

Michael Bell

Tue, Aug 11,
9:50 PM

to me

I submit this statement to formally record serious concerns arising from the events surrounding the final meeting of the Reform UK East Branch at Wadsley Bridge in June, together with subsequent allegations made concerning Michael Bell.

In particular, there are significant discrepancies between the accounts given regarding an alleged comment about John Hesketh, as well as serious questions concerning the subsequent exclusion of members of the East Branch Committee from a meeting.

I believe these matters should be investigated objectively, with all witnesses identified and interviewed and with the competing accounts properly tested against the available evidence.

1. The Wadsley Bridge Meeting

The final meeting of the Reform UK East Branch was held at Wadsley Bridge in June.

During or following that meeting, Susan Dyas alleged that Michael Bell had referred to John Hesketh as a “fat bastard”.

Michael Bell categorically denies making this statement.

At the time the allegation was made, Susan Dyas stated that she had personally heard Michael Bell make the alleged comment.

It is understood that no other person present at the time came forward to independently confirm that they had heard Michael Bell make the alleged statement.

This is an important point because the allegation was initially presented as being based upon Susan Dyas's own direct hearing of the alleged words.

2. The Statement Allegedly Made by Susan Dyas

There is a significant competing account concerning words allegedly spoken by Susan Dyas herself.

When John Hesketh entered the room, Susan Dyas was heard by several people to remark the effect:

“Who invited that fat bastard here?”

Unlike the allegation against Michael Bell, this remark was allegedly heard by several people who were present.

Susan Dyas was challenged about the remark and, according to those present, maintained that she was certain Michael Bell had been the person who had used the words.

This creates a direct and significant conflict between the accounts.

There is therefore a clear need to establish:

- exactly what Susan Dyas said;
- exactly what Michael Bell is alleged to have said;
- who was present at the time;
- who personally heard each alleged statement; and
- when each allegation was first made.

3. Subsequent Change in the Account

On the evening of 11 August 2026, Susan Dyas was questioned outside the club about the allegation by two of the East committee members.

On this occasion, her account appeared to differ materially from her original account.

Whereas the original allegation was that Susan Dyas herself had heard Michael Bell make the alleged comment, she subsequently stated that it was another guest who had heard Michael Bell say it.

This is a material change in the account.

The distinction between personally witnessing an alleged incident and subsequently relying upon another person as the alleged witness is fundamental.

It is therefore essential that Reform UK establish why the account changed and identify precisely who is now being relied upon as the alleged witness.

4. The Alleged Witness

I understand that the individual now being identified as having heard the alleged statement is a known friend of Susan Dyas.

I further understand that this individual has previously sought to become a Reform UK candidate but was not permitted to do so because of matters relating to his criminal record.

I do not suggest that these circumstances automatically determine whether his evidence is true or false.

However, if this person is now being relied upon as the principal or sole witness against Michael Bell, his relationship with Susan Dyas and any relevant background are matters which should be disclosed and properly considered as part of a fair investigation.

The investigation should establish:

1. The full identity of the alleged witness.
2. Whether that person was actually present.
3. Where that person was positioned.
4. Exactly what they claim to have heard.
5. When they first reported hearing it.
6. To whom they first reported it.
7. Whether their account has changed.
8. Whether any independent witnesses corroborate their account.
9. The nature of their relationship with Susan Dyas.
10. Why Susan Dyas originally stated that she personally heard the alleged comment.

5. Exclusion of the East Branch Committee

Following these events, members of the East Branch Committee were prevented from entering the meeting.

I understand that Susan Dyas was described as being too upset for the East Branch Committee to be permitted to enter.

People were positioned at the entrance to prevent members of the East Branch Committee from gaining access.

This is an extremely serious matter.

The question must be answered as to who authorised the exclusion of the East Branch Committee and under what constitutional, organisational or procedural authority that decision was made.

If members of a branch committee were excluded from a meeting because one individual was upset or distressed, Reform UK National Headquarters should explain what rule or authority permitted such action.

The exclusion should not simply be treated as an unfortunate disagreement between individuals. It directly concerns the ability of elected or appointed branch members to participate in the affairs of their branch.

6. Serious Concerns Regarding Due Process

Taken together, these events raise serious concerns about whether proper procedures were followed.

There appears to be:

- an allegation against Michael Bell which was initially presented as being based upon Susan Dyas's own evidence;
- a subsequent change in that account identifying another person as the alleged witness;
- a competing allegation concerning words allegedly spoken by Susan Dyas which several people state they heard;
- a relationship between Susan Dyas and the person now relied upon as the alleged witness; and
- the subsequent exclusion of members of the East Branch Committee from a meeting.

These circumstances cannot reasonably be dismissed as a simple dispute over words.

If disciplinary, organisational or political decisions have subsequently been made on the basis of the allegation against Michael Bell, then the reliability of the evidence upon which those decisions were based becomes particularly important.

7. Formal Request for Investigation

I therefore formally request that Reform UK National Headquarters conduct an **independent and properly documented investigation** into these matters.

Specifically, I request that:

1. **Susan Dyas is formally interviewed** regarding both the original allegation and her subsequent account.
2. **The alleged witness is identified and formally interviewed** regarding precisely what they claim to have heard.
3. **All available witnesses are identified and interviewed**, including those who were present when Susan Dyas allegedly made the remark concerning John Hesketh.
4. **The conflicting accounts are directly compared** and the reason for the change in Susan Dyas's account is established.
5. **Any relevant written, electronic or recorded evidence is preserved and considered**, including messages or correspondence in which the allegation was discussed.
6. **The circumstances surrounding the exclusion of the East Branch Committee are investigated**, including who gave the instruction, who enforced it and what authority they believed they had to do so.
7. **Any subsequent decisions made on the basis of the allegation against Michael Bell are reviewed** to establish whether they were based upon properly tested evidence.
8. **Any conflicts of interest or personal relationships between witnesses and those involved in making decisions are disclosed and considered.**
9. **The East Branch Committee members who were excluded are given an opportunity to provide their evidence and account of events.**

10. **A written outcome is provided**, setting out the findings of the investigation and the evidence upon which those findings are based.

8. Requirement for Fairness

I am not asking Reform UK to accept Michael Bell's account simply because it is his account.

I am asking for the same standard to be applied to everyone involved.

If an allegation is made against an individual, it must be properly investigated. If the evidence supporting that allegation subsequently changes, that change must also be investigated.

Equally, if several witnesses say they heard a substantially similar statement from another individual, that evidence cannot simply be ignored because it is inconvenient to the preferred account.

There must be one standard of investigation and one standard of evidence.

9. Conclusion

The issue is now considerably broader than an alleged insult.

It concerns the reliability of evidence, contradictory accounts, the identification and independence of witnesses, the treatment of members of the East Branch Committee and the manner in which organisational decisions appear to have been made.

I consider it wholly inappropriate for any conclusion to be reached against Michael Bell without first resolving these material discrepancies.

I therefore request that National Headquarters formally acknowledge receipt of this statement and confirm what investigation will be undertaken.

I further request that no adverse finding or disciplinary action concerning Michael Bell should be relied upon or maintained until the contradictory accounts have been properly investigated and the relevant witnesses have been given an opportunity to provide their evidence.

This statement is submitted so that the events and outstanding questions are formally recorded and cannot subsequently be dismissed as hearsay, misunderstanding or an informal disagreement between individuals.

Statement of Truth

--

Mike Bell
34 School Lane
Grenoside
Sheffield
S35 8QU
Mobile: 07415311300
Email: Michael.bell2112@gmail.com