

Case Number: **2803805/2010**

IN THE SHEFFIELD EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL

BETWEEN

ANTHONY FARRELL

Claimant

and

SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY

Respondent

WITNESS STATEMENT OF
ANTHONY FARRELL

WITNESS STATEMENT

UNFAIR DISMISSAL

ANTHONY FARRELL

SECTION I – PURPOSE OF STATEMENT

1. This statement has been compiled to inform the substantive hearing of the Employment Tribunal scheduled for 7th September 2011.
2. The statement concerns my claim for unfair dismissal from South Yorkshire Police Authority which occurred on 2nd September 2010.

SECTION II – CLAIM FOR UNFAIR DISMISSAL

1. In the particulars of claim, it was contended that my dismissal was unfair for the following reasons:
 - a. The respondent has failed to demonstrate a potentially fair reason for the claimant's dismissal;
 - b. The claimant's suspension was unfair, unwarranted and in breach of contract;
 - c. The claimant was denied the opportunity to be afforded legal representation at his appeal hearing despite his request for the same in his letter dated September 13th 2010 and despite raising the legal issue of whether his treatment was by reason of my religion and belief;
 - d. The claimant was not provided with any adequate reasons as to why his appeal was unsuccessful
 - e. If, which is denied, the Respondent is able to show a potentially fair reason for the Claimant's dismissal it is denied that dismissal was a reasonable response to the same bearing in mind the Claimant's length of service, previously unblemished employment history and the fact that redeployment to a role which did not involve terrorist threat analysis would have allayed any reasonable concerns which the respondent may have held.

SECTION III – BRIEF PERSONAL INTRODUCTION

2. I joined South Yorkshire Police on 6th September 1993 as the Force Statistics Officer and I was dismissed on 2nd September 2010 as the Principal Intelligence Analyst. Reasons given for the dismissal were that my position as Principal Intelligence Analyst had become untenable because of the beliefs I held. I had been a Principal Analyst since 1998.
3. Other employment experience consisted of several years as a manager with Sheffield City Council and a two year secondment to the Home Office in the role of Senior Research Officer between 2004 and 2005. Relevant educational qualifications included an Honours Degree in Applied Statistics (2:1); a Postgraduate Diploma in Management Studies and a Postgraduate Diploma in Criminal Intelligence Analysis.
4. Up to the point of dismissal, I had enjoyed an unblemished record for 17 years of service; I had served as a Special Constable and had brought credit to the Force by being the first representative of South Yorkshire Police to become a prestigious winner of the Home Office's Police Research Award Scheme.

SECTION IV – BACKGROUND TO THE EVENTS LEADING UP TO MY BELIEFS

1. In order to make a fair assessment, I feel it is vital that the context in which the beliefs that lead to my dismissal is fully understood. The beliefs emerged within the context of working within the National Intelligence Model framework. In my role as Principal Intelligence Analyst, the Director of Intelligence (Detective Superintendent Teague) of South Yorkshire Police in accordance with NIM had tasked me to deliver two assignments to the Intelligence Strategy Management Board (ISMB). This was standard procedure.
2. The date for the ISMB had been set weeks in advance and my task was to present to the ISMB on the 8th July 2010. The assignments were a Force Strategic Threat Assessment Matrix and an updated Force Control Strategy.
3. I was used to delivering updates on the Force Control Strategy and had completed an extensive round of consultation with managers and departmental heads. A feature of this year's task however was the fact that the Chairperson of South Yorkshire Police Authority had been consulted on the requirements and was keen to have a Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment Model to consider. This gave the work extra importance.

4. It was a known fact to the Director of Intelligence that I had always urged caution against the use of Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment Matrices. In the previous two years I had persuaded management to resist pressure to deploy them in Force preferring in my professional judgment to rely on more conventional Strategic Intelligence Assessments.
5. It was my professional opinion that mathematical models in use elsewhere in other police forces were too crude and simplistic to have utility. I was acutely aware of reliability and validity issues around their application and there was no nationally accepted model to follow in spite of draft guidance practice from the National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) which later became discredited.
6. After consultation with Mr Charles Perryman who was the chairperson of the South Yorkshire Police Authority, the task fell to me to attempt to formulate a statistical model in spite of my many professional misgivings. To that effect, I had a number of feasibility discussions with my line manager DCI Steve Williams. Working together we reached an acceptable compromise on how best to proceed in practical terms.
7. In the few weeks leading up to the deadline, I had developed some promising looking models for testing. From a purist perspective, I still had reservations but I was prepared to set these aside in order to support my managers.
8. One mandatory subject to be included in the strategic threat and risk assessment model was the threat from terrorism. In this respect, the source of my information would come second hand via Special Branch Analysts. They would provide me with sanitised reports on the subject from time to time.
9. With just a week before my two assignments were due, home study unexpectedly led me to disbelieve the official version behind the attacks of 11th September 2001 (9/11). When this occurred as it did on Thursday 1st July 2010, there was a terrible realisation that something dreadfully evil was at work in the world. As a trained strategic analyst and statistician used to putting theories to the test, it was relatively straightforward to see that something was radically wrong with the US Government narrative on 9/11.
10. Given this, the requirement to cover the strategic threat coming from terrorism was suddenly causing me a dilemma. At lunch, I explained to him my predicament and moral dilemma over 9/11 to a local Minister of the Church whereupon he pondered whether the

same might not be true of the London bombings on 7th July 2005.

11. Later that evening, at the first opportunity I set about researching at home the subject of the London bombings. I spent all weekend at home looking at internet research on the subject. I watched several professional documentaries - all in quick succession and read as much as I could find.
12. By the evening of Sunday 4th July 2010 after an intensive period of exhaustive home study and using my knowledge and analytical skills, I was certain that something was also radically wrong with the official version of the London bombings of 7th July 2005. Those attacks had all the hallmarks of being inside jobs too.
13. My conceptual model of strategic threat was suddenly turned upside down. No longer was it safe for me to assume that the biggest strategic threat to the UK came from Islamic terrorism since underlying assumptions I had previously held had been destroyed.
14. This is a terrible thing to have to say, but based on my own special blend of analysis I believed that by far and away the single biggest strategic threat came from internal government controlled tyranny. Unfortunately for me, my new conceptual model of strategic threat came to me just as the assignment deadline was fast approaching.
15. My interest in geopolitical affairs, history and religion had given me insight into the secrets behind Secret Societies. I was also studying the end- time bible prophesy. All that had given me an understanding of the darker side of the highest levels of Freemasonry with its satanic ideology.
16. I saw the government lies behind the events of 9/11 and 7/7 as monstrous acts of wickedness and evil and examples of the satanic New World Order at work. To my mind the perpetrators behind 9/11 and 7/7 had to now be considered as a legitimate strategic threat. This new conceptual model of strategic threat overtook the strategic threat from Islamic Terrorism in the hierarchical structure.
17. When I studied 9/11 and 7/7, I was utterly appalled and disgusted. I felt compelled to protest but I did not know what to do. I felt alone, isolated and vulnerable.
18. Given my assignment, I felt obliged to alert management to my knowledge as it was

pertinent to the strategic threat assessment.

19. On Monday 5th July 2010, after a weekend of relentless home study, I notified Melanie Morrison that I would be taking a day's annual leave. In a mobile phone text message to her, I intimated that I had come across wickedness in high places and needed to extra time-out to think about what to do for the best.
20. On Tuesday 6th July 2010, I went into work knowing that as head of profession it was my professional duty to alert management to the situation. I feared that the merest mention of my doubts about the government narrative of the London Bombings of 7/7 carried risks. With my conceptual model of strategic threat, I was not at all certain how management would take my position but I felt it entirely appropriate to set aside any personal fears and at least alert them to the situation. I felt that honesty was the best policy.
21. That morning in advance of the meeting, I notified Mr Teague of my predicament. I prepared a briefing note and I went into the meeting with some trepidation. Present at the meeting were two other officers. These were Intelligence Managers who shared the same office as me. I did not want to break this news without witnesses being present.
22. My briefing note alerted management to the likelihood of the alternative threat to society as a whole which I saw as an ascendant New World Order. My briefing note was compiled in an unorthodox way and drew attention to the fact that people are waking up to the lies and cover ups of 9/11 and 7/7. I stated that a tipping point was approaching and that in itself was a threat to community cohesion. I made it abundantly clear that amongst other things, that I did not personally believe the respective government narratives on either 9/11 or 7/7.
23. It was not long into my briefing when Mr Teague interrupted me and asked the other two members to leave the office. Alone with him, we discussed my views. I tried to explain how I had unexpectedly fallen onto my conclusions and beliefs. I reassured him that this was not from information gleaned from police information systems.
24. I touched on a range of special interests which had given me such insight. I indicated that these new beliefs were critical to the validity of a threat assessment that they needed to be considered otherwise all my previous work on the threat assessment would be misleading.
25. I stressed that I could hardly now produce a valid strategic threat and risk assessment

matrix if I were forced to omit the most significant of all strategic threats.

26. I had to be true to my beliefs and I tried earnestly to impress upon Mr Teague the need for product integrity.

27. Mr Teague, in showing some empathy said to me and I quote: "*Tony, neither you nor I will ever be able to get the political leaders in question to tell the truth on what has happened.*" He indicated that they would never admit to any such wrong-doing. Mr Teague never said that my beliefs were incorrect.

28. Mr Teague also stated that "*we were mere government foot-soldiers*". I asked him whether he could offer up any evidence that could dissuade me from my current views. With an air of resignation, Mr Teague indicated that he could do nothing to assist in that request.

29. Clearly, in spite of my knowledge and beliefs, Mr Teague wanted me to overlook my own analysis and simply accept the official narratives as the unvarnished truth in order to deliver on my given assignments. In other words, it is fair to say that I was being asked to turn a blind eye to my own analysis. I felt this was unreasonable as an instruction as it would place me in conflict with the profession standard for honesty and integrity where it states that "*police staff do not knowingly make any false, misleading or inaccurate or written statements or entries.*" Basically Mr Teague was asking me to lie.

30. Worse was to follow. Even in that first meeting, Mr Teague indicated that it was required of me to go to occupational health for a check up. I protested that I was fine and completely failed to see why I should seek medical assistance for merely alerting them to a strategic threat.

31. Mr Teague indicated that it was standard procedure in such circumstances. This irked me as I felt absolutely fine. I began to distrust my manager's motives. It seemed to me that just because I had brought to their attention an almost unthinkable threat, management's automatic response was to cast doubts on my mental health. This seemed unreasonable.

32. They were specifically asking me in my assignment to identify strategic threats. It did not seem right that I should be treated as mentally unstable just because the threat I had identified was not to their liking. This was tantamount to shooting the messenger.

33. The implications for the assignments were discussed and Mr Teague made it clear that

there could be no consideration of such a threat real or imagined within the assignment. This was not negotiable. This had serious implications for me as the analyst required to produce the assessment of threat. Basically I knew that I would either have to lie about my analysis or disobey and make a stance. There was no easy way out.

SECTION V – THE EVENTS OF 7TH JULY 2010

1. It is a significant fact that the management statement of case omits to make any mention of the events of 7th July 2010. I suspect that is because deep down they are far from proud what they did to me and therefore found it convenient to omit any mention of it.
2. In an effort to keep everything on track for the ISMB and restore a sense of normality to the situation, it had been agreed for me to meet early that day with my line manager DCI Steve Williams. It was my understanding that management wanted to do this so that they could ensure that things could be kept on track for the ISMB meeting on 8th July 2010.
3. The best part of half a day was spent in the presence of Mr Williams. Together, we took a trip out to an out-station away from headquarters.
4. During discussions, I was able to show Mr Williams the progress I had made with the assignments and I reassure him that I was in a position to deliver as required to the ISMB the following day.
5. In examining my models, Mr Williams seemed relieved that everything appeared on track and that the models were close to completion. Mr Williams even asked me if I would mind him taking the completed work to the National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) later that week with a view to offering them up as potential best practice.
6. With reference to his visit to NPIA, he mentioned that innovative work and potential best practice like this would always be useful to have up his sleeve for his promotional prospects. Mr Williams was prone from time to time to do this. I did not object in principle, but I did think his motives somewhat selfish and insensitive in the circumstances. Whereas I was concerned about matters of potential serious importance in the police service and government, his priority seemed to be about gathering up evidence for his promotion board. The contrast was stark. Mr Williams' self interest was less than helpful.
7. He indicated that he had an appointment with NPIA on the 9th July 2010. It is a fact that Mr

Williams at the Police Authority Appeal's Committee was later to deny all knowledge of these discussions.

8. Some philosophical debate was had between us about 9/11 and 7/7. It was clear that on these issues, my former manager held no empathy with my position. Mr Williams revealed to me that he was part of a training drill in London on the day and that he'd even heard live events unfold over the airwaves. He seemed to think that this gave him an authoritative position on 7/7 and discussion was soon closed down.
9. Asking him hypothetically about 9/11, Mr Williams slid out of the question by stating he could not think like that. Given the moral crisis I was in, this lack of meaningful engagement and his inability to think hypothetically was less than helpful to my plight. Hypothesis development is expected of analysts and no more so than when looking at strategic threat. It is core to our role. Thus we had a ludicrous position of a Principal Analyst being managed by an officer who was unable or unwilling to think hypothetically.
10. Management were slowly but surely exerting pressure to coax me into giving out misleading analysis that would conflict with all my beliefs about the strategic threat. What they were doing was tantamount to instructing me to lie about my own analysis. To my mind that seemed unreasonable.
11. Again, this would appear to run contrary to their own professional standards for instructions where it states that *"police staff do not give out or carry out instructions which an individual would conclude were unreasonable."*
12. In the afternoon, I went to see Mr Teague in order to reluctantly submit to his wishes and sign the form for an appointment with Occupational Health. Mr Teague was listening to the radio which just so happened to be covering news of the London bombings. Briefly, we reflected on the irony of the situation as it was the fifth anniversary.
13. As I left work that evening, I suspected both managers would have felt that they had restored normality. Somewhat relieved, they would have thought that I was ready, willing and able to deliver to the ISMB even if it meant me handing out misleading analysis.
14. That evening outside of work, when confronted with compelling scripture, I examined my conscience and became aware of the spiritual requirement to make a stance. Deep down, I

knew that it would be morally, ethically, spiritually and professionally wrong to hand over assignments that perpetuated what I saw as a truly monstrous lie about the threat from terrorism. I had to be true to my conscience.

SECTION VI – THE EVENTS OF 8TH JULY 2010

1. Arriving in extra early, in spite of my fears, I felt compelled to do the right thing. I braced myself for some hard times ahead.
2. In an effort to impress upon my management the seriousness of the situation, I put together what were deliberately ludicrous looking front sheets for the Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment Models and the Force Control Strategy. At no stage were these ever intended for consumption at a board meeting. They were crafted instead to reflect the absurdity of the situation to my manager Mr Teague. I consider it completely disingenuous of higher management to later try to claim that these were bone fide as Mr Hiller did in the Police Authority Appeals Committee hearing. I was trying to make a point. It was not an act of handing over a real assessment.
3. The notion of internal tyranny in connection with 9/11 and 7/7 was deadly serious and to my mind demanded more attention than it was being afforded by management. To my mind they ought not to have dismissed the views of their Principal Analyst so lightly. It was only because they were not prepared to listen to my most significant findings that I felt compelled to reflect back to them a ludicrous looking front sheet matrix and strategy. When our freedoms are at stake, silence is not golden, it is yellow!
4. Somewhat startled at my audacious approach, Mr Teague asked me to explain the sheets. I indicated that I felt compelled to withhold all my previous work as I was not prepared to go along with the lie. The ludicrous front sheets were all I had to offer unless permission was granted to reflect the 9/11 and 7/7 lies within the strategic threat and risk assessment. I felt compelled to make a stance.
5. Mr Teague retorted: "*We can't do business like this, Tony!*" Sadly, I looked at Mr Teague and gently nodded with an air of resignation and quietly said "*I know!*"
6. I think Mr Teague realised he could do nothing to alter my position.
7. In the management case, it is stated that I said that I **could** not deliver on this work. A

far more accurate position was that I would not deliver on it. In one sense I could have easily delivered what management wanted as I had completed the work but to have handed it over as my analysis would have meant me going against conscience and meant also breaching Professional Standards for Honesty and Integrity.

8. Thus it was clear that there was no way that either of these assignments would be ready for presentation at ISMB board meeting later that afternoon. Before making my stance, I had considered the implications of missing that ISMB meeting. It would have been an inconvenience, but I felt it vital the bigger message was got across. I hoped that in so doing, they would not shoot the messenger. It was agreed that I would go home and write a report explaining my position. That seemed a reasonable request for me to follow.
9. Later that afternoon, I received a phone call from Mr Williams. The conversation was perfectly amicable and it seemed that although Mr Williams did not personally share my beliefs, it appeared to me at least that he respected my stance. He described it as a defining moment in my life. Sadly I agreed. I did not want to be in this difficult position.

SECTION VII – MONDAY 12TH JULY

1. Having worked on my report over the weekend, I encountered a last minute problem in printing out the report I had compiled. Therefore I went in early to explain to Mr Teague my technical problem. He granted me an extra day to complete my report.
2. The issue of the occupational health visit was again raised but I made it clear that since there was nothing wrong with my mental or physical health I saw no good reason to have to go. This was threatening for me. I was annoyed that management should deploy such a tactic when all I was doing was standing up for the truth. Mentally, and spiritually, I had never felt stronger and I had no physical ailment.
3. During our meeting, further discussions were had about my religious beliefs. At one point, when I was talking about my beliefs in end time bible prophesy, Mr Teague stated that I could be very useful for the police service. He did not elaborate on what he meant by this.
4. Mr Teague explained to me how my position would be reported to Detective Chief

Superintendent Talbot. I considered that the meeting was entirely amicable and somewhat reflective and philosophical in nature.

SECTION VIII – TUESDAY 13TH JULY 2010

1. I reported into work early and I was invited into a meeting in which Mr Teague and Mr Williams were both present. I handed over my report to Mr Teague, although he chose not to read it in front of me.
2. Before discussions really started, I asked both managers whether or not they were Freemasons. They provided answers to my question. Between the three of us, we had discussions about my analysis, my beliefs, my future in the organisation, and the immediate steps that management were to take in managing me.
3. I stated that the analysis I had come up with was my most insightful ever even if it was somewhat unorthodox. Mr Teague merely observed, whereas Mr Williams disagreed. This was no ordinary situation. Again I tried to impress upon management the seriousness of the situation with respect to strategic threat. I offered to produce a full strategic assessment. They showed no interest. At that point, I realised that they were in danger of shooting the messenger.
4. Management seemed unconcerned with my views on threat. Their only priority seemed concerned with getting me to go to occupational health. The dreadful realisation of what they were doing was becoming clearer. They appeared to want to label me as mentally unfit for work. I felt no need to go to occupational health. It was unwarranted. I soon understood that privileges were to be withdrawn but first I was asked to hand over my work on the assignments. I was allowed access to the computer so as to accomplish this task. There was a sinking feeling inside me. It was now clear to me that management were going to be taking a hard line against the stance I had taken even before they had read my report.
5. It was agreed that I could go on three weeks leave as planned beforehand. It was also agreed that management would keep me updated while my position in the organisation was under consideration. Again the meeting between the three of us was amicable enough but I was beginning to fear the worst.

6. Immediately after the meeting, I went to my desk in order to hand over work to Melanie Morrison as appropriate. In the course of tidying my desk I printed off a colour copy of the personal report I had just handed in to Mr Teague.
7. At that precise moment, Mr Williams swooped in and intercepted the report by snatching it off me. This was the first openly hostile act I had encountered in seventeen years of service. I realised that they no longer wanted me or my analysis. Now they seemed dead set against me. By this very act, they made it clear to me that they no longer wanted to trust me. I felt that was totally unwarranted. Calmly, I explained that this was my personal report and that I saw nothing wrong in the circumstances with obtaining a copy. Mr Williams calmed down and eventually seemed to accept my explanation although he was later to use this incident as evidence against me. However, he pointed out that the appendices had SYP logos on them and so confiscated some parts but permitted me to take the rest home.
8. While I was still on the computer, Mr Teague popped in seemingly to alert me to the fact that he had just read the report. He put his thumbs up - presumably indicating that the report was sufficient for his needs and that he needed no more from me in order to progress the case. I smiled sympathetically at him with sadness and a sense of foreboding.

SECTION IX – THE REPORT THAT LED TO MY DISMISSAL

1. The actual report I had handed over to Mr Teague was entitled "*A Rich Picture of an Ignoble Lie or Enabling the One Truth*". The main report was supplemented with a number of Appendices
2. The title of the main report was full of irony with subliminal meaning in connection with the evil ideology I was standing against for the sake of our freedoms. To explain further:
3. The words "Rich Picture" were related to the government's Contest Strategy. The Rich Picture initiative concerned something which could no longer be justified.
4. The words "*Ignoble Lies*" were related to the secretive New World Order and the lies of former Prime Minister Tony Blair with respect to the "War on Terror" based upon Dr Kelly and the Weapons of Mass Destruction saga and the painfully obvious government cover ups of 9/11, 7/7 and the deceptive motives behind the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

5. The words "*Enabling the One Truth*" was related to a putrid slogan that had just been introduced into the force by Senior Command Team. Prior to my stance, when I had asked the Performance Manager of the Force what that new slogan meant, she candidly replied, if Senior Management says it's the truth, then the truth it is! There is to be no dissent amongst the ranks! Being an analyst I pondered the implications with a sense of dread.
6. The main report I produced for Mr Teague is largely self explanatory and can be seen in Appendix A. There were essentially five main strands to the report.
7. Firstly there was a section about my beliefs about the strategic threat. Second, there was a self assessment of why I felt compelled to make my stance. This was done from a number of perspectives which included financial, organisational, ethical, religious, system and role considerations. Third, the report made a plea for action from within South Yorkshire Police. Fourth, the report clearly illustrated my willingness to write an extensive report to justify my beliefs and support any inferences made about the strategic threat. I was seeking sponsorship to present my analysis of the threat. I felt it sufficiently important and relevant to matter. Finally, the report included some attached Appendices which were not explicitly referenced from within.
8. The inclusion of such appendices was a last minute impulse decision to show Mr Teague a small selection of the insight I had. Arguably, this may have made sense to Mr Teague given all our one to one discussions but it would not have made much sense to outsiders. Let me be quite clear that his report was a personal and confidential report only ever intended for Mr Teague's eyes. By mutual agreement it was never intended to be an intelligence product that would follow conventional NIM guidelines.
9. Given neither Mr. Teague, nor any other manager ever once took steps to ask me about the contextual meaning of any of these appendices, I feel it now necessary to elaborate.
10. First, I will deal with the print out slides concerning Ephesians 6 and the scripture "*Putting on the Armour of God*". This concerns the spiritual battle between God and the devil, good and evil, light and darkness, openness and secrecy and between truth and lies. If my beliefs about 9/11 and 7/7 were correct, then the situation I was embroiled in with management was indeed a battle between all these things.
11. A couple of years earlier I had originally created these slides when I did a talk to a largely

Christian audience about how my faith and my analytical role in the workplace were compatible. I would speak about how much enjoyed being an analyst working for SYP. These exhibits were used as an opportunity to promote SYP as a good employer. I'd get a standing ovation. Two years on and these pictures seemed relevant to my circumstances.

12. Second, the print out slides containing the SYP logo plus photographs of various statesmen from a distant era, local politicians and senior police officers were a straight lift from previous work I had produced just for Mr Teague one year earlier. All contained a famous quote of one kind or another and Mr Teague had previously seen fit to use these slides in a light-hearted and philosophical way in front of Senior Managers. Their inclusion in my report to Mr Teague was done merely to reflect the irony of the quotes one year later.
13. Given the accusing line of cross examination in my pre-hearing review, I believe management completely misinterpreted their intentions. This was most definitely not pointing the finger at any officers in the photographs in any detrimental way whatsoever.
14. Third, the slides with the pyramid / capstone pictures taken from the Intelligence Services, the American Dollar and one particular lodge of the Freemasons were there to depict the Satanic dimension that I was stating represented a major strategic threat to our freedoms. All logos contained the eye of Horus or Lucifer and represent an evil ideology.
15. Fourth, the Kundali slides show not only the eye of Lucifer but also the coiled serpent climbing up the 33 bones of the spine. The parallels with the thirty three degrees of Scottish Rite freemasonry are all too obvious to see with their Satanic subliminal meanings. They were included to demonstrate that I had insight. I know the evil and wicked games of the elite. In the light of government lies behind 7/7, I was offering real insight.
16. Fifth, I will deal with the photographs of the four alleged London bombers. It remains a fact that these individuals have never been found guilty in a court of law and tried by a jury. That alone is suspicious. I could go on.
17. Last but not least, the slides showing pictures of former Prime Minister Tony Blair looking smug contrasting with a young student from Sheffield in an act of drunken silliness were included to highlight the warped thinking in the value systems of our nation.

18. We use an iron fist on the trivial crime and by our media actions condemn, yet we cower away from the monstrous crimes of the state – and by our cowardly inactions condone.

SECTION X – WEDNESDAY 14TH JULY 2010 – THE FIRST CASE CONFERENCE

34. At my exclusion, management held a Case Conference about my situation. Disclosure notes of this meeting are startling and are included in Appendix B.
35. These notes say nothing about my beliefs. They do however state that *“there was evidence that Tony Farrell may well be suffering from some sort of psychiatric condition that required early assessment professionally via the Occupational Health Unit.”* I consider this an unjustified and unwarranted accusation. I was standing firm for what I genuinely believed to be the truth regarding strategic threat. I had given 17 years of loyal service and I had only acted in accordance with the organisation’s Professional Standards for Honesty and Integrity. Few if any in that Case Conference meeting were in any kind of position to question my analysis let alone label me as requiring psychiatric help.
36. It is never once made clear what specific evidence leads management to the conclusions that I may be psychiatrically unwell. Management completely fail to state in specific terms why they have collectively formed the opinion that I am suffering from a psychiatric medical condition. At no stage in my career had I ever complained of feeling unwell mentally. I had never in my long career taken absence from work for any stress related condition. On the contrary, I had never felt mentally sharper than I did at the time of making the stance.
37. There is no reference to any redeployment considerations. In the recent light of this SYP disclosure, I consider management’s position disingenuous in the extreme. It seems obvious to me that management had already decided that my dissenting position and stance for truth was not to be tolerated. It is quite obvious to me that dismissing me was their sole objective in answer to my stance on what I believed to be the truth about the threat.
38. Absent from any of these disclosure notes is any evaluation whatsoever of my stated beliefs. Not once do management state which if any of these beliefs led them to their candidly admitted confession that they thought that I needed psychiatric help.
39. Not once did they give me an opportunity to explain the report they asked me to produce in

a non hostile environment. Their rush to get me to occupational health was motivated not out of concern for my welfare, but rather out of a desire to oust me out.

SECTION XI – THURSDAY 15TH JULY 2010

1. Mr Williams phoned to update me on the outcome of discussions of the previous day's case conference meeting. A meeting was arranged between Mr Williams and DI Brook.
2. During amicable enough discussions, Mr Williams again requested me to go to occupation health and then when I declined, he later instructed me about the same. As I again refused, he explained the possible implications of continued refusal.
3. When I responded that I was feeling fine, Mr William's retorted that he was a trained negotiator used to dealing with people in crisis. He said this as if his police training gave him some authoritative say over his ability to assess the mental state of Principal Intelligence Analyst who had the conviction to hold true to his conscience.
4. Mr Williams asked me whether I wanted to remain in the organisation. I answered in the affirmative. He told me that the Force Solicitor had already been consulted and that job loss was almost inevitable. Given that, he asked me to consider resignation as an alternative to dismissal. Mr Williams even went to the trouble of trying to explain how resignation was preferable. All this was something Mr Williams was later to deny under cross examination at the South Yorkshire Police Appeals Committee. Mr Williams implored me not to "martyr" myself. I was not sure what he meant by that but felt intimidated.
5. The rest of the three-way meeting was amicable enough and contained philosophical discussions about my faith and his lack of it. Throughout all of this, Detective Inspector Brook remained silent and watched sometimes looking quite tortured.
6. These philosophical discussions were later used in evidence against me. Mr Williams had an unfortunate habit of misrepresenting what I said in a way I found mocking of my Christian beliefs. I was later to contest that Mr Williams presented these discussions in an unrepresentative and discriminatory manner.

SECTION XII - TUESDAY 20TH JULY 2010 – THE SECOND CASE CONFERENCE

7. Notes of the second case management meeting were not disclosed until over a full year had elapsed. I first saw sight of these notes on Friday 19th August 2011. See Appendix C.
8. Once again, these notes are very scant. Given the seriousness of the situation, I would have expected to see much more than this. The subject matter is very narrow and concerns only my mental health.
9. Absent is any discussion about options for dealing with me such as redeployment. Absent is any kind of evaluation of my beliefs about the threat.
10. It seems abundantly clear to me that since management cannot argue effectively against the truth in what I have to say on these matters concerning threat, their only option is to resort to the labelling of my beliefs as extreme. Again their tactic has all the hallmarks of attempting to label me as mentally ill in an effort to oust me out of the organisation.
11. Close and critical examination of the notes clearly suggests that they are incomplete. For instance the opening paragraph of the notes says this: "*DCI Williams updated the meeting on his contact with TF on 15th July 2010, summarised above.*" However the disclosure notes plainly show that whatever was supposed to be summarised above has been omitted. It is not clear why this has been excluded from the notes and it arouses further suspicion.
12. It is stated that "*his behaviour continued to raise concerns about his mental health, although it was agreed that there was no evidence that Tony might physically harm himself or others.*" Never once is it explained why my behaviour or what aspects of my behaviour raises concerns about my mental health. For standing on principle for the truth, Mr Williams seems to be placing me in the same category as a suicidal maniac who needs coaxing down from jumping off a bridge. After 17 years of exemplary service and for standing firm for the truth, this treatment of their Principal Analyst seems to me at least nothing short of disgraceful.
13. Exactly which members in this case management conference are giving their expert opinion about my mental health in such bland terms is never once revealed. There is a minimalist approach to everything. No single decision maker's opinion goes on record. Collectively, they knowingly or otherwise enact out that slogan "*Enabling the One Truth*".
14. It strikes me that it is Mr Williams' task to report back to them that I'm mad probably so

that they can all agree that Mr Williams as the manager is probably right. It is clear they want the truth to be that I am mentally unwell and design their strategy around making things fit within that very pursuit under the disingenuous pretence of caring for my welfare.

15. Not a single officer from HQ Personnel Department took the trouble to speak to me. There is no record of any discussions about my beliefs that have been disclosed. It is inconceivable to me that the nature of my beliefs would not have been discussed at high levels. Nothing has been disclosed to that effect.
16. There is not a single hint at any redeployment consideration at either of these two case conferences. Nothing has been disclosed about redeployment considerations.
17. It seems to me that it was easily within Detective Chief Superintendent Talbot's gift to move me out of harm's way and deploy me into an analytical role in his Specialist Crime Services that would not compromise either side. Where options to shuffle analysts around ever explored? I might have been more than willing to take a pay cut rather than be dismissal. Sure I wanted to pursue the truth if possible, but seeing as that was not required there may have been alternatives which could have been explored in a supportive setting rather than a hostile one. There were flexible structures already in place to do some kind of job rotation. As a Principal Intelligence Analyst, I had transferable skills and in my opinion should not have been thrown on the scrap heap just for standing for the truth.
18. At the time, there were approximately eighteen intelligence analysts in the SCS department alone and approximately 45 intelligence analysts within the force. Of those, less than ten would ever have to analyse anything to do with terrorism. The option of redeployment and taking a pay cut for lower graded work was never once explored with me. This seems unreasonable.

SECTION XIII - WEDNESDAY 21ST JULY 2010

19. Mr Williams and Mr Brook visited me at my home by prior arrangement. I informed them that after speaking to the local Minister, I was prepared under protest to swallow my pride and go to occupational health. I made it clear though that I felt it unwarranted. I was by now deeply suspicious of the motive as I believed they just wanted to get rid of me.

SECTION XIV - TUESDAY 27TH JULY 2010 - VISIT TO OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

1. My visit went ahead and the Force Medical Advisor's report contradicted the earlier general consensus of opinion within the two Case Management Conferences. The report came back showing no evidence of any psychiatric disorder.
2. The implications of management getting there accusations so wrong are never acknowledged.
3. I did not endorse the Force Medical Report as I felt that I should never have been subjected to an assessment in the first place. In any case, it contained an inaccurate statement. The report states that I acknowledge that my view of the World is incompatible with my role as Principal Intelligence Analyst. Categorically, I deny that I ever said that.
4. I was always careful to qualify such a statement with a caveat. I may have said that I am incompatible in the role whilst-ever management hold on to their "sacred cows" or something similar. There is a world of difference between the meanings of two statements. How easy is it for management to twist things around with a word omission here and a word omission there!

SECTION XV – 30TH JULY 2010

1. Mr Williams visited my home to hand deliver a letter informing me that I would take gardening leave. Again discussions were amicable enough between us but I did consider that he divulged information to me in an unprofessional way about work colleagues.
2. Yet again, the manner in which Mr Williams did this came across as an attempt to mock my religious beliefs. In mentioning an office affair that he indicated was going on, he went on to say to me that he knew that I- with my strong religious beliefs – would disapprove.
3. I felt awkward about what he said. I considered it to be sly, devious, insensitive and unprofessional. Upon later reflection I found it somewhat mocking. At the Police Authority Appeal's Committee, when challenged, Mr Williams denied he had ever said such things. One of us is clearly consistently telling lies here. We both can't be telling the truth. Either I am making this up maliciously or he has deliberately lied at the Police Authority Appeals Committee on several occasions.

SECTION XVI – 20TH AUGUST 2010

1. I met with Mr Williams for the last time over coffee. We had a philosophical discussion about what I'd do when I got sacked. Ever since our meeting on 15th July 2010, Mr Williams had led me to believe that I was going to be sacked if I did not resign. I did not think I deserved to be sacked. For being faithful to my conscience in standing up for what I believed to be the truth and also in adhering to professional standards for honesty and integrity, I had become a dissenting voice which can't be tolerated in an era of "*Enabling the One Truth*". If that's their dogma they don't need analysts and are therefore the one's in breach of contract.
2. Briefly we discussed the death of Dr David Kelly as his case had been in the news that week. In one sense, it had relevance to what I had been saying all along about the strategic threat.
3. Again Mr Williams strayed into telling me about office politics and divulged to me that one of his subordinates had been acting in a cruel way towards me. Mr Williams called the officer in question "pure evil." It struck me as odd that he was candidly telling me this much about one of his own subordinate officers but seemingly doing little to prevent it. Looking back at his behaviour with me, it was as if Mr Williams was either spineless or trying to exert some kind of exquisite torment over me. I was later to challenge him about this. Upon reflection it was sick. I was later to challenge him in the SYPAC hearing.
4. Upon handing me an envelope containing the management case against me, he said he preferred me not to open it in his presence and he said that I would naturally find that things quoted out of context. He told me that he had taken no pleasure in having to do this. Actually, I think this was half genuine. We had always got on quite well together but like it or not he was willing to play out the hatchet man.
5. It is my assessment, that Mr Williams had been given the unenviable job of steering me through to the disciplinary hearing with an objective of finding evidence to justify management's pre-determined decision to dismiss me rather than consider any other reasonable alternative such as redeployment.
6. Likewise, it is my assessment that Mr Williams - in being given such an unenviable task - slipped up professionally on a number of occasions with loose talk.
7. Our relationship was friendly but I think Mr Williams underestimated my ability to see

exactly what the game plan was. He was playing the “nice guy” while being asked to do the dirty work.

8. Since I had been a long time manager myself, I was acutely aware of the need for him to be professional at all times. Unfortunately for him, he fell short of the task and then had to lie repeatedly at the South Yorkshire Police Appeals Committee to cover up his obvious mistakes in carrying out his unenviable task.

SECTION XVII – THE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT OF CASE AGAINST ME

1. In the penultimate paragraph of the management statement of case it says that consideration has been given to redeployment, however given his declared beliefs, the perceived risk to the organisation is felt to be too great in any role commensurate with his grade and seniority.
2. It is a fact that at no stage had redeployment ever been discussed with me as an option. At no stage has there been any disclosure about any meeting in which such redeployment considerations took place.
3. Management talk about my reluctance to engage with Occupational Health but fail to acknowledge the error of their ways in judging me to be mentally ill. By all too hastily misjudging me to be mentally ill, they forced me into an unnecessary stand-off position.
4. I do not consider telling lies about the strategic threat to be within the parameters of acceptable operation. This is what management were asking me to do.
5. The only risk I posed to the organisation was one of embarrassing them by their own unwillingness to confront the evidence on the strategic threat.
6. I did not suddenly become a bad Principal Analyst overnight. Analysis is supposed to lead investigations to the truth. To that end I deny that I was incompatible in my role.
7. The incompatibly occurred because the organisation wanted not a Principal Analyst but a spin doctor. It was they not I that were in breach of contract.
8. I thought it was necessary to produce analysis without fear and without favour. I do not deny for one moment that my findings carried a risk to the force. Policing done well when facing state corruption is indeed a risky business. However as public servants, when

facing possible state corruption, there is no business to be had by keeping policing risk free.

9. The kind of support that I needed, did not come from a health therapist. Instead of appreciating my difficulties as a Principal Intelligence Analyst bound by Professional Standards for Honesty and Integrity and seeing that I was earnestly seeking the truth about the strategic threat, management responded - when they did not like the threat I was alerting them to - by immediately sticking a mental health label on me.
10. Management seemingly could not face up to the dreadful truth. Since they could not or would not argue against the truth, they ignored my alert and tried to get me sectioned off in some way.
11. Repeatedly they turned down my offers to provide them with insight. On at least three formal occasions, I offered to provide them all the strategic analysis to justify my inferences in full. It was management and not me that were totally closed on the issue. Yet deceitfully they try to frame it as if it was the other way round.
12. The whole manner of the case management write up and the two sets of scant disclosure notes clearly show that they had all wanted to give out the impression that they were united in thinking me psychiatrically unwell. The foundation of all their decisions seemed to be based on the assumption that I was mentally unwell.
13. Management try to make out that they are concerned for my welfare, but I do not believe for one moment that this was genuine. If management were so concerned for my well being, how does dismissing me help me? Where was the duty of care?
14. Deep down management knew that I was far from unwell. Their failings are there for all to see. They were all too cowardly to face up to the implications as to what I was saying was a strategic threat. When freedom is at stake, silence is not golden it is yellow.
15. As the Principal Intelligence Analyst, it fell to me to do a strategic threat assessment. It was my analysis they were wanting. When I alerted them to a terrible threat that they did not like the look of, they could not win the argument so they shot the messenger instead by sacking me.
16. Their modus operandi was to quickly attempt to label me insane. When expert opinion did

not support their fabrication, instead of acknowledging the error of their ways, they went ahead with the sacking me regardless and disclosed virtually nothing. Somebody in that group clearly wanted me sacked from the very first meeting. Detective Chief Superintendent Talbot was the highest ranking officer.

SECTION XVIII – 2nd SEPTEMBER THE DISMISSAL HEARING

1. Mr Hiller, the Director of Finance was the chair of the dismissal hearing. It was by all accounts an unusual hearing. The following is quoted from the transcripts: *“It is a very sad occasion as you have done some excellent work for South Yorkshire Police and I have never been involved in a situation like today. Your views are very sincere and you may be right but it is I’m afraid incompatible at the moment with where we are.”*
2. If we pause for one moment here and reflect upon the implications of what Mr Hiller was saying. As the analyst tasked to do work about strategic threat, having alerted them to a strategic threat of monstrous proportions they actually accept I could be correct. They are sacking me as the analyst whose analysis could be correct. Who is in breach of contract here I ask myself?
3. In sacking me for my analysis, Mr Hiller acknowledges that I am very sincere. He is on record as saying there are no allegations of any misconduct whatsoever. What are they saying here? Surely, they are admitting that the only way I can survive and keep my job is to lie about my analysis and thereby breach Professional Standards for Honesty and Integrity. If I did that, would not that be the real breach of contract?
4. Contrary to all those earlier views expressed about my mental health as evidenced in the case management conference disclosures, Mr Hiller’s own summing up gave absolutely no hint of any suspicion from him that he thought I had a mental disorder. All management’s assumptions that pushed me towards a disciplinary hearing were clearly based on their flawed or more likely deliberately manipulated thinking about my mental health.
5. Mr Hiller chose to downplay the significance of this fact.
6. As a Christian, it was a requirement of my faith not to break the ninth commandment and bare false witness. As a public servant, it was a requirement of my contract to act with honesty and integrity. As a Principal Intelligence Analyst, it was a requirement to present

what I consider to be the truth in my analysis. Analysts are there to protect the service from framing the innocent as well as pursuing the guilty.

7. Under what circumstances is it permissible for me as the analyst to lie? Irrespective of whether I am a Christian, a public servant, a Principal Intelligence or just a citizen of the United Kingdom, telling the truth matters. Telling lies is plainly wrong.
8. It was my insistence in telling the truth about my analysis that seemingly makes me incompatible to them as a Principal Intelligence Analyst. Presumably, telling a lie about my analysis of threat would have rendered me compatible by their perverse definition. Had I gone along with management's instruction to regurgitate the governments rhetoric on the terrorist threat knowing that 9/11 and 7/7 were a pack of monstrous lies then I would have been in clear breach of professional standards for Honesty and Integrity.
9. Management were not obliged to accept my analysis, when they found the threat unpalatable, they could have easily tasked me with something other than working on the strategic threat.

SECTION XIX – THE POLICE AUTHORITY APPEALS COMMITTEE (SYPAC)

I consider the appeal hearing to have been unfair for the following reasons:

1. On 6th October 2010, my solicitor requested that I was allowed legal representation at the SYPAC hearing. That request was declined and I considered it unfair for me to have to face an appeal, the procedure of which appeared as legally complex as an employment tribunal. (See Appendix D)
2. SYPAC were informed that it was considered the Chief Constable in breach of the Employment (Religious and Belief) Regulations 2003 and/or his response to the matter and failure to simply redeploy is unreasonable.
3. In their response, the SYPAC asked me to specifically to expand upon this and ensure it forms part of the grounds for the appeal. Thus they were asking me to do something which demands a technical legal argument but were denying me legal representation. I concluded that the Chief Constable was also in breach of the European Convention of Human Rights (schedule 1 to the Human Rights Act 1998) Article 6(i). See Appendix A.

4. In spite of management denying me any legal representation, Mr Hiller then proceeded to quote from case law in the hearing to argue a point concerning my religious belief. Specifically, he used the case *McFarlane v Relate* in reference to the Employment (Religious and Belief) Regulations 2003. Since I was not legally qualified and I had no knowledge whatsoever of the issues of that particular case, I was immediately placed at a distinct disadvantage by not being allowed to have legal representation in the hearing. I considered this unfair.
5. The grounds for appeal submitted to the South Yorkshire Police Appeals Committee contained a 12-page document with no less than 63 issues raised as grounds for appeal (*refer to bundle*). Without legal representation, I had to rely upon my ability to cross examine hostile witnesses. I had never had any training and was ill equipped to do this.
6. In the hearing itself, I cross examined two hostile witnesses. These were Mr Hiller who was taking the management case against me and Mr Williams who had been my line manager at the time of my dismissal.
7. Upon enquiring to Stephanie Barker from the South Yorkshire Police Authority beforehand, we were told that minutes / notes of the meeting would be made available and disclosed afterwards as there were clerks specifically there for this purpose. I was told that the meeting was not to be taped.
8. During the meeting, as far as I could see, not one person in that room was making any notes whatsoever of the meeting. This greatly concerned me and made me immediately suspicious. When we requested notes of the meeting afterwards, I was told the next day by Stephanie Barker that no notes were available to be disclosed.
9. I consider this unfair on two points. First, it was unfair that no notes of such an important meeting were disclosed. When there was so much at stake for me personally this was disadvantageous. Second, it was unfair to be misled and told beforehand by the Police Authority that notes would be made available to me when this plainly did not happen. There were many contentious issues being discussed at this hearing. Given these two issues, being denied a barrister put me at a considerable disadvantage.

10. During the course of the meeting, in response to my cross examination, both Mr Hiller and Mr Williams avoided answering my questions. Not being a trained barrister, I did not know how to deal with this aspect of cross examination.
11. By way of illustration, I asked Mr Hiller was he aware of the Professional Standards set for Honesty and Integrity for Police Staff. Mr Hiller answered in the affirmative. Then I went on to ask Mr Hiller whether or not he considered that Principal Intelligence Analysts were ever exempt from those professional standards. He was not prepared to give an answer. I repeated the question and again he refused to answer.
12. I considered that to have had an honest answer to this question as vital to the outcome of the hearing. I was in a disciplinary hearing as a result of making a stance about the analysis I was prepared to hand over in my assignment. The fact was that I was not prepared to hand out misleading analysis. That was in accordance with Professional Standards for Honesty and Integrity. Had I not made such a stance, and handed over what management desired my analysis to say, I would have been in clear breach of professional standards for honesty and integrity. It would have necessitated being untruthful about my analysis. Without legal representation, I did not have the skills of a barrister to know how to cope with Mr Hiller's evasiveness on this point. This was to my great disadvantage.
13. With reference back to the earlier hearing on 2nd September 2010, when cross examined, Mr Hiller denied at the SYPAC hearing that he had any knowledge of my religious beliefs at the point at which he dismissed me. He said this in spite of the fact that he had presided over that earlier hearing and was supposed to have already read and heard both the management statement of case against me and my own statement of case.
14. Both my own and my manager's statement of case had contained repeated references to my religious beliefs. In fact, the very report that is commonly agreed to have been the basis for my dismissal (*see bundle*), contained clear and explicit references to my Christian beliefs. Mr Hiller's proclaimed ignorance on this matter at the SYPAC hearing was not something I felt able to challenge effectively given the relevance of the Employment (Religious and Belief) Regulations 2003. Again, the denial of having a barrister to cross examine on this important point was disadvantageous to me.

15. When Mr Williams was called as a witness, a number of important issues arose which I considered it essential to have had legal support beside me.
16. First, in trying to establish who was the author of the management statement case against me, Mr Williams under questioning indicated that it was Mr Teague. I put it to Mr Williams that he must have played a major part in the formulation of the management statement of case against as so much of it referred to our communication together. In response, Mr Williams indicated that he provided Mr Teague with notes. It is a fact that if such notes exist, no such notes have ever been disclosed for this tribunal despite requests.
17. I asked Mr Williams why minutes of the two case management conference meetings held about me had not been disclosed for the SYPAC hearing. Mr Williams answered that he did not know, and said to me that I will have to ask Mr Teague.
18. Given Mr Williams as my line manager, was key to both theses case management meetings, I asked him if he found it odd that in both case management meetings in which my fate is being virtually sealed on the basis of his insinuations about my mental health and where I am excluded – that no minutes are forthcoming for the hearing. Again the response from Mr Williams was that I would have to ask Mr Teague.
19. I asked Mr Williams, which Senior Police Officer made the decision to recommend that I should be sacked. Mr William's replied no-one, that's the business of Mr Hiller.
20. I put it to Mr Williams that he had actually indicated to me the next day that those at the case conference meeting held as early as 14th July 2010 considered I should be sacked. I put it to him that he had even told me that the Force Solicitor had been consulted and thought the same. Mr Williams flatly denied that we had had these conversations.
21. When I put it to Mr Williams that this hearing could not be fair without minutes disclosed of case management and the meeting with the Force Solicitor, Mr Williams gave no comment. This was a crucial issue and without a barrister, I did not know how to proceed with questioning.
22. There followed a series of quick fire questions which I put to Mr Williams which illustrate that a denial of legal representation was clearly to my disadvantage.

TF: *"Any misconduct allegations?"*

SW: *"Absolutely not."*

TF: *"What relevance my divorce?"*

SW: *"You'd have to ask Adrian Teague."*

TF: *"What relevance my career break?"*

SW: Same answer: *"You'd have to ask Adrian Teague. You took all that before my time"*

TF: *"What relevance my business interest?"*

SW: *"You'd have to ask Adrian Teague."*

TF: *"What happened on 7th July 2010?"*

SW: There was a pause and silence

TF: *"Can you remember what happened that day"*

SW: *"Yes, very much so!"*

TF: *"Why did you fail to mention it in the management statement of case when you have covered all other events? Why leave this one out?"*

SW: *"Not sure of its relevance"* or probably something like that.

TF: *"I put it to you that it's conspicuous by the absence?"*

SW: *"I'll tell you what happened. We met up together as I was concerned for you, Tony. We wanted you to go to Occupational Health so we could get a professional assessment of your health."*

TF: *"That's about it is it?"*

SW: *"Yes!"*

TF: *"What about the work I was doing for ISMB? Did that not feature in our session together?"*

SW: *"Yes it did. We went through some of your work."*

TF: *"This is the Force Threat Assessment Matrix and the updated Force Control Strategy. Is that correct?"*

SW: *"Yes!"*

TF: *"Were you reassured that I'd done the work and was just about ready to go to ISMB the next day?"*

SW: *"You'll remember that you were a long time opponent of these strategic threat assessment matrices, so we had previously spent some time together working on them. New and promising models were emerging and we spent some time looking at how these had progressed."*

TF: *"So was the work required for ISMB the next day more or less done?"*

SW: *"Yes!"*

TF: *"You considered the models as potential best practice models and you wanted to take them down to the National Police Improvement Agency as you told me you had a meeting on the Friday. – the day after the ISMB. Correct?"*

SW: *"I never went down to NPIA."*

TF: *"You wanted these models ready so you could take down to NPIA. You had a promotion board coming up?"*

SW: *Silence*

TF: *"You said that to me didn't you?"*

SW: *"No I did not."*

TF: *I put it to him that he had told me he wanted to use these models at NPIA and that they would help with your promotion board.*

SW: *He again denied it.*

TF: *"Work had been done, work was handed over to Melanie Morrison?"*

SW: *"Yes, we knew we were never in favour of STRA matrices so we've used one that works well in other forces."*

TF: *"Do you accept my beliefs are genuinely held about 9/11 etc?"*

SW: *"Yes but as you know I don't share those beliefs."*

TF: *"Can you explain why I could not be correct in my beliefs?"*

SW: *"I was down there on the day and friends of mine were injured that day. I am convinced about what happened."*

TF: *"Why did you declare that you were unable to hypothesise with me about 9/11?"*

SW: *"I was down there on the day at 7/7 ... Everything I have come across has led me to believe otherwise."*

TF: *"Where you not able to hypothesis or unwilling? Which?"*

SW: Silence

TF: *"As an experienced negotiator used to dealing with people in crisis, how well do you rate your negotiations with me?"*

SW: *"We were all greatly concerned for your mental health. I still am concerned. I was trying to support you. We always got on well together. Our discussions were amicable, we always shook hands."*

TF: *"Why all the repeated references appertaining to my mental health?"*

SW: *"We were greatly concerned, I was concerned. This wasn't the Tony Farrell we were used to seeing."*

TF: *"Why did you say I was a serious threat to the Force?"*

SW: *"Again, we were concerned for your mental health. We thought you were having some kind of a breakdown. You'd gone through a lot. I think you are having a crisis. You had had a lot of personal issues to deal with, divorce, financial pressures, we were all concerned."*

TF: *"What ways were there concerns for personal safety? For my sanity?"*

SW: *"We were worried about what you might do given you where in such a crisis."*

TF: *"You thought I would harm myself or others?"*

SW: *"Possibly yes."*

TF: *"I put it to you that that's ludicrous."*

SW: *"Tony that was also the view of Adrian Teague."*

TF: *"You write up my mental health as if you think I'm about to jump off a bridge or something?"*

SW: Looked startled: *"That's exactly what I was doing at 6am this morning - saving someone from jumping of a bridge."*

TF: *"What mental health issues where being considered in the context of invoking the law?"*

SW: I can't recall what he said in a long answer

TF: *"Specifically what law?"*

SW: Specifically he quoted something under the Mental Health Act.

TF: "What did you mean when you said you did not want me to martyr myself?"

SW: In a lengthy response he mentioned I personally had used the words sacrifice my job, my career, my financial well-being all in pursuit of the truth.

TF: "While you write that I do not represent a significant threat to the public, were you of the opinion that I represented any threat to the public?"

SW: "You were in crisis. This was not the Tony Farrell we were used to seeing."

TF: "Why all the implicitness?"

SW: No answer!

TF: "So having made such a great song and dance about my mental health, how did you feel when the FMA report did not square up with all your previous insinuations?"

SW: Silence

TF: "When I repeatedly told you I was fine did you not believe me? Did I ever report feeling unwell? Did I take any sick leave?"

SW: "No you did not take sick leave during this period."

TF: "So you accept the FMA findings?"

SW: "He's the professional."

TF: "So you accept that I am not mad after all?"

SW: "I still have concerns for you Tony!"

TF: "Did it never once occur to you that your repeated instructions to go to OHU merely aroused all my worst suspicions that all you wanted to do was certify me as mentally ill so that you could brush the issue under the carpet? I'm correct aren't I?"

SW: "No!"

TF: "Given the FMA report showed no concerns, what steps were taken to redress all the incorrect assumptions that were made in the two case conferences held at my exclusion?"

SW: "You'd be better asking Adrian Teague."

TF: "Are you aware of professional standards for Honesty and Integrity?"

SW: "Yes but could not quote them?"

TF: I quoted them out.

TF: "Under what circumstances is it acceptable for an analyst to provide dishonest or misleading analysis?"

SW: Never

TF: "Why pressurise me to provide analysis as such?"

SW: "You did not deliver what we asked you for."

TF: "The work had been done. It was passed over to Mel Morrison?"

SW: "Yes but ISMB did not get their products as we expected and needed."

TF: "Would have it been right to mislead or lie about the threat?"

SW: "No product, no report!"

TF: "Awareness of Employment and Equality (Religious and Belief) Regulations 2003?"

SW: "No!" He quoted back some other regulations – can't remember which ones he said.

TF: "Were the Employment Regulations considered at the two case conference meetings?"

SW: I think he again deflected me by mentioning Adrian Teague.

TF: "Why are there so many repeated references to my religious beliefs in the management statement of case?"

SW: "It was you made the references to them in our discussions together."

TF: "Were they not important?"

TF: "Were they not a confidential matter expressed while at home and on leave?"

SW: "You asked me to give that exhibit to AT for instance?"

TF: "Why try to embarrass me?"

TF: "Why have you mocked me for my Christian beliefs?"

SW: "I haven't"

TF: "I put it to you that repeated references the behaviour of two members of staff"

and your comment about my thoughts on their salvation is both mocking and unprofessional."

SW: He denied this

TF: "On handing over the management case on 20th August, why did you mention to me that I would view much of what you had written as misquoted and written up out of context?"

SW: "I have never said that."

TF: Specifically you said this when you were handing over the Barbara Russell's letter to me that I did not open at the time. I distinctly remember this? Are you denying you said any such thing?"

SW: "I never said this."

TF: "I put it to you that almost every single reference you have made about my faith and my religious beliefs have been written out of context?"

SW: He denied this.

TF: On 20th August 2010, why did you tell me that one of your key members of staff had been spreading malicious rumours about me and why did you tell me that the key member of staff was 'pure evil'?"

SW: He denied all this.

TF: "I put it to you that this was said as either some kind of exquisite torment of me or some attempt to deflect what guilt you had for your own wrong doing?"

SW: "I take great offence to your use of the word spineless. I am anything but spineless!"

(Please note he did not say he took offence to any of the other accusations of him saying that his staff member was "pure evil". Absence is a good indicator that he is accepting we had these discussions)

TF: "Or tormentative instead? I said either or!"

TF: "Are you denying you used the word "pure evil"?"

SW: Yes

TF: "What exactly have members of staff been told about why I have been dismissed?"

SW: "They have been told that you have had a crisis at work. They have been told that there was no misconduct."

TF: "With respect to harming the Force reputation do you really consider me a threat to the Force reputation?"

SW: I can't recall what he said although nothing of any great concern. I did however make one further point here.

TF: "I have not made any contact with a single analyst either in force or out in order to try to influence any of their thinking. I have behaved. I have not used the Principal Analysts network to let them know what's happened to me in other police forces. I repeat I have behaved. I have not gone firing off like a loose cannon. All this has been controlled and restrained."

TF: "As you have read my statement, are there any other issues for you?"

SW: "No!"

TF: "That's all the questions for Mr Williams."

RL: Is that your presentation finished?

TF: No there are other sections.

DCI Williams departs.

23. The above transcript shows that on key issues, Mr Williams is evasive and not giving a response to my important questions. Getting answers was critical to my case. There are clear disagreements about what had been said at earlier meetings between us.
24. During the course of this interaction, there was much squabbling that went unchallenged and the chair of the meeting, Mr Reg Littleboy did not think to intervene. Things were degenerating and it was not until Mr Peter Moore felt it necessary to intervene, that the unfair practice was stopped. By this time I had started to become exhausted in a hearing that lasted nearly four hours. This was unfair and would not have been allowed had I had legal representation.
25. There were other disclosure issues. Despite our requests, South Yorkshire Police again failed to disclose any notes from the two Case Management Conferences that were held in July 2010. It is only in August 2011 that these notes have emerged for the employment tribunal hearing. No satisfactory explanation was given for their absence from the appeal hearing. It was unfair and unreasonable to be denied these notes at the internal appeal hearing as they offer clear evidence to show the extent to which management were

labelling me as mentally ill. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the note that was provided about 20th July 2010 appears in any case incomplete with parts of the notes clearly omitted. This is deeply suspicious especially as the part missing came from Mr Williams.

26. It is a fact that in the SPYPAC hearing itself, I cross examined both Mr Hiller and Mr Williams on a good number of issues. Within that hearing both these witnesses can be classed as hostile witnesses. On occasions both witnesses were evasive at times and I was greatly disadvantaged by not having the services of a barrister.
27. I contend that Mr Williams was untruthful on numerous occasions during this SYPAC hearing on significant matters that could have had a bearing on the outcome. Because of this fact, I requested a note be made that I wanted it on record that at that hearing that I considered that Mr Williams had on several occasions repeatedly lied under cross examination.
28. Specifically, I asked the chair Mr Reg Littleboy to include my accusation in the subsequent notes of the meeting. I never got a response from the chair to my request and no notes of the official notes of the hearing have ever been released. It seems inconceivable to me that had a barrister been there that that unfair and unreasonable practice would have been permitted.
29. Some of my allegations that Mr Williams was not speaking truthfully concerned crucial issues in connection with unfair dismissal. For instance I had contested that as early as 15th July 2010, Mr Williams told me that the Force Solicitor had been consulted and that it was her view and the view coming from the Case Conference meeting that I should be dismissed.
30. When I put it to him that that is what he personally had told me, Mr Williams denied ever having had these conversations with me. Clearly at least one of us must have been speaking untruthfully at this hearing. It is illogical that we both were telling the truth.
31. A look back to the management notes - while not revealing that he said I was likely to be dismissed - does admit to asking me to consider resigning. Why would he ask me to consider resigning, if dismissal was not foremost in their thoughts? Which of these two

versions of events is more plausible? Who is more likely to be telling the truth? Which side benefits most from not having any notes made available at crucial times in these proceedings. Throughout all this case, never once has my honesty and genuineness been in question. It seems to me management have things they want to hide.

32. In spite of the evidence to the contrary within the Force Medical Advisors Report, Mr Williams still declared in front of the SYPAC hearing that he still had concerns for my mental health. This interaction serves as a clear indication why it was so necessary to have had both notes and legal representation at that hearing. Without either available to me, what chance had I got of it being fair?
33. If it assumed for one moment that Mr Williams was speaking untruthfully at the SYPAC hearing and I am speaking truthfully about what I claim he said to me, then it follows that management were determined to see me dismissed well before actual hearing. Close examination of the disclosed notes shows their sole preoccupation is my health. This lends support to that theory. If, as I suggest is the case, Mr Williams has spoken untruthfully on many occasions, then it brings into question the real motives of my managers.
34. I believe on balance that the information disclosed and /or in some cases not disclosed points less towards some kind of collective concern for my welfare: rather it clearly points towards a predetermined decision by managers to dismiss me.
35. It is my view that the occupational health / mental health issue was just a convenient tactic being used as a disingenuous front to give the appearance that they had my best interests at heart. The decision to dismiss me was unwarranted and unfair.
36. At no stage did the chair of the Police Authority probe any of these issues. It seems to me that the Police Authority have sided with Mr Williams, believed his denials and brushed aside my concerns and my questions he plainly refused to answer.
37. For these reasons, I find it deeply suspicious and disadvantageous that notes of this SYPAC hearing have never been disclosed and that I was denied legal representation.
38. Furthermore, the notes of two case conferences are so scant that they plainly do not

adequately cover anything like the entirety of the discussions that were had about my future in the organisation. It seems to me that as much as possible is being kept secret about these discussions. That in essence is what strikes at the heart of the problem with the strategic assessment. Such secrecy is not reasonable in an unfair dismissal appeal hearing.

39. There is no specific disclosure of any meetings whatsoever where consideration was given to redeployment. Neither is there any disclosure of any meetings that were held subsequent to the emergence of the FMA report were contrary to all management's uttering's, my mental health came back clean.
40. In dismissing my appeal, South Yorkshire Police Appeals Committee failed to produce any notes or transcripts of the meeting as promised. They failed to give me any explanation of why they had dismissed the appeal.
41. The personal implications of being dismissed as a Principal Intelligence Analyst were massive. It is quite inconceivable that I would ever be considered for employment in the police service or related fields ever again. Even Mr Williams even pointed this out to me when telling me that resignation would be a better option than dismissal in a meeting as early as 15th July 2010.
42. I had post graduate qualifications in criminal intelligence analysis that have been rendered largely obsolete by this decision. At 50, being suddenly thrown out of the police service risked ruining me completely both financially and professionally. It was not going to be easy setback to recover from. Many options for alternative work in the intelligence analyst profession would have been automatically closed down. The South Yorkshire Appeal Hearing was crucial. It needed to be fair. In my opinion it was anything but fair. That was when I most needed legal representation to try to avert the harm that has been done to me in my profession and to my finances and general well being. Where was the duty of care I ask myself?
43. I went on record as saying that I wanted a note made that I was making these allegations. I never got an answer from the Chairperson.
44. The Chair allowed the meeting to degenerate into a very lengthy two-way argument between Mr Williams and myself, where the roles for cross examination were allowed to

be reversed. This left me feeling exhausted. It was left to a panel member other than the chairperson to point out the error of the Committee's ways. Since I had no legal representation, I was placed in an unfair position.

45. In the absence of any official notes arising from that meeting, I invite the Judge to accept the notes in Appendix E as the most accurate record available.

46. Contrary to what Mr Hiller states, I accept that management's actions were all about my well being only insofar as they were about seeking to destroy my well being.

47. In the final analysis, I as the analyst was tasked to do a threat assessment. When I alerted them to the prospect of a terrible threat, they closed ranks on me. They did not want to consider my alert as is there right, but when I refused to breach professional standards and hand out misleading analysis, they could have and should have acted differently.

48. The fact that Mr Hiller is on record as rightfully acknowledging my sincerity and genuineness and has spoken of some of my excellent work seems inconsistent with the views of other managers and personal staff who clearly were labelling me as mentally ill. It does not seem congruent. It should be abundantly clear that I made a courageous decision to stand for the truth about massively important issues concerned with strategic threat and the assignment I was working on. My stance was entirely consistent with Professional Standards for Honesty and Integrity. Managers are on record as saying there is absolutely no allegations of misconduct. Mr Hiller is on record as saying my beliefs may even be correct. Therefore, I fail to see why dismissing me was inevitable in the circumstances.

SECTION XX – QUANTUM

1. Appendix F provides details of a 6 page report from Chris Makin who has outlined the values of the losses based on appropriate data provided by South Yorkshire Pensions Authority. The figures shown are therefore likely to be underestimates but as there is a ceiling to what can be awarded for an unfair dismissal it was not cost effective to incur additional expenditure when my position is so tight.

2. Since dismissal, I have not been employed in full time employment. In the first six

months, I was given an indication by the local Minister that a temporary three year job on the Heart for Rockingham Project on a salary of £35,000 was being created and that I was ideally placed to secure it. I therefore studied intensively in preparation for the opportunity arising. Clearly I had brand new skills and knowledge to acquire as it was related to religious and faith matters.

3. Sadly for me funding collapsed at the last minute and so my recovery plans were derailed.
4. I have since applied for several church jobs within the Sheffield and District Methodist Church ranging from part time work to full-time temporary work but without success as I do not hold any formal theological qualifications even though I have studied intensively using on-line sources. Examples of this are included in Appendix G.
5. I have applied for ASOS local factory night shift work where pay is basic. This is a large employer in Barnsley and the company were giving a few thousand starts in Grimethorpe only a few miles from where I live. On anticipating a realistic chance of gaining some full time employment, I went on all their week long induction programmes and successfully passed all the tests with 100 per cent scores. They were greatly impressed by my attitude. I reckoned if I got a start, there might be promotion opportunities. Having invested in this recruitment process when it came handing out my CV, they were again impressed until looking at my dismissal. This said that they would look into it. They indicated that they would require references from my previous employer South Yorkshire Police. I was expected to be making a start at £7.56 per hour. However, others applicants are being taken on while I have not yet been called up. I do not know where the blockage lies.
6. I have left my CV with on line recruitment firms such as Indeed Job Alert, Reeds Recruitment and where there are hundreds of Intelligence jobs available of a technical nature and would require retraining in specialist IT skills. Some opportunities are in Sheffield and surrounding areas. Of those few where I am a potential match I am finding no interest as a result of having been dismissed from Police as a Principal Intelligence Analyst. This is hardly endearing to any perspective employer in a related field in the current economic climate. My CV has been passed on to many prospective employers but there has been no interest.
7. I have tried new employment opportunities such as Courier work as there are several

Courier firms in the local area. However, most employment opportunities exist on a self employed basis, and many I have looked into and researched in depth are simply not financially viable.

8. Moving away from South Yorkshire to find employment would be problematic given I now have a mortgage with negative equity.
9. As a top up, I have a part time role in the business where I earn an income of £100 per month.

I believe that the contents of this witness statement are true.

Tony Farrell

Signed:



Date:

31 / August / 2011

Case Number: **2803805/2010**

IN THE SHEFFIELD EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL

BETWEEN

ANTHONY FARRELL

Claimant

and

SOUTH YORKSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY

Respondent

APPENDIX A

REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE