



Dai Richards <dairichardswales@gmail.com>

Welsh Government legal child murders, Glynneath toxic waste murders

1 message

Dai Richards <dairichardswales@gmail.com>

17 October 2025 at 13:19

To: justicecom@parliament.uk, enquiries@cps.gov.uk, ohchr-InfoDesk@un.org, supportercare@unicef.org.uk, Dai Richards <dairichardswales@gmail.com>

Reference: Correct interpretation of the law - Welsh Government legal child murders, Glynneath toxic waste murders

Our communication reference: 2025-ACEM-CPSE-defence

This communication can be viewed on-line as a webpage at:

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/archive/2025/09-2025/20250929A-WBEM-CPSE-defence.htm>

Dear Director of Public Prosecutions & United Nations

My company requires a correct interpretation of UK law that I believe only the CPS could assist with. We are in two situations whereby whatever we do we will be breaking the laws of the United Kingdom. It is what is commonly known as a catch 22 situation. Whichever course of action we take, we will be breaking the law, even if we do nothing. In the lead up to this situation we have sought the correct interpretation of the law from the Crown Prosecution Service, which we believe is your responsibility, but they have refused to give one, instead, providing, in my opinion, three inappropriate referrals. We are approaching you in your role as the head of the CPS with regards to your responsibility to *"provide information, assistance and support to victims"* as defined on the CPS website. The information below provides evidence of our quandary and we am seeking clarification from, you, the Director of Public Prosecutions as to which laws we should break so that we can remain lawful citizens of this country.

LAW BREAKING DECISION 1 - WELSH GOVERNMENT CHILD MURDERS

We believe the judiciary (<https://www.judiciary.uk/>) have created a precedent for the legal murder of children in Wales by designer deaths. A coroner has deliberately made a judgement on the death of a child that is biased or incompetent and supports a system of child abuse extant within Wales that is designed to cause the death of children through the medium of play. Disinformation made public by the coroner supports the actions of the Welsh Government* who are systematically abusing children through legislation, guidance and education in a similar style to that used by Nazi Germany to eventually exterminate 6,000,000 Jews. References used to support disinformation can be traced back to Nazi scientists who conducted experiments on prisoners in the concentration camps during WWII. Some children will die through negligence, manslaughter or murder because a system of governance has been built to support the legal death of a child through play. The judiciary have created a precedent for the mechanism of recording these deaths incorrectly as 'misadventure' by failing to follow judiciary protocol, avoiding key elements within the mechanism of death.

This communication is a reply to the CPS communication of 12 August 2025 ([communication link](#)) which directs me to the police and is made with you under the auspices of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The CPS were informed in my initial contact on 30 July 2023 that the police were refusing to investigate environmental breaches in law that was killing people. ([communication link](#)). For the third time the CPS has provided an **inappropriate response** to matters of urgency that relate to the **lives** of UK citizens. You as a leading public figure have a responsibility to uphold the law and in particular the Human Rights Act 1998.

Right to life:

1 Everyone's right to life shall be protected by law. No one shall be deprived of his life intentionally save in the execution of a sentence of a court following his conviction of a crime for which this penalty is provided by law.

The United Nations are copied into this email for the benefit of making them aware of this and that the systematic abuse of children by the Welsh Government in Wales exists. Other organisations with an interest in the protection of children are also copied in to this email along with my relevant local and national government representatives, media and other potentially interested parties.

I refer now to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

Article 1

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and

should act towards one another in a **spirit of brotherhood**

The purpose for this reference to the United Nations is to identify that I am approaching you in a in a **spirit of brotherhood** because for seven years I have been informing and reporting to the regulatory authorities that the relevant governing bodies in Wales that the Welsh Government are systematically abusing children through the medium of play and that children will lose their lives as a result of this. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

The Welsh government are signatories to **UNCRC Article 31** which provides universal rights to children in Wales. My opinions and information submitted to the Welsh Government show that deception is being used by the Welsh Government to avoid children's rights as outlined in **UNCRC Article 31**. My analysis of this deception has been ignored or has not been challenged, it has only been hidden. My follow up concerns are either ignored or blocked.

The staff of this company have been **endowed with reason and conscience** and so have followed protocol and approached the relevant governance organisations in a **spirit of brotherhood** to protect Welsh children from abuse.

The following web-page is the information submitted to the former Assembly Member for Swansea, Suzy Davies on 30/7/2019. It identifies deception within education material that relates to the **UNCRC Article 31** and the subsequent directive **General Comment 17**.

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/pages/play-wales/correspondence/2019/2019-07-30-am-davies-suzy.htm>

Suzy Davies AM was also a member of the Children, Young Person and Education Committee. The following document was submitted to her and the other 5 members of the CYPE Committee. The response from that committee in relation to its content was that the legal murder of children was to be allowed based upon Health and Safety Executive guidance included with their reply. It should be noted that the same people were advising HSE as were advising the Welsh Government only their charity format was different. The document itself and the discussion by the committee has not been recorded by the Welsh Government which is against their rules. The paper should have been openly discussed by the committee or behind closed doors given reasons why the discussion was private. It was not.

<https://www.a-better.wales/pages/play-wales/wag/cype-report.pdf> - paper as a video on YouTube -
https://youtu.be/2hECe_AVQy0

No reply or communication was received from Ms Davies. The only reply was from the chair of the committee Lynne Neagle AM who avoided addressing our concerns. It must therefore be accepted that Wales is a country where children can be legally killed through the malicious interpretation of information that targets children.

CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE MISREPRESENTATION OF ROLE

I refer to your inappropriate referral dated 12 August 2025: ([communication link](#))

*"It is important to understand, that the CPS and the police are separate authorities. Further, the CPS is not an investigative body and has no power to investigate allegations of crime, therefore, if you believe that a criminal offence has been committed, it should be reported to the police **in the first instance** so that an appropriate course of action can be taken."*

The crimes I am setting out in this communication with you have been reported to the police ("**in the first instance**") twice and on both occasions the police have failed in their duty of care to investigate the abuse of our children. They have not taken an appropriate course of action.

I refer to the Crown Prosecution Service home page of your website:

*"The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) prosecutes criminal cases that have been investigated by the police and **other investigative organisations** in England and Wales. The CPS is **independent**, and we make our **decisions independently of the police and government**."*

Your directive states "**other investigative organisations**" - I have previously approached you in my role as the chairman of a public **organisation** who have made an **investigation** into local council and police corruption. You have ignored crimes that have been investigated by **other investigative organisations**.

and

*The CPS is **independent**, and we make our **decisions independently of the police and government**." - The CPS continually makes inappropriate referrals to other government bodies. this is not being **independent**, **this is relying on external sources, and when you say "decisions independently of the police and government"**, there is no evidence in our case of you making a decision other that to make an inappropriate referral.*

The CPS:

decides which cases should be prosecuted;

*determines the appropriate charges in more serious or complex cases, **and advises the police during the early stages of investigations;***

"and advises the police during the early stages of investigations;" suggests that you were either informed by the police that the Welsh Government were systematically abusing children or the police did not inform you. I reported it twice and I would suggest that the systematic abuse of children is a **more serious or complex case** on which CPS advice should be sought. If I am wrong on this assumption, you will of course correct me.

THE LEGAL MURDER OF WELSH CHILDREN SUPPORTED BY SOUTH WALES POLICE AND/OR THE CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE

The following link was provided in my communication with you on 15 May 2025:

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/ds-peach.htm>

This publicly available page has identified two causes for concern that could cause the death of children. Because of the complexities of corruption within the governance system involved with these potential deaths, a system of effective communication was agreed with a local police sergeant DS Peach to report these crimes. This police officer refuses to uphold the agreed system of communication by not replying to my communications as agreed. One of the links show that Welsh children are systematically abused by the Welsh Government with the resulting outcome being that they may die through the negligent instructions given to a playworker by the Welsh Government funded education service, Adult Learning Wales.

This was initially reported through the 101 service in an on-line submission (BCA-24663-21-6262-01) on 4 December 2021. Link below.

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/archive/2021/12-2021/20211205A-EM-play-wales-police.pdf>

The police refused to investigate the Welsh government, referring me to the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales and then failed to communicate with me when I informed them that the Ombudsman is an inappropriate referral. The Ombudsman is a civil servant appointed by the Welsh Assembly Government that has no legal powers over the Welsh Assembly Government or of UK Government law. It was in effect an inappropriate referral because the Ombudsman deals with governance issues not crimes. **Child abuse through governance malpractice is still child abuse**, it is a crime. The prevention of harm to children is a government requirement, it is not optional, it is a regulatory function. The failure to investigate child abuse is an offence that should be dealt with by the relevant regulatory authority, the police and then prosecuted by the Crown Prosecution Service. If the police fail to investigate child abuse then other police should investigate those police etc until the requirements of the law are met and those responsible for the abuse of children are prosecuted.

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/ds-peach.htm>

The page link above submitted to DS Peach was built and published on 23 January 2023. About a mile away from where DS Peach is stationed in Port Talbot, on the 19 June 2023, a 15 year old boy, David Chiaka Ejimofor tragically lost his life by jumping into the sea off the pier on Aberavon Beach. I would suggest that recording of his death by the coroner is incorrect and has given legal precedent by the judiciary to the systematic murder of Welsh children through educational 'misadventure' using the physical attributes of the death (the environment) as opposed to the mental attributes (circumstances).

THE POTENTIAL LEGAL MURDER OF DAVID EJIMOFOR

David Ejimofor was taking part in the form of play known as deep play. This is the type of play I was informed during a Welsh Government funded playworkers' course was good for children and **was essential for a child's personal development** (The First Claim, Play Wales). During the film 'Pushing Eddie in the Nettles with Connor' on the Adult Learning Wales - level 2 Playworker Award course, we, as students**** witnessed children jumping into water in a similar fashion to David without the presence of a lifeguard. It was pointed out to the course instructor by a practising play leader***** (not myself) that a lifeguard should have been present while the film was being made. Having trained and worked professionally as a lifeguard I was also of the same opinion. The course leader quickly changed the subject and continued to promote the abuse of children as a form of play education. The course was designed to be deleterious (cause harm) to children and we as students were being coerced into believing that children should be placed in danger as part of the play curriculum.

I have looked at the Judiciary report below and I believe it is incorrect in its conclusions and may be covering up the potential manslaughter/murder of David Ejimofor.*****

Judiciary report - <https://www.judiciary.uk/prevention-of-future-death-reports/david-ejimofor-prevention-of-future-deaths-report/>

The following relevant text is pasted from that report

I am EDWARD RAMSAY, His Majesty's Assistant Coroner for the coroner area of SWANSEA AND NEATH PORT TALBOT.

The investigation concluded at the end of the inquest held between 19 – 21 MAY 2025 before me sitting alone in the Swansea Coroner's Court.

Box 2: Record of Inquest recorded that DAVID'S medical cause of death was "1a) consistent with drowning".

Box 3 of the Record of Inquest recorded that DAVID died:

"At 2005 on 19 June 2023 at the little beach at Aberavon having drowned after jumping into the sea from the breakwater, to which he had, effectively, unrestricted and undeterred access. The breakwater should not have been used for that purpose but was known to have been used for that purpose by local children and teenagers, especially in the spring and summer months when the weather was good and the tides were high. In the past lifeguards had been stationed at or around the pier, at these times, to deter this activity. No lifeguard was present at the time that David jumped. Had there been one it is possible that David would not have jumped and therefore would not have drowned".

Box 4 of the Record of Inquest recorded a conclusion of Misadventure.

next

Our conclusion is: It is not the dangerous environment that caused the death, the fact that David wasn't a very good swimmer, that there was no lifeguard in attendance. It is the information process, his belief that it was safe to jump and the decision to jump that killed him. Edward Ramsey is sitting alone passing judgement without paying attention to what really killed David, an incorrect thought process. This is the mechanism of death and the coroner does not refer to it in his judgement.

He has stated the following in relation to the death of a child that is disinformation.

*(3) The practice of placing a lifeguard at the breakwater at times of higher risk in the spring and summer months (when the weather is good and the tides high) **had been in place historically and was known to be effective at reducing the risk.***

*(4) I was not given, in evidence, a satisfactory or cogent explanation **as to why that measure had been removed prior to DAVID's death, nor why that measure continues to be absent today.***

The coroner is blaming the lack of a lifeguard for David's death and the information in bold and red is potentially deliberate disinformation designed to support the 'designer deaths' of children in Wales. In this instance, by blaming the environment as opposed to the circumstances. The above disinformation and judgement on David's death is incompetent and potentially, deliberately so as to support the Welsh Government stance that children dying at play due to a scientific misrepresentation is legally acceptable. I believe it is intended to make death by 'deep play' legally acceptable. These are designer deaths, they are designed to be used in Wales by children and have been introduced into the education programme by the subversive organisation Play Wales who are responsible for advising the Welsh Government on child's play. The Welsh Government's Child Commissioner and Minister for Children were made aware of their subversive teaching on 24 July 2018. Evidence of this can be found in the communications below:

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/pages/play-wales/correspondence/2018-07-24-huw-i-d-email.pdf>

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/pages/play-wales/correspondence/2018-07-24-child-comm-email.pdf>

South Wales Police have been aware of this child abuse since 4 December 2021 and DS Peach since January of 2023. It is possible that the large number of government officials who are aware of this within Welsh Government are working together with the judiciary to cover up the systematic abuse of Welsh children with the occasional death from child abuse at play reported as 'misadventure'. It is my opinion that a process of making the death of a child through deliberate governance malpractice, manslaughter or murder has been made legal.

To refer again to Edward Ramsay's investigation and inquest

Box 2: Record of Inquest recorded that DAVID'S medical cause of death was "1a) consistent with drowning".

Box 4 of the Record of Inquest recorded a conclusion of Misadventure.

Box 3 states:

"At 2005 on 19 June 2023 at the little beach at Aberavon having drowned after jumping into the sea from the breakwater, to which he had, effectively, unrestricted and undeterred access. The breakwater should not have been used for that purpose but was known to have been used for that purpose by local children and teenagers, especially in the spring and summer months when the weather was good and the tides were high. In the past lifeguards had been stationed at or around the pier, at these times, to deter this activity. No lifeguard was present at the time that David jumped. Had there been one it is possible that David would not have jumped and therefore would not have drowned".

If we refer to the instructions on the judiciary website with a view to identifying how the coroner should have recorded the death:

<https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/conclusions/>

Part (Box) 3: How, when and where the deceased came by their death

27. Here the coroner or jury must set out how, when and where the death occurred. In most inquests the question of 'how' will mean 'by what means'. The answer to 'how' the deceased died may well go wider than the medical cause of death and **encompass a description of the mechanism of death**.

If we look at the facts in relation to the environment and circumstances in relation to this case:

ENVIRONMENT - Aberavon Pier* existed before David was born and it still exists today, it has always been a dangerous place to jump off which is why you rarely see people doing this. These are the physical facts and they did not change on the day when David died. The tides are variable, however, the water was there before David jumped in. It was and still is a dangerous environment. The environment is a physical attribute and David died because his physical being, his body was unable to deal with the environment in which he placed himself, the water, his swimming was not of the standard required to survive. The drowning is a result of this process, it is a physical outcome to a physical process, it is not the cause of death.

CIRCUMSTANCES - David arrived at the pier and eventually made the decision to jump into the sea. That decision may have been made before he arrived there which I suspect it was. If we refer to a [government information source](#):

"David Ejimofor died at Aberavon beach, Neath Port Talbot, on 19 June in what his family believed was a "coming of age ceremony" after exams."

and what the police officer said he had been researching prior to his death:

"how long should I wait after eating before swimming" and "what shorts to wear for swimming" [government information source](#):

This would suggest that David had a belief that the process of celebrating his right of passage to adulthood included jumping off Aberavon Pier. This also suggests that the principle reason that David was on Aberavon Pier was not to go swimming, the principle reason was that he was at Aberavon Pier to celebrate an milestone achievement in the process of his life. It is unfortunate that death by drowning was the outcome of that process, but it is not the cause. It was the thought process, and the information contained within that thought process that caused him to die. The decision to jump may have been linked to a psychological condition or to disinformation that affected his belief. However, I will not consider that in this instance but will refer to it later on. The source of the information and the process of information consideration by David that resulted in his belief that it was safe to the jump is the mechanism of death.

If we refer to what his mother said about him:

"he would not have put himself in a dangerous situation because he was not a risk taker." - [government information source](#)

This is confirmation that David's jump was linked to the belief that it was safe to jump. The jump itself was a conscious decision he made based upon the belief that it was safe.

It could be that he made that decision himself, however I would suggest the following options were not considered by the coroner:

That an adult informed David with malicious intent that it was a safe thing to do. If this is the case then this is not misadventure, this is potentially manslaughter or murder. He could have been told this a few weeks previous which is why he was researching 'swimming' information on his phone as identified by the policeman during the inquest.

To refer again to the judiciary guidance and resources conclusions:

*The answer to 'how' the deceased died may well go wider than the medical cause of death and **encompass a description of the mechanism of death**.*

It is my considered opinion that the **mechanism of death** is a three step process as follows

EDUCATION - There must be a source for the information. David has learned from a source that "we need to jump off the pier to celebrate the end of our exams".

INFORMATION CONSIDERATION - There was a process of information consideration by David after learning this information, David made information searches relating to swimming, he was gathering information so that he could make an informed decision.

DECISION - At the end of the information step in the process David decided that it was safe to the jump. It is possible he was still at step 2 and because of time restrictions and he still wasn't 100% sure he should jump, but eventually he took a risk believing it was safe.

If we look at the coroner's verdict on the death:

"In the past lifeguards had been stationed at or around the pier, at these times, to deter this activity. No lifeguard was present at the time that David jumped. Had there been one it is possible that David would not have jumped and therefore would not have drowned".

and compare it to the relevant responses from the organisations he provided his report to:

"Associated British Ports have no record of a lifeguard being located on the breakwater at times of higher risk."

RNLI - "Lifeguards are normally deployed to facilitate bathing rather than preventing aquatic activities. If solely deployed to stop access it would be more appropriate to deploy a security guard or warden service."

Neath-Port Talbot Council "As outlined at the inquest hearing, lifeguards were not regularly stationed at the breakwater but would occasionally pass there as part of a patrol."

MECHANISMS OF DEATH - COERCION TO KILL CHILDREN

As part of the qualification to become a playworker in a Welsh Government funded course run by Swansea City Council, I was shown David's mechanism of death in a film which included children jumping into unsafe water without the presence of a lifeguard but in the vicinity of adults who were controlling the information that it was safe to jump and the environment surrounding those jumps. I was informed that this was normal behaviour and I was expected to allow children to take part in these mechanisms of death if I was to gain a qualification that allowed me to work with children in the play environment. This information was communicated to those present on the course through the medium of film. Some of these mechanisms are also written into the publication 'The First Claim' which encourages death play as part of the play curriculum. There are three pages in the publication which coerce adults with the responsibility to look after children to place them in positions of danger. This is unlawful according to UK Government guidance because it places children in 'harm's way'

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/images/publications/PWAL2008TFC/PWAL2008TFC018.jpg>

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/images/publications/PWAL2008TFC/PWAL2008TFC020.jpg>

<http://walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/images/publications/PWAL2008TFC/PWAL2008TFC021.jpg>

This information is maliciously presented as normal activities for children and essential for their development. My wife and I refused to complete the course based upon its abhorrent content that we agreed together was child abuse. We were traumatised by the course content and the coercion to abuse children. This we believe is the United Kingdom legal definition of child abuse. ([image link](#)) which includes:

"Somebody may abuse or neglect a child by inflicting harm, or by failing to act to prevent harm."

Following the course, I was informed by the Welsh Government that it is legal for children to die in the play environment and it is OK for them to continue to fund an education process that disinform adults like myself to teach children that it is safe to jump into deep water along with the following other play activities :

'PLAYING IN FRONT OF TRAFFIC'

'RIDING A BIKE ON A PARAPET OF A BRIDGE'

'RIDING A BIKE THROUGH A FIRE'

'HIGH TREE CLIMBING, ESPECIALLY OVER RIVERS OR THE SEA'

The following document was submitted to the Welsh Government to prevent such 'designer deaths'. The Welsh Government failed to follow protocol with regards its content which shows the deliberate misrepresentation of a scientific article to cause the mechanism of legal death in Welsh children.

<https://www.a-better.wales/pages/play-wales/wag/cype-report.pdf> - https://youtu.be/2hECe_AVQy0 document on YouTube with additional information.

The result is that a legal mechanism of the death of children by play through disinformation still exists within Welsh Government and what we see with the potential disinformation released by the coroner is the rubber stamping of the process of designer deaths for children in Wales.

David Ejimorfor's death may be misadventure but the deliberate disinformation in Welsh Government funded literature is not and will result in similar outcomes like David's death because adult playworkers are being coerced into disinforming children about play environments, manipulating them to take risks beyond their capabilities.

There are many cliffs, trees, water features and dangerous locations within Wales that provide opportunities for 'deep play'. It is impossible to make them all safe or to patrol each and every one of them. They are all 'misadventures' waiting to happen.

THE WELSH GOVERNMENT LEGAL THIRD PARTY (PLAYWORKER) MECHANISM OF DEATH

EDUCATION - "Deep play" (playing with death) is part of the play curriculum. Play education literature identifies that deep play is essential for a child's personal development. Source: [Explanation - First Claim, Play Wales - Play Framework - First Claim, Play Wales](#)

<https://www.a-better.wales/images/999/zzw/95-deep-play.jpg>

INFORMATION CONSIDERATION - There is no information consideration. If you want to work with children in Wales, you have to have a qualification and part of that qualification is learning to put children's lives at risk in the play process.

DECISION - Ultimately it is a child's decision to take a risky action, however the adult playworker who placed them in that position is part of the mechanism for the legal death of a child during play:

This method of murder was shared with Jeremy Miles AM by hand delivery on 31/7/2019 after he used methods of deception (paltering) to avoid taking this to his government.

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/subject/play/pages/play-wales/correspondence/2019-07-30-miles-am.pdf>

"Your policies in relation to children's play still include placing children at risk. WAG funded educational material provided by Adult Learning Wales references "The First Claim" as an additional learning 'tool' and you can still buy this publication from Play Wales, a WAG funded charity. Fire is still number one on the curriculum, and deep play is still essential for child development....."

IT IS THEREFORE YOUR GOVERNMENT'S POLICY TO PLACE CHILDREN IN LIFE THREATENING SITUATIONS

For example: a playworker can take a group of children onto a main road to dodge traffic and if one, or two, or even three die they can point to your play policy and funded literature and say, "it says right here I should to do this, it says so on pages 10, 31 & 35, in fact it says it is essential, I'm just doing my job."

end of quote:

The refusal of the relevant government organisations to investigate this disinformation and to protect children from information designed to cause their deaths makes them culpable for future child deaths. They are breaking UK Government law with regard to the [abuse of children](#), [UK Government moral guidelines](#) and [UNCRC Article 31](#). relevant links below:

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/images/aaaaa/wu/95.jpg>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life/the-7-principles-of-public-life--2>

<https://www.unicef.org.uk/what-we-do/un-convention-child-rights/>

To summarise; I believe what killed David Ejimofor was the internal thought process he undertook, the consideration of information he believed to be true and the decision he made to make that jump which was based upon that information. The reason he jumped was because he believed he was undertaking a 'right of passage' in his life process, it was the celebration of a milestone achievement. Aberavon Pier was the environment for that process. If the 'right of passage' had been different, say riding a bike on the parapet of a bridge, climbing to the top of a tree, running across (playing chicken) on the M4 near his school, then potentially he may have met his death in a different environment. Ultimately the decision was David's to jump but if it was made having been disinfomed and if he was manipulated into believing it was safe by an adult then as a minor he was not responsible for his actions. Therefore a third party, may be responsible for causing David's death through the intentional provision of false information (disinformation) designed to endanger David's life.

The mechanism for such deaths are part of the education process in Wales, play employees in Wales must accept this form of play as standard practice to gain a playworkers qualification. The Welsh and UK Governments have created a legal precedent to support the mechanism of death by 'deep play' and have used disinformation to enable the third party murder of children in Wales through the play process. Children can and will be murdered through the process of sharing disinformation with malicious intent and the manipulation to act upon that information.

We have reported the Welsh Government twice to South Wales Police who refuse to investigate by referring me back to the Welsh Government or refuse to communicate as in the case of DS Peach. The mechanism for the death in children through disinformation already exists, the judiciary have rubber stamped that mechanism with an incorrect verdict of death and an unnecessary attack on the lifeguard services provided by the local authority.

THE SELF DEFENCE OF WELSH CHILDREN?

DO I PAY TAX TO SUPPORT THE SYSTEMATIC ABUSE AND MURDER OF WELSH CHILDREN?

With regards to myself, I have a catch 22 position, do I break the law and not pay my corporation tax or do I break the law and pay my corporation tax to a criminal state, the United Kingdom Government who are allowing a devolved

power over whom they have regulatory powers to systematically abuse children through the medium of play against UK Government law, United Nations principles and UK Government moral obligations, the [Nolan Principles](#).

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life/the-7-principles-of-public-life--2>

It is important to note that 'deep play' is considered acceptable in Scotland as well but I'm unable to find evidence if it is in England.

For my stance on this, I will refer to the *United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; Article 29: 2*

*In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing **due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality**, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.*

I refer to "**due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality**" as the key text in my refusal to uphold the lesser of the laws to which I refer.

The purpose of the law should be to "**meet the just requirements of morality**". I will not pay to abuse children, therefore my company will not pay corporation tax to fund child abuse. This is current my stance.

However at this point as the experts in UK law, I would refer to the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Crown Prosecution Service for the **interpretation** of this catch 22 law situation with a straightforward question.

Do we pay our corporation tax to fund, support and enable the abuse of children in the UK?

Please take into consideration the fact that, I'm not asking for advice, just an interpretation of the laws of the United Kingdom.

CROWN PROSECUTION DUTY OF CARE - YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

If you, the CPS believe that children are not being abused through the play process in Wales, you, or another relevant government organisation should provide counter evidence to support this stance. If you are unable to provide counter evidence then I would suggest that you work together with our investigative department at Rugby Relics Ltd, Ambididdleous (www.ambididdleous.com) to bring criminals to justice who are intentionally breaking the law to cause the death of children. The following link will provide more information about our investigative service:

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/people/family-close/DRIC-richards-dai/ambididdleous/channels/government.htm>

You, the CPS have a responsibility to the nation as defined on your website: (<https://www.cps.gov.uk/>)

*"Our duty is to make sure that the right person is prosecuted for the right offence, **and to bring offenders to justice wherever possible.**"*

I refer to the following section of that statement

"and to bring offenders to justice wherever possible."

I've been telling the Welsh Government for 7 years that they are abusing children through their play education and no counter evidence has been provided. You have a responsibility **to bring these offenders to justice**.

Please note that the Crown Prosecution Service is an independent organisation and referrals outside of your organisation are inappropriate and potentially illegal. The Director of Public Prosecutions has a duty to uphold UK law and to bring offenders to justice.

LAW BREAKING DECISION 2 - GLYNNEATH TOXIC WASTE MURDERS

To refer back to our previous correspondence on the matter of self defence, the initial requirement for a level of self defence against interlinked developers, planning agents, councillors, council officials, government agencies, police etc who are causing the perpetual corporate manslaughter and attempted murder of residents including my family, through the refusal to follow environmental protocol with regards to identified toxins.

DO I PAY TAX TO SUPPORT THE POTENTIAL MURDER OF MY FAMILY AND OTHER GLYNNEATH RESIDENTS?

My first contact with the CPS was on 30 July 2023 in relation to the perpetual Corporate Manslaughter of residents surrounding a toxic waste dump in Glynneath, south Wales.

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/county/npt/glynneath/enzo-development/corruption-coalition-heol-y-glyn.htm>

I refer you to my initial introduction:

A situation has arisen within my community where public officials **and regulatory authorities such as the police, environment agency are refusing to investigate breaches of environmental laws** that has, and still is, almost certainly causing the deaths of people living within this community.

and to the sign off:

I would ask that you refer the Crown Prosecution Service page to the local Community Police Inspector Sweeney for guidance on the level and methods of self defence I can achieve against corrupt public officials like yourself so that my actions remain within the UK law as defined by the Crown Prosecution Service. - regards - David Richards - Director, Rugby Relics Ltd.

The following video identifies that we spent 30+ minutes attempting to report crimes to the local police inspector to include, a governance expert, an industry specialist and a former councillor who identifies council malpractice:

<https://youtu.be/qXBmBBZ3g14>

The following video shows our follow up with the police that includes the initial 101 report and relevant conversation with the police Inspector who still to this day refuses to communicate with us.

<https://youtu.be/acroiJgAztU>

If we refer again to your latest refusal to provide an interpretation of law:

"It is important to understand, that the CPS and the police are separate authorities. Further, the CPS is not an investigative body and has no power to investigate allegations of crime, therefore, if you believe that a criminal offence has been committed, it should be reported to the police in the first instance so that an appropriate course of action can be taken."

Extract from an email exchange with DS Peach, South Wales Police.

"People are dying unnatural deaths in this area and we are living next to a toxic waste dump that is confirmed as toxic but is deliberately misrepresented by NPTC. Toxic waste is lying on the surface after being spread by the developer Enzo and nothing is being done about it. The local councillors are lying to the public about this and are also lying to the public about having meetings with Public Health Wales . A FOI to PHW shows that no meetings have taken place. I have clear evidence of this. A chemical test of the toxic waste area can be clearly seen to have been tampered with and reports of barrels of toxic waste being tipped at the site are not investigated. Both regulatory authorities NRW & PHW refer our group back to NPTC Planning who it would seem are a self regulating authority who refuse to investigate our concerns use methods of deception to avoid accountability for their crimes.

*We, as a community desperately need the police to **investigate this please** and to allow us, the Glynneath Residents Against Contamination group to work with you in the provision of relevant information and pointers to misconduct incidents."*

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/archive/2022/11-2022/20221104-EM-EGRA-SWPO-peach-report-chain.pdf>

I refer you again to my initial introduction:

"A situation has arisen within my community where public officials and regulatory authorities such as the police, environment agency are refusing to investigate breaches of environmental laws that has, and still is, almost certainly causing the deaths of people living within this community."

you will note that I stated the police have already **refused to investigate** the perpetual manslaughter of residents and this is now perpetual attempted murder because these public officials are aware that poison exists at the site. Poison is an indiscriminate killer and they are still covering up that it exists and is killing people. Vulnerable people are dying, a crime is being committed and you, the CPS refuse to accept an investigation by our team. I refer you to the front page on your website:

The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) prosecutes criminal cases that have been investigated by the police and other investigative organisations in England and Wales. The CPS is independent, and we make our decisions independently of the police and government.

Here are the links to investigative reports that we have made in relation to these crimes:

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/county/npt/glynneath/enzo-development/info-other/20200816A-DO-EGRA-report-submitted.pdf> - <https://youtu.be/KcivmWSeK0Q>

<https://www.walk-around-wales.com/county/npt/glynneath/enzo-development/archive/2021/05-2021/20210501A-DO-EGRA-psp-report-plain.pdf> - <https://youtu.be/2X2tkxPl6rE>

You, the CPS were advised that people are dying because of government corruption and over the last 2 years the Crown Prosecution Service have refused to set a level of self defence we as residents can use against corrupt public organisations who are causing the perpetual corporate manslaughter of Glynneath residents. I am not asking for

advice, I am asking for an interpretation of law which the CPS have refused to provide. If a law or guidance is extant and its meaning subjective, you as the regulatory governance organisation for the interpretation of the law are morally and potentially legally required to provide a definitive interpretation to that law for the benefit of those people who require meaning to the law and wish to use it. Your organisation have constantly refused to provide the relevant interpretation by making inappropriate referrals to irrelevant organisations who have less of an understanding of law that the CPS. I think we have reached a point in our relationship where it could be said that you, **the CPS are potentially accessories to murder** based upon your continuous misconduct and refusal to accept your responsibilities.

I have been stating publicly for at least 4 years that my local council are murdering residents in this area to support historic corruption and you have ignored my requests that you define a level of self defence that we the public can use against corrupt public officials who are deliberately avoiding environmental safety protocol that will save lives. The following video published in 2021 is evidence of this.

<https://youtu.be/ZNR32GjgBqM>

and the following video shows that the local council who are murdering residents are using the police as weapon against our group.

<https://youtu.be/655BmK-sNO0>

Instead you would prefer to turn a blind eye to the death of United Kingdom citizens. The Crown Prosecution Service do this anonymously without identifying who you are in your responses.

Empirical evidence in video form of the historic use of the site has now been published by my company Rugby Relics Ltd to YouTube and X in support of residents. At least three of the people in the video appearing in the video are dead along with their partners from the probable toxic poisoning that the state is still allowing and the police will not investigate.

<https://youtu.be/XIVbWDKSPQ>

That is 6 people in 4 houses and the remaining person is being physically threatened by a local councillor who in this video can be seen to fabricate information about me in a communication with the local M.P.

https://youtu.be/nNb1eMEK_7s

More people will die including children because of your refusal to act in the interest of the British people.

However at this point I would refer to the Crown Prosecution Service for the interpretation of this catch 22 law situation with a straightforward question.

Do I pay my corporation tax and council tax to support and enable governance corruption and the potential murder of my family and residents in Glynneath?

Thank you for taking the time to consider the information in this communication, I look forward to further communications from you that provide the interpretation of catch 22 law that we; Glynneath Residents Against Contamination and Rugby Relics Ltd require.

I believe I have with reason and conscience represented the facts truthfully in this communication and I have wherever possible placed information into the public domain with relevant links so that my information can be verified as the truth. This type of information is known as evidence. We take the word evidence in these instances to mean:

Evidence = Information that gives reason to believe that something is true.

If you believe that any facts based upon the evidence we have presented is not true you should present counter evidence to dispute the relevant evidence presented.

I trust this communication finds you in good health and I hope to hear back from you soon. This communication is made to you in a triple role capacity and as previously stated it is made with you in the spirit of brotherhood under the auspices of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To refer again to article 1 of this declaration:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

It is also made with you under the auspices of UK Government obligations (Nolan Principles).

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life>

and responsibilities (Human Rights Act):

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/42/contents>

I'll look forward to your reply in due course.

yours faithfully

Dai Richards,

Director - Rugby Relics Ltd, 66 Brynhyfryd, Glynneath, Neath, SA11 5BA - www.rugbyrelics.com

Chairman - Glynneath Residents Against Contamination. www.glynneath.wales

Manager - Governance investigations department - Ambididdleous, Play Sport & Recreation Consultancy

<http://www.dai-richards.wales/>

***** body of communication ends *****

NOTES

(*To simplify matters, the Senedd & Welsh Government here are termed as Welsh Government)

**WITNESS STATEMENT - ABERAVON PIER - FOR BACKGROUND INFORMATION ONLY

I grew up in Aberavon and have been familiar with Aberavon Pier since the early 1970s and have spent an extensive amount of time in the vicinity. During this time:

I have competed in the Aberavon Round the Pier race approximately 38 times almost consecutively between 1983 and 2023. I have swum, kayaked, walked (at low tide) around the pier approx 70-100 times in total.

I have walked up and down the pier approx 100-200 times.

In the 1980s I worked on the Aberavon Beach gang for a number of years which meant that I spent 8-12 hours a day at Aberavon Beach, in the summers of 1982 & 1983 I was stationed approximately 200 metres away from the pier.

I was a member of Aberavon Surf Lifesaving Club who's headquarters overlooked the pier.

I have organised events on the 'little' side next to the pier.

I have appeared (without pre-planning) in the background of two films that have been shot at the pier including one with Glenda Jackson.

I do not recollect having seen a lifeguard on duty on Aberavon Pier.

I have rarely seen people jump off the pier.

For the benefit of public information. The lifeguard clubhouse used to overlook the pier until it was moved to its current location which is the slipway near the Four Winds pub.

**** In 2016 I was taking the course as part of my research into 'child's play' for my second book which was to be about child's play. I published my first book [Understanding the Origin and Evolution of Sport - Volume 1 - Rugby Union](http://www.dai-richards.wales/Understanding%20the%20Origin%20and%20Evolution%20of%20Sport%20-%20Volume%201%20-%20Rugby%20Union.pdf) in December 2016 and this was to be a follow up to that book.

***** The student Tom took the first day of the course and never came back. He was by far the most knowledgeable of the students with regards to play safety attending the course, I believe he was already a play leader with a number of years of experience.

***** I have looked at the available government public information with regards the coroners verdict and have based my opinion on the information available to me. I reserve the right to alter my judgement on any matter in this communication should additional information or a logical counter conclusion be made available to me.

ENDS

Dai Richards - www.dai-richards.wales

dairichardswales@gmail.com

www.walk-around-wales.com



Virus-free.www.avg.com