Funding the Future

Should the Independent Police Complaints Commission inv...

Published: January 13, 2026, 2:22 am

Today's hearing brought by UK Uncut is bringing out serious and new evidence on HMRC's dealings with Goldman Sachs, especially with regard to the evidence from Dave Hartnett. Some of this appears to conflict with itself, more with what has been said to parliament.

Is this a serious issue given the sums involved? I think so, and I also think there is potentially something that can be done about it. The Independent Police Complaints Commission can address issues arising in HMRC. As they say on their web site:

Of course most of these are completely irrelevant to this matter.

But is it corrupt to, as a Commissioner of HMRC, over-rule decisions made elsewhere in the department to save embarrassment to yourself when there is a direct resulting loss of revenue? After all, avoiding serious embarrassment is a personal gain, secured here by a personal decision at cost to the Exchequer.

I do not know is the honest answer. But it seems to me that the IPCC have a case to look at.

UPDATE AT 14.40:

Corruption in this context could either be theft, which seems inappropriate to consider in this case as there is no evidence I can see of it, or it could be fraud. It's worth noting section 4 of the Fraud Act 2006:

Clearly a Commissioner of HMRC meets the criteria of part 1(a).

I do not know the answer to part 1 (b). That is why I have said the IPCC may wish to look at this issue.

I do think it possible that saving embarrassment can constitute a gain in part 1(c). I also think it possible not pursuing a negotiation is to expose an organisation to loss, and section 2 makes that clear.

Again, I make no conclusion, at all. I am saying the IPCC could be asked for an opinion.