

Core Participants Ruling 9

1. At paragraph 115 of my first Core Participants ruling dated 21 October 2015, I designated Robin Lane as a core participant in the Inquiry, in category [L] Social and environmental activists, for reasons explained at paragraphs 1 – 11,126 and 132 of that ruling. On 30 October 2015 Mr Lane sent an email to the Inquiry withdrawing his consent to designation. He did not at that stage explain his reasons and was not obliged to do so. Since, under rule 5 (1) of the Inquiry Rules 2006, a person may be designated a core participant only with their consent I terminated Mr Lane's designation with effect from 9 November 2015 (see first Recognised Legal Representatives ruling dated 9 November 2015, paragraph 32).
2. On 13 May 2016 the Inquiry received an application from Mike Schwarz of Bindmans LLP, on behalf of Mr Lane, seeking Mr Lane's re-instatement as core participant, Mr Schwarz's designation as Mr Lane's recognised legal representative at the Inquiry and an award of costs of legal representation.
3. The Inquiry sought further information from Mr Lane since no explanation had been given for his changes of heart. I am now informed that Mr Lane withdrew his consent to designation because he was worried about the financial commitment his role as a core participant might require. He has since been informed that in my first Costs of Legal Representation ruling of 16 December 2015, at paragraph 12, I indicated that I would not refuse a costs award to an individual on the ground of personal financial circumstances unless that individual's financial resources were so exceptional as to make it an affront to place the financial burden of representation on public funds.
4. Mr Lane was designated a core participant in consequence of his involvement with London Animal Action in the mid-1990s. He says that in the late 1980s he was also a media spokesman for the Animal Liberation Front supporters' group. In September 1987 he was arrested on suspicion of involvement in the incendiary attacks on Debenhams stores (see first Core Participant ruling, paragraph 53). Mr Lane is aware of the application for leave to appeal against conviction in respect of those attacks made by Geoff Sheppard and Andrew Clarke on the ground that an alleged undercover officer, "Bob Robinson", took a central role in the planning and execution of the offence. The Metropolitan Police Service is carrying out further inquiries into the commission of the offences. I emphasise that the appeal is in its early stages and that no findings have been made as to the involvement of any undercover police officer. No prosecution of Mr Lane resulted from his arrest but he regards his earlier exposure to the activities of other undercover police officers and his arrest in 1987 as

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

additional reasons for claiming that he has played a direct and significant role in part of the subject matter of the Inquiry within the meaning of rule 5 (2) of the Inquiry Rules 2006.

5. Application for designation as a core participant in this Inquiry is a serious commitment that should not be made lightly. However, I am satisfied that there has been an adequate explanation for Mr Lane's course of action and he has established his qualification under rule 5 (2)(a). I shall designate Mr Lane a core participant under rule 5 (1) of the Inquiry Rules 2006 with effect from the date of this ruling. I shall deal with his applications in respect of a recognised legal representative and costs in separate rulings.

14 June 2016

Sir Christopher Pitchford
Chairman, Undercover Policing Inquiry