

Full Video Incident Explained & Legal Summary – Alleged Harassment & Threat Charge

◆ Background Context

- **Location:** Communal hallway, second floor, Burncroft Avenue.
- **Date of Incident:** Believed to be the **second month of this year**, as documented on your website horrificcorruption.com.
- **Your Condition:** You were in your **flat**, wearing a **nightgown**, and actively documenting neighbour misconduct.

You've made repeated complaints to the **police and council** over 12 years regarding:

- **Richard Edward Skinner** (Flat 113)
- **Rebecca O'Hare** and previous tenants of her flat

Despite extensive documentation and diary entries submitted to the council, **no arrests or investigations** have been made into your claims.

◆ Events Leading to Arrest

1. Inside Your Flat:

- Richard began **banging on the floor above** your front room.
- You heard **drilling noises** from the front of the building.
- You were actively **typing documentation** on your website about these disturbances.

2. Going Upstairs:

- You went to knock on **Richard's door (Flat 113)** to address the noise.
- You noticed **Rebecca's front door was missing**, being replaced by a **council subcontractor**.
- You said **nothing to the builder**, but realised he was responsible for the drilling.

3. Encounter with Rebecca:

- Richard did **not answer** his door.
- As you turned around, **Rebecca appeared**, recording you with her phone.
- You asked: **"What are you recording me for?"**

- You then addressed her **tapping through walls and floors**, which you've documented repeatedly.
 - She **deflected**, referencing her front door, but you clarified it was her **kitchen wall and floor** adjoining yours.
 - You said: "**You're a liar**," and said aloud your **website URL** as you walked away.
 - The entire interaction was **brief**, and you had **no intention of engaging** with her: "**From the Start**."
-

◆ Arrest & Interview – Section 4 Harassment

You were arrested under:

Section 4(1) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997

"A person whose course of conduct causes another to fear, on at least two occasions, that violence will be used against him is guilty of an offence if he knows or ought to know that his course of conduct will cause the other so to fear on each of those occasions."

The **police interview**:

- You were advised to give a **prepared statement** about the 03/08/2025 and say "**No comment**" during interview, which you followed.
- You were also shown a **video** of a past date!
- You were accused of making a **direct threat to harm Rebecca** in that video.
- However, the **police themselves admitted** that the alleged threat was **not present** in the full video.
- They stated that **if it had been**, you would have been charged under:

Section 5 of the Public Order Act 1986

"Using threatening or abusive words or behaviour likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress."

Additionally:

- A **police officer attempted to question you** about allegedly harassing a police officer.
 - Your **solicitor intervened**, stating you had **not been arrested for that**, and the officer **must not ask**.
-

◆ Procedural Irregularities

After the interview:

- The **harassment 1997 charge (Section 4)** was to be **dropped**.
- Your **solicitor and appropriate adult** left the station.
- Then, without further arrest or interview, a **new charge was applied**:
 - **“Threats to blow up her car”**
 - You were **charged to court** without legal representation or guidance and refused bail due to alleged allegations of arrest due to committing similar offences to the same victim before that are false as your criminal record and police records and council records prove as well.

You believe this new charge falls under:

Section 5 of the Public Order Act 1986 and Not under **Section 2 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971**, which applies only if:

- The threat was made **without lawful excuse**
- The accused **intended the recipient to fear** it would be carried out

You assert that:

- You **never made such a threat**
- The **video evidence**, while showing you in a **raised tone**, does **not contain the alleged words accused of as they did not happen**.
- You’ve requested the video be **transcribed**, as your words will make **perfect sense** when read clearly

◆ Your Position

- You’ve **never visited Rebecca’s front door** before in your life.
- Any interaction with her has been **brief and documented**, including diary entries submitted to the council and police.
- You believe this incident was a **setup**, and that the council and police have both:
 - **Refused to act** on your complaints
 - **Met with these individuals** and attempted to build a **false profile** in your name, which you can prove was **maliciously constructed**.

Absolutely, Simon. Here's a comprehensive section that outlines the **breaches of protocol, legal standards, human rights, and regulatory frameworks** relevant to your case. It’s

structured to support legal rebuttal, council complaints, or publication on your site. I've integrated everything from our prior chats and added statutory references where applicable.

Breaches of Protocol, Law, and Regulatory Standards

◆ 1. Procedural Breaches – Police Conduct

Issue	Breach	Relevant Law/Standard
Charge Switching Without Re-Arrest or Interview	You were charged with a new offence (“threats to blow up her car”) after your solicitor and appropriate adult had left, without re-arrest or interview.	Breach of PACE Code C (Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984) – suspects must be informed of charges and given legal representation.
Interview Conduct	Police attempted to question you about harassing a police officer, despite no arrest for that offence.	Breach of PACE Code C, para 6.4 – questioning must relate to the offence under arrest.
Failure to Verify Evidence Prior to Bail Refusal	During interview, the video shown did not contain the alleged verbal threat, and the harassment charge was fairly dropped due to lack of evidence of two separate incidents. Despite this, bail was refused based on a custody officer’s claim that the alleged victim had previously had you arrested and found guilty twice. You challenged this, citing your criminal record and internal police logs, both of which disprove the claim. The video itself has not been refused as of disclosed to me as of yet, but its contents already undermine the accusation and the new illegally imposed charge. In addition, the PNC/ACRO record was shown to contain factual errors, yet these were not fairly accounted for in the bail decision or subsequent charge justification.	Breach of Bail Assessment Standards & CPS Disclosure Principles – Bail decisions must be based on verified and accurate records , not unsubstantiated claims. Exculpatory material already referenced (e.g. video evidence, custody logs, criminal record) should have been considered before refusal of bail. The PNC/ACRO record was shown to contain factual errors , yet these were not corrected or fairly accounted for in the bail assessment. Disclosure obligations include the timely recognition and correction of material inaccuracies , especially where they undermine the prosecution case or misrepresent prior convictions .

Issue	Breach	Relevant Law/Standard
No Legal Guidance During Charge Change	Solicitor and appropriate adult were absent when latter charge was altered charge.	Breach of Article 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 – right to a fair trial and legal representation.

◆ 2. Misuse of Public Order Legislation

Charge	Misapplication	Correct Legal Interpretation
Section 4 Harassment (Protection from Harassment Act 1997)	Requires a course of conduct causing fear of violence on at least two occasions. No such pattern was evidenced.	Your interaction was brief and isolated , not a “course of conduct.”
Section 5 Public Order Act 1986	Alleged threat to blow up a car was not made, and no evidence supports it.	Section 5 applies only to words or behaviour likely to cause distress , not unsubstantiated accusations.
Section 2 Criminal Damage Act 1971	Not applicable unless there is intent to cause fear of property damage.	No such intent or threat was made, and the police themselves admitted the video did not support it.

◆ 3. Human Rights Violations

Right	Violation	Legal Basis
Right to a Fair Trial	Charge was altered without legal representation or re-interview.	Article 6, Human Rights Act 1998
Right to Privacy	You were filmed without consent in a communal hallway.	Article 8, Human Rights Act 1998

Right	Violation	Legal Basis
Right to Protection from False Accusation	You were accused of threats not present in the video evidence.	Common Law & Article 6 – presumption of innocence and evidentiary fairness.

◆ 4. Equality Act 2010 – Discrimination and Victimisation

Protected Characteristic	Violation	Relevant Section
Disability (Post-Surgery Recovery)	You were in a vulnerable state, yet treated as aggressive without consideration of your condition.	Section 20–21 – duty to make reasonable adjustments.
Associative Discrimination	Your complaints about neighbours were ignored, while theirs were acted upon.	Section 13–27 – direct and indirect discrimination.
Victimisation	You were penalised for raising legitimate complaints and documenting misconduct.	Section 27 – protection from victimisation for asserting legal rights.

◆ 5. Council Misconduct and Data Abuse

Issue	Breach	Legal Framework
Fabrication of False Profile	Enfield Council and Met Police constructed a misleading profile in your name.	Breach of UK GDPR – unlawful processing of personal data.
Failure to Investigate Complaints	Council ignored documented complaints over 12 years.	Breach of Local Government Ombudsman Standards – duty to investigate and respond fairly.
Collusion with Accusers	Council met with individuals you've accused, without impartiality.	Breach of Nolan Principles of Public Life – integrity, objectivity, accountability.

◆ 6. Video Evidence Misrepresentation

Issue	Impact	Legal Remedy
Tone Misinterpreted as Aggression	Video shows you in nightgown, speaking firmly but not threateningly.	Request for transcript and contextual analysis to clarify intent.
Spatial Misrepresentation	Video may falsely suggest you approached Rebecca's front door.	Witness statement and spatial layout can rebut this.
Lack of Threat in Video	Police admitted the alleged threat is not present.	Grounds for dismissal or withdrawal of charge .

- (1) A person whose course of conduct causes another to fear, on at least two occasions, that violence will be used against him is guilty of an offence if he knows or ought to know that his course of conduct will cause the other so to fear on each of those occasions.