

# PCCS



Police Complaints Commissioner  
for Scotland

**Request for complaint handling review of a complaint about**

**Tayside Police**

**under the provisions of  
the Police, Public Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 2006**

**November 2009**

Case reference: PCCS/00396/PF-TP

# **CONTENTS**

## **Introduction**

- 1. Request for review**
- 2. Power to conduct a complaint handling review**
- 3. Background**
- 4. Internal handling**
- 5. PCCS review**
- 6. Consideration**
- 7. Conclusion**

## **Introduction**

The role of the Police Complaints Commissioner for Scotland was established by the Police, Public Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 2006 (“the Act”) to consider and review the way police bodies handle complaints from the public. The Commissioner provides a free and independent service, reviewing the handling of complaints fairly, looking at both sides of what has happened and looking at the facts.

The Commissioner aims to review complaints in an independent, open and fair manner. In line with this aim the Commissioner will publish the reports of his complaint handling reviews, whilst bearing in mind individuals’ rights to confidentiality. The following report therefore details the Commissioner’s consideration, but does not include individual names of complainers, police officers or others affected by the events detailed therein.

## **1. Request for review**

The complainer has asked the Commissioner to review the handling of his complaints about Tayside Police. The complaints stem from allegations made to Tayside Police by the complainer's former wife, which resulted in the complainer being charged with several offences against two of his children, including attempted rape and lewd, indecent and libidinous practices. The complaints are as follows:

- (1) That Detective Constable A was biased against the complainer, and in particular:
  - (a) prematurely formed the opinion that he was guilty;
  - (b) sought only to obtain evidence establishing the complainer's guilt;
  - (c) did not establish that the alleged victims had been coached by his former wife; and
  - (d) did not conduct any follow-up investigation to establish whether his former wife had lied.
- (2) That the complainer's complaint about the police was not dealt with in the appropriate manner.

## **2. Power to conduct a complaint handling review**

Section 35 of the Act provides the Commissioner with the authority to examine the manner in which an appropriate authority has handled a complaint about a police officer, member of police staff or the service provided by a relevant authority.

In order to carry out such a complaint handling review the Commissioner's office requests the complaint case papers from the police body in question. The Commissioner examines the facts of the case, looking at information provided by both the complainer and the police body. The Commissioner considers whether the information available does, or does not, support the complaint, and whether or not the police body has responded to the complaint in a reasonable manner. The Commissioner also considers whether the police body communicated with the complainer in a reasonable manner, including whether the police body handled the complaint within a reasonable timescale. The Commissioner then comes to a view on whether the conclusions drawn by the police body in handling the complaint were reasonable in all the circumstances.

Once the Commissioner has reached his conclusions he prepares a report which details his findings. This is then forwarded to the relevant authority in accordance with section 35(3) of the Act. The complainer will be advised of the conclusions of this review and of what action, if any, the Commissioner proposes to take in consequence of those conclusions. Where the complaint is in respect of an act or

omission by an individual police officer, that person will also be informed of the conclusions of this review.

## **2.1 Relevant complaint**

Section 34 of the Act provides that the Commissioner may review the handling of a complaint where the complaint is “a relevant complaint”, defined as

*(1) ... a complaint which is given or sent ... to the appropriate authority in relation to the complaint.*

*(2) .... “complaint” means a written statement expressing dissatisfaction about an act or omission...*

*(3) But “complaint” does not include*

*(a) any statement made by a person serving with, or who has served with, the police, about the terms and conditions of that person's service with the police; or*

*(b) a statement which consists of or includes an allegation of an act or omission which constitutes a crime.*

The complainer has supplied a written statement expressing dissatisfaction about an act or omission by a police body. The complaint is therefore a relevant complaint.

## **2.2 Relevant complainer**

The Act further provides that the Commissioner may review the handling of a complaint where the complainer falls within one of the following categories (section 34(6)):

*(a) a member of the public who claims to be the person in relation to whom the act or omission took place;*

*(b) a member of the public not falling within paragraph (a) who claims to have been adversely affected by the act or omission;*

*(c) a member of the public who claims to have witnessed the act or omission;*

*(d) a person acting on behalf of a person falling within any of paragraphs (a) to (c)*

The complainer is a member of the public who claims to have been adversely affected by an act or omission by the police. The complainer is therefore a relevant complainer under the terms of section 34(6)(a).

### **3. Background**

During January to March 2006, the complainer's former wife made allegations to the police that he had sexually abused two of their children. According to the complainer's former wife these allegations were based on information disclosed to her by the children concerned. The matter was investigated jointly by Detective Constable A of Tayside Police and the local social services. At the time of the investigation, Detective Constable A had six years experience as a domestic abuse and child protection investigator within Tayside Police's Family Protection Unit.

In her report to the Procurator Fiscal, which was submitted on 1 March 2006, Detective Constable A explained how the allegations had been made and summarised the information that was gathered during the investigation. The report listed a number of charges including attempted rape and several charges of lewd, indecent and libidinous behaviour.

Ultimately, the Crown took no proceedings against the complainer.

On 16 July 2007 the complainer wrote to Tayside Police complaining about Detective Constable A's investigation of the alleged offences.

### **4. Internal handling**

In his letter of 16 July 2007, the complainer detailed complaints 1(a) and (d) and said that he trusted Tayside Police would examine the processes followed in the investigation as well as Detective Constable A's conduct.

In respect of complaint 1(a) the complainer stated that Detective Constable A had formed the opinion that he was guilty and that this prejudiced her approach to the case. He added that the police had a duty to investigate all aspects of an alleged offence and to report all circumstances to the Procurator Fiscal, not just the evidence against him.

In respect of complaint 1(d) the complainer stated in his letter that Detective Constable A had failed to conduct a "follow-up" investigation. According to the complainer, had she done so she would have been able to establish that his former wife was lying. The complainer believed that his former wife's motives for lying were that she was "clearing her debt" and that she wanted him out of the house. He also believed that by accusing him of a serious crime she hoped to obtain "criminal compensation".

Following receipt of the complainer's letter, on 24 July 2007 Superintendent B of Tayside Police's Professional Standards Department prepared a memo asking that a preliminary report into the complaints be prepared and submitted within 14 days.

A statement was taken from the complainer on 3 August 2007 by the enquiry officer, Inspector C. The complainer repeated complaint 1(a) at this time and also raised complaint 1(c). In respect of complaint 1(c), he stated that he would have expected the police to have found out during its investigation that the children had been “coached”.

According to the statement (which the complainer signed), Inspector C explained the roles of the police and Procurator Fiscal, specifically that the police investigated allegations and submitted reports to the Procurator Fiscal. Inspector C also explained that there were strict interviewing techniques used in relation to child witnesses. He also explained the variety of approaches interviewing officers may take with suspects. As a result of these explanations, the complainer stated that he “now appreciated the approach” Detective Constable A had taken with him. However, he still expected the police to have considered the use of “more specialised external bodies to ascertain the credibility of the allegations”, for example psychologists. The complainer added:

*“I am content that having listened to [Inspector C’s] explanation of Police and interviewing procedures, this enquiry was carried out in line with the proper guidance.*

*I also understand that my defence would have been given at any Court hearing should that have happened. It did not, I did not get any day in Court and I am in no man’s land with this allegation hanging over me.”*

Inspector C thereafter prepared a report to Superintendent D dated 5 August 2007. According to the report, the complainer believed that his former wife had lied to and misled social services, and had coached his daughters into making false allegations against him. The complainer was also concerned that Detective Constable A and Social Worker E, who interviewed the children, should have had the skills to establish that they had been coached. Inspector C said that he had spent time explaining to the complainer the strict protocols for interviewing child witnesses and also the level of training and types of interview techniques employed.

According to Inspector C’s report, by the end of the interview he had resolved the police-related issues to the complainer’s satisfaction. Inspector C suggested to the complainer that if he wished to influence the debate on child interview techniques he should make representations to the appropriate agencies. The complainer said that he was already pursuing this avenue.

Inspector C concluded that he was satisfied the complainer had been treated in a fair and reasonable manner and was subject to due legal process. He added that the fact that no proceedings were taken demonstrated that the process worked. This, he said, was a point not wholly acknowledged by the complainer who wanted more than was currently available from the legal and judicial systems.

On 7 August 2007, Superintendent D wrote to the complainer stating that he understood the complainer to have been given a clearer understanding of the requirements upon the police to investigate impartially criminal allegations. Of the decision by the Crown to take no proceedings against him, Superintendent D said

that this “may have reflected the impartial and unbiased enquiry and subsequent reporting by Detective Constable [A] and her colleagues.” Superintendent D added that the complainer’s observations had been passed to Detective Constable A and her colleagues so that they might consider them in future enquiries.

The complainer replied to Superintendent D’s letter on 19 September 2007. He stated he had no difficulty with the explanation given to him by Inspector C. However, he added that his complaint was specifically in relation to “information that came to light well into the enquiry and was conveyed to Detective Constable A”. According to the complainer that information was not adequately investigated by Detective Constable A. In the complainer’s view, the information could be “construed as the witness giving false statements to the police or indeed an attempt to pervert the course of justice”. He claimed that this point was based on a letter he had received from social services “outlining that they were aware that they had been told lies by [the complainer’s former wife] and did not put this information in the reports.” According to the complainer, when he told Detective Constable A about this she said there was nothing she could do. The complainer went on to repeat his belief that Detective Constable A had formed the opinion he was guilty and therefore only sought evidence to support this view. He also stated that he believed his complaint about the police had not been investigated properly and had not been resolved to his satisfaction.

In a handwritten note dated 23 October 2007, Superintendent B advised Superintendent D that there should be another attempt made with the complainer to conciliate those aspects of his complaints not previously covered. He also advised that obtaining an operational statement from Detective Constable A would be helpful.

Inspector C obtained a second statement from the complainer on 30 October 2007. The main issue dealt with in the statement was the complaint that information which had come to light during the investigation was not adequately investigated by Detective Constable A. According to the statement, the information was that the complainer’s former wife had “told lies to the Social Work Department.” Specifically, the complainer alleged that his former wife had told social services that the complainer wanted to sell their house as soon as possible, when the truth was that it was the complainer’s former wife who wanted to do so. The complainer explained that this information had come to light during a discussion between his solicitor and Social Worker E. The complainer said that he was still dealing with social work issues through his solicitor and that he felt the outcome should be considered “if there is evidence that [his former wife] was telling lies.” The complainer concluded his statement by saying that there were no other issues in his letter of 19 September 2007 requiring police action at that time.

On 31 October 2007 Detective Constable A provided a detailed statement regarding the complaints. Detective Constable A stated that after the initial allegations were made against the complainer by his former wife, she discussed the matter with Social Worker E. In line with normal multi-agency practice Detective Constable A then conducted a joint investigation with Social Worker E. Detective Constable A first noted a statement from the complainer’s former wife and thereafter, together with Social Worker E, interviewed Child F and Child G, the two children in question. She then interviewed the complainer who denied any wrongdoing.

A few weeks later Detective Constable A was contacted again by the complainer's former wife who said that Child G had disclosed information which supported Child F's allegations. Detective Constable A thereafter noted a second statement from the complainer's former wife and spoke again to Child G.

Some weeks later, Detective Constable A was contacted again by the complainer's former wife who said that Child G had now revealed further information about the complainer. At this stage, Detective Constable A discussed with the complainer's former wife the dangers of "over interviewing" children. Detective Constable A advised the complainer's former wife that it was not her intention to speak to Child F and Child G immediately but that if both continued to disclose information she would arrange to talk to them in about a week's time. This approach was approved by Detective Sergeant H.

One week later, Detective Constable A and Social Worker E interviewed Child G again. Detective Constable A also took possession of a letter which had been written by Child G.

During the investigation Child F and Child G were medically examined, although the results of this neither confirmed nor denied the allegations.

According to Detective Constable A, at this stage of the enquiry it was clear that there was evidence to prefer charges against the complainer. Thereafter the complainer was detained and interviewed in relation to the allegations. According to Detective Constable A's statement, the complainer again denied the allegations and said that his children had been forced to make up the allegations in order that his former wife could end their relationship. He also stated that he and his former wife had debts in excess of £60,000. He believed he was being "set up" and that Child F and Child G had been coerced into making the allegations.

Following the interview the complainer was placed under arrest.

Detective Constable A recalled receiving a telephone call at some stage from the complainer in which he alleged that she had not properly investigated the case. In particular he had told her that she had failed to take account of the family debt problem as being the reason for the allegations. According to her statement, Detective Constable A informed the complainer that she did not believe debt problems had any bearing on the allegations made by his children and had no relevance to the investigation.

Detective Constable A said that in accordance with normal practice within the Family Protection Unit the file on the complainer's case was reviewed by a senior officer on completion of the investigation.

On 14 December 2007 Superintendent D wrote a further letter to the complainer responding to his complaints. Reference was made to the complaint that information which had come to light during the enquiry, and which was conveyed to Detective Constable A, was not properly investigated by her. In response to this complaint, Superintendent D stated that he understood the complainer was still dealing with the

social work department and that he would contact the police again “should these discussions uncover evidence that [the complainer’s former wife] was telling lies to the Police.”

Superintendent D also stated that the report which had been sent to the Procurator Fiscal made reference to the family debt problem and also the complainer’s suggestion that the allegations were made so that his former wife could end their relationship.

On 5 May 2008, following a meeting of the social work complaints review committee on 1 February 2008, the complainer wrote again to Superintendent D. The complainer stated that while under questioning from the complainer’s solicitor, Social Worker E had agreed with the suggestion that the complainer’s former wife had “her own agenda” when dealing with social services. The complainer asked Tayside Police to confirm if there was any communication between Detective Constable A and Social Worker E to corroborate the latter’s comment at the meeting. According to the complainer this was of paramount importance in ensuring that the police were aware of all the facts. It would, he claimed, also clarify whether the police had carried out a full and honest investigation.

The complainer went on in his letter to repeat his belief that his former wife had lied on numerous occasions during the investigation and that the reason for the allegations was to bring the marriage to an end so that she could escape her debts. He believed that his former wife had had sufficient time to coach and manipulate her children into making the allegations.

On 20 May 2008 a letter of response was sent to the complainer from Superintendent D’s successor (the letter is from a Superintendent, but his/her identity is not clear). The Superintendent noted that while the complainer believed that his former wife had lied and manipulated their children, Detective Constable A had relied, not only on the statements given by the complainer’s former wife, but also those provided by their children. The complainer was informed in the letter that no evidence could be found to substantiate his contention that his former wife had lied and manipulated their children. However, the Superintendent understood that the complainer would soon receive a report from the social work department and assured him that Tayside Police would investigate any new evidence arising from this.

## **5. PCCS review**

The complainer first contacted the Commissioner’s office by telephone on 12 June 2008. He was thereafter asked to complete an application form which was received on 16 July 2008. Tayside Police supplied its papers to the Commissioner’s office on 31 July 2008.

On 1 May 2009 the Commissioner’s office contacted Tayside Police to request copies of any further witness statements or notes of meetings in relation to the complainer’s complaint, and also a copy of the report sent by Detective Constable A

to the Procurator Fiscal. Various items were received by Tayside Police on 7 May 2009.

On 11 May 2009 the Commissioner's office wrote to the complainer's solicitor requesting any notes of meetings involving the social work department. The complainer's solicitor provided a range of information which was received on 11 June 2009.

## **6. Consideration**

**Complaint 1 – That Detective Constable A was biased against the complainer, and in particular:**

**(a) prematurely formed the opinion that he was guilty; and**

**(b) sought only to establish the complainer's guilt.**

In the Commissioner's view, the justification for these complaints is undermined by the fact that the complainer effectively withdrew them in his signed statement of 3 August 2007. In that statement, the complainer stated that in light of explanations given to him by Inspector C he appreciated the approach that Detective Constable A had taken in relation to him. Later in the statement the complainer stated that, in light of these explanations, he was "content that... this enquiry was carried out in line with the proper guidance." In the Commissioner's view, given the terms of the complainer's statement of 3 August 2007, Tayside Police was entitled to view both these complaints as having been conciliated through the efforts of Inspector C.

Further support for the view that the complainer had withdrawn these complaints is given by him in his statement of 30 October 2007 in which he says in relation to his letter of 19 September 2007:

*"There are no other points in my letter that require any further Police action at this time."*

Among the "other" points raised by the complainer in that letter were complaints that Detective Constable A had prematurely formed the opinion that he was guilty and only sought to gather evidence in support of that opinion (ie complaints 1(a) and (b)).

With regard to complaint 1(b) specifically, Tayside Police's response to this was that the investigation carried out by Detective Constable A and her colleagues was impartial and unbiased.

In the Commissioner's view there is nothing in the report submitted by Detective Constable A to the Procurator Fiscal to suggest that she sought only to establish the complainer's guilt. As well as a summary of the evidence against the complainer, the report sent by Detective Constable A to the Procurator Fiscal contained details of the complainer's position as stated by him at interview. These included the complainer's belief that the Child F and Child G had been coerced by their mother

into making the allegations as a means of ending her relationship with the complainer. The report also contained details of the family's debt problems and the complainer's belief that the allegations were a ploy by his former wife to gain sympathy from her parents before they became aware of the debt. Detective Constable A explained in the report that the complainer was "incredulous" at the allegations and that he believed he was innocent. Detective Constable A also mentioned that within the family of the complainer's former wife, there had previously been an incident of sexual assault. According to the report, the complainer's former wife had admitted to being "hyper" about child abuse because of this.

Detective Constable A also went as far as enclosing with her report a copy of a letter she had received from the complainer containing a history of the events as he saw them.

In the Commissioner's view, these factors all point to a full and impartial investigation and police report.

For the reasons given, the Commissioner considers that Tayside Police's handling of complaints 1(a) and (b) was entirely reasonable.

**(c) Detective Constable A did not establish that the alleged victims had been coached by his former wife.**

According to the complainer's statement of 3 August 2007, Inspector C explained to him the techniques employed in interviews with child witnesses. The complainer appears to have accepted these explanations; however, he still thought that the police should look at his own case, and others, and consider the use of "more specialised external bodies" to ascertain the credibility of such allegations. Inspector C then explained to the complainer that "joint protocols" continually evolve, and the complainer stated that he wished to make a contribution to that. Ultimately, however, the complainer accepted that the enquiry had been carried out in line with guidance.

As explained above, on the basis of these discussions Inspector C in his report of 5 August 2007 believed that he had resolved this complaint to the complainer's satisfaction. According to the report, the complainer was advised that if he was seeking to influence the debate on child witness interview procedures he should make representations to the appropriate agencies. The complainer reportedly said that he was already in the process of doing so.

In the Commissioner's view, given the terms of the complainer's statement of 3 August 2007, it was understandable that Tayside Police considered complaint 1(c) to have been resolved.

In the Commissioner's view, where children have in fact been coerced or "coached" into making allegations it is unrealistic to expect that in every such case the police will establish this through its enquiries. The same would no doubt also apply to specialists such as psychologists. It is the role of the courts, not the police, to establish whether evidence of child witnesses proves an offence beyond reasonable doubt. As noted earlier, that stage was never reached in the complainer's case.

In the Commissioner's view, Tayside Police handled and responded to this complaint in a reasonable manner.

**(d) Detective Constable A did not conduct any follow-up investigation to establish whether his former wife lied.**

This complaint was first referred to by the complainer in his letter to Tayside Police of 16 July 2007. In the letter, he stated that he had informed Detective Constable A that his former wife had "completely misled the Social Services by blatantly lying."

In his statement of 3 August 2007, the complainer stated that the social work department knew his former wife was telling lies, but he makes no reference to having conveyed this information to Detective Constable A during the police investigation.

It was not until his letter of 19 September 2007 that the complainer provided fuller details of this complaint. He repeated that during the enquiry he told Detective Constable A information that he believed could be construed as "the witness giving false statements to the police or indeed an attempt to pervert the course of justice". The complainer went on to say that this complaint was based on a letter he received from social services "outlining that they were aware that they had been told lies by [the complainer's former wife] and did not put this information in the reports." The complainer claimed to have received an apology for this (presumably from social services). However, he claimed that when he advised Detective Constable A of this she informed him that there was nothing she could do about it.

Further details of the information relating to his former wife were given by the complainer in his statement of 30 October 2007. There, he stated that his former wife told the social work department that the complainer wanted to sell their house as soon as possible. According to the complainer, it was in fact his former wife who wanted to sell the house. According to the statement this fact came to light during discussions between the complainer's solicitor and Social Worker E.

As explained above, towards the end of his statement of 30 October 2007 the complainer stated that he was still dealing with social work issues through his solicitor. The complainer felt that the outcome of that process should still be considered by Tayside Police:

*"... if there is evidence that my wife was telling lies. ... I am quite clear if my wife told them lies then any evidence or statement given to the police should be re-examined. I will not let this matter rest and I may come back with new evidence."*

As noted above, Superintendent D dealt with this complaint in his letter to the complainer dated 14 December 2007. Superintendent D referred to the complainer's assertion that information which he passed to Detective Constable A during the enquiry was not properly investigated. He then went on to say that, as he understood matters, the complainer was still dealing with the social work department in relation to these issues and that he would contact the police again should he uncover evidence that his former wife had told lies to the police.

In the Commissioner's view there is some confusion over the nature of this complaint. On the one hand, the complainer states that Detective Constable A failed properly to investigate information he gave to her during the police enquiry to the effect that his former wife had lied to social services. On the other hand, it seems clear from his statement of 30 October 2007 that at that date (ie well after the police investigation was completed) he had no such evidence. The complainer's statement of 30 October 2007 contains phrases such as "if there is evidence that my wife was telling lies..." and states that he may return to the police with new evidence. In the Commissioner's view, if it is true that by 30 October 2007 there was no evidence that the complainer's former wife had lied to social services, this wholly undermines any complaint that Detective Constable A failed to investigate such evidence at the time of the investigation.

In his letter of 19 September 2007 to Tayside Police the complainer makes reference to a letter he claims to have received from social services "outlining that they were aware that had been told lies by the complainer's former wife." It was established by the Commissioner's office during a telephone call with the complainer that the letter referred to by the complainer is in fact a reference to notes made by his solicitor during his discussion with Social Worker E described above. Whatever the position, the complainer does not appear to have produced this information to Tayside Police and it was not submitted to the Commissioner's office in connection with his application.

As noted earlier, the complainer's solicitor has provided the Commissioner's office with a range of information relating to his complaints. One of the documents is a list of questions which it appears are those which were put to Social Worker E at the meeting of the Social Works Complaints Review Committee on 1 February 2008. This meeting is referred to in the complainer's letter to Tayside Police of 5 May 2008. The list also contains handwritten notes of what appear to be the answers given by Social Worker E to a number of the questions. Although some of the answers are difficult to read, one of them appears to be to the effect that the complainer's former wife "may have had an agenda". This would appear to support what the complainer wrote in his letter to Tayside Police of 5 May 2008.

Social Worker E also appears to have been asked "Did it ever occur to you that the children were being coached by [the complainer's former wife]?", to which the answer is noted as "Yes".

Insofar as complaint 1(d) is that Detective Constable A failed to investigate information to the effect that the complainer's former wife lied in her statements to the police, the Commissioner considers that Tayside Police's response was reasonable. There is nothing to show that Detective Constable A was supplied that information during the police investigation. Given that in his statement of 30 October 2007 the complainer clearly implies that there was no such evidence at that date, it was reasonable for Tayside Police to deal with the complaint by saying that any new evidence to this effect would be investigated.

However, on 5 May 2008 the complainer gave to Tayside Police what he believed to be evidence pointing to his former wife having lied during the investigation. In his

response of 20 May 2008 the Superintendent does not consider that evidence, despite the earlier pledge that such evidence would be investigated. There are clearly doubts as to whether the information provided by the complainer in his letter is actually evidence that his former wife lied, as opposed to just the impressions of Social Worker E. However, for completeness Tayside Police should now consider the information contained in the complainer's letter of 5 May 2008 and provide the complainer with a written response as to whether the information justifies a further police investigation. It is a matter for the complainer whether he provides Tayside Police with the list of questions his solicitor put to Social Worker E and her answers to these.

**Complaint 2 - that the complainer's complaint about the police was not dealt with in the appropriate manner**

For the reasons given, the Commissioner believes that the complaints made by the complainer were handled by Tayside Police in a reasonable manner.

<b>7. Conclusion</b>
----------------------

**Complaint 1 – that Detective Constable A was biased against the complainer, and in particular:**

**(a) prematurely formed the opinion that he was guilty; and**

**(b) sought only to obtain evidence establishing the complainer's guilt**

For the reasons given, the Commissioner considers that Tayside Police dealt with these complaints in a reasonable manner.

**c) Detective Constable A did not establish that the alleged victims had been coached by the complainer's former wife**

For the reasons given, the Commissioner considers that Tayside Police dealt with this complaint in a reasonable manner.

**(d) Detective Constable A did not conduct any follow up investigation to establish whether his wife lied**

For the reasons given, the Commissioner considers that Tayside Police dealt with this complaint in a reasonable manner. However, he recommends that Tayside Police now consider the information contained in the complainer's letter of 5 May 2008 and provide the complainer with a written response as to whether this justifies further police investigation.

**Complaint 2** - that the complainer's complaint about the police was not dealt with in the appropriate manner.

The Commissioner believes that the complaints made by the complainer were handled by Tayside Police in a reasonable manner.

John McNeill  
Police Complaints Commissioner for Scotland  
November 2009