

The below printout represents the results of the public survey available at the URL:


<https://www.youtube.com/post/Ugkxh4mr8WMnunNTAE2IEiuHBReR2v731djc>



BlackBeltBarrister 11 days ago

A high-ranked police officer approves a wholly misleading court application and then refuses to give any comment on such conduct. Should he go through misconduct proceedings?

12K votes



645

178 Comments

Sort by



Add a comment...



@laceandwhisky 11 days ago

Public servants should be accountable for their actions. Clearly police are in another box

86 Reply

7 replies



@bradfordzone5187 11 days ago (edited)

But they are not servants of the public. They are servants of the Crown. They swear an oathe to serve the King and to keep the Kings peace.

5 Reply



@hollandsemum1 10 days ago (edited)

I agree. There are too many times, UK or US, in which "public servants" do not uphold that premise. And whether or not they are "Crown", they are performing public duties and should be accountable.

As someone else pointed out, if anyone behaved like that in a non-government position, they'd be instantly sacked.

Frankly, I'm kind of sick of the way government employees are protected. In the US, they commonly get tax exemptions too, even as they are the epitome of bureaucratic behavior. Oxymoronic.

Show less

1 Reply



@msmrepo3271 10 days ago

@bradfordzone5187 Thier oath to the Crown is to serve us on behalf of the Crown, the Crown serves us, we are the principle.

👍 1 🗨️ Reply



@spud7823 10 days ago

@bradfordzone5187 and the king serves the people, coronation oath, he's a public servant, public servants should follow the Nolan Principles.

👍 1 🗨️ Reply



@msmrepo3271 7 days ago

@spud7823 yep he even says it in the coronation "I'm here to Serve and not be served".

👍 🗨️ Reply



@Bran_Redmaw 5 days ago

There are processes for holding Police to account. Try holding Politicians, Journalists, judges and solicitors to any type of account.

👍 🗨️ Reply



@ro63rto 11 days ago

To quote a famous character....

"Just 'cause you have a badge doesn't mean you can treat people any way you like. And as a law enforcement professional, you have an obligation to be more ethically upstanding than the average man, not less."

👍 54 🗨️ Reply

▲ 2 replies



@RaffSomma 10 days ago

Don't forget the police's 4 E's lol..

👍 🗨️ Reply



@OoO-rf2gt 9 days ago

And the native people of the land people have a responsibility to make the police who can't stay in line.. To go missing.

👍 🗨️ Reply



@hawkhoskins4250 11 days ago

We investigated ourselves and found we are innocent. What's new?

👍 67 🗨️ Reply

▲ 11 replies



@thomas.parnell7365 11 days ago

No great fucking surprises

👍 🗨️ Reply



@B-26354 11 days ago

This American biased comment gets tossed around alot on UK police videos and I find it incredibly frustrating.

In the US it is generally the case that Police Departments investigate themselves via internal affairs with little if any outside scrutiny or oversight.

In Great Britain we are much more sensible and have something called "*Independent Office of Police Conduct*" which is entirely separate government agency established away from the police which investigates a majority of police misconduct including all deaths after police contact and serious allegations of misconduct.

Britain is NOT the US, stop pretending it is.

We tend to do things alot better than our US cousins.


Show less

 1  Reply

 **@Umski** 11 days ago

The NHS does the same it seems until someone uncovers the rug 😬


 3  Reply

 **@B-26354** 11 days ago

[@Umski](#)

How many people go straight to the ombudsman?

 3  Reply



 **@thedoctor007dfw** 11 days ago

[@B-26354](#) not quite accurate. Professional Standards Departments/Counter Corruption Units in various forces deal with the vast majority of cases without the need to involve the IOPC. Notable exceptions would be police shootings for example.

Death or serious injury following recent police contact would be assessed by PSD to see if it needs an IOPC referral. If it does, the IOPC can decide whether no action is necessary or what level of action is needed.

Action can include an independent IOPC investigation, an IOPC directed investigation with PSD doing the leg work, or a local investigation with PSD in total control but they must report their findings to the IOPC.

Show less

  Reply

 **@B-26354** 10 days ago (edited)

[@thedoctor007dfw](#)

Professional standards deal with the general low level complaints but anything classified as gross misconduct gets referred to the IOPC who can instruct a force what to do with an officer.

My point being there is that external oversight which most US Departments don't have.


Show less

  Reply



@thedoctor007dfw 10 days ago

[@B-26354](#) no it doesn't

  Reply



@thedoctor007dfw 10 days ago

[@B-26354](#) I understood your point but the majority of gross misconduct matters do not have IOPC involvement. Stats and figures can be fed back to them and HMIC though.

  Reply



@B-26354 10 days ago (edited)

[@thedoctor007dfw](#)

All gross misconduct investigations have IOPC input.

IOPC simply directs the local PSD as what to do aka it goes to them for local investigation.

  Reply



@thedoctor007dfw 10 days ago

[@B-26354](#) that's not how it works at all. The local forces serve papers, investigate and deal with the outcome at either a hearing or an accelerated hearing without any input from the IOPC.

...

 1  Reply



@Johnarry 4 days ago

We will learn from this, evening all.

  Reply



@DigBipper188 11 days ago

If we civilians tried that we'd be on the hook for our attempt to mislead the court

Any civil servant should be liable for the same, and this includes fellow bar members as well.

Accountability should be a universal thing.

Show less



 29  Reply

 1 reply



@maxjohn6012 10 days ago

Seriously not trying to start an argument, but police are civilians ;) I 100% get what you're saying though and agree with you.

  Reply



@movarvo1217 11 days ago

In any event the public servant for being suspectedshould be removed from office immediately.

 3  Reply



@danb4530 11 days ago

There are too many bent people in positions of power in this Country.

8 Reply



@derbyshireguru5680 11 days ago

If you commit deception or fraud in any other job you would be instantly dismissed... and then you would also be taken to court and probably jailed..... Police and other public servants seem to be able to get away with things that in any other job would be severely punished..... its high time the 'boys club' favours system was eradicated and everyone was made equally accountable under law.

16 Reply

4 replies



@hawkhoskins4250 11 days ago

Unless you're a politician or DWP employee. Deception is trained into these people.

1 Reply



@derbyshireguru5680 11 days ago

[@hawkhoskins4250](#) ...both truly evil entities.

1 Reply



@RaffSomma 10 days ago

I agree, but that's never going to happen, but there is such a thing called karma that they would not have the intelligence to understand!!

Reply



@derbyshireguru5680 9 days ago

[@RaffSomma](#) I do believe that Karma is certainly coming for these people; and that the whole malthusian British regime is going to be collectively punished if not eradicated completely very soon.

Reply



@robinmouzer6953 7 days ago

ALL public servants including elected public servants like Members of Parliament, Police & Crime Commissioner should all be dealt with this way! They are exempt and our lawmakers police themselves.

Reply



@geoffnorton9279 10 days ago

Barristers and solicitors also included. Alas, they also are currently exempt. Take note Mr BBB.

11 Reply

1 reply



@yorkiemike 8 days ago

What are they exempt from?

Reply



@ace90210ace 11 days ago

The silence I don't hold against them, often in these cases they are advised to say nothing innocent or not and if we start proclaiming people are guilty because they say nothing we are just encouraging innocent people to feel pressured to speak up against legal advice which is bad.

But the initial act of signing off a clearly misleading statement in court is wrong.

Show less

6 Reply

▲ 5 replies



@B-26354 11 days ago

Again saying nothing at all is often a very bad idea IN BRITAIN because the police caution specifically states if you fail to mention when questioned you can't necessarily rely on a defence at court.

You've provided no alibi or defence.

Britain is not the US yet most people watch US based videos and believe that we are - always seek independent legal advice but always pay particular attention to the police caution, it is immensely important.

Show less

Reply



@RaffSomma 10 days ago

Yes and don't forget the police's 4 E's ...

Reply



@B-26354 10 days ago

@RaffSomma

That was a Coronavirus Directive...

2 Reply



@RaffSomma 10 days ago

[@B-26354](#) they have always used the 4 E's even before the Coronavirus directive.

Reply



@B-26354 10 days ago

[@RaffSomma](#)

You got a source for that?

Reply



@Rob-vw3if 11 days ago

Silence speaks volumes in most cases.

5 Reply



@AnthonyStafford-qx5hx 11 days ago

The "public" are a nuisance filth to avoid

 1  Reply



@antonrudenham3259 10 days ago

Did the application mislead him or was he complicit in its generation??

 5  Reply



@ianstoyan 11 days ago

No, just sack him.

 26  Reply

▲ **6 replies**



@TheLonerSupreme 11 days ago

Make him go through Mis -Conduct Proceedings (Kangaroo Court) Then sack him!

 4  Reply



@johnworkman2743 11 days ago

Definitely not, by the sound of it he has been involved in something he shouldnt have been and should face the process of the law and not investigated via his local mates but from an outside authority

 1  Reply



@johnworkman2743 11 days ago

[@TheLonerSupreme](#) not just this person but others as well should not be allowed to step down and get their full pension as if nothing was wrong

 1  Reply



@PA1606X 11 days ago

[@TheLonerSupreme](#) Sorry mate, I am confused. If the disciplinary procedure is a kangaroo court then it is unfair and rigged against the person appearing in front of it. Are you saying that that's fine as long as you do not like the accused?

 1  Reply



@superscatboy 10 days ago



Drag him through the courts. Let him have a dose of his own medicine.

 1  Reply



@TheLonerSupreme 10 days ago

If you ever had disciplinary proceedings against you at work you will know they have already decided the outcome . Anyway the statement states he is guilty. [@PA1606X](#)

  Reply



@se9225 11 days ago

Such an action is subject to Judicial Review under Administration Law. If such an order is considered to be ultra viries, then said Officer may face civil litigation or potentially criminal if a Court finds in favour of the applicant.

 1  Reply



@j.g.becket 10 days ago

Misconduct in Public Office is a matter of public trust; actions or negligence to act in such ways as to amount to causing a loss of the public trust, placed into the offices they hold.

It's important to remember that the public do not place trust into the individual, rather they place trust into the office they serve in;

To cause the loss of that trust, is to cause the institution itself to be distrusted; this is a serious offence.

Show less

1 Reply



@DyslecticAttack 11 days ago (edited)

There's quite a few gaps here that make me say no, but that might depend on the court system and what is approved, and with what authority it is approved, since that's woefully vague to me.

But first off, what does the approval mean? My reading is that it's nothing conclusionary, but that it approves a next procedural step. And depending on the step, then you've got room to shed light on what is "misleading".

And if boundaries are overstepped that shouldn't be, then either you've not argued against it well enough, or you should have got grounds for appeal (which if it is immoral or unjust, should be granted and should earn such an investigation anyway).

Secondly, "misleading" can be quite subjective. "Inaccurate" would be factual, but to what degree of inaccuracy is something tolerable depends on circumstances. And well, "misleading" would require some proof of intent, so from my perspective, the best moment to gather and present said proof is in a procedural (more regulated than normal) environment. And depending on the "approval", that's exactly the environment the approval should be offering.

So TLDR, the question is vague, but generally speaking it shouldn't be grounds directly, but could be grounds in a later stage.

Show less

3 Reply



@philipsgeekery4589 11 days ago

Be interested to know he did it what were the circumstances, political or corruption?

3 Reply

1 reply




@DyslecticAttack 11 days ago (edited)

That also assumes it's willfully misleading. Incompetence, misunderstanding, or just miscommunication are also possible reasons.

None of them are ideal, but considering the vagueness of the question and the 98/2 split, I am a bit in a "we shouldn't draw too many conclusions that haven't been provided" mindset. And at least to me, there is a possibility that the assumed error isn't made with malice (and despite the anecdotal evidence against police, I do still tend to stick to a "don't attribute malice to what can easily be attributed to stupidity" stance).



And frankly, there are undefined consequences, an undefined "what was approved", and even an undefined "at what point (if any, since even that is unclear) is/was it concluded it is a 'misrepresentation'". So I'm quite hesitant to say "yes, every single instance that could be this needs to be investigated for malpractice at an undefined moment in the procedure". Since that seems like a whole ton of bureaucracy that could be more harmful than helpful.

Show less

  Reply



 **@gurglejug627** 11 days ago

Social services and family court judges need to be investigated for what is either corruption and/or total ineptitude - as do numerous women lying and abusing the court system. Even when the police see them lying with their own eyes and at the very least committing perjury and wasting police time they won't touch it - yet they pounce on men at the slightest spurious/nonsensical allegation.

  Reply

 **@WasNotWas999** 11 days ago

They are so used to doing what they want without question that's it's hard for them to know times, have changed and the police cannot be quite so dishonest and corrupt as before

 1  Reply

 **@minty3103** 11 days ago

Was he aware that it was misleading? If he signed it in the knowledge it was misleading, then he should. If he'd was mislead , then it's less cut & dried.

 3  Reply

[▲ 2 replies](#)



 **@robertharper6481** 11 days ago

It really is not. The moment they discovered that they had misled, they had one chance to immediately come forward and admit this was the case. The fact they did not do this and then refused to comment makes them just as guilty as if they had known from the start.

  Reply



 **@stevecarter8810** 11 days ago

That's what the proceedings should figure out

  Reply

 **@richymoore** 10 days ago

Police, politicians, civil service bosses, judges and armed forces top brass should be subject to quarterly reviews by public juries as a requirement of the job. If any of them are found to be corrupt (which would be all of them in modern day Britain) they should be sent to prison with immediate effect.

  Reply

 **@farmerned6** 10 days ago

Misconduct?????,
Should be arrested, charged and sacked

  Reply



@Cat10980 9 days ago

Surely he's also in contempt of court?

 1  Reply



@alphaomega1089 11 days ago

Can approve anything they want. The police aren't the law. He/she was stating their approval. Will it hold in a court of law.

  Reply



@solitaryangel722 8 days ago



But if the application was misleading why didn't the court question it?

 1  Reply



@sarahlogan942 10 days ago



Far too many get away with their corruption because cops investigate cops and cover for them sick of the two tier system now

  Reply



@scrubsrc4084 9 days ago

Sacked and jailed.

  Reply



@UKsoldier45 11 days ago



Such applications can be made in camera before a court to ensure ethics and confidentiality. What's the fuss about??!!

 1  Reply



@hugohugohugohugohugo 10 days ago (edited)

I would need to know more details before making a decision.

  Reply



@MrStaffy01 9 days ago



police no matter what the rank are crown servants not public, but even so as the profession they work in involves the duties it does they should be held to as a minimum the same standards as everyone else and due to the nature of their job in fact an even higher standard ... knowingly misleading a court with material facts, what makes him so special as to not to have to comply with ...

 1  Reply



@fathersonbrotherunclefrien4238 6 days ago



No person is above the law, regardless of job, stature, bloodline, aristocracy!
But we all know it's a one way game to be Frank!

  Reply



@damianleah6744 10 days ago



Public servants should be beyond reproach. He should be fired. This is the problem at the moment. They hold everyone else to high standards. But think those very standards that they uphold seem not to apply to them. At the very least it shows complete lack of judgement.

  Reply



@derekgargan5080 10 days ago

As with any business, if a senior position makes a bad decision they need to explain themselves. If a lower position had made the same error all hell to pay for it.

  Reply



@karenlee7711 10 days ago

Yes .tbh there are a lot of politicians police judges that need to be looked into .

  Reply



@myasin1286 9 days ago

He is a public servant. Disciplinary is necessary

  Reply



@marksargent2440 11 days ago

I sometime think they forget their jobs to uphold the law not to bend it to fit their interpretation of the law look at what's going on in London it doesn't look good at the moment

  Reply



@user-yg3sj1ig4d 9 days ago

Experiencing cafcass social services solicitors and barristers and a judge all knowing lies was fabricated and the facts omitted yes!!!!, afterwards there isn't a thing you can do to hold any one accountable

  Reply



@davidfisher2359 11 days ago



Should be immediately dismissed. Along with the chief constable to send a clear message.

  Reply



@nonestopmadness3575 8 days ago



More often than not the police think they are the law, rather than just upholding the law.

  Reply



@rayandlesleywestcar8351 9 days ago

Every system is corrupt someone always on the make

  Reply





@GeraintHughes-pp1cy 10 days ago

that's why the police should not be allowed to give court applications and search warrants because they are biased in favour of their own people

  Reply



@99tisard 10 days ago
Dismissal and loss of pension....

  Reply





@Typhoidpol 10 days ago
If only we could hold the cult NHS to the same standard as the old bill.

  Reply





@nicholasmurrell7904 9 days ago
After having to defend myself from a spade wielding attacker who hit my bare leg with said garden implement, I had possible charges hanging over me for about five months. I asked my solicitor about complaining to the police about the very long wait. He chuckled and told me that in 30 years of legal practice he had NEVER heard tell of ANY complaint being upheld against the police. I got 'No Further Action', and I parked outside of his rented flat to conduct my business for years after the incident.

Show less

  Reply



@rubblestacker 9 days ago
anyone paid by the public purse should be held fully accountable , sentences for police, politicians etc should be doubled as they should be setting a example to society

  Reply





@gregabott5583 11 days ago
Any police officer who either knowingly misapplies the law, or ignorantly misapplies the law, in anyway which leads to a member of the public having to do anything they wouldn't normally have done, should be fired and banned for public sector work for life.

 1  Reply

[▲ 2 replies](#)





@sahhull 11 days ago
Any settlement should come from the cops own pocket or pension fund. Not the tax payers.

  Reply





@gregabott5583 11 days ago
[@sahhull](#) they should be made to take out professional insurance like lawyers have to. Then there policy can pay out.

  Reply



@Brizlebird 10 days ago
Misconduct? No. No "we investigated ourselves and found we didn't do anything wrong" shenanigans. He should be prosecuted.

  Reply



@barrybueler3356 11 days ago

Of course



Reply



@silkyfan 10 days ago

He should go on the grounds of either Perverting the Course of Justice or attempting to Pervert the Course of Justice, or Perjury.



Reply



@andrewgarner9194 7 days ago

Not only does the public need to have total faith in the police, they can't possibly use a defense of not understanding the implications and people in position of trust have a higher requirement to operate correctly



Reply



@xyz987123abc 9 days ago

No, he should be terminated and lose all pension rights. And potentially left open to being sued by his victims.



1



Reply



@Historyfan476AD 11 days ago

Without accountability, there can be no public trust.



Reply



@CtrlAltDeleteLawz 9 days ago

EVERYONE should be accountable for their actions. No one should be above the law



Reply



@35milesflead 11 days ago (edited)

Isn't perversion of the course of justice in a public office exactly that - perversion of the course of justice? But also misconduct while in public office? As well as perjury if given as a statement in court?



1



Reply

▲ 5 replies



@markstott6689 11 days ago

"Course" ???



Reply



@35milesflead 11 days ago

@markstott6689 spelling sorted.



1



Reply



@markstott6689 11 days ago

@35milesflead You didn't have to acknowledge my observation, but thank you for doing so.



 1  Reply



@35milesoflead 11 days ago

@markstott6689 I did. I like to correct what I get wrong at the earliest opportunity. It's no harm or foul to edit two words! 🙌🙌🙌

 1  Reply



@markstott6689 11 days ago



@35milesoflead Have a wonderful weekend whatever you get up to. ✨😊✨

 1  Reply



@sonofsomerset1695 10 days ago



I'm sure he will fully investigate himself and find himself innocent, as with every institutional power nowadays.

  Reply



@janegreen9340 11 days ago

And some people wonder why confidence in the Police is at rock bottom, it puts the good officers in the same bracket when they're just trying to do the best for us.

  Reply



@jboy9643 10 days ago

Yes, he should. The action is intentional and did not happen by accident. The application suggests a blithe attitude to the Courts, their time etc, towards his job and to the public generally. I am sure that prior to approval this Police officers' advisers would have presented him with several ways to proceed. My impression is that the Police have become more politicised and beholden to city mayors (London?). These types of incidents will increase. Worryingly they reveal an unconscious bias or contempt on the part of this senior officer for certain elements of the public, and a real pressure from their political masters to achieve headlines or a 'result'.....especially in the run up to an election!! "...round up all the usual suspects..." (ref Casablanca) They should, but of course they wont! Smiley face!!



Show less

  Reply



@jaytee8188 10 days ago

Of course, either a no-brainer or daft question depending on what point you're driving at.

  Reply



@denisemckeown6847 11 days ago



He clearly knew what he was doing so yes

 1  Reply



@jaybee1921 11 days ago


Of course he should...as Arfur would have said, "We pay his wages..."

  Reply



@BigBenn2014 10 days ago

Malfeasance in public office?




Reply



@AndreaReid-bl9ns 11 days ago

This is the problem with society today people from all walks of life seem to think they are above the law no one is above the law regardless what background we come from we are all answerable for any wrong doing




Reply



@spudhead169 9 days ago

There was a time this tomfoolery could be done and there would be little to no reaction. Today it's not so simple, the people are no longer reliant on main stream media, we can make our own, we can communicate directly. It's high time these scuzz balls understand they simply can't get away with crap like this anymore. It doesn't matter if the Police shield this guy from disciplinary action or not, he's done. His actions are going to be scrutinized and monitored on both sides from now on and the public will never give him any credence again. The days of bending the rules because you think you can slip past the consequences are rapidly coming to an end, we're not there yet, but with guys like BBB and Louis Rossmann etc.. it soon will be.

Show less




Reply



@reznovvazileski3193 11 days ago

Well yes ofcourse. If you're a public servant both conducting yourself wrongfully and trying to keep it a private affair at the same time, oh what was the term I used again? Yes, I remember, PUBLIC servant. Then of course somebody else is going to have to review your conduct for us because nobody in this universe should be immune to scrutiny.




Reply



@Zeyr01 10 days ago

Lol said the government, lmao!




Reply



@scoutfinch47 11 days ago

Give someone a uniform and most will respect what that uniform represents. Others will abuse the fact they can do things because they wear that uniform.




Reply



@marianmain 4 days ago

He swore an oath. He broke that oath. At what stage in their careers exactly, does accountability stop for the police? He would be immediately sacked if he was a civilian.




Reply

































@woofbarkyap 11 days ago

Without context, I have no idea






1

Reply

-  **@suecharnock9369** 11 days ago
If he can not explain why he misled then yes, but if he can show that he went of information available to him at the time, then no.
  Reply
-  **@msmrepo3271** 10 days ago
Even if he did, nothing would happen, they got excuses for letting our girls get you know what in Rotherham and most other cities here.
  Reply
-  **@E-Ryder** 11 days ago
Rules for one & Rules for another
  Reply
-  **@lucyheed2013** 9 days ago
will be pensioned off or moved onto new area till dust settles... jobs for the boys funny handshake club rules..
  Reply
-  **@ohsosome01** 11 days ago
Come on, give us a tough one!
  Reply
-  **@ashleym4887** 11 days ago (edited)
With a daughter in the MET working for the DPS, my observation is that it is highly likely he could face disciplinary action through misconduct and a lack of professional standards.
  Reply
-  **@bertbox69** 11 days ago
It's a mockery of a civilised society of you can skirt and avoid the law depending on who you are. The public doesn't have recourse to refuse, corruption at its simplest
  Reply
-  **@rileymorgan9084** 9 days ago
Think before one speaks on subject. Remember get all facts first. First thought. With no evidence. Did a person do it in order to bring down a corrupt official.
  Reply
-  **@PilotChris06FW** 8 days ago
Is that even a question we should be asking....he should face criminal proceedings.
  Reply
-  **@kippertrace5808** 10 days ago
Nah. 😏
  Reply

P @philbo2152 9 days ago (edited)
Misleading in what way or is that just the defence's opinion?
An officer can only face a misconduct hearing following an investigation into a breach of regulations, and even then it can be upheld or dismissed

  Reply

 @lornemalvo2045 9 days ago
Who voted No?!? His mates?

  Reply



W @warringtonminge4167 10 days ago
Should without any doubt but I'll bet the rent he f'king won't equally without doubt.


  Reply

M @1mlister 9 days ago
You're missing the lawyer answer: it depends

  Reply

G @geedub2019 10 days ago (edited)
I said yes but I might have been a bit hasty, if the high ranking officer has been misled then surely they were unaware and the person who was misleading them is the ones who are accountable?
Edit: Police are trained to react on information received, if that information is misleading then it's not the officers fault

  Reply



 @mercedesblack7828 11 days ago
Was the officer aware it was misleading?

  Reply


T @trudycarmichael6050 9 days ago
And jail time


  Reply



C @craigbrannan9734 9 days ago (edited)
The 1% is the copper voting no. Haha

  Reply

S @sabbimoriarty8887 8 days ago
Clicked accidentally no, of course yes!

  Reply

 @kingkong81icloud 10 days ago (edited)
What is wholly ? Yes he should because he is guilty as hell

  Reply



@Musician-Lee 9 days ago

The question as asked, states as a fact that the statement was "Wholly misleading". I would only ask if this is a proven fact or a matter of opinion?

Reply



@no-oneinparticular7264 11 days ago

I have ticked yes, but think maybe he was unaware of nuances that made this application misleading??.

Reply



@robertthomson1587 10 days ago

Who's the 'no' voter? The police officer's spouse?

Reply



@GwladYrHaf 11 days ago

If it's a general hypothetical question and we take the "misleading" qualifier as a given then the answer is yes.

If it pertains to an actual scenario then details must be provided to analyse what constitutes ...

2 Reply



@biddyboy1570 11 days ago

Impossible to say based off two sentences. This second one is only to balance this comment with the accusation.

Reply



@christastic100 11 days ago

Strange question as the law is the law. Most people don't get special privileges except certain religious groups and politicians.

Reply



@motiveintentionsincerity1925 10 days ago

Well he sure sounds like a hypocrite

Reply



@doktorparadox1791 11 days ago

Reminds you about police in soviet/communists countries

Reply



@dougsmonsters4866 11 days ago

Public servants should be totally transparent in there dealings.

1 Reply



@QiuEnnan 10 days ago



wot is the purpose of such a question

  Reply






@colettefoy5961 11 days ago

Of course he's not above accountability

  Reply



@alexmarshall4331 10 days ago


PLEASE...Stop filming us (The Met)   

  Reply





@chloehood6355 11 days ago



Ignore the other two, his wife and his sister!

  Reply



@dromnispank4723 10 days ago



 who was that 1%? 

  Reply



@cplcabs 8 days ago


Can't see the vote buttons. Have I been restricted?

  Reply



@lrdisco2005 11 days ago

Why bother.

  Reply



@bren4061 11 days ago


No he shouldn't

  Reply



@robertroberts3rd265 11 days ago (edited)


99% v 1%...3.3k votes... There's 33 police officers in here
*edit now 11k votes, still split 99 to 1, so now 110 cuntstables in here

  Reply



@taggart64 10 days ago

Gary Waterman the truth will set you free, on YouTube look him up, I bet this BBB guy won't

  Reply



@MATkins791 11 days ago

Yes he absolutely should. I'm pretty sure it's a crime to mislead the court and society expects and demands professionalism from the police. The police are appalling these days.

  Reply

