

From: [Jennie Lucas](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation
Date: 25 April 2023 15:41:05
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Outlook-3jwepe0z.png](#)

Good afternoon [REDACTED],

Thanks for coming back to me and for bearing with me while I looked into to what has happened. While I obviously cannot share any details of interactions with individual survivors, I can confirm that I have spoken with Rick about the situation. It is clear that Rick discussed approaching [REDACTED] with two survivors in 2021. While the Foundation does not make official referrals, this was clearly a recommendation from us, especially given that no other possible legal services or law firms were mentioned.

Hindsight is a wonderful thing, and Rick should have looked into the firm more thoroughly before pointing anyone in its direction. Per my previous email, in addition to providing emotional support and legal advocacy services ourselves, we also try to signpost people to services we think will be helpful to them. We are unable to thoroughly research every one, and we can make mistakes. We find it especially difficult to find good law firms to represent survivors with actions against the police. Back in summer 2021, the Foundation was in its infancy with just Maggie, Rick and a group of volunteers. We have subsequently grown and put in place more processes and procedures, such as clearly stating that any signposting is not a recommendation, and hiring an Outreach Worker to research and meet with external services.

I can again assure that there was never any official referral pathway or affiliation between The Maggie Oliver Foundation and [REDACTED] regardless of what might have been claimed by others in relation to this. The Foundation also never received any financial payments from [REDACTED] for introducing their services to any survivors supported by us. According to our records, [REDACTED]'s services were only ever mentioned to two survivors.

I have discussed the matter with Rick and confirmed our policies on signposting and not making recommendations. I have also impressed on him the necessity for complete transparency in all of his communications. Mistakes can and do happen. If any of us make one, I want us to own up to that and learn from it. Exactly what we demand so publicly from police forces!

I note your reference to Rick's own background. Rick's desire to help victims and survivors, and to fight for justice is very much rooted in his personal experiences. I obviously must protect his privacy but will say that the criminal justice system, and actions by police forces are not always what they appear. From information you have shared publicly about your own journey, I'm sure you are more aware of this than many! Rick was cleared of shoplifting charges in a court of law. In a public independent tribunal, GMP has been found guilty of breaching Rick's human rights in investigating these dropped charges. It is

not beyond the realms of possibility that some subsequent allegations against him were also false. Again, I am unable to elaborate anymore on this at this stage but watch this space.....

Maggie often says that she herself could be referred to as a “rogue ex cop” and that she feared being sent to prison before going public about the corruption she had witnessed. She understands from personal experience that the establishment closes ranks on anyone who tries to highlight its imperfections.

You clearly share our drive to root out corruption in the criminal justice system and to fight for those who might not otherwise have a voice. Maggie and I would very much welcome a meeting with you. If this is something you’d be willing to do, please let me know.

All the best,

Jennie

Jennie Lucas
Chief Executive
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com
jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com

We'd love to keep you updated on our work. If you'd like to join our mailing list please [subscribe here](#).

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 April 2023 21:54
To: Jennie Lucas <jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Subject: RE: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Hi Jennie,

I do appreciate you taking the time to reply, and I now understand that you are in touch with those I have named, but I honestly believe that your response is out of self preservation, not solely acting in the best interest of victims.

Rick has lied to me and to the survivors, he is certainly not been entirely truthful. He has then ignored my emails of fact and I believe only then sought a response from you when he knew I was not taking ‘no for an answer’.

I have been involved in helping people for some time, the majority are those suffering sexual abuse, including rape, and generally being ignored (or failed) by the system. You will know that I stand up without fear or favour and will put myself in harms way to make things public if action

is not taken. I do this for free, I do not take a salary as I expect the members of the foundation do!

The following comment you made does not fill me with any confidence as what you say would not be accepted by any reasonable person, based on face value and the full circumstances.

*“Please bear with me while I have these conversations then perhaps we can arrange to speak? **I want to give you all the reassurance that I can that we have the best interests of the survivors who approach us** for help at the heart of all we do at the Foundation, and totally agree that transparency is key in this.”*

I am not at all doubting your personal views on the foundation, but your assurance that you **collectively** have the best interests (*we have the best interests*) of the survivors, does highlight some ignorance as this is not something you can truthfully express on behalf of others. This is akin to the Chief of police stating that ALL police officers act in the best interest of the public, which the family of Sarah Everard would disagree, as would the vast majority of the right minded public.

That brings me to Rick. He is an ex-police officer (disgraced) and is, by his own account, a friend of [REDACTED]. He has unquestionably referred people to her unregulated firm suggesting she is the best person to bring action against police which is so inaccurate, it raises suspicions of corporate ‘back scratching’. He has lied about this to me (and others), and this now puts him in a bad light, especially that he was sacked from the police for serious dishonesty offences.

Rick was charged with shoplifting (albeit cleared) he was then sacked over serious data breaches putting the lives of others at risk based on them data leaks. How can you have an honest held belief that Rick is suitable for working (and benefiting) in such a charity, especially one that handles sensitive information of vulnerable victims and then goes on to refer victims to a [REDACTED] law firm that has now tried to illegally strike out their company to avoid legal ramifications!

I am happy to speak with you once you have made your enquiries, but I will not entertain any excuses if that is the intent.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: Jennie Lucas <jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 5:31 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Thanks for coming back to me [REDACTED]. I have a meeting scheduled with Rick later this week and will discuss again with him the details in your email.

With regards to speaking to the survivors involved, I will need to contact each of them separately to ensure they are happy to speak with me. I will contact them this evening and try to schedule to speak to them this week as well.

You mention in your email that several survivors have confirmed that Rick referred them to [REDACTED]. It would be helpful to me if you were able to tell me their names so I am able to look into this further as well. I appreciate that you will need their consent to share this information with me.

Please bear with me while I have these conversations then perhaps we can arrange to speak? I want to give you all the reassurance that I can that we have the best interests of the survivors who approach us for help at the heart of all we do at the Foundation, and totally agree that transparency is key in this.

Kind regards,
Jennie

Jennie Lucas
Chief Executive
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com
jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com

We'd love to keep you updated on our work. If you'd like to join our mailing list please [subscribe here](#).

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 April 2023 13:02
To: Jennie Lucas <jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Subject: RE: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Hi Jennie

Thank you for the response. Sadly, it appears the foundation is taking a defensive approach.

Rick has communicated with several survivors who have confirmed that he **did** refer them to [REDACTED]

In fact, this is evidenced in communication logs (emails and calls).

I am also aware that he refers to one of the directors () as a close friend and that he stated was the **best firm to deal with actions against the police**. A comment that is both reckless and untrue.

I am also aware that Rick is an ex-GMP police officer and was sacked for serious data breaches. I am concerned and shocked that he has access to the personal data of many survivors who may well be concerned that he has access to their case files.

One survivor has asked me to relay this...

"Tell MOF we did not get signposted to more firms we were not given a choice"

And

"Nor were we safeguarded as per their own policy"

You say, *"We are a small team of committed individuals trying our best to support survivors through an often daunting, challenging and opaque criminal justice system."*

I am aware that this small team takes a 'healthy salary', and that one, Rick, is a disgraced police officer, sacked from a branch of the criminal justice system.

Don't get me wrong, I am an active campaigner in the same area and can see glaring issues in the way you appear to be dealing with things.

■

From: Jennie Lucas <jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 12:38 PM

To: ■

Subject: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Good afternoon ■

Rick has forwarded to me several emails from you including the chain below. The information you request is publicly available on the Charity Commission's website here: <https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search/-/charity-details/5146000/trustees>

In terms of any involvement with ■, I can confirm that we have never had any affiliation with the firm or the individuals running it. I'm sure you can appreciate that from a confidentiality and data protection perspective, I am unable to discuss specific cases, but I can confirm that the no further survivors have been signposted

to the firm by us.

As explained by Rick, and also on our website, in some cases we do signpost survivors who approach us for help towards numerous law firms and many other services which we think they might find helpful, however no signposting is ever an endorsement or recommendation from us, it is purely our best efforts to find all ways we can to help them.

We are a small team of committed individuals trying our best to support survivors through an often daunting, challenging and opaque criminal justice system. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources to thoroughly research every outside service that we come into contact with [REDACTED], nor do we ever pretend we do.

Please note also that Maggie, who is our Chair of Trustees, is aware of these email exchanges and the situation you are highlighting.

Kind regards,
Jennie

Jennie Lucas
Chief Executive
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com
jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com

We'd love to keep you updated on our work. If you'd like to join our mailing list please [subscribe here](#).

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2023 12:19:17 PM
To: Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Subject: FW: Your Email

Hi Rick,

This is the audio recording

[REDACTED]

This is advising and coaching to commit an offence.

██████ has told me that she came to you for advice and support. She said she was *thinking* of going with ████████████████████ and you told her she couldn't get any better, and due to your reassurance, she instructed them.

██████ and ████████ agree that it is unlikely that they are the only two referred to ████████.

There is another recording of ████████ telling ████████████████████ cannot talk to a Solicitor. The reason given by ████████ was that ████████ is not a Lawyer, inferring ████████ is a lawyer and has a higher right.

This is fraud by misrepresentation.

As I have said, I am not criticising the Foundation, but it does appear to be trying to backpedal. It appears you have some prior connection to ████████, which could be a conflict of interest and why you resist making a public statement.

Can you provide me with a copy of the Charity constitution and the elected trustees?

Regards

██████

From: ████████████████████

Sent: 26 March 2023 13:33

To: Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>

Subject: FW: Your Email

Hi Rick,

I have had a detailed conversation with ████████, and she has confirmed that you, on behalf of the Foundation, said **"You cannot get better ████████████████████"** for actions against the police. Can you provide me with your basis for this claim?

This is absolutely disgraceful. I could reel off 20 reputable and SRA regulated law firms that are 100% better than ████████ for actions against the police. You are well aware that ████████ have destroyed the credibility of ████████ and ████████ have destroyed ████████'s complaint. You are aware of the ████████ recording of coercing a rape victim to lie to police.

Why are you, (the Maggie Oliver Foundation) intentionally trying to distance yourself?

You have referred and recommended. I accept that hindsight is a wonderful thing and you may not have known at the time, but firstly, ████████ have never been the best for actions against police and that now you are aware you have made referrals or promoted services of ████████, I am extremely concerned why the Foundation will not issue a statement that ANY victims who have

contacted, or been contacted [REDACTED] after advice from the Foundation should contact you.

You have heard the 100% conclusive evidence of the coerced rape victim, why are you so reluctant to take risk away from other rape victims.

Regards
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2023 08:57
To: Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Subject: FW: Your Email

Hi Rick

After discussing our conversation with [REDACTED] she insists she was referred to [REDACTED] directly by you on behalf of the foundation. She specifically told me that you personally took her personal details and sent them to [REDACTED], and that, as a direct result, [REDACTED] called her.

I will be speaking to [REDACTED] and a few others over the coming days, but I wanted to get your response to this and clarify if this is what you mean by 'signposting'.

I am not looking to cause any harm to the foundation, on the contrary, I support the same cause, but as I have said, I am concerned that I am told that the foundation has referred directly to [REDACTED] an unregulated law firm.

I suspect you have heard the recording of [REDACTED] coaching [REDACTED] to lie to the police. This is not the fault of the foundation, but the foundation should take a positive step to ensure that based on that recording alone, it has referred/signposted victims to [REDACTED] and a statement (however watered down) should be made **in the interest of the victims?**

Regards
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 March 2023 22:25
To: Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email

Hi Rick,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Keep up the good work,

Regards

[REDACTED]

Hi [REDACTED]

We have solicitors and other organisations which we signpost people to this means that they make their own choice and decisions to take on board the advice offered.

There was no affiliation with anyone. Their website had a link to our website nothing more.

I would describe it as the BBC offering various organisations with a click through as support.

[REDACTED]

We support victims of sexual abuse both historic and current. No one has claimed any affiliation with the Foundation. Many organisations jump on the back of Maggie.

With regards to my quote that refers to what the Foundation does which is help victims of abuse and where we can emotionally support them.

[REDACTED]

Best Wishes

Rick Pendlebury
Operations Director
The Maggie Oliver Foundation

www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 23 March 2023, 20:15
To: Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email

Hi Rick

Thanks for the reply.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told me that they were advised by the foundation that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were the best out there for actions against (or complaints against) police. If this is how victims are signposted, it is important that anyone who received this 'signpost' should be updated.

I understand [REDACTED] were claiming an affiliation with the Foundation. While I suspect this was false, it may be an idea to make a public comment about this.

There are a lot of people coming to me saying there were directed to [REDACTED] and I am increasingly concerned that the organisation are not going public.

When you say *"I have outlined the Foundations position which is that we will not get involved in anything other than offer support if appropriate."*

Does this mean you will not provide any form of statement to confirm the position?

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>
Sent: 23 March 2023 19:20
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Your Email

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for the email.

Can I just point out we don't refer anyone to any organisation we just sign post numerous options and allow the client to make their own decision.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I have spoken with [REDACTED]

I have outlined the Foundations position which is that we will not get involved in anything other than offer support if appropriate.

Best Wishes

Rick Pendlebury
Operations Director
The Maggie Oliver Foundation

www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.