

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

---

**OPEN APPLICATION FOR A RESTRICTION ORDER (ANONYMITY)  
RE: HN67  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE MPS**

---

**Restriction Order Sought**

1. The MPS apply for a restriction order over the real identity of HN67 to last indefinitely in the following terms:
  - (1) No direct or indirect disclosure of HN67's real name (including any description or image capable of identifying HN67) 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 under Article 8 ECHR

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 and minded to notes issued since that date.

**Evidence in Support**

4. This application is supplemented by a closed risk assessment which is not to be disseminated further than the Chairman and the Inquiry team. The

application is further supported by medical evidence supplied by HN67's lawyers.

## **Reasons**

### Section 17

5. Application of the statutory and common law principles of fairness require that the real identity of HN67 is not disclosed. The considerations which apply are highlighted below in relation to s. 19(3)(a) and/or 19(3)(b) and s.19(4).

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

6. A restriction order protecting HN67'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 HN67's real name would amount to an unjustified and/or disproportionate interference with his/her right to private and family life. See the Risk Assessment at §8.10, §16.2, §19, §20 for the objective effect of, and extent of risk of, disclosure. It is reasonable to infer that there would be some public interest in HN67 (see Risk Assessment at §16.1, §20).

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

8. The Chairman is invited to find that a Restriction Order protecting HN67'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



9. It is in the public interest for HN67's real identity to be restricted on the basis that it would avoid or reduce the risk of causing harm to this person namely damage to HN67's health and well being, and interference with HN67's private and family life. The risks of harm to HN67 in the event of disclosure of real name are set out in the Risk Assessment at §8.10, §16.2, §19, §20.
10. The following public interest factors are relevant:
  - a. HN67 was attached to the SDS in the 1980s as a UCO and again in the 1990s in a management capacity. The MPS makes no application to restrict the cover identity used whilst deployed as a UCO.
  - b. HN67 has respected the confidentiality of his/her work and has relied on his/her anonymity as a source of protection and security. See Risk Assessment at §3.4.

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

11. The MPS appreciates that the public interest in openness is a factor which weighs against the making of a Restriction Order in HN67's case. However, the real name will not assist the Inquiry in fulfilling its Terms of Reference or assist Core Participants or witnesses who would not have known HN67 by their real name.
12. Witnesses who know HN67 by real name would be able to give evidence about HN67 using the cipher. For the reasons set out in the Risk Assessment and other evidence, the MPS submits that restriction of real name is necessary to avoid the interference in HN67's private and family life and associated harms.

#### Where the public interest balance lies

13. The MPS has considered the Chairman's Principles Ruling and has had particular regard to the importance of openness in the Public Inquiry.
14. In all the circumstances, the MPS makes this application for a Restriction Order over HN67's real name on the bases of fairness, and to avoid a risk or serious harm/of unjustified and/or disproportionate interference with HN67's right to private and family life. The MPS submits such an application is in the public interest and conducive to the Inquiry's terms of reference.

**MPS, Department of Legal Services**

**26 February 2018**