

5 Foundry Terrace  
Llanidloes  
Powys  
SY18 6AY

01686 412451

graham@campaignfordemocracy.org.uk

19-3-13

Dear Ms Kneller

I wish to bring to your attention poor performance in the review of a case. This was caused by the supply of incomplete information to the CCRC from the CPS and probation service.

The background needs to be explained first, the problem the CCRC has is described at the end of the letter. The case concerned a conviction for assault that was sent to the CCRC for review. I claimed that I had been attacked and the complainant and his partner had made false allegations as an act of revenge having been successfully restrained and by this humiliated. A glance at the enclosed table, Table 1, will show that this claim is true. The table lists the allegations made against me. Red crosses indicate where evidence from independent witnesses or other sources contradicts the allegations. It is clear that there is substance in my claim and if it can be accepted that there could be a problem with this conviction what follows will be easier to understand.

After I had been charged with assault I knew two things. The first was that I would be able to prove that the allegations were false, the second was that I will have a high profile because of the unique nature of my work.

I had set up a political campaign to get floating voters in key marginal seats, the few people who actually decide the outcome of elections in Britain and Wales, to demand something in return for those vital votes. The demand is for Swiss style direct democracy, a system that allows people to initiate referendums on any proposal they want, and stop any legislation they don't want. The system is directly responsible for the health, wealth and happiness of the Swiss people. It is a powerful idea. That the Prime Minister likes the Swiss system helps, and he has given me some discreet assistance with the work. He knows about Table 1 and the witness intimidation case. He does not yet know how the CCRC managed to make a mess of the review they conducted.

David Cameron found out about my work in 2009 as I had been contacting supporters of the Open Europe group. Many are wealthy and are Conservative party supporters and they told him about the project. Cameron knew that tens of thousands of pounds had been spent on a small team to prepare the project. He also knew that sooner or later the project would reach the public and by its nature would succeed so he decided to do a bit of prepositioning. He announced that he would introduce a political system that would allow people to initiate local and national referendums. This can be heard on the enclosed CD. The crucial point here is that if people are allowed to *initiate* referendums then sovereignty has been transferred from Parliament to the people, a historic change. This was the source of the 'Big society' concept, an active, involved and genuinely empowered citizenry.

I knew what Cameron was up to and knowing my campaign would succeed and that I could prove I had been framed left me with a problem. One of the people who had made

the false allegations was an ex-partner and she would also have a high profile, but as a liar. To avoid emotional harm to her I approached her and I warned her in a friendly way that her false statement would be exposed. Others interfered and I was charged with witness intimidation, convicted and imprisoned. I was lucky as the judge knew the barrister had made a mess of the defence and that I was innocent. Instead of the normal 15-18 months he gave me six, and I was out in ten weeks. Check the tariffs and my sentence and you will see that this is true.

This case is now back with you for review and should have arrived today.

On release I got back to work and eventually emailed Eric Pickles, then chairman of the Conservative Party. Both Pickles and Cameron responded indirectly as detailed in the application and Appendix 1 of the application. This led to the legislation that gets a 100,000 signature petition a debate in Parliament. One email, one piece of legislation. Cameron and Pickles were told about my convictions, saw an early version of Table 1, and told about the circumstances of the witness intimidation case. Other work in Wales was undertaken and this is detailed in the application. It looked as if the campaign would soon succeed and the injustice done to me become public knowledge. I had nothing to fear on that point as I could easily prove the original allegations made against me were false. The problem was that it would be seen that the criminal justice system had failed and that it was easy for people to make false allegations and get away with it. To avoid that the assault case was sent to the CCRC.

What happened next is what led to the error by the CCRC. I contacted my ex-partner again warning her the truth would come out but this time everything was in writing to cover myself. The communications were polite and helpful and contained details of evidence that she had lied, including an early version of this application and details about Table 1. I believed that if she were to take them to the police and complain the police and the CPS would read about specific examples of her perjury and start wondering what was going on. I even stated this in the letters and emails. There were no insults or abuse in them. She then took the letters and emails to the police. They and the CPS kept their blinkers on and charged me with harassment and the case went to trial. I was found guilty.

The problem for the CCRC is that one of the emails included a warning that the assault case had gone to the CCRC. When my ex-partner handed the emails and letters to the police the CPS picked this up. They got in touch with you, told you about my record as a serial offender and that I was now harassing a victim again. Bearing in mind my record the CPS assumed I was just wasting CCRC time and you would be able to quickly and easily reject the application, so that is what they asked you to do. Having looked at my record and being told that I was harassing a 'victim' you knocked out a quick decision that ignored the evidence and the CPS were able to ambush me in court. That the CPS asked me about your decision in court is clear evidence of collusion. The question is, did incomplete information from the CPS influence a CCRC decision?

As soon as I received the CCRC decision I knew something was wrong. The analysis and reasons were ridiculous and ignored all the evidence. I didn't think you're staff were that stupid and guessed there had been another factor involved. I have enclosed a copy of the analysis and reasons and I suggest you read it. Once that is done please read my response. An explanation of why you're staff were misled is at the end of that document.

If the review had been done properly and independently the court would have been told that my claims were true and the case against me would have collapsed. The witness

intimidation case now with you would also have been overturned about two years ago.

You now have all the relevant documents for the assault case, the witness intimidation case and the emails and letters used in the harassment case so you will be able to see that the claims I make are true. Instead of examining each case separately and assuming that my other convictions prove I am a 'bad character', and therefore not taking individual applications seriously you will now see how the content of each, and the linkage between them, reinforces my claims that the original allegations made against me were false.

I have three ways forward. The first is to get my MP, Glyn Davies, to help me with a complaint about your review of the assault case. His caseworker, Julie Turner, has already assessed it and is convinced I am innocent. The details of the witness intimidation case are now with him and I think his team are very impressed with my campaigning work and it's results. Glyn Davies is a Conservative, so I imagine Cameron is now up to date on the situation. Politicians can't intervene in matters of the law but they are responsible for the performance of government departments, such as yours. If you look again at Table 1 and then think about the CCRC analysis and my response you will see that there is a problem with your performance in this matter. You could try and claim that CPS/CCRC collusion had no impact on this but it is unlikely you would be believed.

My second option is to take the story to a newspaper and tell them how a serial offender managed to get a piece of legislation introduced by sending an email to Eric Pickles. They would also be delighted to discover why the Big Society didn't happen, and once they start looking at my situation the story gets more interesting by the minute. This is a good option for me as it brings matters to a head quickly and Cameron won't mind.

The third route is for you to sort the problem out. This is my preferred option as it is in the public interest that this is done within the criminal justice system. The system will then be seen to have got it right in the end.

I would like to meet you to discuss how this will done. I expect an admission from you that the collusion between the CCRC and the CPS distorted the review process, and because of that another review will be undertaken. That review should take about an hour as you already have the paperwork (it is also in Appendix 2 of the current application) and the evidence is laid out clearly.

Your failure resulted in my imprisonment so this is not an unreasonable request. That you made the mistake does not matter, we all make mistakes. What matters is that you correct your mistake. I expect to hear from you by the end of this week.

Yours faithfully

Graham McArthur