

Statement on behalf of NPNSCPs

Statement of Harriet Wistrich

Statement No 2, as supplemented

Date: 31 January 2018

---

**SECOND STATEMENT OF  
HARRIET WISTRICH, AS  
SUPPLEMENTED**

---

Name: Harriet Wistrich

Address: Birnberg Peirce Ltd  
14 Inverness Street  
London, NW1 7HJ

Age: Over 21

On 25 January 2018 I made a statement of 14 paragraphs which read as follows:

1. I am a solicitor employed by Birnberg Peirce Ltd and I am the Recognised Legal Representative of a total of 17 core participants in the undercover policing public inquiry. 13 of those clients are Core Participants who have been categorised by the Chair as falling into category H, individuals who were in relationships with undercover officers and a further 2 individuals, and other associated groups, fall within category J, justice campaigns.
2. I have seen the third witness statement of Donal O'Driscoll dated 11 January 2018. I can confirm that my clients share Mr O'Driscoll's concerns outlined at paragraphs 7 and 8 of that statement. They share the view that the post-police activity outlined therein falls within the following Inquiry Terms of Reference ('ToR') and that if those ToR are to be adequately investigated, the disclosure of real names is necessary:

- "examine the motivation for, and the scope of, undercover police operations in practice and their effect upon individuals in particular and the public in general"
  - "identify and assess the adequacy of the statutory, policy and judicial regulation of undercover policing."
3. I make this statement to provide further examples of post deployment activity by former undercover officers which is relevant to these terms of reference.

**Evidence of officers using skills and tools learnt whilst working undercover to either continue abusive, exploitative and deceptive relationships with women after leaving their undercover deployments**

4. A significant number of my clients have described how the officers who they had intimate relationships with used the skills that they had learned during their deployments to initiate and continue their relationship with them or to initiate similarly abusive relationships with other women after leaving their deployment. This is relevant to both the inadequacy of supervision and regulation of undercover policing and to the continuing effects on individuals of such deployments even after they have officially ended.

*Jim Boyling*

5. 'Rosa' was first deceived into a relationship with Boyling in November 1999. In September 2000 it appears that he was withdrawn from undercover work and he disappeared.
6. Just over a year after disappearing from London, in November 2001, Boyling located 'Rosa' and rekindled their relationship. He explained that he had been an undercover officer but that he loved her and wanted to be with her.
7. 'Rosa' was in a state of extreme vulnerability, as so many of the events surrounding Boyling's disappearance were extremely traumatic. Boyling used information he learned about 'Rosa' and her psychology while working

undercover to control and manipulate her. For example he knew how she had cared for her mother when she was a child and how this had left her unable to refuse demands for care from those she loved. He used this knowledge to keep her trapped in the relationship, claiming that he needed her care and was dependent upon her. This was all information that he had obtained through his undercover deployment. Rosa rekindled the relationship and was pregnant within two weeks. Two children were born of the relationship.

8. When 'Rosa' indicated that she might leave the relationship, Boyling used his status as a police officer to coerce her into staying with him. He told her that he would always be able to find her through his colleagues in the police and that she would never be safe. Again this is relevant to the adequacy or otherwise of supervision and the on-going impact on individuals. [See corrections to paragraphs 5 to 8 at paragraphs 18 to 21 below]

#### *Mike Blake*

9. 'Lizzie' was in a relationship with undercover officer Mike Blake between October 1985 and May 1987, when he disappeared.
10. Two years after his disappearance, Blake reappeared and attempted to rekindle the relationship. Again her experiences illustrate the on-going effects of an undercover operation beyond the official end of the deployment.

#### *Mark Kennedy*

11. 'Lisa' was in a relationship with undercover officer Mark Kennedy between September 2004 and October 2010.
12. In around October 2009, Kennedy's deployment as an undercover officer ended. He left the country, saying that he was visiting his brother in the United States.

13. In January 2010 Kennedy returned. He bought a narrow boat and from January 2010 until October 2010 he mostly moored it next to a boat belonging to 'Lisa' and they effectively lived together. He continued to maintain his undercover identity during this period.

14. In July 2010 Kennedy and 'Lisa' went on holiday together to Italy. While there 'Lisa' found an expired passport for Kennedy in his van which stated his name was Mark Kennedy and that he had one dependent. She also found messages from two children on his phone. When 'Lisa' questioned him about this he said he had previously been a drug smuggler, and that the children were his best friend's. He claimed this friend had been killed and that he had taken responsibility for them, but that he had not discharged this responsibility that well. 'Lisa' now believes that this was the cover story he had been given as an undercover officer, and he used it to maintain his deceit following his departure from the police. He was at the very least utilising his experience/training as an undercover officer to invent and sustain a cover story and to pursue an intimate relationship with 'Lisa'. The relationship continued until October 2010 when she discovered his real identity.

*Amendments to my second statement*

15. The preparation of my statement of 25 January 2018 had been undertaken by my colleague Kate Thomas on my behalf due to my having to deal with an urgent unexpected and all encompassing matter over the past few weeks. The statement was sent to the other RLRs representing NPSCPs and it was agreed it should be submitted. I understood that 'Rosa' had communicated her approval of the content of paragraphs 5 to 8 to my colleague and therefore signed the statement and provided it to Tamsin Allen for onward submission to the Inquiry.

16. I was contacted by the Inquiry on 30 January 2018 to ask if it was ok to publish the statement on the Inquiry website. I emailed the CPs I represent who were affected and discovered then that Rosa had not seen emails sent

with the statement and had, in fact, not approved the final content of paragraphs 5 to 8 because it did not properly capture the nuances of her instructions.

17. She requested that I amend paragraphs 5 to 8 as set out in paragraphs 18 to 21 below. The accurate and approved account from Rosa, under the heading 'Jim Boyling' reads as follows:

18. 'Rosa' was first deceived into a relationship with Boyling in November 1999. In September 2000 it appears that he was withdrawn from undercover work and he disappeared.

19. After disappearing from London and going missing abroad, Rosa started investigations into his background, whereupon he started sending intermittent and cryptic emails to Rosa and then in November 2001, Boyling 'bumped into' 'Rosa' in a bookshop where she was working. He explained that he was deployed as an undercover officer but that he had quickly realised that his true beliefs chimed with activists he was spying on, that he loved Rosa and had found out where he belonged. He assured that he was the only undercover officer in the movement, that the movement was safe but that he was at risk from his superiors. He asked for her help to get away from the police, he said he loved her and wanted to 'live a free life with her'.

20. 'Rosa' was in a state of extreme vulnerability, as so many of the events surrounding Boyling's disappearance were extremely traumatic. Boyling used information he learned about 'Rosa' and her psychology while working undercover to control and manipulate her. For example he knew how she had cared for her mother when she was a child and how this had made her feel deeply responsible for others in need and those she loved. He used this knowledge to keep her trapped in the relationship, claiming that he needed her care and was dependent upon her. This was all information that he had

obtained through his undercover deployment. The secrecy surrounding the operations meant that Boyling was able to make many claims we now know to be false. The relationship recommenced and 'Rosa' was pregnant within two weeks. Two children were born of and into the relationship.

21. 'When 'Rosa' repeatedly indicated that she might leave the relationship, Boyling used his status as a police officer and his by then narrative of a police state to coerce her into staying with him. He made it clear that he would always be able to find her through his colleagues in the police and that she would never be safe. Rosa only managed to extricate herself and her children via Refuge a service less available in the present day. Again this is relevant to the adequacy or otherwise of supervision and the on-going impact on individuals.

I believe the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true.

Signed: [the Inquiry holds a signed copy]

Dated: 31/1/18