

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 1 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

Answered by Juddith Griffiths social worker with 2 pages and a simple statement – ‘We don’t believe you’

Complaint to the Local Authority (v1)

Dear Sir/ Madam.

I have made a number of complaints to the LA¹ previously that have not been replied to². In response to comments made to me by TH Judge Barnett, I have compiled some of the most pertinent complaints as one document here. The true list is very large due to the extensive negligence and abuse, especially in false reporting made by the LA employees. I have reduced the list considerably here.

An analysis of the emails, already presented to the courts, shows a huge list of requests for honesty, transparency and help from the LA employees. Not one single email was answered. The LA employees do not want to work cooperatively or have traceability; these maverick employees are hiding what is happening and desperately disapproved of a possible judicial review.

What was proven protracted domestic violence by a mum in 2009/2010 and confirmed by social services, two courts, witnesses and media, was then partly confused by a rewrite of the history by the social workers at Ellesmere Port Social Services. Social workers not only tried to hide the abuses and re write the history, they then assisted the assailant to cover her trail and further victimise the victims starting in July 2010 and up to the current date. The LA has allowed its employees to hide domestic violence and propagate harassment of the victims.

The first social workers 2009/2010 were decent professional people who set about helping a distressed family in need. After [mum] assaulted her toddler son and lied³ about an assault on herself to the police et al, the second set of social workers got involved and set about a malicious program of promoting falsely that ‘dad is bad’ and ‘mum is good’.

The root of any confusion is contributed by [mum]’s initial lies, the initial police negligence⁴, [mum]’s ongoing lies and faked compliance⁵ on paper, combined with a very strong prejudice⁶ by the social workers to believe her and dislike any man they falsely believe has been violent. If the social workers had investigated thoroughly and not been so enthusiastic to propagate [mum]’s version of things there would not have been two years of upset for the children amongst other things.

¹ This document uses LA for Local Authority meaning Cheshire West and Chester County Council.

² There were numerous complaints which escalated as a result of the LA not replying. One formal reply was made by the LA in 2009 telling me not to inform them of the children’s distresses (contrary to legal requirements). A second formal response was received on 7th Dec 2011 to complaints made on 17th Dec 2010. The second formal response was reported back to the LA as unsatisfactory and a response to that is still outstanding. LGO were informed but insisted the complaints were put into the LA for a second round before they could become involved.

³ The two criminal courts in Chester found [mum] had lied about the situation. Both courts saw the father as going to the rescue of the toddler. Both courts saw [mum] initiate a substantial assault on [dad]. The magistrates court thought [dad] had over retaliated after being assaulted. The higher court found there was no evidence of over retaliation. **The main point is both courts found [mum] had lied and had assaulted her toddler son and [dad].**

⁴ With IPCC currently.

⁵ [mum] was reported as very compliant by social workers while she was actually causing abuses to the children as reported by CAFCASS and others.

⁶ The LA has demonstrated prejudice as have individual social workers.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 2 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

The ability of the social workers to maintain their position of untruthfulness is based mainly on the abuse of authority⁷ and things being kept secret by the abuse of laws designed to protect children's interests.

It is demonstrable that this situation is serious and involves:-

- the continuous attempt to hide mum's domestic violence and abuses,
- the continuous attempt to propagate mum's version of an alleged assault,
- the covering up of a serious assault,
- emotional abuse of the children,
- malicious harassment of [dad] ,
- emotional abuse of [dad] ,
- the violation of the children and [dad] 's human rights,
- destruction of [dad] 's property,
- perjury to numerous courts by [mum] and social workers.

The social workers reports contain so much hearsay and so little fact that they warrant an entire book on forensic analysis of the subject. An expert in writing children's case reports reported that these reports as being exceptionally bad. These outstandingly unprofessional reports must be given to Ofsted to see what utter nonsense is being written by social workers and being accepted by the LA.

Prejudice against men has been clearly demonstrated by the LA in general⁸, and is demonstrated against the father involved (me) quite blatantly by individual social workers. The reports are used to cover up mum's history as well as ongoing events. The reports accentuate 'mum is good' and paint as unsavoury a picture of dad through mal reporting and implied stereotyping⁹.

This list in this document is far from exhaustive. Separate subsets have been created in an attempt to keep the focus with various parties, with the whole being for the police and future legal use.

To prevent further confusion over documents, I have attached a few relevant documents inside this PDF. These are - the email from [mum] , the [stepbrother] statement, extracts from the original social services report (PDF copy too big), [dad] diary entries referred to by Jean Davies and Caroline Harley, the transcript from the [daughter] blogs, extract from CAFCASS rfj report, extracts from Dr Alwin report.

I am a consultant physicist who has lectured at NASA and worked in military and civil projects with an extensive history running at CEO and director level on a global basis. Contract work undertaken by me has included high level forensic auditing of complex processes. As such, I am used to working inside operations that are at a high level of professionalism and have quality assurance at a very high level.

Every version of any documents that I write has a unique reference and revision declared. The latest version of this document is v1 and can be seen from the title at the top. All previous document revisions in this 'Complaint to LA' are overridden by this current document.

Yours Faithfully,

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by the local authority.
Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

⁷ The LA has taken me to court on numerous occasions to try and force me to say that [mum] was not violent and abusive, contrary to the original social services report, criminal court summing, witness's and evidence.

⁸ See the photographs of domestic violence posters shown by the LA in various locations. All cite men only as responsible for domestic violence. Also the conversations with the social workers ref [CLA1](#)

⁹ e.g. Andrea Blears reports 'dad talks to women on the internet'. How does she know if such a situation exists or not ? She cannot corroborate her statement in any way. This is simply a malicious comment.

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 3 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

Index

Index (Hyperlinks in softcopy)	
	Complaint Summary Table.
	Note on supposed irrational behaviour’.
	L: Lies and more lies.
	B1: Early troubles with [mum] and children
	B2: Early violence and abuses by [mum] . Social workers trying to help a family.
	B3 : Highly prejudiced social services and the case of the vanishing violence.
	B4 [daughter] ’s First Running Away From Mum’s & Exposure Of Social Workers Lies.
	B5 [mum] and social workers pushing ‘dad is bad’ & ‘mum is good’
	B6 Acts of serious negligence by mum covered up by social services.
	B7 Malicious slander, repeated perjury by social workers and [mum] .
	B8 Social services push their abuses to extremes.
	B9 Extreme destruction caused by [mum] and social workers malicious acts.
	B10 Hiding and burying of all complaints against social services.
	B11 EVERYTHING depends on the truth.
	B12 A little girl fears violence. The LA and [mum] don’t want the truth.
	B13 Perjury on a grand scale.
	B14 Malicious slander and harassment on a grand scale.
	B15 Children taken into custody based on a perjured court.
	B16 Mr Rawlinson said both parents had emotionally abused [daughter] .
	B17 [daughter] put into custody with the person who had abused her lots; again !.
	B18 Post Liverpool abuses of children.
	B19 Social services hiding abuses and still trying to sell ‘dad is bad’.
	B20 Assault never even investigated
	B21 [daughter] ’s drawings, writings and blogs.
	B22 Response to Vicki Dudley of CAFCASS.
	B23 Mr Rawlinson said [daughter] was happy to go to mum’s house.
	B24. LA excuse of dad is mentally unwell to cover their abuses.
	B25. Dr Alwin’s report say mum is a real risk, but LA reports dad is the problem.
	Appended in PDF : Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009, [dad] Diary Notes, [stepbrother] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription. CAFCASS rfa extract, Court order page1

Note: Softcopy pdf has hyperlinks and Blue without hyperlinks indicates references.

Complaints Summary Table

Complaint Summary Table. (Hyperlinks in softcopy)		
No.	Complaint in short form.	Future use.
CS	<p>My complaint in summary is that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the LA has been negligent in allowing its employee and contract workers to behave unprofessionally in dealing with my children's welfare and well being. 2. the LA has been negligent in allowing its employee and contract workers to interact unprofessionally with myself, as the father of the children involved. 3. the LA social workers Dana Murray, Vivian Saunders, Barbra Goldsmith, Andrea Blears, Kevin Buck and Helen Jones have all demonstrated professional negligence. 4. the LA social workers Dana Murray, Vivian Saunders, Barbra Goldsmith, Andrea Blears, Kevin Buck and Helen Jones have gone considerably beyond negligence and have perjured courts. 5. the LA social workers Dana Murray, Vivian Saunders, Barbara Goldsmith, Andrea Blears, Kevin Buck and Helen Jones have criminally harassed me. 6. the LA has allowed, through a protracted campaign of harassment by its employee and contract workers, to emotionally assault [daughter] . 7. the LA has allowed, through a protracted campaign of harassment by its employee and contract workers, to emotionally assault me and damaged my health. 8. the LA has allowed, through a protracted campaign of harassment by its employee and contract workers, to damage my property and the children's financial security. 9. the LA has allowed its employee and contract workers to have operated in an out control fashion in creating stories to promote the false idea of 'dad is bad' and 'mum is good'. 10. the LA has allowed its employees to cover up the truthfulness of the violence and abuse carried out by [mum] on her children by opposing a Judicial review. 11. the LA has allowed its employees to saying dad is mentally ill and that [daughter] only tells lies and all other evidence should be ignored in their efforts to hide their abuses. 12. the LA has allowed its employees to negligently serve imprisonment documents on [dad] . 13. the LA has allowed its employees to waste circa £500,000 of tax payers money in carrying out an abusive campaign of 'dad is bad' and 'mum is good' 14. the LA has allowed its employees to write a highly prejudiced interpretation of the report by Dr Alwin. 15. the LA has allowed it's employees to create a perverted report by Prof. Billington by stopping what he deemed 'ESSENTIAL'. 16. the LA has permitted it's employees to Perjure the High Courts in Liverpool and Chester. 	

List of individual complaints and the referencing to the history

Note: The complaints run CUMMULATIVELY. Each person at the next point in time is working on the premise that the social workers previously have told the truth only. They are all professionally negligent of not checking the full history. They are negligent of not seeing contradictions between professionals and not investigating why these contradictions exist. They are negligent of contradicting themselves between reports. They are negligent of not checking readily available evidence from reports, courts, barristers and witnesses.

CLA1	<p>The LA and it's social workers showed extreme prejudice against men in cases of domestic violence.</p> <p>From July 2010 until late Q1 2011, the LA only showed posters which displayed extreme prejudice against men in the dealing and understanding of domestic violence. Photo evidence and witnesses. These posters were in the council's offices and in 3 sets of doctors surgeries. Ref B3.1.1</p> <p>The prejudice has been displayed openly and with hostility in conversations with social workers ref CA1 ref CV1 ref CV2 refCB4 refCK1 ref B7.3.1. ref B7.3.1.1. Ref B7.3.2. ref B7.3.3</p>	
CLA2	<p>The LA has repeatedly forced me to court to stop criticising them only for the Judges repeatedly to curtail their ambition drastically. ref Chester and Liverpool courts. Ref Emails.</p>	
CLA3	<p>CLA3.1. The LA has shown professional negligence in selectively using Dr Alwin's work to present a case of 'dad is bad' and 'mum is good' Ref B25 all</p> <p>CLA3.2. Further, they fail to see that [mum] presents a significant threat to the children in her responses and behaviour. Ref B25.6.</p>	
CLA4	<p>The LA allows contract staff to make up policy on the hoof because they do not know what is happening. Ref CA2</p>	
CLA5	<p>The LA allows its staff to use threatening, intimidating and bullying language and behaviour in its dealings with its customer. ref CA1 ref CV1 ref CV2 refCB4 refCK1 ref B7.3.1. ref B7.3.1.1. Ref B7.3.2. ref B7.3.3</p> <p>and</p> <p>e. g. email from Debbie Williams, LA Solicitor. "I must emphasise that if you wittingly or unwittingly breach the order made yesterday the Local Authority will be applying to the Court to have you committed to prison"</p> <p>and</p> <p>e.g. the negligent and malicious act of wrongly issuing imprisonment documents on me Ref B8, and their personal behaviour during this charade ref B8.3.2</p> <p>e.g. LA employees calling [dad] irrational as an excuse to try and avoid answering questions that show negligence and malice created by the LA employees. ref Emails</p>	
CLA6	<p>The professional negligence of the LA and it's social workers has</p>	

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 6 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

	contributed to allow ongoing abuse of the children at huge expense to the tax payer. Current estimates run at around £500,000 so far.	
CLA7	The LA social workers since July 2010 have clearly alienated dad and aligned themselves with [mum] . This is not in line with the children’s act 1989 which puts the children as the priority. The LA is professionally negligent of breaking the children’s act 1989. Ref TimeLine Document, ref Emails, ref B25.2, ref B25.2.1.	
CLA8	The LA allows its social workers to repeatedly act in promoting [mum] ’s version of the supposed assault in their reports, which two courts had decided are lies. e.g.	
CLA9	The LA allows its social workers to repeatedly act in suppressing the reported assaults on the children and the assault created by mum on [toddler] and [dad] which two courts agreed upon as part of ‘bad character evidence’. All reports and refusal of judicial review.	
CLA10	It cannot be explained by simple negligence that the LA employees have managed to avoid seeing and acting on a huge list of proven blatant lies told by [mum] . ref L It can only be explained by malice. They knew these were lies, and proof of the lies were easily identified e.g. contradiction between [mum] reporting to social workers and CAFCASS reporting. Helen Jones, when challenged on this issue replied ‘well you can’t trust what CAFCASS reported’ ‘[daughter] is a liar’. ref CH14	
CD1	Dana Murray fails to act on the fact that [mum] accepted she was violent and abusive to the children previously and is now reporting that only [dad] has ever hit the children.. Ref B3.3.0	
CD2	Dana Murray emotionally abuses [daughter] by telling her she is a liar. Ref B3.3.0.3	
CD3	Dana Murray emotionally abuses [daughter] by talking openly in earshot of [daughter] with [mum] discussing [mum] ’s emotional allegations of her assault. See Dana Murray report.	
CD4	Dana is negligent of recognising that she is questioning [daughter] in an environment that prevents her from criticising her mother. Ref CH report.	
CD5	Dana is negligent of creating a report that does not recognise serious contradictions between [mum] ’s version of events and supporting information from previous social services and other documents. This is the start of confusion towards the ‘ dad is bad ’ and ‘ mum is good ’ campaign that social services then run heavy handed with for over two years.	
CD6	Dana Murray acts to promote [mum] ’s version of the supposed assault in Dana’s reports, which two courts have decided are lies. Ref DM report.	
CV1	Vivian Saunders first ever discussion by phone to [dad] discussed him as factually having assaulting [mum] . Ref 3.3.0	
CV2	Vivian Saunders first visit to my rented house happened while I had visitors. These visitors were flabbergasted at her talking at me and in a derogatory manner. After she left, they asked me if she was from the police or something. Vivian Saunders was rude and unprofessional and witnessed by [motherofbabysitter] and [babysitter] (family	

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 7 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

	friends and [daughter] ’s friend and babysitter). see Email complaint.	
CV3	Vivian Saunders lied about [daughter] and put down what Vivian wanted, not what [daughter] said. Ref CAFCASS rfj report.	
CV4	Vivian Saunders S7 report is not a true reflection of what has been happening. CV4.1. Vivian put down what Vivian wanted [daughter] to have said. ref CAFCASS rfj. CV4.2. Vivian takes everything mum says at face value and simply ignores the children and dad. Some of the things that actually had happened are in the retrospective ref CAFCASS report rfj. CV4.3. Vivian ignores all current and previous abuses reported that mum caused and presents a ‘dad is bad’ and ‘mum is good’ campaign and recommends the children stay with mum. CV4.4. Vivian is professionally negligent in dressing up her report conclusion to make it look more acceptable saying the recommendation is based on maintaining the status quo – and that report is falsely based as shown by the ref CAFCASS rfj report.	
CV5	Vivian Saunders is professionally negligent in that she has the mentality of inventing bad things about people because she simply doesn’t like them. See 7.3.3.	
CV6	Vivian Saunders acts to promote [mum] ’s version of the supposed assault in her reports, which two courts have decided are lies. Ref VS reports.	
CV7	Vivian suppresses the reported assaults on the children previously and the assault created by mum on [toddler] and [dad] which two courts agreed upon as part of ‘bad character evidence’. Ref VS reports.	
CB1	Barbra Goldsmith is professionally negligent in not realising that [mum] has demonstrably been telling lies and manipulating the social workers – given CAFCASS report , Caroline Harley report , witnesses , court summings , evidence .	
CB2	Barbara Goldsmith asked [mum] if she had ever been abusive or hit the children at a meeting. [mum] told the meeting no – which was clearly a lie. Barbara Goldsmith did not put this in writing. ref Email	
CB3	At the first CIN meeting at [chidschool] with [mum] is reported as willing to engage with the CIN plan based on her version of the history. This is taken at face value by Barbra Goldsmith irrespective of what CAFCASS rjf, [daughter] and [dad] are reporting. [mum] has been demonstrably manipulative previously saying exactly the same. ref BG reports.	17 th oct 2011
CB4	At the first CIN meeting at [chidschool], Barbara Goldsmith falsely reports [dad] as not cooperating because he has asked for transparency and honesty, which Barbara refuses. ref Emails	17 th oct 2011
CB5 CK1	At the second CIN meeting at EP, Kevin Buck falsely reports [dad] as not cooperating using exactly the same tactic that was used in CB4. . ref Email .	17 th nov 2011
CB6	CB6.1. Barbara Goldsmith falsely reports there was no warmth of emotion between [toddler] and [dad] . When discussed with [dad] she agreed this was an “error”. CB6.2. However, no correction is made and this statement appears later as cut and paste repetition of ‘Barbara reports’ used by Andrea Blears in a report to the court.	

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 8 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

	CB6.3. The same comment is again repeated by Tom Billington who reports ‘Barbara reports..... ref [dad] emails/fax	
CB7	Barbara Goldsmith acts to promote [mum] ’s version of the supposed assault in her reports, which two courts have decided are lies. ref BG reports.	
CB8	Barbara Goldsmith suppresses the reported assaults on the children previously and the assault created by mum on [toddler] and [dad] which two courts agreed upon as part of ‘bad character evidence’ ref BG reports	
CK2	CK2.1. Kevin Buck was aware of the error in CB6.1 above by face to face discussion, but took no action to remove the error. CK2.2. He later sees the same error in Andrea Blears document which he approves. CK2.3. He later sees the same false statement in Prof. Billington’s report and declines to inform anyone it is a mistake. CK2.4. Kevin Buck wanted a ‘dad is bad’ advert even if it was false and malicious. Kevin Buck is professionally negligent and has slandered and harassed [dad] and deliberately misleads the courts.	
CK3	Kevin Buck is professionally negligent in interpreting [dad] ’s actions as bad, simply because he has psychological issues of his own. Ref B7.3.2	
CK4	Kevin Buck supports the promotion of [mum] ’s version of the supposed assault which two courts have decided are lies. As the manager, he approves the reports.	
CK5	Kevin Buck supports the suppressing of the reported assaults on the children previously and the assault created by mum on [toddler] and [dad] which two courts agreed upon as part of ‘bad character evidence’. As the manager, he approves the reports.	
CS1	CS1.1. Susanne Leece falsely reports [dad] as not cooperating. [dad] requested truth and transparency, and it was refused by Susanne Leece. CS1.2. At the first SL meeting, the teachers from [daughter] ’s school said there were no problems at school. At later meetings, they finally said yes there were and had been problems. CS1.3. At the first SL meeting, the police said there were no real incidents to report. [mum] had allowed an under age child ‘[boy] ’ known as being a liability for years to be alone with [daughter] in her bedroom and assault her. CS1.4. At this meeting, mum and social services knew about the [boy] incident but declined to say. They had lied and were covering up mum’s extreme negligence.	
CA1	Andrea Blears first action in her first meeting with [dad] is to threaten [dad] that she will take his children off him. Andrea creates total distrust and destroys the professional and amicable relationship that existed between [dad] and the previous social worker Barbra Goldsmith. see Emails	
CA2	Andrea Blears makes up policy for social services operations ad hoc and on the hoof. (see TWD email 12 03 30 Core Group; Child Protection Meeting ; Shambles. copied to all).	
CA3	CA3.1. Andrea Blears writes very unprofessional social services	

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 9 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

	<p>reports that are error ridden and filled with amplification of mum's bad mouthing of dad. See all of ref B7.3</p> <p>CA3.2. See [childwelfareprofessional] professional criticism of one of Andrea's reports. Copy already with LA. If you cannot find it we can send another. If you don't accept [childwelfareprofessional] report as valid criticism we can get ask OFFSTED or LGO to audit the document.</p> <p>CA3.3. One dreadful example is Andrea reporting [mum] being good as a mum to [stepbrother] . [stepbrother] is a witness to [mum] 's violence and is available should you wish to hear it directly from him how dreadful [mum] was.</p>	
CA4	Andrea Blears is professionally negligent and covers up the fact in all of her reports to the courts that [mum] has allowed an assault to have taken place with [daughter] . ref AB reports .	
CA5	Andrea Blears commits perjury and lies to the court in Liverpool see report 23rd 05 12012 saying things are only good at mum's house. HH Judge Dodds asked social services on that occasion to go and try a lot harder to work properly with their clients.	
CA6	Andrea Blears commits perjury again in Chester B13.0	
CA7	Andrea Blears continues maliciously promoting dad is bad and mum is good ref B13.0.1	
CA8	Andrea Blears followed on the tradition set from Dana onwards to tell [daughter] she was a liar for believing that her mum had been violent and abusive to both children. ref Emails , ref [daughter] , ref [daughter] Blogs .	
CA9	Andrea Blears lies and writes in reports that [daughter] likes her. She later blames [dad] for [daughter] not liking her. see PPU comments and [daughter] blogs .	
CA10	Andrea Blears has [daughter] screaming and crying and running away from her. The LA cover up the incident even though it is reported as a complaint to them independently by [childwelfareprofessional]. 17 th Nov 2012. Ref see B23 and B4.3 .	
CA11	Andrea Blears deliberately perjures the court in Liverpool saying [daughter] was very content to be at her mother's house and had not run away from her mother's house. Ref B4.2 .	
CA12	Andrea Blears acts to promote [mum] 's version of the supposed assault in her reports, which two courts have decided are lies. Ref AB reports .	
CA13	Andrea Blears suppresses the reported assaults on the children previously and the assault created by mum on [toddler] and [dad] which two courts agreed upon as part of 'bad character evidence'. ref AB reports	
CA14	Andrea Blears both hides and plays down emotional abuses created by mum in her reports. Ref B4.4 , ref B4.5 , B4.6 , .. Ref B4.7	
CH1.	Helen Jones demonstrably perjured the court in Chester supporting that [mum] had only once ever smacked her daughter [daughter] . ref Perjury letters to police and court .	
CH2.	Helen Jones maliciously lied in her report saying [toddler] had WRITTEN that [dad] had hit [toddler] . Ref B19.3 . through to B20.	
CH3	Helen Jones reports [mum] 's malicious allegations without proof as	

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 10 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

	part of her campaign of ‘dad is bad’. ref B5.2.	
CH4	CH4. [mum] is screaming and shouting at [daughter] and [toddler] and assaults [daughter] . Helen Jones reports the situation wrongly and blames ‘dad is bad’ after [mum] assaults her child Ref B18.4 CH4.1. Helen Jones is professionally negligent to have allowed this to be recorded by [mum] and social services as ‘nothing’. see B19 and especially B19.1	
CH5	Helen Jones emotionally abuses [daughter] causing her to have a fit. Ref 18.4.1.	
CH6	[toddler] was reported to have been assaulted by [pervert] . To this day, nobody has investigated it. [daughter] told me it happened as did [toddler] . Helen Jones is professionally negligent of not having a reported assault on a child she is responsible for investigated. see B20	
CH7	Helen Jones punishes dad for mum assaulting her child and uses the incident to promote ‘dad is bad’ and tries to cover mum’s assault on [daughter] as being acceptable. Ref B19 ref [daughter]	
CH8	Helen Jones having isolated the children from dad does not respond to requests for contact by email. various emails.	
CH9	Helen Jones fails to report mum is physically fighting with the children and breaks expensive computer equipment. Ref B18.3 Ref [daughter] , ref Emails	
CH10	Helen Jones has [daughter] screaming at her and running away from her and fails to report it, both at the contact centre and at mum’s home. ref emails regarding contact. ref [daughter]	
CH11	Helen Jones signs a sworn affidavit and participates maliciously to have [dad] served with imprisonment documents by the LA Ref LA docs Helen Jones is professionally negligent. If she had read all of the documents concerned, it was clear there was no breach of the order. . See B8	
CH12	Helen Jones is professionally negligent of promoting [mum] based on what she says at face value, and yet at odds with reports showing differently. ref CAFCASS et al. ref L	
CH13	Helen Jones professional negligence allowed the children to be taken into custody based on perjury see B15.	
CH14	When I asked Helen Jones about [mum] and her friends bad mouthing dad – as reported under oath by Alan Rawlinson at Liverpool, Helen Jones tells me ‘It’s just [daughter] lying again’. Helen Jones is professionally negligent of believing everything other than what she says is false. Ref TWD	
CH15	[daughter] has always written, drawn and recorded herself on tape machines and video recorders. She has done lots of media as cathartic activities regarding all the violence and emotional abuse she has experienced from mum, [pervert] and the social workers. When blogs were discovered and I took them to the court, the knee jerk reaction of social services was to say [daughter] is a liar. Helen Jones priority was not to investigate the abuses of children in her care, it was to hide the evidence and call [daughter] a liar –yet again. The social worker did not want the statements investigated as	

From:-Dad.
 Whose children are being abused by
 the local authority.
 Sanitised version for public
 by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
 To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
 Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
 Page 11 of 28
 Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
 Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
 [dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

	part of a Judicial review. The social worker was more interested to promote 'dad is bad' & 'mum is good'. Helen Jones is professionally negligent of not putting the children first. See B21.	
CH15	Helen Jones is professionally negligent of recommending to a court to put the children into the custody of a mother who has been violent and abusive to the children, carried out a protracted emotional abuse campaign, lied repeatedly for two years, allowed her daughter to be assaulted, carried out a malicious campaign on a grand scale to destroy the very financial security of the children and is seen as a significant risk to the children's well being by the psychologists report. See B6	
	This list is not exhausted, but we are finite creatures.	
Suggestions.		
S1.	Please reform the social services function at Ellesmere Port. What these maverick social workers have done to my children and me is dreadful. Given they are doing this to my family, then they are certainly injected chaos and distress into the local community under a blanket of mal applied secrecy.	

Background.

Note On Supposed Irrational Behaviour.

One of the reasons that social workers have managed to keep this mess going for over three years has been the fact that they have been working from false premises and have created a huge amount of wrong statements both negligently and deliberately¹⁰. Their reports are filled with hearsay and little factual content other than dates of meetings. [Ref Expert Analysis.](#)

When LA social workers first became involved in 2009, they behaved in a manner conducive to helping a distressed family. After [mum] assaulted her [toddler] and lied about being assaulted herself, the LA social services showed the attributes of a man hating monster abusing its powers to help the 'poor woman'.

Against abusive employees in an authority, the only defence¹¹ is to switch on as many lights as possible and hope that either they behave properly, or the good people in authority come and help.

The specific LA social workers at Ellesmere Port involved after July 2010 have been professionally negligent on a scale that I personally find bewildering. They have been allowed to abuse their power to an extent that has severely shocked most of my family, friends and an experienced child welfare manager.

¹⁰ The social workers have been shown that [mum] has lied to them frequently, but they chose to not only ignore it, but cover it up.

¹¹ I initially tried to work collaboratively and professionally with each of the LA social workers. My efforts proved worthless as each of the social workers was prejudiced against me as a man with the stigma of domestic violence.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com**

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 12 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

That my behaviour is called irrational by the employees of the LA, is another part of their abuse. It is a desperate attempt to protect them from having their negligence and malice identified. This document is an overview of the complaints against these abusive employees.

L: Lies and More Lies.

Recorded lies (provable)

- L1. [mum] lied to the police in 2006 to help her break a prohibited steps order. [Police](#)
- L2. [mum] lied and perjured the courts in Chester in 2006 testifying under oath about having sex or not [submissions](#). [Ref B1.3](#)
- L3. [mum] lied to police about an assault 23rd July 2010. [Court records](#), [barristers notes](#), [solicitors notes](#), [ref TWD court notes](#)
- L3. [mum] lied about an assault and perjured the magistrate's court in Chester under oath January 2011. [Court records](#), [solicitors notes](#), [ref TWD court notes](#)
- L4..[mum] lied about an assault and perjured the high court in Chester under oath April 2011. [Court records](#), [Barristers Notes](#), [ref TWD court notes](#)
- L5..[mum] lied to police about [daughter] staying at my house April 2011. [Police](#)
- L6. [mum] lied repeatedly to social services about being assaulted in 2010 until now ([reflection from L3, L4 above](#)).
- L7..[mum] lied to social services not telling them about emotional abuse of [daughter] by herself and [pervert] repeatedly in 2010/2011 ([social services v CAFCASS rfj](#)).
- L8. [mum] lied repeatedly to social services not telling them of emotional abuses created by her on the children. ([Compare AB Liverpool O'Leary v CAFCASS](#)).
- L9. [mum] lied and perjured the high courts in Liverpool (under oath) and in Chester saying she had only smacked [daughter] once only. ([compare court order, v CH2009, \[mum\] email, diary notes, \[stepbrother\] , \[daughter\] Blogs et al](#))

..and social services report [mum] is compliant and trustworthy.

B1: Early troubles with [mum] and children

B1. [mum] , before having her own children, emotionally abused her stepson for years. [Ref evidence previously provided to lawyers, social services and police by \[stepbrother\]](#) .

B1.1. In early 2006 [mum] tried to abduct [daughter] to Scotland without any previous or then current discussion. I contacted social services who said it was none of their business and I should talk to lawyers. This was done and a prohibited steps order served on [mum] not to remove [daughter] . [mum] then phoned from a neighbour's house to her brothers in Scotland to come down and take her and [daughter] to Scotland. [mum] then phoned the police telling them I was stopping her leaving the home with [daughter] – she did not tell them about the prohibited steps order. I was then assaulted without cause by police while they allowed [mum] to remove things from the house. When I informed the police and showed them the prohibited

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 13 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

steps order, they stopped [mum] and had [daughter] returned to me in the middle of the night.
[ref Police and other documents and witness](#) (currently with IPCC).

B1.1.1. This was **emotional abuse of [daughter] by her mum yet again.**

B1.2. Custody of [daughter] was awarded to me in 2006.. A letter is in that court bundle from her [mum] stated she hated family life and looking after [daughter] . She was identified to have used a very large amount cut and paste malicious statements about me which were simply proven in court as lies. [mum] went off to live with her sister in Scotland. [daughter] stayed with me in England. [Ref Previous case documents.](#)

B1.3. [mum] returned pregnant to our family home from Scotland. She had previously **testified under oath** in court in Chester that she had not had sex with me making it impossible for the child to be mine. She swore under oath in court in Chester that the child was mine. [mum] lies to the police and lies to the courts under oath. [Ref Previous case documents.](#)

B2: Early violence and abuses by [mum] . Social workers trying to help a family.

B2. The original social services reports from Caroline Harley in Nov2009 and the documents and witnesses around them **show clearly that [mum] had been frequently violent leaving marks on the children, throwing them around, slapping them, screaming and shouting at them (politely worded at points as 'losing it')** . The pattern was a mixture of violence, abuse and affection all interspersed. Abuses included [mum] telling [daughter] frequently that [daughter] was the problem, life was better before she was ever born. [Ref CH9th Nov 2009](#), [Ref \[mum\] Email](#), [Ref \[dad\]diary](#), [Ref \[blogs\]](#) , [Ref Chester Magistrates Court summing](#), [Ref Chester Crown Court Summing](#), [Ref \[daughter\]](#) , [Ref \[dad\]](#), [Ref \[stepbrother\]](#), [Ref \[stepbrother\]](#), [Ref\[babysitter\]](#). [Ref Letter \[family\]](#) .

B2.0. Dana Murray reports [mum] as showing **NO EMPATHY or WARMTH** when shown evidence of [mum] not reacting to [daughter] in distress. [Ref . DM report 09/08/2010.](#)

B2.0. It is quite clear from this reporting that [mum] is not saying anything bad about [dad] – only that he works too much.

B2.0.1. There are no abuses of dad to anybody – child, adult or animal; he just works too much.

B2.1. **This extended violence and abuse of [daughter] by her mum is the basis of her deep rooted fear at times of her mother as well as her loving her mother.**

B2.2. At this time, social services were professional and there was good rapport between them and the family. It was clear to see they were attempting to fix and heal a very distressed family.

B2.3. However, the fixing wasn't working and [mum] was getting worse.

B2.4. My older son [stepbrother] and others were saying to get rid of [mum] ([Ref \[stepbrother\] evidence submitted to lawyers, police, social services](#)). I made excuses saying she was simply unwell and was trying desperately to take all the stresses off of her. That was in line with the social services requests on how to improve things.

B2.5. [mum] seemed to follow a pattern of violence related to high stress times – morning routine etc. She had a lot of control over it when other people could witness her; she rarely 'lost it' when strangers were around.

B2.6. [stepbrother] and [babysitter] saw frequent assaults of the children. [babysitter] has witnessed [mum] head butting [daughter] , spitting at [daughter] , slapping [daughter] as well as frequent screaming and shouting. [stepbrother] has witnessed [mum] sitting on top of [daughter] bashing [daughter] 's head off the floor. Social services made [mum] sign an agreement to stop having slap fights with [daughter] . [Ref DM report](#)

B2.7. The violence got more vicious with [mum] 'learning' to avoid [dad] getting between her and the children to stop her hitting the children.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 14 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B2.8. [mum] assaulted [toddler] in July 2010 and went on to lie to the police fabricating lies about a fictitious assault on her to deflect the attention away from her violence and abuses on the children.

B2.8.0. The police, having arrested [dad] , could not contact anybody in social services or the health services to corroborate that this was a troubled household.

B2.8.0.1. [stepbrother] contacted the police, but they declined his offer of evidence.

B2.8.0.2. The police without reasonably investigating the matter, assumed [dad] was to blame and offered [dad] a caution. The caution was refused as it did not correspond to what actually happened.

B2.8.0.3. [dad] , based on [mum] 's lies about an assault was bailed not to go near his home.

B2.8.0.4. [mum] under police protection set about the destruction of the family business by destroying computer files and hardcopy to prevent her lies being exposed.

B2.8.0.5. These events are with IPCC.

B2.8.1. The high court Judge summing up and barristers notes have been readily available to social services, CAFCASS and the LA.

B2.8.2. The '**bad character' evidence**' agreed by the courts showed [mum] as violent and abusive in general and assaulting [toddler] and [dad] on that night and having lied extensively.

B2.9. [mum] was reported to the police as assaulting the children at the time of [mum] telling lies about her assault. The police ignored the reported child assaults; initial police investigations into this said the sergeant involved believed [dad] was merely reporting the child abuse in retaliation for being charged. IPCC are investigating the failure of the police to respond properly to a reported child assault, reported domestic violence as well as why the police were negligent in not investigating the matter properly before charging [dad] .

B3 : Highly prejudiced social services and the case of the vanishing violence.

July 2010.

B3. At the instant of the falsely reported assault by [mum] , social services changed personnel and became extremely prejudiced and hostile to [dad] as well as taking on a very active role to break up the family.

B3.1. This is nasty social engineering.

B3.1.1. I visited social services immediately after the police released me. I wanted to get them to make sure the children were protected. I was horrified to be confronted with lots of posters showing ONLY men being responsible for domestic violence. It was just the same as when I had looked on the internet for help after [mum] assaulted [toddler] and me. Everywhere you looked, it was about 'men are bad' 'men kill women' 'men are the cause of domestic violence'.

[I took photographs of some posters and later took friends to show them the blatant prejudice.](#)

B3.2 and it is based on having completely wrong facts.

B3.3. The first social worker told [dad] he couldn't be expected to be treated the same as other people because as he had assaulted his wife and children ([ref first complaint to Chief Exec Cheshire West and Chester County Council](#) and replies).

B3.3.0. Dana Murray having-

- read [mum] 's own email admission of her hitting [daughter] ,
- and having read Caroline Harleys report showing [mum] doing this frequently,
- and is described as suffering signs of depression and had refused help in treatment of it
- then manages to report the bizarre situation of saying that [daughter] had said only dad had hit her. ([compare DM first report with CH report and notes](#))

B3.3.1 Note in Dr Alwin's report that [mum] states she had smacked [daughter] more than once.

B3.3.2. This is the start of the lies by social workers to create 'dad is bad'.

B3.3.3. When Dana interviews [daughter] away from mum's house, [daughter] then tells her that mum did hit the children lots. [DM report.](#)

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com**

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 15 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B3.3.3.1. Dana is shown a photograph that is clearly taken in mum's house and it is easily recognisable as [daughter] by [daughter] , myself and family friends. It shows a large slap mark which [daughter] and I know was made by mum. I do not immediately have the computer to hand to show the exact date of the photograph. Dana tells [daughter] she is telling lies and the photograph is not her and mum never hit her and reports the photo is invalid because the police were never shown it. [ref DM report](#), [ref Emails](#)

B3.4. From this point onwards we see [mum] running a malicious, slandering, perjuring campaign to hide her violence and promote [dad] as bad. She uses the authorities to try and force her version of things. Social services oblige more than willingly as they interpret the event as poor woman attacked by bad man. Social services set about hiding [mum] 's history of abuse and set about re writing history to create a whole new story of '[mum] is good' and 'dad is bad'.

B3.4.1. What is seen in Dana's formal report is the start of the vanishing of mum's violence.

B3.4.1. [daughter] reports that [mum] was going round telling all of her friends that dad had assaulted [mum] and the children with [daughter] in tow. [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#)

B3.4.2. [daughter] told me to be careful, that a lot of the [mum] 's at [daughter's school] would be hating me because [mum] had told them her lies. ([documented various places](#)).

B3.4.3. [daughter] knew that her [mum] was telling lies about the assault ([documented in various places](#)).

B3.4.4. Social services knew [mum] was doing this. [daughter] told them. [ref CAFCASS rfj](#).

B3.4.5. Dana Murray was even talking to [mum] about her supposed assault with [daughter] listening.

B3.4.6. Much worse, is that the social workers were now telling [daughter] she never was assaulted by [mum] . [Ref \[daughter\]](#) and [Ref DM report](#).

B3.4.7. **This was the start of [daughter] distrusting and disliking social workers – for her own reasons.**

B3.4.8. This was extensive emotional abuse of [daughter] brought on by both [mum] and the social workers involved (Dana Murray and Vivian Saunders).

B3.4.9. A report of the children's concerns were sent to social services by me. [Lawyer's letter](#).

B3.4.9.1. **I received a response with a legal letter from social services saying do not report anything to us.**

B3.3.1. The LA replied, but were told the replies were unsatisfactory as they were merely cover ups answered by the party the complaint was made against. [ref Emails](#)

B3.3.2. LA never followed their own procedure and took the complaint to the next level

B3.5. Evidence is clear from the Dana Murray files and Vivian Saunders files. There is also the evidence files lodged with the courts and social services which refer to Caroline Harley reports and the diary evidence passed on to Jean Davies and Caroline Harley. [stepbrother] witnessed and submitted statements to the lawyers, police and social services. **The CAFCASS RFJ report shows [daughter] telling about how social services are just saying what they like.**

B3.8. A first criminal trial regarding the alleged assault took place in January 2011.

B3.8.1. The summing up of this trial with the allowed '**bad character evidence about [mum]**' was that :-

B3.8.1.1. [mum] had been violent and abusive to the family and had lied about much of what was presented. (the 2009 Caroline Harley report and it's supporting documents were evidence).

B3.8.1.2. [mum]¹² had been assaulting her child [toddler] .

B3.8.1.3. [dad] had gone to the rescue of the child.

B3.8.1.4. [mum] had substantially assaulted [dad] .

¹² I use [mum] here instead of [mum] for readability.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 16 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B3.8.1.5. The court felt [dad] had over reacted after being assaulted, and was therefore guilty.
B3.8.1.5.1. The over reaction was based on a supposed bump on [mum] 's head that nobody saw. She herself said in the court there was no such wound. It was only recorded by the constable who reported that she had a golf ball sized wound on her head. A wound that would have required a hospital check up; nobody saw, no records, just this constables notes. The IPCC are investigating this as well.

B3.9. [dad] attended probation. They quickly came to the conclusion there had been a **gross miscarriage of justice**.

B3.9.1. Interestingly, they tried to contact social workers at Ellesmere Port numerous times to ensure that the children were genuinely being looked after. They never got replies.

B3.10. A high court appeal took place in April 2011 and the summing up :-

B3.10.1. [mum] had been violent and abusive to the family. (based on the same **bad character evidence** as above).

B3.10.2. [mum] had been assaulting her child.

B3.10.3. Dad had gone to the rescue of the child.

B3.10.4. [mum] substantially assaulted [dad] .

B3.10.5. Dad removed the child and himself from further harm by [mum] . Not guilty.

B3.11. The police could not now charge [mum] with the assaults of that night based on a technicality (6 month limit). [Email](#), [Police](#)

B3.11.1. The whole incident is still with the IPCC and PSD.

B3.12. [mum] is still promoting today that she was assaulted, that she never assaulted [toddler] and only once smacked [daughter] .

B3.13. Social workers Dana Murray, Vivian Saunders, Barbara Goldsmith, Andrea Blears and Helen Jones have all told [daughter] she is a liar for saying that she was hit by mum.

B3.14. This is extreme emotional abuse of [daughter] by the social workers.

B3.15. [mum] phoned up [daughter] 's friends mum's in front of [daughter] and told them not to let their children go to [daughter] 's birthday party at dad's. This greatly distressed [daughter] , but the social workers do not report it. [Ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) , [ref \[daughter\] Blogs](#).

B3.16. [mum] phones up [daughter] 3 times over one weekend greatly distressing her. [mum] then lies to the police to have them get [daughter] back to her house after promising [daughter] she could stay longer – again, greatly distressing [daughter] . The police were shown texts from mum to [daughter] proving [mum] had lied to them. [ref Email](#), [ref Police](#).

B3.16.1. Social workers don't report this.

B3.17. On 4th Feb 2012, [mum] terrorised [daughter] into a fit and then lied to her lawyer getting a false report of the incident sent to me. [ref Emails](#), [ref Witnesses](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) [ref Barbara Goldsmith](#) .

B3.17.1. Social workers don't report this.

B4 [daughter] 's First Running Away From Mum's & Exposure Of Social Workers Lies.

B4. In 2011, [daughter] refused to go back to [mum] 's. CAF/CASS became involved. They reported that [daughter] was undergoing abuses at [mum] 's over an extensive period.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 17 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

CAFCASS report recommended the children stay with dad and that [mum] should have psychological testing.

B4.1. Over the very same period in B4 above, social services were only reporting and promoting '[mum] is good' and 'dad is bad'.

B4.2. [Andrea Blears in her Statement](#) to the court [14th Nov 2012](#) at point no 3.13 deliberately lies to the court reporting -

‘[daughter] has never done anything about wanting to live with her father – She has only gone to her Father’s once when she should have been at her Mother’s home and that was after she had been in some trouble with a friend and she knew that Mother would be cross when she got back. Mr. [dad] attempted to harbour [daughter] on that occasion but Mother persuaded her home’

B4.2.1. Andrea Blears knows [daughter] ran away from mum’s house in 2011 for two months and again for 2 weeks in Feb 2012 as well as a number of other incidents. [ref Emails](#), [ref CAFCASS rfj](#).

B4.3 [Andrea Blears in her statement](#) to the court [14th Nov 2012](#) at point 3.14 reports that –
‘[daughter] told her Solicitor in Court on the 13th November 2012 that she wanted to live with her father. Mr. Hogan said that [daughter] was clear and that he thought she had capacity and understood what she was saying. However, she then went home with her Mother when told that was the Court’s decision without incident. [daughter] was brought into the court room by the Guardian and her solicitor because she wanted to see where decisions were made. She was laughing and giggling. [daughter] then left with Mother with no problem’.

B4.3.1. Andrea is not truthful. Andrea knew that what was told to [daughter] was that she was going home to her mum’s house to go on to her dad’s house the following day.

B4.3.2. When [daughter] saw Andrea Blears the night of the [17th Nov 2012](#), she screamed and cried and ran away from Andrea. [daughter] knew they were trying again to make her stay at her mother’s. [see B23](#) below. [ref Emails](#), [ref formal complaint by babysitter to LA](#)

B4.3.3. Andrea Blears cannot see reality as she is blinded by an insatiable drive to create ‘dad is bad’

B4.4. Andrea Blears also hides the emotionally abusive incident where mum upset [daughter] by phoning up her friends mums telling them not to go to the birthday party at dad’s house. [ref B3.15](#)

B4.5. Andrea Blears also hides mum’s emotional abuse where she upsets [daughter] greatly 4 times in one weekend. [ref emails](#), [ref witnesses](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) [ref B3.16](#).

B4.6. Andrea Blears makes out as innocuous mum’s emotional abuse that terrorised [daughter] into a fit on [4th Feb 2012](#). [ref B3.17](#).

B4.7. Andrea Blears also manages to make innocuous mum lying by sending a lawyers letter falsely reporting what happened on the [4th Feb 2012](#). [ref B3.17](#)

B5 [mum] and social workers pushing ‘dad is bad’ & ‘mum is good’

B5. Social services pushed hard to get [mum] back in the picture as much as possible. Having succeeded, further abusive events took place. Social services instead of addressing [mum] 's problems continued onwards with their campaign of '[mum] is good' and 'dad is bad'. The court records show the most blatant lies by social services. This is also part of the police investigation. [see Expert comment on the reports](#).

B5.1 Barbara Goldsmith falsely reported there was no emotional warmth between [toddler] and dad. She later admitted this statement was very wrong, but it found itself propagated into Andrea Blears and Tom Billington’s reports. [Ref Lawyers Letter](#).

B5.2. Helen Jones reports mum as saying dad has been texting [daughter] saying bad things about mum. She reports this without proof to the court as it makes dad sound bad.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 18 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

At a meeting with police present, I show Helen Jones on my phone the text message did indeed say to [daughter] to erase her messages, and it was because [daughter] had written 'Helen is a bitch'.

Helen makes no attempt to correct the situation and report what actually had happened and that she and [mum] were previously making up slander about [dad] . Helen is falsely promoting 'mum is good' and 'dad is bad'. [Ref Mtg at social services and follow up Emails.](#)

B5.3. see all of [B7](#) below.

B6 Act of serious negligence by mum covered up by social services.

B6 [daughter] was assaulted at her [mum] 's house. It was by one of [mum] 's friends sons. It was known for years that you could not leave [boy] alone with [daughter] from things he had done previously.

[mum] left [daughter] with [boy] in [daughter] 's bedroom playing with [daughter] in the top bunk bed unsupervised - knowing all this history. [mum] allowed [daughter] to be unsupervised with [boy] so she could chat with her friend. There was no justifiable reason to have allowed this situation.

The boy assaulted [daughter]. [mum] only knew about the assault after the neighbour, whose daughter was in the room with them, came and complained to her.

B6.1. [mum] and social services kept it as quiet as possible because it showed how negligent [mum] was. **Notice the absence of reporting this event since 2011.**

B6.2. When the court ordered to see all of the police records about this case, social services knew this event was missing and did not correct the matter. Effectively, they were again committing perjury by misleading the court about what was truthfully happening.

B6.3. The matter was recorded with North Wales Police and that's why it doesn't show up in the Cheshire police cava. The Cheshire PPU have been involved a few times with this case and are very friendly with the Ellesmere Port social workers involved and knew all about it. [Police](#)

B6.4. No GP was contacted or counselling of [daughter] was investigated by [mum] or social services. [ref Medical Records](#)

B6.5. Only now, under the threat of a Judicial Enquiry, does [mum] acknowledge to the courts that such an event took place; but again she tries to trivialise it.

B6.5.1. **[mum] committed perjury by wilfully concealing important information from the court, and by wilfully telling lies on all previous occasions and under oath.**

B7 Malicious slander, repeated perjury by social workers and [mum] .

B7. Social services took [dad] to court again and again and again (at great expense to the tax payer and cost to [dad] in preparation and attending).....trying to force him to retract the statement that [mum] had ever been violent and abusive.

B7.1. Given the Caroline Harley report and supporting documents, social services and [mum] have **perjured courts on numerous occasions** as well as committing slander and **behaving malicious towards [dad]** .

B7.2. Social worker Andrea Blears and her manager Kevin Buck were in attendance at most of these and are professionally negligent of not reading the files and knowing that social services were actually being malicious and harassing [dad] and not putting the children first.

B7.3. Social services created evidence some of which is bizarre and reported it to the courts in their desperation to say 'dad is bad'. They also covered up evidence showing mum was violent and abusive. There is also a mountain of background facts that are completely wrong. e.g. Andrea Blears reports both Grandmas died in 2009.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com**

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 19 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B7.3.1. e.g. Andrea Blears reports [dad] is mentally ill because he wears rugby shorts inside his own home. [ref AB report](#)

B7.3.1.1. Andrea Blears attends [dad] 's home and talks at him nonstop. [dad] cannot get her to stop at all, so he sticks his fingers in his ears. Andrea Blears reports about [dad] sticking his fingers in his ears as evidence of his desperate state of mind (along with the shorts), but does not report her unreasonable behaviour to illicit such a polite response from [dad] . [ref AB report](#), [ref emails](#)

B7.3.2. e.g. Kevin Buck foamed at the mouth in anger and shouted at me calling me an abuser when he heard I had bought my ex wife £200 of shopping to help feed the children (his claim was I was a woman abuser showing off to [mum] that I could buy food for the children !) Kevin Buck made no comments about me having sponsored children or supporting a whole family in Africa because the mother had cancer or other such charitable acts. However, he deemed the buying of food for my children an act of abuse. The man is simply toxic. [ref Emails](#)

B7.3.3. e.g. Vivian Saunders shouted at me very angry because I said 'I had taken my wife on holiday to Australia'. She was fuming angry at me for forcing a poor woman to do something.

B7.3.3.1. [mum] used to tell everybody that was the best holiday of her life. I was on a business visit and used air miles to pay for [mum] 's air ticket, the hotels and food being paid for by the company. To Vivian Saunders I was 'guilty' of a heinous crime because I used the phrase 'I took my wife'. [ref Emails](#).

B7.3.4. e.g. Andrea Blears said [dad] talks to women on the Internet. When asked how she knows this, she couldn't answer. Just cut and paste lies to make [dad] look bad. [ref AB report](#). [ref Emails](#).

B7.4. As the LA were ignoring complaints, I tried to make the court and other professionals more alert to the absurdity of the social services claims. One attempt was by reporting to people that Andrea Blears must be invisible and have broken into my house and been watching me. [ref Court Submissions.](#) , [ref Emails](#)

B7.4.1. The social workers had created such a strong mindset to the other professionals in their 'dad is bad' campaign, that instead of seeing how stupid the LA claim was, nobody blinked an eye. **Notice the absence of querying social services.**

B7.5. Andrea Blears, Kevin Buck and those copied in the emails are professionally negligent in not speaking out where blatant bizarre evidence is attempted again and again.

B8 Social services push their abuses to extremes.

B8. It is extremely disturbing that I have made a huge number of formal complaints about such things, and the local authority just doesn't reply. They believe they have the authority to abuse people and ignore any criticism, or have it hidden.

B8.1. their response has been to try to gag me and gag [daughter] . [ref Court submissions](#), [ref Emails](#)

B8.1.1. after [daughter] had been assaulted by [mum] , social worker Helen Jones told the police they could not interview [daughter] as there was no need to. [ref Police](#)

B8.2. Social services using the full power of the LA have tried repeatedly to gag me about criticising them. The Judge has frequently told the LA that their requests not only go beyond what is lawful, but also beyond what is decent and reasonable. [Chester and Liverpool](#)

B8.3. Social services used the local authority to issue imprisonment documents on me. This wasn't we want to take you to court, these were documents that positively stated you are going to prison. I was allowed however, to present myself to the high court to offer an explanation of why I may possibly not be imprisoned. At the high court the Judge informed them they didn't have the authority to imprison people. **THEY DID NOT KNOW THIS !**

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
[Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com](#)

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 20 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B8.3.1. When asked by the judge to explain themselves, it turned out that if they had read the previous court documents there was nothing to get excited about. There was no case to answer for.

B8.3.2. More disturbing, the social services and local authority personnel attending a formal high court thought they were finally going to get me imprisoned – for criticising them. I was already identified by various experts and authorities as an excellent father who dearly loved his children. The children love me and it is recognised they dearly want to live with me – but it doesn't suit social services. The social workers were joking and laughing and happy; they were going to the execution of their critic. The little fat woman social worker skipped into the court because she was so happy. This was the dark ages with sprinklings and flavouring by Torquemada. When they found out they were not burning anybody at the stake, the social workers became miserable. Helen Jones eyes were watering like she was going to cry. [ref Email Ref TWD](#)

B8.3.3. Mr Rawlinson and Mr Hogan were respectably sombre at the hearing.

B8.3.4. Helen Jones had attended the previous court cases and is professionally negligent, or maliciously motivated to have sworn an affidavit against [dad] to have him imprisoned.

B8.3.5. The Judge was really nice to the LA and had the wording made easier to read for them.

B8.3.6. An MP is questioning the Chief Executive Of Cheshire West for answers. Other government departments have been made aware and this.

B9 Extreme destruction caused by [mum] and social workers malicious acts.

B9. Since the false accusation and malicious lies by [mum] to cover up her assault of [toddler] , social services in attempting to run a campaign of 'dad is bad' and '[mum] is ultra compliant' have cost the taxpayer in excess of £500,000. Most of the activities show clear malice from social workers to dad. They also show a documented trail of bizarre lies. They also show a very high level of negligence.

B9.1. The social services campaign has destroyed the family business which was the children's legacy and short term funding. It has gone from £300,000 (and was about to sign up for a million pound joint venture before all the authoritarian crazy stuff started). So the children lost out financially on a huge scale. [ref \[dad\]](#), [ref\[university\] Joint Venture Plan](#).

B9.2. I am requesting a government audit of all of this already and various government departments and MP's are already involved.

B10 Hiding and burying of all complaints against social services.

B10. One of the fascinating facts of this 2+ years is that whenever social services have been asked face to face to be truthful, they halt the meeting and close it down. When asked in over 100 emails to be truthful, they have refused. Andrea Blears came to my house and would not stop talking aloof AT me for a considerable time , even to take breath so I pulled out my phone and said I would now record the meeting she ran out of the house. and so much more ... all documented. [ref Emails](#).

B10.1. On meeting me for the very first time, Andrea Blears told me I had to obey what she wanted or she would have my children taken off of me. [ref Emails](#) (and she did, by crook).

B11 EVERYTHING depends on the truth.

B11. When Mr Rawlinson of CAFCASS was first appointed guardian, he discussed with me how he could see EVERYTHING was pivotal around if or not violence and abuse had taken place with the children.

B11.1. It was over 5 months before he even talked to [daughter] .

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com**

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 21 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B11.2. Mr Rawlinson only now has stated **he has always taken serious the POSSIBILITY that [mum] MAY have harmed the children.**

B11.2.1. Mr Rawlinson is negligent of not doing the basics in reading readily available first documents in this case which clearly show [mum] was violent and abusive to the children on a frequent scale (first social services report and supporting documents).

B11.3. Mr Rawlinson has proceeded through the case without this knowledge which he agreed was ESSENTIAL to working professionally with children put into his care as guardian.

B11.4. Mr Rawlinson's negligence has allowed ongoing abuse of the children. We can assume he would have put much more effort into protecting the children from ongoing harm and saved £500,000 of wasted tax payers money had he read the early documents and realised the violence and frequent lies from [mum] .

B12 A little girl fears violence. The LA and [mum] DO NOT want the truth.

B12 Helen Jones, Andrea Blears and Kevin Buck are negligent because they have missed the understanding of **WHY [DAUGHTER] HAS GENUINE CAUSE TO FEAR HER MOTHER.**

B12.1. [mum] , Helen Jones, Andrea Blears and Kevin Buck have created the false ideas of people believing [daughter] 's fear of her mother is simply fiction, a tantrum or caused by dad.

B12.1.1. Social services have put such significant efforts to put the flavour of 'dad is bad' into their reporting that they cannot retract and agree that it is readily available evidence that [daughter] genuinely has a deep fear of her mother because of her mother's own behaviour and actions.

B12.2. [mum] and social services were all for psychologists reports. As soon as Prof Billington said it was ESSENTIAL to know about [daughter] 's abuses and violence we see [mum] and social services desperately not wanting a judicial review.

B12.2.1. Given the importance of knowing the truth about the violence and abuse that the children had suffered, that both **the LA and [mum] did not want a judicial enquiry** into the violence and abuse suffered by the children shows **they do not want the truth known.** This is just like social services in 2010 sending me a lawyer's letter saying do not tell about the children's abuses.

B12.2.2. It is commonly advertised in posters which are against domestic violence - 'SILENCE IS VIOLENCE'.

B12.2.3. Social services and [mum] want silence. They have things to hide.

B12.3. [mum] has lied extensively, perjured extensively, physically and emotionally abused [daughter] and [toddler] and carried out a malicious campaign against [dad] . [Ref L](#) etc.

B12.4. Helen Jones did not want the truth to be known about the violence to the children. She is negligent in her duty of care of the children.

B13 Perjury on a grand scale.

B13. For over three years in numerous courts we have seen [mum] and social services put forward that [dad] is an abuser because he will not back off and say [mum] was never violent and abusive. see section [B7](#) above.

B13.0. Andrea Blears in her court evidence deliberately leaves out the 2009 events and reports of Caroline Harley and others showing mum was indeed violent and abusive to the children. e.g. reports to court [17th May 2012](#), and [21st May 2012](#), . She also leaves out the assault of [daughter] by [boy] .

B13.0.1. When Andrea Blears does finally mentions the 2009 violence and abuse by [mum] , she reports it briefly as innocuous, she then proceeds to amplify [mum] 's version of the assault

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 22 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

she is court proven to have lied about e.g. see 3.4 and 3.5 from Andrea Blears statement 11th [October 2012](#). Andrea Blears is deliberately promoting ‘dad is bad’ and ‘mum is good’.

B13.1. Under the threat of a Judicial review, [mum] agrees she was, after all, violent and abusive. It is described as innocuous as having hit [daughter] **only one time. This is perjury.**

B13.1.1. In a meeting with Helen Jones, [mum] , police and [dad] , Helen Jones said everybody knew that this meant it was more than just one slap.

B13.2. **This is admission of perjury on a grand scale.**

B13.2.1. [mum] and social services have repeatedly perjured the courts in knowing there was violence all along.

B13.2.2. [mum] and social services have further perjured TH Judge Barnett’s court in making out the submission of violence as little more than innocuous. (see Caroline Harley report, CAFCASS rfj and supporting documents) and made out the [boy] incident as something to just ignore.

B13.2.3. [mum] perjured HH Judge O’Leary under oath.

B13.2.4. Andrea Blears perjured HH Judge O’Leary under oath.

B13.2.5. Helen Jones perjured TH Judge Barnett.

B13.2.6. [mum] perjured TH Judge Barnett.

B13.3. Mr Rawlinson’s professional negligence failed to stop this situation.

B14 Malicious slander and harassment on a grand scale.

B14. [mum] and social workers have admitted they took [dad] to court repeatedly to retract statements which they now admit were real.

B14.1. Social services in their meetings repeatedly wrote [dad] was uncooperative based on him not retracting statements which social services are saying were actually true.

B14.2. For three years, [mum] and social services have slandered, harassed and maliciously pursued [dad] over these basic facts of violence.

B14.3. [mum] and social services have destroyed the family business that was to be used to ensure a good education and stability for the children.

B14.4. Mr Rawlinson’s professional negligence in not reading the early documents prevented him from stopping this.

B15 Children taken into custody based on a perjured court.

B15. Judge O’Leary had 4 teams presenting to her.

B15.1. [mum] concealing extensive history of violence, abuse, lies, slander, perjury.

B15.2. Social services concealing an extensive history of malicious prejudice and perjury.

B15.3. CAFCASS, negligent in the basis of the violence and abuses, negligent in the contradictions between CAFCASS social workers and therefore negligent in the offences covered above.

B15.4. A very weary [dad] bedraggled by lack of sleep (writing his reply to the court overnight without sleep and looking after the children), hospital appointments and a heart physically being driven wild by the wrong medication.

B15.5 I cannot emphasise too strongly, HH Judge O’Leary was extensively perjured on those two days.

B16 Mr Rawlinson said both parents had emotionally abused [daughter].

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 23 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B16. In Liverpool before Judge O’Leary, Mr Rawlinson said it was clear that both parents had emotionally abused [daughter] .

B16.1. Mr Rawlinson has been told directly by [daughter] that she was very unhappy because mum and her friends talked bad things about dad.

B16.2. In the CAFCASS report we have [daughter] telling RFJ that the social workers and mum were saying bad things.

B16.3. At no point in any reports do we have [daughter] reporting to anybody about being unhappy with dad. We had a system where if she was troubled and wanted to talk about anything, like any responsible dad to daughter I would talk to her.

[daughter] is very bright and gets agitated and distressed at times. She has asked me on numerous occasions about things concerning what was going on around her. She was especially distressed by the lies that had been told to her by social workers. She felt these people were bullying her and nobody was doing anything to stop them. [daughter] talked to me about death and everything conceivable. Not just things that troubled her, but lots and lots of things. We enjoy talking to each other.

B16.3.1. There are numerous professional people who say I am exceptionally good with children. **I have had extensive experience in working with inner city and other distressed children.** When [daughter] was very upset, her mum would have to send her to me for calming and reassurance – **documented. ref [childwelfareprofessional] references. others available**

B16.3.2. It is recorded in social services records that [mum] had to bring [daughter] to dad’s house because dad could calm her down and mum couldn’t.

B16.4. Mr Rawlinson’s rationale to say what he did in B13 above was based on two ideas :-

B16.4.1. not knowing that extensive violence had taken place and that **[daughter] saw dad as safety (CAFCASS rfj).**

B16.4.2. slanderous hearsay from mother (the woman who swore repeatedly under oath there was no violence).

B16.5. Mr Rawlinson is professionally negligent of making a false statement to Judge O’Leary. His statement based on false premise.

B17 [daughter] put into custody with the person who had abused her lots; again !.

B17. In Liverpool before Judge O’Leary, Mr Rawlinson said it was safer to put [daughter] with her mum as the lesser of two evils.

B17.1. Mr Rawlinson based this recommendation on not being clearly aware of the extent of mum’s violence, abuse and lies.

B17.2. Mr Rawlinson makes his decision in the light of being negligent of [daughter] 's deep genuine fear of [mum] based on real violence.

B17.3 **Mr Rawlinson’s own testimony at Liverpool shows conflict with social services, who were basically saying everything was wonderful at [mum] 's house.**

B17.3.1. Mr Rawlinson fails to recognise that [daughter] has told social workers what she has told him, but the social workers never report [daughter] 's concerns and problems at [mum] 's house.

B17.4. Mr Rawlinson fails to see the connection, or feels that the misreporting and hiding of abuses at [mum] 's by social services is magically now going to stop. He is negligent.

B18 Post Liverpool abuses of children.

B18. Post Liverpool evidence backs up that mum has still been lashing out at the children – [daughter] especially.

B18.1. Social services have not reported [daughter] screaming and shouting at the social worker. Instead they report a good relationship. **ref Email, ref [daughter]**

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
[Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com](#)

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 24 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B18.2. [daughter] reports there have been quite a few incidents in the house. Social services reports how settled the children are. [ref HJ reports](#), [ref email](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#)

B18.3. In one of the fights between [daughter] , [toddler] and [mum] they smash a £450 tablet computer. Social services only report how settled the children are. [ref HJ reports](#), compare [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) . [ref Evidence](#).

B18.4. [daughter] was screamed at and assaulted with a toothbrush dragged across her face by her mother. She refused to go back to her [mum] 's house saying it was just like 2010 all over again. [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) .

B18.4.1. I reported to the PPU. They reported to Helen Jones, she ordered out of hours social worker and police to attend and [force \[daughter\] back to \[mum\] 's setting \[daughter\] off into one of her 'fits'](#). [daughter] was triggered into these fits on a number of occasions historically by [mum] . She also had them when she felt forced to leave the safety of dad's house. [ref Emails](#)

B18.4.2. Helen Jones has pronounces herself as suitably medically qualified and [daughter] was merely having a tantrum (and Helen wasn't even present). [ref Emails](#)

B18.5. It states in the Caroline Harley social services report that [daughter] had severe panic attacks and we were witnessing such things again. [Ref CH2009](#).

B18.6. Helen Jones has caused an extreme reaction in [daughter] , even though she knows the history of these as reported by Caroline Harley et al. [Helen Jones has emotionally assaulted \[daughter\]](#) . [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) , [ref CH2009](#), [ref Prof Billington Report](#).

B18.7. Helen Jones was more motivated to be malicious to dad than to protect a child. She is negligent in her duty of care to [daughter] .

B18.8. Helen Jones has reported a false version of what happened. This is professional negligence. [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) , [ref \[dad\] v HJ report](#),

B19 Social services hiding abuses and still trying to sell 'dad is bad'.

B19. As a result of mum assaulting [daughter] and being terrified of her, Helen decides to reduce all possible contact between [dad] and the children. She manages to reduce it to 3 hours supervised with no phone calls or texts – complete isolation; worse than murderers get. [ref Emails](#)

B19.1. I met up with Helen Jones and [mum] and police. [mum] said the children were fighting and she grabbed [daughter] 's arm and it got dragged across [daughter] 's face. [mum] lashed out in a brawl with the children. [ref Emails](#).

B19.1.1 This incident in isolation is not much to talk about. What is disturbing is when you place it in the context of years of [mum] lashing out physically at the children. Helen Jones knows about the original social services documents and knows that [daughter] has genuine deep rooted reasons to fear her mother. Knowing this, she maliciously proceeds to blame [dad] for [daughter] being terrified of her mother. This is a malicious criminal act on [dad] as well as negligence in her duty of care to [daughter] . It is part of a large list that has already been passed on to the police. [ref Emails](#), [ref CH2009 et al](#)

B19.2. Mr Rawlinson knows about this incident and is in agreement with what Helen is doing. Mr Rawlinson is approving a criminal act of perjury and harassment because he never took the trouble to act professional and read all of the readily available documents. He is negligent.

B19.3. Social services maliciously lied to the court that [toddler] had WRITTEN that 'dad had hit him'. Helen was malicious and made sure nobody could successfully challenge her in court about this by not presenting evidence. [ref HJ report](#)

B19.3.1. When I asked to see the evidence at a subsequent meeting with police in attendance, the A4 sheet had three very nice things [toddler] had written about his dad. There was nothing about any hitting; just nice things about his dad. [ref Email](#)

B19.3.2. Helen further explained she had visited [toddler] with the document and asked about if dad had hit him. [toddler] said no, never. The document only said good things and [toddler]

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
[Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com](#)

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 25 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

only said good things. and yet, Helen Jones went on to maliciously lie to the court in this incessant campaign from social services to try and promote 'dad is bad'. [ref Email](#)

B19.3.3. Helen did this quite deliberately, she committed perjury.

B19.3.4 Mr Alan Rawlinson had read Helen Jones report but neither he nor Helen Jones reported to the court that the report was wrong.

B19.3.4.1. Mr Alan Rawlinson is either negligent of not being interested in a child he has professional responsibility for, who supposedly had WRITTEN he has been hit by his father, or

B19.3.4.2. Mr Alan Rawlinson not only knew it was wrong, he knew this document said three times how much this child loved his dad, but Mr Alan Rawlinson knowingly participated in allowing another 'dad is bad' advert to be put in the records and in front of the judge; this would make him malicious and negligent.

B19.3.4.3. Mr Alan Rawlinson, already knows through the first CAFCASS report and his Liverpool testimony (his direct dialogue with [daughter]) that there is a significant difference between reality and what social services are reporting.

B20 Assault never even investigated

B20. [pervert] was reported to have dragged [toddler] screaming upstairs by [daughter] , and to this day, nobody has investigated it. [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) , [ref \[dad\]](#)

B20.1. Helen Jones told DI Nigel Parr there was nothing to investigate. She is negligent. [ref Emails](#)

B21 [daughter] 's drawings, writings and blogs.

B21. [daughter] has always written, drawn and recorded herself on tape machines and video recorders. She has done lots of media as cathartic activities regarding all the violence and emotional abuse she has experienced. [daughter] had been blogging about abuses and had also demonstrated she was angry at what happened in Liverpool and she ran away from social workers after Liverpool and at the contact centre.

When blogs were discovered and I took them to the court, the knee jerk reaction of social services was to say [daughter] is a liar. [Ref Witness Solicitors email.](#)

Helen Jones priority was not to investigate the abuses of children in her care, it was to hide the evidence and call [daughter] a liar –yet again. The LA did not want the statements investigated as part of a Judicial review. The LA was more interested to stay on the 'dad is bad' & 'mum is good' psychological train that [mum] and social services are running.

B21.1. Helen Jones told police there was nothing new that she did not know already from the [daughter] Blogs. This means that Helen Jones committed and supported Perjury in her court appearances in Chester. [Ref Email \[dad/HJ/NP\].](#)

B22 Response to Vicki Dudley of CAFCASS.

B22. You stated that Mr Alan Rawlinson references his court case report dated 11 Dec 2012 'the court case has been extensive and the significant emotional harm the children are suffering because of parental acrimony'.

B22.1. The court case is extensive because Mr Rawlinson and others have been negligent in reading the historical documents and recognising the extent of violence and abuse suffered by the children. It is also protracted because [daughter] repeatedly told social workers about abuses and violence from [mum] and they simply ignored her ([please read the first CAFCASS report where \[daughter\] tells RFA that social worker Vivian Saunders did not listen to her and just said what Vivian wanted to say](#)).

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 26 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B22.2. In terms of proven facts (rule out social services hearsay and simple amplification of whatever [mum] says) [dad] has not emotionally or physically harmed the children.

B22.3. [dad] is being persistently attacked by [mum] and social services to retract that [mum] has ever been violent.

B22.4. Mr Rawlinson says ‘their assessment, notwithstanding mother’s admissions, is that the children are safe in her care’ .

B22.5. [mum] had not made any admissions at this point. Mr Rawlinson is confused.

B22.6. When mother finally does make her admissions, they are little more than innocuous chastisement that falls extremely far from what is proven in the initial documents. [see Court Doc](#)

B22.7. If Mr Rawlinson had read the available historical documents; he would have recognised the malicious abuse of [mum] in using social services as a weapon. Mr Rawlinson is negligent and his negligence has contributed to Judge O’Leary in Liverpool effectively working from evidence which is PERJURY.

B22.8. **Judge O’Leary was grossly perjured and her resultant order comes from her being perjured. That she was perjured is a fact based purely on Caroline Harley’s document alone.**

B22.9. As for [daughter] being safer, since then, [mum] has lost it loads of times with her and physically assaulted her and social services are desperately covering it up. When discovered, because they can’t gag [daughter] forever, social services try to make the incidents seem innocuous. [daughter] has also been talking to friends and relatives. [ref Emails](#), [ref \[daughter\]](#) , [ref Evidence](#)

B23 Mr Rawlinson and Andrea Blears said [daughter] was happy to go to mum’s house.

B23. At Liverpool Mr Rawlinson stated how [daughter] was relieved to be free of decision making at the court in Liverpool. [ref Guardian report](#).

B23.1. Mr Rawlinson made [daughter] so angry at him that she refused to talk or be interviewed by him on the two subsequent attempts by him to talk to her after the event above. [documented](#).

B23.2. Mr Rawlinson stated how happy [daughter] was to be going home with [mum] . [ref Guardian report](#)

B23.3. [daughter] screamed and cried and ran away from the social worker when she saw the social worker and realised she was being forced to stay at [mum] ’s house; not what Mr Rawlinson told her. ([formal complaint lodged with LA by the babysitter](#)).

B23.4. Mr Rawlinson has demonstrated he does not understand [daughter] . He is confused by what makes her happy or sad. He makes up his own fantasy story which falls in line with the bombardment of propaganda from social services ‘mum is good’ & ‘dad is bad’.

B23.5. All of the social workers reported [daughter] liked them. What we have is social workers trying to make themselves look good in reports.

B23.6. What Mr Rawlinson told [daughter] in Liverpool was that she was going home to [mum] ’s and on to dad’s the following day. What he reported to the court was how happy [daughter] was to go with [mum] . – These are very different things.

B23.6.1. Mr Rawlinson cannot see these two statements as being very different. Mr Rawlinson made up a story that sounded good and made him look good. It wasn’t the truth, it was merely wishful thinking that Mr Rawlinson was a knight in shining armour.

B23.7. [daughter] has been under siege with social workers for over three years. All of them have tried to force her to believe that [mum] had not been violent and abusive to her.

B23.7.1. **That is a nightmare of emotional abuse created by mum and the social workers.**

B23.8. What [daughter] wants is people who are decent and truthful that she can trust. That was not fulfilled by her guardian. Mr Alan Rawlinson is negligent; and sadly, because he never read reports.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 27 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B24. LA excuse of dad is mentally unwell to cover for their abuses.

B24. This is the most desperate attempt from local authority employees to cover up extensive and ongoing abuses, perjury and criminal harassment created by its employees.

B24.1. Since seeing my children abused, and that abuse carrying on through the actions of negligent authorities, I have been greatly distressed.

B24.2. I am working with professionals from the NHS and being treated for anxiety and distress that resulted from external stressors – mainly the actions of the local authority.

B24.3. My doctors show I am not mentally ill, or paranoid or deluded or such like.

B24.4. I have interacted professionally with the authorities and reported what is happening in a professional manner. **I have deliberately escalated the audience given the level of abuse of authority power.**

B24.5. The local authority has not followed its own complaints procedures and has been negligent in simply avoiding answering complaints, questions and comments.

B24.6. Like any concerned parent or professional should be, I have drawn more attention as required to this matter as it has had a bad influence on my children's well being.

B24.7. Faced with people like Helen Jones who takes the position that anybody disagreeing with her is a liar or mentally ill, then it warrants bringing a lot of attention to these matters.

B25. Dr Alwin's report say mum is a real risk, but LA reports dad is the problem.

B25. On a balanced view, Dr Alwin's report says the children are safer with dad.

B25.1. Social services as usual, use it in a prejudiced manner to say 'dad is bad' and 'mum is good'. [see LA application to court.](#)

B25.2. [mum] reports to Dr Alwin –

' [mum] informed me at the beginning of the assessment that at the moment social services were backing her desire to have the children placed in her care'and

'[mum] added that social services have told her [dad] was mentally abusing the children and they have referred [dad] to have a psychological assessment. [mum] said that she doesn't need to be here'and

'[mum] was not prepared to consider, act on or maintain changes in her behaviour'.

B25.2.1. Social services make it clear; they are prejudiced in their dealings between [dad] and [mum] . They are on a one track path to give the children to mum.

B25.3. [mum] refused mental health help in 2009 by health services and again in 2010 by health services and again in 2011 after CAFCASS recommended she should be seen by a psychologist. She only does it because she says it helps social services force the children off of their dad. She says she has no need to change.

B25.3.1. Dr Alwin reports – '*her behaviour in the past had been inappropriate. However, I continue to have concerns that [mum] may struggle to assert herself in situations where she was required to maintain a moral framework when under pressure from others*'.

B25.4 LA report [dad] as unwilling to recognize or seek help.

B25.4.1. LA position not supported as [dad] has taken the trouble to go himself and ask for help in 2010 after being distressed by the stressors created by [mum] , police and LA.

B25.4.2. LA position not supported by - Dr Alwin reports [dad] SCQ – '*This profile indicates an individual who was prepared to accept they had issues requiring personal change and was prepared to recognize the need to maintain change over time*'.

From:-Dad.
Whose children are being abused by
the local authority.
**Sanitised version for public
by Dr Morality.**
www.moralpropositions.com

Document Complaint LA Sanitised
To; Cheshire West and Chester Local Authority,
Complaints Department . Chester, England Dated 08/04 /2013.
Page 28 of 28
Page numbers refer only to the main body of text. The full document includes
Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009,
[dad] diary Notes, [stepson] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription.

B25.4.3. LA position not supported by Dr Alwin reports – *‘he states he tried to deal with these problems on his own but realized he could nothe reported to his GP..’*

B25.5. LA report there are concerns by Dr Alwin about [mum] , however, we are reassured by [mum] that she will undertake courses and will reduce these concerns.

B25.5.1. LA position not maintained by B25.2 last part.

B25.5.2. LA position hugely undermined by B25.3.

B25.5.3. LA position hugely undermined by Jean Davies comments in Caroline Harley 2009 social services report.

B25.5.4. LA position undermined by the fact that [mum] has lied to them repeatedly over two years about the domestic violence she caused. [ref L](#)

B25.5.5. LA position undermined as [mum] is not even truthful to Dr Alwin – said she *‘slapped [daughter] on her bottom and put [toddler] in his bed’* (compare with her own email admission alone). [mum] lies lots [ref L](#)

B25.5.5.1. LA position undermined as [mum] still citing her version of events about the assault which ALL other evidence says is lies. [mum] lies a lot [ref L](#)

B25.6 Social services have shown gross unprofessional behaviour in respect of understanding Dr Alwin’s report and the significance of what he says.

B25.6.1. The report says [mum] **is LIKELY to step back and let someone take control of what is happening to her children;** and if this person is not holding the children’s interests as a high priority, then there could be serious risks to the children.

B25.6.2. The report says she could POSSIBLY benefit in reducing this LIABILITY.

B25.6.3. [pervert] has already shown his genuine interests. He wanted sex and didn’t want noisy children in the way. Once the spotlight was turned on, he behaved rather better, but that spotlight will switch off.

B25.7. Dr Alwin asked [mum] , given that she felt so bad about their relationship, what motivated her to stay with [dad] (as opposed to leaving and getting on with her own life) –

‘[mum] stated that she was ‘terrified of losing everything’, losing the children and losing her home..’

B25.7.1. So [mum] took action to resolve that problem. By telling lies to police and social services about a fictitious assault knowing they are already highly prejudiced against men in issues of domestic violence.

B25.7.2. Social services willingly obliged to champion her cause and lied in reports and courts to do so.

B25.8. The only thing, is truth was hanging about everywhere in the details.

B25.8.1. [mum] and social workers have tried to hide the evidence, tell lies to courts, calling [dad] mentally unwell and [daughter] an extreme liar.

B25.8.2. the LA and [mum] desperately did not want a Judicial review.

B25.9. The LA is negligent and has used Dr Alwin’s report in an unprofessional manner to make the case of ‘dad is bad’ and ‘mum is good’.

Appended in PDF : Timeline of events. [mum] Email to Social Services, Extracts CH report 2009, [dad] Diary Notes, [stepbrother] Witness Statement, [daughter] Blogs transcription. CAFCASS rfj extract, Court order page1
