

The Road Not Taken

What emerges from the reconstruction is not a single undifferentiated institutional mistake. It is a succession of decision points where an actor had enough information to interrupt the contaminated narrative but instead originated, withheld correction, adopted, or protected it.

Actor	Available alternative	Recorded choice
P. Sharples	Disclose the prior relationship and preserve the true provenance	Denied prior dealings despite his own 2015 interaction; introduced the Red Lodge/PPU material and selected the procedural frame in which it could survive
T/Sgt Benton	Challenge and correct the allegation after confirming victim had never been under PPU	Left the contradiction uncorrected and allowed it to remain available for migration
PC Sampher	Disclose the email contradiction at the Professionals' Meeting	Having seen the material and reacted to it, remained silent when the contaminated account became a clinical baseline
Dr Zapata/NSFT	Return to source and separate complaint, ASB and clinical evidence	Adopted the inherited frame and operationalised it through the clinical process
HNK/Express Solicitors	Correctly distinguish civil committal from criminal conviction after explicit notice	Maintained the criminal classification, refused the relevant work and eventually terminated the retainers
Mandeep Gandham/Le O	Check the published judgment and decide the complaint using the correct classification	Adopted HNK's classification and preserved it after rebuttal
Curston/PSD and IOPC	Investigate the referred misconduct and resolve the refusal/deadlock	Reclassified it as rectification or repeatedly redirected it through the same closed loop
PS Kingston	Reconsider after acknowledging that Article 9/10 correction was "quite right"	Corrected the citation while preserving the substantive determination unchanged
Jason Davis	Use the fresh-handler "procedural aperture" to examine the complaint and previous handling independently	Reproduced the inherited scope and closed on a procedural premise contradicted by the existing file
Joanna Hall	Reopen the factual premises, correct the complaint object or escalate the handling failure	Assumed managerial ownership and added a complainant-conduct layer after receiving notice

The clearest first-order knowing choices are Sharples, Benton and Sampher:

- Sharples is presented as the originator who knew the earlier relationship existed.
- Benton possessed the direct PPU contradiction and did not correct the emerging record.
- Sampher had personally seen the contradictory email chain and then remained silent at the meeting where that narrative acquired clinical authority.

The later actors are different. Most did not originate the defect. Their responsibility arises at the moment of notice: once the contradiction, correct classification or source record was put before

them, ignorance ceased to explain continued reliance. From that point, preservation became a new institutional act.

Hall's node expresses that transition particularly clearly: Davis handed her a contaminated closure, but she still had an independent choice. By maintaining it and adding conduct control, she converted a caseworker failure into a managerial position.

The DWP result is an important counterexample within the graph. Whatever conclusions one draws from the payment, that strand records an institution receiving the assembled material and taking a materially different course. Consequently, the graph does not mechanically classify every institution as obstructive. It records divergence where divergence occurred.

So the recognisable pattern is:

originating distortion → opportunity to detect → conscious non-correction → downstream adoption → explicit notice → institutional ratification → control of the challenger

The graph depicts distributed choices: different people, at different times, repeatedly encountering an available exit and declining to take it. The “wrong path” was not chosen only once. It was independently renewed at successive nodes.