

<p>1 2 (2.00 pm) 3 MR JAY: Mr Fedorcio, we're back to the gift and hospitality 4 registers. The names who keep on cropping up are 5 Lucy Panton, Stephen Wright, Mike Sullivan and John 6 Twomey. Would that be right? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Given all the interactions which you had with them, one 9 begins to wonder what you had to talk about. What was 10 it, Mr Fedorcio? 11 A. I think in the main, they -- as I said earlier, they 12 were quite active in covering the Metropolitan Police, 13 following lots of different angles and stories. They 14 were often exploring whether -- you know, they were the 15 sorts of stories that we would be interested in 16 assisting them with. 17 Q. A lot of people might think -- and therefore I put it to 18 you bluntly in these terms -- that the reason why they 19 kept on lunching with you, really serially or 20 systematically, is they knew you were a very good source 21 of leaks. Is that right or not? 22 A. That's wrong. 23 Q. May I move on, please, to paragraph 61 of your 24 statement. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 A. But the horse remains in the ownership of the 2 Metropolitan Police. 3 Q. Certainly. And arrangements were made for Rebekah Wade 4 to visit Imber Court where the stables were? 5 A. That's right. 6 Q. And to meet with both presumably the horse and Inspector 7 Hiscock? 8 A. No, not the horse. 9 Q. Not the horse at that point? 10 A. There was a nine-month gap between this meeting and 11 Rebekah Wade getting the horse, I think in July the 12 following year. 13 Q. Okay, we'll go through the history. As far as you were 14 concerned, you were keen, were you not, that Rebekah 15 Wade get her horse; is that right? 16 A. I was keen that if she was able to enter the scheme like 17 any other member of the public, then she should be able 18 to. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: How long had this scheme been going 20 on for? Did you find out? 21 A. I don't know. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you know how many people have been 23 lent animals in this way? 24 A. Subsequently, I think in recent weeks because of some of 25 the coverage, I've seen suggested about 12 horses</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 Q. This is something, to be fair, that you volunteer, and 2 it relates to Rebekah Wade acquiring the retired police 3 horse; is that correct? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. When Rebekah Wade first telephoned you, which you say 6 you think was in September 2007, did she contact you on 7 your mobile phone or office phone? 8 A. I think it was a call to the office by her PA, who put 9 her through to me. 10 Q. She made a general enquiry about the MPS loan of retired 11 police horses. Was that something you knew about before 12 she raised the matter? 13 A. Not in any great depth. I was aware of a police officer 14 who had taken a retired horse after the officer had 15 retired to his home in the north of England, but 16 I wasn't aware of a broader scheme, no. 17 Q. You made enquiry. You think the person you spoke to was 18 someone called Inspector Hiscock; is that right? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. He outlined the scheme to you, which was simply this: 21 that the retired horse is lent to the member of the 22 public, is that right, and the member of the public pays 23 for upkeep and everything else? 24 A. That's right, but it remains -- 25 Q. Pardon me?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 a year. 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I've not seen that. 3 MR JAY: You say at paragraph 63 that you felt that this, 4 which presumably was Rebekah Wade taking up with 5 a horse, could possibly lead to some positive coverage 6 about the care of retired police horses, which suggests 7 that you were keen that Rebekah Wade, as it were, get 8 her horse; is that right? 9 A. No, I was just expressing a view that if she were to get 10 a horse, then it might lead to some coverage. 11 Q. Why did you speak to the Commissioner about it, if it 12 wasn't on the premise that Rebekah Wade would get her 13 horse? 14 A. I spoke to the Commissioner because on the day that 15 I was due to take her to Imber Court, we were having 16 lunch with Rebekah Wade, and I thought it would be wrong 17 for Rebekah Wade to turn up at the lunch, having been at 18 the Metropolitan Police stables that morning and had 19 such a discussion with the officer, and I assumed one of 20 her first lines would be: "I've had a very interesting 21 morning at stables", and the Commissioner would have 22 looked blank. I thought he needed to be briefed on what 23 might come up over lunch. 24 Q. Yes. So the lunch had been arranged before Rebekah Wade 25 was ever going to see the horse?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Or --</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Was the issue discussed at lunch?</p> <p>5 A. Briefly. It was, as I predicted, that he sort of said,</p> <p>6 "Have you had a good morning?" and she said, "Yes, I had</p> <p>7 a good visit to the stables, they were very good</p> <p>8 facilities." That was it.</p> <p>9 Q. Presumably, she was, by that stage, aware that in</p> <p>10 principle she was going to acquire a horse on loan; is</p> <p>11 that right?</p> <p>12 A. No. No, there would be further steps, as it were, to go</p> <p>13 through between a prospective temporary owner and the</p> <p>14 Metropolitan Police mounted branch, and that would be</p> <p>15 for her to deal directly with Inspector Hiscock</p> <p>16 subsequently, and I was not involved with that. I then</p> <p>17 withdrew and left Inspector Hiscock to deal with Rebekah</p> <p>18 Wade direct.</p> <p>19 Q. Yes, but all that had to be done was a suitable horse</p> <p>20 identified, the two of them matched up, as it were,</p> <p>21 owner or new owner or new lender, I suppose, of the</p> <p>22 horse and the horse itself, and then that would be it.</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. There was nothing more, was there?</p> <p>25 A. There was one further stage and that would require</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 in journalism:</p> <p>2 "When all the pupils in his year were encouraged to</p> <p>3 find one week's relevant work experience, I approached</p> <p>4 the editor of the Sun, Rebekah Wade, and she agreed to</p> <p>5 provide this."</p> <p>6 Can you remember when that was?</p> <p>7 A. That would have been in 2003, 2004.</p> <p>8 Q. So that's long before the arrangements we were</p> <p>9 discussing?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. You say the subsequent arrangements were made between</p> <p>12 the school and the HR department of the Sun. Who did</p> <p>13 your son work for at the Sun?</p> <p>14 A. He -- in the week that he was there, I think he spent</p> <p>15 some time on the Bizarre desk. I think he spent some</p> <p>16 time on the general news desk. I think he also spent</p> <p>17 some time on the online version of the paper. I'm not</p> <p>18 totally sure, but that's my recollection.</p> <p>19 Q. Then you say:</p> <p>20 "At the end of his week at the Sun, he was invited</p> <p>21 to return for further work experience if he wished, an</p> <p>22 offer he took up after university, completing another</p> <p>23 four weeks work experience."</p> <p>24 So when was that, Mr Fedorcio?</p> <p>25 A. That was in 2007, some stage after he left university.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 Inspector Hiscock to inspect the facilities where she</p> <p>2 was intending to keep the horse, which he obviously did</p> <p>3 at some stage after that and before July.</p> <p>4 Q. Weren't you left with the impression at the lunch that</p> <p>5 there was an agreement in principle, subject to these</p> <p>6 matters being finalised, these practical matters, that</p> <p>7 she would get her horse?</p> <p>8 A. I don't believe so. Whether she felt that is different,</p> <p>9 but as far as I was concerned, there were more steps to</p> <p>10 be taken.</p> <p>11 Q. So when you say in paragraph 66 that some time later you</p> <p>12 received a call from Inspector Hiscock that he'd</p> <p>13 identified a suitable horse, how much time later?</p> <p>14 A. I now believe that to be July the following year, at</p> <p>15 around the time that he'd identified the horse for her</p> <p>16 to have. So probably about nine months later.</p> <p>17 Q. Have you carried out further enquiries then since your</p> <p>18 statement was prepared?</p> <p>19 A. No, I've just seen the press coverage around the story</p> <p>20 and the Metropolitan Police statements that have been</p> <p>21 issued, which put a timing on when the horse was</p> <p>22 provided to her.</p> <p>23 Q. Look at paragraph 97 of your statement, page 09553.</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. This relates to your son, who was considering a career</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 Q. Was it about the time of the telephone call, first call</p> <p>2 in relation to the horse, which was September 2007?</p> <p>3 A. It may have been.</p> <p>4 Q. Mm.</p> <p>5 A. May have been.</p> <p>6 Q. But was it a question, put bluntly, of favours being</p> <p>7 called in here?</p> <p>8 A. I don't believe it was at all. Not as far as I was</p> <p>9 concerned. And the arrangement at that stage in 2007,</p> <p>10 I was not involved in. That was a matter between my son</p> <p>11 and the Sun direct.</p> <p>12 Q. Yes, but the Sun -- it's, if I may say so, a slightly</p> <p>13 unusual name, by which I mean there are not many</p> <p>14 Fedorcios around.</p> <p>15 A. No, I appreciate that.</p> <p>16 Q. And the Sun knew well who your son was?</p> <p>17 A. Oh yes.</p> <p>18 Q. In other words, you were the father?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So it was all clear?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. It sounds a little bit incestuous; is that a fair</p> <p>23 observation or not?</p> <p>24 A. No, it's not. They're totally unconnected.</p> <p>25 Q. Although they might have been coincident in time?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

<p>1 A. They may have been coincident in time, but as far as 2 I was concerned, there was no crossover between the two. 3 Q. And then in November 2007 -- this is paragraph 99 -- you 4 were asked by the director of human resources, Martin 5 Tiplady: 6 "... if I knew of anyone who might be available 7 immediately for a short term contract to work in his 8 press office. I told him of my son's recent work 9 experience at the Sun and he suggested that my son 10 should approach the HR press office senior information 11 officer to see if he could be of help to her." 12 Was the upshot that your son gained employment at 13 the Metropolitan Police? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Which department? 16 A. The human resources department, and that was on 17 a short-term contract. 18 Q. Following that, he made an application for a permanent 19 position? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. But, of course, outside your directorate. 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Sir Ian Blair, as he then was, says that you fixed up 24 work experience for his son at the Sun newspaper in 25 2005; is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 which might help her in her job as editor of the Sun? 2 A. No. 3 Q. She didn't even try, Mr Fedorcio? 4 A. Not that I recall, no. 5 Q. There's nothing wrong with trying, of course. 6 A. No. 7 Q. You don't think she even attempted? Okay. 8 A. I assure you she wouldn't have got anything. It would 9 have been inappropriate. 10 Q. Can I ask you, please, to look back to paragraph 69 of 11 your statement? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. You deal with various meetings with AC Hayman. 14 Mr Yates' evidence was that you were nearly always there 15 when he met Lucy Panton. Might that be correct? 16 A. Not that I recall. 17 Q. So were there occasions when he met her, to your 18 knowledge, when you weren't there? Is that right? 19 A. I can't be sure about that, but I wouldn't have thought 20 I was there on every occasion that he met there. There 21 were a number of occasions when we were both there. 22 Q. The same would be true for AC Hayman; is that right? 23 A. With AC Hayman, there was only one occasion, which is 24 the one I refer to there in April 2006. I was with AC 25 Hayman and anyone else that I recall from the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 A. I heard him say that the other day. I'd forgotten about 2 it, but I think I did, yes. 3 Q. In order to do that, did you speak to Rebekah Wade? 4 A. I think I did, yes. 5 Q. What was the basis of your relationship with Rebekah 6 Wade, in the sense of how close a friend was she of you 7 and vice versa? 8 A. I knew her. I'd met her as editor, usually with the 9 Commissioner. I'd had probably one or two meetings with 10 her on my own. I'd been to dinner with her and the 11 Commissioner or previous commissioners. But -- you 12 know, someone that I was on good terms with but not 13 a personal friend. It was a work connection. 14 Q. Yes. I think there was one dinner; is this right? You, 15 Sir John Stevens, Rebekah Wade and your respective 16 spouses; is that correct? 17 A. That's right, yes. 18 Q. But only one dinner? 19 A. As far as I can recall, yes. 20 Q. Aside from the horse, do you feel Rebekah Wade was 21 trying to get something out of you? 22 A. No. 23 Q. Did she try to get something out of you -- 24 A. No. 25 Q. -- by which I mean in terms of a story, a tip, anything</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 News of the World. 2 Q. Do you feel that on any of the occasions which you 3 witnessed when Lucy Panton was there with either 4 Mr Yates or Mr Hayman, that Lucy Panton was trying to 5 get these senior police officers to be indiscreet? 6 A. No. 7 Q. So the subject matter of their interactions was always 8 wholly professional, above board and within proper 9 parameters; is that right? 10 A. From those that I observed, yes. 11 Q. There was a lunch meeting, I think, on 19 September 12 2006. Let me dig it up. It's in the gifts and 13 hospitality register. The trouble is it's not in the 14 version which has been copied at the master bundle 15 because part of the relevant page has not come out in 16 the printing, but I'm looking at the version which was 17 obtained pursuant to an FOI request, which has been 18 given to me. 19 A. All right. 20 Q. A dinner, actually. Dick Fedorcio with the Deputy 21 Commissioner, and then it says "News of the World". So 22 who it was at the News of the World isn't specified. It 23 might have been an editor or deputy editor. It might 24 have been Lucy Panton. Given that the Deputy 25 Commissioner was there, Sir Paul Stephenson, can you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 help us, please, as to who it was at the 2 News of the World who might have been there? 3 A. I don't think it was Lucy Panton. It could have been 4 the editor or the deputy editor, which is then -- I'm 5 not sure. Was that still Andy Coulson? 6 Q. Mr Coulson editor, Mr Wallis deputy. 7 A. Yes. One or other or both of those. 8 Q. It's likely to have been, given that the Deputy 9 Commissioner was there -- 10 A. It would have been the deputy then, yes, probably. 11 Q. That was not long -- it was about six or seven weeks 12 after the arrest of Goodman/Mulcaire. Were you aware of 13 those arrests? 14 A. I was aware of those arrests on the day that they took 15 place, yes. 16 Q. Was there any mention of that at this dinner, as far as 17 you can recall? 18 A. Not that I can recall. I must admit, in all the 19 interactions that I've had with News of the World, 20 I don't recall ever any discussion around phone hacking 21 or those arrests. 22 Q. There was another lunch with the News of the World on 23 23 August. I'm going back in time. Again, the provider 24 of the lunch is not specified beyond that it was the 25 News of the World.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Mr Clarke decided it should go no further -- 2 MR JAY: End of September. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So it's all very live. 4 A. Yes. There was no discussion that I was party to, and 5 I think this is something that I've touched on elsewhere 6 about what should an organisation do, or a police 7 organisation do, when it's involved in an investigation 8 into a newspaper business which continues to report 9 about the organisation. Do we just keep totally clear? 10 Should that be the approach? Could that send a message 11 that -- or a mismessage that something else is ongoing 12 or not ongoing? Or do you appear to have what I call 13 the business as usual going on in terms of the media 14 relationship between myself, who is not an officer, and 15 a journalist? 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Of course you let them carry on 17 coming to press briefings, and if you're meeting the 18 CRA, you meet with them there. But I raise the question 19 whether one-to-ones might not give quite the wrong 20 impression, irrespective of what we now know, and 21 that's -- 22 A. Yes, I agree, and I take your point, sir. 23 MR JAY: As you say, the lunches and dinners -- it's fair to 24 say that there weren't that many -- with the 25 News of the World did continue over the years, didn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 A. Right, yes. 2 Q. The register -- 3 A. I think that was with Rebecca Mowley, who was the 4 temporary or the maternity cover, I think, for 5 Lucy Panton at the time. 6 Q. Yes. We heard that Lucy Panton was on maternity leave. 7 We heard that, I think, from either Mr Yates or 8 Mr Hayman. So that's in the summer of 2006. 9 A. Yes. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Were you present at that lunch? 11 A. I was the only person present. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So that was you? 13 A. That was me and Rebecca Mowley, yes. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That was just a couple of weeks, 15 was it, after the arrest of Mr Mulcaire and Mr Goodman? 16 A. Yes. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, was that wise, Mr Fedorcio? 18 A. I think, looking at it now, one would question that and 19 one would question a whole series of interactions over 20 the following months and years. But there was no -- 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I agree, and I understand the value 22 of hindsight, but I'm just going back to what we knew 23 then. Forget what we now know. On any showing, there 24 was an investigation. On any showing, the police were 25 looking at stuff. I can't remember the date on which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 they? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. On any of these occasions, are you saying there was no 4 discussion of the phone hacking affair? 5 A. I do not recall on any occasion having a discussion 6 around phone hacking. 7 Q. In the year 2011, these interactions really stopped, 8 didn't they, with the News of the World? 9 A. Yes. I think that it was at the beginning of 2011 10 Weeting was launched and that put a brake on it. 11 Q. So did you take a policy decision then or a strategic 12 decision that with Weeting starting, it really was no 13 longer appropriate for you to have lunches or dinners 14 with journalists from the News of the World? 15 A. I didn't discuss it with anybody else, but I took the 16 view myself that it was appropriate -- or no longer 17 appropriate with the scale and extent of what was now 18 being looked at to have that contact. 19 Q. Did you share that view with any other senior officer? 20 A. I don't recall doing so, no. 21 Q. Can I ask you, please, to move back to your statement in 22 paragraph 74. 23 A. 74? 24 Q. 74, please. 25 A. Thank you, yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

<p>1 Q. 09548. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. You refer to one of the weekend meetings with 4 Lucy Panton. These were meetings which took place 5 usually on Fridays; is that right? 6 A. Sometimes Thursday, sometimes Friday. 7 Q. And these were usually one-to-one meetings, were they? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. You say that at the end of one of those meetings you 10 recall that she arrived with a story about the reception 11 into prison of ex-commander Ali Dizaei, in particular 12 concerning his alleged refusal to hand over his suit to 13 the prison staff. She was being chased by telephone 14 and/or text to file the story. To help her, as she was 15 under pressure, you offered to let her type the story, 16 which she did from notes when she arrived, in an email 17 on the stand-alone computer in your office. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Now, the story itself, or the email which contains the 20 story, is in DF/4, under our tab 5, page 09623. We can 21 see the story. Actually, this one is on a Thursday, not 22 a Friday. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. 18 February. The year is 2010. The time is 16.14. You 25 say that you saw this story at the time; is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 sight of a story which I may not otherwise have sight of 2 until Sunday morning. At the time, I had no idea what 3 was in it, but of course, it enabled me then to consider 4 the impact of that on the Metropolitan Police, if at 5 all. 6 Q. You were helping out a friend, really, weren't you? 7 A. I was helping out someone who I dealt with on a regular 8 basis. 9 Q. You wouldn't have done it otherwise, would you? 10 A. I may well have done. I think that if another 11 journalist had been there in a similar set of 12 circumstances, then I would have considered doing the 13 same. 14 Q. Mm. 15 A. It was fairly unique -- well, it was a unique situation. 16 Q. We see the email chain a bit higher up, top of the page, 17 where Lucy Panton is using sort of text speak: 18 "Had 2 use Dick's computer 2 file. Can't seem to 19 delete the original message details. Would not be 20 helpful 2 him for people 2 know I was using his office 21 so please delete that." 22 I'm not sure what "MFL" is. 23 A. I think it may mean "more to follow later". I'm 24 guessing. 25 Q. "More follows later", mm. Well, that's her view of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. As she typed it and sent it, I was able to have 2 a read of it, yes. 3 Q. She had no difficulty with that, obviously? 4 A. No. 5 Q. Was there anything in the story which troubled you in 6 any way? 7 A. Not from a Metropolitan Police perspective, but I think 8 for Commander Dizaei it would have been embarrassing. 9 Q. Well, there's certainly that, but also the reference to 10 "a prison source" and then, later down, "insiders". Do 11 you see that? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Which suggests, possibly -- or indeed perhaps 14 probably -- that the News of the World had had a source 15 within the prison who was furnishing them with this 16 story. 17 A. That is possible. 18 Q. Did you have any concern about the ethics of that, 19 putting aside for one moment that she was using your 20 machine to pass on this story? 21 A. I -- at the time, I recall thinking that I was helping 22 someone who was being put under what I thought was quite 23 unnecessary pressure, if not bullying, by her news desk, 24 and -- you know, to help her solve her problem. In 25 return, from my perspective, I felt I was going to get</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 matter, not necessarily your view of the matter. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. But you can see how this appears, I suppose, 4 Mr Fedorcio? 5 A. Yes. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So she used your computer, from your 7 email address -- 8 A. Yes. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- to write an email to her? 10 A. Yes. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And then -- 12 A. She forwarded it to her office. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: She forwarded it from her email to 14 the office. 15 A. Yes. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Within 20 minutes, 25 minutes? 17 A. Mm. 18 MR JAY: Probably using her BlackBerry, though? 19 A. That's what it looks like. I think that was part of the 20 issue, that she was under pressure to type a story, to 21 produce the story, and the BlackBerry keyboard is such 22 that to have done this would have been a bit of 23 a challenge. 24 Q. Hm. Did you ask her to delete the message? 25 A. No. I was keen to say to her that I wouldn't want</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

<p>1 anyone to think that I had been the source of the story,</p> <p>2 which I wasn't. She arrived with the notes on this when</p> <p>3 she came to see me.</p> <p>4 Q. Has this email been retained on your system?</p> <p>5 Presumably, however, we're looking at --</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. -- Lucy Panton's email, aren't we, because of the fact</p> <p>8 it's been forwarded?</p> <p>9 A. Yes. It wasn't retained on mine. I deleted it almost</p> <p>10 immediately afterwards. My practice with emails</p> <p>11 generally, both on this stand-alone computer and my work</p> <p>12 computer, is that I regularly clean out the inbox, the</p> <p>13 outbox and the deleted box.</p> <p>14 Q. You make it clear in paragraph 75 that while Lucy Panton</p> <p>15 was using this computer -- and the computer you're</p> <p>16 referring to is a stand-alone computer which was not</p> <p>17 connected to the MPS computer system?</p> <p>18 A. That's right.</p> <p>19 Q. You used it for presentations and/or as a back-up. She</p> <p>20 wouldn't have had access to any of your files or</p> <p>21 documents?</p> <p>22 A. No. No. That would have been inappropriate.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you feel that this is an example of an error of</p> <p>24 judgment, perhaps, which resulted from your friendship</p> <p>25 with Lucy Panton?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 Association a bit of a self-appointed cabal, that it</p> <p>2 gets you access to an inner circle, and beyond that,</p> <p>3 access to people like you?</p> <p>4 A. I think the Crime Reporters Association was existed</p> <p>5 before my time of joining the Metropolitan Police, and</p> <p>6 I think it was -- I mean, they can answer this for</p> <p>7 themselves, but I believe it was originally set up for</p> <p>8 dedicated crime correspondents on national media, to be</p> <p>9 their representative group, a bit like the lobby, a bit</p> <p>10 like the home affairs correspondents or defence</p> <p>11 correspondents, and they were, in the main, the only</p> <p>12 national journalists that dealt with the</p> <p>13 Metropolitan Police. It was very rare, in my early</p> <p>14 days, for any event where we had a press briefing or</p> <p>15 press conference, to have anyone other than one of those</p> <p>16 members there. So they were the experts, as it were, on</p> <p>17 following the Metropolitan Police closely.</p> <p>18 It was, at that stage, when I started,</p> <p>19 unrepresentative. I had concerns that there were parts</p> <p>20 of the national media that weren't within that</p> <p>21 organisation because they didn't have a dedicated crime</p> <p>22 correspondent. The BBC was not in it. ITN weren't in</p> <p>23 it. And I felt that I couldn't see how you could deal</p> <p>24 with this as a group of people who you may bring in and</p> <p>25 brief on special occasions without being fully</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 A. I don't think it resulted from my friendship. As I said</p> <p>2 earlier, I think I would have considered doing it for</p> <p>3 anybody who was in that set of circumstances, but</p> <p>4 I accept it may have been an error of judgment.</p> <p>5 Q. Someone might say it was a bit difficult for you to</p> <p>6 refuse, given all the lunches and dinners you'd enjoyed</p> <p>7 at her expense.</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Is that right?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. We've noted that another journalist, this time someone</p> <p>12 who works for the Sunday Times, Mr Ungoed-Thomas, in his</p> <p>13 witness statement, paragraph 11, said he had no contact</p> <p>14 with the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, you or</p> <p>15 any assistant commissioner. Does that surprise you?</p> <p>16 A. No, because I have no knowledge of him working on</p> <p>17 Metropolitan Police issues. My main contact there was</p> <p>18 David Leppard.</p> <p>19 Q. So he's not one of the Sunday Time's crime reporters; is</p> <p>20 that right?</p> <p>21 A. I -- he'll have to answer that. I don't think so,</p> <p>22 but -- I don't believe he was a member of the Crime</p> <p>23 Reporters Association. But then, I don't think the</p> <p>24 Sunday Times have a member, or has a member.</p> <p>25 Q. I mean, to what extent is the Crime Reporters</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 representative of the media. So I encouraged them to</p> <p>2 broaden their membership. It took a little bit of time,</p> <p>3 but now, for example, I think the BBC have four or five</p> <p>4 members in there representing different parts of the</p> <p>5 organisation. So it's grown over the years. It's been</p> <p>6 a constant group of experts, as it were, on policing</p> <p>7 matters that have been, you know, the group that people</p> <p>8 turn and say, "Are we briefing them? Are we doing</p> <p>9 whatever in their territory?"</p> <p>10 Q. I think the direct answer to my question is it's not</p> <p>11 a self-appointed cabal; is that what you're saying?</p> <p>12 A. I don't believe it is.</p> <p>13 Q. Can I move on now to Mr Wallis?</p> <p>14 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>15 Q. Before the spring of 2009, what was the nature/level of</p> <p>16 your interactions with Mr Wallis?</p> <p>17 A. I think that the record will show he was someone that</p> <p>18 I saw two or maybe three times a year, usually at one of</p> <p>19 the lunches or dinners that the Commissioner would have</p> <p>20 with News of the World, or I may see him alone on</p> <p>21 occasion.</p> <p>22 Q. Therefore you had known him since 1997; is that right?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. I first met him at a dinner with Sir Paul Condon.</p> <p>24 In fact, it was the dinner that I think Sir Paul</p> <p>25 mentioned when he gave evidence with Stuart Higgins, the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<p>1 editor of the Sun, in December 1997, and Mr Wallis 2 I think was then deputy editor of the Sun and attended 3 the same dinner. 4 Q. May I ask you what was your understanding of the nature 5 of Mr Wallis' friendship with Mr Yates? 6 A. All right. I was aware that they knew each other. 7 I was aware that they got on quite well. I understood 8 their contact to be mainly work. I was aware of what 9 I would call sort of banter between them over football 10 matters. Occasionally, John would show me a text that 11 he'd received from Neil Wallis, which would have been 12 passing comment, shall we say, on a recent football 13 result, which Liverpool, John's team he supported, had 14 played in. So I was aware of that sort of interaction. 15 Through that, I think I was aware that on one 16 occasion they went to a football match together, but 17 I couldn't say when I heard that or where it was. 18 Q. Either Old Trafford or Anfield, probably. Does that 19 ring a bell? 20 A. That would be the obvious assumption, but beyond that, 21 I wasn't aware of any greater contact. 22 Q. You told the Select Committee that you knew that 23 Mr Wallis was a friend of Mr Yates'. Does that more or 24 less sum it up? 25 A. I think so, but in the same way that I would describe</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 friendly or do I mean that there's close, extensive 2 contact? 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We can unpick that a bit. To go 4 either to Old Trafford or to Anfield means a journey up 5 the M6 or by train. This isn't just: "Well, we have 6 tickets for a match that's two minutes down the road." 7 A. Yes. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: In your capacity as the director of 9 public affairs, and therefore the adviser to the 10 Metropolitan Police, and the link between the 11 Metropolitan Police and the press, do you think it is 12 right that you should know of friendships, of 13 relationships, that exist outside the relationships you 14 are personally arranging between the most senior 15 officers and editors of newspapers or senior managerial 16 people in newspapers? 17 A. I think that would be helpful, yes. I think the Met now 18 is looking at that or doing that, about disclosing 19 personal contact. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, have you ever been surprised to 21 have read about the extent of the out-of-hours meetings 22 that there were between Mr Wallis and Mr Yates? 23 A. Yes. I heard the evidence. I -- it was a revelation to 24 me. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you surprised that you didn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 other friendships today. These were business 2 friendships, not personal friendships. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So that's what you were saying to the 4 committee, that you thought they'd developed a business 5 friendship? 6 A. That's what I understood, but -- I think I was aware of 7 the football banter, as I call it, and that they'd once 8 been to a match together. But beyond that, I wasn't 9 aware of anything else that took place. 10 MR JAY: Wouldn't it be more accurate to analyse it as 11 a personal friendship which grew out of a business or 12 professional relationship in the first instance? 13 A. I'm not in a position to make that judgment. 14 Q. If there's banter about football -- nothing wrong with 15 that, of course -- and if there's a trip, whether it be 16 to Old Trafford or Anfield, that does suggest a degree 17 of personal friendship, doesn't it? 18 A. Not necessarily. I think that people who know each very 19 well might occasionally go to a sporting function. 20 Q. Only if they're friends, I think, Mr Fedorcio; isn't 21 that right? 22 A. Well, it depends if there's an opportunity that they're 23 both available and have tickets or whatever. I mean, in 24 preparing for this, I thought: what do we mean by 25 "friend"? Do I mean they get on well, do I mean they're</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 know? 2 A. Not really. I didn't think that I would expect to know 3 people's personal contact, if that sort of thing was 4 going on. But I take your point. I mean, at the time 5 I didn't, and I didn't think really of it, but I look at 6 it now and say, "That's the sort of information I think 7 that the Met should know from senior people, and that 8 people in my job perhaps should know as well", 9 especially if it's a relationship with the media. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, because one of the things you're 11 doing is advising the Metropolitan Police about 12 reputational risk, and I'm just interested to know what 13 you've done to advise police officers, who are police 14 officers and not necessarily as aware of these things as 15 you will be, of their need to keep you informed of 16 issues that might create a reputational risk for the 17 Met. 18 A. I think within -- the management board document we 19 showed them earlier was about contact with the media, 20 about having press officers there. This may or may not 21 have been appropriate, but I think it alludes to a more 22 open or a wider knowledge, shall we say, of personal any 23 relationships. But in my time up until when I went on 24 extended leave, I hadn't addressed that, but 25 I understand the Met are or have set about addressing it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 now.</p> <p>2 MR JAY: I mean, was part of the reason, perhaps, why you</p> <p>3 didn't think clearly or sufficiently clearly about these</p> <p>4 issues because it was part of the culture of the police,</p> <p>5 or certainly some aspects of it, which would encourage</p> <p>6 these social interactions between police officers and</p> <p>7 journalists, and therefore it didn't occur to you that</p> <p>8 some of those interactions would inevitably become</p> <p>9 rather close ones?</p> <p>10 A. I had not considered it.</p> <p>11 Q. What happened in relation to the awarding of the</p> <p>12 contract to Mr Wallis' company? If we can cover that</p> <p>13 now, please. Your deputy unfortunately was ill and on</p> <p>14 prolonged sick leave from mid-February 2009. That's the</p> <p>15 starting point.</p> <p>16 A. Right.</p> <p>17 Q. So inevitably you turned your mind to considering</p> <p>18 whether to engage some external support; is that --</p> <p>19 A. Not at that stage, no. Initially we were hopeful that</p> <p>20 he might be off for four, five months and return. My</p> <p>21 view was that in that time we should seek to cope and</p> <p>22 manage within our resource.</p> <p>23 Q. When it became clear that this might endure, you then</p> <p>24 turned your mind to that, and that was in about July</p> <p>25 or August 2009; is that correct?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 second opinion, guidance, you know, a reference point,</p> <p>2 for some of the things that I did, to make sure that</p> <p>3 I wasn't missing the sort of opportunities that might be</p> <p>4 around that I should do. So that led me then to think</p> <p>5 about what sort of resource I might take on within the</p> <p>6 sort of budget that I might have available within all of</p> <p>7 this, and came to the view there was a need for</p> <p>8 something -- for someone, but not for a lot of time,</p> <p>9 that I needed on a retainer basis so that I could access</p> <p>10 it if or when I felt I needed that support.</p> <p>11 Q. In paragraph 79 you say that you identified some</p> <p>12 potential suppliers.</p> <p>13 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>14 Q. Was Mr Wallis one of those suppliers at that point?</p> <p>15 A. In June, July when I started thinking about what I might</p> <p>16 do, he wasn't. He came onto the list after I'd seen him</p> <p>17 in mid-August.</p> <p>18 Q. This was a lunch on 12 August 2009, which was organised</p> <p>19 following Mr Wallis' leaving party from the</p> <p>20 News of the World. He left the News of the World</p> <p>21 in July 2009. At the lunch, Mr Wallis, you say, told</p> <p>22 you of his new line of work as a media consultant and</p> <p>23 offered his services to you and the Metropolitan Police</p> <p>24 Service.</p> <p>25 A. (Nods head)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 A. I remember some sort of previous interactions with the</p> <p>2 Commissioner during my internal appraisal. The</p> <p>3 Commissioner in there asked how I was coping wouldn't</p> <p>4 a deputy in place, whether I needed any additional</p> <p>5 support, and at that stage I said it was my aim not to</p> <p>6 do it, in the hope that he would return shortly. The</p> <p>7 issue arose again when I had the second stage of that</p> <p>8 appraisal with the Commissioner and the chairman of the</p> <p>9 police authority, and again it was my view that I would</p> <p>10 try and cope without the deputy.</p> <p>11 The trigger, I suppose, to act on this was that</p> <p>12 probably about the third week of August, my deputy found</p> <p>13 that the treatment had not been successful and was</p> <p>14 therefore now going to have to undergo further</p> <p>15 treatment, which gave us some quite serious concern</p> <p>16 about his health and the prospect of him ever returning.</p> <p>17 It was my decision that I would not want to take any</p> <p>18 pre-emptive action to replace him. I felt that he</p> <p>19 needed to know that we believed that he was always</p> <p>20 coming back to work, but I felt that I wasn't perhaps</p> <p>21 giving the total attention to my level of work that</p> <p>22 I should have been because I was picking up a number of</p> <p>23 his tasks.</p> <p>24 So my assessment was that I wasn't looking to</p> <p>25 replace my deputy, I was looking to find some support,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 Q. Did he know, do you think, that your deputy was on</p> <p>2 long-term sick leave and there was the possibility of an</p> <p>3 opening for him, Mr Wallis?</p> <p>4 A. I think he was aware that my deputy was off, because he</p> <p>5 started this conversation in the margins of the lunch</p> <p>6 around: "How's Chris? How's he doing, how's he getting</p> <p>7 on?" That was the starting point, and then from that:</p> <p>8 "If there's anything I can do to help either you or the</p> <p>9 Met, then I'm here to do so." So he sort of offered his</p> <p>10 help on that basis, but I don't think he was expecting</p> <p>11 me to appoint a deputy. He was just, "If you need a --</p> <p>12 some assistance."</p> <p>13 Q. Yes. You say:</p> <p>14 "Over the following few days, I considered that he</p> <p>15 met the selection criteria and would be available to</p> <p>16 start almost immediately."</p> <p>17 So looking at that sentence, what were the selection</p> <p>18 criteria? Last sentence of paragraph 81, page 09550.</p> <p>19 A. Yes. The criteria is actually in paragraph 79, which is</p> <p>20 that -- I took the view that I needed someone who had</p> <p>21 worked as an adviser at a senior level in an</p> <p>22 organisation, who had relevant media, speech-writing,</p> <p>23 public affairs experience, had knowledge, contacts,</p> <p>24 strong awareness of policing issues, and I wanted him to</p> <p>25 be available to give advice, possibly at short notice,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 which I thought was sort of reliable, credible advice.</p> <p>2 Q. Were these selection criteria ever confined to writing?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. So they were just an idea you had in your mind as to</p> <p>5 what this extra helping hand might be able to furnish;</p> <p>6 is that right?</p> <p>7 A. That's right. I mean, I'd been thinking about this over</p> <p>8 a period of months and I'd been scribbling odd notes</p> <p>9 down about where I felt something might just take some</p> <p>10 of the pressure off or to give me the confidence or</p> <p>11 resilience to know that I was ticking all the boxes in</p> <p>12 what I should be doing.</p> <p>13 Q. As far as you were concerned, if there weren't any</p> <p>14 difficulties with procurement, matters of that sort, you</p> <p>15 would have taken him there and then, wouldn't you?</p> <p>16 A. That's right. What had happened was that just before</p> <p>17 we'd got the news about the relapse in the deputy's</p> <p>18 health, the Commissioner and I had been discussing what</p> <p>19 we needed to do in the autumn regarding his profile,</p> <p>20 because he'd been accused by many people of being</p> <p>21 invisible. He was still only sort of nine -- eight</p> <p>22 months into his contract. I think at the start, early</p> <p>23 in his days, we'd had the G20 demonstration, the death</p> <p>24 of Ian Tomlinson, and was seen as not around. We needed</p> <p>25 to do more to raise his profile. So I was identifying</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 A. He was the person in my mind, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. You mentioned this to Mr Yates, as you say. Was he</p> <p>3 enthusiastic or not?</p> <p>4 A. I didn't get anything like enthusiasm. I think he felt</p> <p>5 that having some additional support for him, for his</p> <p>6 speech-writing and presentations for other people in his</p> <p>7 office would be beneficial. I don't think he expressed</p> <p>8 a view as to whether this was the -- the person involved</p> <p>9 was better than anybody else. I think he was just</p> <p>10 prepared to take my view on who I should approach.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But he didn't tell you then: "Well,</p> <p>12 you ought to know actually, we meet frequently for</p> <p>13 dinner with other friends"?</p> <p>14 A. He didn't tell me.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Would that have affected you?</p> <p>16 A. I think it would have done. I think if that was the</p> <p>17 case, then I would have sort of moved away from</p> <p>18 John Yates in terms of seeking his views on the</p> <p>19 appointment, the selection. I may have gone elsewhere,</p> <p>20 to one of his deputies or the lead investigator on the</p> <p>21 phone hacking team to ask that question myself.</p> <p>22 MR JAY: Can I ask you this question: had you known what you</p> <p>23 know now about the proximity of Mr Yates' relationship</p> <p>24 with Mr Wallis, might you have taken the view that it</p> <p>25 was inappropriate to hire Mr Wallis at all?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 there a boost, shall we say, in the work that needed to</p> <p>2 be provided around the Commissioner. So that was</p> <p>3 a driving point.</p> <p>4 And these things just happened to come together. So</p> <p>5 sort of coincidence.</p> <p>6 Q. You point out that when you were giving evidence to the</p> <p>7 Home Affairs Select Committee, you couldn't remember who</p> <p>8 had recommended Neil Wallis to you. In other words, you</p> <p>9 couldn't remember this lunch on 12 August 2009, but now,</p> <p>10 having thought about it some more, you do remember it?</p> <p>11 A. That's right. I'm satisfied now this is where the sort</p> <p>12 of offer or suggestion that he could provide that</p> <p>13 service to me came from.</p> <p>14 Q. You spoke about this to the Commissioner. Was he, the</p> <p>15 Commissioner, in favour or not?</p> <p>16 A. He didn't express a view. I was having one of my</p> <p>17 regular meetings with him and we had a long list of</p> <p>18 things to talk about, and I think towards the end I just</p> <p>19 said to him: "I've considered your encouragement about</p> <p>20 finding some additional support, I think I now need to</p> <p>21 to it, and I've had a look around and I think -- I'm</p> <p>22 considering Neil Wallis." He didn't make any comment on</p> <p>23 Neil Wallis. I think he was just pleased that I'd</p> <p>24 thought about taking on some support.</p> <p>25 Q. Neil Wallis was front runner by now, wasn't he?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 A. That may well have been the case, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. But that wasn't your immediate reaction, though,</p> <p>3 30 seconds ago when the matter was put to you. You</p> <p>4 thought: "Well, I might speak to someone else under</p> <p>5 Mr Yates."</p> <p>6 A. Mm.</p> <p>7 Q. Of course, you are aware that there was an issue</p> <p>8 surrounding Mr Wallis and the News of the World. He was</p> <p>9 the deputy editor of the News of the World. Mr Yates</p> <p>10 had been carrying out the exercise he did carry out</p> <p>11 fairly shortly before, on 9 July 2009. You were aware</p> <p>12 of all of that, weren't you?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Did that not of itself cause warning bells to ring?</p> <p>15 A. I think it -- I needed to be sure whether, in the work</p> <p>16 that had been done originally or in this scoping work</p> <p>17 that had been done at that time, was there anything</p> <p>18 where Mr Wallis' name or anything in that that might</p> <p>19 give a cause a concern, that would say, "You shouldn't</p> <p>20 touch him", but I didn't get that indication.</p> <p>21 Q. I think you did ask Mr Yates, or Mr Yates, in any event,</p> <p>22 told you -- it's unclear from paragraph 86 of your</p> <p>23 statement what it was that caused Mr Yates to speak to</p> <p>24 Mr Wallis on 31 August 2009. Can you help us on that?</p> <p>25 A. I can't say why he did it. He told me that he had done</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

1 **it, so he obviously took a view that it was necessary**
 2 **for him to pose that question.**
 3 Q. You don't believe that you asked Mr Yates to do it; is
 4 that so?
 5 **A. I don't think so.**
 6 Q. We can see what Mr Yates told you, and he gave us
 7 evidence on identical lines:
 8 "The question was if there was anything that was
 9 going to emerge at any point about phone hacking that
 10 could embarrass the MPS, me [that's Mr Yates], him
 11 [that's Mr Wallis] or the Commissioner."
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. Mr Yates had received "categorical assurances that this
 14 was not the case". Did you feel those assurances were
 15 sufficient?
 16 **A. I felt it was a pretty good assurance, yes.**
 17 Q. "Pretty good", but that qualifies it a bit.
 18 **A. Oh, sorry. It was a good assurance.**
 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You would have read the Guardian
 20 article, presumably?
 21 **A. I'd read the Guardian article, but I didn't see anything**
 22 **in the Guardian article which pointed anything towards**
 23 **Mr Wallis.**
 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But to senior staff in the
 25 News of the World?

Page 37

1 **A. I didn't see it as Mr Wallis at that time. And, you**
 2 **know, Mr Yates had done his work and had come to the**
 3 **view, which had been made public, was that there was**
 4 **nothing there to be looked at.**
 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you're looking at reputational
 6 risk, aren't you?
 7 **A. Mm-hm.**
 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You were aware that the Guardian were
 9 pressing on. When was the meeting that Sir Paul had
 10 with Mr Rusbridger?
 11 **A. That was in -- I think it was December.**
 12 MR JAY: November.
 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry?
 14 MR JAY: It was November 2009.
 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So the whole thing is still rumbling
 16 on. The Guardian hadn't said, "Okay" --
 17 **A. But the Met position was very clear: there was nothing**
 18 **in this to pursue. That was the operational decision.**
 19 **Whether it was right or wrong --**
 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I understand that, and
 21 I recognise the decision has to be made at the time that
 22 you're making it.
 23 **A. Mm-hm.**
 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you must have been concerned,
 25 during the course of the latter part of 2009, that there

Page 38

1 was a reputational risk to the Metropolitan Police
 2 surrounding phone hacking. However much Mr Yates was
 3 saying, "Oh, there's nothing there" and he's gone public
 4 to say it, the story hadn't gone away and you must have
 5 known that because the decision to go and see
 6 Mr Rusbridger didn't come out of the blue; it was
 7 obviously a rumbling issue.
 8 **A. Mm. But I don't think there had been anything new or**
 9 **different that the Guardian had pulled out in that**
 10 **period from the July story. It was reinforcement of**
 11 **that original story, rather than any new lines or**
 12 **direction. There was nothing going on within the Met to**
 13 **say, "Do we need to have another look operationally at**
 14 **this?" So, you know, I, in the same way, was not seeing**
 15 **any change that I needed to reflect.**
 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You didn't think then that there was
 17 some sort of reputational risk to the Met that there was
 18 this debate with the Guardian, ongoing, and here you
 19 were contemplating just giving the chap who'd been the
 20 deputy editor at the time the consultancy arrangement?
 21 **A. Well, that decision had been made in September. At that**
 22 **stage, I didn't see anything that had changed, from my**
 23 **point of view, the position we'd been at in July. But I**
 24 **see the point --**
 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm just wondering about in

Page 39

1 September.
 2 **A. I see your point.**
 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You say you see my point. Do you
 4 think there's something in it?
 5 **A. I didn't at the time. Now, one can take a different**
 6 **view. But at the time I didn't see it that way.**
 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Would you have wanted assurance of
 8 the type that Mr Yates gave you, having spoken to
 9 Mr Wallis?
 10 **A. Would I have wanted it?**
 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.
 12 **A. I think in terms of risk assessing what I was doing, it**
 13 **may well have been something that I would have asked**
 14 **Mr Wallis if Mr Yates hadn't. So, yes.**
 15 MR JAY: I just wonder whether you would have done, though,
 16 Mr Fedorcio. The lunch was on 12 August. You moved,
 17 you say, over the following few days to the conclusion
 18 that Mr Wallis met the selection criteria and it wasn't
 19 until 31 August that the question was asked of Mr Wallis
 20 by Mr Yates. Are you sure you would have asked the
 21 question yourself, if Mr Yates hadn't --
 22 **A. I believe I would have done, yes.**
 23 Q. So why didn't you do so earlier, then?
 24 **A. Because I suppose in a way I wasn't moving at a fast**
 25 **pace. I probably saw John just before that weekend.**

Page 40

<p>1 I think 31 August was a bank holiday Monday, so I would</p> <p>2 have been talking to John towards the end of that</p> <p>3 previous week. So there's not a big timescale in there.</p> <p>4 I didn't come back from lunch on the 14th and say, "Yes,</p> <p>5 now, let's go"; there was a period of probably eight to</p> <p>6 10 days.</p> <p>7 Q. You then say in paragraph 88, page 09551, that you felt</p> <p>8 there were no reasons as to why you should not go ahead</p> <p>9 and discuss the possibility of engaging the services of</p> <p>10 Mr Wallis:</p> <p>11 "I arranged to meet him to speak about the draft</p> <p>12 speech being prepared for the Commissioner, as I was</p> <p>13 interested in hearing his views."</p> <p>14 So there was lunch on 3 September 2009.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. He offered to do some work on the speech at no cost, to</p> <p>17 demonstrate the sort of help he could provide, and so</p> <p>18 this was a sort of -- not really an interview, but it</p> <p>19 was a trial that you were giving him, and he came up</p> <p>20 trumps, really; is that right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. So on 7 September, you asked your staff to request</p> <p>23 a single tender process on the grounds of urgency, the</p> <p>24 period from then until the end of March 2010. So to be</p> <p>25 clear about that, it was going to be a tendering process</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 Q. Which was an accelerated process then, wasn't it?</p> <p>2 A. It took the time it did. I don't know whether it was</p> <p>3 accelerated.</p> <p>4 Q. How long did you give the tenderers to submit their</p> <p>5 tenders? Can you remember?</p> <p>6 A. I'm not sure I actually give them a date. I can't</p> <p>7 remember, I don't have the email in front of me, but</p> <p>8 I wrote to them by email asking if they'd like to put</p> <p>9 forward a proposed approach to the work and the cost.</p> <p>10 Q. As soon as possible, presumably?</p> <p>11 A. Probably as soon as possible, yes.</p> <p>12 Q. So it wouldn't have surprised you that you did get</p> <p>13 answers back as fast as you did; is that right?</p> <p>14 A. I was surprised how quickly it happened, because I think</p> <p>15 if I'd known it could have happened that quickly,</p> <p>16 I wouldn't have even considered a single tender; I'd</p> <p>17 have gone down that route.</p> <p>18 Q. What made you choose Mr Bingle and Mr Lewington?</p> <p>19 A. They're both people that I've known for some time</p> <p>20 professionally, and in my selection criteria, they met</p> <p>21 it. In particular, both of them had previously been</p> <p>22 advisers to the Police Federation, so I was aware of</p> <p>23 their work for the Police Federation and their knowledge</p> <p>24 of policing matters.</p> <p>25 Q. Which companies did they work for?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 where there was only one applicant?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. But what happened and what I discovered, of</p> <p>3 course, is that they should have advised that that</p> <p>4 wouldn't have been possible at that stage. The</p> <p>5 procurement advice I was given was that this could be</p> <p>6 done in this manner. Subsequently they came back and</p> <p>7 said, "No, we couldn't", but I think the advice should</p> <p>8 have been that in the first place.</p> <p>9 Q. So you were clearly of the mind that Mr Wallis was the</p> <p>10 man. He'd impressed you in the work he'd done. You</p> <p>11 knew about him in any event. But on 18 September, you</p> <p>12 received advice from your procurement department that</p> <p>13 you couldn't do it on the single procurement basis; you</p> <p>14 needed to obtain three competitive quotes. That's the</p> <p>15 upshot?</p> <p>16 A. That's right.</p> <p>17 Q. Which you probably thought was a bit of a bore, didn't</p> <p>18 you?</p> <p>19 A. I didn't think it was a bore. My experience of tenders</p> <p>20 in the Met was these things can take an awful long time</p> <p>21 and I was concerned about how long it would take to put</p> <p>22 this in place. In the end, it took five days, I think,</p> <p>23 from start to finish --</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. -- to achieve that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 A. I think Peter Bingle was Bell Pottinger and Charles</p> <p>2 Lewington was Hanover.</p> <p>3 Q. Bell Pottinger is, if I may say so, rather on the</p> <p>4 expensive side. You knew that Mr Bingle was going to be</p> <p>5 much more expensive than Mr Wallis, didn't you?</p> <p>6 A. No, I didn't. I've never had to let a contract like</p> <p>7 this, so this was new territory for me. My reference</p> <p>8 points, I suppose, were two in a way. One, I was aware</p> <p>9 of a colleague who had a daily contract with a London</p> <p>10 borough at a figure of about £800 a day, and I had --</p> <p>11 the Met had a London PR agency working on property</p> <p>12 matters whose cost, depending on who did the work,</p> <p>13 varied between £125 and £250 an hour. So that's what my</p> <p>14 reference was. But I had no idea what either of them</p> <p>15 were going to pitch.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But did you do any work to see who it</p> <p>17 might actually be appropriate to ask? I mean,</p> <p>18 Bell Pottinger are very well-known names. I don't know</p> <p>19 how well-known Hanover is because I don't recognise it,</p> <p>20 but even I recognise Bell Pottinger, and I just wonder</p> <p>21 whether it's a square battle to put Bell Pottinger up</p> <p>22 against this one-man band who'd just started business?</p> <p>23 A. Bell Pottinger recommended one of their -- not their top</p> <p>24 people, one of their junior people to do the work. They</p> <p>25 are -- I was of the view -- I'd been -- as I said,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

<p>1 previously, I'd been looking at potential suppliers.</p> <p>2 I'd had a list in my mind, which included these two. It</p> <p>3 included a couple of others as possibilities, but</p> <p>4 I decided on these at the end of the day. I felt they</p> <p>5 could do what I was looking for. I knew of them, and</p> <p>6 I would trust any of them. I would have chosen any of</p> <p>7 them to do the work.</p> <p>8 MR JAY: You went hoping, if not expecting, that Shami Media</p> <p>9 Limited would pitch in at a much lower level than these</p> <p>10 two rather big guys?</p> <p>11 A. I had no idea what the others were going to submit as</p> <p>12 their proposals.</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: How big is Hanover?</p> <p>14 A. It's probably a medium-size consultancy. I can't put</p> <p>15 a figure on that for you.</p> <p>16 MR JAY: It couldn't have been a surprise to you when you</p> <p>17 got the quotes back, could it?</p> <p>18 A. Uh ... a surprise? No. I think I said I was surprised</p> <p>19 at the speed they came back. I was surprised that</p> <p>20 Hanover -- their approach to it was that it would</p> <p>21 involve a number of people. They sort of carved it</p> <p>22 into -- rather than just one person, they'd have</p> <p>23 a combination of people, which was their approach. It</p> <p>24 was an interesting approach but it was going to cost</p> <p>25 more. I could see why that was. And bell Pottinger,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The reason I ask is because I seem to</p> <p>2 remember at one of the seminars, another ex-editor of</p> <p>3 a tabloid newspaper spoke, who had his own PR company.</p> <p>4 Am I right? It's Mr Hall.</p> <p>5 A. Yes, he does.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, did he have that business then?</p> <p>7 A. I'm not sure what or where he was doing at the time.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What I'm saying is there were</p> <p>9 obviously other people --</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- who are perhaps more comparable to</p> <p>12 Shami Media than Hanover and Bell Pottinger. That's</p> <p>13 what I'm asking. You see, the point Mr Jay is putting</p> <p>14 to you --</p> <p>15 A. I can see what he's doing, yes.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- is that this is set up to get</p> <p>17 a result. That's the point.</p> <p>18 A. Which it wasn't.</p> <p>19 MR JAY: Sorry, which it was or it wasn't?</p> <p>20 A. Was not.</p> <p>21 Q. Because by then, of course, you knew Mr Wallis' charges,</p> <p>22 didn't you?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. When you refer to potential suppliers at the end of</p> <p>25 paragraph, did you know their charges?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 the fact that put on a junior person to do it, I was</p> <p>2 quite surprised at the figure that that came out at for</p> <p>3 that level of person.</p> <p>4 Q. Without giving us the figures -- we're not interested in</p> <p>5 those -- by what factor were the other two higher than</p> <p>6 Shami's bid?</p> <p>7 A. 50 per cent.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, we know.</p> <p>9 MR JAY: Oh, do we?</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Don't we? If we go behind your</p> <p>11 divider 6, there's a document dated 24 May 2011 --</p> <p>12 MR JAY: Oh yes, sorry.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- which, on the first page,</p> <p>15 "External strategic communication support contract",</p> <p>16 identifies what the responses were. But you chose</p> <p>17 Hanover and Bell Pottinger, as it were, out of the</p> <p>18 ether. Did you do any research to see whether there</p> <p>19 were specialist small companies that did this sort of</p> <p>20 thing?</p> <p>21 A. I -- my research or my thinking over the period of</p> <p>22 months was people that I knew who were in this line of</p> <p>23 work, people that I trusted that could do it and had</p> <p>24 policing experience. That was quite important. And so</p> <p>25 both of those --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 A. No. As I say, I've not bought this PR -- type of PR</p> <p>2 support previously, and therefore I wouldn't have</p> <p>3 a track record of knowing the rates that they would run</p> <p>4 at, apart from that experience of their contract</p> <p>5 elsewhere in the Met.</p> <p>6 Q. Well, Mr Wallis got the job and, as you say in</p> <p>7 paragraph 91, he was paid for the September work, wasn't</p> <p>8 he?</p> <p>9 A. He was, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Even though it wasn't on any expectation that he would</p> <p>11 be paid; is that right?</p> <p>12 A. That's right.</p> <p>13 Q. Why did you think it appropriate to pay him?</p> <p>14 A. I thought someone had done work for the Metropolitan</p> <p>15 Police, then the police should be prepared to pay them</p> <p>16 for it. I didn't think we should take a freebie.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But he'd offered to do the work on</p> <p>18 the speech at no cost to demonstrate the sort of help he</p> <p>19 could provide.</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So it was part, effectively, of his</p> <p>22 pitch to do the job.</p> <p>23 A. Maybe, but I was of the view that I didn't think we</p> <p>24 should be in debt to or owing for that relationship.</p> <p>25 I thought it was quite reasonable that he'd spent the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

<p>1 time on it and that we should recognise that.</p> <p>2 MR JAY: Was it your understanding that Mr Wallis would</p> <p>3 still have a continuing relationship with the</p> <p>4 News of the World, inasmuch as obviously his personal</p> <p>5 contacts there would endure?</p> <p>6 A. Not really, no. I thought he'd had a clean break from</p> <p>7 the News of the World. I think that he didn't see eye</p> <p>8 to eye with other senior people there and it was a clean</p> <p>9 break. That was my understanding.</p> <p>10 Q. I'm just thinking whether it was in your mindset that</p> <p>11 there might have been wider advantages to the police for</p> <p>12 hiring Mr Wallis, that he might be able to cause the MPS</p> <p>13 to be painted in a favourable light by the</p> <p>14 News of the World. Do you think that's right or not?</p> <p>15 A. No, I didn't expect that from him.</p> <p>16 Q. But whether or not you expected it, did you think that</p> <p>17 it might not happen?</p> <p>18 A. I didn't think he had the influence with the paper to</p> <p>19 achieve that anymore.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just thinking about other potential</p> <p>21 candidates, I think I've read somewhere that Stuart</p> <p>22 Higgins, also another NI editor, was in this line of</p> <p>23 business. Did you think about any other small</p> <p>24 operations?</p> <p>25 A. I think Stuart's work is a bit different from this.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 same proposition that I've been concerned about.</p> <p>2 A. There is such a place to go to, but I didn't go there.</p> <p>3 I knew Mr Bingle, I knew Mr Lewington, I've known them</p> <p>4 for a number of years. I both felt that they were</p> <p>5 capable of -- the sort of people that I would trust</p> <p>6 their judgment and their support.</p> <p>7 MR JAY: I don't think the issue concerns their experience;</p> <p>8 it concerns what they are likely to charge. Do you see</p> <p>9 the point, Mr Fedorcio?</p> <p>10 A. I do, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Go back to the horse analogy: a race which was only</p> <p>12 going to be won by one of these horses?</p> <p>13 A. True, but I think both of the other people worked for</p> <p>14 the Police Federation and I didn't believe the Police</p> <p>15 Federation would be paying massive fees. I thought</p> <p>16 they'd be paying reasonable fees. That was part of my</p> <p>17 judgment.</p> <p>18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There might be a conflict with the</p> <p>19 Police Federation.</p> <p>20 A. Neither were then working for them. They'd previously</p> <p>21 worked for them.</p> <p>22 MR JAY: Paragraph 102, page 09553. Back to events</p> <p>23 in January 2003.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think, Mr Jay, it might be</p> <p>25 sensible, as you're moving to another topic, if we have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 It's more celebrity or personality PR than this sort of</p> <p>2 specialism.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, it may be that it is, but --</p> <p>4 A. I didn't consider Stuart Higgins.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or, indeed, Mr Hall?</p> <p>6 A. Or Mr Hall, no. I didn't know Mr Hall.</p> <p>7 MR JAY: Well, we're left with the position now that</p> <p>8 Mr Wallis left you in, I think, 2011; is that right?</p> <p>9 A. 2010, I think.</p> <p>10 Q. And the matters we've just discussed are being</p> <p>11 considered elsewhere?</p> <p>12 A. That's right.</p> <p>13 Q. So I think we can leave it there for the time being.</p> <p>14 May I move forward then to paragraph 102 of your</p> <p>15 statement --</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, I just want to tease this</p> <p>17 a bit more, if you don't mind, Mr Jay.</p> <p>18 There must be somebody to whom you can go to find</p> <p>19 out who is available to do this sort of work, small PR</p> <p>20 companies. I don't know whether -- I'm sure there is --</p> <p>21 A. There is. There is. That I'm aware of, yes.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you didn't go to them?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: To point yourself in the direction of</p> <p>25 the specialist niche business? I'm simply testing the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 five minutes now, because Mr Fedorcio's been there for</p> <p>2 some time.</p> <p>3 MR JAY: Sir.</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And it's quite warm in here, so let's</p> <p>5 just have five minutes.</p> <p>6 (3.17 pm)</p> <p>7 (A short break)</p> <p>8 (3.24 pm)</p> <p>9 MR JAY: We're going back in time now to January 2003,</p> <p>10 Mr Fedorcio, of paragraph 102, page 09553.</p> <p>11 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>12 Q. You were asked by commander Baker to see if you could</p> <p>13 arrange a meeting for him and Detective Superintendent</p> <p>14 Dave Cook with Rebekah Wade, then editor of the</p> <p>15 News of the World, to help them understand why Dave Cook</p> <p>16 had been the subject of intrusion by the paper.</p> <p>17 So what precisely was the purpose of the meeting?</p> <p>18 A. I wasn't sure, as it happened, but as it turned out,</p> <p>19 Commander Baker and Dave Cook wanted to ask her why they</p> <p>20 thought Dave had been under intrusion by the</p> <p>21 News of the World and to hear from her direct the</p> <p>22 reasons.</p> <p>23 Q. So you organised a meeting, to which Rebekah Wade</p> <p>24 readily agreed?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 Q. This took place in your office at NSY on 9 January 2003.</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Which was just before a media reception that you'd been</p> <p>4 invited to attend that day?</p> <p>5 A. That's right.</p> <p>6 Q. That's the sequence of events. You hosted the meeting.</p> <p>7 Detective Superintendent Cook then voiced his concerns</p> <p>8 about him being under surveillance and about his wife,</p> <p>9 Jacqui Hames, being doorstepped; is that right?</p> <p>10 A. That's what I recall, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Because plainly it didn't make any sense to him?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. What was Rebekah Wade's explanation?</p> <p>14 A. I have some difficulty in answering that. I'll give you</p> <p>15 an answer, but let me just explain. This was a long</p> <p>16 time ago, and since then I've read a number of media</p> <p>17 reports of what people have claimed went on in the</p> <p>18 meeting, so I'm trying to pull my version out of that as</p> <p>19 opposed to where I've been influenced in thinking.</p> <p>20 But -- I didn't take any notes of the meeting because it</p> <p>21 was not my meeting, but as I recall she said that they</p> <p>22 had information that Mr Cook was having an affair and</p> <p>23 that's why they were taking a look at him.</p> <p>24 Q. Did she begin to explain what the public interest was in</p> <p>25 that investigation?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 distressed. It surely wasn't just a question of you</p> <p>2 mediating the meeting. Wasn't it more a question of you</p> <p>3 trying to find out what was going on and helping</p> <p>4 Detective Superintendent Cook?</p> <p>5 A. In the process, that's what happened, yes. I found out</p> <p>6 through their discussion. They had the questions to</p> <p>7 put, they had the detail on what they believed had</p> <p>8 happened. I didn't.</p> <p>9 Q. Who is the "they" in that sentence?</p> <p>10 A. Commander Baker and Dave Cook, in terms of the</p> <p>11 intrusion, what the intrusion was. I didn't know</p> <p>12 anything about it until the meeting took place.</p> <p>13 Q. But this comes up during the meeting?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Rebekah Wade gives an explanation. Were you satisfied</p> <p>16 with that explanation?</p> <p>17 A. It didn't strike me as a good explanation.</p> <p>18 Q. Didn't you then take it any further?</p> <p>19 A. Commander Baker and Mr Cook asked more questions, and</p> <p>20 she promised to come back to them.</p> <p>21 Q. Did she?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know. I'd have thought that would be direct</p> <p>23 between Rebekah Wade and Commander Baker and Dave Cook.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But go back to Mr Jay's question.</p> <p>25 Wasn't there a wider issue here? You're there trying to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 A. Not that I recall, no.</p> <p>2 Q. Of course, it didn't make any sense to Detective</p> <p>3 Superintendent Dave Cook, because the affair that was</p> <p>4 going on was with his own wife.</p> <p>5 A. That's what it appears. I mean, I'm again trying to</p> <p>6 recollect what happened at the time and what I've heard</p> <p>7 since. Some versions that have been given to you now</p> <p>8 say that he was told that he was having an affair with</p> <p>9 Jacqui Hames, which of course was his wife and therefore</p> <p>10 would not would have not been correct. I'm not sure</p> <p>11 that Rebekah Wade actually said an affair with her, as</p> <p>12 opposed to an affair, which could have been anybody</p> <p>13 else.</p> <p>14 Q. When you say it was essentially a welfare meeting, what</p> <p>15 do you mean by that?</p> <p>16 A. That Commander Baker was doing it because of his</p> <p>17 concerns about Mr Cook's concerns, really. It wasn't</p> <p>18 about taking any action against the News of the World;</p> <p>19 it was to help Mr Cook understand and come to terms with</p> <p>20 what had gone on. That was how Commander Baker</p> <p>21 described to me, as a welfare meeting, looking after</p> <p>22 a member of his staff who --</p> <p>23 Q. But weren't you concerned to bottom this out, you as</p> <p>24 director of public affairs? Of course, a detective</p> <p>25 superintendent who is under attack is obviously</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 develop the Metropolitan Police relationship with the</p> <p>2 press, and here's one journal which you've had a fair</p> <p>3 amount of contact with getting involved in some pretty</p> <p>4 intrusive work, which appears to be private life stuff</p> <p>5 and not to do with the job. Isn't that something that</p> <p>6 actually you would want to take up not merely because of</p> <p>7 Mr Cook, which I understand, but as a systemic issue?</p> <p>8 A. I didn't see it that way at the time and I think -- my</p> <p>9 expectation was that Rebekah Wade would be coming back</p> <p>10 to Commander Baker and Mr Cook with further information.</p> <p>11 If they felt there was something that I needed to do,</p> <p>12 they would ask me to do so.</p> <p>13 I should say on this that as soon as I was asked to</p> <p>14 do something, I did it. This meeting was arranged not</p> <p>15 at a lot of notice. As I understand, the intrusion had</p> <p>16 taken place the previous July, so it was probably five</p> <p>17 or six months after the incident, as it were, that it</p> <p>18 came to my attention via Commander Baker. So it wasn't</p> <p>19 a current piece of activity; it was historic.</p> <p>20 Q. Were you aware of any of the background? For example,</p> <p>21 Detective Superintendent Cook was reinvestigating the</p> <p>22 murder of Daniel Morgan. The main suspect was the</p> <p>23 director of Southern Investigations, Jonathan Rees.</p> <p>24 A. Prior to the meeting, no, but as a result of the meeting</p> <p>25 I became aware of those linkages. I knew Dave Cook was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

<p>1 working on the Morgan reinvestigation, but the Southern 2 investigation link into it I did not know. 3 Q. So was the name "Southern Investigations" something you 4 heard for the first time at the meeting? 5 A. I think I'd heard of them in previous anti-corruption 6 activity. So when the name came up, it wasn't 7 a surprise to me. 8 Q. Did you send an email to Mr Cook before the meeting on 9 9 January 2003 stating that the Commissioner had 10 sanctioned the meeting with Rebekah Wade regarding 11 a News of the World journalist? 12 A. I don't think I did, no. The Commissioner wasn't 13 involved in my setting up the meeting at all. 14 Q. At the meeting itself -- this is at the top of 15 page 09554 -- you say: 16 "Cook and Baker also told Rebekah Wade they had 17 information suggesting one of her journalists was being 18 paid by the Southern investigators and that she should 19 be aware." 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Was that journalist named? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Were you shown invoices or was Rebekah Wade shown 24 invoices at this meeting that showed that this 25 journalist was receiving payments from Southern</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 back to them with some information, but I can't recall 2 what that was. 3 Q. You say in paragraph 105: 4 "Prior to the meeting, I had informed the 5 Commissioner [that's Lord Stevens, of course] that it 6 was due to take place and that Rebekah Wade would be in 7 the building and attending the reception afterwards." 8 What information did you give to Lord Stevens about 9 the meeting? 10 A. No more than that. I took the view there should be no 11 surprises with the Commissioner. If an editor of the 12 newspaper was in the building and he happened to bump 13 into them, he should know that they were there. So 14 basically when I was discussing with him -- briefing him 15 ahead of the reception who was coming, I made him aware 16 that Rebekah Wade was coming into the building an hour 17 earlier for a meeting in my office. That's what I told 18 him. I didn't tell him any of the detail because, as 19 I say, I didn't have any of the detail to tell him. 20 Q. Yes, but after the meeting, did you communicate any of 21 the detail to Lord Stevens? 22 A. I don't recall doing that at all. I took her down to 23 reception. Lord Stevens was there chatting to some 24 other people, and I sort of handed her over to him and 25 just said, "We had a useful meeting" and left it at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 Investigations for consultancy work? 2 A. I don't recall there being any invoices presented or 3 shown. 4 Q. You don't think that any evidence was produced, only 5 that that's what Cook and Baker were saying to Rebekah 6 Wade? 7 A. As I recall, yes. 8 Q. When this information was given to Rebekah Wade, what 9 was her reaction? 10 A. Sort of nonplussed in a way, as if she was sort of 11 saying, "Very interesting, thank you", but I didn't see 12 a big reaction one way or the other. 13 Q. Were you aware of the corruption investigation into MPS 14 police officers leaking information to Southern 15 Investigations? 16 A. I don't think so, no. 17 Q. So what happened after this meeting on 9 January? Did 18 you feature at all in the course of events? 19 A. No, as far as I was concerned, that was it. The meeting 20 ended, I took her down to the reception, and I never 21 heard anything else about it. 22 Q. At the end of the meeting, did Rebekah Wade say that she 23 would investigate the matter in any way? 24 A. I don't think she said those words, but I think she'd 25 been asked for some more information and said she'd come</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 that. It would have been inappropriate to discuss any 2 of it in that forum, and I don't believe I discussed it 3 with him since. 4 Q. So it follows from that that Lord Stevens wouldn't have 5 known what the meeting was about from that exchange? 6 A. Not from my exchange, no. 7 Q. Okay. Paragraphs 106 to 109 deal with intrusive 8 reporting of you. 9 A. Uh-huh. 10 Q. Which you clearly wish to refer to and to put right. 11 A. I just really wanted to document it. The question had 12 been asked and I thought it was important just give an 13 example of what I have received. I'm not complaining 14 about it in any sense. That, you know, is the nature of 15 the job and what goes on, but I thought for the record 16 you should be aware of what has happened and in 17 particular, in paragraph 109, if I may, the Guardian 18 responded quickly to correct inaccuracy in their -- on 19 their online website, so for that I was pleased. 20 But I want to make the point that you don't get an 21 apology, you just get a correction, and I think that 22 many people who are in that situation, you want someone 23 just to say, "Sorry, we got it wrong", and hold their 24 hand up. As soon as the situation arose, a week or ten 25 days ago, when I was similarly accused of being under</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

<p>1 investigation for phone hacking by the Evening Standard</p> <p>2 in their printed edition, I requested a correction and</p> <p>3 an apology, and the next day there was a correction but</p> <p>4 there was no sorry. I just feel that, as somebody who</p> <p>5 works in the business, it's not very hard to say sorry.</p> <p>6 It's a little word, but it means an awful lot to victims</p> <p>7 of media intrusion.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think you're the first person</p> <p>9 to say that.</p> <p>10 A. I agree. I just thought I would --</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, it is actually very interesting.</p> <p>12 You are in the business, as us say, so you're perfectly</p> <p>13 entitled to offer your view as to the mechanisms that</p> <p>14 ought to be available to get the press to correct</p> <p>15 errors.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So I've no difficulty about your</p> <p>18 offering your opinion at all.</p> <p>19 A. I think in both these examples, I happened to know who</p> <p>20 to go to quickly to seek redress. Other people may not.</p> <p>21 Whether they'd find it quickly or get those amendments</p> <p>22 made quickly is another matter, but there is</p> <p>23 a reluctance to say sorry. Whether they fear that</p> <p>24 they're going to end up in legal battles and so on --</p> <p>25 but I made it very clear to the Guardian that wasn't my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 Q. Yes?</p> <p>2 A. He assures me he didn't.</p> <p>3 Q. So it wasn't you; it was Mr Webb?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. You don't know where the New York Times got that idea</p> <p>6 from, then?</p> <p>7 A. No. They put it to us as a question, I think as part of</p> <p>8 a series of questions that they submitted to the Met.</p> <p>9 It was one of those, and I can't remember the actual</p> <p>10 words, but I think we just said we don't recognise this</p> <p>11 accusation.</p> <p>12 Q. Were you concerned about damage the investigation into</p> <p>13 the phone hacking issue might do to your relationship</p> <p>14 with News International?</p> <p>15 A. No, I wasn't concerned about the damage. An</p> <p>16 investigation would have to do what it had to do, and</p> <p>17 if, as a result of that, my relationship with the paper</p> <p>18 changed, so be it. I mean, that's -- the primary</p> <p>19 concern is a proper policing response to the problem.</p> <p>20 Q. Would it be fair to say that your relationship with</p> <p>21 News International was better than your relationship</p> <p>22 with Associated News, the Daily Mail and Sunday titles?</p> <p>23 A. I don't think so. I would say that my relationship with</p> <p>24 Associated was probably on a similar par to</p> <p>25 News International.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 intention. I just never got a response. And with the</p> <p>2 Evening Standard, I think we agreed to differ.</p> <p>3 MR JAY: Can I ask you some general questions about phone</p> <p>4 hacking before I move to the concluding sections of your</p> <p>5 witness statement. Do you recall any discussions at</p> <p>6 management board about the phone hacking issue?</p> <p>7 A. Other than, I think -- some time after the Guardian</p> <p>8 article in 2009, it may have been mentioned that -- you</p> <p>9 know, just noting that Mr Yates had done his piece of</p> <p>10 work, but beyond that, I don't recall any other</p> <p>11 discussions. It's not the sort of thing that would be</p> <p>12 discussed at the management board.</p> <p>13 Q. Now, the New York Times article, which I think was dated</p> <p>14 1 September 2010.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you read that at about that time?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. It alleged, I think, that the DPA, your department, was</p> <p>19 very concerned in 2006 about the possibility of a major</p> <p>20 investigation into the activities of numerous</p> <p>21 News of the World journalists and the damage that could</p> <p>22 do to your relationship with News International. Is</p> <p>23 that correct?</p> <p>24 A. Not to my knowledge. The article suggested that my</p> <p>25 deputy had expressed that to a detective.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 Q. Notwithstanding the propensity of the Mail on Sunday and</p> <p>2 on occasion the Daily Mail to have a go at the police?</p> <p>3 A. Well, most papers have had a go at the police in my time</p> <p>4 at the Met, so I'm quite used to them doing that.</p> <p>5 Q. At paragraph 110 of your statement, you say you have</p> <p>6 reservations about the validity of some of the</p> <p>7 perceptions described --</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. -- in Elizabeth Filkin's report. Well, those</p> <p>10 perceptions can be separately judged.</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. But you accept the general thrust of the</p> <p>13 recommendations?</p> <p>14 A. I do. I think where we are now with what's happened,</p> <p>15 the Met needs to change. It would be inappropriate to</p> <p>16 continue the way in which things have been done in the</p> <p>17 past. I think that the recommendations cannot be argued</p> <p>18 with. I'd support them and I know the Commissioner's</p> <p>19 looking to implement them and I would support that.</p> <p>20 Q. One of her observations was that there was a perception</p> <p>21 that certain organs of the press were favoured over</p> <p>22 others, in particular News International. You, no</p> <p>23 doubt, would dispute the underlying fact, but would you</p> <p>24 dispute that perception, at least?</p> <p>25 A. If she found that perception, then it exists.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

<p>1 Q. In paragraph 116 you say you are aware of situations 2 when officers have given a story to a journalist contact 3 which has not gone through the DPA for prior issue, and 4 also occasions when a journalist places a private 5 question with the DPA which they believe is based on 6 information they have obtained exclusively to them. You 7 say that that can create friction between the DPA and 8 the rest of the media; is that right?</p> <p>9 A. I think whenever one paper appears to have got something 10 ahead of the others, then it's quite normal to expect 11 all the others to complain, and that has happened as and 12 when these things have happened.</p> <p>13 Q. Can I ask you, please, about the list or the group of 14 London print and broadcast journalists who are seen and 15 briefed regularly.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Paragraph 117. Is there, in fact, a list which contains 18 names?</p> <p>19 A. I think the chief press officer has a list of people 20 that he invites to that meeting, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Does that list cover all titles or not?</p> <p>22 A. I think it covers London media. So it would be BBC 23 London, ITV London, the Standard and some of the local 24 newspaper groups, the large groups that operate in 25 London. So does it cover everyone? Probably no. But</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 going to the Times with that because it's of particular 2 interest to the campaign that they're running. At 3 times, different papers have run different campaigns, so 4 you would identify them and if you had stories that came 5 from that territory, then you would consider placing it 6 with them. If you have a murder in Havering, you 7 wouldn't necessarily send it to a paper in Ealing. But 8 I think the professional experience over time is knowing 9 which papers -- which stories are likely to appear 10 where, in which parts of the media. It doesn't mean 11 that you don't issue the information to everybody; it 12 means that you may phone up a particular paper to make 13 sure they don't miss it.</p> <p>14 Q. Were you responsible, Mr Fedorcio, for causing 15 Sir Ian Blair's resignation by briefing against him 16 secretly to journalists?</p> <p>17 A. I don't believe I was, no.</p> <p>18 Q. Well, you either were or you weren't. Were you 19 responsible for that?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Hang on, that's two questions, isn't 22 it? First of all, did you brief against Sir Ian Blair?</p> <p>23 A. I answered that one earlier, sir, when I said I do not 24 believe I have ever briefed against Sir Ian Blair.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, well, if you haven't done that,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 does it cover the main ones that tend to follow the Met? 2 Then yes. It's a step in the right direction.</p> <p>3 Q. Does it cover all national titles?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you remember who's not on the list?</p> <p>6 A. I can't, no. I mean, it's months since I've been 7 anywhere near that.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Well, if the Inquiry wishes to pursue that 9 further, we'll make a request to see the list.</p> <p>10 A. The Met can provide it, I'm sure. But I think it's 11 a group that's evolving and I think the Met is quite 12 open to look to broaden that.</p> <p>13 Q. You told the Select Committee:</p> <p>14 "I must admit I have placed stories with all sorts 15 of papers and all sorts of journalists." 16 What did you mean by that?</p> <p>17 A. I meant that when you're dealing with stories and 18 information, there are sometimes stories that are 19 perhaps only going to be of interest to certain parts of 20 the media. So to send it to everyone would mean -- 21 it would just go on the spike, so over time, experience 22 would lead you to send things to certain people rather 23 than to everybody.</p> <p>24 As an example, at the moment, if there was a story 25 which had a cycling dimension to it, one might consider</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 then the second question doesn't require answering. All 2 right.</p> <p>3 MR JAY: In terms of your position and Sir Ian Blair's 4 position, Sir Ian Blair had been depicted as rather on 5 the liberal wing. Whether that has any validity or not 6 others may judge. That's not your position, is it?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Would this be fair to say: as far as you were concerned, 9 you'd prefer to have someone else as Commissioner? Is 10 that right or not?</p> <p>11 A. No, no. My job is there to advise the Met and look 12 after the interests of the Met, to support and advise 13 the Commissioner, whoever that may be.</p> <p>14 MR JAY: Okay. The rest of your statement we'll take as 15 read, Mr Fedorcio. Thank you very much.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you want to say anything about the 17 HMIC report, Mr Fedorcio?</p> <p>18 A. I think I touched on it earlier in there, but again 19 I felt that that touched the right buttons, as it were, 20 and the recommendations in there, again, were things 21 that needed to be addressed, and in particular, I think 22 that some national standards around this are important, 23 so there's no difference between one police force and 24 another in how they go about in their relations with the 25 press.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Thank you very much
2 indeed.
3 **A. Thank you.**
4 MR JAY: Another early day, I'm afraid. Shocking.
5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right.
6 Mr Garnham, there were certainly a couple of
7 documents that we're waiting for. Not the one that was
8 mentioned this morning, but how is the quest to get hold
9 of the Home Office document going?
10 MR GARNHAM: Sir, we've invited the Home Office to disclose
11 that to us or to you. I heard this morning that they
12 had agreed to do so, subject only to redaction of some
13 names. The last time I asked those instructing me,
14 which I think was at lunchtime, that redaction process
15 was under way, and then you could have the document.
16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good. Thank you very much.
17 Right.
18 Tomorrow morning, 10 o'clock. Thank you.
19 (3.52 pm)
20 (The hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock the following day)
21
22
23
24
25

A	62:18	21:2	B	Blair's 67:15	cause 36:14,19	10:9,11 12:21
able 3:16,17 18:1	allude 28:21	article 37:20,21	back 1:3 11:10	68:3	49:12	12:25 13:9
33:5 49:12	amendments	37:22 62:8,13	13:23 14:22	blank 4:22	caused 36:23	22:14,14,15
AC 11:13,22,23	61:21	62:24	16:21 30:20	blue 39:6	causing 67:14	24:19 30:2,3,8
11:24	amount 56:3	aside 10:20	41:4 42:6	bluntly 1:18 8:6	celebrity 50:1	33:18 34:2,14
accelerated 43:1	analogy 51:11	18:19	43:13 45:17,19	board 12:8 28:18	cent 46:7	34:15 37:11
43:3	analyse 26:10	asked 9:4 30:3	51:11,22 52:9	62:6,12	certain 64:21	41:12 57:9,12
accept 22:4	Andy 13:5	37:3 40:13,19	55:20,24 56:9	boost 34:1	66:19,22	59:5,11 68:9
64:12	and/or 17:14	40:20 41:22	59:1	bore 42:17,19	certainly 3:3	68:13
access 21:20 23:2	21:19	52:12 55:19	background	borough 44:10	18:9 29:5 69:6	commissioners
23:3 31:9	Anfield 25:18	56:13 58:25	56:20	bottom 54:23	chain 19:16	10:11
accurate 26:10	26:16 27:4	60:12 69:13	back-up 21:19	bought 48:1	chairman 30:8	Commissioner's
accusation 63:11	angles 1:13	asking 43:8	Baker 52:12,19	box 21:13	challenge 20:23	64:18
accused 33:20	animals 3:23	47:13	54:16,20 55:10	boxes 33:11	change 39:15	committee 25:22
60:25	answer 22:21	aspects 29:5	55:19,23 56:10	brake 16:10	64:15	26:4 34:7
achieve 42:25	23:6 24:10	assessing 40:12	56:18 57:16	branch 5:14	changed 39:22	66:13
49:19	53:15	assessment	58:5	break 49:6,9	63:18	communicate
acquire 5:10	answered 67:23	30:24	band 44:22	52:7	chap 39:19	59:20
acquiring 2:2	answering 53:14	assistance 32:12	bank 41:1	brief 23:25 67:22	charge 51:8	communication
act 30:11	68:1	assistant 22:15	banter 25:9 26:7	briefed 4:22	charges 47:21,25	46:15
action 30:18	answers 43:13	assisting 1:16	26:14	65:15 67:24	Charles 44:1	companies 43:25
54:18	anti-corruption	Associated 63:22	based 65:5	briefing 23:14	chased 17:13	46:19 50:20
active 1:12	57:5	63:24	basically 59:14	24:8 59:14	chatting 59:23	company 29:12
activities 62:20	anybody 16:15	Association	basis 10:5 19:8	67:15	chief 65:19	47:3
activity 56:19	22:3 35:9	22:23 23:1,4	31:9 32:10	briefings 15:17	choose 43:18	comparable
57:6	54:12	assumed 4:19	42:13	Briefly 5:5	chose 46:16	47:11
actual 63:9	anymore 49:19	assumption	battle 44:21	bring 23:24	chosen 45:6	competitive
additional 30:4	apart 48:4	25:20	battles 61:24	broadcast 65:14	Chris 32:6	42:14
34:20 35:5	apology 60:21	assurance 37:16	BBC 23:22 24:3	broaden 24:2	circle 23:2	complain 65:11
address 20:7	61:3	37:18 40:7	65:22	broader 2:16	circumstances	complaining
addressed 28:24	appear 15:12	assurances 37:13	beginning 16:9	66:12	19:12 22:3	60:13
68:21	67:9	37:14	begins 1:9	brother 2:16	claimed 53:17	completing 7:22
addressing 28:25	appears 20:3	assure 11:8	believe 6:8,14	budget 31:6	Clarke 15:1	computer 17:17
adjourned 69:20	54:5 56:4 65:9	assures 63:2	8:8 22:22 23:7	building 59:7,12	clean 21:12 49:6	19:18 20:6
admit 13:18	applicant 42:1	attack 54:25	24:12 37:3	59:16	49:8	21:11,12,15,15
66:14	application 9:18	attempted 11:7	40:22 51:14	bullying 18:23	clear 8:20 15:9	21:16,17
advantages	appoint 32:11	attend 53:4	60:2 65:5	bump 59:12	21:14 29:23	concern 18:18
49:11	appointment	attended 25:2	67:17,24	bundle 12:14	38:17 41:25	30:15 36:19
advice 32:25	35:19	attending 59:7	believed 30:19	business 15:8,13	61:25	63:19
33:1 42:5,7,12	appraisal 30:2,8	attention 30:21	55:7	26:1,4,11	clearly 29:3,3	concerned 3:14
advise 28:13	appreciate 8:15	56:18	bell 25:19 44:1,3	44:22 47:6	42:9 60:10	6:9 8:9 9:2
68:11,12	approach 9:10	August 13:23	44:18,20,21,23	49:23 50:25	close 10:6 27:1	33:13 38:24
advised 42:3	15:10 35:10	29:25 30:12	45:25 46:17	61:5,12	29:9	42:21 51:1
adviser 27:9	43:9 45:20,23	31:18 34:9	47:12	buttons 68:19	closely 23:17	54:23 58:19
32:21	45:24	36:24 40:16,19	bells 36:14	C	coincidence 34:5	62:19 63:12,15
advisers 43:22	approached 7:3	41:1	beneficial 35:7	cabal 23:1 24:11	coincident 8:25	68:8
advising 28:11	appropriate	authority 30:9	better 35:9 63:21	call 2:8 6:12 8:1	9:1	concerning
affair 16:4 53:22	16:13,16,17	autumn 33:19	beyond 13:24	8:1 15:12 25:9	colleague 44:9	17:12
54:3,8,11,12	28:21 44:17	available 9:6	23:2 25:20	26:7	combination	concerns 23:19
affairs 23:10	48:13	26:23 31:6	26:8 62:10	called 2:18 8:7	45:23	51:7,8 53:7
27:9 32:23	April 11:24	32:15,25 50:19	bid 46:6	campaign 67:2	come 4:23 12:15	54:17,17
34:7 54:24	argued 64:17	61:14	big 41:3 45:10,13	campaigns 67:3	34:4 38:2 39:6	concluding 62:4
afraid 69:4	arose 30:7 60:24	awarding 29:11	58:12	candidates 49:21	41:4 54:19	conclusion 40:17
agency 44:11	arrange 52:13	aware 2:13,16	Bingle 43:18	capable 51:5	55:20 58:25	Condon 24:23
ago 36:3 53:16	arranged 4:24	5:9 13:12,14	44:1,4 51:3	capacity 27:8	comes 55:13	conference 23:15
60:25	41:11 56:14	25:6,7,8,14,15	bit 8:22 19:16	care 4:6	coming 15:17	confidence 33:10
agree 14:21	arrangement 8:9	25:21 26:6,9	20:22 22:5	career 6:25	30:20 56:9	confined 33:2
15:22 61:10	39:20	28:14 32:4	23:1,9,9 24:2	carried 6:17	59:15,16	conflict 51:18
agreed 7:4 52:24	arrangements	36:7,11 38:8	27:3 37:17	carry 15:16	commander 18:8	connected 21:17
62:2 69:12	3:3 7:8,11	43:22 44:8	42:17 49:25	36:10	52:12,19 54:16	connection 10:13
agreement 6:5	arranging 27:14	50:21 56:20,25	50:17	carrying 36:10	54:20 55:10,19	consider 19:3
ahead 41:8 59:15	arrest 13:12	57:19 58:13	Bizarre 7:15	carved 45:21	55:23 56:10,18	50:4 66:25
65:10	14:15	59:15 60:16	BlackBerry	case 35:17 36:1	comment 25:12	67:5
aim 30:5	arrests 13:13,14	65:1	20:18,21	37:14	34:22	considered 19:12
Ali 17:11	13:21	awareness 32:24	Blair 9:23 67:22	categorical	commissioner	22:2 29:10
alleged 17:12	arrived 17:10,16	awful 42:20 61:6	67:24 68:4	37:13	4:11,14,21	32:14 34:19

43:16 50:11 considering 6:25 29:17 34:22 constant 24:6 consultancy 39:20 45:14 58:1 consultant 31:22 contact 2:6 16:18 22:13,17 25:8 25:21 27:2,19 28:3,19 56:3 65:2 contacts 32:23 49:5 contains 17:19 65:17 contemplating 39:19 continue 15:25 64:16 continues 15:8 continuing 49:3 contract 9:7,17 29:12 33:22 44:6,9 46:15 48:4 conversation 32:5 Cook 52:14,15 52:19 53:7,22 54:3,19 55:4 55:10,19,23 56:7,10,21,25 57:8,16 58:5 Cook's 54:17 cope 29:21 30:10 copied 12:14 coping 30:3 correct 2:3 10:16 11:15 29:25 54:10 60:18 61:14 62:23 correction 60:21 61:2,3 correspondent 23:22 correspondents 23:8,10,11 corruption 58:13 cost 41:16 43:9 44:12 45:24 48:18 Coulson 13:5,6 couple 14:14 45:3 69:6 course 9:21 11:5 15:16 19:3 26:15 36:7 38:25 42:3 47:21 54:2,9 54:24 58:18 59:5 Court 3:4 4:15 cover 14:4 29:12 65:21,25 66:1	66:3 coverage 3:25 4:5,10 6:19 covering 1:12 covers 65:22 CRA 15:18 create 28:16 65:7 credible 33:1 crime 22:19,22 22:25 23:4,8 23:21 criteria 32:15,18 32:19 33:2 40:18 43:20 cropping 1:4 crossover 9:2 culture 29:4 current 56:19 cycling 66:25 <hr/> D <hr/> daily 44:9 63:22 64:2 damage 62:21 63:12,15 Daniel 56:22 date 14:25 43:6 dated 46:11 62:13 Dave 52:14,15 52:19,20 54:3 55:10,23 56:25 David 22:18 day 4:14 10:1 13:14 44:10 45:4 53:4 61:3 69:4,20 days 23:14 32:14 33:23 40:17 41:6 42:22 60:25 deal 5:15,17 11:13 23:23 60:7 dealing 66:17 dealt 19:7 23:12 death 33:23 debate 39:18 debt 48:24 December 25:1 38:11 decided 15:1 45:4 decision 16:11 16:12 30:17 38:18,21 39:5 39:21 dedicated 23:8 23:21 defence 23:10 degree 26:16 delete 19:19,21 20:24 deleted 21:9,13 demonstrate 41:17 48:18	demonstration 33:23 department 7:12 9:15,16 42:12 62:18 depending 44:12 depends 26:22 depicted 68:4 depth 2:13 deputies 35:20 deputy 12:20,23 12:24 13:4,6,8 13:10 22:14 25:2 29:13 30:4,10,12,25 32:1,4,11 36:9 39:20 62:25 deputy's 33:17 describe 25:25 described 54:21 64:7 desk 7:15,16 18:23 detail 55:7 59:18 59:19,21 details 19:19 detective 52:13 53:7 54:2,24 55:4 56:21 62:25 develop 56:1 developed 26:4 DF/4 17:20 Dick 12:20 Dick's 19:18 differ 62:2 difference 68:23 different 1:13 6:8 24:4 39:9 40:5 49:25 67:3,3 difficult 22:5 difficulties 33:14 difficulty 18:3 53:14 61:17 dig 12:12 dimension 66:25 dinner 10:10,14 10:18 12:20 13:16 24:23,24 25:3 35:13 dinners 15:23 16:13 22:6 24:19 direct 5:18 8:11 24:10 52:21 55:22 direction 39:12 50:24 66:2 directly 5:15 director 9:4 27:8 54:24 56:23 director 9:21 disclose 69:10 disclosing 27:18 discovered 42:2	discuss 16:15 41:9 60:1 discussed 5:4 50:10 60:2 62:12 discussing 7:9 33:18 59:14 discussion 4:19 13:20 15:4 16:4,5 55:6 discussions 62:5 62:11 dispute 64:23,24 distressed 55:1 divider 46:11 Dizaei 17:11 18:8 document 28:18 46:11 60:11 69:9,15 documents 21:21 69:7 doing 16:20 19:12 22:2 24:8 27:18 28:11 32:6 33:12 40:12 47:7,15 54:16 59:22 64:4 doorstepped 53:9 doubt 64:23 DPA 62:18 65:3 65:5,7 draft 41:11 driving 34:3 due 4:15 59:6 <hr/> E <hr/> Ealing 67:7 earlier 1:11 22:2 28:19 40:23 59:17 67:23 68:18 early 23:13 33:22 69:4 edition 61:2 editor 7:4 10:8 11:1 12:23,23 13:4,4,6 25:1,2 36:9 39:20 49:22 52:14 59:11 editors 27:15 effectively 48:21 eight 33:21 41:5 either 12:3 14:7 25:18 27:4 32:8 44:14 67:18 Elizabeth 64:9 email 17:16,19 19:16 20:7,9 20:13 21:4,7 43:7,8 57:8 emails 21:10	embarrass 37:10 embarrassing 18:8 emerge 37:9 employment 9:12 enabled 19:3 encourage 29:5 encouraged 7:2 24:1 encouragement 34:19 ended 58:20 endure 29:23 49:5 engage 29:18 engaging 41:9 England 2:15 enjoyed 22:6 enquiries 6:17 enquiry 2:10,17 enter 3:16 enthusiasm 35:4 enthusiastic 35:3 entitled 61:13 error 21:23 22:4 errors 61:15 especially 28:9 essentially 54:14 ether 46:18 ethics 18:18 Evening 61:1 62:2 event 23:14 36:21 42:11 events 51:22 53:6 58:18 everybody 66:23 67:11 evidence 11:14 24:25 27:23 34:6 37:7 58:4 evolving 66:11 example 21:23 24:3 56:20 60:13 66:24 examples 61:19 exchange 60:5,6 exclusively 65:6 exercise 36:10 exist 27:13 existed 23:4 exists 64:25 expect 28:2 49:15 65:10 expectation 48:10 56:9 expected 49:16 expecting 32:10 45:8 expense 22:7 expensive 44:4,5 experience 7:3 7:21,23 9:9,24 32:23 42:19 46:24 48:4	51:7 66:21 67:8 experts 23:16 24:6 explain 53:15,24 explanation 53:13 55:15,16 55:17 exploring 1:14 express 34:16 expressed 35:7 62:25 expressing 4:9 extended 28:24 extensive 27:1 extent 16:17 22:25 27:21 external 29:18 46:15 extra 33:5 ex-commander 17:11 ex-editor 47:2 eye 49:7,8 <hr/> F <hr/> facilities 5:8 6:1 fact 21:7 24:24 46:1 64:23 65:17 factor 46:5 fair 2:1 8:22 15:23 56:2 63:20 68:8 fairly 19:15 36:11 far 3:13 6:9 8:8 9:1 10:19 13:16 33:13 58:19 68:8 fast 40:24 43:13 father 8:18 favour 34:15 favourable 49:13 favoured 64:21 favours 8:6 fear 61:23 February 17:24 Federation 43:22,23 51:14 51:15,19 Fedorcio 1:3,10 7:24 11:3 12:20 14:17 20:4 26:20 40:16 51:9 52:10 67:14 68:15,17 Fedorcios 8:14 Fedorcio's 52:1 feel 10:20 12:2 21:23 37:14 61:4 fees 51:15,16 felt 4:3 6:8 18:25	23:23 30:18,20 31:10 33:9 35:4 37:16 41:7 45:4 51:4 56:11 68:19 figure 44:10 45:15 46:2 figures 46:4 file 17:14 19:18 files 21:20 Filkin's 64:9 finalised 6:6 find 3:20 7:3 30:25 50:18 55:3 61:21 finding 34:20 finish 42:23 first 2:5 4:20 8:1 24:23 26:12 42:8 46:14 57:4 61:8 67:22 five 24:3 29:20 42:22 52:1,5 56:16 fixed 9:23 FOI 12:17 follow 19:23 66:1 following 1:13 3:12 6:14 9:18 14:20 23:17 31:19 32:14 40:17 69:20 follows 19:25 60:4 football 25:9,12 25:16 26:7,14 force 68:23 Forget 14:23 forgotten 10:1 forum 60:2 forward 43:9 50:14 forwarded 20:12 20:13 21:8 found 30:12 55:5 64:25 four 7:23 24:3 29:20 freebie 48:16 frequently 35:12 friction 65:7 Friday 17:6,22 Fridays 17:5 friend 10:6,13 19:6 25:23 26:25 friendly 27:1 friends 26:20 35:13 friendship 21:24 22:1 25:5 26:5 26:11,17 friendships 26:1 26:2,2 27:12
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

front 34:25 43:7	group 23:9,24	he'll 22:21	11:9 21:22	62:20 63:12,16	23:12 29:7	50:6,20 55:11
fully 23:25	24:6,7 65:13	Higgins 24:25	35:25 60:1	Investigations	57:17 62:21	55:22 57:2
function 26:19	66:11	49:22 50:4	64:15	56:23 57:3	65:14 66:15	59:13 60:14
furnish 33:5	groups 65:24,24	higher 19:16	inasmuch 49:4	58:1,15	67:16	61:19 62:9
furnishing 18:15	grown 24:5	46:5	inbox 21:12	investigator	journey 27:4	63:5 64:18
further 5:12,25	Guardian 37:19	hindsight 14:22	incestuous 8:22	35:20	judge 68:6	knowing 48:3
6:17 7:21 15:1	37:21,22 38:8	hire 35:25	incident 56:17	investigators	judged 64:10	67:8
30:14 55:18	38:16 39:9,18	hiring 49:12	included 45:2,3	57:18	judgment 21:24	knowledge 11:18
56:10 66:9	60:17 61:25	Hiscock 2:18 3:7	indication 36:20	invisible 33:21	22:4 26:13	22:16 28:22
	62:7	5:15,17 6:1,12	indiscreet 12:5	invited 7:20 53:4	51:6,17	32:23 43:23
	guessing 19:24	historic 56:19	inevitably 29:8	69:10	July 3:11 6:3,14	62:24
G	guidance 31:1	history 3:13	29:17	invites 65:20	29:24 31:15,21	known 24:22
gained 9:12	guys 45:10	Hm 20:24	influence 49:18	invoices 57:23,24	36:11 39:10,23	35:22 39:5
gap 3:10	G20 33:23	HMIC 68:17	influenced 53:19	58:2	56:16	43:15,19 51:3
Garnham 69:6		hold 60:23 69:8	information 9:10	involve 45:21	June 31:15	60:5
69:10		holiday 41:1	28:6 53:22	involved 5:16	junior 44:24	
general 2:10	H	home 2:15 23:10	56:10 57:17	8:10 15:7 35:8	46:1	L
7:16 62:3	hacking 13:20	34:7 69:9,10	58:8,14,25	56:3 57:13	JUSTICE 3:19	large 65:24
64:12	16:4,6 35:21	hope 30:6	59:1,8 65:6	irrespective	3:22 4:2 14:10	launched 16:10
generally 21:11	37:9 39:2 61:1	hopeful 29:19	66:18 67:11	15:20	14:12,14,17,21	lead 4:5,10 35:20
getting 3:11 32:6	62:4,6 63:13	hoping 45:8	informed 28:15	issue 5:4 20:20	15:3,16 20:6,9	66:22
56:3	Hall 47:4 50:5,6	horse 2:3,14,21	59:4	30:7 36:7 39:7	20:11,13,16	leaking 58:14
gift 1:3	50:6	3:1,6,8,9,11,15	Initially 29:19	51:7 55:25	26:3 27:3,8,20	leaks 1:21
gifts 12:12	Hames 53:9 54:9	4:5,8,10,13,25	inner 23:2	56:7 62:6	27:25 28:10	leave 14:6 28:24
give 15:19 32:25	hand 17:12 33:5	5:10,19,22,22	Inquiry 66:8	63:13 65:3	35:11,15 37:19	29:14 32:2
33:10 36:19	60:24	6:2,7,13,15,21	insiders 18:10	67:11	37:24 38:5,8	50:13
43:4,6 53:14	handed 59:24	8:2 10:20	inspect 6:1	issued 6:21	38:13,15,20,24	leaving 31:19
59:8 60:12	Hang 67:21	51:11	Inspector 2:18	issues 22:17	39:16,25 40:3	led 31:4
given 1:8 12:18	Hanover 44:2,19	horses 2:11 3:25	3:6 5:15,17 6:1	28:16 29:4	40:7,11 44:16	left 5:17 6:4 7:25
12:24 13:8	45:13,20 46:17	4:6 51:12	6:12	32:24	45:13 46:8,10	31:20 50:7,8
22:6 42:5 54:7	47:12	hospitality 1:3	instance 26:12	ITN 23:22	46:14 47:1,6,8	59:25
58:8 65:2	happen 49:17	12:13	instructing	ITV 65:23	47:11,16 48:17	legal 61:24
gives 55:15	happened 29:11	hosted 53:6	69:13		48:21 49:20	lender 5:21
giving 30:21 34:6	33:16 34:4	hour 44:13 59:16	intending 6:2	J	50:3,5,16,22	lent 2:21 3:23
39:19 41:19	42:2 43:14,15	how's 32:6,6,6	intention 62:1	Jacqui 53:9 54:9	50:24 51:18,24	Leppard 22:18
46:4	52:18 54:6	HR 7:12 9:10	interaction	January 51:23	52:4 55:24	let's 41:5 52:4
go 3:13 5:12 15:1	55:5,8 58:17	human 9:4,16	25:14	52:9 53:1 57:9	61:8,11,17	level 30:21 32:21
26:19 27:3	59:12 60:16		interactions 1:8	58:17	67:21,25 68:16	45:9 46:3
39:5 41:5,8	61:19 64:14	I	12:7 13:19	Jay 1:3 4:3 15:2	69:1,5,16	LEVESON 3:19
46:10 50:18,22	65:11,12	Ian 9:23 33:24	14:19 16:7	15:23 20:18		3:22 4:2 14:10
51:2,2,11	hard 61:5	67:15,22,24	24:16 29:6,8	26:10 29:2	K	14:12,14,17,21
55:24 61:20	Havering 67:6	68:3,4	30:1	35:22 38:12,14	keen 3:14,16 4:7	15:3,16 20:6,9
64:2,3 66:21	Hayman 11:13	idea 19:2 33:4	interest 53:24	40:15 45:8,16	20:25	20:11,13,16
68:24	11:22,23,25	44:14 45:11	66:19 67:2	46:9,12 47:13	keep 1:4 6:2 15:9	26:3 27:3,8,20
goes 60:15	12:4 14:8	63:5	interested 1:15	47:19 49:2	28:15	27:25 28:10
going 3:19 4:25	head 31:25	identical 37:7	28:12 41:13	50:7,17 51:7	kept 1:19	35:11,15 37:19
5:10 13:23	health 30:16	identified 5:20	46:4	51:22,24 52:3	keyboard 20:21	37:24 38:5,8
14:22 15:13	33:18	6:13,15 31:11	interesting 4:20	52:9 62:3 68:3	knew 1:20 2:11	38:13,15,20,24
18:25 28:4	hear 52:21	identifies 46:16	45:24 58:11	68:14 69:4	8:16 9:6 10:8	39:16,25 40:3
30:14 37:9	heard 10:1 14:6	identify 67:4	61:11	Jay's 55:24	14:22 25:6,22	40:7,11 44:16
39:12 41:25	14:7 25:17	identifying 33:25	interests 68:12	job 11:1 28:8	42:11 44:4	45:13 46:8,10
44:4,15 45:11	27:23 54:6	ill 29:13	internal 30:2	48:6,22 56:5	45:5 46:22	46:14 47:1,6,8
45:24 51:12	57:4,5 58:21	Imber 3:4 4:15	International	60:15 68:11	47:21 51:3,3	47:11,16 48:17
52:9 54:4 55:3	69:11	immediate 36:2	62:22 63:14,21	John 1:5 10:15	56:25	48:21 49:20
61:24 66:19	hearing 41:13	immediately 9:7	63:25 64:22	25:10 35:18	know 1:14 3:21	50:3,5,16,22
67:1 69:9	69:20	21:10 32:16	interview 41:18	40:25 41:2	3:22 10:12	50:24 51:18,24
good 1:20 5:6,7,7	help 9:11 11:1	impact 19:4	intrusion 52:16	John's 25:13	14:23 15:20	52:4 55:24
10:12 37:16,17	13:1 17:14	implement 64:19	52:20 55:11,11	joining 23:5	18:24 19:20	61:8,11,17
37:18 55:17	18:24 32:8,10	important 46:24	56:15 61:7	Jonathan 56:23	24:7 26:18	67:21,25 68:16
69:16	36:24 41:17	60:12 68:22	intrusive 56:4	journal 56:2	27:12 28:1,2,7	69:1,5,16
Goodman 14:15	48:18 52:15	impressed 42:10	60:7	journalism 7:1	28:8,12 30:19	Lewington 43:18
Goodman/Mul...	54:19	impression 6:4	investigate 58:23	journalist 15:15	31:1 32:1	44:2 51:3
13:12	helpful 19:20	15:20	investigation	19:11 22:11	33:11 35:12,23	liberal 68:5
great 2:13	27:17	inaccuracy	14:24 15:7	57:11,21,25	38:2 39:14	life 56:4
greater 25:21	helping 18:21	60:18	53:25 57:2	65:2,4	43:2 44:18	light 49:13
grew 26:11	19:6,7 33:5	inappropriate	58:13 61:1	journalists 16:14	46:8 47:25	Limited 45:9
grounds 41:23	55:3					

line 31:22 46:22 49:22	Lucy 1:5 11:15 12:3,4,24 13:3 14:5,6 17:4 19:17 21:7,14 21:25	32:22 45:8 47:12 53:3,16 61:7 65:8,22 66:20 67:10	45:2 50:17 mindset 49:10 mine 21:9 minutes 20:16,16 27:6 52:1,5	needed 4:22 30:4 30:19 31:9,10 32:20 33:19,24 34:1 36:15 39:15 42:14 56:11 68:21	obvious 25:20 obviously 6:2 18:3 37:1 39:7 47:9 49:4 54:25	opposed 53:19 54:12 order 10:3 organisation 15:6,7,9 23:21 24:5 32:22
linkages 56:25	lunch 4:16,17,23 4:24 5:4 6:4 12:11 13:22,24 14:10 31:18,21 32:5 34:9 40:16 41:4,14	mediating 55:2	mismessage 15:11	needs 64:15	occasion 11:20 11:23 16:5 24:21 25:16 64:2	organised 31:18 52:23
list 31:16 34:17 45:2 65:13,17 65:19,21 66:5 66:9	lunches 15:23 16:13 22:6 24:19	medium-size 45:14	missing 31:3	Neil 25:11 34:8 34:22,23,25	occasionally 25:10 26:19	organised 31:18 52:23
little 8:22 24:2 61:6	lunching 1:19	meet 3:6 15:18 35:12 41:11	mm 8:4 19:14,25 20:17 36:6 39:8	Never 51:20	occasions 11:17 11:21 12:2 16:3 23:25 65:4	organs 64:21 original 19:19 39:11
live 15:3	lunchtime 69:14	meeting 3:10 12:11 15:17 38:9 52:13,17 52:23 53:6,18 53:20,21 54:14 54:21 55:2,12 55:13 56:14,24 56:24 57:4,8 57:10,13,14,24 58:17,19,22 59:4,9,17,20 59:25 60:5 65:20	Mm-hm 24:14 31:13 38:7,23 52:11	never 44:6 58:20 62:1	originally 23:7 36:16	originally 23:7 36:16
Liverpool 25:13	lunching 1:19	meetings 10:9 11:13 17:3,4,7 17:9 27:21 34:17	moment 18:19 66:24	news 7:16 12:1 12:21,22 13:2 13:19,22,25 15:25 16:8,14 18:14,23 24:20 31:20,20 33:17 36:8,9 37:25 49:4,7,14 52:15,21 54:18 57:11 62:21,22 63:14,21,22,25 64:22	ought 35:12 61:14	ought 35:12 61:14
loan 2:10 5:10	lunchtime 69:14	member 2:21,22 3:17 22:22,24 22:24 54:22	Monday 41:1	new 5:21,21 31:22 39:8,11 44:7 62:13 63:5	outbox 21:13	outbox 21:13
lobby 23:9	M	members 23:16 24:4	months 6:16 14:20 29:20 33:8,22 46:22 56:17 66:6	news 7:16 12:1 12:21,22 13:2 13:19,22,25 15:25 16:8,14 18:14,23 24:20 31:20,20 33:17 36:8,9 37:25 49:4,7,14 52:15,21 54:18 57:11 62:21,22 63:14,21,22,25 64:22	outlined 2:20	outlined 2:20
local 65:23	machine 18:20	membership 24:2	Morgan 56:22 57:1	newspaper 9:24 15:8 47:3 59:12 65:24	outside 9:21 27:13	outside 9:21 27:13
London 44:9,11 65:14,22,23,23 65:25	Mail 63:22 64:1 64:2	mentioned 24:25 35:2 62:8 69:8	morning 4:18,21 5:6 19:2 69:8 69:11,18	NI 49:22	out-of-hours 27:21	out-of-hours 27:21
long 3:19 7:8 13:11 34:17 42:20,21 43:4 53:15	main 1:11 22:17 23:11 56:22 66:1	merely 56:6	mounted 5:14	niche 50:25	owing 48:24	owing 48:24
longer 16:13,16	major 62:19	message 15:10 19:19 20:24	move 1:23 16:21 24:13 50:14 62:4	nine 6:16 33:21	owner 5:13,21 5:21	owner 5:13,21 5:21
long-term 32:2	making 38:22	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	moving 40:24 51:25	nine-month 3:10	ownership 3:1	ownership 3:1
look 6:23 11:10 28:5 34:21 39:13 53:23 66:12 68:11	man 42:10	MFL 19:22	mounted 5:14	Nods 31:25	o'clock 69:18,20	o'clock 69:18,20
looked 4:22 16:18 38:4	manage 29:22	Metropolitan 1:12 3:2 4:18 5:14 6:20 9:13 18:7 19:4 22:17 23:5,13 23:17 27:10,11 28:11 31:23 39:1 48:14 56:1	move 1:23 16:21 24:13 50:14 62:4	nonplussed 58:10		
looking 12:16 14:18,25 21:5 27:18 30:24,25 32:17 38:5 45:1,5 54:21 64:19	management 28:18 62:6,12	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	move 1:23 16:21 24:13 50:14 62:4	nonplussed 58:10		
longer 16:13,16	managerial 27:15	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	moved 35:17 40:16	noticed 22:11		
long-term 32:2	manner 42:6	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	moving 40:24 51:25	noticed 22:11 33:8 53:20		
look 6:23 11:10 28:5 34:21 39:13 53:23 66:12 68:11	March 41:24	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	Mowley 14:3,13	notice 32:25 56:15		
looked 4:22 16:18 38:4	margins 32:5	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	noting 62:9		
looking 12:16 14:18,25 21:5 27:18 30:24,25 32:17 38:5 45:1,5 54:21 64:19	Martin 9:4	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	Notwithstanding 64:1		
looks 20:19	massive 51:15	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	November 9:3 38:12,14		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	master 12:14	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	number 11:21 30:22 45:21 51:4 53:16		
looks 20:19	match 25:16 26:8 27:6	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	match 25:16 26:8 27:6	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	matched 5:20	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	maternity 14:4,6	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	matter 2:12 8:10 12:7 20:1,1 36:3 58:23 61:22	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	mean 8:13 10:25 19:23 22:25 23:6 26:23,24 26:25,25 27:1 28:4 29:2 33:7 44:17 54:5,15 63:18 66:6,16 66:20 67:10	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	means 27:4 61:6 67:12	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	meant 66:17	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	mechanisms 61:13	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:12,17 40:18 42:20 43:20 44:11 48:5 63:8 64:4 64:15 66:1,10 66:11 68:11,12	MPS 2:10 21:17 37:10 49:12 58:13	numerous 62:20		
Lord 3:19,22 4:2 14:10,12,14,17 14:21 15:3,16 20:6,9,11,13 20:16 26:3 27:3,8,20,25 28:10 35:11,15 37:19,24 38:5 38:8,13,15,20 38:24 39:16,25 40:3,7,11 44:16 45:13 46:8,10,14 47:1,6,8,11,16 48:17,21 49:20 50:3,5,16,22 50:24 51:18,24 52:4 55:24 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 61:8,11 61:17 67:21,25 68:16 69:1,5 69:16	media 15:13 23:8 23:20 24:1 28:9,19 31:22	met 10:8 11:15 11:17,20 24:23 27:17 28:7,17 28:25 32:9,15 38:17 39:1				

63:7	placed 66:14	practice 21:10	12:8 26:12	66:11	69:14	requested 61:2
particular 17:11	places 65:4	precisely 52:17	67:8	quotes 42:14	redress 61:20	require 5:25
43:21 60:17	placing 67:5	predicted 5:5	professionally	45:17	Rees 56:23	68:1
64:22 67:1,12	plainly 53:11	prefer 68:9	43:20		refer 11:24 17:3	research 46:18
68:21	played 25:14	premise 4:12	profile 33:19,25	R	47:24 60:10	46:21
parts 23:19 24:4	please 1:23 11:10	prepared 6:18	prolonged 29:14	race 51:11	reference 18:9	reservations
66:19 67:10	13:1 16:21,24	35:10 41:12	promised 55:20	raise 15:18 33:25	31:1 44:7,14	64:6
party 15:4 31:19	19:21 29:13	48:15	propensity 64:1	raised 2:12	referring 21:16	resignation
pass 18:20	65:13	preparing 26:24	proper 12:8	rare 23:13	reflect 39:15	67:15
passing 25:12	pleased 34:23	present 14:10,11	63:19	rates 48:3	refusal 17:12	resilience 33:11
Paul 12:25 24:23	60:19	presentations	property 44:11	reaction 36:2	refuse 22:6	resource 29:22
24:24 38:9	pm 1:2 52:6,8	21:19 35:6	proposals 45:12	58:9,12	regarding 33:19	31:5
pay 48:13,15	69:19	presented 58:2	proposed 43:9	read 18:2 27:21	57:10	resources 9:4,16
paying 51:15,16	point 3:9 15:22	press 6:19 9:8,10	proposition 51:1	37:19,21 49:21	register 12:13	respective 10:15
payments 57:25	28:4 29:15	15:17 23:14,15	prospect 30:16	53:16 62:16	14:2	responded 60:18
pays 2:22	31:1,14 32:7	27:11 28:20	prospective 5:13	68:15	registers 1:4	response 62:1
people 1:17 3:22	34:3,6 37:9	56:2 61:14	provide 7:5	readily 52:24	regular 19:7	63:19
19:20 23:3,24	39:23,24 40:2	64:21 65:19	34:12 41:17	really 1:19 16:7	34:17	responses 46:16
24:7 26:18	40:3 47:13,17	68:25	48:19 66:10	16:12 19:6	regularly 21:12	responsible
27:16 28:7,8	50:24 51:9	pressing 38:9	provided 6:22	28:2,5 41:18	65:15	67:14,19
33:20 35:6	60:20	pressure 17:15	34:2	41:20 49:6	reinforcement	rest 65:8 68:14
43:19 44:24,24	pointed 37:22	18:23 20:20	provider 13:23	54:17 60:11	39:10	result 25:13
45:21,23 46:22	points 44:8	33:10	proximity 35:23	reason 1:18 29:2	reinvestigating	47:17 56:24
46:23 47:9	police 1:12 2:2	presumably 3:6	public 2:22,22	47:1	56:21	63:17
49:8 51:5,13	2:11,13 3:2 4:6	4:4 5:9 21:5	3:17 27:9	reasonable 48:25	reinvestigation	resulted 21:24
53:17 59:24	4:18 5:14 6:20	37:20 43:10	32:23 38:3	51:16	57:1	22:1
60:22 61:20	9:13 12:5	pretty 37:16,17	39:3 53:24	reasons 41:8	relapse 33:17	retained 21:4,9
65:19 66:22	14:24 15:6	56:3	54:24	52:22	relates 2:2 6:25	retainer 31:9
people's 28:3	18:7 19:4	previous 10:11	pull 53:18	Rebecca 14:3,13	relation 8:2	retired 2:2,10,14
perception 64:20	22:17 23:5,13	30:1 41:3	pulled 39:9	Rebekah 2:2,5	29:11	2:15,21 4:6
64:24,25	23:17 27:10,11	56:16 57:5	pupils 7:2	3:3,11,14 4:4,7	relations 68:24	return 7:21
perceptions 64:7	28:11,13,13	previously 43:21	purpose 52:17	4:12,16,17,24	relationship 10:5	18:25 29:20
64:10	29:4,6 30:9	45:1 48:2	pursuant 12:17	5:17 7:4 10:3,5	15:14 26:12	30:6
perfectly 61:12	31:23 39:1	51:20	pursue 38:18	10:15,20 52:14	28:9 35:23	returning 30:16
period 33:8	43:22,23 48:15	pre-emptive	66:8	52:23 53:13	48:24 49:3	revelation 27:23
39:10 41:5,24	48:15 49:11	30:18	put 1:17 2:8 6:21	54:11 55:15,23	56:1 62:22	right 1:6,21 2:18
46:21	51:14,14,19	primary 63:18	8:6 16:10	56:9 57:10,16	63:13,17,20,21	2:22,24 3:5,15
permanent 9:18	56:1 58:14	principle 5:10	18:22 36:3	57:23 58:5,8	63:23	4:8 5:11 9:25
person 2:17	64:2,3 68:23	6:5	42:21 43:8	58:22 59:6,16	relationships	10:14,17 11:18
14:11 35:1,8	policing 24:6	print 65:14	44:21 45:14	recall 10:19 11:4	27:13,13 28:23	11:22 12:9,19
45:22 46:1,3	32:24 43:24	printed 61:2	46:1 55:7	11:16,25 13:17	relevant 7:3	14:1 17:5,25
61:8	46:24 63:19	printing 12:16	60:10 63:7	13:18,20 16:5	12:15 32:22	21:18 22:9,20
personal 10:13	policy 16:11	prior 56:24 59:4	putting 18:19	16:20 17:10	reliable 33:1	24:22 25:6
26:2,11,17	pose 37:2	65:3	47:13	18:21 53:10,21	reluctance 61:23	26:21 27:12
27:19 28:3,22	position 9:19	prison 17:11,13		54:1 58:2,7	remains 2:24 3:1	29:16 33:6,7
49:4	26:13 38:17	18:10,15	Q	59:1,22 62:5	remember 7:6	33:16 34:11
personality 50:1	39:23 50:7	private 56:4 65:4	qualifies 37:17	62:10	14:25 30:1	38:19 41:20
personally 27:14	68:3,4,6	probably 6:16	quest 69:8	received 6:12	34:7,9,10 43:5	42:16 43:13
perspective 18:7	positive 4:5	10:9 13:10	question 8:6	25:11 37:13	43:7 47:2 63:9	47:4 48:11,12
18:25	possibilities 45:3	18:14 20:18	14:18,19 15:18	42:12 60:13	66:5	49:14 50:8,12
Peter 44:1	possibility 32:2	25:18 30:12	24:10 35:21,22	receiving 57:25	replace 30:18,25	53:5,9 60:10
phone 2:7,7	41:9 62:19	40:25 41:5	37:2,8 40:19	reception 17:10	report 15:8 64:9	65:8 66:2 68:2
13:20 16:4,6	possible 18:17	42:17 43:11	40:21 55:1,2	53:3 58:20	68:17	68:10,19 69:1
35:21 37:9	42:4 43:10,11	45:14 56:16	55:24 60:11	59:7,15,23	reporters 22:19	69:5,17
39:2 61:1 62:3	possibly 4:5	63:24 65:25	63:7 65:5 68:1	recognise 38:21	22:23,25 23:4	ring 25:19 36:14
62:6 63:13	18:13 32:25	problem 18:24	questions 55:6	44:19,20 49:1	reporting 60:8	risk 28:12,16
67:12	potential 31:12	63:19	55:19 62:3	63:10	reports 53:17	38:6 39:1,17
picking 30:22	45:1 47:24	process 41:23,25	63:8 67:21	recollect 54:6	representative	40:12
piece 56:19 62:9	49:20	43:1 55:5	quickly 43:14,15	recollection 7:18	23:9 24:1	road 27:6
pitch 44:15 45:9	Pottinger 44:1,3	69:14	60:18 61:20,21	recommendati...	representing	route 43:17
48:22	44:18,20,21,23	procurement	61:22	64:13,17 68:20	24:4	rumbling 38:15
place 13:15 17:4	45:25 46:17	33:14 42:5,12	quite 1:12 15:19	recommended	reputational	39:7
26:9 30:4 42:8	47:12	42:13	18:22 25:7	34:8 44:23	28:12,16 38:5	run 48:3 67:3
42:22 51:2	PR 44:11 47:3	produce 20:21	30:15 46:2,24	record 24:17	39:1,17	runner 34:25
53:1 55:12	48:1,1 50:1,19	produced 58:4	48:25 52:4	48:3 60:15	request 12:17	running 67:2
56:16 59:6	practical 6:6	professional	64:4 65:10	redaction 69:12	41:22 66:9	Rusbridger

38:10 39:6	39:21 40:1 41:14,22 42:11 48:7 62:14	soon 43:10,11 56:13 60:24 sorry 37:18 38:13 46:12 47:19 50:16 60:23 61:4,5 61:23 sort 5:5 19:17 25:9,14 28:3,6 30:1 31:3,5,6 32:9 33:1,14 33:21 34:5,11 35:17 39:17 41:17,18 45:21 46:19 48:18 50:1,19 51:5 58:10,10 59:24 62:11 sorts 1:15 66:14 66:15 sounds 8:22 source 1:20 18:10,14 21:1 Southern 56:23 57:1,3,18,25 58:14 speak 4:11 10:3 19:17 36:4,23 41:11 special 23:25 specialism 50:2 specialist 46:19 50:25 specified 12:22 13:24 speech 41:12,16 48:18 speech-writing 32:22 35:6 speed 45:19 spent 7:14,15,16 48:25 spike 66:21 spoke 2:17 4:14 34:14 47:3 spoken 40:8 sporting 26:19 spouses 10:16 spring 24:15 square 44:21 stables 3:4 4:18 4:21 5:7 staff 17:13 37:24 41:22 54:22 stage 5:9,25 6:3 7:25 8:9 23:18 29:19 30:5,7 39:22 42:4 Standard 61:1 62:2 65:23 standards 68:22 stand-alone 17:17 21:11,16 start 32:16 33:22 42:23 started 23:18	31:15 32:5 44:22 starting 16:12 29:15 32:7 statement 1:24 6:18,23 11:11 16:21 22:13 36:23 50:15 62:5 64:5 68:14 statements 6:20 stating 57:9 step 66:2 Stephen 1:5 Stephenson 12:25 steps 5:12 6:9 Stevens 10:15 59:5,8,21,23 60:4 stopped 16:7 stories 1:13,15 66:14,17,18 67:4,9 story 6:19 10:25 17:10,14,15,19 17:20,21,25 18:5,16,20 19:1 20:20,21 21:1 39:4,10 39:11 65:2 66:24 strategic 16:11 46:15 strike 55:17 strong 32:24 Stuart 24:25 49:21 50:4 Stuart's 49:25 stuff 14:25 56:4 subject 6:5 12:7 52:16 69:12 submit 43:4 45:11 submitted 63:8 subsequent 7:11 subsequently 3:24 5:16 42:6 successful 30:13 sufficient 37:15 sufficiently 29:3 suggest 26:16 suggested 3:25 9:9 62:24 suggesting 57:17 suggestion 34:12 suggests 4:6 18:13 suit 17:12 suitable 5:19 6:13 Sullivan 1:5 sum 25:24 summer 14:8 Sun 7:4,12,13,20 8:11,12,16 9:9	9:24 11:1 25:1 25:2 Sunday 19:2 22:12,19,24 63:22 64:1 superintendent 52:13 53:7 54:3,25 55:4 56:21 suppliers 31:12 31:14 45:1 47:24 support 29:18 30:5,25 31:10 34:20,24 35:5 46:15 48:2 51:6 64:18,19 68:12 supported 25:13 suppose 5:21 20:3 30:11 40:24 44:8 sure 7:18 11:19 13:5 19:22 31:2 36:15 40:20 43:6 47:7 50:20 52:18 54:10 66:10 67:13 surely 55:1 surprise 22:15 45:16,18 57:7 surprised 27:20 27:25 43:12,14 45:18,19 46:2 surprises 59:11 surrounding 36:8 39:2 surveillance 53:8 suspect 56:22 system 21:4,17 systematically 1:20 systemic 56:7	telephoned 2:5 tell 35:11,14 59:18,19 temporary 5:13 14:4 ten 60:24 tend 66:1 tender 41:23 43:16 tenderers 43:4 tendering 41:25 tenders 42:19 43:5 term 9:7 terms 1:18 10:12 10:25 15:13 35:18 40:12 54:19 55:10 68:3 territory 24:9 44:7 67:5 testing 50:25 text 17:14 19:17 25:10 thank 16:25 58:11 68:15 69:1,3,16,18 they'd 26:4,7 43:8 45:22 51:16,20 61:21 thing 28:3 38:15 46:20 62:11 things 28:10,14 31:2 34:4,18 42:20 64:16 65:12 66:22 68:20 think 1:11,17 2:6 2:8,17 3:11,24 7:14,15,16 10:2,4,14 11:7 12:11 13:3 14:3,4,7,18 15:5 16:9 18:7 19:10,23 20:19 21:1 22:1,2,21 22:23 23:4,6 24:3,10,17,24 25:2,15,25 26:6,18,20 27:11,17,17 28:2,5,6,18,21 29:3 31:4 32:1 32:4,10 33:22 34:18,20,21,23 35:4,7,9,16,16 36:15,21 37:5 38:11 39:8,16 40:4,12 41:1 42:7,19,22 43:14 44:1 45:18 48:13,16 48:23 49:7,14 49:16,18,21,23 49:25 50:8,9 50:13 51:7,13	51:24 56:8 57:5,12 58:4 58:16,24,24 60:21 61:8,19 62:2,7,13,18 63:7,10,23 64:14,17 65:9 65:19,22 66:10 66:11 67:8 68:18,21 69:14 thinking 18:21 31:15 33:7 46:21 49:10,20 53:19 third 30:12 thought 4:16,22 11:19 18:22 26:4,24 33:1 34:10,24 36:4 42:17 48:14,25 49:6 51:15 52:20 55:22 60:12,15 61:10 three 24:18 42:14 thrust 64:12 Thursday 17:6 17:21 tickets 26:23 27:6 ticking 33:11 time 6:11,13,15 7:15,16,17 8:1 8:25 9:1 13:23 14:5 17:24,25 18:21 19:2 22:11 23:5 24:2 28:4,23 29:21 31:8 36:17 38:1,21 39:20 40:5,6 42:20 43:2,19 47:7 49:1 50:13 52:2,9 53:16 54:6 56:8 57:4 62:7 62:16 64:3 66:21 67:8 69:13 times 22:12,24 24:18 62:13 63:5 67:1,3 timescale 41:3 Time's 22:19 timing 6:21 tip 10:25 Tiplady 9:5 titles 63:22 65:21 66:3 today 26:1 told 9:8 25:22 31:21 36:22,25 37:6 54:8 57:16 59:17 66:13 Tomlinson 33:24
S					T	
sanctioned 57:10	sequence 53:6				tab 17:20	
satisfied 34:11	serially 1:19				tabloid 47:3	
55:15	series 14:19 63:8				take 4:15 15:22	
saw 17:25 24:18	serious 30:15				16:11 28:4	
40:25	service 31:24				30:17 31:5	
saying 16:3	34:13				33:9 35:10	
24:11 26:3	services 31:23				40:5 42:20,21	
39:3 47:8 58:5	41:9				48:16 53:20	
58:11	set 19:11 22:3				55:18 56:6	
says 9:23 12:21	23:7 28:25				59:6 68:14	
scale 16:17	47:16				taken 2:14 6:10	
scheme 2:16,20	setting 57:13				33:15 35:24	
3:16,19	seven 13:11				56:16	
school 7:12	Shami 45:8				talk 1:9 34:18	
scoping 36:16	47:12				talking 41:2	
scribbling 33:8	Shami's 46:6				tasks 30:23	
second 30:7 31:1	share 16:19				team 25:13 35:21	
68:1	she'd 58:24,25				tease 50:16	
seconds 36:3	Shocking 69:4				telephone 8:1	
secretly 67:16	short 9:7 32:25				17:13	
sections 62:4	52:7					
see 4:25 9:11	shortly 30:6					
17:21 18:11	36:11					
19:16 20:3	short-term 9:17					
21:3 23:23	show 24:17					
24:20 37:6,21	25:10					
38:1 39:5,22	showed 28:19					
39:24 40:2,3,6	57:24					
44:16 45:25	showing 14:23					
46:18 47:13,15	14:24					
49:7 51:8	shown 57:23,23					
52:12 56:8	58:3					
58:11 66:9	sick 29:14 32:2					
seeing 39:14	side 44:4					
seek 29:21 61:20	sight 19:1,1					
seeking 35:18	similar 19:11					
seen 3:25 4:2	63:24					
6:19 31:16	similarly 60:25					
33:24 65:14	simply 2:20					
Select 25:22 34:7	50:25					
66:13	single 41:23					
selection 32:15	42:13 43:16					
32:17 33:2	sir 9:23 10:15					
35:19 40:18	12:25 15:22					
43:20	24:23,24 38:9					
self-appointed	52:3 67:15,22					
23:1 24:11	67:23,24 68:3					
seminars 47:2	68:4 69:10					
send 15:10 57:8	situation 19:15					
66:20,22 67:7	60:22,24					
senior 9:10 12:5	situations 65:1					
16:19 27:14,15	six 13:11 56:17					
28:7 32:21	slightly 8:12					
37:24 49:8	small 46:19					
sense 10:6 53:11	49:23 50:19					
54:2 60:14	social 29:6					
sensible 51:25	solve 18:24					
sent 18:1	somebody 50:18					
sentence 32:17	61:4					
32:18 55:9	son 6:25 7:13					
separately 64:10	8:10,16 9:9,12					
September 2:6	9:24					
8:2 12:11 15:2	son's 9:8					

<p>Tomorrow 69:18 top 19:16 44:23 57:14 topic 51:25 total 30:21 totally 7:18 8:24 15:9 touch 36:20 touched 15:5 68:18,19 track 48:3 Trafford 25:18 26:16 27:4 train 27:5 treatment 30:13 30:15 trial 41:19 trigger 30:11 trip 26:15 trouble 12:13 troubled 18:5 true 11:22 51:13 trumps 41:20 trust 45:6 51:5 trusted 46:23 try 10:23 11:3 30:10 trying 10:21 11:5 12:4 53:18 54:5 55:3,25 turn 4:17 24:8 turned 29:17,24 52:18 two 5:20 9:2 10:9 24:18 27:6 44:8 45:2,10 46:5 67:21 Twomey 1:6 type 17:15 20:20 40:8 48:1 typed 18:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>Uh 45:18 Uh-huh 60:9 unclear 36:22 unconnected 8:24 undergo 30:14 underlying 64:23 understand 14:21 28:25 38:20 52:15 54:19 56:7,15 understanding 25:4 49:2,9 understood 25:7 26:6 unfortunately 29:13 Ungoed-Thomas 22:12 unique 19:15,15 university 7:22 7:25</p>	<p>unnecessary 18:23 unpick 27:3 unrepresentati... 23:19 unusual 8:13 upkeep 2:23 upshot 9:12 42:15 urgency 41:23 use 19:18 useful 59:25 usual 15:13 usually 10:8 17:5 17:7 24:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>validity 64:6 68:5 value 14:21 varied 44:13 various 11:13 versa 10:7 version 7:17 12:14,16 53:18 versions 54:7 vice 10:7 victims 61:6 view 4:9 16:16 16:19 19:25 20:1 29:21 30:9 31:7 32:20 34:16 35:8,10,24 37:1 38:3 39:23 40:6 44:25 48:23 59:10 61:13 views 35:18 41:13 visit 3:4 5:7 voiced 53:7 volunteer 2:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>Wade 2:2,5 3:3 3:11,15 4:4,7 4:12,16,17,24 5:18 7:4 10:3,6 10:15,20 52:14 52:23 54:11 55:15,23 56:9 57:10,16,23 58:6,8,22 59:6 59:16 Wade's 53:13 waiting 69:7 Wallis 13:6 24:13,16 25:1 25:5,11,23 27:22 29:12 31:14,19,21 32:3 34:8,22 34:23,25 35:24 35:25 36:8,18 36:24 37:11,23</p>	<p>38:1 40:9,14 40:18,19 41:10 42:9 44:5 47:21 48:6 49:2,12 50:8 want 20:25 30:17 50:16 56:6 60:20,22 68:16 wanted 32:24 40:7,10 52:19 60:11 warm 52:4 warning 36:14 wasn't 2:16 4:12 21:2,9 25:21 26:8 30:20,24 31:3,16 34:25 36:2 40:18,24 43:1 47:18,19 48:7,10 52:18 54:17 55:1,2 55:25 56:18 57:6,12 61:25 63:3,15 way 3:23 18:6 25:25 39:14 40:6,24 44:8 56:8 58:10,12 58:23 64:16 69:15 Webb 63:3 website 60:19 week 7:14,20 30:12 41:3 60:24 weekend 17:3 40:25 weeks 3:24 7:23 13:11 14:14 week's 7:3 Weeting 16:10 16:12 welfare 54:14,21 well-known 44:18,19 went 25:16 28:23 45:8 53:17 weren't 6:4 11:18 15:24 19:6 23:20,22 33:13 36:12 54:23 67:18 we'll 3:13 66:9 68:14 we're 1:3 21:5 46:4 50:7 52:9 69:7 we've 22:11 50:10 69:10 wholly 12:8 wider 28:22 49:11 55:25 wife 53:8 54:4,9 wing 68:5 wise 14:17 wish 60:10</p>	<p>wished 7:21 wishes 66:8 withdrew 5:17 witness 22:13 62:5 witnessed 12:3 won 51:12 wonder 1:9 40:15 44:20 wondering 39:25 word 61:6 words 8:18 34:8 58:24 63:10 work 7:3,13,21 7:23 9:7,8,24 10:13 21:11 25:8 30:20,21 31:22 34:1 36:15,16 38:2 41:16 42:10 43:9,23,25 44:12,16,24 45:7 46:23 48:7,14,17 49:25 50:19 56:4 58:1 62:10 worked 32:21 51:13,21 working 22:16 44:11 51:20 57:1 works 22:12 61:5 World 12:1,21 12:22 13:2,19 13:22,25 15:25 16:8,14 18:14 24:20 31:20,20 36:8,9 37:25 49:4,7,14 52:15,21 54:18 57:11 62:21 wouldn't 11:8,19 19:9 20:25 21:20 26:10 30:3 33:15 42:4 43:12,16 48:2 60:4 67:7 Wright 1:5 write 20:9 writing 33:2 wrong 1:22 4:16 11:5 15:19 26:14 38:19 60:23 wrote 43:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>Yates 11:14 12:4 14:7 25:5,23 27:22 35:2,18 35:23 36:5,9 36:21,21,23 37:3,6,10,13 38:2 39:2 40:8 40:14,20,21</p>	<p>62:9 year 3:12 4:1 6:14 7:2 16:7 17:24 24:18 years 14:20 15:25 24:5 51:4 York 62:13 63:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>09548 17:1 09550 32:18 09551 41:7 09553 6:23 51:22 52:10 09554 57:15 09623 17:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>1 62:14 10 41:6 69:18,20 102 50:14 51:22 52:10 105 59:3 106 60:7 109 60:7,17 11 22:13 110 64:5 116 65:1 117 65:17 12 3:25 31:18 34:9 40:16 125 44:13 14th 41:4 16.14 17:24 18 17:24 42:11 19 12:11 1997 24:22 25:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>2 19:18,18,20,20 2.00 1:2 20 20:16 2003 7:7 51:23 52:9 53:1 57:9 2004 7:7 2005 9:25 2006 11:24 12:12 14:8 62:19 2007 2:6 7:25 8:2 8:9 9:3 2009 24:15 29:14 29:25 31:18,21 34:9 36:11,24 38:14,25 41:14 62:8 2010 17:24 41:24 50:9 62:14 2011 16:7,9 46:11 50:8 23 13:23 24 46:11 25 20:16 250 44:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p>3 41:14 3.17 52:6 3.24 52:8 3.52 69:19 30 36:3 31 36:24 40:19 41:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5 17:20 50 46:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>6 46:11 61 1:23 63 4:3 66 6:11 69 11:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>7 41:22 74 16:22,23,24 75 21:14 79 31:11 32:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>800 44:10 81 32:18 86 36:22 88 41:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>9 36:11 53:1 57:9 58:17 91 48:7 97 6:23 99 9:3</p>
---	--	--	---	---	--