

Although we have considered carefully the comments you make in that document (and in your subsequent letter dated, incorrectly, 9 March 2013), the CCRC does not consider that any of the points you make have the potential to impact upon the safety of your conviction. All of the issues that you take regarding those "facts" were matters for consideration at trial. That view was discussed in our letter of 3 August 2011 declining to refer your conviction to the Crown Court. We cannot add to the comments made in our previous letter in this regard.

No comparison of the evidence which was available prior to trial is relevant at this stage. Any contradictions or discrepancies that there are in that evidence would have been considered by the magistrates in reaching their finding. They are not new evidence, and cannot at this stage raise a potential ground of appeal.

You refer also to the CCRC's reliance, in its 2011 decision, on the report of the Probation Service that was taken into account at your sentencing for the subsequent conviction for witness intimidation. You state that using that report as a justification for the CCRC's previous decision was wrong, because it is misleading to say that you told the Probation Officer that you agreed with the Court's verdict. Although we have noted your comments, we have not sought to investigate the issue. It is not a factor that can be relevant to the safety of your conviction since the report in question was prepared after you were found guilty. The CCRC's reference to it was an indication of what the Probation Officer reported you had told her.

Your letter of 19 March 2013 raised also a number of points regarding the refusal to grant you leave to appeal. Although we have noted your comments in this regard, the conduct of appeal proceedings and any application for an appeal is not a matter open to comment or criticism by the CCRC. It is only those proceedings that led to your conviction – at Welshpool Magistrates' Court – that can be scrutinised.

In your letter to the CCRC dated 4 June 2013 you raised a number of matters regarding the way in which witnesses were inadequately cross-examined during your trial and submit that, had they been properly questioned, the evidence of Ms King and Mr Stooke-Vaughan would have been exposed as false. We have considered your submission although, as discussed above, it cannot raise a potential ground of appeal at this stage. What discrepancies and contradictions that there might have been between the various witnesses who gave evidence were exactly what would have been considered by the magistrates at trial. There is no way