



Freedom of Information Publication Scheme					
<b>Protective Marking:</b>	OFFICIAL	<b>Publication (Y/N):</b>			
<b>Title:</b>	Jaipur - Risk Assessment				
<b>Summary:</b>	Operation MOTION Metropolitan Police Service Assessment of Risk in the Event of Identification of Jaipur by the Undercover Police Inquiry				
<b>Branch / OCU:</b>	Assistant Commissioner's Public Inquiry Team				
<b>Date created:</b>	18/02/2016	<b>Review date:</b>	18/02/2016	<b>Version:</b>	1.0
<b>Relevant to:</b>	ACPO Lead				
<b>Author:</b>	[REDACTED]				
<b>Authorising Officer:</b>	DSU Neil Hutchison				
<b>Quality Assurance:</b>	Checking supervisor				
<b>Reference:</b>	General Registry [REDACTED]				
<b>MOPI Group</b>	Group 4 (Subset 10)	<b>Retention period:</b>	100 years		

**1. Introduction**

1.1. This Assessment has been prepared by Operation Motion for the assistance of the Inquiry. The purpose of the document is to provide an objective assessment of the creation of or increase in risk if information is disclosed by the Inquiry which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of Jaipur as a police officer responsible for Operation Motion.

**2. Summary**

2.1. **Dates of Service in Metropolitan Police Special Branch (MPSB) and the Counter-Terrorism Command (SO15):** MPSB: 199[REDACTED]-199[REDACTED], 199[REDACTED]-200[REDACTED]; SO15: 200[REDACTED] until present

2.2. **Covert or sensitive posts:** [REDACTED]

2.3. **Other covert agency staff deployed with (if any):** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

2.4. **Information currently in the public domain regarding deployment and/or identity:**  
None



- 2.5. **Official confirmation regarding deployment and/or identity:** None
- 2.6. **Age and current employment:** [REDACTED]. Detective Inspector in SO15, seconded to Operation Motion.
- 2.7. **Risk of Jaipur being exposed and profiled by activists or anti-UCO campaigners with the concomitant interference to his private and family life in event of identification of Jaipur through information disclosed by the Inquiry is:** HIGH.
- 2.8. **Risk of a compromise of operational capability in event of identification of Jaipur through information disclosed by the Inquiry is:** HIGH.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- 2.11. **Risk of physical or psychological harm to Jaipur in event of identification through information disclosed by the Inquiry is:** LOW.

**3. What this document is based on**

- 3.1. Jaipur has supplied all the information outlined in this Risk Assessment and has referred where necessary to the following documents:

- MPSB records,
- UCPI documents,
- Open source material.



**4. Overview of the assessed individual**

4.1. Jaipur [REDACTED] years of age (DoB [REDACTED]) and he is a serving MPS Detective Inspector. He joined the MPS on [REDACTED] 198[REDACTED] and he has an exemplary service record. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.2. On joining the MPS he was posted to Kingston Borough where he served in uniform and on the Crime Squad.

4.3. In 199[REDACTED] Jaipur successfully applied to join MPS Special Branch (MPSB) and in 199[REDACTED] was posted there as a Detective Constable. After an initial six months at Heathrow on 'P' Squad (Ports) he was posted to 'B' Squad (Irish) where he served on the Prison Section for two years.

4.4. In 199[REDACTED] Jaipur was posted to 'C' Squad (Domestic) and he served on the Animal Rights and Environmental Desk until 199[REDACTED] when he was promoted and transferred to Hounslow Borough as a Sergeant. He returned to MPSB in 199[REDACTED] as a Detective Sergeant and was posted to 'E' Squad (International) and worked on the [REDACTED] until 200[REDACTED].  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4.5. In 200[REDACTED] Jaipur transferred to the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Shortly after in 200[REDACTED] he was promoted to Detective Inspector and became the [REDACTED]  
This role included the supervision of [REDACTED] and various covert operations. [REDACTED]. Jaipur was deployed abroad on eight occasions.

4.6. Jaipur was the [REDACTED] for five years until 200[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. During this period he managed four [REDACTED] UCO/CHIS deployments in London. Between 200[REDACTED] and 200[REDACTED], Jaipur received four Commander's commendations.



- 4.7. Between [REDACTED] 200[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 201[REDACTED], Jaipur worked as a supervisor of Counter-Terrorist Intelligence Officers who were based in boroughs on South and West London.
- 4.8. Between [REDACTED] 201[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 201[REDACTED], Jaipur was a Detective Inspector at SO15 Ports based at St Pancras International.
- 4.9. In January 2015, Jaipur was one of two officers selected to take on responsibility for Operation Motion (henceforth referred to as Op Motion).
- 4.10. Op Motion is responsible for the risk management and provision of welfare and support to all former SDS officers, including those who served in an undercover role and those who worked in the 'Back Office' as Cover Officers, Supervisors or Managers. There are in excess of one hundred and fifty officers within the remit of Op Motion and this number is increasing because MPS officers who served as undercover officers on the NPOIU have recently also been brought within the remit of Op Motion.
- 4.11. One of the primary tasks undertaken by Jaipur and his colleague (Karachi) has been to identify, trace and locate and contact all officers as outlined above for the purpose of:
- (i) Compiling a definitive list of all officers in scope of the Op Motion terms of reference,
  - (ii) To invite them to a meeting for the purposes of ascertaining sufficient information about their SDS role, particularly if they deployed as an undercover officer (UCO), to enable an assessment to be made of the current level of risk to them,
  - (iii) To discuss what security measures, if any, are required to mitigate the risk(s) identified,
  - (iv) To highlight any personal or health issues linked to their SDS role that requires intervention from Op Motion or the offer of assistance,
  - (v) Should the officer choose not to want to meet or engage, then at the very least they will be made aware of the existence Op Motion and the support that is available to them should they require it.



4.12. The process of contacting all SDS officers is not yet complete and at present has been put on hold while Jaipur (and Karachi) prepare reports and Risk Assessments for submission to the UCPI. Preparation of this material has required continued engagement and meetings with undercover officers.

**5. Current level of exposure**

5.1. The current level of exposure of Jaipur is LOW. There are no details about him in the public domain in respect of his work on MPSB or SO15 operations and no information linking him to Op Motion.

5.2. Jaipur has never worked as an undercover officer. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5.4. The level of exposure of Jaipur online is low. For example, he does not use social media and does not have a Facebook account.

5.5. Therefore, Jaipur has taken all reasonable precautions to minimise the risk of him being easily identified as a police officer who works in SO15 and in the past, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] His immediate family and friends are also mindful that alluding to his work openly could compromise his security.



**6. Objective Assessment of Impact in the event of identification**

6.1. I identify the following risk factors arising if information is disclosed by the Inquiry which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of Jaipur as a police officer responsible for Op Motion.

- (i) Jaipur being exposed and profiled by activists or anti-UCO campaigners with the concomitant interference to his private and family life,
- (ii) Compromise of operational capability,
- (iii) [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- (v) Risk of physical or psychological harm to Jaipur.

6.2. Paragraph 6.1, points (i) to (v) in detail:

- (i) Jaipur being exposed and profiled by activists or anti-UCO campaigners with the concomitant interference to his private and family life:

6.3. It is assessed that were information to be disclosed by the Inquiry which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of Jaipur as a police officer responsible for Op Motion, then the risk of Jaipur being exposed and profiled by activists or anti-UCO campaigners with the concomitant interference to his private and family life would be HIGH.

6.4. Of significant concern is that once the name of Jaipur is published in the context of the Public Inquiry and Op Motion, then the activists and researchers with a proven track record of profiling officers deemed to be of interest would research his name and link it to a photograph which would then be published with his profile.

6.5. As has been outlined, Jaipur maintains a low public profile, however it is assessed that it is likely to be within the capabilities of the activists, researchers or interested journalists to discover a photograph of him in due course.



- 6.6. Since the SDS closed in 2008 there is no current management structure to expose and therefore the next best thing for the activists and researchers would be to expose the de facto management which now exists for the SDS officers, namely the officers involved in running Op Motion.
- 6.7. This assessment has been made on the basis of the actions of activists and researchers seeking to identify undercover officers to date, who have analysed every snippet of information released into the public domain about any officer linked to the SDS, including managers, supervisors and senior officers who in reality had little or no day to day involvement with the unit.
- 6.8. Details of a number of these officers have been published online and an example is a post which can be found on the Undercover Research Group website (see Appendix A) and a linked article on another similar website Undercoverinfo (see Appendix B).
- 6.9. The article on the Undercover Research Group website was posted on 23 November 2015 and titled "The spycops supervisors"<sup>1</sup> and it names senior officers who are alleged to have held supervisory posts with responsibility for the SDS, NPOIU or a national remit in respect of covert or undercover policing or domestic extremism.
- 6.10. The article concludes with an 'NB' comment that clearly illustrates the intentions of the group to expose and profile all officers involved in covert or undercover policing, regardless of whether they deployed as a UCO or not. It states:  
*"As you can see the Undercover Research Group portal does not have profiles on all of these supervisors yet. Assistance to populating the Wiki would be warmly welcomed. Get in touch with us!"*
- 6.11. The Undercover Research Group has also published detailed profiles of a number of officers that did not serve on the SDS, but who are perceived to have held significant posts linked to the unit in the past or to be involved in managing issues around the unit or undercover officers at present.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://undercoverresearch.net/2015/11/23/the-spycops-supervisors-who-remain-accountable/>



6.12. Examples are the profiles of:

- Phil Gormley, currently Chief Constable of Scotland. In 2005-2006 he was head of MPSB for a short period and as such was the senior officer in charge of the SDS, albeit in reality he would have had minimal input to the running of the unit.
- Martin Hewitt, Assistant Commissioner, head of MPS Professionalism portfolio. He recently issued the apology on behalf of the MPS to the women who were engaged in sexual relationships with alleged SDS and NPOIU undercover officers and he has responsibility for Op Motion.
- Both profiles have photographs of the officers attached.

6.13. Another reason why the identity of Jaipur would be of significant interest to activists and researchers such as the Undercover Research Group is that together with Karachi, he is responsible for drafting the Risk Assessments and other reports which are being submitted to the Inquiry in support of applications for anonymity for the SDS officers. The anti-UCO campaigners want nothing less than the identification of all undercover officers and they will perceive that the work of Jaipur (and Karachi) is designed to obstruct and thwart their ambitions and the work of the UCPI.

6.14. It is conceivable that if the Inquiry does support anonymity applications for the majority of SDS officers then the activists will turn their attentions to Jaipur (and Karachi) and target them, if their identities are in the public domain. This is because of the officer's involvement with Op Motion and because their names would be known, while the primary targets (the undercover officers) would remain out of reach.

6.15. The publication of a profile of Jaipur accompanied by a photograph and details of his work as a police officer would be an intrusion into his private and family life. He has never disclosed details about his work to anyone who does not need to know and when taking on the Op Motion role, he did not anticipate that his identity and details about his work might be placed in the public domain.





- 6.16. A further intrusion into the private life of Jaipur is that it would have an adverse impact on his friendship with an SDS officer who deployed undercover, who he has known as a friend for many years. If the identity of Jaipur is revealed with his photograph and he is identified as one of the officers currently dealing with the SDS officers, this would severely restrict where he could meet and socialise with this person because of the potential for a compromise of his friend's identity if they were observed together. This is particularly relevant because this person is now retired and the only opportunity they have to meet is away from work.
- 6.17. Finally, there is a high public interest in the SDS and the UCPI; therefore it is assessed that if the identity of Jaipur is revealed and he is identified as one of the officers currently working closely with the undercover officers, then he will be subject to press attention. He may be targeted by media sympathetic to the cause of 'anti-UCO campaigners' and because the UCPI is a newsworthy item, his details could also be reported by the broadsheet and tabloid newspapers, as well as on television, online news outlets and social media. The press has already shown it's willingness to publish the names and photographs of undercover officers and so would have no qualms about doing the same to Jaipur.
- 6.18. Given that Jaipur would be of sufficient interest to the activists and anti-UCO campaigners for them to justify researching and publishing his profile and photograph, then there would be a potential compromise of operational capability [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]
- (ii) Compromise of operational capability:
- 6.19. It is assessed that were information to be disclosed by the Inquiry which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of Jaipur as a police officer responsible for Op Motion, then the risk of compromise to the operational capability of (Op Motion) would be HIGH.



- 6.20. The Op Motion role involves Jaipur maintaining regular contact with former SDS officers either in person, by phone, or by email, or in many cases all three. A key factor underpinning the work of Op Motion is maintaining the trust and confidence of the SDS officers, which is achieved first and foremost by ensuring that their anonymity is maintained and their safety and security is not compromised. In respect of personal meetings it is of the utmost importance that these are carried out with discretion and that the SDS officers are comfortable meeting Jaipur in public and private without a fear of compromise.
- 6.21. As has been outlined, if the identity of Jaipur were to be revealed it is assessed that his personal details and in due course his photograph would be published online by activists and anti-UCO campaign groups and he would be identified as one of the officers currently dealing with the SDS officers. This would seriously jeopardise the ability of Jaipur to operate effectively as an Op Motion officer for the following reasons.
- 6.22. Jaipur would no longer be able to carry out liaison meetings with SDS officers in public places because of the potential for a compromise of an undercover officer's identity. If the meeting was observed by any person with an interest in the UCPI they could make the assumption that the person Jaipur was with was an SDS officer.
- 6.23. At present, the ability of Jaipur to meet SDS officers discreetly and if necessary at short notice in a public place allows for considerable operational agility and flexibility. This would be severely curtailed if his identity were to be revealed.
- 6.24. As the UCPI progresses it is anticipated that Jaipur (and Karachi) will play a vital role in supporting the SDS officers through the process in a role similar to that of a Witness Liaison Officer. It is envisaged that this will entail accompanying officers to and from the venue covertly. If the identity of Jaipur is revealed and he is identified as one of the officers currently dealing with the SDS officers, this would limit how he could be deployed in this role because of the potential for a compromise of an undercover officer's identity if they were observed together.



6.25. All the undercover officers are experiencing a degree of anxiety associated with the fear that their identity will be exposed during the UCPI. Many of the officers suffer from a range of psychological issues and a small number have suffered nervous breakdowns. Often, Jaipur (and Karachi) are the only people that an SDS officer has been able to confide in and on these occasions they take on the mantle of de facto counsellors. If the identity of Jaipur is revealed, this will erode the trust and confidence of the most psychologically vulnerable who will perceive that the work of Op Motion is being compromised. This could irreparably damage the delicate relationships that Jaipur (and Karachi) have established over the past year and potentially have an adverse impact on all the officers in scope of Op Motion.

6.26. The skills profile of Jaipur which led to his selection to take on responsibility for Op Motion is one that only a very limited number of officers within the MPS possess:

- (i) Extensive MPSB service,
- (ii) Good understanding of the operation of the SDS,
- (iii) Known to the majority of former SDS undercover officers still serving in the MPS,
- (iv) Also known to many other ex/retired SDS officers,
- (v) Excellent working knowledge of many of the groups the SDS infiltrated,

[REDACTED]

6.27. This means that if Jaipur is compromised in the eyes of the SDS officers, it would be difficult to find another similarly qualified officer to take on his work.

[REDACTED]

6.28. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

6.38. [REDACTED]

(v) Risk of physical or psychological harm to Jaipur:

6.39. It is assessed that were information to be disclosed by the Inquiry which directly or indirectly leads to the identification of Jaipur as a police officer responsible for Op Motion, then the risk of physical or psychological harm to Jaipur would be LOW.

6.40. There is a general threat to Jaipur consequent to the current terrorist threat against police officers which, since January 2015, has been rated as 'Severe' (an attack is highly likely). Since this date, serving police officers including Jaipur have received briefings about their security and have received advice about maintaining a low profile on social media and when off duty.

6.41. Jaipur has worked in sensitive counter-terrorism roles within MPSB and SO15 for twenty two years. He is well aware of the need to be discreet about his work in his private life to protect the security of him and his family. If his identity was exposed and he is identified as an SO15 officer with an extensive service in counter-terrorism, then it would arguably heighten the risk to him from extremists in general.

**7. Measures in place to manage risk**

7.1. The following security measures are currently in place to minimise risk faced by Jaipur:

(i) Jaipur manages his risk in consultation with Karachi and taking into account the factors he considers when assessing the risk for the SDS officers he deals with,



- (ii) Daily social media and open source monitoring to identify threats to SDS officers,
  - (iii) Operation Motion Contingency Plan in the event of an incident lodged in the 24/7 Reserve Room.
- 7.2. These measures are presently minimal and commensurate with the fact that at present, there is no information about Jaipur in the public domain in connection with his work with the SDS officers under the auspices of Op Motion.
- 7.3. If the identity of Jaipur was exposed, a review would be carried out of the risk to him and additional security considered as appropriate, however it is unlikely that the physical risk would justify some of the standard security measures that are offered to the SDS officers  
[REDACTED]
- 7.4. Furthermore if his identity is exposed, it is assessed that there is no practical action that could be taken to mitigate the resultant HIGH risk of being profiled and targeted by activists or anti-UCO campaigners, the HIGH risk of compromise to the operational capability of Op Motion, or the MEDIUM/LOW risk of compromise of a CHIS.



**METROPOLITAN  
POLICE**

## **TOTAL POLICING**

### APPENDIX A

Undercover Research Group, 23 November 2015:  
"The spycops' supervisors who remain accountable"





**METROPOLITAN  
POLICE**

**TOTAL POLICING  
APPENDIX B**

UndercoverInfo 20 November 2015:  
"The spycops and their supervisors who remain accountable"