



IPCA: 13-1674/hva

13 June 2014

Cameron Slater  
E-mail: [camlater@gmail.com](mailto:camlater@gmail.com)

Dear Mr Slater

Further to your email dated 29 April 2014, the Authority requested further information from Police. Their response has now come to hand.

You say that Constable Guest acted as an intermediary for Matthew Blomfield, and appears to be very familiar with him. You refer to an email between yourself and Constable Guest where he asks to arrange for the return of photographs on behalf of Matthew Blomfield.

The Police reiterate that Constable Guest has never met Matthew Blomfield. The context behind this email is that you offered to copy and save Matthew Blomfield's documents and photographs. Constable Guest states in his email that he did not want to be involved "too much". He also questions whether he was needed to act as a medium for the return of the files as Police did not want the two of you meeting up and then subsequently receiving allegations of something else occurring.

You also say that Matthew Blomfield is misleading others with his "false complaints about an allegedly stolen hard drive". The Police note that their investigation found the missing hard drive to have never been stolen, and how Matthew Blomfield refers to and reports the loss of his hard drive is his own choice.

You believe that the incident Matthew Blomfield claims to be his reporting of a burglary was in fact reported by Warren Powell. You further state that Matthew Blomfield filed an affidavit in the High Court which referred to his reported burglary, and he stated that he laid the complaint. This is an act of perjury. However, the Police advise that Warren Powell made a report of burglary on 21 April 2010, and Matthew Blomfield made a complaint to Police on 9 May 2012. They are two separate Police files.

You also say that Constable Guest was acting on two false complaints. The Police state that while Matthew Blomfield's initial statement lacked information, his second statement outlined a number of possible offences. These were all investigated by Police.

The Authority accepts the explanations provided and is unable to identify any clear situation where there has been a neglect of duty or misconduct by the Police. The Authority will therefore take no further action in the matter and in the absence of any new and compelling evidence; your file will remain closed.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P Roozendaal', with a large, stylized flourish above the first few letters.

P Roozendaal  
Manager: Complaints  
INDEPENDENT POLICE CONDUCT AUTHORITY

