

WHY THE CORRESPONDENCE PASSING BETWEEN MARK SEXTON AND DETECTIVE INSPECTOR AKSHAY CHIBBER IN JANUARY 2022 IS SO VERY IMPORTANT

***A forensic examination of the contemporaneous
correspondence concerning Metropolitan Police crime
report 6029679/21***

Introduction

Sometimes the importance of a document becomes apparent only when it is read alongside what came before it.

The email sent by Detective Inspector Akshay Chibber to Mark Sexton on 12 January 2022 is such a document.

Read alone, it records a Metropolitan Police position concerning crime report 6029679/21.

Read together with the email to which Chibber was responding, it reveals considerably more.

The exchange shows that one of the original complainants was actively seeking to arrange for further witnesses and evidence to be received by the Metropolitan Police.

It shows what the Commissioner's Office said in response.

It records that the allegation had been closed and would not be investigated further.

It records an apparently broader proposition concerning allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programmes.

And it records that any further emails sent to the Commissioner's Office about the matter would be:

“read and logged, but not responded to.”

Most importantly, these are not later recollections. They are contemporaneous communications.

This paper examines exactly what they say.

1. What Mark Sexton was actually asking the police to do

The starting point is Mark Sexton's email of 10 January 2022.

Its substance matters.

Sexton addressed Detective Chief Superintendent Treena Fleming and Detective Inspector Akshay Chibber concerning 6029679/21.

He stated that he had been advised that they were the senior investigators into the criminal complaint.

He then explained that experts were making contact with the Metropolitan Police:

“A number of renowned experts from around the world are making contact with The Metropolitan Police on a daily basis.”

He identified them as including:

“Doctors, professors, virologists, immunologist, scientists, data experts and psychiatrists”.

Sexton then became more specific.

He said UK doctors and professors wished to attend the Metropolitan Police:

“in person to provide their first accounts.”

He described the proposed evidence as relating to alleged serious injury, harm and death associated with vaccines.

Whatever view might ultimately have been taken of that evidence, the nature of Sexton's request is unmistakable.

He concluded:

“Can you please arrange an urgent appointment/meeting for us to attend to allow the initial accounts to be obtained?”

That is important.

Sexton was not merely asking for an update. He was expressly asking the Metropolitan Police to facilitate the provision of further accounts and evidence in support of an existing crime report.

That is the request to which the Commissioner's Office responded.

2. The response from the Commissioner's Office

At 8:35pm on 12 January 2022, Detective Inspector Akshay Chibber replied.

His email begins:

“Thank you for your email, received in the Commissioner's office.”

He then states:

“I'm afraid this office is not directly involved in local investigations and certainly has no bearing into the above mentioned crime report.”

That establishes the institutional setting. The email had reached the Commissioner's Office.

Chibber then addressed the status of the allegation:

“I can see that your allegation was recorded and initially assessed through the relevant office at the Central West Command Unit.”

Then:

“It has subsequently been closed and will not be investigated any further.”

But what follows is considerably more important.

3. What happened to Sexton's request to provide further evidence?

Sexton's request was explicit.

Doctors and professors wished to attend.

He wanted an appointment.

He wanted their initial accounts obtained.

Chibber's response does not arrange that appointment.

It does not ask what evidence the proposed witnesses possessed.

It does not ask for their identities.

It does not direct Sexton to the officer dealing with the crime report for the evidence to be assessed.

It does not explain a mechanism by which their accounts could nevertheless be submitted.

Instead:

“It has subsequently been closed and will not be investigated any further.”

The public should see the two propositions beside one another:

10 January - Sexton

“Can you please arrange an urgent appointment/meeting for us to attend to allow the initial accounts to be obtained?”

12 January - Commissioner's Office

“It has subsequently been closed and will not be investigated any further.”

The correspondence contains no assessment of the proposed new accounts.

It contains no explanation of their evidential value.

The request to have those accounts obtained is simply not substantively addressed.

That is the first reason this exchange is important.

4. The proposition which goes considerably further

Chibber did not stop at saying that this particular crime report had been closed.

He wrote:

“I'm afraid allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programs are not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence.”

The wording deserves careful attention.

It does not say:

The evidence submitted in CRN 6029679/21 does not establish a criminal offence.

It does not say:

These particular allegations have been assessed and do not meet the threshold for investigation.

It does not say:

The conduct alleged falls outside the criminal law.

Instead, the proposition is expressed by reference to the subject matter of the allegations:

“allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programs”

and says those allegations are:

“not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence.”

This is considerably more broad than an evidential assessment of CRN 6029679/21.

5. If not the Metropolitan Police, then who?

That wording creates an elementary but important question.

If an allegation of criminal offending concerns the Government's Covid regulations or vaccine programmes, why would its governmental subject matter determine whether it is a matter for police investigation?

More simply:

If such an allegation was ***“not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence”***, which police force was supposed to investigate it?

The email does not say.

Instead, Chibber offered two alternatives.

Where Sexton possessed:

“specific information, and medical evidence”

concerning national vaccine delivery, Chibber advised him to:

“seek appropriate legal advice on the best means to progress any litigation you seek to bring against the government”

or:

“contact your local MP.”

Again, the contrast should be seen plainly.

Sexton was seeking to provide evidence in support of an allegation of criminal offending.

The alternatives offered by the Commissioner's Office were civil/legal proceedings against Government or political representation through an MP.

The correspondence itself does not explain why those routes were considered the appropriate response to the proposed further evidence.

6. “Read and logged, but not responded to”

Chibber's concluding instruction is equally significant:

“Further emails into the Commissioner's office on this matter, will be read and logged, but not responded to.”

Every part of that sentence matters.

Further communications would still be:

Read and logged, but they would not be responded to.

That creates an obvious question concerning what would happen if a subsequent communication contained precisely the additional evidence Sexton had been attempting to provide.

Would it merely be logged?

Would its evidential content be assessed?

Would it be added to CRN 6029679/21?

Would it be forwarded to CID?

Would it be treated as intelligence?

Would it be capable of causing the decision to be reconsidered?

The email does not say.

Those questions arise from the Metropolitan Police's own words.

7. Why the later national evidence makes that sentence particularly important

The significance of **“read and logged, but not responded to”** becomes greater when viewed against material subsequently disclosed concerning the national policing response to Covid/vaccine-related reports.

Chibber's email does not establish that his instruction was part of the subsequently disclosed national **“guidance to not record”**.

Nor does it establish that “logged” meant “recorded as intelligence”.

Those propositions should not be asserted without evidence.

But the functional similarity now warrants investigation.

The later national documentary record reveals an approach under which attempted reports were being considered nationally, intelligence structures were engaged, and correspondence subsequently recorded:

“it would appear that the guidance to not record has been a success as only one additional report has been created.”

The question therefore is:

Did Chibber's 12 January response represent an MPS-specific decision, or was it an early manifestation of a

wider national policing approach towards Covid/vaccine-related criminal allegations?

That question is made more important by the date.

8. 12 January 2022

Chibber's email was sent on 12 January 2022.

That date is now particularly significant in the wider documentary chronology.

On that same date, CRN 6029679/21 was being considered at national policing level.

The national record stated that:

“the final assessment should be complete next week when a clearer steer can be communicated.”

The resulting Operation Talla action was to share the peer-review assessment concerning the MPS crime report with all chiefs.

That produces an exceptionally important juxtaposition.

At national level, the **“final assessment”** was apparently still to be completed and a **“clearer steer”** was expected thereafter.

But that evening, from the Commissioner's Office, Sexton was told:

“It has subsequently been closed and will not be investigated any further.”

And, more broadly:

“allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programs are not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence.”

The question almost asks itself:

If the national “*final assessment*” had not yet been completed and the “***clearer steer***” was still to come, what was the source of the categorical policing position communicated by the Commissioner's Office on the evening of 12 January?

That question requires a documentary answer.

9. A tension within Chibber's own response

There is another feature which should not be overlooked.

Chibber says:

“this office is not directly involved in local investigations and certainly has no bearing into the above mentioned crime report.”

Immediately afterwards however, he communicates definitive propositions concerning:

the status of that crime report;

whether it would be investigated further;

and:

whether allegations concerning Government Covid regulations and vaccine programmes were matters for MPS criminal investigation.

That produces two distinct provenance questions.

From where did Chibber obtain the information that CRN 6029679/21 had been closed and would not be investigated further?

And:

From where did he obtain the broader proposition concerning allegations against Government Covid regulations and vaccine programmes?

They need not necessarily have had the same source.

The records should establish whether or not they did.

10. Chibber's position matters

The email was not signed by a generic correspondence officer.

It was signed:

“Akshay Chibber

Detective Inspector

Staff Officer to Commissioner Cressida Dick”

That does not, by itself, establish that Commissioner Cressida Dick personally approved, formulated or even knew of the wording, but it does establish something important: This was a communication from the Commissioner's Office, sent by the Detective Inspector serving as Staff Officer to the Commissioner.

The provenance of the position communicated by Chibber therefore matters.

Who briefed him?

What records did he consult?

Was the broader proposition his own formulation?

Was it an MPS position?

Was it supplied through Central West?

Was it derived from Operation Talla?

Was it derived from NPCC/NPoCC material?

Was there already a national policing position in existence?

These questions should be capable of documentary resolution.

11. The exchange viewed as a whole

Strip the correspondence back to its essentials.

Sexton says:

We have additional experts.

They wish to attend the police.

They wish to provide first accounts.

Please arrange for those accounts to be obtained.

The Commissioner's Office replies:

The allegation has been closed.

It will not be investigated further.

Allegations against Government Covid regulations and vaccine programmes are not matters for the MPS to investigate as allegations of criminal offending.

Take specific information and medical evidence towards litigation or an MP.

Further emails will be read and logged, but not answered.

That is what the correspondence records. Nothing needs to be added to it.

12. The questions the Metropolitan Police should now answer

The exchange creates a limited number of very precise questions:

1. Why was Sexton's express request for further witness accounts to be obtained not substantively addressed?
2. What would have happened if further correspondence contained material evidence relevant to CRN 6029679/21 after Chibber had said that emails would be ***“read and logged, but not responded to”***?
3. What did ***“logged”*** mean operationally?
4. Where would those logs have been held?
5. Would relevant information have been attached to the crime report, assessed as evidence, recorded as intelligence, or dealt with in some other way?
6. What was the legal or policing basis for the statement that allegations against Government Covid regulations and vaccine programmes were ***“not a matter for the Met police to investigate as allegation of a criminal offence”***?

7. Was that proposition specific to CRN 6029679/21, or did it describe a broader policing position?
8. If it was specific to CRN 6029679/21, why was it expressed categorically by reference to allegations concerning Government regulations and vaccine programmes generally?
9. If it represented a broader position, who formulated and authorised that position?
10. If such allegations were outside the MPS criminal-investigation function, which police body had jurisdiction to receive and investigate them?
11. What was the source of Chibber's information?

And critically:

12. Did the position communicated from the Commissioner's Office on 12 January have any relationship to the national policing approach subsequently evidenced through Operation Talla, NPCC/NPoCC, the anticipated **“clearer steer”**, Police Scotland's NPCC-derived directive, or the later-described **“guidance to not record”**?

These questions do not depend upon accepting anybody's theory. They arise from the documents themselves.

CONCLUSION - WHY THIS EXCHANGE MATTERS

The importance of the January 2022 Sexton - Chibber correspondence lies not only in what Detective Inspector Chibber said.

It lies in what he was responding to.

One of the complainants was seeking to place further witnesses and evidence before the Metropolitan Police.

He expressly asked for an appointment so that their initial accounts could be obtained.

Two days later, the Commissioner's Office told him that the allegation had been closed and would not be investigated further.

It did not substantively engage with the request to obtain those accounts.

It instead communicated the broader proposition that allegations against the Government's Covid regulations and vaccine programmes were not matters for the Metropolitan Police to investigate as allegations of criminal offending.

Specific information and medical evidence were redirected towards litigation or an MP.

Further emails would be:

“read and logged, but not responded to.”

And all of this occurred on 12 January 2022 - the same date on which the wider national policing structure was considering the MPS crime report, with its **“final assessment”** apparently still awaited and a **“clearer steer”** expected to follow.

That chronology does not prove the source of Chibber's position. It makes discovering that source imperative.

The central question is therefore:

What policing position was operating within the Commissioner's Office on 12 January 2022; who or what supplied it; and was it connected to the national approach towards Covid/vaccine-related criminal allegations which the subsequently disclosed Operation Talla, NPCC/NPoCC and Police Scotland records have begun to reveal?

The correspondence cannot answer that question, but it establishes why the question must now be answered.

Invite you to read the relevant correspondence for yourself, which is accessible via this link:

https://ethicalapproach.co.uk/chibber_email_12012022_redacted.pdf

Ian Clayton

30 September 2026