

## IN THE MATTER OF THE UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

---

### GISTED SUMMARY OF GROUNDS FOR APPLICATION OF EN30

---

1. EN30 seeks a Restriction Order covering his/her real or covert identities. EN30's statement in support of the application provides a detailed explanation of the risks arising to him/her and others if his/her real or covert identity is disclosed by the Inquiry. In particular, EN30 explains the risks arising from his/her policing role prior to his/her secondment to the National Public Order Intelligence Unit ('NPOIU').
2. EN30 did not use a pseudonym whilst engaged in sensitive policing work and is extremely concerned that, if his/her real name is publicised as being a covert officer, then there is a possibility that EN30 and others would be exposed to unnecessary risk and interference with their article 2, 3 and 8 rights. A risk to others may arise in the event that EN30's photograph is released. EN30 has not had access to the documents and, as this was some time ago, he/she is unable to recall the details. EN30 requests that the appointed risk assessor considers carefully the relevant records in order to analyse risk to EN30 and others.
3. EN30's application details the dates of the NPOIU deployments, his/her cover name and the operations in which he/she was a cover officer. EN30 is concerned about the specific risks to him/her and an undercover officer arising from revelation of his/her real name. EN30 requests that all relevant documents are considered by the risk assessor.
4. EN30 submits that there are also article 2 and article 3 risks arising from the fact that he/she was a cover officer for officers deployed against animal rights and environmental activists. EN30's statement deals with his/her concerns based on the direct action that he/she is aware of; including the planting of incendiary devices. EN30 refers the Inquiry to the recent targeting of Juley Howard which has added to his/her anxiety about the possibility of his/her real name being disclosed.
5. EN30 requires the Inquiry to take into account the interference with EN30's and his/her family's article 8 rights which would arise from disclosure of his/her real identity. EN30 explains the impact on his/her family.

6. EN30 is certain that assurances were provided that his/her identity as a cover officer would never be revealed. EN30 contends that it is self-evident that he/she and others would never have undertaken this work if they considered that there was a risk of public disclosure. EN30 also asserts that guarantees were provided by senior officers in charge of the NPOIU at the time. EN30 also recalls that he/she and others were given this assurance on the training course.
  
7. Due to the passage of time, EN30 does not have a vivid recollection of the day to day work and intelligence that was provided and he/she is, consequently, uncertain about the extent of the risk that flows from the revelation of his/her real name or the possibility of a photograph linking him/her to his/her name being released. EN30 also cannot comment fully on the risk to undercover officers for whom he/she was appointed as cover officer or others with whom s/he worked. EN30 is anxious about the possibility of assault or attacks on him/her, his/her family and home, reputational attacks and cyber-attacks. EN30 is concerned to ensure that the risks posed by animal rights and environmental activists are considered fully by the risk assessor and the Inquiry when considering the impact on EN30's and his/her family's article 2, 3 and 8 rights. EN30 seeks a Restriction Order precluding disclosure of his/her real and cover names.

Clyde and Co

7 July 2017