

Ildar Sharipov  
86-90 Paul Street  
London, EC2A 4NE  
Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2020

To: The public of the UK

## Evidence of serious corruption in Merseyside Police: 2018-2020

To whom it may concern,

This post should be read in the context of my [Open letter to the UK public on the issue of serious corruption in the UK system](#) and is also available in PDF-format.

In my current post I am aiming to present the public of the UK with what I believe to be irresistible evidence of serious corruption in Merseyside Police so that anyone can make his own judgement on the allegations I make about existence of serious corruption and wilful cover-up of it on the highest levels of this police force.

Every allegation of wrongdoing has two main elements. The first element is the gravity / seriousness of the alleged wrongdoing when considered at the highest and taken at face value of the allegations. The second element is, of course, available evidence of that alleged wrongdoing.

Only when taken together and forming a critical interplay, those two elements can represent a ground for serious concern. It is my belief which, I am sure, will be shared by any reasonable person, that both the character of allegations I raise about Merseyside Police and the available evidence are strongly forming the ground of **very serious public concern**.

Today I have made public the material related to the conduct of Merseyside Police and I have deliberately divided content of it by categories to different documents / articles / letters, to make it most convenient to understand a) the character of my allegations and b) the evidence of those allegations. My main letter to the UK's public called "[Open letter to the UK public on the issue of serious corruption in the UK system](#)" largely circles around the character of the allegations which I make – the repeated committal by Merseyside Police's officers of imprisonable criminal offences and an established network of serious corruption aimed to cover these crimes up. That letter – deliberately – does not contain any evidence and refers to the current post / document where the need of the evidence follows from the context.

Thus, the current post / document (I will call it "document" rather than "letter") has fundamental importance for understanding the seriousness of concerns which I allege to exist: it is not self-enough to raise serious allegations, it is important to underpin those allegations by **sound evidence** which would allow a reasonable observer, at the very least, to get serious concern over integrity of the alleged offenders, if not to get the conclusion over irresistible – as I believe it to be the case – picture of a group of police officers committing imprisonable criminal offences and deliberate, wilful cover-up of those by themselves and their superiors up to **the highest management** of Merseyside Police.

While this document contains most salient examples of serious corruption – in form of deliberate misleading the courts – it should be noted that the presented below examples are just 'a peak of the iceberg' in what I believe to be an established culture of routine misleading the courts in *ex parte* (in my absence) applications by the detectives of Merseyside Police's Economic Crime Team ("MPECT"). There were two primary complaints of me dedicated to deliberate misleading of the courts by MPECT: the one of 17th April 2019

and another one of 13<sup>rd</sup> August 2019. Those complaints contain much more evidence of the culture of routine misleading the courts by MPECT while the current document is aimed to provide most salient points of these fabrications filed by MPECT under oath to the courts at different points in time in my absence and without my knowledge.

One of the biggest technical risk which I see for myself when making public the materials and allegations which I publish today is the risk of creating the impression of a person who, even if accepted to suffer 'injustice' from a police force, due to having psychological trauma from that, is 'foaming at the mouth' with anger and exaggerating the weight of evidence of wrongdoing and the conclusions from his observations. That is a big technical risk of being perceived in such a way by a third party observer who has experience of dealing with people suffered from injustice: it is correct to say that facing injustice and malice, especially applied with the power of the state at the hands and over prolonged period of time, causes psychological trauma, and it is correct – and fully admitted by me – that I have it.

However, I want to state it loud and clear that, despite of having suffered enormous pains and what, I think, costed me ten years of health (beside almost two years of time), I have saved my mind and I am conscious about where is the reality and where is a subjective belief. That, in fact, represents a very important circumstance which, I hope, differs me from the other people suffered from police corruption and malice, in terms of adequacy of my logical analysis. One of the salient examples of this is that, making today's materials public, I do not list the names of the corrupt officers from whom it all started: that is one of the indications that I am acting without anger and emotions as I consider them merely a circumstance, part of the critical for the public interest picture discovered by me. Instead of floating in anger and revenge aiming vendetta, I 're-programmed' in my mind the pains which I suffered into the desire to determine the full perimeter of the corruption I faced, reach the root of that corruption so as to hit it at its highest by what I believe to be the pendulum of justice pursuing the public interest, by applying the logical steps and research measures.

The roots of the observed by me deliberate and wilful misconduct by the police officers are on the top of the hierarchical tree of Merseyside Police: serious corruption I have become victim of could never flourish and sustain so long and so efficiently without a wilful and deliberate cover up of the 'anti-corruption department' and the management of the Force wilfully turning a blind eye on irresistible evidence of rampant dishonesty and malice of the officers in their command lines. My interaction with the corrupt officers started from asking – unexpectedly for them – questions during my interview, but that performed by me investigation – being made in absence of the investigation by PSD and the IOPC, whose job it actually was – never stopped. Up to the latest months (including December 2019) I was conducting my investigation by addressing Merseyside Police by series of messages, requests, challenges and questions, which allowed me to reach the conclusions which I reached, by way of drawing inferences from the reaction to my challenges and complaints made with explicit evidence, which, at the very least, was irresistibly raising serious concerns. Despite of having no investigatory powers, I have performed my own investigation which, I believe, serves also the public interest, and what I make public today is the results of that investigation.

Without having the power of the state and being now openly opposed to the highest management of Merseyside Police, against all of whom (Assistant Chief Constable Ian Critchley, Deputy Chief Commissioner Serena Kennedy, Chief Constable Andrew Cooke) I have recently filed official complaints and whose involvement in cover-up of serious corruption was discovered by me, I have no choice but to present my discoveries to the public of the UK and ask to make its own judgements and conclusions of the need of further investigatory actions in addressing of what my own investigation has discovered.

It is plain that malice against me was allowed to persist because all of them were sure they can keep the case '*under control*', benefiting from me having no power of the state and them having ringed the system of safeguards. Having the power of the state granted to them by the betrayed by their trust of the UK's public, they surely can keep me and my fight for justice '*under the carpet*'. But **can they do so with the public interest, in front of the public?** My logic and my principles have directed me to check that, however embarrassing, damaging (for my own career) and painful is the public step which I do today.

Having said that, I want to underscore to the reader that I am not '*a madman from the street*' who floats in some anger-powered hysteria and '*foams at the mouth*' with some weakly justified conspiracy theories where the effort in bringing those up is intended / deemed to replace the logical soundness or importance of the agenda he addresses. As of the moment of writing these words, I am employing more than 400 staff around the world and have more than 12-year experience in running my own financial businesses. Even my opponents – the corrupt officers of MPECT – while attacking my credibility by abusing their powers in their fight for escaping from responsibility over their criminal conduct, cannot say that I do not have an intellect which would allow me to sensibly draw logical conclusions from available to me data and facts, let alone when I am perfectly focused and analysing the discovered data for more than 1.5 years in a row. Luckily, the evidence of their serious corruption, which I provide below, is not being based on my integrity which is attacked by these acting maliciously people calling themselves "*police officers*", as I provide the irresistible facts which are coming from the documents, not my mind. All I do is taking these facts as they are and using my intellect to connect the dots – without emotions, anger and anything that could undermine my logical analysis.

The reality lying behind the below presented facts is that the officers of MPECT have committed – inevitably imprisonable – criminal offences of perjury, perverting the course of justice and [improper / corrupt exercise of police powers](#). Each of the below listed examples clearly falls to that description, even when considered separately. What is probably more important and practical, **when taken together, those presented below facts form irresistible evidence** of the committal of criminal offences by the officers whom I allege to be corrupt.

Much more importantly for the public interest, when doing so, these facts –automatically – also represent irresistible evidence of deliberate and wilful cover-up of those criminal offences of the police officers by the 'anti-corruption' body of Merseyside Police (PSD) and by the management of the Force. That inference of wrongdoing on the side of those safeguarding bodies, let me underscore that, follows not from the fact that MPECT have committed criminal offences (which is not yet proved by any tribunal or court) but from the fact that the test which was before PSD and the management of the Force was the test of suspicion that integrity of the officers, who are said to have misled the courts in the below described manner, is in question and fulfilling which test was **obligatory** ought to trigger action / investigation against those officers. Instead of such action PSD and the management of the Force did **everything possible** to cover up the alleged by me with irresistible evidence to be corrupt police officers and defend them against any investigations, going so far as stating in the High Court proceedings that "*the biased are acceptable*" and replying to me in a letter signed by Assistant Chief Constable of the Force that all the below, which he had read and familiarised himself with, is fully "*in line with the high standards he sets for his investigation teams*".

**But enough introductions. Ladies and gentlemen, meet below "the high standards" of Merseyside Police, observed and wholly endorsed by the management of the Force!**

## **Background**

On 10th August 2017 MPECT have filed an *ex parte* application for Production Order ("PO") about my UK personal and business bank accounts. Production Order application is a kind of application to the court that allows to acquire from third parties – banks or financial institutions – information about the subject of interest. That means, a law enforcement body cannot simply contact any institution it wants and get any information it requests – it needs first to apply through the court for a Production Order, satisfying the judge that certain conditions to reasonably suspect are met, which process allows to ensure integrity of the process of applying the investigatory powers of the police that otherwise could be abused. That PO application of 10th August 2017 was the beginning of Operation Kobus, which then continued 8 months later by another *ex parte* application, for the Account Freezing Order ("AFO"), in relation to the same UK bank accounts with the total balance of £1.577 million, made on 23rd April 2018.

For those not knowing what "ex parte" means, it is the way to make an application to the court without the presence (and without notice to) the affected person or legal entity, whose interests (e.g. information) are affected by the order being applied for: be it a Production Order for producing the information or some kind of account freezing / restraining order, about which the affected party may not learn ever (like in case of Production Orders) or learn only after the order is granted (like AFO applications). *Ex parte* applications are almost exclusively used in the investigations because it would be quite strange for an investigated person or company to be informed that a law enforcement body starts collecting information about him / her / it. Where an *ex parte* Production Order is obtained – in most cases the affected person would never even be informed it had place. In case a freezing order is obtained *ex parte*, then the affected party is being notified **after** the order is granted. In both cases (of PO and AFO) such sequence in which the applying party puts to the court application without the affected party being able to put a response, creates additional **legal** duty on the applying body to be frank in the application (it is called "**full and frank disclosure**") and present a honest picture so that the judge can make fair decision (which is not always supposed to be a grant of the order) even despite of the affected party being not present: without the judge having honest picture, the process becomes a mockery of justice because that is what the role of the court is for – to issue an order on the basis of truth, **not** on the basis of lies. Albeit it is plain that lying to the judge is a crime, the character of *ex parte* applications creates an inherent context of **extremely** explicit duty for the applying body that it is to be very frank and very honest in describing the circumstances in its application to the court for any kind of order. As demonstrated in current document, that is rarely – if not never – the case with MPECT who appear to consider *ex parte* applications as some kind of logical game in which they need to lie as much as possible in as many points of their applications as possible. Of course, all lies are being made only in one direction – the one which benefits the application, so as to prejudice the decision of judges. To pervert the course of justice, by way of perjury. This kind of '*game*' is, of course, always a one side road, because that is the nature of the *ex parte* applications that there is no one to respond.

Both the initial PO application of 10th August 2017 and subsequent AFO application of 23rd April 2018 were examples of extremely rampant misleading two different courts by police officers, which, as is plainly seen from the below evidence, amounted to criminal offences. My understanding that I deal with the group of corrupt police officers started from the moment of obtaining by me on 27th June 2018 the copy of AFO application: analysing it, I slowly got conclusion that the police officers have deliberately misled the court. But that was only the beginning of my discoveries, as one year later, on 14 June 2019, I managed to obtain all the rest *ex parte* applications of MPECT, which has unleashed to me the whole

world of culture of routine, malicious misleading the courts by MPECT in their *ex parte* applications which they never expected anyone to obtain and analyse.

As result of my analysis of the initial AFO application of 23rd April 2018 I filed a 22-page complaint on 17th April 2019. As result of my further analysis of the *ex parte* PO applications, copies of which I was able to obtain through a court order from MPECT in June 2019, I filed a 53-page complaint on 13th August 2019. Both those complaints were stonewalled by Merseyside Police's '*anti-corruption body*' and by the management of the force: the officers I complained about were left untouchable, having 'immunity' against any my allegations. The analysis presented below provides with most salient examples of misleading the courts by MPECT. Unsurprisingly, 4 out of 5 examples below are taken from the two initial *ex parte* applications, which were made by MPECT when they were not yet aware of my complaint against them addressing their misleading the courts and – for the first PO application – were likely confident I will never learn about its existence and contents.

In short, both those applications were made by MPECT in full knowledge of my business footprints, that I am an international businessman engaged in the financial industry and owning different financial regulated and licensed businesses in several jurisdictions, including two EU countries and having licences from Central Bank of Russia. My biggest business – [InstaForex](#) – is large brokerage, which [has more then 3,500,000 mentions in the internet](#) and as of the moment of filing both applications [sponsored top-tier Football Club](#) – Liverpool FC – for the fourth year in a row. My another business, regulated – as they knew – by the FCA, was allowing them to collect from the FCA any information about me they were unsure about. Knowing all that (and pretending they do not know about the FCA regulating my UK company), MPECT have presented to the courts a totally different picture, presenting me as a '*mysterious Russian man*' without any business footprints, without websites, and who was mixed up in selling a fake airline ticket to Nigeria for £750 and a fake car on eBay for £6,300. To put that into correct context, plainly observable by them sponsorship of Liverpool FC costed me £1,800,000 during the four years. Alone. But that was just one of many my business footprints known to MPECT when in two *ex parte* applications they portrayed me as a "*person whose whereabouts are unknown*" and "*whose source of monies is unclear*", doing so on top and in the conjunction with the allegations of me being mixed up in selling fake airline ticket to Nigeria for £750. The very person who has done it – DC [Officer 5] – is continuously used by MPECT as a '*witness of truth*' in new and new applications.

**First example of deliberate misleading the court by MPECT: portraying my payment company being a fraudulent client of the website of... my payment company itself.**

In the Production Order ("PO") application dated 10th August 20176 MPECT asserted:

*"... A number of reports have also been made where funds are transferred for investing purposes **through** [Megatransfer.com](#) **to** Online Currency Corp Ltd. In April 2017 investors were informed that the servers were being updated and their accounts would not accessible for a few days. However, all website, email addresses and contact numbers appear to have disappeared now... "*

[MegaTransfer.com](#) was the website of my licensed by the FCA UK payment company Online Currency Corp ("OCC"). However, in this text OCC is portrayed as a client of [MegaTransfer.com](#) (pay attention to underscored by me "*through*" and "*to*" in the citation above) and not the operator / owner of the website [MegaTransfer.com](#). Instead of correctly presenting the role of OCC as a licensed by the FCA payment processor, this very same text effectively asserts that OCC is an investment scam, while the applying body – MPECT –

knowing that it is not, due to knowledge that it was a payment company (see the next example).

It is impossible to mention the website ([MegaTransfer.com](http://MegaTransfer.com)) of the company (OCC) and not visit it. Indeed, MPECT have later admitted they visited the website MegaTransfer.com from the beginning of their '*investigation*' in 2017. Visiting it, MPECT could clearly see that it is operated by OCC. Nevertheless, they have chosen to portray a totally different picture to the court when applying for a Production Order in which OCC was only a client of [MegaTransfer.com](http://MegaTransfer.com) website despite of them knowing that, in fact, this website was owned and operated by OCC itself.

Like card sharps, MPECT, through omittance of material information (the name of perpetrator of the investment scam) and even deliberate fabrication (presenting OCC as **a client** of the website which it, in fact, owned), had replaced the picture before the judge by a totally different one. It is beautiful and elegant, is not it? To portray the licensed payment company as a fraudulent client of itself, by swapping the names in the court application.

Beside being beautiful and elegant, this also represents the criminal offences of (1) perjury and (2) perverting the course of justice in the context that it was a deliberate misleading of the court. This also represents the criminal offence of (3) [improper / corrupt exercise of police powers and privileges](#) in the context that MPECT abused their police powers knowing the court was entitled to rely on good faith of the applying body (MPECT themselves) and was expected to inevitably accept the stated facts as true ones without checking those. As a result, the compulsory (for the banks) Production Order (an order obliging to produce information) was obtained by MPECT by way of misleading the court. The lies born in office rooms of corrupt police officers of MPECT were transformed into the court order, which is a form of **the highest power** of the state in the UK.

One does not want to deal in his life with the **power of the state** being applied by malicious '*card sharps*' because it is the worst thing which can happen to the state and to the public interest: such thing can happen to anyone, and I wish no one to learn how it is felt like when you are in the deadly vendetta '*until destroying*' with someone who has the power of the state, the vendetta triggered simply because you have witnessed something '*you were not ought to*' and, hence, need to be destroyed before someone starts listening to you.

Not least importantly, there is no need for any special analytical exercises to conclude that the officers who wilfully commit imprisonable criminal offence, by misleading the court, to simply obtain a court order, especially with such an ease and '*elegance*' as demonstrated above, can be logically deemed to be ready to do (and do) the same in many, if not all the rest their applications to the courts and, even worse, applying the same dishonesty where they have discretion not requiring involvement of other bodies such as courts, as police have very wide discretion in applying their enormous powers. However, there is no need in such deeming and guessing: after obtaining copies of ten other *ex parte* applications of MPECT for ten other Production Orders, I was able to observe this logically expected fact, and some examples of that culture of routine misleading the courts (and routine committal of the above listed criminal offences) are presented below, the others – in my 53-page complaint of 13th August 2019 written as a result of my discovery of these other *ex parte* applications of MPECT to the English courts.

**The second example of deliberate misleading the court: portraying in the £1.577 million account freeze *ex parte* application my payment company (OCC) as an investment scam, despite OCC having filed Action Fraud report against that investment scam and despite of knowing that OCC was only a payment processor used by the company behind that investment scam.**

While it is plain from the previous example that MPECT were aware of the FCA licence of OCC for payment services and its website since at least August 2017, **8 months later** they filed the AFO application for freezing £1.577 million, in which they asserted that OCC was an investment scam:

*"Action Fraud received multiple reports from individuals outside the UK who invested substantial sums into online investments. These investments ranged between £13,300 and £24,222. Enquiries in respect of the above online investments can be traced to a company named "Online Currency Corp Ltd" with SHARIPOV as one of the directors"*

First of all, it is very important to underscore the fact that the misleading portraying of OCC as an investment scam simply vanishes otherwise already neglectable chances for MPECT to say that in the initial PO application of 10th August 2017 they have, let say, '*accidentally misspelled the text of the application*' because the same misleading portraying of OCC is clearly repeated in a totally different application with totally different wording. This makes it plain that a licensed by the FCA payment company with all signs of legitimacy (website, registered trademark, ability to contact the FCA or the regulated company – OCC – itself) was again portrayed as an investment scam which disappeared with clients monies in April 2017 (one year before the AFO application), and it was done deliberately and wilfully, so as to mislead the court.

Secondly, unlike with the previous application which – albeit still representing three above mentioned imprisonable criminal offences of MPECT – was only allowing them to unlawfully acquire banking information of me and my businesses, the new application, citation from which is presented above, was much more draconian one because it was an account freeze application for £1.577 million. For those who do not know the **unique feature** of AFO applications, it should be clarified that once an AFO is granted (and it was granted as result of the misleading), the monies on the affected bank accounts can be forfeited **out-of-court** by simply sending **out-of-court** a forfeiture notice (a piece of paper saying "*We want to forfeit the monies in this account*"). A court order which was opening the direct shortcut to further forfeiture without participation of the court was obtained *ex parte* by the rampant misleading of the judge. All what was needed for the forfeiture to happen after the AFO was obtained in a misleading way, was lack of my desire to appear and oppose it – something that MPECT did not expect due to observing me '*being reluctant*' for two years to travel to the UK despite of request of the bank to visit the bank branch, due to not knowing I stopped travelling at all because of the onset of my serious autoimmune disease in 2016).

To make the legal picture explicitly clear, MPECT have obtained by rampant misleading of the judge a court order which allowed them to subsequently forfeit £1.577 million out of the court, if ever it would be the case that, after 2 years of absence, I would not appear within 30 days after the forfeiture notice would be sent by post.

Going back to the merits of misleading of the court cited above, it is of note that OCC had **itself** submitted a detailed Action Fraud report about that investment scam to the UK authorities, which report surely was available to MPECT, but, even filing its own report did not allow OCC to avoid being portrayed as the perpetrator of the fraud by MPECT in *ex parte* court application. It is a matter of fact MPECT have obtained Action Fraud reports which were mentioning OCC as payment company because even those to which they refer in the application, mentioned OCC as a payment processor, not perpetrator of fraud (I know that because OCC itself advised payers to file those reports when it was contacted by them in its capacity of payment processor whose services were used by the fraudulent company), and MPECT must have been aware of own Action Fraud report of OCC about that investment scam. Albeit this matter is not necessary to conclude they knew that they were misleading the court as to the role of OCC (this is plainly seen from the above presented logical row

already, as they knew the website of OCC 8 months before the AFO application), the existence of own Action Fraud report made by my company, OCC, makes the misleading even more '*elegant*': police officers, who are granted by the public trust with enormous powers, act, again, as card sharps, by presenting the regulated by the FCA payment company as the perpetrator of the fraud, whom the payment company has itself reported to the police and from which it itself has suffered a £39,000 damage. Just think of it, how witty it is. Not only do they lie to the courts, they even do so with a sense of humour! **This was an application to the English court with a sense of English humour.** We are speaking about the police officers of Financial Investigation Unit of a modern UK police force, which unit, among other duties, represents the UK law enforcement system in communication with foreign colleagues on very serious topics.

These live walking examples of unrivalled shame have even spoke to the US authorities: one day they lie rampantly in a court application, committing imprisonable criminal offences, the next day they go to the US embassy with serious faces to speak about "*possible US-UK cooperation on the serious investigation*", while the real reason of such "*request for assistance*" is to create a smoke screen and a hurricane of dust around complainant, so as to disguise their own criminal offences. And they, I can only logically assume, were seriously perceived by their US counter-parties, who did not know with whom they were speaking – with the intruders in a public office of the UK who are keen to use all available to their powerful office instruments to get away from responsibility over their criminal conduct, by discrediting the witness and the victim of their criminal offences. That is an example of how provincial malice and lies of lowest rank police officers (albeit made with sign off of higher ranks) project themselves into an absolutely ludicrous and outrageous abuse of international channels of cooperation.

It is of special note that the initial PO application of 10th August 2017, cited in the first example above, clearly indicated that payments were sent by victims of the fraud **through MegaTransfer.com**. This makes it plain that as early as August 2017 MPECT knew that OCC (which was operating the website MegaTransfer.com) was merely processing payments, as any bank, for example, does, not being the ultimate beneficiary of those. However, after misleading the Crown Court in the initial PO application of 10th August 2017 by stating that OCC was a client of (its own) website MegaTransfer.com, in the *ex parte* AFO application of 23rd April 2018 MPECT have totally removed mention of MegaTransfer.com website. This was, obviously, done so as to create impression they were unaware of it, so as to use it as an excuse for filing such a misleading AFO application that they '*got confused*' – if ever I would appear and raise any concern – because, unlike with the PO application, a copy of the AFO application had much better chances to reach me (albeit they did big efforts to prevent that – by sending AFO notice for all my personal bank accounts to non-existent address and then delaying providing copy of AFO application for 2 months, despite of having obligation to provide it together with the AFO notice, simultaneously).

Indeed, when providing me on 27th June 2018 with the copy of AFO application, with 2 months delay and only after several chasing up for it by my staff, DS [Officer 4] stated in his accompanying email to me:

*"Dear Mr Sharipov,*

*Thank you for taking the time to speak with us this morning.*

*As agreed, I have attached copies of the Account Freezing Order documents, the contents of which were **based on the information known at the time.**"*



The letter of DS [Officer 4] effectively implied that as of the moment of filing the initial AFO application of 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 MPECT did not know about the payment licence from the FCA, payment business and the website of my UK company, about my business footprints, my sponsoring Liverpool FC, various financial licences in different jurisdictions (including UK and Cyprus, both with EU-wide coverage), about the website of OCC ([MegaTransfer.com](http://MegaTransfer.com)), about OCC being merely a payment processor, not a perpetrator of the investment scam they referred to. I do believe that this false pretence clearly stated by an officer of the police in an official letter was the initial plan "B" of MPECT for the scenario in which they would be questioned by me or my lawyers why did they apply for the AFO in such a misleading way. The prepared explanation was "*we did not know anything about Mr Sharipov and that OCC is a licenced payment institution*". This is effectively the message the police officer who was involved in the preparation and filing AFO, has brought to me in his letter.

**The third example of deliberate misleading the court under oath – stating in the £1.577 million AFO application that my company, OCC (and any of my businesses) has no website, while knowing it to be plainly untrue.**

The same £1.577 million AFO application of DC [Officer 5] dated 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 (authorised by the signature of DCI [Officer 2] more than **8 months after** the investigation started) stated that OCC has no website:

*"No business bank account has been uncovered for Online Currency Corp Ltd and **no website** has been located for this company. ...*

*There appears to be **no internet presence** for the companies SHARIPOV has had involvement with, **highly unusual** bearing in mind that those companies appear to operate as online businesses"*

As is plain from the cited above the first example of misleading – PO application filed 8 months before the AFO – **the website MegaTransfer.com was known to MPECT for more than 8 months** when the cited above misleading AFO application was filed on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 asserting no websites have been located and insinuating "*it is highly unusual to not have websites*".

In addition, MPECT's officer, DS [Officer 4] later admitted that MPECT knew website [MegaTransfer.com](http://MegaTransfer.com) when filing that AFO application; he stated he does not know why the website of OCC was not mentioned in the AFO application in the preparation of which he participated, being the immediate superior to DC (as he was then) Cooper.

In his turn, DC [Officer 5] admitted that he knew about another my business – [InstaForex](http://InstaForex) – when filing the *ex parte* the AFO application of 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 in which he stated three times in different parts of the application that my businesses and I have no websites and any signs of online presence of my business activity. Knowing that I own / run a large brokerage with more 3,500,000 mentions in the internet (as he already admitted later), DC [Officer 5] was inescapably knowing (from the home page of the company, see [archived page](#) dated by the day of the court application) that it sponsors Liverpool Football Club – by the irony of life, the club of the city in which MPECT are based, which even made them able to drop by the Liverpool FC's office and ask about my sponsorship – something that they have failed for 8 months before coming to the court and stating that "*I have no business footprint*" and "*my whereabouts are unknown*". When stating to the court under oath I had sold fake airline ticket to Nigeria for £750 and a fake car for £6,000 on eBay, he could see the following clear indication of the sponsorship of Liverpool FC on the homepage of my main business:



DC [Officer 5] and the whole MPECT, of course, did not need to believe the website of my licensed in the EU company, but that 4-year long sponsorship was verifiable by the external sources, such as, for example, publication at the webpage:

[http://www.sportspromedia.com/news/liverpool\\_bank\\_on\\_instaforex\\_renewal](http://www.sportspromedia.com/news/liverpool_bank_on_instaforex_renewal)

Being in the face of such information did not create an obstacle for MPECT to allege the following in their application:

*"On 8th May 2017, Action Fraud receive a report regarding an online vehicle purchase in the sum of **£8,960**. Further reports were received on 8th June 2017 regarding an online vehicle purchase in the sum of **£6,300** and on 22nd June 2017 regarding an online vehicle purchase in the sum of **£6,750**. The purchasers in all the above cases and who were from the UK, noticed the vehicles for sale on Ebay and subsequently messaged the seller seeking more details. All communications were conducted outside Ebay guidelines and using personal email addresses. The suspect's email appears to have utilised a fraudulent URL link in order to entice the purchaser to register. Each purchaser was told the vehicle was based in Finland and they would need to register with AES Logistics who would transport the vehicle to the UK. Upon the purchasers receiving an email with an AES Logistics link showing a car inspection report, shipping invoice and tracking number, the purchasers transferred payment. In one case the purchaser found the same vehicle being advertised for sale on Autotrader using the same photos that had been sent to him. The account used to receive payment was a business account in the name of [subsidiary of OCC]. On 17th July 2017, Action Fraud receive a report regarding an online purchase for flights to Lagos in the sum of **£750**. The company involved in the fraud were named 'Creek Travel UK', however payment for the flights was made to the [subsidiary of OCC] bank account. "*

To put the above into the correct context I need to remind that as of the moment of writing this DC [Officer 5] and the whole MPECT knew that OCC is a licensed in the UK payment institution and I own / run several financial businesses with very prominent business footprints. However, the court does not get all this information, instead, it is being presented by the assertions of me committing low-level frauds, while being a 'mysterious Russian person whose whereabouts are unknown'.

Among sponsorships of Liverpool FC and dozen of other leading teams and sport stars, DC [Officer 5] could not avoid seeing on the website of my business – again, in the very first screen of the homepage – the following slide:



He could also see in the same slider on the same homepage of my business the following:



While it is unknown exactly if the cars above were the “fake cars” to which DC [Officer 5] referred and which he meant when alleged in his sworn application to the court that “I have sold on eBay fake cars for for £6,300 and £6,750” to unsuspecting victims who lost their monies to those unfortunate online frauds, I conclude by logical analysis that he meant some other “fake cars” because the cars consented above must have ‘fallen out of his attention’ when he was filing account freeze application in which I was portrayed to the judge of an English court as a ‘mysterious Russian man’ with wholly “unclear source of monies” and “with no websites”.

DC [Officer 5] and MPECT as a whole disliked very much what they have found before filing the AFO application in April 2018, examples of which findings are presented above. I

underscore that it is an **established** and admitted by MPECT fact that they knew about my major businesses when making that AFO application. At the same time, they liked very much the fact that I have inexplicably (for them) stopped to travel to the UK for 2 years, failing to attend the bank's branch when the bank requested it as a mean to verify my enquiry about my bank account where substantial monies were left by me for a prolonged period in a naïve belief that Merseyside is a safe place of the UK to keep monies at, and it was thrilling them, because they got the (virtually driving them crazy, I assume) idea that I am 'afraid' to come. But they were understanding that if the judge would know my profile, she would laugh (or, rather, get outraged) about their desire to make an '*experiment of spooking by a court application by the police*', when it was seen in the overall context of my profile and the standards of the Rule of Law which the judge would be reasonably expected to maintain. And because they disliked very much that part of known to them picture (my websites, my businesses, my licences), which part did not support the logic of the thrilling them idea of me having stopped travels to the UK for 2 years because of '*being afraid*', they have simply withheld from the court my websites, instead stating by direct words that "*there are no websites and no online presence*" of my dealings. This is not a "*white lie*" in a job application, this is an application to an English court under oath by a financial investigator of the police force making it with the intention of forfeiting £1.577 million.

The obvious bet was that the court would grant the order due to being misled and the affected person (I myself) would never turn up due to – after 2 years of inexplicable for them, mysterious absence – learning that my accounts were targeted by – what was logically expected to scare the 'damn Russian' – the UK police. Admittedly, the latter assertion is my logical conclusion, but it is not an ungrounded insinuation: the AFO application had so much misleading in the 3 pages of text that it is logically plain that the officers who were making it **after 8 months** of investigation were sure that either no one ever will oppose it (and, thus, bring up all their lies) or, if the owner of account – the '*damn Russian*', not believed to ever return – turns up, they would say that they '*got confused*'. The logic here is that one does not commit imprisonable criminal offences (whatever is the temptation of result) by wilful misleading the court without being sure it is safe. Their safety safeguard was their belief that most likely I will never turn up and, even if I would turn up, they could pretend to be confused and to 'not know' all the facts which they have withheld from the court when portraying the opposite to these facts picture.

#### **The fourth example of deliberate misleading the court – statement about me having no business footprints**

The same AFO application of 23rd April 2018 stated that I did not have business footprints:

*"There is **no clear footprint** in terms of his business operations and dealings nor in respect of the source of particular transfers of monies into his account."*

Again, later MPECT confirmed that he knew about InstaForex when filing the AFO application on 23rd April 2018. They also admitted that before filing the AFO application they had visited website of OCC and knew its business (and **it is plain in any case** from the initial PO application of 10th August 2017, made 8 months before the AFO application). That means, knowing both my businesses – [InstaForex](#) and [MegaTransfer](#) – had prominent business footprints (InstaForex has more than 3,500,000 mentions in the internet and MegaTransfer was [licensed by the FCA](#), the UK regulator) MPECT have portrayed to the court exactly the opposite picture by direct words. Not just omitted the material fact of me running large and prominent business but stated by direct words that '*they checked and there is none*', portraying me as a 'mysterious person'. Simple contact with the FCA – my having licence from which they knew since at least 8 months before applying for the AFO – could give them my full profile. Moreover, as they knew about InstaForex, they could see on

its website [list of more than 180 staff](#) with their biographies, [mention of financial licences in different jurisdictions](#) and all the sport sponsorship such as, for example:

- a. A number of professional football clubs, including a top tier one – [Liverpool FC](#) – as also [Palermo FC](#) and [Las Palmas FC](#);
- b. Two racing teams: the UK based [Dragon Racing \(Formula E\)](#) and Czech based [InstaForex Loprais Dakar Rally team](#) (the title Dakar team of InstaForex since 2010);
- c. The [Slovakian championship ice hockey club Zvolen](#);
- d. The chess world champion and grand master, Sven [Magnus Carlsen](#);
- e. The former tennis world number one and twice [Wimbledon winner Victória Azárenka](#);
- f. The 19-times world champion in biathlon, [Ole Bjorndalen](#), and [many others](#).

These business footprints **were known** to MPECT and DC [Officer 5] when he filed the initial AFO application of 23rd April 2018, as follows from his later admission of knowledge of my ownership of InstaForex, however **he stated by direct words there are no business footprints**, in order to benefit his purpose of obtaining an AFO against ‘a mysterious Russian guy mixed up in selling fake airline ticket to Nigeria for £750 and a fake car for £6,300’. Such a blatant misleading of the court under oath is plainly a bunch of imprisonable criminal offences (perjury, perverting the course of justice, corrupt exercise of police powers). But what is more important than lies of a provincial police officer of the lowest rank to the court (and the committal by him of imprisonable criminal offences), is that he is not alone in that trouble.

It should be noted that, albeit the application was filed by DC [Officer 5], it was inescapably prepared with the participation of others in MPECT, simply because a) the amounts of monies were enormous for them; b) involvement of different departments of MPECT was a pre-requisite for such kind of application (financial Investigation Units are acting in hand-in-hand cooperation with other departments of the same police force); c) the application was made under the novel legislation enacted two months before the AFO application. The latter circumstance means not that ‘novel legislation might cause confusion on the side of DC [Officer 5]’ (as there is no legislation under which a police officer can rampantly lie to an English court) but that his competence was not and could not be enough to prepare and file, acting alone, such application, which likely was **one of the first (if not the first) AFO applications in the history of the UK**: it was a product of work of the whole investigation team. And it was authorised by the signature of Detective Chief Inspector [Officer 2], who, it can be easily logically concluded, does not sign applications for such amounts of monies every month and could not avoid the knowledge of the real picture **after 8 months** of the investigation throughout which he was ought to be repeatedly briefed on it. For comparison, income from annual seizure of financial assets for the year 2018/19 was lesser than £500,000, and that is for the whole region, for the whole year. The [budget of Merseyside Police](#) is publicly available.

Just like the initial AFO application of 23rd April 2018 mirrored misleading about investment scam made in the initial PO application made 8 months earlier, that initial PO application of 10th August 2017 had ‘played with facts’ about my business footprints that were later misrepresented in the AFO application. In particular, the initial PO application of 10th August 2017 has described my business footprints in another style:

**“SHARIPOV has also been linked to a *Forex Trading Company which appears to be suffering financial difficulties.*”**

This is a representation of known to MPECT sponsorship (listed above and inevitably known from the website of InstaForex which, MPECT admitted, had known from the onset),

financial licences in a bunch of jurisdictions including two EU countries, the UK itself, 180 staff listed on the website with their photos and biographies. All that information plainly was available on the official website of the company, which MPECT could not avoid to visit when stating anything about its work, let alone such a bald and outrageous assertion of it "*having financial difficulties*", simply sucked from the thin air. In my complaint of 13th August 2019 which addressed bulk of the *ex parte* applications of MPECT including the cited above one, I have commented this interesting episode by the following words:

***“Sham police officers file sham applications to the court.”***

I can't say it better.

What is important here is that those two initial *ex parte* applications (of August 2017 and April 2018), albeit repeating the same rampant lies to two different English courts by a group of police officers, do that lying in different styles and wording and are distanced in time by 8 months. Both those circumstances are very material because they demonstrate that those lies cannot be a '*confusion*', '*misspelling*' and any other excuse which – albeit desperately – could be attempted to be used if there would be no mirroring of the same fabrications in two different, distanced in time, applications.

The inescapable interplay between the two misleading of the two different courts in the two *ex parte* applications of 10th August 2017 and 23rd April 2018 is that MPECT have rampantly misled the court in August 2017, then they have hidden themselves **for 8 months**, thought a lot, analysed the most appropriate course of action and... **decided to mislead – again** – another court with a much more draconian application, for freezing of £1.577 million. It was a wholly new application in April 2018, there was not even a word copied from the initial PO application, but it has mirrored the similar misleading, beside, of course, introducing new one: for example, the PO application of 10th August 2017 stated that "*I am connected to a Forex Trading Company*" (see the citation above – it was stated in their inherent style of rampant lying, yet the connection was stated) but the application of 23rd April 2018 'evolved' to '*inability*' to find any business footprints of me. Likewise, mention of MegaTransfer.com, which was present in the initial PO application, had disappeared in the AFO application filed 8 months later, quite obviously to facilitate the false pretences that they were confused when making the AFO application, which pretences they started right in the AFO application's text, by stating there are no websites of my businesses. They found the very sound, prominent business footprints of me and associated to those businesses websites as of August 2017, because the PO application of 10th August 2017 referred both to my payment and brokerage businesses (both licensed in the EU); it did so even with the mention of the website of my payment company. But, nevertheless, 8 months later MPECT 'lost' those business footprints from their '*knowledge*'.

Beside supposition of a brain damage, which we, of course, will not consider because nothing in what happened later demonstrates such a mental impairment on the side of MPECT (quite the opposite), the inescapable and **irresistible inference** from this is that a group of police officers of Merseyside Police which included, at the very least, rank of Detective Chief Inspector, after 8 months of '*thorough thinking what to do*' ended up by the decision to wilfully, deliberately commit imprisonable criminal offences of perjury, perverting the course of justice and improper/corrupt exercise of police powers, by way of filing another misleading application to the court, for freezing £1.577 million, which, once granted, would allow them to further forfeit those monies out of court in 30 days, by simply sending a forfeiture notice by post.

And that is a very material circumstance in the context of consideration of everything they have been doing afterwards (to put it simply – the whole Operation Kobus, an 'investigation'

into me) because inescapable outcome of that wilful and conscious committal of criminal offences of them is that those police officers have become deadly motivated to destroy – and, at the least, discredit and damage – the only witness and the victim of their committal of criminal offences – me. As per another very interesting admittance of DS [Officer 4] made during the PO hearing in October 2019, Operation Kobus had become a “*large international investigation*” **right after** the AFO, albeit they knew I am an international businessman since before AFO, as they admitted, and as is plain from the text of the initial PO application made in August 2017 which referred to the website of international payment company of me. The fact that the AFO application itself was for £1.577 million, was not enough for Operation Kobus to qualify for being a “*large international investigation*”, but once MPECT were caught up in embarrassing situation of committal of criminal offences by the whole team, virtually with smoking guns at the hands, Operation Kobus instantly had become a “large, complex international investigation of big importance”. Of big importance **for them** – as they always forget to add.

And from the above it is clear why it is so important for them: before the initial AFO it was just a game; provincial police officers played with their power of Financial Investigation Unit, the power of police officers who, inherently, cause big stress to anyone by their contact or enquiry, let alone a court application. They were playing because they were thinking they have an incredible power so “*why bother?*”. It was all the more logical and attractive because that ‘damn Russian’ whose accounts they attacked by misleading application (me) appeared to be afraid to come to the UK for 2 years. What can happen to people possessing the incredible power of the state when they ‘*misconduct a bit*’ against a ‘*spooked Russian guy*’ who even could not turn up at the bank branch when a bank officer asked him to? They did not know that ‘*the damn Russian*’ is one of those 1 out of 150 in the population affected by a serious autoimmune disease which at the age of 29 had knocked him out from travelling for 2 years. So after 8 months of hiding themselves (since the first PO application of August 2017), they have decided to ‘*play a bit*’ with their powers. The moment when, after obtaining AFO, few days later, they were contacted by my staff with the question what on earth is going on, was the moment when a group of police officers have realized that, due to being too engaged in ‘*playing with muscles by the state’s power*’ they were unexpectedly caught up in something they could not be caught up in: a group committal of criminal offences.

Going back to the misleading about business footprints which I refer to in the current section of my analysis. Similarly with the websites, they did not like what they found as a result of their research, but because they wanted to get the order – they ‘*just got it*’, by a fabrication. The ‘integrity’ of these officers is of such level that they consider it as a sufficient fulfilling of their positive duty of candour / honesty / fairness in *ex parte* courts applications if they simply mention the fact of the connection of me to a “Forex Trading Company”, while all the rest is portrayed in exactly the opposite to the reality format. In my complaint of 13th August 2019 I have described their conduct in routine misleading the courts by the following words:

***“When they need a court order, they just go and take it.”***

Again, I can’t say it better.

**The fifth example of deliberate misleading the court: fabricating the assertion that no information about licences was provided in the e-mail communication so as to disguise from the court the real picture.**

Four examples above were circling around the two initial *ex parte* applications. However – and surprisingly – a similar misleading, analysed below, was done by MPECT in another *ex*

*parte* application, which was made not only after my first complaint about misleading the courts had been filed but also in full understanding that I will be served by the copy of that application (which was not the case with the rest *ex parte* PO applications). This phenomenon cannot be explained by me otherwise that at some point rampant lying to the courts had become so inherent to MPECT that they simply could not stop anymore even when already knowing they are being watched. Another explanation which comes to my mind is that by that time they had already realized how successfully they ringed the whole system of safeguards against corruption and that no one ever will do anything for investigating my complaints (as of that moment PSD was '*marinating*' my complaint for 3 months with zero prospect of doing anything on it, it was wholly stonewalled). It is logical: when you know that you can do whatever you want and there will be no consequences – why not indulge yourself into another round of pleasure with rampant – but very efficient for the purposes – lying?

In the *ex parte* application of 8th July 2019 against my multi million account held with a UK brokerage (another one than those affected by the initial AFO), DC [Officer 5] stated:

*“No evidence has been provided to show that Instaforex (or any of the companies trading under that banner) are legitimate.”*

This text was written in relation to the email exchange in which DC [Officer 5] **was** provided by my staff (who contacted him aftermath AFO application) with the financial licenses held by my firms in **four different jurisdictions**, including two EU countries and two licenses issued by the Russian Central Bank for two of my Russian companies.

Three months later, when challenged on that lying, during the PO hearing on 21st October 2019 DC [Officer 5] 'justified' that misleading of the court in the previous *ex parte* application in July 2019 by saying that he "*would expect to see payrolls and bank statements, this is why he has stated so in his ex parte application for restraining a multi-million account*". It is of note that neither payrolls nor bank statements were requested by him, and the licences were provided to him in that email communication without any his request, voluntarily, together with my wide business profile which, same with licences, was withheld from the court when a new multi- million freeze application was made in July 2019. It is plain that he knew that he had been provided with **prominent evidence** of legitimacy, but nevertheless he preferred not only to disguise from the court the existence of the EU licence of my brokerage firm (which, even by itself would amount to material misleading), but even to clearly and explicitly state on top of this that "*there was no evidence of legitimacy provided*", which was a measure to avoid extra questions from the judge in his new *ex parte* application about my background, which DC [Officer 5] successfully avoided as a result of that misleading. That was a deliberate committal of perjury in a hurried attempt to obtain a new *ex parte* order for a large sum of money, so as to get a further '*veneer of credibility*', when my complaints about his and his superiors' previous criminal conduct were considered by the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC).

If such kind of excuse as the one in previous paragraph can be accepted, then with the same success he could say in an *ex parte* application that I am a murderer and then '*justify*' it later, when challenged after the *ex parte* hearing, by saying that because I am 32 years old, it is almost inevitable that at least once in my life I have killed a cockroach or a mosquito / any other insect, not to say how many animals are caused to die by meat-eating humans. All of this is, of course, very interesting and entertaining, but the inescapable question that a reasonable observer rests himself into is: **are we really speaking about the UK police and whether do these people have any brain damages?** They do not and, trust me, where they need to demonstrate very high intellect – they do (as they fight for their lives, this is what Operation Kobus is about). But they lie to the courts under oath in *ex parte* applications



time after time, even when already being on notice of my complaints on the same issue of misleading the courts, and when asked for explanation why they do so, they provide excuses which, in their absurdity, trigger the question if they are serious or it is some kind of joke, a demonstration of English humour and irony.

## **Conclusions**

Having provided the above 5 examples of irresistible committal of criminal offences and the associated logical analysis, I want to finalize few important matters below.

First, I want to underscore that what is presented above is a peak of an iceberg of the enormous evidence of the culture of routine misleading of the courts by MPECT provided in my complaints. Each and every their ex parte application to the courts is construed in a way where virtually **every single** paragraph contains misleading or a fabrication, either directly or by context of how it is placed in the application. I could never in my life imagine such a world of wilful, deliberate lies, let alone lies which are made in sworn applications under oath to the courts by the members of a law enforcement body in such a country as the UK.

## **The Code of Ethics of the UK Police**

It is all the more outrageous when the above examples of misleading are put into the full context: not only were those rampant lies to the courts were done by the operational ranks of Merseyside Police, but the management of the Force, when presented with those, stated that this is "*in line with the high standards that [we] set for [our] investigation teams*" and "*in line with the Code of Ethics of the UK Police*". This begs the question whether did the management of Merseyside Police, who in the letter of Assistant Chief Constable Ian Critchley dated 21st November 2019 had blatantly stated full consonance of the above examples of misleading with the Code of Ethics of the UK Police, ever read that fundamental for the UK policing document which in 22 pages of it contains in total more than 40 (**fourty**) mentions of such words as "fairness", "impartiality", "integrity" and "honesty".

## **The approach of the management of Merseyside Police**

I have already understood, from the official legal position of Merseyside Police in the High Court proceedings initiated by me on the issue of stonewalling of my complaints by the corrupt '*anti-corruption department*' of Merseyside Police, that they do not consider as their duty such things as impartiality and fairness: they hired using available to them public funding a Queen's Counsel to persuade the court that biases arising from own criminal conduct are acceptable for the investigators, which I consider to be an admission of the biases and malicious prejudice against me (otherwise why argue with the need to recuse officers with biases?). But it is still unclear to me if they also do not consider as their duty maintaining of their integrity and demonstrating honesty to the public. Based on the fact that the above examples were referred to by the Assistant Chief Constable of the Force as being fully "*in line with the high standards which he sets for his investigation teams*", by logical analysis I slowly conclude that honesty and integrity are also not considered by the management of Merseyside Police as the duty of their Force to the public, at least in relation to those members of the public whom they choose to '*exclude*' from being dealt with in accordance with the Code of Ethics of the UK Police. This, of course, would mean that those unlucky ones whom they decide to '*exclude*', are being chosen by themselves in accordance with their personal preferences and, when there would be the case – malice. "*Do not mess with the UK Police if you do not want the power of the UK state being applied against you with personal malice of our officers*" – this is the message which I read from the position of the management of Merseyside Police who have fully endorsed the explicitly criminal conduct of the members of their Force irresistible evidence of which I have provided to them.

## Doing the right thing?

But one question remains unanswered: why would need the people who, assumable, do the right thing and believe they do the right thing, lie so much under oath when dealing with the courts and why would those lies (or, at the very least, serious possibility of existence of those) be endorsed, covered up, rejected for 8 months to be even investigated by the Force? It appears to me that, allowing the malicious approach to persist, the management of Merseyside Police are aware they are doing the wrong thing and are wilfully opposing themselves to the public interest.

Doing the wrong thing and opposing to the public interest is not in line with the Code of Ethics and blatantly saying that it is, when endorsing malice and serious corruption – as was done by the management of Merseyside Police – does not fix that, it only makes it worse.

## Time for changes

As long as this situation is left unaddressed by the appropriate overseeing authorities and safeguards of the UK' system of justice, it would plainly mean that any police officer in the country can come to any court and tell any rampant lies: *"It does not matter, nothing does matter; there are no rules, because we are the UK Police and we can do anything just because we want. The Code of Ethics is just an abstract declaration, no one takes it seriously farther than pathetic references to it when blatantly doing exactly the opposite, did you still not understand that?"* – say, in my opinion, by their actions, to the public the management of Merseyside Police.

The answer to that question is that I did understand that, in the isolated case of the management of Merseyside Police. But did the public of the UK get that understanding about practices of Merseyside Police?

If the answer is "yes" and it is considered as normal, then there is a need in certain changes in the Code of Ethics of the UK Police. If the answer is "no" or if that is not considered to be normal, then there is a need in certain changes in the personnel occupying the three highest positions of Merseyside Police. **They may think they own their office, but I do believe they merely serve it**, and it has come the time for being dismissed from their duties to the public which, it appears to me, they have deliberately and wilfully failed, as is plain from the fact that most critical part of those duties is not even recognized by them and / or 'exceptionally dis-applied'.

I do not have the power of the state but it so happened that I have a common sense and my common sense says to me that the latter scenario – dismissal of the management of the Force – is the one which is to persist, from the standpoint of the public interest.

## Understanding the provided evidence of serious corruption

The importance and significance of the examples of irresistible evidence of serious corruption in Merseyside Police presented above is not in that a group of police officers have committed imprisonable criminal offences. I do believe that they did and, even when taken at the highest, that would certainly not be the *'breaking news of the century'* – however drastic are the circumstances such as involvement of high operational ranks, subsequent orchestration of destroying of a regulated by the FCA financial business and a fabrication of the criminal investigation, all aimed to disguise own criminal conduct of the police officers united in a malicious plot to disguise their own criminal offences. The significance of the above evidence is in that, after reviewing this *"peak of an iceberg"* and all the underlying

'iceberg' of the rest evidence, the management of Merseyside Police have fully and explicitly, **by direct text in the official response** and further upholding that position despite of my repeated challenges, endorsed this serious corruption, effectively stating that there is no even a question of integrity of the involved officers as per the standards of Merseyside Police, no reasons even to consider possibility of serious concerns and risks for the public interest and disrepute for policing. They have went so far as stating that they are fully satisfied with what they have seen and there is no need in any changes, in the face of a very simple proposal to move their precious Operation Kobus – to which now the whole Force is clinging as sinking in water cats, by all their claws – to another Force (one of 42 police forces of the country), whose integrity and biases could not be questioned by me so soundly as it is the case with Merseyside Police. The rejection of that simple proposal draws another irresistible inference that Operation Kobus – investigation into me – is nothing but a leverage against my complaints which have highlighted witnessing of something I was not permitted to highlight – the fully tolerable, wilful and deliberate criminal conduct of the whole layer of police officers of Merseyside Police, now fully endorsed by the management of that Force.

I do faithfully reject to believe that this is the UK's standard of justice and the Rule of Law, but it appears to me Merseyside Police have '*invented*' their own standard of the Rule of Law and of '*integrity*' which is far below the Rule of Law for which the UK and its business climate are recognized internationally.

Sincerely yours, Ildar Sharipov – 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2020