

# PO box 42 Truro Cornwall UK

01 May 2005

Mr David Lanyon


Dear Mr Lanyon

It has been suggested that I made to the police an allegation against you in respect of the theft of a fabric rolling machine from 52 Fore Street, Redruth. Please be assured I did not.

John Layte apparently told the officer investigating the break in that he had given the key to his preferred buyer and at least one other person. As there is no way to establish how many people might have been given the key by the people to whom John gave the key, the world and his wife could have had access. Thus upon discovery of the theft of the machine there were a multiplicity of suspects mostly unknown.

I informed the police that the prime suspect was John Layte, but he would need a larger vehicle and you might have provided it. It was not suggested that you were implicated, in fact the only implication is that if John denied taking it you would tell the truth about the use of the vehicle.

Yours faithfully



D J Arthur

At the 27 April 2005 hearing of his 4 November 2004 [Application](#) Mr Arthur told the Judge that he "*immediately reported the FRM missing to the Police Officer attending the break in on the 9 September 2003*" [but that he did not suspect J Layte at that time.](#)

Mr Arthur's reason for writing this letter to Mr Lanyon (Who the Police told J Layte that Mr Arthur had also implicated in the "theft") is simply to make an excuse as to why he did not implicate J Layte at the time (i.e. Others had the key and could have "stolen" the FRM without the need to break in.

PC Silver attended on the 9 September 2003 and confirms (verbally) that Mr Arthur did not even mention the FRM missing let alone anyone he suspected of stealing it.

In Mr Arthur's own [note of the break in and Police attendance](#) there is no mention of the FRM being missing or that he "immediately" reported it missing to PC Silver. Strange since one would have thought the "disappearance" of a £6000 machine would have been paramount in his mind. At least this note proves that Mr Arthur was lying to the Police on 19 December 2003 when he told them he had not been to the shop since January 2003.

Mention of "Blocks replaced" is more important than it may appear since these blocks had been removed from the double doors in order to remove the FRM.

Mr Arthur must be a liar. He lied to the Police about when he *first* noticed it missing (19 December 2003) *and* he lied to the Judge about [immediately reporting it missing to the Police](#) on 9 September 2003 when he told the Judge he first noticed it missing.

Mr Arthur lied to the Police when on 19 December 2003 he told them he did not know who had "stolen" it because a month before he had demanded the Defendants [return it or it would be taken as theft.](#)