

LONDIS-T-G1 [REDACTED]

From: LONDIS-T- [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 March 2013 09:37
To: LONDIS-T- [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Complaint.
Attachments: londist2.docx

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 March 2013 11:31
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Complaint.

~~—STAFF IN CONFIDENCE—~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
15 March 2012

Ref: LONDIST2

[REDACTED]
G1 Discipline,
Headquarters London District,
Horse Guards,
Whitehall,
London SW1A 2AX

COMPLAINT AGAINST [REDACTED]

I have received your letter e mail dated 13 March 2013. It is an improvement on your initial letter.

I am glad to hear that your original letter was written with 'resolution in mind'. I did not get that message. I was also hoping for an expression like 'justice must be seen to be done'.

It is not your fault that my copies are out of date, no apology required. The fact that you are deliberately choosing not to follow the principles laid out in them is cause for concern.

I am unhappy with your proposed suggested method of operation. If I was mugged I would be interviewed by the investigating officer. If my wife was raped I would like to think she would be interviewed by the investigating officer. By reducing it to a paper exercise and choosing to interview the respondent before you interview me, is not ethically correct.

I don't believe you have any intention of interviewing him. I also don't believe you will press my allegations and be putting my allegations to him in a robust way. I suspect you are part of the 'sweep it under the carpet brigade'. In a court the prosecution is the first to be allowed to verbally outline their case, not the defence. In yesterday's Times here was a good article about the shoddy justice system in the Army, supporting the call for an ombudsman. Your suggested approach merely re-enforces that need.

I you need to gain my trust by being impartial. You will do that by adopting a sensible and rational approach as opposed to the one you have suggested. I suspect you have no intention of investigating the complaint but will only attempt to assemble a file for the GOC. I have seen it all before.

Whether you are a Foot Guards Officer or not is not a factor, I am missing the point of your comment. I don't see how referring to the building you work in by its name, Horse Guards, is a problem. If you don't work there, then the error is mine. Again, I don't understand how refereeing to a building can be 'unhelpful'.

You now suggest I can supply supporting evidence. That is an improvement on just writing a 'letter'. I will also supply series of direct questions which I would like you to put to [REDACTED]. I suggest you judge him by how he responds. It would be a good idea to record the meeting as this would leave him no room for wriggling at a later date. It would also make him focus. I will not be able to provide all the evidence, so you may have to do some legwork.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

LONDIST-G1 [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Sent: 13 March 2013 14:51
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Subject: release-authorized: Your Complaint

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Orange

PERSONAL

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email and letter. I am disappointed that you object to the tone of my letter; it was written with resolution in mind.

I very much regret that the documents to which you refer are both out of date and will not form any part of the process. I must remind you that you are a civilian for the purposes of this investigation and my aim is to receive your allegations in writing, I shall interview the respondent, obtain his statement and disclose these to you for your comment, prior to the GOC taking a view. There will be no gathering of evidence at unit level; you have made as of yet unsubstantiated allegations against [REDACTED] and they will be investigated, but in a correct and timely manner.

May I remind you that I am not here to gain the trust from either party but that I will remain impartial throughout the investigation, Disclosure and subsequent Determination of your complaint. Your constant reference to Horse Guards is in my view unhelpful; I am not a Foot Guards officer so do not know the personalities involved.

So, please can I ask that you forward to me the allegations you are making against [REDACTED] and supporting evidence, The GOC will play no further part in this matter until a Decision has to be made.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Thank you.
Yours,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 March 2013 15:40
To: [REDACTED]
Subject:

Please acknowledge receipt of this.

Yours

[REDACTED]

LONDIST- [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 April 2013 09:29
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: release-authorized: Complaint- [REDACTED]
Good Morning [REDACTED]

Very many thanks for your email. I will look into your request and get back to you.

Trust that you are well.

Yours,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 April 2013 17:51
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: Complaint [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

I am gathering various documents. However there are two documents that are the foundation to my case. There are two 'brief style' documents, that I am not 100% sure I can recreate. Could you ask RHQ welsh Guards for copies?

They are:

Brief for AJEM from [REDACTED] dated 14 April 2008. This was sent to [REDACTED] who was the [REDACTED] at the time. He refused to discuss the matter.

[REDACTED] Improper Removal from post in 1989, dated 8 August 2011. This was sent to [REDACTED]

I suggest you ask for a copy of my file in RHQ. It may make interesting reading!

Yours [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Sent: 05 June 2013 15:13
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: release-authorised: YOUR COMPLAINT

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letters and emails. This HQ is aware that a number of complaints submitted by you are currently being handled at Army HQ. As such it is felt that the matters you have thus far raised are best dealt with centrally for the sake of completeness. Accordingly, I am directed to inform you that your complaint has been forwarded to Andover for further action as appropriate. Please refrain from writing further emails to this HQ or [REDACTED]

Many thanks and best wishes; I expect a staff officer from Andover will make contact you shortly.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 June 2013 16:02
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Ref your last

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your email.

I do not intend responding any further, I have given you advice on the next steps and I will not be goaded into additional correspondence. You have a right to complain against me and I acknowledge that right.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 June 2013 12:51
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Ref your last

The attached is self explanatory. [REDACTED]

HEADQUARTERS
HOUSEHOLD DIVISION
HORSE GUARDS
WHITEHALL
LONDON SW1A 2AX

Mil: London Dist [REDACTED]
Civ: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

GOC/2005
July 2013

Thank you for your letter of 25 June 2013 in which you state that [REDACTED] has refused to process your complaint against [REDACTED]. This is not the case. To the contrary, in the process of doing so it became clear that your complaint against [REDACTED] could not properly be dealt with in isolation given a number of other complaints submitted by you that are currently being handled at Army Headquarters. For this reason, and with my consent [REDACTED] has forwarded your complaint against [REDACTED] to Army Headquarters to be addressed by Army Legal Service, working to Brigadier John Donnelly, Director Personal Services (Army)..

I am informed by Army Headquarters that you will be contacted by Army Legal Services when your case has been investigated.

Please see my e-mail

Colonel,
What's the status of the
[redacted] complaint (PSA)?
Has it gone beyond London level
as you suggested the other day?
This letter was forwarded to Italy
so has only just arrived back here.
Best, ADC ✓

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

1/10
Re. Query, Advice psc, and
ground to case, as quickly
re-actable.

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
16 July 2013

hold Division,

Dear General

COMPLAINT AGAINST [redacted]

I have received your letter of 5 July 2013. I will list the numerous flaws and failings.

1. You made it very clear this was an in house matter and yours to deal with. You now claim it could not be dealt with in isolation. This is wrong, complaints are meant to be dealt with in isolation for a very good reason; to stop people like [redacted] and you playing pass the parcel. It is meant to be dealt with at the lowest level possible, as near to the complaint as possible. This allows a level of appeal at the higher level.
2. We are in this position because [redacted] did exactly the same as you are doing. He refused to get involved. I branded him a coward.
3. I have no complaints at Army Headquarters, so that is a clear lie. In fact it is exactly the opposite. See attached letter.
4. The Army Legal Services (ALS) is not the department that deal with complaints and you should know that. There is no a Services Complaints Panel that process complaints. The role of the ALS is to advise the chain of command and support them in their aims and objectives.
5. I believe you are bluffing as there is no evidence to suggest [redacted] ever started the investigation. You can prove me wrong by producing a copy of the case file, which I now formally request under the Freedom of Information Act.
6. If you don't produce the case file I will take this to another level.

Your actions epitomise exactly why we need an independent ombudsman.

I caught the end of 'Broken in Battle' last night. I noted there was no evidence of any support by the Welsh Guards or the Household Division. No surprise with [redacted] at the helm.

Yours sincerely

[redacted signature]

Attached:
Army Headquarters Secretariat 03/12/689818 dated 18 February 2013.



Army Headquarters
Army Secretariat
IDL 24
Marlborough Lines
Monxton Road
ANDOVER
SP11 8HJ



E-mail: lf-sec-group@mod.uk
Website: www.army.mod.uk



Our Reference: Army/Sec/03/12/69818

Date: 18 February 2013

Dear 

Thank you for your letter of 12 January 2013 to the Minister for Defence Personnel, Welfare and Veterans. Your letter has been passed to this office and I have been asked to respond.

Your comments regarding the Service Complaints system are noted. I also understand that you have recently received a letter from the Head of Defence Strategy and Priorities regarding your complaints of maladministration.

I regret that there is nothing further I can add.

Yours sincerely



SO2 Sec Discipline & Welfare 1b

[REDACTED]

From: LONDIST [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 15:23
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Message for GOC

Dear [REDACTED]

Very many thanks for your email. This matter will be dealt with as an FoI investigation and the appropriate person will make contact with you shortly.

With Many Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Headquarters London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall | London | SW1A 2AX

DTN: [REDACTED]

MOB [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 14:37
To: LONDIST [REDACTED]
Subject: Message for GOC

Dear [REDACTED]

As I do not have the GOC's e mail address I am writing to you.

I recently wrote to the GOC asking for information concerning under the Freedom of information Act. It is in my letter ref GOC7 dated 16 July 2013. A copy is attached.

My request at paragraph 5 asks for evidence of your investigation, and request a copy of the case file.

Please could you pass this reminder to the GOC.

Yours [REDACTED]

LONDIST-[REDACTED]

From: LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 15:20
To: LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Cc: LONDIST-[REDACTED]; LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Message for GOC
Importance: High
Attachments: GOC7.docx

[REDACTED]

An Fol request. Can you please lead on this.

This matter has now been passed to LF.

I have no other comments to make other than any Legal Advice is not for disclosure.

VMT

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Headquarters London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall | London | SW1A 2AX

DTN: [REDACTED]

MOB [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 14:37
To: LONDIST-[REDACTED]
Subject: Message for GOC

Dear [REDACTED]

As I do not have the GOC's e mail address I am writing to you.

I recently wrote to the GOC asking for information concerning under the Freedom of information Act. It is in my letter ref GOC7 dated 16 July 2013. A copy is attached.

My request at paragraph 5 asks for evidence of your investigation, and request a copy of the case file.

Please could you pass this reminder to the GOC.

Yours [REDACTED]

LONDIST [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 15:24
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Cc: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: release-authorized: Message for GOC
[REDACTED]

PSB my response.

TY

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Headquarters London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall | London | SW1A 2AX
DTN: [REDACTED]
MOB [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 15:23
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: release-authorized: Message for GOC

Dear [REDACTED]

Very many thanks for your email. This matter will be dealt with as an FoI investigation and the appropriate person will make contact with you shortly.

With Many Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Headquarters London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall | London | SW1A 2AX
DTN: [REDACTED]
MOB [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 August 2013 14:37
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: Message for GOC

Dear [REDACTED]

As I do not have the GOC's e mail address I am writing to you.

I recently wrote to the GOC asking for information concerning under the Freedom of information Act. It is in my letter ref GOC7 dated 16 July 2013. A copy is attached.

My request at paragraph 5 asks for evidence of your investigation, and request a copy of the case file.

Please could you pass this reminder to the GOC.

Yours [REDACTED]

LONDIST- [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 April 2015 11:34
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Cc: APC- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request [REDACTED] Aug 2013

I'm thinking you'll need to contact [REDACTED] as your the one that requires her assistance.

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
HQ London District, Horse Guards Parade, Whitehall, London SW1A 2AX
Mil: [REDACTED]
Civ: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 April 2015 10:36
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request [REDACTED] Aug 2013

Thanks for checking. I'll await word from [REDACTED]

Many thanks.

regards,

[REDACTED]
HQ LONDIST

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
✉ G1 (Disc), HQ London District, Horse Guards, Whitehall, London SW1A 2AX.

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 April 2015 10:25
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Cc: APC- [REDACTED] LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request [REDACTED] Aug 2013

[REDACTED]
I've checked our files and achieved files and we don't have anything relating to an FOI for [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] If you speak to [REDACTED] at APC Glasgow (cc'd) she maybe able to assist you.

[REDACTED] Can I introduce you to [REDACTED] he is from our Discipline dept.

Regards

28/04/2015

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
HQ London District, Horse Guards Parade, Whitehall, London SW1A 2AX
Mil: [REDACTED]
Civ: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 April 2015 17:30
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Cc: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request_ [REDACTED] Aug 2013

[REDACTED]
Did we have any record of this one?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | HQ London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall London | SW1A 2AX

Tel: [REDACTED] Duty mobile: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 April 2015 12:11
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request_ [REDACTED] Aug 2013

[REDACTED]
No probs - shouldn't take [REDACTED] long to check

Kind regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] HQ London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall London | SW1A 2AX

Tel: [REDACTED] Duty mobile: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]

From: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 April 2015 12:09
To: LONDIST- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request_ [REDACTED] Aug 2013

Hi [REDACTED]

28/04/2015

Righto, I'll await your record check. As said, it was around August 2013.

Many thanks.

regards,

[Redacted signature]

HQ LONDIST

Mil: [Redacted]
LONDIST- [Redacted]
G1 (Disc), HQ London District, Horse Guards, Whitehall, London SW1A 2AX.

From: LONDIST- [Redacted]
Sent: 22 April 2015 18:23
To: LONDIST- [Redacted]
Cc: LONDIST- [Redacted]
Subject: RE: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request_ [Redacted] Aug 2013

Hi [Redacted]

Thanks for this. Its not one I recognise. [Redacted]

[Redacted] - please can you check our records for any FOI cases with this name and let [Redacted] know your findings. If we don't have anything, can you provide [Redacted] with [Redacted] details at APC Glasgow as we may have passed to them to deal.

Thanks

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted] | HQ London District | Horse Guards | Whitehall London | SW1A 2AX

Tel: [Redacted] Duty mobile: [Redacted] Email: [Redacted]

From: LONDIST- [Redacted]
Sent: 22 April 2015 16:50
To: LONDIST- [Redacted]
Subject: 20150422-Query_FOI_Request_ [Redacted] Aug 2013

Good evening [Redacted]

We are trying to trace some information / a case file concerning a Freedom of Information request made by a [Redacted] in Aug 2013. He had made a complaint against [Redacted] and had asked for disclosure of the Case File.

Would you have any information on this matter in your office, at all?

Grateful for any assistance you can provide.

regards,

[REDACTED]

HQ LONDIST



[REDACTED]



LONDIST



G1 (Disc), HQ London District, Horse Guards, Whitehall, London SW1A 2AX.

File Proc

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

11 March 2012

Ref: LONDIST1

[REDACTED]

Headquarters London District,
Horse Guards,
Whitehall,
London SW1A 2AX

COMPLAINT AGAINST [REDACTED]

I have received your letter dated 1 March 2013. As outlined in my previous letters to the GOC you will need to gain my trust. I am unhappy with the tone of your letter for several reasons.

I am keen to know what the 'ground rule's' are before we start the 'game'. I have submitted complaints before, many to Horse Guards only to receive a dismissive note, with no investigation whatsoever. That is why we are in the position we are in today. I am keen to know what your aims and objectives are.

I have (old) copies of AGAI 70 and JSP 831. Please could you let me know which one you intend to follow and how you will fit this into the scheme of things? I understand that this is happening at 2 star level, so the initial interviews, investigating and information gathering that should have been done at unit level, has not been done. I suggest this duty falls to you.

I am not convinced that your proposed way ahead will provide justice. I spent a considerable amount of time and effort providing evidence for [REDACTED] Only for him to refuse to discuss the matter and ignore the issues and then state he is not convinced. I suspect you will intend to do the same.

I will prepare a letter as you suggest, but I am keen to know the rules of the game first. Mediation was a recommended way to resolve complaints. I suggest a monitored meeting with the respondent, and you can see how we perform. If you don't propose such a meeting I will deduce you are protecting the respondent. I expect to be interviewed after I have submitted my complaint and before the complaint is presented to the respondent. If you refuse to do so, you will have failed to gain my trust.

It is over four months since this was raised with the GOC, that says legion about Horse Guard's attitude to complaints.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

G1 Discipline
Headquarters London District
Horse Guards, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2AX



ARMY



Telephone: [REDACTED] Military: [REDACTED]
Facsimile: [REDACTED] Military: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Reference: Disc/71/per [REDACTED]

Date: 1 Mar 13

Dear [REDACTED]

I have been directed by The General Officer Commanding The Household Division to advise you of the course of action he wishes to take further to receipt of your recent letters. From the letters submitted to date it appears clear that you feel let down by the actions of the [REDACTED] of the Welsh Guards. I would be most grateful in the first instance if you would list in clear terms the exact nature of your concerns to use as a starting point for subsequent investigation.

It is essential that we understand the precise nature of your complaint. I encourage you to express yourself without recourse to emotional comment. In my experience complaints are best investigated when the complaint is articulated in factual terms.

On receipt of your letter I anticipate that I will be able to put the allegations to the respondent for his comment. I look forward to hearing from you.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

For GOC

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
3 December 2012

Ref: GOC2

Major General George Norton CBE,
Major General Commanding the Household Division,
Horseguards,
Whitehall SW1A 2AX

Copy. [REDACTED] 21/1/12

I wrote to you on 18 December concerning the conduct of [REDACTED] I am concerned, as I have not received a response. I hope this is an error or oversight and not a deliberate action.

May I suggest you either follow the procedures in AGAI 70 approach or JSP 763.

Please acknowledge you have received my letters.

FROM Major General G P R Norton CBE



HEADQUARTERS
HOUSEHOLD DIVISION
HORSE GUARDS
WHITEHALL
LONDON SW1A 2AX

Mit: [REDACTED]
Civ: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

GOC/2005

28 February 2013

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letters of 5 and 20 February 2013. I explained in my previous letter that you have no statutory entitlement to avail yourself to the Service complaint processes in order to raise concerns regarding the fitness of the [REDACTED] of the Welsh Guards to hold his appointment.

Nevertheless as Major General Commanding the Household Division I wish to understand the substance behind your concerns and to that end I have given direction to my staff to write to you within the week advising you of my proposed course of action.

I ask that you engage with my staff in the first instance.

Yours sincerely

George Norton

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
20 February 2012

Ref: GOC5

Major General George Norton CBE,
Major General Commanding the Household Division,
Horseguards,
Whitehall SW1A 2AX

Dear Major General,

In your letter dated 30 January, you asked me to trust you and 'leave the matter in my hands for me to act as I judge necessary'.

I commented in my previous letter I commented that you had to gain my trust. I wrote to you on 18 October 2012 and did not receive a response. I wrote to you on 3 December 2012 and did not receive a response. I wrote to you on 21 January 2013 by recorded/registered delivery. I suspect I only received a response because it was recorded/registered. You have yet to gain my trust.

You responded on 30 January 2013. In your letter you made a hollow commitment and asked me to trust you.

Any complaint should be dealt with urgently as the respondent could be doing damage to the system. Unless I am approached with a view to come to Horseguards to discuss the complaint and submit evidence, I will deduce you are adopting the same approach as [REDACTED] and attempting to sweep the issue under the carpet.

Recent articles in the Times have highlighted the shoddy justice system in the Army and MOD, they make very revealing and interesting reading. There has also been a move in the National Health Service to encourage 'whistle blowing'. This is what I did back in the day. I did it to try and maintain basic values and standards.

It is now over four months since I first raised the matter with you and no action has been taken. Your potential loose cannon is still loose and doing damage. I hope you take the grievances of serving soldiers more seriously.

My e mail address is [REDACTED] Let's keep an audit trail and avoid the telephone unlike [REDACTED]

Your sincerely
[REDACTED]

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
5 February 2012

Ref: GOC4

Major General George Norton CBE,
Major General Commanding the Household Division,
Horseguards,
Whitehall SW1A 2AX

Dear General

Many thanks for your letter dated 30 January 2012.

I have discovered there is a complaints system in the MOD called the DIN?, which I can use as a civilian. Hopefully this can be resolved within the Division.

In my initial letter I suggested you follow the AGAI, and the suggestion still holds. I am willing to attend Horseguards for meetings and submit evidence and play my part.

Hopefully an informal approach with mediation could be adopted to start with. However I suspect [REDACTED] will make his excuses and refuse to attend, thus showing his true colours.

I urge you to take this seriously and not to adopt the 'sweep it under the carpet' policy of your predecessors. If mediation is not attempted, or paperwork gathered in then I will fear the worst.

You may have noticed recent articles in the Times by Deborah Haynes about the failings of the military justice system. Your letter arrived on the day a question was raised in the Commons by Madeleine Moon, MP for Bridgend.

You ask me to trust you. You will gain my trust by adopting transparent positive action and keeping me informed, unlike [REDACTED]

I await your response with anticipation.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

FROM Major General G P R Norton CBE



HEADQUARTERS
HOUSEHOLD DIVISION
HORSE GUARDS
WHITEHALL
LONDON SW1A 2AX

Mil: [REDACTED]
Civ: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

GOC/2005

30 January 2013

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 18 October 2012 and subsequent hasteners. I am sorry to learn that you feel you have been let down by the [REDACTED] of the Welsh Guards and harbour concerns regarding his fitness to hold the appointment. As you rightly point out in your letter, there is no process open to you as a retired Serviceman to complain about his conduct, save to raise the matter out of a sense of duty to me as the Major General Commanding the Household Division.

Having raised your concerns, I trust that you will leave the matter in my hands for me to act as I judge necessary.

Yours sincerely
George Norton

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
21 January 2012

Ref: GOC3

Major General George Norton CBE,
Major General Commanding the Household Division,
Horseguards,
Whitehall SW1A 2AX

Dear Major General.

I wrote to you on 18 October and again on 3 December, concerning the conduct of [REDACTED]. I am concerned, as I have not received a response. Copies of the letters are enclosed

It is now three months since the issue was first raised, and I have not received any response at all. I am aware that in previous years the practise in Horseguards was to ignore complaints and any matter that portrayed the Division in a poor light. I was hoping there had been some intellectual evolution and that man-management skills had developed in a positive way since my day.

If you continue to ignore the matter, I will go 'up' the chain of command, and outside. Hopefully this can be resolved internally.

Yours sincerely
[REDACTED]

Enclosures:

GOC1 dated 18 October 2012

GOC2 dated 3 December 2012

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
18 October 2012

Ref: GOC1

Major General George Norton CBE,
Major General Commanding the Household Division,
Horseguards,
Whitehall SW1A 2AX

Dear Major General,

I am 52 year old former Welsh Guards Officer, writing to you, as the General Officer Commanding the Household Division, concerning [REDACTED] of the Welsh Guards, [REDACTED]

To put things in perspective, I was commissioned with [REDACTED] and went on to train the likes of [REDACTED] at the Junior Leaders under the command of [REDACTED]

I have a long series of outstanding of grievances with the Army and MOD, as a result of poor staffing by staff at Horseguards amongst others, who chose to adopt a shoot the messenger policy!

I recently wrote to General Charles Guthrie (May 2011), in his position as the 'tribal elder' for assistance. He delegated the problem to [REDACTED] I prepared a comprehensive brief which he appears to have ignored. Only after considerable pressure did he agree to meet to discuss the problem. I drove to Bristol and back, only for him to refuse to discuss the matter in detail. I was seeking assistance to get vital evidence to support my case, but he refused to listen and assist. This was followed by 'tantrums' in letters suggesting that I should be grateful to him. There is AGAI 70, which is used for complaints, it is sensible guidance and should be followed. He could not be bothered to get a copy.

He has blown hot and cold, firstly claiming he would 'thump the table' if there was an injustice, and later offering a chance of a 'civilised conversation'. All for nought. This culminated in an abusive call on the evening of 13 September 2012. He behaved as if I was an 18 year old guardsman with dirty boots and he was the Platoon Sergeant! I tried to calm him down and asked him to provide evidence to support his outbursts and the DS solution. He hung up. It was from an unknown number so I could not call back.

He is fully aware I have been wronged. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The present [REDACTED] was part of the problem and the Commanding Officer was too weak to do anything. [REDACTED] can't explain why you don't punish the cheat, and do punish the one who reports it! It was a case of shoot the messenger. Nowadays it is called whistle blowing.

I am concerned he is not fit to be the [REDACTED] for the Welsh Guards. He lacked the ability to follow the basic direction of the AGAI. He was fully aware I had been wronged but refused to do anything. Instead he resorted to tantrum management, and lacked the courage to meet and discuss the problem.

His approach was that of tantrum management and not at all cerebral. I would have expected an informed, logical, rational forensic approach. He is not under undue pressure. He is not being deprived of sleep, food or water. He is not suffering from the extremes of climate, be it cold and wet, or extremely hot and dry. He is not under fire or running the risks of mines or IED's. This is a straight forward exercise in an office environment, which should suit him. He has been found wanting.

If there was a process to complain against his conduct, I would use it. Sadly this was an internal Regimental matter, so no process is available. I believe it is my duty to inform you, as his superior in Regimental matters. I am whistle blowing again!

I am willing to come into Horseguards with documentary evidence to support my concerns. You may wish to reflect his conduct in his annual report.

Your Sincerely

[REDACTED]

~~STAFF IN CONFIDENCE~~

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3 December 2012

Ref: GOC2

Major General George Norton CBE,
Major General Commanding the Household Division,
Horseguards,
Whitehall SW1A 2AX

Copy. [REDACTED] 21/1/12

I wrote to you on 18 December concerning the conduct of [REDACTED] I am concerned, as I have not received a response. I hope this is an error or oversight and not a deliberate action.

May I suggest you either follow the procedures in AGAI 70 approach or JSP 763.

Please acknowledge you have received my letters.

~~PROTECT STAFF~~

From: [REDACTED]



ARMY

Service Complaints
Directorate of Personal Services (Army)
Army Headquarters
IDL 428
Ramilies Building
Marlborough Lines
Monxton Road
ANDOVER
Hampshire
SP11 8HJ

Military Network: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Facsimile: [REDACTED]

Defence Business Improvement
Level 3 Zone D
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

Reference: SCW/ [REDACTED]

Date: 20 Sep 13

Dear Sirs

[REDACTED]

The above named ex serviceman wrote to GOC LONDIST on 18 Oct complaining of the conduct of a senior officer in connection with other matters subject to Service Complaints.

Whilst the Service Complaints have been determined this new and recent complaint is clearly divisible from those earlier matters and falls outside the scope of section 334 AFA 06. Under the circumstances it would be normal to investigate and consider the complaint under the provisions of 2010DIN05-068.

The matter has been referred from LONDIST to HQ Army. It is fair to say that in the interim the complainant has become critical of the manner in which his complaint has been considered and of those involved in staffing the process. At each turn those involved in either addressing the Service Complaints or this complaint have themselves become the subject of satellite complaints.

Given the circumstances, and whilst not constituting an internal review, you may agree it is quite clear that relations have been so damaged that it is now appropriate that this matter is investigated and considered by another department and therefore we are hereby referring the matter ERU for their action.

The complainant has been written to and informed of our intention and of your address for correspondence. We attach herewith copy correspondence and are grateful for your assistance in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

PROTECT STAFF

From: [REDACTED]



ARMY

Service Complaints
Directorate of Personal Services (Army)
Army Headquarters
IDL 428
Ramilies Building
Marlborough Lines
Monxton Road
ANDOVER
Hampshire
SP11 8HJ

Military Network: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Facsimile: [REDACTED]

Reference: SCW/ [REDACTED]

Date: 20 Sep 13

Dear [REDACTED]

I write with regard to your complaint concerning [REDACTED] of 18 Oct 12, and to subsequent correspondence in this matter.

You will be aware that General Sir George Norton KCVO CBE has referred your letter to this HQ. I respond on behalf of DPS(A).

As you are no longer a serving member, your complaint concerning [REDACTED] should be dealt with in accordance with the provisions contained in the Complaints Handling in the Ministry of Defence procedures. Any issues that have already been determined by the Army Board as part of your Applications for Redress of Complaint will not be considered under those procedures and will not be further investigated as you have received the Army Board's determination.

Because of previous Army Board involvement and your stated lack of confidence your correspondence from 18 Oct 2012 to present has been passed to Defence Business Improvement for investigation and determination. Their address for correspondence is:

Defence Business Improvement
Level 3 Zone D
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

Should you have any further queries in relation to this matter you should write to Defence Business Improvement for their resolution.

Yours sincerely, [REDACTED]