

**IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO UNDERCOVER  
POLICING**

**OPEN APPLICATION FOR A RESTRICTION ORDER (ANONYMITY)  
RE: HN345  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE MPS**

**Restriction Order Sought**

1. The MPS apply for a restriction order over the real identity of HN345 to last indefinitely in the following terms:
  - (1) No direct or indirect disclosure of HN345's real name (including any description or image capable of identifying him) beyond the Chairman and the Inquiry team;
  - (2) The Commissioner reserves the right to make further submission as to the effective operation of this Restriction Order during the course of the Inquiry.

**Legal Basis for the Application**

2. The Application is made on the following statutory basis:
  - s.17(3) of the Inquiries Act 2005: the duty to act with fairness in the procedure or conduct of an inquiry
  - s.19(3)(a) of the Inquiries Act 2005 and Article 8 ECHR: the duty to act in a way that is not incompatible with the right to private and family life.
  - s.19(3)(b) read together with s.19(4)(b)-(d) of the Inquiries Act 2005: conducive to the Inquiry fulfilling its terms of reference or necessary in the public interest, having regard in particular to the matters mentioned in subsection (4).
3. The applicable legal principles have been comprehensively set out in the Chairman's Restriction Order: Legal Principles and Approach Ruling ("the Principles Ruling") of 3 May 2016. Regard has also been had to the restriction order rulings in respect of Cairo and HN7; the 'minded to' note dated 25 October 2016 in respect of Jaipur and Karachi; and the 'minded to' notes dated 3 August 2017 and 23 October 2017 in respect of former SDS officers.

**Evidence in Support**

4. This application is supplemented by a closed Risk Assessment and a closed impact statement, which is not to be disseminated further than the Chairman and the Inquiry team.

## Reasons

### *Section 17*

5. Application of the statutory and common law principles of fairness require that the real identity of HN345 is not disclosed. The considerations which apply are highlighted below in relation to s.19(3)(a) and ss19(3)(b) and 19(4).

### *Section 19(3)(a) and Article 8*

6. A restriction order protecting HN345's identity is required in order for the Inquiry to meet its duty under the Human Rights Act 1998 not to act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention right. The Convention right in issue is Article 8.
7. Disclosure of HN345's real name would amount to a disproportionate interference with his right to private and family life. In particular, the objective effect of disclosure is set out at §§16, 19 of the Risk Assessment. HN345 has set out the subjective interference that he fears in his impact statement: see in particular §§10-13.
8. It is reasonable to infer that there would be some public interest in HN345 by virtue of his status as a former UCO.
9. The level of risk posed by this interference with HN345's private and family life is set out in the Risk Assessment at §19.

### *Section 19(3)(b) and s19(4)*

10. The Chairman is invited to find that a Restriction Order protecting HN345's real identity is conducive to the Inquiry fulfilling its Terms of Reference or is necessary in the public interest having regard in particular to the factors set out at s.19(4) of the Act read together with the Chairman's approach at [152] of the Principles Ruling:

*"...when considering whether to make an order restricting disclosure of any relevant particular piece of information on public interest grounds I will be required to:*

- (1) identify the public interest in non-disclosure;*
- (2) assess the risk and level of harm to the public interest that would follow disclosure of that information;*
- (3) identify the public interest in disclosure;*
- (4) assess the risk and level of harm to the public interest that would follow non-disclosure of that information;*
- (5) make in respect of that information a fact sensitive assessment of the position at which the public interest balance should rest".*

### The public interest in non-disclosure of real identity

11. The following public interest factors are pertinent:

- (a) HN345 was attached to the SOS in the early 1970s. He infiltrated a range of groups, most of which are now defunct. Although it is not possible to conclusively state the duration of his deployment, it was brief in time and the extent of his infiltration is best described as superficial.
- (b) HN345 understood the nature of his work to be confidential and has respected that confidentiality for the better part of 40 years: see impact statement at §12.
- (c) It is in the public interest for HN345's real identity to be restricted on the basis that it would amount to a disproportionate interference with his right to private and family life. The likely source and level of such interference is set out in the Risk Assessment at §19 and in the impact statement at §§10-11.

The public interest in disclosure of real identity

- 12. The MPS appreciates that the general presumption in favour of openness is a factor which weighs against the making of a Restriction Order in HN345's case. However, MPS submits that there is no identifiable public interest in disclosure of HN345's real name in circumstances where the real name alone is of no assistance to the Inquiry in fulfilling its Terms of Reference or to Core Participants or witnesses who would not have known HN345 by his real name.

Where the public interest balance lies

- 13. The MPS has considered the Chairman's Principles Ruling and has had particular regard to the presumption of openness in the Public Inquiry.
- 14. In all the circumstances, the MPS makes this application for a Restriction Order over HN345's real name on the bases of fairness, and to avoid a risk or of disproportionate interference with HN345's right to private and family life. The MPS further submits such an application is in the public interest and conducive to the Inquiry's terms of reference.

**MPS, Department of Legal Services**

**24 October 2017**