

Access Log Reports (Metropolitan Police)

- These include only material where the party involved is clear (from the IP address, and/or immediate circumstances)
- They are distilled from the original Apache access log (AL) files, which are available on request to an appropriate party for verification
- HTML documents appear even where they have been recently accessed and thus cached by the browser
- All URLs are given as offsets from my website domain specification: <https://www.elpobrecorderito.com/>
- There are hyperlinks to documents wherever appropriate
- Hover (mouse-over) icons are included where they give useful information about user actions
- All times are GMT (adjusted from the original access logs)

This concerns responses to a crime report I made on 09 February 2019 to the Metropolitan Police via Twitter (a legitimate way to report crime). I had previously made two previous crime reports to the Metropolitan Police against TPO (a tweet of 20 June 2018 and a comprehensive paper report of 04 July 2018). These were both completely ignored, and I suspected that this was because TPO operates under police protection. To test this, I raised another report via Twitter, but this time directly against the individual adjudicator, in such a way that they would initially have no indication that TPO was involved. As you will see, this time they did respond. However, at the time of writing (07 June 2019), there have been no further accesses or other actions by the Metropolitan Police (as would be required to investigate this case). It has become clear that TPO does indeed operate above the law, being protected by the Metropolitan Police, as well as the Department for Work & Pensions (and no doubt other government organisations).

09 February 2019 (AL 06.6) (Contact Centre)

IP / Details	212.139.143.66 / Talk Talk Comms Ltd, London (?Leyton)
User Agent	Internet Explorer 11 / Windows 8.1
Context	Response by the Metropolitan Police Contact Centre to the tweet I made a few minutes earlier. This was raised only against Barry Berkengoff, giving a link to the report below (which also did not mention TPO). <i>Note that a tweet I made on 20 June 2018 against TPO was ignored, as was a paper report of 04 July. I purposely avoided mentioning TPO, as my previous experiences suggested that that it was off the Met's "patch" (perhaps especially as Arter and one or two others in TPO are ex cops).</i>
20:47:51	PersonalPensionFiasco/Docs/MetCC/ReportBerkengoff.pdf (ref: https://twitter.com/)
20:53:57	PersonalPensionFiasco/Front.html
20:54:48	PersonalPensionFiasco/Icons/LearnMoreH.png (hover icon shows they reached the foot of the page).

10 February 2019 (AL 06.7)

IP / Details	212.74.97.2216 / Tiscali UK Ltd Customer (Government), met.police.uk, London
User Agent	Internet Explorer 11 / Windows 8.1
Context	Response to report tweeted to MetCC yesterday. <i>I had hoped that this brief perusal was in preparation for an investigation, but the lack of any accesses since (especially to the emails that provide the key evidence) seem to confirm that TPO is indeed immune to the law, and that my report went further this time only as it was raised against an individual.</i>
08:16:57	PersonalPensionFiasco/Docs/MetCC/ReportBerkengoff.pdf (ref: https://twitter.com/MetCC)
08:19:46	PersonalPensionFiasco/DetailsTPO.html
08:20:40	PersonalPensionFiasco/Overview.html
08:20:57	PersonalPensionFiasco/DetailsTPO.html
08:21:46	PersonalPensionFiasco/Overview.html
08:21:48	PersonalPensionFiasco/Epilogue.html
08:21:56	PersonalPensionFiasco/Outcome.html
08:21:58	PersonalPensionFiasco/Documents.html
08:22:01	PersonalPensionFiasco/DetailsTPO.html