



## Maggie Oliver Foundation Scandal



Maggie Oliver, born on October 23, 1955, is a British social activist and former Detective Constable with the Greater Manchester Police. She is best known for her role as a whistleblower in exposing the mishandling of the Rochdale child sex abuse ring case by her own police force.

Oliver joined the Greater Manchester Police in 1997 and worked on various serious crime cases, including gangland murders, shootings, kidnappings, rapes, and witness protection. Her involvement in the Rochdale case began when she investigated multiple severe sexual assaults perpetrated mainly by Pakistani men. She was shocked by the lack of response from the police force and the authorities' apparent knowledge of the crimes for years.



In 2013, Oliver resigned from the police force in protest of the handling of the Rochdale case. Since then, she has become a prominent advocate for victims of child sexual abuse and has founded the Maggie Oliver Foundation to support survivors.

## **Rick Pendlebury**



Manchester CID has recently arrested Pendlebury, a former GMP Police officer, for the unlawful disclosure of a survivor's identity on X, an act being described as retaliatory. Rick is currently released on police bail.

In a video, a visibly upset Dannika accuses Maggie Oliver of being "as bad as the men in the Rochdale Grooming Gangs." She states, "I was there, I saw it; I went out after a Vera Baird review meeting."

### **Video on my website**

During this incident, Pendlebury allegedly violated the personal data of other survivors, leading to a formal complaint that Maggie Oliver is accused of concealing before Rick's departure from the charity, which he implied was a resignation.

Dannika describes Pendlebury as behaving like a sexual predator, claiming he was attempting to ply another young woman with alcohol and tried to leave with her. She further asserts that he also attempted to leave with her.



Here is the [Public statement](#)

Remarkably, Pendlebury held the position of head of safeguarding, despite both Maggie Oliver and Jennie Lucas being aware of his prior dismissal from Greater Manchester Police due to gross misconduct related to data breach offences. He had access to the personal details of up to 2,000 survivors. Dannika mentions, "Rick would disclose data about other victims to me."

Sinister text messages exchanged between Rick and Dannika have recently come to light, revealing claims that Rick received a financial incentive from Maggie Oliver in an undisclosed arrangement. He claims "I tell you the truth they are that frightened I would bring down the Foundation they gave me a payoff. A sweetener and that was on the understanding that I never spoke about her [Maggie Oliver] and she never spoke about me but if she has then she's fucked."



This message suggests that Maggie Oliver may have been intimidated by Rick and opted to provide him with a financial settlement. It remains unclear whether this payment came from her personal funds or from the Charity's resources. There are claims of £100,000 being unaccounted for, although this remains speculative and unverified. Rick refers to the payment as a "sweetner."

Given the identified safeguarding risks that remain unaddressed, along with a noticeable financial settlement intended to safeguard the Charity's interests, this matter requires careful regulatory examination.



Additionally, the message hints at potential legal ramifications for either party should they discuss one another, which could pose a challenge for Rick if he has indeed violated the terms of the agreement he mentions. His concluding remark appears to carry a threatening tone, indicating that Maggie would be in serious trouble if she has spoken about him, despite his own comments regarding her.

The incident referenced in the previous article involves Rick being accused of providing alcohol to a young female survivor. In response, Rick's statement seems to support the content of the video.

Following the allegations of grooming survivors, numerous individuals have taken to social media to assert that The Maggie Oliver Foundation was unaware of the potential risks posed by Pendlebury. They claim that the Foundation acted swiftly to distance itself from him upon learning of the possible dangers.

**This assertion is incorrect.**

Included below is an email correspondence sent to the Foundation in 2023, which initially raised concerns about survivors being referred to a legal firm lacking SRA regulation. Pendlebury, at that time, was believed to have a significant personal connection to the legal firm to which he was making referrals, a connection that has since been verified.

The email thread shows as the most recent messages appear first. This exchange, dated March 2023, highlights concerns that the Maggie Oliver Foundation was not adequately prioritising the safety of survivors by directing them to an unregulated law firm, as two survivors had come forward with their experiences.

**See attached PDF of emails appendix**



Evidence was presented to the foundation indicating that:

- Rick informed them that they could not find a better firm than the one he recommended.
- The law firm allegedly advised one survivor to provide false information to the police regarding a Claire's law request.
- The law firm also told another survivor that she could not communicate directly with a solicitor because she was not a lawyer.

In her first email, Jennie stated that there has never been a law firm or individuals associated with it, and that Maggie Oliver is aware of the email correspondence.

The reply to Jennie Lucas highlighted the established connection between Rick and the law firm. Additionally, it was formally reported to Jennie that Pendlebury had been dismissed from the police force due to serious data breaches, which included access to personal information of sexual abuse survivors.

Jennie mentioned that she had a meeting scheduled with Rick to discuss the email details. In her email, she reiterated, "we have the best interests of the survivors at heart."

Maggie was also aware of additional allegations against Rick. The Charity Commission was informed about the issues concerning Rick Pendlebury but no action was taken to enforce its own safeguarding policies.



In a statement from Amanda Rees of the Charity Commission, she mentioned, "You were informed that we were assured appropriate action had already been taken by the charity, and therefore we would not be contacting the trustees at this time. As

the Regulator of Charities, our role is to determine whether there are regulatory concerns or issues and whether it is appropriate for us to take action."

Confirmation on the website [See here](#)



Income / Expenditure	Financial period end date				
	30/06/2020	30/06/2021	30/06/2022	30/06/2023	30/06/2024
Total gross income	£60.14k	£94.05k	£236.94k	£191.79k	£265.93k
Total expenditure	£22.49k	£49.54k	£152.55k	£200.68k	£273.09k
Income from government contracts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Income from government grants	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### 4. Charitable activities

	Emotional Support	Legal Advocacy and Force for Change	Total 2024
	£	£	£
Staff costs (£67,829 restricted)	43,481	75,721	119,202
Consultancy	-	30,875	30,875
Phone helpline	4,351	-	4,351
Group Therapy (£5,920 restricted)	5,920	-	5,920
Volunteer costs (£2,668 restricted)	2,668	-	2,668
Other direct costs (£5,784 restricted)	9,451	3,000	12,451
Support costs (note 5)	17,296	40,357	57,653
	83,167	149,953	233,120

Confirmation in the accounts that Maggie gets paid a consultancy fee and that is not illegal but represents a total of **11.6%** of the charities total income

#### Year ended 30 June 2024

##### Recruitment and Appointment of Trustees

As per the charity's constitution, trustees are appointed by a resolution passed at a properly convened meeting of the charity trustees. In selecting trustees, the existing trustees must have regard to the skills, knowledge and experience needed for the effective administration of the charity.

All trustees give their time voluntarily and received no benefits related to exercising their duties as trustees. As outlined in note 6 to the accounts, in March 2021, the Board resolved to explore the option of paying a consultancy fee to our founder and Chair, Maggie Oliver, in recognition of the unique services she provides as a result of her experience and profile. A consultancy agreement was entered into between the charity and Maggie on this basis, and payment commenced for these services in July 2021. Payment is exclusively for specific services listed in this agreement and not for any duties expected of a trustee.



The CRM system confirmed in the latest accounts which is where access to sensitive information is freely available for the team and that included Pendlebury.

Every interaction with a survivor is recorded within our bespoke client relationship management (CRM) database. As well as facilitating case management, this allows us to build an evidence base of the, often difficult, realities that victims / survivors face in seeking justice.

In the past twelve months, we have responded to 546 new requests for legal advocacy support from survivors seeking help or advice in navigating the criminal justice process (329 for financial year ending 30<sup>th</sup> June 2023).

If Pendlebury were to receive a payout, it would be reflected in next year's financial statements. However, it is evident that the amount cannot approach the stated £100,000, as the charity simply lacks the funds to cover such a sum. Only time will reveal the outcome.

I contacted Maggie but did not receive a response to my inquiries.

**From:** [Jennie Lucas](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation  
**Date:** 25 April 2023 15:41:05  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Outlook-3jwepe0z.png](#)

---

Good afternoon [REDACTED],

Thanks for coming back to me and for bearing with me while I looked into to what has happened. While I obviously cannot share any details of interactions with individual survivors, I can confirm that I have spoken with Rick about the situation. It is clear that Rick discussed approaching [REDACTED] with two survivors in 2021. While the Foundation does not make official referrals, this was clearly a recommendation from us, especially given that no other possible legal services or law firms were mentioned.

Hindsight is a wonderful thing, and Rick should have looked into the firm more thoroughly before pointing anyone in its direction. Per my previous email, in addition to providing emotional support and legal advocacy services ourselves, we also try to signpost people to services we think will be helpful to them. We are unable to thoroughly research every one, and we can make mistakes. We find it especially difficult to find good law firms to represent survivors with actions against the police. Back in summer 2021, the Foundation was in its infancy with just Maggie, Rick and a group of volunteers. We have subsequently grown and put in place more processes and procedures, such as clearly stating that any signposting is not a recommendation, and hiring an Outreach Worker to research and meet with external services.

I can again assure that there was never any official referral pathway or affiliation between The Maggie Oliver Foundation and [REDACTED] regardless of what might have been claimed by others in relation to this. The Foundation also never received any financial payments from [REDACTED] for introducing their services to any survivors supported by us. According to our records, [REDACTED]'s services were only ever mentioned to two survivors.

I have discussed the matter with Rick and confirmed our policies on signposting and not making recommendations. I have also impressed on him the necessity for complete transparency in all of his communications. Mistakes can and do happen. If any of us make one, I want us to own up to that and learn from it. Exactly what we demand so publicly from police forces!

I note your reference to Rick's own background. Rick's desire to help victims and survivors, and to fight for justice is very much rooted in his personal experiences. I obviously must protect his privacy but will say that the criminal justice system, and actions by police forces are not always what they appear. From information you have shared publicly about your own journey, I'm sure you are more aware of this than many! Rick was cleared of shoplifting charges in a court of law. In a public independent tribunal, GMP has been found guilty of breaching Rick's human rights in investigating these dropped charges. It is



not beyond the realms of possibility that some subsequent allegations against him were also false. Again, I am unable to elaborate anymore on this at this stage but watch this space.....

Maggie often says that she herself could be referred to as a “rogue ex cop” and that she feared being sent to prison before going public about the corruption she had witnessed. She understands from personal experience that the establishment closes ranks on anyone who tries to highlight its imperfections.

You clearly share our drive to root out corruption in the criminal justice system and to fight for those who might not otherwise have a voice. Maggie and I would very much welcome a meeting with you. If this is something you’d be willing to do, please let me know.

All the best,

Jennie

**Jennie Lucas**  
**Chief Executive**  
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



[www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com](http://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com)  
[jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)

We'd love to keep you updated on our work. If you'd like to join our mailing list please [subscribe here](#).

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 April 2023 21:54  
**To:** Jennie Lucas <[jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Hi Jennie,

I do appreciate you taking the time to reply, and I now understand that you are in touch with those I have named, but I honestly believe that your response is out of self preservation, not solely acting in the best interest of victims.

Rick has lied to me and to the survivors, he is certainly not been entirely truthful. He has then ignored my emails of fact and I believe only then sought a response from you when he knew I was not taking 'no for an answer'.

I have been involved in helping people for some time, the majority are those suffering sexual abuse, including rape, and generally being ignored (or failed) by the system. You will know that I stand up without fear or favour and will put myself in harms way to make things public if action

is not taken. I do this for free, I do not take a salary as I expect the members of the foundation do!

The following comment you made does not fill me with any confidence as what you say would not be accepted by any reasonable person, based on face value and the full circumstances.

*“Please bear with me while I have these conversations then perhaps we can arrange to speak? **I want to give you all the reassurance that I can that we have the best interests of the survivors who approach us for help at the heart of all we do at the Foundation, and totally agree that transparency is key in this.**”*

I am not at all doubting your personal views on the foundation, but your assurance that you **collectively** have the best interests (*we have the best interests*) of the survivors, does highlight some ignorance as this is not something you can truthfully express on behalf of others. This is akin to the Chief of police stating that ALL police officers act in the best interest of the public, which the family of Sarah Everard would disagree, as would the vast majority of the right minded public.

That brings me to Rick. He is an ex-police officer (disgraced) and is, by his own account, a friend of [REDACTED]. He has unquestionably referred people to her unregulated firm suggesting she is the best person to bring action against police which is so inaccurate, it raises suspicions of corporate ‘back scratching’. He has lied about this to me (and others), and this now puts him in a bad light, especially that he was sacked from the police for serious dishonesty offences.

Rick was charged with shoplifting (albeit cleared) he was then sacked over serious data breaches putting the lives of others at risk based on them data leaks. How can you have an honest held belief that Rick is suitable for working (and benefiting) in such a charity, especially one that handles sensitive information of vulnerable victims and then goes on to refer victims to a [REDACTED] law firm that has now tried to illegally strike out their company to avoid legal ramifications!

I am happy to speak with you once you have made your enquiries, but I will not entertain any excuses if that is the intent.

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Jennie Lucas <jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2023 5:31 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Thanks for coming back to me [REDACTED]. I have a meeting scheduled with Rick later this week and will discuss again with him the details in your email.

With regards to speaking to the survivors involved, I will need to contact each of them separately to ensure they are happy to speak with me. I will contact them this evening and try to schedule to speak to them this week as well.

You mention in your email that several survivors have confirmed that Rick referred them to [REDACTED]. It would be helpful to me if you were able to tell me their names so I am able to look into this further as well. I appreciate that you will need their consent to share this information with me.

Please bear with me while I have these conversations then perhaps we can arrange to speak? I want to give you all the reassurance that I can that we have the best interests of the survivors who approach us for help at the heart of all we do at the Foundation, and totally agree that transparency is key in this.

Kind regards,  
Jennie

**Jennie Lucas**  
**Chief Executive**  
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



[www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com](http://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com)  
[jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)

We'd love to keep you updated on our work. If you'd like to join our mailing list please [subscribe here](#).

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 April 2023 13:02  
**To:** Jennie Lucas <[jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Hi Jennie

Thank you for the response. Sadly, it appears the foundation is taking a defensive approach.

Rick has communicated with several survivors who have confirmed that he **did** refer them to [REDACTED]

In fact, this is evidenced in communication logs (emails and calls).

I am also aware that he refers to one of the directors ( [REDACTED] ) as a close friend and that he stated [REDACTED] was the **best firm to deal with actions against the police**. A comment that is both reckless and untrue.

I am also aware that Rick is an ex-GMP police officer and was sacked for serious data breaches. I am concerned and shocked that he has access to the personal data of many survivors who may well be concerned that he has access to their case files.

One survivor has asked me to relay this...

*"Tell MOF we did not get signposted to more firms we were not given a choice"*

*And*

*"Nor were we safeguarded as per their own policy"*

You say, *"We are a small team of committed individuals trying our best to support survivors through an often daunting, challenging and opaque criminal justice system."*

I am aware that this small team takes a 'healthy salary', and that one, Rick, is a disgraced police officer, sacked from a branch of the criminal justice system.

Don't get me wrong, I am an active campaigner in the same area and can see glaring issues in the way you appear to be dealing with things.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Jennie Lucas <[jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2023 12:38 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** A response from The Maggie Oliver Foundation

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

Rick has forwarded to me several emails from you including the chain below. The information you request is publicly available on the Charity Commission's website here: <https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search/-/charity-details/5146000/trustees>

In terms of any involvement with [REDACTED], I can confirm that we have never had any affiliation with the firm or the individuals running it. I'm sure you can appreciate that from a confidentiality and data protection perspective, I am unable to discuss specific cases, but I can confirm that the no further survivors have been signposted

to the firm by us.

As explained by Rick, and also on our website, in some cases we do signpost survivors who approach us for help towards numerous law firms and many other services which we think they might find helpful, however no signposting is ever an endorsement or recommendation from us, it is purely our best efforts to find all ways we can to help them.

We are a small team of committed individuals trying our best to support survivors through an often daunting, challenging and opaque criminal justice system. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources to thoroughly research every outside service that we come into contact with [REDACTED], nor do we ever pretend we do.

Please note also that Maggie, who is our Chair of Trustees, is aware of these email exchanges and the situation you are highlighting.

Kind regards,  
Jennie

**Jennie Lucas**  
**Chief Executive**  
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



[www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com](http://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com)  
[jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:jennie@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)

We'd love to keep you updated on our work. If you'd like to join our mailing list please [subscribe here](#).

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 27, 2023 12:19:17 PM  
**To:** Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <[help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: Your Email

Hi Rick,

This is the audio recording

[REDACTED]



contacted, or been contacted [REDACTED] after advice from the Foundation should contact you.

You have heard the 100% conclusive evidence of the coerced rape victim, why are you so reluctant to take risk away from other rape victims.

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 March 2023 08:57  
**To:** Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <[help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: Your Email

Hi Rick

After discussing our conversation with [REDACTED] she insists she was referred to [REDACTED] directly by you on behalf of the foundation. She specifically told me that you personally took her personal details and sent them to [REDACTED], and that, as a direct result, [REDACTED] called her.

I will be speaking to [REDACTED] and a few others over the coming days, but I wanted to get your response to this and clarify if this is what you mean by 'signposting'.

I am not looking to cause any harm to the foundation, on the contrary, I support the same cause, but as I have said, I am concerned that I am told that the foundation has referred directly to [REDACTED] an unregulated law firm.

I suspect you have heard the recording of [REDACTED] coaching [REDACTED] to lie to the police. This is not the fault of the foundation, but the foundation should take a positive step to ensure that based on that recording alone, it has referred/signposted victims to [REDACTED] and a statement (however watered down) should be made **in the interest of the victims?**

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 March 2023 22:25  
**To:** Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <[help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Your Email

Hi Rick,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Keep up the good work,

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <[help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>

**Sent:** 23 March 2023 21:00

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Your Email

Hi [REDACTED]

We have solicitors and other organisations which we signpost people to this means that they make their own choice and decisions to take on board the advice offered.

There was no affiliation with anyone. Their website had a link to our website nothing more.

I would describe it as the BBC offering various organisations with a click through as support.

[REDACTED]

We support victims of sexual abuse both historic and current. No one has claimed any affiliation with the Foundation. Many organisations jump on the back of Maggie.

With regards to my quote that refers to what the Foundation does which is help victims of abuse and where we can emotionally support them.

[REDACTED]

Best Wishes

Rick Pendlebury  
Operations Director  
The Maggie Oliver Foundation



[www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com](http://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 23 March 2023, 20:15  
**To:** Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <[help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Your Email

Hi Rick

Thanks for the reply.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told me that they were advised by the foundation that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were the best out there for actions against (or complaints against) police. If this is how victims are signposted, it is important that anyone who received this 'signpost' should be updated.

I understand [REDACTED] were claiming an affiliation with the Foundation. While I suspect this was false, it may be an idea to make a public comment about this.

There are a lot of people coming to me saying there were directed to [REDACTED] and I am increasingly concerned that the organisation are not going public.

When you say *"I have outlined the Foundations position which is that we will not get involved in anything other than offer support if appropriate."*

Does this mean you will not provide any form of statement to confirm the position?

Regards

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Help - Maggie Oliver Foundation <[help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com](mailto:help@themaggieoliverfoundation.com)>  
**Sent:** 23 March 2023 19:20  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Your Email

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for the email.

Can I just point out we don't refer anyone to any organisation we just sign post numerous options and allow the client to make their own decision.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

I have spoken with [REDACTED]

I have outlined the Foundations position which is that we will not get involved in anything other than offer support if appropriate.

Best Wishes

Rick Pendlebury  
Operations Director  
The Maggie Oliver Foundation

[www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com](http://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com)

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.

**To keep accidental printing of disclaimers to a minimum this email is subject to our disclaimer which can be found here: <https://www.themaggieoliverfoundation.com/email-disclaimer/> Please read if you have any doubts of adherence to it.**