

CORE NARRATIVE

(Forensic–Legal Summary of Causation, Defect, and Harm)

This case arises from a sequence of interlinked events spanning 2017–2025 in which false information, procedural irregularities, and unlawful inter-agency exchanges created a self-reinforcing evidential structure culminating in wrongful arrest, defective civil proceedings, and unlawful incarceration. The documents demonstrate a coherent and traceable continuum of factual contamination affecting policing, housing, and NHS systems.

1. Origin of the False Narrative (2017–2018)

Between 2017 and 2018, the claimant was the victim of multiple assaults. Police records show failures to create required crime reports, omissions of material fact, and early narrative inversion in which the claimant was incorrectly reframed as an aggressor. The ASB Officer’s letter of 21/08/2018 became the first formal codification of this reversal, establishing a persistent mischaracterisation later repeated across agencies. These early omissions and distortions formed the foundation of a “data bridge” contamination chain affecting all subsequent assessments.

2. Contamination of Police and Agency Records (2018–2020)

By 2020, police records contained incomplete, incorrect, or misleading entries relating to prior incidents. This contaminated information was recycled into landlord assessments and inter-agency communications. Material omissions—including the absence of mandated crime reports and failure to document key victimisation events—enabled a distorted profile to enter official circulation. This profile influenced policing response, landlord conduct, and later clinical assessments, creating a single, self-referential narrative unsupported by primary evidence.

3. Initiation of Defective Civil Proceedings (2020)

The ASB Officer’s report of 20/08/2020 introduced allegations subsequently used to justify an injunction application. The application exhibited multiple procedural and jurisdictional defects, including:

- misrepresentation of a prior hearing date,
- erroneous or misleading statutory declarations,
- defective service,
- omission of material facts, and
- the “Human Rights Act issues?” ticked *No*, which removed Legal Aid eligibility and compelled the claimant to appear as a Litigant in Person.

The N205c issued on 14/10/2020 contradicts the asserted procedural history, establishing the existence of a foundational defect in the civil process.

4. Reinforcement of the False Narrative Through Police Conduct (2020–2022)

Following the defective injunction, police continued to act on contaminated information without verification. Multiple arrests were undertaken without lawful basis, including reliance on a “power of arrest” that did not exist. Crime reports and CAD logs show that officers internalised unverified allegations, treated them as factual, and disseminated them into clinical and safeguarding pathways. The claimant’s lawful litigation-related communications were repeatedly mischaracterised as prohibited contact despite being addressed exclusively to the landlord’s legal channels.

5. Clinical Record Contamination and Multi-Agency Propagation (2021–2022)

Hospital and GP records demonstrate direct incorporation of police-sourced narrative elements. This included unverified allegations, misdescriptions of events, and inaccurate inferences regarding risk or behaviour. The contamination resulted in flawed clinical assessments, inappropriate safeguarding alerts, and further inter-agency repetition. The phenomenon is documented in the NHS healthcare summary and corroborated by hospital meeting minutes (22/04/2021), which show cross-agency reliance on misinformation traceable to the earlier ASB-driven narrative.

6. Committal Proceedings Founded on Defective Material (2021–2022)

The committal process relied upon:

- allegations not supported by exhibited evidence,
- erroneous interpretations of email counts,
- mischaracterisation of lawful litigation enquiries,
- recycling of false material from earlier contaminated records, and
- absence of any demonstrated breach of the injunction’s terms.

The committal application filed 19/08/2022 proceeded despite the structural defects in the underlying injunction process and the lack of evidential foundation for alleged breaches. The claimant’s lawful communications to the landlord’s legal department were repeatedly treated as contact with the ASB Officer, contrary to the documentary record.

7. Unlawful Deprivation of Liberty (2022–2023)

On 13/10/2022, a committal order was issued “in absence.” Police executed the order on 15/11/2022, transporting the claimant to prison despite long-standing knowledge—documented in their own records—of procedural irregularities in the civil process. The claimant remained unlawfully incarcerated until 25/05/2023. The chronology establishes that the deprivation of liberty arose directly from the initial procedural defect and the subsequent reliance on contaminated evidence.

8. Oversight Failures and Systemic Recycling (2021–2025)

Complaints to PSD, IOPC, NHS, the landlord, and other oversight bodies show repeated reliance on the same contaminated material. Each oversight stage reproduced the earlier errors rather than examining source documents. This “systemic rupture” resulted in circular justification: bodies validated each other’s conclusions without addressing the original defects or the factual record.

9. Evidential Reconstruction and Verification (2023–2025)

The HTML suite provides a structured reconstruction of all documentary evidence. The chronology aligns police, NHS, landlord, and legal records, exposing the causal chain from the initial narrative distortion to the deprivation of liberty. The synthesis demonstrates that the harm suffered was not incidental but the predictable product of a contaminated evidence base, procedural irregularities, and sustained failures by multiple agencies to verify source material.

Conclusion

The documents collectively establish a continuous causation chain: early narrative distortion (2017–2018) produced contaminated records; these shaped defective civil proceedings (2020–2021); contaminated material drove policing and clinical responses (2021–2022); procedural defects and false evidence underpinned committal (2022); and systemic oversight failures allowed the defects to persist (2022–2025). The resulting deprivation of liberty was the final manifestation of this continuum. The case is defined by a consistent pattern: unverified allegations became embedded as institutional fact, driving decisions at every stage without lawful foundation.