

Gist of HN354's accounts of sexual relationships

1. A risk assessment, dated 2 November 2017, was prepared in respect of HN354. Section 4.12 of the risk assessment said:

"4.12 Relationships entered into

[H]N354 stated that he had four "one night stands" during his deployment on dates unknown. This had not previously been disclosed.

- *he spent the night with an activist named 'Madeleine'. He could not remember her surname, but recalls that she was a bus conductor. The situation arose after a party at her house when he intended to sleep on the floor, however there was a mutual attraction and they ended up in bed together. Both had been drinking and it was completely spontaneous. No relationship followed as a result of this and the two remained on good terms.*
- *he spent the night with an activist at the end of his deployment when he was leaving the group. This was a similarly spontaneous situation and he is again unable to remember her name at all. [H]N354 said that both were drunk as they had been celebrating his impending departure. Again, no relationship followed as a result of this.*
- *He had two other very brief sexual relationships during his deployment, both with women unconnected to his role or political activity but whom he met in the course of his daily 'routine'.*

[H]N354 was adamant that none of these incidents were planned or designed to further his standing in the group, or for the purpose of intelligence gathering. He was a single man in his 20's at the time and these were spontaneous events, although he believes it would have appeared odd to have acted otherwise. He also said that he had deliberately distanced himself from potential relationships, which had then invited overtures from a gay activist. Although not the driving factor, the sexual encounters avoided this other equally awkward situation.

To illustrate this distinction, [H]N354 said that Julia Pointer (4.8 above) was keen to start a relationship with him and had made this clear. He did not reciprocate for the very reason that this was contrary to SDS directions, morally questionable and could have compromised his deployment. There is no indication that any children were born as a result of these relationships."

The name of the second individual referred to above was listed at section 4.8 of the risk assessment; under 'peripheral associations'. The person referred to as "keen to start a relationship" at the end of section 4.12 (who was a different, further, individual) is also named within section 4.8, but under 'key associates'.

2. Within an impact statement dated 29 November 2017 provided to the Inquiry, HN354 said:

"10. I had two very brief sexual encounters with activists associated with the SWP whilst I was deployed undercover. In each case we had sex on one occasion, we didn't have a lasting intimate relationship thereafter and remained friends whilst I was deployed."

3. The Inquiry sent a letter dated 8 February 2018 to the Designated Lawyers as representatives of HN354 which sought details of "any individuals with whom the officer may have had either a

sexual relationship of any kind, or a particularly intimate but non-sexual relationship, in his or her cover identity.” In response the Designated Lawyers replied in a letter dated 22 February 2018:

“In respect of HN354, para. 10 of his impact statement refers to two one night stands. Both women would now be in their sixties and their names were [Madeleine] (surname unknown) and [Privacy] (surname possibly [Privacy] or [Privacy]).

Subject to the above, and on our understanding of the relevant test, none of the other relationships referred to in the risk assessments and impact statements for these individuals was “particularly intimate” in the requisite sense. However, please let me know if you read any of those documents differently and wish to request more information about any particular relationship referred to.”

The second individual mentioned in this letter is same person referred to in the second bullet point of section 4.12 (and named in section 4.8 under ‘peripheral associations’) of the risk assessment.

UCPI