

Cover Sheet

S35A



Witness: 1st Witness Statement of Brian Lockie

Exhibits Referred to: None

Date Statement Made: 26th January 2021

UNDERCOVER POLICING INQUIRY

Witness: Brian Lockie

Occupation: Aviation Security Compliance Auditor

Address: c/o Metropolitan Police Service, Directorate of Legal Services, Empress State Building, London SW6 1TR

1. I have been asked to provide a witness statement to assist the Undercover Policing Inquiry regarding the risk assessment prepared in respect of HN155. In preparing this statement I have sought to answer all the questions asked of me in the Rule 9 request dated 15 January 2021 and provided to me on 19 January 2021.

2. I was employed by the Metropolitan Police Service as an Independent Risk Assessor from February 2017 until the end of February 2018. During this time I prepared and assisted with the preparation of a number of risk assessments in relation to nominals involved in the Undercover Policing Inquiry.

3. Before making this witness statement, I had regard to the following documents which were provided to me with the Rule 9 request:
 - (i) Paragraph 4.12 of the final risk assessment prepared in relation to HN155;

[REDACTED]

(ii) Paragraph 115 of HN155's witness statement (MPS-0746083).

Risk assessment prepared in respect of HN155

4. I was present, along with David Reid, when HN155 was interviewed on 14 November 2017 for the purposes of his risk assessment. Dave and I attended HN155's home address for this interview. Dave was the lead risk assessor for HN155 and I was the second risk assessor. As a general rule, my role as the second risk assessor was to be the second person in the room. If Dave missed something or misunderstood something that was said, I was there to help. I would not have done any real preparation for the interview; Dave would have done that. During the interview, Dave would have taken 95% of the lead.

5. I did not make any notes of the interview with HN155. Dave would have taken the notes. It was a three-way conversation, but Dave would have been the person recording HN155's answers.

6. HN155 was very cagey and would not directly answer on the question of sexual relationships. I recall HN155 describing groupies and sexual relationships of sorts. HN155 would not say explicitly what he had done, but there was a strong suggestion that something had gone on. HN155 was flirting around the issue of sexual relationships and we were going round in circles. I got the feeling he was asking our opinion about whether he should provide more detail on the issue. I definitely had the impression he was talking about himself and his own experience of engaging in sexual activity with those in groups he infiltrated whilst deployed. My impression was that HN155 was referring to his actual experience

[REDACTED]

of such interactions rather than the possibility of such interactions during his deployment.

7. It is stated at paragraph 4.12 of the final risk assessment prepared in relation to HN155 that:

"N155 admitted to having a number of liaisons, although he would not necessarily use the term 'relationship' as they were very short lived. He stated that he needed to live a 'full alternative lifestyle' in all aspects, but could not recall the specifics. None of the relationships were medium or long term. He stated there were 'groupies' who wanted to spend the night with someone who was close to the SWP Central Committee. He was reluctant to discuss matters further, but thought that he would only have given the women his first name. He does not recall their names. He stated that not all of the 'dalliances' (his word) would have led to sex. He initially stated there may have been 2 or 3 women but then said there may possibly have been a few more. ..."

8. This is a very accurate record of the account given by HN155 and accords with my recollection of what was said.
9. I have considered paragraph 115 of the witness statement prepared by HN155 (MPS-0746083), which cites paragraphs 9-13 of his impact statement. As I have stated above, paragraph 4.12 is a very accurate record of HN155's account and accords with recollection of what was said in the interview; I do not consider it "misinterpreted" HN155's comments.



10. I make the following comments about HN155's account of the interview:

- (i) In paragraph 9 of his impact statement, HN155 states: *"I was not as clear as I should have been about the dividing line between the specific, factual details of my particular deployment and more hypothetical comments about such deployments"*. HN155 is suggesting that it was not a specific conversation that we had about engaging in sexual relationships whilst undercover, but a general conversation. As I have stated above, my view of his comments during the interview were that they were about his experience. Other nominals with whom we discussed the issue of sexual relationships during the risk assessment interview would say, for example, "I did not have sexual relationships but I am aware some people did and this is how I know". HN155 never spoke in the hypothetical. I only got the impression he was talking about himself.

- (ii) In paragraph 10 of his impact statement, HN155 states: *"I recall being quite clear that I did not engage in sexual activity while I was undercover"*. At no stage did HN155 say this during the interview. If HN155 had said this, Dave would have recorded it in his notes. It was not our job as risk assessors to prove anything; our job was to try and get the nominal to tell us what he wanted to tell us, and we would prepare a risk assessment based on that. I had no bias one way or the other.

- (iii) We would not have said, as is stated at paragraph 10 of HN155's impact statement, that it would have been quite possible and not surprising if

[REDACTED]

HN155 had engaged in sexual activity given the length and depth of his deployment. I have no recollection of such a conversation because I do not think it happened. I know I would not have said this, and I am pretty sure Dave would not have said this either. This involves a suggestion that such behaviour was okay and it was not our remit as risk assessors to suggest or say that.

(iv) I remember HN155 saying something in the interview about him "living his life to the full", words which he uses in paragraph 10 of his impact statement. I am pretty sure he did say the words "dalliances" and "groupies", which are recorded in quotation marks in paragraph 4.12 of the risk assessment. They are quite unusual words and I do not remember them being mentioned by anyone else in the interview.

11. I cannot remember, 3 years on, what question(s) were asked of HN155 to illicit the responses recorded in the risk assessment. There is a pro forma set of questions for the risk assessment and you would ask the question in front of you. The question would have been simple and open ended, something like "did you have sexual relationships with anybody?". Depending on the answer there would be follow up questions. We were not conducting a criminal investigation, but a risk assessment on behalf of the Inquiry. HN155 was not the only nominal we had this kind of conversation with. You can ask the question once or twice, but we were not there to interrogate. It was his chance to tell us what he wanted to say; it was not a case of us keeping going and going until we got the answer we 'wanted'.



12. I did not attend the subsequent 'fact checking' meeting as part of the risk assessment. I therefore cannot comment on paragraphs 11 and 12 of HN155's impact statement, cited at paragraph 115 of his witness statement. As a general rule, we would try and have two risk assessors attend the initial interview and then the lead risk assessor would attend the 'fact checking' meeting. As stated above, Dave was the lead risk assessor for HN155 and so he attended the 'fact checking' meeting with HN155. I do not remember when the 'fact checking' meeting was, but I remember Dave coming back and saying it was a brief meeting. It was up to the nominal how long the 'fact checking' meeting lasted and often it would take a long time because the nominal wanted to go through every single line of the risk assessment. However, I believe in HN155's case it was quite quick.

13. I would have read through the risk assessment Dave prepared, probably before he visited HN155 for the 'fact checking' meeting. Dave would have discussed with me any bits of the risk assessment he was not sure about, for example if there was anything very unusual. A lot of it was very subjective. We would have discussed matters again if anything came up in the 'fact checking' meeting.

14. I remember having a conversation with Dave about the sexual relationship issue after the initial meeting; I cannot remember exactly when this was, but it was probably when he reached the sexual relationships part of the risk assessment. This was quite an important part of the risk assessment and it was important that we were both comfortable that the risk assessment was accurate in terms of what HN155 had said. The interview is not tape recorded; we only had the notes of the



interview and had to compile the risk assessment based on those notes. Dave and I discussed what was in the notes. It would have been the unusualness and uncertainty about what HN155 had said about sexual relationships that prompted this discussion between us. However, we were both of the opinion that HN155 was talking about himself and his own experiences. Dave did not discuss anything with me which came out of his 'fact checking' meeting with HN155.

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed: Brian Lockie 

Dated: 26th January 2021