

Date: 9 July 2026

Dear Baroness Hallett and Mr Keith KC

Purpose of this correspondence:

The purpose of this correspondence is not to invite the Inquiry to determine criminal liability, nor to revisit matters falling outside its statutory Terms of Reference. It is to bring to the Inquiry's attention documentary evidence which has emerged since much of the evidence was received and which, in my respectful submission, raises legitimate questions concerning the completeness of the evidential record upon which the Inquiry continues to proceed.

I respectfully invite the Chair and Lead Counsel to consider whether those developments have implications for the integrity of the Inquiry's continuing work.

I write to you again, in your respective capacities as Chair and Lead Counsel to the UK Covid-19 Inquiry, because I consider it necessary to place before you information of the utmost importance.

I do so respectfully, recognising the significance of your offices and the considerable responsibilities entrusted to you. Equally, however, I do so with a profound sense of public duty. The matters set out in

this correspondence raise issues which, in my respectful submission, bear directly upon the integrity of the Inquiry and upon the completeness of the evidential picture upon which it must ultimately rely.

I have previously submitted a number of communications to the Inquiry, each of which has been acknowledged. I am grateful for the courtesy consistently shown in those responses.

Throughout those earlier submissions I have advanced allegations of exceptionally serious criminal conduct involving members of Government, regulatory authorities, senior police officers and senior public officials. Those allegations have not been made lightly. They have been advanced only after extensive investigation and are founded upon documentary material obtained from public authorities themselves.

The responses I have received from the Inquiry have consistently made clear that its function is not to determine questions of criminal liability or innocence, but rather to examine the Government's handling of the Covid-19 pandemic. I fully understand and acknowledge that constitutional distinction.

I have also been advised that where allegations of criminal conduct arise, they should be brought to the attention of the appropriate

police authorities. That course of advice has been followed repeatedly.

Complaints have been submitted not only by me, but by a number of other individuals acting independently. Those complaints have now resulted in a number of active investigative processes, the existence of which is capable of objective verification.

By way of summary, I draw your attention to the following chronology.

1. In January 2026, I provided Mr Andrew Holt, a solicitor in the Directorate of Legal Services at the Metropolitan Police Service, with substantial new evidence relating to serious alleged criminal conduct concerning Covid-19, the vaccine programme, the actions of Government, the handling of Metropolitan Police Crime Reference Number 6029679/21 and evidence relating to both the Speirs Directive and Operation Talla.

Mr Holt replied by advising that the appropriate course was for me to submit a formal complaint directly to the Metropolitan Police Service.

The matters concerned all arise from the crime report originally made at Hammersmith Police Station in December 2021 under Crime Reference Number 6029679/21.

2. In March 2026, I accordingly submitted a detailed formal complaint to the Metropolitan Police concerning those matters.

3. In June 2026, I was contacted by the Metropolitan Police Directorate of Professional Standards and informed that my complaint had been formally acknowledged. I was further advised that guidance was being sought from the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC) regarding the manner in which the complaint should proceed.

4. On 2 July 2026, the IOPC confirmed that it had become involved in the matter and had requested that the Metropolitan Police Directorate of Professional Standards undertake the investigation. I was also provided with a dedicated single point of contact within the IOPC for all future communications.

5. The matters under investigation include the document commonly referred to as the Speirs Directive, issued in January 2022 by then Assistant (now Deputy) Chief Constable Alan Speirs of Police Scotland. That directive instructed officers and members of police staff throughout Police Scotland not to accept reports or evidence relating to alleged criminality connected with Covid-19, the vaccine programme or Government.

6. Freedom of Information disclosures now demonstrate that the directive was issued following communication originating from the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) and that the relevant information was disseminated to Chief Constables throughout England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland with the knowledge of Government and the Civil Service.

These developments are of obvious significance. They are no longer matters of speculation or inference but arise from documentary material disclosed by the relevant public authorities themselves.

It is because of that developing evidential position that I now consider it necessary to write to you once again.

7. The numerous disclosures obtained through Freedom of Information requests, together with material released pursuant to Subject Access Requests, reveal an extensive and consistent chronology concerning the handling of reports relating to Covid-19.

Taken collectively, those documents raise serious concerns regarding policing decisions, investigative processes and institutional accountability. They also identify what appear to be repeated failures to investigate matters which had been reported as suspected criminal conduct.

8. In particular and in relation to:

- the Speirs Directive;
- Police Scotland; and

- Operation Talla,

a substantial number of complaints have now been submitted directly by members of the public to the Scottish Police Authority.

9. On 3 July 2026, the Scottish Police Authority confirmed that it had received thirty-six complaints between 23 April 2026 and 14 June 2026 concerning these matters.

I understand that a number of those complaints are now the subject of active investigation involving Deputy Chief Constable Alan Speirs, Police Scotland and Operation Talla.

10. These matters do not stand in isolation.

They are intrinsically connected with Metropolitan Police Crime Reference Number 6029679/21, the handling of that crime report and the wider body of evidence which has subsequently emerged.

11. Importantly, the chronology to which I refer has not been constructed from speculation or secondary commentary. It has been assembled from documents disclosed by policing bodies, governmental departments and public authorities themselves.

Amongst the most significant of those documents are the records of a meeting held on 12 January 2022.

Those minutes record attendance by Chief Constables and senior policing representatives from across the United Kingdom, together

with representatives connected with the National Police Chiefs' Council, Government, the Royal Military Police and others whose identities remain redacted.

The agenda for that meeting included both Operation Talla and Metropolitan Police Crime Reference Number 6029679/21.

The minutes further record that a "steer" was to be agreed regarding the manner in which the matter should be dealt with.

The published minutes are available here:

https://ethicalapproach.co.uk/14_january_2022_260406_032139.pdf

That document speaks for itself.

12. A number of identifiable individuals who participated in, or were associated with, these events have subsequently provided written statements and oral evidence to the UK Covid-19 Inquiry.

That fact inevitably gives rise to an important question as to whether the evidential picture presented to the Inquiry has been complete.

13. Having carefully reviewed the material now available, I have become increasingly concerned that the continuing duty of candour expected of public officials may not, in every instance, have been fully discharged.

That concern is founded not upon conjecture, but upon comparison between documentary disclosures now in the public domain and the evidence which has been presented to the Inquiry.

14. The documentary record identifies a number of significant omissions which, had they been disclosed to the Inquiry, may reasonably have affected its understanding of the relevant factual landscape.

Those omissions include, amongst other matters:

- directions issued within Operation Talla concerning the refusal to investigate or accept reports of alleged criminal offences relating to Covid-19, the vaccine programme or Government;
- evidence indicating that reports from members of the public were prevented from entering the normal criminal justice recording process; and
- statements attributed to NPCC command indicating that only two crime reports entered the policing system, expressed in terms which appear to regard that outcome as a successful operational achievement.

If established, the existence of a nationally coordinated instruction which had the effect of preventing members of the public from reporting suspected criminal offences would raise constitutional issues of the utmost seriousness.

Such matters plainly extend beyond questions of operational policing and engage wider principles concerning access to justice,

equality before the law and public confidence in the administration of justice.

15. I am further concerned that the documentary record now available gives rise to questions as to whether certain public officials, within policing, Government and the Civil Service, may have provided evidence to the Inquiry which was incomplete or materially misleading.

I do not advance that proposition lightly. Nor do I invite the Inquiry simply to accept my opinion.

Rather, I invite the Inquiry to examine the documents disclosed by the relevant public authorities themselves and to compare those documents with the evidence already received.

It is the documentary record, not rhetoric, which gives rise to these concerns.

Accordingly, the question which now arises is both legitimate and unavoidable:

Has the UK Covid-19 Inquiry been materially misled by omissions from those under a continuing duty of candour?

That is not a question which should be dismissed. It is one which, in my respectful submission, now requires careful and independent consideration.

The question is not raised in the abstract.

From the body of evidence now available, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Inquiry has, at the very least, been deprived of material information which ought properly to have formed part of its evidential landscape.

The significance of that position extends beyond any individual witness.

If those responsible for directing national policing policy, Government policy or associated public administration failed to disclose material facts relevant to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference, the consequence is not merely that evidence may have been incomplete. It is that the Inquiry itself risks reaching conclusions upon an evidential foundation which was never complete.

It is for this reason that I now write to you both.

The concern I raise is not intended to criticise the Inquiry. It is to ensure that the Inquiry is afforded the opportunity to consider information which has emerged through subsequent disclosures by public authorities themselves.

It is also important to emphasise that these developments have not occurred in isolation.

Mr Ian Clayton, Lead Investigator at Ethical Approach UK, has undertaken extensive investigative work over a prolonged period. His published analysis, together with the documentary evidence he has assembled, corresponds closely with the evidence I have independently obtained and with the material previously submitted by me to the Inquiry, to police forces, to Government departments and to regulatory bodies.

Taken together, those independent lines reveal a striking degree of consistency.

They point towards a coherent chronology rather than a series of unrelated events.

My concern is therefore not founded upon isolated documents or individual disclosures.

It arises from the cumulative weight of a substantial body of documentary evidence originating from various official sources.

My investigations have led me to conclude that serious criminal offences have been committed against the people of the United Kingdom.

Those concerns include the Government's decisions concerning Covid-19, the vaccine programme and the subsequent actions taken by public authorities.

It is my contention that evidence of death and serious harm became apparent at an early stage.

Rather than those matters resulting in a pause and comprehensive reassessment, the vaccination programme continued.

Reports raising allegations of criminal conduct were made to police forces.

The responses received repeatedly asserted that the authorities were acting in accordance with Government policy and that the vaccine programme was lawful.

However, the documentary material now disclosed suggests that a separate and equally significant process was taking place.

Evidence indicates that, with input from Government, the National Police Chiefs' Council and others, some of whom are identified, whilst others remain unidentified, arrangements were implemented which had the effect of preventing many reports of alleged criminal offences relating to Covid-19, the vaccine programme and Government from entering the normal police crime recording system.

If that evidence is correct, the consequence is self-evident.

Allegations of suspected criminality were prevented from progressing through the ordinary criminal justice process at the very point at which they were reported.

That is not a proposition I advance merely as opinion.

It is a conclusion which I respectfully submit arises from the documentary record itself.

The investigations to which I have referred are capable of independent verification.

By way of example:

Firstly, the Independent Office for Police Conduct has confirmed that the Metropolitan Police Directorate of Professional Standards has been instructed to investigate my complaint.

https://ethicalapproach.co.uk/iopc_letter_02072026_redacted.pdf

Secondly, the Scottish Police Authority has confirmed, by way of a Freedom of Information response, that it has received thirty-six complaints concerning these matters, a number of which are now the subject of active investigation.

https://ethicalapproach.co.uk/spa_letter_03072026.pdf

These are not speculative assertions. They are official confirmations issued by the relevant public authorities themselves.

The cumulative effect of the documentary evidence is profound.

The various disclosures, viewed individually, are significant.

Viewed collectively, they present a chronology which is internally consistent, independently corroborated and increasingly difficult to reconcile with the evidence that has thus far been presented to the Inquiry.

That is why I respectfully consider these matters require your immediate attention.

The existence of those investigations inevitably gives rise to a question of considerable constitutional importance.

How can the Inquiry confidently discharge its statutory function if there now exists credible documentary evidence suggesting that material information may not previously have been placed before it?

I recognise, of course, that the Inquiry was established to examine the Government's handling of the pandemic and to identify lessons for the future.

I equally recognise that it is not the Inquiry's function to determine criminal liability.

Those propositions are entirely uncontroversial.

However, they do not answer the present difficulty.

An inquiry can fulfil its purpose only if the factual foundation upon which it proceeds is both accurate and complete.

Where subsequent documentary disclosures raise legitimate questions concerning the completeness of evidence previously provided, those questions cannot simply be disregarded because they fall outside the ordinary determination of criminal guilt.

On the contrary, they become directly relevant to the integrity of the Inquiry itself.

That, respectfully, is now the position.

I therefore invite you to consider whether the continued progression of the Inquiry, before these matters have been properly investigated by the relevant authorities, carries a significant risk.

Should ongoing investigations ultimately establish that material evidence was omitted, or that relevant information was not disclosed by those under a duty of candour, there is an obvious possibility that findings or conclusions reached by the Inquiry may later require reconsideration.

Such an outcome would serve neither the public interest nor the considerable work already undertaken by the Inquiry.

I fully appreciate the substantial public expenditure that has already been committed.

I also recognise the enormous commitment of time and effort invested by yourself, your legal team, witnesses and all those who have participated in the Inquiry process.

For precisely that reason, I respectfully suggest that it would be prudent to ensure that the Inquiry proceeds upon the fullest evidential foundation available, rather than one which may subsequently prove to have been materially incomplete.

The position in which you now find yourselves is, I acknowledge, an unenviable one.

Nothing within this correspondence is intended as criticism of either of you personally.

To the contrary, I recognise that if material information has not previously been disclosed to the Inquiry, responsibility for that

omission rests not with those conducting the Inquiry, but with those who bore the obligation to provide complete and accurate evidence.

It is because of that distinction that I consider it important to write to you directly.

Mr Ian Clayton, Solicitor Philip Hyland and I continue to investigate these matters.

As those investigations progress, further documentary evidence continues to emerge from public authorities through Freedom of Information disclosures, Subject Access Requests and other official processes.

Far from diminishing the concerns already identified, each successive disclosure appears to reinforce the developing chronology.

The body of evidence continues to grow.

Accordingly, I respectfully invite you to give careful consideration to whether the Inquiry should now pause, at least temporarily, pending the outcome of the ongoing investigations in both England and Scotland.

That is not a request made for tactical or procedural advantage. It is made because public confidence in the Inquiry ultimately depends not only upon its independence, but also upon confidence that its conclusions have been reached after consideration of all material evidence.

If there now exists a realistic possibility that significant evidence has yet to be examined, I respectfully suggest that public confidence is more likely to be strengthened by ensuring those matters are first properly investigated than by continuing regardless.

The constitutional importance of the Inquiry demands nothing less.

I respectfully suggest that the matters set out in this correspondence now require urgent consideration.

Whether every concern ultimately proves to be well founded is, of course, a matter for proper investigation.

What is no longer open to doubt is that official disclosures made by public authorities have fundamentally altered the evidential landscape since much of the Inquiry's evidence was received.

That development alone, in my respectful submission, justifies careful reconsideration of the present position.

The purpose of every public inquiry is to establish the truth so far as the available evidence permits.

That objective can only be achieved where all material evidence is available for consideration.

Where credible evidence subsequently emerges which may materially affect the factual matrix upon which an inquiry proceeds, it is surely better to examine that evidence than to risk conclusions being reached upon an incomplete foundation.

I therefore respectfully invite you to consider whether it is now appropriate to review the implications of the ongoing investigations before the Inquiry proceeds further.

I appreciate entirely that this is not a decision to be taken lightly. Nor do I underestimate the complexity of the issues now confronting the Inquiry.

However, the public interest requires confidence not only in the independence of the Inquiry, but equally in the completeness of the evidence upon which its conclusions will ultimately rest.

If those two principles come into conflict, it is the evidence which must prevail.

Public confidence is not strengthened by avoiding difficult questions. It is strengthened by confronting them openly and by ensuring that they are examined impartially wherever the evidence leads.

Should the ongoing investigations establish that material information was omitted from the evidence previously provided to the Inquiry, the consequences will extend well beyond any individual witness. They will inevitably affect public confidence in the Inquiry's conclusions and more broadly, confidence in the constitutional mechanisms by which Government and public authorities are held to account.

For that reason, I respectfully ask that this correspondence, together with the supporting documentary material to which it refers, be given careful consideration.

Should the Inquiry require any further information, documents or clarification, Mr Ian Clayton, Solicitor Philip Hyland and I remain willing to provide whatever assistance may properly be required.

The evidence upon which these concerns are founded is documented, capable of verification and is derived from disclosures made by public authorities themselves.

It is for that reason that I now place these matters before you.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this correspondence.

Yours sincerely

Mark Sexton

(Retired Police Constable)

Ian Clayton

(Lead Investigator – Ethical Approach UK)