

IN THE MATTER OF
THE UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF BRIAN HEALY

I, BRIAN HEALY, c/o Bindmans LLP, 236 Grays Inn Road, London WC1X8QB, WILL SAY as follows:

1. I am a Core Participant in this Inquiry. I make this statement in response to the statement of Jim Boyling ('Sutton') dated 14 July 2016, which was disclosed to me for the first time on 7th November 2017.
2. Jim Boyling says that his statement was made in response to a request from the Inquiry to provide details of any violence or intimidation to which he had been subjected since being confirmed as having been an undercover officer. Jim's statement recounts three incidents, which he suggests may be relevant, one of which concerns me. I would like to explain what actually happened on that occasion and to demonstrate that there is no question of any violence or intimidation at all.
3. The incident relates to a time in December 2010 when I saw Jim at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] *Gist: a location where Brian Healy was not aware that Jim Boyling would be.*
4. I have lived in the area since 2003. Between 2003 and 2012 (possibly 2013) we (as a family) went to the [REDACTED] *Gist: location* almost every week, often several times week as we used it for various activities. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] *Gist: Location which was visited by Brian Healy and his children regularly attending a variety of cultural events.*
5. The first time I bumped into Jim at the [REDACTED] *Gist: location* was prior to Dec 2010, it was sometime over the course of the previous year (2009 I think or possibly early 2010). At the time I knew nothing of his real identity or the fact he had any connection to the area. At

that time he was still, so far as I knew, Jim Sutton - the campaigner I'd briefly known from years before. I remember being totally surprised to bump into him and to see him where I live, which is very far from where I'd assumed he still was (i.e. London). In our brief friendly chat I said I lived locally and that I was at the [REDACTED] *Gist: location* to drop-off and pick-up my kids. It would have been clear that we used the [REDACTED] *Gist: location* a lot. I think he mentioned he was here to meet/ pick up his kids too. We parted without saying much else. The main feeling I left with was amazement about having bumped into Jim in my home town so far from London.

6. On the day Jim mentions in his statement, I was - as usual - at the [REDACTED] *Gist: location* to drop off, wait for and then pick up my two kids who, as mentioned above, attended dance classes every week. So I was already at the venue waiting for my kids.
7. As with the previous time we came across each other - he was walking through the venue, and I was coming out of the [REDACTED] *Gist: location* at the time. Our paths crossed, it was - as with the previous time - a completely random coincidence.
8. I can't remember what was said in detail but it was frostier than the previous time. Initially we again discussed what we were doing here, but by this point I knew more about him, his real identity and the backstory with his partner ('Rosa') and kids and his treatment of Rosa particularly. I expressed my view that he had hurt people. I made a point of saying it was unfortunate when you hurt and betray people and turn out not to be who you say you are. As far as I was concerned I was mainly referring to the pain that Rosa had been through and was still enduring.
9. The encounter was brief, I'd say about 1-2 minutes max.
10. Jim says that I "backed off" when his children arrived, but that is a mischaracterisation - I had nothing to "back off" from - we simply parted ways, he off with his kids, me to collect mine.

I believe that the facts stated in this statement are true



Brian Healy

17 November 2017