

Why the Letter Authored by Tor Garnett (Former Detective Superintendent at the Metropolitan Police Service) Dated 21 February 2022 Cannot Legitimately Justify the Closure of CRN 6029679/21

A forensic analysis

By Ian Clayton, for Ethical Approach UK

Date: 9 December 2025

1. Introduction

On 21 February 2022, then Detective Superintendent Tor Garnett wrote to the complainants in relation to CRN 6029679/21, informing them that the Metropolitan Police Service had decided not to investigate allegations concerning potential criminal conduct connected to the COVID-19 vaccine programme.

This report explains, clearly and without speculation, why the reasoning set out in that letter cannot be regarded as a lawful, logical, or procedurally valid justification for closing the crime.

The issue here is not one of opinion, but of investigative standards, legal obligations, and basic evidential logic.

For information, the relevant letter can be accessed via this link:

https://ethicalapproach.co.uk/tor_garnett_correspondence_21022022.jpg

2. The Letter's Core Problem:

It Relies on Incorrect and Irrelevant Premises

Detective Superintendent Garnett framed the closure decision by asserting:

- that vaccines had been “approved” by international regulators,

- that their widespread use in many countries demonstrated safety, and
- that therefore “no criminal offences are apparent”.

This reasoning fails for three fundamental reasons:

2.1 It is factually incorrect

By 21 February 2022, no COVID-19 vaccine had full UK approval.

All were either:

Temporarily Authorised under Regulation 174, or
Conditionally Authorised, which is not an equivalent to full approval.

The MHRA itself makes this distinction clear.

The letter relies on an incorrect premise that approval existed when it actually did not.

2.2 Regulatory authorisation does not extinguish potential criminality

Even if full approval had existed, it would still be irrelevant to allegations of:

- gross negligent manslaughter,
- misconduct in public office,
- suppression of safety data, or
- fraud.

Approval (which in this instance, in any event, did not exist) does not provide immunity from criminal investigation.

Products can be approved while wrongdoing occurs around how they are designed, manufactured, promoted, evaluated, or implemented etc.

2.3 International usage does not provide legal evidence

Stating that “over 100 countries” used the vaccines adds nothing to the legal question:

did the evidence supplied disclose reasonable grounds to suspect a criminal offence?

Policing decisions cannot lawfully be based on global adoption or usage patterns.

3. The Decision Fails to Meet Basic Legal Investigative Standards

3.1 The wrong evidential test was applied

The letter states that there was “not sufficient evidence” to pursue an investigation.

This is the wrong legal standard.

The correct threshold to open or continue an investigation is:

Reasonable grounds to suspect that an offence may have been committed.

The police do not need “sufficient evidence to prosecute” before investigating.

Requiring near-prosecution standard evidence before even beginning inquiries inverts the law and makes serious allegations impossible to investigate.

3.2 No analysis of the actual submitted evidence

The letter provides:

- no reference to what evidence was reviewed,
- no comment on engagement with witness statements,
- no discussion of expert materials,
- no legal reasoning against each alleged offence.

It states a conclusion without demonstrating any investigative process.

In public law terms, a conclusion without reasons is not a lawful decision.

4. National Crime Recording Standards Were Not Followed

The letter explains that the matter was recorded only as an “incident” under NSIR rules, not as a crime.

Under Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR), police must record a crime when:

a victim or third party reports conduct that, on the balance of probability, amounts to a crime,

and there is no credible evidence to the contrary at the time of reporting.

The allegations made in CRN 6029679/21 clearly described conduct that, if true, would amount to serious criminal offences.

There was no “credible evidence to the contrary” presented in the Garnett letter.

Therefore, the refusal to record the matter as a crime appears to breach the HOCR.

5. Incompatibility with the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA)

CPIA requires the police to:

- begin an investigation when a crime is reported;
- pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry;
- retain and examine submitted material;
- act impartially and objectively.

None of these statutory duties can be satisfied when:

- no investigation is opened (However, ‘no investigation being opened’ was not the case in the instance of this CRN, as is already clearly established evidentially)
- no crime is recorded,

- and the matter is disposed of by relying on regulatory assumptions rather than evidential analysis.

One cannot lawfully satisfy CPIA duties by avoiding investigation altogether.

6. The Letter Treats the Matter as a Policy Question, Not a Criminal Allegation

Perhaps the most striking flaw in the letter is that it reads as though the police believed they were being asked to comment on vaccine policy rather than investigate potential criminal conduct.

The repeated emphasis on:

- regulatory agencies,
- international use,
- and vaccine safety assessments

suggests the complaint was reframed through a policy lens, rather than being evaluated as a criminal allegation.

Criminal allegations must be addressed through evidence and not policy reassurance.

7. Conclusion:

The Closure Rationale Cannot Stand

After analysing the reasoning provided by DS Garnett as indicated in her 21 February 2022 letter, it is clear that:

- the factual foundation of the decision is wrong,
- the legal standards applied are incorrect,
- essential investigative obligations appear to have been bypassed,
- statutory CPIA duties were not met,
- crime-recording rules were misapplied,
- and the explanation given does not amount to lawful, reasoned decision-making.

Therefore:

The letter of 21 February 2022 cannot be accepted as a valid explanation for the closure of CRN 6029679/21.

It does not show that the police conducted an adequate investigation, applied the right legal tests, or followed statutory obligations.

It demonstrates only that the matter was closed based on assumptions, rather than on evidence.

For these reasons, the decision requires full reconsideration and the public is entitled to a proper, lawful and full investigative process.