

TOR'S LETTER AND THE SEVEN MISSING MODULES

What exactly did the Metropolitan Police close on 21 February 2022?

On 21 February 2022, Detective Superintendent Tor Garnett, Head of CID for the Metropolitan Police Central West BCU, wrote to Mark Sexton concerning CRN 6029679/21.

The letter is important not merely for what it says.

It is important for what it does not say.

The allegations being advanced to the Metropolitan Police were considerably wider than one allegation concerning the safety of Covid-19 vaccines. They were presented as a case comprising multiple, distinct but potentially interrelated areas of alleged criminality.

There were, in substance, eight modules, but Garnett's closure letter expressly addresses only one of them.

That creates a straightforward evidential question:

What happened to the other seven?

The eight modules

The case presented to police encompassed allegations concerning:

Module 1 - The origin of the pathogen - allegations concerning whether SARS-CoV-2 was man-made.

Module 2 - UK knowledge, involvement and alleged concealment - allegations concerning UK involvement in, knowledge of, or subsequent concealment relating to the matters within Module 1.

Module 3 - Testing - allegations concerning the reliability and use of Covid testing.

Module 4 - Psychological measures - allegations concerning the deliberate use of behavioural and psychological techniques to engender fear, including allegations as to their potential criminal significance.

Module 5 - Suppression of therapeutics - allegations concerning the treatment and availability of therapeutics including ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine.

Module 6 - Iatrogenic harm - allegations concerning medical interventions and practices, including Remdesivir, DNACPR decisions, mechanical ventilation and Midazolam.

Module 7 - Non-pharmaceutical interventions - allegations concerning masking, lockdowns and associated measures and harms.

Module 8 - Vaccination - allegations concerning the vaccine rollout, adverse-event signals, the response to those signals and alleged subsequent concealment.

These were not eight different descriptions of the same allegation. They represented materially different factual subject areas capable of requiring different evidence, different witnesses and potentially different legal analysis.

What Tor Garnett's letter actually addressed

Now compare those eight modules with the letter dated 21 February 2022.

Its subject heading was:

“Allegations relating to the suppression of information regarding the severity of health implications from the Covid 19 vaccine by persons in parliament and other organisations.”

The body of the letter then concentrated upon vaccines.

It referred to their approval by the World Health Organisation, European Medicines Agency and MHRA;

clinical trials; safety approval processes; and their use internationally.

It then characterised the allegations in these terms:

“The allegations you have made suggest that a number of people are responsible for suppressing information regarding the severity of health implications from the COVID 19 vaccines.”

The conclusion followed:

“The allegations you have made out have no basis in the available evidence. It is clear that there are no criminal offences apparent.”

And consequently:

“As a result, the MPS does not consider that there is sufficient evidence to pursue an investigation regarding the offences alleged. Therefore no further action will be taken by the MPS in relation to this matter.”

Read the letter carefully.

It plainly addresses Module 8: vaccination. But where, within that letter, are Modules 1 to 7?

Seven modules apparently absent from the reasoning

The letter does not, on its face, explain the Metropolitan Police assessment of:

- the alleged origin of the pathogen;
- alleged UK knowledge, involvement or concealment concerning its origin;
- the reliability and use of testing;
- the alleged use of psychological techniques to create fear;
- the alleged suppression of therapeutics;
- alleged iatrogenic harm arising from treatment practices;
or
- the alleged harms and criminal implications associated with non-pharmaceutical interventions.

That observation requires considerable precision.

The absence of those matters from the closure letter does not, by itself, prove that the Metropolitan Police failed to consider them.

- There may be documents elsewhere recording such consideration.
- There may have been separate assessments.
- There may have been decisions which Garnett's letter simply did not articulate.

That is precisely the problem.

Where are they?

If seven further modules of allegations and supporting evidence were placed before the Metropolitan Police, a closure letter concentrating upon vaccination cannot itself establish how those seven modules were assessed or disposed of.

The evidential question

The issue therefore becomes documentary rather than rhetorical.

For each of Modules 1 to 7, the Metropolitan Police should be capable of identifying:

- what allegation it understood had been made;
- what evidence it received;
- who examined that evidence;
- what investigative assessment was undertaken;
- what potential offences were considered;
- what conclusion was reached;
- who reached it;
- when it was reached;
- and where the reasoning was recorded.

If those records exist, they should resolve the issue.

If they do not exist, a substantially more serious question arises:

Upon what documented assessment were seven separate components of the case disposed of?

There is another possibility which equally requires an answer.

If the Metropolitan Police treated the entire eight-module case as capable of being disposed of merely by determining that there was insufficient evidence concerning vaccine safety, the documentary record should demonstrate why that reasoning was considered capable of determining allegations concerning seven materially different subject areas.

“No criminal offences apparent”

This makes one sentence in Garnett's letter particularly important:

“It is clear that there are no criminal offences apparent.”

- Clear from what?
- And in relation to which allegations?

If that conclusion concerned only the vaccine allegations described immediately before it, the position of Modules 1 to 7 remains to be identified.

If it was intended to dispose of all eight modules, the MPS should be capable of producing the assessment demonstrating how each materially distinct category was considered before that conclusion was reached.

Either way, the primary documents matter.

The simple question

The issue can ultimately be reduced to one question which any member of the public can understand.

- Eight modules were advanced.
- Tor Garnett's closure letter expressly addresses the vaccine allegations.

Where is the documented Metropolitan Police assessment of the other seven?

- There is no need to speculate about the answer.
- There is no need to attribute motive.
- There is no need to construct an explanation on behalf of the Metropolitan Police.

The records either exist or they do not.

If they exist, they should now be produced.

If they do not, the Metropolitan Police should explain how the entirety of the allegations represented by CRN 6029679/21 could properly have been brought to an end without them.

That is why Tor's letter and the seven modules it does not address now require considerably closer examination.

Ian Clayton

6 October 2026