



## Who's bad?

### Chris Spivey/Maria Muir

So here is the state of play as it stands tonight.

I have one court case coming up that was given the go ahead out of spite by Essex Chief Constable, Stephen Kavanagh for no other reason than I found out that my extremely serious complaint against the police who illegally arrested me – of that there is no doubt whatsoever – was purposely not being investigated and I had the cheek of a young whippersnapper to question why this was... The court summons was Gods Stephen Kavanaghs response to that email.

You can read the email, checked for accuracy by a barrister before I sent it to those now guilty of police corruption, who are all connected to the Essex Police force – the very same Essex police force who are already being extensively investigated for corruption, by clicking [HERE](#)

Indeed, it would certainly appear that as it happens I have been charged rather hastily & without thought for the legalities or public funds in these times of austerity.

This much is quite blatantly obvious from the information sent to me today by a barrister. This information pertains to the Guidelines on prosecuting cases involving communications

sent via social media.

The following is particularly interesting:

33. *Every day many millions of communications are sent via social media and the application of section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 and section 127 of the Communications Act 2003 to such comments creates the potential that a very large number of cases could be prosecuted before the courts. Taking together, for example, Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and YouTube, there are likely to be hundreds of millions of communications every month.*
34. *In these circumstances there is the potential for a chilling effect on free speech and prosecutors should exercise considerable caution before bringing charges under section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 and section 127 of the Communications Act 2003. There is a high threshold that must be met before the evidential stage in the Code for Crown Prosecutors will be met. Furthermore, even if the high evidential threshold is met, in many cases a prosecution is unlikely to be required in the public interest (see paragraphs 46 onwards).*
35. *Since both section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 and section 127 of the Communications Act 2003 will often engage Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, prosecutors are reminded that these provisions must be interpreted consistently with the free speech principles in Article 10, which provide that:  
“Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers ...”*

36. *As the European Court of Human Rights has made clear, Article 10 protects not only speech which is well-received and popular, but also speech which is offensive, shocking or disturbing (Sunday Times v UK (No 2) [1992] 14 EHRR 123):*

*“Freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of a democratic society ... it is applicable not only to ‘information’ or ‘ideas’ that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also as to those that offend, shock or disturb ...”*

37. *Freedom of expression and the right to receive and impart information are not absolute rights. They may be restricted but only where a restriction can be shown to be both:*

- *Necessary; and*
- *Proportionate.*

*These exceptions, however, must be narrowly interpreted and the necessity for any restrictions convincingly established.*

33. *The common law takes a similar approach. In Chambers v DPP [2012] EWHC 2157 (Admin), the Lord Chief Justice made it clear that:*

*“Satirical, or iconoclastic, or rude comment, the expression of unpopular or unfashionable opinion about serious or trivial matters, banter or humour, even if distasteful to some or painful to those subjected to it should and no doubt will continue at their customary level, quite undiminished by [section 127 of the Communications Act 2003].”*

34. *Prosecutors are reminded that what is prohibited under section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 and section 127 of the Communications Act 2003 is the*

*sending of a communication that is grossly offensive. A communication sent has to be more than simply offensive to be contrary to the criminal law. Just because the content expressed in the communication is in bad taste, controversial or unpopular, and may cause offence to individuals or a specific community, this is not in itself sufficient reason to engage the criminal law. As Lord Bingham made clear in DPP v Collins [2006] UKHL 40:*

And having read the information yet still find myself being prosecuted for two counts of Harassment without violence under Section 2(1) and (2) of the protection from harassment act 1997 – which is a piece of piss to prove that I am not guilty of – and two counts of sending malicious communications contrary to Section 127 (1)(a) and (3) of the communications act 2003 – which if the aggrieved repeat the claims that they made in their witness statements on oath they will be committing perjury that can be evidenced by the transcripts of the conversations which are logged with my solicitor – it is blatantly obvious that the CPS guidelines have totally been ignored.

You can read those CPS guidelines advising when to prosecute under Section 2 and Section 127 by clicking [HERE](#)

Now, the fact that I was illegally arrested has also been confirmed to me today by a barrister – not my own I hasten to add – although I knew that fact a year ago.

Course, the fact that over 100,000 results are given by a very quick Google search of websites who have written the same or similar things that I have – and indeed quite a few have written a lot worse – all of which apparently constitutes a crime, with me being the only one charged I kinda feel harassed as well.

Yet stranger still, the evidence that the prosecution are relying on remains easily accessible on this website because I

have never been told to take it down.

Now that is akin to punching someone in the head as they walk past you, being arrested for it and then punching that person in the head every single day for a year with no further arrests until the case comes to court.

So in reality, what we have here is a malicious prosecution brought about by someone who obviously believes that he is far superior to us and with not being given the respect that he falsely believes that he is automatically entitled to, he abuses his oath of office and embarks on a vendetta... Hardly a man worthy of respect then.

As for the other court case which I cannot give you a definite date for yet, I have been charged with possession of Legal Images that if convicted would have devastating consequences for Led Zeppelin, Elton John, Ebay, Amazon Google and so on and so on.

Moreover, it would mean that HM Treasury, Customs & Excise & the Inland Revenue are in receipt of the proceeds of crime... Which could be viewed as laundering money made through the making, exhibiting, distribution, and profiteering of Category C: child pornography.

And there can surely be no mistake since the Essex CID have been investigating these images for 11 months at least, in which time the finest detectives on the Essex force must surely have checked and double checked the legality of the photos for the CPS to agree that it is in the public interest to pursue a conviction.

Which strangely enough the CPS didn't think it was in the public interest to charge Rolf Harris with the ILLEGAL child pornography found on his computer:

***Rolf Harris was today sentenced to five years and nine months after his conviction for sex charges against women***

*Earlier, the court was told today that child porn was found on Harris' computer in November 2012 when police searched his home in Bray after a sex assault victim came forward.*

*Material found on Rolf Harris' computer included hundreds of adult porn images, as well as 24 indecent images. Some were of children under 13.*

*The entertainer was accused of copying a total of 33 indecent images after trawling websites including 'Tiny Teen P\*\*\*\*'; Teeny Tiny Girlfriend'; 'Young Little Girlies'; Russian Virgins; 'My Little Nieces'; 'Little V\*\*\*\*\*'; and 'Babes Joy'. [Source](#)*

And this:

*Rolf Harris downloaded appalling images of child abuse from websites offering picture of 'little girlies' and 'tiny girlfriends', it can be revealed for the first time.*

*The 83-year-old, who was convicted of 12 counts of indecent assault earlier this week, had been due to stand trial for the offences at a future date.*

*But at his sentencing hearing at Southwark Crown Court, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) announced it no longer intended to proceed with the case. [Source](#)*

How very fucking strange especially when it was reported that a plumber found child pornography under Harris's floorboards 40 years ago:

*Rolf Harris's plumber has reportedly claimed he discovered a stash of child abuse images under the floorboards of the entertainer's home 40 years ago.*

*The plumber, who apparently panicked at the time and put the illegal images back, was one of the first people to come forward with claims about Harris in the wake of the Jimmy Savile scandal.*

*According to the Mirror, the man found the collection of pictures of underage girls at Harris's former property in Sydenham, South East London, where he lived during the 1960s and early 70s.*

*Harris was charged with four counts of accessing indecent images by police, but never entered pleas as his defence team successfully persuaded the judge, Mr Justice Sweeney, to separate them off from the main trial.*

*On Friday, prosecutor Sasha Wass QC told Southwark Crown Court that the Crown Prosecution Service had since decided that it was "no longer in the public interest" to pursue a second trial on the outstanding charges "in the light of the 12 unanimous convictions on the counts that Mr Harris faced".*

Source

Ohhhhh, I getcha. Having been found guilty of interfering with children, Harris had been punished enough and as such it wasn't in the public interest to prosecute him for continually possessing and downloading child pornography over the past 40 years despite only stopping when the plod raided his home.

Yet I, who has never been so much as accused of ANY sexual offence whatsoever, let alone questioned by the police about them, until they illegally stole my computers and planted child pornography on there which predictably I haven't been charged with – and despite bringing my daughter up alone and as such it was the norm for me to have little girls and boys round my home, many of whom stayed overnight, yet I remained allegation free, find myself being prosecuted for having LEGAL images on my computer which the police were aware of over 2 years ago but did nothing about and which are still on this very website and have been republished at least twice since my arrest, yet I haven't been told to remove them or been re-arrested... Roger that.

Who knows, perhaps it is the norm in Essex for the police to

turn up mob handed in the middle of the night with the specific intention of illegally arresting someone and stealing their computers & other property without an arrest or search warrant – which obviously they would not have been granted anyway since I was arrested on a trumped up charge of suspicion of a misdemeanour, only for the police to return TWO MONTHS LATER, again without arrest or search warrant but to compensate for that they kick down my front door, my back gate and smash my window, whilst blatantly abusing Section 17 of PACE.

And of course the illegal arrest that time was for having child porn on my computers that they themselves put on there and as such, they haven't charged me with the sick photos.

Hmmm, I wonder if the policemen from the very same police station as the 3 thugs who kicked my door down instead of getting a warrant did the same to Deputy Headmaster Martin Goldberg when they finally got around to visiting him TWO YEARS after the Canadian police had warned them that the pervert schoolteacher was buying ILLEGAL child porn:

*A paedophile deputy headmaster who secretly filmed his pupils was left free to continue his abuse for more than two years after police failed to act on information that he could be a danger to children.*

*Martin Goldberg, who had worked at the £10,000-a-year private school for more than 20 years, was named to British authorities as a suspect in July 2012.*

*He was among 2,345 individuals suspected of having accessed child pornography whose names were handed to the UK's Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) following a major inquiry in Canada.*

*But the CEOP failed to act on the information from Toronto Police's Operation Spade – and it was only in November last year that Essex Police were told that Goldberg had been buying*

*videos of naked boys from a vendor based in Canada.*

*Even then, Essex Police did nothing about the 46-year-old until three weeks ago – almost a year after being informed.*

*Nor did officers warn Thorpe Hall School in Southend, where Goldberg, an IT expert, regularly took children away on school trips.*

*The blunders were compounded when officers failed in a bid to get a search warrant from a magistrate.*

*So they simply visited the paedophile's home, just over a mile from the school, and politely asked if they could examine his computer. He refused and the officers left without arresting him. [Source](#)*

So, they went to his home, but had no warrant. They asked to look at his computers and he said no... So they left... Roger that.

Do you think that maybe I am being targeted by people in law enforcement who think that they are above the law... Or is that me just being paranoid?

Mind you, I can also prove collusion between corrupt police officers and social workers working in tandem to steal my grandson.

Of course, The HCPC originally tried to close down the complaint yet had no choice but to re-open it and unsurprisingly it has now been taken off the qualified barrister originally given the case to investigate and passed to someone else... Who will no doubt try and argue that there was no wrongdoing

Just think about that for a moment.

The police and social workers conspired to steal an innocent baby...



Who is very much loved, well cared for and very happy.



Indeed the boy never stops smiling and chattering away.



Unlike the two boys who I have grave concerns about who were purchased by the two fellas who owned the legal image that I published in condemnation of them doing so.. Imagine that? The

two boys were bought by two fellas to whom money means fuck all... If something gets broken it is no problem to replace.



Look at the boys tense body language!

Yet strangely Elton John's drug and alcohol addiction, promiscuity, violent mood swings, and worrying taste in art is of no concern whatsoever to the social services or police despite the two young boys never smiling and both having 'dead eyes'... Which of course they wouldn't have because the law doesn't apply to the mega rich, and the social services have a mandate to break up normal families whilst leaving the rich sick fucks to do whatever they want.



Is it only me who feels uneasy about this family snap?

However, when I highlight these matters and show the kind of sick photos that these two pampered piss-takers consider to be art, I find myself in court for showing the image that they fucking own as well as becoming the victim of a conspiracy to steal my happy, funny, cute as a button grandson who always has a smile wider than a mile, by the very people who should be applauding me.

So the police thugs who took part in that criminal act which can carry a life sentence can hide behind whatever false

Polish sounding names they want on Facebook, but I know exactly who they are and what concerns me is that they too have young children themselves.

And I find that fact as disturbing as Elton John and his furniture having children.

I mean, what kind of shit fathers must they be if they are willing to condemn an innocent baby to a life of misery by stealing him away from a loving home just because they were told to?

But justice is looming because finally support for me is beginning to gain momentum and there is now looking like a real opportunity to expose the evil scum who think that they are untouchable... Including those higher up the ladder.

I mean, for the past year I have been wondering where my support is from those who will be affected by the outcome of these malicious prosecutions... Their silence in support has been deafening and speaks volumes. Worse still, at a time when I needed their support, there was plenty willing to publish total bullshit about me, backed by no evidence whatsoever thus making a very stressful time even worse.

Again, that speaks volumes about the true nature of those who tout themselves as the voice of the people... The awakened ones... Fuck me, a real case of "meet the new boss, same as the old boss"... Controlled opposition at best.

Indeed, of the leading sites in the Alternative Media there is only the Coleman Blog and to a lesser extent Aangirfan who have publicly backed me... You can draw your own conclusions from that.

So, it was nice to have Maria Muir come out in support of me today, because despite the malicious prosecutions not having any foundation to them, you know that they are still going to try and tuck me up.

And as such, I thank Maria for her bravery for publicly supporting me... I won't forget it:

# **The cover of Led Zeppelin's the Houses of the Holy has been classed as Category C child pornography by Essex police!**

*Chris Spivey, tattoo artist, body piercer and former feature writer for the [Sovereign Independent Newspaper](#), from Rochford, Essex has been charged with possessing legal images on his computer including Led Zeppelin's that are also printed on t-shirts and other memorabilia and which can be purchased in your high street store and the internet.*

*There are 21 images Chris is being charged with, 18 of them are legal images – the remaining images have nothing to do with child pornography and one that he suspects was planted in his computer after police confiscated it after an illegal search of his home.*

*Why do charges for legal images found on his computer appear on the charge sheet? [Continue Reading](#)*