Risk ID	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy
C00018 []	R8 Political / Government	Procedural Failures in Kent Police Speed Enforcement and SJP	Kent Police have issued a Single Justice Procedure Notice (SJP) for an alleged offence of exceeding a variable speed limit. The enforcement process has been conducted without due process, transparency, or lawful justification, relying on intimidation, financial coercion, and flawed legal premises. Reformation is needed for removal from the proces of intimidation tactics, lack of due process, financial exploitation and refusal to engage in legitimate dialogue.	Transparency on enforcement policy and a formal response to key legal objections raised in related correspondence. Compensation for time and resources expended on responding to these legal defects, as invoiced. **What Could Go Wrong?** 1. Proceeding to court without proper due process. 2. Illegitimate imposition of increased financial penalties. 3. Kent Police could continue to ignore legitimate objections, reinforcing a pattern of abuse. 4. Escalation without resolution, requiring further external intervention (legal, media, advocacy group involvement).	SJP Notice received on 07 March 2025. Letter 5 (Response to SJP) prepared and ready for submission on 24 March 2025, rejecting the process as invalid. Ongoing assessment of potential legal counteraction or public exposure of procedural misconduct.	1. Submit Letter 5 rejecting the SJP process and asserting invoice for incurred costs. 2. Document all correspondence and track responses for a later escalation if required. 3. Develop a bespoke PHC Concerns Register for ongoing monitoring. 4. If unresolved, escalate via public channels (legal action, media, public records request). 5. Consider a campaign exposing the financial nature of speed enforcement schemes if necessary.

Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk									
Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (PxI)	Response Type	Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Due Date	Close Date	Last Review Date / Notes
Flawed legal framework of Kent Police enforcement practices.	Unjustified financial and legal coercion through the SJP process.	Wrongful financial penalty, legal harassment, and erosion of due process rights.	4	2 H-1 C-2 Q-1 S-1	8	Mitigate	3	4	Winter, David	31May25	Open	13Apr25

Mitigating Actions / Response				
ID	Actions	Action Owner	Due Date	Close Date
#1	Submit Letter 5 rejecting the SJP process and asserting invoice for incurred costs.	Winter, David	20May25	Open
#2	Document all correspondence and track responses for a later escalation if required.	Winter, David	20May25	Open
#3	Develop a bespoke PHC Concerns Register for ongoing monitoring.	Winter, David	20May25	Open
#4	If unresolved, escalate via public channels (legal action, media, public records request).	Winter, David	20May25	Open
#5	Consider a campaign exposing the financial nature of speed enforcement schemes if necessary.	Winter, David	20May25	Open

Last 10 RM Events (Meetings/Interviews/Workshops).

Mtg.	Date	Title / Person / Department	Objective	(0 Events held.)

Comments

[new Concern at 21mar25]

History

Concern created on 21mar25

Top Risk **Summary**

Top Risk Mitigation