

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF SAR DISCLOSURE

Breaches, Inconsistencies, Procedural Failures and Officer Conduct

SAR Reference: 748-25 | Complaint Reference: CO/434/25

Prepared by Andrew Griffiths | March 2026

Introduction

Dear DI Iwan Jones,

Following receipt of my Subject Access Request disclosure (Ref 748/2025), I have conducted a detailed review of the Occurrence Enquiry Logs, filing forms, custody records, Part 5 meeting minutes, and all related entries for occurrence 25000381349 (harassment charge) and the linked church reports (25000479811 and 25000630992).

I am extremely concerned by what has been disclosed. This document sets out every breach, inconsistency, procedural failure, data inaccuracy, and instance of unprofessional officer conduct that I have identified. These issues go well beyond the points I originally raised in my complaint and directly contradict several statements in your responses of 27 November 2025 and your follow-up email.

I have used software that I built utilising large language model APIs to assist in systematically cross-referencing the SAR disclosure against relevant legal frameworks and best practices. All findings are supported by specific references to entries within the SAR itself.

1. Subjective, Biased and Fabricated Recording in Official Logs

The following table sets out every instance I have identified where PC Jade Jones (#6073191) used subjective, editorialised, inaccurate, or fabricated language in her official log entries and filing forms. Each entry is referenced to its source within the SAR.

| Date | Source | Quote / Entry | Issue |
|------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13/06/2025 | Entry 1, occ. 25000479811 | "I am aware of this male and the history..." | Vague, implies pre-existing negative perception before evidence reviewed. |
| 20/07/2025 | Entry 9, occ. 25000479811 | "I have been reluctant to contact Andrew until he had been interviewed for the harassment against his ex partner" | Explicit admission of deprioritising victim reports due to suspect status in a separate matter. Direct breach of impartiality. |
| 20/07/2025 | Entry 9, occ. 25000479811 | "he is continuing to report to control room about the Church" | Frames legitimate victim reporting as a problem to be managed rather than investigated. |
| 20/07/2025 | Email to me | "I am aware of the numerous reports you have made to Police" | Mischaracterises volume of contact. Eight contacts over 5.5 months is not "numerous." |
| 20/07/2025 | Entry 26, occ. 25000381349 (harassment occ.) | "The suspect has contacted FCC a number of times" | Church victim reports logged on the harassment occurrence, referring to me as "the suspect" while discussing my victim reporting. Clear conflation of roles. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | raising his concerns for the Church" | |
| 22/07/2025 | Entry 12, occ. 25000479811 | "quite rambling and difficult to follow at times" | Dismisses structured submissions containing cited evidence as incoherent. |
| 23/08/2025 | Entry 12, occ. 25000479811 | "I am struggling to see what actual evidence there is and if there is any offences" | Dismissive of documented evidence (WhatsApp transcripts, witness testimony, screenshots) without recorded assessment against specific offences. |
| 07/09/2025 | Entry 13, occ. 25000479811 | "Andrew clearly has an issue with the Church and blames the Church for his and his wife's break down in marriage" | Personal opinion presented as fact in official log. Reduces safeguarding and criminal reports to a marital grievance. A clear breach of impartiality and objectivity in handling evidence. |
| 07/09/2025 | Entry 13, occ. 25000479811 | "There is no concerns here" | Blanket dismissal without any documented objective assessment of the evidence submitted. |
| 07/09/2025 | Entry 13, occ. 25000479811 | "This incident wasn't dealt with at the time as he was going to be arrested for harassing his ex wife" | Second explicit admission that victim reports were delayed because of suspect status. |
| 31/07/2025 | Entry 1, occ. 25000630992 | "Andrew is constantly webchatting in to FCC with complaints against the Church" | FABRICATION. Zero webchats existed at this date. The only webchat in the entire SAR was logged four months later (29/11/2025, Amy Holland). |
| 07/09/2025 | Filing summary, both occs. | "The male clearly has an issue with the Church due to the break down in marriage with his wife. There is no concerns, male has also now stated he wishes to take this no further." | Identical editorialised text on both occurrences. Misrepresents my position (I said "shelve" pending ICO, not withdraw). Informed supervisor's decision to approve filing. |
| 07/09/2025 | Filing forms, both occs. | "Is the victim vulnerable? No" | Recorded despite full written disclosure of PTSD, panic attacks, Propranolol, post-arrest distress. |
| 07/09/2025 | Filing forms | Victim views: "no complaint" (25000479811) / "unwilling" (25000630992) | Misrepresents my email of 27/08/2025 which stated temporary pause pending ICO with explicit reservation to return. |
| 07/09/2025 | Filing forms, both occs. | "Have they been informed of the Victims Right to Review? No" | Mandatory requirement under Victims' Code Right 7 when investigation closed without prosecution. Not offered on either occurrence. |

1.1 The "Constantly Webchatting" Fabrication

This point warrants particular emphasis. PC Jones recorded on 31/07/2025 (entry 1, occurrence 25000630992):

"Andrew is constantly webchatting in to FCC with complaints against the Church and I have a number of emails that have been forwarded to me that Andrew has sent in."

The only webchat documented anywhere in the entire SAR is a single conversation logged by Amy Holland (#6093897) on 29/11/2025 - four months after PC Jones made this claim. At the time she wrote "constantly webchatting," there were zero webchats on record.

This is not exaggeration or imprecise language. It is the fabrication of a fact in an official police log. It was used to create an impression of obsessive, unreasonable behaviour that is not supported by the evidence she herself maintained. This breaches the Code of Ethics requirement for honesty and integrity.

1.2 Actual Contact Frequency

To put the characterisation of "constant" and "numerous" contact in context, the following table sets out every documented contact I made with North Wales Police regarding Kings Christian Centre:

| Date | Contact | Method |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 11/06/2025 | Online crime report (TVH-2252-25-15000-IR) | Online form |
| 03/07/2025 | Email with WhatsApp screenshots to PC Jones | Email |
| 06/07/2025 | Email with co-founder screenshot | Email |
| 09/07/2025 | Email with YouTube evidence | Email |
| 11/07/2025 | Two emails (WhatsApp PDFs; house incident context) | Email |
| 15/07/2025 | Email providing harassment charge context | Email |
| 27/08/2025 | Email agreeing to shelve pending ICO | Email |
| 29/11/2025 | One webchat (Amy Holland) confirming receipt | Webchat |

This amounts to eight contacts over approximately five and a half months, an average of fewer than two per month, each containing evidence or following up on outstanding matters. This is not "constant webchatting" or "numerous reports." Meanwhile the great number of reports my ex wife made are treated as gospel and not as a nuisance to be dismissed- like my reports have been.

1.3 Editorialised Filing Summaries

PC Jones submitted identical filing summaries for both church occurrences on 07/09/2025:

"The male clearly has an issue with the Church due to the break down in marriage with his wife. There is no concerns, male has also now stated he wishes to take this no further."

This language is opinion, not fact. It reduces serious safeguarding and criminal allegations supported by documentary evidence including the church's own "brainwashing" admission to a personal grievance over a divorce. It misrepresents my stated position (I said I would "shelve" pending the ICO outcome and explicitly reserved the right to return).

Filing summaries inform supervisor decisions. The supervisor, Sgt Dewberry (#6073146), approved the filing on the same day without challenge. A supervisor reading "there is no concerns" and "he wishes to take this no further" would have had no reason to question the closure. The editorialised summary therefore directly prevented proper supervisory scrutiny.

1.4 Admitted Deprioritisation of Victim Reports

PC Jones made two explicit admissions in the OEL that she deprioritised my victim reports because of my suspect status in a separate matter:

20/07/2025 (entry 9, occ. 25000479811):

"I have been reluctant to contact Andrew until he had been interviewed for the harassment against his ex partner however, he is continuing to report to control room about the Church."

07/09/2025 (entry 13, occ. 25000479811):

"This incident wasn't dealt with at the time as he was going to be arrested for harassing his ex wife and therefore did not want to discuss this with him until he was arrested."

These are not inferences or interpretations. They are the officer's own words. My status as a suspect in one matter does not diminish my rights as a victim in another. Deliberately delaying engagement with a victim report because the victim is also a suspect in an unrelated case is a direct breach of the Code of Ethics requirement for impartiality and the Victims' Code requirement for fair treatment.

1.5 Conflict of Interest

PC Jones simultaneously handled the investigation where I am the suspect (harassment, occ. 25000381349) and the cases where I am the victim/reporter (church reports, occ. 25000479811 and 25000630992). Her own log entries demonstrate this created bias:

- On 20/07/2025 (entry 26, occ. 25000381349), she logged my church victim reports on the harassment occurrence, referring to me as "the suspect" while discussing my victim reporting.
- Her admitted reluctance to engage with my church reports (see 1.4 above) was directly caused by her dual role.
- Her editorialised filing summaries (see 1.3 above) demonstrate that her view of me as a suspect coloured her assessment of my victim evidence.

This conflation of roles was never acknowledged or mitigated by any supervising officer.

2. Discrimination, Mental Health Markers and Vulnerability Recording

2.1 Unexplained "Drugs" RMS Marker

On 13/05/2025, Officer Shea (#6093133) recorded an RMS marker against my name: "Andrew — Drugs, Mental health — PTSD." The "PTSD" element is accurate. The "Drugs" marker has no documented basis anywhere in the SAR. Every custody risk assessment contradicts it:

- 11/08/2025 custody assessment: "Have you consumed alcohol/drugs recently? No." "Do you have any drug/alcohol/gambling or any other dependencies? No."
- 28/12/2025 custody assessment: Same questions, same answers: No.
- Inspector Ferguson's risk assessment (11/08/2025): "Alcohol or other substance abuse: No."

My only medication is Propranolol, a beta blocker prescribed by my GP for anxiety. It is not a controlled substance.

An inaccurate "Drugs" marker on a police record is stigmatising and potentially discriminatory under the Equality Act 2010. It may have contributed to how my reports were perceived by officers reviewing my record. I request an immediate explanation of the basis for this marker and, if none can be provided, its removal from my record.

2.2 Victim Recorded as "Not Vulnerable"

On both church occurrence filing forms (07/09/2025), PC Jones answered: "Is the victim vulnerable? No."

At this point she was fully aware, from my own written communications, of the following:

- Complex PTSD (disclosed in email of 14/08/2025)
- Panic attacks and inability to leave the house (disclosed in email of 15/08/2025)
- Anxiety managed with prescribed Propranolol (disclosed in email of 14/08/2025)
- Severe distress following arrest at home in front of my mother (disclosed in email of 14/08/2025)
- Request for written communication as a reasonable adjustment (repeated across multiple emails)

A victim who has disclosed these conditions should be assessed as vulnerable under the Victims' Code (Right 1, enhanced entitlements for vulnerable victims). Recording "No" without explanation suggests either a failure to consider the information I provided or a deliberate minimisation of my vulnerability. Either way, it is a breach of the Victims' Code.

2.3 Mental Health Used to Justify Insistence on Face-to-Face Meetings

I repeatedly explained in writing that my mental health conditions made it extremely difficult for me to attend the police station. Rather than accepting written evidence as a reasonable adjustment under the Equality Act 2010, PC Jones continued to insist on face-to-face meetings. On 23/08/2025 she stated:

"Without speaking to you in person I am struggling to see there is any offences for the Police to deal with and feel as though it would be best if you explain these to me in person?"

This insistence came despite my having already provided detailed evidence in writing, including WhatsApp screenshots, witness testimony, legal references, and screenshots of surveillance. There is no evidence in the SAR that my request for written communication was formally considered as a reasonable adjustment or that any Equality Act assessment was carried out.

2.4 Contradictory Custody Risk Assessments

Two risk assessments were completed on the same custody record (C25045734) but contain contradictory basic facts:

- 11/08/2025: Neurodiverse = Yes (ADD diagnosed), Medication = No, Dietary needs = Yes (dairy allergy).
- 28/12/2025: Neurodiverse = No, Medication = Yes (Propranolol), Dietary needs = No.

To clarify: I do not have ADD. I was anxious at the time of my initial arrest and misunderstood what an NHS consultant had said to me a few weeks prior. My actual diagnosis is anxiety. However, the fact that contradictory basic information was recorded on the same custody record without being queried or corrected raises concerns about the accuracy of record-keeping. Inaccurate records in custody can affect risk assessments, healthcare provision, and how a detainee is treated. I'd like to also raise the fact that whoever checked me in when I was charged, was extremely aggressive and hostile.

3. Misrepresentation of Victim Views and Victims' Code Breaches

3.1 Filing Form Misrepresentations

On the filing forms for both church occurrences (07/09/2025), PC Jones recorded:

- Occurrence 25000479811: Victim views = "no complaint"
- Occurrence 25000630992: Victim views = "unwilling"

My actual email of 27/08/2025, which is logged in the OEL on both occurrences, stated:

"I think it may be best to shelve this matter for now and await the outcome of the ICO report I've submitted regarding the data protection issues. Once I receive their findings, I can reassess whether there are any criminal matters that warrant police involvement and get back in touch if there's anything further of concern. If this sounds okay with you?"

This is plainly a temporary pause with an explicit reservation to return. It is not "no complaint" or "unwilling." Misrepresenting a victim's stated position on an official filing form is a breach of the Code of Ethics (honesty) and had direct consequences: it provided the basis for closing both occurrences without further investigation.

3.2 Victims' Right to Review Not Offered

On both filing forms, PC Jones recorded: "Have they been informed of the Victims Right to Review? No." This is a mandatory requirement under Victims' Code Right 7 when an investigation is concluded without prosecution. The failure to inform me of this right meant I had no opportunity to challenge the decision to close the occurrences through proper channels. This is a direct and documented Victims' Code breach.

4. Flawed Part 5 / MASH Safeguarding Meeting (24 October 2025)

The Part 5 meeting that assessed my safeguarding concerns was fundamentally flawed in multiple respects:

4.1 Exclusion of the Complainant

I was never invited to, informed of, or present at this meeting. The attendee list records:

- Flintshire County Council: Service Manager (Chair), Business Support (Minute Taker), Education representative
- Ysgol Estyn: Headteacher
- North Wales Police: Sophie Drews
- Kings Christian Centre: Safeguarding Trustee, and two Safeguarding Leads

I am not listed. No apologies are recorded for me because I was never invited. I first became aware of this meeting through your complaint response on 27/11/2025.

4.2 Subjects of the Complaint Present

Three representatives of Kings Christian Centre, the organisation I was complaining about were present at the meeting that assessed my complaint. This is a fundamental breach of procedural fairness and the Wales Safeguarding Procedures requirement for independent, impartial, child-centred assessment.

4.3 Police Withheld Complaint Details

Sophie Drews (North Wales Police) stated at the meeting:

"ACG made a complaint on 11th June about concerns in relation to the church. Not going into detail as members of Church are present."

The police representative deliberately withheld the substance of my allegations because the subjects of the complaint were sitting at the table. The meeting therefore proceeded to assess my concerns without the professionals present knowing what those concerns actually contained.

4.4 Misrepresentation of My Position

Sophie Drews stated at the meeting:

"ACG decided that he was going to get legal advice and come back to police if he wanted to pursue a complaint. He has reported some concerns, but decided he is not going forward with it."

As set out in Section 3.1, my actual email explicitly reserved the right to return after the ICO outcome. I did not "decide not to go forward with it." This misrepresentation was made in my absence, at a meeting I did not know was taking place, and I had no opportunity to correct it.

4.5 Unchallenged Assertions by Church Representatives

The meeting minutes record that a church representative stated I "continues to make unsubstantiated allegations against the Church" and that my "posts on line are derogatory." These assertions were made in my absence, without any opportunity for me to respond, and without any challenge from the professionals present, including the police representative.

4.6 AI Dismissal of Evidence

The Flintshire County Council Education representative stated:

"From my perspective I can see they have been generated through AI because there is a clear style as to how they were written. They quote every bit of legislation, every bit of guidance that he could possibly link up."

She then stated:

"After much deliberation and thought and reviewing the evidence which is essentially his own writing and complaints he has sent to the church, he is not actually providing any hard evidence except for the WhatsApp messages, which were screen shot."

This is significant for two reasons. First, dismissing a complainant's evidence because it appears well-structured or references legislation is discriminatory, particularly when the complainant has disclosed mental health difficulties that may make clear written communication harder without assistance. Second, she acknowledged the existence of the WhatsApp screenshots, which contain the most significant evidence (including the "brainwashing" admission), while treating them as an afterthought. The substance of evidence, not the style of its presentation, should determine how it is assessed.

4.7 Irrelevant Question About My Occupation

A participant asked "what ACG's occupation is." The response was: "GJ states he uses Network Force emails." My employer is Net World Sports, not "Network Force." The relevance of my occupation to a child safeguarding discussion is unclear. Combined with the AI dismissal of my evidence, it suggests an interest in discrediting me as a person rather than assessing my evidence on its merits. The whole safeguarding meeting was flawed, and a mess.

5. Data Inaccuracies in Police Records

5.1 Incorrect Address on Initial Occurrence

The initial occurrence log (25000381349) records my address as "1 Willow Avenue, Hope, LL12 9PG." This is my estranged wife's address, not mine. My actual address (7 Redland Close, Gresford, LL12 8HP) is correctly recorded in the custody record and elsewhere. Recording the wrong address for a suspect on an occurrence could have practical consequences for bail conditions and address checks.

5.2 Unexplained "Drugs" Marker

As detailed in Section 2.1, this marker has no documented basis and is contradicted by all custody assessments.

5.3 Contradictory Custody Records

As detailed in Section 2.4, basic facts about me are recorded contradictorily on the same custody record.

5.4 Employer Name Recorded Incorrectly

My employer was recorded as "Network Force" at the Part 5 meeting. My employer is Net World Sports.

6. Phone Seizure, Notice of Seizure and Artificial Compartmentalisation

My phone was seized on 11/08/2025 in connection with the harassment charge. No notice of seizure was provided at the time, contrary to PACE Code B paragraph 7.1. In your initial complaint response you stated: "We do not routinely issue receipts for items that are seized."

You then attached the notice of seizure in your follow-up email, demonstrating that the documentation existed but was not provided to me for over four months.

The phone contained Google security alerts showing unauthorised device access, which I had submitted as evidence supporting my church reports. My estranged wife had previously admitted in WhatsApp messages to accessing my phone without consent. In your complaint response you treated the phone seizure as entirely unrelated to the church matter. However, the phone contains evidence relevant to both matters. By compartmentalising them, you failed to recognise that my access to evidence supporting my victim reports was removed when the phone was seized as a suspect in a separate investigation.

Sgt Eaton noted on 05/09/2025 (entry 33): "LIMA form to be submitted for phone to be downloaded." I was charged on 28/12/2025. I request confirmation of:

- Whether the phone was fully examined.
- What, if any, material was identified.
- Whether any exculpatory material was found that should have been disclosed to the defence under CPIA 1996.

7. Crime Recording and NCRS Compliance

The only formal crime recording decision in the SAR is by Jan Owens (#6093808, 10/08/2025) on occurrence 25000630992 only. It was narrowly framed around "derogatory comments made in an online group chat." The rationale concluded:

"The comments made about him, although upsetting to him, are not grossly offensive and do not amount to a Malicious Communications or any other crimes. There is no indication at the time of review that any individual or group have embarked on a course of conduct against the victim which amounts to harassment."

This assessment was made on 10/08/2025. It predated much of the evidence I subsequently submitted, including:

- Co-founder testimony (exorcism, corruption, family splitting)
- Ex member reports of abuse
- "Don't tell daddy" & branded gifts grooming evidence (confirmed by school at Part 5)
- Additional WhatsApp evidence and surveillance documentation

Despite this, your complaint response treated the 10/08/2025 decision as a comprehensive assessment of all the evidence. It was not.

Furthermore, I reported potential offences under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 (ss.1-2), the Data Protection Act 2018 (ss.170-173), the Computer Misuse Act 1990 (s.1), and the Malicious Communications Act 1988. None of these were formally assessed against the NCRS "balance of probabilities" standard. No crime reference numbers were issued for any of these reported offences.

8. Failure of Supervisory Oversight

Sgt Dewberry (#6073146) approved the filing of occurrence 25000479811 on 07/09/2025 the same day PC Jones submitted it, with the summary: "Not a crime occurrence. CID16 submitted." There is no indication in the supervisor review that:

- The underlying evidence was examined.
- The editorialised filing summary was questioned.
- The failure to offer Victims' Right to Review was identified.
- The recording of a known PTSD sufferer as "not vulnerable" was challenged.
- The misrepresentation of victim views was noticed.

Supervisory reviews exist to provide quality assurance. If the supervisor simply accepted the OIC's filing summary without checking the underlying evidence or the filing form, the review process failed in its purpose. This is an organisational learning point that your initial complaint response stated did not exist.

9. Direct Contradictions Between Your Complaint Responses and the SAR

The following table sets out specific claims you made in your complaint responses alongside what the SAR actually shows.

| # | Your Statement | What the SAR Shows | Issue |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | "As you are aware a Part 5 meeting was conducted..." | I was never invited to, informed of, or present at the Part 5 meeting (24/10/2025). The attendee list confirms this. The first time I became aware of this meeting was your email of 27/11/2025. | Factual error. You implied I attended or communicated with the meeting. I did not. |
| 2 | "I believe you advised representatives at the meeting that you would be seeking legal advice on this matter?" | Sophie Drews (NWP) stated this about me in my absence. I did not advise anyone at the meeting of anything because I was not there. | You appear to have confused something said about me by another officer with something I said myself. |
| 3 | "I do not find that the actions of Pc Jones have been anything other than supportive" | Her logs contain: fabricated webchat claim; editorialised language; admission of reluctance to engage due to suspect status; mischaracterisation of contact frequency; misrepresentation of victim views on filing forms; failure to offer Victims' Right to Review; recording me as not vulnerable despite known PTSD. (See Section 1 table.) | Unsupported conclusion. This assessment appears based on a conversation with PC Jones rather than a review of her documented log entries. |
| 4 | "The evidence that was presented to Pc Jones was deemed not to amount to a crime in law" | The only formal crime recording decision was by Jan Owens on 10/08/2025 on occ. 25000630992 only, narrowly framed as "derogatory comments in an online chat." It predated much of the evidence I later submitted and did not assess the full pattern across both occurrences. | Incomplete assessment presented as comprehensive. The brainwashing admission, grooming behaviours, surveillance, co-founder testimony, and sex offender allegation were never assessed against specific offences. |
| 5 | Sophie Drews at Part 5: "ACG decided... he is not going forward with it" | My actual email (27/08/2025): "shelve this matter for now and await the outcome of the ICO report... get back in touch if there's anything further of concern. If this sounds okay with you?" | Material misrepresentation. I paused pending ICO outcome; I did not withdraw my complaint. My email explicitly reserved the right to return. |
| 6 | Part 5 concluded: "no breaches in safeguarding. NFA." | Police withheld complaint details ("Not going into detail as members of Church are present"). Church reps stated I make "unsubstantiated allegations" without challenge. Complainant excluded. Meeting assessed incomplete information. | The outcome was based on a fundamentally flawed process and cannot be relied upon as a valid safeguarding assessment. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7 | "I do not find any individual or organisational learning" | The SAR discloses: fabricated log entries; Victims' Code breaches; vulnerability misrecording; misrepresented victim views; flawed Part 5 process; supervisory failure; AI dismissal of evidence; deprioritised victim reports. | This conclusion is not consistent with the documentary evidence your own force has disclosed. |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

10. Summary of Evidence Submitted to North Wales Police

For completeness, I set out in one place the full body of evidence I submitted to North Wales Police in relation to Kings Christian Centre. To my knowledge, none of this evidence has resulted in a criminal investigation, a crime reference number, or a formal safeguarding outcome.

It is my opinion that this evidence was dismissed, at least in part, due to mental health markers recorded against my name, the subjective characterisations made by the investigating officer, and my concurrent status as a suspect in a separate harassment matter, rather than being assessed on its own merits.

| # | Evidence | Detail | Significance | Outcome |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Church WhatsApp: "our brainwashing of his wife" | 03/05/2025. Church leader: "I think he is fishing here to maybe take our brainwashing of his wife to the Evangelical Alliance." Obtained via SAR from Kings Christian Centre. | Direct admission using the word "brainwashing." Central to safeguarding and my defence. | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 2 | Church WhatsApp: "head of the snake" | Senior church leaders refer to me as "the head of the snake" in WhatsApp group. Obtained via SAR. | Genesis 3:15 reference — violent spiritual warfare connotations. Dehumanising when applied to a named individual whose children attend the church. | Crime recording (10/08/2025): "not grossly offensive." No investigation. |
| 3 | Church WhatsApp: speculative mental health references | Church leaders discussed my mental health in WhatsApp group without my knowledge, consent, or professional basis. | Potential UK GDPR breach (special category data without lawful basis). Mirrors high-control group pattern of discrediting critics. | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 4 | Systematic surveillance: Google Drive files | SAR from Kings CC revealed dozens of documents/screenshots about me including Reddit and Instagram activity, collected without consent. | Potential DPA 2018 ss.170-173 offences. PHA 1997 (surveillance as course of conduct). | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 5 | Cease and desist dismissed as "pseudo legal" | Church member described my cease and desist as "pseudo legal" in WhatsApp group; stated they would ignore it. | Deliberate decision to disregard formal request. Relevant to PHA 1997 course of conduct. | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 6 | Co-founder testimony | Co-founder left citing corruption, family splitting, and attempted exorcism on her teenage daughter who had | Founding member corroborating harmful practices including exorcism on a medically ill child. | Referenced at Part 5. No follow-up. |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| | | glandular fever and developed CFS. | | |
| 7 | Ex-member testimony | Multiple former members describing abusive practices, spiritual manipulation, coercion, intimidation in private prayer meetings. | Multiple independent witnesses corroborating same pattern. Not one person with a grievance. | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 8 | Abrupt relocation of long-standing pastors | Two main pastors of 15 years abruptly relocated shortly after I raised safeguarding concerns. | Recognised institutional safeguarding red flag (moving personnel to avoid scrutiny). | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 9 | "Don't tell daddy" outings and branded gifts | Church safeguarding officer gave children branded "Kings Kids" trophies, took them to evangelical events (United Beach Missions) without consent. Children instructed not to tell me. School confirmed at Part 5: child said "We don't talk about that." | NSPCC identifies secretive gift-giving, loyalty rewards, and "don't tell" instructions as grooming behaviours. Carried out by adult in position of trust (safeguarding officer). | Confirmed by school at Part 5. Still NFA. |
| 10 | Google security alerts: unauthorised device access | Unrecognised desktop login alerts. Evidence on seized phone, currently inaccessible to me. | Potential Computer Misuse Act 1990 s.1 offence. On seized phone — not examined or disclosed. | On seized phone. Not examined. |
| 11 | Wife's admission of accessing my phone without consent | Admitted in WhatsApp to repeatedly accessing my phone without consent. | Potential Computer Misuse Act 1990 offence. Pattern of unauthorised access. | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 12 | YouTube service recordings | Publicly livestreamed services referencing "the evil one" and "a slight enemy problem" shortly after my complaints, in context I believe directed at me. | Part of pattern of demonisation in context of "head of the snake" messages and surveillance. | Dismissed. No investigation. |
| 13 | Wife's language consistent with coercive control | Accused me of "persecuting her faith" and stated "you disgust me." Mirrors ICSEA-identified high-control group influence patterns. She also repeated the mantra "faith, before family" many times when we still lived together | Evidence of undue influence. Relevant to safeguarding and my defence (genuine concern about coercive control). | Characterised by PC Jones as marital dispute. |

11. Closing Observations

The evidence listed in this document was submitted to North Wales Police across multiple reports between June and November 2025. It includes documentary evidence obtained via lawful Subject Access Requests, the church's own internal WhatsApp transcripts containing admissions of "brainwashing," independent witness testimony from the organisation's co-founder and former members, a report from an ex member about abuse, independent confirmation from the children's school of secretive behaviours matching NSPCC-identified grooming indicators, and publicly available recordings.

Despite the volume, the seriousness, and the independent corroboration of this evidence, no crime reference numbers were issued, no criminal investigation was initiated, and the Part 5 safeguarding meeting concluded with "no further action" while three representatives of the organisation being complained about sat at the table and I was not invited.

I am a father who sent messages to his estranged wife because he was genuinely worried about his children. The church's own leadership used the word "brainwashing." Their own co-founder described exorcisms performed on a sick child. The school confirmed my children were being told to keep secrets from me in a manner that the NSPCC identifies as grooming behaviour. Multiple former members independently described the same patterns of manipulation and control. And yet I am the one facing criminal charges, while not a single one of the concerns I raised has been formally investigated.

12. Summary of Requested Actions

Against PC Jade Jones (#6073191):

1. Fabricated the claim of "constantly webchatting" when zero webchats were documented at that date.
2. Editorialised in official logs, presenting personal opinion as fact and reducing safeguarding reports to a marital grievance.
3. Admitted deprioritising my victim reports because of my suspect status in a separate matter (two separate admissions).
4. Created a conflict of interest by handling both my suspect and victim cases simultaneously, with no acknowledgement or mitigation.
5. Recorded me as "not vulnerable" on both filing forms despite full written disclosure of complex PTSD, panic attacks, and anxiety.
6. Misrepresented my victim views on filing forms as "no complaint" and "unwilling" when my email said "shelve" pending ICO.
7. Failed to inform me of my Victims' Right to Review on both occurrences (Victims' Code Right 7).
8. Insisted on face-to-face meetings without considering written communication as a reasonable adjustment under the Equality Act 2010.
9. Mischaracterised the volume and nature of my contact across multiple log entries ("constantly," "numerous," "a number of times").
10. Failed to conduct an objective assessment of the evidence against the specific offences I reported (PHA 1997, DPA 2018, CMA 1990, MCA 1988).
11. Described my submissions as "quite rambling and difficult to follow" without engaging with their substance.

Organisational / Procedural Failings:

12. Unexplained "Drugs" RMS marker - provide documented basis or remove immediately from my record.

13. Multiple breaches in the Part 5 meeting process: exclusion of complainant; presence of subjects; withheld complaint details; unchallenged assertions; AI dismissal of evidence; irrelevant occupation question with inaccurate employer name.
14. Failure of supervisory oversight - Sgt Dewberry approved flawed filing without identifying any of the issues documented in this report.
15. Contradictory custody risk assessments on the same record (neurodiversity, medication, dietary needs all contradictory).
16. Incorrect address recorded on initial occurrence (my estranged wife's address, not mine).
17. Failure to provide notice of seizure at the time of property seizure (PACE Code B para 7.1).
18. No NCRS-compliant assessment of reported offences under PHA 1997, DPA 2018, CMA 1990, or MCA 1988.
19. Sophie Drews misrepresented my position at the Part 5 meeting, stating I had decided not to go forward when my email explicitly reserved the right to return.

For your personal attention (refreshed investigation):

The filing summaries on both church occurrences incorrectly state I wished to "take this no further." My email of 27/08/2025 explicitly reserved the right to return. This misrepresentation formed the basis for closing both occurrences and must be corrected as part of the refreshed investigation.

I also request confirmation of whether my seized phone was examined and what, if any, material was identified, including whether any exculpatory material exists that should have been disclosed to the defence under CPIA 1996.

I remain willing to engage constructively, but the volume and seriousness of the issues now disclosed require urgent, independent review. Please confirm within 14 days how these matters will be addressed and by whom.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Griffiths

drewjohngriffiths@gmail.com

07884390306