

## Core Participants Ruling 5

1. This is the fifth ruling that I have given in relation to applications to be considered for designation as core participant under rule 5 of the Inquiry Rules 2006. Reference should be made to paragraphs 1 – 16 of my revised first Core Participants Ruling of 26 October 2015 (to be found on the Inquiry’s website) for an understanding of the principles that I shall apply to the applications made.
2. Since about 14 December 2014 the Inquiry has been in correspondence with a person to whom I shall refer as ‘M’. M wishes to be considered for designation as a core participant in the Inquiry but to remain anonymous. I shall for that reason be circumspect as to publication of the grounds for the application.
3. M considers that there is evidence that her personal communications, electronic and manual, have been monitored and intercepted, that her home has been entered unlawfully, that her property has been stolen, that her vehicle has been tampered with and that, “unethically”, someone has been sharing information about her at her workplace. She considers that the motivation for this interference may be her “political, union and media activity”. M expresses the belief that her friends, colleagues and family have been “used, compromised or coerced into supplying information”. She considers that undercover police officers may have befriended her friends, colleagues and family for a similar purpose.
4. M has ongoing complaints made to and about the police and she has made an application to the Investigatory Powers Tribunal in respect of the police, the security services and a local authority.
5. I have considered whether there is a proper evidential basis for a conclusion that M “played or may have played a direct and significant role in relation to matters to which the Inquiry relates” or has “a significant interest in an important aspect of the matters to which the inquiry relates” (see rule 5(a) and (b) of the Inquiry Rules 2005). As the Inquiry has already explained to M in a letter of 18 December 2015 this Inquiry is concerned with undercover police activity as it is defined in the Inquiry’s terms of reference, that is the use of a police officer as a covert human intelligence source to make a personal or other relationship by means of which to obtain or disclose information. It does not seem to me that there is any evidence, direct or indirect, from which I could conclude that M has been or may have been the target of such activity. For this reason I **shall not designate** her a core participant in the Inquiry.

## UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

6. The Inquiry has received an application from John Burke-Monerville dated 28 January 2016. Mr Burke-Monerville's son, Trevor, was held at Stoke Newington police station in 1987 during which, it was alleged, he was beaten and in consequence suffered brain damage. A Justice for Trevor campaign was mounted, supported by the Hackney Community Defence Association which has already been designated a core participant. Trevor was murdered in Hackney in 1994. In August 2014 the Operation Herne team made contact with Mr Burke-Monerville saying that they had information to impart to him relating to Trevor. However, for reasons that it is unnecessary to specify no meeting took place between them. Mr Burke-Monerville has since been shown a photograph of a person he recalls attending his justice campaign meetings. That person was using the name Mark Cassidy who, it is contended, was in fact an undercover police officer. In my view the information provided establishes that Mr Burke-Monerville had or may have had a direct and significant role in matters to which the Inquiry relates. I shall **designate** him a core participant in the Inquiry in **Category [J] Justice campaigns**.
7. The Inquiry has received an application for designation dated 29 January 2016 from Hickman and Rose, solicitors, made on behalf a person who wishes to be anonymous. I shall refer to this person as 'KTC'. The grounds of the application are as follows: KTC was married to a man she knew to be an undercover police officer. She later discovered that he was having an affair with another woman and, with their two children, she separated from him in 2005. They were later divorced. KTC played or may have a direct and significant role in relation to matters to which the Inquiry relates. She says she was herself interviewed before her husband became an undercover police officer and, she asserts, had a mistaken appreciation of the importance of his work. I **shall designate** KTC a core participant in the Inquiry in **Category [M] Families of police officers**.

11 February 2016

Sir Christopher Pitchford  
Chairman, Undercover Policing Inquiry