

Statement made on behalf of: The Metropolitan Police, Designated Lawyer
Witness: HN53
Statement No: 1
Exhibits: 1
Date Statement Made: 17 November 2017

IN THE MATTER OF: PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO UNDERCOVER POLICING

Witness: HN53
Address: c/o Designated Lawyer, PO Box 73779, London, WC1A 9NL

I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Unsigned but approved

1. I have been asked to make a statement about the impact on me if my real or cover name were released in connection with the UCPI. I have made this statement without recently having seen any documents save exhibit 2 to the Cairo Statement published online this week. The dates set out below are from memory.
2. I wish for my real and cover identities to be restricted for the reasons set out below. In summary, **sets out public interest reason(s)**

3. I understand that the Inquiry has invited applications based on impact, and without the benefit of a Risk Assessment in a number of cases. I understand that making an application now, based on the evidence set out below will not preclude me from making a fuller application with the benefit of my own Risk Assessment if the Inquiry is not minded to restrict my real and cover



names based on the current evidence. I would ask the Inquiry to err on the side of caution with respect to any bridge between my cover and real identity.

4. I further understand that there are a considerable number of documents that relate to me, particularly in my management role, and that the Commissioner will not be able to review them for quite some time. I would want to be able to fully consider the overall picture before any final decision short of restricting real and cover names were made. The inclusion of my cipher within Exhibit 2 of the Cairo statement has already identified my rank and, to an extent, dated my involvement with the SDS as a manager as HN53. I would hope that any further publication of documents is more cautiously considered until my restriction order application is dealt with.

Expectation of confidentiality

5. There was an expectation of confidentiality within the SDS. It was taken as read that you were in the position of an informant with the same privileges and it was implicit in the Positive/Developed Vetting process that it would remain secret and was part of the SB ethos.

SDS Involvement

6. I was a UCO *in the 1980s* [redacted] and returned as Detective Inspector from about [redacted] 1998 to [redacted] 2005. I targeted *sets out group(s) deployed into* [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

7. My cover name was [redacted]
Sets out details of cover identity [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

8. I had no sexual relationships of any kind and no particularly intimate relationships. No one went to prison or was convicted because of me being a UCO. I think public order was helped e.g. at demos by my reporting and generally that of other UCOs. The SDS did have a great influence on the overall policing of public order; Gold would know what to do based on intelligence received.

9. Whilst I would hope that my cover name would not lead to me being identified, there has been no assessment of this, and I would ask the Chairman to err on the side of caution. In any event, I also think that there are compelling reasons to restrict my real and cover name when looked at together and when considering *another issue* [redacted] I am concerned about *sets out reason* [redacted]
[redacted] and I am concerned about any risk (however small) of there being bridging between the cover and real names such that my real name becomes associated with the SDS and Special Branch.



Time in management

10. I took over from Bob Lambert. I thought that his systems were over complicated, i.e. the want for secrecy made things cumbersome.

11. I know that I will be of interest to the Inquiry in my management role. I can't see, however, how my real name assists with the Inquiry exploring this. I was involved in the A&B v the Commissioner litigation and **sets out specific occasion on which involved** [redacted]. Whilst I appreciate that some of the evidence that I would give would identify me to Peter Francis and B, I don't see why I cannot remain ciphred and screened, with closed hearings if necessary. I was involved in formulating the policy for psychiatric monitoring, outside of the usual MPS process which was seen as a box-ticking exercise. [redacted]

12. [redacted] **Sets out officers that he managed**

13. I was a cover officer. **Sets out detail of some travel as a cover officer** [redacted]

Other police work

14. **Sets out other non SDS police work** [redacted]

Current work

15. **Sets out details of current employment** [redacted]

[Redacted]

16. [Redacted]

17. [Redacted]

18. [Redacted]

Concerns

19. My main concern is **a public interest concern not connected to the SDS** [Redacted]

20. My wife knows I am an ex UCO and she knows some of my SB contemporaries. **Sets out limited knowledge of friends and family and potential risks of being identified** [Redacted]

[Redacted]

21. Friends and family from **where we used to live** [Redacted]

[Redacted] knew I was police and doing something undercover. Whilst "drugs" was the easy cover, they may now suspect me of being SDS. Where we live now, some people know I am ex-police and some people know a little about what I do now. I do not know how family and friends would react, but I doubt it would be positive given the revelations that have come out.

22. **Sets out article 8 family issues including relating to health of spouse and impact of revelation of cover name on family members** [Redacted]

[Redacted]

23. [Redacted]

[Redacted]

24. I am further concerned that I have the same cipher in both UC and management roles and I am concerned that this highlights to **others** [Redacted] who I am and that I was a UC as well as being a manager. **Sets out concern re unmasking of other officers by journalists** [Redacted]

[Redacted]