

Q. Coming back to your concern about participation in crime, you have used the adjective "serious". Where did you draw the line? What was "serious"?

A. I think that had to be decided at the time. That was the wording, I think, of the -- the instruction we followed, and frankly, "serious" would have involved, well, anything which was going to cause serious damage to people or property.

Q. Now, I'm reading from your witness statement where you've written: "It was accepted that if you attended demonstrations and were involved in punch ups you would probably be arrested. The concern was with serious crime." We're going to come in more detail to HN13 later, but how are we to understand that part of your evidence? Are you saying that it was part and parcel of an infiltration into one of the rowdier groups that your officers would get involved in public disorder?

A. Yes. I -- I -- what I'm saying is that they -- if the group was involved in disorder, then clearly my undercover man would have to be involved with it. Now, that's a difficult one for him to play, but clearly avoiding causing too much damage to anybody, but if -- if he's involved with the crowd, he was going to be arrested.

Q. So he may be involved in a punch up --

A. Yes.

Q. -- but you would not want him to be punching very hard.

A. Exactly.

Q. But you would accept he might be involved in some violence.

A. Yes. I don't think there's any -- any way he could have got out of it.

Q. Was any guidance given to officers in this sort of group?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. Was any guidance given to officers in this sort of group?

A. No, I think there was general discussion in terms of what happened if they became involved in the violent part of disorder.

Q. So if we take somebody like HN13, who is deployed into a Maoist group which was getting involved in scuffles, presumably, when you're speaking to him in the safe house, he's telling you what life is like on the streets with the Maoists?

A. Absolutely.

Q. And are you giving him any guidance or help with how he should behave?

A. I can't remember specifically talking to HN13 about it, but I'm sure we did discuss it.

Q. And how did the UCOs know where to draw the line?

A. I think only -- it had to be their own judgment, because one was not there to help them. You can't -- in the middle of a fracas, you can't say, "You may do this, but you can't do that". I think that would be impossible.

Q. Is it fair to say that a great deal was left to the judgment of the officers on the ground?

A. It had to be. They were police officers after all.