing and by name ("I do not intend to detail the content of our conversation", 19 April 2024; "I cannot discuss the exact details of the conversation had with your mother as she is a witness", 5 December 2024); the final closure rests on the failure.

10.2 Suspect interviews avoided in every strand

In the entire 2024 to 2026 period, across three forces and multiple named suspects, no interview under caution occurred. The Metropolitan Police declined arrest and interview of the mother ("no necessity"); Gloucestershire never interviewed Alison Jacks, on a stated logic that requires evidence before the step designed to obtain it; Northamptonshire never interviewed anyone, and closed on the non-interview. The single suspect interview in the record, David Hope's on 10 October 2023, produced a prepared denial and preceded the victim's withdrawal by five weeks.

10.3 Closure precedes the evidence

- Met: case closed 27 March 2024 while the announced mother enquiries were unresolved, the password and encrypted-laptop questions open, and the file review unparticularisable four weeks later.
- Gloucestershire: complaint finalised 12 November 2025; the reviewing DCI requested the central document on 18 November 2025.
- Northamptonshire: "the crime will be filed pending upon the information" (December 2024) before the evidential account was taken; the closure of 12 June 2026 issued in the same email that commissioned the work to establish which crimes were recorded; and a rationale letter whose evidential analysis engages no case-specific corroboration line (Section 9.5.8).

10.4 The 28-day machinery, always in the same direction

Fraser, 8 March 2024: updates "in 28 days time" if nothing sooner. Northamptonshire property store, June 2025: collect within 28 days or the material "may be destroyed". Howe, February 2026: contact resets the cycle. Dempsey, February 2026: the day-28 reminder is "when you will be contacted". Gloucestershire PSD, April 2026: the review window "has now expired". The same administrative rhythm functions as an update ceiling, a destruction threat, a reset doctrine and a limitation trap, in each case to the victim's detriment. His contemporaneous account of the lived effect, "when 28 days have passed, she gets a notification... and then that's when she'll remember to message me" [A], matches the doctrine the officers put in writing.

10.5 Subject access obstruction, force-independent and near-simultaneous

Identical requests went to three forces on 12 January 2026. All three produced friction: the Met's two admitted-erroneous refusals, admitted mis-stated deadline, and expiry of the corrected deadline; Gloucestershire's same-day-reversed identity rejection followed by an admitted statutory breach unremedied for months; Northamptonshire's serial identity demands despite holding the deed poll, a closure and reopening, and no disclosure date, past even the maximum lawful extension.

North Yorkshire, requested separately in April 2026, responded late with an unreviewed 383-email corpus behind a non-statutory cap. Coordination is not asserted and is not needed: four independent statutory failures on the records of one case is itself the finding, each evidenced in the forces' own words, and the practical effect is uniform, the records that would test the officers' accounts remain undisclosed.

10.6 Record corruption at every stage

The founding record inverted the victim's sex and name and erased a known suspect (May 2023). One force file records three different sentence lengths for the same offender. The report date of the Metropolitan Police's own 2024 crime is given two different days by two of its officers. The complaint report dates the complaint three weeks after the complaint email in the archive. Northamptonshire's offence dates were wrong by seven years at one end and four at the other until the victim corrected them; its May 2026 summary garbled three names; and in June 2026 it was still establishing "exactly what crimes are recorded, against which suspect, and within which force". Two contested statements in Gloucestershire's NFA letter are the subject of a live fabrication complaint, one of them already contradicted by a 2023 police record and its construction now documented in the complainant's recording of the force's call of 25 September 2025 (Section 9.4.5). Northamptonshire's account of the source of the "Big Roy" description changed within one afternoon: "the witnesses you have provided" at 16:09 on 4 December 2024; "when we have spoken to your mother" at 17:38. Whatever the cause of each instance, the cumulative effect is constant: at no point, in any force, has the official record accurately reflected the allegation as made.

10.7 The complaint system's geometry

The Metropolitan Police complaint was handled within the command of the officers complained about, without investigation, partly on a premise rebutted in writing and never revisited, and partly by adopting a pre-declared review. Gloucestershire finalised before its reviewer sought the evidence, then cited the expired window, then misrouted the fabrication complaint before accepting it. Northamptonshire recorded CO/540/26 into a four-to-five-month backlog and referred the substance to a DCI on the basis that it concerned "a live and sensitive investigation", the same investigation that was closed eight weeks later. The IOPC submission of April 2026 was routed back to the force complained about. At no stage has any element of this case been examined by a body outside the force whose conduct was in question.

11. Statutory, code and procedural breaches

11.1 Data Protection Act 2018, Part 3, section 45 (right of access). Gloucestershire: admitted in writing, 19 February 2026; unremedied at the date of this file. Metropolitan Police: two erroneous refusals admitted in writing; an admitted mis-stated deadline; the corrected deadline of 14 April 2026 missed; no timescale offered as at 24 June 2026. Northamptonshire: identity accepted 17 February 2026; nothing disclosed past even the three-month maximum extension (expired 17 May 2026 on the force's own arithmetic, as put to it on 17 June 2026 and not disputed). North Yorkshire: response late, with apology, and 383 identified emails unreviewed behind an asserted "350 email" cap that appears nowhere in the Act. Two of these are self-proving on the forces' own written admissions.

11.2 Code of Practice for Victims of Crime. Right 2 (crime recorded without unjustified delay): the Turkey disclosure of July 2024 answered with signposting and no reference; the lead force still establishing in June 2026 which crimes are recorded against which suspect. Right 6 (information about the investigation): the documented update vacuum after the December 2025 interview; the written reset doctrine converting the update entitlement into a ceiling. Right 9 and the Victims' Right to Review: closure decisions communicated without the completed record they depend on; the Gloucestershire review window operated against a complaint the force had finalised before seeking the evidence. Complaint CO/540/26 puts its Victims' Code case in its own terms and is pending in backlog. Right 2 is further engaged by the closure letter's own reference: a 2025-series crime number (25000316894) for allegations reported into a 2024-series occurrence, consistent with the crime number first being provided to the victim on 7 July 2025; the recording audit trail (Section 12) will date the record definitively.

11.3 Home Office Counting Rules and the National Crime Recording Standard. The Metropolitan Police's own 2023 transfer invokes HOCR ("transferred to you for recording (as per HOCR)"). Against that standard: the

misclassification at origin; the non-recording of the Turkey disclosure; and the June 2026 admission that recording across forces was still being established.

11.4 PACE Code C and the Mental Capacity Act 2005: the fitness determination. Fitness for interview is an individualised assessment made with an appropriate healthcare professional against the PACE Code C Annex G criteria; for a vulnerable interviewee the Code's response is safeguards, not automatic exclusion. The rationale letter discloses the determination actually made: Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards status, which under the Mental Capacity Act 2005 concerns capacity to consent to care arrangements and is decision-specific and time-specific by statute, was treated, on the advice of a custody sergeant, as meaning the suspect "is not fit to be interviewed". Wrong test, wrong assessor, no individualised assessment disclosed, no date for the status relied on, no reconciliation with the 2024 Metropolitan Police contact or the force's own 2026 informal conversation, and the unassessed non-interview treated as dispositive.

11.5 CPIA 1996 and Management of Police Information: retention and continuity. The written threat to destroy submitted material within 28 days; the hand-return of third-party-submitted material, including an item of facially obvious

evidential significance, without exhibit log or continuity documentation. These are retention and disclosure-integrity issues, not service complaints, and they are unrebutted in the record.

11.6 Police Reform Act 2002, Schedule 3: complaint handling. Handling "otherwise than by investigation" of a multi-head conduct complaint; determination within the subject officers' own command; reliance on a pre-declared review; a determination resting on a rebutted premise never revisited; finalisation before the evidence was sought (Gloucestershire); initial misrouting of a fresh conduct complaint as an out-of-time review. Each is a departure from the reasonable-and-proportionate handling the Schedule requires.

11.7 Data protection: the password disclosure. The disclosure of a police-generated credential to a third party without the subject's consent (27 March 2024, in writing) is a discrete processing event requiring its own lawful basis; none has been articulated beyond the rebutted "provider" premise.

11.8 Article 3 ECHR: the investigative obligation. The state owes a duty to conduct an effective investigation into credible allegations of serious ill-treatment; serious operational failures in the investigation of grave sexual offending can found liability under the Human Rights Act (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis v DSD [2018] UKSC 11). This file does not assert the legal conclusion; it assembles the record against which an instructed solicitor would assess it: a corroborated offending environment, a witness assessed by police as likely decisive never interviewed in three years, an evidential interview steered away from the index abuse, closures preceding the completion of their own predicate enquiries, and the systematic non-disclosure of the records that would permit scrutiny. The one-year Human Rights Act limitation period (extendable at the court's discretion) makes this a time-sensitive assessment; the Northamptonshire closure of 12 June 2026 is a recent, dated decision.

12. The undisclosed records and what each would establish

Every record below is covered by the subject access requests already in breach, by the preservation notices served on 15 June 2026, or by both. Non-production is now a documented choice, not an administrative accident.

Record	Holder	What it would establish
CRIS entries and contact record of the Fraser conversation with Ann Edwards (2024)	Met	The date (before or after the 27 March 2024 closure), the content, and whether the closure communication to the victim was materially incomplete. The single most consequential record in the case (Section 8.4).
VRI recording and interview plan, 15 February 2024, with control-room notes	Met	Whether specific matters (Malsis School, David Hope, and others) were named as excluded; the circumstances of the break; the completeness of the account against which "no clear allegations of sexual assault" was recorded. Resolves the remaining [A] elements of Section 9.3.6.
Complaint-handling audit trail, PC/03332/24	Met	Recording pathway (15 March to 8 April to 25 April to 30 April); head selection; any involvement of subject officers in handling; the treatment of the 27 June 2024 rebuttal.
999/101 call recordings and metadata, all relevant dates	Met, Northants, Glos	The contested telephone interactions of Concern 1; the "shall I cancel" remark; the 27 April 2026 Dempsey call; the alleged number-diversion [A]; the Gloucestershire calls of 8 and 25 September 2025 (the complainant holds his own recording of the latter: Section 9.4.5).
DS Morgan's written report referenced on the 25 September 2025 call ("Gareth has written a report saying that you had therapy"), and any force note or recording of that call	Glos	The documentary basis, if any, for the therapeutic-suggestion assertion, and whether the force's own record of the call matches the complainant's recording. Within the scope of the admitted-breach subject access request (Section 9.4.6).
Capacity actions: the "returned actions", the custody sergeant's advice now relied on in the rationale letter, care-home enquiries (2026)	Northants	Whether any healthcare professional was involved at any point; whether any Annex G-standard assessment of Ann Edwards exists; what material the custody sergeant was given and what advice was recorded.
Any Northamptonshire consideration of the Met's 2024 contact with Ann Edwards	Northants	Whether the closing force ever obtained the record that bears on its stated obstacle. The rationale letter's total silence on the 2024 contact has documented the omission; its absence from the decision is itself a review ground.
The DoLS authorisation(s) for Ann Edwards: date of first authorisation, renewals, and the supporting capacity and best-interests assessments	Supervisory body (local authority) and care home; obtainable by the force	The date decides Finding 2 either way: after the 2024 Met contact and the November 2025 interview promise, the delay consumed the evidence; before them, an account was obtained from her under the same status and the categorical inference collapses.
Occurrence 24000017113 decision log; offence-date	Northants	The basis for closing a line of enquiry on "probably dead" following a statement from the person later

Record	Holder	What it would establish
correction records; the "Big Roy" closure rationale and the Edwards witness statement		treated as the suspect; the audit trail of the misrecorded dates; and the crime-recording history of reference 25000316894 against the 2024-series occurrence.
Property and exhibit records for the Larkman material; the hand-return decision	Northants	Continuity, retention decisions, and who authorised return of third-party material including the marked photograph.
NFA decision log and drafts, CR/23708/25; handling of the "Admission" email; the DNA-request decision	Glos	Authorship and evolution of the two contested statements; what was known of the admission email and the excluded-paternity result at closure; why the consensual test was not sought.
Complaint files CO/1268/25, CO/443/26, CO/540/26, with audit trails	Glos, Northants	The finalisation-before-evidence sequence; the misrouting; the backlog decisions; any contact with subject officers.

Record	Holder	What it would establish
Northamptonshire record of its conversation(s) with Ann Edwards (by December 2024), and the witness statement referenced in the "Big Roy" closure	Northants	Which officer spoke to her, when, in what form and what she said; whether an account was obtained under the status later treated as preclusive; reconciliation of the two attributions of 4 December 2024 (Section 9.5.2A).
The Social Services documents received by the force on 6 December 2024, the record of their review, and the care provider's notes of the mother's reported "took the blame for everything" statement	Northants; Adult Social Services; care provider	What the documents contain concerning Ann Edwards's reported statements; whether the promised review occurred and what it concluded; resolution of the [A] item at Section 13.2.
The 383 unreviewed North Yorkshire emails	NYP	The force-side record of the 2023 investigation, including the interview arrangements, the prison-interview logistics, and any inter-force traffic.
CAID/VID search parameters and result record (2 January 2026)	Northants	What was searched, against what identifiers and age ranges, supporting or qualifying the "no identifiable images" statement.
Leigh Day disclosure bundle, 14 March 2024 (contents confirmed by NYP)	NYP / Leigh Day	Not disclosable under subject access, but its confirmed existence and contents matter to any civil claim; the instructed solicitor should obtain it from the recipient side.

13. Corroboration register and accuracy safeguards

13.1 Formerly uncorroborated items now documented [A to R]

- That the case was recorded as the sexual assault of a female under a wrong name: established by the 2 May 2023 transfer email and STORM persons record, corrected 11 May 2023.
- That the Metropolitan Police interview was steered away from the Malsis matters: established, as to the fact and purpose of steering, by TDC Tasselli's own account in the DPS report ("I just wanted to avoid speaking on incidents which had already led to the trial and conviction of others").
- That the subject's account predates any therapy: established by the MG15 of 19 May 2023.
- That the mother received a contemporaneous disclosure and "had taken a deal with the school": recorded in the MG15; her status as a "disclosure witness" recorded in the supervisor review of 26 November 2023.
- That prospective legal proceedings existed by March 2024: established by North Yorkshire's confirmation of the 14 March 2024 Leigh Day disclosure.
- That David Hope, interviewed in prison, provided a pre-prepared statement and denied the offences: supervisor review, 2 January 2024.
- That the organised dimension forms part of the formal evidential record: the force's own rationale letter of 12 June 2026 summarises the interview account as including "the abuse from the Freemasons".

13.2 Items pending corroboration [A], with the record that resolves each

Assertion (contemporaneous account only)	Resolving record (all preserved by notice)
That specific matters (Malsis School, David Hope, and a third name) were verbally named as off-limits in the 15 February 2024 interview, with the warning that mentioning them "would nullify the entire thing"; and the physical conditions of the interview room	Met VRI recording and interview plan

Assertion (contemporaneous account only)	Resolving record (all preserved by notice)
That a telephone number provided for the investigation was diverted to an unrelated third party	Met telephony records and CRIS contact log
That an officer remarked words to the effect that the subject's mental health had been "weaponised"	Call recordings; CRIS entries
That DS Fraser was at one point the handler of a complaint concerning herself, and that complaints were merged or marked complete irregularly	Met complaint-handling audit trail, PC/03332/24 and related references
That DC Dempsey stated the mother "could have a conversation... like a normal conversation" (the informal conversation itself, and capacity as the sole stated obstacle, are documented via the un rebutted contemporaneous record of 29 April 2026)	Northamptonshire call recording of 27 April 2026; the capacity action records
That an officer attributed delay to the case having been "listed" as the sexual assault of a female by two males (the misclassification itself is now documented at origin)	Northamptonshire and Metropolitan Police classification and audit records
That a member of care staff told the subject that the mother "admitted she 'took the blame for everything'" (the subject's written accounts to the force of 4 and 6 December 2024 are documented and un rebutted; the force's request to Adult Social Services and its stated receipt of documents on 6 December 2024 are documented)	The care provider's notes; the Social Services documents received by the force on 6 December 2024 and the record of their review

None of the pending items is load-bearing for the findings in Section 4. They should not lead any formal document until the resolving records are produced; their evidential role at present is to specify, precisely, what the withheld records are for.

13.3 Accuracy safeguards

The therapy formulation. Complaint CO/443/26 contains the absolute statement "I have never received therapy of any kind." The MG15 records first-ever therapy commencing in 2023 (weekly, with Galop), and DI Ainslie's 8 September 2025 note

records discussion of "the therapy you were receiving". The absolute phrasing is therefore vulnerable and should be corrected by short addendum to the force and the IOPC, in this form: the account predates any therapeutic involvement and was not, and could not have been, shaped by therapeutic suggestion at the time it was given; the police's own record of 19 May 2023 states that the subject had never had therapy before that year. The corrected formulation is stronger than the original, because it is the one the documents prove.

The 25 September 2025 call quotations. Quotations from the recorded call are taken from the machine transcript, which garbles proper names and in places misattributes lines between the two officers; each quoted passage is to be verified against the audio before formal deployment. The call also contains absolute statements by the subject that he had never had therapy, made while distinguishing facilitated peer-support attendance from therapy; the corrected formulation above governs here too. The MG15 records first therapy commencing in 2023, and the evidential point, that the account predates any therapeutic contact, is unaffected by the phrasing.

The 2023 consent posture. Addressed pre-emptively at Section 8.2 and to be addressed pre-emptively in any submission: the non-contact of the mother in 2023 was at the victim's request; every failure after January 2024 occurred against his documented demand.

The Hope sentence figure. Where the sentence is cited, use the judicially accurate form, 17 years' custody with a one-year extended licence, and note that the forces' own records variously state 16, 17 and 18 years.

14. Procedural posture and available routes, as at 4 July 2026

Information Commissioner's Office. Two breaches are self-proving on the forces' written admissions (Gloucestershire, 19 February 2026; the Metropolitan Police's admissions of 21 January and 19 March 2026 plus the missed corrected deadline). Northamptonshire's is proven by its own dates, put to it on 17 June 2026 and not disputed. The Met stated on 24 June 2026 that the Commissioner "was aware of its position". The exhibits for each complaint are the forces' own emails, reproduced at Appendix A.

Victims' Right to Review, Northamptonshire closure of 12 June 2026. The letter sets the mechanics: deadline 12 September 2026, by the force's online route or VRR@Northants.pnn.police.uk, outcome within six weeks. The intention to challenge any capacity-based decision has been on the force's record since 27 April 2026, and the letter's own invited categories ("evidence dismissed or not considered... biases or misunderstandings") describe the grounds this file assembles: the fitness determination made against the wrong legal test, by the wrong assessor, with no individualised assessment disclosed (Section 8.3); the undated DoLS status, whose authorisation date decides Finding 2 whichever way it falls; the 2024 Metropolitan Police account from the suspect neither obtained nor mentioned in the closure document; the Section 4A framework acknowledged in the letter but not applied, leaving the closure to rest on an evidential analysis that engages no case-specific corroboration line and misstates the standard (Section 9.5.8); the unexamined alternatives to interview; the unresolved evidential gates of Section 9.5.5; and the closure's issue in the same email that commissioned the work to establish which crimes were recorded. None of the withheld records is needed to lodge the review: their absence is itself pleaded. File well inside the deadline.

Independent Office for Police Conduct. CO/443/26 is live (recorded 30 April 2026; IOPC submission code 7693245); CO/540/26 is recorded and in backlog with a parallel DCI referral; review rights will arise on each determination. The 13.3 addendum should be filed before any determination on CO/443/26. The PC/03332/24 review window closed on 6 August 2024, but the matters it left unexamined (Section 9.3.7) are pleadable as context in every live process.

Preservation. Notices served on all three active forces on 15 June 2026, covering the full Section 12 inventory, including call recordings whose routine retention windows are short. From that date, non-production is a preservation issue as well as a disclosure one, and any destruction is a documented act after notice.

Civil and Human Rights Act assessment. North Yorkshire's confirmation of the 14 March 2024 Leigh Day disclosure establishes that prospective civil proceedings existed by that date; the instructed solicitor should obtain the disclosed bundle from the recipient side. The Article 3 framework at Section 11.8, and its one-year (extendable) limitation running from identifiable decisions, of which the 12 June 2026 closure is the most recent, make prompt legal assessment the correct next step. This file states the record, not the legal conclusions.

For journalistic verification. Every load-bearing quotation in this file was written by a police force or officer, is dated, and names its author. The verification pathway is: the North Yorkshire disclosure (a statutory document with its own reference), the DPS report (a signed force document), the forces' subject access admissions (their own emails), and the Northamptonshire closure email. The convictions of Hope and Holmes are public record. The subject's uncorroborated assertions are quarantined at Section 13.2 and are not required for any finding.

Appendix A. Key record extracts

Exact transcriptions, including original spelling and grammar. Sources as stated.

"Offence: Sexual Assault on a Female Date: 19/04/2023 Venue: 1, CARR HEAD LANE, GLUSBURN, KEIGHLEY, WEST YORKSHIRE, BD20 8FS Victim: Senn JACQUES Suspect: Unknown Method: Victim alleging that she was abused by her school teacher 21 years ago. This incident is transferred to you for recording (as per HOCR) and any further investigation." E1. *Metropolitan Police transfer email, quoted in the North Yorkshire occurrence log, entry 1, 2 May 2023, 12:12.*

"Classification: AGGRIEVED Gender: FEMALE Name: JACQUES, SENN DoB: 06/09/1981" E2. *North Yorkshire STORM incident report NYP-02052023-0181, persons record, 2 May 2023.*

"THIS IS A SKELETON REPORT CREATED AT THE REQUEST OF CN OPS... I AM NOT THE OIC" E3. *STORM remarks, 2 May 2023, recording the report of PC 257430 J Hesketh, Metropolitan Police.*

"Victim details updated... confirming correct name for victim is Fenn JACQUES and their gender is male" E4. *North Yorkshire occurrence log, CROMU update, 11 May 2023.*

"He spoke to his mum, and something happened there. His mum was his best friend, but he hasn't seen her since he was 13. He told her and he found out she had taken a deal with the school, something happened." E5. *North Yorkshire MG15 record of interview, 19 May 2023, pages 4 to 5.*

"He had never had therapy in his life. The first time he had therapy was this year, a charity called Gallop- Sexual Assault Charity- sees them every week." E6. *North Yorkshire MG15 record of interview, 19 May 2023, page 5.*

"At the time the police spoke to Fenn when the initial investigation went on with regards to [a second teacher] being found with images- he did not mention to the police what had happened to him" E7. *North Yorkshire MG15 record of interview, 19 May 2023, page 4 (name redacted in the disclosure).*

"Fenn called Childline about what had happened... Childline never made contact or followed it up." E8. *North Yorkshire MG15 record of interview, 19 May 2023, page 4.*

"The suspect in the case is currently serving a sentence for historical sexual abuse at the school." E9. *North Yorkshire initial investigation plan, occurrence log, 24 May 2023.*

"Fenn states he does not want his mum being contacted, he hasn't had contact with her since he was 13. He did however disclose to his mum around that time what happened and it has been stressed to Fenn that we do really need to make contact with her." E10. *North Yorkshire occurrence log, investigator action, 12 October 2023.*

"To put it bluntly, the emotional strain of this process increases the risk of me having suicidal thoughts. For the sake of my well-being and safety, I need to be able to make an informed decision about what's happening." E11. *The subject's email via his ISVA, quoted in the occurrence log, 8 November 2023.*

"I replied to Fenn stating that if we are able to speak to his mum and obtain as much evidence as possibly, it is likely the CPS will charge, especially as he has bad character." E12. *North Yorkshire occurrence log, officer in the case, 8 November 2023.*

"...the fact that he does not want the police to speak to his mum who is a disclosure witness." E13. *North Yorkshire supervisor review, 26 November 2023.*

"He does not want her contacting and understands this would be an enquiry the CPS would be likely to ask for to consider charges." E14. *North Yorkshire finalisation request, 31 December 2023.*

"The suspect has been interviewed in prison and gave a pre prepared statement and denied the offences." E15. *North Yorkshire supervisor review, 2 January 2024 (disposal: Outcome 16, sexual assault on a male child under 13).*

"I will not be arresting your mother because there is no necessity to do so.... I will be making enquiries next week in relation to your mother." E16. *DS Gemma Fraser, Metropolitan Police, 14 March 2024.*

"we have completed all reasonable lines of enquiry in this investigation and we are not able to progress this any further.... A specialist trained officer has reviewed all of the e-mails in this folder and the attachments... found no evidence of indecent images.... The password to that e-mail account has been changed to 'Greentree71' I have updated Emily with this information." E17. *DS Gemma Fraser, closure email, 27 March 2024.*

"I will say in advance that I am supportive of the decision to close the investigation." E18. *DI Mark Head, Metropolitan Police, 28 March 2024.*

"As confirmed previously, I have spoken to your mother, she did not provide any further information that assisted me in progressing the investigation. I do not intend to detail the content of our conversation." E19. *DS Gemma Fraser, 19 April 2024.*

"I accept that I should have taken more steps to ensure I communicated what a focused interview was, as I understand that Mr. Jester interpreted it to mean he was not 'allowed' to speak when in actuality I just wanted to avoid speaking on incidents which had already led to the trial and conviction of others." E20. *TDC Tasselli's account, DPS complaint report PC/03332/24, 25 June 2024, Concern 5.*

"The break was implemented so TDC Tasselli could spend some time developing a structure for the interview as he was unable to complete this in the planning phase." E21. *DPS complaint report PC/03332/24, 25 June 2024, Concern 5.*

"In the review she details there are no clear allegations of sexual assault."

E22. *DPS complaint report PC/03332/24, 25 June 2024, Concern 4, recording DS Fraser's closure review of the interview account.*

"Miss Jacks never had the password to the BT email/data account. The password was solely in my possession until the police took my Mac computer away. During this event, at my home, the police changed the password in front of me, on my computer, to one that they would use for their investigation. This newly set password by the police was then given to Miss Jacks, not by my consent, but by the police." E23. *The subject's written rebuttal to the DPS report, 27 June 2024.*

"Certain aspects of this report will not be disclosed to you... in particular what was spoken between your mother and DS Fraser." E24. *PC Rita Panteli, Metropolitan Police DPS, 8 July 2024.*

"In the absence of any specific recollection of Alison JACKS committing a sexual act upon you and dearth of evidence... no reasonable grounds to suspect... the case will now be closed." E25. *DS Gareth Morgan, Gloucestershire Constabulary, 28 August 2025.*

"I misunderstood that and misrepresented it. So you discussed the situation with Allison, but you haven't actually asked her for DNA." E26. *DI Rory Ainslie, recorded call of 25 September 2025 (machine transcript; audio held), conceding the 8 September summary's account of the DNA request.*

"Gareth has written a report saying that you had therapy... My interpretation of what he had written is that memories have been implanted on you." E27. *DI Rory Ainslie, recorded call of 25 September 2025, first stated basis for the therapeutic-suggestion assertion.*

"the information came from you... you've had Zoom meetings, group meetings. So in my report, I would have just alluded to the fact that... abuse is being discussed. And as a result of that, memories may have surfaced." E28. *DI Rory Ainslie, recorded call of 25 September 2025, final stated basis for the same assertion, after being pressed to identify the passage of the report supporting it.*

"That's not going to happen. If you could come up with some new and compelling evidence for me to consider, I'll reconsider my decision."... "And what kind of form would new and compelling evidence take?"... "Well, I'm not going to suggest that." E29. *Recorded call of 25 September 2025: DI Ainslie declining to question Alison Jacks; the subject's question; the refusal to specify the threshold (attributed in the transcript to DS Morgan).*

"I have not had long conversations with Gareth Morgan. I had a conversation with him when I was walking my dog, like a very casual conversation." E30. *The subject, recorded call of 25 September 2025, correcting the assertion that conversations with the officer in the case stood in place of a formal statement.*

"we acknowledge that we have been unable to meet our statutory duty in relation to your request" E31. *Mr J Turner (245590), Gloucestershire Information Disclosure Unit, 19 February 2026 (also 17 February 2026).*

"every time we contact you our 28 day cycle resets, therefore please consider this when you are seeking further updates." E32. *DI Ben Howe, Northamptonshire Police, 23 February 2026.*

"A system issue prevented the updated deadline date from displaying correctly, and a member of staff should have spotted this before the letter was sent... The deadline you have is not the extended one." E33. *Metropolitan Police Data Rights Team, 19 March 2026.*

"I have asked DC Dempsey not to respond directly at this stage... An explanation of why it has not previously been provided (...you appear to have held this material for some time...)" E34. *DI Ben Howe, 27 April 2026, twenty-seven minutes after the subject's call with DC Dempsey.*

"it appears there is some uncertainty regarding which force is owning which investigation."... "ensuring we can understand exactly what crimes are recorded, against which suspect, and within which force." E35. *DI Ben Howe, 21 May 2026 and 4 June 2026.*

"We have been unable to interview your mother, and having reviewed the evidence in this case, I have decided to take no further action.... I have also asked DC Dempsey to continue to seek further information from colleagues around the country to clearly establish which crimes that you have reported. This is to ensure that they are all accurately recorded and so that we can provide you with any reference numbers for your own records." E36. *DI Ben Howe, no-further-action email, 12 June 2026, 17:02, with attachment "NFA Letter Fenn Jester.docx".*

"Under Subject Access we are only required to review up to 350 emails. As this search exceeds this amount I have not reviewed the results."... "I can confirm that a disclosure was made to Leigh Day solicitors on 14 March

2024... Disclosure has been deemed necessary for the purpose of, or in connection with, legal proceedings (which includes prospective legal proceedings)." E37. *Carly Busfield, North Yorkshire Police Civil Disclosure Unit, subject access response CDU/CXB/SAR/85463, 2 June 2026.*

"As a part of this investigation, we had hoped to interview your mother to discuss the allegations made against her, but we have been unable to do so. As per our e-mails exchanged and conversation on 13th May 2026 the investigating officer had concerns regarding the capacity of your mother to be interviewed about her involvement in these offences. We have now been able to establish that she is subject to Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)... Having sought advice from a Custody Sergeant on this matter, this means that your mother is not fit to be interviewed." E38. *Northamptonshire Police no-further-action rationale letter, 12 June 2026, DI Ben Howe (X0232), crime reference 25000316894.*

"You have stated that Section 4A Criminal Procedure (Insanity) Act 1964 allows for a "trial of the facts," and that you expect this case to be presented to the CPS. However, this provision does not negate the requirement for the prosecution to establish a realistic prospect of conviction based on evidence which is where the challenge lies in this case for the above reasons." E39. *Northamptonshire Police no-further-action rationale letter, 12 June 2026.*

"While you provided as much detail as possible, there is a concern that we cannot reach the level of evidence required. In particular we need to be able to show a complete and coherent explanation of the offences which you were victim to. Due to your age at the time of the alleged offences, and the passage of time since then this unfortunately causes us some difficulty in progressing the case to charge." *E40. Northamptonshire Police no-further-action rationale letter, 12 June 2026, evidential rationale.*

"you provided a helpful account of what happened in a visually recorded interview.... you spoke your childhood and about your belief that you had been victim to rape facilitated by your mother, Ann Edwards and how it had, and continues to affect you.... you explained your difficult upbringing and the abuse you suffered and school [sic], the abuse from the Freemasons, and the abuse from your family." *E41. Northamptonshire Police no-further-action rationale letter, 12 June 2026, "useful evidence" summary of the 5 December 2025 interview account.*

Appendix B. Reference index

Force / body	References
Metropolitan Police	Crime CR:2710712/23 (reported 19 April 2023; transferred to North Yorkshire 2 May 2023). Crime 2700409/24 (reported 1 or 6 January 2024; closed 27 March 2024). Complaint PC/03332/24 (report 25 June 2024; review window to 6 August 2024; appropriate authority Mr Jay Chapman). Right of access: 01/ROA/25/114868/M (2025); 01/ROA/26/123648/U and 01/ROA/26/123653/R (2026; corrected deadline 14 April 2026, missed; status email 24 June 2026).
North Yorkshire Police	STORM NYP-02052023-0181 (2 May 2023). Occurrence 12230078064 (Outcome 16, 2 January 2024). Subject access CDU/CXB/SAR/85463 (request 15 April 2026; response 2 June 2026). Third-party disclosure to Leigh Day solicitors, 14 March 2024, under DPA 2018 Schedule 2, Part 1, paragraph 5(3).
Gloucestershire Constabulary	Crime CR/23708/25 (reported 24 June 2025; closed 28 August 2025; NFA letter 3 October 2025). Complaints CO/1268/25 (recorded 3 November 2025; finalised 12 November 2025) and CO/443/26 (recorded 30 April 2026; IOPC submission 8 April 2026, code 7693245). Subject access W1123/25 / SAR_26_011 / SAR_26_019 (due 13 February 2026; breach admitted 17 and 19 February 2026). Recorded telephone call of 25 September 2025 (complainant's audio, 19:21 to 19:50 BST, with machine transcript).
Northamptonshire Police	Occurrence 24000017113 (opened 2024); crime reference 25000316894 (per the NFA letter; a 2025-series number). VRI 5 December 2025; NFA 12 June 2026 with rationale letter of the same date; Victims' Right to Review deadline 12 September 2026. Complaint CO/540/26 (recorded 13 to 15 April 2026; OPFCC acknowledgment 14 April 2026). Subject access 16261/25, AD 17589-25, AD26334/26 (identity accepted 17 February 2026; maximum extension expired 17 May 2026; final-deadline notice 17 June 2026; force reply 18 June 2026).
SurvivorsUK	ISVA case references 8818 and 9586; CRN 12230078064; subject access print record dated 21 December 2023.
Preservation notices	Served 15 June 2026 on the Metropolitan Police, Northamptonshire Police and Gloucestershire Constabulary, covering the inventory at Section 12.

End of case file. Prepared 5 July 2026; revised 21 July 2026; revised 10 August 2026 to incorporate the Northamptonshire Police correspondence of 4 to 6 December 2024, drawn from the archive cited at Section 2.1. Quotations are exact transcriptions from the records identified in Section 2; [A]-flagged matters are set out, and quarantined, at Section 13.2.