

The Sexton Chronology Measured Against the Police Handling Record

A Forensic Reconstruction of CRN 6029679/21

"Chronology is often the most objective witness. It records what occurred before opinion attempts to explain it"

Methodology

This paper reconstructs the chronology of Metropolitan Police Crime Reference Number 6029679/21 by comparing two independent evidential sources.

The first is the chronology as experienced and contemporaneously understood by former police constable Mark Sexton, one of the four original complainants.

The second is the documentary record subsequently disclosed by public authorities, including the Metropolitan Police Service, the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC), Operation Talla documentation, Subject Access disclosures, Freedom of Information responses and related official records.

Where those sources converge, confidence in the chronology is strengthened.

Where they diverge, the divergence is identified and examined.

This paper seeks to reconstruct, as accurately as possible, what occurred between the reporting of the complaint on 20 December 2021 and the subsequent closure of the matter and to compare the chronology experienced by one of the complainants with the documentary record generated by the police themselves.

The chronology should therefore be read as an evidence-led reconstruction rather than an advocacy document.

Introduction

On 20 December 2021, four individuals attended Hammersmith Police Station to report allegations of serious criminal offending connected with the United Kingdom's Covid-19 response.

One of those individuals was Mark Sexton, a former police constable.

The allegations were serious. They included suspected gross negligence manslaughter, misconduct in public office and associated criminal offences.

The Metropolitan Police accepted the complaint and created Crime Reference Number 6029679/21.

Over the following weeks the complainants submitted an extensive body of evidential material.

- Witness statements.
- Scientific reports.
- Medical evidence.
- Legal submissions.
- Expert opinion.
- Additional documentary material.

The complainants understood that the Metropolitan Police were considering that evidence.

In February 2022 they were informed that there would be no criminal investigation.

For many observers, that appeared to be the end of the matter. However, it was not.

Over the years which followed, Subject Access disclosures, Freedom of Information responses, internal police correspondence, Operation Talla documentation and national policing records gradually revealed a far more complex chronology than had previously been understood.

That chronology now deserves careful reconstruction. Not because it necessarily proves wrongdoing, but because

confidence in policing depends upon public understanding of how serious criminal allegations are handled.

Why Mark Sexton's Perspective Matters

This chronology is presented through the perspective of Mark Sexton for one important reason - Unlike many complainants, Mark Sexton previously served as a police constable.

He therefore viewed events not simply as a member of the public, but as someone familiar with police procedures, crime recording, investigative practice and the ordinary progression of criminal complaints.

That does not render his interpretation automatically correct. Neither does it make it infallible. It does, however, provide an informed contemporary perspective against which the documentary record can now be measured.

The significance of this paper lies not in accepting either perspective without question. Its significance lies in comparing both.

The Initial Report

On 20 December 2021 the four complainants attended Hammersmith Police Station carrying documentary evidence.

The Metropolitan Police handling record confirms their attendance.

It records memory devices containing evidential material together with allegations relating to criminal conduct.

A Crime Reference Number was created.

From the perspective of an experienced former police officer, these initial actions would ordinarily indicate that a complaint had progressed beyond simple reception.

The creation of a crime reference number, together with subsequent handling entries, naturally suggested that the matter had entered an investigative pathway.

Nothing occurring during those earliest stages suggested that the complaint would immediately be dismissed.

Indeed, the opposite impression emerged.

The Documentary Record Begins to Develop

The Metropolitan Police handling record demonstrates that the complaint did not simply disappear after it had been reported.

- The report was screened.
- Responsibility passed through detective supervision.
- CID became involved.
- Investigating Officers were allocated.
- Detective Constable Hussey ultimately became Officer in Charge of the Case.

These developments occurred and are evidenced within the Metropolitan Police's own data systems.

They are matters of documentary record.

From Mark Sexton's perspective, these developments were entirely consistent with an allegation progressing through recognised investigative processes.

The First Point of Divergence

An early supervisory entry records the opinion that the matter appeared to constitute protest activity rather than a legitimate allegation of crime.

That observation is important and equally important is what occurred afterwards.

Despite that opinion, the report remained within the Metropolitan Police handling process.

- It was screened into further handling.

- CID involvement continued.
- Detective supervision remained.

The chronology therefore immediately presents two competing narratives.

- One suggesting that the matter resembled protest activity.
- The other demonstrating continued investigative management.

Both narratives exist within the Metropolitan Police's own data records.

Evidence Continues to Arrive

During the weeks which followed, further evidential material continued to be submitted.

The complainants did not simply lodge a complaint and await a response. They continued providing additional evidential documentation.

- Scientific evidence expanded.
- Witness material increased.
- Legal submissions developed.
- The evidential picture was evolving.

From the complainants' perspective there was every reason to believe that this material was being received for genuine consideration.

Nothing suggested that further evidence had become irrelevant.

National Attention

During January 2022 the chronology expands beyond the Metropolitan Police.

- Chief Constables throughout the nation and beyond discussed the existence of the Metropolitan Police crime report.
- Operation Talla command became involved.
- National coordination was underway.
- Information concerning the Metropolitan Police assessment was to be shared nationally.

The complaint had therefore become more than a local crime report. It had entered the national policing environment.

That fact alone demonstrates the significance attributed to the complaint within policing structures at the time.

Legal Services

One of the most striking features of the chronology is the subsequent involvement of the Metropolitan Police Directorate of Legal Services.

Internal correspondence demonstrates that Legal Services became involved in reviewing and approving the proposed response to the complainants.

This represents an important development.

Routine complaints rarely require legal scrutiny at that level.

Whether such involvement ultimately supports or undermines confidence in the handling of the complaint is a matter for individual readers to consider. Its existence, however, forms part of the chronology.

Later Documentary Disclosures

Years after the complaint had been closed, additional disclosures fundamentally altered public understanding of the chronology.

- Subject Access material revealed continued internal handling.
- Freedom of Information responses disclosed national communications.

- NPCC internal correspondence revealed discussion concerning guidance affecting the recording of further reports.
- Internal emails referred to the apparent success of that guidance.

The documentary picture therefore continued to evolve long after the complainants had been informed that the matter was effectively concluded.

This is an unusual feature of the chronology.

The Williams Review as an Independent Benchmark

In June 2018 Professor Sir Norman Williams published his independent review into investigations of suspected gross negligence manslaughter in healthcare.

The review was not commissioned to encourage prosecutions. Its objective was to improve consistency, fairness and public confidence in investigative decision-making.

The Review repeatedly emphasised several principles.

- Early specialist investigation.
- Appropriate Senior Investigating Officer oversight.
- Early expert opinion.

- Consideration of systemic and human factors.
- Effective liaison between police, prosecutors and healthcare regulators.
- Transparent, evidence-led decision-making.

Those principles provide an objective benchmark against which the chronology of CRN 6029679/21 can be considered.

This paper does not seek to determine whether those principles were satisfied. It simply observes that they exist and provides readers with the chronology necessary to make their own assessment of what the evidence suggests.

The Questions That Remain

The chronology reconstructed from the available documentary record raises several legitimate questions.

- Why was the complaint screened into further handling?
- Upon what basis did an early-stage supervisory opinion consider the reporting of alleged crimes to be identified as protest activity?
- Why were detective officers allocated?
- Why did CID remain involved?
- Why was substantial evidence accepted over an extended period?

- Why did Directorate of Legal Services become involved?
- Why was the matter discussed within national policing structures?
- Why did later disclosures reveal a chronology considerably more extensive than the public explanation originally suggested?

These questions arise naturally from the documentary record. They do not depend upon speculation, nor do they require assumptions concerning motive.

They are questions generated by chronology itself.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to reconstruct the chronology surrounding CRN 6029679/21 by comparing the experience of one of the original complainants with the documentary record subsequently disclosed by public authorities.

The result is a chronology which is substantially richer, more detailed and in certain respects, more difficult to reconcile with the brief public explanation ultimately provided by the Metropolitan Police.

Whether satisfactory explanations exist remains a matter for those responsible for the handling of the complaint.

For the wider public, however, one proposition should command broad agreement - Confidence in policing is strengthened not by avoiding difficult questions, but by addressing them openly.

Chronology neither accuses nor defends. It simply records - and when chronology is reconstructed from primary evidence, it becomes one of the most reliable witnesses available.

Ian Clayton

24 June 2026