

From the Desk of:



Gordon W. Watts

821 Alicia Road
Lakeland, FL 33801-2113

H: (863) 688-9880 / C: (863) 513-4315

Gww1210@aol.com

<http://GordonWatts.com>

Florida Department of Law Enforcement
ATTN: Professional Compliance Section
Subject: "Addendum to Previous"

Friday, 19 January 2007

Dear FDLE:

Since I sent you recent report (dated 11 Jan 2007), and delivered to your office in Tallahassee at 7:23 AM on January 16, 2007 (USPS, Label Number: 7005 1160 0001 9046 7012) and a copy to your Lakeland Office (to keep a promise I had made to one special agent regarding giving him a copy), three things have happened that require me to submit an "addendum to previous," and titled this way, as case worker, Mr. Murphy, in your Tallahassee Office said I should title this letter:

1) **LATE ARRIVAL AFTER PRESS TIME:** After I sent you that report on the 11th, a letter arrived in the mail from the Lakeland Police Department late that evening, in reply to my Public Records Request to LPD of the 21st of December. I had all but given up on them responding, since I had waited almost a month. (You can read their letter, in which they refuse to release some records -and ask me to pay an exorbitant -and probably quite illegal -amount for a few others.)

2) **TYPOS:** Because of this "late arrival," the "TABLE OF REFERENCES" on page v. of my report must be updated, so I am Re-Submitting my original report, and correcting this typo; Additionally, I found NUMEROUS other small typos, and I am correcting them too. **Fret not over this matter: It shall be very easy to spot the corrections:** I shall highlight them in bright yellow in a corrected copy. So, what this means in Plain-English is that the original report I submitted is still "good," except that this addendum here merely points out a few small typos. (Sorry, but I am human and make typographical errors.)

3) **NEW COMPLAINT - possibly MORE PERJURY by a LEO:** I had originally not planned to put this in, probably because I had found so many other valid complaints, and this one was, honestly, borderline, but caseworker Murphy said it sounded like it might be perjury to him (when I read him the transcript), so I am including it. LPD Officer, Chuck Dallas made two identifiably false statements under my direct cross-examination of the traffic court case documented here:

a) Please note on **page 11** of the transcript (page 72 of the Transcript of Record on Appeal of Case No. CI03-012168-LD; Appeal Case No. GG-9), that officer Dallas insists that the person he (falsely) arrested for trespass on public property was Dan Bishop (lines 15-17 on **page 11**, referring to his testimony on **page 7**, generally). Although he was wrong, and would not admit it later, even after he had a chance to see the records which you can see (reference: [E1], which you already have), it is hypothesized that he simply made a mistake. Evidence for this theory is the fact that it doesn't seem likely that he could gain anything by naming the wrong person (he falsely arrested numerous people). However, it does indicate a memory problem - AND a refusal on his part to review the official records and make a correction. Both are bad for a cop.

b) However, on the bottom of page 11 and the top of page 12 of that transcript, we find Mr. Dallas claiming, under my cross-examination, that he had nothing in his file. We know that to be false (please see a copy of his LENGTHY disciplinary record included: Over 32 citizen complaints as of late 2003 when the record was prepared). Yet, it is possible, I admit, however,

unlikely, that he is telling the truth here. Note, if you would that I asked him to clarify: I asked him if there were any citizen complaints at all made against him. He says there MAY be, but, if they existed, they were "unfounded," that is, deemed to be invalid complaints by Internal Affairs. There, I admit, is a weak case in support for this claim by the officer:

It is a widely known fact that LPD keeps their officers in the dark about things. Here are three examples to support this theory:

TYPO: a "slightly" different.

i) The night I tried to call police and report a road obstruction near my home (cf. [Track02.cda] CD audio of: 23Jan2006_circa1130pm_GWattsCallToLPD.wma), I was unable to call the main dispatch (863-834-6900), and I was also unable to call the lobby desk (863-834-6929), as shown by reference [C6]. However, I kept trying to call, using a different number, something like 834-6901, or 834-6930 -in other words, a slightly different number. I finally found a number to the police station that wasn't blocked, simply by trial and error. I had to press many extensions to get to the duty desk. As soon as I got a real live, person, I asked why my number had been blocked to the "regular" numbers. As my notes contemporary from that time period indicate, I spoke with an **Officer "Bowling"** (pronounced like "Bowling Ball," I believe) who assured me that LPD couldn't and wouldn't block my phone number, and he asked me to try again calling the downstairs lobby number, 834-6929. I was unable, and he asked me if I wanted an officer dispatched. (I had already called in on my pre-paid cell phone account, as high cost to me.)

ii) I then called back on the alternate number, and, again -after much pressing of buttons to get the right extension, I again got hold of the station duty desk at the lobby. This time, I spoke to an **Officer "Crackum."** (Spelling uncertain on both this and previous. This officer assured me that LPD couldn't block a person's phone from calling the police department.

iii) Sometime later, when I was shopping at the local Wal-Greens here in Lakeland, I saw an officer there who had been assigned special duty. I recall (but am not 100% certain) that it was **LPD Officer, Virgil Cardin**, a middle-aged white male officer. I asked him about who I could talk to if my Public Records requests were being repeatedly denied, and he (predictably) suggested the records department -which was of no help here. However, and this is the main point, when I asked him why LPD could or would block my number from calling, he said that they could not do that. When I told him I had proof from the phone company, he then apologised to me, saying that I might be correct, but he had not thought they could do that -because he had wanted to think the best about his department. Because of his candor and the tenor of his voice, I believe he was telling the truth.

My point here? Three "good" officers were "kept in the dark" about routine (and probably illegal) departmental policy to block citizen telephone numbers, and, if this is true (I believe all 3 officers were candid and totally unaware of this illegal practice), then it might be possible that Officer Chuck Dallas ALSO was kept in the dark about the 32+ citizen complaints made against him. However, if he was telling the truth, then this police department has a major problem of lying to and keeping in the dark its sworn officers. What, now? They can't trust the officers to "know the truth?" What it look more like to me is that this police department INDEED has something to hide -and thus does not tell its officers. If, however, LPD insists innocence on this charge (lying to police officers and/or failing to make them aware of routine things -like citizen complaints and phone-blocking policies), then we MUST OF NECESSITY conclude that Mr. Dallas *did* know there were numerous complaints made against him. Thus, this action, if true, would constitute yet another instance (read: pattern of behaviour) of perjury by a LEO. Remember, however, if this is not true, then, as I stated above, we have a department that can't even trust its own cops to know the truth, and this is possibly as scary as the perjury here: The police department has no motive to hide facts from its cops -unless it is trying to cover up illegal behavior (such as the phone-blocking policy here). Either way it is scary. Well, I know this is a lot of paperwork, but I hope you pace yourself and don't work too hard -after all, it is never good to hate your job, but rather to find the enjoyable aspects of it. *With kind regard, I am,*

Sincerely,


Gordon Wayne Watts

Fri. 01-19-2007

My Identifying data

Redacted!

ERATTA / ADDENDUM Re the 32+ citizens: Ofc. Dallas' claim that he did not know of the 32+ complaints here is proof that Internal Affairs NEVER investigated even the first complaint: In order for them to properly investigate a complaint, they have to speak with the officer in question, and apparently they didn't. --GW