

<p>1 Monday, 20 November 2017 2 (11.35 am) 3 4 I N D E X 5 6 Opening remarks1 7 Submissions on behalf of the3 8 non-state, non-police core 9 participants by MS KAUFMANN 10 Submissions on behalf of the34 11 Metropolitan Police Service by 12 MS MANNION 13 Submissions on behalf of the51 14 National Police Chiefs' 15 Council by SIR ROBERT FRANCIS 16 Submissions on behalf of the59 17 National Crime Agency by 18 MR O'CONNOR 19 Submissions in reply on behalf of61 20 the non-state, non-police core 21 participants by MS KAUFMANN 22 23 Opening remarks 24 THE CHAIR: There will be a delay of not less than two 25 minutes between any words spoken or information given in the hearing room, and any communication or publication of these words or information using Twitter, other social media or any other means of communication. For the avoidance of doubt, this delay applies to any words spoken or information given in the hearing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 the third row, immediately behind me and slightly to the 2 right, Sir Robert Francis opposes of the National Police 3 Chiefs' Council, Mr Griffin appears on behalf of the 4 Home Office, Mr O'Connor on behalf of the National Crime 5 Agency, leading Mr O'Brien. 6 Sir, we have set out in our notes our understanding 7 of the position legally, and in those circumstances 8 I don't propose to repeat what we have committed to 9 writing rather we will leave it to others to have an 10 opportunity to address you on the issues which arise. 11 The advocates have been given a speaking order and 12 it falls to my learned friend Ms Kaufmann to address you 13 first. 14 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, before you get underway, can I just 15 obtain some paper please. My notebook unfortunately has 16 not been brought into the room. 17 Thank you. 18 Yes, Ms Kaufmann. 19 Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core 20 participants by MS KAUFMANN 21 MS KAUFMANN: Sir, I, too, am not going to repeat what is in 22 our written submissions that you will have had an 23 opportunity to look at. 24 THE CHAIR: Yes, I have. 25 MS KAUFMANN: So I'm just going to take matters slightly</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 whether or not they form part of the evidence. There 2 shall be no communication or publication by any means of 3 any words spoken or information given which any person 4 has indicated should not have been revealed in public 5 until such time as the objection to its publication is 6 withdrawn or the chairman has ruled upon it. 7 Subject to any future order, including any 8 restriction order under section 19 of the 2005 Act, it 9 will be permissible to use Twitter and social media from 10 within the hearing room to report on any part of the 11 proceedings providing that any such use accords with 12 their restriction and does not involve photography or 13 filming or recording devices. 14 Mr Barr? 15 MR BARR: Sir, I appear this morning in relation to the 16 Rehabilitation of Offenders Act issue, with 17 Ms Gargitter, who sits to my right. To my left 18 Ms Kaufmann QC leads Ms Brander for the non-state 19 non-police core participants, who are represented. To 20 my right Ms Mannion and Mr Payter appear on behalf of 21 the Metropolitan Police Service. Immediately behind me, 22 Mr Sanders QC leads Mr McAllister and Ms Palmer for the 23 officers who are represented by the designated lawyers 24 team. To my extreme right Ms Woods appears on behalf of 25 the officers who are represented by Slater & Gordon. On</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 further forward and summarise to some extent what our 2 position is. 3 We have both a narrow and a wide basis upon which we 4 put the procedural issues in this case. You will have 5 seen that our concern is that where the question of 6 whether a spent conviction is to be admitted arises, 7 then we, the non-state core participants, are concerned 8 that insofar as those spent convictions concern any 9 particular individual that individual should have 10 an opportunity to say something about the circumstances 11 of the particular offence before a decision is taken on 12 whether to admit it. 13 THE CHAIR: Is that submission made both on behalf of 14 non-state core participants and those who have not 15 participated at all in the Inquiry? 16 MS KAUFMANN: Who are not core participants as well. 17 It is, and I will come on to precisely how we submit 18 this might be managed. 19 So participation and an opportunity to make 20 representations to set out the circumstances of the 21 offence is what it is submitted is required. It is put 22 on both a narrow basis and on a broad basis. 23 The narrow basis is this, which is that whenever 24 a spent conviction arises in circumstances with which 25 this inquiry is concerned, that is whenever</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

1 an individual was convicted in the context of
 2 an operation where there were undercover officers
 3 operating and deployed, then that in and of itself gives
 4 rise to a question mark in relation to those spent
 5 convictions. It is necessary for there to be an
 6 opportunity for the individual concerned to have an
 7 opportunity to make representations.
 8 That's not just in relation to whether or not the
 9 issue is miscarriages, that is in relation to whether
 10 the issue is do I rely upon this spent conviction for
 11 the purposes of making a restriction order because it
 12 indicates a risk of harm to a particular officer? Or
 13 equally where the question for you is some way down the
 14 line: was it proportionate to decide to deploy
 15 undercover officers, obviously in this context it would
 16 be for a future period in light of convictions that
 17 arose which are now spent in the course of an already
 18 extant deployment?
 19 So in all those cases, we would submit that there is
 20 a very compelling case for the court -- where there is
 21 a question mark over convictions -- to ensure that there
 22 is an opportunity to make representations.
 23 But our broader submission subsumes that, and is to
 24 the effect that whenever a spent conviction falls to be
 25 considered for admissibility, an opportunity to make

Page 5

1 representations as to the circumstances of that
 2 conviction is necessary before a proper and informed
 3 decision can be made by yourself as to whether or not to
 4 admit it and to rely upon it, whether that be in
 5 evidence as to the risk posed to a particular officer
 6 for the purposes of their application for a restriction
 7 order, or as to the proportionality, say, of a decision
 8 to deploy undercover operations.
 9 The reason for that is that in relation to risk
 10 assessment and the restriction order as, sir, you have
 11 recognised already, your task is to get to the truth.
 12 In order to get to the truth it is absolutely central
 13 that individuals who were affected by undercover
 14 policing have an opportunity to know that they were the
 15 victims of such in order to come forward and provide the
 16 Inquiry with information as to what went on, so that it
 17 is possible then in light of all the facts to establish
 18 whether there was wrongdoing on the part of the
 19 officers.
 20 Any time an officer comes along and applies for
 21 a restriction order on the basis of a risk to
 22 themselves, as you have already indicated where the
 23 issue is one of personal safety, risk to life or limb --
 24 THE CHAIR: It can only be either safety or perhaps
 25 harassment, it cannot be other considerations personal

Page 6

1 to an officer.
 2 MS KAUFMANN: We will come on to that at a later stage. But
 3 you have already indicated personal safety, as in risk
 4 to life or limb, is a key consideration and would, if
 5 you are satisfied that an officer's personal safety is
 6 at risk, be a basis upon which to refuse a restriction
 7 order -- sorry, to grant a restriction order.
 8 THE CHAIR: Grant.
 9 MS KAUFMANN: Now that could mean that a cover name would
 10 not be disclosed at all if there would be a risk of
 11 a mosaic effect in relation to the cover name and the
 12 real name. Because, of course, releasing the cover name
 13 would not protect the officer in his real name if that
 14 mosaic effect is liable to lead to their identification.
 15 So the restriction order process, albeit part of the
 16 process only, is absolutely a central part of the
 17 process in terms of whether or not this Inquiry is
 18 likely to get to the truth. Any aspect of that process
 19 is also therefore critical.
 20 So insofar as you are presented with evidence which
 21 is being relied upon to substantiate an allegation that
 22 there is a risk to the officer's safety, then it is
 23 fundamental that that assessment is done on the basis of
 24 all the available evidence. Insofar as that is a spent
 25 conviction -- this doesn't just apply to spent

Page 7

1 convictions, we will come on to this later in relation
 2 to restriction orders more generally -- the
 3 circumstances of that conviction are obviously central
 4 to the question of future risk.
 5 Insofar as those convictions affect individuals who
 6 are core participants, then there is no question that
 7 they should be given an opportunity to make
 8 representations, subject to this: subject to that
 9 opportunity effectively defeating the purpose of the
 10 application because it would disclose the identity of
 11 the officer. But we do not for a moment accept that
 12 that is going to be the case in the generality of cases.
 13 THE CHAIR: It will vary from case to case.
 14 MS KAUFMANN: It will vary and it is a judgment which has to
 15 be made on a case-by-case basis.
 16 In relation to those individuals who are core
 17 participants, there is absolutely no difficulty
 18 whatsoever in giving them an opportunity, they are
 19 known, they are identifiable. They can be written to in
 20 private. There is need to disclose their spent
 21 conviction to anybody else, that is entirely a matter
 22 for them.
 23 Because we do respectfully submit that spent
 24 convictions, there is no need to disclose the identity
 25 of individuals who are the subject of spent convictions

Page 8

<p>1 when your Lordship takes them into account. So 2 anonymity can be respected -- 3 THE CHAIR: Like Sir Christopher Pitchford, I would much 4 prefer to be called "Sir". 5 MS KAUFMANN: I try, but I called a female judge the other 6 day "my Lord", it is just really difficult, we get into 7 these terrible habits. I will try. 8 THE CHAIR: Do try, yes. 9 MS KAUFMANN: So there is no difficulty. You can respect 10 their anonymity and you can give them an opportunity to 11 make representations and should do if you are going to 12 have the best evidence on this critical issue. 13 Then, so far as non-core participants are concerned, 14 individuals who are said to present a risk albeit they 15 are not participating in these proceedings, then 16 obviously the situation is more difficult because it is 17 going to be more difficult to make contact with them, 18 but we nonetheless submit that efforts should be made to 19 make contact. That can be through liaising with the 20 police to find out where those individuals were last 21 located. There are also ways in which it might be 22 possible -- we have not worked out the logistics of this 23 but we will do and come back to the Inquiry about it. 24 There are ways in which it would be possible -- for 25 example, in relation to core participants who are groups</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 and it is possible to do it and we would not suggest 2 doing it in any other way than that which maintains the 3 anonymity of the individuals concerned. 4 But the question of the logistics and the 5 practicalities is a separate question from the question 6 of whether as a matter of necessity to get to the truth 7 the Inquiry should be undertaking this exercise. 8 THE CHAIR: There, with respect, I disagree with you. 9 I said at the start of my remarks that I would not make 10 a procedural decision which would not fulfil the purpose 11 of the Inquiry of getting at the truth. I am not minded 12 to make decisions of a kind that satisfy legal purists 13 if it doesn't serve that end. In the course of the two 14 notes I produced about experience so far I was trying to 15 explain how very limited this issue is. 16 MS KAUFMANN: Well, precisely, my Lord. And that is an 17 incredibly important point. It is limited, but when it 18 arises it is still an issue that goes to your function 19 in getting to the truth. 20 Now it may be that these cases are going to arise 21 incredibly rarely but if and when they do they are 22 arising because you are making a judgment on 23 a prima facie basis that the admission of this spent 24 conviction is going to be necessary for you to assess 25 risk.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 and who had a changing membership over the years, it 2 might be possible for liaison with those groups to 3 provide a mechanism if the Inquiry knows the group to 4 which an individual who has a spent conviction belonged, 5 it may be possible through liaison with the group to 6 actually identify the individual concerned. But those 7 sorts of logistics can be worked out. 8 THE CHAIR: That would involve disclosing by the Inquiry to 9 whoever is currently in or controlling the group, if it 10 is under control, the identity of those who may have -- 11 MS KAUFMANN: Not necessarily -- 12 THE CHAIR: -- nothing at present to do with them. 13 MS KAUFMANN: Not necessarily. That's why I am suggesting 14 that the logistics can be worked out. For example, it 15 could be that you were presented with names of 16 individuals so that you look along a list and are able 17 to check. That is one way, but that has its own 18 problems. 19 Or it could be that you simply anonymise the 20 convictions and you provide details of the particular 21 dates and circumstances that the police are saying gave 22 rise to those convictions. It might have been 23 a particular demonstration on a particular date and from 24 that then the group can contact the individual members 25 and see whether they can work it out. It is possible</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 THE CHAIR: Forgive me. Can I take the example which I gave 2 in the first of the two notes that I produced, where 3 there is an unspent conviction for a relevant offence 4 and a series of spent convictions of a kind that are 5 potentially relevant. 6 Given the existence of the unspent conviction, what 7 real purpose would be served by investigating at this 8 stage -- not later on in the Inquiry but at this 9 stage -- the spent convictions? 10 MS KAUFMANN: That's precisely a reason why your Lordship 11 would decide I don't need to rely upon it at all. If it 12 is not necessary -- we will come on to section 7(3) in 13 a moment. 14 THE CHAIR: I have given you the instance in which I have 15 relied upon it, where it arguably discloses a pattern of 16 conduct. 17 MS KAUFMANN: Exactly. But then you have to -- the question 18 is: what sort of pattern of conduct does it disclose? 19 That is when the circumstances relating to the older 20 convictions become relevant, because it may be that in 21 investigating the circumstances that pattern which you 22 assume is disclosed by the facts that you have is in 23 fact not disclosed, or other things might be said 24 about it. 25 That's particularly important where why you are</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 looking at it is precisely because there is a pattern of 2 conduct, then it is really important to understand the 3 whole history and the circumstances that arise. 4 So the starting point for you to look at any of 5 these spent convictions is that prima facie you think it 6 is necessary for you to take it into account to make 7 a risk assessment -- 8 THE CHAIR: I have so far looked at a fair number of 9 individuals with spent convictions, which I have simply 10 put to one side. They are of no relevance. They simply 11 don't give rise to even a possible conclusion that there 12 might be a risk from that individual to the safety of 13 someone applying for a restriction order. 14 In those circumstances, it seems to me to be utterly 15 futile -- 16 MS KAUFMANN: I agree -- 17 THE CHAIR: You are -- 18 MS KAUFMANN: I agree, my point is -- 19 THE CHAIR: Hold on, your initial submission was that 20 I should before reaching any view about these things 21 give every person with a spent conviction where 22 reference is made to it to have the opportunity of 23 making submissions about it. 24 MS KAUFMANN: Sir, you are misunderstanding my point. My 25 point is there is an admissibility threshold which is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 instances and that obviously is an important 2 consideration: how practical is it? 3 Yes, just to make it absolutely clear, we are not 4 submitting if you are going to look at a conviction and 5 say that has no bearing whatsoever, a spent conviction, 6 we have nothing to say about that. It is where there is 7 a prima facie issue. 8 That is our position. Just on the statute and how 9 it applies, there was a question mark over whether or 10 not these were judicial proceedings for the purposes of 11 the Act. You will have seen our submission that they 12 are unquestionably judicial proceedings -- 13 THE CHAIR: I think that is now common ground. 14 MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. 15 Can I just add one further thing to the mix, and 16 that is the Defamation Act, because it makes it 17 absolutely clear that these are judicial proceedings. 18 I'm sorry it is not in the bundle -- 19 THE CHAIR: The most relevant authority never is. Thank you 20 very much. (Handed) 21 MS KAUFMANN: I have a copy. 22 The question is not whether or not the proceedings 23 are going to determine a right. The question is whether 24 they are going to determine questions affecting a right. 25 THE CHAIR: Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 necessity, you don't rely upon it unless you think it is 2 necessary to do so. Before you get to that necessity 3 threshold we say there are two stages in the process 4 that you should take. 5 The first is you have all the information relating 6 to the spent conviction from the police and you look at 7 it and you say: 8 "Prima facie, in the context of everything else, 9 I think it will be necessary for me to rely upon this." 10 At that stage, you then say, "I need to go and take 11 ..." 12 THE CHAIR: Ah, I had misunderstood you -- 13 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. 14 THE CHAIR: -- what you said, I thought expressly, was that 15 before I made any decision of any kind -- 16 MS KAUFMANN: No. 17 THE CHAIR: -- everybody who's spent convictions were being 18 relied upon had to be given an opportunity of saying -- 19 MS KAUFMANN: Absolutely not. 20 THE CHAIR: Fine. Then we are on a much narrower focus and 21 the difficulties of doing it become much smaller, 22 I agree. 23 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. My understanding was the difficulties 24 would be very small because you have already indicated 25 that you don't actually rely upon them in that many</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 MS KAUFMANN: If we turn in the Defamation Act -- this is 2 the 1996 Act amended by the 2013 Act. If we turn to 3 section 15 of the Act. So this is the Act that gives 4 rise to a right to bring proceedings if things which are 5 written or said about you that are untrue and published. 6 Section 15 deals with qualified privilege in certain 7 circumstances, and provides that a fair and accurate 8 report or copy of an extract from any adjudication 9 report statement or notice issued by a body or officer 10 or other person designated for the purpose of this 11 paragraph, is -- 12 THE CHAIR: There are two versions of section 15 -- 13 MS KAUFMANN: There are two versions of it, I'm sorry. 14 THE CHAIR: -- and the current version is over the page. 15 MS KAUFMANN: I know why I'm looking at it wrongly, because 16 I am looking in the schedule. That is why. I'm sorry. 17 THE CHAIR: No, don't worry. 18 MS KAUFMANN: We need to go to page 4: 19 "The publication of any report or other statement 20 mentioned in schedule 1 to this Act is privileged unless 21 the publication is shown to be made with malice, subject 22 as follows ..." 23 That first subparagraph there has an effect on the 24 right to reputation. Because instead of being able to 25 sue because somebody has defamed you by writing about</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 you in terms that are untrue, full stop, qualified 2 privilege attaches to these particular statements such 3 that you can only sue where malice is established. So 4 that plainly affects the right to reputation. 5 If we look in schedule 3.1, paragraph 3. We can see 6 that section 15 applies to these proceedings. 7 THE CHAIR: Yes. 8 MS KAUFMANN: That is page 7: 9 "A fair and accurate report of proceedings in public 10 of a person appointed to hold a public inquiry by 11 a government or legislature anywhere in the world." 12 So let's imagine a situation in which your Lordship 13 in drawing your conclusions and setting them out in your 14 Inquiry report makes findings about the conduct of 15 police officers, makes findings about the conduct of 16 some of the core participants which are untrue, are 17 actually inaccurate despite your best endeavours, then 18 section 15 means that they can only sue on the basis of 19 malice and so too in relation to any of the press that 20 report upon it. 21 So plainly these are proceedings that affect the 22 right to reputation because you will be determining 23 questions which then affect that right. 24 THE CHAIR: Yes. I don't doubt that the proceedings do 25 affect rights, but they are not in their substantive</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 legislation. The existing powers are sufficient. 2 I have explained how so far I have deployed them and 3 I think we are coming down actually to rather a narrow 4 question. 5 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. 6 THE CHAIR: As far as the wider purposes of the Inquiry go, 7 it is a rather different question and a much wider one. 8 MS KAUFMANN: We are being asked to address both at this 9 point in time. 10 THE CHAIR: Certainly, you are, yes. It has been organised 11 that way. But I would be grateful if when you do 12 address me if you can compartmentalise your submissions 13 into restriction orders and everything else. 14 MS KAUFMANN: So the wider question is proportionality, 15 that's the critical question -- 16 THE CHAIR: Yes. 17 MS KAUFMANN: -- and it is very difficult to know what it is 18 that you are going to be presented with in terms of 19 spent convictions. But I can imagine there will be 20 quite a number of those. 21 THE CHAIR: You mean at the substantive phase of the 22 Inquiry? Yes. 23 MS KAUFMANN: When it comes to looking at proportionality in 24 relation to the decisions to deploy -- 25 THE CHAIR: I would prefer to call it justification, but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 part intended to determine rights. 2 MS KAUFMANN: Absolutely, no question. 3 THE CHAIR: They can't. 4 MS KAUFMANN: No question. But that is not what 5 section 4(6) is about, so section 7(3) does bite. 6 I don't think there is any dispute between us and 7 the Inquiry team about the test to be applied under 8 section 7(3). My understanding from Mr Barr is that it 9 is a test of strict necessity or necessity, and it is 10 a judgment, it is not a discretion and it must be the 11 case, therefore, that justice cannot be done without 12 admitting the spent conviction. 13 I have already made submissions on the manageability 14 of a process of relying upon spent convictions, 15 deploying section 7(3) in light of what you say, 16 my Lord, about the number of cases. Even if you were to 17 apply a section 7(3) test in relation to every spent 18 conviction that crosses your path and do so in 19 accordance with the procedure that we submit should 20 apply, that is a manageable process in our submission 21 and therefore resort should absolutely not be had, as 22 was suggested might be necessary by Mr Barr, to 23 section 7(4) and the possibility of -- 24 THE CHAIR: As far as the restriction order applications go, 25 your submission is plainly right. There is no need for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 I don't mind. 2 MS KAUFMANN: At that stage, when the issue is one of 3 justification, then of course it is likely that you will 4 be presented with more spent convictions to take into 5 account. 6 THE CHAIR: Certainly. Also I will have to look into them 7 at that stage, whether or not anybody consents. I'm 8 going to have to look into whether a spent conviction 9 incurred in the course of a deployment by an undercover 10 officer into the group where the events occurred which 11 gave rise to the conviction, whether or not that 12 possibly amounted to a miscarriage of justice. 13 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. In that situation -- so if we look at 14 the miscarriages of justice situation, in our submission 15 there can be absolutely no question that in order for 16 you to discharge that responsibility of looking into 17 whether there might have been a miscarriage of justice, 18 it is clearly going to be necessary for representations 19 to be made in relation to those convictions. And the 20 spent conviction is, as it were, the subject of your 21 Inquiry at that stage and so there can be no question of 22 admitting it. The question then is your job of finding 23 the truth about it. It necessarily has to be admitted 24 at that stage. 25 THE CHAIR: I agree it necessarily has to be admitted, but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 it may be prohibited if the strict argument is correct, 2 by the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act. 3 MS KAUFMANN: Well no, because in that situation 4 section 7(3) would mean that you necessarily have to 5 admit it. 6 THE CHAIR: That is if at that stage I am engaged in 7 considering the interests of justice. There is 8 a perfectly respectable view that a public inquiry of 9 this nature has two purposes, to find out the facts and 10 to express an opinion upon them. 11 It is not strictly a question of justice in the 12 sense that is traditionally understood, of determining 13 rights, of reaching conclusions about rights -- 14 MS KAUFMANN: But, sir, at this stage when you are looking 15 at miscarriages you are part of a chain. So you are the 16 first stage. Your decision having made your Inquiry and 17 looked into the truth is going to be: do I refer this on 18 to the specialist panel that is looking at miscarriages? 19 That is an aspect of serving the interests of 20 justice, because if there has been a miscarriage of 21 justice it is plainly in the interests of justice that 22 it is brought to light and the conviction is overturned. 23 So in the broader sense there will be no question that 24 you at that stage will be serving the interests of 25 justice by admitting the spent conviction.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 suggesting that the law be amended to permit inquiries 2 to take these things into account was to deal with an 3 uncertainty not with a proposition that is certainly 4 established one way or the other. 5 MS KAUFMANN: My submission would be that you should read 6 interests of justice broadly, given the broad nature of 7 what judicial proceedings themselves are defined to be. 8 Judicial proceedings are not defined as proceedings 9 in which a right is determined, so you have to give 10 a broader reading to the interests of justice. 11 Secondly, if you then give a narrow reading to it 12 and resort to section 7(4) as a means by which to exempt 13 this inquiry from the constraints of section 7(3). Then 14 it leads to two difficulties. 15 Firstly, an exemption under section 7(4) is 16 an exemption for all purposes. It means that you can 17 side stepped the necessity test in section 7(3), and you 18 can just look at spent convictions for any purpose. And 19 we can see that if we look at the schedule to the order. 20 THE CHAIR: I agree that some limitation has to be placed 21 upon it. I would have thought a limitation of the 22 following kind, namely for the purposes of permitting 23 the Inquiry to fulfil its terms of reference, would 24 serve that purpose. 25 MS KAUFMANN: That would be one way, or to narrow it and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 If an individual is subject to a conviction that 2 should not have occurred, that individual wants justice 3 in relation to it. 4 THE CHAIR: That is a good point. It doesn't, however, 5 arise when considering the justification for 6 deployments. But I accept what you say about that, in 7 first instance there the interests of justice are 8 engaged, I agree. 9 MS KAUFMANN: And in relation to proportionality, again the 10 interests of justice are engaged in the broad sense in 11 that one of the outcomes of this Inquiry will, we hope, 12 be to determine whether or not the undercover tool was 13 disproportionately used in circumstances where the 14 threats did not justify it. 15 If that is right, and if that finding is made or not 16 made, whatever the finding, the interests of justice 17 will have been served. 18 THE CHAIR: I agree with you wholeheartedly about one of the 19 purposes of the Inquiry. Whether or not deployments 20 which did occur were justified on 21 a deployment-by-deployment basis and perhaps more 22 generally, is a question I have to enquire into and do 23 my best to answer. But I query whether that raises 24 questions about the interests of justice. 25 I raise it merely as a query because my purpose in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 replicate the wording of section 7(3). To make sure 2 that you only admitted where it is necessary -- so use 3 the word "necessary", yes. 4 THE CHAIR: I quite agree it has to be in some way 5 constrained. The precise wording of it is ultimately 6 a matter for Parliament not for me. I would merely be 7 making a suggestion to the Ministry of Justice, that is 8 all I would be doing. 9 MS KAUFMANN: One would imagine they would listen very 10 carefully to you given that it is your request -- 11 THE CHAIR: I would hope so and I would hope that they would 12 listen to it in the spirit in which it is intended, 13 namely to make the task of fulfilling the terms of 14 reference of public inquiries generally a little easier. 15 MS KAUFMANN: The second objection is if one looks at the 16 sorts of orders made contained in the order -- I don't 17 need to take you to them, sir -- it is quite clear that 18 these are all proceedings where in the nature of the 19 proceedings, in the nature of the issue that falls to be 20 determined, somebody's history whether it relates to 21 spent or unspent convictions is critical to the 22 determination. Because they are in a position of trust, 23 for example, or they are in a profession or whatever it 24 is. So there is a general exception that is made. 25 Secondly, those proceedings are also ones that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

1 concern particular individuals. An individual in
 2 a disciplinary context, in whatever context. It is
 3 clearly not intended to cover a situation such as this,
 4 which is again why I would submit that a broad reading
 5 of "in the interests of justice" is what is appropriate
 6 here, so that it can cover all the judicial proceedings
 7 to which it applies, that is ones that do not determine
 8 rights but look at more broader matters.
 9 THE CHAIR: The more I listen to you. The more I think we
 10 are on the same track. It is merely a means of arriving
 11 at the destination.
 12 MS KAUFMANN: I think that is right and I simply urge you to
 13 arrive at that destination under section 7(3) and not
 14 distort the intended use of section 7(4).
 15 THE CHAIR: Yes.
 16 Of more immediate concern is the restriction order
 17 process.
 18 MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
 19 THE CHAIR: I think there we are getting at any rate
 20 a closer understanding of the position of each other.
 21 I have explained to you in the two notes the very
 22 limited purposes for which spent convictions are used
 23 and you explained to me that in those circumstances only
 24 a very few need be looked at.
 25 MS KAUFMANN: Yes, that is correct.

Page 25

1 THE CHAIR: I make it clear now that I thought the breadth
 2 of the original proposal in effect required me to
 3 conduct an inquiry into the facts before I could start
 4 conducting an inquiry into the facts, if you see what
 5 I mean --
 6 MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
 7 THE CHAIR: But now we are focused on a much narrower
 8 question, which is: where I am minded to take into
 9 account a spent conviction then I should give the person
 10 who has incurred the spent conviction the opportunity of
 11 making representations about it.
 12 MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
 13 Sir, those are my submissions in relation to the
 14 rehabilitation of Offenders Act. Unless I can assist
 15 you further?
 16 THE CHAIR: Can I put to you difficulties that arise with
 17 that. In the case of, I think, the groups of
 18 individuals -- I'm trying to express this not too
 19 clumsily, either the individuals or the groups to which
 20 they belonged, that you are speaking on behalf of, there
 21 is not too much of a problem generally. I will have to
 22 think about it on a case-by-case basis but not too much
 23 of a problem generally.
 24 In the case of some of those who belong to groups
 25 that you do not represent and none of the individuals

Page 26

1 are core participants who you represent, then if they
 2 fall into that category of group which posed and poses
 3 a real risk to the safety of the individual undercover
 4 officer, then even revealing the fact that spent
 5 convictions of individuals who belonged to or were
 6 associated with that group may trigger a risk which
 7 doesn't previously exist and may jeopardise the making
 8 of the restriction order itself.
 9 I'm not just dealing with groups of the kind that
 10 you represent. I'm dealing with, as I explained in my
 11 opening statement, groups which pose a real risk to the
 12 safety of officers. I simply don't see how I could do
 13 it in those circumstances, or why I should do it.
 14 MS KAUFMANN: We would not for a moment suggest you should
 15 do it in those circumstances. If the disclosure of
 16 a spent conviction is going to create the very risk that
 17 the application for the restriction order is seeking to
 18 avoid, then that is obviously a good reason for not
 19 giving an opportunity.
 20 What we are concerned to ensure is that where it
 21 doesn't create the risk -- where there is no question
 22 that that risk is created or where the evidence simply
 23 does not make out the existence of such a risk, then an
 24 opportunity should be given.
 25 THE CHAIR: Yes. Does that submission arise even in cases

Page 27

1 where although I am minded to take the spent conviction
 2 into account, typically in the circumstances described
 3 in my first note, nevertheless I would still make the
 4 restriction order even if I didn't?
 5 MS KAUFMANN: In those circumstances, in my submission, what
 6 you should do is simply not take them into account.
 7 Because if you have enough evidence to make the
 8 restriction order on without that spent conviction, then
 9 it is not necessary, it doesn't meet the section 7(3)
 10 test. So you would not even need to go there.
 11 THE CHAIR: Logically that is right, but in human life
 12 things are never as neat as that. When one makes
 13 a decision one takes into account all sorts of things
 14 which can be explained by reasons, but not all of them
 15 can be. And to say you must exclude -- let me put
 16 a concrete example to you. This is a theoretical one,
 17 and does not relate to any individual. I make this
 18 absolutely clear, this is purely a theoretical example.
 19 Suppose someones has been convicted during quite
 20 a long history of convictions of a really serious
 21 offence and has received a number of years of
 22 imprisonment, well over the minimum threshold of four
 23 years and has a string of lesser convictions from
 24 everything from public order to quite serious violence
 25 but not sufficient to attract a four year plus sentence,

Page 28

<p>1 and those convictions have been incurred over a large 2 number of years. Should I not be permitted to take 3 those into account as factors relevant to the making of 4 the order with or without giving an opportunity to the 5 individual to comment on every one of the string of 6 spent convictions? 7 MS KAUFMANN: No. You should in that situation give them an 8 opportunity to comment. That is our position -- 9 THE CHAIR: Yes. 10 MS KAUFMANN: -- and it doesn't actually -- for the 11 restriction order purposes, which we will come on to 12 later, it doesn't matter whether they are spent or not. 13 They are should be given an opportunity to comment on 14 their convictions. 15 THE CHAIR: I know you are going to move on to the wider 16 pattern of information to take into account. As 17 I understand your submission will be not only should the 18 individual be given the opportunity of commenting on 19 spent convictions but also on any other intelligence or 20 information which does not result in a conviction which 21 is being taken into account. 22 That potentially creates wider practical 23 difficulties and wider difficulties of principle. One 24 will be revealing information which is for the time 25 being at least confidential or even secret.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 with others in the group. 2 In those circumstances, what is to be gained by 3 going back over the spent convictions or the other 4 information? Because there will be happening that which 5 I think the core participants want, which is the 6 disclosure of the identity of the individual who 7 interacted with them in the name in which they knew him 8 or her. 9 MS KAUFMANN: That begs the question of the outcome of 10 a dispute that continues to exist between the non-state 11 core participants and yourself, which is your minded to 12 decision in relation to real names. 13 You know that we do not agree with you about where 14 you have decided to draw the line -- 15 THE CHAIR: Yes. 16 MS KAUFMANN: -- which is that you will not disclosure real 17 names, save in circumstances which remain unclear. 18 I think you just indicated there for example where 19 a woman has had an intimate deceitful relationship with 20 an officer, then maybe their real name will be 21 disclosed. 22 THE CHAIR: It is not a question of maybe. All other 23 considerations being equal, they will be disclosed. 24 MS KAUFMANN: They will be disclosed. 25 We will come on to this afterwards in relation to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 MS KAUFMANN: Well one would have to examine the basis upon 2 which it was confidential or secret for example. So one 3 would have to examine is disclosure of that information 4 going to disclose the individual who is the source of 5 the information, is that disclosure of the source going 6 to imperil that individual? All those questions have to 7 be taken into account. 8 THE CHAIR: Well not just those considerations, but it would 9 include those, yes, I agree. 10 MS KAUFMANN: Well there are a whole series of 11 considerations that have to be taken into account, but 12 the starting point is if you want to get to the truth, 13 you need accurate information, you do not want to be 14 imposing restriction orders where they are not 15 necessary. 16 THE CHAIR: I utterly agree. 17 In a case in which the decision is to publish the 18 cover name of an undercover officer. Not talking about 19 senior officers, at the moment, just undercover 20 officers. 21 Those officers have been deployed against a group 22 containing one or more individuals who have spent 23 convictions which I'm minded to take into account. 24 Disclosure of the cover name will be probably all that 25 will result, unless there is a deceitful relationship</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 restriction orders, but our position is there are more 2 reasons for the disclosure of real names or reasons that 3 you have not addressed and they include -- so there are 4 instrumental reasons which go to serving the purposes of 5 enabling you to discharge your function of getting to 6 the truth. 7 There are also very important reasons about public 8 confidence and -- 9 THE CHAIR: Forgive me for interrupting, may I do so at the 10 moment. These are matters of general principle. If, as 11 a matter of general principle it is right that the real 12 names of undercover officers should be published unless 13 there is some compelling reason why they shouldn't, for 14 example a threat to their safety. Then your submissions 15 clearly have force and it would be necessary to look at 16 things like spent convictions. 17 But if I don't agree with you on the general 18 proposition and I am looking simply at individual cases 19 and in general cover names will be disclosed but not 20 real names, then in those cases where I do refuse 21 a restriction order in respect of cover name or none is 22 applied for, then I don't really see where this exercise 23 of considering spent convictions gets us. 24 MS KAUFMANN: That may well be right. But there is 25 a fundamental point that we need to debate and iron out,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 which at the moment, sir, you are seemingly refusing to 2 engage in. Which is are you right about the way you 3 have drawn the line and should we be given an 4 opportunity to actually persuade you that you are not 5 right about where you have drawn the line. 6 So Lord Justice Pitchford, 18 months ago in 2016, 7 issued his decision about the applicable principles. 8 This is the first time upon which those principles are 9 being applied to individual cases. 10 There remains debate and dispute amongst all the 11 parties as to what his judgment actually means, and 12 there remains a serious difference between some of us 13 and yourself about where the line has been drawn. And 14 we would seek to make submissions on exactly that, where 15 the line is drawn. 16 THE CHAIR: I entirely agree, and you are going to do that 17 when we get to restriction order applications. I hope 18 we will do it in relation to individual officers and use 19 concrete examples upon which to explore these questions 20 of principle. Fine. 21 But at the moment I'm only concerned with 22 restriction order applications. My question to you is, 23 I think, a reasonably straightforward one: in those 24 cases in which it is decided to publish the cover name, 25 then what does it matter that the restriction order in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 I think, is the question of principle. 2 That is very helpful. I think it clarifies matters 3 greatly. 4 Good. Ms Payter? 5 MS MANNION: You have, I think, an error, sir, on your note. 6 THE CHAIR: Yes, I do. I'm very sorry, could you tell me 7 who you are, I do apologise. 8 MS MANNION: Amy Mannion, Ms Mannion. 9 THE CHAIR: Yes, you do not appear at all. Right. 10 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 11 MS MANNION 12 MS MANNION: Sir, thank you for the minded to note of 13 2 August. The metropolitan Police Service agrees with 14 the proposals you have set out there. 15 As you know from the position statement, the 16 Metropolitan Police's position in respect of section 17 4(6) was that it was in all likelihood applicable, but 18 in common I think with Counsel to the Inquiry, we 19 recognised that it was not an issue which was clear cut 20 or easy. For that reason, to avoid any possible 21 uncertainty, it was and is the Metropolitan Police 22 Service's position that the Inquiry should seek an 23 amendment to the exceptions order. 24 THE CHAIR: Well, should propose to the Secretary of State 25 for Justice that she should present to Parliament --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 respect of the real name may have been based in part 2 upon spent convictions? 3 MS KAUFMANN: So can I take it that your premise is you are 4 right about where you draw the line, you will not 5 disclose real names save in the circumstances you have 6 identified, the narrow circumstances? So that all that 7 is going to happen in cases where to do so will not 8 involve a threat to the safety of the officer, is that 9 their cover name will be disclosed. In those 10 circumstances I agree, in those circumstances, but it 11 depends upon the premise being the correct one. So if 12 in fact you are not right in relation to real names then 13 it becomes incredibly important to look at. 14 THE CHAIR: I follow the submission -- 15 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. 16 THE CHAIR: -- but I think what you are saying to me is if 17 I am right about the non-disclosure of real names and 18 the ordinary disclosure of cover names, then in cases in 19 which cover names are disclosed, the argument about the 20 Rehabilitation of Offenders Act doesn't matter. 21 MS KAUFMANN: No, because it doesn't form part of a risk 22 assessment that we need to be concerned with. 23 THE CHAIR: Yes. 24 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. 25 THE CHAIR: Right. What we are then coming down to,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 which ultimately will decide -- a form of words which 2 would permit the Inquiry, in its substantive phase at 3 least, to take into account spent convictions. 4 MS MANNION: Indeed. And, sir, as I will mention in a 5 moment, those exact protections, sir, that you set out 6 will assist in ensuring that any amendment is 7 an appropriate one. 8 Sir, I propose then to address very briefly the 9 practical exercise of the section 7 power in respect of 10 restriction orders and then make a small number of 11 observations about the benefits that we foresee in -- 12 for seeking an exception. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MS MANNION: Firstly, in respect of section 7(3), of course 15 whatever approach the Inquiry adopts for the exercise of 16 the section 7 power, that approach must allow the 17 Inquiry to fulfil its terms of reference fully, 18 efficiently, without unnecessary costs and fairly. 19 It is the Metropolitan Police Service's position and 20 experience that spent convictions play a small but 21 important part in the risk assessment exercise. Sir, as 22 you indeed have observed in your 23 October note they 23 are relevant in a small number of cases, but our 24 submission is when they are relevant they are important 25 and they are necessary. And it is right that the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 Inquiry should be able to take them into account. That 2 is fairness requires that they are taken into account. 3 So there will be occasions -- 4 THE CHAIR: If they disclose a real risk to the safety of 5 a former undercover officer, then fairness demands that 6 I take them into account. 7 The question which Ms Kaufmann raises is in those 8 circumstances does fairness and/or section 7(3) also 9 demand that the individual whose spent convictions are 10 in issue is given an opportunity to say something about 11 them. 12 MS MANNION: I'm grateful and I hear Ms Kaufmann today has 13 narrowed what we understood to be the very wide terms of 14 the suggestion, for which I am grateful -- 15 THE CHAIR: Yes. 16 MS MANNION: -- but our position is that fairness does not 17 demand that engagement at this stage. 18 Firstly, that does not mean that the Metropolitan 19 Police suggests that you should accept uncritically any 20 evidence in relation to any matter that you receive in 21 a risk assessment, be that a conviction spent or unspent 22 or any other topic, and no doubt you will consider each 23 piece of evidence and give it whatever weight it 24 deserves -- 25 THE CHAIR: For the purpose of civil litigation, which this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 unworkable. 2 THE CHAIR: Yes, in its broadest exposition it certainly was 3 unworkable -- 4 MS MANNION: Yes. 5 THE CHAIR: -- in the much more narrowly focused one now 6 postulated by Ms Kaufmann it may not be. 7 MS MANNION: It may not be, and, sir, I have heard it as 8 recently as you have. So it is hard to have formulated 9 all thoughts in respect of it. 10 My initial concern, though, is that it is not clear 11 how even the narrower version would work in respect of 12 an individual who cannot be contacted for whatever 13 reason, does that mean, sir, that -- 14 THE CHAIR: Well, it can't didn't work. 15 MS MANNION: -- you are allowed to take into account -- 16 THE CHAIR: An individual who can't be contacted because it 17 puts the application and/or the safety of the officer at 18 risk, simply has to be taken into account if I think it 19 is right, even though the individual cannot be 20 contacted. 21 If an individual cannot be contacted because they 22 can't be found, then I don't see what else I can do 23 other than if I am minded to properly to take them into 24 account. 25 I think that Ms Kaufmann's proposition only really</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 isn't, the 1967 Civil Evidence Act establishes that 2 a conviction is prima facie proof of the facts upon 3 which it was based. 4 MS MANNION: Yes, but that is slightly different from the 5 issue which as I understand it has been raised, which is 6 does the timing for example of a particular conviction 7 suggest it took place within the currency of an 8 undercover deployment, such that it might in fact be 9 masking some form of miscarriage. 10 Those matters, sir, you can be aware of or seek 11 information in respect of if you require, but we would 12 say that fairness does not require the rehabilitated 13 person be found and consulted at this stage for a proper 14 consideration of the evidence or a restriction order 15 application for five reasons. 16 Firstly, the size of the problem to address. 17 Secondly because it is unlikely, we would submit, to 18 cause undue inhibition of your later and proper 19 investigation of your terms of reference. 20 That in any event any restriction order you make is 21 reviewable, it is not set in stone. 22 Fourthly, we would submit there is no prejudice at 23 this stage to the rehabilitated individual. 24 Fifthly -- and perhaps in this regard my submissions 25 are less than they were -- that the suggestion is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 arises in relation to those individuals who can be 2 contacted. 3 MS MANNION: Yes, in respect of spent convictions. But 4 there is also the wider submission -- this is why I'm 5 not sure that it is genuinely narrowed -- in the wings 6 that even those who have unspent convictions should be 7 contacted or those who were the receipt of intelligence 8 reports, and certainly that wider exercise would 9 continue to be just as unworkable as this initial -- 10 THE CHAIR: The wider exercise, I agree, has great 11 logistical difficulties. 12 The very narrow exercise which I think is the 13 absolute baseline of Ms Kaufmann's submissions doesn't 14 create quite the same difficulty. 15 MS MANNION: No, but the difficulty is that the principle 16 behind the submissions she makes apply, one might think, 17 with force in respect of spent and unspent convictions 18 and on that basis I would suggest that there is a danger 19 that it can creep into something which is not workable. 20 But, as I say, I have heard the narrowing as recently, 21 sir, as have you. 22 I will still nonetheless mention my other reasons 23 why in my submission it is nonetheless unfair at this 24 stage or fairness does not demand at this stage the 25 engagement of the rehabilitated person.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 As I said first, the size of the problem -- if the 2 core concern is that absent consultation with the 3 rehabilitated person the Inquiry might end up relying 4 upon a spent conviction which would prove to be unsafe 5 were it properly investigated at the pre-restriction 6 order stage. In my submission that is a scenario which 7 is unlikely to arise on the facts -- 8 THE CHAIR: I don't actually see how it can be explored. 9 I think Ms Kaufmann's submission is more limited. 10 It is that the individual must be given the opportunity 11 of making representations about it. But once that has 12 happened, I think it would be very difficult fairly to 13 reach even a provisional conclusion about the safety or 14 otherwise of the spent conviction, on the basis of 15 submissions by the individual concerned what else 16 I might glean from the information that has been 17 provided to me, without actually conducting a sort of 18 mini trial, which would be a complete waste of effort. 19 MS MANNION: Exactly. Then one wonders what it actually is 20 doing to assist you, sir, in the restriction order phase 21 of the Inquiry. You have indicated that you would only 22 be considering spent convictions where there are unspent 23 convictions, and then only where they appear on the 24 evidence to show a pattern of conduct relevant to the 25 matter that you were determining and not otherwise.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 undertake. 2 So in my submission this is an even narrower problem 3 if not a non-existent problem, and one can that cannot 4 be resolved in any event by engagement with the 5 rehabilitated person. 6 It also, in my submission, won't cause difficulties 7 for you when you come to the substantive stage of the 8 Inquiry when you will be considering the terms of 9 reference in relation to miscarriage of justice. You 10 have already indicated that at that stage you would 11 consult where appropriate and subject to any restriction 12 and you will also at that stage, whether or not there is 13 a restriction or a number of restrictions in place, have 14 other sources from which to begin your investigation and 15 continue your investigation. 16 This is not an inquiry where you are likely to be 17 reliant solely on the account of an individual to 18 trigger an investigation of whether there has been 19 miscarriage or indeed whether there is proper 20 justification. 21 So at that substantive stage there will be a wider 22 basket of evidence and there will be the assistance of 23 consultation, where it is appropriate, to investigate 24 properly those terms of reference. 25 THE CHAIR: Sorry, you are losing me slightly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 So it would appear that a restriction order will 2 always be based on more than a spent conviction. There 3 will always be more in the public interest balance than 4 simply that. 5 THE CHAIR: So far that is unquestionably the case. The 6 more of these things I have looked at and the more 7 minded to decisions that I have published, the more 8 convinced I am that a case in which one or more spent 9 convictions is absolutely the critical factor which 10 justifies making a restriction order, or not making 11 a restriction order, simply won't arise. It has not 12 done so far, I would be astonished if it were to do so. 13 MS MANNION: No, sir, and certainly the approach you are 14 taking at this stage would highlight any such 15 application very clearly at an early stage and it may be 16 that that needs to be considered then. But in my 17 submission that is right and it is unlikely, if not 18 impossible, that a restriction order would be based 19 solely on a spent conviction. 20 In that context there are lesser grounds to need to 21 do the exploration at any early stage, because your 22 restriction order is not going to be tethered to one 23 conviction which may prove weak or wrong at some future 24 date if it were better investigated with all of the 25 limitations on any proper investigation you can</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 Consultation, you are talking about consultation 2 before making a suggestion to the Secretary of State for 3 Justice that the secondary legislation is amended or 4 something else? 5 MS MANNION: No, sir, I'm making submissions that the 6 concern that is raised that you, sir, will not able to 7 properly investigate that term of reference in respect 8 of miscarriage in due course in the substantive phase, 9 if there is a restriction granted at this early stage 10 which was based on something that but for using the 11 section 7 route and engaging with the rehabilitated 12 person you might have discovered more. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't at the moment think that 14 consultation comes into it. It is inquiry into it. 15 MS MANNION: Inquiry, or indeed speaking with, to use the 16 most basic term, the rehabilitated person about their 17 account of the conviction. 18 THE CHAIR: Again, this is a purely theoretical example and 19 not tied to any particular set of facts. 20 Suppose that I hear from a core participant about 21 a particular event that gave rise to the conviction of 22 half a dozen people. And I don't hear from the 23 remaining five. And as a result of what I'm told by the 24 core participant I think something has gone badly wrong 25 in all cases, then I would, I think, be minded to refer</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 all six convictions to the panel which will look into 2 these things. 3 MS MANNION: That is exactly it. One perfect example of the 4 fact that you, sir, will not be required to only proceed 5 in your investigations on the basis of an account from 6 an individual. There will be much wider sources of 7 evidence. So the term of reference is also to enquire 8 into the disclosure of undercover police operations and 9 whether there was non-disclosure and whether that 10 non-disclosure could have led in any given case to 11 a miscarriage of justice. 12 So you will already be looking at the disclosure 13 picture in respect of a range of offences or a range of 14 convictions that will be driven by the conduct of the 15 deployment. 16 THE CHAIR: I think she is in principle right, which I had 17 not before, and so it shows the power of good advocacy 18 and good ideas, that it is within the interest of 19 justice test when I'm considering spent convictions and 20 therefore section 7(3), even though other aspects of the 21 Inquiry may not fall into section 7(3) comfortably, that 22 would. 23 MS MANNION: Yes, I can see strength of that, yes. 24 Sir, my third basis for suggesting that fairness 25 doesn't demand engagement with the rehabilitated person</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 delay. Anything which serves only a theoretical rather 2 than a practical purpose is unlikely to be done by me. 3 MS MANNION: Indeed. 4 In short, sir, the Metropolitan Police Service's 5 position in respect of what fairness demands at this 6 early engagement stage is that there will be little or 7 no actual tangible benefiting for the decision making of 8 restriction order applications and there will be 9 a process which at the very least will cause delay and 10 may at its widest be unworkable and cause unnecessary 11 cost and, as I say, without benefit. 12 THE CHAIR: Can I just explore the practical side of it? 13 If I were to accede to Ms Kaufmann's suggestion -- 14 I speak here from recollection rather than having gone 15 back and checked everything line by line -- then the 16 tiny handful of instances in which the possibility of 17 going and seeking the views of the individual or 18 individuals affected might arise, would arise in 19 relation to later rather than earlier deployments. 20 So it would not stop that which I want to do, which 21 is to get the Inquiry going substantively in relation to 22 early deployments, obtaining witness statements from 23 both officers and from those affected by the deployments 24 so that we would be in a position when the substantive 25 part of the hearing of the Inquiry actually starts to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 is that any restriction order made in respect of where 2 there has been a spent conviction can of course be 3 reviewed and if appropriate revised or removed if 4 anything came to light at a later stage which showed 5 that it was based on a risk which was not found to be 6 a true risk. 7 We would submit that the rehabilitated person would 8 not be prejudiced by not engaging at the restriction 9 order stage and for the same reason it would not be 10 a disproportionate interference with their rights under 11 article 8 of the Convention, because they are not the 12 subject of the restriction order decision, nothing about 13 their spent conviction would be published and this is 14 not a case of a person's spent conviction being made 15 public without their consent or being disclosed 16 unnecessarily. 17 Sir, finally -- as I submitted earlier -- we feared 18 that the process of engagement with the rehabilitated 19 person at the earliest stage would be unworkable. It 20 will certainly lead to some delay and, sir, we at the 21 very least ask that any decision you make -- and I know 22 that it will -- is one which is both fair and bears in 23 mind the need to avoid unnecessary cost and delay. 24 THE CHAIR: I hope that if nothing else was clear from what 25 I said, that I really am determined to avoid unnecessary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 get underway efficiently. 2 MS MANNION: No, it would slow down the decision making in 3 that individual application certainly -- 4 THE CHAIR: It would be. 5 MS MANNION: -- and we would call that delay rather than 6 simply the time that it takes, because of my submission 7 that there is little or no actual benefit that will 8 derive from it. 9 THE CHAIR: The benefit is a separate point from the delay. 10 I am inclined to agree with you that I can't see at the 11 moment that there would be much practical benefit, even 12 though there might be a theoretical one. 13 MS MANNION: Sir, in respect of an invitation to the 14 Secretary of State for Justice to lay before Parliament 15 an amendment to the exceptions order. 16 Firstly, we agree that the narrower suggested 17 amendment proposed in the minded to is preferable, and, 18 sir, I hear the exchange with Ms Kaufmann today in 19 respect of the limits on the precise wording and that in 20 my respectful submission must be all to the good. 21 We do, nonetheless, submit that whilst the range and 22 volume of spent conviction material which may come in 23 the substantive phase of the Inquiry in respect of the 24 motivation for undercover operations, the justification 25 for undercover operations and in reviewing disclosure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 under the miscarriage of justice term of reference, and 2 while I recognise that the Inquiry will be best placed 3 to assess what that volume of conviction material is. 4 It is on any view likely to be a matter which the 5 Inquiry is going to have to consider with regularity. 6 Given that in other forum where the receipt of 7 information about spent convictions is likely to occur 8 with regularity, for example in criminal proceedings, 9 are of a type which fall for exception within the Act in 10 any event, our submission is it can be inferred that 11 section 7(3) is designed for those circumstances when 12 a judicial authority is required to consider a spent 13 conviction in a non-routine manner when it is less 14 likely to be common and provides the judicial test for 15 its admission. 16 Bearing in mind the volume that this Inquiry is 17 likely to be dealing with, there are, in our submission, 18 very good practical reasons to seek an exemption, 19 because an inquiry on these terms is, we would submit, 20 the very sort of proceeding in which an exemption would 21 be appropriate. 22 THE CHAIR: It would be absurd to examine the justification 23 for a deployment into a group which habitually used 24 minor acts of disorder and violence to further its 25 ends -- it would be absurd that I would have to treat</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 a matter of lesser protection. It is a matter of 2 certainty and workability and the Inquiries Act provides 3 you with the tools to ensure that your application of 4 the exception is fair and avoids unnecessary cost and 5 the restriction order process allows you to protect the 6 privacy of any individual who is rehabilitated and their 7 concerns, and in my submission that can meet the 8 concerns that have been articulated. 9 THE CHAIR: I entirely agree. There is absolutely no reason 10 why anyone who in his or her youth incurred some 11 relatively minor public order convictions should have 12 that fact broadcast around the world. I would be 13 completely opposed to that if anyone were to suggest it. 14 But the fact that the group contained people who had got 15 such convictions is a different matter. 16 MS MANNION: Sir, against that background it is hard, in our 17 submission, to see the benefit of section 7(3) when with 18 that substantive phase of the Inquiry over an exception 19 given that the protections will remain just the same for 20 you, sir. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 22 Sir Robert? 23 Submissions on behalf of the National Police Chiefs' Council 24 by SIR ROBERT FRANCIS 25 MR FRANCIS: Happily, sir, I can be very brief because we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 them as all having no convictions at all for the very 2 acts which gave rise to the perceived need for the 3 deployment. It doesn't mean that to say that once the 4 convictions are in, the deployment is justified -- 5 MS MANNION: No. 6 THE CHAIR: But it is absurd to say why do you deploy into 7 a group of people all of whom are of clean character and 8 have never posed a threat of disorder or disturbance to 9 anybody? 10 MS MANNION: I mean at that end of the spectrum it would 11 make the Inquiry's work entirely unworkable of course, 12 and we bear in mind the practical concerns raised by 13 Counsel to the Inquiry in their second note, it is at 14 paragraphs 25 and 26, as to the challenges which will 15 face the Inquiry in seeking witness statements and 16 evidence from individuals in circumstances where without 17 knowing what the full picture is they have to apply the 18 section 7(3) gateway. Those seem to us very proper 19 concerns for the effective management of the Inquiry so 20 that the Inquiry can receive the information upon which 21 it is to apply whether the test is met. 22 THE CHAIR: I would not be inquiring into what happened, 23 I would be inquiring into something else and I rather 24 doubt that that is why the Inquiry was set up. 25 MS MANNION: No, but, sir, our position is that it is not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 adhere to our original submissions and in essence we 2 agree with what Counsel to the Inquiry and counsel to 3 the Metropolitan Police said as far as the general 4 matters are concerned. 5 Can I just add two things -- one thing really with 6 two bits to it -- in relation to the process of relying 7 on spent convictions or otherwise in relation to 8 anonymity applications. 9 The National Police Chiefs' Council at the moment is 10 beginning to get but has still limited experience in 11 relation to the risk assessment process with the 12 officers who were deployed by the National Public Order 13 Intelligence Unit. 14 THE CHAIR: It is just getting underway. 15 MR FRANCIS: Just getting underway. 16 Our experience to date in what we read, both in the 17 reports that are being submitted and in those that are 18 being prepared, is that inevitably spent convictions 19 play a part in the process of the risk assessment. 20 Whether in the end that is relied on either by the risk 21 assessor or in due course by you, sir, is a different 22 matter, but it is intrinsic as part of the process of 23 risk assessment that the matter of convictions, whether 24 spent or otherwise, will be taken into account. 25 Therefore we submit that it is pretty artificial to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 suggest that these reports are submitted to you and in 2 some way or another you then are asked -- and your team 3 are asked -- to ignore what is said there about spent 4 convictions. Alternatively to have to go through 5 a line-by-line consideration as to whether they should 6 be taken into account or whether they shouldn't be. 7 There is a workability aspect which is not just 8 about numbers, it is about the quality of the process -- 9 THE CHAIR: Forgive me, there is no difficulty at all about 10 a line-by-line approach to convictions which are 11 referred to in a risk assessment. The practical 12 difficulty arises if one has to do a lot more than 13 simply take them into account or not do so. 14 MR FRANCIS: Yes. In that regard, sir, what we would say is 15 this: the magic is in the word "risk". What you are 16 being asked to consider at that stage is the risk that 17 it is being suggested, either by the applicant or by the 18 risk assessor, arises out of a spent conviction, maybe 19 in combination with non-spent convictions but also maybe 20 in conjunction with other facts. That is the context in 21 which this is being looked at. 22 Along with Ms Mannion we would submit that the 23 benefit to you, the Inquiry and the public interest of 24 at that stage hearing from a person whose spent 25 conviction it is, by definition the only reason for them</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 If I then invite further material from others who 2 have provided evidence which gave rise to the 3 conviction, then I am conducting a mini paper trial -- 4 MR FRANCIS: Correct. 5 THE CHAIR: -- which is very unsatisfactory, bound to 6 produce an answer based on incomplete material which 7 would occur after quite a lot of legal and other effort 8 to assemble the information. 9 MR FRANCIS: Yes. 10 THE CHAIR: I simply can't, in a principled manner, make 11 a final determination of this sort of issue, except 12 perhaps at the end of the Inquiry when all the facts are 13 in. 14 MR FRANCIS: And, sir, neither do you need to. Because as 15 has been said more than once, the restriction orders you 16 make are not irreversible and should it turn out later 17 down the line more information coming in that actually 18 the spent conviction has been misunderstood in some way 19 or another, which actually means it presents no risk at 20 all, and that is the determinative factor in why the 21 anonymity order is being made, then you can revise your 22 decision. 23 THE CHAIR: Yes. It is but another example of the ability 24 under section 20(4) of the Inquiries Act where 25 a decision made provisionally, even firmly, can be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 wishing to put forward submissions would be to say that 2 it was not really like that at all, would be in a sense 3 an artificial exercise for the very reason you mention, 4 which is that prima facie the conviction is evidence of 5 that of which the person was convicted. It would not be 6 for you at that stage to be determining whether that 7 conviction is correct or not, what you are looking at is 8 whether it gives rise to the risk that the applicant 9 says it gives rise to. 10 Therefore what the person with the conviction can 11 add is perhaps of limited -- 12 THE CHAIR: On any view, when deciding whether or not to 13 make a restriction order which is in part to any extent 14 dependent upon a spent conviction, I would be bound to 15 be performing an exercise which is based on incomplete 16 material. 17 MR FRANCIS: Yes. 18 THE CHAIR: If I just rely on the conviction then I'm in 19 effect giving in effect to the civil law provision in 20 the 1967 Act. If I then take into account submissions 21 that are made about it from the person subject to the 22 conviction, but stop there, then all I have is 23 a conviction and some submissions and how am I to tell 24 at that stage where the truth lies? Whether the 25 conviction is just or not just.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 reviewed and replaced by yet another decision in the 2 light of facts. 3 MR FRANCIS: There is also this issue, we would submit, 4 which is that in order to decide whether it was safe to 5 consult -- because it is accepted, as I understand it, 6 that there could be no consultation in cases where that 7 would give rise or enhance the very risk which the order 8 is seeking to -- 9 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann rightly disclaims that, and 10 I certainly do. 11 MR FRANCIS: Indeed. 12 In order to make that decision, it will actually 13 interest in your decision making process I would suggest 14 yet another stage, which is to decide whether it is safe 15 to consult or whether it isn't, in relation to 16 a conviction which you have already decided you wish to 17 take into account, because it appears to be enhanced -- 18 is relevant in some way or another to the risk to the 19 officer. 20 There becomes a degree of circularity, I would 21 suggest, about that, which either leads to no benefit at 22 all or it means that some additional consideration has 23 to be given, even before you had come to a decision 24 whether to consult. I think it perhaps illustrates the 25 very limited use to which that could be put, when placed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 in the context of a decision which is reversible and 2 whereas you have already indicated it may well be there 3 are many other things that you take into account in 4 relation to the assessment of the risk to the officers. 5 Sir, that's really all we wish to say about that. 6 When it comes to the use of spent convictions for 7 the substantive part of the Inquiry, clearly different 8 considerations apply. Sir, we would respectfully agree 9 that when it comes to assessing the justification of 10 a deployment, if the evidence shows that those deciding 11 on the deployment relied in some way or another on 12 a spent conviction, then it is inevitable that that is 13 relevant material you are going to have to consider, 14 whether or not they were justified in so doing. 15 THE CHAIR: Under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 16 I could only do so if it served the interests of 17 justice. I have raised the general query about whether 18 or not enquiring into facts of that kind does give rise 19 to a question of justice. 20 MR FRANCIS: So there is clearly at the very least 21 uncertainty about that. And there is an uncertainty 22 about a number of the positions that we have all taken, 23 which is why we in particular perhaps have agreed that 24 this is a matter for an application to the Secretary of 25 State, because the last thing this Inquiry needs is an</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 THE CHAIR: Right, well -- 2 MR FRANCIS: But that I absolutely accept is not a matter of 3 legal certainty and therefore we agree with those who 4 think that section 7(4) should be applied. 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 6 It is almost 1 o'clock now. The shorthand writers 7 and everybody else need a break. I'm going to rise 8 until 2.00. 9 Then, Mr O'Connor, I know you are not going to be 10 very long, but would you mind waiting until 2.00? 11 MR O'CONNOR: Not at all, sir. 12 THE CHAIR: Very well, until 2 o'clock. 13 (12.58 pm) 14 (The short adjournment) 15 (2.00 pm) 16 THE CHAIR: Mr O'Connor. 17 Submissions on behalf of the National Crime Agency by 18 MR O'CONNOR 19 MR O'CONNOR: Sir, on the first question, that is the 20 question of whether those subject to spent convictions 21 should be approached if their convictions are to be 22 relied on for the purposes of restriction orders, our 23 principal concern was the question of the risk that 24 might be created by doing just that, but that problem is 25 avoided by the way Ms Kaufmann has put the matter this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 uncertainty about the basis upon which it is proceeding, 2 which will cause delay after delay after delay in terms 3 of satellite applications and so on. 4 If it helps -- I just put this forward with some 5 diffidence however -- we would submit that the 6 investigation of facts by a public inquiry set up for 7 that purpose is a matter of justice. 8 Maybe it is somewhat circular to say this, but we 9 would submit that although the Inquiry is not delivering 10 just items in the sense of a determination of liability, 11 criminal or civil, what it is delivering is a report on 12 what happened and the lessons to be learned. That in 13 law is what it is set up to do. It is set up to do that 14 because there is some reason in the public interest that 15 that should happen and in this case the government has 16 decided it is in the public interest to investigate 17 these matters and that is a form of justice. 18 It has been apparent perhaps today, the reason there 19 is a public inquiry is that these matters are ventilated 20 in public. That in itself is a matter of justice which 21 you have a responsibility to fulfil. 22 So justice in the wider sense, if one starts off 23 with the proposition that you are a judicial authority, 24 seems to me, if we may say so, that one follows from the 25 other.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 morning. 2 THE CHAIR: Yes. 3 MR O'CONNOR: So really we submit where that leaves one is 4 that in a case where there is no such risk, first, and 5 second it is possible for the Inquiry to approach that 6 individual because their whereabouts are known, really 7 the question for the Inquiry then is little more than 8 a question of case management. Is it going to be 9 a useful or proportionate task to undertake? We don't 10 suggest there are any principled reasons why the Inquiry 11 should not seek submissions at that point. The question 12 is likely to turn on the facts of the individual case as 13 to whether the Inquiry takes a view that anything 14 substantially is to be gained by that exercise. 15 I don't repeat them, but we say many of the points 16 made by Ms Mannion and Sir Robert Francis before lunch 17 will be of weight at that stage. 18 That is all I wanted to say about the first point. 19 On the second point, the question of secondary 20 legislation, I don't have anything to add to the points 21 we made in writing earlier this year. 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 23 MR O'CONNOR: I'm grateful. 24 THE CHAIR: Mr Griffin? 25 MR GRIFFIN: Sir, I have no submissions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

1 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, there is not a formal batting order
2 here when someone opens they have a right of response,
3 but I will give you a right of responding to the
4 submissions that have been made.
5 There is one particular point I would like your
6 assistance on.
7 MS KAUFMANN: Yes, sir.
8 THE CHAIR: I will mention that now, if that helps.
9 MS KAUFMANN: Yes, that would.
10 THE CHAIR: It is this.
11 Suppose that I accept your argument that in relation
12 to a very small number of individuals it is in principle
13 permissible and may even be arguably required that
14 I should approach them to give them the opportunity of
15 making submissions before taking into account a spent
16 conviction of theirs, what would happen, I anticipate,
17 is that they would make a paper submission about it and
18 say either, "I have nothing to say about it", or,
19 alternatively, "These were the circumstances which gave
20 rise to the conviction, and they did involve the person
21 who is now known to be [because some are known to be] an
22 undercover officer", or, alternatively, "They may well
23 have involved an undercover officer and I was prompted
24 into doing this, that and the other by him or her, would
25 you please therefore ask yourself the question of

Page 61

1 whether the conviction is a just one?"
2 Now, if we get to that stage and stop there, I have
3 a conviction, presumably either on the basis of a guilty
4 plea or on the basis of contested evidence which has
5 resulted in a conviction, and I have submissions made
6 about it which may call into question the propriety of
7 the conviction. What am I then to do?
8 Submissions in reply on behalf of the non-state, non-police
9 core participants by MS KAUFMANN
10 MS KAUFMANN: So can I just clarify, are those the only
11 circumstances you are considering receiving
12 representations? That is contrary to our primary
13 submission which is that you should receive submissions
14 in relation to all spent convictions not simply ones
15 that arose in relation to a particular operation, that
16 is question one.
17 THE CHAIR: In relation to -- sorry, you mean in relation to
18 an individual? I thought you had either retreated from
19 or clarified your earlier stance.
20 MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
21 THE CHAIR: So that what you were suggesting that I should
22 do is that in those cases where it was safe to do so,
23 and where the individual was known or capable rapidly of
24 being discovered and I was minded to take into account
25 the spent convictions of that person, that I should give

Page 62

1 them the opportunity of making representations about it.
2 I have described, I think, the sort of things that might
3 be said. There may well be others.
4 MS KAUFMANN: That is one instance. So another instance
5 might be this is not a conviction that arises in the
6 context of any undercover operations but what the
7 purpose of giving an opportunity to make representations
8 is so that the individual can outline the circumstances
9 in which the offence occurred. That can inform your
10 assessment of what inferences can be drawn as to risk
11 having taken into account that explanation of the
12 circumstances.
13 Then there is a subset of conviction, which are
14 those convictions which arose in the course of
15 undercover operations, and that is a subset. If
16 an individual made recommendations at this stage when
17 you are considering for example restriction orders, and
18 said, "Actually, one of the reasons for you to not take
19 account of this conviction is that actually it arose in
20 these circumstances" and there is a question mark
21 about it, then what we would suggest is in those
22 circumstances you ought not to be relying upon it
23 because you have not yet done the investigation that is
24 part of your substantive inquiry into whether or not
25 that conviction can be safely relied upon.

Page 63

1 So it would be wholly wrong to rely upon it at the
2 restriction order stage but having had notification that
3 there is a potential question mark over it, that in
4 itself would be reason not to rely upon it.
5 So there are two separate sorts of representations
6 that could be made.
7 THE CHAIR: I had not fully understood that before. I now
8 do. You have made it perfectly clear.
9 But that may result in a decision that is not fair
10 to the officer. We are I think in the theoretical
11 territory here -- I think we have never really left
12 that -- but let's assume that the question arises and
13 I receive representations which say in relation to,
14 let's say, two convictions, well, (1) I was goaded into
15 doing it by someone who may well have been an undercover
16 officer and if I was, ignore it. And the other is that
17 this had nothing to do with this deployment and although
18 I was convicted of this offence it didn't amount to very
19 much as you can tell by the sentence, or something like
20 that.
21 The latter is fairly easy to comprehend.
22 The former raises problems because it raises factual
23 problems. As it happens in the instance I have given
24 which go to the heart of the Inquiry. I simply can't
25 resolve that at that stage, I don't think.

Page 64

<p>1 MS KAUFMANN: But that's precisely why, given that you can't 2 resolve it at that stage, you shouldn't take account of 3 it. Because if you rely upon it you are resolving it 4 against the individual -- the individual whose 5 convictions it is -- in circumstances where a proper 6 doubt has been raised about it which is the very purpose 7 of this Inquiry to investigate. 8 You have a choice at that stage. You either say, 9 "I have to put it aside because I simply cannot, in 10 fairness to anybody, rely upon it", or "If I really feel 11 that this spent conviction is a proper and safe 12 conviction, it is something that this officer must be 13 able to rely upon", then you would have to extend the 14 process and would you have to make some sort of 15 resolution. 16 THE CHAIR: How? 17 MS KAUFMANN: If you can't do it, then in my submission you 18 can't rely upon it at that stage. 19 THE CHAIR: Of course it is possible to resolve a question 20 of fact by having a miniature trial. 21 MS KAUFMANN: Yes, that is what you would have to do. You 22 would have to end up having evidence about it. I mean 23 I have no idea, sir, whether this is going to arise 24 given what you were suggesting earlier it seems unlikely 25 that you were going to be presented with such</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 rely upon what you are presented with, however 2 inaccurate that might be or however incomplete it might 3 be. So you should always have as much evidence as you 4 can. 5 THE CHAIR: We are back to the basic problem, there, 6 I think, of having to conduct an inquiry into the facts 7 so as to permit an inquiry into the facts to be 8 conducted. It is ultimately a pointless exercise. 9 MS KAUFMANN: In our submission it is not pointless, because 10 until you have received the information you don't know 11 how it will assist you. 12 THE CHAIR: "Impracticable" is perhaps a better choice of 13 words. 14 MS KAUFMANN: It is a difficult one. Unquestionably it is 15 a difficult one. 16 THE CHAIR: I understand the position, thank you very much. 17 We are now going to move on to restriction orders. 18 I understand there is to be something of a change of 19 counsel and in any event this desk needs to be set up so 20 that I have the right documents in front of me. 21 I will rise to permit that to happen. 22 Forgive me, Mr Barr, I didn't ask you if there was 23 anything you wanted to say publicly? 24 MR BARR: No, there isn't. 25 THE CHAIR: Fine. Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 a situation where a spent conviction is going to be so 2 decisive of the risk for a particular officer. But if 3 it did, then those are our submissions. 4 You either put it aside on the basis it cannot 5 possibly fairly be resolved at this stage, or you are 6 going to have to have a mini trial. From what you have 7 been suggesting, it would be very, very rare indeed that 8 you would be confronted with that situation. 9 THE CHAIR: Yes. I have been at pains to make it clear that 10 I think the issue of spent convictions in relation to 11 restriction orders is a very small order issue. But 12 thank you for that, that makes it clear. 13 Is there anything else you want to say in response? 14 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. The only other thing I would say is 15 I heard it said or suggested that there would be no 16 point in taking representations from those affected by 17 convictions or those subject to convictions, because you 18 would just be presented with two conflicting pieces of 19 information. 20 I, in my submission you can't actually gainsay what 21 you are going to be presented with or how persuasive it 22 is going to be. 23 2, the fact that you may be in that difficulty is 24 not a reason not to receive the evidence, because 25 otherwise it is just a foregone conclusion, you simply</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 (2.13 pm) 2 (The hearing on the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 3 concluded) 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

A				B
ability 55:23	addressed 32:3	and/or 37:8 39:17	40:1 53:12,18	back 9:23 31:3
able 10:16 16:24	adhere 52:1	anonymise 10:19	63:5 64:12	47:15 67:5
37:1 44:6 65:13	adjournment 59:14	anonymity 9:2,10	arising 11:22	background 51:16
absent 41:2	adjudication 16:8	11:3 52:8 55:21	arose 5:17 62:15	badly 44:24
absolute 40:13	admissibility 5:25	answer 22:23 55:6	63:14,19	balance 42:3
absolutely 6:12	13:25	anticipate 61:16	arrive 25:13	Barr 2:14,15 18:8
7:16 8:17 14:19	admission 11:23	anybody 8:21 20:7	arriving 25:10	18:22 67:22,24
15:3,17 18:2,21	49:15	50:9 65:10	article 46:11	based 34:1 38:3
20:15 28:18 42:9	admit 4:12 6:4 21:5	apologise 35:7	articulated 51:8	42:2,18 44:10
51:9 59:2	admitted 4:6 20:23	apparent 58:18	artificial 52:25	46:5 54:15 55:6
absurd 49:22,25	20:25 24:2	appear 2:15,20	54:3	baseline 40:13
50:6	admitting 18:12	35:9 41:23 42:1	aside 65:9 66:4	basic 44:16 67:5
accede 47:13	20:22 21:25	appears 2:24 3:3	asked 19:8 53:2,3	basis 4:3,22,22,23
accept 8:11 22:6	adopts 36:15	56:17	53:16	6:21 7:6,23 8:15
37:19 59:2 61:11	advocacy 45:17	applicable 33:7	aspect 7:18 21:19	11:23 17:18 22:21
accepted 56:5	advocates 3:11	35:17	53:7	26:22 30:1 40:18
accords 2:11	affect 8:5 17:21,23	applicant 53:17	aspects 45:20	41:14 45:5,24
account 9:1 13:6	17:25	54:8	assemble 55:8	58:1 62:3,4 66:4
20:5 23:2 26:9	Agency 1:13 3:5	application 6:6	assess 11:24 49:3	basket 43:22
28:2,6,13 29:3,16	59:17	8:10 27:17 38:15	assessing 57:9	batting 61:1
29:21 30:7,11,23	ago 33:6	39:17 42:15 48:3	assessment 6:10	bear 50:12
36:3 37:1,2,6	agree 13:16,18	51:3 57:24	7:23 13:7 34:22	bearing 15:5 49:16
39:15,18,24 43:17	14:22 20:25 22:8	applications 18:24	36:21 37:21 52:11	bears 46:22
44:17 45:5 52:24	22:18 23:20 24:4	33:17,22 47:8	52:19,23 53:11	beginning 52:10
53:6,13 54:20	30:9,16 31:13	52:8 58:3	57:4 63:10	begs 31:9
56:17 57:3 61:15	32:17 33:16 34:10	applied 18:7 32:22	assessor 52:21	behalf 1:7,9,11,13
62:24 63:11,19	40:10 48:10,16	33:9 59:4	53:18	1:15 2:20,24 3:3,4
65:2	51:9 52:2 57:8	applies 1:24 6:20	assist 26:14 36:6	3:19 4:13 26:20
accurate 16:7 17:9	59:3	15:9 17:6 25:7	41:20 67:11	35:10 51:23 59:17
30:13	agreed 57:23	apply 7:25 18:17	assistance 43:22	62:8
Act 2:8,16 15:11,16	agrees 35:13	18:20 40:16 50:17	61:6	belong 26:24
16:1,2,2,3,3,20	Ah 14:12	50:21 57:8	associated 27:6	belonged 10:4
21:2 26:14 34:20	albeit 7:15 9:14	applying 13:13	assume 12:22 64:12	26:20 27:5
38:1 49:9 51:2	allegation 7:21	appointed 17:10	astonished 42:12	benefit 47:11 48:7
54:20 55:24 57:15	allow 36:16	approach 36:15,16	attaches 17:2	48:9,11 51:17
68:2	allowed 39:15	42:13 53:10 60:5	attract 28:25	53:23 56:21
acts 49:24 50:2	allows 51:5	61:14	August 35:13	benefiting 47:7
actual 47:7 48:7	alternatively 53:4	approached 59:21	authority 15:19	benefits 36:11
add 15:15 52:5	61:19,22	appropriate 25:5	49:12 58:23	best 9:12 17:17
54:11 60:20	amended 16:2 23:1	36:7 43:11,23	available 7:24	22:23 49:2
additional 56:22	44:3	46:3 49:21	avoid 27:18 35:20	better 42:24 67:12
address 3:10,12	amendment 35:23	arguably 12:15	46:23,25	bite 18:5
19:8,12 36:8	36:6 48:15,17	61:13	avoidance 1:24	bits 52:6
38:16	amount 64:18	argument 21:1	avoided 59:25	body 16:9
	amounted 20:12	34:19 61:11	avoids 51:4	
	Amy 35:8	arises 4:6,24 11:18	aware 38:10	

bound 54:14 55:5	chain 21:15	circular 58:8	19:12	42:16
Brander 2:18	CHAIR 1:19 3:14	circularity 56:20	compelling 5:20	considering 21:7
breadth 26:1	3:24 4:13 6:24	circumstances 3:7	32:13	22:5 32:23 41:22
break 59:7	7:8 8:13 9:3,8	4:10,20,24 6:1 8:3	complete 41:18	43:8 45:19 62:11
brief 51:25	10:8,12 11:8 12:1	10:21 12:19,21	completely 51:13	63:17
briefly 36:8	12:14 13:8,17,19	13:3,14 16:7	comprehend 64:21	constrained 24:5
bring 16:4	14:12,14,17,20	22:13 25:23 27:13	concern 4:5,8 25:1	constraints 23:13
broad 4:22 22:10	15:13,19,25 16:12	27:15 28:2,5 31:2	25:16 39:10 41:2	consult 43:11 56:5
23:6 25:4	16:14,17 17:7,24	31:17 34:5,6,10	44:6 59:23	56:15,24
broadcast 51:12	18:3,24 19:6,10	34:10 37:8 49:11	concerned 4:7,25	consultation 41:2
broader 5:23 21:23	19:16,21,25 20:6	50:16 61:19 62:11	5:6 9:13 10:6	43:23 44:1,1,14
23:10 25:8	20:25 21:6 22:4	63:8,12,20,22	11:3 27:20 33:21	56:6
broadest 39:2	22:18 23:20 24:4	65:5	34:22 41:15 52:4	consulted 38:13
broadly 23:6	24:11 25:9,15,19	civil 37:25 38:1	concerns 50:12,19	contact 9:17,19
brought 3:16 21:22	26:1,7,16 27:25	54:19 58:11	51:7,8	10:24
bundle 15:18	28:11 29:9,15	clarified 62:19	concluded 68:3	contacted 39:12,16
	30:8,16 31:15,22	clarifies 35:2	conclusion 13:11	39:20,21 40:2,7
C	32:9 33:16 34:14	clarify 62:10	41:13 66:25	contained 24:16
call 19:25 48:5 62:6	34:16,23,25 35:6	clean 50:7	conclusions 17:13	51:14
called 9:4,5	35:9,24 36:13	clear 15:3,17 24:17	21:13	containing 30:22
capable 62:23	37:4,15,25 39:2,5	26:1 28:18 35:19	concrete 28:16	contested 62:4
carefully 24:10	39:14,16 40:10	39:10 46:24 64:8	33:19	context 5:1,15 14:8
case 4:4 5:20 8:12	41:8 42:5 43:25	66:9,12	conduct 12:16,18	25:2,2 42:20
8:13,13 18:11	44:13,18 45:16	clearly 20:18 25:3	13:2 17:14,15	53:20 57:1 63:6
26:17,24 30:17	46:24 47:12 48:4	32:15 42:15 57:7	26:3 41:24 45:14	continue 40:9
42:5,8 45:10	48:9 49:22 50:6	57:20	67:6	43:15
46:14 58:15 60:4	50:22 51:9,21	closer 25:20	conducted 67:8	continues 31:10
60:8,12	52:14 53:9 54:12	clumsily 26:19	conducting 26:4	contrary 62:12
case-by-case 8:15	54:18 55:5,10,23	combination 53:19	41:17 55:3	control 10:10
26:22	56:9 57:15 59:1,5	come 4:17 6:15 7:2	confidence 32:8	controlling 10:9
cases 5:19 8:12	59:12,16 60:2,22	8:1 9:23 12:12	confidential 29:25	Convention 46:11
11:20 18:16 27:25	60:24 61:1,8,10	29:11 31:25 43:7	30:2	convicted 5:1 28:19
32:18,20 33:9,24	62:17,21 64:7	48:22 56:23	conflicting 66:18	54:5 64:18
34:7,18 36:23	65:16,19 66:9	comes 6:20 19:23	confronted 66:8	conviction 4:6,24
44:25 56:6 62:22	67:5,12,16,25	44:14 57:6,9	conjunction 53:20	5:10,24 6:2 7:25
category 27:2	chairman 2:6	comfortably 45:21	consent 46:15	8:3,21 10:4 11:24
cause 38:18 43:6	challenges 50:14	coming 19:3 34:25	consents 20:7	12:3,6 13:21 14:6
47:9,10 58:2	change 67:18	55:17	consider 37:22 49:5	15:4,5 18:12,18
central 6:12 7:16	changing 10:1	comment 29:5,8,13	49:12 53:16 57:13	20:8,11,20 21:22
8:3	character 50:7	commenting 29:18	consideration 7:4	21:25 22:1 26:9
certain 16:6	check 10:17	committed 3:8	15:2 38:14 53:5	26:10 27:16 28:1
certainly 19:10	checked 47:15	common 15:13	56:22	28:8 29:20 37:21
20:6 23:3 39:2	Chiefs' 1:11 3:3	35:18 49:14	considerations	38:2,6 41:4,14
40:8 42:13 46:20	51:23 52:9	communication	6:25 30:8,11	42:2,19,23 44:17
48:3 56:10	choice 65:8 67:12	1:21,23 2:2	31:23 57:8	44:21 46:2,13,14
certainty 51:2 59:3	Christopher 9:3	compartmentalise	considered 5:25	48:22 49:3,13

53:18,25 54:4,7 54:10,14,18,22,23 54:25 55:3,18 56:16 57:12 61:16 61:20 62:1,3,5,7 63:5,13,19,25 65:11,12 66:1 convictions 4:8 5:5 5:16,21 8:1,5,24 8:25 10:20,22 12:4,9,20 13:5,9 14:17 18:14 19:19 20:4,19 23:18 24:21 25:22 27:5 28:20,23 29:1,6 29:14,19 30:23 31:3 32:16,23 34:2 36:3,20 37:9 40:3,6,17 41:22 41:23 42:9 45:1 45:14,19 49:7 50:1,4 51:11,15 52:7,18,23 53:4 53:10,19 57:6 59:20,21 62:14,25 63:14 64:14 65:5 66:10,17,17 convinced 42:8 copy 15:21 16:8 core 1:7,15 2:19 3:19 4:7,14,16 8:6 8:16 9:25 17:16 27:1 31:5,11 41:2 44:20,24 62:9 correct 21:1 25:25 34:11 54:7 55:4 cost 46:23 47:11 51:4 costs 36:18 Council 1:12 3:3 51:23 52:9 counsel 35:18 50:13 52:2,2 67:19 course 5:17 7:12 11:13 20:3,9	36:14 44:8 46:2 50:11 52:21 63:14 65:19 court 5:20 cover 7:9,11,12 25:3,6 30:18,24 32:19,21 33:24 34:9,18,19 create 27:16,21 40:14 created 27:22 59:24 creates 29:22 creep 40:19 Crime 1:13 3:4 59:17 criminal 49:8 58:11 critical 7:19 9:12 19:15 24:21 42:9 crosses 18:18 currency 38:7 current 16:14 currently 10:9 cut 35:19 <hr/> D <hr/> D 1:4 danger 40:18 date 10:23 42:24 52:16 dates 10:21 day 9:6 deal 23:2 dealing 27:9,10 49:17 deals 16:6 debate 32:25 33:10 deceitful 30:25 31:19 decide 5:14 12:11 36:1 56:4,14 decided 31:14 33:24 56:16 58:16 deciding 54:12 57:10 decision 4:11 6:3,7	11:10 14:15 21:16 28:13 30:17 31:12 33:7 46:12,21 47:7 48:2 55:22 55:25 56:1,12,13 56:23 57:1 64:9 decisions 11:12 19:24 42:7 decisive 66:2 Defamation 15:16 16:1 defamed 16:25 defeating 8:9 defined 23:7,8 definition 53:25 degree 56:20 delay 1:19,24 46:20 46:23 47:1,9 48:5 48:9 58:2,2,2 delivering 58:9,11 demand 37:9,17 40:24 45:25 demands 37:5 47:5 demonstration 10:23 dependent 54:14 depends 34:11 deploy 5:14 6:8 19:24 50:6 deployed 5:3 19:2 30:21 52:12 deploying 18:15 deployment 5:18 20:9 38:8 45:15 49:23 50:3,4 57:10,11 64:17 deployment-by-d... 22:21 deployments 22:6 22:19 47:19,22,23 derive 48:8 described 28:2 63:2 deserves 37:24 designated 2:23 16:10 designed 49:11	desk 67:19 despite 17:17 destination 25:11 25:13 details 10:20 determination 24:22 55:11 58:10 determinative 55:20 determine 15:23,24 18:1 22:12 25:7 determined 23:9 24:20 46:25 determining 17:22 21:12 41:25 54:6 devices 2:13 difference 33:12 different 19:7 38:4 51:15 52:21 57:7 difficult 9:6,16,17 19:17 41:12 67:14 67:15 difficulties 14:21 14:23 23:14 26:16 29:23,23 40:11 43:6 difficulty 8:17 9:9 40:14,15 53:9,12 66:23 diffidence 58:5 disagree 11:8 discharge 20:16 32:5 disciplinary 25:2 disclaims 56:9 disclose 8:10,20,24 12:18 30:4 34:5 37:4 disclosed 7:10 12:22,23 31:21,23 31:24 32:19 34:9 34:19 46:15 discloses 12:15 disclosing 10:8 disclosure 27:15 30:3,5,24 31:6,16	32:2 34:18 45:8 45:12 48:25 discovered 44:12 62:24 discretion 18:10 disorder 49:24 50:8 disproportionate 46:10 disproportionately 22:13 dispute 18:6 31:10 33:10 distort 25:14 disturbance 50:8 documents 67:20 doing 11:2 14:21 24:8 41:20 57:14 59:24 61:24 64:15 doubt 1:24 17:24 37:22 50:24 65:6 dozen 44:22 draw 31:14 34:4 drawing 17:13 drawn 33:3,5,13,15 63:10 driven 45:14 due 44:8 52:21 <hr/> E <hr/> E 1:4 earlier 46:17 47:19 60:21 62:19 65:24 earliest 46:19 early 42:15,21 44:9 47:6,22 easier 24:14 easy 35:20 64:21 effect 5:24 7:11,14 16:23 26:2 54:19 54:19 effective 50:19 effectively 8:9 efficiently 36:18 48:1 effort 41:18 55:7 efforts 9:18
---	--	--	---	---

either 6:24 26:19 52:20 53:17 56:21 61:18 62:3,18 65:8 66:4	exactly 12:17 33:14 41:19 45:3	extent 4:1 54:13	67:25	further 4:1 15:15 26:15 49:24 55:1
enabling 32:5	examine 30:1,3 49:22	extract 16:8	firmly 55:25	futile 13:15
endeavours 17:17	example 9:25 10:14	extreme 2:24	first 3:13 12:2 14:5 16:23 21:16 22:7 28:3 33:8 41:1 59:19 60:4,18	future 2:7 5:16 8:4 42:23
ends 49:25	12:1 24:23 28:16	F	Firstly 23:15 36:14 37:18 38:16 48:16	G
engage 33:2	28:18 30:2 31:18	face 50:15	five 38:15 44:23	gained 31:2 60:14
engaged 21:6 22:8 22:10	32:14 38:6 44:18	facie 11:23 13:5 14:8 15:7 38:2 54:4	focus 14:20	gainsay 66:20
engagement 37:17 40:25 43:4 45:25 46:18 47:6	45:3 49:8 55:23 63:17	fact 12:23 27:4 34:12 38:8 45:4 51:12,14 65:20 66:23	focused 26:7 39:5	Gargitter 2:17
engaging 44:11 46:8	examples 33:19	factor 42:9 55:20	follow 34:14	gateway 50:18
enhance 56:7	exception 24:24 36:12 49:9 51:4 51:18	factors 29:3	following 23:22	general 24:24 32:10,11,17,19 52:3 57:17
enhanced 56:17	exceptions 35:23 48:15	facts 6:17 12:22 21:9 26:3,4 38:2 41:7 44:19 53:20 55:12 56:2 57:18 58:6 60:12 67:6,7	follows 16:22 58:24	generality 8:12
enquire 22:22 45:7	exchange 48:18	factual 64:22	force 32:15 40:17	generally 8:2 22:22 24:14 26:21,23
enquiring 57:18	exclude 28:15	fair 13:8 16:7 17:9 46:22 51:4 64:9	foregone 66:25	genuinely 40:5
ensure 5:21 27:20 51:3	exempt 23:12	fairly 36:18 41:12 64:21 66:5	foresee 36:11	getting 11:11,19 25:19 32:5 52:14 52:15
ensuring 36:6	exemption 23:15 23:16 49:18,20	factfulness 64:22	Forgive 12:1 32:9 53:9 67:22	give 9:10 13:11,21 23:9,11 26:9 29:7 37:23 56:7 57:18 61:3,14 62:25
entirely 8:21 33:16 50:11 51:9	exercise 11:7 32:22 36:9,15,21 40:8 40:10,12 54:3,15 60:14 67:8	fairness 37:2,5,8,16 38:12 40:24 45:24 47:5 65:10	form 2:1 34:21 36:1 38:9 58:17	given 1:20,25 2:3 3:11 8:7 12:6,14 14:18 23:6 24:10 27:24 29:13,18 33:3 37:10 41:10 45:10 49:6 51:19 56:23 64:23 65:1 65:24
equal 31:23	exist 27:7 31:10	falls 3:12 5:24 24:19	formal 61:1	gives 5:3 16:3 54:8 54:9
equally 5:13	existence 12:6 27:23	far 9:13 11:14 13:8 18:24 19:2,6 42:5 42:12 52:3	former 37:5 64:22	giving 8:18 27:19 29:4 54:19 63:7
error 35:5	existing 19:1	feared 46:17	formulated 39:8	glean 41:16
essence 52:1	experience 11:14 36:20 52:10,16	feel 65:10	forum 49:6	go 14:10 16:18 18:24 19:6 28:10 32:4 53:4 64:24
establish 6:17	explain 11:15	female 9:5	forward 4:1 6:15 54:1 58:4	goaded 64:14
established 17:3 23:4	explained 19:2 25:21,23 27:10 28:14	Fifthly 38:24	found 38:13 39:22 46:5	goes 11:18
establishes 38:1	exploration 42:21	filming 2:13	four 28:22,25	going 3:21,25 8:12 9:11,17 11:20,24 15:4,23,24 19:18
event 38:20 43:4 44:21 49:10 67:19	explore 33:19 47:12	final 55:11	Fourthly 38:22	
events 20:10	explored 41:8	finally 46:17	Francis 1:12 3:2 51:24,25 52:15 53:14 54:17 55:4 55:9,14 56:3,11 57:20 59:2 60:16	
everybody 14:17 59:7	exposition 39:2	find 9:20 21:9	friend 3:12	
evidence 2:1 6:5 7:20,24 9:12 27:22 28:7 37:20 37:23 38:1,14 41:24 43:22 45:7 50:16 54:4 55:2 57:10 62:4 65:22 66:24 67:3	express 21:10 26:18	finding 20:22 22:15 22:16	front 67:20	
exact 36:5	expressly 14:14	findings 17:14,15	fulfil 11:10 23:23 36:17 58:21	
	extant 5:18	Fine 14:20 33:20	fulfilling 24:13	
	extend 65:13		full 17:1 50:17	
			fully 36:17 64:7	
			function 11:18 32:5	
			fundamental 7:23 32:25	

20:8,18 21:17 27:16 29:15 30:4 30:5 31:3 33:16 34:7 42:22 47:17 47:21 49:5 57:13 59:7,9 60:8 65:23 65:25 66:1,6,21 66:22 67:17 good 22:4 27:18 35:4 45:17,18 48:20 49:18 Gordon 2:25 government 17:11 58:15 grant 7:7,8 granted 44:9 grateful 15:14 19:11 37:12,14 60:23 great 40:10 greatly 35:3 Griffin 3:3 60:24 60:25 ground 15:13 grounds 42:20 group 10:3,5,9,24 20:10 27:2,6 30:21 31:1 49:23 50:7 51:14 groups 9:25 10:2 26:17,19,24 27:9 27:11 guilty 62:3	Happily 51:25 harassment 6:25 hard 39:8 51:16 harm 5:12 hear 37:12 44:20 44:22 48:18 heard 39:7 40:20 66:15 hearing 1:21,25 2:10 47:25 53:24 68:2 heart 64:24 helpful 35:2 helps 58:4 61:8 highlight 42:14 history 13:3 24:20 28:20 hold 13:19 17:10 Home 3:4 hope 22:11 24:11 24:11 33:17 46:24 human 28:11	Impracticable 67:12 imprisonment 28:22 inaccurate 17:17 67:2 inclined 48:10 include 30:9 32:3 including 2:7 incomplete 54:15 55:6 67:2 incredibly 11:17,21 34:13 incurred 20:9 26:10 29:1 51:10 indicated 2:4 6:22 7:3 14:24 31:18 41:21 43:10 57:2 indicates 5:12 individual 4:9,9 5:1 5:6 10:4,6,24 13:12 22:1,2 25:1 27:3 28:17 29:5 29:18 30:4,6 31:6 32:18 33:9,18 37:9 38:23 39:12 39:16,19,21 41:10 41:15 43:17 45:6 47:17 48:3 51:6 60:6,12 62:18,23 63:8,16 65:4,4 individuals 6:13 8:5,16,25 9:14,20 10:16 11:3 13:9 25:1 26:18,19,25 27:5 30:22 40:1 47:18 50:16 61:12 inevitable 57:12 inevitably 52:18 inferences 63:10 inferred 49:10 inform 63:9 information 1:20 1:22,25 2:3 6:16 14:5 29:16,20,24 30:3,5,13 31:4	38:11 41:16 49:7 50:20 55:8,17 66:19 67:10 informed 6:2 inhibition 38:18 initial 13:19 39:10 40:9 inquiries 23:1 24:14 51:2 55:24 inquiring 50:22,23 inquiry 4:15,25 6:16 7:17 9:23 10:3,8 11:7,11 12:8 17:10,14 18:7 19:6,22 20:21 21:8,16 22:11,19 23:13,23 26:3,4 35:18,22 36:2,15,17 37:1 41:3,21 43:8,16 44:14,15 45:21 47:21,25 48:23 49:2,5,16,19 50:13,15,19,20,24 51:18 52:2 53:23 55:12 57:7,25 58:6,9,19 60:5,7 60:10,13 63:24 64:24 65:7 67:6,7 Inquiry's 50:11 insofar 4:8 7:20,24 8:5 instance 12:14 22:7 63:4,4 64:23 instances 15:1 47:16 instrumental 32:4 intelligence 29:19 40:7 52:13 intended 18:1 24:12 25:3,14 interacted 31:7 interest 42:3 45:18 53:23 56:13 58:14 58:16 interests 21:7,19,21	21:24 22:7,10,16 22:24 23:6,10 25:5 57:16 interference 46:10 interrupting 32:9 intimate 31:19 intrinsic 52:22 investigate 43:23 44:7 58:16 65:7 investigated 41:5 42:24 investigating 12:7 12:21 investigation 38:19 42:25 43:14,15,18 58:6 63:23 investigations 45:5 invitation 48:13 invite 55:1 involve 2:12 10:8 34:8 61:20 involved 61:23 iron 32:25 irreversible 55:16 issue 2:16 5:9,10 6:23 9:12 11:15 11:18 15:7 20:2 24:19 35:19 37:10 38:5 55:11 56:3 66:10,11 issued 16:9 33:7 issues 3:10 4:4 items 58:10
<hr/> H <hr/> habits 9:7 habitually 49:23 half 44:22 Handed 15:20 handful 47:16 happen 34:7 58:15 61:16 67:21 happened 41:12 50:22 58:12 happening 31:4 happens 64:23	<hr/> I <hr/> idea 65:23 ideas 45:18 identifiable 8:19 identification 7:14 identified 34:6 identify 10:6 identity 8:10,24 10:10 31:6 ignore 53:3 64:16 illustrates 56:24 imagine 17:12 19:19 24:9 immediate 25:16 immediately 2:21 3:1 imperil 30:6 important 11:17 12:25 13:2 15:1 32:7 34:13 36:21 36:24 imposing 30:14 impossible 42:18	<hr/> J <hr/> jeopardise 27:7 job 20:22 judge 9:5 judgment 8:14 11:22 18:10 33:11 judicial 15:10,12 15:17 23:7,8 25:6 49:12,14 58:23 justice 18:11 20:12 20:14,17 21:7,11 21:20,21,21,25		

22:2,7,10,16,24 23:6,10 24:7 25:5 33:6 35:25 43:9 44:3 45:11,19 48:14 49:1 57:17 57:19 58:7,17,20 58:22 justification 19:25 20:3 22:5 43:20 48:24 49:22 57:9 justified 22:20 50:4 57:14 justifies 42:10 justify 22:14	knew 31:7 know 6:14 16:15 19:17 29:15 31:13 35:15 46:21 59:9 67:10 knowing 50:17 known 8:19 60:6 61:21,21 62:23 knows 10:3	limitation 23:20,21 limitations 42:25 limited 11:15,17 25:22 41:9 52:10 54:11 56:25 limits 48:19 line 5:14 31:14 33:3 33:5,13,15 34:4 47:15,15 55:17 line-by-line 53:5,10 list 10:16 listen 24:9,12 25:9 litigation 37:25 little 24:14 47:6 48:7 60:7 located 9:21 Logically 28:11 logistical 40:11 logistics 9:22 10:7 10:14 11:4 long 28:20 59:10 look 3:23 10:16 13:4 14:6 15:4 17:5 20:6,8,13 23:18,19 25:8 32:15 34:13 45:1 looked 13:8 21:17 25:24 42:6 53:21 looking 13:1 16:15 16:16 19:23 20:16 21:14,18 32:18 45:12 54:7 looks 24:15 Lord 9:6 11:16 18:16 33:6 Lordship 9:1 12:10 17:12 losing 43:25 lot 53:12 55:7 lunch 60:16	27:7 29:3 41:11 42:10,10 44:2,5 47:7 48:2 56:13 61:15 63:1 malice 16:21 17:3 17:19 manageability 18:13 manageable 18:20 managed 4:18 management 50:19 60:8 manner 49:13 55:10 Mannion 1:10 2:20 35:5,8,8,8,11,12 36:4,14 37:12,16 38:4 39:4,7,15 40:3,15 41:19 42:13 44:5,15 45:3,23 47:3 48:2 48:5,13 50:5,10 50:25 51:16 53:22 60:16 mark 5:4,21 15:9 63:20 64:3 masking 38:9 material 48:22 49:3 54:16 55:1,6 57:13 matter 8:21 11:6 24:6 29:12 32:11 33:25 34:20 37:20 41:25 49:4 51:1,1 51:15 52:22,23 57:24 58:7,20 59:2,25 matters 3:25 25:8 32:10 35:2 38:10 52:4 58:17,19 McAllister 2:22 mean 7:9 19:21 21:4 26:5 37:18 39:13 50:3,10 62:17 65:22 means 1:23 2:2	17:18 23:12,16 25:10 33:11 55:19 56:22 mechanism 10:3 media 1:23 2:9 meet 28:9 51:7 members 10:24 membership 10:1 mention 36:4 40:22 54:3 61:8 mentioned 16:20 merely 22:25 24:6 25:10 met 50:21 metropolitan 1:9 2:21 35:10,13,16 35:21 36:19 37:18 47:4 52:3 mind 20:1 46:23 49:16 50:12 59:10 minded 11:11 26:8 28:1 30:23 31:11 35:12 39:23 42:7 44:25 48:17 62:24 mini 41:18 55:3 66:6 miniature 65:20 minimum 28:22 Ministry 24:7 minor 49:24 51:11 minutes 1:20 miscarriage 20:12 20:17 21:20 38:9 43:9,19 44:8 45:11 49:1 miscarriages 5:9 20:14 21:15,18 misunderstanding 13:24 misunderstood 14:12 55:18 mix 15:15 moment 8:11 12:13 27:14 30:19 32:10 33:1,21 36:5 44:13 48:11 52:9
K	L	M		
Kaufmann 1:8,16 2:18 3:12,14,18 3:20,21,25 4:16 7:2,9 8:14 9:5,9 10:11,13 11:16 12:10,17 13:16,18 13:24 14:13,16,19 14:23 15:14,21 16:1,13,15,18 17:8 18:2,4 19:5,8 19:14,17,23 20:2 20:13 21:3,14 22:9 23:5,25 24:9 24:15 25:12,18,25 26:6,12 27:14 28:5 29:7,10 30:1 30:10 31:9,16,24 32:24 34:3,15,21 34:24 37:7,12 39:6 48:18 56:9 59:25 61:1,7,9 62:9,10,20 63:4 65:1,17,21 66:14 67:9,14 Kaufmann's 39:25 40:13 41:9 47:13 key 7:4 kind 11:12 12:4 14:15 23:22 27:9 57:18	large 29:1 law 23:1 54:19 58:13 lawyers 2:23 lay 48:14 lead 7:14 46:20 leading 3:5 leads 2:18,22 23:14 56:21 learned 3:12 58:12 leave 3:9 leaves 60:3 led 45:10 left 2:17 64:11 legal 11:12 55:7 59:3 legally 3:7 legislation 19:1 44:3 60:20 legislature 17:11 lesser 28:23 42:20 51:1 lessons 58:12 let's 17:12 64:12,14 liability 58:10 liable 7:14 liaising 9:19 liaison 10:2,5 lies 54:24 life 6:23 7:4 28:11 light 5:16 6:17 18:15 21:22 46:4 56:2 likelihood 35:17 limb 6:23 7:4	magic 53:15 maintains 11:2 making 5:11 11:22 13:23 24:7 26:11		

Monday 1:1	30:13 32:25 34:22	9:16 15:1 27:18	27:24 29:4,8,13	part 2:1,10 6:18
months 33:6	42:20 46:23 50:2	occasions 37:3	29:18 33:4 37:10	7:15,16 18:1
morning 2:15 60:1	55:14 59:7	occur 22:20 49:7	41:10 61:14 63:1	21:15 34:1,21
mosaic 7:11,14	needs 42:16 57:25	55:7	63:7	36:21 47:25 52:19
motivation 48:24	67:19	occurred 20:10	opposed 51:13	52:22 54:13 57:7
move 29:15 67:17	neither 55:14	22:2 63:9	opposes 3:2	63:24
	never 15:19 28:12	October 36:22	order 2:7,8 3:11	participant 44:20
	50:8 64:11	offence 4:11,21	5:11 6:7,10,12,15	44:24
<hr/> N <hr/>	nevertheless 28:3	12:3 28:21 63:9	6:21 7:7,15	participants 1:8,16
N 1:4	non-core 9:13	64:18	13:13 18:24 20:15	2:19 3:20 4:7,14
name 7:9,11,12,12	non-disclosure	offences 45:13	23:19 24:16 25:16	4:16 8:6,17 9:13
7:13 30:18,24	34:17 45:9,10	Offenders 2:16	27:8,17 28:4,8,24	9:25 17:16 27:1
31:7,20 32:21	non-existent 43:3	21:2 26:14 34:20	29:4,11 32:21	31:5,11 62:9
33:24 34:1,9	non-police 1:7,15	57:15 68:2	33:17,22,25 35:23	participated 4:15
names 10:15 31:12	2:19 3:19 62:8	Office 3:4	38:14,20 41:6,20	participating 9:15
31:17 32:2,12,19	non-routine 49:13	officer 5:12 6:5,20	42:1,10,11,18,22	participation 4:19
32:20 34:5,12,17	non-spent 53:19	7:1,13 8:11 16:9	46:1,9,12 47:8	particular 4:9,11
34:18,19	non-state 1:7,15	20:10 27:4 30:18	48:15 51:5,11	5:12 6:5 10:20,23
narrow 4:3,22,23	2:18 3:19 4:7,14	31:20 34:8 37:5	52:12 54:13 55:21	10:23 17:2 25:1
19:3 23:11,25	31:10 62:8	39:17 56:19 61:22	56:4,7,12 61:1	38:6 44:19,21
34:6 40:12	note 28:3 35:5,12	61:23 64:10,16	64:2 66:11	57:23 61:5 62:15
narrowed 37:13	36:22 50:13	65:12 66:2	orders 8:2 19:13	66:2
40:5	notebook 3:15	officer's 7:5,22	24:16 30:14 32:1	particularly 12:25
narrower 14:20	notes 3:6 11:14	officers 2:23,25 5:2	36:10 55:15 59:22	parties 33:11
26:7 39:11 43:2	12:2 25:21	5:15 6:19 17:15	63:17 66:11 67:17	path 18:18
48:16	notice 16:9	27:12 30:19,20,21	ordinary 34:18	pattern 12:15,18
narrowing 40:20	notification 64:2	32:12 33:18 47:23	organised 19:10	12:21 13:1 29:16
narrowly 39:5	November 1:1	52:12 57:4	original 26:2 52:1	41:24
National 1:11,13	number 13:8 18:16	older 12:19	ought 63:22	Payter 2:20 35:4
3:2,4 51:23 52:9	19:20 28:21 29:2	once 41:11 50:3	outcome 31:9	people 44:22 50:7
52:12 59:17	36:10,23 43:13	55:15	outcomes 22:11	51:14
nature 21:9 23:6	57:22 61:12	ones 24:25 25:7	outline 63:8	perceived 50:2
24:18,19	numbers 53:8	62:14	overturned 21:22	perfect 45:3
neat 28:12		opening 1:6,18		perfectly 21:8 64:8
necessarily 10:11		27:11		performing 54:15
10:13 20:23,25	<hr/> O <hr/>	opens 61:2	<hr/> P <hr/>	period 5:16
21:4	O'Brien 3:5	operating 5:3	page 16:14,18 17:8	permissible 2:9
necessary 5:5 6:2	o'clock 59:6,12	operation 5:2 62:15	pains 66:9	61:13
11:24 12:12 13:6	O'Connor 1:14 3:4	48:24,25 63:6,15	Palmer 2:22	permit 23:1 36:2
14:2,9 18:22	59:9,11,16,18,19	operations 6:8 45:8	panel 21:18 45:1	67:7,21
20:18 24:2,3 28:9	60:3,23	48:24,25 63:6,15	paper 3:15 55:3	permitted 29:2
30:15 32:15 36:25	objection 2:5 24:15	opinion 21:10	61:17	permitting 23:22
necessity 11:6 14:1	observations 36:11	opportunity 3:10	paragraph 16:11	person 2:3 13:21
14:2 18:9,9 23:17	observed 36:22	3:23 4:10,19 5:6,7	17:5	16:10 17:10 26:9
need 8:20,24 12:11	obtain 3:15	5:22,25 6:14 8:7,9	paragraphs 50:14	38:13 40:25 41:3
14:10 16:18 18:25	obtaining 47:22	8:18 9:10 13:22	Parliament 24:6	43:5 44:12,16
24:17 25:24 28:10	obviously 5:15 8:3	14:18 26:10 27:19	35:25 48:14	

45:25 46:7,19 53:24 54:5,10,21 61:20 62:25 person's 46:14 personal 6:23,25 7:3,5 persuade 33:4 persuasive 66:21 phase 19:21 36:2 41:20 44:8 48:23 51:18 photography 2:12 picture 45:13 50:17 piece 37:23 pieces 66:18 Pitchford 9:3 33:6 place 38:7 43:13 placed 23:20 49:2 56:25 plainly 17:4,21 18:25 21:21 play 36:20 52:19 plea 62:4 please 3:15 61:25 plus 28:25 pm 59:13,15 68:1 point 11:17 13:4,18 13:24,25 19:9 22:4 30:12 32:25 48:9 60:11,18,19 61:5 66:16 pointless 67:8,9 points 60:15,20 police 1:9,11 2:21 3:2 9:20 10:21 14:6 17:15 35:10 35:13,21 36:19 37:19 45:8 47:4 51:23 52:3,9 Police's 35:16 policing 6:14 pose 27:11 posed 6:5 27:2 50:8 poses 27:2 position 3:7 4:2 15:8 24:22 25:20	29:8 32:1 35:15 35:16,22 36:19 37:16 47:5,24 50:25 67:16 positions 57:22 possibility 18:23 47:16 possible 6:17 9:22 9:24 10:2,5,25 11:1 13:11 35:20 60:5 65:19 possibly 20:12 66:5 postulated 39:6 potential 64:3 potentially 12:5 29:22 power 36:9,16 45:17 powers 19:1 practical 15:2 29:22 36:9 47:2 47:12 48:11 49:18 50:12 53:11 practicalities 11:5 pre-restriction 41:5 precise 24:5 48:19 precisely 4:17 11:16 12:10 13:1 65:1 prefer 9:4 19:25 preferable 48:17 prejudice 38:22 prejudiced 46:8 premise 34:3,11 prepared 52:18 present 9:14 10:12 35:25 presented 7:20 10:15 19:18 20:4 65:25 66:18,21 67:1 presents 55:19 press 17:19 presumably 62:3 pretty 52:25	previously 27:7 prima 11:23 13:5 14:8 15:7 38:2 54:4 primary 62:12 principal 59:23 principle 29:23 32:10,11 33:20 35:1 40:15 45:16 61:12 principled 55:10 60:10 principles 33:7,8 privacy 51:6 private 8:20 privilege 16:6 17:2 privileged 16:20 probably 30:24 problem 26:21,23 38:16 41:1 43:2,3 59:24 67:5 problems 10:18 64:22,23 procedural 4:4 11:10 procedure 18:19 proceed 45:4 proceeding 49:20 58:1 proceedings 2:11 9:15 15:10,12,17 15:22 16:4 17:6,9 17:21,24 23:7,8,8 24:18,19,25 25:6 49:8 process 7:15,16,17 7:18 14:3 18:14 18:20 25:17 46:18 47:9 51:5 52:6,11 52:19,22 53:8 56:13 65:14 produce 55:6 produced 11:14 12:2 profession 24:23 prohibited 21:1	prompted 61:23 proof 38:2 proper 6:2 38:13 38:18 42:25 43:19 50:18 65:5,11 properly 39:23 41:5 43:24 44:7 proportionality 6:7 19:14,23 22:9 proportionate 5:14 60:9 proposal 26:2 proposals 35:14 propose 3:8 35:24 36:8 proposed 48:17 proposition 23:3 32:18 39:25 58:23 propriety 62:6 protect 7:13 51:5 protection 51:1 protections 36:5 51:19 prove 41:4 42:23 provide 6:15 10:3 10:20 provided 41:17 55:2 provides 16:7 49:14 51:2 providing 2:11 provision 54:19 provisional 41:13 provisionally 55:25 public 2:4 17:9,10 21:8 24:14 28:24 32:7 42:3 46:15 51:11 52:12 53:23 58:6,14,16,19,20 publication 1:21 2:2,5 16:19,21 publicly 67:23 publish 30:17 33:24 published 16:5 32:12 42:7 46:13	purely 28:18 44:18 purists 11:12 purpose 8:9 11:10 12:7 16:10 22:25 23:18,24 37:25 47:2 58:7 63:7 65:6 purposes 5:11 6:6 15:10 19:6 21:9 22:19 23:16,22 25:22 29:11 32:4 59:22 put 4:4,21 13:10 26:16 28:15 54:1 56:25 58:4 59:25 65:9 66:4 puts 39:17
				Q
				QC 2:18,22 qualified 16:6 17:1 quality 53:8 query 22:23,25 57:17 question 4:5 5:4,13 5:21 8:4,6 11:4,5 11:5 12:17 15:9 15:22,23 18:2,4 19:4,7,14,15 20:15,21,22 21:11 21:23 22:22 26:8 27:21 31:9,22 33:22 35:1 37:7 57:19 59:19,20,23 60:7,8,11,19 61:25 62:6,16 63:20 64:3,12 65:19 questions 15:24 17:23 22:24 30:6 33:19 quite 19:20 24:4,17 28:19,24 40:14 55:7
				R

raise 22:25	recommendations 63:16	relied 7:21 12:15 14:18 52:20 57:11 59:22 63:25	resort 18:21 23:12	15:23,24 16:4,24 17:4,22,23 18:25 22:15 23:9 25:12 28:11 32:11,24 33:2,5 34:4,12,17 34:25 35:9 36:25 39:19 42:17 45:16 59:1 61:2,3 67:20
raised 38:5 44:6 50:12 57:17 65:6	recording 2:13	rely 5:10 6:4 12:11 14:1,9,25 54:18 64:1,4 65:3,10,13 65:18 67:1	respect 9:9 11:8 32:21 34:1 35:16 36:9,14 38:11 39:9,11 40:3,17 44:7 45:13 46:1 47:5 48:13,19,23	17:4,22,23 18:25 22:15 23:9 25:12 28:11 32:11,24 33:2,5 34:4,12,17 34:25 35:9 36:25 39:19 42:17 45:16 59:1 61:2,3 67:20
raises 22:23 37:7 64:22,22	refer 21:17 44:25	relying 18:14 41:3 52:6 63:22	respectable 21:8	rightly 56:9
range 45:13,13 48:21	reference 13:22 23:23 24:14 36:17 38:19 43:9,24 44:7 45:7 49:1	remain 31:17 51:19	respected 9:2	rights 17:25 18:1 21:13,13 25:8 46:10
rapidly 62:23	referred 53:11	remaining 44:23	respectful 48:20	rise 5:4 10:22 13:11 16:4 20:11 44:21 50:2 54:8,9 55:2 56:7 57:18 59:7 61:20 67:21
rare 66:7	refuse 7:6 32:20	remains 33:10,12	respectfully 8:23 57:8	risk 5:12 6:5,9,21 6:23 7:3,6,10,22 8:4 9:14 11:25 13:7,12 27:3,6,11 27:16,21,22,23 34:21 36:21 37:4 37:21 39:18 46:5 46:6 52:11,19,20 52:23 53:11,15,16 53:18 54:8 55:19 56:7,18 57:4 59:23 60:4 63:10 66:2
rarely 11:21	refusing 33:1	remarks 1:6,18 11:9	responding 61:3	Robert 1:12 3:2 51:22,24 60:16
rate 25:19	regard 38:24 53:14	removed 46:3	response 61:2 66:13	room 1:21 2:10 3:16
reach 41:13	regularity 49:5,8	repeat 3:8,21 60:15	responsibility 20:16 58:21	route 44:11
reaching 13:20 21:13	rehabilitated 38:12 38:23 40:25 41:3 43:5 44:11,16 45:25 46:7,18 51:6	replaced 56:1	restriction 2:8,12 5:11 6:6,10,21 7:6 7:7,15 8:2 13:13 18:24 19:13 25:16 27:8,17 28:4,8 29:11 30:14 32:1 32:21 33:17,22,25 36:10 38:14,20 41:20 42:1,10,11 42:18,22 43:11,13 44:9 46:1,8,12 47:8 51:5 54:13 55:15 59:22 63:17 64:2 66:11 67:17	row 3:1
read 23:5 52:16	rehabilitation 2:16 21:2 26:14 34:20 57:15 68:2	reply 1:15 62:8	restrictions 43:13	ruled 2:6
reading 23:10,11 25:4	relate 28:17	report 2:10 16:8,9 16:19 17:9,14,20 58:11	result 29:20 30:25 44:23 64:9	<hr/> S <hr/>
real 7:12,13 12:7 27:3,11 31:12,16 31:20 32:2,11,20 34:1,5,12,17 37:4	relates 24:20	reports 40:8 52:17 53:1	resulted 62:5	safe 56:4,14 62:22 65:11
really 9:6 13:2 28:20 32:22 39:25 46:25 52:5 54:2 57:5 60:3,6 64:11 65:10	relating 12:19 14:5	represent 26:25 27:1,10	retreated 62:18	safely 63:25
reason 6:9 12:10 27:18 32:13 35:20 39:13 46:9 51:9 53:25 54:3 58:14 58:18 64:4 66:24	relation 2:15 5:4,8 5:9 6:9 7:11 8:1 8:16 9:25 17:19 18:17 19:24 20:19 22:3,9 26:13 31:12,25 33:18 34:12 37:20 40:1 43:9 47:19,21 52:6,7,11 56:15 57:4 61:11 62:14 62:15,17,17 64:13 66:10	representations 4:20 5:7,22 6:1 8:8 9:11 20:18 26:11 41:11 62:12 63:1,7 64:5,13 66:16	revealed 2:4	safety 6:23,24 7:3,5 7:22 13:12 27:3 27:12 32:14 34:8 37:4 39:17 41:13
reasonably 33:23	relationship 30:25 31:19	represented 2:19 2:23,25	revealing 27:4 29:24	
reasons 28:14 32:2 32:2,4,7 38:15 40:22 49:18 60:10 63:18	relatively 51:11	reputation 16:24 17:4,22	reversible 57:1	
receipt 40:7 49:6	releasing 7:12	request 24:10	reviewable 38:21	
receive 37:20 50:20 62:13 64:13 66:24	relevance 13:10	require 38:11,12	reviewed 46:3 56:1	
received 28:21 67:10	relevant 12:3,5,20 15:19 29:3 36:23 36:24 41:24 56:18 57:13	required 4:21 26:2 45:4 49:12 61:13	reviewing 48:25	
receiving 62:11	reliant 43:17	requires 37:2	revise 55:21	
recognise 49:2		resolution 65:15	revised 46:3	
recognised 6:11 35:19		resolve 64:25 65:2 65:19	right 2:17,20,24 3:2	
recollection 47:14		resolved 43:4 66:5		
		resolving 65:3		

Sanders 2:22	64:19	51:16,20,22,24,25	15:5 18:12,14,17	stone 38:21
satellite 58:3	separate 11:5 48:9	52:21 53:14 55:14	19:19 20:4,8,20	stop 17:1 47:20
satisfied 7:5	64:5	57:5,8 59:11,19	21:25 23:18 24:21	54:22 62:2
satisfy 11:12	series 12:4 30:10	60:16,25 61:7	25:22 26:9,10	straightforward
save 31:17 34:5	serious 28:20,24	65:23	27:4,16 28:1,8	33:23
saying 10:21 14:18	33:12	sits 2:17	29:6,12,19 30:22	strength 45:23
34:16	serve 11:13 23:24	situation 9:16	31:3 32:16,23	strict 18:9 21:1
says 54:9	served 12:7 22:17	17:12 20:13,14	34:2 36:3,20 37:9	strictly 21:11
scenario 41:6	57:16	21:3 25:3 29:7	37:21 40:3,17	string 28:23 29:5
schedule 16:16,20	serves 47:1	66:1,8	41:4,14,22 42:2,8	subject 2:7 8:8,8,25
17:5 23:19	Service 1:9 2:21	six 45:1	42:19 45:19 46:2	16:21 20:20 22:1
second 24:15 50:13	35:10,13	size 38:16 41:1	46:13,14 48:22	43:11 46:12 54:21
60:5,19	Service's 35:22	Slater 2:25	49:7,12 52:7,18	59:20 66:17
secondary 44:3	36:19 47:4	slightly 3:1,25 38:4	52:24 53:3,18,24	submission 4:13
60:19	serving 21:19,24	43:25	54:14 55:18 57:6	5:23 13:19 15:11
Secondly 23:11	32:4	slow 48:2	57:12 59:20 61:15	18:20,25 20:14
24:25 38:17	set 3:6 4:20 35:14	small 14:24 36:10	62:14,25 65:11	23:5 27:25 28:5
secret 29:25 30:2	36:5 38:21 44:19	36:20,23 61:12	66:1,10	29:17 34:14 36:24
Secretary 35:24	50:24 58:6,13,13	66:11	spirit 24:12	40:4,23 41:6,9
44:2 48:14 57:24	67:19	smaller 14:21	spoken 1:20,25 2:3	42:17 43:2,6 48:6
section 2:8 12:12	setting 17:13	social 1:23 2:9	stage 7:2 12:8,9	48:20 49:10,17
16:3,6,12 17:6,18	short 47:4 59:14	solely 42:19 43:17	14:10 20:2,7,21	51:7,17 61:17
18:5,5,8,15,17,23	shorthand 59:6	somebody 16:25	20:24 21:6,14,16	62:13 65:17 66:20
21:4 23:12,13,15	show 41:24	somebody's 24:20	21:24 37:17 38:13	67:9
23:17 24:1 25:13	showed 46:4	someones 28:19	38:23 40:24,24	submissions 1:7,9
25:14 28:9 35:16	shown 16:21	somewhat 58:8	41:6 42:14,15,21	1:11,13,15 3:19
36:9,14,16 37:8	shows 45:17 57:10	sorry 7:7 15:18	43:7,10,12,21	3:22 13:23 18:13
44:11 45:20,21	side 13:10 23:17	16:13,16 35:6	44:9 46:4,9,19	19:12 26:13 32:14
49:11 50:18 51:17	47:12	43:25 62:17	47:6 53:16,24	33:14 35:10 38:24
55:24 59:4	simply 10:19 13:9	sort 12:18 41:17	54:6,24 56:14	40:13,16 41:15
see 10:25 17:5	13:10 25:12 27:12	49:20 55:11 63:2	60:17 62:2 63:16	44:5 51:23 52:1
23:19 26:4 27:12	27:22 28:6 32:18	65:14	64:2,25 65:2,8,18	54:1,20,23 59:17
32:22 39:22 41:8	39:18 42:4,11	sorts 10:7 24:16	66:5	60:11,25 61:4,15
45:23 48:10 51:17	48:6 53:13 55:10	28:13 64:5	stages 14:3	62:5,8,13 66:3
seek 33:14 35:22	62:14 64:24 65:9	source 30:4,5	stance 62:19	submit 4:17 5:19
38:10 49:18 60:11	66:25	sources 43:14 45:6	start 11:9 26:3	8:23 9:18 18:19
seeking 27:17	sir 1:12 2:15 3:2,6	speak 47:14	starting 13:4 30:12	25:4 38:17,22
36:12 47:17 50:15	3:21 6:10 9:3,4	speaking 3:11	starts 47:25 58:22	46:7 48:21 49:19
56:8	13:24 21:14 24:17	26:20 44:15	State 35:24 44:2	52:25 53:22 56:3
seemingly 33:1	26:13 33:1 35:5	specialist 21:18	48:14 57:25	58:5,9 60:3
seen 4:5 15:11	35:12 36:4,5,8,21	spectrum 50:10	statement 16:9,19	submitted 4:21
senior 30:19	38:10 39:7,13	spent 4:6,8,24 5:4	27:11 35:15	46:17 52:17 53:1
sense 21:12,23	40:21 41:20 42:13	5:10,17,24 7:24	statements 17:2	submitting 15:4
22:10 54:2 58:10	44:5,6 45:4,24	7:25 8:20,23,25	47:22 50:15	subparagraph
58:22	46:17,20 47:4	10:4 11:23 12:4,9	statute 15:8	16:23
sentence 28:25	48:13,18 50:25	13:5,9,21 14:6,17	stepped 23:17	subset 63:13,15

substantially 60:14	tangible 47:7	third 3:1 45:24	ultimately 24:5	50:11
substantiate 7:21	task 6:11 24:13	thought 14:14	36:1 67:8	urge 25:12
substantive 17:25	60:9	23:21 26:1 62:18	uncertainty 23:3	use 2:9,11 24:2
19:21 36:2 43:7	team 2:24 18:7 53:2	thoughts 39:9	35:21 57:21,21	25:14 33:18 44:15
43:21 44:8 47:24	tell 35:6 54:23	threat 32:14 34:8	58:1	56:25 57:6
48:23 51:18 57:7	64:19	50:8	unclear 31:17	useful 60:9
63:24	term 44:7,16 45:7	threats 22:14	uncritically 37:19	utterly 13:14 30:16
substantively 47:21	49:1	threshold 13:25	undercover 5:2,15	
subsumes 5:23	terms 7:17 17:1	14:3 28:22	6:8,13 20:9 22:12	V
sue 16:25 17:3,18	19:18 23:23 24:13	tied 44:19	27:3 30:18,19	vary 8:13,14
sufficient 19:1	36:17 37:13 38:19	time 2:5 6:20 19:9	32:12 37:5 38:8	ventilated 58:19
28:25	43:8,24 49:19	29:24 33:8 48:6	45:8 48:24,25	version 16:14 39:11
suggest 11:1 27:14	58:2	timing 38:6	61:22,23 63:6,15	versions 16:12,13
38:7 40:18 51:13	terrible 9:7	tiny 47:16	64:15	victims 6:15
53:1 56:13,21	territory 64:11	today 37:12 48:18	understand 13:2	view 13:20 21:8
60:10 63:21	test 18:7,9,17 23:17	58:18	29:17 38:5 56:5	49:4 54:12 60:13
suggested 18:22	28:10 45:19 49:14	told 44:23	67:16,18	views 47:17
48:16 53:17 66:15	50:21	tool 22:12	understanding 3:6	violence 28:24
suggesting 10:13	tethered 42:22	tools 51:3	14:23 18:8 25:20	49:24
23:1 45:24 62:21	thank 3:17 15:19	topic 37:22	understood 21:12	volume 48:22 49:3
65:24 66:7	35:12 51:21 59:5	track 25:10	37:13 64:7	49:16
suggestion 24:7	60:22 66:12 67:16	traditionally 21:12	undertake 43:1	
37:14 38:25 44:2	67:25	treat 49:25	60:9	W
47:13	theirs 61:16	trial 41:18 55:3	undertaking 11:7	waiting 59:10
suggests 37:19	theoretical 28:16	65:20 66:6	underway 3:14	want 30:12,13 31:5
summarise 4:1	28:18 44:18 47:1	trigger 27:6 43:18	48:1 52:14,15	47:20 66:13
Suppose 28:19	48:12 64:10	true 46:6	undue 38:18	wanted 60:18 67:23
44:20 61:11	thing 15:15 52:5	trust 24:22	unfair 40:23	wants 22:2
sure 24:1 40:5	57:25 66:14	truth 6:11,12 7:18	unfortunately 3:15	waste 41:18
	things 12:23 13:20	11:6,11,19 20:23	Unit 52:13	way 5:13 10:17
T	16:4 23:2 28:12	21:17 30:12 32:6	unnecessarily	11:2 19:11 23:4
take 3:25 12:1 13:6	28:13 32:16 42:6	54:24	46:16	23:25 24:4 33:2
14:4,10 20:4 23:2	45:2 52:5 57:3	try 9:5,7,8	unnecessary 36:18	53:2 55:18 56:18
24:17 26:8 28:1,6	63:2	trying 11:14 26:18	46:23,25 47:10	57:11 59:25
29:2,16 30:23	think 13:5 14:1,9	turn 16:1,2 55:16	51:4	ways 9:21,24
34:3 36:3 37:1,6	15:13 18:6 19:3	60:12	unquestionably	weak 42:23
39:15,23 53:13	25:9,12,19 26:17	Twitter 1:22 2:9	15:12 42:5 67:14	weight 37:23 60:17
54:20 56:17 57:3	26:22 31:5,18	two 1:19 11:13 12:2	unsafe 41:4	went 6:16
62:24 63:18 65:2	33:23 34:16 35:1	14:3 16:12,13	unsatisfactory 55:5	whatsoever 8:18
taken 4:11 29:21	35:2,5,18 39:18	21:9 23:14 25:21	unspent 12:3,6	15:5
30:7,11 37:2	39:25 40:12,16	52:5,6 64:5,14	24:21 37:21 40:6	whereabouts 60:6
39:18 52:24 53:6	41:9,12 44:13,24	66:18	40:17 41:22	whilst 48:21
57:22 63:11	44:25 45:16 56:24	type 49:9	untrue 16:5 17:1	wholeheartedly
takes 9:1 28:13	59:4 63:2 64:10	typically 28:2	17:16	22:18
48:6 60:13	64:11,25 66:10		unworkable 39:1,3	wholly 64:1
talking 30:18 44:1	67:6	U	40:9 46:19 47:10	wide 4:3 37:13

wider 19:6,7,14 29:15,22,23 40:4 40:8,10 43:21 45:6 58:22	<hr/> Z <hr/>	<hr/> 7 <hr/>		
widest 47:10	<hr/> 0 <hr/>	7 17:8 36:9,16 44:11		
wings 40:5	<hr/> 1 <hr/>	7(3) 12:12 18:5,8 18:15,17 21:4 23:13,17 24:1 25:13 28:9 36:14 37:8 45:20,21 49:11 50:18 51:17		
wish 56:16 57:5	1 1:6 16:20 59:6 64:14 66:20	7(4) 18:23 23:12,15 25:14 59:4		
wishing 54:1	11.35 1:2			
withdrawn 2:6	12.58 59:13			
witness 47:22 50:15	15 16:3,6,12 17:6 17:18			
woman 31:19	18 33:6			
wonders 41:19	19 2:8	<hr/> 8 <hr/>		
Woods 2:24	1967 38:1 54:20	8 46:11		
word 24:3 53:15	1974 68:2			
wording 24:1,5 48:19	1996 16:2	<hr/> 9 <hr/>		
words 1:20,22,25 2:3 36:1 67:13	<hr/> 2 <hr/>			
work 10:25 39:11 39:14 50:11	2 35:13 59:12 66:23			
workability 51:2 53:7	2.00 59:8,10,15			
workable 40:19	2.13 68:1			
worked 9:22 10:7 10:14	20 1:1			
world 17:11 51:12	20(4) 55:24			
worry 16:17	2005 2:8			
writers 59:6	2013 16:2			
writing 3:9 16:25 60:21	2016 33:6			
written 3:22 8:19 16:5	2017 1:1			
wrong 42:23 44:24 64:1	23 36:22			
wrongdoing 6:18	25 50:14			
wrongly 16:15	26 50:14			
	<hr/> 3 <hr/>			
<hr/> X <hr/>	3 1:7 17:5			
X 1:4	3.1 17:5			
	34 1:9			
<hr/> Y <hr/>	<hr/> 4 <hr/>			
year 28:25 60:21	4 16:18			
years 10:1 28:21,23 29:2	4(6) 18:5 35:17			
youth 51:10	<hr/> 5 <hr/>			
	51 1:11			
	59 1:13			
	<hr/> 6 <hr/>			
	61 1:15			