

Roger A. Mallory, General Counsel
Lakeland Police Department
219 N. Mass Ave
Lakeland, Fla 33801

Thursday, 21 December 2006

Counselor Mallory:

I received your postal letter dated 19 Dec 2006 in which you ask for clarification on my recent records request; I am moved to ask why you couldn't call me on the phone, since our many tax dollars have put you in a good position to use telephone communication -that is much faster and easier. If you need a written record of my requests, a phone call will not slow it down.

First, I would like to know why you "decline to direct any LPD employee to certify the absence of an LPD record." What other choice would they have -under the law -if it did not exist?

Next, you say that my last records request was "hopelessly ambiguous," however, I would counter by saying that you are incorrect, and proof of that fact is that all my requests for "calls to service" to LPD Records have been granted (which would be impossible if I made an "ambiguous" request) You are "hopelessly confused," but I don't mean that in an insulting way at all. Your problem lies in the fact that, while you are trained in legal matters, you are not trained in the records terminology of our local police department where you work. The term "call to service" refers strictly to a written record of a citizen's call to your department. You may confirm this with Records Personnel, but you must comply. However, you should not feel bad: In my sole Internal Affairs complaint (which you reviewed), I was indeed ambiguous on one important point, and now that I have realised my oversight, I shall apologise and clarify.

You recall that I accused officers Chuck Dallas and Leann Yeager of falsely accusing me of helping a criminal escape -or words to that effect. While I did indeed recall being accused of something like this, I made a grave error in not clarifying my main complaint, due partly to human error: What I meant to say was that officers Leann Yeager and Dennis Mosser swore an affidavit (of which you have copies from my IA complaint) that "the dispatcher told the defendant [myself] not to go in the area." If you review the audio tapes, you will discovered the polices officers both perjured themselves -they lied -and (more importantly) their chain of command was not responsive to my complaint, meaning that the Lieutenant at the time (he is now "Captain" Harry Katt), as well as the sergeant (whose name I forget) were probably more to blame than the rank and file officers who lied and perjured. Perjury is a serious charge, so take note.

Since I was not clear in my initial IA complaint, this constitutes a "new complaint," and I now bring it to you; If you assert that the court looked into this, I would remind you that the court never reviewed a case in which the police officers were defendants, so you would be false in such a claim. In fact, this legal point was never approached at all, since the case (with me as defendant) never proceeded to court.

Detective Elisa Martin told me in the presence of 2 witnesses that I would be able to bring a "new" matter to IA, but not an old one; When I told her this matter was "new," she then threatened to kick me off the property, and I now raise an IA complaint against her for this purpose, but before I finish my complaint, I would like to point out Det. Martin does not know me, and I do not know her, so therefore she would have to have been ordered to lie or deny me, and I suspect Sgt. Debra More (her immediate supervisor) of this, so I make an IA complaint primarily against Det. Sgt. More; Since she is in charge of that division that investigates IA complaints, a replacement must be sought to avoid a conflict of interest: She can not investigate herself; The reason being police officers who commit perjury are a serious bane to the law enforcement.

In addition, I recall that you told me in your Jan 11 letter this year that all matters of investigation of my

[C 18]

[C 18]

complaints were now closed by your department. If you wish to "close" them, I shall not argue, but I would like an explanation as to why you felt that your officers were justified in executing a patters of behavior of illegal requests of panhandlers when the courts had outlawed that practice. I await your reply on this point.

So, in conclusion, to answer your question of whether or not I request any more records, the answer is yes, I seek the following records:

- 1) A copy of a letter that you wrote to all police officers about me. That should not be too "ambiguous," since you probably should have no trouble remembering a letter you wrote about me to all cops.
- 2) Reports 2006-29553 and 2006-78993. If you cite confidentiality, then show me the law authorizing you, and know that other agencies regularly release this type information.
- 3) A copy of that audio record described in my letter to you this past October 25 -for the regular \$15.00 fee -and not the 2,000 dollar fee you had quoted me. Since I have heard LPD has blocked my telephone from calling your department, then this is proof that the "limitations in the technology available," as you put it, do not include ability to see which number called you, that is, caller ID: In order to block my number, you, at some point, have to know what it is, so since you have caller ID capabilities, then I expect my records request of October 25 to be granted: I indeed provided you, among other things, my phone number, the approximate time I called, the nature of the call, etc.

So, in conclusion, I answered all of your questions and had some of my own; **I am sorry for all the frustration you may have encountered in these matters**, but my legal advice for you would be to discipline either the officers in question (who perjured and committed a pattern of abuse of false arrests, etc. -and to cough up that audio record) -and I give you this legal advice, not to be offensive to you but rather because I feel it is the path of least resistance and will result in a reduction of frustration more quickly than any other option available -not to mention the fact that it would uphold the laws of the land, something police department personnel should do anyhow. If you have any problems, first, please re-read my correspondii to you, and then, if you are still in need of assistance, please contact me if you still have ambiguity. *Merry Christmas,*

Sincerely,

Gordon Wayne Watts

Gordon W. Watts



[C 19]