

Extract from Peter Timms ADDENDUM 7 to Set Aside Motion
delivered to Methodist House 27th January 2017.

Concerning organised attacks on
the character of the complainant.

And then came the “dog that did not bark”.

I was very surprised when I received a letter from Mr. Kitchin dated 16th November. This included the words:

“You are now well enough that you were able to fulfil your commitment to speak at the Monday Fellowship at Sackville Road Methodist Church on Monday 7th November 2016 and visit the MHA Richmond Care Home.

We therefore intend to complete the rest of this complaints process as soon as possible, and will not wait until January to fix a new date to interview you.”¹

The second paragraph demonstrated that the panel *believed the truth* of the first paragraph. As with the Troughton email, I was found guilty before I even heard the charge.

But who had supplied the information in the first paragraph?

None of the events concerning this are mentioned in the inquiry’s decision. The accusation, indeed the whole story, is simply left out – in spite of the fact that, as explained in the second paragraph, it was this information which led the panel leader to bring the date of the inquiry forward from January to December.

That decision was disastrous to my cause.

That change of date was a crucial intervention – and yet the leader’s true reason for it is *left out* of the final decision.

Worse, at line 135 a *substitute reason* was put in its place – this was to the effect that, if I was well enough to write voluminous material, I must be well enough to attend the meeting in December.

Why would the leader of the panel leave out the information about the Sackville Road meeting and the visit to the MHA – and instead substitute the somewhat spurious notion that, if I could write a lot, I was not ill?²

¹ App 3

² For further on this see Addendum 5 page 9 – Peter Hill was doing the writing.,

I am particularly concerned about this because the truth of the matter *supports my general contention about the pernicious atmosphere within the Circuit and the District.*

The facts are that, a few weeks after my first stay in hospital, I attended the Sackville Road church to fulfil a long-standing invitation to speak. In fact I only managed to speak for about seven minutes before I had to sit down and rest.

When I left there, I drove home via the MHA Richmond – mainly to tell them there that I was getting better and would soon be able to spend more time with the old people. I sat down talking to some of them.

All this was swiftly reported to Mr. Kitchin – and he responded with the letter quoted above.

What actually happened here?

I was at both venues of course - but I did not see any of the respondents there. In fact there were no senior members of the church present at all, not even stewards.

Was it possible that it was one single person who attended at the two venues? I certainly did not see anyone at the church who later went to the MHA. Why would they do that?

Was it possible that someone who saw me at the church followed me after I left? How could they know that I was going anywhere except to my home? I had clearly been ill in the church.

The simple, indeed obvious, explanation would be that two persons, one at the church, another at the MHA, separately and independently, reported my presence to someone - who then passed the information on to Mr. Kitchin.

But how could any lay person at either venue know that *my health* was an issue in the complaints inquiry?

They must have been told.

Such a scenario seems to be more than a coincidence. It seems organised. As with the Troughton email and the Martin letter, it would seem that there had been *prior prompting* at both venues that people should report on my movements.

The word had gone out – keep tabs on Peter Timms and report. The only question was – report to whom? Ordinary members of the

Methodist community do not normally report to the District Chair – they probably do not even know how to do that.

If the informants were lay persons, as seems likely, then they would more likely report to a minister or a steward. The ministers involved in this would be Rev Pruden, possibly Rev. Luscombe and, less likely, Rev. Hellyer.

However, I think it unlikely that Rev Luscombe and Rev Pruden would speak to the leader of the panel without first consulting Rev Hellyer.

So who told the informants to report on me and my movements? Had the stewards been told – and did they pass the request on to the lay persons in the community? Or did the ministers make the request directly?

This information was, in some way, collated. If the matter of the Troughton email and the Martin letter set a pattern, then the pattern here might be that Rev Hellyer was the person who told Mr. Kitchin.

Here, the reputation of the District Chair comes into question. Mr. Kitchin is not a minister. Would he feel the need to double-check a story that came from such a reputable senior person as Rev Hellyer? Surely the word of a District Chair is to be trusted?

Is that why Mr. Kitchin paid no attention to my explanation of the two visits – and indeed is that why he also took no notice of my reasons expressed in my letter to Mr. Kitchin concerning S.O. 040 with regard to the Troughton Email? (The two matter were dealt with almost concurrently in mid-November)

In a letter of 18th November I made the same points about the Sackville Road and MHA visits as above - though I added the point that Mr. Kitchin was accepting, as true, hearsay at second or even third hand. I also mentioned that he should have refused to listen to such gossip.

Mr. Kitchin appears to have been happy to accept both the Troughton email incident and the Sackville/MHA incident *without questioning where this information had come from and how it had been collected*. This is contrary to many Standing Orders. Surely his only excuse for this is that he had complete trust in the source – Rev Hellyer – and assumed that the background of the collection of the information was in no way contrary to Standing Orders.

However, when it came to the report on the inquiry, the Sackville/MHA episode was left out. Why?

Did Mr. Kitchin now suddenly realise that there had indeed been an organised surveillance operation going on against me in the Bexhill area? Would that not support some of the contentions I made in my original grievances about the antipathy shown to me? The evidence was actually in my favour.

Such might be embarrassing considering that Mr. Kitchin was accusing me of bullying, manipulation, disputing Standing Orders, and refusing to answer question etc (see Lines 287 – 292).

What other possible explanation can there be for him leaving this Sackville/MHA affair out of the final decision and substituting the idea that I was fit enough to attend his meeting because I could write a lot?

The substitution of the reason for pulling the date of the inquiry forward by a month suggests that he was trying to hide something. Was it that he finally understood that I had been subjected to surveillance for several months and that my claims of ill-treatment might be true?

Was that the information he was trying to hide?

If he had paused for thought, as he appears to have done, a recapitulation of the evidence might have brought a further point to his attention.