	•	, 0
1 2	Tuesday, 21 November 2017 INDEX	1 non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re
3	INDLX	2 HN294
4	Opening remarks1	3 Submissions on behalf of the138 Metropolitan Police Service by
5	Submissions on behalf of1 Peter Francis by MS SIKAND	4 MR HALL re HN294
6	Total Timbes by the Still I to	5 Submissions on behalf of the140 non-state, non-police core
_	Submissions on behalf of officers15	6 participants by MS KAUFMANN re
7	represented by Slater & Gordon by MR BRANDON	HN297 7
8		Submissions on behalf of the144
9	Submissions on behalf of the21 Metropolitan Police designated	8 Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297
	lawyers by MR SANDERS	9
10		Submissions on behalf of the149 10 non-state, non-police core
11	Submissions on behalf of the39 non-state, non-police core	participants by MS KAUFMANN re
	participants by MS KAUFMANN re	11 HN321 12 Submissions on behalf of HN321 by MR151
12	HN16	SANDERS
13	Submissions on behalf of the	Submissions on behalf of the156
14	MR HALL re HN16	14 Metropolitan Police Service by
15	Submissions on behalf of the54	MR HALL re HN321
16	non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re	Submissions on behalf of the167
	HN26	16 non-state, non-police core
17	Submissions on behalf of the61	participants by MS KAUFMANN re 17 HN326
18	non-state, non-police core	18 Submissions on behalf of the
10	participants by MS KAUFMANN re	Metropolitan Police Service by 19 MR HALL re HN326
19 20	HN58 Submissions on behalf of the68	20 Further submissions on behalf of the170 non-state, non-police core
	Metropolitan Police Service by	21 participants by MS KAUFMANN re
21 22	MR HALL re HN58	HN326 22
22	Submissions on behalf of75 Mr Peter Francis by MS SIKAND	Submissions on behalf of the171
23	re HN58	23 non-state, non-police core
24	Submissions on behalf of HN58 by82 MR BRANDON	participants by MS KAUFMANN re 24 HN329
25	WIKEDIALOON	25 Submissions on behalf of the173
	D 1	D 2
	Page 1	Page 3
1	non state, non nellios core	1 MD HALL IDV220
1	non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re	1 MR HALL re HN329 2 Submissions on behalf of the173
2 3	HN58 Submissions on behalf of the88	non-state, non-police core
	non-state, non-police core	3 participants by MS KAUFMANN re
4	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN68	HN330 4
5		Submissions on behalf of HN330 by MR174
6	Submissions on behalf of the90 Metropolitan Police Service by	5 SANDERS
7	MR HALL re HN68	6 Submissions on behalf of the175
,	Further submissions on behalf of the97	non-state, non-police core 7 participants by MS KAUFMANN re
8	non-state, non-police core	7 participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN333
9	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN68	8
10	Submissions on behalf of the102 non-state, non-police core	Submissions on behalf of176
11	participants by MS KAUFMANN re	9 Mr Peter Francis by MS SIKAND re HN333
12	HN81	10 IE HN333
	Submissions on behalf of the107	Further submissions on behalf of the177
13	Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN81	11 non-state, non-police core
14		participants by MS KAUFMANN re 12 HN333
15	Submissions on behalf of the	12 FIN333 13 Submissions on behalf of HN333 by MR178
	participants by MS KAUFMANN re	SANDERS
16 17	HN104 Submissions on behalf of the112	14 Discussion on statement of Louise 170
18	Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN104	Discussion re statement of Louise179 15 Meade
19	Submissions on behalf of the114	16 Submissions by MS STEEL189
20	non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re	17
	HN123	18 (10.30 am)
21	Submissions on behalf of123	19 Opening remarks 20 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, you have finished your general
22	Peter Francis by MS SIKAND re	21 submissions. I think in fairness to others I have to
23	HN123	22 give them the opportunity of making any general
	Submissions on behalf of the130	23 submission that they may wish to.
24	Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN123	I have received today an email from the media which indicates that they do not seek to depart from the
25		20 maicaces that they do not seek to depart from the
	Page 2	Page 4
	O =	- "O" '

1	rulings made by Sir Christopher, which I think should	1	identities will not in most circumstances help you get
2	narrow the area of open debate on this issue.	2	to the truth insofar as you will be faced with some
3	I have lost the batting order, I am afraid. That is	3	hostility from officers who are denied that.
4	entirely my fault. (Handed)	4	The second point, sir, that
5	Thank you. Next is Mr Payter, according to the	5	THE CHAIR: Is that submission made in relation to deployed
6	list, but it is actually Mr Hall.	6	undercover police officers, their managers or both?
7	MR BARR: On the list for the Special Demonstration Squad	7	MS SIKAND: Deployed undercover police officers. We will
8	anonymity applications next on the list after Mr Bunting	8	come to the position so far as managers are concerned,
9	is Ms Sikand. I understand that Ms Sikand wants to	9	I suppose, in relation to the specifics of the
10	suggest to you that she too should make some submissions	10	application in relation to HN58
11	on principle. If she still wishes to do so, now is her	11	THE CHAIR: Yes.
12	chance.	12	MS SIKAND: and the sort of split procedure that you have
13	Submissions on behalf of Peter Francis by MS SIKAND	13	suggested. But we do have specific submissions in
14	MS SIKAND: Sir, they are very short.	14	relation to
15	On behalf of Peter Francis I want to make just three	15	THE CHAIR: Of course, and you will have the opportunity of
16	points before we turn to the specifics of each	16	making them in relation to specific officers. All I'm
17	application.	17	seeking at the moment is any general submissions that
18	The first is this, it explains our overall approach	18	you want to make, as you have said, briefly.
19	to the specific applications. Sir, as you know,	19	MS SIKAND: In relation to senior officers, we accept
20	Peter Francis through his lawyers both orally and in	20	straightaway as you have indicated yesterday that senior
21	writing has consistently stated that disclosure of cover	21	officers must be accountable. However we think senior
22	names would usually meet the needs of this inquiry.	22	officers need to be distinguished from Special
23	THE CHAIR: Yes.	23	Demonstration Squad managers, simply because in
24	MS SIKAND: By that I mean when balancing the competing	24	Peter Francis's experience those managers would usually
25	public interest factors as identified by the previous	25	have also have had an undercover role. I hear what you
	1		·
	Page 5		Page 7
1	charge the balance should usually rest at disclosing	1	say that this may not have always been the case, but
2	cover names. We accept of course that there are	2	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997
2 3	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday	2 3	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later.
2 3 4	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as	2 3 4	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later
2 3 4 5	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given	2 3 4 5	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But
2 3 4 5 6	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In	2 3 4 5 6	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not
2 3 4 5 6 7	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may	2 3 4 5 6 7	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and will cooperate, but should his true identity be revealed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers, but we will certainly return to it in relation to HN58.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and will cooperate, but should his true identity be revealed he would effectively evade this jurisdiction. That is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers, but we will certainly return to it in relation to HN58. THE CHAIR: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and will cooperate, but should his true identity be revealed he would effectively evade this jurisdiction. That is my understanding. So that is one of the practical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers, but we will certainly return to it in relation to HN58. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, the second point is really about seeking to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and will cooperate, but should his true identity be revealed he would effectively evade this jurisdiction. That is my understanding. So that is one of the practical consequences that Mr Francis alerts everybody to, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers, but we will certainly return to it in relation to HN58. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, the second point is really about seeking to put right some assertions that have been made by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and will cooperate, but should his true identity be revealed he would effectively evade this jurisdiction. That is my understanding. So that is one of the practical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers, but we will certainly return to it in relation to HN58. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, the second point is really about seeking to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cover names. We accept of course that there are exceptions to this, as identified by you yesterday morning, which include disclosing real names where as you say the conduct of an undercover officer has given rise to a moral right to know the true identity. In a sense at the other end, withholding a cover name may be found by you to be necessary in certain we say very limited circumstances. Sir, Peter Francis is of the view, however, that we must keep an eye on the practical consequences of revealing true identities when you do decide to do so. It is something that you, sir, alluded to in discussions with Ms Kaufmann yesterday, when you said that you had no jurisdiction meaning you had no territorial jurisdiction and I think, sir, that that is a reference to an email exchange that we have now seen in the generic disclosure bundle between HN321 and the Metropolitan Police Service, in which he effectively says he will come to court, he will give evidence and will cooperate, but should his true identity be revealed he would effectively evade this jurisdiction. That is my understanding. So that is one of the practical consequences that Mr Francis alerts everybody to, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	certainly that was his experience up at least until 1997 if not slightly later. THE CHAIR: Yes. I think what he says about the later period of the Special Demonstration Squad is right. But I think you will find that the earlier managers did not all come from the Special Demonstration Squad by any means. Obviously right at the start they can't have done. But even in the early days when it had already been established for a few years, I think we will find that not all did. MS SIKAND: I am sure in due course we will have evidence of this. But of course he speaks to his experience and in relation to HN58 of course THE CHAIR: You rightly highlight a problem which happens when someone moves from being an undercover police officer to being a manager. I think as with all these cases it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. MS SIKAND: Indeed. Which is why I don't make an overarching submission in relation to senior officers, but we will certainly return to it in relation to HN58. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, the second point is really about seeking to put right some assertions that have been made by

1	have heard what you have said about the role of	1	That undertaking did not come until 28 August 2016,
2	assurances of confidentiality and the weight that you	2	and let alone the Inquiry having reached a position
3	would accord them, whether express or implied, and say	3	where they were in a position to request evidence. He
4	no more, therefore, about the way in which we say	4	has, as will be well known to the Inquiry, to the
5	Mr Sanders has sought to reinterpret or go behind the	5	secretariat, offered to provide us evidence on more than
6	previous chairman's ruling, as summarised by him at	6	one occasion and he has been told that he must wait for
7	A8 the previous chairman that is other than to say	7	the formal request so he will do so.
8	that we agree with Ms Kaufmann that Mr Sanders has it	8	THE CHAIR: I am grateful to him for his patience. We are
9	wrong, but we need not trouble you as to why.	9	attempting to do it more or less chronologically, which
10	There is a related point, sir, which I wish to deal	10	seems to make sense.
11	with. That is more about setting the record straight.	11	MS SIKAND: But, sir, to say he's keen to give his evidence
12	You will be aware, sir, that Mr Sanders devotes a whole	12	is not to overstate the position.
13	section in his submissions at paragraph 7 to the	13	In dealing then very briefly, sir, in what he has
14	position of Peter Francis as he describes that	14	said, namely that he's never been promised "lifelong
15	particular paragraph.	15	confidentiality", and the suggestion that it cannot be
16	Sir, his submissions are at tab 14 of the	16	relied upon, there has been no evidence so far as we are
17	submissions bundle.	17	aware produced by the Metropolitan Police Service as an
18	THE CHAIR: Yes.	18	institution as opposed to anything individual
19	MS SIKAND: That paragraph, we say, includes some	19	officers may or may not have said in their personal
20	surprisingly personal attacks on Mr Francis. We would	20	statements that we are aware of that casts any doubt
21	like to take this opportunity to correct some of them.	21	even on that very limited assertion that he made in
22	You will see, sir, 7.1, he submits that nothing can	22	those 2016 assertions.
23	reliably be gleaned about the expectations of	23	Sir, Ms Kaufmann has made reference to Cairo's
24	confidentiality of the DL officers from the statements	24	statement
25	or experiences of Peter Francis.	25	THE CHAIR: Yes.
	Page 9		Page 11
		1	
1	He then goes on to support this assertion, I think,	1	MS SIKAND: and it is statement of course that you will
1 2	He then goes on to support this assertion, I think, by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed	1 2	MS SIKAND: and it is statement of course that you will be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you
	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed		
2	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He	2	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you
2 3	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed	2 3	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic
2 3 4	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016.	2 3 4	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo
2 3 4 5	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following	2 3 4 5	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of
2 3 4 5 6	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to	2 3 4 5 6	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection
2 3 4 5 6 7	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that	2 3 4 5 6 7	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by Mr Sanders, sir, as you will know Mr Francis has not yet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to safeguarding the true identity of the officers."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by Mr Sanders, sir, as you will know Mr Francis has not yet been approached by the Inquiry to provide witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to safeguarding the true identity of the officers." So that is the highest he puts it, "frequently".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by Mr Sanders, sir, as you will know Mr Francis has not yet been approached by the Inquiry to provide witness evidence. No such formal request has been made. The assertion in his submissions of 7 March 2016 were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to safeguarding the true identity of the officers." So that is the highest he puts it, "frequently".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by Mr Sanders, sir, as you will know Mr Francis has not yet been approached by the Inquiry to provide witness evidence. No such formal request has been made. The assertion in his submissions of 7 March 2016 were deliberately bald and limited, given that at that date,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to safeguarding the true identity of the officers." So that is the highest he puts it, "frequently". But at 70 he then makes reference to a document which he describes as a memorandum which, sir, you know was drawn
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by Mr Sanders, sir, as you will know Mr Francis has not yet been approached by the Inquiry to provide witness evidence. No such formal request has been made. The assertion in his submissions of 7 March 2016 were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to safeguarding the true identity of the officers." So that is the highest he puts it, "frequently". But at 70 he then makes reference to a document which he describes as a memorandum which, sir, you know was drawn up by HN53. That is exhibited as exhibit 2. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	by suggesting that Peter Francis has effectively failed to provide any evidence about what was said to him. He points, sir, to a submission that we made in March 2016. He then goes on to set out in the following paragraph some criticisms as to how Mr Francis came to reveal his own identity, and ends by saying that Mr Francis is somehow firmly in the camp of the Guardian and the media. First of all, sir, Mr Francis it must be clear is in nobody's camp. He stands alone. That must be clear not only from the position that he has occupied throughout but from his submissions as well, which are patently different from those of the Guardian insofar as the position the Guardian takes in relation to what you should or should not disclose in relation to real and cover names. So we refute that, if we need to. In dealing with the evidential point made by Mr Sanders, sir, as you will know Mr Francis has not yet been approached by the Inquiry to provide witness evidence. No such formal request has been made. The assertion in his submissions of 7 March 2016 were deliberately bald and limited, given that at that date, sir, the Attorney General had not yet even granted an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	be familiar with. But if I may, sir, just trouble you for a moment to turn it up. It is in the generic evidence bundle behind tab 5. At paragraph 15, Cairo begins to explain there, sir, what the expectation of undercover operatives was in relation to the protection that they would be offered. Sir, you will see at paragraph 16, Cairo says that as part of the process of assessing and interviewing a prospective Special Demonstration Squad field officer more senior officers would attend the home address of the candidate. Then he goes on to say: "Part of this purpose of the exercise was to provide reassurance to both the officers and their family about the nature and ramifications of the role." He finishes that paragraph with this: "The reassurance frequently extended to reinforcing the commitment of the Metropolitan Police Service to safeguarding the true identity of the officers." So that is the highest he puts it, "frequently". But at 70 he then makes reference to a document which he describes as a memorandum which, sir, you know was drawn up by HN53. That is exhibited as exhibit 2. That follows behind tab 8, please.

1	the context in which that document came into being. At	1	stage at which Mr Francis himself chose to reveal his
2	17, sir, Cairo makes mention that that document came	2	true identity is one that I won't speak at length to
3	into being during the litigation that was brought	3	that point, other than to say that there were various
4	against the Metropolitan Police Service by Officers A	4	external and personal factors which led him to make the
5	and B, two former Special Demonstration Squad officers.	5	decision that he did. But we say that this probably is
6	It is no secret, sir, that Officer A is Peter Francis.	6	not the time or the place to go into details about
7	This document, sir, only came into being because as	7	that
8	far as Peter Francis is aware that litigation was the	8	THE CHAIR: It isn't.
9	very first time that a light was publicly shone on the	9	MS SIKAND: but it has been raised so we respond to it.
10	workings of the Special Demonstration Squad. As	10	THE CHAIR: Forgive me, Ms Sikand, I don't mean to interrupt
11	Ms Kaufmann has already pointed out, sir, if you look at	11	your flow, but this is precisely what I hoped would not
12	the undertaking in the way that it is described there in	12	happen. Namely that we would have a whole lot of points
13	2005, it is heavily qualified.	13	being made of a general nature or in your case rather
14	The confidentiality itself could be waived with the	14	more specific nature – going to general principles
15	undercover officer's consent or, as is put there, under	15	which would inhibit me from determining the individual
16	compulsion of law or statutory duty.	16	cases I have to.
17	Sir, if you look at the exhibit itself, it suggests	17	MS SIKAND: I am most certainly not going to stand in your
18	that this document was going to be rolled out, as it	18	way and I have only been on my feet for a few minutes,
19	were, to all officers and they were going to be asked to	19	sir, and I certainly don't ask for an hour and a half.
20	sign it.	20	But I do ask for just a few moments before we can move
21	THE CHAIR: There were mutual promises, weren't there?	21	on to the obviously important task that lies ahead.
22	MS SIKAND: Yes. There were mutual promises as set out in	22	But it is important that assertions that are made
23	2005. That is the first written document that we are	23	that cast doubt on the credibility and integrity of
24	aware of that seeks to evidence this mutual	24	Mr Francis, that I have the right at least to put them
25	understanding.	25	into their proper context.
	Page 13		Page 15
1	And so bearing in mind that the Special	1	THE CHAIR: You have done.
1 2	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that	1 2	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could
	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time.		This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could even if I were minded to conceivably embark on
2	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the	2 3 4	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could
2	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact	2 3 4 5	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could even if I were minded to conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later.
2 3 4	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled	2 3 4 5 6	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could even if I were minded to conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any
2 3 4 5 6 7	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new	2 3 4 5 6 7	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions about the stage at which Peter Francis chose to reveal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual experts at this stage, but simply that we had raised the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions about the stage at which Peter Francis chose to reveal his true identity. Sir, I don't know that that has any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual experts at this stage, but simply that we had raised the point that Peter Francis, we raised the point publicly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions about the stage at which Peter Francis chose to reveal his true identity. Sir, I don't know that that has any bearing of any kind on the nature of the confidential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual experts at this stage, but simply that we had raised the point that Peter Francis himself was treated at The Priory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions about the stage at which Peter Francis chose to reveal his true identity. Sir, I don't know that that has any bearing of any kind on the nature of the confidential relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual experts at this stage, but simply that we had raised the point that Peter Francis, we raised the point publicly that Peter Francis himself was treated at The Priory Ticehurst in 1999 and 2000, and that he was sent there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions about the stage at which Peter Francis chose to reveal his true identity. Sir, I don't know that that has any bearing of any kind on the nature of the confidential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual experts at this stage, but simply that we had raised the point that Peter Francis himself was treated at The Priory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Demonstration Squad came into being in 1968, sir, that is a significant period of time. In any event, as we say, it came about after the litigation but importantly we say that despite the fact that the document itself says that it ought to be rolled out, that is to say given to officers before a new deployment and given also to those already deployed, paragraph 18 of Cairo's statement confirms that this was never done. So we say that there is nothing in the public domain that casts doubt on anything that Peter Francis has asserted thus far about the promise of confidentiality to him. Sir, it is accepted by Mr Sanders himself in his own submissions that there were varying degrees of promises made and mostly probably they were implied as opposed to expressed, so it is difficult to understand his submission on that point. Lastly, on this point, he makes various assertions about the stage at which Peter Francis chose to reveal his true identity. Sir, I don't know that that has any bearing of any kind on the nature of the confidential relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is not, bluntly, the moment at which I could — even if I were minded to — conceivably embark on an assessment of the credibility of various individuals, that comes much later. MS SIKAND: I am grateful, sir. So then I will not say any more about the litigation and the way in which, in fact, the Metropolitan Police Service chose to conduct it as opposed to Mr Francis. Sir, the third and my last point is really to clarify a matter that we raised in our written submissions of 4 October at our paragraph 5. Just because others have asked in their written submissions as to what that means, just simply this: Peter Francis had raised concerns about the relationship between the Metropolitan Police Service and the trauma service at The Priory Ticehurst. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Sir, those were just concerns, may I make plain. We have not cast any aspersions about the individual experts at this stage, but simply that we had raised the point that Peter Francis, we raised the point publicly that Peter Francis himself was treated at The Priory Ticehurst in 1999 and 2000, and that he was sent there

1 co-claimant was also sent there. 1 with the individual officers. 2 That is why it is extremely surprising to note the 2 Having said that, I suspect there is not a great	
2 That is why it is extremely surprising to note the 2 Having said that, I suspect there is not a great	
	t
3 contents of the letter which is at tab 21 of the generic 3 deal I'm going to be able to say about individua	1
4 evidence bundle, sir, which is a letter from the 4 officer's cases in any event.	
5 Metropolitan Police Service to the Inquiry in response 5 THE CHAIR: That's what I anticipate. Three of	hem at any
6 to the Inquiry seeking further information triggered by 6 rate have been fully considered in the closed he	aring in
7 our own correspondence with you. 7 which you participated.	
8 If I can just take you to the second page, and the 8 MR BRANDON: Yes. I am happy to deal with t	he general
9 second-to-last paragraph, it is said there that although 9 points now or deal with it all in one go. I suspe	ct
10 it can't be ruled out that individual Metropolitan 10 I will not detain you for long.	
Police Services officers may have been treated at The 11 THE CHAIR: Entirely in your hands, whatever y	ou prefer.
12 Priory in the past. It goes to say: 12 MR BRANDON: Why don't I deal with the gene	al point now.
13 "That said, my enquiries with The Priory to date 13 To get it out of the way, then it may be that I w	ill be
have not provided any positive indications that 14 very short when we come to the individual case	s.
15 Metropolitan Police Services officers have been treated 15 Sir, I only address the single issue which is r	
by The Priory or by either Dr Busuttil or Dr McLaren." 16 names and what has been submitted by Ms Kai	
17 Sir, as I say, Mr Francis was, his co-claimant 17 the disclosure of real names is the key to this Ir	
18 was 18 getting to the truth.	
19 THE CHAIR: You say that is wrong. 19 Well, sir, we disagree. Sir, we ought to just	point
20 MS SIKAND: We say that is obviously wrong. 20 out that the position now taken by the non-state	
21 THE CHAIR: Yes. 21 non-police core participants is a little different	rom
22 MS SIKAND: Sir, for those who keep up with books written by 22 the position that had been taken at earlier heari	igs.
former undercover police officers, Peter Bleksley has 23 Mr Squires appearing for the non-state in the A	pril of
24 written in a book called "Gangbuster" that he was sent 24 this year hearing accepted that cover names rat	
25 to The Priory Ticehurst by the Yard. So correspondence 25 real names were the primary concern for the In	
Page 17 Page 19	
1 that we have from 1999 and 2000 to Peter Francis show 1 albeit he did say of course that there were a ra	nge of
2 that he was treated there and that Dr Walter Busuttil, 2 views among the non-state, non-police core p	-
3 for example, was the clinical co-director at that time. 3 as to whether disclosure of real names was ne	
4 So no doubt further enquiries can be made about that. 4 that there would be a public interest in the dis	
5 THE CHAIR: You have asked the Inquiry to make enquiries 5 of real names only in some cases.	
6 about that and your request is noted. 6 Sir, that is, for your note, at the transcript of	f
7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. That is all I say in general 7 5 April of this year at page 107.	
8 terms. 8 Sir, the reasons we say that Ms Kaufmann	gives in
9 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 9 support for the release of real names cannot ju	
10 Mr Hall, I think you are next in the batting order, 10 assertion that it is essential to the Inquiry to g	-
11 are you not? 11 to the truth or even that it is necessary.	C
12 MR HALL: Sir, yes. If I may, I would prefer not to make 12 Sir, just to deal with the two points made b	v
any submissions in the abstract but respond in relation 13 Ms Kaufmann where the cover name is not ki	
to the individual officers where the points arise. 14 been submitted, as you have heard, that where	-
15 THE CHAIR: As you know, that is my preferred course, I am 15 name is not known the real name should be d	
16 grateful to you. 16 because it is the only means of linking the off	
17 Next, Mr Brandon, likewise? 17 the deployment.	
18 Submissions on behalf of officers represented by Slater & 18 Well, sir, we say it is not clear how publications of the state of the	tion of
19 Gordon by MR BRANDON 19 a real name would assist those who only knew	
20 MR BRANDON: Sir, I think so. If I can roll everything up 20 undercover officers by their cover names in a	
21 together. 21 THE CHAIR: That is a pretty obvious point wh	
We do have a couple of observations to make about 22 possibly better debated in relation to individu	
23 Ms Kaufmann's principal submission that cover names 23 MR BRANDON: Very well, sir.	
24 ought to be disclosed. I can deal with those now, they 24 Again, in relation to individuals of course to	hat
25 will not take long, or I can just roll it up together 25 point doesn't arise in relation to any of the off	
Page 18 Page 20	

The UTALER. No. quite. THE CHAIR. No. when the same is in shealif of the officers whom I represent, that they application supporting the assertion that the finquiry can't get to the truth without knowing what the real anaest are. As fir as whistle blowers are concerned, sir, we say that in relation to any allegations of wrongoding which are said colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation Squad colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation of the colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation of the colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation of the colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation of the colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation of the colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any representation of wrongoding which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is Blowly to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the linquiry based of from the multiple wintesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of a misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 The broaden the scope of the linquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanipageable. It would a give that the period of their deployment. The those is assisted by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite and cover officer's accounts without the need, really, and potentially satellite and cover officer's deployment, then those allegations of or ourse would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite and cover officer's deployment, then those allegations of or ourse would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite and the cover officer's deployment, then those allegations of or ou				
MR BRANDON. We say it can't be a principle of general application supporting the assertion that the Inquiry applications of a support of the Inquiry applications of the Inquiry applications of the Inquiry application of Inquiry Inquiry application of the Inquiry application of Inquiry Inquiry application of Inquiry Inq	1	that we represent.	1	on behalf of the officers whom I represent, that they
4 application supporting the assertion that the Inquiry 5 can't get to the truth without knowing what the read 6 names are. 7 As far as whistle blowers are concerned, sir, we say 8 that in relation to any allegations of wrongdoing which 9 occurred during the course of deployments, of course 10 relevant undercover officers, core participants, their 11 cover names are known to Special Demonstration Squad 12 colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any 13 reports of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without 14 disclosure of real names. 15 As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said 16 to have occurred outside deployment, we make the 17 following very short submissions. 18 First, we say there is likely to be more than 19 sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry 20 has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no 21 doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of 22 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 23 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 24 miscondact which may arise outside the period of their 25 deployment. To seek that information, we say, would 26 power of the Inquiry beyond its terms of 27 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 28 undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, 29 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 20 and the course of the Inquiry beyond its terms of 20 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 21 undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, 22 and its more of the special Demonstration Squad was a secret 23 undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, 24 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 25 undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, 26 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 27 of the propersion of the final propersion of the time, and what was and what was not 28 wrongdoing with the proposed of the Inquiry beyond its terms of 29 reference. It would make it ummanageable. It would 30 impact upon its achievably proposed to the				
5 cart' get to the truth without knowing what the real 6 names are. 7 As far as whistle blowers are concerned, sir, we say 8 that in relation to any allegations of wrongdoing which 9 occurred during the course of deployments, of course 10 relevant underover officers, core participants, their 11 cover names are known to Special Demonstration Squad 12 colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any 13 reports of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without 14 disclosure of real names. 15 As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said 16 to have occurred outside deployment, we make the 17 following very short submissions. 18 First, we say there is likely to be more than 19 sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry 20 has and from the multiple wimesess that it will no 21 doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of 22 underover officers' accounts without the need, really, 23 to seek ovidence of the Americar arising from 24 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their 25 deployment. To seek that information, we say, would 26 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 3 impact upon its achievability. If allegations of 4 wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the 5 wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the 6 undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations 6 of course would have to be assessed by you, sr, and we 7 would face the prospect of potentially scalled 8 litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of 8 wongdoing which may be read or sort problems. If a deployment and which frankly have very limited 10 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 11 reports of the following very short submissions. 14 What the problems of the progression; if 15 reference of the following very short submissions which are deployment and which frankly have very limited 16 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 17 relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 18 wongdoing which may be now management. 19 with BRANDON: That what				
6 characterised as wrongology when assessed against the courted during the course of deployments, of course reference in which their actions were some coverage and the relation to any allegations of wrongology which are said to leave courted during the course of deployments, of course reports of wrongology should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. 11 colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any reports of wrongology should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. 12 As far as allegations of wrongology which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. 13 First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has afform the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, 22 deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 1 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite as deployment and which frank's have very limited to decrease of the Inquiry service of after a deployment and which frank's have very limited to decrease of officers accused of varnagiong to deduce the relation of varnagiong to the relation of varnagiong to the relation of varnagiong to the function of the course of the second outside the relation of varnagiong which are advantage and the text in which their actions were a deployment and the center to which the culture was at the individual wound allegation of varnagiong within any action to the culture was at the function of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would a proposed to the culture was at the function of their deployment. To seek that information of wornagiong which are admitted the proposed to the culture was at the und				
As far as whistle blowers are concerned, sir, we say that in relation to any allegations of wrongdoing which as course of deployments, of course relevant undercover officers, core participants, their cover ammers are known to Special Demonstration Squad to colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any discover of real rames. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to thave occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the linquiry has and from the multiple winesses that it will no an advance of the relevence of bad character arising from a make the deployment. To seek that information, we say, would be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad was a severel broaded the time, and which frankly have very limited the worngdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited the should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad was a severel brackled that it constituted wrongdoing that has a course for progression, if relevence to the core task of the inquiry and sea severel brackled the significant processed of the progression of deciment whether they were permitted top rogress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of fake assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of fake assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are average of the Special Demonstration Squad would have the original season of the progression of individual officers are average of the Special Demonstration Squad would have the original progression of individual officers are average of the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret brackled to the progre				
that in relation to any allegations of wrongdoing which occurred during the course of deployments, of course relevant undercover officers, core participants, their cover names are known to Special Demonstration Squad collegues and therefore they can come forward with any reports of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry as and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the tir will no doubt hear accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite lingation, trials within trials, over incidents of wooding within havy be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad dualed and polyments. Were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the prospect of potentially satellite and practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also telles on a number of false assumptions. It assumptions of the progression of individual officers accussed of wrongdoing under wongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make				
occurred during the course of deployments, of course relevant undercover officers, core participants, their relevant undercover officers, core participants, their collegages and therefore they can come forward with any together officers of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than 19 sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry 20 has and from the multiple writessess that it will no 21 doubt hear accounts from to assess the erdbiblity of 22 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 23 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 24 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would 25 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 26 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their 27 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 27 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 28 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their 29 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 27 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 29 wrongdoing which have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite 10 a deployment, then those allegations of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited 11 relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if 12 relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, was ay term of the seek provided the significant 13 period and which frankly have very limited 14 should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad dual, aware of the allegations of more dealers of real names. The decision to the side to associate the special Demonstration Squad dual all, aware of the allegations of 24 that it constituted wrongdoing. This lead				
relevant undercover officers, core participants, their cover names are known to Special Demonstration Squad 11 colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any reports of wrongodoing should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. 15 As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. 16 to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. 18 First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry Das and from the multiple witnessess that it will no doubt hear accounts without the need, really, 22 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 23 to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of vorongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of occurse would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite lingation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which fankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 10 Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 21 Sir, was far as corporate police progression, if relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 22 Sir, so far as corporate police progression, if relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 23 Sir, was a as corporate police progression, if relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 24 Sir, so far as corporate police progression, if relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 25 Sir, was a as corporate police progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad and all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it				
cover names are known to Special Demonstration Squad colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any reports of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officer's dead character arising from deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. MR BRANDON: That is in rolation to an assessment of the individual vrongdoing - 15 IEECHAIR: Sex. MR BRANDON: In but what we urge upon the Inquiry, and feel quite sure that this point has been made namy times, is to sasses that inforial allegation of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader context of what the culture was at the origination of wrongdoing so within a broader other origination of wrongdoing whith may be many years before or after a deployment. In the what was not what was not wh				
colleagues and therefore they can come forward with any reports of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without discoure of real names. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts of whort the need, really, to so seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would aimpact upon its achievability, If allegations of would face the prospect of potentially staellie litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of worogdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of cocurse would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially staellie litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of worogdoing with may be many years before or alter a should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad would have individual every limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate of potentially staellie should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad would here were accorded to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if some care and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of terms to be given to assurances expressed in mindividual deployments.				
reports of wrongdoing should they wish to do so without disclosure of real names. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no 20 doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from 24 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 1 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of woogloing which are said to the core bask of the inquiry. Sir, you have made had trise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of young sing and so it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of the core task of the inquiry. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make Assumes that those service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers of the progression of a deployment and which frankly have very limited the determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant producing which are proving the release				
disclosure of real names. As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the redubility of doubt hear accounts from to assess the redubility of doubt hear accounts witnout the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from deployment. To seek that information, we say, would preference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of variety and the variety of course, would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trails within trials, over incidents of edetermine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, you have already identified the significant projects of the solution of post Special Demonstration for a deployment and which frankly have very limited determine whether they were permitted to progress. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make the following very short testing from the multiple witnesses that those allegations of very doubt the culture was at the organisation at the time, and what was and what was not known what was and what was not known what was and what was not known what was all to be considered by the linquiry. The CHAIR: Yes. MR BRANDON: what the culture was at the organisation at the time, and what was and what was not known what was and what was not known what was and what was not known what would a lite to be considered by the linquiry. The CHAIR: Thankly so, and the financial all propriets of the successful professes whether that be obtained and the intime, is to considered by the linquiry. The CHAIR: Thankly so, and the composition of post	12	-		
As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. It and to that to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. It and to that to that we was a the variety of the families and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, at the case widence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it ummanageable. It would important on its achievability, If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing within that I make the form of the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make the proper of implied of the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of worn of the propersion of individual officers are aware of the Spe				
to have occurred outside deployment, we make the following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess that the crothility of undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 I broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of would face the prospect of potentially satellite of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite related by wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited 15 Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. It should be investigation of post Special Demonstration 15 Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. It should be investigation of post Special Demonstration 15 Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. It should be investigation of post Special Demonstration 15 Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. It should be investigation of post Special Demonstration 16 and progress. It such a special permonstration Squad was a secret and fire is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have taken place within it, the alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. It is load to be investigation of post Special Demonstration 15 Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whet				individual wrongdoing
following very short submissions. First, we say there is likely to be more than sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry and a form the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it ummanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of occurse would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite the litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of worngdoing which may be many years before or after a should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to gassumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make The chart that this point has been made many times, is to a deseases that this course of the funding within a broader context of the time, cand what was and what the sime call it the funding without assess falt to be considered by the liquity. The CHAIR: Certainly that the time, and what was and what was and what was and what the store. All of the time, and what was and what the organisation at the time, and what was and what the some sale is the	15	As far as allegations of wrongdoing which are said	15	THE CHAIR: Yes.
18 First, we say there is likely to be more than 19 sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry 20 has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no 21 doubt hear accounts from to assess the redibility of 22 undercover officer's accounts without the need, really, 23 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 24 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their 25 deployment. To seek that information, we say, would 26 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 27 impact upon its achievability. If allegations of 28 wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the 29 undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations 20 of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we 21 would face the prospect of potentially satellite 23 litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of 24 wrongdoing which may be many years before or after 25 a deployment and which frankly have very limited 26 a deployment and which frankly have very limited 27 sir, as far as corporate police progression, if 28 litigation of wrongdoing within a broader context of what the eculture was at the 29 organisation at the time, and what was nother. 21	16	to have occurred outside deployment, we make the	16	
sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would moreover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officer's are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. within a broader context of what the culture was and what was not call it broadly force orders, and so on and so forth. All of those issues fall to be considered by the latiropady force orders, and so on and so forth. All of those issues fall to be considered by the Inquiry. THE CHAIR: Certainly they do. Page 23 MR BRANDON: Sir, it is a point, sir, you have made of course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special officers service and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special outs	17	following very short submissions.	17	quite sure that this point has been made many times, is
bas and from the multiple witnesses that it will no doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of 22 undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, 23 to seek evidence of bad character arising from 24 misconduct which may arise outside the period of their 25 deployment. To seek that information, we say, would 26 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 3 impact upon its achievability. If allegations of 4 wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of 5 of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite 8 litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of 9 wrongdoing which may be many years before or after 10 a deployment and which frankly have very limited 11 relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 12 Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if 13 Lanc all it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there 14 should be investigation of post Special Demonstration 15 Squad carers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. 17 Sir, you have already identified the significant 18 practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say 19 also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It 20 assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officer's are aware of the Special 22 Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. 25 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 32 A green and so it relies on a number of false assumptions. It 24 Inquiry. 26 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 34 All of those issues fall to be considered by the 18 Inquiry. 27 THE CHAIR: 18 apoint, sir, you have as secret of officers deployment and what was and so in call it the information, as on an also on an also on an any so on an ande of a course, would are the incuity of an officer is a significant step which needs and indivi	18	First, we say there is likely to be more than	18	to assess that individual allegation of wrongdoing
doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 Droaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration and post of the progress of individual officers accused of wrongdoing to individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration in the practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say. Mr BRANDON: Sir, it is a point, sir, you have made of course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply to reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say THE CHAIR: I agree. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I	19	sufficient evidence on the documents that the Inquiry	19	within a broader context of what the culture was at the
undercover officers' accounts without the need, really, to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the Special Demonstration of Squad at all, aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the Special Demonstration of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration of the individual offi	20	has and from the multiple witnesses that it will no	20	organisation at the time, and what was and what was not
to seek evidence of bad character arising from misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 Demonstration Squad was a secret branch of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if squad at all, aware of the allegations of determine whether they were permitted to progress. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make All of those issues fall to be considered by the laquiry. THE CHAIR: Certainly they do. Page 23 MR BRANDON: Sir, it is a point, sir, you have made of course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Poles evervice, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment.	21	doubt hear accounts from to assess the credibility of	21	known by senior management, what was within, if I can
misconduct which may arise outside the period of their deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 Droaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it ummanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 11	22	undercover officers' accounts without the need, really,	22	call it broadly force orders, and so on and so forth.
25 deployment. To seek that information, we say, would Page 21 1 broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of 2 reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would 3 impact upon its achievability. If allegations of 4 wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the 5 undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations 6 of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we 7 would face the prospect of potentially satellite 8 litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of 9 wrongdoing which may be many years before or after 10 a deployment and which frankly have very limited 11 relevance to the core task of the inquiry. 12 Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if 13 I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there 14 should be investigation of post Special Demonstration 15 Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to 16 determine whether they were permitted to progress. 17 Sir, you have already identified the significant 18 practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say 19 also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It 20 assumes that those responsible for the progression of 21 individual officers are aware of the Special 22 Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of 23 wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised 24 that it constituted wrongdoing. 25 THE CHAIR: Certainly they do. Page 23 1 MR BRANDON: Sir, it is a point, sir, you have made of course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the 4 Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. 15 Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real	23	to seek evidence of bad character arising from	23	All of those issues fall to be considered by the
broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if 1 Can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I lagree. MR BRANDON: Thank you is in a point, sir, you have made of course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Polices Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration of post post incidents of alone be alone be assessed whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify	24	misconduct which may arise outside the period of their	24	Inquiry.
broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of migrat upon its achievability. If allegations of the wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite to officers outside the surrough which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to release of real names. The decision to disclose the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The CHAIR: I agree. Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Scruce, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad to take taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behavior was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we s	25	deployment. To seek that information, we say, would	25	THE CHAIR: Certainly they do.
broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of migrat upon its achievability. If allegations of the wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite to officers outside the surrough which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to a deployment and which frankly have very limited to release of real names. The decision to disclose the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The CHAIR: I agree. Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Scruce, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad to take taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behavior was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we s				
reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad wild between the should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: Tank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of		Page 21		Page 23
reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad wild between the should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: Tank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of				
impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited lit relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if litigation in trials, within trials, over incidents of should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It midividual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited trelevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, was far as corporate police progression, if a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	1	broaden the scope of the Inquiry beyond its terms of	1	MR BRANDON: Sir it is a point sir you have made of
wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of worngdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if l can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It midvidual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. Wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration be determine whet would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surpri				
of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It permonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. 5 certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would	2	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret
of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It practical difficulties with those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make officers outside the Special Demonstration tale when what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of	2 3	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the
would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It midvidual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the	2 3 4	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were
litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations	2 3 4 5	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other
wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if 1 can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. We say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make	2 3 4 5 6	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we	2 3 4 5 6	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would
a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It practical difficulties with those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite	2 3 4 5 6 7	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let
relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. In sleads me to perhaps the core point that I make Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that
Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of cindividual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. I a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of
I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment.
should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify
Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the
determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make 16 their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. 17 THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the
Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make ir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which
practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and
also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists,
assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make 21 Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree.
Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir.
wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing. This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you.
that it constituted wrongdoing. 24 status, importance and weight in the most general of 25 This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make 26 terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not?
This leads me to perhaps the core point that I make 25 terms to be given to assurances expressed or implied of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the
Page 22 Page 24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reference. It would make it unmanageable. It would impact upon its achievability. If allegations of wrongdoing are made that arise from a period outside the undercover officer's deployment, then those allegations of course would have to be assessed by you, sir, and we would face the prospect of potentially satellite litigation, trials within trials, over incidents of wrongdoing which may be many years before or after a deployment and which frankly have very limited relevance to the core task of the inquiry. Sir, as far as corporate police progression, if I can call it that, Ms Kaufmann has submitted there should be investigation of post Special Demonstration Squad careers of officers accused of wrongdoing to determine whether they were permitted to progress. Sir, you have already identified the significant practical difficulties with this proposal, but we say also it relies on a number of false assumptions. It assumes that those responsible for the progression of individual officers are aware of the Special Demonstration Squad at all, aware of the allegations of wrongdoing which may have been made or even recognised that it constituted wrongdoing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	course, the Special Demonstration Squad was a secret branch. Its activities were not known within the Metropolitan Police Service, individual deployments were certainly secret and there is simply no reason why other officers outside the Special Demonstration Squad would have known what would have taken place within it, let alone be in a position to be able to assess whether that behaviour was appropriate during the course of an individual officer's deployment. Sir, we say the reasons given can't justify a principle of general application supporting the release of real names. The decision to disclose the real identity of an officer is a significant step which necessarily increases the risk to those individuals and their families and the justification, if any exists, sir, must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. THE CHAIR: I agree. MR BRANDON: Thank you sir. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr Sanders next, I think, is it not? Mr Sanders, I read your written submissions with a degree of surprise, because the issue about the status, importance and weight in the most general of

1	confidentiality has already been dealt with in	1	individual cases. Which will involve different factors
2	Sir Christopher's rulings and I was not minded to depart	2	and the weight to be given to them all depends on the
3	from them. I'm not at all sure whether you are urging	3	individual case.
4	me to do so or not?	4	MR SANDERS: Sir, absolutely.
5	MR SANDERS: No, sir. Of course we weren't established at	5	My submission is that that submission is the
6	the time of the hearing and the ruling last year	6	departure from the principles in approach ruling.
7	THE CHAIR: No.	7	There is an important point that I think that having
8	MR SANDERS: so to a certain extent, we are taking our	8	heard the oral submissions yesterday and today, when we
9	seat a bit late and I understand that in doing that	9	refer in our submissions to expectations and obligations
10	other people have to stand up and there is a bit of	10	of confidentiality, we are going beyond simply that
11	grumbling and then we sort of occupy our place.	11	issue in terms of section 19(4)(c). So in your
12	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police designated	12	assessment of questions of harm and damage, one material
13	lawyers by MR SANDERS	13	consideration in terms of the statute is conditions of
14	MR SANDERS: I don't urge you to depart from the principles	14	confidentiality.
15	in approach ruling.	15	When we refer to the expectations the reasonable
16	I do have a submission to make that Ms Kaufmann and	16	expectations of former undercover officers we are not
17	Mr Bunting in his written submissions have put	17	looking at it in that narrow context, we are looking at
18	a particular gloss on it which isn't justified. So to	18	it in the broader context of their reasonable
19	be absolutely clear, I'm not, as Ms Kaufmann said,	19	expectations as a matter of fairness and as a matter of
20	urging you to sideline openness. We recognise openness	20	article 8 and so on. In my submission, the mistake that
21	as a factor in favour of disclosure, and we recognise	21	Ms Kaufmann makes is to read the part of
22	that it has weight. That obviously needs to be assessed	22	Sir Christopher's ruling on section 19(4) (c) as being
23	in context, bearing in mind the type of proceeding and	23	somehow dispositive of all of that package of rights and
24	so on.	24	interests. In my submission that's not right and that's
25	But my submission is that the expectations of former	25	not the correct reading of it.
	Page 25		Page 27
	O		O
1	undercover officers and the obligations owed to them	1	I would just like to take you very briefly to that
			Just to thirt you rely ey to thin
2	also have a particular weight, an in-built weight, and	2	part of the ruling
2 3	also have a particular weight, an in-built weight, and that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that		
		2	part of the ruling
3	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that	2 3	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly.
3 4	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined.	2 3 4	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else.
3 4 5	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover	2 3 4 5 6 7	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162.
3 4 5 6	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to	2 3 4 5 6	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry".
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of personal injury level which could justify a restriction	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165: "I have indicated that in my view section 19(4)(c)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of personal injury level which could justify a restriction order.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165: "I have indicated that in my view section 19(4)(c)"
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of personal injury level which could justify a restriction order. THE CHAIR: She did make that submission, I am not persuaded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165: "I have indicated that in my view section 19(4)(c)" So that is the context:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of personal injury level which could justify a restriction order. THE CHAIR: She did make that submission, I am not persuaded by it. I think we have, as I have said repeatedly, to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165: "I have indicated that in my view section 19(4)(c)" So that is the context: " is couched in terms wide enough to embrace
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of personal injury level which could justify a restriction order. THE CHAIR: She did make that submission, I am not persuaded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165: "I have indicated that in my view section 19(4)(c)" So that is the context:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that Ms Kaufmann falls into error in suggesting that that falls to be sidelined. She says first that the expectations of undercover officers will automatically and always give way to the interests of openness. THE CHAIR: I don't think she does say that. If she were to do it, I would not agree with her. But I don't think she does say it. MR SANDERS: Essentially, my understanding of the submissions yesterday was that Neither Confirm Nor Deny went in the bin and the expectations of former undercover police officers followed swiftly afterwards. THE CHAIR: That may be where she wishes to put them, but it is not my view at the moment. MR SANDERS: I am grateful, sir. Apologies, Ms Kaufmann then went on to suggest in effect that it is only a risk of physical harm or serious psychiatric/psychological injury of the kind of personal injury level which could justify a restriction order. THE CHAIR: She did make that submission, I am not persuaded by it. I think we have, as I have said repeatedly, to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	part of the ruling THE CHAIR: Certainly. MR SANDERS: and to nothing else. I think it is authorities bundle 7, tab 141. There is a subheading on page 60 of 85, just above paragraph 162. THE CHAIR: Yes. For anybody who is looking, it is actually tab 140. MR SANDERS: Apologies. Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Give me the page reference again, please? MR SANDERS: 60 of 85. Just above paragraph 162 there is the subheading there "Any conditions as to confidentiality subject to which a person acquired information that he is to give or has given to the Inquiry". That is obviously a reference to the provision in section 19(4)(c). Then what follows is Sir Christopher's analysis of the considerations arising under that heading. We see at paragraph 165: "I have indicated that in my view section 19(4)(c)" So that is the context: " is couched in terms wide enough to embrace

1 evidence that will be provided by undercover officers to 1 put to one side. 2 2 the Inquiry, not just confidential information given to One has to bear in mind the extent to which the 3 the police services that they will provide to the 3 individual officers on a case-by-case basis would have 4 Inquiry in documentary form." 4 understood their expectations to be capable of being 5 Then he goes on: 5 qualified. In the case of Special Demonstration Squad 6 "Subject to evidence I may receive, it seems to me 6 officers, my submission is they had a very strong likely that undercover officers will have embarked on 7 7 expectation that they would not be identified. 8 their roles with a strong expectation that their 8 Sir Christopher referred to civil or criminal trials, 9 employers would do everything that they properly could 9 which obviously we are not in the context of a civil or 10 to protect them from public exposure." 10 criminal trial, but the expectation would be that if it Then there is a reference in the context of the 11 11 came to criminal proceedings, the officer's evidence 12 Special Demonstration Squad, the distinction between the 12 would not be relied upon. They would either be -- there 13 evidential and the intelligence-gathering roles. Then 13 would either be a public interest immunity claim or the 14 he says: 14 prosecution itself would be dropped. 15 "However ..." 15 In terms of expectation, it would be that criminal 16 In my submission this "however" has been 16 proceedings would not lead to public identification or 17 misconstrued by Ms Kaufmann to mean that at this point 17 exposure and the same with civil proceedings, there 18 Sir Christopher was really setting aside as essentially 18 would be a PII claim, there would be a settlement or, 19 non-factors the expectations of former undercover police 19 failing that, there would be some kind of order for 20 officers, because he goes on to say: 20 anonymity and screening as one sees often in inquests 21 "However, I'm inclined to accept the submission made 21 involving the police and so on. 22 22 to me by Mr Emmerson QC that any assurance or I accept entirely these expectations and obligations 23 understanding, even in the case of a Special 23 are qualified, but it is the extent to which they are 24 Demonstration Squad officer, must have been qualified 24 qualified. In my submission that qualification does not 25 and could not have been absolute, for the very good 25 mean they essentially fall away in the face of the Page 29 Page 31 reason every police officer is aware of the supremacy of 1 1 interests of openness and transparency. 2 a judicial decision on disclosure should the officer 2 THE CHAIR: I do not understand Sir Christopher to have so 3 3 find that his activities have become relevant to a civil ruled. 4 or criminal trial." 4 MR SANDERS: No, and that is my submission. 5 Then: 5 It is my submission that Ms Kaufmann when she puts 6 "This reservation will apply with particular force 6 that spin or that gloss on this part of the ruling and 7 7 to officers whose undercover activity was conducted for then says, "These expectations, obligations, are 8 the purpose of acquiring evidence." 8 effectively peripheral matters", that that is wrong. q 9 That as a proposition we don't dispute at all. Of Then at 165, as he goes on, he tales about: 10 course the expectations of former undercover officers, 10 "While an expectation of confidentiality is both 11 expectations of anonymity and confidentiality could not 11 material and weighty consideration it is not likely, 12 be considered absolute. There is no such thing as an 12 except in unusual circumstances, to make the difference 13 absolute obligation of confidence. There must be 13 between disclosure and non-disclosure if disclosure is 14 limits. And of course they would have understood that 14 necessary in the fair pursuit of fulfilment of the terms 15 if there was a court order requiring their 15 of reference." 16 identification then the Metropolitan Police Service 16 In my submission that again is important. It is if 17 17 would have no option but to comply with that, but in my disclosure is necessary in the interests of fulfilment 18 submission that recognition of the fact that these 18 of the terms of reference. 19 obligations and expectations are inevitably qualified 19 THE CHAIR: He did however go on in the next paragraph to 20 doesn't mean -- it is not some sort of key that one 20 say that he considered that: 21 turns and then they just fall away as a factor. They 21 "... an expectation of confidentiality, while both 22 remain in play and in my submission they remain very 22 material and weighty is not likely, ordinarily, to make 23 weighty and important considerations. 23 the difference between disclose and non-disclosure if 24 It is a misreading of this passage to suggest that 24 disclosure is necessary for the fair pursuit of 25 25 in some way Mr Emmerson's submission led to them being fulfilment of the terms of reference." Page 30 Page 32

1	MD CANIDEDG Device by the 14 in the High share High	1	
1	MR SANDERS: Precisely, sir. It is the "if" there, "if	1	period of time.
2	necessary".	2	I accept in relation to HN321, HN330 and HN333 they
3	THE CHAIR: Yes.	3	weren't individuals who undertook this role for a long
4	MR SANDERS: The point I emphasise as well is that this is	4	period of time. So that part of the picture is not as
5	in the context of section 19(4)(c), and my submissions	5	heavy in their case as it may be in other cases. But
6	on expectations and obligations of confidentiality go	6	undertaking this work entailed restrictions on what they
7	beyond that and are bound up with the package of rights	7	could disclose about their work and about their lives.
8	and interests that undercover officers, former	8	In the case of these police officers, two who are in
9	undercover officers, have as a matter of article 8.	9	their 70s, one who is in his 80s
10	It is not the case that Sir Christopher was saying,	10	THE CHAIR: Can we deal with them as individuals when we
11	"Well, they are there, but they are qualified and	11	deal with their cases?
12	therefore we just put them to one side and forget about	12	MR SANDERS: We can do. Just in relation to article 8
13	them". They are very much in the mix and in my	13	and I won't sort of spend long on it in terms of the
14	submission they have a very powerful in-built weight on	14	factors that I say are important and they may play out
15	the other side of the scales to the openness.	15	differently for the individuals, the fact that you then
16	So I'm not urging you to put aside or depart from	16	go on and in living your life you, yourself, have to
17	the ruling, I'm simply making a targeted submission	17	keep certain things secret, and you yourself have to
18	about what is the effect of paragraphs 165 and 166. And	18	take precautions about the extent to which you can have
19	when one comes to the conclusion, obligations,	19	a public profile and so on, is important in
20	expectations of confidentiality are at A8, B1, B2 and	20	an assessment of the article 8 interests in play. There
21	C4. So they are still there.	21	were consequences for these individuals in terms of
22	They go, in my submission, not only to harm and	22	where they could live and so on.
23	damage but also to the Inquiry's obligation under	23	In my submission, as you alluded to earlier, sir, it
24	section 19(3)(a), which then imports section 6 of the	24	is a question of the obligations and the expectations
25	Human Rights Act, which imports article 8 of the	25	being mutual. The state says to these individuals, "We
	Page 33		Page 35
1	Convention.	1	want you to undertake this work".
2	These are obviously general submissions, but I am	2	The state takes the benefit in terms of the
3	only here today on behalf of HN321, HN330 and HN333, but	3	intelligence of them undertaking that work. The state
4	coming to article 8 and the factors which weigh against	4	says to them, "You are not allowed to talk about it" and
5	public identification of these individuals, I make the	5	the state also says, whether impliedly or expressly,
6	submission that one has to look beyond Ms Kaufmann's	6	"You won't be exposed as a result".
7	physical harm, psychological/psychiatric harm, to the	7	All of that is bound up with article 8, with these
8	rights and interests that are protected by article 8.	8	individuals having lived their lives subsequently on
9	It is well established that article 8 is concerned	9	that basis.
10	with the autonomy of the individual, the extent to which	10	In my submission for the state now to say, "Well, we
11	they have control over their identity, their private	11	are going to have a public inquiry about that and that's
12	life and their family life.	12	all changed, sorry", isn't acceptable unless there is
13	In my submission, in that regard it is very	13	some credible allegation of misconduct or wrongdoing,
14	important to keep in mind the effect on the undercover	14	which in the case of these three officers there isn't.
15	police officers of undertaking this work on behalf of	15	In my submission, Ms Kaufmann drew the analogy
16	the state. Undertaking undercover work was not simply	16	yesterday of Harvey Weinstein. On behalf of my clients
17	a choice between traffic and ports; it's a very	17	it is just simply completely inapposite. There is no
18	particular unique type of work which carries with it	18	suggestion that my clients have done anything
19	particular and unique stresses that the individual in	19	approaching what Harvey Weinstein did and so therefore
20	the short term has to undergo while they undertake that	20	tough luck therefore tough luck your family then have
21	work.	21	to sort of take the consequences of publicity and so on.
22	Also, as we say in our submissions, it has	22	In relation to these individuals that is simply not
		1	the case and it is not an apposite analogy. One has to
23	a life-changing effect on individuals and their	23	the case and it is not an apposite analogy. One has to
	a life-changing effect on individuals and their identities, because of the effect of having to assume	23	bear in mind of course the terms of reference of the
23			
23 24	identities, because of the effect of having to assume	24	bear in mind of course the terms of reference of the

1	policing from 1968 onwards. It is not the case that	1	provide it. That forms the basis of this area of public
2	simply because there is this Inquiry in relation to	2	interest immunity and the protection that in all
3	these issues everyone who worked in an undercover	3	common law jurisdictions is given to confidential
4	capacity during that period is liable unless there is	4	informants.
5	some very strong reason in terms of physical harm,	5	THE CHAIR: It does when those who are not employed by the
6	psychiatric harm to be identified.	6	state are invited to provide information to it. All
7	In relation to the Special Demonstration Squad in	7	state agencies worldwide, including our own, provide
8	this period, concerned with, for these clients, the late	8	near absolute promises about that. But we are not
9	1960s, there has been no allegations not simply in	9	actually dealing with that situation precisely here.
10	relation to these individuals but in relation to	10	MR SANDERS: We are not, but in my submission the general
11	anyone	11	proposition holds good, because we are talking about
12	THE CHAIR: Again, can we please discuss those matters in	12	individuals providing information for the state. Now
13	relation to individual officers?	13	whether they are doing it on a salaried basis or in
14	MR SANDERS: Sir, yes.	14	return for one-off payments or for free, they will want
15	One point, just as a generic point, not limited to	15	to know that their confidentiality will be protected.
16	the officers, is the question of recruitment and	16	If an individual hears the fact that there is
17	retention and the impact which in our submission is	17	a public inquiry into a particular area means that may
18	a relevant consideration for you, the impact on future	18	fall away, then that will have a bearing on their
19	recruitment and retention of not just undercover police	19	decision-making. So someone who is being approached by
20	officers but of all covert human intelligence sources	20	MI5 to provide information, if they think, well, maybe
21	who might give information to confidential informants.	21	there is going to be a public inquiry no one would
22	There is evidence before you, sir, in the risk	22	have thought there would have been this public inquiry
23	assessment briefing note we have given the references	23	as Ms Kaufmann accepted and all bets may be off, then
24	in the skeleton argument and in the statement of	24	that may influence their thinking.
25	Cairo. You have now also seen the statement of	25	We say that for that reason these expectations and
	Page 37		Page 39
			3
1	Mr Pughsley, which provides further evidence about that	1	obligations going beyond simply section 19(4)(c) have
2	and endorses the evidence of Cairo.	2	a powerful in-built weight and we draw the analogy with
3	THE CHAIR: I think both you and I would be wise not to make	3	the expectations and obligations arising in the case of
4	any general assertions about it, after the debate that	4	journalist's sources. Of course they are qualified, but
5	I had with Ms Kaufmann yesterday I learnt something that	5	that doesn't mean because they are qualified they are
6	suggests that she might be right and I might be wrong.	6	easily set aside.
7	MR SANDERS: I obviously can't address you on that.	7	THE CHAIR: No, but there is a difference. Exactly what
8	THE CHAIR: Of course you can't. But that is one of the	8	impact it has remains to be worked out, but there is
9	aspects of this Inquiry. Things keep on arriving which	9	a difference between people who provide information to
10	cause one to rethink decisions that you were reasonably	10	the state or as you rightly remind me to the media who
11	confident about when they were made. Facts change, I'm	11	are given an expectation of confidence by those to whom
12	not going to repeat Maynard Keynes's statement, but	12	they provide the information, and those who are working
13	everybody knows what it is.	13	for the state or for that matter for the media who
14	MR SANDERS: My apologies, sir?	14	gather information.
15	THE CHAIR: I'm not going to repeat Maynard Keynes's	15	MR SANDERS: Yes. I entirely agree there is a difference,
16	statement about facts and changing, but everybody knows	16	but it doesn't mean that in this case those obligations
17	what it is.	17	and expectations can just be set aside. They are
18	MR SANDERS: Yes. I thought perhaps another witness to the	18	important and their frustration without good reason
19	Inquiry	19	without there being any suggestion that the individual
20	THE CHAIR: No, Lord Keynes.	20	did something that the state did not ask them to do
21	MR SANDERS: In our submission there is powerful supportive	21	in my submission would have dangerous consequences.
22	evidence before the Inquiry. It is a matter of common	22	THE CHAIR: I would hold your fire on that for the time
23	sense, it is self-evident, if individuals do not have	23	being until all of the evidence on that issue is
24	confidence that their anonymity will be maintained if	24	disclosed to the extent it can be, and I think a certain
25	they provide information to the state, then they won't	25	amount can be.
25			
23	Page 38		Page 40

1	MR SANDERS: I am grateful.	1	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
2	Sir, that is all I want to say on the generality.	2	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN16
3	I understand you are then going to take each one in	3	MS KAUFMANN: Sir, we are dealing with HN16.
4	turn, sir.	4	THE CHAIR: Yes.
5	THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much.	5	MS KAUFMANN: Can we start with your minded to note at
6	Mr O'Connor?	6	tab 9, it is the October minded to note, where you set
7	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, we have put in some very short written	7	out your reasons for being minded to disclose the cover
8	submissions. There is nothing I want to say to add.	8	name but not the real name.
9	THE CHAIR: Thank you.	9	THE CHAIR: Yes.
10	Mr Griffin?	10	MS KAUFMANN: In paragraph 2, when identifying why you are
11	MR GRIFFIN: Sir I have no submissions at this stage.	11	minded to disclose the cover name, you identify why it
12	Indeed my name can come off the list of counsel as you	12	is necessary to do so. Then you balance that against
13	now move on to consider the applications.	13	what you say is a small risk of significant interference
14	THE CHAIR: I shall put a line through it, thank you.	14	with the right to respect for private life if it leads
15	The shorthand writers do need a break and 11.30 is	15	to the revelation of his real name.
16	about the usual time we have it. Would it be convenient	16	THE CHAIR: Yes.
17	now? Let's do it.	17	MS KAUFMANN: We, as you will know, sir, are concerned
18	Ms Kaufmann, can you give me an indication of which	18	obviously with the disclosure of the real name, we are
19	one we are going to start with?	19	obviously happy that you are minded to disclose the
20	MS KAUFMANN: The order that was set out by the Inquiry. It	20	cover name. Taking that as a starting point, we take
21	is going to be HN16.	21	from that, that should the real name be disclosed that
22	THE CHAIR: Numerical order, splendid.	22	will carry a risk of interference with his article 8
23	(11.30 am)	23	rights or her article 8 rights.
24	(A short break)	24	What I want to do is try to trace through, insofar
25	(11.42 am)	25	as we are able given the limited disclosure, what the
	Page 41		Page 43
			1 480 10
1	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, can I just say something before we	1	nature of such risks might or might not be.
2	begin. As we are about to embark on submissions which	2	In tab 3 of the anonymity applications bundle, we
3	deal with real individuals, the possibility that one of	3	have the applicant to this officer's behalf by Slater &
4	us may say something which should not be said publicly	4	Gordon. In paragraph 14 we move on to issues related to
5	at this stage of the Inquiry exists.	5	interference with article 8 rights.
6	Can I remind everybody therefore of the formal order	6	At paragraph 16 it is said that:
7	that is in place and applies to today's hearing as to	7	"His or her application for restriction orders if it
8	every other one. There shall be a delay of not less	8	is refused is likely to lead to the kind of intrusion
9	than two minutes between any words spoken or information	9	suffered by Bob Lambert."
10	given in the hearing room and any communication or	10	Who we all know about.
11	publication of those words or information using Twitter,	11	That is the first issue that I would like to address
12	other social media or any other means of communication.	12	briefly. If it does lead to the kind of interference
13	For the avoidance of doubt, this delay applies to any	13	that Bob Lambert suffered, and it is because there is an
14	words spoken or information given in the hearing of any	14	allegation that this particular officer engaged in
15	kind, given that we are not hearing evidence today.	15	wrongdoing, then for the reasons that we addressed
16	There shall be no communication or publication by	16	yesterday there is nothing wrong with that. That is
17	any means of any words spoken or information given which	17	something to which he can quite properly be subjected if
18	any person has indicated should not have been revealed	18	he was engaged in wrongdoing.
19	in public, until such time as the objection to its	19	If there is no evidence that this officer engaged in
20	publication is withdrawn or I have ruled upon it.	20	any wrongdoing, then our submission is that assessment
21	Subject to all of that, it is of course permissible	21	is wrong. Because it is extremely unlikely that any
22	to use Twitter and social media from within the hearing	22	officer in relation to whom there is no concern, once
22 23	to use Twitter and social media from within the hearing room to report on any part of the proceedings, provided	23	names are disclosed, that they engaged in wrongdoing, it
22 23 24	to use Twitter and social media from within the hearing room to report on any part of the proceedings, provided of course it doesn't involve photography.	23 24	names are disclosed, that they engaged in wrongdoing, it is extremely unlikely they are going to be subjected to
22 23	to use Twitter and social media from within the hearing room to report on any part of the proceedings, provided	23	names are disclosed, that they engaged in wrongdoing, it
22 23 24	to use Twitter and social media from within the hearing room to report on any part of the proceedings, provided of course it doesn't involve photography.	23 24	names are disclosed, that they engaged in wrongdoing, it is extremely unlikely they are going to be subjected to

1	a sense of betrayal and anger at what the particular	1	cover has been blown how they feel about that. But,
2	officer did.	2	again, what we are talking about in terms of the likely
3	So then the next issue that is addressed so our	3	reaction once that is known, it is not harassment, but
4	submission is that that risk is not a basis for	4	it is an understandable
5	non-disclosure of the real name.	5	THE CHAIR: You appear, therefore, I think, to assert that
6	THE CHAIR: I'm trying to choose my words carefully.	6	engaging in a I call it confidential relationship, not
7	What you mean by "wrongdoing" and what I understand	7	sexual, with somebody for the purpose of the deployment
8	by "wrongdoing" in the context we are both discussing	8	could amount to wrongdoing?
9	are not necessarily the same. I think it may be helpful	9	MS KAUFMANN: Let me be careful to distinguish what is
10	if you would clarify what you assert is wrongdoing.	10	wrongdoing for purposes of the Inquiry and what is
11	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. So if it came to light, for example,	11	considered to be a wrong in a personal sense for the
12	that this officer had intimate sexual relationships with	12	person affected.
13	women upon whom he was spying, or if it came to light	13	THE CHAIR: Yes.
14	that this officer was engaged in on the face of it	14	MS KAUFMANN: So for the individual affected, they have an
15	racist undercover policing of justice groups, then it is	15	incredibly I mean this happened to lots of
16	likely that there will be a good measure of opprobrium	16	individuals, they had a very, very close relationship
17	in relation to those activities.	17	with somebody who they thought was a true friend, a true
18	It is possible that the individuals who were	18	confidante. So in terms of their own sense of
19	affected would want to confront that officer with their	19	wrongdoing, whether or not the Inquiry considers at the
20	wrongdoing, would want to go and meet them and address	20	end of the day, and we can't gainsay what you will
21	it and ask about it	21	consider, that it was appropriate to develop these
22	THE CHAIR: Forgive me, I was not asking what they might do,	22	relationships over years and years and years. Let's
23 24	but what is understood by "wrongdoing" in your submission?	23 24	imagine your conclusion was it was appropriate, it doesn't stop that individual feeling deeply, deeply
25	MS KAUFMANN: The mere fact of being an undercover police	25	betrayed.
23	Wis KAOTWANN. The filere fact of being all undercover police	23	ochayed.
	Page 45		Page 47
,	CC i- and in and a City-1Clif-day, manifely day	,	The acception is about 4 deat in distinct and about 4
1	officer is not in and of itself likely to result in that	1	The question is should that individual and should
2 3	kind of Bob Lambert confrontation. THE CHAIR: It can't be categorised as wrongdoing full stop	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\3 \end{vmatrix}$	that individual's desire to confront an individual in a nonviolent, nonthreatening way, to say, "You know,
4	as a matter of definition, can it?	4	this was deeply meaningful to me, do you know what
5	MS KAUFMANN: No.	5	impact it has had upon me?" Is that something they
6	THE CHAIR: So sexual relationships, racist attitudes	6	shouldn't be confronted by? In our submission, no.
7	displayed in the course of informing on justice groups.	7	THE CHAIR: From what you said to me, I think it is your
8	Is there anything else?	8	submission that it is not merely what would objectively
9	MS KAUFMANN: For example if it came to light that	9	be regarded as wrongdoing, but also a sense of betrayal
10	an individual officer might have been involved in	10	not arising from wrongdoing that might give rise to
11	circumstances that led to a miscarriage of justice, that	11	a wish to confront the individual officer?
12	is another instance where it is liable to cause	12	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
13	opprobrium.	13	THE CHAIR: That is ordinary human nature, I readily
14	THE CHAIR: Forgive me for pressing but I want to have the	14	understand it.
15	categories identified as concrete examples so I can then	15	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. If that is all we are talking about,
16	respond and deal with them in a way which addresses the	16	then in our submission that is that expression of
17	concrete examples on which you rely.	17	ordinary human nature is readily understandable,
18	We have three so far. Are there any others? If you	18	entirely appropriate and is not something or the risk of
19	think of others and want to express others later I'm not	19	it is not something that should cause this Inquiry to
20	stopping you.	20	say, "Real names should not be disclosed, officers
21	MS KAUFMANN: One possibility I can think of is that	21	should be protected from that".
22	individuals who had very, very close personal but	22	In circumstances where if it has not happened it is
23	non-intimate relationships could feel incredibly	23	extremely unlikely that anything is going to happen to
24	betrayed as a consequence and therefore may want to draw	24	the particular officer.
25	to the attention of the undercover police officer whose	25	I should say there are other areas of potential
		1	
	Page 46		Page 48

1	wrongdoing, blacklisting is another area.	1	Then there is, at tab 10, paragraph 3, this is
2	THE CHAIR: This is in the industrial field?	2	further written submissions of 11 October, and here in
3	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, if it has become clear that an officer's	3	addition to risks said to arise in relation to physical
4	undercover situation has led to blacklisting of	4	harm, which have obviously been discounted by yourself,
5	individuals.	5	there is at 3:
6	As well as officer's conduct leading to	6	"A real risk of loss of HN16's employment and
7	miscarriages, if there is evidence that the officers	7	reputation."
8	themselves have engaged in criminal activity in some	8	In relation to the risk of the loss of his
9	sort of joint enterprise or encouraged others into	9	employment, again I mean we can say absolutely nothing
10	criminal activity, that would obviously be an issue of	10	there. We don't know what he's doing, we don't know how
11	concern.	11	realistic
12	Then another issue of concern is where officers have	12	THE CHAIR: You don't know he's a he.
13	built relationships with the children of protesters.	13	MS KAUFMANN: We don't. We don't. I assume most of them
14	Again that is just another instance of where there	14	are hes, but we know not all of them are hes. But don't
15	having done so is going to cause an understandable	15	know whether he or she, what he or she is doing, so
16	natural human reaction of pain, betrayal and anger.	16	I can't make any meaningful representations on this.
17	If going back to paragraph 16 the likely	17	Again, in circumstances where it is not going to
18	attention from protesters who might find out the name is	18	lead to his identification, I again raise the question
19	going to be no graver than is said there, that is the	19	of why we cannot be told more and the basis upon which
20	risk of a Bob Lambert reaction, then in our submission	20	it is said that it would lead to his loss of
21	for the reasons given that is not a reason not to	21	employment
22	disclose real names.	22	THE CHAIR: Forgive me. Your submission, though, doesn't go
23	The next issue in relation to HN16 is risk of	23	to cover name where you support the decision that I am
24	psychological harm. In paragraph 17, of the same	24	minded to make?
25	document we are told the risk is high. We have	25	MS KAUFMANN: Absolutely, we are focusing here on real name.
	Page 49		Page 51
1	absolutely no disclosure in relation to the basis upon	1	THE CHAIR: We are focusing here on real name, in which case
2	which that assessment is made. We have, in tab 7,	2	this part of your submission doesn't with respect make
3	a so-called gisted report of sorry, tab 7 of	3	sense.
4	Dr Walter Busuttil I'm not sure how to pronounce his	4	If disclosing the nature of the risk to HN16's
5	name, for which I apologise:	5	employment will not lead to his identification, what
6	"Report includes opinion that should HN16's cover,	6	possible purpose can it serve in considering whether or
7	undercover and true identity be revealed medical issues	7	not the real name of HN16 should be published?
8	will become more severe."	8	MS KAUFMANN: Sir, I think we might be talking at
9	That leaves us absolutely no wiser than we were	9	cross-purposes.
10	without that information. How severe are they now?	10	THE CHAIR: I think we might be.
11	What does "more severe" mean? We obviously can't make	11	MS KAUFMANN: This has been put forward by this officer's
12	any meaningful representations on that, and that brings	12	representatives as a reason for not disclosing his real
13	us to a point that I touched upon yesterday, which is	13	name, because if his real name was disclosed, it is
14	that in our submission the medical confidentiality,	14	said, he will lose his employment.
15	which obviously arises is not a reason in and of itself	15	THE CHAIR: Could we possibly refer to HN16 as HN16?
16	for this Inquiry to say there can be no disclosure	16	It is very difficult avoid doing so, but HN16 has
17	whatsoever of an individual's medical	17	not been identified as a man or a woman, it is simply
18	THE CHAIR: I think I can offer you some reassurance about	18	HN16.
19	this issue.	19	MS KAUFMANN: HN16's representatives are saying that if
20	I have of course seen the full report and I am	20	HN16's identity is disclosed, HN16 will lose her or her
21	satisfied, subject to any submissions that may be made	21	employment.
22	on other sides, that the risk to health is not such as	22	THE CHAIR: Yes.
23	to amount to a major factor in the balancing exercise.	23	MS KAUFMANN: I am seeking to address you on whether or not
24	MS KAUFMANN: I am grateful for that. So if we can discount	24	that factor which weighs in the balance against
25	that then.	25	disclosure of the real name is one that you should take
	Page 50		Page 52
	1 age 30		1 age 32

1	into account as a reason not to disclose the real name.	1	On which point I should say that we wanted to
2	This is on the back of all my submissions yesterday	2	endorse your proposed approach outlined yesterday, that
3	about there is no presumption and so forth	3	it should be the Inquiry team's job to deal with
4	THE CHAIR: It is, surely you would concede, a relevant	4	redactions in the first instance.
5	factor?	5	THE CHAIR: Yes. That is a suggestion I made one of
6	MS KAUFMANN: Absolutely. So the point I am making is	6	two for improving or streamlining the Inquiry's
7	I cannot make any meaningful submissions to you about	7	processes.
8	the weight to be given to this factor, because I don't	8	MS KAUFMANN: We would endorse that approach.
9	know anything about the nature of the employment,	9	On this specific point, this is in a sense an
10	I don't know anything about whether or not this	10	example of this in action. Why could the Inquiry team
11	particular employment is something that this particular	11	not simply look at this material and reach a conclusion
12	officer will be unable to engage in elsewhere should	12	about whether or not the identification of this
13	that officer's employment be lost and so forth.	13	particular individual officer is going to be risked by
14	The point I am making goes back to the issues of	14	disclosure of the nature of their employment and the
15	disclosure. If this officer and disclosure of the	15	reasons why they think they are going to lose their
16	nature of the employment of this officer is not going to	16	employment and make that disclosure if you conclude
17	put this officer's identity at risk, then we do not see	17	there won't be such a risk.
18	why we cannot have some further disclosure about the	18	THE CHAIR: I know what the nature of HN16's employment is.
19	nature of the employment and so forth and the reasons	19	I have considered it and I have reached a view about it.
20	why it is said disclosure would be likely to lead to the	20	I don't think at this stage I can say any more
21	loss of the job in order to make meaningful	21	about it. Let me search for a form of words, I am
22	representations.	22	afraid this problem is going to recur frequently.
23	That's our point. I am not making a point of	23	The risk to HN16's employment is something that
24	substance, because I can't.	24	I have taken into account in arriving at the decision
25	THE CHAIR: Right, if I were to do that, then I am required	25	I am minded to make about disclosure of both cover name
	Page 53		Page 55
1	by the rules to go back to HN16 and his representatives	1	and non-disclosure of real name. I am not prepared to
2	and invite them to make representations about that	2	say any more about the nature of the employment.
3	submission. Then conceivably to hold a hearing to deal	3	I don't think I can properly do so.
4	with them.	4	MS KAUFMANN: I am grateful. And I am grateful that you
5	All of this is going to put back the disclosure	5	have considered the position.
6	which I am minded to make of what everybody, as	6	In those circumstances there is nothing more I can
7	I understand it, really wants, the cover name of HN16.	7	say in relation to this particular officer.
8	MS KAUFMANN: Well, firstly it doesn't have to put back the	8	THE CHAIR: No. Thank you.
9	disclosure of the cover name in any way, sense or	9	Mr Brandon, I think this officer being your client
10	form	10	you have the right of first word.
11	THE CHAIR: On the contrary, it does. These things have to	11	MR BRANDON: I don't think there is anything I can say, sir,
12	be dealt with together.	12	in open.
13	MS KAUFMANN: I don't understand why they do. If you have	13	THE CHAIR: No.
14	taken a decision that the cover name is going to be	14	Does anybody else have anything they wish to say
15	disclosed and there is an entirely separate question of	15	about this officer?
16	whether the real name would be disclosed, then they	16	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
17	don't need to be considered together. This is something	17	MR HALL re HN16
18	that you could look into after the event.	18	MR HALL: Sir, only this behalf of the Metropolitan Police
19	That is our first submission, you can get on with	19	Service. We have not made an application in relation to
20	disclosing the cover name.	20	this officer
21	A second point is this: it is a decision for you as	21	THE CHAIR: No.
22	to whether or not the disclosure of further information	22	MR HALL: but the suggestion is made that you should make
23	about the nature of his employment and so forth is going	23	a sequential decision, cover name and then real name.
24	to risk identification. If you conclude it is not going	24	Our submission would be that it might not be fair to
25	to risk identification, then why can't you disclose it?	25	deliver and act upon rulings sequentially, unless there
	Page 54		Page 56
	1 age J+		1 age 30

1	is very good reason to the contrary of our submission is	1	disclosure are set out as being matters related to the
2	that if you are going to real something confidential	2	article 8 rights of this particular individual, HN26.
3	about an officer, then that officer should know the	3	Interference with article 8 rights, the nature of
4	worst so they can prepare accordingly rather than to	4	which are not identified. The particular likely
5	have one revelation about their cover name with the	5	consequences are not identified.
6	consequences that that could have, only to find out some	6	THE CHAIR: I think everybody ought to have in mind that
7	weeks or months later that their real name is going to	7	when one is considering safety risks that some do engage
8	be disclosed as well.	8	article 3, both because of the source of the risk and
9	We strongly support unless there is good reason	9	because of its immediacy. Likewise article 2, if that
10	to the contrary the idea of making complete decisions	10	were ever to arise. But both those factors can play
11	rather than doing it bit by bit.	11	a part in an article 8 assessment, even though not as
12	THE CHAIR: Yes.	12	freestanding claimed interferences with human rights.
13	You have, I trust, seen the closed reasons which	13	If in the long run you face the threat of some
14	followed upon the closed hearing that I conducted in	14	degree of violence from someone as a result of an action
15	this officer as in other officer's cases.	15	by the state, then that does not engage article 3
16	MR HALL: Yes.	16	immediately because it is not an immediate risk. But it
17	THE CHAIR: All decisions of this kind are subject to review	17	does engage your article 8 rights.
18	under section 20(4), of necessity the possibility of	18	MS KAUFMANN: So threshold of article 3 not reached but that
19	review in the case of this officer is a real one.	19	risk hanging over an individual engages their article 8
20	MR HALL: That is why I qualified by saying "unless very	20	rights?
21	good reason to the contrary", but in principle, one	21	THE CHAIR: Yes.
22	should attempt to achieve a complete decision at this	22	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, because of the worry and the concern
23	stage.	23	THE CHAIR: If is not just the worry, it is if it matures.
24	THE CHAIR: On the basis that one can never say never,	24	But it doesn't impose upon the state an obligation under
25	I agree with that submission. I think people are	25	article 3 as would knowledge that if a decision is taken
	Page 57		Page 59
1	antitled to Impay whom they stand subject to things	1	someone will come round to the house armed with a weapon
1	entitled to know where they stand, subject to things	2	and inflict injury.
2 3	changing. MR HALL: Of course.	3	MS KAUFMANN: So, again, that exemplifies I'm grateful
4	THE CHAIR: All right.	4	for your expansion on what the possible bases are
5	The next I think is HN26, is it not?	5	upon which the article 8 rights might be interfered
6	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core	6	with, because that introduces a threat of violence,
7	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN26	"	
	participants by W.S. KAOTWANN ICTIN20	7	
	MS KALIEMANN: In relation to this officer the Metropolitan	7	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon
8	MS KAUFMANN: In relation to this officer the Metropolitan	8	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making.
9	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order	8 9	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are
9 10	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk	8 9 10	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in
9 10 11	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of	8 9 10 11	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about
9 10 11 12	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as	8 9 10 11 12	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise.
9 10 11 12 13	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting.	8 9 10 11 12 13	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved
9 10 11 12 13 14	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the October submissions at tab 9 sets out the reasons,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals. Therefore, we are left in a position where we are
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the October submissions at tab 9 sets out the reasons, having identified why you think it is necessary for the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals. Therefore, we are left in a position where we are standing here with nothing sensible or meaningful to
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the October submissions at tab 9 sets out the reasons, having identified why you think it is necessary for the cover name to be disclosed, the reasons in the last	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals. Therefore, we are left in a position where we are standing here with nothing sensible or meaningful to say, other than this is a very important decision-making
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the October submissions at tab 9 sets out the reasons, having identified why you think it is necessary for the cover name to be disclosed, the reasons in the last three lines of paragraph 10 as to the countervailing	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals. Therefore, we are left in a position where we are standing here with nothing sensible or meaningful to say, other than this is a very important decision-making process and you need to make sure that you have the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the October submissions at tab 9 sets out the reasons, having identified why you think it is necessary for the cover name to be disclosed, the reasons in the last	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals. Therefore, we are left in a position where we are standing here with nothing sensible or meaningful to say, other than this is a very important decision-making
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Police Service have only applied for a restriction order in relation to the real name, but in their risk assessment at tab 22, page 18, they identified a risk of physical attack if the cover name was disclosed as medium and medium harm resulting. That same assessment was made in relation to the release of the real name. We would submit that if no restriction order is needed to protect against physical harm in relation to their cover name, then equally that self-same risk assessment would not justify it in relation to their real name. Your minded to note at paragraphs 10 to 12 of the October submissions at tab 9 sets out the reasons, having identified why you think it is necessary for the cover name to be disclosed, the reasons in the last three lines of paragraph 10 as to the countervailing	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a risk of violence, that obviously has a bearing upon your decision-making. Again, it exemplifies the difficult position we are in, because we simply cannot make any representations in relation to that, because we don't know anything about the circumstances in which that risk is said to arise. We don't know what groups this officer was involved in infiltrating. We don't know whether the said risk of harm which, albeit not hitting an article 3 threshold, nonetheless feeds into article 8, we don't know whether or not that risk arises from the infiltration of those particular groups. We don't know therefore whether or not something could be said by our clients in respect of the likely threat in respect of those individuals. Therefore, we are left in a position where we are standing here with nothing sensible or meaningful to say, other than this is a very important decision-making process and you need to make sure that you have the

1	THE CHAIR: Can I say that I am now confident I have it.	1	I can say anything sensible about, it is for you to
2	MS KAUFMANN: There is nothing more I can say in relation to	2	consider.
3	this.	3	THE CHAIR: Of course you can't.
4	THE CHAIR: No.	4	MS KAUFMANN: So if it makes the difference, if it would
5	MS KAUFMANN: I hear what you say and I'm not going to press	5	make the difference, then we consider that that the
6	any further in relation to that, but this is important	6	absence of any disclosure here is a procedural problem
7	moving forward because one of the questions that arose	7	that has to be resolved.
8	now was do you now go back if we submit now, not enough	8	THE CHAIR: Whether it is correctly described as
9	disclosure, do you go back and make further disclosure	9	a procedural problem is moot. I am constrained in what
10	and that is going to hold up the process?	10	can be disclosed by the particular circumstances of this
11	Moving forward, when you come to consider new	11	officer's case at this stage in the Inquiry.
12	applications, I press upon you our submissions now in	12	I simply cannot say any more about it than that, and
13	relation to disclosure. Insofar as we have there are	13	I can't think and I have thought of a procedure
14	things we could say that you would be assisted in	14	which would permit non-state core representatives to
15	hearing from, because it affects our particular groups	15	provide information about this officer's deployment
16	or so forth, in circumstances where you can satisfy	16	without frustrating the process.
17	yourself that disclosure is not going to risk	17	I therefore have to ask, and I do ask, for the trust
18	identifying the officer, then we would urge upon you	18	of those who do not know what I know in making difficult
19	that when the exercise of redaction is being undertaken,	19	decisions as may eventually become apparent in the case
20	proper consideration is given to our participatory	20	of some individual officers like this officer.
21	rights and the way in which that assists you in reaching	21	MS KAUFMANN: Please just give me a moment, sir.
22	the right decision.	22	Those, then, are my submissions in relation to HN26.
23	THE CHAIR: I think I can say, without disclosing anything	23	THE CHAIR: Yes.
24	that shouldn't be disclosed, that if I were to undertake	24	Mr Brandon?
25	that course in relation to this officer, it would	25	MR BRANDON: Sir, would you mind if we followed the speaking
	D /1		D (2
	Page 61		Page 63
1	greatly increase the risk that the real identity of this	1	order that originally had been set out
2	officer would be revealed.	2	THE CHAIR: Not at all.
3	MS KAUFMANN: I am grateful for that.	3	MR BRANDON: I say that because the Metropolitan Police
4	Then just moving on to the risk in relation to the	4	Service's position and our position on some of these
5	psychiatric condition. In a sense, it sounds as though	5	applications shall we say, is not
6	it is neither here nor there given your assessment of	6	THE CHAIR: Are not always ad idem, I agree.
7	the possible risk of future threat of violence	7	MR BRANDON: They are not always the same.
8	THE CHAIR: On the contrary, the picture is complex. It is	8	THE CHAIR: Certainly, Mr Hall, I think.
9	a factor.	9	MR HALL: I don't think there is anything I can usefully
10	MS KAUFMANN: It is factor?	10	add.
11	THE CHAIR: Yes.	11	MR BRANDON: Then in that case, there is nothing I wish to
12	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. So again, if this were a factor that	12	say either, sir.
13	would tip the balance so that otherwise you were minded	13	THE CHAIR: No one else has any observation, I take it?
14	with all the other factors not to make disclosure as it	14	Good.
15	were when balancing everything, then the absence of any	15	Next in the batting order is HN58, I think.
16	details again in relation to the psychiatric report	16	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
17	would be a matter that would be a cause for real concern	17	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN58
18	for us, because we can't make any representations	18	MS KAUFMANN: In your initial minded to in relation to HN58
19	about it.	19	you were minded to withhold both the real and the cover
20	If at the end of the day your view is, "I am	20	names. That is in paragraph 4.
21	satisfied because of the other risks arising under	21	THE CHAIR: Yes I was.
22	article 8 [ie the risk to his article 8 rights through	22	MS KAUFMANN: That was on the basis of some risk to his
23	the risk of violence] that I am not going to disclose	23	personal safety and a slight risk of causing a stress
24	the real name", then in a sense the non-disclosure here	24	reaction.
25	makes no difference. So, again, that is not something	25	We then made submissions
	Page 62		Page 64
	1 age 02	1	I age 04

1	THE CHAIR: Yes.	1	Peter Francis, particular individuals have become
2	MS KAUFMANN: and those submissions both ours and those	2	suspicious in relation to particular officers.
3	on behalf of Mr Francis, paragraph 116 of ours,	3	THE CHAIR: That of course is right. Because of the
4	paragraphs 16 to 19 in relation to those on behalf of	4	revelations that have been made, it is possible to reach
5	Mr Francis, set out why this officer was a key officer	5	a provisional view in some cases that there may be more
6	in relation to the matters that this Inquiry is going to	6	revelations and in others that there may not be.
7	investigate. He was head of the Special Demonstration	7	MS KAUFMANN: That view will always be provisional and may
8	Squad in 1998 when he received Bob Lambert's report on	8	indeed be entirely wrong
9	a meeting with HN81 and Richard Walton.	9	THE CHAIR: Of course.
10	Our first issue of concern is that none of this was	10	MS KAUFMANN: but what we do know about this officer is
11	ever set out in the original documents, so this is	11	that he moved into a managerial position, like, for
12	an issue of concern in relation to disclosure.	12	example, Bob Lambert, and we know about Bob Lambert's
13	THE CHAIR: I accept your joint submissions that the	13	activities before, so his role as an undercover officer
14	activity of this officer as a manager is one of the key	14	is obviously incredibly important in terms of looking at
15	things that I have to investigate. I have changed my	15	the culture he established in a managerial position. If
16	mind about how that can best be investigated, subject of	16	in fact he did engage in wrongdoing it is fundamental
17	course to representations which I anticipate hearing at	17	that it comes out. In order to come out, his cover name
18	a closed hearing later.	18	must be disclosed. It is going to be the only way it is
19	MS KAUFMANN: You have changed your mind, the position now	19	going to happen.
20	is that you are minded to reveal the real name but not	20	It is not a solution, we submit, to the function of
21	the cover name?	21	this Inquiry in getting to the truth to only reveal his
22	THE CHAIR: That is a proposal that I have advanced, because	22	real name so that his managerial activities can be
23	I understand the force of the submission that in the	23	investigated. One then has to go back to the drawing
24	capacity of HN58 as a manager it is necessary and in the	24	board and assess whether or not disclosure of his cover
25	public interest that HN58 should account for actions	25	name is going to be there are two choices. You
	Page 65		Page 67
1	multish	1	aith an diaglaca, wa would submit his saven name and his
1	publicly	1	either disclose, we would submit, his cover name and his
2	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.	2	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just
2 3	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name.	2 3	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job.
2 3 4	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is	2 3 4	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple
2 3 4 5	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who	2 3 4 5	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to
2 3 4 5 6	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer	2 3 4 5 6	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer — THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer — THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer — THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were affected by the undercover policing activities of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights, as it were.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer — THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were affected by the undercover policing activities of a particular officer to know whether or not that officer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights, as it were. THE CHAIR: Are you contending that disclosure of the cover
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer — THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were affected by the undercover policing activities of a particular officer to know whether or not that officer engaged in anything wrong.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights, as it were. THE CHAIR: Are you contending that disclosure of the cover name is of greater significance than disclosure of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer— THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were affected by the undercover policing activities of a particular officer to know whether or not that officer engaged in anything wrong. As you will know, the only reason the wrongdoing has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights, as it were. THE CHAIR: Are you contending that disclosure of the cover name is of greater significance than disclosure of the real name?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer — THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were affected by the undercover policing activities of a particular officer to know whether or not that officer engaged in anything wrong.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights, as it were. THE CHAIR: Are you contending that disclosure of the cover name is of greater significance than disclosure of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. THE CHAIR: — and in real name. MS KAUFMANN: Starting from that premise, our submission is it does not go far enough. Because he was a manager who before he was a manager was an undercover officer— THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: — and his conduct as an undercover officer falls to be looked at in just the same way as all the other undercover officers in the Special Demonstration Squad at this point in time. THE CHAIR: Indeed it does. I know of nothing so far in relation to this officer which would suggest that HN58 has done anything which would call for enquiry beyond establishing what HN58 did. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, but that simply begs the question, as you yourself have recognised in relation to HN81. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: It is only by disclosing the cover name that we begin to give people the opportunity who were affected by the undercover policing activities of a particular officer to know whether or not that officer engaged in anything wrong. As you will know, the only reason the wrongdoing has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	real name, or you disclose his cover name. But just disclosing his real name is not going to do the job. Therefore you have to ask yourself, if I simple disclose his cover name, what is the risk going to be to him, to his safety, to his article 8 rights and so forth? You have to ask the same questions if I disclose his cover and his real. In an ideal world you would want to disclose both, because you want him to account for his managerial role in his real name, but you also want to get to the truth of his undercover activities. In our submission your starting point should be, "If I can, having sufficient regard and giving sufficient weight to his rights under articles 3 or 8 safely disclose his cover name and his real name, that is the course I should take". It is only if you conclude you cannot do that then you should ask yourself whether or not disclosing his cover name is going to sufficiently balance the rights, as it were. THE CHAIR: Are you contending that disclosure of the cover name is of greater significance than disclosure of the real name?

1	that. It is a difficult issue, but what I am contending	1	of a risk of violence.
2	is that in an ideal world you should disclose both.	2	Similarly in relation to article 8. We don't know
3	Because there are separate reasons	3	the nature of the alleged interference. We know that
4	THE CHAIR: Can we assume for the moment that the world is	4	there is only a very slight risk of a stress reaction,
5	not ideal and you are being put to a preference, which	5	so we can put away aside any psychiatric injury, but we
6	would it be?	6	don't know whether or not we are dealing with
7	MS KAUFMANN: This is a difficult issue for the individuals	7	a situation where the concern is of a similar kind of
8	involved and there would need to be disclosure of the	8	activity or interaction as in the case of Bob Lambert.
9	groups infiltrated, the dates of the infiltration,	9	We don't know whether it is something more serious. If
10	before a view could be taken as to which of the two	10	it is a similar reaction as arises in the case of
11	would be preferable. So it may be that this simply has	11	Bob Lambert, we simple repeat our submissions in
12	to await that disclosure.	12	relation to that, either justifiable or it is not going
13	You will understand there are a large number of	13	to happen.
14	different individuals that we are representing, and	14	On what we have at the moment our submission would
15	there are different factors that they weigh in the	15	be that there are compelling factors to release both the
16	balance themselves. So that is an issue that would have	16	cover name and the real name and that is the course you
17	to be looked into in light of that information so that	17	should take. But in the event that you are not in a
18	an informed decision could be made by those who are	18	position to take that decision now, then we would seek
19 20	affected, because at this moment we don't even know.	19 20	further disclosure and an opportunity to make further submissions.
20	THE CHAIR: I'm going, I am afraid, to try to put you on the spot. On the basis of what is now known I appreciate	21	THE CHAIR: Okay, the batting order may matter here because
22	that what is now known is incomplete as far as you and	22	I know there are different views about this.
23	those whom you represent are concerned, highly	23	Mr Hall, I think you better go first.
24	incomplete do you have a preference and if so what	24	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
25	is it?	25	MR HALL re HN58
23	15 11.	25	MICH EE 10 III (30
	Page 69		Page 71
1	MS KAUFMANN: I have no instructions, I cannot give you	1	MR HALL: Yes. Our initial application was that there
2	a preference. I have interest groups who may take	2	should be restrictions over both, initially accepted by
3	conflicting positions. As you will understand, there	3	you, sir, and now you are minded to depart from that.
4	are is a very broad umbrella. There is the Lawrence	4	THE CHAIR: There are a number of possibilities and
5	groups and the justice campaigns, then there may be	5	I indicate that I have changed my mind about the
6	others who were infiltrated whilst he was in his	6	potential importance of this officer in his managerial
7	undercover policing role and there could be a conflict	7	capacity giving evidence in the real name.
8	between the positions that they take.	8	MR HALL: May I say, we understand that and the question of
9	At which point then that conflict would have to be	9	what to do with officers whose managerial role may be
10	dealt with by adequate and separate representation so	10	more significant in the context of the Inquiry than
11	that each person could put forward their position.	11	their undercover role is something that we are wrestling
12	I have no instructions, I cannot tell you.	12	with in relation to other officers as well and how best
13	THE CHAIR: Okay. I have pressed you as far as I can	13	to assist you.
14	reasonably do.	14	THE CHAIR: Yes.
15	MS KAUFMANN: In a sense there is nothing further I can	15	MR HALL: We do recognise there is an issue here. Obviously
			i- ll-i
16	sensibly say further at this stage as to what direction	16	one is looking at the personal safety and psychiatric
17	you should go in.	17	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to
17 18	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing	17 18	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the
17 18 19	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful	17 18 19	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed
17 18 19 20	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first	17 18 19 20	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent.
17 18 19 20 21	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first risk assessment put that as low, a later risk assessment	17 18 19 20 21	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent. So far as the principles are concerned, it is right
17 18 19 20 21 22	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first risk assessment put that as low, a later risk assessment put it as medium. But we don't understand the basis for	17 18 19 20 21 22	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent. So far as the principles are concerned, it is right that as far as one knows there is no evidence of
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first risk assessment put that as low, a later risk assessment put it as medium. But we don't understand the basis for the difference, we don't know who is said to pose that	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent. So far as the principles are concerned, it is right that as far as one knows there is no evidence of wrongdoing against HN58 in HN58's undercover role.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first risk assessment put that as low, a later risk assessment put it as medium. But we don't understand the basis for the difference, we don't know who is said to pose that medium risk or why. And so we are in the same position	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent. So far as the principles are concerned, it is right that as far as one knows there is no evidence of wrongdoing against HN58 in HN58's undercover role. THE CHAIR: That is the position as of now —
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first risk assessment put that as low, a later risk assessment put it as medium. But we don't understand the basis for the difference, we don't know who is said to pose that	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent. So far as the principles are concerned, it is right that as far as one knows there is no evidence of wrongdoing against HN58 in HN58's undercover role.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you should go in. There are very compelling reasons for disclosing both. We don't have information to make any meaningful submissions about the risk of serious harm. The first risk assessment put that as low, a later risk assessment put it as medium. But we don't understand the basis for the difference, we don't know who is said to pose that medium risk or why. And so we are in the same position	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	harm to an officer. So it is a matter one is going to have to consider carefully and we welcome the opportunity to deal with that, I think, in closed because it is a nuts and bolts issue to some extent. So far as the principles are concerned, it is right that as far as one knows there is no evidence of wrongdoing against HN58 in HN58's undercover role. THE CHAIR: That is the position as of now —

THE CHAIR: -- as always, no one can tell what might be 1 not agree that an exploration of an issue in closed is 1 2 2 revealed in future. effectively shutting down the Inquiry. 3 MR HALL: That's right. 3 First of all, as a matter of reality you, sir, even 4 So when one looks at where the current public 4 in a completely closed hearing will have the opportunity 5 interest balance lies, one might very well say --5 to hear from officers who give evidence, their evidence credibly say -- that the public interest in will be tested by yourself and by Mr Barr and perhaps by 6 6 7 7 consideration of HN58's managerial role is more others. You will have documents by which to test their 8 8 important in the context of the Inquiry, bearing in mind account and there is a volume of documents in this case, 9 one can't look at the terms of reference in the 9 so that is not something to be left out of account, and 10 abstract, we all know the significance of HN81's 10 you have the capacity to call for further evidence in 11 deployment to the setting up of the Inquiry, one might 11 order to ensure that you are getting the complete 12 credibly say that is more important than what HN58 may 12 nicture. 13 or may not have done as an undercover officer. 13 Now of course it is not ideal that one doesn't have 14 As I will perhaps develop in relation to HN123, when 14 all the people who may in principle be affected in the 15 we reach HN123's case, our stance is that it is not 15 room assisting you, but we disagree strongly with the 16 a good reason to disclose a cover name merely on the 16 proposition that a completely closed hearing achieves no 17 chance that something may turn up. But I will address 17 value. We know that is not right and we know that 18 that in relation to N123 when we reach that officer's 18 closed hearings happen and do achieve value. 19 19 THE CHAIR: Sir Christopher did reject the submission that 20 THE CHAIR: Yes. I mean that also arises in principle in 20 you made, that the Inquiry globally could be conducted 21 the case of HN58; does it not? 21 on that basis. I'm entirely satisfied that he was right 22 MR HALL: I will happily deal with it then. I mean, I have 22 to do so. 23 made the point --23 I am therefore focused on individual cases to see 24 THE CHAIR: Yes. Given there is going to be almost 24 whether something can be done in the case of 25 certainly a closed hearing and this is an opportunity to 25 an individual officer which is not ideal if spread Page 73 Page 75 inform me of the factors that I should take into 1 1 across the whole piece. 2 account. I think it is best for everybody publicly to 2 MR HALL: Yes, I'm not reiterating the submission that the 3 3 take advantage of that to the extent that they can. majority of this can be done in closed. Simply to make 4 4 the point that there is value in a closed exploration of MR HALL: Of course. 5 5 We agree with the proposition that has been made by the evidence. 6 THE CHAIR: I think one has to face the fact that if there Mr Sanders, there is a fairness issue here. Of course 6 7 there is -- this is to be fair to what is said, there is 7 were, for example, evidence available that HN58 8 8 a chicken and egg situation. Unless one puts as much conducted an inappropriate intimate relationship with 9 Q information out there as possible, one is never going to a member of the public, that it would be unlikely to be 10 know what there is. But one is not dealing either with 10 disclosed unless the cover name of HN58 were to be 11 a perfect world or with an inquiry of unlimited 11 disclosed. 12 12 duration. Nor is one dealing with abstract entities. MR HALL: I think one has to face up to that consequence. 13 One is dealing with people and our submission is that 13 I mean that is a necessary corollary of my submissions. 14 you can form, even now, a relatively sensible view of 14 Because either one does disclose all the cover names 15 where the Inquiry really needs to shine the light. 15 irrespective of the risk to officers because they may 16 Things will crop up and it may in due course require 16 have had a relationship, or one takes the view which we 17 reconsideration. We submit that you can make decisions 17 advocate respectfully, which is that one knows quite 18 18 now that are sensible. a lot now already and one can take sensible decisions. 19 19 You have a wealth of information available to you There are cases where even though there has been no 20 and you can decide now where to shine that light. We 20 resolution of the factual issue -- take HN16's case for 21 say it would not be right simply to throw out an 21 example -- the Metropolitan Police Service have formed 22 identity, particularly where that carries risk to 22 a view not to apply either in relation to real or cover 23 23 an individual or to their family members, hoping that 24 something may come back. So that's the first point. 24 One can take sensible decisions now, but I accept 25 25 The second general point which I can make is we do the point. It is quite possible and perhaps inevitable Page 74 Page 76

1	that by not disclosing all cover names there are some	1	submission is that one can and indeed must form a view,
2	pieces of information that one will never get. That has	2	even if it is provisional, as to important at this
3	to be right.	3	stage.
4	THE CHAIR: Indeed.	4	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
5	MR HALL: But equally, the Inquiry has to make progress and	5	Mr Brandon, I think Ms Sikand has something to say
6	one has a lot of information and one knows why the	6	about this issue and I thought you might like to speak
7	Inquiry was set up.	7	last.
8	It is said sometimes, well, the terms of reference	8	MR BRANDON: Thank you, sir.
9	are so broad and they require the Inquiry to consider	9	THE CHAIR: Ms Sikand?
10	all undercover policing. My submission is that the	10	Submissions on behalf of Mr Peter Francis by MS SIKAND
11	terms of reference shouldn't be considered in the	11	re HN58
12	abstract. One knows why the Inquiry was set up. One	12	MS SIKAND: Sir, yes. You asked Ms Kaufmann whether she was
13	knows the issues of concern, which is no doubt why we	13	prepared to make a choice, as it were.
14	are starting with particular officers.	14	THE CHAIR: Yes.
15	THE CHAIR: In the case of this particular, on the	15	MS SIKAND: We are.
16	information that is at present known to me and to you,	16	As you know, Peter Francis's position is that if you
17	it is far more important that this officer's managerial	17	have to make a choice between disclosing a real name and
18	role should be subject to public scrutiny and in the	18	then having effectively secret in relation to his
19	real name of HN58, than is the possibility that	19	undercover activities, the choices you should make is to
20	something might have occurred during the deployment of	20	disclose his cover name and have an open hearing in
21	HN58 as a undercover officer, which might occur.	21	relation to that, although obviously we accept that
22	MR HALL: That is exactly what Sir Christopher recognised in	22	there may have to be modifications.
23	his ruling.	23	The point about that is whilst we understand your
24	Can I refer you to a passage? I am not going to do	24	point of principle that senior police officers should be
25	this much, but it is in the concluding sections. In the	25	expected to account for their decisions, particularly in
	,		
	Page 77		Page 79
			d
1	summary at the end, one has section C at page 83.	1	the case of a significant officer like HN58, given his
2	THE CHAIR: Yes.	2	senior role in the Special Demonstration Squad at that
3	MR HALL: Under "Personal applications", Sir Christopher	3	time, and knowing that he in fact managed HN81 and that
4	dealt first of all with an application based on risk of	4	is not a secret, one can work that out from the
5	death or injury, relying on the fairness principle of	5	time-frame in which he was employed and the time at
6	common law under section 17(3) or 19(3)(b). One of the	6	which he was said to be a boss.
7	matters that the chairman will examine is at (5):	7	Given the significance of HN81, we can understand
8	"The status of the applicant in the Inquiry and the	8	that there is an additional public interest in his real
9	importance of the evidence the applicant is to provide."	9	identity being exposed, but that, as we understand it,
10	The same subsection is found under (c)(3), which is	10	is simple a point of principle about the accountability
11	when one is dealing with human rights based applications	11	of senior officers as opposed to that that would reveal
12	at number 4.	12	or secure further evidence, which would somehow cast
13	My submission is that Sir Christopher recognised	13	light on his role as a manager at the time.
14	that one would have to form a view as to the likely importance of the officer at the restriction order	14	That is our understanding.
15	INDOCTABLE OF THE OTHER AT THE RESTRICTION OFGER	15	It is not because you say that if you expose his
	-	17	tang idaggita yang mandalah adalah sa attang antang at da
16	consideration stage.	16	true identity you would be able to gather evidence that
16 17	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable	17	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his
16 17 18	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might	17 18	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name.
16 17 18 19	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted	17 18 19	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure
16 17 18 19 20	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not.	17 18 19 20	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly
16 17 18 19 20 21	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not. MR HALL: No. The reason that I refer to that is this	17 18 19 20 21	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly for decisions as a manager involve considerations other
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not. MR HALL: No. The reason that I refer to that is this is, I suppose, a response to one of the submissions in	17 18 19 20 21 22	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly for decisions as a manager involve considerations other than just the Stephen Lawrence campaign and the
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not. MR HALL: No. The reason that I refer to that is this is, I suppose, a response to one of the submissions in the principal that is made by counsel for the non-state	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly for decisions as a manager involve considerations other than just the Stephen Lawrence campaign and the infiltration into groups supporting the campaign, and
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not. MR HALL: No. The reason that I refer to that is this is, I suppose, a response to one of the submissions in the principal that is made by counsel for the non-state core participants. She invites you to consider all	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly for decisions as a manager involve considerations other than just the Stephen Lawrence campaign and the infiltration into groups supporting the campaign, and what was done with information gathered about the
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not. MR HALL: No. The reason that I refer to that is this is, I suppose, a response to one of the submissions in the principal that is made by counsel for the non-state	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly for decisions as a manager involve considerations other than just the Stephen Lawrence campaign and the infiltration into groups supporting the campaign, and
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	consideration stage. THE CHAIR: I doubt that even he, with his considerable knowledge and experience, appreciated that there might be a case in which the cover name had to be restricted but the real name not. MR HALL: No. The reason that I refer to that is this is, I suppose, a response to one of the submissions in the principal that is made by counsel for the non-state core participants. She invites you to consider all	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you would not ordinarily be able to if you disclosed his cover name. THE CHAIR: I think that is right, however, the disclosure of HN58's real name and asking HN58 to account publicly for decisions as a manager involve considerations other than just the Stephen Lawrence campaign and the infiltration into groups supporting the campaign, and what was done with information gathered about the

1	HN58 can speak of other things too and can, I think,	1	disclosure should be made.
2	properly be required to account for decisions in other	2	What we are saying is that if the sacrifice that you
3	instances as well.	3	say has to be made in the circumstances, because you are
4	MS SIKAND: If, for example, he gave that evidence in his	4	not prepared for whatever reason to disclose both those
5	cover name, that would not hamper the evidence gathering	5	names, we say that the principled course must be that
6	in relation to evidence that may contradict, for	6	you simply disclose his cover name. Because why would
7	example, the evidence he gives in relation to his	7	you take a different approach, sir, in relation to
8	managerial role, because that evidence could be gathered	8	him I hear what has been said by the Metropolitan
9	from other officers who know who he is.	9	Police Service and Mr Sanders has described as fishing
10	THE CHAIR: Which was my initial reasoning for deciding	10	expeditions, but that doesn't sit well with what you
11	provisionally that I was minded to restrict both real	11	have already said in relation to numerous other officers
12	and cover names. But I have been persuaded that that	12	and indeed what you said yesterday morning in your
13	view is not ultimately tenable. At any rate for the	13	opening note to the public, that in any case where it
14	reason that I expressed.	14	can be done without disproportionate damage to the
15	There is also although this is not at the	15	public interest you would disclose the undercover name.
16	forefront of considerations a practical problem.	16	You yourself have said that that may promote
17	HN58's name is going to be all over the documents during	17	valuable evidence being gathered.
18	the period when he had managerial duties. To impose	18	THE CHAIR: Of course.
19	upon anybody the task of going meticulously through all	19	MS SIKAND: Why you would take a different position in
20	of the documents knocking out HN58's real name and	20	relation to HN58 simply because you believe, for reasons
21	putting in a cipher or a cover name is quite an	21	unknown to us, that this officer would be in a different
22	exercise, and may not be perfectly executed.	22	category to those that you have already said should
23	MS SIKAND: Sir, I'm not sure that that is a legitimate	23	generally should the risk factors
24	reason for withholding his cover name and exposing his	24	THE CHAIR: There is a problem with those who have been
25	real name. I understand that it is an administrative	25	undercover officers who go on to have senior management
	Page 81		Page 83
		_	- 484 00
1	burden of the kind that the Inquiry would seek to	1	positions. Their cases, along with a fairly large
1 2	burden of the kind that the Inquiry would seek to avoid	1 2	positions. Their cases, along with a fairly large number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and
		1	
2	avoid	2	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and
2 3	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is	2 3	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be
2 3 4	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into	2 3 4	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis
2 3 4 5	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by	2 3 4 5	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes
2 3 4 5 6	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not	2 3 4 5 6	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account.
2 3 4 5 6 7	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within	2 3 4 5 6 7	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of course we are very pleased that you changed your mind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as an undercover officer which if it were revealed would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of course we are very pleased that you changed your mind and have openly changed your mind. We are grateful for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as an undercover officer which if it were revealed would be necessary to make public and to investigate in public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of course we are very pleased that you changed your mind and have openly changed your mind. We are grateful for that, we don't seek to make you change your mind again	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as an undercover officer which if it were revealed would be necessary to make public and to investigate in public for the Inquiry's purposes to be fulfilled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of course we are very pleased that you changed your mind and have openly changed your mind. We are grateful for that, we don't seek to make you change your mind again in a way that would be detrimental to our submissions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as an undercover officer which if it were revealed would be necessary to make public and to investigate in public for the Inquiry's purposes to be fulfilled. MS SIKAND: Sir, Mr Francis's position is this you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of course we are very pleased that you changed your mind and have openly changed your mind. We are grateful for that, we don't seek to make you change your mind again	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as an undercover officer which if it were revealed would be necessary to make public and to investigate in public for the Inquiry's purposes to be fulfilled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	avoid THE CHAIR: I am not putting it at the forefront. It is actually a factor that I am entitled to take into account, indeed I think required to take into account by section 17(3), but that is by the by. MS SIKAND: Yes, I appreciate that it is something within the statute that you can take note of. But it is not something that is weighed in the balance in relation to your other decision-making processes so far as in relation to such officers. Given the importance of this particular officer, it is difficult to accept that that would be the decisive factor or indeed in any way determinative. I'm not sure that is what THE CHAIR: I am not putting it forward as a determinative factor. If it has to be done, it has to be done. I merely mention it as a factor that I suspect that the Inquiry and the Metropolitan Police would be grateful to be relieved of. MS SIKAND: Sir, our position is simply this that whilst of course we are very pleased that you changed your mind and have openly changed your mind. We are grateful for that, we don't seek to make you change your mind again in a way that would be detrimental to our submissions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	number of others, raise acutely difficult questions and this is one of them. I understand your position to be made as a matter of principle rather than on the basis of any information that your client has that he wishes me to take into account. MS SIKAND: Sir, in relation to the risk factors that have been identified in relation to his undercover name, they are extremely low. THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is conceivable that Mr Francis knows or believes he knows something about HN58 which if it were to be made public would support the proposition that his cover name should be disclosed. I don't understand that to be the position. If you are able to clarify it, I will be grateful. MS SIKAND: Obviously Mr Francis knows who HN58 is. THE CHAIR: Of course he does, but let me put it in simpler language. Does he know something about what HN58 got up to as an undercover officer which if it were revealed would be necessary to make public and to investigate in public for the Inquiry's purposes to be fulfilled. MS SIKAND: Sir, Mr Francis's position is this you know

1	risk or there is a low risk or the lowest risk there can	1	The third very obvious point is that this is plainly
2	be of physical harm. You have already expressed the	2	a very difficult application for you to consider, sir,
3	risk of psychological harm of releasing his cover name.	3	and I don't mean this at all facetiously, we are
4	Mr Francis knows who the groups were that HN58	4	assisted by the submissions that Ms Kaufmann has made in
5	infiltrated and can say that he agrees with the risk	5	identifying just the very problem that we will seek to
6	assessment that any risk of harm is the lowest it can	6	address in the closed hearing.
7	possibly be in the circumstances.	7	THE CHAIR: Yes.
8	Given that those are the risks as enunciated by the	8	Further submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police
9	Metropolitan Police Service's risk assessors, and given	9	core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN58
10	the low risk of psychological harm, there is	10	MS KAUFMANN: Sir, may I just say, given there is going to
11	a compelling reason for you to disclose his cover name.	11	be a closed hearing, may I just say something to inform
12	Notwithstanding your desire of course for him to be	12	your discussions on where things seem to stand.
13	accountable in his real name.	13	THE CHAIR: Certainly.
14	THE CHAIR: Forgive me. The answer to my question, which	14	MS KAUFMANN: Yesterday, as Ms Sikand pointed out, you
15	was rather more focused than that, is that Mr Francis	15	indicated that moving forward with this Inquiry where
16	does not know of anything about the activities of HN58	16	cover names can be disclosed without risks to officers
17	as an undercover officer which would require his cover	17	that should be done because it is the only way of
18	name to be disclosed?	18	getting to the truth. Here we know disclosure of cover
19	MS SIKAND: No.	19	name is not going to give rise to any significant risk
20	THE CHAIR: Thank you.	20	in relation to HN58
21	MS SIKAND: Sir, I don't think I can assist any further.	21	THE CHAIR: I am sorry, I interrupt that. We do not know
22	THE CHAIR: Thank you. That is very helpful.	22	that.
23	Mr Brandon, I think the floor is yours.	23	MS KAUFMANN: So the risk assessments suggest the risk is
24	Submissions on behalf of HN58 by MR BRANDON	24	low of
25	MR BRANDON: I'm going to make three very obvious points,	25	THE CHAIR: Forgive me. It is I who make these decisions on
	Page 85		Page 87
1	for which I apologise in advance.	١,	
	for which rapologise in advance.	1	the basis of material which includes the risk
2	The first is that in submission my learned friends	2	the basis of material which includes the risk assessment, but my decision is not determined by the
	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision.	2 3	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view.
2	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm	2 3 4	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in
2 3	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity	2 3 4 5	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark
2 3 4	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all	2 3 4 5 6	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are.
2 3 4 5 6 7	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated.	2 3 4 5 6 7	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am persuaded to go back to my original view or to take some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name. That is the trajectory that we have understood you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am persuaded to go back to my original view or to take some view different from that which I am minded to at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name. That is the trajectory that we have understood you to be going down, until you just introduced this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am persuaded to go back to my original view or to take some view different from that which I am minded to at the moment, then the issue will be publicly ventilated again	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name. That is the trajectory that we have understood you to be going down, until you just introduced this possibility that there may be an element of risk here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am persuaded to go back to my original view or to take some view different from that which I am minded to at the moment, then the issue will be publicly ventilated again in the light of what I will then know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name. That is the trajectory that we have understood you to be going down, until you just introduced this possibility that there may be an element of risk here that we don't know about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am persuaded to go back to my original view or to take some view different from that which I am minded to at the moment, then the issue will be publicly ventilated again	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name. That is the trajectory that we have understood you to be going down, until you just introduced this possibility that there may be an element of risk here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The first is that in submission my learned friends have all referred to your decision. THE CHAIR: It is not a decision, it is a decision that I'm minded to make but only after giving you the opportunity of making submissions in a closed session at which all of these issues can be fully ventilated. MR BRANDON: That was going to be my second point, which was we are going to make submissions and we are going to seek to persuade you that the approach you took in the first instance was the correct one. THE CHAIR: My intention is to adopt the same course as I did in relation to the three officers whose cases we considered in closed session earlier. Namely to give you full opportunity to make closed representations about it and indeed to put in any written material you may want. As you know, no oral evidence has been given so far as in these proceedings and I don't intend that it should do. But if as a result of your submissions I am persuaded to go back to my original view or to take some view different from that which I am minded to at the moment, then the issue will be publicly ventilated again in the light of what I will then know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	assessment, but my decision is not determined by the risk assessor's view. MS KAUFMANN: I see. I see. Well again we are entirely in the dark THE CHAIR: Of course you are. MS KAUFMANN: we know nothing about your view as to the risk assessment, which is unhelpful to us because we can't make targeted submissions. But now understanding your position to be that your assessment may be different, that may inform the basis upon which you are taking the view you are. Because otherwise the way things look is that despite the statement you made yesterday, where we are dealing with a managerial position and the issue of principle comes into play, namely that you are of the view that such individuals should give their evidence in their own name and be accountable, then unless there is evidence of wrongdoing already out there in the ether, you will not disclose the cover name. That is the trajectory that we have understood you to be going down, until you just introduced this possibility that there may be an element of risk here that we don't know about.

1	hit the proper target is: is that your position? That	1	turn on the factors relevant to the particular case.
2	in these cases of management, because you take the view	2	MS KAUFMANN: I understand, but we are not being told things
3	as a matter of principle individuals should be	3	we could be told about. For example, that your
4	accountable in their own name. Then unless there is	4	assessment is that there is a risk, despite the risk
5	already in existence evidence of wrongdoing, you will	5	assessments that have been made that signify the risk is
6	not release the cover name	6	low if the cover name is disclosed, that you nonetheless
7	THE CHAIR: Forgive me, it is not as simple as that. It	7	consider if the cover name is disclosed there is a more
8	never is. I'm not willing to make a statement of	8	substantial risk. Because the risk assessments inform
9	principle beyond that which I have made in the remarks	9	us that the risk of harm if the cover name disclosed is
10	I made yesterday. It is obvious in the case of someone	10	low.
11	who has been an undercover officer who subsequently	11	MR BRANDON: Sir, this is of course only physical harm.
12	becomes a manager that the two outcomes that I stated	12	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I absolutely understand it is only
13	I would expect to result from the application of	13	physical harm, but yesterday
14	established principles are in conflict.	14	THE CHAIR: Hold on. I have said in my original minded to
15	MS KAUFMANN: I am afraid, forgive me, because I don't	15	note that the publication of details about the
16	understand that. I understand there is a conflict	16	deployment would give rise to some risk to HN58's
17	between the desire than the individual gives evidence	17	personal safety. It is not correct to say that I have
18	and accounts in their real name, but that doesn't	18	not said that, it is there in print.
19	necessarily create any conflict	19	MS KAUFMANN: I'm sorry, but if that I apologise, that
20	THE CHAIR: Hold on. I said that I expect that a cover name	20	then is my mistake.
21	of an officer will be published. I expect that the real	21	THE CHAIR: It is very easy to make these mistakes, I don't
22	name of a undercover officer will not be published.	22	hold it against you at all.
23	I expect that the real name of a manager will be	23	MS KAUFMANN: But again details. We are lacking in details.
24	published.	24	We are lacking in any ability to make any meaningful
25	When a single individual fulfils the two roles,	25	representations. It just puts us in an impossible
<u> </u>	Page 89		Page 91
1	I think those two statements are in conflict and so one	1	position to know exactly is going on, as it were, in
2	has to examine, as always, the individual facts.	2	your mind when you are balancing what the various
3	MS KAUFMANN: One does. Into that balance one must put	3	factors are, or what those factors even are.
4	this, because it is going to happen in all managerial	4	THE CHAIR: Of course it is. It is in the nature of the
5	cases where the individual officer was an undercover	5	process that you can't know everything that I know at
6	officer before that management position.	6	the stage at which I decide whether or not to make
7	What they did as an undercover officer and if there	7	a restriction order in respect of a name.
8	was wrongdoing is going to be very important in relation	8	Your timing is impeccable, we will rise now until
9	to what they later do in their managerial role. It is	9	2.00 pm.
10	obviously a matter of very great significance.	10	(1.00 pm)
11	THE CHAIR: I completely agree.	11	(The short adjournment)
12	MS KAUFMANN: Therefore you are going to have to engage with	12	(2.00 pm)
13	the importance of getting to the truth in relation to	13	THE CHAIR: Yes, Ms Kaufmann.
14	their undercover activities in order for you to enquire	14	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
15	properly in relation to their managerial functions.	15	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN68
16	So insofar as at the moment and I don't know all	16	MS KAUFMANN: I believe we are now on HN68.
17	the other factors that you are considering there is	17	THE CHAIR: Yes.
18	a predisposition to prioritise giving evidence in that	18	MS KAUFMANN: This officer is deceased.
19	individual's real name, because they are accounting as	19	THE CHAIR: Yes.
20	a manager, over getting to the truth about all their	20	MS KAUFMANN: Therefore no risk obviously of physical injury
21	activities that are relevant to may be managerial role.	21	from disclosure of cover or real names.
22	Then we would question that.	22	THE CHAIR: No.
23	THE CHAIR: You would be right to question it. I have tried	23	MS KAUFMANN: In relation to his surviving wife there is
24	my best to say that these are not inflexible principles.	24	a low assessed risk of interference with her private
25	They are expected outcomes and that each case has to	25	life, but the minded to decision is not to reveal the
	Page 90		Page 92
	1 42 0 7 0	1	1 use 14

```
1
          real name --
                                                                            1
                                                                                     submission was made this morning that the first time
 2
                                                                            2
        THE CHAIR: Yes.
                                                                                     that effectively confidential undertakings arose were in
 3
                                                                            3
                                                                                     connection with the A and B litigation in 2005, you were
        MS KAUFMANN: -- as opposed to the cover name.
 4
             In relation to this officer, regard needs to be had
                                                                            4
                                                                                     taken to tab 8.
 5
          to an instrumental reason for releasing the real name,
                                                                            5
                                                                                       In our submission that simply is not a knock-out
 6
          which is the ability to identify this particular officer
                                                                            6
                                                                                     blow. Cairo's evidence, paragraph 18, is that the
 7
                                                                            7
          because it is quite possible -- this being an old
                                                                                     document reflected what was already well-established
 8
                                                                            8
          case -- that cover names will have been forgotten.
                                                                                     practice. That is actually not surprising that it was
 9
                                                                            9
                                                                                     established practice by that stage.
          Then, in addition to that, there are the factors that
10
          I identified as a matter of general principle falling
                                                                           10
                                                                                       So we have a risk of harm and how, the Metropolitan
11
          for openness yesterday, and the need not to start from
                                                                           11
                                                                                     Police Service asks rhetorically, is it in the public
12
          the presumption of not revealing real names.
                                                                           12
                                                                                     interest to ignore causing worry, upset and distress to
13
             In our submission, this is a case which exemplifies
                                                                           13
                                                                                     an elderly lady who believed that her husband's identity
14
          a wrong approach and the application of such
                                                                           14
                                                                                     would be kept confidential since 1968, so almost
15
          a presumption, because there really is nothing here to
                                                                           15
                                                                                     50 years.
16
                                                                           16
                                                                                       This gives rise to what has been described in the
          weigh in the balance against disclosure. There is no
17
                                                                           17
                                                                                     context of Mr Francis's submissions earlier as personal
          risk of physical injury, minor risk of interference.
18
                                                                           18
          Needless to say, if this is an officer in respect of
                                                                                     considerations, but none the worse for that, because
19
          whom there is no allegation of any form of misconduct.
                                                                           19
                                                                                     human beings are made up of personal considerations. So
20
                                                                           20
                                                                                     it is not enormous harm. That would be reflected in
          then there is no reason whatsoever to believe that the
21
          officer's wife is going to be in any way harassed by
                                                                           21
                                                                                     terms of weight, but it is harm to which the Inquiry can
22
                                                                           22
          disclosure of the name.
                                                                                     have regard. I will give you the paragraph reference,
23
             Those are our short submissions on HN68.
                                                                           23
                                                                                     I think you have already been taken to it in connection
24
        THE CHAIR: Yes. Thank you.
                                                                           24
                                                                                     with the principles ruling, but one has paragraph 165
25
                                                                           25
                                                                                     and again paragraph 154.
                             Page 93
                                                                                                        Page 95
       Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
                                                                            1
 1
                                                                                       Paragraph 165, Sir Christopher said that
 2
                     MR HALL re HN68
                                                                            2
                                                                                     confidentiality is relevant to the public interest
                                                                            3
 3
       MR HALL: Sir, just on a point of detail, I understand this
                                                                                     balance. At paragraph 154, he noted that harm is wide
 4
                                                                            4
          is a case where the cover name is known and I know that
                                                                                     enough to encompass any form of harm, not limited to
 5
          you are not minded to restrict the cover name.
                                                                            5
                                                                                     physical or psychiatric harm.
 6
       THE CHAIR: No.
                                                                            6
                                                                                       On behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service we
 7
                                                                            7
       MR HALL: I'm not going to try to persuade you otherwise in
                                                                                     would resist any test that says you can exclude any
 8
          relation to the cover name, but we do maintain our
                                                                            8
                                                                                     particular type of harm. Or indeed I would resist
 9
                                                                            9
          application in relation to the real name. This case
                                                                                     a test of exceptionallism, in other words everything
10
          does raise an issue of genuine principle, because what
                                                                           10
                                                                                     must be thrown out of the window except and unless there
11
          has been said yesterday and in effect reiterated just
                                                                           11
                                                                                     is something -- our submission, I hope, is simple:
12
          now is that there is simply nothing to weigh against the
                                                                           12
                                                                                     everything is relevant and should be considered in the
13
          general presumption of openness.
                                                                           13
                                                                                     public interest and given the appropriate weight on the
14
                                                                           14
            The Metropolitan Police Service disagrees with that
                                                                                     particular facts of the case.
15
          proposition. Our submission is that a risk of harm,
                                                                           15
                                                                                       It follows that as a matter of principle we disagree
16
          although here it is very much a question of personal
                                                                           16
                                                                                     that this sort of harm is not capable of outweighing the
17
          upset and feelings, is relevant to the public interest
                                                                           17
                                                                                     presumption of openness.
18
          balance. You have seen the evidence in connection with
                                                                           18
                                                                                       The second point I was going to make on this one
19
          this, it is at tab 32.
                                                                           19
                                                                                     simply mirrors the point I made in relation to cover
20
       THE CHAIR: Yes.
                                                                           20
                                                                                     names. It cannot be right, as was suggested yesterday,
21
       MR HALL: The elderly widow, who is in her 80s, she says
                                                                           21
                                                                                     and in written submissions on behalf of the non-state
22
          that she trusted and understood that the identity of her
                                                                           22
                                                                                     core participants, that the Inquiry will not be
23
                                                                           23
          husband would be kept confidential. She is worried,
                                                                                     effective unless you put the real name of an officer
24
          upset and distressed about the prospects for her if the
                                                                           24
                                                                                     into the public domain so that one can investigate every
25
                                                                           25
          identity is revealed, and -- pausing there -- the
                                                                                     detail of their life pre and post their deployment.
                             Page 94
                                                                                                        Page 96
```

1	There would be two major prices to pay if that	1	The only point I was trying to make through you is
2	substance was taken.	2	that in relation to an officer who has died, then
3	Firstly, one would never finish this Inquiry.	3	bluntly it doesn't matter from the point of view of the
4	Secondly, it would be unfair to cause upset just on	4	public interest whether his actions as a manager are
5	the offchance that something discreditable about an	5	described by reference to a cipher or by reference to
6	officer might come up.	6	his real name.
7	It is always horses for courses but we say in	7	He cannot or in the small number of cases she
8	relation to this case, there is harm, it is relevant and	8	cannot be called upon to account for actions because
9	it does outweigh the presumption of openness.	9	they have died.
10	THE CHAIR: If HN68 had been alive, sentient and able to	10	MR HALL: Yes. Anticipating what could be said, well, one
11	give evidence about his managerial position, the	11	still needs to know the real name in case there is some
12	position might well have been different. It might have	12	nugget of information out there known about their
13	been more like HN58.	13	subsequent career which could be relevant to the
14	But this is somebody who is obviously not in	14	credibility that you put upon, for example, documents or
15	a position to account publicly for his actions as	15	actions done by that person.
16	a manager. I think, therefore, the only consideration	16	You have our submission which is that that would be
17	I am faced with is whether or not his widow's right to	17	a fishing expedition that would not be justified.
18	respect for her private life outweighs the public	18	THE CHAIR: There has to come a point, I think, at which the
19	interest in having his real identity disclosed.	19	desire to know everything possible has to be curtailed
20	MR HALL: I agree with respect, and it is obviously the case	20	in the interests of finishing things.
21	that with dead officers one is not going to be able to	21	MR HALL: And I would venture to suggest also in the
22	investigate as thoroughly as if the officers were alive.	22	interests of fairness to individuals.
23	That will curtail the ability and the importance that	23	THE CHAIR: Yes. I can conceive that that might occur,
24	will be placed upon this particular officer in the	24	although I'm entirely unaware of any suggestion that
25	overall Inquiry.	25	HN68's subsequent career requires to be examined to cast
	D 07		D 00
	Page 97		Page 99
1	I should say that I would wish to be heard were it	1	light upon his actions as a manager or as a deployed
1 2		1 2	light upon his actions as a manager or as a deployed officer.
	I should say that I would wish to be heard were it said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and		
2	said that there is a bright line or presumption in	2	officer.
2 3	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and	2 3	officer. MR HALL: Likewise.
2 3 4	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the	2 3 4	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be
2 3 4 5	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really	2 3 4 5	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something
2 3 4 5 6	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would	2 3 4 5 6	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited.
2 3 4 5 6 7	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word	2 3 4 5 6 7	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case— THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case— THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the head of the squad, which may not always result in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case— THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else? No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the head of the squad, which may not always result in the same outcome in relation to a detective inspector, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else? No. This is a case where the interests of the widow are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the head of the squad, which may not always result in the same outcome in relation to a detective inspector, but I don't need to address it because it doesn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else? No. This is a case where the interests of the widow are being looked after by the Metropolitan Police Service
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the head of the squad, which may not always result in the same outcome in relation to a detective inspector, but I don't need to address it because it doesn't THE CHAIR: No, quite. We will address it in due course.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else? No. This is a case where the interests of the widow are being looked after by the Metropolitan Police Service MR HALL: That's right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the head of the squad, which may not always result in the same outcome in relation to a detective inspector, but I don't need to address it because it doesn't THE CHAIR: No, quite. We will address it in due course. As I said it is a forecast not a statement of principle and every case turns on its own facts.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else? No. This is a case where the interests of the widow are being looked after by the Metropolitan Police Service MR HALL: That's right. THE CHAIR: directly? MR HALL: That's right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	said that there is a bright line or presumption in relation to managers because there are managers and there are managers. I think we have used, for the Metropolitan Police Service, the term "manager" really to mean anyone above undercover officer, so that would include sergeants and inspectors and the like. THE CHAIR: There may be a grey area where the word "manager" is imprecise. I agree, we may need to look at those, but I was thinking of someone in the position of the detective inspector or detective chief inspector in charge of the squad. There would have, I think, to be fairly good reasons why their real names should not be put into the public domain. MR HALL: I would prefer to demur until that arises. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I accept there is a stronger public interest in relation to the detective chief inspector, who is the head of the squad, which may not always result in the same outcome in relation to a detective inspector, but I don't need to address it because it doesn't THE CHAIR: No, quite. We will address it in due course. As I said it is a forecast not a statement of principle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	officer. MR HALL: Likewise. THE CHAIR: His personnel record should, in principle, be available to be examined and if that throws up something then the issue may have to be revisited. MR HALL: Quite. THE CHAIR: Am I right in assuming that the personnel records of at any rate the managers are retained? I have certainly seen some, but I don't know whether it is that they are comprehensive. MR HALL: I will just consult, if I may. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: In principle, yes, they do exist. That doesn't mean that they will always exist in every single case THE CHAIR: No, no document retention system is perfect. MR HALL: In principle there should be personnel records, yes. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else? No. This is a case where the interests of the widow are being looked after by the Metropolitan Police Service MR HALL: That's right. THE CHAIR: directly?

1	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, there is one issue upon which	1	I can't at the moment see how it could, unless
2	I would like, please, your submission. You submitted in	2	a photograph of him in his appearance at the time was
3	I think one sentence that the real identity might permit	3	available.
4	the deployed undercover officer to be identified.	4	MS KAUFMANN: Exactly, that's precisely the mechanism. But
5	I can understand that submission, although I don't	5	what we don't know is whether that mechanism is going to
6	accept it, in relation to cases where the cover name is	6	be available until the name is known and then people can
7	not known, but where the cover name is known, as it is	7	search and try to identify. We don't know.
8	here, what can the real identity add to that?	8	But you have to then ask yourself, is there a reason
9	Further submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police	9	of sufficient force to say we don't try and undertake
10	core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN68	10	that exercise?
11	MS KAUFMANN: Because, let's imagine the cover name is known	11	The only reason put forward in this case and it
12	but nobody can actually remember the person by their	12	is a very stark example therefore of the balance between
13	cover name because the events took place a long time	13	openness and the potential instrumental interests it can
14	ago. That is one possibility. There is one officer who	14	serve, plus the value of openness in and of itself, as
15	says in terms, "I can't imagine anyone would remember my	15	against the concern of the widow not about being
16	name".	16	harassed but simply about the name of her husband coming
17	So disclosure of the real name may afford a means by	17	out. That's the only concern she has, in our
18	which that person can be identified through photographs	18	submission, the balance would be wrongly struck if that
19	or whatever and so you can actually look at the image	19	concern of the widow were to override the potential
20	and identify who that individual was.	20	instrumental value of disclosure coupled with the
21	THE CHAIR: I can understand that contemporaneous	21	general value that disclosure has in terms of this being
22	photographs might, and there is a theoretical route to	22	an accountable public inquiry.
23	obtaining them, but I can't at the moment understand how	23	THE CHAIR: It is, I think you acknowledge in that
24	disclosure of the real name even in theory could.	24	statement, a balance to be struck. It is a matter
25	MS KAUFMANN: Through that theoretical route. In the modern	25	therefore of judgment?
	Page 101		Page 103
	1 100		1480 100
1	world it is quite possible that having disclosure of	1	MS KAUFMANN: We made the submission yesterday, and I repeat
2	a name of an individual might lead to photographs of	2	it, that the balance is one which, in our submission, is
3	them at a particular point in time sufficiently far back	3	not such that it is open for you to find it one way or
4	for him to be recognised or her to be recognised as they	4	the other. In our submission the balance clearly comes
5	were at the time.	5	down in favour of openness.
6	Again, one can't gainsay it. It is exactly the same	6	That that interest in not having her husband's name
7	point as my response to Mr Hall's point, which is that	7	put out in the public simply cannot outweigh those other
8	we shouldn't go on some fishing expedition to look at	8	interests that we have identified.
9	potentially valuable information about individuals'	9	THE CHAIR: Okay. So it is not merely a question of don't
10	future conduct or past conduct in their real name.	10	identify, they are not capable of identifying sorry
11	We shouldn't discount the possibility that valuable	11	balancing
12	information will come to light serving the instrumental	12	MS KAUFMANN: That particular interest is not capable of
13	purposes of providing the Inquiry with relevant	13	outweighing the force and the weight to be given to the
14	information just because we do not know about it at the	14	interests in openness and disclosure. And if it is, it
15	moment.	15	really means that there will never be cases in which
16	THE CHAIR: I understand the principled arguments, I was	16	real names can be disclosed, save for where you are
17	simply concerned with the practicality.	17	dealing with this principle. And the principle that it
18	MS KAUFMANN: It would not be a matter for you to concern	18	is a manager and therefore the manager's name needs to
19	yourself with. It would be a matter for other people to	19	be disclosed.
20	see if they can piece it together.	20	If the interest of an individual in simply not
21	THE CHAIR: I was just querying the mechanism by which	21	having her husband named is sufficient to outweigh the
22	publication of the real name of somebody who has	22	interest in openness that I have identified, then there
23	fulfilled managerial functions later on in life might	23	will not be any cases in which real names fall to be
24	trigger a recollection which the publication of the	24	disclosed and that is the point we make
25	cover name would not.	25	THE CHAIR: With respect, that is a significant
	Page 102		Page 104

1	overstatement. There are two instances that I have	1	At the time that his role was disclosed to the
2	already identified and I do not exclude the possibility	2	public at large or hers this officer considered
3	of more in which the real name will, I expect, be	3	the risk of physical attack to be low. That was this
4	published.	4	officer's personal assessment.
5	One is where they are managers.	5	Then in July this year, if we look at tab 40, the
6	The other is where they have done something wrong.	6	risk of physical attack has been assessed in the risk
7	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, absolutely. Putting those two situations	7	assessment, the Metropolitan Police Service risk
8	aside, other than those two situations, if this interest	8	assessment, pages 16 to 17 as a medium risk if real
9	on the part of a wife or a family member is sufficient	9	identity is revealed. It is a medium risk could
10	to outweigh all the other factors weighing in respect of	10	reasonably be foreseen with a serious impact if it
11	openness, in circumstances where one doesn't know yet	11	happened.
12	that there has been wrongdoing, then it follows save for	12	Again, we have absolutely no information whatsoever
13	those two instances you have identified, that there will	13	as to the basis on which that risk assessment is made.
14	never be a revelation of real names.	14	We are told that the risk is not from known groups but
15	THE CHAIR: Thank you.	15	from others who might form a hostile attitude. That
16	I think the next one is HN81, is it not?	16	comes in tab 42, paragraphs 11 to 12 of Slater &
17	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, it is.	17	Gordon's submissions.
18	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core	18	THE CHAIR: I think I can assist you on the facts of this
19	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN81	19	case, by saying that it is not the risk of physical
20	MS KAUFMANN: This is another situation in which there has	20	injury or threat to safety that was determinative.
21	been a reconsideration on your part	21	MS KAUFMANN: So it is an article 8 risk here?
22	THE CHAIR: I think not, I think I said I was going to	22	THE CHAIR: Yes.
23	have	23	MS KAUFMANN: It is an article 8 risk.
24	MS KAUFMANN: Let me remind myself. I'm sorry.	24	Again, that brings us back to what is the nature of
25	THE CHAIR: I said there would have to be a closed hearing	25	the risk? Are we talking about a risk of hostility of
	Page 105		Page 107
1	and explained why.	1	the kind manifested towards Bob Lambert? One should
2	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Forgive me, I'm back on the right page	2	remind oneself, Bob Lambert was a manager
3	now.	3	THE CHAIR: Can I just draw your attention to the words
4	We are in a position where you are now minded to	4	I have used in the public document:
5	disclose the cover name and withhold the real name, as	5	"It is likely that this decision will have an
6	I understand it.	6	adverse impact on HN81's mental health and so interfere
7	THE CHAIR: Yes.	7	with his right to respect for family and private life."
8	MS KAUFMANN: In your minded to note, in tab 9, at	8	MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful, because I have to grapple with
9	paragraphs 5 and 6, you set out the basis upon which you	9	a number of different points that are put forward. One
10	identify the necessity of disclosing the cover name.	10	of these was of hostility of that kind, so that has been
11	You then recognise the potential adverse impact that it	11	put aside.
12	is going to have and that is an impact upon HN81's	12	THE CHAIR: I entirely appreciate that. I appreciate that
13	mental health and thereby an inference with his or her	13	my words are laconic and have to be read perhaps more
		1.4	About and As and December 2011 and 1912 and 1913
14	right to respect for private life and equally that of	14	than once to realise what I'm getting at, but I draw
15	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the	15	your attention to that, because that is the
15 16	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary.	15 16	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety.
15 16 17	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To	15 16 17	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made
15 16 17 18	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether	15 16 17 18	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or
15 16 17 18 19	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not	15 16 17 18 19	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure,
15 16 17 18 19 20	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name.	15 16 17 18 19 20	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name. THE CHAIR: Quite, I assume that you are pleased about the	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make any submissions because we know nothing about the basis
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name. THE CHAIR: Quite, I assume that you are pleased about the decision I am minded to make about cover name.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make any submissions because we know nothing about the basis of Dr Busuttil's analysis, we are simply told that there
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name. THE CHAIR: Quite, I assume that you are pleased about the decision I am minded to make about cover name. MS KAUFMANN: Indeed we are, given the critical role of this	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make any submissions because we know nothing about the basis of Dr Busuttil's analysis, we are simply told that there is a high risk of health issues at tab 39. We don't
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name. THE CHAIR: Quite, I assume that you are pleased about the decision I am minded to make about cover name. MS KAUFMANN: Indeed we are, given the critical role of this officer in relation to the issues to be looked at in	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make any submissions because we know nothing about the basis of Dr Busuttil's analysis, we are simply told that there is a high risk of health issues at tab 39. We don't know if they can be mitigated in any way and we don't
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name. THE CHAIR: Quite, I assume that you are pleased about the decision I am minded to make about cover name. MS KAUFMANN: Indeed we are, given the critical role of this	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make any submissions because we know nothing about the basis of Dr Busuttil's analysis, we are simply told that there is a high risk of health issues at tab 39. We don't
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	his or her partner. And conclude nonetheless that the disclosure is necessary. Observations in relation to articles 2 and 3. To the issue here now I am going to address you on whether or not there should be disclosure of real name and not just cover name. THE CHAIR: Quite, I assume that you are pleased about the decision I am minded to make about cover name. MS KAUFMANN: Indeed we are, given the critical role of this officer in relation to the issues to be looked at in	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your attention to that, because that is the determinative risk here, not physical safety. MS KAUFMANN: Then I simply repeat the submissions I made before in relation to issues as to the psychiatric or the likely impact upon psychiatric health of disclosure, which is that we are in no position whatsoever to make any submissions because we know nothing about the basis of Dr Busuttil's analysis, we are simply told that there is a high risk of health issues at tab 39. We don't know if they can be mitigated in any way and we don't

1	THE CHAIR: I have explored that in the closed session in	1	the Metropolitan Police Service are very, very conscious
2	detail and with care.	2	of the importance of this officer's deployment to the
3	One measure is referred to in the open reasons in	3	Inquiry and the questions that need to be considered and
4	paragraph 8.	4	answered, obviously in particular about the extent of
5	MS KAUFMANN: That relates to disclosure of the cover name	5	HN81's interaction with the Lawrence family campaign
6	and the groups.	6	through HN81's infiltration of an as yet unnamed group.
7	THE CHAIR: Yes, but it would apply also to real name if	7	The Metropolitan Police Service, having said that,
8	I were minded to do that.	8	accepts your ruling on cover name. The Metropolitan
9	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, sir.	9	Police Service has never advanced its own interest as
10	THE CHAIR: HN81 is someone whose case has to be handled	10	a reason to restrict that cover identity but has only
11	with great care so as not to inflict quite serious	11	been concerned about the impact on HN81.
12	mental health damage.	12	You have ruled that the importance of examining
13	MS KAUFMANN: Given the limitations of what I can say at	13	HN81's deployment justifies the identified risk of harm
14	this stage, I would simply urge that the issue of real	14	from disclosing the cover name and we do not challenge
15	name disclosure be kept under review should you maintain	15	that conclusion.
16	your position, as currently set out in your minded to,	16	I was going to say a fair amount about why we do
17	of not disclosing the real name. But that it be kept	17	maintain our application over the real name, but in
18	under review so that both the state of his ill-health	18	light of the exchange that you have had with Ms Kaufmann
19	can be kept under review but also the interests in	19	and her realistic approach on being told that this is
20	favour of disclosure can continue to be weighed.	20	a genuine issue of mental health, I don't think I would
21	THE CHAIR: Of necessity, all of these decisions are kept	21	help you by saying any more, apart from to say that we
22	under review, some of them more perhaps anxiously than	22	do strongly maintain our application in relation to
23	others.	23	restriction over the real name.
24	In a case in which there is the risk of quite	24	THE CHAIR: I think this can be said.
25	serious mental health problem, then saying "I'm going to	25	Although the question of the group or groups
	Page 109		Page 111
			C
1	keep it under review" is potentially itself a cause of	1	infiltrated has not yet been addressed specifically,
2	further problems or of exacerbation of existing	2	I can imagine no circumstances in which if the cover
3	problems.	3	name is revealed the group or groups also would not be.
4	These are difficult and delicate questions and	4	MR HALL: Absolutely, yes.
5	I think this is an instance in which actually disclosing	5	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
6	more about the mental health condition of HN81 would not	6	Mr Brandon.
7	greatly assist you, but would risk harm to HN81. It is	7	MR BRANDON: Sir, for very obvious reasons I'm not proposing
8	one of those cases where there is nothing more that	8	to address you at all on this application.
9	could be done other than disclosing the full medical	9	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
10	report. I could not, for example, require HN81 to	10	MS KAUFMANN: So where to next?
11	submit to psychiatric examination at the behest of the	11	THE CHAIR: HN104, who for once has a name and agenda.
12	non-state core participants or for that matter the	12	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
13	Inquiry, and it would, I think, be wrong in principle	13	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN104
14	even to attempt that.	14	MS KAUFMANN: Carlo Neri. The only issue here, as you know,
15	This is one of those cases where frustrating though	15	is disclosure of real name, Mr Neri's real name, and the
16	it may be for those who instruct you, and possibly even	16	position of my clients in relation to that.
17	for you and those behind you, it is one of those cases	17	THE CHAIR: Yes.
18	in which no more can be said than I have already said.	18	MS KAUFMANN: Which is that the real name should be
19	MS KAUFMANN: Well that is all we propose to say then on	19	disclosed. My clients know the real name already, as we
20	this particular officer.	20	have explained. They have known it for some time. They
21	THE CHAIR: Thank you, yes.	21	have not disclosed it on the basis that they felt it was
22	Mr Hall?	22	appropriate for an opportunity and time to be given to
23	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by	23	Mr Neri and those of his former and current family
24	MR HALL re HN81	24	members to prepare themselves for the fact of its
25	MR HALL: Yes, briefly. But I will say one or two things,	25	disclosure.
	D 440		D 110
	Page 110		Page 112
			28 (Pages 109 to 112)

	The state of the s		
1	They expected that this would happen as a result of	1	but what would be different is it would be official
2	an order in the course of this Inquiry, and that is the	2	confirmation and official requirement to account.
3	question with which you are now having to grapple. Do	3	THE CHAIR: I understand that proposition. I also respect
4	you do it or do we do it?	4	and commend the decision of the women I think it is
5	THE CHAIR: I think that is the question.	5	concerned not so far to make public his name.
6	MS KAUFMANN: That's the question.	6	May I ask through you if I do accede to your
7	THE CHAIR: As I know you and those who instruct you know,	7	submission, that they would hold their hand while the
8	the interest to which I referred in my second minded to	8	Inquiry seeks to manage the impact on in particular his
9	note indirectly and obliquely were those of his former	9	two children itself?
10	wife and two children of his first marriage. It is	10	MS KAUFMANN: I will take instructions on that.
11	fundamentally their interests which are at stake here.	11	THE CHAIR: Yes.
12	The interests of Carlo Neri personally play	12	MS KAUFMANN: As soon as we can we will tell you the
13	a negligible if any part.	13	position.
14	Those of his current partner and his current family	14	THE CHAIR: Yes. It is not something that needs to be done
15	do play a part, but the issue that I think everybody has	15	instantly.
16	to face up to is what is the impact of revealing the	16	MS KAUFMANN: No.
17	real name on his ex-wife and perhaps more importantly	17	THE CHAIR: I don't know how many individuals are in
18	their two children who bear his name.	18	immediate contact, but we have a break in the middle of
19	MS KAUFMANN: My clients have considered that, whilst they	19	the afternoon anyway and if necessary it can be done
20	understand the distress it is going to cause and don't	20	later.
21	intend or wish to cause that distress, what is a matter	21	Can I take this opportunity of explaining a phrase
22	of higher principle to them is that this officer should	22	that I used in my minded to note which you submit caused
23	be accountable for his conduct. He should be	23	offence that these are "claimed" relationships.
24	accountable for his conduct in his real name, which	24	Admissions have been made by the Metropolitan Police
25	accords entirely with your cases repeatedly that those	25	Service, none have, so far as I know, yet been made by
	Page 113		Page 115
1	who have engaged in wrongdoing should be identified.	1	Carlo Neri himself. Ultimately, it is not for the
2	His case has been settled by the Metropolitan Police	2	Metropolitan Police Service to decide these questions.
3	Service on the basis that he did engage in such	3	If it has to be decided it is for me to decide them, and
4	reprehensible conduct, and therefore the first point is	4	therefore I used a word which did not prejudge.
5	that the interests in his accountability or in his being	5	I intended absolutely no disrespect to anybody.
6	accountable outweigh the interests of the family	6	MS KAUFMANN: There is no reason now for us not to then
7	members.	7	continue.
8	That has this further consequence, which is that	8	Those are my submissions.
9	because that balance has been struck by my clients	9	THE CHAIR: Quite. Certainly not. No, no, of course not.
10	themselves, it is inevitable that his identity is going	10	Mr Hall?
11	to be disclosed one way or the other. Therefore, it is	11	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
12	inevitable that that distress is going to be caused to	12	MR HALL re HN104
13	the family members one way or another. That thereby	13	MR HALL: I'm not sure what I can usefully add in the light
14	weakens to the point of nil the value of any protection	14	of that exchange. It may be better for me to, if you
15	that you could afford to her and the children by	15	will permit, wait until the outcome of that
16	refusing to disclose his real name.	16	consultation
17	Which in our submission means that that really	17	THE CHAIR: Yes.
18	leaves you in the position of doing what the Inquiry	18	MR HALL: this is a desperately difficult matter. You
19	should do, which is to officially hold accountable those	19	know the Metropolitan Police Service's position in
20	who engage in wrongdoing and therefore we submit it	20	relation to our understanding the importance of true
21	should be your decision to publicly and within the	21	names to deceived women.
22	context of this Inquiry officially confirm his real	22	Equally, as I am sure Ms Kaufmann is acknowledging,
23	name, rather than to leave it to my clients to do that	23	the interests of children and third parties weigh in the
24	in an unofficial way.	24	balance. There is a management exercise, I think
25	The consequence would be exactly the same for her,	25	probably the less I say the better.
I			D 447
	Page 114		Page 116

1	THE CHAIR: Very wise, thank you.	1	eroded I think is an overstatement. I quite appreciate
2	Mr Brandon?	2	it imposes a significant obstacle in permitting others
3	MR BRANDON: Sir, we have a hearing I think fixed at some	3	to come forward.
4	point in the future.	4	MS KAUFMANN: The central role of this officer in relation
5	THE CHAIR: I have indicated that I would be willing to hold	5	to the Lawrence Inquiry is set out in our submissions at
6	one, certainly, and you want one?	6	paragraphs 141 to 143, and in those of Mr Francis at
7	MR BRANDON: I think so, yes, please.	7	paragraphs 21 to 24.
8	THE CHAIR: Then I think the hearing would have to be	8	It is clear that the evidence is central relating to
9	undertaken on a slightly different basis from that which	9	this officer, and so the potential damage from
10	applied to the previous cases, namely that this is about	10	individuals affected by this officer's conduct not being
11	the real identity not the cover name. If I were, as	11	able to come forward with evidence is all the greater
12	a result of the hearing, minded to make a restriction	12	because of the centrality of this officer.
13	order in respect of the real name, then I would give	13	THE CHAIR: I don't agree with you about this officer's
14	everybody else the opportunity of saying something about	14	centrality. You make the point that well we don't yet
15	it after I reached that provisional decision.	15	know, but I think that is the position, rather than we
16	MR BRANDON: Yes, of course, sir.	16	know the opposite.
17	THE CHAIR: But provided that that is understood, then it	17	MS KAUFMANN: Well, again, I of course can't gainsay that.
18	seems to me that that is a sensible course.	18	But what we certainty don't know is the extent to which
19	MR BRANDON: Yes.	19	other additional valuable information could come to
20	THE CHAIR: I don't think anyone else has any interest in	20	light which might shed a different picture on your
21	this issue.	21	current understanding of the situation, should the cover
22	Ms Kaufmann, in those circumstances, I perhaps need	22	identity at the very least be known.
23	to ask you to take instructions on whether the women	23	What it appears forms the basis of your minded to
24	concerned will stay their hand until after this process	24	are not concerns about a risk to his physical safety so
25	has been undertaken. It will not take all that long, it	25	engaging articles 2 and 3, but more risks to his
	Page 117		Page 119
	rage 117		rage 119
1	will be a matter of weeks at most.	1	article 8 rights arising from his own or her own
2	MS KAUFMANN: We will get our clients' instructions on that.	2	psychiatric condition and concerns in relation to the
3	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. That is very helpful.	3	partner.
4	MR BARR: Sir, the next officer that falls for consideration	4	I just want to confirm that that is correct.
5	is HN123. Before my learned friend Ms Kaufmann	5	I don't want to go off on a wrong footing. As
6	addresses you, sir, I think it is right that I should	6	I understand it, this isn't a physical safety case, it
7	make clear to everyone that HN123 is no longer a core	7	is
8	participant, having indicated that HN123 did not want to	8	THE CHAIR: Insofar as physical safety arises at all, it
9	be a core participant any longer. Neither is HN123	9	arises under article 8 and not under 2 or 3.
10	legally represented.	10	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
11	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, in theory an open goal should be	11	THE CHAIR: I have given the reasons why I made the decision
12	easier to shoot at but it is not.	12	and it is not focused upon that at all. It is focused
13	MS KAUFMANN: I don't take it as being any easier.	13	upon what I have been told by HN123 and the partner.
14	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core	14	MS KAUFMANN: Can I just point you to our request for
15	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN123	15	disclosure which was sent in last week, on Thursday of
16	MS KAUFMANN: This is an officer in relation to whom	16	last week. I don't know whether you have that with you.
17	currently you are minded neither to disclose the cover	17	I can just read it to you and then I can seek some
18	name nor the real name.	18	clarification so we can I don't want to start making
19	THE CHAIR: Yes.	19	submissions that are not necessary and are unhelpful.
20	MS KAUFMANN: It is an officer where the prospects of	20	THE CHAIR: I don't, I think, have the document.
21	getting to the truth, should that position be	21	MS KAUFMANN: We wrote:
22	maintained, whatever the truth may be, are necessarily	22	"Disclosure limited to the gist of an outdated risk
23	wholly eroded because people simply will not be in	23	assessment from March 2016, which was presumably
24	a position to come forward.	24	prepared by Jaipur or Karachi."
25	THE CHAIR: May be inhibited, to say it will be wholly	25	Sorry, that's what we have.
	Page 118		Page 120
	1 age 110		1 agc 120

1	What we wrote about last week was the limits of what	1	example.
2	we have so far, which is the outdated risk assessment,	2	I assume the concern is in relation to the cover
3	this dating from 2016, and we highlighted the problems	3	name, even if the cover name is revealed this officer is
4	that there were with Jaipur and Karachi's independence	4	going to suffer serious psychiatric consequences.
5	and what I want then to clarify with you is that that	5	THE CHAIR: It is, I am afraid, a little more complicated
6	problem as to the inadequacy of the disclosure in	6	than that. I am treading on eggshells here and I'm
7	relation to risk is not something I need to concern	7	conscious of that fact.
8	myself with, because risk in terms of physical safety is	8	I have stated that the decision that I'm minded to
9	not a factor.	9	make is squarely founded on two personal statements,
10	THE CHAIR: You are right. I have set out the reasons for	10	not, as one would expect to see in a case of this
11	reaching the decision I am minded to make in the	11	nature, medical reports. I am minded to make this
12	published note in paragraph 9.	12	decision because of all that I know about HN123 and his
13	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.	13	partner, and I make it on an express factual premise
14	THE CHAIR: As always, it is couched in rather more general	14	which may prove to be wrong, namely that he was involved
15	terms than you would like. But it should at least	15	only indirectly in deployments affecting the Lawrence
16	disclose to you the mainspring of the reasons.	16	family. I know that that factual premise is challenged
17	MS KAUFMANN: Then similarly we complained about the risk	17	by Peter Francis, the basis for the challenge I made
18	assessment in relation to Mark Veljovic I'm not sure	18	need to explore with Ms Sikand, but I have made
19	how that is pronounced. We complained that we don't	19	a decision on a factual premise and on the statements of
20	have that. But again, the question I have and I assume	20	HN123 and his partner.
21	the answer is we don't need it, because we are not	21	Should the factual premise prove to be wrong, then
22	concerned with a risk to physical safety and that what	22	of course I will have to revisit this decision. In that
23	we are concerned with is his psychiatric health should	23	event, a professional medical opinion would, if it were
24	there be disclosure.	24	to be available, play a far greater part, as would
25	THE CHAIR: Yes.	25	considerations of public interest.
	Page 121	_	Page 123
1	MS KAUFMANN: So I can put that aside as well.	1	MS KAUFMANN: If I might, I will just in light of that
2	THE CHAIR: He has fears about it, as I have stated.	2	information for which I am grateful just make some
3	MS KAUFMANN: I understand he has fears, but I am talking	3	submissions, which are that insofar as this particular
4	about the objective foundation to his fears, which is	4	officer has a concern in relation to disclosure of his
5	what these risk assessments are concerned with.	5	or her cover name, which is not rationally based in the
6	If the objective foundation to those fears is	6	terms of the likely consequences of disclosure of the
7	something that you are taking into consideration, then	7	cover name. That is if it were the case that the
8	the absence of any disclosure in relation to that is	8	disclosure of the cover name is not going to lead to
9	something that I would express concern about. I'm	9	revelation of the real name, there is not going to be a
10	trying to clarify whether I need to press for disclosure	10	mosaic effect, such that the cover name can safely be
11	or I don't need to because these matters are irrelevant	11	disclosed. Then in my submission where there is no
		1	
12	to your consideration.	12	•
12 13	to your consideration. THE CHAIR: You don't.	12 13	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged
13	THE CHAIR: You don't.	13	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration
13 14	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful.	13 14	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak
13 14 15	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation	13 14 15	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There
13 14 15 16	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of	13 14 15 16	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the
13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no	13 14 15 16 17	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But
13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which	13 14 15 16 17 18	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this. I cannot say, for example or I am not informed	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for redecision.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this. I cannot say, for example or I am not informed whether or not the concerns that this officer has that	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for redecision. MS KAUFMANN: The difficulty with that is that there may be
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this. I cannot say, for example or I am not informed whether or not the concerns that this officer has that are going to lead to a deterioration in his psychiatric	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for redecision. MS KAUFMANN: The difficulty with that is that there may be other facts about this officer's undercover activities,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this. I cannot say, for example or I am not informed whether or not the concerns that this officer has that are going to lead to a deterioration in his psychiatric condition are going to flow whether the cover name is	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for redecision. MS KAUFMANN: The difficulty with that is that there may be other facts about this officer's undercover activities, apart from this officer's involvement in Lawrence, which
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this. I cannot say, for example or I am not informed whether or not the concerns that this officer has that are going to lead to a deterioration in his psychiatric	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for redecision. MS KAUFMANN: The difficulty with that is that there may be other facts about this officer's undercover activities,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: You don't. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. What we are then left with is yet again a situation where an assessment is being made on the basis of psychiatric evidence that we have no access to and no information about in any meaningful sense, and which leaves me in the position again where I can't say anything meaningful to you in relation to this. I cannot say, for example or I am not informed whether or not the concerns that this officer has that are going to lead to a deterioration in his psychiatric condition are going to flow whether the cover name is	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	psychiatric evidence to support the alleged deterioration THE CHAIR: I didn't say there was none. I'm sorry to speak in riddles but it is more complicated than that. There is one person in the room who fully understands the position, apart from possibly better than I do. But this is genuinely a problematic case. If the factual foundation for the decision which I'm minded to make goes, then everything is open for review and for redecision. MS KAUFMANN: The difficulty with that is that there may be other facts about this officer's undercover activities, apart from this officer's involvement in Lawrence, which

1	name we are not going to find that out. If in fact this	1	Unless Mr Hall wants to saying something first?
2	officer's stated concerns are irrational concerns in the	2	No, you have the floor.
3	face of what the implications of disclosure of the cover	3	Submissions on behalf of Peter Francis by MS SIKAND re HN123
4	name are going to be, if in fact those irrational	4	MS SIKAND: Sir, I am sorry if I missed this whilst I was
5	concerns are ones which a psychiatrist does not	5	taking some instructions, but in the supplemental
6	persuasively say are going to result in some sort of	6	application on behalf of N123, there is mention of
7	psychiatric injury	7	medical reports, at paragraph 1.
8	THE CHAIR: I'm sorry, the concerns are not irrational. If	8	THE CHAIR: There are umpteen medical reports. I'm very
9	one looks at it purely objectively, the article 3 risk	9	sorry, I really can't say any more than that. This is
10	is quite insufficient to give rise to a breach of his	10	not a case in which I have an up-to-date medical report
11	rights under article 3 if his cover name were to be made	11	which sets out the problems and I am then able to say
12	public.	12	that the fears of HN123 are rational or irrational.
13	In this instance I'm speaking about "his" because	13	That isn't the position, but there have been medical
14	everybody knows it is a him and there is no possible	14	reports.
15	interest to be served by pretending otherwise.	15	MS SIKAND: Sir, as you know, Peter Francis knows who N123
16	In an ideal world I would put a decision on HN123 on	16	is
17	the back-burner and look at it later in the proceedings.	17	THE CHAIR: Yes, he does.
18	In fairness to him and his partner, I can't. I have to	18	MS SIKAND: and we have written to you privately as to an
19	make a decision on the basis of what I'm told by them,	19	aspect of that and how he knows him.
20	I think, in fairness to him.	20	Peter Francis knows who he infiltrated.
21	The decision is necessarily provisional because it	21	THE CHAIR: Yes, but there is a difference of recollection,
22	is based on the factual premise, but I simply cannot at	22	I think, which needs to be explored between them about
23	the moment see any other way of doing it that protects	23	exactly what happened.
24	legitimate interests and ensures that the Inquiry gets	24	MS SIKAND: Yes.
25	something of value from and in relation to HN123.	25	THE CHAIR: I know there are opposing views about some of
	Page 125		Page 127
1	MS KAUFMANN: I keep coming back to, my concern is there	1	the issues into which the Inquiry is looking which have
2	seem to be a disjuncture it may not be a total	2	been fairly forcefully expressed by both of them.
3	disjuncture – between what he is saying and his wife is	3	MS SIKAND: Yes. You have seen the way both Ellison and
4	saying and what is being said in support by	4	Herne have expressed the differing views
5	a psychiatrist.	5	THE CHAIR: Yes.
6	THE CHAIR: I'm sorry, it really is not as simple as that.	6	MS SIKAND: and there is no point me repeating them and
7	I'm sorry, I can't tell you why it isn't as simple as	7	I have extrapolated from both of those reports in my
8	that, but it is not. It is not that I have a medical	8	4 October submissions.
9	report that says the concerns are daft and he's not ill,	9	THE CHAIR: Yes.
10	I don't.	10	MS SIKAND: Some of the broader disputes between HN123 and
11	MS KAUFMANN: No. Well there really is nothing further	11	Peter Francis about whether or not there was any general
12	I think I can say on this point. It is a frustrating	12	smearing of the Lawrence family.
13	and difficult situation for us, because this officer	13	THE CHAIR: Yes.
14	clearly has relevant evidence to give. There is no	14	MS SIKAND: But I have also made reference to Bob Lambert's
15	doubt relevant evidence can be given by others about	15	view, such that it is
16	this officer	16	THE CHAIR: Yes.
17	THE CHAIR: Yes.	17	MS SIKAND: about the role that HN123 played in relation
18	MS KAUFMANN: and at the moment	18	to the Lawrence family campaign.
19	THE CHAIR: I'm very anxious to obtain it. I don't want to	19	THE CHAIR: You have done.
20	put at risk the possibility of obtaining it, which is	20	MS SIKAND: Which contradicts of course the position, your
21	why he has to be handled with great care.	21	premature somewhat premature finding of fact
22	MS KAUFMANN: I have no further submissions.	22	THE CHAIR: It is not a premature finding of fact. This is
23	THE CHAIR: No.	23	a misunderstanding. It comes no doubt from the laconic
24	Ms Sikand, I think you probably go next on this,	24	way in which I express things. That is the factual
25	don't you.	25	premise on which I am minded to make the order. If the
		1	
	Page 126		Page 128

1			
	factual premise turns out to be wrong, then I have to	1	I don't know about, you may be making the wrong
2	start again. But I don't see how I can find out whether	2	decision. And it doesn't help to then revisit that
3	the factual premise is right or wrong until we have got	3	wrong decision at a later date if the reason for making
4	into the substantive phase and I have heard from people.	4	the decision early is to give him some finality.
5	One of the people from whom I must hear if possible	5	So it seems to us that the principled way to
6	is HN123.	6	proceed, or the most sensible way to proceed, is to
7	MS SIKAND: Sir, there is also the difficulty so I also	7	release his cover name.
8	have to be careful about the way in which I express	8	THE CHAIR: I am anxious to obtain evidence from HN123.
9	myself.	9	I may not do so if I adopt the course that you suggest.
10	THE CHAIR: Yes.	10	I think obtaining evidence from him is more important to
11	MS SIKAND: But what we have put in our original	11	the ability to find the truth than publishing his cover
12	paragraph 24, if I could take you there, is that at this	12	name to prompt evidence from the infiltrated groups
13	stage of course, as I have already said, that	13	which might cast some bearing on him.
14	Peter Francis has not been asked to provide any formal	14	Your client knows the personnel involved here. In
15	evidence and then I deal with the factual premise upon	15	the course of the substantive hearing, or conceivably
16	which you were operating in your minded to note, to say	16	before it, I would not encourage it but if in the course
17	that the level of involvement, the chicken and egg	17	of the substantive hearing it becomes obvious that
18	scenario, the only way in which you can actually get to	18	I have not been told the truth by HN123 about his
19	the truth of that, of where he was in relation to the	19	deployment, and I think it would become fairly obvious
20	Lawrences, to put it broadly, is if you release his	20	if that were so, then I will have to revisit it. Not at
21	cover name because then those who he infiltrated will be	21	an ideal stage but at a stage which might permit
22	able to assist you.	22	something to be rescued.
23	What I can say is as far as Peter Francis is	23	You say my decision may be wrong. I acknowledge
24	concerned, from what he knows about the group that he	24	that that is the case in many of these matters of
25	did infiltrate, whilst on the face of it were not	25	judgment. This is a very difficult judgment in a very
	Page 129		Page 131
1	directly related to the Lawrence's direct campaign, it	1	unusual and difficult case.
2	most certainly was on the fringes of it and interacted	2	MS SIKAND: No one envies your task, sir, but as
3	with it. I won't say anything further.	3	I understand what you are now saying, what you are
4	THE CHAIR: Quite right.	4	
5	MS SIKAND: In those circumstances, it seems to us extremely		saving is you would like to delay this decision but you
		5	saying is you would like to delay this decision but you won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing
		5	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing
6	important that you do disclose his cover name because	6	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him
6 7	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able	6 7	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes.
6	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say	6	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean
6 7 8 9	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in	6 7 8 9	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do
6 7 8 9 10	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence.	6 7 8 9 10	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different
6 7 8 9 10 11	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and	6 7 8 9 10 11	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now?
6 7 8 9 10	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence.	6 7 8 9 10	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is
6 7 8 9 10 11	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you THE CHAIR: Of course.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that there would be circumstances in which I would have to do
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you THE CHAIR: Of course. MS SIKAND: as to when balancing the two	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that there would be circumstances in which I would have to do that, but I really don't want to do it and I don't think
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you THE CHAIR: Of course. MS SIKAND: as to when balancing the two THE CHAIR: I quite understand.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that there would be circumstances in which I would have to do that, but I really don't want to do it and I don't think it is in principle the right approach.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you THE CHAIR: Of course. MS SIKAND: as to when balancing the two THE CHAIR: I quite understand. MS SIKAND: All we can say is that if you now make this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that there would be circumstances in which I would have to do that, but I really don't want to do it and I don't think it is in principle the right approach. MS SIKAND: But given that it seems, as I understood it, and
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you THE CHAIR: Of course. MS SIKAND: as to when balancing the two THE CHAIR: I quite understand. MS SIKAND: All we can say is that if you now make this decision on potentially a false premise, for the reasons	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that there would be circumstances in which I would have to do that, but I really don't want to do it and I don't think it is in principle the right approach. MS SIKAND: But given that it seems, as I understood it, and please correct me if I have this wrong. As I understand
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	important that you do disclose his cover name because those who then become aware of who he was will be able to assist you with that dispute, which is what you say in general terms about disclosure of cover names in terms of valuable evidence. But given that this is a significant officer, and given that there is in some ways a defined factual dispute, the public interest in disclosure of his cover name we say becomes more real or the balance lies in favour of disclosure. And in terms of looking at our hands are tied in relation to the personal statements and what they say in order to make any meaningful submissions to you THE CHAIR: Of course. MS SIKAND: as to when balancing the two THE CHAIR: I quite understand. MS SIKAND: All we can say is that if you now make this decision on potentially a false premise, for the reasons that you say, because you want to give him some	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	won't delay it; that you want to get on with hearing evidence from him THE CHAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: I have not quite understood. Do you mean evidence in the context of a fully blown inquiry or do you mean getting evidence from him through a different source, like now? THE CHAIR: No, no, I don't mean that. I don't think it is right generally I don't think that is so in this case for me to obtain what would necessarily be closed oral evidence from participants. Or from, in this case, someone who is not a participant but who is a relevant figure. I would never say never. It is conceivable that there would be circumstances in which I would have to do that, but I really don't want to do it and I don't think it is in principle the right approach. MS SIKAND: But given that it seems, as I understood it, and please correct me if I have this wrong. As I understand it, that evidence would help you decide the nature of

THE CHAIR. No, no, we are at cross-purposes. The cordence for histing about is the evidence which would be given at a substantive hearing - the deployments in respect to the Lawrence campaign. Have said fire determined to do that. I am determined to do that and I think that having now, which is a risk that would be run if I were not to make the order that. The minided to note, I six worth making and practised the use of violence and that should not, as it were got by the board when one is considering. — 11 Mes NIKAND. Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if deliced in the way that you anticipate would be a client in the way that you anticipate would be understand that. I make the should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have root participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested. 12 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have root participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested. 13 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have root participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested. 14 The CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have root participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested. 15 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have root expects, but any to be the conty one of his type, who have the conty of the participant and the control of the deployment. In other words an office, and may not be the only one of his type, who have the control of the participant and his				
3 First of all, and I am taking this from, sir your minded to note. It is worth making the point publicly that the value being this from, sir your substituted to the complete of the company in the deployments in respect to the Lawrence campaign. I have said red determined to do that. I am determined to do that. I am determined to do that and I think that having some evidence from HN123 is better than having none, which is a risk in the was the polyed against a number of groups in the 1990s, at least one of which advocated and practised the value of the poly of violence and that should not, as it were, go by the buard when one is considering. 11 If the CHAIR: I accept that All I'm saying is that the mainspring for my decision is not an article 3 risk. 12 MS SIKAND: Yes, ris, but of course that evidence if elicited in the way that you anticipate would be untested, electinity. 13 MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. 14 THE CHAIR: Hardly 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we core participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested. 17 HE was diagnosed as sufficing from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part from the effects our attitude. 18 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there is in the should give his evidence publicly, per pass with protective measures, but as your lightly say your client knows in great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. 19 Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose IIN123's evidence and 2 lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 1 I really don't want to lose IIN123's evidence and 2 lemphasis than there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 1 I really don't want to lose InN123's evidence and 2 lemphasis on that after its a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded	1	THE CHAIR: No, no, we are at cross-purposes.	1	which HN123 makes the application and which we support
4 MS SIKAND: Which will test it. 5 THE CHAIR: — to enable me to get to the truth about the 6 deployments in respect to the Lawrence campaign. Have 8 said Tru determined to do that. I am determined to do 8 my best to do that and think that having some evidence of from HN123 is better than having none, which is a risk 11 I'm minded to. 12 MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if 13 elicited in the way that you anticipate would be untested, certainly— 14 untested, certainly— 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we care participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested— 19 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 11 is tested— 12 should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have 21 in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say yes close. 10 Page 133 11 Leally don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 1 emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 11 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and 1 am grateful for your submissions. 12 MR HALL: Rhaw like cans yan ym owne, sir. 13 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and 1 am grateful for your submissions. 14 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and 1 am grateful for your submissions. 15 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and 1 am grateful for your submissions. 16 WIR HALL: Rhaw licans yan ym owne, sir. 17 THE CHAIR: Wes. 18 MR HALL: Rhaw licans yan ym owne, sir. 29 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 90 with your and the tought of the manure of the application. 14 THE CHAIR: Wes. 15 THE CHAIR: Hard. The definitely is not. 16 Will you mean by that? 17 THE CHAIR: Wes would point, however, to two aspects of this case. 20 One is that this case allustratest if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular finds. 21 I	2	The evidence I'm talking about is the evidence which	2	so far as I understand it.
5 THE CHAIR:—I no enable me to get to the truth about the 6 deployments in respect to the Lawrence campaign. I have 8 said Tm determined to do that. I am determined to do 8 my best to do that and I think that having some evidence 9 from IRIV23 is better than having none, which is a risk. 10 that would be run if I were not to make the order that 11 I'm minded to. 12 MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if 13 elicited in the way that you anticipate would be 14 unitested, certainly— 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we 18 esteed— 19 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there 20 should be a closed hearing of his evidence publicly, 21 perhaps with protective measures, but a sput rightly say 22 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 23 your client shows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose HN1235 evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 5 tateful and I am grafted for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 11 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Of course. 14 THE CHAIR: Of course. 15 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 16 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 27 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 28 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 39 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 40 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 41 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 42 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 43 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 44 Lemphasise that the	3	would be given at a substantive hearing	3	First of all, and I am taking this from, sir your
deployments in respect to the Lawrence campaign. Have said frm determined to do that. I am determined to do my best to do that and think that having some evidence from HN123 is better than having some evidence from HN123 is better than having some, which is a risk that the would be run if I were not to make the order that I m minded to. 12 MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if elifected in the way that you anticipate would be untested, certainly — 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we core participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested — 19 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence publicly, perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 clse. 10 Tracilly don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 1 Lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a a coarse other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I have been externely helpful and very 6 tactful and 1 am grateful for your submissions. 11 THE CHAIR: I don't limit I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 12 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Rive in the wind word in the submissions of the publication. 13 THE CHAIR: When you is a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to abopt. 4 mark the proper is a risk that will if I adopt a coarse other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 mark the proper is a risk that will if I adopt a coarse other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 mark that is a risk with grown and the proper met if his is my minditify to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what	4	MS SIKAND: Which will test it.	4	minded to note. It is worth making the point publicly
said Fin determined to do that. I am determined to do my best to do that and I think that having some evidence from IFN 123 is better than having none, which is a risk that would be run if I were not to make the order that I fin minded to. MS SIKAND: Ves, sir, but of course that evidence if clicited in the way that you anticipate would be unested, certainly— THE CHAIR: Hardly, MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we recore participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested— THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence what I have in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say your client knows a great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everyhody ebc. Page 133 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: Idon't bink I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: Mo, you have been extremely helpful and very tactful and lam grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Idon't bink I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: Mo, you have been extremely helpful and very tactful and lam grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Idon't bink I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: May wou, sir. MS HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Mo core participant and his communications with you THE CHAIR: No count of the minded to adopt. MR HALL: Artica Signed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part mental health condit	5	THE CHAIR: to enable me to get to the truth about the	5	that he was deployed against a number of groups in the
### the board when one is considering — ### the CHAR: All The saying is that the mantapsring for my decision is not anticle 3 risk. ### ### the the mainspring for of it at the mainspring for of it, at the mainspring for of it, but it is worth me saying it because it affects our autitude to note and of course, sit, because you vroit of, but it is meant lead to note and of course, sit, because you wrote were consucted in the was diagnosed as suffering from the minded to note and of course, sit, because you wrote were course, sit, because you wrote if the tree should be a closed earified on the and of course, sit, because you wrote the none and	6	deployments in respect to the Lawrence campaign. I have	6	1990s, at least one of which advocated and practised the
from HN123 is better than having none, which is a risk that the would be run if I were not to make the order that I minided to. MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if elicited in the way that you anticipate would be it untested, certainly THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. The second point, again taking it from the minded to note and of course, sir, because you wrote it you are very conscious of it, but it is worth me saying it because it affects our attitude. If was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part of the were the end of course, sir, because you wrote it you are very conscious of it, but it is worth me saying it because it affects our attitude. If was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part of the was a fiftering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part of the wend you got a submission. If was diagnosed as suffering from the efficts of his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. Page 133 THE CHAIR: I accept that, All I'm saying is that the mainspring for my decision is not an article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: And therefore one heave in you are very conscious of it, but it is worth me saying it because it affects our attitude. If were diagnosed as suffering from the efficts of his deployment. If were diagnosed as suffering from the minded to note on decision of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. IF the CHAIR: Health the health conditions resulting at least in part of from the efficts was a softicer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his definitely in not not health and the health condit	7	said I'm determined to do that. I am determined to do	7	use of violence and that should not, as it were, go by
that would be run if I were not to make the order that I Pm minded to. I MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if elicited in the way that you anticipate would be untested, certainly— I the CHAIR: Hardly. I the CHAIR: Hardly. I the CHAIR: Hardly. I the content of the way that you anticipate would be untested, certainly— I the CHAIR: Hardly. I the CHAIR: Hardly. I the chair is tested— I the was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part from the effects our attitude. I was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part from the effects of his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the only on this type, who has been affected by his deployment. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence who are considered to the supplication. I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence who account that there is a risk	8	my best to do that and I think that having some evidence	8	the board when one is considering
II MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. III CILAIR: Yes. MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if identified in the way that you anticipate would be untested, certainly— ITHE CHAIR Hardly. ITHE CHAIR Hardly. ITHE CHAIR: Hardly. ITHE CHAIR: Hardly. ITHE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, and in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, and in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, and in mind is that he should he a closed hearing of his evidence and though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. Page 133 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: John You, size that I have in mind that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: John You submissions. MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that. ITHE CHAIR: I there we cause, you wrote it you are very conscious of it, but it is worth me saying it because it affects our attitude. He was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part from the effects of his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. ITHE CHAIR: It definitely is not. THE CHAIR: It definitely is not. THE CHAIR: It and therefore one where the employer – past employer – fels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselve	9	from HN123 is better than having none, which is a risk	9	THE CHAIR: I accept that. All I'm saying is that the
12 THE CHAIR: Yes. 13 elicited in the way that you anticipate would be 14 untested, certainly 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we 17 core participants are excluded from that hearing then it 18 is tested 19 THE CHAIR: Id on to for one moment have in mind that there 20 should be a closed hearing of his evidence, What I have 21 in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say 23 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose HIN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: Than't think I'can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 10 MR HALL: The second point, again taking it from the minded to note and of course, sir, because you wrote it you are 15 wery conscious of it, but it is worth me saying it 16 because it affects our stitude. 16 He was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part from the effects of his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. 17 THE CHAIR: It definitely is not. 18 MR HALL: The addition, or office, and may not be the one where the employer past employer feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by 2 carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my submissions, should not be overlooked. 2 carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 3 MR HALL: Thank you. 1 carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my submissions on beauting in this a	10	that would be run if I were not to make the order that	10	mainspring for my decision is not an article 3 risk.
elicited in the way that you anticipate would be untested, certainly— 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly, 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we 17 core participants are excluded from that hearing then it 18 is tested — 19 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there 20 should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have 21 in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say 23 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: Thank think Ic ansay any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 4 MS SIKAND: Thank think Ic ansay any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, lost have limited information about the nature of the application. 1 THE CHAIR: No focurse. 1 MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer — past employer — feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by Page 135 1 Carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my submissions, should not be overlooked. 1 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 1 That I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on INN123. 1 MS SIKAND: Thank ji, if you are able to, and forgive me if this is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? 1 THE CHAIR: Phave limited information about the nature of the application. 1 THE CHAIR: Phave limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications with you. 1 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 1 THE C	11	I'm minded to.	11	MR HALL: Article 3 is very hard to get, I understand that.
14 untested, certainly — 15 THE CHAIR: Hardly. 16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we core participants are excluded from that hearing then it is tested — 17 title CHAIR: Ido not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say your client knows a great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. 18 Treally don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 1 renphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: Idon't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactiful and I am grafted for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 7 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactiful and I am grafted for your submissions. 7 MS HALL: Rh Hall? 8 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Have limited information about 1 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Of course. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about 1 the nature of the application. 15 from being a core participant and his communications with you. 16 MR HALL: Base allustrates if ever a case did 1 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 1 for one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. 15 from the effects of his deefects of his to effects of his top the words an officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. 1 THE CHAIR: 1 definitely is not. 12 THE CHAIR: 1 definitely is not. 13 THE CHAIR: 1 deffinitely is not. 14 THE CHAIR: 1 definitely is not. 14 THE CHAIR	12	MS SIKAND: Yes, sir, but of course that evidence if	12	THE CHAIR: Yes.
THE CHAIR: Hardly. MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we preconscious of it, but it is worth me saying it because it affects our attitude. He was diagnosed as suffering from significant mental health conditions, resulting at least in part from the effects of his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. In other words an officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who has been affected by his deployment. THE CHAIR: It do not for one moment have in mind that there should give his evidence publicly. In mind is that he should give his evidence publicly. The chair is precised by his deployment. THE CHAIR: It definitely is not. MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer – past employer – feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by Tage 133 Page 135 The chair is precised by his deployment. The CHAIR: It definitely is not. MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer – past employer – feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by The chair is precised by his deployment. The CHAIR: It definitely is not. MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer – past employer – feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by The CHAIR: It also the three is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: Idon't think I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: No bus have been extremely helpful and very tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: No bus have been extremely helpful and very tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: The chair is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier than usual	13	elicited in the way that you anticipate would be	13	MR HALL: The second point, again taking it from the minded
16 MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we core participants are excluded from that hearing then it list site sted — 19 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have 12 in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say 23 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. 25 Page 133 Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I camphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, 3r. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Of course. 14 MR HALL: Have limited information about 15 from being a core participant and his communications with you. 15 Chair Six AD: Thank You. 16 CHAIR: Mr Hall: Would point, however, to two aspects of this that there is a variety of possibilities. 16 or one is that this case the current attitude. 17 THE CHAIR: No course. 18 MR HALL: Have limited information about 16 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 17 THE CHAIR: Thank you or participant and his communications 17 you can take instructions on the outstanding point or not? 18 MR HALL: Have limited information about 16 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 17 HE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 17 HE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 17 HE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 17 HE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 17 HE CHAIR: T	14	untested, certainly	14	to note and of course, sir, because you wrote it you are
17 core participants are excluded from that hearing then it is itsted— 18 is tested— 20 should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have 21 in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say 23 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. 21 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 Ittle CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 2 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 4 THE CHAIR: No, you know, I have limited information about 2 the nature of the application. 5 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 2 the nature of the application. 5 MR HALL: I have limited information about 3 more 2 mo	15	THE CHAIR: Hardly.	15	very conscious of it, but it is worth me saying it
18 is tested — 19 THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there 20 should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have 21 in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, 22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say 23 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. 26 Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: MF Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. 15 Gase. 16 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular facts. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 19 of the ME or polital and time of the application. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 22 THE CHAIR: I hank you, as in the distribution of the member of the application. 23 MS KAUPMANN: We will do that. 24 THE CHAIR: Thank you on the particular facts. 25 THE CHAIR: Thank you on the outstanding point or not? 26 THE CHAIR: Thank you on the outstanding point or not? 27 THE CHAIR: I have been asked to seek clarification, probably righty, if you are able to, and forgive me if this is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? 3 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 3 MS KAUPMANN: We will do that. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you on the outstanding point or not? 4 THE CHAIR: Thank you on the outstanding point or not? 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you ve	16	MS SIKAND: Sorry, not wholly untested, obviously, but if we	16	
THE CHAIR: I do not for one moment have in mind that there should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say your client knows a great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. Page 133 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and I remphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very tateful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular facts. Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you are able to, and forgive me if this is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? THE CHAIR: Of course. MS SIKAND: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you were asked to seek clarification, probably rightly, if you are able to, and forgive me if this is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? THE CHAIR: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank summan, we have reached slightly earlier than usual the point at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or not? MS SIKAND: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Thank you	17	core participants are excluded from that hearing then it	17	He was diagnosed as suffering from significant
should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, perhaps with protective measures, but as your rightly say your client knows a great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. Page 133 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and Temphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very tattful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the mature of the application. MR HALL: Ne would point, however, to two aspects of this case. One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that are veryfling depends upon the particular facts. Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. Submissions on the mature of the application. THE CHAIR: We would point, however, to two aspects of this case. One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that are veryfling depends upon the particular facts. Including in this case the current attitude of HN123.	18	is tested	18	mental health conditions, resulting at least in part
in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly, perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say your client knows a great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. Page 133 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: Idon't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Nr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Fix HN123 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. 1 THE CHAIR: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications with you. 1 THE CHAIR: Of course. 1 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this case. 1 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular facts. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case illustrates if ever a case did the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case illustrates if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular facts. 2 Including in this case illustrates if ever a case did the current attitu	19		19	from the effects of his deployment. In other words an
22 perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say 23 your client knows a great deal about these matters even 24 though his views are not identical to those of everybody 25 else. 26 Page 133 1 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. 11 THE CHAIR: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications 15 with you. 16 WR HALL: And therefore one where the employer past employer pest employe	20	should be a closed hearing of his evidence. What I have	20	officer, and may not be the only one of his type, who
your client knows a great deal about these matters even though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. Page 133 Page 135 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications with you. THE CHAIR: One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular facts. Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by Page 135 MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by Page 135 Author themselves effectively in harm's way by Page 135 THE CHAIR: Job and those two aspects, in my submission, should not be overlooked. THE CHAIR: Thank you. That I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. MS SIKAND: Sorry, sir, I have been asked to seek clarification, probably rightly, if you are able to, and forgive me if this is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? THE CHAIR: Then to going to amplify that, there are a variety of possibilities. MS SIKAND: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reache	21	in mind is that he should give his evidence publicly,	21	has been affected by his deployment.
though his views are not identical to those of everybody else. Page 133 Page 135 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and lemphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: F HN123 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications with you. THE CHAIR: Of course. MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this with draw. MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this that else. Doe is that this case illustrates if ever a case did that everything depends upon the particular facts. Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. Employer — feels a degree of moral beholdenness to someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by Bosence who put themselves effectively in harm's way by Page 135 Carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my submissions, should not be overlooked. THE CHAIR: Thank you THE CHAIR: Na du those two aspects, in my submissions, should not be overlooked. THE CHAIR: Thank you THE CHAIR: I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. MS SIKAND: Thank you. THE CHAIR: I'm not going to samplify that, there are a variety of possibilities. THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are a variety of possibilities. THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are in variety of possibilities. THE CHAIR: I'm not going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or not? MS	22	perhaps with protective measures, but as you rightly say	22	THE CHAIR: It definitely is not.
Page 133 Page 135 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 1 emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 2 submission, should not be overlooked. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 4 That I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 6 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Birn ted Hall: MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: I have limited information about 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 16 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 10 Cone is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 20 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	23	your client knows a great deal about these matters even	23	MR HALL: And therefore one where the employer past
Page 133 Page 135 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 1 carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my submission, should not be overlooked. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 5 made on HN123. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 7 clarification, probably rightly, if you are able to, and 6 forgive me if this is my inability to understand what 9 you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 1 the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. 13 MS RAND: Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR RALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or mot? 19 Case. 10 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 12 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	24	though his views are not identical to those of everybody	24	employer feels a degree of moral beholdenness to
1 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 11 THE CHAIR: Yes. 12 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 20 One is that this case the current attitude of HN123. 21 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123.	25	else.	25	someone who put themselves effectively in harm's way by
1 I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and 2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 11 THE CHAIR: Yes. 12 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 20 One is that this case the current attitude of HN123. 21 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 2 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123.		Dags 122		Dage 125
2 I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt 3 a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. 4 MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. 5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 11 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 21 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 submission, should not be overlooked. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 4 That I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. 5 THAIR I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. 5 THAIL I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. 5 THAIL I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. 5 THAIL I I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. 6 THAIL I I think exhausts the submissions that can be made on HN123. 6 MR SIKAND: Thank you. 7 clarification, probably rightly, if you are able to, and forgive me if this is my inability to understand what you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? 10 the CHAIR: Thank you. 11 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 11 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier than usual the point at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or not? 18 MS S		1 age 133		1 age 133
a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications with you. MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this Land All All All All All All All All All Al	1	I really don't want to lose HN123's evidence and	1	carrying out their job and those two aspects, in my
a course other than that which I'm minded to adopt. MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir. THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about the nature of the application. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications with you. MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this Land All All All All All All All All All Al	2	I emphasise that there is a risk that I will if I adopt	2	submission, should not be overlooked.
5 THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very 6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Fe HN123 11 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 18 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 19 with you. 10 when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? 11 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 12 a variety of possibilities. 13 THE CHAIR: A Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123.	3		3	THE CHAIR: Thank you.
6 tactful and I am grateful for your submissions. 7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL: Fe HN123 11 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 18 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 19 with you. 10 with you. 11 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 12 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 13 with you. 14 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 15 Good one is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 20 One is that this case the current attitude of HN123. 21 (A short break)	4	MS SIKAND: I don't think I can say any more, sir.	4	That I think exhausts the submissions that can be
7 MS SIKAND: Thank you, sir. 7 clarification, probably rightly, if you are able to, and 8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 8 forgive me if this is my inability to understand what 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 9 you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? 11 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 11 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 12 the nature of the application. 12 a variety of possibilities. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 13 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 15 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 16 with you. 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 17 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 18 not? 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	5	THE CHAIR: No, you have been extremely helpful and very	5	made on HN123.
8 THE CHAIR: Mr Hall? 9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL re HN123 11 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 24 Including in this case index the police Service by 9 you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his evidence, what did you mean by that? 10 evidence, what did you mean by that? 11 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 12 a variety of possibilities. 13 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 14 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier than usual the point at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 15 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 16 not? 17 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	6	tactful and I am grateful for your submissions.	6	MS SIKAND: Sorry, sir, I have been asked to seek
9 Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by 10 MR HALL re HN123 11 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	7		7	clarification, probably rightly, if you are able to, and
10 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 11 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 13 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 18 with you. 19 case. 10 evidence, what did you mean by that? 11 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 12 a variety of possibilities. 13 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 14 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 15 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 18 not? 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	8	THE CHAIR: Mr Hall?	8	forgive me if this is my inability to understand what
11 MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about 12 the nature of the application. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 Avariety of possibilities. 16 a variety of possibilities. 17 THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are 18 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 19 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 18 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 (A short break)	9	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by	9	you just said, but when you said you risk "losing" his
the nature of the application. 12 a variety of possibilities. 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 Avariety of possibilities. 14 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 15 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 18 NS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 (A short break)	10	MR HALL re HN123	10	evidence, what did you mean by that?
13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal 15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 17 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 10 MS SIKAND: Thank you. 11 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier 12 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 13 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 14 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 15 not? 18 not? 19 Case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	11	MR HALL: Sir, as you know, I have limited information about	11	THE CHAIR: I'm not going to amplify that, there are
MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal from being a core participant and his communications from being a core participant at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see from the unusual the point at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see from the unusual the point at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see from the University All Participant and the point at which I'm going to give the shorthand writers their br	12	the nature of the application.	12	a variety of possibilities.
15 from being a core participant and his communications 16 with you. 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 than usual the point at which I'm going to give the 26 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 27 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 28 not? 29 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 (A short break)	13	THE CHAIR: Yes.	13	MS SIKAND: Thank you.
with you. 16 shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 Shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see 17 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 18 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 (A short break)	14	MR HALL: I have limited information about his withdrawal	14	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, we have reached slightly earlier
17 THE CHAIR: Of course. 18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 17 if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or 18 not? 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 (A short break)	15	from being a core participant and his communications	15	than usual the point at which I'm going to give the
18 MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this 19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 (A short break)	16	with you.	16	shorthand writers their break. Would you be able to see
19 case. 19 MS KAUFMANN: We will do that. 20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 (A short break)	17	THE CHAIR: Of course.	17	if you can take instructions on the outstanding point or
20 One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did 21 that everything depends upon the particular facts. 22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 23 (A short break)	18	MR HALL: We would point, however, to two aspects of this	18	not?
that everything depends upon the particular facts. Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 21 (3.10 pm) 22 (A short break)	19	case.	19	MS KAUFMANN: We will do that.
22 Including in this case the current attitude of HN123. 22 (A short break)	20	One is that this case illustrates if ever a case did	20	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
	21	that everything depends upon the particular facts.	21	(3.10 pm)
These are all that features that would feed into the 23 (3.17 pm)	22	Including in this case the current attitude of HN123.	22	(A short break)
	23	These are all that features that would feed into the	23	(3.17 pm)
24 public interest. 24 THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I understand you have had the	24	public interest.	24	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I understand you have had the
25 The second aspect is just to note the context in 25 opportunity to take instruction but don't	25	The second aspect is just to note the context in	25	opportunity to take instruction but don't
Dags 124		D 124		D 12/
Page 134 Page 136		Page 134		Page 150

1 MS KAUFMANN: I haven't had 2 THE CHAIR: You don't have the answer yet? 3 MS KAUFMANN: I don't have the answer. 4 THE CHAIR: Entirely understandable. 5 MS KAUFMANN: We are meeting tonight so I hope that I will 6 be able to give you an answer tomorrow, but I suspect it 7 won't be before then because there are various different 8 individuals. 1 deployment. It is amongst the first, it is very shadened and proposed in the strength of the deployment was into group. 2 The nature of the deployment was into group. 3 the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, I can't remem the top of my head if 294 was deployed into that it's that sort of group. Namely political activists not as sometimes happened a bit later those group together for living and other purposes, but peop sindividuals. 8 simply came together from a variety of different	s like aber off t, but
THE CHAIR: You don't have the answer yet? The nature of the deployment was into groups the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, I can't remerr the top of my head if 294 was deployed into that MS KAUFMANN: We are meeting tonight so I hope that I will be able to give you an answer tomorrow, but I suspect it won't be before then because there are various different together for living and other purposes, but peop	s like aber off t, but
3 MS KAUFMANN: I don't have the answer. 4 THE CHAIR: Entirely understandable. 5 MS KAUFMANN: We are meeting tonight so I hope that I will 6 be able to give you an answer tomorrow, but I suspect it 7 won't be before then because there are various different 3 the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, I can't rement the top of my head if 294 was deployed into that it's that sort of group. Namely political activists not as sometimes happened a bit later those group together for living and other purposes, but people.	aber off t, but
4 THE CHAIR: Entirely understandable. 4 the top of my head if 294 was deployed into that 5 MS KAUFMANN: We are meeting tonight so I hope that I will 6 be able to give you an answer tomorrow, but I suspect it 7 won't be before then because there are various different 7 together for living and other purposes, but people	t, but
5 MS KAUFMANN: We are meeting tonight so I hope that I will 5 it's that sort of group. Namely political activists 6 be able to give you an answer tomorrow, but I suspect it 6 not as sometimes happened a bit later those group won't be before then because there are various different 7 together for living and other purposes, but peop	
6 be able to give you an answer tomorrow, but I suspect it 7 won't be before then because there are various different 6 not as sometimes happened a bit later those ground together for living and other purposes, but peop	,
7 won't be before then because there are various different 7 together for living and other purposes, but peop	mad
	-
I & individuals I & simply came together from a variety of different	
9 THE CHAIR: That is entirely satisfactory. If the answer is 9 and geographical locations to undertake political	1
10 what I hope it will be and we have finished all the 10 protest.	
other cases, would it be possible to communicate it in 11 The chances in those circumstances of something the chances in the chance i	•
12 writing? 12 an illicit sexual relationship being formed, espec	-
13 MS KAUFMANN: Yes. 13 given the shortage of time, are pretty slim, I thir	
14 THE CHAIR: Yes. You might know by some time later today 14 MS KAUFMANN: Absolutely, that may be entire	-
15 whether that is so, so we don't have to reassemble here 15 the question is why not put into place a situation	
16 all tomorrow just to hear one thing. 16 which if anything like that did happen, it can co	me to
17 MS KAUFMANN: Absolutely, we will communicate that in 17 light?	
18 writing to the Inquiry team. 18 The only reason not to do it is because the	
19 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 19 disclosure of the name carries with it a very, ver	y slim
20 MS KAUFMANN: I think we are now on HN294. 20 chance of leading to intrusion into the family lif	e of
21 THE CHAIR: Yes, we are. 21 the deceased's remaining family.	
22 Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core 22 In our submission the balance clearly comes of	lown in
23 participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN294 23 favour, therefore, of just trying to put in place the	ne
24 MS KAUFMANN: This is an officer where he's deceased, we do 24 circumstances that would enable that information	n to come
25 not know the cover name. So the only way to find out 25 to light, because there is really nothing to be los	t of
Page 137 Page 139	
1 about this officer and this officer's activities on the 1 any moment or significance.	
2 part of those who were affected by his conduct is going 2 If in fact nothing comes to light, it is	
3 to be through disclosure of the real name. It may or it 3 inconceivable that the wife of this particular of	ficer
4 may not lead to the identification of the officer. We 4 is going to be in any way troubled by the disclo	
5 don't know that until we try. So there is actually here 5 the fact that he I'm sorry, yes, apparently we	
6 an important instrumental purpose behind disclosure of 6 have contacts with people in the Vietnam Solic	
7 the real name, which in our submission has not been 7 Campaign, so there are people who could come	-
8 recognised in your minded to decision thus far. 8 THE CHAIR: I don't doubt that is so. It was quit	
9 THE CHAIR: Yes. That is partly because I had difficulty in 9 grouping, wasn't it, and certainly large numbers	_
10 understanding how other than by the luckiest of shots it 10 people turned up for the demonstration in Gros	
11 could work. But we have been through that ground 11 Square, which appears to have been the motive	
13 MS KAUFMANN: We have been through it. It may or may not 14 Work but it is the only yields way in which compthing. 15 MS KAUFMANN: There is an added interest in	
14 work, but it is the only viable way in which something 14 officer in that he was a manager, so if and inso	
15 can be achieved. Then we have to ask ourselves what 15 any information does come to light of any wron	
16 goes into the balance on the other side. 16 that would obviously be important to feed in in	relation
17 Really, I simply repeat my submissions in relation 17 to his managerial role.	
to HN68. There is nothing, in our submission, the small 18 Against that we simply have the concern for	
19 risk of some minimal risk of intrusive interference, 19 admittedly his elderly surviving family and in c	
20 interest in the family, is insufficient to weigh against 20 submission that just doesn't sufficiently weigh	
	th
21 taking a step which could bring about the disclosure of 21 balance against the interest in getting to the tru	
22 information that will be or could be useful to the 22 whatever it might be. However unlikely.	
22 information that will be or could be useful to the 22 whatever it might be. However unlikely. 23 Inquiry. 23 THE CHAIR: There is an interest in the early his	-
22 information that will be or could be useful to the 23 Inquiry. 24 THE CHAIR: This cases raises in fairly sharp focus an issue 25 whatever it might be. However unlikely. 26 THE CHAIR: There is an interest in the early his 27 Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration	on Squad
 information that will be or could be useful to the Inquiry. THE CHAIR: There is an interest in the early his 	on Squad
 information that will be or could be useful to the Inquiry. THE CHAIR: This cases raises in fairly sharp focus an issue Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration 	on Squad

1	the various practices which are now the subject of	1	openness in those circumstances wins, I think one can
2	criticism came into existence, came to be adopted.	2	ask well why should an elderly lady not be left in peace
3	I don't think you are likely to get anything about	3	unless there is a good purpose in disturbing her.
4	that from a 1968 deployment.	4	MR HALL: That is right. I mean one looks at the final
5	MS KAUFMANN: I can't repeat my submissions any further.	5	paragraph of the letter. One doesn't need to read much
6	There is a prospect and that prospect should be made	6	between the lines to see what is happening:
7	or it should be possible for that prospect to have	7	"This has been challenging to extract personal
8	materialised.	8	responses from my parent-in-law with minimum stress and
9	THE CHAIR: I understand that there are 19 living officers	9	ensuring the thoughts and wishes of a frail 85-year old
10	from the Special Operations Squad era, namely I think	10	are represented correctly."
11	the first three years. Not all of them, as I know from	11	It doesn't take much to understand what is going on
12	one case, will be able to give evidence about the issues	12	there.
13	because of failing memory and ill health and so forth.	13	THE CHAIR: Quite.
14	But one hopes that some will be able to and we may	14	In the next batch we actually have a living officer
15	therefore get something of value about what I can,	15	of the same vintage and age and the same considerations
16	I think, properly refer to as the ancient history of all	16	apply to him and his family.
17	of this, and which will inform the critical question	17	MR HALL: Quite.
18	which is: how did the Special Demonstration Squad come	18	THE CHAIR: I really do wonder why so much effort is being
19	to adopt the practices that it did? Which is I think	19	expended upon these very early cases because I simply
20	partly a managerial and partly an experience question.	20	can't see they are going to tell us much about what
21	MS KAUFMANN: Those are then my submissions.	21	happened in the Special Demonstration Squad, what went
22	THE CHAIR: Yes.	22	wrong in the Special Demonstration Squad.
23	Mr Hall.	23	That is HN294.
24	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by	24	297, I think.
25	MR HALL re HN294	25	
	75		70
	Page 141		Page 143
1	MR HALL: Sir, I gratefully adopt what you have just said in	1	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
2	dialogue with Ms Kaufmann as to the fact that there are	2	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN297
3	a other ways of getting at the truth. Of course,	3	MS KAUFMANN: It is H297.
4	because the officer is dead, inevitably his particular	4	THE CHAIR: Yes.
5	deployment, whatever happened, is not going to form an	5	MS KAUFMANN: This is another officer who is deceased. His
6	important part of the Inquiry because you can't get	6	cover identity is known, Rick Gibson. The risk
7	evidence from the officer himself.	7	assessment in relation to interference with family life
8	THE CHAIR: No. His managerial role is much more important.	8	rights is low. Could be managed without significant
9	MR HALL: But again because	9	assistance. That is on page 16, tab 62.
10	THE CHAIR: All we can do with that is records and with	10	Our understanding is that this officer did in fact
11	those who can be told what his real name is, if they	11	engage in at least two intimate relationships, which
12	don't remember it, and can therefore give evidence if	12	obviously puts a very different complexion on matters.
13	they can about what he did and didn't do.	13	THE CHAIR: Indeed it does.
14	MR HALL: Exactly.	14	Is that because the cover name already known from
15	As far as the harm on the other side, it has not	15	sources other than the Inquiry has produced this
16	been totally correctly described. It is at tab 58, it	16	information?
17	is not a case in which the application is made on the	17	MS KAUFMANN: I assume that is the case.
18	basis of a risk of intrusion actually happening.	18	Yes, it is the case.
19	THE CHAIR: No, is not.	19	So that puts a very different complexion on matters.
20	MR HALL: It is a concern/fear.	20	THE CHAIR: I agree it does.
21	THE CHAIR: This is an elderly lady whose family wish that	21	MS KAUFMANN: We are dealing with a situation where putting
22	she should be able to remain in peace. This is	22	into the balance on the other side against disclosure of
23	a problem that occurs in relation to these old	23	the real name are really the sorts of factors that we
24	deployments. Although Ms Kaufmann says with some force,	24	have just been discussing in relation to HN294 and HN68.
25	well, there is not much in the weight on that side and	25	THE CHAIR: Except, forgive me, HN294's deployment was right
			70
	Page 142		Page 144

1			
1	at the start. HN297 is 1974 to 1976, that is probably	1	the bundle of documents for the hearing this is not
2	in the period when practices started to be adopted	2	a case in which I have a statement from the widow.
3	routinely and things may have started to go wrong.	3	I have made an assumption about it. In those
4	MS KAUFMANN: Exactly. In those circumstances we would	4	circumstances, the issue is, I think, a little simpler.
5	submit that this is a case where the disclosure of both	5	If I receive plausible statements from the two
6	cover and the real name is something that should	6	people you have referred to, then the weight to be
7	properly take place.	7	afforded to openness to see if anything else turns up is
8	THE CHAIR: Can I ask whether the two individuals to whom	8	much greater than in those cases where there is no such
9	you have, by inference, referred are willing to supply	9	thing.
10	the Inquiry with short statements setting out what they	10	Furthermore, the likely end result would be that
11	know before I reach a final decision?	11	they will be told either by being published or being
12	MS KAUFMANN: On this?	12	told for their own benefit, but not broadcast to the
13	THE CHAIR: On this.	13	wider world unless they wish it to be, what the real
14	MS KAUFMANN: I would have to take some instructions on	14	name was.
15	that.	15	Let's deal with it on the alternative bases. If you
16	We would need to take some instructions on that.	16	are able to provide me with the statements and they look
17	THE CHAIR: Is that something you would be able to do	17	plausible, then no doubt you would say "publish now".
18	overnight, as in the other cases?	18	If you are not able to, then it may be that I will have
19	MS KAUFMANN: I will find out.	19	to wait until I have heard from one or both of the two
20	THE CHAIR: Yes. No hurry, just do it calmly and	20	people concerned before making a decision about it. But
21	systematically.	21	I suppose it wouldn't have to await the substantive
22	MS KAUFMANN: So, yes, those are my submissions on HN297.	22	
23	THE CHAIR: Let's pause a moment while things are being	23	hearing, it could precede it.
24	found out. (Pause)	23	The interests in not publishing would then, I am
25	. ,	25	sure you would submit, form very little to counteract
23	MS KAUFMANN: Sir, I'm not in a position now to say	25	their right to know and the public right to know.
	Page 145		Page 147
1	anything	1	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
2	THE CHAIR: No.	2	THE CHAIR: Anyway, I think it does depend on whether or not
3	MS KAUFMANN: but we are going to continue with our		
,		1 1	Lean be provided with statements now. Lask that
4	endeavours to get instructions and we will inform you as	3	I can be provided with statements now. I ask that, I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them
4 5	endeavours to get instructions and we will inform you as	4	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them.
5	and when we know whether we can provide you with	4 5	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all
5 6	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement.	4 5 6	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing.
5 6 7	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you.	4 5 6 7	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that.
5 6 7 8	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is	4 5 6 7 8	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that?
5 6 7 8 9	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or	4 5 6 7 8 9	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
5 6 7 8 9	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they	4 5 6 7 8 9	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you or not able to provide you with	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you or not able to provide you with a statement?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you — or not able to provide you — with a statement? THE CHAIR: To avoid convening everybody for what will be	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: Pes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe in my room here and I need to check that obviously. If
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you or not able to provide you with a statement? THE CHAIR: To avoid convening everybody for what will be a very small exercise, let's see if we can deal with the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe in my room here and I need to check that obviously. If that is right, and the form of words I have chosen
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you — or not able to provide you — with a statement? THE CHAIR: To avoid convening everybody for what will be a very small exercise, let's see if we can deal with the position on one of two alternative bases.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe in my room here and I need to check that obviously. If that is right, and the form of words I have chosen suggest it is, then it really is an open goal and if
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you or not able to provide you with a statement? THE CHAIR: To avoid convening everybody for what will be a very small exercise, let's see if we can deal with the position on one of two alternative bases. As you know from what I have said, this is not	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe in my room here and I need to check that obviously. If that is right, and the form of words I have chosen suggest it is, then it really is an open goal and if I am faced with plausible evidence that something did go
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you — or not able to provide you — with a statement? THE CHAIR: To avoid convening everybody for what will be a very small exercise, let's see if we can deal with the position on one of two alternative bases.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe in my room here and I need to check that obviously. If that is right, and the form of words I have chosen suggest it is, then it really is an open goal and if
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and when we know whether we can provide you with a statement. THE CHAIR: Thank you. Given what you have said, I think the question is a narrow one. Should the real name be published now, or should that be deferred until after I have heard if they wish to give evidence, from the two women about their experience and upon being satisfied that what they have told me is true, then they have the moral right to which I have referred. I think it therefore probably comes down to a question of timing. MS KAUFMANN: Yes. Would you be happy for us to make submissions on that at the point at which we are able to provide you or not able to provide you with a statement? THE CHAIR: To avoid convening everybody for what will be a very small exercise, let's see if we can deal with the position on one of two alternative bases. As you know from what I have said, this is not	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I won't take it amiss if I'm not provided with them. I would welcome an explanation if I'm not and it can all be done in writing. MS KAUFMANN: I'm grateful. We will do that. Mr Hall, anything about that? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN297 MR HALL: Yes, I think so. Because it raises quite a tricky and new area THE CHAIR: It does, yes. MR HALL: that I have not done the thinking on. Obviously, dead, I'm not conscious of what the evidence is that the widow has put in THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any, which is why I expressed myself as I did. MR HALL: Right. THE CHAIR: I will check that. I have the files in my safe in my room here and I need to check that obviously. If that is right, and the form of words I have chosen suggest it is, then it really is an open goal and if I am faced with plausible evidence that something did go

1	started to go wrong, then the public interest in	1	then decide whether or not to hold a hearing similar to
2	publishing becomes much more compelling.	2	this in the light of those representations. And if
3	MR HALL: The only things I would wish to think about is	3	there is to be one, that it would take place very early
4	that threshold of plausibility. One would probably need	4	in the New Year, so that will give you some idea of
5	to think a bit carefully about whether or not the	5	timescale.
6	threshold of a plausible allegation is enough to require	6	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
7	the immediate disclosure of a name. Because, as you	7	Ms Brander is pointing out to me that in relation to
8	say, the real issue here is the moral right to know.	8	your recent minded to note, obviously before we can make
9	There is the side issue that maybe if you know the real	9	submissions we need the underlying material.
10	name that may throw some more light, but in my	10	THE CHAIR: Of course you do. Such underlying material as
11	submission that is less forceful.	11	there is after the elaborate but pretty unproductive
12	THE CHAIR: It is actually understanding what happened as	12	process that has been gone through so far, of course you
13	well which caused a practice which undoubtedly occurred	13	are.
14	for whatever reason	14	Let me just think about that. That is in relation
15	MR HALL: There is that.	15	to the August tranches but not subsequent ones?
16	THE CHAIR: of forming deceitful relationships with	16	MS KAUFMANN: Whichever ones you are going to want our
17	women, or possibly deceitful, but I think actually	17	decision on, so that you then decide about them in
18	deceitful in most cases and possibly in some, whether	18	January. Whichever ones they are that we are going to
19	this is individual officers going off piste or whether	19	have to make submissions for the purpose of you making
20	it is actually a practice is one of the things I have to	20	decisions on we are going to need.
21	try to get to the bottom of.	21	THE CHAIR: Yes, I mean one of the things I put out for
22	MR HALL: Yes, we tried to get to the bottom of whether he's	22	consultation I appreciate this is all being
23	a manager and one of the difficulties is working out	23	concertinaed and everything is being done at something
24	whether he was. Our current view is that he was not	24	of a gallop by reference to the past history of the
25	a manager, although there are indications the other way.	25	Inquiry and some things, like the closed hearings I
	Page 149		Page 151
1	I think what I'm building up to is to say I would	1	conducted which you objected to, I didn't have hearing
2	rather not make a final submission now. I would welcome	2	beforehand to is decide whether I should have closed
3	the opportunity to think about what we would be saying	3	hearings I went along and did it. It may be that you
4	about the threshold, whether plausibility is enough,	4	will find that you will be presented at the end of
5	process, whether one should do it now or later.	5	January let's say with a package of material that
6	Perhaps once a decision has been made by	6	doesn't include everything that you would get under
7	Ms Kaufmann, now, I would in these circumstances	7	current processes in relation to September and October
8	probably invite you to allow us to see what is said, not	8	tranches.
9	in any way to check or undermine what is said, but just	9	We will have to see where we get to. I am sorry to
10	so that whatever submissions we decide to make if any	10	take you on a voyage where the route is not carefully
11	are made on the fullest information.	11	mapped out, but I think it is necessary to adopt these
12	THE CHAIR: I know that there are deceased officers with	12	measures to get things moving forwards so that we can
13	elderly families whose applications I have considered	13	get to substantive phase, which is my aim.
14	and issued a minded to note about recently. It may be	14	Anyway, as far as this is concerned, you are content
15	that the best thing to do with this is to put it back to	15	that I should await receipt of your documents if there
16	be finally determined then with them. That will give	16	are to be any, and submissions if not?
17	Ms Kaufmann's team sufficient time to talk to the	17	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.
18	individuals concerned and to decide their course of	18	THE CHAIR: Fine, good.
19	action without being under tremendous pressure of time.	19	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
20	MR HALL: Yes, please.	20	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN321
21	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, is that an appealing suggestion?	21	MS KAUFMANN: Now we are on HN321.
22	As you know, I have issued a minded to note in	22	THE CHAIR: Yes.
23	respect of tranches 2 and 3, not for decision or debate	23	MS KAUFMANN: This is the officer Mr Sanders represents, who
24	today, obviously. My current thinking is that I will	24	is clear is abroad and it appears has made it clear that
25	invite written representations in fairly short order,	25	he's not going to return unless his identity is not
	Page 150		Page 152
<u> </u>	1 age 150		1 age 132

1	revealed. That appears to be the condition.	1	the cover name would be revealed. As you know, HN321 is
2	If we were to put aside that condition at the	2	in his 70s.
3	moment, then in our submission his situation appears to	3	THE CHAIR: Yes.
4	be indistinguishable from HN68 in terms of the sorts of	4	MR SANDERS: He was deployed for a matter of months in the
5	risks that we are dealing with. I know that he	5	late 1960s, almost 50 years ago, against two groups that
6	expresses concerns about media interest in him should	6	are now defunct, but not core participants in this
7	his real identity be disclosed, but the fact is he's	7	Inquiry. He's a very peripheral figure.
8	abroad.	8	In terms of his rights and interests under
9	If there is in fact no evidence of wrongdoing in	9	article 8
10	connection with him, it is inconceivable why there	10	THE CHAIR: That is a nice moot point, isn't it, whether he
11	should be great media interest and intrusion or interest	11	has any if he's not within the territory of the
12	and intrusion from protesters into his life.	12	United Kingdom?
13	As I indicated earlier, if there is evidence of his	13	MR SANDERS: Sir, I am happy to make submissions on that at
14	wrongdoing then that is to be expected and there is	14	some point, but I'm not prepared to do that today.
15	nothing wrong with that.	15	THE CHAIR: No, quite. I have had to look at this issue in
16	As I submit, there really is nothing to distinguish	16	other contexts and it is all fuzzy, like so much
17	this case from HN68, other than the fact that he is	17	article 8 law.
18	abroad and he's indicated to you, sir, that he is not	18	MR SANDERS: Sir, yes.
19	going to come back unless his identity is protected.	19	In my submission, even if there were some issue
20	That is obviously a factor that you have to take	20	about extraterritorial effect, when it comes to harm and
21	into account, because as you say you want to make sure	21	damage, under the statute and when it comes to fairness,
22	you get evidence before the Inquiry. We recognise that	22	the same interests are very much in play and the same
23	and we understand that.	23	balancing exercise needs to be undertaken.
24	All we can say, I would suggest, is that before you	24	THE CHAIR: Yes.
25	accede to that, whatever discussion can take place takes	25	MR SANDERS: The first submission I make in this regard is
	-		
	Page 153		Page 155
		1	
1	mlage to managementhis individual as to the libralihood	1	M- VC
1	place to reassure this individual as to the likelihood	1	Ms Kaufmann suggests that in effect it is a heads she
2	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking	2	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has
2 3	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to	2 3	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real
2 3 4	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the	2 3 4	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them.
2 3 4 5	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his	2 3 4 5	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their
2 3 4 5 6	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity	2 3 4 5 6	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is	2 3 4 5 6 7	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on this particular officer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that, hasn't been to the press, has not appeared on TV, hasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on this particular officer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that, hasn't been to the press, has not appeared on TV, hasn't talked to other people about it. All of that shapes his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on this particular officer. THE CHAIR: No. Mr Sanders?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that, hasn't been to the press, has not appeared on TV, hasn't talked to other people about it. All of that shapes his private life, shapes his identity, shapes his zone of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on this particular officer. THE CHAIR: No. Mr Sanders? Submissions on behalf of HN321 by MR SANDERS	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that, hasn't been to the press, has not appeared on TV, hasn't talked to other people about it. All of that shapes his private life, shapes his identity, shapes his zone of interaction, his autonomy for the purposes of article 8.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is — THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on this particular officer. THE CHAIR: No. Mr Sanders?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that, hasn't been to the press, has not appeared on TV, hasn't talked to other people about it. All of that shapes his private life, shapes his identity, shapes his zone of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the sorts of intrusion that he anticipates taking place to see whether or not in fact it is possible to persuade him that that is extremely unlikely but the interest in openness will be served should he give his true identity or agree to come back if his true identity is THE CHAIR: I don't think there is any question of anybody harassing him. But I do know something about his personal circumstances and I know the country in which he lives and the circumstances in which he lives, and I readily understand that there would be considerable disturbance to him and his family if his name were to be published. In those circumstances, if he says, well, I won't cooperate if you publish my name, I'm put in a situation in which I think I have own one answer to give. MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I can see the difficulties that presents. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS KAUFMANN: So there is nothing more I can say again on this particular officer. THE CHAIR: No. Mr Sanders? Submissions on behalf of HN321 by MR SANDERS	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wins tails I lose situation, because if the officer has done nothing wrong then publication of their real identity will have absolutely no consequences for them. If they have done something wrong, publication of their identity may lead to confrontation but that is too bad and they deserve that. In my submission, that submission is based on a false premise because a former officer who has done nothing wrong is in a qualitatively and normatively different position from one who has done something wrong, in terms of what he can expect should be done which has an impact on his private life and has an impact on his expectations. Because this is an individual who 50 years ago was asked to do something for the state, which the state benefitted from and which he did on a certain basis. In the intervening 50 years he's lived his life on the instructions of the Metropolitan Police Service without disclosing that. He has not talked about that, hasn't been to the press, has not appeared on TV, hasn't talked to other people about it. All of that shapes his private life, shapes his identity, shapes his zone of interaction, his autonomy for the purposes of article 8.

1	didn't know that about his past that that is the case is	1	THE CHAIR: Even a century ago.
2	going to have consequences for him. Now those	2	MR SANDERS: Indeed.
3	consequences may not sound as confrontation or	3	The second instrumental argument is that by
4	harassment, but they are consequences which have	4	publishing his real name it may be that someone comes
5	ramifications which he does not wish to experience and	5	forward to say that he was in some way racist or sexist
6	which he's entitled to be protected from.	6	away from his undercover work.
7	He has kept this secret. It is now too late for him	7	In my submission, first that is outside the terms of
8	to live a different life, for him to have a different	8	reference. That is nothing to do with undercover
9	50 years in which this is okay for him to discuss	9	policing. That is to do with an inquiry into everything
10	because other people are going to be discussing it. So	10	about anyone who was an undercover police officer
11	in terms of his article 8 rights they have been wrapped	11	THE CHAIR: I can't do that and it's outside the terms of
12	up, shaped and defined by the secrecy that he was	12	reference anyway, even if I could.
13	required to observe.	13	MR SANDERS: It would just become endless, because someone
14	In my submission, bearing in mind there is not an	14	comes forward and say, "Well, I heard him make a racist
15	allegation of misconduct, there is no suggestion he did	15	remark", he can disagree. What is the point of this
16	anything other than what he was asked to do, to identify	16	Inquiry conducting factual investigations into what
17	him because his cover name will be disclosed and	17	happened in some other context?
18	anyone who says or remembers anything about him may come	18	THE CHAIR: His deployment is part of a significant bit of
19	forward, but to disclose his true identity, first would	19	history, how the Special Demonstration Squad as it
20	not achieve anything. Secondly, is completely	20	eventually became known came into existence and why.
21	unjustified.	21	That is basically a high level question.
22	If you come to whether it would achieve anything,	22	MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. I have nothing further to say on
23	Ms Kaufmann posits two instrumental benefits.	23	this.
24	One is that by disclosing his true identity we can	24	THE CHAIR: No.
25	look at his subsequent career and whether or not he was	25	HN326 now
	Page 157		Page 159
1	in some way overpromoted.	1	MR HALL: Sir, sorry to interrupt.
2	In my submission, that's outside the terms of	2	THE CHAIR: Sorry, Mr Hall, I do apologise, I overlooked
3	reference. But it is not achieved in any event by	3	you.
4	closing his true identity to the world. You, sir, can	4	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
5	do that if you felt it was necessary and felt it was	5	MR HALL re HN321
6	within your terms of reference, without that	6	MR HALL: Can I ask the question, at some stage I would like
7	publication.	7	to respond to some of the propositions made at the level
8	THE CHAIR: Yes, I think Ms Kaufmann's point about looking	8	of principle yesterday and I was going to reply in the
9	at subsequent career is to inform views about the time	9	context of this officer.
10	maintheanna mith the Consist Demonstration Count Dest		
	point he was with the Special Demonstration Squad. But	10	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine.
11	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly	10 11	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine.
11 12	•		
	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly	11	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you
12	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into	11 12	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point
12 13	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of	11 12 13	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states
12 13 14	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes.	11 12 13 14	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names
12 13 14 15	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of	11 12 13 14 15	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that
12 13 14 15 16	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending	11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held
12 13 14 15 16 17	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred long before the Special Operations Squad/Special	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any other officer.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred long before the Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration Squad were formed I think. The books	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any other officer. In my submission, one does need to ask yourself what
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred long before the Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration Squad were formed I think. The books about Special Branch say they used to turn up at public	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any other officer. In my submission, one does need to ask yourself what is meant by "these people". It appears to be treating
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred long before the Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration Squad were formed I think. The books about Special Branch say they used to turn up at public meetings and find out what was going on there decades	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any other officer. In my submission, one does need to ask yourself what is meant by "these people". It appears to be treating all officers identically. On behalf of the Metropolitan
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred long before the Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration Squad were formed I think. The books about Special Branch say they used to turn up at public meetings and find out what was going on there decades ago. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any other officer. In my submission, one does need to ask yourself what is meant by "these people". It appears to be treating all officers identically. On behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service, we would submit that it is inappropriate to start off on the footing that all officers are
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this is such ancient history that that seems wildly unlikely to play any part. Furthermore, the groups into which deployments were made did not involve race, and it seems unlikely to have given rise to the sort of problems that arose later between the sexes. MR SANDERS: Sir, yes. Because at this stage in the evolution of the unit it was very much attending meetings using a false name, but nothing more than that. THE CHAIR: Yes. It is the sort of deployment that occurred long before the Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration Squad were formed I think. The books about Special Branch say they used to turn up at public meetings and find out what was going on there decades ago.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: Okay, fine. MR HALL: But it can be any other officer, sir. But if you are willing to hear I was going to deal with a point which was addressed by counsel for the non-states yesterday, which was about the importance of real names for confrontations to take place. What was said, at page 56 of the transcript, is that there was a public interest in "these people being held to account". Obviously I'm saying this in the context of this officer but it could be in the context of any other officer. In my submission, one does need to ask yourself what is meant by "these people". It appears to be treating all officers identically. On behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service, we would submit that it is inappropriate

1 identical. 1 confront the person in their real name and existence. 2 2 Officers will have done many different things, some MR HALL: It is undoubtedly right that human beings will 3 of them very commendable, some of them very 3 feel betrayed when they find out they have had someone 4 uncommendable, but the notion that in general one needs 4 from the state looking at their business and deceiving 5 to get at the real name in order to "hold these people" 5 them. That is of course right as a matter of human 6 to account really appears to be the bad apple/rotten 6 reality. Really the punchline of the submission is that 7 7 barrel theory. In other words the entirety of the that is a legitimate reason for giving out the real 8 8 Special Operations Squad/Special Demonstration Squad names. My point is simply no it is not. The point of 9 over its time has been up to such terrible practices 9 the Inquiry is to get to the truth, it is not to give 10 that as soon as you are an officer from that unit you 10 people an opportunity to confront. 11 are one of these people and you need to be held to 11 THE CHAIR: I think her point was that people who feel 12 12 betrayed will in some circumstances wish to confront the account. 13 Obviously I will be submitting that would be an 13 person who has betrayed them. But that's ordinary human 14 inappropriate stance to take, because it involves 14 activity, it is not unlawful and you have to put up 15 generalising and as we know these cases turn on their 15 with it. 16 particular facts. 16 MR HALL: I think her submission was actually aimed at the 17 The second point, related point -- Mr Sanders just 17 point of this hearing, which is does it weigh in the 18 touched upon this -- was this notion of confrontation. 18 balance? 19 The submission is made, well, really officers have 19 I think her submission is it does weigh in the 20 nothing to fear at all, because if they have done 20 balance. That that natural desire to confront people is 21 something wrong then they deserve to be confronted. If 21 itself a reason why you should release real names. If 22 22 they have not done anything wrong, then they have I am wrong I am wrong, but our submission is that that 23 nothing to fear about being confronted and any 23 is not something that should lead the Inquiry to release 24 confrontation would be so de minimis it wouldn't matter 24 a real name. Because were it the case, one would be 25 25 anyway. saying, probably in every case of a lawful undercover Page 161 Page 163 1 Our submission is that cannot be right. If 1 deployment, well there is bound to be someone deployed 2 a person -- let us take an elderly officer, but it could 2 so we better put their real name out there so that 3 be a more recent officer -- has genuine subjective 3 person can understandably confront them. 4 fears, why, we ask, should they be disregarded because 4 In our submission, wrongdoing -- of course there are 5 in fact counsel tells you that they have nothing to 5 going to be areas of grey but that is a million miles 6 fear. A genuine fear is a genuine fear and is an aspect 6 away from the sort of sexual relationships we are 7 of harm, however founded or unfounded. 7 talking about. We would be very worried indeed about 8 8 In any event, the Metropolitan Police Service does mission creep, so that one starts off with wrongdoing 9 9 not agree that the submissions that are made about only which we all know, we can see it, and then one gets into 10 happening justly or just confrontation only happening 10 wrongdoing which is really nothing to do with the poor conduct of the officer themselves but something quite 11 when it is deserved means that those officers have 11 12 nothing to fear. Because it does rather depend upon 12 fuzzv 13 what you mean by "wrongdoing". 13 THE CHAIR: It is not in principle wrongdoing, it is 14 14 performance by the undercover officer of his or her job. When you put that to counsel, the list of potential 15 wrongdoing expanded somewhat alarmingly. So it 15 MR HALL: Absolutely, statutorily based. Where done under 16 comprised miscarriage of justice, racist attitude, 16 statute, entirely lawful. That is what section 29 says, 17 sexual relationships obviously, close personal 17 it is lawful. 18 relationships and, sir, you teased out in dialogue that 18 Other aspects that have been suggested as types of 19 19 wrongdoing are blacklisting as an outcome of the is simply fulfilling the meaning of a covert human 20 intelligence source. 20 information received, that does seem to be an 21 THE CHAIR: I don't actually understand Ms Kaufmann to say 21 extraordinarily wild category. 22 that that either does or necessarily does amount to 22 THE CHAIR: That is a outcome rather than an act. It may be 23 wrongdoing. But she was merely pointing out -- I think 23 that it includes wrongdoing by the person gathering the 24 correctly -- the circumstances which might give rise on 24 information, but it may not necessarily. 25 the part of someone to whom that had occurred to 25 MR HALL: But it may not. It may have nothing to do with

Page 164

the poor officer who has reported, and it happens that his intelligence has been taken by another part of an organisation and handed it is not wrongdoing. Similarly, my learned friend said that anyone who has engaged in criminal activity. Again, that cannot be right, because as we know criminal activity will be authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do mot accept that simply because someone has engaged in mot accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. The other one that we noted is the definition of pistively take into account the side of openness, we is confrontation. MR KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. The fact that it will have this consequence and interfere with article 8 rights in that way, is not	s vhich r usofar hose
organisation and handed it is not wrongdoing. Similarly, my learned friend said that anyone who has engaged in criminal activity. Again, that cannot be right, because as we know criminal activity will be authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. Means them to be explored all well and good terms of reference. What is in fact being said is that there is an extra benefit that the Inquiry should allow, positively take into account the side of openness, v is confrontation. MS KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of the other one that we noted is the definition of The other one that we noted is the definition of The fact that it will have this consequence and	s vhich r usofar hose
Similarly, my learned friend said that anyone who has engaged in criminal activity. Again, that cannot be right, because as we know criminal activity will be authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. THE CHAIR: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. The other one that we noted is the definition of racism, which was that they were targeted into a black The simply because which and the reference. What is in fact being said is that there is an extra benefit that the Inquiry should allow, positively take into account the side of openness, value is confrontation. MS KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fact being said is that there is an extra benefit that the Inquiry should allow, positively take into account the side of openness, value is confrontation. MS KAUFMANN: No. The chair it don't think so, I don't think that is fact being said is that there is an extra benefit that the Inquiry should allow, positively take into account the side of openness, value is confrontation. MS KAUFMANN: No. The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the confronted by th	vhich r usofar hose
has engaged in criminal activity. Again, that cannot be right, because as we know criminal activity will be authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. The other one that we noted is the definition of The fact that it will have this consequence and	vhich r usofar hose
right, because as we know criminal activity will be authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. Me positively take into account the side of openness, v is confrontation. MS KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of the other one that we noted is the definition of The other one that we noted is the definition of Tracism, which was that they were targeted into a black MS KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. The fact that it will have this consequence and	r isofar hose
right, because as we know criminal activity will be authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. Me positively take into account the side of openness, v is confrontation. MS KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of the other one that we noted is the definition of The other one that we noted is the definition of Tracism, which was that they were targeted into a black MS KAUFMANN: No. THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. The fact that it will have this consequence and	r isofar hose
authorised. THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in oriminal at this time you have the point. The other one that we noted is the definition of The fact that it will have this consequence and	r isofar hose
8 THE CHAIR: A bit of flyposting is one thing, but there are 9 other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are 10 admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that 11 category. 12 MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do 13 not accept that simply because someone has engaged in 14 criminal at this time you have the point. 15 The other one that we noted is the definition of 16 racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 18 MS KAUFMANN: No. 19 THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fared. 10 MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? 11 The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. 16 The fact that it will have this consequence and	nsofar hose
9 other acts alleged and in one or two instances which are 10 admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that 11 category. 12 MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do 13 not accept that simply because someone has engaged in 14 criminal at this time you have the point. 15 The other one that we noted is the definition of 16 racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 19 THE CHAIR: I don't think so, I don't think that is fa 10 MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? 11 The consequence of disclosing the real names in 12 as it means that individuals will be confronted by the disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. 15 The fact that it will have this consequence and	nsofar hose
admitted to have occurred which don't fall into that category. MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. The other one that we noted is the definition of racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 10 MS KAUFMANN: Shall I put it how I put it? The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the search of the point and it is expected in the point. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. The fact that it will have this consequence and	hose
11 category. 12 MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do 13 not accept that simply because someone has engaged in 14 criminal at this time you have the point. 15 The other one that we noted is the definition of 16 racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 11 The consequence of disclosing the real names in as it means that individuals will be confronted by the assistance of the point as it means that individuals will be confronted by the fact they have been betrayed is not a reason in disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of the point in the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have this consequence and the fact that it will have	hose
MR HALL: Absolutely, it depends upon the facts but we do not accept that simply because someone has engaged in criminal at this time you have the point. The other one that we noted is the definition of racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 12 as it means that individuals will be confronted by the whole of the point who feel they have been betrayed is not a reason in disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. The fact that it will have this consequence and	hose
13 not accept that simply because someone has engaged in 14 criminal at this time you have the point. 15 The other one that we noted is the definition of 16 racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 18 who feel they have been betrayed is not a reason n 19 disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of 10 how you are putting it. 11 The fact that it will have this consequence and	
14 criminal at this time you have the point. 15 The other one that we noted is the definition of 16 racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 17 disclose the real names. It is quite the opposite of how you are putting it. 18 The fact that it will have this consequence and	
15 The other one that we noted is the definition of 15 how you are putting it. 16 racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 16 The fact that it will have this consequence and	
racism, which was that they were targeted into a black 16 The fact that it will have this consequence and	
that is wrongdoing on the part of an officer personal 18 a reason not to disclose, because that is a natural	ļ
19 wrongdoing because if they were targeted into a black 19 THE CHAIR: I think I had understood you correctly	
20 justice campaign. 20 understand Ms Kaufmann's submissions in that se	
There may be a compelling or a good ground to 21 MR HALL: I am grateful, and I was wrong about ho	
release the cover name in such a situation 22 it, but the consequences of the confrontation are, v	
23 THE CHAIR: I think that that issue is more likely to arise 23 would submit, clearly material depending on what	
24 in relation to managerial decisions than conduct on the 24 are	
25 ground by undercover officers. 25 THE CHAIR: And they will vary from case to case.	
Page 165 Page 167	
1 MR HALL: That must be right. And I am grateful, yes. It 1 MR HALL: And they will vary.	
2 can't be right to say of an officer who was carrying out 2 THE CHAIR: Confronting a fit middle aged man with	what he's
3 his or her 3 done 20 years before is one thing. Confronting the	
4 THE CHAIR: If it is managerial decisions then the 4 85-year old widow of a deceased officer is quite	
5 likelihood is that they will be disclosed. 5 another, and there is anything in between.	
6 MR HALL: The accountability is different, yes. 6 MR HALL: Yes.	
7 THE CHAIR: No, but the likelihood is that the real name 7 Perhaps where I still do differ from Ms Kaufmanr	is
8 will be disclosed so that any information about that 8 the sanguine view that where a confrontation takes r	
9 person, subsequent career included, will be available 9 one has nothing to worry about, because only in case	
10 anyway. 10 genuine wrongdoing will confrontation really take p	
11 MR HALL: As I have previously indicated I don't accept the 11 and where it does take place it will be proportionate	
12 position that anyone who is a manager 12 lawful in that way.	
13 THE CHAIR: I know you don't. But if my forecast is right 13 THE CHAIR: It is not always confrontation either. It	IS
then the problem will not arise in practice, or at any 14 simply unwelcome attention from the local media, o	
15 rate will rarely arrive in practice. 15 neighbours, the people with whom one works if still	
16 MR HALL: Yes. I will confront that as and when it arises. 16 employment. All of those sort of things.	
Just to complete the submissions on confrontation, 17 They are factors, they may or may not count heavy	ly,
all of these "wrongdoing" were put forward as reasons 18 it remains to be seen. It all depends on the individual	
19 for releasing the real name. We respectfully disagree 19 case.	
that they are reasons for releasing the real name, 20 MR HALL: If we are talking about real names then the	only
whether it is of this particular officer or indeed any 21 circumstances, we would submit, in which one is in	-
22 other officer. 22 practice going to release those real names is the long	
23 THE CHAIR: As I understand it, it was advanced on the basis 23 term sexual relationships or perhaps more senior	;
23 THE CHAIR: As I understand it, it was advanced on the basis 23 term sexual relationships or perhaps more senior 24 that well this is what openness will do. It will permit 24 managers. So the confrontation that is going to arise	ļ
that well this is what openness will do. It will permit 24 managers. So the confrontation that is going to arise	

1	THE CHAIR: I am not excluding the possibility that there	1	left over tomorrow morning so that esprit d'escalier can
2	will be other situations in which it arises, but those	2	be voiced.
3	are the two obvious ones.	3	MS KAUFMANN: Yes, I think we have four more to get through.
4	MR HALL: Yes. The reason why one should not be sanguine	4	THE CHAIR: Let's embark on them. I am not intending to
5	about what confrontation means is that of course what	5	stop until 4.30. That was not, as it were, an oblique
6	one person understands by wrongdoing Ms Kaufmann	6	way of saying, "Shall we stop now?"
7	assures you that really this is what they understand by	7	MS KAUFMANN: I think that we are now on HN326.
8	wrongdoing will not necessarily be shared by others.	8	THE CHAIR: Correct.
9	What is viewed as a proportion and lawful sort of	9	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
10	confrontation, I am sure Ms Kaufmann speaks for all of	10	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN326
11	her clients, I don't doubt that for a moment, but of	11	MS KAUFMANN: Tab 68 is this officer's personal statement,
12	course one is not simply dealing with the core	12	which is very frank, expresses no fears for personal
13	participants, those who Ms Kaufmann represents, but one	13	safety. Wants to carry on living a quiet life, doesn't
14	is also dealing with other people who may take a very	14	want press intrusion, all very understandable, but
15	different view as to the consequences of a deployment	15	doesn't express any concerns for physical safety.
16	and one is not simply talking about now but one is	16	We do have a risk assessment, which at paragraph 13
17	talking about the rest of an officer's natural life.	17	says that the risk of physical harm is medium but there
18	So it is a pretty big decision to say "don't worry	18	is no basis given for this at all. That seems to be
19	about the consequences of confrontation". We say do	19	contrary to the officer's own view.
20	worry, and officers are entitled to worry about that,	20	Obviously I can't say anything meaningful whatsoever
21	which is why a real name ought, in our submission, only	21	about that risk assessment, but if we are assuming that
22	to be exposed in the more narrow categories that you	22	the risk assessment does not bear out any realistic risk
23	have outlined.	23	to this particular officer's life should the real name
24	Ms Kaufmann of course is saying and there is no	24	be disclosed.
25	point in hiding the difference between us she's	25	Then again this is an instance and I hear
	Page 169		Page 171
1	roally saving "Don't warry about roal names at all"	1	avanthing that you gay about those ages being old
1	really saying, "Don't worry about real names at all",	1	everything that you say about these cases being old
2	and our submission is do.	2	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name
2 3	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk	2 3	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this
2 3 4	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply.	2 3 4	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the
2 3 4 5	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where	2 3 4 5	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public
2 3 4 5 6	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk.	2 3 4 5 6	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10
2 3 4 5 6 7	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and	2 3 4 5 6 7	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN326
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN326 MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is a genuine concern.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on that. THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I suspect if we do them at a gallop	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN326 MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is a genuine concern. The submission is made that the police need to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on that. THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I suspect if we do them at a gallop we might finish this afternoon. I'm not going to compel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN326 MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is a genuine concern. The submission is made that the police need to be held to account, I don't know what that means in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on that. THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I suspect if we do them at a gallop we might finish this afternoon. I'm not going to compel everything to do them at a gallop and it may be that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is a genuine concern. The submission is made that the police need to be held to account, I don't know what that means in this context. His cover identity, Douglas Edwards, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on that. THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I suspect if we do them at a gallop we might finish this afternoon. I'm not going to compel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL re HN326 MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is a genuine concern. The submission is made that the police need to be held to account, I don't know what that means in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and our submission is do. THE CHAIR: She, I think, accepts that where there is a risk to life and limb then different considerations apply. I think her remarks are addressed to those cases where there is not such a risk. MR HALL: Yes, her remarks are addressed to lesser cases and she invites the Inquiry to be sanguine about all those other human consequences, whether it is the effect on neighbours, children, livelihoods, jobs and whatever. THE CHAIR: In the end it all depends and it all depends on the individual facts. There is no getting away from that and that is why this exercise is being undertaken to look at the case of each officer. So to take 321, as an individual, even if he were not abroad and this was the only way of getting his evidence, the concerns he expresses about the circumstances in which he lives would still be real. MR HALL: Yes. Sir, I think that is all, then, I need to say on that. THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann, I suspect if we do them at a gallop we might finish this afternoon. I'm not going to compel everything to do them at a gallop and it may be that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	cases and so forth where disclosure of the real name is going to have very limited impact, if any, upon this particular officer. But it is an aspect of holding the police to account in respect of their activities, public confidence in the Inquiry process, and the article 10 interests of the press being served. It is really no different to the HN68 case. I really don't have any further submissions to make on it. THE CHAIR: That is very economical. This I think is one of yours? Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by MR HALL: It is one of mine. Same point, very superficial deployment, almost 50 years ago. It looks like this gentleman kept the code of secrecy very strongly. He says he didn't even tell his parents. He says disclosure of my real name causes me worry and concern. No reason to doubt that that is a genuine concern. The submission is made that the police need to be held to account, I don't know what that means in this context. His cover identity, Douglas Edwards, is

1	is difficult to understand. It is not said that this	1	MS KAUFMANN: Indeed.
2	officer has done something wrong as far as I understand.	2	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core
3	It entirely ignores the basis upon which officers	3	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN329
4	undertook this sort of work.	4	MS KAUFMANN: So 329, this is another.
5	It reduces it to almost meaninglessness	5	THE CHAIR: Same box, isn't it?
6	THE CHAIR: I think it is at a time when it was genuinely	6	MS KAUFMANN: Same box, way, way back. Personal statement
7	understood that everything would be kept secret	7	at tab 72. Of significance that this officer doubts
8	MR HALL: Yes.	8	that anybody would actually remember the cover name, so
9	THE CHAIR: rather than any express, still less written,	9	there is that instrumental purpose that might be served.
10	promise being made.	10	I should add this, that in relation to the use of
11	MR HALL: But nonetheless valid for that.	11	real names way back when in 1968 and 1969 when the
12	THE CHAIR: Of course.	12	names of deceased children were not being used my
13	MR HALL: Judged by his actions, not telling anyone at all.	13	understanding is that quite often the cover name would
14	THE CHAIR: It is an immensely attractive promise, secrecy,	14	use the same first name as the real name. So actually
15	isn't it. I'm going to tell you something and you must	15	disclosure of the real name may trigger memories in
16	not tell anybody about it, it gives it an importance	16	relation to that individual.
17	that it otherwise might not have.	17	Also there is then also the possibility of putting
18	MR HALL: Maybe. I mean, I'm not going to go there, if	18	the picture together through disclosure of the real name
19	I may not, because secrecy is important obviously. But	19	and ways in which that can lead to identification
20	also it is a point Mr Sanders makes. However actually	20	through other sources.
21	unnecessary it may have been, if a person constructs	21	This statement is a pretty laid back statement,
22	their entire life on the basis of that secrecy, doesn't	22	actually. The only expression of concern from this
23	tell their neighbours, their friends, their family and	23	particular officer is set out at paragraph 22:
24	the like. It just seems extraordinary without some	24	"I would prefer that my real name and status as
25	pretty good reason to pull all that away. It just	25	a former undercover officer didn't come out. I don't
	Page 173		Page 175
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
1	distinguishes these cases from the ordinary case in	1	want to be associated with the idiot that caused all
2	which a party to a litigation or an individual in an	2	this, because it is a question of being tarred with the
3	inquest seems anonymity. That is how they have built	3	same brush."
4	their lives. And it is not so much granting	4	So, yes, would prefer it not to come out. But not
5	restrictions but taking them away, restrictions which	5	actually any serious sense of a risk to his own
6	they would naturally expect to exist.	6	safety
7	Our submission is that even though one is in the	7	THE CHAIR: There is no question of safety. He appears to
8	territory of subjective worry and concern, those are	8	be a reasonably phlegmatic person who takes things in
9	relevant considerations and outweigh the presumption of	9	his stride.
10	openness on the facts of this particular case.	10	MS KAUFMANN: Yes. In a sense it is neither here nor there
11	THE CHAIR: Yes.	11	for this individual whether it comes out or not. That
12	HN329 next, I think.	12	is one of the reasons why we say, well, then, it should
13	MS KAUFMANN: Yes.	13	come out. Because it is better to be open for all the
14	Further submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police	14	reasons that we have advanced than to impose secrecy
15	core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN326	15	where it is not needed.
16	MS KAUFMANN: Can I just say that obviously even though	16	Can I double this up with the next officer because
17	these events took place a long, long time ago, we do	17	it is very similar?
18	have core participants in relation to these events.	18	THE CHAIR: I better just hear if Mr Halls has anything to
19	Three of them were here yesterday concerned with	19	say about this one.
20	1968.	20	Is this one of yours, Mr Hall?
21	THE CHAIR: I don't doubt that there are people still alive	21	Submissions on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service by
22	who are deeply interested	22	MR HALL re HN329
23	MS KAUFMANN: Deeply concerned and interested.	23	MR HALL: Just to say where an individual is phlegmatic,
24	THE CHAIR: Indeed one or two of them have become well known	24	that is precisely why one needs to look at their words
25	public figures since and are core participants.	25	with care and weight. Where this phlegmatic individual
	Page 174		Page 176
	1 450 1/7	1	1 450 110

1	has expressed a preference one can sensibly read into	1	to withhold the real name. We see in relation to the
2	that that he has constructed his life and would rather	2	reasons a very small risk that:
3	be left alone.	3	"If his cover name were to be associated with the
4	THE CHAIR: Exactly, we are dealing with a preference	4	valuable duties which he performed subsequent to his
5	against an offchance that something might conceivably be	5	deployment he would be of interest to those who might
6	discovered. These are two interests of pretty tiny	6	position pose a threat to him or his family."
7	weight.	7	A very small risk, that is in relation to the cover
8	Next one.	8	name.
9	Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core	9	We ask ourselves if there is only a very, very small
10	participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN330	10	risk, that is that it is highly unlikely, what is the
11	MS KAUFMANN: The next one I think is again Mr Sander's	11	basis for refusal to disclose the cover name in this
12	client. That is tab 74, personal statement.	12	particular officer's case? We are, I am afraid, at
13	This individual is even more phlegmatic.	13	something of a loss as to what the basis is that this
14	Paragraph 15:	14	individual should be treated differently to the other
15	"Finally, whether or not the Commissioner of Police	15	individuals where at least the cover name is being
16	wishes to apply for my anonymity to be respected is	16	disclosed.
17	a choice to be made by him or her, as the case may be."	17	I don't know whether it is possible to shed any
18	So really not concerned in the slightest.	18	light upon that.
19	Dealing again very briefly with this, this officer	19	THE CHAIR: I can't, I am afraid. There are closed reasons
20	is simply not concerned about it.	20	as you know and I am afraid I can't say any more about
21	In those circumstances, let us know the officer's	21	them than is in the open note.
22	real name.	22	As you know, this is a judgment that I have made and
23	THE CHAIR: Right.	23	it is not based upon the published risk assessment.
24	HN330 is one whose cover name was not known but as	24	MS KAUFMANN: No. Well I mean in those circumstances, there
25	a result of another officer is now known.	25	is really absolutely nothing I can say.
	Page 177		Page 179
	Tage 177		rage 177
1	MS KAUFMANN: That is all I propose to say in relation to	1	THE CHAIR: I readily appreciate that.
2	this officer.	2	MS KAUFMANN: It seems like a very strange decision to us,
3	THE CHAIR: Snap, Mr Hall?	3	but we are unable to identify why it looks strange and
4	MR HALL: Yes, I think it is a DL one.	4	therefore to say anything sensible about whether it in
5	THE CHAIR: I am sorry, it is Mr Sanders, isn't it?	5	fact is an illustration of you taking a wrong turn. We
6	I do apologise.	6	simply can't say anything.
7	Anything to add to what Mr Hall has said about this?	7	THE CHAIR: You are quite right, I agree with that.
8	Submissions on behalf of HN330 by MR SANDERS	8	Ms Sikand wants to say something about it I think.
9	MR SANDERS: Just to confirm that we make the application on	9	Submissions on behalf of Mr Peter Francis by MS SIKAND
10	his behalf on his instructions.	10	re HN333
11	THE CHAIR: Quite.	11	MS SIKAND: Sir, only that as you know we have said
12	MR SANDERS: What he may have said in correspondence with	12	something in writing about this officer. Not because
13	the Metropolitan Police Service prior to being given	13	he's an officer known to Mr Francis but because of
14	legal representation and taking advice is one thing.	14	the principle position and we talked about what
15	The application is made, he doesn't wish his real name	15	Ms Kaufmann has to say about that it is difficult to see
		1	
16	to be published. He's in his 80s, his deployment was	16	on the face of what we have been disclosed why you would
16 17	to be published. He's in his 80s, his deployment was very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related	16 17	on the face of what we have been disclosed why you would make a different decision in relation to this officer,
		1	
17	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related	17	make a different decision in relation to this officer,
17 18	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321.	17 18	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera.
17 18 19	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you.	17 18 19	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which
17 18 19 20	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. MS KAUFMANN: We are actually on HN333.	17 18 19 20	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which supports the submission which you make on his behalf
17 18 19 20 21	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. MS KAUFMANN: We are actually on HN333. THE CHAIR: HN333. We are going to finish.	17 18 19 20 21	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which supports the submission which you make on his behalf that the cover name should be disclosed?
17 18 19 20 21 22	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. MS KAUFMANN: We are actually on HN333. THE CHAIR: HN333. We are going to finish. Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core	17 18 19 20 21 22	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which supports the submission which you make on his behalf that the cover name should be disclosed? MS SIKAND: It is a different era of officers, as you know.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. MS KAUFMANN: We are actually on HN333. THE CHAIR: HN333. We are going to finish. Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN333	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which supports the submission which you make on his behalf that the cover name should be disclosed? MS SIKAND: It is a different era of officers, as you know. THE CHAIR: Of course. It is self-evident, but I was just
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. MS KAUFMANN: We are actually on HN333. THE CHAIR: HN333. We are going to finish. Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN333 MS KAUFMANN: HN333 is a real and cover name minded to withhold. The Metropolitan Police Service applied only	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which supports the submission which you make on his behalf that the cover name should be disclosed? MS SIKAND: It is a different era of officers, as you know. THE CHAIR: Of course. It is self-evident, but I was just confirming it. MS SIKAND: That's right.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	very, very short in 1968, all Grosvenor Square related and then just the same submissions as I made for 321. THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. MS KAUFMANN: We are actually on HN333. THE CHAIR: HN333. We are going to finish. Submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN333 MS KAUFMANN: HN333 is a real and cover name minded to	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	make a different decision in relation to this officer, given the levels of risk et cetera. THE CHAIR: Again, Mr Francis knows of no fact which supports the submission which you make on his behalf that the cover name should be disclosed? MS SIKAND: It is a different era of officers, as you know. THE CHAIR: Of course. It is self-evident, but I was just confirming it.

1	THE CHAIR: Yes. Thank you.	1	HN343, the disclosure exercise such as it is has not
2	Ms Kaufmann?	2	been performed and therefore I am not inviting any
3	Further submissions on behalf of the non-state, non-police	3	submissions on N343. We will put HN343 off to a later
4	core participants by MS KAUFMANN re HN333	4	date.
5	MS KAUFMANN: All I would want to say is just as a marker	5	Mr Barr, anything you want to say in conclusion?
6	for the future, this is an officer whose activities were	6	Discussion re statement of Louise Meade
7	confirmed in the early period.	7	MR BARR: There is one matter, sir, which has not been
8	THE CHAIR: Yes.	8	publicly ventilated and I think it would help if I said
9	MS KAUFMANN: Obviously as we move forward and we get to	9	something about it.
10	officers whose activities arose in the period with which	10	That is to explain the inclusion in the bundle of
11	this Inquiry is really concerned	11	the statement of Louise Meade, which was done at the
12	THE CHAIR: Yes.	12	behest of the inquiry legal team.
13	MS KAUFMANN: this is obviously, this sort of gisting, is	13	THE CHAIR: Yes.
14	going to cause great problems for us because those	14	MR BARR: We decided it was necessary to prepare for
15	officers will be important in relation to the Inquiry's	15	publishing that statement and publishing it because of
16	activities and to the extent that we are totally shut	16	what we had read in the statement of Chief Constable
17	out from saying anything meaningful or understanding	17	Alan Pughsley, on whom the Metropolitan Police Service
18	anything meaningful it will be much more difficult.	18	wish to rely in support of the proposition that the
19	THE CHAIR: I appreciate that.	19	revelations about undercover policing in recent years
20	There will be decisions I'm minded to make, the	20	and the institution of this public Inquiry have deterred
21	explanations for which will make leave you none the	21	and are deterring the recruitment of undercover police
22	wiser. I am afraid that it is unavoidable. I do my	22	officers.
23	best to explain what I'm doing, but sometimes I know	23	The relevant section of Chief Constable Pughsley's
24	I don't always succeed and sometimes I can't explain.	24	statement are at tab 18 of the generic bundle right at
25	This is one of those cases where I can't say any	25	the very back, pages 13 and 14, paragraphs 425 onwards.
	Page 181		Page 183
,	a e e a		Will discount in the city
1	more than is in the open note.	1	Where the Chief Constable cites a paragraph from Cairo's
2	Mr Sanders?	2	witness statement. That citation includes a very proper
3	Submissions on behalf of HN333 by MR SANDERS	3	acceptance by Cairo that there may be several
4	MR SANDERS: Sir, very little to add other than just to	4	explanations for a decline in applications which he had
5	highlight the additional closed letter that we sent in	5	been aware of.
6	relation to this former officer dated 8 November. It	6	The Chief Constable then goes on to try to reinforce
7	was just one further matter, closed matter	7	that argument with some statistical evidence, which
8	THE CHAIR: I don't believe I have seen that, but thank you	8	appears to have been derived from the College of
9	for drawing it to my attention.	9	Policing.
10	Closed letter, 8 November?	10	Louise Meade is the head of selection and assessment
11	MR SANDERS: Yes, it is	11	for the College of Policing, she leads and manages the
12	THE CHAIR: It is possible I have seen it and I have	12	selection and assessment department. Her statement is
13	forgotten about it, but I don't recollect having seen	13	93 pages long and I don't propose to go through it in
14	it. MD SANDEDS: Obviously if it has gone actray than we will	14	any detail at all. I would like to say is that what it
15	MR SANDERS: Obviously, if it has gone astray, then we will	15	effectively communicates is that there has been a great
16	provide	16	deal of thinking and change in the recruitment processes
17	THE CHAID. A rest amount ofti-1 i O't O	17	
17	THE CHAIR: A vast amount of material comes in. Quite often	17	for undercover police officers since 2011. Part of
18	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my	18	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable
18 19	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may	18 19	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible
18 19 20	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it.	18 19 20	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply.
18 19 20 21	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it. I can't at the moment bring it to mind. I will look at	18 19 20 21	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply. It follows from that, and from the statistics which
18 19 20 21 22	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it. I can't at the moment bring it to mind. I will look at it.	18 19 20 21 22	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply. It follows from that, and from the statistics which she's published, which do not establish a fixed pattern
18 19 20 21 22 23	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it. I can't at the moment bring it to mind. I will look at it. MR SANDERS: I am grateful.	18 19 20 21 22 23	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply. It follows from that, and from the statistics which she's published, which do not establish a fixed pattern or statistically reliable trend, that we consider that
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it. I can't at the moment bring it to mind. I will look at it. MR SANDERS: I am grateful. There is nothing more I can say in open about this.	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply. It follows from that, and from the statistics which she's published, which do not establish a fixed pattern or statistically reliable trend, that we consider that it cannot be said that there is any statistical basis in
18 19 20 21 22 23	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it. I can't at the moment bring it to mind. I will look at it. MR SANDERS: I am grateful.	18 19 20 21 22 23	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply. It follows from that, and from the statistics which she's published, which do not establish a fixed pattern or statistically reliable trend, that we consider that
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I see almost everything, but you will appreciate that my capacity to remember things is not infinite and I may therefore have seen the letter and forgotten it. I can't at the moment bring it to mind. I will look at it. MR SANDERS: I am grateful. There is nothing more I can say in open about this.	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which has been to focus on ensuring that unsuitable candidates are deterred at the earliest possible opportunity and therefore only the most suitable apply. It follows from that, and from the statistics which she's published, which do not establish a fixed pattern or statistically reliable trend, that we consider that it cannot be said that there is any statistical basis in

1	to support the proposition that Chief Constable Pughsley	1	MR HALL: I think we would, on behalf of the Metropolitan
2	was trying to advance.	2	Police Service, say that that has to register. I mean,
3	And that the proper acknowledgement by Cairo that	3	the purpose of this Inquiry is to discover the truth,
4	there may well be alternative explanations for any	4	but it is not to prevent the tactic from operating
5	trend, if there had been one, was quite proper. We	5	again. That might because of the way in which things
6	therefore wish to draw that to public attention so that	6	are shaping up it seems unlikely, but that consideration
7	if my learned friend for the Metropolitan Police Service	7	might play a part in certain cases where one has to
8	wishes to say anything, he can do so now.	8	accept that the imperative of allowing undercover
9	MR HALL: I have not prepared to deal with this point, other	9	deployments against let us bear in mind really serious
10	than to observe that it is very important not to misread	10	crimes as well as the sort of policing that we are
11	statistics.	11	looking at here, has to go on.
12	THE CHAIR: Yes.	12	It is not a case of saying, you know, let justice be
13	MR HALL: I don't know whether or not ultimately the	13	done, may the heavens fall. Because what is in issue
14	proposition which has been accepted for decades by the	14	here is jolly serious, as Cairo explains in Cairo's
15	courts that revealing identities of those who do	15	statement.
16	valuable service in a confidential way will have an	16	THE CHAIR: I acknowledge that it is. I strongly doubt that
17	impact upon recruitment and retention. I don't know	17	anyone will make the suggestion that I should pull my
18	whether or not the statistics will bear that out or not.	18	punches, if I am minded to deliver them, in the
19	I doubt that whatever the statistics say I will abandon	19	interests of future deployments.
20	reliance on that proposition.	20	I would be very surprised if they were to be made
21	But if statistics are an issue, and if there is	21	that I would accede to them.
22	a previous perceived inconsistency, probably better to	22	MR HALL: That is because you would be punching, as it were,
23	get to the bottom of it if only to discount them.	23	when you had made findings
24	THE CHAIR: Yes. The fact is that at the moment the issue	24	THE CHAIR: Yes.
25	is not clear cut at all.	25	MR HALL: and you had exposed wrongdoing and the
23	is not elear cut at an.	23	WINCHALL and you had exposed wrongdoing and the
	Page 185		Page 187
1	MR HALL: No.	1	imperative of exposing wrongdoing would be a pretty
2	THE CHAIR: Ms Kaufmann's submission made to me yesterday	2	powerful punch. But we are not at that stage at the
3	has a sounder foundation than perhaps she may have	3	moment, we are at an earlier stage.
4	realised, although I may not be doing her full credit	4	THE CHAIR: No, no we are miles away from it.
5	and her research may have been more up to date than	5	MR HALL: Which is why the proposition that one disregards
6	mine.	6	the risk to recruitment and retention when one is
7	MR HALL: She may know more than all of us.		
· '		7	
8		7 8	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of
8	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to	8	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach.
9	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the	8 9	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer
9 10	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or	8 9 10	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future
9 10 11	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley	8 9 10 11	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that
9 10 11 12	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it.	8 9 10 11 12	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then
9 10 11 12 13	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client	8 9 10 11 12 13	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and
9 10 11 12 13 14	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck".
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally. I think it is one of these continuing debates most	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment. If what I can say cannot be said without damage to
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally. I think it is one of these continuing debates most likely. I doubt, in any event, to be blunt that it	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment. If what I can say cannot be said without damage to a serious public interest, such as national security or
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally. I think it is one of these continuing debates most likely. I doubt, in any event, to be blunt that it makes that much difference. I have to get at the truth.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment. If what I can say cannot be said without damage to a serious public interest, such as national security or the policing of serious crime, then I will say it
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally. I think it is one of these continuing debates most likely. I doubt, in any event, to be blunt that it makes that much difference. I have to get at the truth. If the truth is uncomfortable and deters people from	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment. If what I can say cannot be said without damage to a serious public interest, such as national security or the policing of serious crime, then I will say it privately. But I am at the moment entirely unpersuaded
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally. I think it is one of these continuing debates most likely. I doubt, in any event, to be blunt that it makes that much difference. I have to get at the truth.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment. If what I can say cannot be said without damage to a serious public interest, such as national security or the policing of serious crime, then I will say it
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Anyway, I think where I left it with Mr Barr was to say that unless objection was taken we would invite the National Policing Improvement Agency to see whether or not there is in fact a difference between what Pughsley says and what Meade says, and if there is explain it. That would, I think, be done by Sir Robert's client rather than mine. I think that is where we left it. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR HALL: It is probably better not to leave this unresolved, otherwise one is simply in the position of one person says one thing, the other one says something else. THE CHAIR: I doubt that it ever will be resolved, finally. I think it is one of these continuing debates most likely. I doubt, in any event, to be blunt that it makes that much difference. I have to get at the truth. If the truth is uncomfortable and deters people from	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	thinking about people against whom nothing is known of anything wrong, that would be the wrong approach. One has to have an eye to what a future officer might think if all that it takes for his or her future wellbeing to be jeopardised is for the possibility that they have done something wrong to be ventilated. Then one has an inquiry, or one has a court hearing and immediately the judge or the person in charge of the tribunal says, "Well, now an allegation has been made, tough luck". THE CHAIR: I understand that, but when I get as near to the bottom of what went on as I can, I will say what I find. I will not alter what I am minded to say because of the possibility of its impact on future recruitment. If what I can say cannot be said without damage to a serious public interest, such as national security or the policing of serious crime, then I will say it privately. But I am at the moment entirely unpersuaded

1	publishy because of a possible impact on future	1	nothing will do apart from statistics
1 2	publicly because of a possible impact on future recruitment.	2	nothing will do apart from statistics. THE CHAIR: You are pushing an open door there, the old
3	MR HALL: If I may say, one has to keep a red line between	3	saying about lies and statistics is true. I don't need
4	those two parts of the Inquiry. It was a point we made	4	to be persuaded that I shouldn't rely on one set of
5	in our written submissions and I have not repeated them,	5	statistics. All I have observed is that the position is
6	but I will mention them now.	6	not as clear cut as I had originally thought it to be.
7	We are not at that stage. We are at the	7	We shall see where in individual cases this factor
8	investigative stage where it would be unappetising for	8	becomes relevant. And on the basis of individual cases,
9	future recruits I will say on this on the basis of as	9	which I intend to decide according to their own merits,
10	it were common sense and what Cairo says, and he's given	10	we will see whether its has any impact on future
11	evidence to that effect. Undesirable for them to think,	11	recruitment. I'm at the moment disinclined to do a top
12	"All you need is an inquiry and then everything comes	12	down exercise which says just as I'm disinclined to
13	out, whatever is known".	13	do it for the sake of openness full stop
14	At the moment the Inquiry is investigating and our	14	MR HALL: Yes.
15	submission has always been in fact that we know why we	15	THE CHAIR: that well, there is this risk, therefore you
16	are here. There are some very bad cases of the	16	ought always to err on the side of avoiding it.
17	long-term relationships, there is the matter of the	17	MR HALL: In fact it probably does not really arise on the
18	Lawrence Inquiry which must be got to the bottom of.	18	cases we have looked at. I mean none of us have
19	I'm not being exclusive, but those are the key reasons	19	actually talked about it, which probably illustrates it
20	why we are here.	20	is not going to determine it either way. But, if you
21	There are officers about whom nothing wrong is known	21	like, I'm simply putting down a marker that if it does
22	and there is no indication that they have done something	22	arise we would submit, as I think is common ground, it
23	wrong. What one cannot do, we would submit contrary	23	can't depend upon statistics and we do say that there is
24	to undertakings, contrary to expectations, contrary to	24	evidence which ought to be given due weight from Cairo.
25	the covert human intelligence source code of conduct, is	25	We obviously have not gone into it here, but
	D 400		D 404
	Page 189		Page 191
1	to sacrifice those interests simply because something	1	somewhere within the six or seven volumes of
2	may ultimately come up.	2	authorities, there is a lot of judicial dicta to that
3	What you are talking about, sir, is pulling punches	3	effect.
4	at the end of the process. I fully understand that, but	4	THE CHAIR: I accept all of that, but the current batches of
5	I would resist the submission that the interests of	5	cases that I have so far considered, and issued minded
6	recruitment and retention count as nothing at this	6	to notes in respect of them, I simply can't see how that
7	stage. At this stage they do count quite a lot.	7	issue arises. I can't see that deciding an individual
8	THE CHAIR: I agree they are a relevant factor. But until	8	case in the manner that I am minded to gives rise to the
9	we can get somewhere nearer to a sound factual basis for	9	risk of which you speak.
10	a conclusion, it is all assertion and speculation.	10	If that is so in relation to the last 50 or 60
11	MR HALL: With respect, we disagree. I don't like to	11	officers, then I think it is pretty unlikely to apply in
12	disagree but we do. Cairo is an authoritative source of	12	the future. But we shall see.
13	evidence.	13	MR HALL: Exactly. I mean if the matters are decided in the
14	One is in that difficult position. Of course Cairo	14	way you have indicated I agree. But obviously I'm
15	is a police officer. He might be expected to say	15	responding to submissions that all of them should come
16	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		
17 18	something that would support the institution of the	16	out
I X	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but	17	THE CHAIR: Right.
	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the	17 18	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect.
19	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently	17 18 19	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to
19 20	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently serving in the field, where else does one go, apart from	17 18 19 20	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to the high level submission that Ms Kaufmann has made
19 20 21	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently serving in the field, where else does one go, apart from someone in Cairo's position who has all of that	17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to the high level submission that Ms Kaufmann has made MR HALL: Yes.
19 20 21 22	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently serving in the field, where else does one go, apart from someone in Cairo's position who has all of that knowledge and experience and it is not simply anecdote,	17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to the high level submission that Ms Kaufmann has made MR HALL: Yes. THE CHAIR: and you say that there are other
19 20 21 22 23	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently serving in the field, where else does one go, apart from someone in Cairo's position who has all of that knowledge and experience and it is not simply anecdote, we submit, coming from a senior officer of that stature.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to the high level submission that Ms Kaufmann has made MR HALL: Yes. THE CHAIR: and you say that there are other considerations, and this is one?
19 20 21 22 23 24	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently serving in the field, where else does one go, apart from someone in Cairo's position who has all of that knowledge and experience and it is not simply anecdote, we submit, coming from a senior officer of that stature. If one needs to hear from or explore further by all	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to the high level submission that Ms Kaufmann has made MR HALL: Yes. THE CHAIR: and you say that there are other considerations, and this is one? MR HALL: Yes.
19 20 21 22 23	police. He's not an expert. He's not a Professor, but when one is asking what might be the impact be upon the cadre of future recruits and those who are currently serving in the field, where else does one go, apart from someone in Cairo's position who has all of that knowledge and experience and it is not simply anecdote, we submit, coming from a senior officer of that stature.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: Right. MR HALL: and we say, actually that could have an effect. THE CHAIR: This is a high level submission in response to the high level submission that Ms Kaufmann has made MR HALL: Yes. THE CHAIR: and you say that there are other considerations, and this is one?

1	an open door but beyond that alarm bells are beginning	1	in paragraph 164 he talks about me tracing John Barker,
2	to tremor.	2	and he refers to it as me tracing the man I knew as
3	MR HALL: We will think about it, but on the face of it it	3	John Barker. He doesn't refer to me tracing the man who
4	seems to us that if statistics matter there is a big	4	abused me and the motivation for that was to find out
5	question mark we ought to try to see if there is some	5	the truth about the abuse that he'd committed on me.
6	way of reconciling them for understanding them better.	6	And that is included in a section on where the heading
7	That is what I think we would be minded to do, even	7	is "Harm to individuals".
8	though ultimately it is likely that it will not resolve	8	THE CHAIR: Could you give me a moment while I turn this up?
9	matters either way.	9	MS STEEL: Sorry.
10	THE CHAIR: My suspicion is that it will be interesting but	10	THE CHAIR: Please don't apologise.
11	wasted effort.	11	This is tab 18 in the generic bundle; isn't it?
12	MR HALL: We will see.	12	MS STEEL: Yes. Paragraph 164.
13	THE CHAIR: Yes. We can see.	13	THE CHAIR: Yes.
14	Submissions by MS STEEL	14	MS STEEL: This is in the heading under "Harm to individuals
15	MS STEEL: Could I speak for a moment, sir?	15	of the fact that they might be traced".
16	THE CHAIR: Yes, you may. You have a particular point	16	THE CHAIR: Yes.
17	I think about	17	MS STEEL: Well the reality is that this man is an abuser
18	MS STEEL: I do. I have not been very well, I have not	18	and that is the context for me tracing him.
19	managed to finish reading the documents. I had wanted	19	Actually, the reason I was tracing him was he had
20	to prepare something properly and I thought I was going	20	faked such a good I was worried he was suicidal.
21	to get overnight to do it.	21	That was why I tried to trace him, that is how
22	THE CHAIR: I am sure you will appreciate that I'm a bit	22	professional these liars are.
23	reluctant to get everybody back here tomorrow.	23	It is not something you know, the implication is
24	MS STEEL: I understand that. That's why I'm doing it now	24	that there is something suspicious about it. It is
25	slightly on the hoof.	25	quite insulting to see it there. But also just to say
	Page 193		Page 195
1	THE CHAID: Fine	1	that straight after paragraph 164 there is no
1	THE CHAIR: Fine. MS STEEL: The leave reason that I wanted to speak, obviously	1 2	that straight after paragraph 164, there is no
2	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously	2	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are
2 3	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the	2 3	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are
2 3 4	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally	2 3 4	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is
2 3 4 5	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there	2 3 4 5	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me?
2 3 4 5 6	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these	2 3 4 5 6	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and	2 3 4 5 6 7	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS STEEL: The key reason that I wanted to speak, obviously I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars. It doesn't mean that everything that they say is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with John Barker
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars. It doesn't mean that everything that they say is a lie, but I just think it is important thing to take	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with John Barker THE CHAIR: I do know that, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars. It doesn't mean that everything that they say is a lie, but I just think it is important thing to take into account.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with John Barker THE CHAIR: I do know that, yes. MS STEEL: and he feigned a breakdown at the end of it in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars. It doesn't mean that everything that they say is a lie, but I just think it is important thing to take into account. I particularly wanted to just refer to the statement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with John Barker THE CHAIR: I do know that, yes. MS STEEL: and he feigned a breakdown at the end of it in which he wrote me long, convoluted letters, long-winded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars. It doesn't mean that everything that they say is a lie, but I just think it is important thing to take into account.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with John Barker THE CHAIR: I do know that, yes. MS STEEL: and he feigned a breakdown at the end of it in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm in full agreement with the submissions made by the lawyers for non-state core participants, but personally I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that there are numerous inaccuracies within a lot of these documents, and some of them relate to me personally and I find it quite insulting to to see and read them and know that the police are being funded to promote these inaccuracies. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS STEEL: And I think it is important that you know that from my perspective and the perspective of many of the women, we have seen the lies that these undercover officers are capable of, and just how convincing they are. They are professional liars. And I think that it is really important to bear that in mind when taking into account statements that they may make to you in letters or things that they may say to psychiatrists. They are professional liars. It doesn't mean that everything that they say is a lie, but I just think it is important thing to take into account. I particularly wanted to just refer to the statement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conclusion and then there is 120 paragraphs that are missing that are not gisted. I would like to know are they all about me or are some of them about me too? Is that being withheld from me? You know it is quite insulting and distressing to see this material being produced, used against you, when you have already had your life invaded in this way other the course of very many years. And I know that other women feel the same about things they have read about them as well. THE CHAIR: May I say, before you continue, and of course you can, that although I know in general about your story by "story", I mean history, I don't mean tale or anything like that while I know in general about your history and the efforts that you made to find the man, John Dines, I have not yet read sufficiently into it to have a really detailed understanding. I have been focusing on other things. MS STEEL: Right. Well, I had a two-year relationship with John Barker THE CHAIR: I do know that, yes. MS STEEL: and he feigned a breakdown at the end of it in which he wrote me long, convoluted letters, long-winded

1	he he indicated that he was feeling suicidal, he had	1	mental wellbeing.
2	been rejected by his family.	2	There is a real feeling of power imbalance between
3	There was all sorts of emotional manipulation in	3	the two sides: the resources at their disposal, the
4	there that made me very, very worried about his	4	representation, the time that we get to read these
5	wellbeing, and that was why I tried to find him. He	5	documents, understand them and discuss them with our
6	also told me at the time that he was still in love with	6	lawyers and indeed with each other.
7	me and he would come back if he could sort his head out.	7	The two points I just wanted to make briefly, you
8	I worried that he was going to commit suicide, and	8	mentioned yesterday about the possibility of releasing
9	that's why I tried to trace him down in South Africa.	9	the names of the groups spied on. I personally think
10	THE CHAIR: I do know about that part of your history.	10	and I think that most, if not all, of the core
11	MS STEEL: Okay.	11	participants think that would be a good step to take
12	THE CHAIR: And I have read that. But I don't claim to have	12	immediately. It would start to restore some faith in
13	a full understanding of everything that you experienced.	13	whether anything is actually going to come out of this
14	MS STEEL: No. But I am just saying that to see it	14	Inquiry.
15	reprinted here as though it was something, you know,	15	Also, Mr Hall referred earlier to the key reasons
16	dodgy, or this poor policeman that is having his life	16	for this Inquiry being the relationships and the
17	intruded into by it is just, like, insulting to read	17	Stephen Lawrence Inquiry
18	it, basically.	18	THE CHAIR: Those, he said I think, if I understood him
19	Then, as I say, there is the 120-paragraphs after	19	correctly are what prompted it. It is what led the
20	that that have been redacted. I don't know what they	20	Home Secretary to say there should be an Inquiry.
21	say. I would like to know what they say, especially if	21	MS STEEL: Yes.
22	they are talking about me or about the other women.	22	THE CHAIR: But the remit of the Inquiry is much broader
23	In the mosaic report, the mosaic effect, there is	23	than that.
24	again another paragraph tracing John Barker. And	24	MS STEEL: Yes. I mean, what I wanted to say is that
25	I wanted to say this as well because Cairo has been	25	basically these units are about political policing and
	Page 197		Page 199
1	mentioned as some great source of information: in all of	1	I think they need to be seen in that context.
2	these documents, if I had the time to go through them	2	This is not about investigating crime. These units
3	I could point out lies in all of them and inaccuracies	3	are about intelligence gathering. Well, actually in
4	in all of them.	4	a democracy you are supposed to be entitled to take part
5	This paragraph 4.1 describes me as a long-term and	5	in political activity. I think the release of the names
6	prominent activist in the field of animal rights.	6	of the groups that were spied on would help to show, you
7	I have not actually been involved in the animal rights	7	know, who was being spied on, and then people can say
8	movement for over 20 years. It is not that I don't want	8	why were they being spied on? It is actually a critical
9	to be associated with it, but it just demonstrates the	9	question that the public have a right to know what
10	factual inaccuracies of these documents that are being	10	groups were being spied on.
11	put in front of you, and the public money that is being	11	A final point is to say that I think releasing the
12	used to basically put this stuff over.	12	files of the groups spied on would be a very key issue
13	I can't go through all the inaccuracies. I have not	13	too. My understanding is that they are already
14	had time to read all the documents, I have not had time	14	sanitised as to the sources of the information. I just
15	to prepare it.	15	wanted to say that the FBI, for example, if you go on
16	THE CHAIR: No.	16	the FIB website, they released the files relating to
17	MS STEEL: The other couple of points that I just wanted to	17	groups political groups that they investigated in
18	draw to your attention is that the police are holding	18	the 60s, 70s, 80s and even some more recent than that.
19	all the evidence in this Inquiry, and yet the Inquiry is	19	I think that releasing those files and releasing the
20	into them.	20	names of the groups spied on would help to restore some
21	They are causing all the massive delays. We have	21	of the faith in the Public Inquiry and the feeling that
22	heard a lot about the impact on officers' mental	22	at the moment the police have got everything and we are
23	wellbeing: well, actually there is a massive impact on	23	all being kept in the dark.
24	the mental wellbeing of those of us who were spied on as	24	That's essentially it for now. Thank you.
25	well and the delays contribute to that impact on our	25	THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Steel, for that.
	Dago 109		Dago 200
	Page 198		Page 200

You have put into words, and eloquent words, the viewpoint of yourself and of others in a similar
viewpoint of yourself and of others in a similar
position. All I can do is to assure you that
I understand it. I am not, I am afraid, going to do
exactly what you have asked me to do to publish all the
files and all the names of groups immediately. This is,
I am afraid, a slow and methodical process, which I'm
trying to speed up, so that we will all get to the
position which you want to get to, which is to have the
truth exposed.
I'm going to do my best to do it, but I thank you
for your submissions.
We will deal with the remaining things by
correspondence, please.
MS KAUFMANN: In writing, we will.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.
Can I thank everybody for attending and the
submissions that they have made. I hope that all have
found it as useful an exercise as I have.
(4.55 pm)
(The Inquiry adjourned to a date to be fixed)
(The inquiry augustica to a date to be fixed)
Page 201

	accepted 14:15	actions 23:8 65:25	134:2,3 141:19	aimed 163:16
<u>A</u>	19:24 39:23 72:2	97:15 99:4,8,15	142:1 152:11	Alan 183:17
a 47:6	19.24 39.23 72.2	100:1 173:13	adopted 141:2	alarm 193:1
A8 9:7 33:20	accepts 111:8 170:3	activist 198:6	145:2	alarmingly 162:15
abandon 185:19	access 122:17		advance 86:1 185:2	albeit 20:1 60:15
ability 91:24 93:6		activists 139:5		
97:23 131:11	accord 9:3	activities 24:3 30:3	advanced 65:22	alerts 6:24
able 19:3 24:8	accords 113:25	45:17 66:21 67:13	111:9 166:23	alive 97:10,22
43:25 80:16,17	account 53:1 55:24	67:22 68:12 79:19	176:14	174:21
84:15 97:10,21	65:25 68:10 74:2	85:16 90:14,21	advantage 74:3	allegation 23:18
119:11 127:11	75:8,9 79:25	124:23 138:1	adverse 106:11	36:13 44:14 93:19
129:22 130:7	80:20 81:2 82:5,5	172:5 181:6,10,16	108:6	149:6 157:15
136:7,16 137:6	84:6 97:15 99:8	activity 30:7 49:8	advice 178:14	188:15
141:12,14 142:22	115:2 153:21	49:10 65:14 71:8	advocate 76:17	allegations 21:8,15
145:17 146:18,19	160:18 161:6,12	163:14 165:5,6	advocated 135:6	22:3,5,22 23:3
147:16,18	167:6 172:5,23,25	200:5	afford 101:17	37:9
abroad 152:24	194:18,23	acts 165:9	114:15	alleged 71:3 124:12
153:8,18 170:15	accountability	acutely 84:2	afforded 147:7	165:9
absence 62:15 63:6	80:10 114:5 166:6	ad 64:6	afraid 5:3 55:22	allow 150:8 167:2,5
122:8	accountable 7:21	add 41:8 64:10	69:20 89:15 123:5	allowed 36:4
absolute 29:25	85:13 88:18 89:4	101:8 116:13	179:12,19,20	allowing 187:8
30:12,13 39:8	103:22 113:23,24	175:10 178:7	181:22 201:4,7	alluded 6:13 35:23
absolutely 25:19	114:6,19	182:4	Africa 197:9	alter 188:19
27:4 50:1,9 51:9	accounting 90:19	added 140:13	afternoon 115:19	alternative 146:23
51:25 53:6 91:12	accounts 21:21,22	addition 51:3 93:9	170:23	147:15 185:4
105:7 107:12	89:18	additional 80:8	age 143:15	amiss 148:4
112:4 116:5	accused 22:15	119:19 182:5	aged 168:2	amount 40:25 47:8
137:17 139:14	achievability 22:3	address 12:11	agencies 39:7	50:23 111:16
156:4 164:15	achieve 57:22	19:15 38:7 44:11	Agency 186:10	162:22 182:17
165:12 179:25	75:18 157:20,22	45:20 52:23 73:17	agenda 112:11	amplify 136:11
abstract 18:13	achieved 138:15	87:6 98:22,23	ago 101:14 155:5	analogy 36:15,23
73:10 74:12 77:12	158:3	106:18 112:8	156:15 158:24	40:2
abuse 195:5	achieves 75:16	addressed 44:15	159:1 172:16	analysis 28:19
abused 195:4	acknowledge	45:3 112:1 160:13	174:17	108:22
abuser 195:17	103:23 131:23	170:5,7	agree 9:8 24:18	ancient 141:16
accede 115:6	187:16	addresses 46:16	26:9 40:15 57:25	158:11
153:25 187:21	acknowledgement	118:6	64:6 74:5 75:1	anecdote 190:22
accept 6:2 7:19	185:3	adequate 70:10	90:11 97:20 98:9	anger 45:1 49:16
29:21 31:22 35:2	acknowledging	adjourned 201:21	119:13 144:20	animal 198:6,7
65:13 76:24 79:21	116:22	adjournment 92:11	154:6 162:9 180:7	anonymity 5:8
82:12 98:18 101:6	acquired 28:15	administrative	190:8 192:14	30:11 31:20 38:24
135:9 165:13	acquiring 30:8	81:25	agreement 194:3	44:2 174:3 177:16
166:11 187:8	act 33:25 56:25	Admissions 115:24	agrees 85:5	answer 85:14
192:4	164:22	admitted 165:10	Ah 167:2	121:21 137:2,3,6
acceptable 36:12	action 55:10 59:14	admittedly 140:19	ahead 15:21	137:9 154:17
	150:19	adopt 86:12 131:9	aim 152:13	answered 111:4
acceptance 184:3				
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

anticipate 19:5	135:1 142:17	40:3 48:10 62:21	11:22 14:20 15:22	130:25
65:17 133:13	178:9,15	120:1	38:4	assurances 9:2
anticipates 154:2	applications 5:8,19	armed 60:1	assess 21:21 23:3	24:25
Anticipating 99:10	41:13 44:2 61:12	arose 61:7 95:2	23:18 24:8 67:24	assure 201:3
anxious 126:19	64:5 78:3,11	158:15 181:10	assessed 22:6 23:6	assures 169:7
131:8	150:13 184:4	arrive 166:15	24:17 25:22 92:24	astray 182:15
anxiously 109:22	applied 58:9	arriving 38:9 55:24	107:6	attack 58:12 107:3
anybody 28:8	117:10 178:25	article 27:20 33:9	assessing 12:9	107:6
56:14 81:19	applies 42:7,13	33:25 34:4,8,9	assessment 16:4	attacks 9:20
100:20 116:5	apply 30:6 76:22	35:12,20 36:7	23:13 27:12 35:20	attempt 57:22
154:8 173:16	109:7 143:16	43:22,23 44:5	37:23 44:20 50:2	110:14
175:8	170:4 177:16	59:2,3,8,9,11,15	58:11,14,18 59:11	attempting 11:9
anyway 115:19	184:20 192:11	59:17,18,19,25	62:6 70:21,21	attend 12:11
148:2 152:14	apposite 36:23	60:5,15,16 62:22	84:25 85:6 88:2,8	attending 158:17
159:12 161:25	appreciate 69:21	62:22 68:6 71:2	88:10 91:4 107:4	201:17
166:10 186:8	82:7 108:12,12	107:21,23 120:1,9	107:7,8,13 120:23	attention 46:25
apart 66:25 111:21	119:1 151:22	125:9,11 135:10	121:2,18 122:16	49:18 108:3,15
124:17,24 190:20	180:1 181:19	135:11 155:9,17	144:7 171:16,21	168:14 182:9
191:1	182:18 193:22	156:24 157:11	171:22 179:23	185:6 194:5
apologies 26:18	appreciated 78:18	167:17 172:6	184:10,12	198:18
28:10 38:14	approach 5:18	articles 68:15	assessments 70:25	attitude 107:15
apologise 50:5 86:1	25:15 27:6 55:2,8	106:17 119:25	87:23 91:5,8	134:22 135:16
91:19 160:2 178:6	83:7 86:10 93:14	aside 29:18 33:16	122:5	162:16
195:10	111:19 132:21	40:6,17 71:5	assessor's 88:3	attitudes 46:6
apparent 63:19	188:8	105:8 108:11	assessors 85:9	Attorney 10:24
apparently 140:5	approached 10:20	122:1 153:2	assist 20:19 72:13	attractive 173:14
appealing 150:21	23:2 39:19	asked 13:19 16:13	85:21 107:18	August 11:1 151:15
appear 47:5	approaching 36:19	18:5 79:12 129:14	110:7 129:22 130:8	authorised 165:7
appearance 103:2 appeared 156:21	appropriate 24:9 47:21,23 48:18	136:6 156:16 157:16 201:5	assistance 144:9	authoritative 190:12
appearing 19:23	96:13 112:22	asking 45:22 80:20	assisted 61:14 87:4	authorities 28:5
appears 119:23	approved 23:9	190:18	assisting 75:15	192:2
140:11 152:24	April 19:23 20:7	asks 95:11	assists 61:21	automatically 26:6
153:1,3 160:22	area 5:2 39:1,17	aspect 127:19	associated 176:1	autonomy 34:10
161:6 176:7 184:8	49:1 98:8 148:12	134:25 162:6	179:3 198:9	156:24
apple/rotten 161:6	areas 48:25 164:5	172:4	assume 34:24 51:13	available 74:19
applicant 44:3 78:8	argument 37:24	aspects 38:9 134:18	69:4 106:21	76:7 100:5 103:3
78:9	159:3 184:7	136:1 164:18	121:20 123:2	103:6 123:24
application 5:17	arguments 102:16	aspersions 16:20	144:17	166:9
7:10 21:4 24:12	arises 50:15 60:17	assert 45:10 47:5	assumes 22:20	avoid 52:16 82:2
44:7 56:19 72:1	71:10 73:20 98:16	asserted 14:13	assuming 100:8	146:21
78:4 87:2 89:13	120:8,9 138:25	assertion 10:1,22	171:21	avoidance 42:13
93:14 94:9 111:17	166:16 169:2	11:21 20:10 21:4	assumption 147:3	avoiding 191:16
111:22 112:8	192:7	190:10	assumptions 22:19	await 69:12 147:21
127:6 134:12	arising 21:23 28:19	assertions 8:24	assurance 29:22	152:15
	1	1	1	1

aware 9:12 11:17 179:23 23:1 25:12 34:3 better 20:22 71:23 56:9,11 63: 64:3,7,11 7 11:20 13:8,24 22:21,22 30:1 147:15 44:3 56:16,18 133:9 164:2 85:23,24,23 130:7 184:5 basically 159:21 58:6 64:16 65:3,4 176:13,18 185:22 86:25 91:1 197:18 198:12 71:24 79:10 85:24 186:16 193:6 112:7 117:3 199:25 87:8 92:14 94:1 beyond 22:1 27:10 117:16,19 199:25 96:6,21 101:9 33:7 34:6 40:1 breach 125:1 192:3 33:20 39:1,13 45:4 50:1 112:12 116:11 big 140:8 169:18 115:18 136 193:4 51:19 57:24 64:22 134:9 137:22 134:9 137:22 193:4 breakdown 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 141:24 144:1 57:11 139:6 149:5 28:1 44:12 102:3 106:2 106:9 107:13 148:9 152:19 57:11 139:6 149:5 28:1 44:12	79:5,8 5 86:8 1 112:6 22,3,7 10 24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
11:20 13:8,24 34:15 36:16 43:1 116:14,25 124:17 64:3,7,11 7 22:21,22 30:1 147:15 44:3 56:16,18 133:9 164:2 85:23,24,23 130:7 184:5 basically 159:21 58:6 64:16 65:3,4 176:13,18 185:22 86:25 91:1 197:18 198:12 71:24 79:10 85:24 186:16 193:6 112:7 117:5 199:25 87:8 92:14 94:1 96:6,21 101:9 33:7 34:6 40:1 breach 125:1 15:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 breakdown 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 69:21 70:22 75:21 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	79:5,8 5 86:8 1 112:6 22,3,7 10 24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
22:21,22 30:1 147:15 44:3 56:16,18 133:9 164:2 85:23,24,23 130:7 184:5 basically 159:21 58:6 64:16 65:3,4 176:13,18 185:22 86:25 91:1 197:18 198:12 199:25 87:8 92:14 94:1 beyond 22:1 27:10 117:16,19 133:9 164:2 16:13,18 185:22 86:25 91:1 112:7 117:3 15 13:5 95:3 199:25 87:8 92:14 94:1 105:18 110:23 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:14 10:11 105:1	5 86:8 1 112:6 2,3,7 10 24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
130:7 184:5	1 112:6 2,3,7 10 24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
B 197:18 198:12 71:24 79:10 85:24 186:16 193:6 112:7 117:2 B 13:5 95:3 basis 8:18 23:2 96:6,21 101:9 33:7 34:6 40:1 breach 125:1 B1 33:20 24:17 31:3 36:9 105:18 110:23 66:14 89:9 193:1 break 41:15, B2 33:20 39:1,13 45:4 50:1 112:12 116:11 big 140:8 169:18 115:18 136 back 49:17 53:2,14 51:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 breakdown 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 69:21 70:22 75:21 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	10 24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
B 199:25 87:8 92:14 94:1 beyond 22:1 27:10 117:16,19 B1 33:20 basis 8:18 23:2 96:6,21 101:9 33:7 34:6 40:1 breach 125:1 B2 33:20 39:1,13 45:4 50:1 112:12 116:11 big 140:8 169:18 115:18 136 back 49:17 53:2,14 51:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 breakdown 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	10 24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
B 13:5 95:3 basis 8:18 23:2 96:6,21 101:9 33:7 34:6 40:1 breach 125:1 B1 33:20 24:17 31:3 36:9 105:18 110:23 66:14 89:9 193:1 break 41:15, B2 33:20 39:1,13 45:4 50:1 112:12 116:11 big 140:8 169:18 115:18 136 back 49:17 53:2,14 51:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 breakdown 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 69:21 70:22 75:21 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	24 5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
B1 33:20 24:17 31:3 36:9 105:18 110:23 66:14 89:9 193:1 break 41:15, B2 33:20 39:1,13 45:4 50:1 112:12 116:11 big 140:8 169:18 115:18 136 back 49:17 53:2,14 51:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 break 40wn 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 69:21 70:22 75:21 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
B2 33:20 39:1,13 45:4 50:1 112:12 116:11 big 140:8 169:18 115:18 136 back 49:17 53:2,14 51:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 breakdown 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 69:21 70:22 75:21 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	5:16,22 196:23 23 11:13
back 49:17 53:2,14 51:19 57:24 64:22 118:14 127:3,6 193:4 breakdown 54:1,5,8 61:8,9 69:21 70:22 75:21 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	196:23 23 11:13
54:1,5,8 61:8,9 67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 134:9 137:22 bin 26:13 briefing 37:2 briefly 7:18	11:13
67:23 74:24 86:21 84:4 88:1,11 141:24 144:1 bit 25:9,10 57:11 briefly 7:18	11:13
1 100.7 107.13	
107:24 126:1 108:21 112:21 154:24 160:4,23 159:18 165:8 177:19 199	1:7
150:15 153:19	
154:6 175:6,11,21 119:23 122:16 174:14 175:2 black 165:16,19 bring 138:21	_
183:25 193:23 123:17 125:19 176:21 177:9 blacklisting 49:1,4 182:21	
197:7 142:18 156:17 178:8,10,22 180:9 164:19 brings 50:12	
back-burner 166:23 171:18 180:20 181:3 Bleksley 17:23 107:24	
125:17 173:3,22 179:11 182:3 187:1 blow 95:6 broad 70:4 7	7:9
bad 21:23 156:6 179:13 184:24 behaviour 24:9 blowers 21:7 broadcast 14	
161:6 189:16 189:9 190:9 191:8 behest 110:11 blown 47:1 132:9 broaden 22:	
balance 6:1 43:12 batch 143:14 183:12 blunt 186:22 broader 23:1	
52:24 62:13 68:20 batches 192:4 beholdenness bluntly 16:2 99:3 27:18 128:	
69:16 73:5 82:9 batting 5:3 18:10 135:24 board 67:24 135:8 199:22	
90:3 93:16 94:18 64:15 71:21 beings 95:19 163:2 Bob 44:9,13 46:2 broadly 23:2	22
96:3 103:12,18,24 bear 31:2 36:24 believe 83:20 92:16 49:20 65:8 67:12 129:20	
104:2,4 114:9	3
116:24 130:14	
138:16 139:22 194:17 believes 84:11 bolts 72:20 building 150):1
140:21 144:22 bearing 14:1,23 bells 193:1 book 17:24 built 49:13 1	
163:18,20 25:23 39:18 60:7 benefit 36:2 147:12 books 17:22 158:21 bundle 6:18	
balancing 5:24 73:8 131:13 167:5 boss 80:6 12:4 17:4 2	
50:23 62:15 92:2 157:14 benefits 157:23 bottom 149:21,22 44:2 147:1	
104:11 130:20 beginning 193:1 benefitted 156:17 185:23 188:18 183:24 195	
155:23 begins 12:5 best 65:16 72:12 189:18 Bunting 5:8	
bald 10:23 begs 66:16 74:2 90:24 133:8 bound 33:7 36:7 burden 82:1	'
Barker 195:1,3 behalf 1:5,6,8,10 150:15 181:23 164:1 business 163	:4
196:21 197:24	
Barr 5:7 75:6 118:4 1:24 2:3,5,7,10,12 betrayal 45:1 48:9 branch 24:3 158:22 50:4	
183:5,7,14 186:8 2:14,17,19,21,23 49:16 Brander 151:7 Busuttil's 10	8:22
barrel 161:7 3:3.5.7.9.12.13.15 betraved 46:24 Brandon 1:7.24	
based 78:4,11 3:18,20,22,25 4:2 47:25 163:3,12,13 18:17,19,20 19:8 C	
124:5 125:22	10
156:8 164:15 5:15 8:25 18:18 bets 39:23 23:13,16 24:1,19 C4 33:21	

cadre 190:19 35:5,8 36:14,23 181:25 187:7 20:21 21:2 23:10 108:3,12 109:1,7 Cairo 12:4,8 18:2 37:15 40:3,16 52:1 189:16 191:7,8 18 23:15,25 24:18,20 109:10,21 11 109:10,21 11(2):5,9 11 189:10 190:12,14 64:11 71:8,10 68:12 99:25 33:3 \$51:0 \$71:2 115:3,11,14,17 115:3,11,14,17 189:10 190:12,14 73:15,19,21 75:8 80:12 99:25 33:3 \$51:0 \$71:2 115:3,11,14,17 189:10 190:12,14 73:15,19,21 75:8 80:12 99:25 33:3 \$51:0 \$71:2 115:3,11,14,17 187:14 190:21 78:19 80! 83:13 89:10 90:25 91:1 133:1 33:3 \$51:0 \$71:2 115:3,11,14,17 47:6 66!14 75:10 93:8,13 94:4,9 64:14 77:10 47:26 64:14 75:10 40:25 99:11 166:25 169:22 43:16 45:6,22 119:17 117:15 calmid 145:20 100:15,21 103:11 107:19 109:10,24 168:25 165:25 169:22 48:7,13 49:2 122:2 13:2 12:2 13 28:28 111:5 127:10 131:24 127:10 131:24 127:10 131:24 132:11 16:11 168:25 169:22 45:21 165:11 25:1,105,22 122:13 16:22 123:8 126:61,71 123:8 126:14					
Cairo 12:4, 813:2 37;1 40:3,16 52:1 189:16 191:7,8,18 23:15,25 24:18,20 109:10,21 110:21 37:25 38:2 184:3 57:19 63:11,19 192:5 25:7 26:8,15,23 111:24 112:5,9,11 189:10 190:12,14 73:15,19,21 75:8 80:12 99:25 33:3 35:10 37:12 115:31,11,4,17 191:24 197:25 78:19 80:1 83:13 east 15:23 16:20 38:3,8,15,20 39:5 116:9,17 117:15, 5 Cairo's 11:23 12:25 78:19 80:1 83:13 east 11:20 14:12 407:22 41:5,9,14 116:9,17 117:15, 5 187:14 190:21 93:8,13 94:4,9 eategorise 46:15 41:22 42:1 43:4,9 118:11,192 called 17:24 99:8 96:14 97:8,20 eategory 83:22 48:7,13 49:2 119:13 120:20 121:10,14 calmly 145:20 107:19 109:10,24 168:25 52:1,10,15,22 13:5 12,22 13:5 12,22 13:5 12,22 125:8 126:6,17,19 campaigns 70:5 133:6 134:19,20,20,22 144:12 142:17 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 129:10 130:41 126:22 157:12,17,24 128:13 16:19 128:13 16:19 128:13 16:19 128:13 16:22 128:18 16:19 128:21 18:19 128:21 18:19 128:21 18:19 <th>cadre 190·19</th> <th>35.5 8 36.14 23</th> <th>181:25 187:7</th> <th>20:21 21:2 23:10</th> <th>108·3 12 109·1 7</th>	cadre 190·19	35.5 8 36.14 23	181:25 187:7	20:21 21:2 23:10	108·3 12 109·1 7
3725 38:2 184:3 57:19 63:11.19 64:11 71:8.10 73:15;19;21 75:8 80:12 99:25 73:24 76:20 77:15 73:15;19;21 75:8 80:12 99:25 73:24 76:20 77:15 73:14;99:56 184:1 187:14 190:21 93:8,13 94:4,9 96:14 97:8,20 47:6 66:14 75:10 98:25 99:11 100:15;21 103:11 100:15;20 47:80:22 47:6 66:14 75:10 101:52 47:10 101:22 47:6 66:14 75:10 102:15 103:11 48:19 102:15 113:11 48:19 102:15 113:11 48:19 102:15 113:11 48:19 103:16 113:16 133:61 139:3 140:7 133:19;20;20;22 133:61 130:1 133:61 139:3 140:7 134:19;20;20;22 144:17 148:145:5 134:19;19 120:20;20;20;20 133:61 140:7 15:20 144:17 148:145:5 166:21 176:25 157:10 182:19 172:81 174:1,10 133:20 144:17 148:145:5 166:21 176:25 168:19 170:14 172:81 174:1,10 173:20 187:12 192:8 187:12 192:9 187:12 192:12 187:12 192:12 187:12 192:12 187:12 192:12 187:12 192					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
185:3 187:14 64:11 71:8,10 cast 15:23 16:20 28:38,11 32:2,19 112:17 113:5,7 189:10 190:12,14 73:15,19,21 75:8 80:12 99:25 33:33 35:10 37:12 115:31,14,17 189:10 190:12,14 75:24 76:20 77:15 80:12 99:25 33:33 35:10 37:12 115:31,14,17 187:14 190:21 93:8,13 94:4,9 93:8,13 94:4,9 6ast 11:20 14:12 40:7,22 41:5,9,14 116:9,17 117:1,5 call 2:13 23:22 96:14 97:8,20 96:14 97:8,20 categories 46:15 43:16 45:6,22 119:13 120:8,11 called 17:24 99:8 100:15,21 103:11 164:21 165:11 50:18 51:12,22 123:5 122:1,10,14 campains 80:22,23 80:25 91:1 142:120:6 cause 38:10 46:12 55:18 56:8,13 127:2,125 128:5,9 80:25 111:5 127:10 131:24 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 133:1,142 133:1,142 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,143 133:1,	/	/	, ,	, ,	*
189:10 190:12,14		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		, ,	, ,
191:24 197:25		,			,
Cairo's 11:23 12:25 78:19 80:1 83:13 casts 11:20 14:12 40:7,22 41:5,9,14 117:8,17,20 118:3 14:9 95:6 184:1 89:10 90:25 91:1 187:14 190:21 41:22 42:1 43:4,9 118:11,19,25 call 22:13 23:22 96:14 97:8,20 48:66:14 75:10 98:25 99:11 48:13 49:2 119:13 120:8,11 called 17:24 99:8 100:15,21 103:11 64:21 165:11 50:18 51:12,22 122:5 122:2,13 camp 10:8,11 107:19 109:10,24 168:25 52:1,10,15,22 123:5 124:14 campaign 80:22,23 123:10 124:7,18 48:19 49:15 62:17 53:4,25 54:11 126:23 127:8,17 128:18 130:1 132:1,14,16 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:18 56:8,13 127:21,215 128:5,9 candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 113:21 181:14 58:4 59:62,12,3 129:10 130:4,19 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 166:25 167:25,25 64:13,21 65:1,13 33:11,5,19 134:5,9 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 72:7 75:10 182:19 66:25 66:3,7,12 68:22 69:4,20 136		· / /			, , ,
14:9 95:6 184:1 89:10 90:25 91:1 73:813 94:4,9 95:6 184:1 93:813 94:4,9 98:25 99:11 14:2 124:99:8 98:25 99:11 100:15,21 103:11 16:25	Cairo's 11:23 12:25		casts 11:20 14:12	, , ,	,
187:14 190:21 93:8,13 94:4,9 166:25 169:22 43:16 45:6,22 119:13 120:8,11 47:6 66:14 75:10 98:25 99:11 categorised 46:3 46:3,6,14 47:5,13 120:02 121:10,14 called 17:24 99:8 100:15,21 103:11 164:21 165:11 50:18 51:12,22 123:5 124:14 camp 10:8,11 114:2 120:6 cause 38:10 46:12 52:1,10,15,22 123:5 124:14 campaign 80:22,23 123:10 124:7,18 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 80:25 111:5 127:10 131:24 97:4 1101 113:20 56:21 57:12,17,24 128:13,16,19,22 128:18 130:1 134:19,20,20,22 144:17,18 145:5 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 132:7,12 133:1,5 campaigns 70:5 144:17,18 145:5 166:25 167:25,25 64:13,21 65:1,13 33:15,19 134:5,8 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 157:1 163:24,25 66:18 67:3,9 135:12,22 136:3 care 109:2,11 172:8 174:1,10 172:8 174:1,10 72:7 75:10 182:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 33:11,1,14,20,24 care 109:2,12 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 79:4,914 80:19 140:8,2	14:9 95:6 184:1	89:10 90:25 91:1	categories 46:15		, ,
47:6 66:14 75:10 called 17:24 99:8 98:25 99:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:11 100:15,21 103:12 114:2 120:6 114:2 120:6 114:2 120:6 114:2 120:6 114:2 120:6 114:2 120:6 114:2 120:6 113:13:12 116:1 120:10 13:24 114:2 120:6 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 133:6 139:3 140:7 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 133:6 139:3 140:7 165:17,20 132:1,20,20,22 141:12 142:17 133:6 134:19,20,20,22 141:12 142:17 144:17,18 145:5 120:14 146:25 147:2 149:13 133:2,14:14 146:25 147:2 140:14 140:15 140:14 140:14	187:14 190:21	93:8,13 94:4,9	9	43:16 45:6,22	, ,
called 17:24 99:8 100:15,21 103:11 164:21 165:11 50:18 51:12,22 123:5 124:14 camp 10:8,11 114:2 120:6 cause 38:10 46:12 52:1,10,15,22 125:8 126:6,17,19 80:25 111:5 127:10 131:24 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 80:25 111:5 132:1,14,16 133:6 139:3 140:7 134:19,20,20,22 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 165:17,20 134:19,20,20,22 141:12 142:17 144:17,18 145:5 66:11 52:147:2 66:28 48:10 130:21 131:8 130:21 131:8 candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 causes 172:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 133:15,19 134:5,8 capacity 37:4 65:24 157:1 163:24,25 95:12 198:21 66:22 66:3,7,12 133:15,19 134:5,8 career 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 177:17 179:12 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:2,49,14,19 career 109:2,15 166:9 case 8:18 15:16 157:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 85:17,40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 166:9 career 92:15 62:25 27:1 35:5 26:25 27:1 35:5 26:25 27:1 35	call 22:13 23:22	96:14 97:8,20	categorised 46:3	46:3,6,14 47:5,13	120:20 121:10,14
calmly 145:20 107:19 109:10,24 168:25 52:1,10,15,22 125:8 126:6,17,19 campaign 80:22,23 123:10 124:7,18 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:12,17,24 128:13,16,19,22 128:18 130:1 132:1,14,16 133:21 181:14 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:12,17,24 128:13,16,19,22 133:6 139:3 140:7 134:19,20,20,22 20,20,22 214:112 142:17 115:22 149:13 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 129:10 130:4,19 campaigns 70:5 144:17,18 145:5 176:1 64:13,21 65:1,13 133:15,19 134:5,8 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 65:12 198:21 66:13,21 66:1,13 133:15,19 134:5,8 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 172:8 174:1,10 72:14,48 72:14,24 73:1,20 137:21,49,14,19 166:25 188:9 24:17 31:3 23:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 142:8,10,19,22 career 199:13,25 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 142:8,10,19,21 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 142:8,10,19,22 careful 49:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 1	47:6 66:14 75:10	98:25 99:11	category 83:22	48:7,13 49:2	121:25 122:2,13
camp 10:8,11 114:2 120:6 cause 38:10 46:12 53:4,25 54:11 126:23 127:8,17 campaign 80:22,23 13:10 124:7,18 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 80:25 111:5 127:10 131:24 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 128:18 130:1 132:1,14,16 133:6 139:3 140:7 134:19,20,20,222 141:12 142:17 66:13:21 181:14 61:1,4,23 62:8,11 130:21 131:8 candidate 12:11 144:17,18 145:5 144:17,18 145:5 caused 114:12 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 132:7,12 133:1,5 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 166:25 167:25,25 causing 64:23 65:22 66:3,7,12 134:13,17 135:9 capacity 37:4 65:24 175:10 182:19 177:17 179:12 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:2,4,9,14,19 care 109:2,11 176:1 77:4,15 78:2,17 72:14,24 73:1,20 137:2,4,9,14,19 care ers 22:15 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 77:4,15 78:2,17 142:8,10,19,21 careful 47:9 129:8 case 8:18 15:16 19:4,14 20:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7	called 17:24 99:8	100:15,21 103:11		50:18 51:12,22	123:5 124:14
campaign 80:22,23 123:10 124:7,18 48:19 49:15 62:17 55:5,18 56:8,13 127:21,25 128:5,9 80:25 111:5 127:10 131:24 97:4 110:1 113:20 56:21 57:12,17,24 128:13,16,19,22 128:18 130:1 133:1 9,20,20,22 133:1 9,20,20,22 141:12 142:17 61:14,23 62:8,11 130:21 131:8 165:17,20 141:12 142:17 115:22 149:13 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 132:7,12 133:1,5 candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 caused 114:12 65:22 66:3,71 133:15,19 134:5,8 candidate 184:19 153:17 154:25 causing 64:23 66:18 67:3,9 135:12,22 136:3 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 95:12 198:21 66:18 67:3,9 135:12,22 136:3 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 catrility 119:2 72:14,24 73:1,20 137:24,9,14,19 care 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 177:17 179:12 26:20:1 176:25 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 careful 47:9 129:8 case-by-case 8:18 157:25 158:9 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 careful 47:9 129:8	calmly 145:20	107:19 109:10,24	168:25	52:1,10,15,22	125:8 126:6,17,19
80:25 111:5 127:10 131:24 97:4 110:1 113:20 56:21 57:12,17,24 128:13,16,19,22 128:18 130:1 132:1,14,16 132:1,14,16 58:4 59:6,21,23 129:10 130:4,19 133:6 139:3 140:7 134:19,20,20,22 132:1,14:12 61:1,4,23 62:8,11 130:21 131:8 campaigns 70:5 144:17,18 145:5 176:1 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 132:7,12 133:1,5 candidates 184:19 153:17 154:25 causes 172:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 134:13,17 135:9 capable 31:4 96:16 166:25 167:25,25 166:19 170:14 166:25 167:25,25 95:12 198:21 68:22 69:4,20 136:11,14,20,24 72:7 75:10 182:19 172:8 174:1,10 177:17 179:12 187:12 192:8 centrality 119:12 72:14,24 73:1,20 137:21 138:9,24 career 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 187:12 192:8 certain 6:8 25:8 79:4,9,14 80:19 142:8,10,19,21 166:9 case-by-case 8:18 24:17 31:3 2ase 8:18 15:16 15:17,19 23:25 86:12 87:7,13,21 148:13,17,20,23 carefully 45:6 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:20 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 156:3	camp 10:8,11	114:2 120:6	cause 38:10 46:12	53:4,25 54:11	126:23 127:8,17
128:18 130:1 132:1,14,16 113:21 181:14 58:4 59:6,21,23 120:10 130:4,19 133:6 139:3 140:7 134:19,20,20,22 141:12 142:17 115:22 149:13 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 132:7,12 133:1,5 campaigns 70:5 144:17,18 145:5 176:1 64:13,21 65:1,13 133:15,19 134:5,8 candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 causes 172:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 134:13,17 135:9 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 causing 64:23 66:18 67:3,9 135:12,22 136:3 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:24,9,14,19 care 109:2,11 172:8 174:1,10 177:17 179:12 central 119:14 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 career 99:13,25 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 career 109:2,15 19:4,14 20:5 19:4,14 20:5 86:18 89:2 86:28 89:7 142:8,10,19,21 career 22:15 career 19:13,25 24:17 31:3 15:617 187:7 85:14,20,22 86:4 146:2,7,21 148:2 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13	campaign 80:22,23	123:10 124:7,18	48:19 49:15 62:17	55:5,18 56:8,13	127:21,25 128:5,9
133:6 139:3 140:7	80:25 111:5	127:10 131:24	97:4 110:1 113:20	56:21 57:12,17,24	128:13,16,19,22
165:17,20 141:12 142:17 115:22 149:13 63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8 132:7,12 133:1,5 campaigns 70:5 144:17,18 145:5 176:1 64:13,21 65:1,13 133:15,19 134:5,8 candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 causes 172:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 134:13,17 135:9 capable 31:4 96:16 104:10,12 194:15 166:25 167:25,25 66:12 66:3,3,9 135:12,22 136:3 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:2,4,9,14,19 care 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 central 119:14 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 career 99:13,25 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 careful 47:9 129:8 cases 8:18 15:16 certainly 8:2,21 85:14,20,22 86:4 146:2,7,21 148:2 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 150:21 15:10,21 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24	128:18 130:1	132:1,14,16	113:21 181:14	58:4 59:6,21,23	129:10 130:4,19
campaigns 70:5 144:17,18 145:5 176:1 64:13,21 65:1,13 133:15,19 134:5,8 candidate 12:11 candidates 184:19 153:17 154:25 causes 172:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 134:13,17 135:9 capable 31:4 96:16 104:10,12 194:15 166:25 167:25,25 central 119:4,8 66:18 67:3,9 135:12,22 136:3 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:2,49,14,19 care 109:2,11 172:8 174:1,10 19:14 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 career 99:13,25 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 24:17 31:3 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 143:13,17,20,23 careers 22:15 case 8:18 15:16 certainly 8:2,21 85:14,20,22 86:4 46:27,21 148:2 carefull 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefull 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefull 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefull 47:9 129:8 <t< th=""><td>133:6 139:3 140:7</td><td>134:19,20,20,22</td><td>caused 114:12</td><td>61:1,4,23 62:8,11</td><td>130:21 131:8</td></t<>	133:6 139:3 140:7	134:19,20,20,22	caused 114:12	61:1,4,23 62:8,11	130:21 131:8
candidate 12:11 146:25 147:2 causes 172:19 65:22 66:3,7,12 134:13,17 135:9 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 157:1 163:24,25 95:12 198:21 68:22 69:4,20 135:12,22 136:3 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:21 138:9,24 care 109:2,11 126:21 176:25 187:12 192:8 centruly 159:1 72:4,15 78:2,17 142:8,10,19,21 career 99:13,25 187:12 192:8 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 careers 22:15 19:4,14 20:5 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 15:10,21 careful 47:9 129:8 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 159:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 15:10,21 care 10 112:14 19:17 10 137:11 104:23 110:8,15 <	165:17,20	141:12 142:17	115:22 149:13	63:3,8,23 64:2,6,8	132:7,12 133:1,5
candidates 184:19 153:17 154:25 causing 64:23 66:18 67:3,9 135:12,22 136:3 capable 31:4 96:16 157:1 163:24,25 95:12 198:21 68:22 69:4,20 136:11,14,20,24 104:10,12 194:15 166:25 167:25,25 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:2,4,9,14,19 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 centrality 119:12 72:14,47 3:1,20 137:21 138:9,24 care 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 century 159:1 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 career 99:13,25 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 150:21 15:10,21 Carlo 112:14 104:23 110:8,15 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 15:3 Carries 34:18 74:22 110:17 113:25 123:14 140:9 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2	campaigns 70:5	144:17,18 145:5	176:1	64:13,21 65:1,13	133:15,19 134:5,8
capable 31:4 96:16 104:10,12 194:15 capacity 37:4 65:24 72:7 75:10 182:19 157:1 163:24,25 166:25 167:25,25 168:19 170:14 95:12 198:21 central 119:4,8 centrality 119:12 68:22 69:4,20 70:13 71:21 72:4 136:11,14,20,24 137:24,9,14,19 racer 109:2,11 126:21 176:25 career 99:13,25 157:25 158:9 166:9 177:17 179:12 187:12 192:8 century 159:1 care-by-case 8:18 24:17 31:3 77:4,15 78:2,17 24:17 31:3 142:8,10,19,21 143:13,18 144:4 career 99:13,25 166:9 case-by-case 8:18 24:17 31:3 35:17 40:24 156:17 187:7 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 83:18,24 84:10,18 85:14,20,22 86:4 145:8,13,17,20,23 145:8,13,17,20 careful 47:9 129:8 carefully 45:6 72:18 149:5 26:25 27:1 35:5 35:11 57:15 67:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 152:10 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 100:10 116:9 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 89:20 90:11,23 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 155:10,15,24 155:10,15,24 155:10,15,24 157:10 137:11 155:10,15,24 157:10 137:11 155:10,15,24 158:8,19 159:1,11 155:10,15,24 159:18,24 160:2 155:10,15,24 166:2 155:11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 166:13,23 166:4,7 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 166:13,23 167:9 <td< th=""><td>candidate 12:11</td><td>146:25 147:2</td><td>causes 172:19</td><td>65:22 66:3,7,12</td><td>134:13,17 135:9</td></td<>	candidate 12:11	146:25 147:2	causes 172:19	65:22 66:3,7,12	134:13,17 135:9
104:10,12 194:15 166:25 167:25,25 central 119:4,8 70:13 71:21 72:4 137:2,4,9,14,19 capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 centrality 119:12 72:14,24 73:1,20 137:21 138:9,24 72:7 75:10 182:19 177:17 179:12 19:14 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 care 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 century 159:1 77:4,15 78:2,17 142:8,10,19,21 126:21 176:25 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 careers 22:15 case 8:18 15:16 19:4,14 20:5 15:17,19 23:25 86:12 87:7,13,21 148:13,17,20 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 15:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 133:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13	candidates 184:19	153:17 154:25	causing 64:23	66:18 67:3,9	135:12,22 136:3
capacity 37:4 65:24 168:19 170:14 centrality 119:12 72:14,24 73:1,20 137:21 138:9,24 72:7 75:10 182:19 172:8 174:1,10 119:14 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 care 109:2,11 126:21 176:25 187:12 192:8 century 159:1 77:4,15 78:2,17 142:8,10,19,21 career 99:13,25 case-by-case 8:18 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 166:9 cases 8:18 15:16 certainly 8:2,21 85:14,20,22 86:4 146:2,7,21 148:2 careers 22:15 19:4,14 20:5 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 15:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 13:19 117:10 137:11 cetra 180:18 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 13:19 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21	capable 31:4 96:16	157:1 163:24,25	95:12 198:21	68:22 69:4,20	136:11,14,20,24
72:7 75:10 182:19 172:8 174:1,10 119:14 73:24 75:19 76:6 140:8,23 141:9,22 care 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 century 159:1 77:4,15 78:2,17 142:8,10,19,21 126:21 176:25 187:12 192:8 certain 6:8 25:8 79:4,9,14 80:19 143:13,18 144:4 career 99:13,25 case by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 cases 8:18 15:16 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 careful 47:9 129:8 cases 8:18 15:16 15:17,19 23:25 86:12 87:7,13,21 148:13,17,20 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 133:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 4 3:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 <	104:10,12 194:15	166:25 167:25,25	central 119:4,8	70:13 71:21 72:4	137:2,4,9,14,19
care 109:2,11 177:17 179:12 century 159:1 77:4,15 78:2,17 142:8,10,19,21 126:21 176:25 187:12 192:8 certain 6:8 25:8 79:4,9,14 80:19 143:13,18 144:4 career 99:13,25 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 cases 8:18 15:16 certainly 8:2,21 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 166:9 cases 8:18 15:16 certainly 8:2,21 85:14,20,22 86:4 146:2,7,21 148:2 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 1	capacity 37:4 65:24	168:19 170:14	centrality 119:12	72:14,24 73:1,20	,
126:21 176:25 187:12 192:8 certain 6:8 25:8 79:4,9,14 80:19 143:13,18 144:4 career 99:13,25 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 cases 8:18 15:16 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 careers 22:15 19:4,14 20:5 15:17,19 23:25 86:12 87:7,13,21 148:13,17,20 carefull 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carry 13:6:2 14	72:7 75:10 182:19	172:8 174:1,10	119:14	73:24 75:19 76:6	
career 99:13,25 case-by-case 8:18 35:17 40:24 81:10 82:3,15 144:13,20,25 157:25 158:9 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 166:9 cases 8:18 15:16 19:4,14 20:5 19:4,14 20:5 85:14,20,22 86:4 146:2,7,21 148:2 carefull 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 104:23 110:8,15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 117:10 137:11 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 14				, ,	
157:25 158:9 24:17 31:3 156:17 187:7 83:18,24 84:10,18 145:8,13,17,20,23 166:9 cases 8:18 15:16 19:4,14 20:5 19:4,14 20:5 15:17,19 23:25 86:12 87:7,13,21 148:13,17,20 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:				, ,	
166:9 cases 8:18 15:16 certainly 8:2,21 85:14,20,22 86:4 146:2,7,21 148:2 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 cetra 180:18 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7				,	, ,
careers 22:15 19:4,14 20:5 15:17,19 23:25 86:12 87:7,13,21 148:13,17,20 careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 cetra 180:18 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</td> <td></td>				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
careful 47:9 129:8 26:25 27:1 35:5 24:5 28:3 64:8 87:25 88:6 89:7 149:12,16 150:12 carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 13:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2			e i	r r	
carefully 45:6 35:11 57:15 67:5 73:25 87:13 89:20 90:11,23 150:21 151:10,21 72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2					, ,
72:18 149:5 75:23 76:19 84:1 100:10 116:9 91:14,21 92:4,13 152:18,22 154:8 152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2					,
152:10 86:13 89:2 90:5 117:6 130:2 92:17,19,22 93:2 154:19,22 155:3 Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2				,	,
Carlo 112:14 99:7 101:6 104:15 133:14 140:9 93:24 94:6,20 155:10,15,24 113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 110:17 113:25 cetera 180:18 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2					,
113:12 116:1 104:23 110:8,15 certainty 119:18 97:10 98:8,17,23 158:8,19 159:1,11 carries 34:18 74:22 110:17 113:25 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 139:19 117:10 137:11 138:24 143:19 138:24 143:19 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2				, ,	,
carries 34:18 74:22 110:17 113:25 cetera 180:18 99:18,23 100:4,8 159:18,24 160:2 139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2				,	
139:19 117:10 137:11 CHAIR 4:20 5:23 100:13,16,19,24 160:10 162:21 carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	č		,
carry 43:22 171:13 138:24 143:19 7:5,11,15 8:4,15 101:1,21 102:16 163:11 164:13,22 carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,
carrying 136:1 145:18 147:8 8:22 9:18 11:8,25 102:21 103:23 165:8,23 166:4,7 166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2					
166:2 149:18 161:15 13:21 15:8,10 104:9,25 105:15 166:13,23 167:9 case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2	•				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
case 8:1 15:13 27:3 168:9,25 170:5,7 16:1,18 17:19,21 105:22,25 106:7 167:19,25 168:2			_		,
			*		,
27.23 31.3 33.10 1/2.1,2 1/4.1 10.3,9,13 19.3,11 100.21 10/.18,22 108.13 109.1			-	*	
	47.43 31.3 33.10	1/4.1,4 1/4.1	10.3,7,13 17.3,11	100.41 107.18,44	100.13 109.1
		<u> </u>			

				3
170.2 11 22 171.4	129:17	120:18 136:7	119:19 139:16,24	75:4,16 90:11
170:3,11,22 171:4 171:8 172:11	chief 98:11,19	clarify 16:11 45:10	140:7,15 141:18	157:20
173:6,9,12,14	183:16,23 184:1,6	84:15 121:5	153:19 154:6	complex 62:8
173.0,9,12,14	185:10,23 184.1,0	122:10	157:18,22 175:25	complex 02.8 complexion 144:12
174.11,21,24	children 49:13	clear 10:10,11	176:4,13 190:2	144:19
· ·		20:18 25:19 49:3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· -
177:4,23 178:3,5	113:10,18 114:15	118:7 119:8	192:15 197:7 199:13	complicated 123:5 124:15
178:11,19,21	115:9 116:23			· -
179:19 180:1,7,19	170:10 175:12	152:24,24 185:25	comes 16:5 33:19	comply 30:17
180:23 181:1,8,12	choice 34:17 79:13	191:6	67:17 88:15 104:4	comprehensive
181:19 182:8,12	79:17 177:17	clearly 104:4	107:16 128:23	100:11
182:17,25 183:13	choices 67:25 79:19	126:14 139:22	139:22 140:2	comprised 162:16
185:12,24 186:2	choose 45:6	167:23	146:15 155:20,21	compulsion 13:16
186:15,20 187:16	chose 14:21 15:1	client 56:9 84:5	159:4,14 176:11	concede 53:4
187:24 188:4,17	16:8	131:14 133:23	182:17 189:12	conceivable 84:11
190:8 191:2,15	chosen 148:22	177:12 186:13	coming 34:4 103:16	132:18
192:4,17,19,22,25	Christopher 5:1	clients 36:16,18	126:1 190:23	conceivably 16:3
193:10,13,16,22	29:18 31:8 32:2	37:8 60:19 112:16	commend 115:4	54:3 131:15 177:5
194:1,11 195:8,10	33:10 75:19 77:22	112:19 113:19	commendable	conceive 99:23
195:13,16 196:12	78:3,13 96:1	114:9,23 169:11	161:3	concern 19:25
196:22 197:10,12	Christopher's 25:2	clients' 118:2	Commissioner	44:22 49:11,12
198:16 199:18,22	27:22 28:19	clinical 18:3	177:15	59:22 62:17 65:10
200:25 201:16	chronologically	close 46:22 47:16	commit 197:8	65:12 71:7 77:13
chairman 9:7 78:7	11:9	162:17	commitment 12:18	102:18 103:15,17
chairman's 9:6	cipher 81:21 99:5	closed 19:6 57:13	committed 195:5	103:19 121:7
challenge 111:14	circumstances 6:9	57:14 65:18 72:19	common 38:22	122:9 123:2 124:4
123:17	7:1 32:12 46:11	73:25 75:1,4,16	39:3 78:6 189:10	126:1 140:18
challenged 123:16	48:22 51:17 56:6	75:18 76:3,4 86:6	191:22	172:20,21 174:8
challenging 143:7	60:12 61:16 63:10	86:14,15 87:6,11	communicate	175:22
chance 5:12 73:17	83:3 85:7 105:11	105:25 109:1	137:11,17	concern/fear
139:20	112:2 117:22	132:15 133:20	communicates	142:20
chances 139:11	130:5 132:19	151:25 152:2	184:15	concerned 7:8 21:7
change 38:11 82:23	139:11,24 143:1	179:19 182:5,7,10	communication	34:9 37:8 43:17
184:16	145:4 147:4 150:7	closing 158:4	42:10,12,16	69:23 72:21
changed 36:12	154:10,11,15	co-claimant 17:1	communications	102:17 111:11
65:15,19 72:5	162:24 163:12	17:17	134:15	115:5 117:24
82:21,22	168:21 170:17	co-director 18:3	compel 170:23	121:22,23 122:5
changing 38:16	177:21 179:24	code 172:17 189:25	compelling 70:18	129:24 147:20
58:2	citation 184:2	colleagues 21:12	71:15 85:11 149:2	150:18 152:14
character 21:23	cites 184:1	College 184:8,11	165:21	174:19,23 177:18
characterised 23:6	civil 30:3 31:8,9,17	come 6:20 7:8 8:7	competing 5:24	177:20 181:11
charge 6:1 98:12	claim 31:13,18	11:1 19:14 21:12	complained 121:17	concerns 16:15,19
188:14	197:12	41:12 60:1 61:11	121:19	119:24 120:2
check 148:20,21	claimed 59:12	66:25 67:17 74:24	complete 57:10,22	122:22 125:2,2,5
150:9	115:23	97:6 99:18 102:12	75:11 166:17	125:8 126:9 153:6
chicken 74:8	clarification 88:25	118:24 119:3,11	completely 36:17	170:16 171:15
1.0	0.23	110.2 117.5,11		1/0.10 1/1.10
	l		l	

				1 age 207
concertinaed	178:9	154:12	72:10 73:8 95:17	corollary 76:13
151:23	confirmation 115:2	consideration	114:22 132:9	corporate 22:12
conclude 54:24	confirmed 181:7	27:13 32:11 37:18	134:25 159:17	correct 9:21 27:25
55:16 68:18	confirming 180:24	61:20 73:7 78:16	160:9,18,19	86:11 91:17 120:4
106:15	confirms 14:9	97:16 118:4 122:7	172:24 195:18	132:23 139:14
concluding 77:25	conflict 70:7,9	122:12 187:6	200:1	171:8
conclusion 33:19	89:14,16,19 90:1	considerations	contexts 155:16	correctly 63:8
47:23 55:11	conflicting 70:3	28:19 30:23 80:21	continue 109:20	142:16 143:10
111:15 183:5	confront 45:19	81:16 95:18,19	116:7 146:3	162:24 167:19
190:10 196:2	48:2,11 163:1,10	123:25 143:15	196:12	199:19
concrete 46:15,17	163:12,20 164:3	170:4 174:9	continuing 186:21	correspondence
condition 62:5	166:16	192:23	contradict 81:6	17:7,25 178:12
110:6 120:2	confrontation 46:2	considered 19:6	contradicts 128:20	201:14
122:24 153:1,2	156:6 157:3	23:23 30:12 32:20	contracts 128.20	couched 28:24
conditions 27:13	161:18,24 162:10	47:11 54:17 55:19	57:1,10,21 62:8	121:14
28:14 135:18	166:17 167:7,22	56:5 77:11 86:14	171:19 189:23,24	counsel 41:12
	-		-	
conduct 6:5 16:8	168:8,10,13,24	96:12 107:2 111:3 113:19 150:13	189:24	78:23 160:13
23:4 49:6 66:8	169:5,10,19		contribute 198:25	162:5,14
102:10,10 113:23	confrontations	192:5	control 34:11	count 168:17 190:6
113:24 114:4	160:15	considering 52:6	convenient 41:16	190:7
119:10 138:2	confronted 48:6	59:7 90:17 135:8	convening 146:21	counteract 147:24
164:11 165:24	161:21,23 167:12	considers 47:19	Convention 34:1	countervailing
189:25	Confronting 168:2	consistently 5:21	convincing 194:15	58:24
conducted 30:7	168:3	Constable 183:16	convoluted 196:24	country 154:10
57:14 75:20 76:8	connection 94:18	183:23 184:1,6	cooperate 6:21	couple 18:22
152:1	95:3,23 153:10	185:1	154:16	198:17
conducting 159:16	conscious 111:1	constituted 22:24	core 1:11,15,18 2:1	coupled 103:20
confidante 47:18	123:7 135:15	constrained 63:9	2:3,8,10,15,19 3:1	course 6:2 7:15
confidence 30:13	148:15	constructed 177:2	3:5,10,16,20,23	8:12,13,14 12:1
38:24 40:11 172:6	consent 13:15	constructs 173:21	4:2,6,11 19:21	18:15 20:1,24
confident 38:11	consequence 46:24	consult 100:12	20:2 21:10 22:11	21:9,9 22:6 24:2,9
61:1	76:12 114:8,25	consultation	22:25 43:1 58:6	25:5 30:10,14
confidential 14:23	167:11,16	116:16 151:22	63:14 64:16 78:24	36:24 38:8 40:4
29:2 37:21 39:3	consequences 6:11	contact 115:18	87:9 92:14 96:22	42:21,24 46:7
47:6 57:2 94:23	6:24 35:21 36:21	contacts 140:6	101:10 105:18	50:20 58:3 61:25
95:2,14 185:16	40:21 57:6 59:5	contemporaneous	110:12 112:12	63:3 65:17 67:3,9
confidentiality 9:2	123:4 124:6 156:4	101:21	118:7,9,14 133:17	68:16 71:16 74:4
9:24 11:15 13:14	157:2,3,4 167:22	contending 68:22	134:15 137:22	74:6,16 75:13
14:13 25:1 27:10	169:15,19 170:9	68:25,25 69:1	144:1 152:19	82:21 83:5,18
27:14 28:14,25	consider 41:13	content 152:14	155:6 169:12	84:18 85:12 86:12
30:11 32:10,21	47:21 61:11 63:2	contents 17:3	171:9 174:15,18	88:6 91:11 92:4
33:6,20 39:15	63:5 72:18 77:9	context 13:1 15:25	174:25 175:2	98:23 113:2 116:9
50:14 96:2	78:24 87:2 91:7	23:19 25:23 27:17	177:9 178:22	117:16,18 119:17
confirm 26:12	184:23	27:18 28:23 29:11	181:4 194:4	123:22 128:20
114:22 120:4	considerable 78:17	31:9 33:5 45:8	199:10	129:13 130:19
			-	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 200
131:9,15,16	165:22 172:24	109:12 119:9	deceitful 149:16,17	defeat 58:25
133:12 134:3,17	175:8,13 177:24	155:21 188:21	149:18	deferred 146:10
135:14 142:3	178:24 179:3,7,11	dangerous 40:21	deceived 116:21	defined 130:12
150:18 151:10,12	179:15 180:21	dark 88:5 200:23	deceiving 163:4	157:12
163:5 164:4 169:5	covert 37:20	date 10:23 17:13	decide 6:12 74:20	definitely 135:22
169:12,24 173:12	162:19 189:25	131:3 183:4 186:5	92:6 116:2,3	definition 46:4
180:23 190:14	create 89:19	201:21	132:24 150:10,18	165:15
196:9,12	credibility 15:23	dated 182:6	151:1,17 152:2	defunct 155:6
courses 97:7	16:4 21:21 99:14	dates 69:9	191:1,17 132.2	degree 24:23 59:14
court 6:20 30:15	credible 36:13	dating 121:3	decided 116:3	135:24
188:13	credibly 73:6,12	day 47:20 62:20	183:14 192:13	degrees 14:16
courts 185:15	credit 186:4	days 8:9	deciding 81:10	delay 42:8,13 132:4
cover 5:21 6:2,7	creep 164:8	de 161:24	192:7	132:5
10:17 18:23 19:24	crime 188:23 200:2	dead 97:21 142:4	decision 15:5 24:13	delays 198:21,25
20:13,14,20 21:11	crimes 187:10	148:15	30:2 51:23 54:14	deliberately 10:23
43:7,11,20 47:1	criminal 30:4 31:8	deal 9:10 18:24	54:21 55:24 56:23	delicate 110:4
50:6 51:23 54:7,9	31:10,11,15 49:8	19:3,8,9,12 20:12	57:22 59:25 61:22	deliver 56:25
54:14,20 55:25	49:10 165:5,6,14	35:10,11 42:3	69:18 71:18 86:3	187:18
56:23 57:5 58:12	critical 106:23	46:16 54:3 55:3	86:4,4 88:2 92:25	democracy 200:4
58:17,23 64:19	141:17 200:8	72:19 73:22	106:22 108:5	demonstrates
65:21 66:19 67:17	criticism 141:2	129:15 133:23	114:21 115:4	198:9
67:24 68:1,2,5,9	criticisms 10:6	146:22 147:15	117:15 120:11	demonstration 5:7
68:16,20,22 71:16	crop 74:16	160:12 184:16	121:11 123:8,12	7:23 8:5,7 12:10
73:16 76:10,14,22	cross-purposes	185:9 201:13	123:19,22 124:19	13:5,10 14:2
77:1 78:19 79:20	52:9 133:1	dealing 10:18 11:13	125:16,19,21	21:11 22:14,22
80:18 81:5,12,21	culture 23:7,19	39:9 43:3 71:6	130:23 131:2,3,4	23:7 24:2,6 29:12
81:24 83:6 84:13	67:15	74:10,12,13 78:11	131:23 132:4	29:24 31:5 37:7
85:3,11,17 87:16	current 73:4	88:14 104:17	135:10 138:8	65:7 66:10 80:2
87:18 88:20 89:6	112:23 113:14,14	144:21 153:5	145:11 147:20	140:10,24 141:18
89:20 91:6,7,9	119:21 134:22	169:12,14 177:4	150:6,23 151:17	143:21,22 158:10
92:21 93:3,8 94:4	149:24 150:24	177:19	169:18 180:2,17	158:21 159:19
94:5,8 96:19	152:7 192:4	dealt 8:18 25:1	decision-making	161:8
101:6,7,11,13	currently 109:16	54:12 70:10 78:4	39:19 60:8,23	demur 98:16
102:25 106:5,10	118:17 184:25	death 78:5	82:10	denied 7:3
106:20,22 109:5	190:19	debate 5:2 38:4	decisions 38:10	Deny 26:12
111:8,10,14 112:2	curtail 97:23	150:23	57:10,17 63:19	depart 4:25 25:2,14
117:11 118:17	curtailed 99:19	debated 20:22	74:17 76:18,24	33:16 72:3
119:21 122:24	cut 185:25 191:6	debates 186:21	79:25 80:21 81:2	department 184:12
123:2,3 124:5,7,8		decades 158:23	87:25 109:21	departure 27:6
124:10,25 125:3	D	185:14	151:20 165:24	depend 148:2
125:11 129:21	D 1:2	deceased 92:18	166:4 181:20	162:12 191:23
130:6,9,13 131:7	d'escalier 171:1	137:24 144:5	decisive 82:13	depending 167:23
131:11 137:25	daft 126:9	150:12 168:4	decline 184:4	depends 27:2
144:6,14 145:6	damage 27:12	175:12	deeply 47:24,24	134:21 165:12
155:1 157:17	33:23 83:14	deceased's 139:21	48:4 174:22,23	168:18 170:11,11
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1490 203
deployed 7:5,7 14:8	deterioration	difficult 14:18	114:11 124:11	discreditable 97:5
100:1 101:4 135:5	122:23 124:13	52:16 60:9 63:18	153:7 157:17	discuss 37:12 157:9
139:4 155:4 164:1	determinative	69:1,7 82:12 84:2	166:5,8 171:24	199:5
188:25	82:14,15 107:20	87:2 110:4 116:18	179:16 180:16,21	discussing 45:8
deployment 14:8	108:16	126:13 131:25	disclosing 6:1,4	144:24 157:10
20:17 21:16,25	determine 22:16	132:1 173:1	52:4,12 54:20	discussion 4:14
22:5,10 24:10	191:20	180:15 181:18	61:23 66:19 68:3	153:25 183:6
47:7 63:15 73:11	determined 88:2	190:14	68:19 70:18 77:1	discussions 6:13
77:20 91:16 96:25	133:7,7 150:16	difficulties 22:18	79:17 106:10	87:12
111:2,13 131:19	determining 15:15	149:23 154:18	109:17 110:5,9	disinclined 191:11
135:19,21 139:1,2	deterred 183:20	difficulty 124:22	111:14 156:20	191:12
141:4 142:5	184:19	129:7 138:9	157:24 167:11	disjuncture 126:2,3
144:25 158:19	deterring 183:21	Dines 196:17	disclosure 5:21	displayed 46:7
159:18 164:1	deters 186:24	direct 130:1	6:18 19:17 20:3,4	disposal 199:3
169:15 172:16	detrimental 82:24	direction 70:16	21:14 25:21 30:2	dispositive 27:23
178:16 179:5	develop 47:21	directly 100:24	32:13,13,17,24	disproportionate
deployments 21:9	73:14	130:1	43:18,25 50:1,16	83:14
24:4 123:15 133:6	devotes 9:12	disagree 19:19	52:25 53:15,15,18	dispute 30:9 130:8
142:24 158:13	diagnosed 135:17	75:15 96:15	53:20 54:5,9,22	130:13
187:9,19	dialogue 142:2	159:15 166:19	55:14,16,25 59:1	disputes 128:10
derived 184:8	162:18	190:11,12	61:9,9,13,17	disregarded 162:4
described 13:12	dicta 192:2	disagrees 94:14	62:14 63:6 65:12	disregards 188:5
63:8 83:9 95:16	died 99:2,9	disclose 10:16	67:24 68:22,23	disrespect 116:5
99:5 142:16	differ 168:7	24:13 32:23 35:7	69:8,12 71:19	distinction 29:12
describes 9:14	difference 32:12,23	43:7,11,19 49:22	80:19 83:1 87:18	distinguish 47:9
12:22 198:5	40:7,9,15 62:25	53:1 54:25 62:23	92:21 93:16,22	153:16
deserve 156:7	63:4,5 70:23	68:1,2,5,8,10,15	101:17,24 102:1	distinguished 7:22
161:21	127:21 169:25	69:2 73:16 76:14	103:20,21 104:14	distinguishes 174:1
deserved 162:11	186:11,23	79:20 83:4,6,15	105:20,21 104:14	distress 95:12
designated 1:9	different 10:14	85:11 88:19 106:5	109:5,15,20	113:20,21 114:12
25:12	19:21 27:1 69:14	114:16 118:17	112:15,25 120:15	196:25
desire 48:2 85:12	69:15 71:22 83:7	121:16 124:25	120:22 121:6,24	distressed 94:24
89:17 99:19	83:19,21 86:22	130:6 157:19	120.22 121.0,24	
163:20	,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	distressing 196:6 disturbance 154:13
desperately 116:18	88:11 97:12 108:9 115:1 117:9	167:14,18 179:11 disclosed 18:24	124:8,25 125:3 130:9,13,15 138:3	disturbing 143:3
despite 14:5 88:13	119:20 132:10	20:15 40:24 43:21	138:6,21 139:19	DL 9:24 178:4
91:4	137:7 139:8	44:23 48:20 52:13	140:4 144:22	document 12:21
detail 94:3 96:25	144:12,19 156:11	52:20 54:15,16	140:4 144:22	
109:2 184:14	157:8,8 161:2	57:8 58:12,23	172:19 175:15,18	13:1,2,7,18,23 14:6 49:25 95:7
	**	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	14:6 49:25 95:7
detailed 196:18	166:6 169:15	61:24 63:10 67:18	183:1 discount 50:24	120:20
details 15:6 62:16	170:4 172:8	76:10,11 80:17		
91:15,23,23 detain 19:10	180:17,22	84:14 85:18 87:16	102:11 185:23 discounted 51:4	documentary 29:4 documents 21:19
	differently 35:15 179:14	91:6,7,9 97:19		
detective 98:11,11		104:16,19,24	discover 187:3	65:11 75:7,8
98:19,21	differing 128:4	107:1 112:19,21	discovered 177:6	81:17,20 99:14
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

147:1 152:15	earliest 184:19	embrace 28:24	184:18	events 101:13
193:19 194:7	early 8:9 131:4	Emmerson 29:22	entailed 35:6	174:17,18
198:2,10,14 199:5	140:23 143:19	Emmerson's 30:25	enterprise 49:9	eventually 63:19
dodgy 197:16	151:3 181:7	emotional 197:3	entire 173:22	159:20
doing 25:9 39:13	easier 118:12,13	emphasise 33:4	entirely 5:4 19:11	everybody 6:24
51:10,15 52:16	easily 40:6	134:2	31:22 40:15 48:18	38:13,16 42:6
57:11 114:18	easy 91:21	employed 39:5 80:5	54:15 67:8 75:21	54:6 59:6 74:2
125:23 181:23	economical 172:11	employer 135:23	88:4 99:24 108:12	113:15 117:14
186:4 193:24	Edwards 172:24	135:24	113:25 137:4,9	125:14 133:24
domain 14:11	effect 26:19 33:18	employers 29:9	139:14 164:16	146:21 193:23
96:24 98:15	34:14,23,24 94:11	employment 51:6,9	173:3 188:24	201:17
door 191:2 193:1	124:10 155:20	51:21 52:5,14,21	entirety 161:7	evidence 6:20 8:12
double 176:16	156:1 170:9	53:9,11,13,16,19	entities 74:12	10:3,21 11:3,5,11
doubt 11:20 14:12	189:11 192:3,18	54:23 55:14,16,18	entitled 58:1 82:4	11:16 12:4 13:24
15:23 18:4 21:21	197:23	55:23 56:2 168:16	157:6 169:20	17:4 21:19,23
42:13 77:13 78:17	effective 96:23	enable 133:5	200:4	29:1,6 30:8 31:11
126:15 128:23	effectively 6:19,22	139:24	enunciated 85:8	37:22 38:1,2,22
140:8 147:17	10:2 32:8 75:2	encompass 96:4	envies 132:2	40:23 42:15 44:19
169:11 172:20	79:18 95:2 135:25	encourage 131:16	equal 78:25	49:7 72:7,22 75:5
174:21 185:19	184:15	encouraged 49:9	equally 58:17 77:5	75:5,10 76:5,7
186:20,22 187:16	effects 135:19	endeavours 146:4	106:14 116:22	78:9 80:12,16
doubts 175:7	effort 143:18	endless 159:13	era 141:10 180:22	81:4,5,6,7,8 83:17
Douglas 172:24	193:11	endorse 55:2,8	eroded 118:23	86:17 88:17,18
Dr 17:16,16 18:2	efforts 196:16	endorses 38:2	119:1	89:5,17 90:18
50:4 108:22	egg 74:8 129:17	ends 10:7	err 191:16	94:18 95:6 97:11
draw 40:2 46:24	eggshells 123:6	enduring 6:25	error 26:3	119:8,11 122:17
108:3,14 185:6	either 17:16 31:12	engage 53:12 59:7	especially 139:12	124:12 126:14,15
194:5 198:18	31:13 64:12 68:1	59:15,17 67:16	197:21	129:15 130:10
drawing 67:23	71:12 74:10 76:14	90:12 114:3,20	esprit 171:1	131:8,10,12 132:6
182:9	76:22 147:11	144:11	essential 20:10	132:9,10,15,24
drawn 12:22	162:22 168:13	engaged 44:14,18	essentially 26:11	133:2,2,8,12,20
drew 36:15	191:20 193:9	44:19,23 45:14	29:18 31:25	133:21 134:1
dropped 31:14	elaborate 151:11	49:8 66:23 114:1	200:24	136:10 141:12
due 8:12 74:16	elderly 94:21 95:13	165:5,13	establish 184:22	142:7,12 146:11
98:23 191:24	140:19 142:21	engages 59:19	established 8:10	148:16,24 153:9
duration 74:12	143:2 150:13	engaging 47:6	25:5 34:9 67:15	153:13,22 170:16
duties 81:18 179:4	162:2	119:25	89:14 95:9	184:7,25 189:11
duty 13:16	element 88:23	enormous 95:20	establishing 66:15	190:13 191:24
	elicited 133:13	enquire 90:14	et 180:18	198:19
	Ellison 128:3	enquiries 17:13	ether 88:19	evidential 10:18
E 1:2	eloquent 201:1	18:4,5	evade 6:22	29:13
earlier 8:6 19:22	email 4:24 6:17	enquiry 66:14	event 14:4 19:4	evolution 158:17
35:23 86:14 95:17	embark 16:3 42:2	ensure 75:11	20:20 54:18 71:17	ex-wife 113:17
136:14 153:13	171:4	ensures 125:24	123:23 158:3	exacerbation 110:2
188:3 199:15	embarked 29:7	ensuring 143:9	162:8 186:22	exactly 40:7 77:22

02.1 102 (102.4			44.21.24.49.22	161.16.165.13
92:1 102:6 103:4	exists 24:16 42:5	exploration 75:1	44:21,24 48:23	161:16 165:12
114:25 127:23	expanded 162:15	76:4	84:9 130:5 134:5	170:12 174:10
142:14 145:4	expansion 60:4	explore 123:18	154:4	factual 76:20
177:4 192:13	expect 89:13,20,21	190:24	eye 6:11 188:9	123:13,16,19,21
201:5	89:23 105:3	explored 109:1		124:18 125:22
examination	123:10 156:12	127:22 166:25		128:24 129:1,3,15
110:11	174:6	167:3	face 22:7 31:25	130:12 159:16
examine 78:7 90:2	expectation 12:5	expose 80:15	45:14 59:13 76:6 76:12 113:16	190:9 198:10
examined 99:25	29:8 31:7,10,15	exposed 36:6 80:9		failed 10:2
100:5	32:10,21 40:11	169:22 187:25	125:3 129:25	failing 31:19
examining 111:12	expectations 9:23	201:10	180:16 193:3	141:13
example 18:3 45:11	25:25 26:5,13	exposing 81:24	faced 7:2 97:17	fair 32:14,24 56:24
46:9 55:10 67:12	27:9,15,16,19	188:1	148:24	74:7 111:16 167:9
76:7,21 81:4,7	29:19 30:10,11,19	exposure 29:10	facetiously 87:3	fairly 84:1 98:13
91:3 99:14 103:12	31:4,22 32:7 33:6	31:17	fact 14:5 16:7	128:2 131:19
110:10 122:21	33:20 35:24 39:25	express 9:3 46:19	30:18 35:15 39:16	138:24 150:25
123:1 200:15	40:3,17 156:14	122:9 123:13	45:25 67:16 76:6	fairness 4:21 27:19
examples 46:15,17	189:24	128:24 129:8	80:3 112:24 123:7	74:6 78:5 99:22
exceptionallism	expected 79:25	171:15 173:9	125:1,4 128:21,22	125:18,20 155:21
96:9	90:25 113:1	expressed 14:18	140:2,5 142:2	faith 199:12 200:21
exceptions 6:3	153:14 190:15	24:25 81:14 85:2	144:10 153:7,9,17	faked 195:20
exchange 6:17	expedition 99:17	128:2,4 148:18	154:3 162:5 167:4	fall 23:23 30:21
111:18 116:14	102:8	177:1	167:16 180:5,19	31:25 39:18
exclude 96:7 105:2	expeditions 83:10	expresses 153:6	185:24 186:11	104:23 165:10
excluded 133:17	expended 143:19	170:17 171:12	189:15 191:17	187:13
excluding 169:1	experience 7:24 8:2	expression 48:16	194:5 195:15	falling 93:10
exclusive 189:19	8:13 78:18 141:20	175:22	196:25	falls 26:3,4 66:9
executed 81:22	146:12 157:5	expressly 36:5	factor 25:21 30:21	118:4
exemplifies 60:3,9	190:22	extended 12:17	50:23 52:24 53:5	false 22:19 34:25
93:13	experienced 197:13	extent 23:8 25:8	53:8 62:9,10,12	130:23 156:9
exercise 12:13	experiences 9:25	31:2,23 34:10	82:4,13,16,17	158:18
50:23 61:19 81:22	expert 190:17	35:18 40:24 72:20	121:9 153:20	familiar 12:2
103:10 116:24	experts 16:21	74:3 111:4 119:18	190:8 191:7	families 24:16
146:22 155:23	explain 12:5 181:23	181:16	factors 5:25 15:4	150:13
170:13 183:1	181:24 183:10	external 15:4	27:1 34:4 35:14	family 12:14 34:12
191:12 201:19	186:12	extra 167:5	59:10 62:14 69:15	36:20 74:23 105:9
exhausts 136:4	explained 106:1	extract 143:7	71:15 74:1 83:23	108:7 111:5
exhibit 12:23 13:17	112:20	extraordinarily	84:7 90:17 91:1	112:23 113:14
exhibited 12:23	explaining 115:21	164:21	92:3,3 93:9	114:6,13 123:16
exist 100:14,15	explains 5:18 12:25	extraordinary	105:10 144:23	128:12,18 138:20
174:6	187:14	173:24	168:17	139:20,21 140:19
existence 89:5	explanation 148:5	extrapolated 128:7	facts 26:25 38:11	142:21 143:16
141:2 159:20	explanations	extraterritorial	38:16 90:2 96:14	144:7 154:13
163:1	181:21 184:4	155:20	98:25 107:18	173:23 179:6
existing 110:2	185:4	extremely 17:2	124:23 134:21	197:2
				-

				1490 212
far 7:8 11:16 13:8	finally 150:16	184:18	156:9 175:25	12:20 55:22
14:13 21:7,15	177:15 186:20	focused 75:23	182:6	friend 47:17 118:5
22:12 46:18 66:5	find 8:6,10 30:3	85:15 120:12,12	forming 149:16	165:4 185:7
66:12,25 69:22	49:18 57:6 104:3	focusing 51:25 52:1	forms 39:1 119:23	friends 86:2 173:23
70:13 72:21,22	125:1 129:2	196:19	forth 23:22 53:3,13	fringes 130:2
77:17 82:10 86:18	131:11 137:25	followed 26:14	53:19 54:23 61:16	front 198:11
102:3 115:5,25	145:19 152:4	57:14 63:25	68:7 141:13 172:2	frustrating 63:16
121:2 123:24	158:23 163:3	following 10:5	forward 21:12	110:15 126:12
129:23 135:2	188:18 194:8	21:17	52:11 61:7,11	frustration 40:18
138:8 142:15	195:4 196:16	follows 12:24 28:18	70:11 82:15 87:15	fudge 167:2
151:12 152:14	197:5	96:15 105:12	103:11 108:9	fulfilled 84:23
173:2 192:5	finding 128:21,22	184:21	118:24 119:3,11	102:23
fault 5:4	findings 187:23	footing 120:5	140:7 157:19	fulfilling 162:19
favour 25:21 104:5	fine 152:18 160:10	160:25	159:5,14 166:18	fulfilment 32:14,17
109:20 130:15	194:1	force 23:22 30:6	181:9	32:25
139:23	finish 97:3 170:23	65:23 103:9	forwards 152:12	fulfils 89:25
FBI 200:15	178:21 193:19	104:13 142:24	found 6:8 78:10	full 46:3 50:20
fear 161:20,23	finished 4:20	forceful 149:11	145:24 201:19	86:15 110:9 186:4
162:6,6,6,12	137:10	forcefully 128:2	foundation 122:4,6	191:13 194:3
fears 122:2,3,4,6	finishes 12:16	forecast 98:24	124:19 186:3	197:13
127:12 162:4		166:13	founded 123:9	fullest 150:11
171:12	finishing 99:20 fire 40:22	forefront 81:16	162:7	
features 134:23		82:3	four 171:3	fully 19:6 86:7
	firmly 10:8	62.3 foreseen 107:10	frail 143:9	124:16 132:9 190:4
feed 134:23 140:16	first 5:18 10:10			
feeds 60:16	13:9,23 21:18	forget 33:12	Francis 1:5,22 2:22	function 67:20
feel 23:16 46:23	26:5 44:11 54:19	forgive 15:10 45:22	4:9 5:13,15,20	functions 90:15
47:1 163:3,11	55:4 56:10 65:10	46:14 51:22 84:10	6:10,24 9:14,20	102:23
167:13 196:10	70:20 71:23 74:24	85:14 87:25 89:7	9:25 10:2,6,8,10	fundamental 67:16
feeling 47:24 197:1	75:3 78:4 86:2,11	89:15 106:2 136:8	10:19 13:6,8	fundamentally
199:2 200:21	95:1 113:10 114:4	144:25	14:12,21 15:1,24	113:11
feelings 94:17	127:1 135:3 139:1	forgotten 93:8	16:9,14,22,23	funded 194:9
feels 135:24	141:11 155:25	182:13,20	17:17 18:1 65:3,5	further 2:7 3:20
feet 15:18	157:19 159:7	form 29:4 54:10	67:1 79:10 84:11	4:10 17:6 18:4
feigned 196:23	175:14	55:21 74:14 78:14	84:17 85:4,15	38:1 51:2 53:18
felt 112:21 158:5,5	firstly 54:8 97:3	79:1 93:19 96:4	119:6 123:17	54:22 61:6,9
FIB 200:16	fishing 83:9 99:17	107:15 142:5	127:3,15,20	70:15,16 71:19,19
field 12:10 49:2	102:8	147:24 148:22	128:11 129:14,23	75:10 80:12 85:21
190:20 198:6	fit 168:2	formal 10:21 11:7	180:9,13,19	87:8 101:9 110:2
figure 132:17 155:7	fixed 117:3 184:22	42:6 129:14	Francis's 7:24	114:8 126:11,22
figures 174:25	201:21	formed 76:21	79:16 84:24 95:17	130:3 141:5
files 148:20 200:12	floor 85:23 127:2	139:12 158:21	frank 171:12	159:22 172:9
200:16,19 201:6	flow 15:11 122:24	former 13:5 17:23	frankly 22:10	174:14 181:3
final 143:4 145:11	flows 44:25	25:25 26:13 27:16	free 39:14	182:7 190:24
150:2 200:11	flyposting 165:8	29:19 30:10 33:8	freestanding 59:12	Furthermore
finality 131:4	focus 138:24	112:23 113:9	frequently 12:17	147:10 158:12

f-4 27:10 (2:7	motting 10:10 20:10	90.17.05.17	112.20 114.10 12	mantan (0-22
future 37:18 62:7	getting 19:18 20:10	89:17 95:16	113:20 114:10,12	greater 68:23
73:2 102:10 117:4	67:21 75:11 87:18	173:16 192:8	122:23,24 123:4	119:11 123:24
181:6 187:19	90:13,20 108:14	giving 68:14 72:7	124:8,9 125:1,4,6	147:8
188:9,10,20 189:1	118:21 132:10	86:5 90:18 163:7	136:11,15 138:2	greatly 62:1 110:7
189:9 190:19	140:21 142:3	gleaned 9:23	140:4 142:5	grey 98:8 164:5
191:10 192:12	170:12,16	globally 75:20	143:11,20 146:3	Griffin 41:10,11
fuzzy 155:16	Gibson 144:6	gloss 25:18 32:6	149:19 151:16,18	Grosvenor 140:10
164:12	gist 120:22	go 9:5 15:6 19:9	151:20 152:25	178:17
	gisted 50:3 196:3	32:19 33:6,22	153:19 157:2,10	ground 138:11
<u>G</u>	gisting 181:13	35:16 45:20 51:22	158:23 160:8,12	165:21,25 191:22
gainsay 47:20	give 4:22 6:20	54:1 61:8,9 66:5	164:5 168:22,24	group 111:6,25
102:6 119:17	11:11 26:6 28:11	67:23 70:17 71:23	170:23 172:3	112:3 129:24
gallop 151:24	28:15 37:21 41:18	83:25 86:21 102:8	173:15,18 178:21	139:5
170:22,24	48:10 63:21 66:20	120:5 126:24	181:14 191:20	grouped 139:6
Gangbuster 17:24	70:1 75:5 86:14	135:7 145:3	193:20 197:8	grouping 140:9
gather 40:14 80:16	87:19 88:17 91:16	148:24 149:1	199:13 201:4,11	groups 45:15 46:7
gathered 80:24	95:22 97:11	173:18 184:13	good 29:25 39:11	60:13,18 61:15
81:8 83:17	117:13 125:10	187:11 190:20	40:18 45:16 57:1	69:9 70:2,5 80:23
gathering 81:5	126:14 130:24	198:2,13 200:15	57:9,21 64:14	85:4 107:14 109:6
164:23 200:3	131:4 133:21	goal 118:11 148:23	73:16 98:13 143:3	111:25 112:3
general 4:20,22	136:15 137:6	goes 10:1,5 12:12	152:18 165:21	131:12 135:5
7:17 10:24 15:13	141:12 142:12	17:12 29:5,20	167:3 173:25	139:2 155:5
15:14 18:7 19:8	146:11 150:16	32:9 53:14 124:20	195:20 199:11	158:12 199:9
19:12 21:3 24:12	151:4 154:5,17	138:16 184:6	Gordon 1:7 18:19	200:6,10,12,17,17
24:24 34:2 38:4	162:24 163:9	going 13:18,19	44:4	200:20 201:6
39:10 74:25 93:10	195:8	15:14,17 19:3	Gordon's 107:17	grumbling 25:11
94:13 103:21	given 6:5 10:23	27:10 36:11 38:12	granted 10:24	Guardian 10:8,14
121:14 128:11	14:7,8 24:11,25	38:15 39:21 40:1	granting 174:4	10:15
130:9 161:4	27:2 28:16 29:2	41:3,19,21 44:24	grapple 108:8	10.13
196:13,15	37:23 39:3 40:11	48:23 49:15,17,19	113:3	H
generalising		51:17 53:16 54:5		H297 144:3
161:15	42:10,14,15,17		grateful 11:8 16:6	half 15:19
generality 41:2	43:25 49:21 53:8	54:14,23,24 55:13	18:16 26:17 41:1	Hall 1:14,21 2:6,13
generally 83:23	61:20 62:6 73:24	55:15,22 57:2,7	50:24 56:4,4 60:3	2:18,24 3:4,8,14
132:13	80:1,7 82:11 85:8	61:5,10,17 62:23	62:3 82:18,22	3:19 4:1 5:6
generic 6:18 12:3	85:9 86:17 87:10	65:6 67:18,19,25	84:16 108:8	18:10,12 56:17,18
17:3 37:15 183:24	96:13 104:13	68:3,5,20 69:20	122:14 124:2	56:22 57:16,20
195:11	106:23 109:13	71:12 72:17 73:24	134:6 148:7 166:1	58:3 64:8,9 71:23
gentleman 172:17	112:22 120:11	74:9 77:24 81:17	167:21 182:23	71:25 72:1,8,15
genuine 94:10	126:15 130:11,12	81:19 85:25 86:8	gratefully 142:1	71.25 72.1,8,15
O	132:22 133:3	86:9,9 87:10,19	graver 49:19	74:4 76:2,12 77:5
111:20 162:3,6,6 168:10 172:21	139:13 146:8	88:22 90:4,8,12	great 19:2 90:10	74.4 76.2,12 77.3
	158:14 171:18	92:1 93:21 94:7	109:11 126:21	,
genuinely 124:18	178:13 180:18	96:18 97:21 103:5	133:23 153:11	94:2,3,7,21 97:20
173:6	189:10 191:24	105:22 106:12,18	181:14 184:15	98:16,18 99:10,21
geographical 139:9	gives 20:8 81:7	109:25 111:16	198:1	100:3,7,12,14,17

				raye 214
100:23,25 110:22	happening 142:18	27:8 98:1 129:4	158:11 159:19	178:8
110:24,25 112:4	143:6 162:10,10	146:10 147:19	196:14,16 197:10	HN333 4:7,9,12,13
116:10,12,13,18	happens 8:15 165:1	159:14 198:22	hit 89:1	34:3 35:2 178:20
127:1 134:8,10,11	happily 73:22		hitting 60:15	
, ,	1 1 0	hearing 19:6,24		178:21,23,24
134:14,18 135:11	happy 19:8 43:19	25:6 42:7,10,14	HN104 2:16,18	180:10 181:4
135:13,23 141:23	146:17 155:13	42:15,22 54:3	112:11,13 116:12	182:3
141:25 142:1,9,14	harassed 93:21	57:14 61:15 65:17	HN123 2:20,22,24	HN343 183:1,3
142:20 143:4,17	103:16	65:18 73:25 75:4	73:14 118:5,7,8,9	HN53 12:23
148:8,10,11,14,19	harassing 154:9	75:16 79:20 87:6	118:15 120:13	HN58 1:19,21,23
149:3,15,22	harassment 44:25	87:11 105:25	123:12,20 125:16	1:24 2:2 7:10
150:20 160:1,2,5	44:25 47:3 157:4	117:3,8,12 131:15	125:25 127:3,12	8:14,21 64:15,17
160:6,11 163:2,16	hard 135:11	131:17 132:5	128:10,17 129:6	64:18 65:24,25
164:15,25 165:12	harm 26:19 27:12	133:3,17,20 147:1	131:8,18 133:9	66:13,15 71:25
166:1,6,11,16	33:22 34:7,7 37:5	147:22 151:1	134:10,22 135:1	72:23 73:12,21
167:2,21 168:1,6	37:6 49:24 51:4	152:1 163:17	136:5	76:7,10 77:19,21
168:20 169:4	58:13,17 60:15	188:13	HN123's 73:15	79:11 80:1,20
170:7,19 172:14	70:20 72:17 85:2	hearings 19:22	134:1	81:1 83:20 84:12
172:15 173:8,11	85:3,6,10 91:9,11	75:18 151:25	HN16 1:12,14	84:17,20 85:4,16
173:13,18 176:20	91:13 94:15 95:10	152:3	41:21 43:2,3	85:24 87:9,20
176:22,23 178:3,4	95:20,21 96:3,4,5	hears 39:16	49:23 52:7,15,15	97:13
178:7 185:9,13	96:8,16 97:8	heavens 187:13	52:16,18,20 54:1	HN58's 72:23 73:7
186:1,7,16 187:1	110:7 111:13	heavily 13:13	54:7 56:17	80:20 81:17,20
187:22,25 188:5	142:15 155:20	168:17	HN16's 50:6 51:6	91:16
189:3 190:11	162:7 171:17	heavy 35:5	52:4,19,20 55:18	HN68 2:4,6,9 92:15
191:14,17 192:13	195:7,14	held 160:17 161:11	55:23 76:20	92:16 93:23 94:2
192:18,21,24	harm's 135:25	172:23	HN26 1:16 58:5,7	97:10 101:10
193:3,12 199:15	Harvey 36:16,19	help 7:1 111:21	59:2 63:22	138:18 144:24
Hall's 102:7	head 65:7 98:20	131:2 132:24	HN294 3:2,4	153:4,17 172:8
Halls 176:18	139:4 184:10	183:8 200:6,20	137:20,23 141:25	HN68's 99:25
hamper 81:5	197:7	helpful 45:9 85:22	143:23 144:24	HN81 2:11,13 65:9
hand 115:7 117:24	heading 28:20	118:3 134:5	HN294's 144:25	66:17 80:3,7
handed 5:4 165:3	195:6,14	Herne 128:4	HN297 3:6,8 144:2	105:16,19 109:10
handled 109:10	heads 156:1	hes 51:14,14	145:1,22 148:10	110:6,7,10,24
126:21	health 50:22	hiding 169:25	HN321 3:11,12,14	111:11
hands 19:11 130:16	106:13 108:6,19	high 49:25 108:23	6:18 34:3 35:2	HN81's 73:10
hanging 59:19	108:23 109:12,25	159:21 192:19,20	152:20,21 154:24	106:12 108:6
happen 15:12	110:6 111:20	higher 113:22	155:1 160:5	111:5,6,13
48:23 67:19 71:13	121:23 135:18	highest 12:20	HN326 3:17,19,21	hold 40:22 54:3
75:18 90:4 113:1	141:13	highlight 8:15	159:25 171:7,10	61:10 89:20 91:14
139:16	hear 7:25 21:21	182:5	172:14 174:15	91:22 114:19
happened 47:15	61:5 75:5 83:8	highlighted 121:3	HN329 3:24 4:1	115:7 117:5 151:1
48:22 107:11	129:5 137:16	highly 69:23	174:12 175:3	161:5
127:23 139:6	160:12 171:25	179:10	176:22	holding 172:4,25
142:5 143:21	176:18 190:24	history 140:23	HN330 4:3,4 34:3	198:18
149:12 159:17	heard 9:1 20:14	141:16 151:24	35:2 177:10,24	holds 39:11
			- ,	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

home 12:11 199:20	111:13 114:1	immunity 31:13	186:10	indications 17:14
homes 139:8	140:25	39:2	improving 55:6	149:25
hoof 193:25	identify 43:11 93:6	impact 22:3 37:17	in-built 26:2 33:14	indirectly 113:9
hope 96:11 137:5	101:20 103:7	37:18 40:8 48:5	40:2	123:15
137:10 201:18	104:10 106:10	106:11,12 107:10	inability 136:8	indistinguishable
hoped 15:11	157:16 180:3	108:6,19 111:11	inaccuracies 194:6	153:4
hopes 141:14	identifying 43:10	113:16 115:8	194:10 198:3,10	individual 11:18
hoping 74:23	61:18 87:5 104:10	156:13,14 172:3	198:13	15:15 16:20 17:10
horses 97:7	identities 6:12 7:1	185:17 188:20	inadequacy 121:6	18:14 19:1,3,14
hostile 107:15	34:24 185:15	189:1 190:18	inapposite 36:17	22:21 23:5,14,18
hostility 7:3 107:25	identity 6:6,21 10:7	191:10 198:22,23	inappropriate 76:8	24:4,10 26:25,25
108:10	12:19 14:22 15:2	198:25	160:24 161:14	27:1,3 31:3 34:10
hour 15:19	24:14 34:11,25	impeccable 92:8	inception 140:12	34:19 37:13 39:16
house 60:1	50:7 52:20 53:17	imperative 187:8	incidents 22:8	40:19 46:10 47:14
human 33:25 37:20	62:1 74:22 80:9	188:1	inclined 29:21	47:24 48:1,2,11
48:13,17 49:16	80:16 94:22,25	implication 195:23	include 6:4 98:7	55:13 59:2,19
59:12 78:11 95:19	95:13 97:19 101:3	implications 125:3	152:6	63:20 74:23 75:23
162:19 163:2,5,13	101:8 107:9	implied 9:3 14:17	included 166:9	75:25 89:17,25
170:9 189:25	111:10 114:10	24:25	195:6	90:2,5 101:20
hurry 145:20	117:10 114:10	impliedly 36:5	includes 9:19 50:6	102:2 104:20
husband 94:23	144:6 152:25	importance 24:24	88:1 164:23 184:2	149:19 154:1
103:16 104:21	153:7,19 154:6,6	72:6 78:9,15,25	including 39:7	156:15 168:18
husband's 95:13	156:4,6,23 157:19	82:11 90:13 97:23	134:22	170:12,15 174:2
104:6	157:24 158:4	111:2,12 116:20	inclusion 183:10	175:16 176:11,23
104.0	172:24	160:14 173:16	incomplete 69:22	175.16 176.11,25
	idiot 176:1	important 15:21,22	69:24	170.23 177.13
idea 57:10 151:4	ignore 95:12	27:7 30:23 32:16	inconceivable	192:7
ideal 68:9 69:2,5	ignores 173:3	34:14 35:14,19	140:3 153:10	individual's 48:2
75:13,25 125:16	ill 126:9 141:13	40:18 60:23 61:6	inconsistency	50:17 90:19
131:21	ill-health 109:18	67:14 73:8,12	185:22	individuals 16:4
idem 64:6	illicit 139:12	77:17 79:2 82:25	increase 62:1	
identical 133:24	illustrates 134:20	90:8 130:6 131:10	increase 02.1	20:22,24 24:15 34:5,23 35:3,10
161:1	191:19	138:6 140:16		, ,
identically 160:23	illustration 180:5		incredibly 46:23 47:15 67:14	35:15,21,25 36:8 36:22 37:10 38:23
identification		142:6,8 173:19 181:15 185:10	independence	39:12 42:3 45:18
30:16 31:16 34:5	image 101:19		121:4	46:22 47:16 49:5
51:18 52:5 54:24	imagine 47:23	194:12,17,22	indicate 72:5	60:20 67:1 69:7
54:25 55:12 138:4	101:11,15 112:2 imbalance 199:2	importantly 14:5 113:17		
175:19			indicated 7:20 28:21 42:18 87:15	69:14 88:16 89:3
identified 5:25 6:3	immediacy 59:9	imports 33:24,25		99:22 115:17
22:17 31:7 37:6	immediate 59:16 115:18 149:7	impose 59:24 81:18	117:5 118:8	119:10 137:8
46:15 52:17 58:11		176:14	153:13,18 166:11	145:8 150:18
58:22 59:4,5 84:8	immediately 59:16	imposes 119:2	192:14 197:1	167:12 179:15
93:10 101:4,18	188:14 199:12	impossible 91:25	indicates 4:25	195:7,14
104:8,22 105:2,13	201:6	imprecise 98:9	indication 41:18	individuals' 102:9
104.0,22 103.2,13	immensely 173:14	Improvement	189:22	industrial 49:2

				1490 210
inevitable 76:25	inhibit 15:15	198:19 199:14,16	intelligence-gath	93:17 138:19
114:10,12	inhibited 118:25	199:17,20,22	29:13	144:7
inevitably 30:19	initial 64:18 72:1	200:21 201:21	intend 86:18	interferences 59:12
142:4	81:10	Inquiry's 23:3	113:21 191:9	interrupt 15:10
inference 106:13	initially 72:2	33:23 55:6 84:23	intended 116:5	87:21 160:1
145:9	injury 26:20,21	181:15	intended 170.3	intervening 156:18
infiltrate 129:25	60:2 71:5 78:5	insofar 7:2 10:14	intention 86:12	interviewing 12:9
infiltrated 69:9	92:20 93:17	43:24 61:13 90:16	interacted 130:2	intimate 45:12 76:8
70:6 85:5 112:1	107:20 125:7	120:8 124:3	interaction 71:8	144:11
127:20 129:21	inquest 174:3	140:14 167:11	111:5 156:24	introduced 88:22
131:12	inquests 31:20	inspector 98:11,11	interest 5:25 20:4	introduces 60:6
infiltrating 60:14	inquiry 5:22 10:20	98:19,21	31:13 39:2 65:25	intruded 197:17
infiltration 60:17	11:2,4 17:5,6 18:5	inspectors 98:7	70:2 73:5,6 80:8	intrusion 44:8
69:9 80:23 111:6	19:17,25 20:10	instance 46:12	83:15 94:17 95:12	139:20 142:18
infinite 182:19	21:4,19 22:1,11	49:14 55:4 86:11	96:2,13 97:19	153:11,12 154:2
inflexible 90:24	23:2,16,24 28:16	110:5 125:13	98:18 99:4 104:6	171:14
inflict 60:2 109:11	29:2,4 36:11,25	171:25	104:12,20,22	intrusive 138:19
influence 39:24	36:25 37:2 38:9	instances 81:3	104.12,20,22	invaded 196:8
inform 74:1 87:11	38:19,22 39:17,21	105:1,13 165:9	117:20 123:25	investigate 65:7,15
88:11 91:8 141:17	39:22 41:20 42:5	instantly 115:15	125:15 130:13	84:22 96:24 97:22
146:4 158:9	47:10,19 48:19	institution 11:18	134:24 138:20	investigated 65:16
informants 37:21	50:16 55:3,10	183:20 190:16	140:13,21,23	67:23 200:17
39:4	63:11 65:6 67:21	instruct 110:16	140.13,21,23	investigating
information 17:6	72:10 73:8,11	113:7	154:5 160:17	189:14 200:2
21:25 28:15,25	74:11,15 75:2,20	instruction 136:25	179:5 188:22	investigation 22:14
29:2 37:21 38:25	77:5,7,9,12 78:8	instruction 130.23	interested 174:22	investigations
39:6,12,20 40:9	82:1,18 87:15	70:12 115:10	174:23	159:16
40:12,14 42:9,11	95:21 96:22 97:3	117:23 118:2	interesting 193:10	investigative 189:8
42:14,17 50:10	97:25 102:13	127:5 136:17	interests 26:7 27:24	invite 54:2 150:8
54:22 60:25 63:15	103:22 106:25	145:14,16 146:4	32:1,17 33:8 34:8	150:25 186:9
69:17 70:19 74:9	110:13 111:3	156:19 178:10	35:20 58:25 99:20	invited 39:6
74:19 77:2,6,16	113:2 114:18,22	instrumental 93:5	99:22 100:21	invites 78:24 170:8
80:24 84:5 99:12	115.2 114.16,22	102:12 103:13,20	103:13 104:8,14	inviting 183:2
	125:24 128:1	138:6 157:23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	involve 27:1 42:24
102:9,12,14 107:12 119:19	132:9 137:18	159:3 175:9	109:19 113:11,12 114:5,6 116:23	80:21 158:13
			· ·	
122:18 124:2 130:25 134:11,14	138:23 142:6 144:15 145:10	insufficient 125:10 138:20	125:24 147:23 155:8,22 172:7	involved 46:10 60:13 69:8 123:14
,	151:25 153:22		,	131:14 198:7
138:22 139:24 140:15 144:16	151:25 153:22	insulting 194:8 195:25 196:6	177:6 187:19	
	· /		190:1,5	involvement
150:11 164:20,24	163:9,23 167:5 170:8 172:6	197:17	interfere 108:6 167:17	124:24 129:17 involves 161:14
166:8 198:1		integrity 15:23		
200:14	181:11 183:12,20	intelligence 36:3	interfered 60:5	involving 31:21
informed 69:18	184:25 187:3	37:20 162:20	interference 43:13	irrational 125:2,4,8
122:21	188:13 189:4,12	165:2 189:25	43:22 44:5,12 59:3 71:3 92:24	127:12
informing 46:7	189:14,18 198:19	200:3	39.3 /1.3 92.24	irrelevant 122:11
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

irrosportivo 76:15	July 107:5	87:9,10,14,23	181:2,4,5,9,13	92:1,5,5 94:4
irrespective 76:15	· ·			
issue 5:2 19:15	jurisdiction 6:15	88:4,7 89:15 90:3	192:20 201:15	99:11,19 100:10
24:23 27:11 40:23	6:16,22	90:12 91:2,12,19	Kaufmann's 18:23	102:14 103:5,7
44:11 45:3 49:10	jurisdictions 39:3	91:23 92:13,15,16	34:6 150:17 158:8	105:11 108:21,24
49:12,23 50:19	justice 45:15 46:7	92:18,20,23 93:3	167:20 186:2	108:25 112:14,19
65:10,12 69:1,7	46:11 70:5 162:16	101:1,10,11,25	keen 11:11	113:7,7 115:17,25
69:16 72:15,20	165:17,20 187:12	102:18 103:4	keep 6:11 17:22	116:19 119:15,16
74:6 75:1 76:20	justifiable 71:12	104:1,12 105:7,17	34:14 35:17 38:9	119:18 120:16
79:6 82:25 86:23	justification 24:16	105:19,20,24	110:1 126:1 189:3	123:12,16 127:15
88:15 94:10 100:6	justified 25:18	106:2,8,23 107:21	kept 94:23 95:14	127:25 131:1
101:1 106:18	99:17	107:23 108:8,17	109:15,17,19,21	134:11 137:14,25
109:14 111:20	justifies 111:13	109:5,9,13 110:19	157:7 172:17	138:5 141:11
112:14 113:15	justify 20:9 24:11	111:18 112:10,13	173:7 200:23	145:11 146:5,24
117:21 138:24	26:21 58:18	112:14,18 113:6	key 19:17 30:20	147:25,25 149:8,9
147:4 149:8,9	justly 162:10	113:19 115:10,12	65:5,14 189:19	150:12,22 153:5
155:15,19 165:23		115:16 116:6,22	194:2 199:15	154:9,10 155:1
185:21,24 187:13	K	117:22 118:2,5,11	200:12	157:1 161:15
192:7 200:12	Karachi 120:24	118:13,15,16,20	Keynes 38:20	164:9 165:6
issued 150:14,22	Karachi's 121:4	119:4,17 120:10	Keynes's 38:12,15	166:13 172:23
192:5	Kaufmann 1:11,16	120:14,21 121:13	kind 14:23 26:20	177:21 179:17,20
issues 23:23 37:3	1:18 2:1,4,8,11,15	121:17 122:1,3,14	31:19 42:15 44:8	179:22 180:11,22
44:4 50:7 53:14	2:20 3:1,6,10,16	124:1,22 126:1,11	44:12,25 46:2	181:23 185:13,17
77:13 86:7 106:24	3:21,23 4:3,7,11	126:18,22 136:14	57:17 71:7 82:1	186:7 187:12
108:18,23 128:1	4:20 6:14 9:8	136:19,24 137:1,3	108:1,10	189:15 194:9,12
141:12	11:23 13:11 19:16	137:5,13,17,20,23	Kingdom 155:12	195:23 196:3,6,10
	20:8,13 22:13	137:24 138:13	knew 20:19 195:2	196:13,15,22
J	25:16,19 26:3,18	139:14 140:13	knock-out 95:5	197:10,15,20,21
Jaipur 120:24	27:21 29:17 32:5	141:5,21 142:2,24	knocking 81:20	200:7,9
121:4	36:15 38:5 39:23	144:2,3,5,17,21	know 5:19 6:6	knowing 21:5 80:3
January 151:18	41:18,20 42:1,25	145:4,12,14,19,22	10:19 12:22 14:22	knowledge 59:25
152:5	43:2,3,5,10,17	145:25 146:3,17	18:15 39:15 43:17	78:18 190:22
jeopardised 188:11	45:11,25 46:5,9	148:1,7 150:7,21	44:10 48:3,4	known 11:4 20:13
job 53:21 55:3 68:3	46:21 47:9,14	151:6,16 152:17	51:10,10,12,14,15	20:15 21:11 23:9
136:1 164:14	48:12,15 49:3	152:20,21,23	53:9,10 55:18	23:21 24:3,7 47:3
jobs 170:10	50:24 51:13,25	154:18,20 156:1	57:3 58:1 60:11	69:21,22 77:16
John 195:1,3	52:8,11,19,23	157:23 162:21	60:13,14,16,18	94:4 99:12 101:7
196:17,21 197:24	53:6 54:8,13 55:8	167:8,10 168:7	63:18,18 66:12,22	101:7,11 103:6
joint 49:9 65:13	56:4 58:7,8 59:18	169:6,10,13,24	66:24 67:10,12	107:14 112:20
jolly 187:14	59:22 60:3 61:2,5	170:22 171:3,7,10	69:19 70:23 71:2	119:22 144:6,14
journalist's 40:4	62:3,10,12 63:4	170.22 171.3,7,10	71:3,6,9,22 73:10	159:20 174:24
judge 188:14	63:21 64:17,18,22		' ' '	
Judged 173:13	65:2,19 66:2,4,8	174:16,23 175:1,3	74:10 75:17,17	177:24,25 180:13
judgment 103:25	66:16,19 67:7,10	175:4,6 176:10	79:16 81:9 84:20	188:7 189:13,21
131:25,25 179:22	68:25 69:7 70:1	177:10,11 178:1	84:24 85:16 86:17	knows 38:13,16
judicial 30:2 192:2	70:15 79:12 87:4	178:20,23,24	86:24 87:18,21	72:22 76:17 77:6
Junicial 30.4 194.4	10.13 17.14 01.4	179:24 180:2,15	88:7,24 90:16	77:12,13 84:11,12

	<u> </u>		1	1
84:17 85:4 125:14	leads 22:25 43:14	139:20 144:7	lives 35:7 36:8	139:25
127:15,19,20	184:11	153:12 156:13,18	154:11,11 170:17	lot 15:12 76:18
129:24 131:14	learn 140:25	156:23 157:8	174:4	77:6 190:7 192:2
133:23 180:19	learned 86:2 118:5	169:17 170:4	living 35:16 139:7	194:6 198:22
	165:4 185:7	171:13,23 173:22	141:9 143:14	lots 47:15
L	learnt 38:5	177:2 196:8	171:13	Louise 4:14 183:6
lacking 91:23,24	leave 114:23	197:16	local 168:14	183:11 184:10
laconic 108:13	181:21 186:16	life-changing 34:23	locations 139:9	love 197:6
128:23	leaves 50:9 114:18	lifelong 11:14	long 18:25 19:10	low 70:21 84:9 85:1
lady 95:13 142:21	122:19	light 13:9 45:11,13	34:25 35:3,13	85:10 87:24 91:6
143:2	led 15:4 30:25	46:9 66:25 69:17	59:13 101:13	91:10 92:24 107:3
laid 175:21	46:11 49:4 199:19	74:15,20 80:13	117:25 158:20	144:8
Lambert 44:9,13	left 60:21 75:9	86:24 100:1	168:22 174:17,17	lowest 85:1,6
46:2 49:20 67:12	122:15 143:2	102:12 111:18	184:13 196:24	luck 36:20,20
71:8,11 108:1,2	171:1 177:3 186:8	116:13 119:20	long-term 189:17	188:16
Lambert's 65:8	186:14	124:1 139:17,25	198:5	luckiest 138:10
67:12 128:14	legal 178:14 183:12	140:2,15 149:10	long-winded	3.5
language 84:19	legally 118:10	151:2 179:18	196:24	<u>M</u>
large 69:13 84:1	legitimate 81:23	184:25	longer 118:7,9	mainspring 121:16
107:2 140:9	125:24 163:7	likelihood 154:1	look 12:25 13:11,17	135:10
Lastly 14:20	length 15:2	166:5,7	26:25 34:6 54:18	maintain 34:25
late 25:9 37:8 155:5	lesser 170:7	likewise 18:17 59:9	55:11 73:9 88:13	94:8 109:15
157:7	let's 41:17 47:22	100:3	98:9 101:19 102:8	111:17,22
law 13:16 39:3 78:6	101:11 145:23	limb 170:4	107:5 125:17	maintained 38:24
155:17	146:22 147:15	limitations 109:13	147:16 155:15	118:22
lawful 163:25	152:5 171:4	limited 6:9 10:23	157:25 170:14	major 50:23 97:1
164:16,17 168:12	letter 17:3,4 143:5	11:21 22:10 37:15	176:24 182:21	majority 76:3
169:9	182:5,10,20	43:25 96:4 120:22	looked 66:9 69:17	making 4:22 7:16
Lawrence 70:4	letters 194:19	134:11,14 168:25	100:22 106:24	33:17 53:6,14,23
80:22 111:5 119:5	196:24,25	172:3	191:18	57:10 63:18 86:6
123:15 124:24	level 26:21 129:17	limits 30:14 121:1	looking 27:17,17	120:18 131:1,3
128:12,18 133:6	159:21 160:7	line 41:14 98:2	28:8 67:14 72:16	135:4 147:20
189:18 199:17	192:19,20	189:3	128:1 130:15	151:19
Lawrence's 130:1	levels 180:18	lines 58:24 143:6	158:8 163:4	man 52:17 168:2
Lawrences 80:25	liable 37:4 46:12	linking 20:16	187:11	195:2,3,17 196:17
129:20	liars 194:16,20	list 5:6,7,8 41:12	looks 73:4 125:9	manage 115:8
lawyers 1:9 5:20	195:22	162:14	143:4 172:17	managed 80:3
25:13 194:4 199:6	lie 194:22	litigation 13:3,8	180:3	144:8 193:19
lead 31:16 44:8,12	lies 15:21 73:5	14:5 16:7 22:8	Lord 38:20	management 23:9
51:18,20 52:5	130:14 191:3	95:3 174:2	lose 52:14,20 55:15	23:21 83:25 89:2
53:20 102:2	194:14 198:3	little 19:21 123:5	134:1 156:2	90:6 116:24
122:23 124:8	life 34:12,12 35:16	147:4,24 182:4	losing 136:9	manager 8:17
138:4 156:6	43:14 92:25 96:25	live 35:22 157:8	loss 51:6,8,20 53:21	65:14,24 66:5,6
163:23 175:19	97:18 102:23	lived 36:8 156:18	179:13	80:13,21 89:12,23
leading 49:6 139:20	106:14 108:7	livelihoods 170:10	lost 5:3 53:13	90:20 97:16 98:5

r				raye 219
98:9 99:4 100:1	110:12 113:21	169:5 172:23	meticulously 81:19	115:22 117:12
104:18 108:2	116:18 118:1	190:25	Metropolitan 1:9	118:17 119:23
140:14 149:23,25	155:4 161:24	meant 160:22	1:13,20 2:6,13,17	121:11 123:8,11
166:12	163:5 182:7,7	172:25	2:24 3:3,8,14,18	124:19 128:25
manager's 104:18	183:7 189:17	measure 45:16	6:19 11:17 12:18	129:16 133:11
managerial 67:11	193:4	109:3	13:4 14:24 16:8	134:3 135:4,13
67:15,22 68:11	matters 32:8 37:12	measures 133:22	16:16,25 17:5,10	138:8 150:14,22
72:6,9 73:7 77:17	59:1 65:6 78:7	152:12	17:15 24:4 25:12	151:8 178:24
81:8,18 88:14	122:11 131:24	mechanism 102:21	30:16 56:16,18	181:20 187:18
90:4,9,15,21	133:23 144:12,19	103:4,5	58:8 64:3 71:24	188:19 192:5,8
97:11 102:23	192:13 193:9	media 4:24 10:9	76:21 82:18 83:8	193:7
140:17 141:20	matures 59:23	40:10,13 42:12,22	85:9 94:1,14	mine 172:15 186:6
142:8 165:24	Maynard 38:12,15	153:6,11 168:14	95:10 96:6 98:5	186:14
166:4	McLaren 17:16	medical 50:7,14,17	100:22 107:7	minimal 138:19
managers 7:6,8,23	Meade 4:15 183:6	110:9 123:11,23	110:23 111:1,7,8	minimis 161:24
7:24 8:6 98:3,3,4	183:11 184:10	126:8 127:7,8,10	110.23 111.1,7,8	minimum 143:8
100:9 105:5	186:12	120.8 127.7,8,10	116:2,11,19 134:9	minor 93:17
168:24	mean 5:24 15:10	medium 58:13,13	141:24 148:9	minor 93:17 minutes 15:18 42:9
manages 184:11	29:17 30:20 31:25	70:22,24 107:8,9	156:19 160:4,23	mirrors 96:19
manages 184.11 manifested 108:1	40:5,16 45:7	171:17	162:8 172:13	
	47:15 50:11 51:9	meet 5:22 45:20		miscarriage 46:11 162:16
manipulation 197:3			176:21 178:13,25	
	73:20,22 76:13	meeting 65:9 137:5	183:17 185:7	miscarriages 49:7
manner 192:8	87:3 98:6 100:15	meetings 158:18,23	187:1	misconduct 21:24
mapped 152:11	132:8,10,12	member 76:9 105:9	MI5 39:20	36:13 93:19
March 10:4,22	136:10 143:4	members 74:23	middle 115:18	157:15
120:23	151:21 162:13	112:24 114:7,13	168:2	misconstrued
mark 121:18 193:5	173:18 179:24	memorandum	miles 164:5 188:4	29:17
marker 181:5	187:2 191:18	12:22	million 164:5	misread 185:10
191:21	192:13 194:21	memories 175:15	mind 14:1 25:23	misreading 30:24
marriage 113:10	196:14,14 199:24	memory 141:13	31:2 34:14 36:24	missed 127:4
massive 198:21,23	meaning 6:15	mental 106:13	59:6 63:25 65:16	missing 196:3
material 27:12	162:19	108:6 109:12,25	65:19 72:5 73:8	mission 164:8
32:11,22 55:11	meaningful 48:4	110:6 111:20	82:21,22,23 92:2	mistake 27:20
86:16 88:1 151:9	50:12 51:16 53:7	135:18 198:22,24	133:19,21 157:14	91:20
151:10 152:5	53:21 60:22 70:19	199:1	182:21 187:9	mistakes 91:21
167:23 182:17	91:24 122:18,20	mention 13:2 82:17	194:17	misunderstanding
196:7	130:17 171:20	127:6 189:6	minded 16:3 25:2	128:23
materialised 141:8	181:17,18	mentioned 194:25	43:5,6,7,11,19	mitigated 108:24
matter 16:11 27:19	meaninglessness	198:1 199:8	51:24 54:6 55:25	mix 33:13
27:19 33:9 38:22	173:5	mere 45:25	58:20 62:13 64:18	modern 101:25
40:13 46:4 62:17	means 8:8 16:14	merely 48:8 73:16	64:19 65:20 72:3	modifications
71:21 72:17 75:3	20:16 39:17 42:12	82:17 104:9	81:11 86:5,22	79:22
84:4 89:3 90:10	42:17 101:17	162:23	91:14 92:25 94:5	moment 7:17 12:3
93:10 96:15 99:3	104:15 114:17	merits 191:9	106:4,8,22 109:8	16:2 26:16 63:21
102:18,19 103:24	162:11 167:12	methodical 201:7	109:16 113:8	69:4,19 71:14

86:23 90:16	54:7,9,14,16,20	154:16 155:1	132:24 134:12	Neri 112:14,23
101:23 102:15	55:25 56:1,23,23	157:17 158:18	139:2	113:12 116:1
103:1 125:23	57:5,7 58:10,12	159:4 161:5 163:1	near 39:8 188:17	Neri's 112:15
126:18 133:19	58:15,17,19,23	163:24 164:2	nearer 190:9	never 11:14 14:10
140:1 145:23	62:24 65:20,21	165:22 166:7,19	necessarily 24:15	57:24,24 74:9
153:3 169:11	66:3,19 67:17,22	166:20 169:21	45:9 89:19 118:22	77:2 89:8 97:3
182:21 185:24	67:25 68:1,2,2,3,5	171:23 172:2,19	125:21 132:14	104:15 105:14
188:3,24 189:14	68:11,16,16,20,23	175:8,13,14,14,15	162:22 164:24	111:9 132:18,18
191:11 193:15	68:24 71:16,16	175:18,24 177:22	169:8	new 14:7 61:11
195:8 200:22	72:7 73:16 76:10	177:24 178:15,24	necessary 6:8 20:3	148:12 151:4
moments 15:20	76:23 77:19 78:19	179:1,3,8,11,15	20:11 32:14,17,24	nice 155:10
money 198:11	78:20 79:17,20	180:21	33:2 43:12 58:22	nil 114:14
months 57:7 155:4	80:18,20 81:5,17	named 104:21	65:24 76:13 84:22	nobody's 10:11
moot 63:9 155:10	81:20,21,24,25	names 5:22 6:2,4	106:16 115:19	non-disclosure
moral 6:6 135:24	82:25 83:6,15	10:17 18:23 19:16	120:19 152:11	32:13,23 45:5
146:13 149:8	84:8,14 85:3,11	19:17,24,25 20:3	158:5 183:14	56:1 62:24
morning 6:4 83:12	85:13,18 87:19	20:5,9,20 21:6,11	necessity 57:18	non-factors 29:19
95:1 171:1	88:17,20 89:4,6	21:14 24:13 44:23	58:25 106:10	non-intimate 46:23
mosaic 124:10	89:18,20,22,23	48:20 49:22 64:20	109:21	non-police 1:11,15
197:23,23	90:19 91:6,7,9	76:14 77:1 81:12	need 7:22 9:9 10:17	1:18 2:1,3,8,10,15
motivation 195:4	92:7 93:1,3,5,22	83:5 87:16 92:21	21:22 41:15 54:17	2:19 3:1,5,10,16
motive 140:11	94:4,5,8,9 96:23	93:8,12 96:20	60:24 69:8 93:11	3:20,23 4:2,6,11
move 15:20 41:13	99:6,11 101:6,7	98:14 104:16,23	98:9,22 111:3	19:21 20:2 43:1
44:4 181:9	101:11,13,16,17	105:14 116:21	117:22 121:7,21	58:6 64:16 87:8
moved 67:11	101:24 102:2,10	130:9 160:14	122:10,11 123:18	92:14 101:9
movement 198:8	102:22,25 103:6	163:8,21 167:11	143:5 145:16	105:18 112:12
moves 8:16	103:16 104:6,18	167:14 168:20,22	148:21 149:4	118:14 137:22
moving 61:7,11	105:3 106:5,5,10	170:1 175:11,12	151:9,20 160:21	144:1 152:19
62:4 87:15 152:12	106:19,20,22	199:9 200:5,20	161:11 170:20	171:9 174:14
multiple 21:20	109:5,7,15,17	201:6	172:22 189:12	175:2 177:9
mutual 13:21,22,24	111:8,14,17,23	narrow 5:2 27:17	191:3 200:1	178:22 181:3
35:25	112:3,11,15,15,18	146:9 169:22	needed 58:16	non-state 1:11,15
	112:19 113:17,18	national 186:10	176:15	1:18 2:1,3,8,10,15
N	113:24 114:16,23	188:22	Needless 93:18	2:19 3:1,5,10,16
N 1:2	115:5 117:11,13	natural 49:16	needs 5:22 25:22	3:20,23 4:2,6,11
N123 73:18 127:6	118:18,18 122:24	163:20 167:18	74:15 93:4 99:11	19:20,23 20:2
127:15	122:25 123:3,3	169:17	104:18 115:14	43:1 58:6 63:14
N343 183:3	124:5,7,8,9,10	naturally 174:6	127:22 155:23	64:16 78:23 87:8
name 6:7 20:13,15	125:1,4,11 129:21	nature 12:15 14:23	161:4 176:24	92:14 96:21 101:9
20:15,19 41:12	130:6,14 131:7,12	15:13,14 44:1	190:24	105:18 110:12
43:8,8,11,15,18	137:25 138:3,7	48:13,17 52:4	negligible 113:13	112:12 118:14
43:20,21 45:5	139:19 142:11	53:9,16,19 54:23	neighbours 168:15	137:22 144:1
49:18 50:5 51:23	144:14,23 145:6	55:14,18 56:2	170:10 173:23	152:19 171:9
51:25 52:1,7,13	146:9 147:14	59:3 71:3 92:4	neither 26:12 62:6	174:14 175:2
52:13,25 53:1	149:7,10 154:13	107:24 123:11	118:9,17 176:10	177:9 178:22

181:3 194:4	obligations 26:1	158:19 162:25	160:9,11,19,20	150:12 160:23,25
non-states 160:13	27:9 30:19 31:22	165:10	161:10 162:2,3	161:2,19 162:11
nonthreatening	32:7 33:6,19	occurs 142:23	164:11,14 165:1	165:25 169:20
48:3	35:24 40:1,3,16	October 16:12 43:6	165:18 166:2,21	173:3 180:22
nonviolent 48:3	oblique 171:5	51:2 58:21 128:8	166:22 168:4	181:10,15 183:22
normatively 156:10	obliquely 113:9	152:7	170:14 172:4	184:17 186:25
note 17:2 20:6	observation 64:13	offchance 97:5	173:2 175:7,23,25	189:21 192:11
37:23 43:5,6	observation 04.13	177:5	176:16 177:19,25	194:15
58:20 82:8 83:13	106:17	offence 115:23	178:2 180:12,13	officers' 21:22
91:15 106:8 113:9	observe 157:13	offer 50:18	180:17 181:6	198:22
115:22 121:12	185:10	offered 11:5 12:7	182:6 188:9	official 115:1,2
129:16 134:25	observed 191:5	officer 6:5 8:17	190:15,23	officially 114:19,22
135:4,14 150:14	obstacle 119:2	12:10 13:6 14:25	officer's 13:15 19:4	okay 70:13 71:21
150:22 151:8	obtain 126:19	20:16 24:14 29:24	22:5 24:10 31:11	104:9 157:9
179:21 182:1				
noted 18:6 96:3	131:8 132:14	30:1,2 44:14,19	44:3 49:3,6 52:11 53:13,17 57:15	160:10 197:11 old 93:7 138:25
	obtaining 101:23	44:22 45:2,12,14 45:19 46:1,10,25	,	142:23 143:9
165:15	126:20 131:10	, ,	63:11,15 73:18	168:4 172:1 191:2
notes 192:6	obvious 20:21	48:11,24 53:12,15	77:17 93:21 107:4	once 44:22 47:3
notion 161:4,18	85:25 87:1 89:10	53:16 55:13 56:7	111:2 119:10,13 124:23,24 125:2	
190:25	112:7 131:17,19	56:9,15,20 57:3,3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	108:14 112:11
Notwithstanding	169:3	57:15,19 58:8	138:1 169:17	150:6
85:12	obviously 8:8 15:21	60:13 61:18,25	171:11,19,23	one's 168:14
November 1:1	17:20 25:22 28:17	62:2 63:20 65:5,5	177:21 179:12	one-off 39:14
182:6,10	31:9 34:2 38:7	65:14 66:6,8,13	officers 1:6 7:3,6,7	ones 125:5 151:15
nugget 99:12	43:18,19 49:10	66:22,22 67:10,13	7:16,19,21,22	151:16,18 169:3
number 22:19	50:11,15 51:4	72:6,17 73:13	8:20,25 9:24	oneself 108:2
69:13 72:4 78:12	60:7 67:14 72:15	75:25 77:21 78:15	11:19 12:10,14,19	onwards 37:1
84:2 99:7 108:9	79:21 84:17 90:10	80:1 82:12 83:21	13:4,5,19 14:7	183:25
135:5	92:20 97:14,20	84:21 85:17 89:11	17:11,15,23 18:14	open 5:2 56:12
numbers 140:9	111:4 133:16	89:21,22 90:5,6,7	18:18 19:1 20:20	79:20 104:3 109:3
Numerical 41:22	140:16 144:12	92:18 93:4,6,18	20:25 21:10 22:15	118:11 124:20
numerous 83:11	148:15,21 150:24	96:23 97:6,24	22:21 23:1,5 24:6	148:23 176:13
194:6	151:8 153:20	98:6 99:2 100:2	26:1,6,14 27:16	179:21 182:1,24
nuts 72:20	154:25 160:18	101:4,14 106:24	29:1,7,20 30:7,10	191:2 193:1
0	161:13 162:17	107:2 110:20	31:3,6 33:8,9	opening 1:4 4:19
O'Connor 41:6,7	171:20 173:19	113:22 118:4,16	34:15 35:8 36:14	83:13
objected 152:1	174:16 181:9,13	118:20 119:4,9,12	37:13,16,20 48:20	openly 82:22
objection 42:19	182:15 191:25	122:22 123:3	49:7,12 63:20	openness 25:20,20
186:9	192:14 194:2	124:4 126:13,16	66:10 67:2 72:9	26:7 32:1 33:15
objective 122:4,6	occasion 11:6	130:11 135:20	72:12 75:5 76:15	93:11 94:13 96:17
objective 122.4,0	occupied 10:12	137:24 138:1,4	77:14 78:25 79:24	97:9 103:13,14
48:8 125:9	occupy 25:11	140:3,14 142:4,7	80:11 81:9 82:11	104:5,14,22
obligation 30:13	occur 77:21 99:23	143:14 144:5,10	83:11,25 86:13	105:11 143:1
33:23 59:24	occurred 21:9,16	152:23 154:21	87:16 97:21,22	147:7 154:5
33.43 37.44	77:20 149:13	156:2,9 159:10	141:9 149:19	166:24 167:6

				1 490 222
174:10 191:13	organisation 23:20	page 17:8 20:7 28:6	2:15,20 3:1,6,10	113:14 120:3,13
operating 129:16	165:3	28:11 58:11 78:1	3:16,21,23 4:3,7	123:13,20 125:18
187:4	original 65:11	106:2 144:9	4:11 19:21 20:2	parts 189:4
Operations 140:12	86:21 91:14	160:16	21:10 43:2 58:7	party 174:2
140:24 141:10	129:11	pages 107:8 183:25	64:17 78:24 87:9	passage 30:24
158:20 161:8	originally 64:1	184:13	92:15 96:22	77:24
operatives 12:6	191:6	pain 49:16	101:10 105:19	patently 10:13
opinion 50:6	ought 14:6 18:24	paragraph 9:13,15	110:12 112:13	patience 11:8
123:23	19:19 59:6 169:21	9:19 10:6 12:4,8	118:15 132:15	pattern 184:22
opportunity 4:22	19.19 39.0 109.21	12:16 14:9 16:12	133:17 137:23	pause 145:23,24
7:15 9:21 66:20	outcome 98:21	17:9 28:7,13,20	144:2 152:20	pausing 94:25
71:19 72:19 73:25		· · · · ·		1 0
	116:15 164:19,22	32:19 43:10 44:4	155:6 169:13	pay 97:1
75:4 86:5,15	outcomes 89:12	44:6 49:17,24	171:10 174:15,18	payments 39:14
112:22 115:21	90:25	51:1 58:24 64:20	174:25 175:3	Payter 5:5
117:14 136:25	outdated 120:22	65:3 95:6,22,24	177:10 178:23	peace 142:22 143:2
150:3 163:10	121:2	95:25 96:1,3	181:4 194:4	people 25:10 40:9
184:20	outlined 55:2	109:4 121:12	199:11	57:25 66:20 74:13
opposed 11:18	169:23	127:7 129:12	participated 19:7	75:14 102:19
14:17 16:9 80:11	outside 21:16,24	143:5 171:16	participatory	103:6 118:23
93:3	22:4 24:6 158:2	175:23 177:14	61:20	129:4,5 139:7
opposing 127:25	159:7,11	184:1 195:1,12	particular 9:15	140:6,7,10 147:6
opposite 119:16	outstanding 136:17	196:1 197:24	25:18 26:2 30:6	147:20 156:22,25
167:14	outweigh 97:9	198:5	34:18,19 39:17	157:10 160:17,22
opprobrium 45:16	104:7,21 105:10	paragraphs 33:18	44:14 45:1 48:24	161:5,11 163:10
46:13	114:6 174:9	58:20 65:4 106:9	53:11,11 55:13	163:11,20 168:15
option 30:17	outweighing 96:16	107:16 119:6,7	56:7 59:2,4 60:18	169:14 174:21
oral 27:8 86:17	104:13	183:25 196:2	61:15 63:10 66:22	186:24 188:7
132:15	outweighs 97:18	parent-in-law	67:1,2 77:14,15	200:7
orally 5:20	overall 5:18 97:25	143:8	82:12 91:1 93:6	perceived 185:22
order 5:3 18:10	overarching 8:20	parents 172:19	96:8,14 97:24	perfect 74:11
26:22 30:15 31:19	overlooked 136:2	part 12:8,13 23:3	102:3 104:12	100:16
41:20,22 42:6	160:2	27:21 28:2 32:6	110:20 111:4	perfectly 81:22
53:21 58:9,16	overnight 145:18	35:4 42:23 52:2	115:8 124:3	performance
64:1,15 67:17	193:21	59:11 105:9,21	134:21 140:3	164:14
71:21 75:11 78:15	overpromoted	113:13,15 123:24	142:4 154:21	performed 179:4
90:14 92:7 113:2	158:1	135:18 138:2	161:16 166:21	183:2
117:13 128:25	override 103:19	142:6 158:12	171:23 172:4	period 8:5 14:3
130:17 132:25	overstate 11:12	159:18 162:25	174:10 175:23	21:24 22:4 35:1,4
133:10 150:25	overstatement	165:2,18 184:17	179:12 193:16	37:4,8 81:18
161:5	105:1 119:1	187:7 197:10	particularly 74:22	145:2 148:25
orders 23:22 44:7	owed 26:1	200:4	79:25 194:24	181:7,10
ordinarily 32:22		participant 118:8,9	parties 116:23	peripheral 32:8
80:17	P	132:16 134:15	partly 138:9 141:20	155:7
ordinary 48:13,17	package 27:23 33:7	participants 1:11	141:20	permissible 42:21
163:13 174:1	152:5	1:16,18 2:1,4,8,11	partner 106:15	permit 63:14 101:3
			-	_
	I	1	ı	ı

116:15 131:21	phase 129:4 152:13	117:7 132:23	20:12 85:25 108:9	position 7:8 9:14
166:24	phlegmatic 176:8	150:20 195:10	198:17 199:7	10:12,15 11:2,3
permitted 22:16	176:23,25 177:13	201:14	police 1:9,13,20 2:6	11:12 19:20,22
permitting 119:2	photograph 103:2	pleased 82:21	2:13,17,24 3:3,8	24:8 56:5 60:9,21
person 28:15 42:18	photographs	106:21	3:14,18 6:19 7:6,7	64:4,4 65:19
47:12 70:11 99:15	101:18,22 102:2	plus 103:14	8:16 11:17 12:18	67:11,15 70:11,24
101:12,18 124:16	photography 42:24	pm 92:9,10,12	13:4 14:24 16:8	71:18 72:24 79:16
162:2 163:1,13	phrase 115:21	136:21,23 201:20	16:16,25 17:5,11	82:20 83:19 84:3
164:3,23 166:9	physical 26:19 34:7	point 7:4 8:23 9:10	17:15,23 22:12	84:15,24 88:10,15
169:6 173:21	37:5 51:3 58:12	10:18 14:19,20	24:4 25:12 26:14	89:1 90:6 92:1
176:8 186:18	58:16 85:2 91:11	15:3 16:10,22,22	29:3,19 30:1,16	97:11,12,15 98:10
188:14	91:13 92:20 93:17	19:12,19 20:21,25	31:21 34:15 35:8	106:4 108:20
personal 9:20	96:5 107:3,6,19	22:25 23:17 24:1	37:19 45:25 46:25	109:16 112:16
11:19 15:4 26:21	108:16 119:24	27:7 29:17 33:4	56:16,18 58:9	114:18 115:13
46:22 47:11 64:23	120:6,8 121:8,22	37:15,15 43:20	64:3 71:24 76:21	116:19 118:21,24
72:16 78:3 91:17	171:15,17	50:13 53:6,14,23	79:24 82:18 83:9	119:15 122:19
94:16 95:17,19	picture 35:4 62:8	53:23 54:21 55:1	85:9 94:1,14	124:17 127:13
107:4 123:9	75:12 119:20	55:9 66:11 68:13	95:11 96:6 98:5	128:20 145:25
130:16,25 143:7	175:18	70:9 73:23 74:24	100:22 107:7	146:23 156:11
154:10 162:17	piece 76:1 102:20	74:25 76:4,25	110:23 111:1,7,9	166:12 179:6
165:18 171:11,12	pieces 77:2	79:23,24 80:10	114:2 115:24	180:14 186:17
175:6 177:12	PII 31:18	86:8 87:1 94:3	116:2,11,19 134:9	190:14,21 191:5
196:25	piste 149:19	96:18,19 99:1,3	141:24 148:9	201:3,9
personally 80:25	place 15:6 24:7	99:18 102:3,7,7	156:19 159:10	positions 70:3,8
113:12 194:4,7	25:11 42:7 101:13	104:24 114:4,14	160:4,24 162:8	84:1
199:9	139:15,23 145:7	117:4 119:14	172:5,13,22	positive 17:14
personnel 100:4,8	151:3 153:25	120:14 126:12	176:21 177:15	positively 167:6
100:17 131:14	154:1,3 160:15	128:6 134:18	178:13,25 183:17	posits 157:23
perspective 194:13	168:8,10,11	135:4,13 136:15	183:21 184:17	possibilities 72:4
194:13	174:17	136:17 146:18	185:7 187:2	136:12
persuade 86:10	placed 97:24	155:10,14 158:8	190:15,17 194:9	possibility 42:3
94:7 154:4	plain 16:19	158:10 159:15	198:18 200:22	46:21 57:18 77:19
persuaded 26:23	plainly 87:1	160:12 161:17,17	policeman 197:16	88:23 101:14
81:12 86:21 191:4	plausibility 149:4	163:8,8,11,17	policing 37:1 45:15	102:11 105:2
persuasively 125:6	150:4	165:14 169:25	66:21 70:7 77:10	126:20 169:1
Peter 1:5,22 2:22	plausible 147:5,17	172:15 173:20	159:9 183:19	175:17 188:11,20
4:9 5:13,15,20	148:24 149:6	185:9 189:4	184:9,11 186:10	199:8
6:10 7:24 9:14,25	play 30:22 35:14,20	193:16 198:3	187:10 188:23	possible 45:18 52:6
10:2 13:6,8 14:12	59:10 88:15	200:11	199:25	60:4 62:7 67:4
14:21 16:14,22,23	113:12,15 123:24	pointed 13:11	political 139:5,9	74:9 76:25 93:7
17:23 18:1 67:1	155:22 158:12	87:14	199:25 200:5,17	99:19 102:1
79:10,16 123:17	187:7	pointing 151:7	poor 164:10 165:1	125:14 129:5
127:3,15,20	played 128:17	162:23	197:16	137:11 141:7
128:11 129:14,23	please 12:24 28:11	points 5:16 10:4	ports 34:17	154:3 179:17
180:9	37:12 63:21 101:2	15:12 18:14 19:9	pose 70:23 179:6	182:12 184:19
	-	-	-	-

				rage 221
189:1	129:1,3,15 130:23	113:22 132:21	117:24 150:5	proposition 30:9
possibly 20:22	156:9	160:8 164:13	151:12 172:6	39:11 74:5 75:16
52:15 85:7 110:16	prepare 57:4	180:14	190:4 201:7	84:13 94:15 115:3
124:17 149:17,18	112:24 183:14	principled 83:5	processes 55:7	183:18 185:1,14
post 22:14 96:25	193:20 198:15	102:16 131:5	82:10 152:7	185:20 188:5
potential 48:25	prepared 56:1	principles 15:14	184:16	propositions 160:7
72:6 103:13,19	79:13 83:4 120:24	25:14 27:6 72:21	produced 11:17	propositions 100.7
106:11 119:9	155:14 185:9	89:14 90:24 95:24	144:15 196:7	prospect 22:7
162:14	present 77:16	print 91:18	professional	141:6,6,7
potentially 22:7	presented 152:4	prior 178:13	123:23 194:16,20	prospective 12:9
102:9 110:1	presents 154:18	prioritise 90:18	195:22	prospects 94:24
130:23	press 61:5,12	Priory 16:17,23	Professor 190:17	118:20
power 199:2	122:10 156:21	17:12,13,16,25	profile 35:19	protect 29:10 58:16
powerful 33:14	171:14 172:7	private 34:11 43:14	progress 22:16	protected 34:8
38:21 40:2 188:2	pressed 70:13	92:24 97:18	77:5	39:15 48:21
practical 6:11,23	pressing 46:14	106:14 108:7	progression 22:12	153:19 157:6
22:18 81:16	pressure 150:19	156:13,23	22:20	protection 12:6
practicality 102:17	presumably 120:23	privately 127:18	prominent 198:6	39:2 114:14
practice 95:8,9	presumption 53:3	188:24	promise 14:13	protective 133:22
149:13,20 166:14	93:12,15 94:13	probably 14:17	173:10,14	protects 125:23
166:15 168:22	96:17 97:9 98:2	15:5 116:25	promised 11:14	protest 139:10
practices 141:1,19	174:9	126:24 136:7	promises 13:21,22	protesters 49:13,18
145:2 161:9	pretending 125:15	145:1 146:15	14:16 39:8	153:12
practised 135:6	pretty 20:21 139:13	149:4 150:8	promote 83:16	prove 123:14,21
pre 96:25	151:11 169:18	163:25 185:22	194:9	provide 10:3,20
precautions 35:18	173:25 175:21	186:16 191:17,19	prompt 131:12	11:5 12:13 29:3
precede 147:22	177:6 188:1	problem 8:15 55:22	prompted 199:19	38:25 39:1,6,7,20
precisely 15:11	192:11	63:6,9 81:16	pronounce 50:4	40:9,12 63:15
33:1 39:9 103:4	prevailing 23:7	83:24 87:5 109:25	pronounced 121:19	78:9 129:14 146:5
176:24	prevent 187:4	121:6 142:23	proper 15:25 61:20	146:19,19 147:16
predisposition	previous 5:25 9:6,7	166:14	89:1 184:2 185:3	182:16
90:18	117:10 185:22	problematic 124:18	185:5	provided 17:14
prefer 18:12 19:11	previously 166:11	problems 110:2,3	properly 23:5 29:9	29:1 42:23 117:17
98:16 175:24	prices 97:1	121:3 127:11	44:17 56:3 81:2	148:3,4
176:4	primary 19:25	158:15 181:14	90:15 141:16	provides 38:1
preferable 69:11	principal 18:23	procedural 63:6,9	145:7 193:20	providing 39:12
preference 69:5,24	78:23	procedure 7:12	proportion 169:9	102:13
70:2 177:1,4	principle 5:11 21:3	63:13	proportionate	provision 28:17
preferred 18:15	24:12 57:21 73:20	proceed 131:6,6	168:11	provisional 67:5,7
prejudge 116:4	75:14 78:5 79:24	proceeding 25:23	proposal 22:18	79:2 117:15
premature 128:21	80:10 84:4 88:15	proceedings 31:11	65:22	125:21
128:21,22	89:3,9 93:10	31:16,17 42:23	propose 110:19	provisionally 81:11
premise 66:4	94:10 96:15 98:24	86:18 125:17	178:1 184:13	psychiatric 37:6
123:13,16,19,21	100:4,14,17	process 12:8 60:24	proposed 55:2	62:5,16 71:5
125:22 128:25	104:17,17 110:13	61:10 63:16 92:5	proposing 112:7	72:16 96:5 108:18
	•	•	•	•

108:19 110:11	154:16 201:5	126:20 129:11,20	44:17 76:17,25	read 24:22 27:21
120:2 121:23	published 52:7	135:25 139:15,23	81:21 93:7 98:23	108:13 120:17
122:17,23 123:4	89:21,22,24 105:4	148:16 150:15	100:7 102:1	143:5 177:1
124:12 125:7	121:12 146:9,25	151:21 153:2	106:21 109:11,24	183:16 194:8
psychiatric/psyc	147:11 154:14	154:16 162:14	116:9 119:1	196:11,17 197:12
26:20	178:16 179:23	163:14 164:2	125:10 130:4,21	197:17 198:14
psychiatrist 125:5	184:22	166:18 167:10,10	132:8 140:8	199:4
126:5	publishing 131:11	167:21 183:3	143:13,17 148:11	readily 48:13,17
psychiatrists	147:23 149:2	198:11,12 201:1	155:15 164:11	154:12 180:1
194:19	159:4 183:15,15	puts 12:20 32:5	167:14 168:4,25	reading 27:25
psychological	Pughsley 38:1	74:8 91:25 144:12	172:25 175:13	193:19
49:24 85:3,10	183:17 185:1	144:19	178:11 180:7	real 6:4 10:16
psychological/ps	186:11 194:25	putting 81:21 82:3	182:17 185:5	19:15,17,25 20:3
34:7	Pughsley's 183:23	82:15 105:7	190:7 194:8	20:5,9,15,19 21:5
public 5:25 14:11	pull 173:25 187:17	144:21 167:15	195:25 196:6	21:14 24:13,14
20:4 29:10 31:13	188:25	175:17 191:21		42:3 43:8,15,18
31:16 34:5 35:19	pulling 190:3		R	43:21 45:5 48:20
36:11 39:1,17,21	punch 188:2	Q	race 158:13	49:22 51:6,25
39:22 42:19 65:25	punches 187:18	QC 29:22	racism 165:16	52:1,7,12,13,25
73:4,6 76:9 77:18	188:25 190:3	qualification 31:24	racist 45:15 46:6	53:1 54:16 56:1
80:8 83:13,15	punching 187:22	qualified 13:13	159:5,14 162:16	56:23 57:2,7,19
84:13,22,22 94:17	punchline 163:6	29:24 30:19 31:5	raise 51:18 84:2	58:10,15,19 62:1
95:11 96:2,13,24	purely 125:9	31:23,24 33:11	94:10	62:17,24 64:19
97:18 98:14,18	purpose 12:13 30:8	40:4,5 57:20	raised 15:9 16:11	65:20 66:3 67:22
99:4 103:22 104:7	47:7 52:6 138:6	qualitatively	16:15,21,22	68:2,3,9,11,16,24
107:2 108:4 115:5	143:3 151:19	156:10	raises 138:24	71:16 72:7 76:22
123:25 125:12	175:9 187:3	querying 102:21	148:11	77:19 78:20 79:17
130:13 134:24	192:25	question 35:24	ramifications	80:8,20 81:11,20
147:25 149:1	purposes 47:10	37:16 48:1 51:18	12:15 157:5	81:25 85:13 89:18
158:22 160:17	84:23 102:13	54:15 66:16 72:8	range 20:1	89:21,23 90:19
172:5 174:25	139:7 156:24	85:14 90:22,23	rarely 166:15	92:21 93:1,5,12
183:20 185:6	pursuit 32:14,24	94:16 104:9	rate 19:6 81:13	94:9 96:23 97:19
188:22 198:11	pushing 191:2	111:25 113:3,5,6	100:9 166:15	98:14 99:6,11
200:9,21	192:25	121:20 139:15	rational 127:12	101:3,8,17,24
publication 20:18	put 8:24 13:15	141:17,20 146:8	rationally 124:5	102:10,22 104:16
42:11,16,20 91:15	15:24 25:17 26:15	146:16 154:8	reach 55:11 67:4	104:23 105:3,14
102:22,24 156:3,5	31:1 33:12,16	159:21 160:6	73:15,18 145:11	106:5,19 107:8
158:7	41:7,14 52:11	176:2,7 193:5	reached 11:2 55:19	109:7,14,17
publicity 36:21	53:17 54:5,8 69:5	200:9	59:18 117:15	111:17,23 112:15
publicly 13:9 16:22	69:20 70:11,21,22	questions 23:11	136:14	112:15,18,19
42:4 66:1 74:2	71:5 84:18 86:16	27:12 61:7 68:8	reaching 61:21	113:17,24 114:16
80:20 86:23 97:15	90:3 96:23 98:14	84:2 110:4 111:3	121:11	114:22 117:11,13
114:21 133:21	99:14 103:11	116:2	reaction 47:3 49:16	118:18 122:25
135:4 183:8 189:1	104:7 108:9,11	quiet 171:13	49:20 64:24 71:4 71:10	124:9 130:14
publish 147:17	122:1 125:16	quite 21:2 23:17	/1.10	138:3,7 142:11

144:23 145:6 146:6 131:3 139:18 149:14 149:89 153:7 167:18 169:4 160:14 161:5 167:18 169:2 163:1,721.24 149:2 195:19 188:6 188:17 199:19 188:6 188:17 199:19 188:6 188:17 199:19 188:6 189:2 170:1,18 171:23 170:14 107:10 170:8 175:14,15,18,24 177:2 178:15,24 177:2 178:15,24 179:1 199:2 43:7 44:15 49:21 179:1 199:2 43:7 44:15 49:21 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 171:22 170:1,18 170:1,27 170:1,18 170:1,27 170:1,18 170:1,27 170:1,18 170:1,27 170:1,18 170:1,27 170:1,18 170:1,27 170:1,27					raye 220
149:89 149:143 163:7, 21 167:13 169:44 160:14 161:5 163:1, 7, 21, 24 160:14 161:5 163:1, 7, 21, 24 160:14 161:5 163:1, 7, 21, 24 160:14 161:5 164:21 166:7, 19, 20 166:22 160:22 170:1, 18 176:8 176:8 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18 176:8 170:1, 18	144.23 145.6	116.6 131.3	records 100:9 17	reinforcing 12:17	128-17 129-19
149.8,9 153:7			-		
166:3 159:4 167:18 169:4 179:19 189:19 179:11 179:19 189:19 179:11 191:10 179:11 179:19 189:19 188:23 16:10 179:15 130:3 16:10 199:15 130:3 16:10 199:15 16:40:10 130:3 130:3 16:10 190:19 179:10 179:14 130:3 130:3 16:10 179:14 130:3 130:3 16:10 179:14 130:3 130:3 16:10 179:14 130:3 130:3 16:10 179:14 130:3 130:3 16:10 179:14 130:3 130:3 16:10 130:3 130:3 16:10 130:3 130:3 16:10 130:3				_	
160:14 161:5	7				, ·
163:1,7,21,24				<u> </u>	
164:2 166:7,19,20					
167:11,14 168:20 168:21 69:21 70:14 107:10 170:1,18 171:23 172:2,19 175:11 175:14,15,18,24 70:14 107:10 70:14 109:15 70:18 81:20 81:10 70:18 83:20 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:13 70:18 80:1			*	"	,
168:22 169:21					,
170:1,18 171:23 70:14 107:10 176:18 176:21 176:18 176:	*	· · · ·			
172:2,19 175:11 176:8 reasoning 81:10 reasons 20:8 24:11 43:7 44:15 49:21 76:8,16 139:12 76:14 17:15 76:14 17:15 76:14 17:15 77:24 78:13 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:23 78:11 76:12,14 179:2 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:23 78:11 76:12,14 179:2 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:23 78:11 77:23 78:11 77:24 78:11 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:23 78:11 77:23 78:11 77:24 78:11 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:24 78:21 77:2		_			
175:14,15,18,24 177:12 178:15,24 177:12 178:15,24 177:12 178:15,24 177:12 178:15,24 177:12 178:15,24 179:1 199:2 179:1 199:2 179:1 199:2 179:1 199:2 179:1 199:2 179:1 199:2 179:1 199:2 186:4 186:4 199:3 112:7 111:19 171:22 120:11 121:10,16 130:23 166:18,20 195:17 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 179:15 189:15 176:12,14 179:2 120:11 121:10,16 130:23 166:18,20 195:3 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:13,14 179:1 176:18 179:19 189:19 176:14,14 179:15 176:18 179:19 189:19 176:14,14 179:14 179:15 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:11 176:25 181:14 177:	-				_
177:22 178:15,24 179:1 199:2 43:7 44:15 49:21 realise 108:14 43:7 44:15 49:21 realise 108:14 53:19 55:15 57:13 realise 108:14 70:18 83:20 98:13 186:4 70:18 83:20 98:13 186:4 70:18 83:20 98:13 111:19 171:22 120:11 12:10,16 141:16 194:24 20:24,25 21:8 162:17,18 164:6 179:19 189:19 176:12,14 179:2 179:19 189:19 176:15 14:17 179:21 179:19 189:19 170:11 179:11 179:18 179:20 134:1 179:20					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
179:1 199:2					,
realise 108:14 realised 23:12 53:19 55:15 57:13 58:21,23 69:3 70:18 83:20 98:13 186:4 redecision 124:21 reduces 173:5 8:21 10:15,16 7:16,19 8:14,20 49:13 115:23 12:61 11:11:10,16 12:44 78:21 20:24,25 21:8 12:61 8:13 20:22 144:11 149:16 12:17,18 164:6 49:13 115:23 14:11 14:16 19:15 12:18 12:13 35:2,12 12:22 20:13 35:2,12 16:10 13:23 16:10 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 176:12,14 179:2 179:18 199:15 13:25 13:15 14:17 reassurance 12:14 199:15 reassemble 137:15 reassurance 12:14 12:17 50:18 reassurance 12:14 138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 receipt 152:15 receipt 152:15 receipt 152:15 receipt 152:15 receipt 29:6 147:5 receipt 29:6 147:5 receipt 29:6 147:5 receipt 38:3 16:10 163:6 164:10 168:10 169:7 170:1 172:8 16:22 17:18 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 187:5 191:17 194:17 196:18 reason 24:5 30:1 37:5 39:25 40:18 37:5 39:25 40:18 49:21 50:15 52:12 53:1 57:1,9,21 66:24 73:15 73:21 66:24 73:15 73:21 66:24 73:16 78:21 12:17 50:18 recollection 10:24 12:17 regard 34:13 68:14 12:22 12:17 12:17 10:18 10:16 11:26 11:26 11:27 11:27 12:27 13:14 12:12 12:12 12:22 13:15 12:17 11:27 12:13 10:21 12:10 30:3 13:13 13:15 12:17 regard 34:13 68:14 12:12 reclibel 184:23 reliable 18:20 reclibed 11:16 31:12 receipt 15:21 reconsideration regarded 48:9 register 187:2 12:8, 20:123:2 reliae 22:19 relice 23:13 receipt 23:10 receipt 23:10 receipt 23:10 receipt 23:1	-				
realised 23:12 58:21,23 69:3 reduces 173:5 8:21 10:15,16 49:13 115:23 144:11 149:16 realistic 51:11 109:3 112:7 77:24 78:21 20:24,25 21:8 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:17,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,18 164:6 162:21,21 164:6 162:21,21 17,18 164:6 162:21,23 165:22 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:16 179:17 179:18 179:18 179:18 179:18 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:14 179:25 181:14 179:25 181:14 179:25 181:14 179:25 181:14 179:25 181:14					_
186:4 realistic 51:11 70:18 83:20 98:13 refer 27:9,15 52:15 12:6 18:13 20:22 144:11 149:16 144:14					
realistic 51:11 109:3 112:7 77:24 78:21 20:24,25 21:8 162:17,18 164:6 reality 75:3 163:6 130:23 166:18,20 195:3 36:22 37:2,7,10 168:23 189:17 reality 75:3 163:6 130:23 166:18,20 195:3 36:22 37:2,7,10 199:16 really 8:23 16:10 176:12,14 179:2 reference 6:16 37:10,13 4:22 relatively 74:14 21:22 29:18 54:7 199:15 28:11,17 29:11 51:3,8 56:7,19 58:15 71:15 89:6 74:15 93:15 98:5 reassemble 137:15 reassurance 12:14 73:9 77:8,11 60:11 61:2,6,13 58:15 71:15 89:6 138:17 139:25 reasure 154:1 73:9 77:8,11 60:11 61:2,6,13 163:21,23 165:22 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 receive 29:6 147:5 receive 29:6 147:5 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 released 200:16 releasing 85:3 93:5 164:10 168:10 164:20 recognise 25:20,21 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 73:49:9 90:21 91:1 91:19 19:19:19 179:25 181:11 153:22 refers 195:2 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 96:2,12 97:8 99:13		*		· ·	
111:19 171:22 120:11 121:10,16 130:23 166:18,20 195:3 36:22 37:2,7,10 199:16 176:12,14 179:2 179:19 189:19 179:15 121:21 22:2 45:17 49:23 50:1 51:3,8 56:7,19 58:15 71:15 89:6 74:15 93:15 98:5 104:15 114:17 126:6,11 127:9 132:20 134:1 12:17 50:18 95:22 99:5,5 132:20 134:1 12:17 50:18 95:22 99:5,5 132:20 134:1 12:17 50:18 148:23 153:16 164:20 161:6,19 163:6 164:20 164:20 169:7 170:1 172:8 179:25 181:11 179:15 179:25 181:11 179:25 181:11 179:15			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
reality 75:3 163:6 130:23 166:18,20 195:3 36:22 37:2,7,10 199:16 really 8:23 16:10 176:12,14 179:2 reference 6:16 37:10,13 44:22 relatively 74:14 21:22 29:18 54:7 199:15 28:11,17 29:11 51:3,8 56:7,19 58:15 71:15 89:6 74:15 93:15 98:5 reassemble 137:15 23:15,18,25 36:24 58:8,10,14,17,19 58:15 71:15 89:6 104:15 114:17 reassurance 12:14 73:9 77:8,11 60:11 61:2,6,13 60:11 61:2,6,13 60:21 4,6 138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 128:14 151:24 63:22 64:18 65:4 release 200:16 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 65:6,12 66:13,17 66:6,12 70:25 71:2 66:27 70:25 71:2 70:25 71:2 70:25 71:2 70:21 70:25 71:2 70:21 70:25 71:2 70:21 17:19 70:21 70:10 30:3 71:19 70:19 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 70:29 78:13 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>*</td> <td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td>				*	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
195:17		,			
really 8:23 16:10 179:19 189:19 11:23 12:21 22:2 45:17 49:23 50:1 release 20:9 24:13 21:22 29:18 54:7 199:15 28:11,17 29:11 51:3,8 56:7,19 58:15 71:15 89:6 74:15 93:15 98:5 reassemble 137:15 32:15,18,25 36:24 58:8,10,14,17,19 129:20 131:7 104:15 114:17 reassurance 12:14 73:9 77:8,11 60:11 61:2,6,13 163:21,23 165:22 122:0 134:1 reassure 154:1 128:14 151:24 63:22 64:18 65:4 168:22 200:5 138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 158:3,6 159:8,12 65:6,12 66:13,17 released 200:16 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 releasing 85:3 93:5 144:10 168:10 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:67, 82:9 relevance 22:11 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:46:23 90:21 91:194:17 194:17 196:18 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 refers 195:2 refers 195:2 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollectin 102:24 recollection 102:24 <td>reality 75:3 163:6</td> <td>130:23 166:18,20</td> <td>195:3</td> <td>36:22 37:2,7,10</td> <td>199:16</td>	reality 75:3 163:6	130:23 166:18,20	195:3	36:22 37:2,7,10	199:16
21:22 29:18 54:7	195:17	176:12,14 179:2	reference 6:16	37:10,13 44:22	relatively 74:14
74:15 93:15 98:5 reassemble 137:15 32:15,18,25 36:24 58:8,10,14,17,19 129:20 131:7 104:15 114:17 126:6,11 127:9 12:17 50:18 73:9 77:8,11 60:11 61:2,6,13 163:21,23 165:22 132:20 134:1 reassure 154:1 12:17 50:18 95:22 99:5,5 61:25 62:4,16 168:22 200:5 138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 128:14 151:24 63:22 64:18 65:4 released 200:16 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 67:2 70:25 71:2 166:19,20 199:8 148:23 153:16 164:20 recognise 25:20,21 73:18 76:22 79:18 73:18 76:22 79:18 200:11,19,19 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 reflected 95:7,20 90:8,13,15 90:21 91:1 94:17 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 199:15 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 199:15 106:17,24 199:18 109:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17	really 8:23 16:10	179:19 189:19	11:23 12:21 22:2	45:17 49:23 50:1	release 20:9 24:13
104:15 114:17	21:22 29:18 54:7	199:15	28:11,17 29:11	51:3,8 56:7,19	58:15 71:15 89:6
126:6,11 127:9 12:17 50:18 95:22 99:5,5 61:25 62:4,16 168:22 200:5 132:20 134:1 reassure 154:1 128:14 151:24 63:22 64:18 65:4 released 200:16 138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 158:3,6 159:8,12 65:6,12 66:13,17 releasing 85:3 93:5 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 67:2 70:25 71:2 166:19,20 199:8 148:23 153:16 received 4:24 65:8 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 200:11,19,19 164:10 168:10 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevance 22:11 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 37:18 53:4 60:25 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 refered 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 194:17 196:18 recognition 30:18 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 refuse 10:17 108:18 111:22 190:8 191:8 49:21 50:15 52:12 127:21 127:21 127:21 127:21 128:49:32 128:40:48	74:15 93:15 98:5	reassemble 137:15	32:15,18,25 36:24	58:8,10,14,17,19	129:20 131:7
132:20 134:1 reassure 154:1 128:14 151:24 63:22 64:18 65:4 released 200:16 138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 158:3,6 159:8,12 65:6,12 66:13,17 releasing 85:3 93:5 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 67:2 70:25 71:2 166:19,20 199:8 148:23 153:16 received 4:24 65:8 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 200:11,19,19 164:10 168:10 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevance 22:11 172:9 177:18 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 90:21 91:1 94:17 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 recognition 30:18 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 192:1 50:15 52:12 recollect 182:13 reculect 10:17 108:18 111:22 174:9 183:23 49:21 50:15 52:12 122:1 reconsideration 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliable 184:23 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 <td>104:15 114:17</td> <td>reassurance 12:14</td> <td>73:9 77:8,11</td> <td>60:11 61:2,6,13</td> <td>163:21,23 165:22</td>	104:15 114:17	reassurance 12:14	73:9 77:8,11	60:11 61:2,6,13	163:21,23 165:22
138:17 139:25 receipt 152:15 158:3,6 159:8,12 65:6,12 66:13,17 releasing 85:3 93:5 143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 67:2 70:25 71:2 166:19,20 199:8 148:23 153:16 received 4:24 65:8 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 200:11,19,19 161:6,19 163:6 164:20 referred 31:8 86:3 73:18 76:22 79:18 relevance 22:11 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 194:17 196:18 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 195:15 52:12 recognition 30:18 reculect 182:13 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 190:8 197:19 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 190:8 199:18 reliable 184:23 reliable 184:23 reliable 184:23 190:19 19:19 respected 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120	126:6,11 127:9	12:17 50:18	95:22 99:5,5	61:25 62:4,16	168:22 200:5
143:18 144:23 receive 29:6 147:5 167:4 67:2 70:25 71:2 166:19,20 199:8 148:23 153:16 received 4:24 65:8 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 200:11,19,19 161:6,19 163:6 164:20 referred 31:8 86:3 73:18 76:22 79:18 relevance 22:11 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevant 21:10 30:3 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 194:17 196:18 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 49:21 50:15 52:12 72:21 regard 34:13 68:14 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 reliable 18:12	132:20 134:1	reassure 154:1	128:14 151:24	63:22 64:18 65:4	released 200:16
148:23 153:16 received 4:24 65:8 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 200:11,19,19 161:6,19 163:6 164:20 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevance 22:11 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 137:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 recollect 10:17 108:18 111:22 190:8 191:8 169:7 177:22 78:13 recollection 102:24 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 187:9 191:17 106:24 73:16 78:21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 12:16 116:20 190:8 191:8 189:15 118:16 119:4 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18 120:2 121:7,18	138:17 139:25	receipt 152:15	158:3,6 159:8,12	65:6,12 66:13,17	releasing 85:3 93:5
148:23 153:16 received 4:24 65:8 references 37:23 71:12 72:12 73:14 200:11,19,19 161:6,19 163:6 164:20 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevance 22:11 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 199:15 recognition 30:18 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 175:3 9:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 recollect 10:17 108:18 111:22 190:8 191:8 187:1,9,21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliable 184:23 181:14,24 83:4 reconsideration 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relied 11:16 31:12	143:18 144:23	receive 29:6 147:5	167:4	67:2 70:25 71:2	166:19,20 199:8
161:6,19 163:6 164:20 referred 31:8 86:3 73:18 76:22 79:18 relevance 22:11 164:10 168:10 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevant 21:10 30:3 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 199:15 recognition 30:18 refused 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 199:15 reflected 95:7,20 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 199:15 recollect 182:13 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 199:15 regard 34:13 68:14 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 199:15 reconciling 193:6 regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 reliably 9:23 181:14,24 83:4 reconsideration register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2	148:23 153:16	received 4:24 65:8	references 37:23	71:12 72:12 73:14	
164:10 168:10 recognise 25:20,21 109:3 113:8 145:9 79:21 81:6,7 82:9 relevant 21:10 30:3 169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 194:17 196:18 recognition 30:18 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 reason 24:5 30:1 recollect 182:13 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollection 102:24 refute 10:17 108:18 111:22 190:8 191:8 49:21 50:15 52:12 reconciling 193:6 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 reliced 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19	161:6,19 163:6	164:20	referred 31:8 86:3		relevance 22:11
169:7 170:1 172:8 72:15 106:11 146:14 147:6 82:11 83:7,11,20 37:18 53:4 60:25 172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 195:15 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 190:8 191:8 recollect 182:13 refused 10:17 108:18 111:22 190:8 191:8 190:8 191:8 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliable 184:23 190:21 21:7,18 reliance 185:20 reliance 185:20 190:21 21:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 190:22 12:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 190:22 12:7,18 relies 22:19					
172:9 177:18 153:22 199:15 84:7,8 86:13 90:21 91:1 94:17 179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 195:15 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 195:15 refused 44:8 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 197:21 regard 34:13 68:14 102:16 116:20 reliable 184:23 197:21 reconciling 193:6 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliance 185:20 181:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 185:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
179:25 181:11 recognised 22:23 refers 195:2 87:20 90:8,13,15 96:2,12 97:8 187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 102:4,4 138:8 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 reason 24:5 30:1 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 refusing 114:16 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 49:21 50:15 52:12 recollection 102:24 refute 10:17 108:18 111:22 reliable 184:23 53:1 57:1,9,21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19					
187:9 191:17 66:17 77:22 78:13 reflected 95:7,20 92:23 93:4 94:8,9 99:13 102:13 194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 reason 24:5 30:1 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 refusing 114:16 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 49:21 50:15 52:12 recollection 102:24 refute 10:17 108:18 111:22 reliable 184:23 53:1 57:1,9,21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliance 185:20 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
194:17 196:18 102:4,4 138:8 refusal 179:11 96:19 97:8 98:3 126:14,15 132:17 reason 24:5 30:1 recognition 30:18 refused 44:8 98:19,21 99:2 174:9 183:23 37:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 refusing 114:16 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 49:21 50:15 52:12 recollection 102:24 refute 10:17 108:18 11:22 reliable 184:23 53:1 57:1,9,21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 66:24 73:16 78:21 reconsideration 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliance 185:20 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19		S			,
reason 24:5 30:1 37:5 39:25 40:18 49:21 50:15 52:12 53:1 57:1,9,21 66:24 73:16 78:21 recognition 30:18 recollect 182:13 101:6 106:17,24 refute 10:17 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 regard 48:9 85:11 93:5,20 174:9 183:23 190:8 191:8 reliable 184:23 reliably 9:23 reliably 9:23 reliably 9:23 reliably 12:16 116:20 regarded 48:9 74:17 105:21 regard 34:13 68:14 12:16 119:4 regarded 48:9 74:17 105:21 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	/	
37:5 39:25 40:18 recollect 182:13 refusing 114:16 101:6 106:17,24 190:8 191:8 49:21 50:15 52:12 recollection 102:24 refute 10:17 108:18 111:22 reliable 184:23 53:1 57:1,9,21 reconciling 193:6 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19		,			, ·
49:21 50:15 52:12 recollection 102:24 refute 10:17 108:18 111:22 reliable 184:23 53:1 57:1,9,21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 66:24 73:16 78:21 reconciling 193:6 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliance 185:20 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19		C		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
53:1 57:1,9,21 127:21 regard 34:13 68:14 112:16 116:20 reliably 9:23 66:24 73:16 78:21 reconciling 193:6 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliance 185:20 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19			O	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
66:24 73:16 78:21 reconciling 193:6 93:4 95:22 155:25 118:16 119:4 reliance 185:20 81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19					
81:14,24 83:4 reconsideration regarded 48:9 120:2 121:7,18 relied 11:16 31:12 85:11 93:5,20 74:17 105:21 register 187:2 122:8,20 123:2 relies 22:19	1 1		U		
85:11 93:5,20					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
103.0,11 111.10 1ccord 7.11 100.4 1cmorec 104.0 124.4 123.23 1cmeved 82.19				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	105.0,11 111.10	1001u 7.11 100.4	10110100100	127.7 123.23	10110104 02.17
				<u> </u>	

				rage 221
reluctant 193:23	representations	respected 177:16	172:25	43:23 44:5 59:2,3
rely 46:17 183:18	50:12 51:16 53:22	respectfully 76:17	revealing 6:12	59:12,17,20 60:5
191:4	54:2 60:10 62:18	166:19 190:25	93:12 113:16	61:21 62:22 68:6
relying 78:5	65:17 86:15 91:25	respond 15:9 18:13	156:25,25 185:15	68:15,20 78:11
remain 30:22,22	150:25 151:2	46:16 160:7	revelation 6:25	120:1 125:11
142:22	representatives	responding 192:15	43:15 57:5 105:14	144:8 155:8
remaining 139:21	52:12,19 54:1	response 17:5	124:9	157:11 167:17
201:13	63:14	78:22 102:7	revelations 67:4,6	198:6,7
remains 40:8	represented 1:7	192:19	183:19	ring 28:25
168:18	18:18 118:10	responses 143:8	review 57:17,19	rise 6:6 48:10 87:19
remark 159:15	143:10	responsible 22:20	109:15,18,19,22	91:16 92:8 95:16
		responsible 22.20 rest 6:1 169:17		
remarks 1:4 4:19	representing 69:14		110:1 124:20	125:10 158:14
89:9 170:5,7	represents 8:25	restore 199:12	revisit 123:22	162:24 192:8
remember 101:12	152:23 169:13	200:20	131:2,20	risk 24:15 26:19
101:15 139:3	reprinted 197:15	restrict 81:11 94:5	revisited 100:6	37:22 43:13,22
142:12 175:8	reputation 51:7	111:10	rhetorically 95:11	45:4 48:18 49:20
182:19	request 10:21 11:3	restricted 78:19	Richard 65:9	49:23,25 50:22
remembers 157:18	11:7 18:6 120:14	restriction 26:21	Rick 144:6	51:6,8 52:4 53:17
remind 40:10 42:6	require 74:16 77:9	44:7 58:9,16	riddles 124:15	54:24,25 55:17,23
105:24 108:2	85:17 110:10	78:15 92:7 111:23	right 6:6 8:5,8,24	58:10,11,18 59:8
remit 199:22	149:6	117:12 132:25	15:24 27:24 38:6	59:16,19 60:7,12
repeat 38:12,15	required 53:25	restrictions 35:6	43:14 53:25 56:10	60:14,17 61:17
71:11 104:1	81:2 82:5 157:13	72:2 174:5,5	58:4 61:22 67:3	62:1,4,7,22,23
108:17 138:17	requirement 115:2	result 36:6 46:1	72:21 73:3 74:21	64:22,23 68:5
141:5	requires 99:25	59:14 86:20 89:13	75:17,21 77:3	70:20,21,21,24,25
repeated 189:5	requiring 30:15	98:20 113:1	80:19 90:23 96:20	71:1,4 74:22
repeatedly 26:24	rescued 131:22	117:12 125:6	97:17 100:8,23,25	76:15 78:4 83:23
113:25	research 186:5	147:10 177:25	106:2,14 108:7	84:7,25 85:1,1,1,3
repeating 128:6	reservation 30:6	resulting 58:13	118:6 121:10	85:5,6,9,10 87:19
reply 160:8	resist 96:7,8 190:5	135:18	129:3 130:4	87:23,23 88:1,3,8
report 42:23 50:3,6	190:25	retained 100:9	132:13,21 143:4	88:23 91:4,4,5,8,8
50:20 62:16 65:8	resolution 76:20	retention 37:17,19	144:25 146:13	91:9,16 92:20,24
110:10 126:9	resolve 193:8	100:16 185:17	147:25,25 148:19	93:17,17 94:15
127:10 197:23	resolved 63:7	188:6 190:6	148:22 149:8	95:10 107:3,6,6,7
reported 165:1	186:20	rethink 38:10	162:1 163:2,5	107:8,9,13,14,19
reports 21:13	resources 199:3	return 8:21 39:14	165:6,17 166:1,2	107:21,23,25,25
123:11 127:7,8,14	respect 43:14 52:2	152:25	166:13 177:23	108:16,23 109:24
128:7	60:19,20 92:7	reveal 10:7 14:21	180:7,25 183:24	110:7 111:13
reprehensible	93:18 97:18,20	15:1 65:20 67:21	192:17 196:20	119:24 120:22
114:4	104:25 105:10	80:11 92:25	200:9	121:2,7,8,17,22
represent 21:1 23:1	106:14 108:7	revealed 6:21 42:18	rightly 8:15 40:10	122:5 125:9
69:23	115:3 117:13	50:7 62:2 73:2	133:22 136:7	126:20 133:9
representation	133:6 150:23	84:21 94:25 107:9	140:25	134:2 135:10
70:10 178:14	172:5 190:11	112:3 122:25,25	rights 27:23 33:7	136:9 138:19,19
199:4	192:6	123:3 153:1 155:1	33:25 34:8 43:23	142:18 144:6
122.1	1,2.0	125.5 155.1 155.1	33.20 31.0 13.23	1.2.10 111.0
			<u> </u>	

170:3,6 171:16,17	safely 68:15 124:10	150:3 160:18	sections 77:25	70:15 122:18
171:21,22,22	safety 59:7 64:23	163:25 169:24	secure 80:12	167:20 176:5,10
176:5 179:2,7,10	68:6 72:16 91:17	170:1 171:6	security 188:22	189:10
179:23 180:18	107:20 108:16	181:17 187:12	see 9:22 12:7 28:20	sensible 60:22 63:1
188:6 191:15	119:24 120:6,8	191:3 197:14	53:17 75:23 88:4	74:14,18 76:18,24
192:9	121:8,22 171:13	says 6:20 8:4 12:8	88:4 102:20 103:1	117:18 131:6
risked 55:13	171:15 176:6,7	14:6 26:5 29:14	123:10 125:23	180:4
risks 44:1 51:3 59:7	sake 191:13	32:7 35:25 36:4,5	129:2 136:16	sensibly 70:16
62:21 85:8 87:16	salaried 39:13	84:25 94:21 96:7	143:6,20 146:22	177:1
119:25 153:5	sanctioned 23:9	101:15 126:9	147:7 150:8 152:9	sent 16:24 17:1,24
Robert's 186:13	Sander's 177:11	142:24 154:15	154:3,18 164:9	120:15 182:5
role 7:25 9:1 12:15	Sanders 1:9 3:12	157:18 164:16	179:1 180:15	sentence 101:3
35:3 67:13 68:11	4:5,13 8:25 9:5,8	171:17 172:18,19	182:18 186:10	sentient 97:10
70:7 72:9,11,23	9:12 10:19 14:15	186:12,12,18,18	191:7,10 192:6,7	separate 54:15 69:3
73:7 77:18 80:2	24:21,22 25:5,8	188:15 189:10	192:12 193:5,12	70:10
80:13 81:8 90:9	25:13,14 26:11,17	191:12	193:13 194:8	September 152:7
90:21 106:23	27:4 28:4,10,12	scales 33:15	195:25 196:7	sequential 56:23
107:1 119:4	32:4 33:1,4 35:12	scenario 129:18	197:14	sequentially 56:25
128:17 140:17	37:14 38:7,14,18	scope 22:1	seek 4:25 21:23,25	sergeants 98:7
142:8	38:21 39:10 40:15	screening 31:20	71:18 82:1,23	serious 26:20 70:20
roles 29:8,13 89:25	41:1 74:6 83:9	scrutiny 77:18	86:10 87:5 120:17	71:9 107:10
roll 18:20,25	152:23 154:23,24	search 55:21 103:7	136:6	109:11,25 123:4
rolled 13:18 14:6	154:25 155:4,13	seat 25:9	seeking 7:17 8:23	176:5 187:9,14
room 42:10,23	155:18,25 158:16	second 7:4 8:23	17:6 52:23	188:22,23
75:15 124:16	158:25 159:2,13	17:8 54:21 74:25	seeks 13:24 115:8	serve 52:6 103:14
148:21	159:22 161:17	86:8 96:18 113:8	seen 6:17 37:25	served 125:15
round 60:1	173:20 178:5,8,9	134:25 135:13	50:20 57:13 94:18	154:5 172:7 175:9
route 101:22,25	178:12 182:2,3,4	159:3 161:17	100:10 128:3	service 1:13,20 2:6
152:10	182:11,15,23	second-to-last 17:9	168:18 182:8,12	2:13,17,24 3:3,8
routinely 145:3	sanguine 168:8	Secondly 97:4	182:13,20 194:14	3:14,18 6:19
ruled 17:10 32:3	169:4 170:8	157:20	200:1	11:17 12:18 13:4
42:20 111:12	sanitised 200:14	secrecy 157:12	sees 31:20	14:24 16:8,16,16
rules 54:1	satellite 22:7	172:18 173:14,19	selection 184:10,12	16:25 17:5 24:4
ruling 9:6 25:6,15	satisfactory 137:9	173:22 176:14	self-evident 38:23	30:16 56:16,19
27:6,22 28:2 32:6	satisfied 50:21	secret 13:6 24:2,5	180:23	58:9 71:24 76:21
33:17 77:23 95:24	62:21 75:21	35:17 79:18 80:4	self-same 58:18	83:9 94:1,14
111:8	146:12	157:7 173:7	senior 7:19,20,21	95:11 96:6 98:5
rulings 5:1 25:2	satisfy 61:16	secretariat 11:5	8:20 12:10 23:9	100:22 107:7
56:25	save 104:16 105:12	Secretary 199:20	23:21 79:24 80:2	110:23 111:1,7,9
run 59:13 133:10	saying 10:7 33:10	section 9:13 27:11	80:11 83:25	114:3 115:25
	52:19 57:20 83:2	27:22 28:18,21	168:23 190:23	116:2,11 134:9
<u>S</u>	107:19 109:25	33:5,24,24 40:1	sense 6:7 11:10	141:24 148:9
sacrifice 83:2 190:1	111:21 117:14	57:18 78:1,6 82:6	38:23 45:1 47:11	156:19 160:4,24
safe 148:20	126:3,4 127:1	164:16 183:23	47:18 48:9 52:3	162:8 172:13
safeguarding 12:19	132:3,4 135:9,15	195:6	54:9 55:9 62:5,24	176:21 178:13,25
L				

				1490 229
183:17 185:7,16	145:10 150:25	136:6,13 180:8,9	20:8,12,18,23	skeleton 37:24
187:2	178:17	180:11,22,25	21:7 22:6,12,17	Slater 1:7 18:18
Service's 64:4 85:9	shortage 139:13	similar 71:7,10	24:1,1,11,17,19	44:3 107:16
116:19	shorthand 41:15	151:1 176:17	25:2,5 26:17 27:4	slight 64:23 71:4
services 17:11,15	136:16	201:2	27:22 28:10,19	slightest 177:18
29:3	shots 138:10	similarly 71:2	29:18 31:8 32:2	slightly 8:3 117:9
serving 102:12	show 18:1 200:6	121:17 165:4	33:1,10 35:23	136:14 193:25
190:20	shut 181:16		37:14,22 38:14	
		simple 68:4 71:11	/	slim 139:13,19
session 86:6,14	shutting 75:2	80:10 89:7 96:11	41:2,4,7,11 43:3	slow 201:7
109:1	side 31:1 33:12,15	126:6,7	43:17 52:8 56:11	small 43:13 99:7
set 10:5 13:22 40:6	138:16 142:15,25	simpler 84:18	56:18 63:21,25	138:18 146:22
40:17 41:20 43:6	144:22 149:9	147:4	64:12 72:3 75:3	179:2,7,9
59:1 64:1 65:5,11	167:6 191:16	simply 7:23 16:14	75:19 77:22 78:3	smearing 128:12
77:7,12 106:9	sideline 25:20	16:21 24:5 27:10	78:13 79:8,12	Snap 178:3
109:16 119:5	sidelined 26:4	33:17 34:16 36:17	81:23 82:20 83:7	so-called 50:3
121:10 175:23	sides 50:22 199:3	36:22 37:2,9 40:1	84:7,24 85:21	social 42:12,22
191:4	sign 13:20	52:17 55:11 60:10	86:25 87:2,10	Solidarity 139:3
sets 58:21 127:11	significance 68:23	63:12 66:16 69:11	91:11 94:3 96:1	140:6
setting 9:11 29:18	73:10 80:7 90:10	74:21 76:3 82:20	109:9 112:7 117:3	solution 67:20
73:11 145:10	140:1 175:7	83:6,20 94:12	117:16 118:4,6	somebody 47:7,17
settled 114:2	significant 14:3	95:5 96:19 102:17	127:4,15 129:7	97:14 102:22
settlement 31:18	22:17 24:14 43:13	103:16 104:7,20	132:2 133:12	somewhat 128:21
seven 192:1	72:10 80:1 87:19	108:17,22 109:14	134:4,7,11 135:3	162:15
severe 50:8,10,11	104:25 119:2	118:23 125:22	135:14 136:6	soon 115:12 161:10
sexes 158:15	130:11 135:17	138:17 139:8	142:1 145:25	sorry 36:12 50:3
sexist 159:5	144:8 159:18	140:18 143:19	153:18 154:25	87:21 91:19
sexual 45:12 46:6	signify 91:5	162:19 163:8	155:13,18 158:4	104:10 105:24
47:7 139:12	Sikand 1:5,22 2:22	165:13 168:14	158:16,25 159:22	120:25 124:14
162:17 164:6	4:9 5:9,9,13,14,24	169:12,16 177:20	160:1,11 162:18	125:8 126:6,7
168:23	7:7,12,19 8:12,19	180:6 186:17	170:20 180:11	127:4,9 133:16
shaped 157:12	8:23 9:19 11:11	190:1,22 191:21	182:4 183:7	136:6 140:5 152:9
shapes 156:22,23	12:1 13:22 15:9	192:6	186:13 190:3	160:1,2 178:5
156:23	15:10,17 16:6,19	single 19:15 89:25	193:15	195:9
shaping 187:6	17:20,22 18:7	100:15	sit 83:10	sort 7:12 23:10
shared 169:8	79:5,9,10,12,15	sir 5:1,14,19 6:10	situation 23:10	25:11 30:20 35:13
sharp 138:24	81:4,23 82:7,20	6:13,16 7:4 8:23	39:9 49:4 71:7	36:21 49:9 96:16
sharply 138:25	83:19 84:7,17,24	9:10,12,16,22	74:8 105:20	125:6 139:5
shed 119:20 179:17	85:19,21 87:14	10:4,10,19,24	119:21 122:15	158:14,19 164:6
shine 74:15,20	123:18 126:24	11:11,13,23 12:2	126:13 139:15	168:16 169:9
shone 13:9	127:3,4,15,18,24	12:5,7,22 13:2,6,7	144:21 153:3	173:4 181:13
shoot 118:12	128:3,6,10,14,17	13:11,17 14:2,15	154:16 156:2	187:10 197:7
short 5:14 19:14	128:20 129:7,11	14:22 15:19 16:6	165:22	sorts 144:23 153:4
21:17 34:20 41:7	130:5,20,22 132:2	16:10,19 17:4,17	situations 105:7,8	154:2 197:3
41:24 92:11 93:23	132:8,22 133:4,12	17:22 18:7,12,20	169:2	sought 9:5
136:22 139:1	133:16 134:4,7	19:15,19,19 20:6	six 192:1	sound 157:3 190:9
	,.	, , : :		
	I		I	I

				1 age 250
sounder 186:3	14:2 21:11 22:15	40:13,20 59:15,24	199:17	52:2 54:3,19
sounds 62:5	22:22 23:7 24:2,6	109:18 156:16,16	stop 46:3 47:24	56:24 57:1,25
source 59:8 132:11	29:12,24 31:5	163:4	171:5,6 191:13	65:23 66:4 68:13
162:20 189:25	37:7 65:8 66:11	stated 5:21 89:12	stopping 46:20	71:14 74:13 75:19
190:12 198:1	80:2 98:12,20	122:2 123:8 125:2	story 196:14,14	76:2 77:10 78:13
sources 37:20 40:4	140:12,24 141:10	statement 4:14	straight 9:11 196:1	79:1 86:2 93:13
144:15 175:20	141:18 143:21,22	11:24 12:1,25	straightaway 7:20	94:15 95:1,5
200:14	158:10,21 159:19	14:9 37:24,25	strange 180:2,3	96:11 99:16 101:2
South 197:9	161:8	38:12,16 88:13	streamlining 55:6	101:5 103:18
speak 15:2 79:6	Squad/Special	89:8 98:24 103:24	stress 64:23 71:4	104:1,2,4 114:17
81:1 124:14 192:9	140:24 158:20	146:6,20 147:2	143:8	115:7 124:11
193:15 194:2	161:8	171:11 175:6,21	stresses 34:19	136:2 138:7,18
speaking 63:25	Square 140:11	175:21 177:12	stride 176:9	139:22 140:20
125:13	178:17	183:6,11,15,16,24	strong 29:8 31:6	149:11 150:2
speaks 8:13 169:10	squarely 123:9	184:2,12 187:15	37:5	153:3 155:19,25
Special 5:7 7:22 8:5	Squires 19:23	194:24	stronger 98:18	156:8,8 157:14
8:7 12:9 13:5,10	stage 14:21 15:1	statements 9:24	strongly 57:9 75:15	158:2 159:7
14:1 21:11 22:14	16:21 41:11 42:5	11:20 90:1 123:9	111:22 172:18	160:21 161:19
22:21 23:7 24:2,6	55:20 57:23 63:11	123:19 130:16	187:16	162:1 163:6,16,19
29:12,23 31:5	70:16 78:16 79:3	145:10 147:5,16	struck 103:18,24	163:22 164:4
37:7 65:7 66:10	92:6 95:9 109:14	148:3 194:18	114:9	169:21 170:2
80:2 140:12,24	129:13 131:21,21	statistical 184:7,24	stuff 198:12	172:22 174:7
141:10,18 143:21	158:16 160:6	statistically 184:23	subheading 28:6	180:20 186:2
143:22 158:10,20	188:2,3 189:7,8	statistics 184:21	28:13	189:15 190:5
158:22 159:19	190:7,7	185:11,18,19,21	subject 28:14 29:6	192:19,20
161:8	stake 113:11	191:1,3,5,23	42:21 50:21 57:17	submissions 1:5,6,8
specific 5:19 7:13	stance 73:15	193:4	58:1 65:16 77:18	1:10,13,15,17,20
7:16 15:14 55:9	161:14	stature 190:23	141:1	1:22,24 2:3,5,7,10
specifically 112:1	stand 15:17 25:10	status 24:24 78:8	subjected 44:17,24	2:12,14,17,19,21
specifics 5:16 7:9	58:1 87:12	175:24	subjective 162:3	2:23 3:3,5,7,9,12
speculation 190:10	standing 60:22	statute 27:13 82:8	174:8	3:13,15,18,20,22
speed 201:8	stands 10:11	155:21 164:16	subjectively 23:12	3:25 4:2,4,6,8,10
spend 35:13	stark 103:12	statutorily 164:15	submission 4:23	4:13,16,21 5:10
spied 198:24 199:9	start 8:8 41:19 43:5	statutory 13:16	7:5 8:20 10:4	5:13 7:13,17 9:13
200:6,7,8,10,12	93:11 120:18	stay 117:24	14:19 18:23 25:16	9:16,17 10:13,22
200:20	129:2 145:1	Steel 4:16 193:14	25:25 26:23 27:5	14:16 16:12,13
spin 32:6	160:25 199:12	193:15,18,24	27:5,20,24 29:16	18:13,18 21:17
splendid 41:22	started 145:2,3	194:2,12 195:9,12	29:21 30:18,22,25	24:22 25:12,17
split 7:12	149:1	195:14,17 196:20	31:6,24 32:4,5,16	26:12 27:8,9 33:5
spoken 42:9,14,17	starting 43:20 66:4	196:23 197:11,14	33:14,17,22 34:6	34:2,22 41:8,11
spot 69:21	68:13 77:14	198:17 199:21,24	34:13 35:23 36:10	42:2 43:1 50:21
spread 75:25	starts 164:8	200:25	36:15 37:17 38:21	51:2 53:2,7 56:16
spying 45:13	state 34:16 35:25	step 24:14 138:21	39:10 40:21 44:20	58:6,21 61:12
squad 5:7 7:23 8:5	36:2,3,5,10 38:25	199:11	45:4,24 48:6,8,16	63:22 64:16,25
8:7 12:10 13:5,10	39:6,7,12 40:10	Stephen 80:22	49:20 50:14 51:22	65:2,13 70:20

71:11,20,24 76:13	157:25 158:9	supply 145:9	107:16 108:23	168:20 169:16,17
78:22 79:10 82:24	166:9 179:4	support 10:1 20:9	142:16 144:9	190:3 197:22
85:24 86:6,9,20	subsequently 36:8	51:23 57:9 84:13	171:11 175:7	talks 195:1
87:4,8 88:9 92:14	89:11	124:12 126:4	177:12 183:24	target 89:1
93:23 94:1 95:17	substance 53:24	135:1 183:18	195:11	targeted 33:17 88:9
96:21 101:9	97:2	185:1 190:16	tactful 134:6	165:16,19
105:18 107:17	substantial 91:8	supporting 21:4	tactic 187:4	tarred 176:2
108:17,21 110:23	substantive 129:4	24:12 80:23	tails 156:2	task 15:21 22:11
112:12 116:8,11	131:15,17 133:3	supportive 38:21	take 9:21 17:8	23:3 81:19 132:2
118:14 119:5	147:21 152:13	supports 180:20	18:25 28:1 35:18	team 55:10 137:18
120:19 124:3	succeed 181:24	suppose 7:9 78:22	36:21 41:3 43:20	150:17 183:12
126:22 127:3	suffer 123:4	147:21	52:25 64:13 68:17	team's 55:3
128:8 130:18	suffered 44:9,13	supposed 200:4	70:2,8 71:17,18	teased 162:18
134:6,9 136:4	suffering 135:17	supremacy 30:1	74:1,3 76:18,20	tell 70:12 73:1
137:22 138:17	sufficient 21:19	sure 8:12 23:17	76:24 82:4,5,8	115:12 126:7
141:5,21,24 144:1	68:14,14 103:9	25:3 50:4 60:24	83:7,19 84:6	143:20 172:18
145:22 146:18	104:21 105:9	81:23 82:14	86:21 89:2 115:10	173:15,16,23
148:9 150:10	150:17	116:13,22 121:18	115:21 117:23,25	telling 173:13
151:9,19 152:16	sufficiently 68:20	147:24 153:21	118:13 129:12	tells 162:5
152:19 154:24	102:3 140:20	169:10 193:22	136:17,25 143:11	tenable 81:13
155:13 160:4	196:17	surely 53:4	145:7,14,16 148:4	term 34:20 98:5
162:9 166:17	suggest 5:10 26:18	surprise 24:23	151:3 152:10	168:23
167:20 171:9	30:24 66:13 87:23	surprised 187:20	153:20,25 160:15	terms 18:8 22:1
172:9,13 174:14	99:21 131:9	surprising 17:2	161:14 162:2	24:25 27:11,13
175:2 176:21	148:23 153:24	95:8	167:6 168:10,11	28:24 31:15 32:14
177:9 178:8,18,22	suggested 7:13	surprisingly 9:20	169:14 170:14	32:18,25 35:13,21
180:9 181:3 182:3	96:20 164:18	surviving 92:23	194:22 199:11	36:2,24 37:5 47:2
183:3 189:5	suggesting 10:2	140:19	200:4	47:18 67:14 73:9
192:15 193:14	26:3	suspect 19:2,9	taken 19:20,22	77:8,11 95:21
194:3 201:12,18	suggestion 11:15	82:17 137:6	24:7 54:14 55:24	101:15 103:21
submit 58:15 61:8	36:18 40:19 55:5	170:22	59:25 69:10 95:4	121:8,15 124:6
67:20 68:1 74:17	56:22 99:24	suspicion 193:10	95:23 97:2 165:2	130:9,10,15 153:4
110:11 114:20	150:21 157:15	suspicious 67:2	186:9	155:8 156:12
115:22 145:5	187:17	195:24	takes 10:15 36:2	157:11 158:2,6
147:24 153:16	suggests 13:17 38:6	swiftly 26:14	76:16 153:25	159:7,11 167:3
160:24 167:23	156:1	system 100:16	168:8 176:8	terrible 161:9
168:21 189:23	suicidal 195:20	systematically	188:10	territorial 6:15
190:23 191:22	197:1	145:21	tale 196:14	territory 155:11
submits 9:22	suicide 197:8	T	tales 32:9	174:8
submitted 19:16	suitable 184:20		talk 36:4 150:17	test 75:7 96:7,9
20:14 22:13 101:2	summarised 9:6	tab 9:16 12:4,24	talked 156:20,22	133:4
submitting 161:13	summary 78:1	17:3 28:5,9 43:6	180:14 191:19	tested 75:6 133:18
subsection 78:10	superficial 172:15	44:2 50:2,3 51:1	talking 39:11 47:2	thank 5:5 18:7,9
subsequent 99:13	supplemental	58:11,21 94:19 95:4 106:8 107:5	48:15 52:8 107:25	24:19,20 28:10
99:25 151:15	127:5	75.4 100.6 107.5	122:3 133:2 164:7	41:5,9,14 42:25

56:8 79:4,8 85:20	71:23 72:19 74:2	116:23	150:24 155:14	195:21 197:5,9
85:22 93:24	76:6,12 79:5	thoroughly 97:22	today's 42:7	trigger 102:24
100:19 105:15	80:19 81:1 82:5	thought 38:18	told 11:6 49:25	175:15
110:21 112:5,9	85:21,23 90:1	39:22 47:17 63:13	51:19 91:2,3	triggered 17:6
117:1 118:3 134:7	95:23 97:16 98:4	79:6 191:6 193:20	107:14 108:22	trouble 9:9 12:2
136:3,13,20	98:13 99:18 101:3	thoughts 143:9	111:19 120:13	troubled 140:4
137:19 146:7	103:23 105:16,22	threat 59:13 60:6	125:19 131:18	true 6:6,12,21,25
154:25 178:19	105:22 107:18	60:20 62:7 107:20	142:11 146:13	12:19 14:22 15:2
181:1 182:8	110:5,13 111:20	179:6	147:11,12 197:6	47:17,17 50:7
200:24,25 201:11	111:24 113:5,15	three 5:15 19:5	tomorrow 137:6,16	80:16 116:20
201:16,17	115:4 116:24	36:14 46:18 58:24	171:1 193:23	146:13 154:6,6
theoretical 101:22	117:3,7,8,20	85:25 86:13	tonight 137:5	157:19,24 158:4
101:25	118:6 119:1,15	141:11 174:19	top 139:4 191:11	191:3
theory 101:24	120:20 125:20	threshold 59:18	total 126:2	trust 57:13 63:17
118:11 161:7	126:12,24 127:22	60:15 149:4,6	totally 142:16	trusted 94:22
thing 30:12 137:16	131:10,19 132:12	150:4	181:16	truth 7:2 19:18
147:9 150:15	132:13,20 133:8	throw 74:21 149:10	touched 50:13	20:11 21:5 67:21
165:8 168:3	134:4 136:4	thrown 96:10	161:18	68:12 87:18 90:13
178:14 186:18	137:20 139:13	throws 100:5	tough 36:20,20	90:20 118:21,22
194:22	141:3,10,16,19	Thursday 120:15	188:16	129:19 131:11,18
things 35:17 38:9	143:1,24 146:8,15	Ticehurst 16:17,24	trace 43:24 195:21	133:5 140:21
54:11 58:1 61:14	147:4 148:2,11,17	17:25	197:9	142:3 163:9
65:15 74:16 81:1	149:3,5,17 150:1	tied 130:16	traced 195:15	186:23,24 187:3
87:12 88:13 91:2	150:3 151:14	time 13:9 14:3 15:6	tracing 195:1,2,3	195:5 201:10
99:20 110:25	152:11 154:8,17	18:3 23:8,20 25:6	195:18,19 197:24	try 43:24 69:20
128:24 145:3,23	158:8,21 162:23	35:1,4 40:22	traffic 34:17	94:7 103:7,9
148:25 149:3,20	163:11,16,19	41:16 42:19 66:11	trajectory 88:21	138:5 149:21
151:21,25 152:12	165:23 167:9,9,19	80:3,5,13 95:1	tranches 150:23	184:6 193:5
161:2 168:16	170:3,5,20 171:3	101:13 102:3,5	151:15 152:8	trying 45:6 99:1
176:8 182:19	171:7 172:12	103:2 107:1	transcript 20:6	122:10 139:23
187:5 194:19	173:6 174:12	112:20,22 137:14	160:16	185:2 201:8
196:11,19 201:13	177:11 178:4	139:13 150:17,19	transparency 32:1	Tuesday 1:1
think 4:21 5:1 6:16	180:8 183:8 186:8	158:9 161:9	trauma 16:16	turn 5:16 12:3 41:4
7:21 8:4,6,10,17	186:13,14,21	165:14 170:25	treading 123:6	73:17 91:1 158:22
10:1 14:25 18:10	187:1 188:10	173:6 174:17	treated 16:23 17:11	161:15 180:5
18:20 20:21 24:21	189:11 191:22	197:6 198:2,14,14	17:15 18:2 179:14	195:8
26:8,9,24 27:7	192:11 193:3,7,17	199:4	treating 160:22	turned 140:10
28:5 38:3 39:20	194:12,16,22	time-frame 80:5	tremendous 150:19	turns 30:21 98:25
40:24 45:9 46:19	199:9,10,11,18	times 23:17	tremor 193:2	129:1 147:7
46:21 47:5 48:7	200:1,5,11,19	timescale 151:5	trend 184:23 185:5	TV 156:21
50:18 52:8,10	thinking 39:24	timing 92:8 146:16	trial 30:4 31:10	Twitter 42:11,22
55:15,20 56:3,9	98:10 148:14	tiny 177:6	trials 22:8,8 31:8	two 13:5 20:12
56:11 57:25 58:5	150:24 184:16	tip 62:13	tribunal 188:15	23:11 35:8 42:9
58:22 59:6 61:23	188:7	today 4:24 27:8	tricky 148:11	55:6 67:25 69:10
63:13 64:8,9,15	third 16:10 87:1	34:3 42:15 137:14	tried 90:23 149:22	89:12,25 90:1

07.1.105.1.7.0.10	77.21.70.10.02.25	140 12 175 12	66 + 1 1 1 4 2 4	4100.17
97:1 105:1,7,8,13	77:21 79:19 82:25	149:12 175:13	unofficial 114:24	vast 182:17
110:25 113:10,18	83:15,25 84:8,21	181:17 193:6	unpersuaded	Veljovic 121:18
115:9 123:9	85:17 89:11,22	196:18 197:13	188:24	ventilated 86:7,23
130:20 134:18	90:5,7,14 98:6	200:13	unproductive	183:8 188:12
136:1 144:11	101:4 124:23	understands	151:11	venture 99:21
145:8 146:11,23	159:6,8,10 163:25	124:16 169:6	unresolved 186:17	viable 138:14
147:5,19 155:5	164:14 165:25	understood 30:14	unsuitable 184:18	Vietnam 139:3
157:23 165:9	175:25 183:19,21	31:4 45:23 88:21	untested 133:14,16	140:6
169:3 174:24	184:17 186:25	94:22 117:17	unusual 32:12	view 6:10,25 26:16
177:6 189:4 199:3	187:8 194:14	132:8,22 167:19	132:1	28:21 55:19 62:20
199:7	undergo 34:20	173:7 199:18	unwelcome 168:14	67:5,7 69:10
two-year 196:20	underlying 151:9	undertake 34:20	up-to-date 127:10	74:14 76:16,22
type 25:23 34:18	151:10	36:1 61:24 103:9	upset 94:17,24	78:14 79:1 81:13
96:8 135:20	undermine 150:9	139:9	95:12 97:4	86:21,22 88:3,7
types 164:18	understand 5:9	undertaken 61:19	urge 23:16 25:14	88:12,16 89:2
	14:18 25:9 32:2	117:9,25 155:23	61:18 109:14	99:3 128:15
U	41:3 45:7 48:14	170:13	urging 25:3,20	149:24 168:8
ultimately 81:13	54:7,13 65:23	undertaking 10:25	33:16	169:15 171:19
116:1 185:13	69:13 70:3,22	11:1 13:12 34:15	use 42:22 135:7	viewed 169:9
190:2 193:8	72:8 79:23 80:7,9	34:16 35:6 36:3	175:10,14	viewpoint 201:2
umbrella 70:4	81:25 84:3,14	undertakings 95:2	useful 138:22	views 20:2 71:22
umpteen 127:8	89:16,16 91:2,12	189:24	201:19	127:25 128:4
unable 53:12 180:3	94:3 101:5,21,23	undertook 35:3	usefully 64:9	133:24 158:9
unappetising 189:8	102:16 106:6	173:4	116:13	vintage 143:15
unavoidable	113:20 115:3	Undesirable	usual 41:16 136:15	violence 59:14 60:6
181:22	120:6 122:3	189:11	usually 5:22 6:1	60:7 62:7,23 71:1
unaware 99:24	130:21 132:3,23	undoubtedly	7:24	135:7
uncomfortable	135:2,11 136:8,24	149:13 163:2		voiced 171:2
186:24	141:9 143:11	unfair 97:4	V	volume 75:8
uncommendable	153:23 154:12	unfounded 162:7	valid 173:11	volumes 192:1
161:4	162:21 166:23	unhelpful 88:8	valuable 83:17	volunteering
undercover 6:5 7:6	167:20 169:7	120:19	102:9,11 119:19	186:25
7:7,25 8:16 12:6	173:1,2 188:17	unique 34:18,19	130:10 179:4	voyage 152:10
13:15 14:25 17:23	190:4 193:24	unit 158:17 161:10	185:16	
20:20 21:10,22	199:5 201:4	United 155:12	value 75:17,18 76:4	W
22:5 23:5 26:1,5	understandable	units 199:25 200:2	103:14,20,21	wait 11:6 116:15
26:14 27:16 29:1	47:4 48:17 49:15	unjustified 157:21	114:14 125:25	147:19
29:7,19 30:7,10	137:4 171:14	unknown 83:21	141:15	waived 13:14
33:8,9 34:14,16	understandably	unlawful 163:14	variety 136:12	Walter 18:2 50:4
36:25 37:3,19	164:3	unlimited 74:11	139:8	Walton 65:9
45:15,25 46:25	understanding	unmanageable	various 14:20 15:3	want 5:15 7:18
49:4 50:7 66:6,8	6:23 13:25 26:11	22:2	16:4 92:2 137:7	36:1 39:14 41:2,8
66:10,21 67:13	29:23 80:14 88:9	unnamed 111:6	141:1 166:25	43:24 45:19,20
68:12 70:7 72:11	116:20 119:21	unnecessary	vary 167:25 168:1	46:14,19,24 68:9
72:23 73:13 77:10	138:10 144:10	173:21	varying 14:16	68:10,11 86:17
	150.10 111.10	113.21		,
				1

				1 age 251
117:6 118:8 120:4	121:1	widow 94:21	word 56:10 98:8	24:22 25:17 41:7
120:5,18 121:5	weeks 57:7 118:1	100:21 103:15,19	116:4	51:2 86:16 96:21
126:19 130:24	weigh 34:4 69:15	147:2 148:16	words 42:9,11,14	127:18 150:25
132:5,20 134:1	93:16 94:12	168:4	42:17 45:6 55:21	173:9 189:5
151:16 153:21	116:23 138:20	widow's 97:17	96:9 108:3,13	wrong 9:9 17:19,20
171:14 176:1	140:20 163:17,19	wife 92:23 93:21	135:19 148:22	23:12 32:8 38:6
181:5 183:5 198:8	weighed 82:9	105:9 113:10	161:7 176:24	44:16,21 47:11
201:9	109:20	126:3 140:3	201:1,1	66:23 67:8 93:14
wanted 55:1 193:19	weighing 105:10	wild 164:21	work 34:15,16,18	105:6 110:13
194:2,5,24 197:25	weight 52:24	wildly 158:11	34:21 35:6,7 36:1	120:5 123:14,21
198:17 199:7,24	weight 9:2 24:24	willing 89:8 117:5	36:3 80:4 138:11	120:3 123:14,21
200:15	25:22 26:2,2 27:2	145:9 160:12	138:14 159:6	131:23 132:23
wants 5:9 54:7	33:14 40:2 53:8	window 96:10	173:4	143:22 145:3
127:1 171:13	68:14 95:21 96:13		worked 37:3 40:8	148:25 149:1
		wins 143:1 156:2		
180:8 wasn't 140:9	104:13 142:25	wise 38:3 117:1	working 40:12	153:15 156:3,5,10
	147:6 176:25	wiser 50:9 181:22	149:23	156:12 161:21,22
wasted 193:11	177:7 191:24	wish 4:23 9:10	workings 13:10 works 168:15	163:22,22 167:21
way 9:4 13:12	weighty 30:23	21:13 48:11 56:14		173:2 180:5 188:8
15:18 16:7 19:13	32:11,22	64:11 98:1 113:21	world 68:9 69:2,4	188:8,12 189:21
26:6 30:25 46:16	Weinstein 36:16,19	142:21 146:11	74:11 102:1	189:23
48:3 54:9 61:21	welcome 72:18	147:13 149:3	125:16 147:13	wrongdoing 21:8
66:9 67:18 82:13	148:5 150:2	157:5 163:12	156:25 158:4	21:13,15 22:4,9
82:24 87:17 88:12	well-established	178:15 183:18	worldwide 39:7	22:15,23,24 23:4
93:21 104:3	95:7	185:6	worried 94:23	23:6,14,18 36:13
108:24 114:11,13	wellbeing 188:11	wishes 5:11 26:15	164:7 195:20	44:15,18,20,23
114:24 125:23	197:5 198:23,24	84:5 143:9 177:16	197:4,8	45:7,8,10,20,23
128:3,24 129:8,18	199:1	185:8	worry 59:22,23	46:3 47:8,10,19
131:5,6 133:13	went 26:13,18	withdrawal 134:14	95:12 168:9	48:9,10 49:1
135:25 137:25	143:21 152:3	withdrawn 42:20	169:18,20,20	66:24 67:16 72:23
138:14 140:4	188:18	withheld 196:5	170:1 172:20	88:18 89:5 90:8
149:25 150:9	weren't 13:21 25:5	withhold 64:19	174:8	105:12 114:1,20
158:1 159:5	35:3	106:5 178:25	worse 95:18	124:25 140:15
167:17 168:12	whatsoever 50:17	179:1	worst 57:4	153:9,14 162:13
170:16 171:6	93:20 107:12	withholding 6:7	worth 135:4,15	162:15,23 164:4,8
175:6,6,11 185:16	108:20 171:20	81:24	wouldn't 147:21	164:10,13,19,23
187:5 191:20	Whichever 151:16	witness 10:20 38:18	161:24	165:3,18,19
192:14 193:6,9	151:18	184:2	wrapped 157:11	166:18 168:10
196:8	whilst 70:6 79:23	witnesses 21:20	wrestling 72:11	169:6,8 187:25
ways 130:12 142:3	82:20 113:19	woman 52:17	writers 41:15	188:1
175:19	127:4 129:25	women 45:13 115:4	136:16	wrongly 103:18
weakens 114:14	whistle 21:7	116:21 117:23	writing 5:21 137:12	wrote 120:21 121:1
wealth 74:19	wholly 118:23,25	146:11 149:17	137:18 148:6	135:14 196:24
weapon 60:1	133:16	194:14 196:10	180:12 201:15	
website 200:16	wide 28:24 96:3	197:22	written 13:23 16:11	$\frac{\mathbf{X}}{\mathbf{Y}_{1,2}}$
week 120:15,16	wider 147:13	wonder 143:18	16:13 17:22,24	X 1:2

				Page 235
Y	13 171:16 183:25	1968 14:2 37:1	39 1:10 108:23	43:22,23 44:5
	130 2:23	95:14 141:4	37 1.10 100.23	59:2,3,11,17,19
Yard 17:25	130 2.23 138 3:3	174:20 175:11	4	60:5,16 62:22,22
year 19:24 20:7			4 16:12 64:20 78:12	
25:6 107:5 151:4	14 9:16 44:4 183:25	178:17	128:8	68:6,15 71:2 95:4
years 8:10 22:9	140 3:5 28:9	1969 175:11	4.1 198:5	107:21,23 109:4
47:22,22,22 95:15	141 28:5 119:6	1974 145:1	4.30 171:5	120:1,9 155:9,17
141:11 155:5	143 119:6	1976 145:1	4.55 201:20	156:24 157:11
156:15,18 157:9	144 3:7	1990s 135:6		167:17 182:6,10
168:3 172:16	149 3:9	1997 8:2	40 107:5	80s 35:9 94:21
183:19 196:9	15 1:6 12:4 177:14	1998 65:8	42 107:16	178:16 200:18
198:8	151 3:12	1999 16:24 18:1	425 183:25	82 1:24
yesterday 6:3,14	154 95:25 96:3		5	83 78:1
7:20 26:12 27:8	156 3:13	2		85 28:6,12
36:16 38:5 44:16	16 12:8 44:6 49:17	2 12:23 43:10 59:9	5 12:4 16:12 20:7	85-year 143:9
50:13 53:2 55:2	65:4 107:8 144:9	106:17 119:25	78:7 106:9	168:4
83:12 87:14 88:14	162 28:7,13	120:9 150:23	50 95:15 155:5	88 2:3
89:10 91:13 93:11	164 195:1,12 196:1	2.00 92:9,12	156:15,18 157:9	
94:11 96:20 104:1	165 28:20 32:9	20 168:3 198:8	172:16 192:10	9
160:8,14 174:19	33:18 95:24 96:1	20(4) 57:18	53 1:13	9 43:6 58:21 106:8
186:2 199:8	166 33:18	2000 16:24 18:1	54 1:15	121:12
100.2 177.0	167 3:15	2005 13:13,23 95:3	56 160:16	90 2:5
$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	168 3:18	2011 184:17	58 142:16	93 184:13
zone 156:23	17 12:25 13:2 49:24	2016 10:4,22 11:1		97 2:7
	107:8	11:22 120:23	6	
0	17(3) 78:6 82:6	121:3	6 33:24 106:9	
	170 3:20	2017 1:1	60 28:6,12 192:10	
1	171 3:22	21 1:1,8 17:3 119:7	60s 200:18	
1 1:4,5 127:7	171 3:22 173 3:25 4:2	22 58:11 175:23	61 1:17	
1.00 92:10	174 4:4	24 119:7 129:12	62 144:9	
10 51:1 58:20,24	175 4:6	28 11:1	68 1:20 171:11	
172:6	176 4:8	29 164:16		
10.30 4:18		294 139:4	7	
102 2:10	177 4:10 178 4:13	297 143:24	79:13 10:22 28:5	
107 2:12 20:7		2)1 173.27	50:2,3	
108 2:14	179 4:14	3	7.1 9:22	
11 51:2 107:16	18 14:9 58:11 95:6	3 44:2 51:1,5 59:8	70 12:21	
11.30 41:15,23	183:24 195:11	59:15,18,25 60:15	70s 35:9 155:2	
11.42 41:25	189 4:16	68:15 78:10	200:18	
11.42 41.23 112 2:17	19 65:4 141:9	106:17 119:25	72 175:7	
114 2:17 114 2:19	19(3)(a) 33:24	120:9 125:9,11	74 177:12	
116 65:3	19(3)(b) 78:6	135:10,11 150:23	75 1:22	
12 58:20 107:16	19(4) 27:22	3.10 136:21		
	19(4)(c) 27:11	3.10 136.21 3.17 136:23	8	
120 196:2	28:18,21 33:5	3.1 7 130.23 32 94:19	8 12:24 27:20 33:9	
120-paragraphs	40:1		33:25 34:4,8,9	
197:19	1960s 37:9 155:5	321 170:14 178:18	35:12,20 36:7	
123 2:21		329 175:4		
	•	•		•