**Cllr Mohammed Hanif,**

**Mayor, DMBC.**

**Dear Mo,**

**Regarding: Fabrication**

I do miss our chats during Councillors' surgeries as we concurred on all major social issues, particularly those concerning The Dog.

You might recall that, on one occasion, Councillor Herbert claimed that my remarks represented "bullying and harassment" - but is that not absurd within a Councillors' surgery? Is that not just the place to air views concerning the way forward? Why have I not heard from the Labour Party concerning my complaint over Herbert's remarks and subsequent involvement of the Borough's, rather expensive, barrister? Why does the Council not respond after it has promised to investigate Herbert's conduct? Is such behaviour not entirely inappropriate for someone with Public Office?

You were also present in Chambers, Mo, when I presented, to the Council Leader, pictorial evidence of the Council Executive's wrong-doing in connection with its management of Housing and Trade Waste. Cllr Lowe claimed that he, "Could not be expected to take action against [his] own authority." Does he not have a responsibility of scrutiny? Is that not a single admission of misconduct? Does that not demonstrate the Council's corrupt condition?

The Conservative Party, you may be pleased, but not surprised, to know, is not free from blame in this regard; I made an appointment and presented evidence to a significant member of the Party, the Chair of the Stourbridge Conservatives, Elizabeth Walker, with Liz agreeing to represent my opinions at the office of Margot James MP. But a while after placing an account of our meeting in Walker's letter-box, I had a visit from West Midlands Police over an alleged act of harassment! After making an appointment? Is this not also absurd? I have not had a reply following my complaint to the Conservatives' Regional Chairman, but it has been suggested to me that this form of 'dirty tricks' has the 'whiff' of your Council Officials. What do you think, Mo? Ought you investigate?

The name of one of your officials, Juliet Davies, footed the dossier considered by the Interviewing Officer after my arrest, again for alleged harassment, last month; subsequently, I have been charged and bailed to appear in court in December. Yet my arrest took place only a few days after I had reported to your officials two particularly nasty acts of harassment, by the same perpetrator, towards me, with witnesses, on the High Street. The charge is an inversion of these acts. I cannot think of a reason why Juliet and her colleagues should want to act in such a spiteful manner, save for the possibility, like the perpetrator, that Juliet, or a super-ordinate, is a member of the dog-lobby. Your officials will not provide the required information. There is then, Mo, the pathetic possibility, that arguably the Borough's most earnest citizen is facing a rather nasty penalty because, indirectly and remotely, he is deemed to have been disrespectful to one of your officials’ pet dog. Is this not again absurd? What do you think, Mo?

**Yours etc,**

**David 'Bill' Austin**

**mail@dwaustin.net**