

Sent: 05 February 2024 15:55

Subject: Investigation request

Dear Chief Constable Hogg,

Further to an earlier email attached – I have received no reply as to whether your office is going to investigate the situation set out in relation to a possible breach of the Forgery and Counterfeiting Act 1981, as suggested for investigation by the retired police inspector, whom I consulted in this matter, and as detailed in my previous correspondence.

ACHES (Adult Child Health and Environmental Support) has been set up recently, to bring, inter alia other health and environmental issues, awareness of the facts of 5G mast radiation to the public at large. ACHES is already using social media to this end and will make contact with local press in addition.

Bracknell Forest Council did refuse their relevant 5G mast application 23/00596/RTD and which application involved the use of a certificate, to verify the safeguarding of public health, in the name of Three UK Ltd – a company never once involved in the telecom industry and which company has been nonexistent since it was dissolved by Companies House in 2015.

Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) however, accepted 5G mast application (230941) which was based on the ICNIRP certificate (a condition of the application) in the name of the nonexistent company Three UK Ltd – and the mast has since been erected in Rances Lane, Wokingham . WBC allowed the erection of this mast even though they had been informed about the irregularity in the ICNIRP certificate. In addition WBC were informed of the fact that at the time of the application, the applicant, Signal Infrastructure UK Ltd was not on the OFCOM register of persons with approved powers under the Electronic Communications Code. A company not listed on the register of persons with powers under the Electronic Communications Code, at the date of submission of a 5G mast planning application, cannot enjoy permitted development rights under Part 16, Class A - according to a firm of solicitors.

WBC planning department referred that in their planning process concerning the Rances Lane 5G mast, that the following companies related to the relevant application 230941:

Three UK Ltd – which is non existent

Hutchinson 3 G Ltd – which is also non existent

Signal Infrastructure UK Ltd – which was not on the relevant OFCOM register at the date of the planning application

Mention has been made by others that a simple clerical error might be involved, but the evidence does not support this notion. Southend City Council has had at least 16 incidents of an ICNIRP certificate in the name of Three UK Ltd and we are aware of similar submissions of an ICNIRP certificate to verify the safety of public health in 5G mast planning applications all across the country. For example in Bedford, Birmingham, Bracknell, Wokingham, Dartford, Elmbridge, Lewis, Lincoln, Maidstone, Lincoln, Trafford, Uxbridge and there may well others too which ACHES might not be aware of.

ACHES is aware of a written legal communication stating that a proposed injunction to stop a 5G mast being erected could not succeed on the basis that it would be invalid because Three UK Ltd as a company does not exist. This has great relevance to the following from the retired police inspector who wrote:

“So this is our initial position in reporting the crime allegation, we have potential offences of making and using a false instrument, however, it will be prudent to mention that this is not an isolated incident, and that a number of employees at various locations in the UK are uttering these false instruments intending that they be accepted as genuine. This would suggest a pattern of behaviour that is potentially about avoiding liability in the event of any incidents or claims in relation to specific masts, which gives the telecom company a financial advantage (a potentially huge one)”.

In relation to the above, below is the Swisscom patent application – which is evidence that the telecom industry is aware this technology damages DNA and causes chromosomal damage and generates increased cancer risk. That means the ICNIRP certificate designed to vouch for public health safety ***is of vital importance doesn't it***? It is self evident that such a certificate should not be issued in the name of a nonexistent company. One might imagine that if that might be self evident to the public, that it might be self evident to the police – and the public might look askance at the police if the police were to take a decision not to investigate this situation.

WO2004075583A1

Application filed by Swisscom Ag 2003-02-24

Abstracted from the above application:

“These findings indicate that the genotoxic effect of electromagnetic radiation is elicited via a non-thermal pathway. Moreover aneuploidy is to be considered as a known phenomenon in the increase of cancer risk.

Thus it has been possible to show that mobile radio radiation can cause damage to genetic material, in particular in human white blood cells, whereby both the DNA itself is damaged and the number of chromosomes changed. This mutation can consequently lead to increased cancer risk. In particular, it could also be shown that this destruction is not dependent upon temperature increases, i.e. is non-thermal.”

We are also aware that Companies House advised a member of ACHES that the use of a document in the name of the company Three UK Ltd, dissolved in 2015 by Companies House, is being investigated by them – and that this very investigation by Companies House, supports the approach of the retired police inspector in the email I have already sent to you – and as summarised above.

I advised WBC of the situation with regard to ICNIRP certification regarding application 230941 and the then position of the applicant, before the mast was erected and so WBC cannot claim they did not have full knowledge of circumstance.

I also advised at that time, that WBC have powers to reverse planning permission as shown below:

Section 97 of the Town & Country Planning Act for revocation:

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

legislation.gov.uk

As stated this matter involves public health of course.

I became a local councillor myself, to uphold the democratic values we hold dear at the local level, as best I can, though in this instance I am writing to you as a resident of Wokingham Borough and chairman of ACHES. I most strongly support the Nolan Principles of public office and believe that the press and relevant media should be fully informed of all of this – which would be in line with the Nolan Principles of openness. The press (and the media generally) have an important role as the 4th estate in our democracy of course.

The scandal of the Post Office saga was unearthed by an MP many years ago – but it is only now, so many years later that real and effective action is being taken – and that is simply because of the power of public awareness.

Maybe it will have to be the same in this situation when the public at large learns that their health is being vouched for with certificates from a nonexistent company and too all the other factors that surround the situation as described, and pertaining as it has, across the country.

In earlier correspondence, the office of the Thames Valley PCC recommended Action Fraud and action Fraud in turn recommended OFCOM to resolve things.

Action Fraud stated it is not their area of activity and that they are more attuned to credit card fraud.

OFCOM stated they do not police matters relating to the Electronic Communications Code.

As chairman of ACHES, what concerns us in ACHES is that if the police are not prepared to investigate into this situation at all, the public might take the view that the police might be seen to be, or could be seen to be, condoning the use of a “false instrument” in public administration - and in view of the potential use of a “false instrument” being as set out by the retired police inspector, above.

I have copied in Bedford police as, separately, they too have been requested to investigate an instance in Bedford. In that particular case not only has an ICNIRP certificate to protect public health been submitted in the name of the non existent company Three UK Ltd, but the very applicant itself was also the nonexistent company, Three UK Ltd.

As already stated it is a requirement that such an applicant has code powers and be on the OFCOM register of persons with approved powers under the Electronic Communications Code. Part of the obligations to be on the relevant OFCOM register relates to insurance. The nonexistent company Three UK Ltd obviously cannot qualify to be on the relevant register nor can it have a valid insurance policy.

Please would you let me know if your office is prepared to investigate the situation in Wokingham set out before you and as set out by the retired police inspector and as notified to you in relation to potential breach of the Forgery and Counterfeiting Act, 1981 .

I would like, before I finish, to point out a purely hypothetical situation of an hypothetical staff member of any council in the relevant catchment area, being stopped by the Thames Valley Police and asked to present his or her driving licence. If the member were to present a licence in the name of a person who had died on 27 October 2015 (coincidentally the date when Companies House dissolved the legal entity Three UK Ltd) what would the police do ? I doubt they would do nothing, would they ?

If you are not inclined to investigate as requested, the Wokingham 5G mast situation as set out before you, ACHES and the public at large might note the possible contrasting approaches in the hypothetical driving licence case and in the case of a certificate designed to protect the health of the residents of Wokingham Borough. Perhaps.

If your office is indeed unwilling to follow the implied advice of the retired police inspector and is not willing to undertake the investigation requested, will you advise me of the procedure for submitting what I have laid out before you, to the IOPC.

I look forward to hearing from you and with kind regards

Nicholas Martin

(In my capacity as a resident of Wokingham Borough and Chairman, ACHES (Adult Child Health and Environmental Support)

This e-mail is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete it. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, disclose or distribute this e-mail without the author's prior permission. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks on any attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. If you are the intended recipient and you do not wish to receive similar electronic messages from us in future then please respond to the sender to this effect. Any quotations subject to terms and conditions of sale. Please let us know if you do not wish to receive emails.