

Threat: Simon Buck, 26-Feb-20

Please note that Mr Buck was misapplying the Parliamentary Behaviour Code.

[It concerns MPs and their staff](#), and I should not have to remind anyone that I am not employed by it. Besides that, if I had not returned Mr Palmer's call there would not be even one instance of a vexatious slanderous or personal attack on Mr Palmer let alone a continuity of them.

From: [BUCK, Simon](#)

Sent: 26 February 2020 10:06

To: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk

Subject: Emails to the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP

Dear Mr Dawson,

Thank you for your recent emails. However, I must draw your attention to your continued vexatious, slanderous and personal attacks on a valued member of staff working from the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP. Staff employed by Members of Parliament are protected under the Parliamentary Behaviour Code which is put in place to ensure a safe working environment and to safeguard them from bullying and harassment. It is now my belief that your continued emails denigrating Mr Palmer have breached that code.

Continued emails of this nature will be forwarded to the relevant Parliamentary Counsel for advice and direction.

Yours sincerely

Simon Buck

Office Manager for the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP

Member of Parliament for South Shields



If Mr Buck had taken the trouble to acknowledge my response and answer the questions raised in [my email of 15-Jan-20 things may have turned out a bit better for him](#). All he has done is to prove he was complicit with Mr Palmer in setting me up and at the same time exposed the pair of them to ridicule.

- 1) *You will see, below, that whatever we said over the phone he misled me into thinking he was Emma's Office Manager but I see from your email that you are her Office Manager. So who is Mr Palmer?*
- 2) *When you consider the matter closed, do you mean that the Council can cover up wrongdoing by misleading the Ombudsman is OK? Do you think it OK that they can then use the Ombudsman's findings to mislead MPs and other enquirers?*

When he considered the matter closed he was repeating what the Case Officer said in January 2014. In the six years in between the Council have consistently lied about the shed having been approved.