

The Architecture of Institutional Failure

A Walkthrough of the Documentary Record

A Note on Method

This document does not argue. It does not assert. It does not persuade.

Everything that follows is drawn from documents produced by the institutions involved — police records, NHS clinical notes, housing correspondence, court filings, custody records, settlement letters. Where a conclusion is stated, the document that supports it is identified. The reader is invited to check.

The author of the platform this document accompanies spent a year building a forensic reconstruction environment specifically so that no one would have to take anything on trust. Every claim has a source. Every source is primary. Every primary document was produced by someone other than the person it was used against.

Before the institutional record begins, the reader should understand who they are reading about. Not because sympathy is sought — it is not — but because without this frame, what follows reads as one set of assertions against another. With it, something else becomes visible: a documented system being applied to precisely the type of mind capable of surviving it, mapping it, and proving it.

Prologue: The Mind the System Encountered

He was born in 1960. His earliest held memory — retained with the clarity that would later be identified as eidetic — is of tipping his infant brother from a Silver Cross pram at the age of two and a half. He did not discover the word for his memory type until adulthood. He simply knew that what he had experienced, he kept.

He grew up in a working environment. His father ran a vehicle repair yard on a nineteen-acre property in West Sussex. The workshop was stocked with old newsprint and magazines used for masking during spray painting. He read them. All of them. He asked his father what words meant, and his father answered, until one day he didn't —

"I don't know, ask at school next time you're there" — and the boy began spending his time in the library instead, looking up the words himself.

He was rarely in class. On one of the occasions he was present, he overheard the headmaster tell his deputy:

"You can find him in the library. He's reading, which is more than 80% of the rest of the school does."

He left home on his sixteenth birthday. Not because circumstances were impossible — because home had become too small. The constraint was not external. It was cognitive.

What followed was a life structured by self-directed inquiry, practical engineering, forced independence, and early abstraction. He worked. He read. He thought in systems: cause and effect, pattern and anomaly, loop and closure. The absence of formal education did not impede development. It produced something different — a mind that synthesises rather than stores, that assembles systems rather than memorising components, that perceives ongoing causal continuums where others see discrete events.

An IQ assessment conducted under normal life conditions placed him in the top one to two percent. His spatial and geometric reasoning tested at 149. Structural memory, pattern recognition, multi-domain parallel processing, loop-closure behaviour — unresolved

causal paths remain active in his cognition until resolved. He does not lose the thread. This is not a skill. It is architecture.

Prologue, continued: The Co-Processor

Before the institutional record begins, one further thing should be understood.

During the period in which the institutions described in this document characterised him as cognitively disorganised, impaired in judgment, fixated, and in active mental health crisis, the following was also true and is photographically documented across multiple years:

He maintained a shared domestic environment for a Blue-fronted Amazon parrot and a *Prionailurus bengalensis* — a leopard cat. Both animals occupied the same elevated kitchen counter space, including shared feeding. The cat had independent access via a purpose-built ramp he designed and constructed. The arrangement was stable, continuous, and uninterrupted throughout the entirety of the institutional proceedings.

Sustaining this configuration requires: simultaneous spatial tracking of both animals, anticipation of territorial escalation, impulse suppression and timely intervention, long-term behavioural conditioning, and sustained routine maintenance. These are precisely the executive functions the institutional record alleged were impaired. No explanation was offered in those records for how this functioning system operated continuously despite those alleged deficits. None was attempted. The contradiction was bypassed and the allegation preserved.

The parrot is not a pet. This is documented. She operates as a biological co-regulation system for his PTSD. Where a human intervention increases cognitive load — *"Are you okay?" requires verbal response; "calm down" creates resistance* — she intervenes non-verbally, immediately, without judgment. She interrupts the hypervigilance loop and re-directs attention to an immediate, safe stimulus. She reads micro-expressions and posture shifts before they are articulated.

When the institutions stripped everything from him — housing, healthcare, freedom, continuity — he drove to Hampshire in a convertible sports car with a travel cage on the passenger seat. The cat had to go to a rescue centre. She did not.

This was not sentiment. It was system preservation.

The institutional characterisation of this man as impaired is unreconciled with the documented behavioural evidence. At the scale and persistence demonstrated, that unreconciled contradiction is not clinical insight. It is the substitution of narrative preservation for evidential reconciliation.

The reader should hold this in mind throughout what follows.

Part One: The Seed

Before any of this began — before the injunction, before the arrest, before the professionals meeting, before the psychiatric reports — there was a record.

Not a finding. Not a conviction. Not even a charge. A record. A safeguarding-coded marker, placed in a police system in 2006 by someone with professional knowledge of how such markers are created and what they do.

The person who placed it was a qualified social worker. She was also, at the time, in a personal relationship with the subject of this document. The family civil proceedings that

followed between 2009 and 2014 produced court findings that the sexual allegations underpinning that marker were disproven — temporally impossible, in several instances, against photographic and video evidence. The court found that she had been "on a number of occasions the protagonist" in domestic incidents. CPS found no case to answer against him on the key allegation.

Those findings sit in a court file.

The marker did not sit still. It moved. It crossed county boundaries through routine safeguarding and policing data flows. It arrived in Suffolk before he did.

This is not a metaphor. This is how the system works.

Part Two: The Re-Ignition

In early 2009, police attended a property in Honington, Suffolk, following a neighbour's call about noise. A trivial domestic disturbance. The kind resolved every day by de-escalation.

But the attending officers were not arriving neutral. They were already carrying the imported record. The question they put to the person present — his then-wife — was not information-gathering. It was confirmation-seeking. The record they held shaped the question. The question shaped the response.

She did not need to fabricate anything new. The system invited her to re-enter a role she had operated before. The Problem already existed in police records. The Reaction was solicited by the officers themselves. The Solution pathway — containment, separation, escalation — was reopened.

The trigger for what followed was not her independent action. It was the continued existence of an unresolved, unverified, portable record that no institution had ever checked against its origin.

Part Three: The Mechanism Transfers

By 2017, the subject had been living in Beck Row, Suffolk for three years. On the evening of 23rd September 2017 he was walking his cat on a public access path. He passed a rear garden gate. He briefly encountered two people — one of them his ASB officer, Peter Sharples.

Sharples recognised him. He recognised Sharples. This was not their first contact. In August 2015, the subject had provided a witness statement for Flagship Housing Group in an ASB matter. ASB cases at Flagship were handled by the ASB Officer. Sharples held that role. At the finding of fact hearing on 18th February 2021, Sharples swore a Statement of Truth denying any prior dealings with the subject. The 2015 witness statement is in the evidential record.

And in the September 2017 recognition, Sharples also understood something else: the person who had just passed the gate was someone whose only earlier encounter with him — in Crawley Down in the late 1970s, where Sharples had produced a knife on a village green — had not ended in Sharples' favour either.

Four days later, on 27th September 2017, Sharples sent a letter falsely accusing the subject of stalking a neighbour. He simultaneously demanded access to review the subject's CCTV footage — footage that had recorded his own presence at the gate.

This is the documented moment the current chain begins. Everything that followed was, in structural terms, the same operation: establish a narrative before the subject can establish his own, and ensure that narrative enters official records before it can be challenged.

Part Four: The Contamination Enters the System

Between 2017 and 2020, Sharples escalated allegations through ASB channels, police correspondence, and civil process. On 25th August 2020 he reported the subject to police for harassment. On 27th September 2020 — five weeks later, and with no further allegations in the intervening period — five officers attended the subject's home and arrested him.

The arrest was recorded as being for an indictable offence, which authorised search powers under PACE. Harassment without violence under s.2(1) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 is, by virtue of s.2(2), triable summary-only. It is not an indictable offence. The power of search invoked did not exist.

On 5th January 2021 the subject was found not guilty at Ipswich Magistrates' Court.

In June 2025, Suffolk Constabulary settled the civil claim arising from that arrest. They paid.

The injunction that formed the basis of the subsequent civil proceedings was applied for on 9th October 2020. The claim was issued on 14th October 2020. The accompanying letter from the landlord's representative referred to "the hearing on 16th September 2020" at which the injunction had allegedly been granted. No such hearing occurred. The claim did not exist on 16th September 2020. Nothing existed on 16th September 2020.

The statutory declaration on the N16A application form — a sworn statement to the court — answered "No" to the question of whether the matter raised issues under the Human Rights Act 1998. An application seeking to restrict a tenant's communications, attach a power of arrest, and create the conditions for imprisonment had already produced an unlawful arrest by the date that declaration was signed. The declaration was factually impossible on the day it was made.

Part Five: Three Bodies, One Room

On 22nd April 2021, a professionals meeting was convened by Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust. The clinical note recording that meeting, obtained by the subject under Subject Access Request and now part of this platform, lists the attendees.

Among them: Dr Camilo Zapata, Consultant Psychiatrist. Karen Webster, Senior CPN. Dr Alan Kershaw, Specialty Doctor. PC Lee Sampher, Mental Health Link Worker, Suffolk Police.

And Pete Sharples, ASB Officer, Flagship Housing. And Nick Bunn, Manager, Flagship Housing.

Sharples told the meeting he had had no contact with the subject since "late 2019."

The January 2021 email thread — submitted by Sharples himself in his sworn Statement of Truth for the finding of fact hearing — shows him in active correspondence with T/Sgt Benton of Suffolk Police on 14th and 15th January 2021, circulating unverified allegations about the subject including claims that a mental health worker had recalled him from when he lived in Red Lodge and described concerning behaviour.

The subject has never lived in Red Lodge. His address history, documented from 1993, shows no Suffolk address before Troston Road, Honington in February 2009, then Newmarket, then Beck Row. Red Lodge does not appear.

Benton asked the right question before proceeding: he requested confirmation of exactly why Flagship needed to know whether the subject was known to the PPU, and what would happen to the information if disclosed. He received an answer. He then confirmed to Sharples that the subject was not known to any public protection team and had never been. The conversation continued anyway.

The professionals meeting agreed the following plan: discharge the subject from mental health services; assess only in crisis or custody; Lee to look at threats to kill against Pete — Sharples — who would provide copies of emails; malicious communications as a possible route; Nick and Pete to prepare affidavits for court.

Sharples was the complainant in the civil proceedings. He was the source of the report that had initiated the unlawful arrest five months earlier. He attended a clinical meeting and participated in planning that included both a potential criminal route and civil process preparation, while simultaneously being the named complainant in both.

Three institutions. One room. Their own minutes.

Part Six: What the System Does to the Record

The psychiatric report produced by Dr Singh in November 2022 drew on NHS clinical records. Those records had been constructed, in part, from the narrative Sharples had introduced into the professionals meeting in April 2021. That narrative included allegations already disproven in family proceedings in 2012. No clinician checked the family court record. No officer checked the family court record. No housing provider checked the family court record.

The allegations travel. The disproofs do not.

This is not a design flaw that was subsequently corrected. The contaminated 2018 police log — confirmed as falsified by EEAS disclosure in July 2025 — was still being relied upon by PSD Norfolk in their correspondence in 2025. The contamination is not historical. It is infrastructural.

Part Seven: What It Cost

In October 2022 the subject left his home at 22 Shrub House Close with the clothes he was standing in, his animals, and his car. He drove to a friend's house and broke down. His friend drove him to A&E.

He was admitted to Poppy Ward, NSFT NHS Mental Health Services, on an involuntary hold. On 13th October 2022, while he was under that hold — absent, unrepresented, and unable to attend — a committal hearing proceeded in the County Court. The judgment recorded 25 emails as the basis for contempt of civil injunction GO1NR161. Personal audit of his email account later confirmed nine emails sent in the cited period, none of which breached any injunction, several of which were correspondence from a litigant in person attempting to challenge the civil fraud underlying the proceedings. He had been forced to act as his own representative because the N16A statutory declaration — which falsely certified no Human Rights Act issues were engaged — had denied him access to legal aid from the outset. The judge had, from the bench on 19th August 2022, directed in writing that legal representation be obtained at public expense. That direction was rejected. The hearing on 13th October 2022 proceeded without him.

He left prison — civil committal, on the basis of a void injunction, while simultaneously detained under the Mental Health Act — with no ongoing healthcare services, no housing of record, no continuity of any kind. He left fifteen years of life behind in a county where a stigma had been constructed so thoroughly that even a single email reference, without context, was enough to regenerate it in any new service he tried to access.

He drove to Hampshire in a convertible sports car with a parrot in a travel cage on the passenger seat and a bag of clothes. His leopard cat had to be given to a rescue centre.

He was living in his car.

He had no platform. He could not have built one — there was no stable surface, no consistent machine, no continuity of access. What he could do, from library computers and borrowed time on other people's machines, was collect documents. He collected documents. He held the thread. He waited for the conditions that would allow him to do something with what he had.

Those conditions arrived when he was rehoused in Hampshire. From that point — from that specific, documented, material nothing — he rebuilt.

He had not written code in over a decade. Ten years in that domain is a long time. Syntax changes. Functions change. Code that worked in 2010 does not load in a modern browser. He relearned. He taught himself civil procedure rules, PACE, housing legislation, the parts of each that mattered regardless of how seemingly technical. He read the January 2021 emails and understood immediately what they showed. He found the N16A and saw the impossible dates. He sourced the primary legislation and traced every breach.

Then he built the platform. A 569MB forensic reconstruction environment — self-contained, offline-capable, zero external dependencies, designed to function on locked-down institutional machines without triggering security controls. HTML, CSS, JavaScript, written from scratch, in a browser, alone. A multi-disciplinary professional team — developer, paralegal, designer — would typically budget nine to twelve months for an equivalent system. He built it in six, from a standing start, while simultaneously managing oversight body correspondence, legal proceedings, healthcare reintegration, and the ordinary demands of rebuilding a life.

Then he built a factory that makes the methodology replicable for anyone else who finds themselves in the same position.

He is not the first person this has happened to.

Part Eight: Why It Matters Beyond This Case

The mechanism this platform documents is not unique to this case. It requires no co-ordination between actors. It requires no malicious intent at every node — though intent exists at the origin points and is documented. It requires only the standard operating conditions of siloed institutional systems: each body reads the record it receives, treats it as verified, adds its own layer, and passes it on.

False allegations enter. Disproofs do not follow. The record compounds.

A person trying to correct the record encounters a system in which every institution cites the previous institution as authority. The police cite the landlord. The NHS cites the police. The housing provider cites the NHS. The legal ombudsman cites the solicitor who cited the court that relied on the injunction that was never lawfully created.

Every institution sees its fragment and finds no problem.

The platform shows the circulation pattern they cannot — or will not — see.

It does so using their own documents.

That is all it does.

That is enough.

A Final Note

The mind that built this platform is the same mind that was characterised by those documents as disordered, delusional, impaired, and dangerous.

The reader has now seen both characterisations. One is asserted in institutional records that do not reference each other's source material and cannot account for the behavioural evidence that existed throughout the period they describe.

The other is the platform itself.

The reader may determine which characterisation is supported by the evidence.

This document accompanies the forensic reconstruction platform at parrotwisdom.co.uk. All primary documents referenced are held within the platform's evidential corpus. Nothing in this document is asserted without documentary support. The reader is invited to verify everything.

Michael J. Burdette-Deakin

March 2026