LONDIS CONTINUUM — FACTUAL BREAK-DOWN

1. Initial Attempted Electricity Top-Up – 28/07/2022

The victim attended Londis Village Store, Holmsey Green, Beck Row, to purchase a £5 electricity top-up using **cash**, specifically a single £5 note.

The cashier requested **£5.50**, asserting that a surcharge applied.
The victim stated he had only the £5 note and could not pay an additional amount.

The victim asked the cashier to **cancel the transaction** and immediately left the store.

2. PayPoint System Behaviour

PayPoint terminals contain two visible options during an incomplete sale:

- **CANCEL** (orange),
- **ACCEPT** (green).

A PayPoint transaction **cannot complete** without payment.
Pressing **ACCEPT** moves the terminal into the payment stage; pressing **CANCEL** voids the transaction.

According to PayPoint policy:

> **Retailers are prohibited from applying surcharges on PayPoint transactions.**
> *(PayPoint Investigation Response, 26/09/2022)*

Therefore, the surcharge request was contrary to PayPoint's contractual rules.

3. Subsequent Purchase at Alternative PayPoint Location

Immediately after leaving the store, the victim drove to the nearest alternative PayPoint retailer, located at services approximately two miles away.

There, the victim purchased **£5 electricity credit** and paid **£5 in cash**.
The transaction completed normally.

4. Police Interpretation of the First Incident

The cashier at the first Londis location reported the matter as a theft-related incident.
This resulted in:

- **Crime Reference 37/48274/22**,
- Classification as a suspected theft/refusal to pay,

- Police acceptance of the vendor's account at face value.

The victim was treated as the **suspect** in the police system from the outset.

5. Second Londis Incident – 03/09/2022

A second dispute occurred at the same store.
The vendor again alleged non-payment.
The victim was arrested by PC 1654 Feeney on suspicion of public order offences and cannabis possession (the latter relating to prescribed medication).

6. Submission of Evidence

Following the second incident, the victim collated documentation demonstrating:

- valid cash payment at the second retailer,
- inability to pay by card (bank balance at £0),
- PayPoint's own confirmation that surcharges are prohibited.

The victim took this documentation to **Bury St Edmunds Police Station**, where a **civilian enquiry officer** retrieved and provided the victim with the crime reference number.

7. Bail Attendance and Review at PIC

When attending **Bury St Edmunds Police Investigation Centre** for bail, the victim showed the same documents to a **custody sergeant**, who reviewed them and allowed the victim to leave without custody processing or further interview.

8. Case Disposal

On **01/11/2022**, Crime Ref **37/48274/22** was closed with a Type 16 disposal ("Evidential Difficulties / Not in Public Interest").

8. Interaction With Broader Case Themes (Neutral, High-Level)

- These incidents appear in the chronology at a point where multi-agency perception of the victim had already begun to diverge from factual events.
- The first Londis case demonstrates a **primary narrative formation** (vendor → police).
- The second incident shows **narrative reinforcement** (continued police acceptance of vendor account).
- The reconstructed events illustrate a **collapse of that narrative** following presentation of evidence.
- The ultimate disposal reflects **evidential inconsistency** and **lack of public interest**.

This appendix does **not** attribute motive or misconduct; it simply contextualises the Londis sequence within the broader chronology.