

Core participants Ruling 28
Recognised Legal Representatives Ruling 22
Costs of Legal Representation Awards Ruling 21

“Maya”

1. “Maya” has provided a statement to the Inquiry about an intimate relationship which she says occurred between her and HN18, an undercover officer deployed into the International Solidarity Movement, in his cover name. She says that she first discovered that he was an undercover officer on 20 March 2019. He has been provided with a copy of her statement and has decided to seek legal advice independently of the Metropolitan Police Service. His application for a restriction order in respect of his real name is pending.
2. “Maya” makes three applications: that she be designated a core participant; that Cormac McDonough of Hodge Jones and Allen Solicitors be designated as her recognised legal representative; and for an award of costs under section 40(2) Inquiries Act 2005. I accede to each application.
3. I am satisfied that she played or may have played a direct and significant role in relation to the matters to which the Inquiry relates and may have a significant interest in an important aspect of them: if, as she alleges, HN18 undertook an intimate relationship with her in his cover name and role as a supporter of the International Solidarity Movement, it would be a further instance of a repeated occurrence and may help to answer questions which the Inquiry must investigate about them, to permit it to fulfil its terms of reference. I am also satisfied that “Maya” did not realise and could not reasonably have been expected to realise that HN18 was an undercover officer until 20 March 2019 and made her application promptly thereafter.
4. She will need legal representation to assist her in both the procedural and substantive phases of the inquiry. Cormac McDonough represents two other participants in the International Solidarity Movement and should be able to provide legal representation for her at economical cost.
5. I have been provided with evidence about her means, which I accept. They would not be adequate to permit her to pay for the legal representation she requires. It would not be reasonable to expect her to do so.

6. Pending determination of her application for a restriction order in respect of her name and witness statement, both are “potentially restricted evidence” under rule 12(1) of the Inquiry Rules 2006 and are subject to the same restrictions as would apply as if in order in respect of both had been made.

Prof Jonathan Rosenhead

7. On 21 March 2019 I designated Professor Rosenhead as a core participant. He now applies for an award of costs under section 40(2) of the 2005 Act. I have been provided with a short statement of his means, which I accept. He falls into the category of members of the public directly affected by the targeting of political and social justice campaigns by undercover police officers, referred to in paragraph 12 of Sir Christopher Pitchford’s costs ruling of 16 December 2015. His financial circumstances are not exceptional so that it would be unfair unreasonable and disproportionate to require him to bear the financial burden of legal representation at the Inquiry. The award of costs will be on the same footing as those already made in respect of the other clients of his recognised legal representative, Mike Schwarz.

7 May 2019

Sir John Mitting
Chairman, Undercover Policing Inquiry