

## **Overview:**

The attached storm report has been altered, I believe to cover up serious crime.

I will provide proof that this storm report has been altered and have attached all the paperwork that I refer to.

## **Proof the Storm report is faked:**

1. In the storm report under the heading of received it states that the report was received at 22:58:20.

The incident log which shows that the first entry was made at 22:29:08.

The first entry was made 29 minutes before the storm report was received, (the storm report is attached at pages 7 and 8).

2. In the storm report under the heading type of offense, the report shows: "A-ASB" which I believe stands for anti-social behavior.

The storm report states that the lady:

***"JUST WISHED FOR OFFICERS TO ATTEND TO TAIT'S ADDRESS, AND POLITELY ASK HIM NOT TO TEXT HER",***

which I am informed would be recorded as "WOA", (words of advice).

Yet in various statements made by the two officers, they say that the lady made a complaint of harassment, which I am informed would be recorded as "HARASS1".

3. I made a subject access request dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018, the subject access report it states:

*"Within your SAR you requested any information regarding complaints made against you in the last year (2017 to 2018) and specifically to a complaint that led to two officers attending your home address.*

*I have conducted an extensive search across our systems and am unable to find any data relating to your request. All search results have resulted in no information being held or recorded",* (the subject access request is attached at page 9).

4. Police computers maintain records that are secure, accurate, dated and timed.
5. The data controller who processed my subject access request had my correct name and address, both were spelt correctly.
6. The Storm report is dated 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 it also contains my correct name and address, both spelt correctly.

7. For both records to exist on the police computer the storm report must have been altered sometime after 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018.
8. The storm report states that PC 854 Matthew Jones was the officer the lady spoke with, however she would have spoken with a non police worker at the front desk before speaking with PC Jones.
9. Why would the front desk worker who has been trained in recognizing incidents that are serious and those that are not, call PC Jones to the front desk after the lady said she received a single text message from me, that was described in the storm report as **“NOT HARASSING OR DISTRESSING”**?
10. If the lady simply wanted words of advice, why did PC Jones allocate the incident to himself and a colleague? The storm report shows that both police officers went immediately to my house at 22.32pm.
12. The timings in the storm report do not allow enough time for the two officers to log off the police computer, do everything they are recorded as doing, and then log back on to the police computer. I have gone into more detail towards the rear, (pages 10 and 11)
13. I examined the metadata in the copy of the document I was given, it showed that there were 2,794 characters with spaces in the original storm report.

When I checked how many characters with spaces there were using word, there were 2,602 characters with spaces.

That is a difference of 192 characters with spaces, in the police report there are an average of 38 characters to a line. The missing characters are the equivalent of around 5 lines of text.

14. In today's age a person can simply block another person from contacting them, yet the storm report states that the lady, who lives and works 15 miles away in Swansea, called at the front desk of Ammanford police station at 22:29 pm, (it can be seen within crime management system DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C on page 12 that she lives in Swansea).
15. When I requested copies of the relevant pages of the officers note books they were not supplied even though I have a legal right to them.
16. When I requested a copy of the officers body worn camera footage, I was not supplied with any footage.
17. It stands to reason that if their was no complaint made, no crime had been committed and the matter would not be recorded in a storm report.

### **The crime management report:**

A document was given to me named “Crime management system DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C”, it had been heavily redacted. When the redaction was removed the complete version of events could be seen.

PC 854 Matthew Jones updated the log, at the end of the document a supervising officer comments, that the lady in question only wanted “*words of advice*”. (page 21)

### **What the storm reports states compared with various other documentation:**

Although the official version of events recorded in the storm report states that the lady “*JUST WISHED FOR OFFICERS TO ATTEND TO TAIT’S ADDRESS, AND POLITELY ASK HIM NOT TO TEXT HER*” the documented comments of the two officers show a complaint of harassment was actually made:

- In Storm report DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C, it mentions that a complaint of harassment was made and was recorded as harassment, by the same lady on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2018, the officer that attended was PC 854 Matthew Jones.  
(attached on page 12 and 13 )
- \*\*\* *has complained* that this behavior amounts to *harassment* and has caused her alarm and distress, and would like Mr Tait warned under the harassment Act.  
(attached at page 17)
- It has been agreed with Mrs Berna Jones that she will be updated in accordance with VCOP (Victims Code of Practice) and she would like to be informed via telephone *as soon as the PIN has been issued* on Mr Tait.  
(this was prior to me being interviewed, and can be seen on page 14).
- Victim has been made aware that incident will be progressed on the 29<sup>th</sup> August 2018  
(contained within crime management system DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C on page 15)
- She has been updated and informed that I have spoken to Mr Tait and arranged for him to attend Ammanford police station on 13<sup>th</sup> August following return from annual leave. She is happy with update.  
(attached at page 15)
- TAIT refused to see that this behavior though, *amounted to harassment* and that this did not appear to be harassing according to him.  
(attached at page 18)
- *Injured person* has been updated via text message awaiting supervisor review and whether Mr Tait will be *reported for the offense of harassment*.  
(attached at page 15)
- *Injured person* believed that Mr Tait’s actions, letters and e-mails have *caused harassment, alarm and distress*.  
(attached at page 20)

- Her ex-partner was also spoken to as he also visited Ammanford police station on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2018, he was also fully updated. He has no right to my information and there had never been a complaint made according to police records.  
(contained within crime management system DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C on page 16)
- PC 854 Matthew Jones partner that day was PC 507 Davies he is documented as saying “we were there to issue him with words of advice only following a complaint of harassment made against him?”
- In a letter from my solicitor dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2018, he states  
“We write further in relation to the allegation of Harassment”  
(attached at page 22)

If we presume that the date on the storm report must be correct, the storm report could not have related to me when I made the subject access request.

### **Other events involving the same policemen.**

In addition to the two officers calling to my former house, they later returned and sat me in the back of a police car for around 15 minutes in front of my house.

Inside the police car they told me that I had to attend what they referred to as a voluntary interview or I would be arrested, even though the police paperwork states that no complaint had been made against me.

There is no record of me being spoken to in the back of a police car on the police computer, the police told me they were making further inquiries and would get back to me. I have not heard anything since.

The day before the voluntary interview it was agreed that PC Jones would not be the interviewing officer, yet on the day he was at the police station waiting to interview me.

I had a solicitor and he spoke with a Sergeant at the station and he arranged for another officer to interview me.

Even though PC Jones had not been present at the interview and had not spoken with the interviewing officer, it was PC Jones who wrote up the interview notes.

### **Suggestions that we have “mental health issues”**

Other police documents strongly suggest that both I and my wife have “mental health issues”, this is totally untrue.

There were no comments suggesting that I had mental health issues when two police officers came to my house, spoke to me in the back of a police car or when I attended a “voluntary” interview.



The “mental health issues” comments only started to appear after we attempted to make our suspicions known. A letter from my doctor shows that I am not on any medication for any form of mental health issue, nor have I ever been.

One document written by Inspector Mark Davies stated that I had been seen by the mental health crisis team in Ammanford, (see page 23)

I made a complaint regarding what the inspector had said and the police apologized stating “there’s clearly been some confusion and an error has been made on the part of Inspector Davies”, (see page 24)

**Why I consider serious crime is, or was, taking place:**

I recorded many bizarre noises at my former property, but they were dismissed by the police.

Strong chemical gas came into my house, we believe it was an effort to kill us.

We reported the incident to the police, again it was not taken seriously.

After we decided to leave our house two cars tried to run us off the road, this time we did not report the matter to the police as we had formed the opinion that we were being ignored by them.

Although I had not mentioned this to my son, he told me that at around the same time, someone tried to run him off the road. He told us who he thought it was, the person he named was the partner of the person who tried to run us off the road.

My wife Christine has kept diaries from 2018 to date, in those diaries she has recorded what happened during the three years that we lived in the back of a van, fearful of what might happen.

After a supporter had recorded noises that sounded like gunshots, Inspector Mark Davies stated that “we have not had any reports of semi-automatic gunfire or shotgun discharges in the Ammanford area recently”.

Three people were trying to report those noises, in one recording, in between the gunshots screams can be heard, (see page 25)

Many people went to my former house and recorded noises for themselves.

We recently made a 40 minute documentary “The Ammanford Untouchables” and posted it onto our YouTube channel. In the documentary nine of the people who recorded noises share their experiences.

<https://youtu.be/eQvcSSI2GJo>

A short 2 minute compilation of some of the noises recorded can be heard here:

<https://youtu.be/G1ojb2q2Utg>

Our YouTube channel is at:

<https://www.youtube.com/c/AlanTaitAmmanford>

I state that the contents of this letter are honest and truthful to the best of my knowledge.

Alan Tait

[contactalantait@gmail.com](mailto:contactalantait@gmail.com)

This document is also available on our website:

<https://thealtarican.co.uk/documents/alteredststormreport.pdf>

**Note by me:** I removed the redaction in this document, although I have replaced the complaints name with \*\*\*

Received: **03/07/2018 22:58:20** Type: **A-ASB** Source: **VISITOR** Priority: **3**  
Dispatch Level: **AAA** Beat: **150** Disposition Code: **ASB PERSONAL** Tags:  
Location of Incident: **20 COLLEGE ST**  
**AMMANFORD SA18 3AF**  
Location Comments:  
Complaint Details: **\*\*\* (Ladies name and mobile telephone number)**  
Incident Log

Incident Log

Comment	Date	Time	User
CALLER HAS ATTENDED AT AA STATION AT FRONT DESK STATING THAT SHE HAS HAD A TEXT MESSAGE FROM AN ALAN TAIT	03/07/2018	22:29:08	84036
**** STATED THAT THERE IS AN ONGOING COUNTY COURT CASE (CIVIL) WHICH IS BEING HEARD ON 13TH JULY.	03/07/2018	22:31:44	84036
SHE HAS COME TO THE STATION STATING THAT TAIT HAD TEXT HER IN RELATION TO THE COURT CASE.	03/07/2018	22:31:44	84036
THE CONTENT OF THE MESSAGE WAS NOT HARASSING OR DISTRESSING, HOWEVER, *** WAS UNAWARE THAT TAIT HAD HER PHONE NUMBER.	03/07/2018	22:31:46	84036
++	03/07/2018	22:32:52	84036
*** JUST WISHED FOR OFFICERS TO ATTEND TO TAIT'S ADDRESS, AND POLITELY ASK HIM NOT TO TEXT HER UNTIL AT LEAST THE COURT CASE WAS OVER,	03/07/2018	22:32:52	84036
AS SHE DID NOT WANT TO IMPLICATE HERSELF IN ANY WAY BY RESPONDING TO TAIT.	03/07/2018	22:47:28	84036
+++			

854/507 ATTENDED AND SPOKEN TO MR TAIT, WHO WAS QUITE ANIMATED UPON OFFICERS EXPLAINING THE REASON FOR THE CALL. FOLLOWING A LENGTHY DISCUSSION OFFICERS REASONED WITH MR TAIT	03/07/2018	22:50:05	84036
AND ADVISED HIM NOT TO MAKE DIRECT CONTACT WITH *** UNTIL THE COURT CASE HAD BEEN HEARD ON 13TH JULY.	03/07/2018	22:50:05	84036
++++	03/07/2018	22:53:44	84036
*** HAS BEEN UPDATED AND MESSAGE CAN BE CLOSED	03/07/2018	22:57:06	84036
CIVIL MATTER IS IN RELATION TO PROPERTY 20 & 22 COLLEGE STREET FOR REFERENCE PURPOSE.	03/07/2018	22:57:41	84036
VULNERABLE=N	03/07/2018	22:58:20	84036
NPT AC TAG ADDED	03/07/2018	22:58:20	84036
TRANSFER TO CRB FROM TERMINAL WEBSTORM4 FOR FORCED CONTROL	03/07/2018	22:58:34	84036
TRANSFER ACCEPTED AT TERMINAL CRB999 FOR FORCED CONTROL	03/07/2018	22:58:34	84036
TRANSFERRED BY WEBCC3	03/07/2018	22:58:34	84036
AC NPT NOTED	04/07/2018	08:18:02	50392
NPT AC TAG DELETED	04/07/2018	08:18:08	50392
NPT AT TAG ADDED	04/07/2018	11:49:01	53822
# Arrests # Cautions # Reports	04/07/2018	11:51:09	53692
Disposition code: 320	04/07/2018	11:51:09	53692
NSIR Qualifiers: NONE	04/07/2018	11:51:09	53692
DP-20180703-501 HAS BEEN DISPOSED	04/07/2018	11:51:09	53692

The above information is subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act, 2018 and must not be used for any purpose other than that for which it is requested. The Data must not be disclosed to an unauthorised person and there is an obligation upon you to ensure that appropriate security measures are taken in respect of it and its disposal.

**Data Protection - Information Management**

Mr Alan Delaney Tait  
20 College Street  
Ammanford  
Carmarthenshire  
SA18 3AF

11<sup>th</sup> July 2018

Our Ref: 189713

Dear Mr Tait,

**Re: Data Protection Act 2018 – Subject Access Application**

I acknowledge receipt of the Subject Access Request relating to you, received into the Data Protection Department on the 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018 in which you request access to information, which may or may not be held about you on Police Systems.

Within your SAR you requested any information relating to complaint(s) made against you during the last year (2017-2018) and specifically to a complaint which led to two Officers attending your home address.

I have conducted an extensive search across our systems and am unable to find any data relating to your request. All search results have resulted in no information held or recorded.

If you wish to discuss my findings further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Under the terms of the Data Protection Act 2018, there is a right of complaint to the Information Commissioner if you are dissatisfied with the decision made in relation to your request. The address for the Information Commissioner is:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
CHESHIRE  
SK9 5AF

Yours sincerely



Selina Barnes  
Penderfynydd Datgelu /Decision Maker  
Adran Rheoli Gwybodaeth / Information Management Department  
Heddlu Dyfed Powys /Dyfed Powys Police



Heddlu Police  
**DYFED  
POWYS**

**Mark Collins**

Prif Gwnstabl/Chief Constable

Pencadlys Heddlu Dyfed-Powys,  
Blwch Post 99, Llangynnwr, Caerfyrddin, SA31 2PF.

Dyfed-Powys Police Headquarters,  
PO Box 99, Llangunnor, Carmarthen, SA31 2PF.

- Ffôn/Tel : 101
- DX : Dyfed-Powys Police DX 120325 Carmarthen 4



Prif Gwnstabl Chief Constable Mark Collins, BSc

Pencadlys Heddlu, Blwch SB 99, Llangynnwr, Caerfyrddin. SA31 2PF  
Police Headquarters, PO BOX 99, Llangunnor, Carmarthen. SA31 2PF

Mae Heddlu Dyfed-Powys yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg a Saesneg. Byddwn ni'n sicrhau ein bod ni'n ymateb yn eich dewis iaith ac ni fydd oedi mewn perthynas ag unrhyw ohebiaeth drwy'r Gymraeg.  
Dyfed-Powys Police welcomes correspondence in Welsh and in English, and we will ensure that we respond to any correspondence through the language of your choice. Corresponding via the medium of Welsh will not endure any delay.



From Storm report DP-20180703-501 dated 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2018

22:29:08 The policeman taking the statement was in Ammanford Police station at the front desk. In under 4 minutes, the officer has spoken with the lady, logged the details and then immediately leaves the station to talk to me

22:32:52 He would have to:

- Decide that the incident was serious enough to justify the immediate dispatch of two officers to my house.
- Contacted his partner and organized a car.
- Walked from the front desk, through the security door, across the waiting area and then through the front door of Ammanford police station.
- Once outside he would need to walk to the car park, unlock the car, and adjust the seat and the mirrors.
- Start the car and drive out of the car park.
- Drive to my former house which according to AA route finder takes three and a half minutes each way, a round trip of 7 minutes
- Park the car near my former house and knock on the front door that protected the alleyway to my house.
- He would then have to wait until I came from inside the house, walked down a flight of stairs and unlocked the front door to the house.
- Once in the alleyway the officer would have had to wait while I walked around 30 meters to the door that protected the alleyway and unlock it.
- Then they would have to explain the reason for their call and ask if they come inside my former house, of course if the true reason for the visit as stated in the storm report was to *politely ask me not to text someone*, they would have had no need to enter the property.
- Then they would have to step inside the alleyway and wait while I locked the door.



- Then they would have had to walk around 30 meters to my front door, go through the front door and wait for me to lock that door.
- Then they would have had to walk up a flight of stairs and into the room.
- In the storm report the officers are documented as having “*A LENGTHY DISCUSSION*” follow me down the alleyway to the front door and up a flight of stairs.

Yet by 22:47:28 he was back at the station writing up details of the officers visit, that gave them just over 14 minutes to achieve everything.

If the 7 minutes for the driving time is taken off, they are left with just over 7 minutes to achieve everything else.

It is simply not possible for the officers to have carried out what is documented in that storm report.

What would be considered a “*A LENGTHY DISCUSSION*”?

Perhaps a discussion of as little as 5 minutes, but personally I consider a lengthy discussion to be at least ten minutes long.

STORM Reference No.  
Linked to Domestic

Crime Ref: DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C

H.O. Class

**08L**

Offence

**HARASS1 Harassment**

Offence Code

**HARASS1**

Beat Code

**150**

**Crime Status: 15 Victim supports action but evidential difficulties**

**Vehicles Involved**

*Vehicle (1)*

Officer in Case: **854 PC Jones**

Reported on **20/07/2018** at **09:00**

##OFFDATE##

Offence Location: **20, COLLEGE STREET, AMMANFORD, CARMARTHENSHIRE, SA183AF**

Scene attended by: **PC Jones 854**

### Victim Information

Name: [REDACTED]

Date of Birth: [REDACTED]

Religion: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] **SWANSEA, SA3 4D\***

Home Telephone:

Work Telephone:

Mobile Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Language Spoken: [REDACTED]

Preferred MOC: [REDACTED]

Impact VS: [REDACTED]

Officer Feelings: [REDACTED]

Victim a Vulnerable Witness - [REDACTED]

Victim an Intimidated Witness - [REDACTED]

Does the IP object to being referred to the Victim Support Co-ordinator? [REDACTED]

Self Assessment Ethnic Code: [REDACTED]

Officer's View of Ethnicity: [REDACTED]

## Risk Assessment - Stalking Harassment

8. Does stalking feature as part of the offence?

NO

A Scientific Support Officer has NOT been requested to examine this scene

This scene has NOT been examined by a Scene Examiner because **SCENE NOT PRESERVED**

Account of Crime

There has been a long standing dispute between both parties over access at the given location.

Following the civil court case the alleged offender has placed a notice on his door revealing all of the injured person's details.

This is a second incident that has been reported by the injured person which has caused the injured person to feel harassed.

### No Alleged Offender Information Held

#### Suspect (1)

Name: **ALAN TAIT (DOB 19/10/1956)**

Sex: **Male**

Self Assessment Ethnic Code: **White - British**

Officer's view of Ethnicity: **WHITE - NORTH EUROPEAN** Note: I am white and English

Height: (Imperial) **Unknown**, (Metric) **Unknown**


Approx. age: **61**

#### Note by me:

PC Jones clearly states that this is the second incident, it follows that the prior incident would have been recorded in the altered storm report.

In the storm report on page 7, the type of offense was recorded as "A-ASB" (antisocial behavior) and not "HARASS1" (Harassment), that storm report states that the complainant 'just wished for officers to attend Tait's address, and politely ask him not to text her', which I believe would be correctly recorded as "WOA" (words of advice).

The picture below shows that the complainant would have to drive from her house (a) past the nearest police station at (b) and onto Ammanford police station (c), a round trip of about 40 miles.



DPP/  
 1576/20/07/2018/02/C  
 MO Details Property  
 Details Enquiry Log  
 Suspect(s) TAIT,  
 ALAN Offender(s)  
 STORM  
 Scanned/Linked  
 Documents SOCO  
 Information Assets Key  
 Witness Details

- Open / Start Crime
- Recent Crimes
- Pending Crimes (0)
- Returned Crimes (0)
- Search Crimes

Crime Reference: **DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C**

Offence: **Protection from Harassment Act 1997  
 Offence (HARASS1)**

Statu s: **15 Victim support s action but evidenti al difficulties**  
 Enq Statu s: **Final Completi on**

Status: Final Completion

Reference: DPP/1576/20/07/2018/02/C

Offence: **HARASS1**

Status: Evidential difficulties

ENQ. Status: Final Completion

The victim's code sets out enhanced entitlements for victims in the following categories because they are more likely to require an enhanced support and service through the criminal justice system. They are entitled to be updated within one working day at each step of the Criminal Justice Process. Vulnerable and intimidated witnesses may also be entitled to special measures if called to give evidence at court.

**Victim Priority Categories** Enhanced service for three categories of victims:  1. Victims of the most serious crime  2. Vulnerable or intimidated victims  3. Most persistently targeted victims

**Code of Practice**

- Victim Opts out of Code
- Victim Personal Statement Completed

Date / Time Updated	Updated By	Contact Agreements
Saturday <b>21/07/2018</b> 09:18	Jones Mathew PC 854	It has been agreed with *** that she will be updated in accordance with VCOP and she would like to be informed via telephone as soon as the PIN has been issued upon Mr Tait.  *** does not class herself to be vulnerable or intimidated by Mr TAIT, however, would like the matter resolved asap.

**Victim Updates:**

Update Reason	Date / Time Updated	Updated By	Details
Enquires Ongoing	Tuesday 24/07/2018 18:00	Jones Mathew PC 854	*** has been updated and informed that I have spoken to Mr Tait and arranged for him to attend AA station on 13th August following return from annual leave.  She is happy with update.
Enquires Ongoing	Wednesday 15/08/2018 05:10	Jones Mathew PC 854	VICTIM HAS BEEN MADE AWARE THAT INCIDENT WILL BE PROGRESSE D ON 20TH AUGUST
Enquires Ongoing	Thursday 30/08/2018 15:00	Jones Mathew PC 854	*** has been updated via text in relation to interview as she is currently in USA.  Result of interview explained to her and informed that advice will be sought from PS prior to any decision
Enquires Ongoing	Monday 24/09/2018 04:00	Jones Mathew PC 854	Injured person has been updated via text message awaiting supervisor review and whether Mr Tait be reported for the offence of harassment.
Enquires Ongoing	Wednesday 10/10/2018 16:45	Jones Mathew PC 854	I have informed the Injured person that I am awaiting a decision on whether Mr Tait is reported or NFA'D in relation to the incident.

The investigation has been closed	Monday 29/10/2018 09:30	Jones Mathew PC 854	Injured person *** was informed o the above date via text, in relation to Mr TAIT.  Her ex partner, *** was also spoken to as he also visited AA station on 12th Oct.  He was also updated fully.
-----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

15 Victim supports action but evidential difficulties  
**PENDING**

Update Outcome...

Add Victim Contact Agreement... Add Victim Update... Leaflet Issued:20/07/2018

[Show Crime Progress...](#)

Start new enquiry...

Edit THRIVES Add Free Text

Last Saved By: Guy Mark T/PS 39 (81703). Last Saved Date: 03/10/2018 19:19

**THREAT**

Is there a Threat to any person(s), or towards property? No

**HARM**

Has harm already been caused? No  
Has damage already been caused? No  
Is there a potential for Harm towards any person(s), or towards property? No  
Is further Harm likely? No

**RISK**

Is there potential Risk towards any person(s), or towards property? No

**INVESTIGATION**

Is specialist support required to investigate this incident, matching the investigator to the investigation? No

**VULNERABILITY**

Is anyone involved or linked to the incident vulnerable by virtue of their circumstances? No

**ENGAGEMENT**

Is engagement required? Yes  
When is the best time to engage with them? anytime  
What is the best means to engage with them? via mobile phone  
Do partner agencies need to engage? No  
Is specialist support required? No

**SAFEGUARDING**

Having considered your assessment,Is safeguarding required? No

**THRIVE SUPERVISOR**

Review the THRIVE appraisal, and evaluate the assessment  
Who should investigate this incident / crime  
Is support required from a specialist department/specially trained officer?(Matching investigation's to investigator ability, for example, Response, NPT, CID, PVPU etc)

There is no thrive element that needs addressing at this time  
**Officer in charge PC 854 Jones**  
No

Filter Entries:



		ALL	ALL
		ALL	Apply
OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	21/07/2018 09:29
<p>*** (victim) attended at Ammanford Police station on Friday 20th July 2018, in relation to a Mr Alan TAIT who resides at the property adjacent to her commercial property at 22 College Street, Ammanford.</p> <p>*** has recently been involved in a civil court case with TAIT, whereby a dispute with property access had been ruled in *** favour.</p> <p>Since the court hearing/ruling, TAIT has however, proceeded to put the final page of *** defence statement on the door to the property 22 College Street.</p> <p>On the defence statement, *** was distressed that her personal information was on show, including her name and signature, and that as a result, she could be a target for identity fraud, as the only details required would now be her D.O.B.</p> <p>*** has complained that this behaviour amounts to harassment and has caused her alarm and distress, and would like Mr Tait warned under the harassment act.</p> <p><u>Note from me:</u></p> <p>The page of the defence statement contained an untrue statement that had been submitted to Court.</p> <p>The police would not entertain my complaint so after checking with a local solicitor that I was not committing any offence by attaching the untrue part of the defence statement to my door, I displayed the statement for everyone to see.</p> <p>Although some details were viable, I made sure that most of her personal information was not.</p>			
OIC	INVESTIGATION PLAN (Actions & lines of enquiry)	Jones Mathew PC 854	22/07/2018 16:55
<p>I have liaised with CRB and it is apparent that due to previous incidents, the alleged offender will not be eligible for a harassment warning, due to there being a course of conduct in place.</p> <p><u>Note from me:</u></p> <p>A CRB check was a criminal history check using the Police National Computer (PNC). It was carried out by the Criminal Records Bureau from 2002 until the introduction of the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) in 2012.</p> <p>This is an untrue statement, there was no course of conduct in place, nor is there one listed on the PNC.</p> <p>Plan (of PC 854 Jones)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I have spoken to Mr Tait who is very evasive and has initially been reluctant to speak to OIC and attempting to dictate and control how I proceed with speaking and dealing with him.</li> <li>2. Arrangements were initially made for him to attend AA station on 21/07/18, however, I was committed with a warrant and domestic at Ardwyn road, Brynamman.</li> </ol> <p>Further arrangements were made for TAIT to attend the Station on 22/07 however he is away in Gloucester.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. I now aim to interview TAIT on 23/07/18 and he will either be interviewed or cautioned, pending result of interview.</li> </ol>			

OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	22/07/2018 16:57
<p>Safeguarding</p> <p>There are no safeguarding issues, as the victim resides in the Swansea area and there have been no physical threats made.</p>			
Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Guy Mark T/PS 39	25/07/2018 20:57
<p>I have discussed this case with the Officer in charge</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>Statement taken with all points to prove and evidence of course of conduct interview suspect</p> <p>I am aware this is going to be delayed to the officer being on leave but there are no safeguarding issues</p>			
OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	26/07/2018 00:44
<p>Contact has been made via e-mail with victim and informed that Mr Tait to be interviewed on 13th August.</p> <p>Mr Tait is arranging his own legal representative and I will be in contact on 12/08 to arrange official time. Investigation is in hand.</p>			
Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Hart Riccardo PC 648	29/08/2018 11:42
<p>Mr TAIT attended at AC station today.</p> <p>Suspect interview has been arranged for tomorrow at Ammanford station at 10am.</p>			
OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	04/09/2018 05:53
<p>Interview</p> <p>Mr TAIT was interviewed in relation to the matter : 63_IRSF12_1795 refers</p> <p>Interview was conducted by PC 948 Lloyd as he refused to be interviewed by myself, as he had made an official complaint the day prior to attending.</p> <p>Mr TAIT admitted to sending letters and emails to [REDACTED] Swansea, workplace of the injured person.</p> <p>He also admitted to putting her defence statement up on his door.</p> <p>TAIT refused to see that this behaviour though, amounted to being harassment, and that this did not appear to be harassing according to him.</p> <p>A full denial of harassment was made by TAIT.</p> <p>A full summary will be added once I have liaised with PC 948 LLOYD.</p> <p>I will now seek advice from PS in relation to whether TAIT is reported for summons or not.</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>PC 854 Jones was not in the interview and had not liaised with the interviewing officer, so why does he update the record with his opinions?</p>			

Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Guy Mark T/PS 39	13/09/2018 13:35
<p>Matthew,</p> <p>Where is the ips statement its not on the scanned documents can you put it on please</p> <p>Can you give me details on these letters and exactly what is the course of conduct and content of the actions and result of interview so I can make a decision please</p>			
OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	13/09/2018 23:32
<p>The articles which indicate a course of conduct from Mr TAIT include -</p> <p>26th April 2018 - A letter from the defendant to [REDACTED] suggesting that the IP is breaching her place of work "Acceptable use policy" in relation to using her work email address. This has been exhibited as BJ/1</p> <p>Further letter from the defendant to [REDACTED] suggesting that *** has been using [REDACTED] envelopes, which TAIT (dp) would amount to theft if his opinion is correct. BJ/2</p> <p><b>Note from me:</b></p> <p>I received letters from *** that were sent by next day special service at a cost of around £12 a time. I checked the franking on the envelopes and they had come from a post office in, or near to, the [REDACTED]</p> <p>I found it unusual that someone would pay £12 to simply post a letter, I reported my suspicions to the [REDACTED] at the same time that I made my justifiable complaints.</p> <p>21st May 2018, letter from Mr TAIT to ***, who has no influence in any way or involvement in the matter.</p> <p>This letter again suggests that *** is harassing TAIT and also stating that he believed that *** should not have a work's e-mail account.</p> <p>7th June 2018, further letter by TAIT to [REDACTED] with him stating that his complaint was made as a whistle blower, however, the [REDACTED] had made *** aware that complaint had come from TAIT.</p> <p>TAIT again accuses *** of defaming his character. BJ/7</p> <p>Chronology of events has also been scanned to crime</p> <p><b>Note from me:</b></p> <p>Why does PC 854 Jones not include all the correspondence including the letters from me and the copy of the [REDACTED] email policy?</p> <p>*** was using that email account to defame my character over and over again, it is against the [REDACTED] policy on the use of email accounts.</p> <p>Further, PC 854 Matthew Jones submits what he says amounts to a "course of conduct" and attaches his "evidence" as BJ/1. BJ/2 and BJ/7.</p> <p>So what are the four exhibits that are missing?</p> <p>What was contained within BJ/3, BJ/4, BJ/5 and BJ/6?</p>			

Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Guy Mark T/PS 39	21/09/2018 21:58
<p>Matthew,</p> <p>Have you spoken to the university, are these complaints legitimate complaints that are being investigated or are they purely harassment by the dp</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>I was interviewed on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018, this supervisors comment was made on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2018.</p>			
Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Guy Mark T/PS 39	21/09/2018 22:00
<p>Have you collected all the evidence of the harassment that you can ie the letters sent</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>Again, I was interviewed on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018, this supervisors comment was made on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2018, why was the evidence of the alleged harassment not available to the interviewing officer?</p>			
OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	24/09/2018 04:01
<p>IN relation to your first input Serg, the [REDACTED] have replied to Mr Tait's complaint and stated that they are not investigating the complaints made by him.</p> <p>The complainant has been spoken to by her place of work, and no concerns made.</p> <p>The IP though, believed that Mr Tait's actions, letters and e-mails have caused harassment, alarm and distress to ***, as she did not wish for her place of work to be involved in their civil dispute.</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>Although PC 854 Jones makes these statements as if they were fact, he offers no supporting evidence. This was not about a civil dispute but was actually about the fact that *** continued to defame my character using her works email address.</p>			
Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Guy Mark T/PS 39	03/10/2018 19:18
<p>This crime is now 2 months old, I need clarification of what documents were sent and why. If there are legitimate complaints and documents being sent to the ip, the court and the ips place of work as part of formal complaints I don't deem these actions as harassment as there is an entitlement for a person to raise concerns and complaints.</p> <p>If the documents of completely unnecessary in content and are sent to just cause harassment alarm and distress then I can make a decision to report the male</p> <p>I want to see the documents (these are going to be required as part of the court case) and speak to you regarding their content and the motivation of them being sent which I am hoping is covered in interview, if these are legitimate complaints then this can be filed.</p> <p>With regards to the suspect displaying his own results of court which is available in the public domain this will not form part of the harassment and I note he has now taken these down anyway.</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>I was interviewed on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018, this supervisors comment was made on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2018. This record was made on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2018, again the supervisor has to request details that should have been available to the interviewing officer.</p>			

OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	04/10/2018 05:33
<p>Documents are scanned onto the crime, and I am also in possession of hard copies.</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>I was interviewed on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018, PC 854 Jones allegedly scans the documentation onto the crime, a full month after the interview.</p>			
OIC	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Jones Mathew PC 854	08/10/2018 13:28
<p>In relation to the documents, the majority of them are from the alleged offender and sent to the [REDACTED] or various persons within the victim's place of work.</p> <p>The only article which wasn't was the defence statement of the IP which was displayed on the front door of TAIT, which the IP witnessed when attending at her property.</p> <p>This causing her further alarm and distress and hence the reason for the call.</p> <p><u>Note by me:</u></p> <p>If PC 854 Jones actually did have the documents he refers to, why has not attached them to the file report and more importantly, why were the documents not available to the officer that interviewed me?</p>			
Supervisor	INVESTIGATION UPDATE	Phillips Gavin PS 1095	23/10/2018 04:37
<p>This seems to be a dispute over property access. In which Mr Tait lost.</p> <p>He believed that the IP had sent items form a her [REDACTED] works address and used envelopes.</p> <p>This was addressed by the [REDACTED], and they dealt with the matter.</p> <p>The posting of the defence statement did annoy the caller.</p> <p><u>However the caller only wanted words of advice.</u></p> <p>The DP has now moved away to Portsmouth permanently.</p> <p>There is no longer any further neighbour dispute.</p> <p>No likely reoccurrence and this is no longer in the public interest.</p> <p>This matter should have been considered for mediation as it is not strong enough to go to court.</p> <p>It seems like petty behaviour form Mr Tait.</p> <p>He was interviewed and positive action was taken at the time.</p> <p>This does not pass the threshold test for a summons of harassment.</p> <p>Please update the caller that the matter is now closed and place outcome of evidential difficulties police decision.</p>			



TRADITIONAL VALUES, FRESH APPROACH

**Head Office:**

Gomer Williams & Co Ltd, 19 John Street,  
Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, SA15 1UP

**Incorporating Randell Lloyd & Martin:**

23 Murray Street, Llanelli,  
Carmarthenshire, SA15 1AQ

DX 40308 Llanelli

Tel: 01554 755101

Fax: 01554 784063

Out of hours emergency: 07580195130

**Our Ref:** MR/MR/TAI6/1

**Telephone No:** 01554 772149

**Your ref:**

**Date:** 02 November 2018

Mr. Alan Delaney Tait

**Sent Via Email:** christinetait378@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Tait

**Re: Ammanford Police Station – 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

We write further in relation to the allegation of Harassment and can confirm that upon discussion with the Police they have indicated that this matter has been concluded and they are taking no further action in relation thereto.

In light of the above, this brings the matter to an end. It is possible for the police to re-open the investigation at a later stage if further evidence comes to light, however this rarely happens.

We do not intend taking any further action in the above matter and will therefore be closing our file. The costs in this matter will now be claimed from the Legal Aid Agency in accordance with the Legal Aid Scheme under which you were initially advised.

 [gomerwilliamssolicitors.co.uk](http://gomerwilliamssolicitors.co.uk) |  [bit.ly/GomerWillFB](https://bit.ly/GomerWillFB)

Directors: Juliet Phillips-James LL.B (Hons)\*, Gareth Gwyndaf Jones LL.B (Hons)<sup>^</sup>#

\* Member of The Family Law Panel | # Member of The Criminal Litigation Accreditation Scheme | ^ Criminal Higher Court Advocate  
Registered in Wales. Company Registration No. 5934117. Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority





On Wed, 26 Jun 2019, 13:23 Davies Mark Insp, <[mark.davies.insp@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk](mailto:mark.davies.insp@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk)> wrote:

SWYDDOGOL OFFICIAL

Mr Tait

In response to your e mail, I can answer the following

Dear Sir or Madam

1. What was the information that the Police have that prompted the phone call  
**You made contact with police at DPP yourself,** and storm ref DP-20190625-119 was created in response to this.

2. The name and number of the person making the call

The officer was **PC 657 Sue Naul who is a member of our mental health triage team.**

3. Full details of the event that was referred to in June where it was alleged that I was seen, locally in June

**You were seen by the crisis team in Ammanford on 4th June 2019,** storm ref DP-20190604-275 refers, again this is something you created via e mail.

Regards

Mark

**Arolygydd /** Inspector Mark Davies

Rheolwr Digwyddiadau'r Heddlu / Force Incident Manager  
Canolfan Gyfathrebu'r Heddlu / Force  
Communication Centre  
Pencadlys Heddlu Dyfed-Powys Police Headquarters

PO Box 99

Llangunnor

Carmarthen


SA31 2PF


E-bost / E-mail: [mark.daviesInsp@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk](mailto:mark.daviesInsp@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk)

Ffon / Tel: 0845 330 2000

Dewiswch Opsiwn 3 / Choose Option 3: Estyniad / Extension 66102

**1DPP – DO THE BASICS BRILLIANTLY, EVERY TIME**

From: PSD <psd@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk> ▼ 

 06/01/2020 (2 days ago)

To: 'alandtait'

Dear Mr Tait,

Thank you for your response. I have now reviewed the STORM message referred to and can confirm there is no mention of you being seen by the Ammanford crisis team in that record. There is mention of a visit to a GP in Barry and you were contacted by our Mental Health Triage Team.

There's clearly been some confusion and an error has been made on the part of Insp Davies.

On behalf of Dyfed Powys Police please accept my apology for this error. I hope that this has now provided you with some reassurance that there is no reference in records held by Dyfed Powys Police of you being seen by the Ammanford crisis team.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

**James Lewis**

Swyddog Cwynion a Chamymddwyn - Complaints and Misconduct Supervisor  
Adran Safonau Proffesiynol - Professional Standards Department

Copy of email received on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020

From: Davies Mark Insp <[mark.davies.insp@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk](mailto:mark.davies.insp@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk)>

To: Alan Tait <[alandtait@gmail.com](mailto:alandtait@gmail.com)>

**SWYDDOGOL OFFICIAL**

Mr Tait

As I said, we have not had any reports of semi-automatic gunfire or shotgun discharges in the Ammanford area recently.

The listening devices your friend has installed could well have picked up noise from miles away and in the case of semi-automatic weapons, they create substantial noise and in the absence of any further reports we will not be investigating the matter further.

Regards

Mark

Note by me: The inspector does not dispute that the noises recorded were of semi-automatic weapons, or that it was a friend of mine that placed the recording devices in the property.

The Inspector states that semi-automatic weapons generate substantial noise, he also states that the noises could have been picked up from miles away.

The friend who placed the recorders in the property that day went with her Mum, if you include my report that was three people who were trying to report this matter.

Although the noises can not be heard by the human ear, when the recordings were played back a scream could clearly be heard between two of the shots.

<https://thealtarican.co.uk/noises/screamsbetweengunshots.mp3>

In another recording a man can be heard speaking saying something like "I'd say to Gareth to stay out of range" followed by what could be the sound of a magazine clip inserted into a weapon.

These two recordings seem to be proof that the noises did not come from miles away as suggested by the Inspector.

<https://thealtarican.co.uk/noises/saytogareth.mp3>