

**F1127A - NOTICE OF REPORT
COPY FOR PRISONER**

Charge number

066/10

First name(s)

Surname
Number

STRACHAN
XA9602

You have been placed on report by O. Leggett
For an alleged offence which was committed at
at C2 - Cell 8

approx 1030 hours on
place

25-Feb-10 date

Rule 51 Para 23

The offence with which you are charged is that you:

**Disobeys or fails to comply with any rule or regulation
applying to him**

Contrary to Rule

Paragraph

Prison/YOI Rules

The report of the alleged offence is as follows:

At approx 10:30 on 25/02/2010 whilst performing routine accommodation fabric checks, I notice a picture of the Queen's head drawn in multiple coloured horizontal lines, it was on display in cell 8 occupied by BANFIELD B74089. I asked to have a look and was proudly told that I could and the artists signature was pointed out to me, It read Strachan. On the reverse was written Strachans full name followed by "Royal blackmailer" and an address. Their was also another document with this picture that resembled a receipt indicating that Banfield had bought the picture from Strachan, this included both persons address's a description of the artwork and a price indicating £1500.

Signature of reporting Officer

Your case will be heard at 10:15 hours on 26.02.10 (date)

You will have every opportunity to make your defence. If you wish to write out what you want to say you may ask for writing paper. You or the adjudicator may read it at the hearing.

You may also say whether you wish to call any witnesses.

This form was issued to you at 19:50 hours on 25.02.10 (date)

by P. ROBINSON:JM (name of issuing officer - block capitals)

Jew Giovanni

Please find my latest 'mching'
attached - I have become the
Subject of an infantile
wasm hunt - feel free to
publish in your daily

1 an
02/03/10

Charge No: 066/10

Date of charge: 25th Day of February 2010

The Charge: Contrary to Rule 51 Para 23, Disobeys or fails to comply with any rule or regulation applying to him.

Response:

This charge is incredulous; it is absurd and puerile in its entirety and unfortunately stands as a testament to the intelligence of the officer who conceived it.

David Banfield is serving a life sentence and has spent the past 25 years in jail. He is not a man of means. He is currently employed at the rate of £10.00pw, as the prison barber, and survives on a limited allowance from his wife.

During the month of November, Mr Banfield was present whilst I, Ian Strachan, was in the process of disposing of paperwork. Mr Banfield commented on a drawing of a female wearing a tiara. I made a gift of the drawing to him, Gratis. I provided Mr Banfield not with a receipt of payment but with a certificate of authenticity as is protocol in the art world when an artist either donates, makes a gift of, or sells a work. As is protocol, an approximate replacement value for insurance purposes was quoted on the certificate which Mr Leggett has naively referred to as a receipt. Although, I very much doubt Mr Leggett has ever seen a certificate of authenticity prior to this wondrous discovery of his. This figure, to which I refer, in this instance, was £1500.

The suggestion that Mr Banfield, a life serving prisoner, whom is not of means, and whom, with the greatest respect is a man of straw, who survives on a weekly wage of £10.00 prior to deductions, who relies on the odd postal order from his wife, who does not have a bank account and has spent the past 25 years in prison, The suggestion that he paid £1500 for a drawing is frankly and utterly ludicrous. Based on his current wage it would take Mr Banfield 150 weeks, approximately 3 years to accumulate such a sum, after which I very much doubt the first thing he would be splashing out on would be a multicoloured drawing of woman wearing a tiara drawn by myself. If he even considered doing so then he should be committed at once to a mental health institution never to see the light of day.

It must also be said, that no attempt was made by Mr Banfield to hide the drawing from Mr Leggett, Indeed quite the opposite took place, please note the use of the word 'proudly' in the following quote from officer Leggett's frivolous charge, 'I asked to have a look and was PROUDLY told that I could and the artists signature was pointed out to me'.

May I draw your attention to the fact that Officer Leggets concludes that he detected, along with the drawing, a document which **resembled** a receipt, not which was a receipt, but something which resembles a receipt, applying Leggett logic one can conclude this was all because a sum, a figure, was quoted. Please note and I quote 'document with this picture that resembled a receipt'. If Officer Leggett had found an actual receipt, I would presume he would have worded that sentence differently, perhaps somewhere along the lines of the following; 'There was also another document with this picture, it was a receipt of sale '. Even that proves nothing, By Mr Leggett's own admission he 'never saw a transaction of sale'.

I put it to you that Officer Leggett does not believe that the sum of £1500 changed hands and he deceitfully purports that he does as per his previous admission; no man in their right mind possibly could.. That the charge lacks credibility and evidence. I put it to you that this is a waste of everyone's time that this charge is incredulous; it is absurd and puerile in its entirety and should be treated as such or perhaps I'm just the subject of Mr Leggett's practical joke or perhaps officer Leggett is embittered that I failed to help him in his campaign against Denise Hodder, The Governor of The Verne.

During the month of November 2009, a derogatory article concerning Governor Hodder was published in the Dorset Echo. Mr Leggett, whilst working on A1 wing, reached into his rucksack and provided me with a colour photocopy. He asked me to use my contacts in the national media to gain further exposure relating to the article. I refused and ever since Mr Leggett has vowed to 'nick me'. Mr Leggett has already admitted at the previous adjudication that he gave me the article although he wisely and deceitfully denied that he asked me to 'get it in the nationals'. I suggest that there is more evidence to suggest that Officer Leggett attempted to form an inappropriate relationship with a prisoner, that he brought an article into the prison for the purposes of disrupting the good order and discipline of the prison. I suggest there is more evidence to suggest the latter than there is to suggest that Mr Banfield bought a drawing for £1500.