

<p>1 2 (2.00 pm) 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 4 MR JAY: Now, Mr Quick, the Damian Green investigation, can 5 we deal with the background quite economically, if we 6 may? 7 There was a briefing or concern within the Cabinet 8 Office that there had been leaks of protected 9 information from within the Home Office; is that right? 10 A. That's correct, yes. 11 Q. And in view of that and the overall sensitivity of the 12 matter, you instructed your deputy, who was DAC, as she 13 then was, Cressida Dick, to undertake a scoping exercise 14 and what in essence did she tell you? 15 A. In effect that the scoping exercise had revealed that 16 someone working very close to the Home Secretary in her 17 private office seemed to be accessing letters from the 18 Secretary of State to the Prime Minister as well as 19 removing documents from a safe in the outer office, 20 private office, and that essentially the CPS, who had 21 been consulted, advised that these are likely to be 22 criminal matters. 23 Q. So DAC Dick instructed you that Stephenson, who then 24 I think was then Deputy Commissioner, he wasn't yet 25 Commissioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 about accessing material that would be useful, and 2 Galley gave a number of descriptions in interview 3 regarding that conversation, intimating that Mr Green 4 was seeking dirt or damage on the Labour government, and 5 other material that would be useful to him. 6 Q. Mr Galley's claim was that he told Mr Green that he 7 wanted a parliamentary job within the party? 8 A. Indeed. His account was that he enquired of Mr Green as 9 to whether he could assist him obtain employment within 10 the party and he claimed that Mr Green had given him 11 positive signals about helping him find employment. 12 Q. In paragraph 37, Mr Quick, Mr Galley then detailed two 13 meetings with Mr Green where he handed over leaked 14 material to Mr Green, including material stolen from the 15 Home Secretary's private outer office safe. One meeting 16 was in a wine bar? 17 A. That's correct, sir. 18 Q. The quotation there, that was in an email? 19 A. That was in an email from Mr Green to Galley arranging 20 a meet: 21 "Anywhere we won't see any of your colleagues! Do 22 you know Balls Brothers opposite Victoria Station?" 23 Q. Then there's a text message, paragraph 38, 24 September 24 2008, where Mr Galley sent a text to Mr Green's mobile 25 stating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. I think he'd just become Sir Paul Stephenson at that 3 point. 4 A. Indeed. 5 Q. He'd been briefed terms of reference for an 6 investigation were established, this was in November of 7 2008, and it soon came about, paragraph 35 of your 8 statement, that a civil servant in the Home Office, 9 Mr Christopher Galley, was a strong suspect for some of 10 the leaks; is that right? 11 A. Correct. At least five had been linked to him, and then 12 I believe a sixth leak late in the day also was linked 13 to this civil servant. 14 Q. When he was arrested on 19 November 2008, and documents 15 seized, those documents indicated that the then Shadow 16 Immigration Minister, Mr Damian Green MP, was involved 17 with Mr Galley; is that right? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Mr Galley was interviewed on that day. He admitted 20 being responsible for four of the six leaks initially 21 linked to him. 22 A. That's correct, sir. 23 Q. What did he say in relation to Mr Green's involvement? 24 A. He claimed that Mr Davis introduced him to Mr Green, and 25 in effect that Mr Green had had a conversation with him</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 "Interviewed today by Cabinet Office about leaked 2 economy and crime paper, I think I managed to deflect 3 all questions." 4 And then Mr Green's response was: 5 "Good let's talk again after conference unless you 6 are going." 7 A. That's correct, sir. 8 Q. Later you found evidence of additional communications 9 between Mr Galley and Mr Green and that's paragraph 39, 10 which I don't think it's necessary to specify but we 11 note in passing. 12 The circumstances leading to Mr Green's arrest, 13 paragraph 41, Mr Quick, are that on 20 November 2008 you 14 were informed by -- this is Commander McDowall, I think, 15 the admissions by Mr Galley in relation to Mr Green, and 16 the first stage was to get advice from the Directorate 17 of Legal Services because obviously issues of 18 parliamentary privilege arose? 19 A. Indeed. This was the late DAC, Deputy Assistant 20 Commissioner McDowall, who briefed me on the arrest and 21 the admissions, and whilst initially it was proposed 22 that we would follow up this by way of searches and 23 potentially an arrest, we agreed to actually slow that 24 process down because of the sensitivities, potential for 25 parliamentary privilege issues to be involved and make</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

<p>1 sure that we were on a very firm legal footing before we 2 moved forward. 3 Q. The advice you received -- this is paragraph 42 -- was 4 that a search of an MP's parliamentary office would be 5 lawful provided it was carried out with the consent of 6 the parliamentary authorities? 7 A. That's correct. 8 Q. But a search warrant could be obtained in any event. So 9 you then moved to a decision-making process as to 10 whether it was appropriate to arrest a Member of 11 Parliament or to invite him in for interview by 12 appointment. Can I ask you to address that, please? 13 It's paragraph 43. You were later criticised for 14 following the arrest course on the basis that it was 15 disproportionate, notwithstanding everybody accepted 16 that there was evidence, so before you decide to arrest, 17 what considerations enter into play? 18 A. Well, there were many considerations, and I think the 19 starting position was moving towards an invitation to 20 attend the police station voluntarily for interview. 21 However, a number of pieces of information came to 22 light, including some information from 23 Christopher Galley, who had been released on bail after 24 his arrest and recontacted the police the following day 25 to tell the officers that he'd had a call, a telephone</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 Q. A search plan was instituted, and this related to the 2 Palace of Westminster. Mr Green was arrested at his 3 Kent constituency. He was taken to the Belgravia police 4 station. 5 A. That's correct. 6 Q. He initially claimed to be too tired to be interviewed. 7 He later agreed to be interviewed, but in effect gave 8 a "no comment" interview, or rather he declined to 9 answer any questions? 10 A. That's correct. 11 Q. And that's where matters were left by the time we reach 12 paragraph 52 and, as you say, on 28 November various 13 influential public figures were severely critical of the 14 arrest and investigation of Green, despite being unaware 15 of the nature of the material obtained by the police. 16 Pausing there, Mr Quick, it might be said that this 17 was bound to be a controversial operation. Were you 18 expecting this level of criticism? 19 A. Absolutely. When I briefed Sir Paul Stephenson prior to 20 the arrest operation we both discussed and recognised 21 this would be controversial, and in some respects that 22 was not a huge surprise, but some of the reporting was 23 a surprise, insofar as the assertions about facts that 24 we knew not to be true. 25 Q. There was obviously a party political agenda here, with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 conversation, with Mr Green, and in relaying the 2 conversation he claimed that Mr Green had told him not 3 to mention certain aspects of the inquiry, the 4 involvement of another person, and therefore the Gold 5 Group, balancing a whole range of issues -- and I won't, 6 unless you require me to, go through every single one -- 7 was unanimous in the belief that the only ethical and 8 effective way forward was to deal with Mr Green by way 9 of an arrest, but with elaborate special measures in 10 place to minimise the impact of that arrest. 11 Q. Thank you. You made reference to a Gold Group. I don't 12 think that term has yet been defined for the Inquiry. 13 What is a Gold Group? 14 A. A Gold Group is a senior strategic decision-making body 15 of experienced and senior or specialist staff to support 16 decision-making. Essentially I was the chairman of the 17 group. The decision ultimately was mine, but I had 18 a whole range of senior and specialist staff to go 19 through all of the issues and dimensions of that 20 decision before we finally made it. 21 Q. What happened there, I think we can take this shortly: 22 special arrangements were put in place? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Sir Paul Stephenson was briefed? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 politicians perhaps briefing the press and then these 2 matters appearing in the press, and Mr Green's 3 colleagues, it might be said, seeking to -- to use the 4 vernacular -- rubbish your investigation. Is that how 5 it appeared to you? 6 A. It certainly appeared that way, yes. 7 Q. You received a telephone call from Sir Paul Stephenson 8 on the evening of Sunday, 30 November. This is 9 paragraph 54. 10 A. That's correct. 11 Q. He expressed his anxieties. Hardly surprising, perhaps. 12 He told you not to worry and that he was not about to 13 row away from you. Did you find that a surprising 14 remark? 15 A. I did. I took some comfort in his call but I was a bit 16 concerned about his remark. I sensed a slightly 17 dispirited tone, and, of course, it was very 18 controversial and the media controversy had built up to 19 a head at the weekend, and I could understand his 20 anxiety and I'm sure I shared in it, but at the same 21 time I was very clear that we were investigating a case 22 where an individual, or possibly others, were prepared 23 to intercept a Secretary of State for national 24 security's personal letters and communications to the 25 Prime Minister, and access safes where we knew sensitive</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 documents to be held.</p> <p>2 So I was very clear that we were within our rights</p> <p>3 to continue the investigation, despite it being</p> <p>4 unpopular potentially with the media and others, because</p> <p>5 I guess leaks in many ways are potentially good copy for</p> <p>6 newspapers, but we needed to be absolutely clear as to</p> <p>7 whether an offence had been committed, whether national</p> <p>8 security had been compromised or sensitive or secret</p> <p>9 documents removed.</p> <p>10 Q. There was a meeting the following day, Monday</p> <p>11 1 December. This was Paul Stephenson, because</p> <p>12 Sir Ian Blair, as he then was, I think had just resigned</p> <p>13 a few days before.</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And the Acting Deputy Commissioner, Tim Godwin, was</p> <p>16 there. You say:</p> <p>17 "Stephenson looked very anxious and told me he had</p> <p>18 written out his resignation."</p> <p>19 But you told him clearly he'd done nothing wrong; is</p> <p>20 that right?</p> <p>21 A. Indeed. I was surprised and quite shocked at that</p> <p>22 remark, because I couldn't see that the police were</p> <p>23 doing anything other than their duty to investigate what</p> <p>24 were very serious allegations from a government</p> <p>25 department.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 should be shined in your direction; would you accept</p> <p>2 that?</p> <p>3 A. Absolutely, sir. I think chief police officers accept</p> <p>4 that and in many ways require that so that their powers</p> <p>5 are appropriately restrained, but I was concerned that</p> <p>6 the Chairman of the Police Authority would enter into</p> <p>7 that fray because -- obviously that person's position in</p> <p>8 overseeing the Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>9 Q. Thank you. You received some advice from AC Yates at</p> <p>10 about this point. He asked to see you in his office.</p> <p>11 He told you he felt the inquiry was doomed, that the CPS</p> <p>12 would withdraw their support due to the outcry, in much</p> <p>13 the same way as they had in cash for honours, and</p> <p>14 advised you to stop the investigation and "cut my</p> <p>15 losses".</p> <p>16 All he was doing I suppose was communicating to you</p> <p>17 what might have been his bitter experience -- we don't</p> <p>18 know, but we know what happened -- in relation to the</p> <p>19 cash for honours; is that right?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. I had huge sympathy for AC Yates' experience in</p> <p>21 cash for honours, but my point was really</p> <p>22 straightforward. We had to have a legitimate reason to</p> <p>23 stop the investigation, and there wasn't one, and</p> <p>24 I didn't think it was appropriate -- and I was surprised</p> <p>25 he asked me to drop it at that point, because we'd just</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 Q. At all events, plainly that didn't happen, Sir Paul</p> <p>2 Stephenson didn't resign, for obvious reasons.</p> <p>3 A. No, sir.</p> <p>4 Q. There was adverse reporting in the press, however, which</p> <p>5 you referred to in annex K, which it is our tab 12.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Maybe we can look at some of that. 01580, the first</p> <p>8 page, the Evening Standard. The Mayor of London,</p> <p>9 Boris Johnson, was very much at the centre of these</p> <p>10 reports. Do you feel that the reporting was</p> <p>11 inappropriate or do you feel that what politicians were</p> <p>12 telling newspapers was inappropriate or neither?</p> <p>13 A. Well, I had concerns at some early reports just before</p> <p>14 the weekend, I believe, where the Mayor had expressed</p> <p>15 concerns about the arrest of Mr Green, and I detected</p> <p>16 that that had an impact, and I detected a change in</p> <p>17 attitude towards the operation on the part of one or two</p> <p>18 colleagues, and real anxiety and fear about what was</p> <p>19 going on around them, and that did concern me, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Might it be said, though, that the role of the press in</p> <p>21 a mature democracy is to hold institutions like the</p> <p>22 police to account? This was a controversial operation,</p> <p>23 a controversial arrest, therefore it wasn't only</p> <p>24 inevitable but almost desirable that you should be held</p> <p>25 under scrutiny, that the bright light, as it were,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 seized a load of evidence that we didn't have the</p> <p>2 opportunity to examine at that point, and clearly to</p> <p>3 stop the inquiry at that time would have consequences if</p> <p>4 later it was established that there had indeed been more</p> <p>5 serious leaks.</p> <p>6 Q. Yes.</p> <p>7 A. So it didn't seem a tenable argument to me.</p> <p>8 Q. Turning it on its head, it would have had the appearance</p> <p>9 of succumbing to political pressure had you stopped in</p> <p>10 your tracks there and then, it might be argued?</p> <p>11 A. Indeed. It could have appeared that way.</p> <p>12 Q. But what happened then, but in your view prematurely,</p> <p>13 was that a review took place which Sir Paul Stephenson</p> <p>14 instigated, and Chief Constable Ian Johnston of the</p> <p>15 British Transport Police was designated to carry out</p> <p>16 that review. You make the point that you felt that that</p> <p>17 was inappropriate, given that you really hadn't reached</p> <p>18 the point in examining the evidence to reach any</p> <p>19 conclusion as to whether your inquiry merited a review?</p> <p>20 A. Indeed.</p> <p>21 Q. Is that so?</p> <p>22 A. But I was very concerned that the review was convened in</p> <p>23 haste, in an air of semi panic, and I felt that the</p> <p>24 chances of the review getting to grips quickly with the</p> <p>25 issues were slim, and I felt that it was essentially</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

<p>1 a result of pressure that was being placed upon the Met.</p> <p>2 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could I just ask, bringing it back to</p> <p>4 the press, did you feel that the line taken by the</p> <p>5 Metropolitan Police at this time was being reflected in</p> <p>6 the reporting?</p> <p>7 A. No, sir. I had concerns about what I was reading in the</p> <p>8 media at that time, particularly across and after the</p> <p>9 first weekend after the arrest, and I couldn't see any</p> <p>10 line of the Metropolitan Police being reflected in that</p> <p>11 reporting. There were reports attributable to people</p> <p>12 close to the Acting Commissioner, that he didn't support</p> <p>13 the arrest, that we had argued furiously about it and</p> <p>14 I'd ignored his advice. There were various claims in</p> <p>15 the media that really troubled me, and my team.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Because that might be relevant to the</p> <p>17 next phase of the inquiry to deal with the relationships</p> <p>18 between the politicians and the press.</p> <p>19 A. Quite possibly, sir, yes.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p>21 MR JAY: We see one such piece, annex M, our tab 14,</p> <p>22 page 01595. I think this was the Daily Telegraph, where</p> <p>23 it was alleged that Sir Paul Stephenson felt that his</p> <p>24 chances to become Commissioner had been damaged and had</p> <p>25 had a row with you, described as a "frank exchange of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 didn't have suspicions about any one particular</p> <p>2 individual? Or did you?</p> <p>3 A. I didn't have any evidence about a specific individual.</p> <p>4 I had formed some concerns about relationships with the</p> <p>5 press in the short time that I had been at</p> <p>6 Scotland Yard. For example, I was aware of a particular</p> <p>7 journalist at the Mail who had done a pretty good job of</p> <p>8 trying to demolish the Metropolitan Police over the</p> <p>9 previous few years and in particular a former</p> <p>10 Commissioner, and I was aware of some quite close</p> <p>11 relationships with people like that, which I found</p> <p>12 extraordinary.</p> <p>13 Q. Who was this journalist at the Mail?</p> <p>14 A. One of them was a guy called Stephen Wright, who</p> <p>15 I believed was a Mail journalist. In fact I'm sure he</p> <p>16 was.</p> <p>17 Q. Yes.</p> <p>18 A. And I was aware that one of my colleagues, AC Yates, was</p> <p>19 close to him. So I did have concerns about these</p> <p>20 relationships in the short time that I'd been back in</p> <p>21 the Met as an Assistant Commissioner.</p> <p>22 Q. Yes. We have a combustible mix here, because to put it</p> <p>23 bluntly, there was a job open at the top, Commissioner</p> <p>24 had just gone, a number of powerful people are jockeying</p> <p>25 for position, who's going to be the next Commissioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 views".</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Was that correct?</p> <p>4 A. This was false. This was a false report. Nothing of</p> <p>5 the kind happened. As I say, I was very concerned about</p> <p>6 the potential source of those articles and it crossed my</p> <p>7 mind whether the journalist was simply making it up or</p> <p>8 whether there was a source somewhere briefing this story</p> <p>9 into the press.</p> <p>10 Q. In terms of briefing behind your back and Sir Paul</p> <p>11 Stephenson's back, do you have any idea from where it</p> <p>12 came? You refer to someone senior at Scotland Yard.</p> <p>13 A. When looking across the reporting, some the reports were</p> <p>14 well informed, if I might say that, given our line was</p> <p>15 relatively narrow in terms of what we were saying to the</p> <p>16 press. It seemed to me that there was some briefing</p> <p>17 going on, and it wasn't authorised by me as the officer</p> <p>18 in charge, and the Acting Commissioner, Sir Paul</p> <p>19 Stephenson, implied very strongly it wasn't him. I did</p> <p>20 raise this issue. No one came forward to say they had</p> <p>21 been briefing the press, as you might expect, but I,</p> <p>22 along with my team, were very concerned about what was</p> <p>23 happening at that time.</p> <p>24 Q. So although you suspected that someone senior at</p> <p>25 Scotland Yard was briefing the press, is this right, you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 and this is one way, arguably briefing behind the</p> <p>2 scenes, of improving your own position, knifing someone</p> <p>3 else or trying to get your friend in a better position</p> <p>4 to be the next Commissioner. Is it that sort of</p> <p>5 situation here?</p> <p>6 A. Well, there's all sorts of potential explanations.</p> <p>7 I guess my concern was we had a criminal inquiry under</p> <p>8 way, the allegations were very serious, and it was</p> <p>9 important that the Met was able to get on with it and</p> <p>10 not, if you like, persuaded to drop the case before the</p> <p>11 inquiry was thoroughly completed.</p> <p>12 Q. What happened then is that the Johnston review began on</p> <p>13 2 December 2008. You felt he was set a deadline which</p> <p>14 was unrealistic, that of two weeks, and there was</p> <p>15 a meeting on 6 December -- this is paragraph 61 -- which</p> <p>16 Acting Deputy Commissioner Godwin asked you to attend,</p> <p>17 and at that meeting you heard what Mr Johnston's</p> <p>18 preliminary findings were; is that right?</p> <p>19 A. That's correct, sir, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And the findings were -- and these are findings which</p> <p>21 are borne out in the final report -- you had evidence to</p> <p>22 justify the arrest but that arresting Mr Green as</p> <p>23 opposed to inviting him in for interview was</p> <p>24 disproportionate; is that right?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. I found the rationale for that extraordinary,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

<p>1 because the proposition put to me was that the Cabinet 2 Office envisaged this as being a discipline matter, and 3 it was clear from the outset that they thought it was 4 a criminal matter and they required the intervention of 5 the police with their powers. They had been 6 investigating these leaks for some time without success. 7 There was a recognition, as I said earlier, that the 8 person responsible, or at least a person, was in a very 9 sensitive place in the Home Office with access to very 10 sensitive material. 11 I was aware that not only did the initial letter 12 make it clear it was criminal, my meeting with the 13 Cabinet Office along with Cressida Dick's meeting made 14 it clear they thought it was criminal, and in any event, 15 regardless of that, the CPS had advised it was criminal. 16 So I found it strange that there was this emphasis 17 constantly on it not being a criminal matter. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Would the police normally be involved 19 in an investigation if it wasn't criminal? If it was 20 going to be disciplinary? 21 A. No, sir. We wouldn't expect to be involved in that 22 whatsoever. 23 MR JAY: At the meeting -- this is your paragraph 62, 24 Mr Quick -- you say: 25 "[Paul] Stephenson and Godwin seemed very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 I've been asked to put this to you: was this because 2 Mr Johnston had given his preliminary conclusion that 3 the arrest of Mr Green, although lawful, was 4 disproportionate, and therefore it was right that the 5 investigation should be stopped? 6 A. Well, Mr Johnston did give some views, but I did respond 7 to those views with pointing out the facts as 8 I understood them to be, and therefore I couldn't see 9 any construct upon which you could hang the cessation of 10 the investigation, anything legitimate, and I made that 11 very clear at the meeting. That wasn't challenged. 12 I didn't sense that anyone was able to challenge that on 13 the basis of facts. 14 Q. What happened then was that Mr Johnston gave his report 15 on 16 December. It was in the line with his preliminary 16 conclusions, as you've told us. 17 Can I move forward to paragraph 67. You 18 subsequently became concerned to discover that certain 19 critical -- by which you mean highly important -- 20 references in the original Johnston review have since 21 had to be redacted from the public version as they were 22 objected to by the Cabinet Office, and a section of your 23 statement has been redacted out because those I think 24 are the bits which were objected to by the Cabinet 25 Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 preoccupied during the meeting about the negative media 2 attention MPS would receive if this investigation 3 continued." 4 So are you saying there that the media agenda and 5 the reputation of the police in the eyes of the media, 6 and then consequentially in the eyes of the public, 7 were, as it were, dictating where this investigation 8 should go? 9 A. Yes. I sensed that it was having an enormous impact on 10 how people were thinking about this case. I was simply 11 concerned that the police are the police in the sense 12 they have a set of statutory functions and duties, and 13 I'm not suggesting for a moment that the police don't 14 take account of things in the media and challenges and 15 criticism, but at the same time the facts were the 16 facts, and there was a perfectly legitimate criminal 17 investigation going on and we had to focus on getting on 18 with it and completing it to the satisfaction of 19 ourselves and reporting matters to the CPS. 20 Q. Immediately after the meeting, as you say, Sir Paul 21 Stephenson came into your office and asked you to stop 22 the investigation. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. And you expressed your view that wouldn't be appropriate 25 in line with the evidence you've been giving to us.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 Paragraph 68: 2 "The proposition that the Cabinet Office considered 3 that this was not a matter that warranted a criminal 4 investigation was at the heart of attempts to persuade 5 [you] to stop the Green investigation and formed 6 a central plank in the argument and conclusion by 7 Mr Johnston that the arrest of Green was 8 'disproportionate'. 9 And you stand by that? 10 A. I do, sir, yes. 11 Q. And you say basically that simply can't be right because 12 what were the police doing in the first place if this 13 wasn't a criminal investigation? It had to be 14 a criminal investigation. 15 A. Indeed, sir, yes. 16 Q. Thank you. The end of this piece of evidence you're 17 going to deal with in a moment, but there's an important 18 piece of evidence you can give which starts at 19 paragraph 70, media attack on your family. 20 Can we take this in slightly more detail than we've 21 done the previous section? Paragraph 70, that on 22 19 December, which I think was three days after the 23 Johnston review -- 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. -- you received a call from your wife to inform you that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 a client of hers had called her to say that a journalist 2 from the Mail on Sunday had called at her house to 3 interview her about your wife's wedding car business. 4 What in essence was your wife's wedding car business? 5 A. It was a wedding service, it was entitled a wedding 6 service and advertised as such. It involved a fleet of 7 Rolls Royces that were made available to families who 8 had a wedding planned, for hire, to take the bride in 9 the traditional way to the service, and several 10 partnerships and other similar wedding-connected events. 11 Essentially, she had been running that for about 18 12 months, she'd made it very successful, she was enjoying 13 it, and subsequently we found that the Mail had found an 14 interest in it and managed in a way that we've never 15 really worked out how to find one of my wife's clients, 16 it wasn't a local client, but they told her they were 17 going to do a special feature on this business, and 18 managed to get into the client's house and the client 19 actually gave a ringing endorsement of my wife's 20 business, but they were very fixated on me and whether 21 I had a role in the business, did I drive the cars 22 personally, did I use police officers in uniform to 23 drive the cars. Quite daft questions in a sense, but 24 that was how it was reported back to my wife from her 25 client.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 motorcar, which was by that stage almost a vintage car, 2 it was almost 30 years old, which was on your wife's 3 website, but you say it was an optimisation tactic, it 4 wasn't in fact for hire? 5 A. That's correct, yes. My wife became suspicious that 6 prior to the call from her client that week, someone had 7 been very persistent in trying to hire the Jensen, and 8 she was very forthright but polite in saying actually it 9 isn't for hire, although it's on the website. The car 10 attracts a lot of interest, it has a big fan club, and 11 it was a website optimisation tactic, as you say. 12 Q. Mm. 13 A. This caller was very persistent. As I understand it, my 14 wife didn't take orders on the Jensen, it was very 15 unusual, so of course subsequently we suspect that that 16 was a journalist trying to hire it and they were told it 17 wasn't for hire. 18 Q. But both the Mail on Sunday and the Daily Mail had been 19 critical of your handling of the Damian Green MP 20 investigation which of course was ongoing at this stage; 21 is that right? 22 A. Indeed, yes. 23 Q. Can I ask you, please, about the assistance you sought 24 from Mr Fedorcio, paragraph 73. 25 A. Yes. I'd asked on the Friday of these events for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 Q. So the interest was not in the business at all, it was 2 your connection with the business; is that right? 3 A. Indeed, yes. 4 Q. Do you know to this day how it was that the Mail on 5 Sunday managed to make this connection? 6 A. I don't know. 7 Q. So we understand the nature the business -- you've 8 alluded to this -- it was a bespoke service, not just 9 the Rolls Royce but a driver for the Rolls Royce, 10 obviously? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And there was an issue relating to licensing, I think? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Which you raised or your wife raised with the borough 15 council and was resolved how? 16 A. She took advice when she started the business about the 17 wedding service. She was advised that weddings and 18 related services do not require a licence, there is no 19 such licence. Subsequently, of course, I have looked 20 and found the same. So she was operating in the belief 21 that there wasn't a licensing requirement, and I think 22 that was quite right. 23 Q. Subsequently, this is paragraph 72, there was further 24 journalistic activity, if I can put it in those terms, 25 and some of it related to your own Jensen Interceptor</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 Mr Fedorcio to assist. He said he would contact the 2 Mail and find out what's going on. I don't think 3 I heard back from him until the following day, 4 20 December, when I took a call from him and he told me 5 that the Mail on Sunday, the next day, the Sunday, were 6 going to run an article that my wife's business uses 7 serving police officers as drivers, and I had 8 a conversation with Dick asserting that that was 9 completely and utterly untrue, and obviously I didn't 10 want to see that article. He told me it was going to be 11 a front-page story and I think I very confidently 12 asserted if they did publish that, then I think I would 13 have a legal redress to it. 14 He then came back to me later that afternoon and 15 said they've now conceded it's not true. However, they 16 spent quite a bit of money on this investigation, 17 they've been doing it for I think he said ten days, and 18 therefore they're going to run a different story, which 19 is that my security is at risk by virtue of my wife's 20 business. 21 So I said to Dick, "I'm sure it will be if they 22 publish it in a million newspapers and link it to my 23 role as the head of counter-terrorism", but I didn't 24 feel there was a link that anyone would find and 25 therefore I felt it was a bogus case they were making to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<p>1 run an article against me in relation to the real issue, 2 as I took it, to be the Damian Green investigation. 3 Q. It was worse than disingenuous, if I may say so, because 4 the security scare they were referring to was one they 5 themselves were fermenting. 6 Tab 15, it's your annex N, we can see the piece. 7 21 December 2008, Mail on Sunday. 8 A. That's correct. 9 Q. Picture of you. You even hire out your own sports car. 10 A. So it appeared, yes. 11 Q. "Questions are being raised over [your] judgment after 12 it emerged that the wedding car hire business including 13 one of his own cars is being run through his home." 14 Given that it was your wife's legitimate business 15 and the sports car wasn't for hire, that was untrue. 16 "The business uses former police officers as 17 chauffeurs for the stable of vintage Rolls Royces?" 18 Was that true or untrue? 19 A. There were some former police officers, retired, who 20 were members of the Chauffeurs Guild I believe my wife 21 employed from time to time. 22 Q. There's a reference then to you hiring out your personal 23 7 litre 130 mile an hour Jensen sports car. 24 "One senior Yard source said 'Bob Quick needs to ask 25 himself whether he is happy that all this is out and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 Mr Fedorcio and Sir Paul Stephenson were not intervening 2 on your behalf. Do you know why they did not intervene 3 on your behalf? 4 A. I don't know. I have no real understanding of why they 5 didn't feel able to approach the editor and really just 6 challenge their motives and their behaviours and whether 7 this was really justifiable. 8 Q. What were the consequences from your personal 9 perspective of the publication of this article? 10 A. Well, the consequences were there was an impact, 11 I think, in the public perception about the Green 12 inquiry. They were -- or the article was laced with 13 references to my judgment and the Damian Green case. 14 There was an impact on my family's safety because now 15 there was a mass media engaged to alert the country that 16 that business actually was connected to the head of 17 counter-terrorism, so it did then introduce some real 18 anxieties for my wife and I about our children, who were 19 still at home at that time, and so we had to take steps 20 to move them out of the house until we could properly 21 assess the impact of it, have a security review and make 22 some modifications just as a precaution, because I was 23 aware of -- I was well aware of cases in the UK where 24 extremists and other violent individuals have targeted 25 members of the police or security forces.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 about. There will need to be a review, bearing in mind 2 his position. He needs to review all of this'. 3 Can you comment on the senior Yard source? 4 A. No, I can't. I have no idea who that was. 5 Q. It's clear that Mr Fedorcio sought to assist you to 6 dampen down this story. Did you feel that he did all 7 that he could? 8 A. If I'm honest, I didn't feel I had huge support from my 9 colleagues at that time, because on the Saturday, when 10 we became aware that the Mail were conceding their 11 original story was not true and then seemed to have 12 conjured up a different story about my personal safety, 13 I made representations to Sir Paul Stephenson that this 14 was really a very cynical move on the part of the Mail, 15 it was clearly linked to the Green investigation and 16 therefore we ought to be speaking to the editor and 17 perhaps, you know, questioning their -- the legitimacy 18 of this article. He wasn't keen to do that, and 19 I wasn't particularly happy with that decision because 20 I felt it was such a blatant move that would create 21 a risk, that didn't currently exist, that impacted on my 22 family. So I felt that I ought to ask him for his 23 support and the organisation's support, but I didn't 24 feel, if I'm honest, that that was forthcoming. 25 Q. And this was, as you make clear in paragraph 78, both</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Was this business run in your name? 2 I don't say "your", I don't mean your first name, but in 3 the name -- was the name Quick associated with it? 4 A. The company was registered in my wife's name, sir. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it was a limited company? 6 A. It was a -- 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or a firm, a business name? 8 A. It was a business name. It was registered probably to 9 our home address in my wife's name, but the cars were 10 actually kept at a location away from home. Essentially 11 it's a web business, so she ran it from her computer at 12 the house. 13 So I guess my point to Mr Fedorcio was that if I was 14 a violent extremist seeking to find out something about 15 Bob Quick, I wouldn't automatically think of doing 16 a search for a Rolls Royce wedding car, so essentially 17 by using the Mail to connect the two, the risk was 18 massively -- well, it was introduced. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, had your surname been Jones or 20 Smith, then of course there would be almost no risk. 21 A. Correct, sir, yes. There are quite a lot of Quicks out 22 there, actually, but it's a much rarer name, I would 23 agree. 24 MR JAY: The trading name of the business was Aphrodite 25 Wedding Services, which presumably if you Googled</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 a wedding service that would come up, but was there 2 anything on the web page which contained the name Quick, 3 even if it was your wife's name, with her first name, of 4 course?</p> <p>5 A. To my knowledge, I can't remember whether there was or 6 wasn't. If there was a name, it would have been my 7 wife's name, and there wouldn't have been anything about 8 me or my role on there.</p> <p>9 MR JAY: There was a conversation you had with the 10 journalist I think that day, it's paragraph 81 of your 11 statement, Mr Quick, where the journalist asked you how 12 you felt about the Mail on Sunday article. Was the 13 journalist from the Mail Group?</p> <p>14 A. No, sir. I think possible Associated Press.</p> <p>15 Q. Well, that would be -- if it's Associated, that is --</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: AP is different from Associated News.</p> <p>17 MR JAY: Oh yes, pardon me.</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. In the heat of the moment you say you shared your 20 initial thoughts about the Mail on Sunday being 21 mobilised by the Conservative Party to undermine the 22 Green investigation. You went on to say this was 23 corrupt.</p> <p>24 A. I did say that, that's correct, sir.</p> <p>25 Q. That was certainly what was passing through your mind at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 isn't that right?</p> <p>2 A. That's as I understand it, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. The article is, you would say, misleading in any event 4 because it isn't your car hire business but your wife's?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. The upshot was that your wife had no alternative but to 7 wind down the business, and that's what happened?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. To go back to the Green investigation --</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Beforehand -- it wasn't just you that 11 had been approached. You say in paragraph 84 that 12 others with whom you were associated, friends and 13 family, had also been approached by journalists.</p> <p>14 A. Yes. We had at one point journalists in the village and 15 my wife, I think, had reports of them approaching people 16 in the street asking about the family.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry. Yes.</p> <p>18 MR JAY: What happened with the Green investigation is that 19 the Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr Keir Starmer QC, 20 took over investigation of the case and indicated that 21 he felt there were issues which required further 22 investigation.</p> <p>23 A. That is correct, sir. I felt that given the controversy 24 and the head of steam that had built up, I felt 25 I wouldn't approach the DPP direct, I would ask one of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 the time. You realised though that perhaps that was -- 2 whether it was true or not -- an unwise thing to say?</p> <p>3 A. Indeed. I said it in the heat of the moment, I guess on 4 the back of what seemed like a series of interventions 5 on the inquiry, but I quickly recognised that I wasn't 6 in a position to prove that and I did drag the Met into 7 an even greater controversy, and so the next day 8 I agreed to withdraw it and apologise.</p> <p>9 Q. And this was after remarks by senior Conservatives 10 stating that you were wrong and you should apologise and 11 Sir Paul Stephenson asked you to withdraw your remarks 12 and apologise and that's what you did?</p> <p>13 A. I did.</p> <p>14 Q. There was a further article in the Mail on Sunday the 15 following weekend, which is at tab 16 or annex O, 16 page 01603. The allegation was made: 17 "Top terror chief's car hire firm is operating 18 without a licence."</p> <p>19 A. That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And you say that's incorrect?</p> <p>21 A. Well, it was operating without a licence, because, as 22 I understand it, there is no licence, but I guess it's 23 the inference that that creates for potential clients of 24 my wife's business.</p> <p>25 Q. The clear suggestion is that they should have licences,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 my senior commanders to attend a case conference, and 2 obviously if the DPP felt in some way the investigation 3 was misconstrued or the original advice given by the CPS 4 was incorrect, then he would doubtless say so and we 5 would review whether the continuance of the inquiry was 6 sensible, but my commander, my colleague, Mr Sawyer, 7 came back from the case conference and indicated that it 8 was felt that the inquiry should continue and it was in 9 the public interest to see it through and satisfy 10 ourselves that no sensitive or secret material had been 11 leaked.</p> <p>12 I should say, of course, during this inquiry one of 13 those who was originally implicated had made a public 14 statement to the effect that they did from time to time 15 receive secret material, so of course that was impacting 16 on our thinking throughout the investigation.</p> <p>17 Q. About this time, or slightly earlier, there was an 18 article in the Guardian -- this is tab 17, annex P, 19 page 01606 -- where you apparently moved quickly to 20 declare a truce with the Conservative Party after it 21 became clear that David Cameron had you in his sights. 22 This, I think, was immediately after you apologised; is 23 that right?</p> <p>24 A. Yes. This article -- this is the "I'm going to get him 25 this time" article, am I looking at the right --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, it is. Tab 17.</p> <p>2 A. Yes, that's the one, sir, I have that. Indeed, that</p> <p>3 appeared just about the time I apologised or just after.</p> <p>4 I think it was repeated a few times in different places.</p> <p>5 MR JAY: Yes. It's interesting that the author of this</p> <p>6 piece is linking this to David Davis taking offence at</p> <p>7 the briefing we heard you give evidence about in</p> <p>8 relation to the 42-day plan.</p> <p>9 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. At the end:</p> <p>11 "The Tories emphatically deny having briefed the</p> <p>12 Mail on Sunday that Quick's wife ran a wedding chauffeur</p> <p>13 car business which sparked his outburst. But one</p> <p>14 well-placed Tory said ..."</p> <p>15 Well, we can see that.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, I don't fully understand</p> <p>17 it.</p> <p>18 "Bob Quick is behind this. I'm going to fucking get</p> <p>19 him this time."</p> <p>20 What was it being said you were behind?</p> <p>21 A. I must say I don't know. I've no idea, sir.</p> <p>22 MR JAY: It may relate to --</p> <p>23 A. I would have thought the Green inquiry, I'm assuming,</p> <p>24 but I don't know.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, it would be fair to say you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 colleagues. On that day I was handed a briefing note</p> <p>2 that was -- should have been prepared the night before.</p> <p>3 There were logistical problems that day, it wasn't</p> <p>4 prepared until the morning. It was handed to me in</p> <p>5 a paper folder, which was unusual, and I guess</p> <p>6 a consequence of the delay. I read it in the car. When</p> <p>7 I stepped out of the car, I realised I hadn't put the</p> <p>8 top sheet back in the paper. I literally saw it as</p> <p>9 I got out the car, turned it quickly, but there was</p> <p>10 a photographer somewhere, it would appear, with a pretty</p> <p>11 good lens. It appears I got snapped and some of that</p> <p>12 was visible.</p> <p>13 It didn't have hugely sensitive data on it, but it</p> <p>14 had some -- I think an operation name and some roles,</p> <p>15 but I don't think it revealed a lot of operational</p> <p>16 detail, but it did reveal that some kind of operation</p> <p>17 may be about to go ahead.</p> <p>18 I later found out, about an hour after I left</p> <p>19 Downing Street, that I'd been photographed and was very</p> <p>20 surprised to learn that whoever took it, or someone, had</p> <p>21 put it on the web, World Wide Web, so I realised the</p> <p>22 operation had been compromised. I was then focused on</p> <p>23 how to mitigate that problem, and a decision was taken</p> <p>24 to bring the arrests forward, which was achievable, and</p> <p>25 actually went quite smoothly, but it was obviously</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 were behind the Green inquiry; you were responsible for</p> <p>2 it.</p> <p>3 A. Indeed, sir. Indeed.</p> <p>4 MR JAY: Is it a reference back to your outburst that the</p> <p>5 Conservative Party had got the Mail on Sunday to target</p> <p>6 you?</p> <p>7 A. Well, again that --</p> <p>8 Q. That doesn't make much sense either, does it?</p> <p>9 A. As Lord Leveson says, it was patently obvious I was</p> <p>10 behind that and those comments were attributed to me, so</p> <p>11 I'm not entirely sure what that grievance is.</p> <p>12 Q. It all suggests a campaign from whoever to smear you in</p> <p>13 relation to the Green inquiry, to use a range of</p> <p>14 strategies. That's really a comment, rather than</p> <p>15 something that might warrant an answer.</p> <p>16 The next thing that happened, Mr Quick, was the</p> <p>17 unfortunate events which led to your resignation.</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Which are fully explained in your statement. In</p> <p>20 a nutshell, what happened?</p> <p>21 A. In a nutshell, during the course of a counter-terrorism</p> <p>22 operation, the day before the operation lots of frenetic</p> <p>23 activity, one of which was for me to go to Number 10 and</p> <p>24 brief the Home Secretary and the Prime Minister and</p> <p>25 other officials along with the Security Service</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 inconvenient and difficult.</p> <p>2 And then at the end of the day I sort of turned my</p> <p>3 attention to the consequences of that momentary lapse</p> <p>4 and what I ought to do about it.</p> <p>5 Q. The Shadow Home Secretary stated your position was</p> <p>6 untenable. You decided, after discussions with family</p> <p>7 and close friends, it was right and proper to offer your</p> <p>8 resignation, and then you say in paragraph 95:</p> <p>9 "The next day whilst my terms and conditions were</p> <p>10 outstanding, and before I had actually tendered my</p> <p>11 resignation, the Mayor of London announced the</p> <p>12 acceptance of my resignation on television."</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So we understand the sequence of events, had you</p> <p>15 communicated the fact that you were intending to resign</p> <p>16 to anybody?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I had.</p> <p>18 Q. To conclude the evidential picture in relation to the</p> <p>19 Green investigation, Mr Yates succeeded you as head of</p> <p>20 ACSO, or as ACSO, I should say, but the Director of</p> <p>21 Public Prosecutions gave a report, which we have seen,</p> <p>22 stating that there was insufficient evidence to provide</p> <p>23 a realistic prospect of convicting either Green or</p> <p>24 Galley with any criminal offence. But he made it clear</p> <p>25 in paragraph 37 of his report that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 "Unauthorised leaking of confidential information is 2 not beyond the reach of criminal law and once the 3 pattern of leaks was established in this case it was 4 inevitable that a police investigation would follow. 5 There's been a thorough investigation. Without it, 6 I would not have been able to reach a conclusion on the 7 particular facts of this case." 8 So impliedly or expressly he's making no criticism 9 of what you did, it's just his conclusion on the 10 evidence which he had. Is that fair? 11 A. That's correct, sir, yes. 12 Q. Then there's a Home Affairs Select Committee report that 13 suggested something different, but didn't have the 14 benefit of the DPP's views? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. In the summer of 2009 -- this is paragraph 101 -- Sir 17 Denis O'Connor was commissioned by the Home Secretary to 18 produce a report on lessons learned, and his report made 19 findings which were really predicated on Mr Johnston's 20 findings. He didn't second guess them; is that right? 21 A. That's correct, yes. 22 Q. And so in the same way as you disagree with 23 Mr Johnston's reviewed findings, you disagree with Sir 24 Denis O'Connor's, as night follows day, really? 25 A. Essentially the Johnston review I feel was -- omitted</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 that are very well defined, and they can be unpopular 2 and protracted but they are thorough, and in more 3 serious cases I think it's probably better to 4 investigate thoroughly rather than try and second guess 5 the outcome of an investigation. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could you help me, please, Mr Quick. 7 It may be that I'll be able to find it all out by close 8 study of every word of this report. Was Sir Denis 9 reviewing this incident on the basis that Sir Ian 10 Johnston's view was correct or was he also reviewing the 11 underlying material which Sir Ian Johnston had reviewed 12 so that he could come to his own conclusion? Do you 13 understand the point I'm making? 14 A. Yes, sir. I think my recollection is in a conversation 15 with Sir Denis he was appending -- 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, he did append it. 17 A. He did append the report but made no judgment or comment 18 on it, it was supporting material. But my belief is he 19 was commissioned to report on lessons learned from the 20 Home Office leaks investigation by the Metropolitan 21 Police, so I think it was closer to your second 22 proposition, sir. But he came to his own views on the 23 work that he and his staff did in reviewing the inquiry. 24 MR JAY: My reading was closer to the first than the second, 25 but maybe it doesn't matter hugely.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 far too much material that was relevant to the decision 2 to arrest Damian Green, so I felt Mr O'Connor's or Sir 3 Denis O'Connor's report seemed to rely heavily on that, 4 but I guess most important of all in relation to my 5 comment about Sir Denis' report, and Sir Denis is 6 someone I know very well and have huge respect for, but 7 I think there was a proposition in the report that the 8 police have to try and anticipate the outcome of an 9 investigation, and in effect should be prepared to stop 10 it in appropriate cases, which I would agree with in 11 less serious cases, but in serious cases I think it's 12 a very dangerous proposition because in the end the 13 police can't read people's minds, they can't see into 14 the future, and I think the police have relied upon 15 a system of jurisprudence which is built around the 16 legal process and procedure and where thresholds are met 17 thorough investigations follow, and I felt this was 18 potentially a difficult proposition, and I notice my 19 former colleague John Yates cited it in -- partly in his 20 evidence as being something that led him to not 21 investigate the phone hacking allegations. 22 Well, my point -- my challenge around this, at the 23 time, back in 2009, was that I think it's just too risky 24 for the police. Police, in my experience over the last 25 32 years, have operated to a system, a set of procedures</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 There was evidence about this which you gave to the 2 House of Commons committee on privilege. 3 A. (Nods head). 4 Q. There was a direct conflict between what you told that 5 committee and what Mr Green told that committee, which 6 it's probably not necessary for this Inquiry to consider 7 because it's travelling outside the terms of reference. 8 As regards more general matters and your personal 9 contact with the media, paragraph 104 and 105, you 10 didn't maintain personal contacts with journalists, is 11 this right, so you didn't engage with them socially or 12 semi socially? 13 A. No. 14 Q. Is that also right? 15 A. No, I think in common with some other evidence you've 16 heard, my approach was to keep relations formal and 17 businesslike, transparent, diaried, presence of a press 18 officer, and organised through the press office. 19 Indeed, when I returned to the Met as Assistant 20 Commissioner, I was asked to participate in a series of 21 briefings with CRA journalists about counter-terrorism, 22 and I was briefed to the effect there had been an 23 established relationship between my predecessors and the 24 CRA journalists, not all of them, but those that 25 specialised in counter-terrorism reporting, and they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

<p>1 would meet periodically as a group and invite ACSO to</p> <p>2 join them, sometimes over lunch, to talk about the very</p> <p>3 complex background to the current plethora of</p> <p>4 counter-terrorism cases that were running, and so</p> <p>5 I agreed to participate in that from time to time, and</p> <p>6 that was probably the extent of my contact with</p> <p>7 journalists at that time.</p> <p>8 Q. Paragraph 107, you recall that on at least two occasions</p> <p>9 you were invited to drinks at a wine bar local to</p> <p>10 Scotland Yard and you saw Stephenson, Yates and</p> <p>11 Fedorcio:</p> <p>12 "... socialising with people I know to be</p> <p>13 journalists, including Lucy Panton of the News of the</p> <p>14 World and Mike Sullivan of the Sun."</p> <p>15 On other occasions you recall seeing Yates in social</p> <p>16 situations with Stephen Wright.</p> <p>17 Can you help us, please, those social situations,</p> <p>18 anything about them you can remember?</p> <p>19 A. Yes. This was early into my time back in the</p> <p>20 Metropolitan Police and I sensed some unease about this</p> <p>21 only because it crossed my mind that these journalists</p> <p>22 have homes to go to and families, I'm sure, and I found</p> <p>23 it surprising that there was this level of social</p> <p>24 engagement in local wine bars or pubs, I witnessed it</p> <p>25 occasionally, and it wasn't something I, and I think</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 difficult job, they're under huge pressure. The police</p> <p>2 have information that they would dearly like to access.</p> <p>3 Some of it of course they can, but some of it they</p> <p>4 can't, and you have to be guarded, and I think there's</p> <p>5 a psychological distance you need to have so that you're</p> <p>6 not compromised, or the perception created that you may</p> <p>7 be giving them more favourable treatment than they</p> <p>8 deserve.</p> <p>9 Q. Paragraph 123 of your statement you're going back to</p> <p>10 your time at Surrey, you state that your judgment was</p> <p>11 that Surrey Police personnel were vulnerable to</p> <p>12 approaches to bribe them by journalists from time to</p> <p>13 time. What evidence was there to support that judgment?</p> <p>14 A. Well, Surrey had experienced a number of very high</p> <p>15 profile events and cases. There was the tragic case of</p> <p>16 the Deepcut Four, the soldiers who died at the Deepcut</p> <p>17 barracks. There was of course the Milly Dowler</p> <p>18 abduction and murder case and there were many others.</p> <p>19 It's a force very close to London, it attracts events</p> <p>20 and incidents that are widely reported, and of course</p> <p>21 I knew from my own experience in the Met in the counter</p> <p>22 corruption world of this risky interface between the</p> <p>23 police and journalists who are in a very commercial</p> <p>24 environment, a fiercely commercial environment, seeking</p> <p>25 scoops, exclusives and stories.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 many of my other colleagues, would involve themselves</p> <p>2 in. I think it has got risks and it crossed my mind as</p> <p>3 to why are they there if there isn't something accruing</p> <p>4 from that type of relationship.</p> <p>5 Q. You're hinting at that, aren't you, a bit further on</p> <p>6 because you say you were aware that Wright was</p> <p>7 responsible for a large number of Daily Mail articles</p> <p>8 that were repeatedly critical of Blair during his tenure</p> <p>9 as Commissioner. Are you suggesting that Mr Wright was</p> <p>10 being briefed by Mr Yates?</p> <p>11 A. I wouldn't suggest that, because I simply don't know.</p> <p>12 What I'm suggesting is it seemed unwise and it really</p> <p>13 struck me in the case of Mr Wright, who I was aware had</p> <p>14 been author of a whole range of articles that were</p> <p>15 highly critical of the Met, sometimes quite viciously</p> <p>16 so, and of its Commissioner, so that really surprised</p> <p>17 me.</p> <p>18 There could be all sorts of explanations for that,</p> <p>19 but it struck me that that was a -- had the perception</p> <p>20 of looking inappropriate.</p> <p>21 Q. You say:</p> <p>22 "I did not mix with journalists in this way."</p> <p>23 Why not?</p> <p>24 A. Well, I think there is a recognition, I think, amongst</p> <p>25 most of my colleagues that journalists have a very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 Q. Then your conclusions, Mr Quick, paragraph 128. I think</p> <p>2 you've already addressed the point on the O'Connor</p> <p>3 report. To be clear, this is the O'Connor report which</p> <p>4 we've just been looking at, not the broader O'Connor</p> <p>5 report of December of last year, which we were looking</p> <p>6 at here on Monday and we'll be looking at next Monday.</p> <p>7 Can I ask you, please, about your comment on the report</p> <p>8 by Elizabeth Filkin, where you say:</p> <p>9 "I do not think this report has identified the</p> <p>10 unique role of the police in our democracy and the full</p> <p>11 potential for, or implications of, collusion or other</p> <p>12 malpractice."</p> <p>13 What are you getting at there?</p> <p>14 A. Well, I think it was a very good piece of work and</p> <p>15 I think it picked up lots of important issues. I think</p> <p>16 from my perspective and perhaps some of the unique</p> <p>17 insights I was able to obtain in my earlier career,</p> <p>18 I think the police are in a unique position because</p> <p>19 they're an institution that can be called upon to</p> <p>20 investigate any other part of the establishment</p> <p>21 machinery, if you like, at any time, so in a sense they</p> <p>22 have to stand slightly apart, and that psychological</p> <p>23 distance between other institutions and the police.</p> <p>24 That doesn't mean to say you can't have completely</p> <p>25 cordial relations and high quality engagement with other</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 professions and other institutions, but at the same time 2 I think the police are that organisation who can 3 sometimes be called upon to investigate, and therefore 4 the need for transparency, the need for accountability, 5 is very high, quite properly, and I wasn't entirely 6 convinced some of those risks were identified and 7 perhaps relevant to some of the issues that the Inquiry 8 is looking into.</p> <p>9 Q. Had you remained in post, instead of telephoning 10 Mr Yates on 9 July 2009, Sir Paul Stephenson would have 11 telephoned you to conduct -- or at least to establish 12 the facts. It's very difficult without using hindsight, 13 but do you have any comment on what happened, trying to 14 remove hindsight from the equation?</p> <p>15 A. You're correct, sir, it is difficult, but my 16 interpretation of those events were that the Guardian 17 were challenging very strongly the first investigation 18 and therefore I like to think I would have concerned 19 myself with understanding in detail what the first 20 investigation had and hadn't revealed, and whether there 21 was any substance to these allegations. So it is very 22 difficult to comment, because it can only be in 23 hindsight, but I certainly had some concerns at the time 24 that the inquiry was ruled out at such an early stage.</p> <p>25 MR JAY: Thank you very much, Mr Quick. There may be some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 Q. And that he had a piece of paper upon which he'd written 2 out what he was going to say about that?</p> <p>3 A. He told me he had written his resignation out, and 4 I took it at face value to mean he'd written his 5 resignation out, not at some future date but there and 6 then.</p> <p>7 Q. So if I were to say to you that all that paper said was 8 that he might not renew his contract the following 9 April, you would say that was inconsistent with what 10 he'd said?</p> <p>11 A. I would say that, yes.</p> <p>12 MR GARNHAM: Thank you, sir. We'll produce that piece of 13 paper.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good. But just reflect on that 15 for a moment, Mr Quick, because there may not be an 16 enormous difference, because, as I understand it, at 17 that stage had the appointment to the new Commissioner 18 been made?</p> <p>19 A. It had not at that stage, sir, no.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So if he was indicating that he 21 wasn't going to renew in three months' time, that really 22 was meaning he was dropping out of the whole thing, 23 because not renewing means I'm not applying for the job 24 of Commissioner?</p> <p>25 A. Quite.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 more questions.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When you say "at the time", do you 3 mean in July 2009?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Reading the newspapers, obviously, 6 because that's what you were doing.</p> <p>7 A. Yes, sir, indeed.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much, Mr Quick. Thank 9 you.</p> <p>10 A. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>11 MR GARNHAM: Sir, there is one question and I ask your 12 permission to ask Mr Quick a question.</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: On what topic?</p> <p>14 MR GARNHAM: The meeting on 1 December 2008 at which, 15 according to Mr Quick, Sir Paul Stephenson indicated he 16 was planning to resign.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Questions by MR GARNHAM</p> <p>19 MR GARNHAM: Just one matter, Mr Quick. You recall what 20 you've said about that. Would it not be more accurate 21 to say that Sir Paul Stephenson indicated to you in that 22 conversation not that he was going to resign but that he 23 was not intending to renew his contract the following 24 April?</p> <p>25 A. No, that's absolutely not the case.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I just wonder whether actually 2 between the two of you there is not a possibility that 3 there are slightly wires crossed.</p> <p>4 A. It's quite possible. I haven't had a protracted 5 conversation about it with Sir Paul, so my understanding 6 was he had written a document out -- I think I was led 7 to believe he was about to resign, and we had 8 a conversation about him not resigning, because he 9 hadn't done anything wrong and neither had I. If 10 I misconstrued what he was saying, then so be it, but 11 that's my recollection, sir.</p> <p>12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, very good. Thank you very 13 much indeed, Mr Quick.</p> <p>14 A. Thank you.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Garnham, of course produce it. 16 I'm not sure it takes me very far.</p> <p>17 MR GARNHAM: Sir, you'll understand why (overspeaking).</p> <p>18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, but I wouldn't want 19 anybody to think that I was going to be focusing upon 20 it.</p> <p>21 MR GARNHAM: I can't imagine you'll be hugely exercised by 22 it, sir.</p> <p>23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. 24 Right.</p> <p>25 MR JAY: Sir, may we have our short break?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, that's a good idea. 2 (3.23 pm) 3 (A short break) 4 (3.32 pm) 5 MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Mr Tim Godwin, please. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. 7 MR TIMOTHY GODWIN (sworn) 8 Questions by MR JAY 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have made clear that when Mr Godwin 10 was an Assistant Commissioner and I was the presiding 11 judge for England and Wales, we worked closely on 12 a number of criminal justice issues. He is presently 13 a member of the Sentencing Council, of which I am the 14 chairman. 15 MR JAY: Mr Godwin, you've kindly provided the Inquiry with 16 a witness statement dated 27 January of this year, 17 signed by you, statement of truth in the standard form, 18 so this is your formal evidence to the Inquiry; is that 19 right? 20 A. That's right, sir. 21 Q. As for your career, you started off in the Sussex 22 Police. You worked your way up the ranks, transferred 23 to the Metropolitan Police in 1999, promoted to the rank 24 of Commander, promoted to Assistant Commissioner in 25 2002, and then Deputy Commissioner in July 2009; is that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 A. That's an interesting question. I think it's an 2 observation rather than any thought-through evidence 3 that the evidence of the celebrity police chief in the 4 USA, the credibility that was then given, meant that we 5 saw a similar evolution of media coverage over here. 6 I thought that that actually undermined the efforts of 7 lots and lots of people who were doing great things and 8 that generally an individual wasn't in themselves able 9 to bring about things like crime reduction in a city 10 like London. 11 Q. Paragraph 11, please, Mr Godwin. You say it seemed to 12 you that this was the result -- "this" being the 13 emphasis on more personalised, individualised focus by 14 the press -- of the press having greater access to 15 individual high profile police officers rather than 16 being limited to obtaining information through the DPA. 17 It may be invidious to name or identify individual high 18 profile police officers, but is this right, that if 19 anyone has been following this Inquiry, one would be 20 able to know who those were? Is that fair? 21 A. I think that would be a fair account, and it was very 22 much depending upon the roles that they were doing at 23 that point, and so obviously serious crime, et cetera, 24 became more interesting than some of the other areas of 25 our business.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 correct? You've been Acting or Temporary Commissioner 2 on two occasions, and you retired from the MPS on 3 5 January 2012, is that a fair summary? 4 A. That's a very fair summary, thank you. 5 Q. First of all, please, some general points, and this 6 chimes with evidence we've already heard. Paragraph 7, 7 following the MacPherson Inquiry your perception was the 8 MPS was perceived by the media and the public as 9 a closed and secretive organisation, so strategically it 10 was thought necessary to be far more open and 11 transparent as an organisation, and that strategic 12 direction came from the top, from Sir John Stevens as he 13 then was; is that right? 14 A. That's correct, sir. 15 Q. Did you generally agree with that strategy? 16 A. I did. 17 Q. You make an interesting point in paragraphs 8 and 9, the 18 shift in media focus from the MPS being conceived as an 19 organisation as a whole to particular individuals, but 20 especially those at the top of the MPS, an almost sort 21 of presidential approach, to adopt a political analogy, 22 and you say that that was derived from the States, 23 really, the celebrity police chief notion. Is that 24 a shift in emphasis which you approved of or deprecated 25 or were just resigned to?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 Q. But underneath this there may be a judgment here whether 2 the press having access to individual high profile 3 police officers is a good thing or a bad thing. Let me 4 ask you, please, you've now left the MPS, what is your 5 judgment as to whether it's a good or a bad thing? 6 A. I think it was a natural progression of opening up the 7 Met in terms of being more accountable, having that 8 responsibility to answer questions, created that more 9 open relationship, and I think ultimately we're here 10 today and I think ultimately it was -- it didn't play 11 well for us. 12 Q. But the last bit, "ultimately it didn't play well for 13 us", which parts didn't play well and why? 14 A. I think it became more focused on the individual than 15 the merits of the Metropolitan Police Service and what 16 they were doing with partners to reduce crime, and we 17 had some good records in crime reduction in that period. 18 Q. Was it also though a question of what certain 19 individuals were doing in their relationships with the 20 media which gave rise to difficulty? 21 A. I think there was tittle-tattle and gossip which came 22 out as well. Where that came from would be very hard to 23 say. 24 Q. It's clear from your evidence -- and we'll come to this 25 in a moment -- that you did very little entertaining, if</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

<p>1 I can put it in those words. Your contacts with the 2 media were formal, were not over dinner, were certainly 3 not over alcohol, were usually in an office; is that 4 right? 5 A. Yes. The normal events would be a media interview 6 arranged by the press office in my office. 7 Q. If someone had suggested to you that it would be 8 appropriate to have interactions with the press in 9 a more social environment, would that have met with your 10 approval or disapproval? 11 A. I used to attend the Crime Reporters Association 12 Christmas party and some of the events hosted by our 13 press office, the media, some bravery awards, for 14 example the Evening Standard Thousand Influential People 15 Award, so I used to attend those, and I didn't -- I had 16 no problem with that. I just was concerned on occasion 17 that the perception of a close relationship in that way 18 might actually be misinterpreted. 19 Q. I think you're saying it meets with your disapproval for 20 perceptual reasons if no other; is that right? 21 A. I think for me -- I wouldn't suggest that I'm right. It 22 was a different path to the one that I went down in 23 terms of my relationship with the media. Namely there 24 are two schools of thought. One, it's better to have 25 a good relationship with the media where you can set the <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p> </p>	<p>1 A. I think as you go into the individual accounts in terms 2 of what appears to be excesses in certain areas in terms 3 of the hospitality, I think that's embarrassing and 4 unfortunate, so that sort of thing, I wasn't aware of 5 that sort of level of hospitality. 6 In terms of the events themselves, I just felt that 7 we needed to have our constitutional separation a bit. 8 MR JAY: In terms of the gifts and hospitality register, 9 there's nothing of interest there to discuss with you, 10 Mr Godwin. Can I move forward to paragraph 26 -- 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, the fact that there is 12 nothing -- the fact you put it like that means that it 13 is of interest. What do you think about the idea that 14 you might have one set of values and your colleagues, in 15 extremely senior positions in the Met, might have quite 16 different sets of values? I mean, how does that come 17 about, and should it? 18 A. I think, sir, to be fair we pretty much had common 19 values about honesty, integrity in terms of conduct. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I'm not suggesting that -- 21 A. I think the difference, with respect, would be that 22 there was one style that was favoured by some members of 23 the management board of the Met and there was another 24 style, which was my style, where I didn't feel 25 comfortable in that environment. So I wouldn't say it's <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p> </p>
<p>1 context, you can explain events, as opposed to mine, 2 which was arranged interviews in the office, et cetera, 3 et cetera, and I just took that particular path and 4 others thought it was better to actually be able to have 5 those debates so that it set the context right in terms 6 of the media reporting of what we were trying to do 7 about reducing crime in London. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not right to suggest, is it, 9 that you were agnostic about what others did? At least 10 we heard, I think, from Mr Yates that you actually had 11 words with him about the subject. 12 A. Yes, that's correct. In terms of -- I thought at a 13 point when, having become the Deputy Commissioner, 14 I thought the frequency of those meetings and the manner 15 of those meetings could be misinterpreted and the 16 perception would be wrong, and as a result I did 17 disapprove at that point. 18 MR JAY: When you had those words with Mr Yates, were you 19 aware in general terms of the nature of his social 20 interactions or did you have as much detail as this 21 Inquiry has heard? 22 A. I didn't have as much detail as has come out in the 23 Inquiry, no. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What do you think about that? What 25 do you think about that? <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p> </p>	<p>1 a values difference, it's a difference of style. 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, is it appropriate for senior, 3 very, very senior police officers each to be able to 4 follow their own perhaps conflicting style or does there 5 need to be rather more around the concept of a common 6 approach? Or am I being too analytical? 7 A. No, sir, I think that as a result of this Inquiry and as 8 a result of the events as they unfolded last year in the 9 Metropolitan Police whilst I was still there and as the 10 Acting Commissioner, we did actually take action to make 11 sure that we had a common style in terms of our 12 interaction with the media. I think in those days about 13 openness, transparency, not wanting to be seen as in 14 a siege mentality scenario, as had been the case in the 15 past, I think there were different styles as to how we 16 could be open, transparent, approachable, accountable, 17 and as a result of that, there were different styles 18 that developed. But the values of the organisation were 19 still the same in terms of honesty, integrity, value 20 human rights, et cetera. 21 MR JAY: Maybe, Mr Godwin, the fact that you felt 22 uncomfortable or would have felt uncomfortable had you 23 enjoyed similar social interactions, is that not an 24 indication that your value system was, as it were, 25 giving you warnings that this was or might be seen to be <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p> </p>

<p>1 inappropriate?</p> <p>2 A. I think I was more concerned about the perceptions where</p> <p>3 you have media stories that are gossip stories or</p> <p>4 embarrassing stories or leaks, then the sheer fact that</p> <p>5 you've engaged in that sort of behaviour does make you</p> <p>6 vulnerable to being accused of misconduct, et cetera, so</p> <p>7 I thought that that was probably not the right</p> <p>8 environment, but that was purely a style issue for me.</p> <p>9 Q. So there's certainly a perception then that if gossip is</p> <p>10 reported in the press, the source of the gossip may be</p> <p>11 the sort of person who does or is seen to be in close</p> <p>12 proximity with the press and therefore might be the</p> <p>13 gossip?</p> <p>14 A. Naturally it would follow that those that are frequently</p> <p>15 meeting with the press, frequently engaging in social</p> <p>16 events with the media, would be the ones that would</p> <p>17 automatically be looked at as potential sources, yes.</p> <p>18 But obviously they may well not be, of course.</p> <p>19 Q. Although the field would be limited logically to those</p> <p>20 of similar mindset who are also having similar social</p> <p>21 interactions with the press. Would you agree with that?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>23 Q. You tell us in paragraph 26 that since July 2011 the</p> <p>24 record of all media contacts by members of the</p> <p>25 management board has been the subject of an auditing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 of the various senior people.</p> <p>2 Q. Oh right, so we have seen some of them, yes.</p> <p>3 Paragraph 37, Mr Godwin. A lot of your statement</p> <p>4 we're simply taking as read, if you don't mind. This is</p> <p>5 page 06949. You say:</p> <p>6 "There are also instances where a few members of the</p> <p>7 media seek contact from MPS staff for less appropriate</p> <p>8 reasons. These can range from attempts by the media to</p> <p>9 either embarrass or attack MPS staff to apportion blame,</p> <p>10 or get operational information that is at that time</p> <p>11 confidential and, if disclosed, may be harmful to</p> <p>12 ongoing police operations."</p> <p>13 Do you have personal knowledge of any of this?</p> <p>14 A. We have a number of inquiries that we launched to try to</p> <p>15 get to the bottom of some of those, but in terms of</p> <p>16 personal evidence against individuals, no. Specific</p> <p>17 individuals.</p> <p>18 Q. But the individuals involved are those, is this right,</p> <p>19 who are having the closer social type engagements with</p> <p>20 the press?</p> <p>21 A. No, I have no evidence to suggest that that would be</p> <p>22 true, it's just that the perception, as I said earlier,</p> <p>23 the perception of that conduct may leave rise to making</p> <p>24 them more vulnerable to that accusation.</p> <p>25 Q. Paragraph 39 you make clear the contact with the media</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 process through the Deputy Assistant Commissioner of</p> <p>2 Professional Standards. First of all, was that</p> <p>3 something that you introduced when you were temporary</p> <p>4 Commissioner?</p> <p>5 A. It was.</p> <p>6 Q. The purpose is probably obvious, but spell it out</p> <p>7 anyway, Mr Godwin. What was the purpose of this?</p> <p>8 A. The purpose was to respond to the concerns being raised</p> <p>9 in a number of quarters about the perception of our</p> <p>10 conduct and our relationships with the media and as</p> <p>11 a result of that I think it was a member of the Police</p> <p>12 Authority said let a light shine in and then actually</p> <p>13 that restores confidence significantly. So for me it</p> <p>14 was about letting a light shine in as to what that</p> <p>15 connectivity, what that contact was.</p> <p>16 Q. Can I just be clear, when you refer to the record of all</p> <p>17 media contacts, is that the gifts and hospitality record</p> <p>18 or some different record?</p> <p>19 A. That's an additional record in terms of the contacts</p> <p>20 that are outside of the hospitality.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So it's a record we haven't yet seen because it</p> <p>22 postdates -- it doesn't postdate what the Inquiry is</p> <p>23 looking at, but postdates most of the events we've been</p> <p>24 looking at?</p> <p>25 A. It comes, I believe, from the diaries. It's the diaries</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 is more broadly recorded by the DPA. Do you know in</p> <p>2 what form that's done?</p> <p>3 A. I can't tell you exactly what the system is in the DPA.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay, we'll wait until Monday.</p> <p>5 The whole issue of leaks, paragraph 44, page 06952.</p> <p>6 This is the use of the term "police source". As you</p> <p>7 opine, it's open to debate whether the police source is</p> <p>8 a police officer at all:</p> <p>9 "The current MPS policy sets out that if you are</p> <p>10 qualified to give a view on a police matter then you</p> <p>11 should."</p> <p>12 First of all, when you say "then you should", do you</p> <p>13 mean then you may or do you mean then you ought to?</p> <p>14 A. "Should" is not a good word in the evidence there, I'll</p> <p>15 take your point. In terms of openness and transparency,</p> <p>16 one of the underpinning philosophies of the Metropolitan</p> <p>17 Police Service that came in at that point in 2000/2001</p> <p>18 is that we shouldn't be hiding away from being held to</p> <p>19 account and if asked a reasonable question we should be</p> <p>20 able to answer it if you're in a position to have that</p> <p>21 knowledge and be able to answer it.</p> <p>22 In those circumstances, that's what I mean by the</p> <p>23 "should". It's not about things that are not within</p> <p>24 your purview, gossip, tittle-tattle or giving away</p> <p>25 operational information that might impact on our ability</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 to perform our responsible operations.</p> <p>2 Q. So when the media use "police source", they very often</p> <p>3 may be referring to someone who's given them an</p> <p>4 anonymous off-the-record briefing or they may be</p> <p>5 referring to the source not being a police officer at</p> <p>6 all, either because they've made it up or because it's</p> <p>7 someone close to a police officer but not actually</p> <p>8 a police officer; is that correct?</p> <p>9 A. That is correct, sir.</p> <p>10 Q. Leak inquiries, your evidence is the same as others:</p> <p>11 extremely difficult to conduct them. You make it clear</p> <p>12 in paragraph 47 that you have launched a number of leak</p> <p>13 inquiries within the DPS. Very difficult to pursue and</p> <p>14 prosecute. Would you agree that the very fact of the</p> <p>15 leak investigation taking place does act as a form of</p> <p>16 deterrence?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Can I ask you about paragraph 48. When you refer to</p> <p>19 accessing police databases, I've been asked to put to</p> <p>20 you this question: do you think that access to the</p> <p>21 Police National Computer is open to abuse, particularly</p> <p>22 by unscrupulous journalists?</p> <p>23 A. One of the key challenges for any organisation is to</p> <p>24 protect its data and to avoid the mishandling of data.</p> <p>25 We have processes in place through our professional</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 likely possibility?</p> <p>2 A. I wouldn't even like to speculate.</p> <p>3 Q. Obviously the last thing you want is a journalist</p> <p>4 calling you on your mobile at whatever time of the day</p> <p>5 or night?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. In terms of looking at the future, paragraph 70 of your</p> <p>8 statement, you say you think there should be "greater</p> <p>9 transparency between the media and the police", the</p> <p>10 relationship is "vital", there should be "consideration</p> <p>11 of having an arrangement with the media to enable the</p> <p>12 MPS to pursue leaks", et cetera. So by transparency,</p> <p>13 I mean the word is self-explanatory, but in practical</p> <p>14 terms what are you looking at there to achieve this</p> <p>15 greater transparency?</p> <p>16 A. I think we started the process with the publication of</p> <p>17 all corporate hospitality and our wider publication of</p> <p>18 the various interactions. We learned lessons from</p> <p>19 people like the GLA and others, and I think the more</p> <p>20 we're exposed to scrutiny, the better it will be.</p> <p>21 Q. In terms of recording contact between police officers</p> <p>22 and media, the point might be made: well, we shouldn't</p> <p>23 burden this with bureaucracy, and that too much</p> <p>24 information is going to achieve nothing. Do you agree</p> <p>25 with that or not?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 standards to monitor the use of PNC, to identify those</p> <p>2 that we identify to be misusing PNC and to deal with</p> <p>3 them appropriately.</p> <p>4 Q. There are various techniques which are designed -- I'm</p> <p>5 sure you don't want to share them with us -- to seek out</p> <p>6 anomalous behaviour and then pursue those further; is</p> <p>7 that right?</p> <p>8 A. That is correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Thank you. We're going to take that issue up possibly</p> <p>10 with other witnesses.</p> <p>11 Paragraphs 57 and 58, please, Mr Godwin. And 59.</p> <p>12 You make it clear that you had no inclination to speak</p> <p>13 to journalists other than through the DPA, but you state</p> <p>14 that on occasion you have received telephone calls on</p> <p>15 your mobile phone from journalists to whom you haven't</p> <p>16 given your mobile phone number or indeed given</p> <p>17 permission to anyone else to do so, and then the natural</p> <p>18 reaction -- indeed you pursued this -- was to bat off</p> <p>19 the questions.</p> <p>20 Do you happen to know how the journalists might have</p> <p>21 got your number?</p> <p>22 A. I can only make assumptions on that. I don't know how</p> <p>23 they got my number, but obviously somebody who had it</p> <p>24 gave it to them.</p> <p>25 Q. Yes. Someone from within the DPA, is that the most</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 A. I think personally I'm not sure how much bureaucracy</p> <p>2 would require to actually put those in. There's</p> <p>3 normally a diary contact and hence the stuff that we're</p> <p>4 doing anyway in London, and so I don't see it as</p> <p>5 a bureaucratic problem.</p> <p>6 Q. The Inquiry has just heard some evidence from Mr Quick</p> <p>7 in which you appear, but not centrally. I just put</p> <p>8 a number of points to you. If you feel that you can't</p> <p>9 deal with them now because you haven't had sufficient</p> <p>10 notice of them, tell us and we'll deal with them in</p> <p>11 a different way, but it may be possible that you can</p> <p>12 deal with them now.</p> <p>13 Mr Quick told us that on 1 December 2008 -- and this</p> <p>14 was the context of the Damian Green operation -- there</p> <p>15 was a meeting in his office and you were present and</p> <p>16 obviously Mr Quick was present. According to Mr Quick,</p> <p>17 Sir Paul Stephenson looked very anxious and told</p> <p>18 Mr Quick he'd written out his resignation. Do you</p> <p>19 recall that or do you recall something different?</p> <p>20 A. I recall the Commissioner reading out a press statement</p> <p>21 that related to not standing for Commissioner and</p> <p>22 ultimately at the end of his tenure and seeing in a new</p> <p>23 Commissioner for retiring at that point from the</p> <p>24 Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. Were you in the room, Mr Godwin, when</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

<p>1 Mr Quick was asked a question about this by Mr Garnham 2 or not? 3 A. I wasn't. 4 Q. I'm not going to ask you anything more about that since 5 it may or may not link in with evidence we've heard. 6 Paragraph 61 -- this is of Mr Quick's evidence. 7 This was a meeting on 6 December 2008 that you, who were 8 then the Acting Deputy Commissioner, asked Mr Quick to 9 attend a meeting at New Scotland Yard, and Mr Johnston 10 and you were there and Sir Paul Stephenson. And Sir 11 Paul Stephenson's Chief of Staff was also there. At 12 that meeting Mr Johnston, who was carrying out a review 13 into the Damian Green operation, expressed a preliminary 14 view that was along the lines: although the arrest was 15 unlawful -- 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It was lawful. 17 MR JAY: It was lawful, pardon me -- on balance he felt that 18 it was disproportionate in that he should have been 19 invited in for interview. Do you recall that occasion? 20 A. I do, yes. 21 Q. At that meeting, did Mr Quick strongly challenge 22 Mr Johnston's view? 23 A. Yes, he did. 24 Q. Who got the better of the argument, insofar as it's 25 possible to say as in your case an impartial observer?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 of concern. 2 Q. The last point that Mr Quick made insofar as it relates 3 to you, you may recall, Mr Godwin, an article in the 4 Mail on Sunday which related to Mr Quick's wife's 5 business. Do you recall that? 6 A. I do. 7 Q. There were two articles. The first one caused 8 particular concern. I think that was on 21 December 9 2008. According to Mr Quick, he made a number of 10 telephone calls throughout the day to various people, 11 including to you. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did he say that? 13 MR JAY: Yes, first line of paragraph 77 -- 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. 15 MR JAY: -- of Mr Quick's statement. 16 Do you remember anything about those calls and what 17 he said? 18 A. Yes. I can't recall exactly what was said, but 19 obviously he was extremely distressed and he naturally 20 had his family there, it was coming up to Christmas, and 21 he was getting a lot of personal attention and his 22 family were getting personal attention that was not 23 welcomed and was actually having a big impact on his 24 family life. 25 Q. Was Mr Quick asking you to do anything in particular?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 A. Both arguments had some merit, as I happened to accord 2 more with the Ian Johnston view, but there were still 3 lines of inquiry that needed to be followed at that 4 point. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Would it be appropriate to treat 6 potential suspects differently? I mean, Mr Galley, was 7 it, had been arrested. Would there be a view that 8 actually one ought to be consistent in one's treatment 9 of those suspected of crime? 10 A. I think necessity and proportionality is something that 11 you have to review and question yourself as the 12 information unfolds, and one arrest might lead to more 13 information that changes your perception of what needs 14 to be done to the next suspect in the same inquiry, so 15 you have to constantly revisit and challenge yourself 16 and that was the point I think that Ian Johnston was 17 making. 18 MR JAY: According to Mr Quick, you and Sir Paul Stephenson 19 seemed very preoccupied during the meeting about the 20 negative media attention the MPS would receive if this 21 investigation continued. Is that right or not? 22 A. I don't think it was right in that context. Certainly 23 we were taking a significant battering in the media 24 about straying over constitutional lines, et cetera, and 25 naturally an organisation likes ours, that is a matter</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 A. I can't recall him asking me to do anything 2 particularly. I recall getting the press office to make 3 contact with him and various other bits but I can't 4 recall anything else. 5 Q. So you assisted him to the extent of getting the press 6 office in contact with him and then the press office 7 would do what they could with the Mail on Sunday; is 8 that right? 9 A. Yes, and equally to actually try to support him in terms 10 of what was a dreadfully challenging time for him and 11 his family and actually to see if there was anything 12 else that we could do to help. 13 Q. I've been asked to put to you these few questions in 14 relation to the referral of Mr Yates' conduct to the 15 MPA's Professional Standard Cases Subcommittee, which 16 was in June and July of last year. Do you recall making 17 two misconduct referral reports to that subcommittee? 18 A. I made them through the Deputy Assistant Commissioner of 19 the Professional Standards, Mark Simmons. 20 Q. One of these related to the Shami Media issue, the other 21 to the Amy Wallis issue, do you remember that? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. In making those referrals, did you form any view as to 24 whether there was evidence to substantiate the 25 allegations or was it more a formal matter that the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

<p>1 issue had been raised, therefore it was appropriate that 2 the relevant body, the PSCSC, should investigate it? 3 A. The latter. 4 Q. Thank you. I've been asked to ask you this: whether 5 during your time as Deputy Commissioner you have made 6 a formal misconduct report involving an ACPO rank 7 officer directly to the PSCSC on any other occasion? 8 A. I can't recall doing that, no. Not personally. 9 Q. And therefore, then, this final question: whether you're 10 aware of any other occasion on which your predecessors 11 as Deputy Commissioner have made any such report 12 directly to the PSCSC? 13 A. I believe they have. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: They? 15 A. Deputy Commissioners in the past have referred other 16 Assistant Commissioners for other matters. 17 MR JAY: But the fact of the referral is not you passing 18 a judgment; it's often if there's a matter of public 19 concern, it's fit to be investigated and the fact that 20 it's investigated and the officer eventually exonerated 21 is in the public interest and may be eventually in the 22 interests of the officer? 23 A. Exactly. 24 Q. Is that broadly -- 25 A. Exactly. It's to make sure that it's seen to be done</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 a wider timeframe, which you may or may not have had the 2 ability to see for yourself, as it's emerged in this 3 public Inquiry. 4 So taking all that into account, if you do have 5 views as to what would work, both for the Met and other 6 forces -- because I see no value in different systems 7 across the country, personally; I understand the 8 different position the Met is in, but I think it's 9 rather odd if different forces have different 10 approaches; they may require a different calibration, 11 but that's a different point -- and also what would work 12 to cope with the issues that have arisen in all these 13 three inquiries. I don't ask you to do that now, but if 14 you've thought about it and are in a position to give me 15 your views, you're very welcome to do so, but what I've 16 said -- and I did not say it to Sir Paul Stephenson, but 17 I will write to him and ask him to do so, it's a thought 18 that I obviously had after he gave evidence and have 19 thrown at Lord Condon, Lord Stevens and Lord Blair, 20 I would be very grateful to receive them. 21 I don't know whether you do have any views on that 22 or whether you'd want to think about them? 23 A. I do have views, but I think in terms of the challenge 24 that you've laid out, I would like to think about that 25 and to write in formally about that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 and independently done. 2 MR JAY: Thank you. Mr Godwin, those are all the questions 3 I have for you. 4 A. Thank you. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Godwin, you've seen the reports 6 both of Sir Denis O'Connor and also Dame Elizabeth 7 Filkin, and you comment upon them in a sentence or so. 8 But I would be grateful for your help in a little bit 9 more detail than that. I've asked others who have 10 achieved the very highest rank in the Met of 11 Commissioner, and I'm prepared to include in this regard 12 the Deputy Commissioner, to provide me with the benefit 13 of their experience in how proportionately 14 recommendations could be framed which allow the 15 Metropolitan Police to do the job in an open and 16 transparent way, but do not create such a rigid 17 structure that the result is, if not paralysis, a lack 18 of ability to respond appropriately to events as they 19 transpire. 20 It is to learn from what has happened, and of course 21 I've not only got the benefit of what Sir Denis has said 22 and his investigations and the benefit of what 23 Elizabeth Filkin has said and her investigation, I have 24 now trawled over some of the same territory myself and 25 received a rather wider and broader picture across</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 I think the key concern that I have is that at the 2 end of it we do not want the police to become hidden and 3 secretive again in basis of the systems and instructions 4 that are put in place. I think actually openness and 5 transparency has many benefits, and equally I think 6 there is an issue about the perception that this is the 7 conduct, in terms of corruption, in terms of the 8 corruption investigations, where arrests have been made, 9 that that is actually wholesale of what goes on in the 10 Police Service. The vast majority of men and women in 11 public services do not get involved in that sort of 12 activity. So it is about balance, it is about getting 13 it right, it is about having certain standards and 14 values, and I will write to you formally if I may, sir. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I ought to say that in exactly the 16 same way that I have said, that the vast majority of 17 journalists do their job entirely appropriately and 18 perform a very valuable service, exactly the same is so 19 for the police, and nothing that I've said should be 20 construed to the contrary. None of the concerns I have 21 expressed should be taken as expressing a more general 22 view about the police, or the Metropolitan Police in 23 particular, to a contrary effect. 24 A. Thank you, sir. I shall take up that invitation and 25 I'll write to you, sir.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I ought to make it clear, and 2 I didn't quite say this to the others but I'm sure 3 they'll learn it, that of course whatever I receive will 4 become public. 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 MR JAY: I missed out one short point in Mr Quick's 7 evidence. 8 Do you recall, Mr Godwin, the DPP chairing a case 9 conference and indicating that in his view it was in the 10 public interest to continue the investigation? This was 11 before he subsequently came to the conclusion that the 12 investigation would not be continued. 13 A. I didn't go to any case conferences with the DPP. But 14 I am aware that he was continuing it in terms of there 15 were some issues around parliamentary privilege about 16 materials that had been seized. 17 Q. Exactly. Do you remember being briefed on that together 18 with Mr Quick by Commander Sawyer? 19 A. I can remember being briefed. It probably would have 20 been Commander Sawyer. 21 Q. According to Mr Quick, you remarked that Sir Paul 22 Stephenson "would go ballistic and would pull the 23 inquiry anyway". Did you say that or something like 24 that? 25 A. I can't recall the "pull the inquiry" part. I can't --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p>
--	--

<p>1 I'm not suggesting that I didn't say that he might go 2 ballistic. I think one of the issues for us at that 3 point was the amount of time it was taking. There were 4 a number of people involved and it needed some answer to 5 be made around public interest, about constitutional 6 separation, constitutional powers, and it was going on 7 an inordinately long amount of time. That was about the 8 amount of time it was taking as opposed to anything 9 else. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The position wasn't quite as Mr Jay 11 said it. The DPP advised the investigation should 12 continue; he didn't ever stop the investigation. After 13 it had concluded, he reached conclusions about 14 prosecution, but as I understand it said nothing adverse 15 about the fact of the investigation. 16 A. Absolutely. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. Mr Godwin, thank you very 18 much indeed. 19 A. Thank you. 20 MR JAY: It's 10 o'clock Monday. 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I'll remember it this time. 22 10 o'clock Monday. 23 (4.13 pm) 24 (The hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock 25 on Monday, 12 March 2012)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	
---	--

A	11:9 13:14 22:16 32:3 advised 1:21 11:14 17:15 22:17 74:11 Affairs 37:12 afternoon 24:14 agenda 7:25 18:4 agnostic 54:9 agree 28:23 38:10 50:15 57:21 61:14 63:24 agreed 4:23 7:7 30:8 41:5 ahead 35:17 air 12:23 alcohol 53:3 alert 27:15 allegation 30:16 allegations 9:24 16:8 38:21 45:21 68:25 alleged 13:23 allow 70:14 alluded 22:8 alternative 31:6 amount 74:3,7,8 Amy 68:21 analogy 50:21 analytical 56:6 annex 10:5 13:21 25:6 30:15 32:18 announced 36:11 anomalous 62:6 anonymous 61:4 answer 7:9 34:15 52:8 60:20,21 74:4 anticipate 38:8 anxieties 8:11 27:18 anxiety 8:20 10:18 anxious 9:17 64:17 anybody 36:16 48:19 anyway 58:7 64:4 73:23 AP 29:16 apart 44:22 Aphrodite 28:24 apologise 30:8 30:10,12 apologised 32:22 33:3 apparently 32:19 appear 35:10 64:7 appearance 12:8 appeared 8:5,6 12:11 25:10	33:3 appearing 8:2 appears 35:11 55:2 append 39:16,17 appending 39:15 applying 47:23 appointment 5:12 47:17 apportion 59:9 approach 27:5 31:25 40:16 50:21 56:6 approachable 56:16 approached 31:11,13 approaches 43:12 71:10 approaching 31:15 appropriate 5:10 11:24 18:24 38:10 53:8 56:2 59:7 66:5 69:1 appropriately 11:5 62:3 70:18 72:17 approval 53:10 approved 50:24 April 46:24 47:9 areas 51:24 55:2 arguably 16:1 argued 12:10 13:13 argument 12:7 20:6 65:24 arguments 66:1 arisen 71:12 arose 4:18 arranged 53:6 54:2 arrangement 63:11 arrangements 6:22 arranging 3:19 arrest 4:12,20,23 5:10,14,16,24 6:9,10 7:14,20 10:15,23 13:9 13:13 16:22 19:3 20:7 38:2 65:14 66:12 arrested 2:14 7:2 66:7 arresting 16:22 arrests 35:24 72:8 article 24:6,10 25:1 26:18 27:9,12 29:12 30:14 31:3 32:18,24,25 67:3	articles 14:6 42:7 42:14 67:7 asked 11:10,25 16:16 18:21 19:1 23:25 29:11 30:11 40:20 60:19 61:19 65:1,8 68:13 69:4 70:9 asking 31:16 67:25 68:1 aspects 6:3 asserted 24:12 asserting 24:8 assertions 7:23 assess 27:21 assist 3:9 24:1 26:5 assistance 23:23 Assistant 4:19 15:21 40:19 49:10,24 58:1 68:18 69:16 assisted 68:5 associated 28:3 29:14,15,16 31:12 Association 53:11 assuming 33:23 assumptions 62:22 attack 20:19 59:9 attempts 20:4 59:8 attend 5:20 16:16 32:1 53:11,15 65:9 attention 18:2 36:3 66:20 67:21,22 attitude 10:17 attracts 23:10 43:19 attributable 13:11 attributed 34:10 auditing 57:25 author 33:5 42:14 authorised 14:17 authorities 5:6 Authority 11:6 58:12 automatically 28:15 57:17 available 21:7 avoid 61:24 Award 53:15 awards 53:13 aware 15:6,10,18 17:11 26:10 27:23,23 42:6 42:13 54:19	55:4 69:10 73:14 B back 13:3 14:10 14:11 15:20 21:24 24:3,14 30:4 31:9 32:7 34:4 35:8 38:23 41:19 43:9 background 1:5 41:3 bad 52:3,5 bail 5:23 balance 65:17 72:12 balancing 6:5 ballistic 73:22 74:2 Balls 3:22 bar 3:16 41:9 barracks 43:17 bars 41:24 basically 20:11 basis 5:14 19:13 39:9 72:3 bat 62:18 battering 66:23 bearing 26:1 began 16:12 behalf 27:2,3 behaviour 57:5 62:6 behaviours 27:6 Belgravia 7:3 belief 6:7 22:20 39:18 believe 2:12 10:14 25:20 48:7 58:25 69:13 believed 15:15 benefit 37:14 70:12,21,22 benefits 72:5 bespoke 22:8 better 16:3 39:3 53:24 54:4 63:20 65:24 beyond 37:2 big 23:10 67:23 bit 8:15 24:16 42:5 52:12 55:7 70:8 bits 19:24 68:3 bitter 11:17 Blair 9:12 42:8 71:19 blame 59:9 blatant 26:20 bluntly 15:23 board 55:23 57:25 Bob 25:24 28:15 33:18	body 6:14 69:2 bogus 24:25 Boris 10:9 borne 16:21 borough 22:14 bottom 59:15 bound 7:17 bravery 53:13 break 48:25 49:3 bribe 43:12 bride 21:8 brief 34:24 briefed 2:5 4:20 6:24 7:19 33:11 40:22 42:10 73:17,19 briefing 1:7 8:1 14:8,10,16,21 14:25 16:1 33:7 35:1 61:4 briefings 40:21 bright 10:25 bring 35:24 51:9 bringing 13:3 British 12:15 broader 44:4 70:25 broadly 60:1 69:24 Brothers 3:22 built 8:18 31:24 38:15 burden 63:23 bureaucracy 63:23 64:1 bureaucratic 64:5 business 21:3,4 21:17,20,21 22:1,2,7,16 24:6,20 25:12 25:14,16 27:16 28:1,7,8,11,24 30:24 31:4,7 33:13 51:25 67:5 businesslike 40:17 C Cabinet 1:7 4:1 17:1,13 19:22 19:24 20:2 calibration 71:10 call 5:25 8:7,15 20:25 23:6 24:4 called 15:14 21:1 21:2 44:19 45:3 caller 23:13 calling 63:4 calls 62:14 67:10 67:16 Cameron 32:21	campaign 34:12 car 21:3,4 23:1,9 25:9,12,15,23 28:16 30:17 31:4 33:13 35:6,7,9 career 44:17 49:21 carried 5:5 carry 12:15 carrying 65:12 cars 21:21,23 25:13 28:9 case 8:21 16:10 18:10 24:25 27:13 31:20 32:1,7 37:3,7 42:13 43:15,18 46:25 56:14 65:25 73:8,13 cases 27:23 38:10,11,11 39:3 41:4 43:15 68:15 cash 11:13,19,21 caused 67:7 celebrity 50:23 51:3 central 20:6 centrally 64:7 centre 10:9 certain 6:3 19:18 52:18 55:2 72:13 certainly 8:6 29:25 45:23 53:2 57:9 66:22 cessation 19:9 cetera 51:23 54:2 54:3 56:20 57:6 63:12 66:24 chairing 73:8 chairman 6:16 11:6 49:14 challenge 19:12 27:6 38:22 65:21 66:15 71:23 challenged 19:11 challenges 18:14 61:23 challenging 45:17 68:10 chances 12:24 13:24 change 10:16 changes 66:13 charge 14:18 chauffeur 33:12 chauffeurs 25:17 25:20 chief 11:3 12:14 50:23 51:3 65:11
----------	---	--	---	---	---	--

chief's 30:17	26:3 34:14	concluded 74:13	contacts 40:10	coverage 51:5	67:10	diaried 40:17
children 27:18	38:5 39:17	conclusion 12:19	53:1 57:24	CPS 1:20 11:11	days 9:13 20:22	diaries 58:25,25
chimes 50:6	44:7 45:13,22	19:2 20:6 37:6	58:17,19	17:15 18:19	24:17 56:12	diary 64:3
Christmas 53:12	70:7	37:9 39:12	contained 29:2	32:3	deadline 16:13	Dick 1:13,23
67:20	comments 34:10	73:11	context 54:1,5	CRA 40:21,24	deal 1:5 6:8	24:8,21
Christopher 2:9	commercial	conclusions	64:14 66:22	create 26:20	13:17 20:17	Dick's 17:13
5:23	43:23,24	19:16 44:1	continuance	70:16	62:2 64:9,10	dictating 18:7
circumstances	commissioned	74:13	32:5	created 43:6	64:12	died 43:16
4:12 60:22	37:17 39:19	conditions 36:9	continue 9:3	52:8	dearly 43:2	difference 47:16
cited 38:19	Commissioner	Condon 71:19	32:8 73:10	creates 30:23	debate 60:7	55:21 56:1,1
city 51:9	1:24,25 4:20	conduct 45:11	74:12	credibility 51:4	debates 54:5	different 24:18
civil 2:8,13	9:15 13:12,24	55:19 58:10	continued 18:3	Cressida 1:13	December 9:11	26:12 29:16
claim 3:6	14:18 15:10,21	59:23 61:11	66:21 73:12	17:13	16:13,15 19:15	33:4 37:13
claimed 2:24	15:23,25 16:4	68:14 72:7	continuing 73:14	crime 4:2 51:9	20:22 24:4	53:22 55:16
3:10 6:2 7:6	16:16 40:20	conference 4:5	contract 46:23	51:23 52:16,17	25:7 44:5	56:15,17 58:18
claims 13:14	42:9,16 47:17	32:1,7 73:9	47:8	53:11 54:7	46:14 64:13	64:11,19 71:6
clear 8:21 9:2,6	47:24 49:10,24	conferences	contrary 72:20	66:9	65:7 67:8	71:8,9,10,11
17:3,12,14	49:25 50:1	73:13	72:23	criminal 1:22	decide 5:16	differently 66:6
19:11 26:5,25	54:13 56:10	confidence 58:13	controversial	16:7 17:4,12	decided 36:6	difficult 36:1
30:25 32:21	58:1,4 64:20	confidential 37:1	7:17,21 8:18	17:14,15,17,19	decision 6:17,20	38:18 43:1
36:24 44:3	64:21,23 65:8	59:11	10:22,23	18:16 20:3,13	26:19 35:23	45:12,15,22
49:9 52:24	68:18 69:5,11	confidently	controversy 8:18	20:14 36:24	38:1	61:11,13
58:16 59:25	70:11,12	24:11	30:7 31:23	37:2 49:12	decision-making	difficulty 52:20
61:11 62:12	Commissioners	conflict 40:4	convened 12:22	critical 7:13	5:9 6:14,16	dimensions 6:19
73:1	69:15,16	conflicting 56:4	conversation	19:19 23:19	declare 32:20	dinner 53:2
clearly 9:19 12:2	committed 9:7	conjured 26:12	2:25 3:3 6:1,2	42:8,15	declined 7:8	direct 31:25 40:4
26:15	committee 37:12	connect 28:17	24:8 29:9	criticised 5:13	Deepcut 43:16	direction 11:1
client 21:1,16,18	40:2,5,5	connected 27:16	39:14 46:22	criticism 7:18	43:16	50:12
21:25 23:6	common 40:15	connection 22:2	48:5,8	18:15 37:8	defined 6:12	directly 69:7,12
clients 21:15	55:18 56:5,11	22:5	convicting 36:23	crossed 14:6	39:1	Director 31:19
30:23	Commons 40:2	connectivity	convinced 45:6	41:21 42:2	deflect 4:2	36:20
client's 21:18	communicated	58:15	cope 71:12	48:3	delay 35:6	Directorate 4:16
close 1:16 13:12	36:15	consent 5:5	copy 9:5	current 41:3	democracy	dirt 3:4
15:10,19 36:7	communicating	consequence	cordial 44:25	60:9	10:21 44:10	disagree 37:22
39:7 43:19	11:16	35:6	corporate 63:17	currently 26:21	demolish 15:8	37:23
53:17 57:11	communications	consequences	correct 1:10 2:11	cut 11:14	Denis 37:17,24	disapproval
61:7	4:8 8:24	12:3 27:8,10	2:22 3:17 4:7	cynical 26:14	38:3,5,5 39:8	53:10,19
closed 50:9	company 28:4,5	36:3	5:7 7:5,10 8:10		39:15 70:6,21	disapprove
closely 49:11	completed 16:11	consequently	14:3 16:19	D	deny 33:11	54:17
closer 39:21,24	completely 24:9	18:6	23:5 25:8	DAC 1:12,23	department 9:25	disciplinary
59:19	44:24	Conservative	28:21 29:24	4:19	depending 51:22	17:20
club 23:10	completing	29:21 32:20	30:19 31:5,8	daft 21:23	deprecated	discipline 17:2
colleague 32:6	18:18	34:5	31:23 33:9	Daily 13:22	50:24	disclosed 59:11
38:19	complex 41:3	Conservatives	37:11,21 39:10	23:18 42:7	deputy 1:12,24	discover 19:18
colleagues 3:21	compromised	30:9	45:15 50:1,14	damage 3:4	4:19 9:15	discuss 55:9
8:3 10:18	9:8 35:22 43:6	consider 40:6	54:12 61:8,9	damaged 13:24	16:16 49:25	discussed 7:20
15:18 26:9	computer 28:11	consideration	62:8	Dame 70:6	54:13 58:1	discussions 36:6
35:1 42:1,25	61:21	63:10	corrupt 29:23	Damian 1:4 2:16	65:8 68:18	disingenuous
55:14	conceded 24:15	considerations	corruption 43:22	23:19 25:2	69:5,11,15	25:3
collusion 44:11	conceding 26:10	5:17,18	72:7,8	27:13 38:2	70:12	dispirited 8:17
combustible	conceived 50:18	considered 20:2	council 22:15	64:14 65:13	derived 50:22	disproportionate
15:22	concept 56:5	49:13	49:13	dampen 26:6	described 13:25	5:15 16:24
come 29:1 39:12	concern 1:7	Constable 12:14	counter 43:21	dangerous 38:12	descriptions 3:2	19:4 20:8
52:24 54:22	10:19 16:7	constantly 17:17	counter-terror...	data 35:13 61:24	deserve 43:8	65:18
55:16	67:1,8 69:19	66:15	24:23 27:17	61:24	designated 12:15	distance 43:5
comes 58:25	72:1	constituency 7:3	34:21 40:21,25	databases 61:19	designed 62:4	44:23
comfort 8:15	concerned 8:16	constitutional	41:4	date 47:5	desirable 10:24	distressed 67:19
comfortable	11:5 12:22	55:7 66:24	country 27:15	dated 49:16	despite 7:14 9:3	document 48:6
55:25	14:5,22 18:11	74:5,6	71:7	David 32:21 33:6	detail 20:20	documents 1:19
coming 67:20	19:18 45:18	construct 19:9	course 5:14 8:17	Davis 2:24 33:6	35:16 45:19	2:14,15 9:1,9
commander 4:14	53:16 57:2	construed 72:20	22:19 23:15,20	day 2:12,19 5:24	54:20,22 70:9	doing 9:23 11:16
32:6 49:24	concerns 10:13	consulted 1:21	28:20 29:4	9:10 22:4 24:3	detailed 3:12	20:12 24:17
73:18,20	10:15 13:7	contact 24:1 40:9	32:12,15 34:21	24:5 29:10	detected 10:15	28:15 46:6
commanders	15:4,19 45:23	41:6 58:15	43:3,17,20	30:7 34:22	10:16	51:7,22 52:16
32:1	58:8 72:20	59:7,25 63:21	48:15 57:18	35:1,3 36:2,9	deterrence 61:16	52:19 64:4
comment 7:8	conclude 36:18	64:3 68:3,6	70:20 73:3	37:24 63:4	developed 56:18	69:8

doomed 11:11	enjoyed 56:23	examine 12:2	feature 21:17	49:18 53:2	25:14 31:23	grips 12:24
doubtless 32:4	enjoying 21:12	examining 12:18	Fedorcio 23:24	68:25 69:6	32:3 51:4 61:3	group 6:5,11,13
Dowler 43:17	enormous 18:9	example 15:6	24:1 26:5 27:1	formally 71:25	62:16,16	6:14,17 29:13
Downing 35:19	47:16	53:14	28:13 41:11	72:14	giving 18:25 43:7	41:1
DPA 51:16 60:1	enquired 3:8	excesses 55:2	feel 10:10,11	formed 15:4 20:5	56:25 60:24	guarded 43:4
60:3 62:13,25	enter 5:17 11:6	exchange 13:25	13:4 24:24	former 15:9	GLA 63:19	Guardian 32:18
DPP 31:25 32:2	entertaining	exclusives 43:25	26:6,8,24 27:5	25:16,19 38:19	go 6:6,18 18:8	45:16
73:8,13 74:11	52:25	exercise 1:13,15	37:25 55:24	forthcoming	31:9 34:23	guess 9:5 16:7
DPP's 37:14	entirely 34:11	exercised 48:21	64:8	26:24	35:17 41:22	28:13 30:3,22
DPS 61:13	entitled 21:5	exist 26:21	felt 11:11 12:16	forthright 23:8	55:1 73:13,22	35:5 37:20
drag 30:6	environment	exonerated	12:23,25 13:23	forward 5:2 6:8	74:1	38:4 39:4
dreadfully 68:10	43:24,24 53:9	69:20	16:13 24:25	14:20 19:17	Godwin 9:15	Guild 25:20
drinks 41:9	55:25 57:8	expect 14:21	26:20,22 29:12	35:24 55:10	16:16 17:25	guy 15:14
drive 21:21,23	envisaged 17:2	17:21	31:21,23,24	found 4:8 15:11	49:5,7,9,15	
driver 22:9	equally 68:9 72:5	expecting 7:18	32:2,8 38:2,17	16:25 17:16	51:11 55:10	H
drivers 24:7	equation 45:14	experience 11:17	55:6 56:21,22	21:13,13 22:20	56:21 58:7	hacking 38:21
drop 11:25 16:10	especially 50:20	11:20 38:24	65:17	35:18 41:22	59:3 62:11	handed 3:13
dropping 47:22	essence 1:14 21:4	43:21 70:13	fermenting 25:5	four 2:20 43:16	64:25 67:3	35:1,4
due 11:12	essentially 1:20	experienced 6:15	field 57:19	framed 70:14	70:2,5 73:8	handling 23:19
duties 18:12	6:16 12:25	43:14	fiercely 43:24	frank 13:25	74:17	hang 19:9
duty 9:23	21:11 28:10,16	explain 54:1	figures 7:13	fray 11:7	goes 72:9	happen 10:1
	37:25	explained 34:19	Filkin 44:8 70:7	frenetic 34:22	going 4:6 10:19	62:20
E	establish 45:11	explanations	70:23	frequency 54:14	14:17 15:25	happened 6:21
earlier 17:7	established 2:6	16:6 42:18	final 16:21 69:9	frequently 57:14	17:20 18:17	11:18 12:12
32:17 44:17	12:4 37:3	exposed 63:20	finally 6:20	57:15	20:17 21:17	14:5 16:12
59:22	40:23	expressed 8:11	find 3:11 8:13	Friday 23:25	24:2,6,10,18	19:14 31:7,18
early 10:13	establishment	10:14 18:24	21:15 24:2,24	friend 16:3	32:24 33:18	34:16,20 45:13
41:19 45:24	44:20	65:13 72:21	28:14 39:7	friends 31:12	43:9 46:22	66:1 70:20
economically 1:5	et 51:23 54:2,3	expressing 72:21	findings 16:18	36:7	47:2,21 48:19	happening 14:23
economy 4:2	56:20 57:6	expressly 37:8	16:20,20 37:19	front-page 24:11	62:9 63:24	happy 25:25
editor 26:16 27:5	63:12 66:24	extent 41:6 68:5	37:20,23	fucking 33:18	65:4 74:6	26:19
effect 1:15 2:25	ethical 6:7	extraordinary	firm 5:1 28:7	full 44:10	Gold 6:4,11,13	hard 52:22
7:7 32:14 38:9	evening 8:8 10:8	15:12 16:25	30:17	fully 33:16 34:19	6:14	harmful 59:11
40:22 72:23	53:14	extremely 55:15	first 4:16 10:7	functions 18:12	good 4:5 9:5 15:7	haste 12:23
effective 6:8	event 5:8 17:14	61:11 67:19	13:9 20:12	furiously 13:13	35:11 44:14	head 8:19 12:8
efforts 51:6	31:3	extremist 28:14	28:2 29:3	further 22:23	47:14 48:12	24:23 27:16
either 34:8 36:23	events 10:1	extremists 27:24	39:24 45:17,19	30:14 31:21	49:1 52:3,5,17	31:24 36:19
59:9 61:6	21:10 23:25	eyes 18:5,6	50:5 58:2	42:5 62:6	53:25 60:14	40:3
elaborate 6:9	34:17 36:14		60:12 67:7,13	future 38:14	Googled 28:25	heard 16:17 24:3
Elizabeth 44:8	43:15,19 45:16	F	fit 69:19	47:5 63:7	gossip 52:21 57:3	33:7 40:16
70:6,23	53:5,12 54:1	face 47:4	five 2:11		57:9,10,13	50:6 54:10,21
email 3:18,19	55:6 56:8	fact 15:15 23:4	fixated 21:20	G	60:24	64:6 65:5
embarrass 59:9	57:16 58:23	36:15 55:11,12	fleet 21:6	Galley 2:9,17,19	government 3:4	hearing 74:24
embarrassing	70:18	56:21 57:4	focus 18:17	3:2,12,19,24	9:24	heart 20:4
55:3 57:4	eventually 69:20	61:14 69:17,19	50:18 51:13	4:9,15 5:23	grateful 70:8	heat 29:19 30:3
emerged 25:12	69:21	74:15	focused 35:22	36:24 66:6	71:20	heavily 38:3
71:2	everybody 5:15	facts 7:23 18:15	52:14	Galley's 3:6	great 51:7	held 9:1 10:24
emphasis 17:16	evidence 4:8	18:16 19:7,13	focusing 48:19	Garnham 46:11	greater 30:7	60:18
50:24 51:13	5:16 12:1,18	37:7 45:12	folder 35:5	46:14,18,19	51:14 63:8,15	help 39:6 41:17
emphatically	15:3 16:21	fair 33:25 37:10	follow 4:22 37:4	47:12 48:15,17	Green 1:4 2:16	68:12 70:8
33:11	18:25 20:16,18	50:3,4 51:20	38:17 56:4	48:21 65:1	2:24,25 3:3,6,8	helping 3:11
employed 25:21	33:7 36:22	51:21 55:18	57:14	general 40:8	3:10,13,14,19	hidden 72:2
employment 3:9	37:10 38:20	false 14:4,4	followed 66:3	50:5 54:19	4:9,15 6:1,2,8	hiding 60:18
3:11	40:1,15 43:13	families 21:7	following 5:14	72:21	7:2,14 10:15	high 43:14 44:25
enable 63:11	49:18 50:6	41:22	5:24 9:10 24:3	generally 50:15	16:22 19:3	45:5 51:15,17
endorsement	51:2,3 52:24	family 20:19	30:15 46:23	51:8	20:5,7 23:19	52:2
21:19	59:16,21 60:14	26:22 31:13,16	47:8 50:7	getting 12:24	25:2 26:15	highest 70:10
engage 40:11	61:10 64:6	36:6 67:20,22	51:19	18:17 44:13	27:11,13 29:22	highly 19:19
engaged 27:15	65:5,6 68:24	67:24 68:11	follows 37:24	67:21,22 68:2	31:9,18 33:23	42:15
57:5	71:18 73:7	family's 27:14	footing 5:1	68:5 72:12	34:1,13 36:19	hindsight 45:12
engagement	evidential 36:18	fan 23:10	force 43:19	gifts 55:8 58:17	36:23 38:2	45:14,23
41:24 44:25	evolution 51:5	far 38:1 48:16	forces 27:25 71:6	give 19:6 20:18	40:5 64:14	hinting 42:5
engagements	exactly 60:3	50:10	71:9	33:7 60:10	65:13	hire 21:8 23:4,7
59:19	67:18 69:23,25	favourable 43:7	form 49:17 60:2	71:14	Green's 2:23	23:9,16,17
engaging 57:15	72:15,18 73:17	favoured 55:22	61:15 68:23	given 3:10 12:17	3:24 4:4,12 8:2	25:9,12,15
England 49:11		fear 10:18	formal 40:16	14:14 19:2	grievance 34:11	30:17 31:4

hiring 25:22	inclination 62:12	instigated 12:14	24:16 25:2	39:11 65:9,12	11:18 22:4,6	48:12,15,18,23
hold 10:21	include 70:11	instituted 7:1	26:15 29:22	66:2,16	26:17 27:2,4	49:1,6,9 54:8
home 1:9,16 2:8	including 3:14	institution 44:19	31:9,18,20,22	Johnston's 16:17	33:21,24 38:6	54:24 55:11,20
3:15 17:9	5:22 25:12	institutions	32:2,16 36:19	37:19,23 39:10	41:12 42:11	56:2 65:16
25:13 27:19	41:13 67:11	10:21 44:23	37:4,5 38:9	65:22	51:20 60:1	66:5 67:12,14
28:9,10 34:24	inconsistent 47:9	45:1	39:5,20 45:17	join 41:2	62:20,22 71:21	69:14 70:5
36:5 37:12,17	inconvenient	instructed 1:12	45:20 61:15	Jones 28:19	knowledge 29:5	72:15 73:1
39:20	36:1	1:23	66:21 70:23	journalist 14:7	59:13 60:21	74:10,17,21
homes 41:22	incorrect 30:20	instructions 72:3	73:10,12 74:11	15:7,13,15		licence 22:18,19
honest 26:8,24	32:4	insufficient	74:12,15	21:1 23:16	L	30:18,21,22
honesty 55:19	independently	36:22	investigations	29:10,11,13	Labour 3:4	licences 30:25
56:19	70:1	integrity 55:19	38:17 70:22	63:3	laced 27:12	licensing 22:12
honours 11:13	indicated 2:15	56:19	72:8	journalistic	lack 70:17	22:21
11:19,21	31:20 32:7	intending 36:15	invidious 51:17	22:24	laid 71:24	life 67:24
hospitality 55:3	46:15,21	46:23	invitation 5:19	journalists 31:13	lapse 36:3	light 5:22 10:25
55:5,8 58:17	indicating 47:20	interaction	72:24	31:14 40:10,21	large 42:7	58:12,14
58:20 63:17	73:9	56:12	invite 5:11 41:1	40:24 41:7,13	late 2:12 4:19	likes 66:25
hosted 53:12	indication 56:24	interactions 53:8	invited 41:9	41:21 42:22,25	launched 59:14	limited 28:5
hour 25:23 35:18	individual 8:22	54:20 56:23	65:19	43:12,23 61:22	61:12	51:16 57:19
house 21:2,18	15:2,3 51:8,15	57:21 63:18	inviting 16:23	62:13,15,20	law 37:2	line 13:4,10
27:20 28:12	51:17 52:2,14	intercept 8:23	involve 42:1	72:17	lawful 5:5 19:3	14:14 18:25
40:2	55:1	Interceptor	involved 2:16	judge 49:11	65:16,17	19:15 67:13
huge 7:22 11:20	individualised	22:25	4:25 17:18,21	judgment 25:11	lead 66:12	lines 65:14 66:3
26:8 38:6 43:1	51:13	interest 21:14	21:6 59:18	27:13 39:17	leading 4:12	66:24
hugely 35:13	individuals	22:1 23:10	72:11 74:4	43:10,13 52:1	leak 2:12 61:10	link 24:22,24
39:25 48:21	27:24 50:19	32:9 55:9,13	involvement	52:5 69:18	61:12,15	65:5
human 56:20	52:19 59:16,17	69:21 73:10	2:23 6:4	July 45:10 46:3	leaked 3:13 4:1	linked 2:11,12
	59:18	74:5	involving 69:6	49:25 57:23	32:11	2:21 26:15
I	inevitable 10:24	interesting 33:5	issue 14:20 22:12	68:16	leaking 37:1	linking 33:6
Ian 9:12 12:14	37:4	50:17 51:1,24	25:1 57:8 60:5	June 68:16	leaks 1:8 2:10,20	literally 35:8
39:9,11 66:2	inference 30:23	interests 69:22	62:9 68:20,21	jurisprudence	9:5 12:5 17:6	litre 25:23
66:16	influential 7:13	69:1 72:6	69:1 72:6	38:15	37:3 39:20	little 52:25 70:8
idea 14:11 26:4	53:14	interpretation	issues 4:17,25	justice 1:3 13:3	57:4 60:5	load 12:1
33:21 49:1	inform 20:25	45:16	6:5,19 12:25	13:16,20 17:18	63:12	local 21:16 41:9
55:13	information 1:9	intervene 27:2	31:21 44:15	28:1,5,7,19	learn 35:20	41:24
identified 44:9	5:21,22 37:1	intervening 27:1	45:7 49:12	29:16 31:10,17	70:20 73:3	location 28:10
45:6	43:2 51:16	intervention	71:12 73:15	33:1,16,25	learned 37:18	logically 57:19
identify 51:17	59:10 60:25	17:4	74:2	39:6,16 46:2,5	39:19 63:18	logistical 35:3
62:1,2	63:24 66:12,13	interventions		46:8,13,17	leave 59:23	London 10:8
ignored 13:14	informed 4:14	30:4	J	47:14,20 48:1	led 34:17 38:20	36:11 43:19
imagine 48:21	14:14	interview 3:2	January 49:16	48:12,15,18,23	48:6	51:10 54:7
immediately	initial 17:11	5:11,20 7:8	50:3	49:1,6,9,12	left 7:11 35:18	64:4
18:20 32:22	29:20	16:23 21:3	Jay 1:4 13:21	54:8,24 55:11	52:4	long 74:7
Immigration	initially 2:20	53:5 65:19	17:23 28:24	55:20 56:2	legal 4:17 5:1	look 10:7
2:16	4:21 7:6	interviewed 2:19	29:9,17 31:18	65:16 66:5	24:13 38:16	looked 9:17
impact 6:10	inordinately	4:1 7:6,7	33:5,22 34:4	67:12,14 69:14	legitimacy 26:17	22:19 57:17
10:16 18:9	74:7	interviews 54:2	39:24 45:25	70:5 72:15	legitimate 11:22	64:17
27:10,14,21	inquiries 59:14	48:25 49:5,8	48:25 49:5,8	73:1 74:10,17	18:16 19:10	looking 14:13
60:25 67:23	61:10,13 71:13	49:15 54:18	49:15 54:18	74:21	25:14	32:25 42:20
impacted 26:21	inquiry 6:3,12	55:8 56:21	55:8 56:21	justifiable 27:7	lens 35:11	44:4,5,6 45:8
impacting 32:15	11:11 12:3,19	65:17 66:18	65:17 66:18	justify 16:22	lessons 37:18	58:23,24 63:7
impartial 65:25	13:17 16:7,11	67:13,15 69:17	67:13,15 69:17		39:19 63:18	63:14
implicated 32:13	27:12 30:5	70:2 73:6	70:2 73:6	K	letter 17:11	Lord 1:3 13:3,16
implications	32:5,8,12	74:10,20	74:10,20	K 10:5	letters 1:17 8:24	13:20 17:18
44:11	33:23 34:1,13	Jensen 22:25	Jensen 22:25	keen 26:18	letting 58:14	28:1,5,7,19
implied 14:19	39:23 40:6	23:7,14 25:23	23:7,14 25:23	keep 40:16	let's 4:5	29:16 31:10,17
impliedly 37:8	45:7,24 49:15	job 3:7 15:7,23	job 3:7 15:7,23	Keir 31:19	level 7:18 41:23	33:1,16,25
important 16:9	49:18 50:7	43:1 47:23	43:1 47:23	Kent 7:3	55:5	34:9 39:6,16
19:19 20:17	51:19 54:21,23	70:15 72:17	70:15 72:17	kept 28:10	Leveson 1:3 13:3	46:2,5,8,13,17
38:4 44:15	56:7 58:22	jockeying 15:24	jockeying 15:24	key 61:23 72:1	13:16,20 17:18	47:14,20 48:1
improving 16:2	64:6 66:3,14	John 38:19 50:12	John 38:19 50:12	kind 14:5 35:16	28:1,5,7,19	48:12,15,18,23
inappropriate	71:3 73:23,25	Johnson 10:9	Johnson 10:9	kindly 49:15	29:16 31:10,17	49:1,6,9 54:8
10:11,12 12:17	insights 44:17	Johnston 12:14	Johnston 12:14	knew 7:24 8:25	33:1,16,25	54:24 55:11,20
42:20 57:1	insofar 7:23	16:12 19:2,6	16:12 19:2,6	43:21	34:9 39:6,16	56:2 65:16
incident 39:9	65:24 67:2	19:14,20 20:7	19:14,20 20:7	knifing 16:2	46:2,5,8,13,17	66:5 67:12,14
incidents 43:20	instances 59:6	20:23 37:25	20:23 37:25	know 3:22 11:18	47:14,20 48:1	69:14 70:5

71:19,19,19 72:15 73:1 74:10,17,21 losses 11:15 lot 23:10 28:21 35:15 59:3 67:21 lots 34:22 44:15 51:7,7 Lucy 41:13 lunch 41:2	63:13 66:6 meaning 47:22 means 47:23 55:12 meant 51:4 measures 6:9 media 8:18 9:4 13:8,15 18:1,4 18:5,14 20:19 27:15 40:9 50:8,18 51:5 52:20 53:2,5 53:13,23,25 54:6 56:12 57:3,16,24 58:10,17 59:7 59:8,25 61:2 63:9,11,22 66:20,23 68:20 meet 3:20 41:1 meeting 3:15 9:10 16:15,17 17:12,13,23 18:1,20 19:11 46:14 57:15 64:15 65:7,9 65:12,21 66:19 meetings 3:13 54:14,15 meets 53:19 member 5:10 49:13 58:11 members 25:20 27:25 55:22 57:24 59:6 men 72:10 mentality 56:14 mention 6:3 merit 66:1 merited 12:19 merits 52:15 message 3:23 met 13:1 15:21 16:9 30:6 38:16 40:19 42:15 43:21 52:7 53:9 55:15,23 70:10 71:5,8 Metropolitan 11:8 13:5,10 15:8 39:20 41:20 49:23 52:15 56:9 60:16 64:24 70:15 72:22 Mike 41:14 mile 25:23 million 24:22 Milly 43:17 mind 14:7 26:1 29:25 41:21 42:2 59:4 minds 38:13 mindset 57:20 mine 6:17 54:1	minimise 6:10 Minister 1:18 2:16 8:25 34:24 misconduct 57:6 68:17 69:6 misconstrued 32:3 48:10 mishandling 61:24 misinterpreted 53:18 54:15 misleading 31:3 missed 73:6 misusing 62:2 mitigate 35:23 mix 15:22 42:22 Mm 23:12 mobile 3:24 62:15,16 63:4 mobilised 29:21 modifications 27:22 moment 18:13 20:17 29:19 30:3 47:15 52:25 momentary 36:3 Monday 9:10 44:6,6 60:4 74:20,22,25 money 24:16 monitor 62:1 months 21:12 47:21 morning 35:4 motives 27:6 motorcar 23:1 move 19:17 26:14,20 27:20 55:10 moved 5:2,9 32:19 moving 5:19 MP 2:16 23:19 MPA's 68:15 MPS 18:2 50:2,8 50:18,20 52:4 59:7,9 60:9 63:12 66:20 MP's 5:4 murder 43:18	66:25 67:19 nature 7:15 22:7 54:19 necessary 4:10 40:6 50:10 necessity 66:10 need 26:1 43:5 45:4,4 56:5 needed 9:6 55:7 66:3 74:4 needs 25:24 26:2 66:13 negative 18:1 66:20 neither 10:12 48:9 never 21:14 new 47:17 64:22 65:9 News 29:16 41:13 newspapers 9:6 10:12 24:22 46:5 night 35:2 37:24 63:5 Nods 40:3 normal 53:5 normally 17:18 64:3 note 4:11 35:1 notice 38:18 64:10 notion 50:23 notwithstanding 5:15 November 2:6 2:14 4:13 7:12 8:8 number 3:2 5:21 15:24 34:23 42:7 43:14 49:12 58:9 59:14 61:12 62:16,21,23 64:8 67:9 74:4 nutshell 34:20,21	63:3 64:16 67:19 71:18 occasion 53:16 62:14 65:19 69:7,10 occasionally 41:25 occasions 41:8 41:15 50:2 odd 71:9 offence 9:7 33:6 36:24 offer 36:7 office 1:8,9,17,19 1:20 2:8 3:15 4:1 5:4 11:10 17:2,9,13 18:21 19:22,25 20:2 39:20 40:18 53:3,6,6 53:13 54:2 64:15 68:2,6,6 10:12 24:22 40:18 60:8 61:5,7,8 69:7 69:20,22 officers 5:25 11:3 21:22 24:7 25:16,19 51:15,18 52:3 56:3 63:21 officials 34:25 off-the-record 61:4 Oh 29:17 59:2 Okay 58:21 60:4 old 23:2 omitted 37:25 once 37:2 ones 57:16 one's 66:8 ongoing 23:20 59:12 open 15:23 50:10 52:9 56:16 60:7 61:21 70:15 opening 52:6 openness 56:13 60:15 72:4 operated 38:25 operating 22:20 30:17,21 operation 7:17 7:20 10:17,22 34:22,22 35:14 35:16,22 64:14 65:13 operational 35:15 59:10 60:25 operations 59:12 61:1 opine 60:7 opportunity 12:2 opposed 16:23	54:1 74:8 opposite 3:22 optimisation 23:3,11 orders 23:14 organisation 45:2 50:9,11 50:19 56:18 61:23 66:25 organisation's 26:23 organised 40:18 original 19:20 26:11 32:3 originally 32:13 ought 26:16,22 36:4 60:13 66:8 72:15 73:1 outburst 33:13 34:4 outcome 38:8 39:5 outcry 11:12 outer 1:19 3:15 outset 17:3 outside 40:7 58:20 outstanding 36:10 overall 1:11 overseeing 11:8 overspeaking 48:17 o'clock 74:20,22 74:24 O'Connor 37:17 44:2,3,4 70:6 O'Connor's 37:24 38:2,3	63:7 65:6 67:13 paragraphs 50:17 62:11 paralysis 70:17 pardon 29:17 65:17 Parliament 5:11 parliamentary 3:7 4:18,25 5:4 5:6 73:15 part 10:17 26:14 44:20 73:25 participate 40:20 41:5 particular 15:1,6 15:9 37:7 50:19 54:3 67:8,25 72:23 particularly 13:8 26:19 61:21 68:2 partly 38:19 partners 52:16 partnerships 21:10 parts 52:13 party 3:7,10 7:25 29:21 32:20 34:5 53:12 passing 4:11 29:25 69:17 patently 34:9 path 53:22 54:3 pattern 37:3 Paul 2:2 6:24 7:19 8:7 9:11 10:1 12:13 13:23 14:10,18 17:25 18:20 26:13 27:1 30:11 45:10 46:15,21 48:5 64:17 65:10,11 66:18 71:16 73:21 Pausing 7:16 people 13:11 15:11,24 18:10 31:15 41:12 51:7 53:14 59:1 63:19 67:10 74:4 people's 38:13 perceived 50:8 perception 27:11 42:19 43:6 50:7 53:17 54:16 57:9 58:9 59:22,23 66:13 72:6 perceptions 57:2 perceptual 53:20 perfectly 18:16 perform 61:1 72:18
<hr/> M M 13:21 machinery 44:21 MacPherson 50:7 Mail 15:7,13,15 21:2,13 22:4 23:18,18 24:2 24:5 25:7 26:10,14 28:17 29:12,13,20 30:14 33:12 34:5 42:7 67:4 68:7 maintain 40:10 majority 72:10 72:16 making 14:7 24:25 37:8 39:13 59:23 66:17 68:16,23 malpractice 44:12 managed 4:2 21:14,18 22:5 management 55:23 57:25 manner 54:14 March 74:25 Mark 68:19 mass 27:15 massively 28:18 material 3:1,5,14 3:14 7:15 17:10 32:10,15 38:1 39:11,18 materials 73:16 matter 1:12 17:2 17:4,17 20:3 39:25 46:19 60:10 66:25 68:25 69:18 matters 1:22 7:11 8:2 18:19 40:8 69:16 mature 10:21 Mayor 10:8,14 36:11 McDowall 4:14 4:20 mean 19:19 28:2 44:24 46:3 47:4 55:16 60:13,13,22	<hr/> M M 13:21 machinery 44:21 MacPherson 50:7 Mail 15:7,13,15 21:2,13 22:4 23:18,18 24:2 24:5 25:7 26:10,14 28:17 29:12,13,20 30:14 33:12 34:5 42:7 67:4 68:7 maintain 40:10 majority 72:10 72:16 making 14:7 24:25 37:8 39:13 59:23 66:17 68:16,23 malpractice 44:12 managed 4:2 21:14,18 22:5 management 55:23 57:25 manner 54:14 March 74:25 Mark 68:19 mass 27:15 massively 28:18 material 3:1,5,14 3:14 7:15 17:10 32:10,15 38:1 39:11,18 materials 73:16 matter 1:12 17:2 17:4,17 20:3 39:25 46:19 60:10 66:25 68:25 69:18 matters 1:22 7:11 8:2 18:19 40:8 69:16 mature 10:21 Mayor 10:8,14 36:11 McDowall 4:14 4:20 mean 19:19 28:2 44:24 46:3 47:4 55:16 60:13,13,22	<hr/> N N 25:6 name 28:1,2,3,3 28:4,7,8,9,22 28:24 29:2,3,3 29:6,7 35:14 51:17 narrow 14:15 national 8:23 9:7 61:21 natural 52:6 62:17 naturally 57:14	<hr/> O O 30:15 objected 19:22 19:24 observation 51:2 observer 65:25 obtain 3:9 44:17 obtained 5:8 7:15 obtaining 51:16 obvious 10:2 34:9 58:6 obviously 4:17 7:25 11:7 22:10 24:9 32:2 35:25 46:5 51:23 57:18 62:23	<hr/> P P 32:18 page 10:8 13:22 29:2 30:16 32:19 59:5 60:5 Palace 7:2 panic 12:23 Panton 41:13 paper 4:2 35:5,8 47:1,7,13 paragraph 2:7 3:12,23 4:9,13 5:3,13 7:12 8:9 16:15 17:23 19:17 20:1,19 20:21 22:23 23:24 26:25 29:10 31:11 36:8,25 37:16 40:9 41:8 43:9 44:1 50:6 51:11 55:10 57:23 59:3,25 60:5 61:12,18		

period 52:17	39:13 44:2	74:6	professions 45:1	quarters 58:9	39:24 46:5	reflect 47:14
periodically 41:1	50:17 51:23	practical 63:13	profile 43:15	question 46:11	64:20	reflected 13:5,10
permission	54:13,17 60:15	precaution 27:22	51:15,18 52:2	46:12 51:1	real 10:18 25:1	regard 70:11
46:12 62:17	60:17 63:22	predecessors	progression 52:6	52:18 60:19	27:4,17	regarding 3:3
persistent 23:7	64:23 66:4,16	40:23 69:10	promoted 49:23	61:20 65:1	realised 30:1	regardless 17:15
23:13	67:2 71:11	predicated 37:19	49:24	66:11 69:9	35:7,21	regards 40:8
person 6:4 17:8	73:6 74:3	preliminary	proper 36:7	questioning	realistic 36:23	register 55:8
17:8 57:11	pointing 19:7	16:18 19:2,15	properly 27:20	26:17	really 11:21	registered 28:4,8
personal 8:24	points 50:5 64:8	65:13	45:5	questions 4:3 7:9	12:17 13:15	relate 33:22
25:22 26:12	police 5:20,24	prematurely	proportionality	21:23 25:11	21:15 26:14	related 7:1 22:18
27:8 40:8,10	7:3,15 9:22	12:12	66:10	46:1,18 49:8	27:5,7 34:14	22:25 64:21
59:13,16 67:21	10:22 11:3,6,8	preoccupied	proportionately	52:8 62:19	37:19,24 42:12	67:4 68:20
67:22	12:15 13:5,10	18:1 66:19	70:13	68:13 70:2	42:16 47:21	relates 67:2
personalised	15:8 17:5,18	prepared 8:22	proposed 4:21	Quick 1:4 3:12	50:23	relating 22:12
51:13	18:5,11,11,13	35:2,4 38:9	proposition 17:1	4:13 7:16	reason 11:22	relation 2:23
personally 21:22	20:12 21:22	70:11	20:2 38:7,12	17:24 25:24	reasonable 60:19	4:15 11:18
64:1 69:8 71:7	24:7 25:16,19	presence 40:17	38:18 39:22	28:3,15 29:2	reasons 10:2	25:1 33:8
personnel 43:11	27:25 37:4	present 64:15,16	prosecute 61:14	29:11 33:18	53:20 59:8	34:13 36:18
person's 11:7	38:8,13,14,24	presently 49:12	prosecution	34:16 39:6	recall 41:8,15	38:4 68:14
perspective 27:9	38:24 39:21	presidential	74:14	44:1 45:25	46:19 64:19,19	relations 40:16
44:16	41:20 43:1,11	50:21	Prosecutions	46:8,12,15,19	64:20 65:19	44:25
persuade 20:4	43:23 44:10,18	presiding 49:10	31:19 36:21	47:15 48:13	67:3,5,18 68:1	relationship
persuaded 16:10	44:23 45:2	press 8:1,2 10:4	prospect 36:23	64:6,13,16,16	68:2,4,16 69:8	40:23 42:4
phase 13:17	49:22,23 50:23	10:20 13:4,18	protect 61:24	64:18 65:1,8	73:8,25	52:9 53:17,23
philosophies	51:3,15,18	14:9,16,21,25	protected 1:8	65:21 66:18	receive 18:2	53:25 63:10
60:16	52:3,15 56:3,9	15:5 29:14	protracted 39:2	67:2,9,25	32:15 66:20	relationships
phone 38:21	58:11 59:12	40:17,18 51:14	48:4	73:18,21	71:20 73:3	13:17 15:4,11
62:15,16	60:6,7,8,10,17	51:14 52:2	prove 30:6	quickly 12:24	received 5:3 8:7	15:20 52:19
photographed	61:2,5,7,8,19	53:6,8,13	provide 36:22	30:5 32:19	11:9 20:25	58:10
35:19	61:21 63:9,21	57:10,12,15,21	70:12	35:9	62:14 70:25	relatively 14:15
photographer	64:24 70:15	59:20 64:20	provided 5:5	Quicks 28:21	recognised 7:20	relaying 6:1
35:10	72:2,10,19,22	68:2,5,6	49:15	Quick's 33:12	30:5	released 5:23
picked 44:15	72:22	pressure 12:9	proximity 57:12	65:6 67:4,15	recognition 17:7	relevant 13:16
picture 25:9	policy 60:9	13:1 43:1	PSCSC 69:2,7	73:6	42:24	38:1 45:7 69:2
36:18 70:25	polite 23:8	presumably	69:12	quite 1:5 9:21	recollection	relied 38:14
piece 13:21	political 7:25	28:25	psychological	13:19 15:10	39:14 48:11	rely 38:3
20:16,18 25:6	12:9 50:21	pretty 15:7 35:10	43:5 44:22	21:23 22:22	recommendati...	remained 45:9
33:6 44:14	politicians 8:1	55:18	public 7:13 18:6	24:16 28:21	70:14	remark 8:14,16
47:1,1,12	10:11 13:18	previous 15:9	19:21 27:11	35:25 42:15	recontacted 5:24	9:22
pieces 5:21	position 5:19	20:21	31:19 32:9,13	45:5 47:25	record 57:24	remarked 73:21
place 6:10,22	11:7 15:25	Prime 1:18 8:25	36:21 50:8	48:4 55:15	58:16,17,18,19	remarks 30:9,11
12:13 17:9	16:2,3 26:2	34:24	69:18,21 71:3	73:2 74:10	58:21	remember 29:5
20:12 61:15,25	30:6 36:5	prior 7:19 23:6	72:11 73:4,10	quotation 3:18	recorded 60:1	41:18 67:16
72:4	44:18 60:20	private 1:17,20	74:5		recording 63:21	68:21 73:17,19
placed 13:1	71:8,14 74:10	3:15	publication 27:9	R	records 52:17	74:21
places 33:4	positions 55:15	privilege 4:18,25	63:16,17	raise 14:20	redacted 19:21	remove 45:14
plainly 10:1	positive 3:11	40:2 73:15	publish 24:12,22	raised 22:14,14	19:23	removed 9:9
plan 7:1 33:8	possibility 48:2	probably 28:8	pubs 41:24	25:11 58:8	redress 24:13	removing 1:19
plank 20:6	63:1	39:3 40:6 41:6	pull 73:22,25	69:1	reduce 52:16	renew 46:23
planned 21:8	possible 29:14	57:7 58:6	purely 57:8	ran 28:11 33:12	reducing 54:7	47:8,21
planning 46:16	48:4 64:11	73:19	purpose 58:6,7,8	range 6:5,18	reduction 51:9	renewing 47:23
play 5:17 52:10	65:25	problem 35:23	pursue 61:13	34:13 42:14	52:17	repeated 33:4
52:12,13	possibly 8:22	53:16 64:5	62:6 63:12	59:8	refer 14:12 58:16	repeatedly 42:8
please 5:12 23:23	13:19 62:9	problems 35:3	pursued 62:18	rank 49:23 69:6	61:18	report 14:4
39:6 41:17	post 45:9	procedure 38:16	purview 60:24	70:10	reference 2:5	16:21 19:14
44:7 49:5 50:5	postdate 58:22	38:25	put 6:22 15:22	ranks 49:22	6:11 25:22	36:21,25 37:12
51:11 52:4	postdates 58:22	process 4:24 5:9	17:1 19:1	rarer 28:22	34:4 40:7	37:18,18 38:3
62:11	58:23	38:16 58:1	22:24 35:7,21	rationale 16:25	references 19:20	38:5,7 39:8,17
plethora 41:3	potential 4:24	63:16	53:1 55:12	reach 7:11 12:18	27:13	39:19 44:3,3,5
pm 1:2 49:2,4	14:6 16:6	processes 61:25	61:19 64:2,7	37:2,6	referral 68:14,17	44:7,9 69:6,11
74:23	30:23 44:11	produce 37:18	68:13 72:4	reached 12:17	69:17	reported 21:24
PNC 62:1,2	57:17 66:6	47:12 48:15	Q	74:13	referrals 68:23	43:20 57:10
point 2:3 11:10	potentially 4:23	professional	QC 31:19	reaction 62:18	referred 10:5	Reporters 53:11
11:21,25 12:2	9:4,5 38:18	58:2 61:25	qualified 60:10	read 35:6 38:13	69:15	reporting 7:22
12:16,18 28:13	powerful 15:24	68:15,19	quality 44:25	59:4	referring 25:4	10:4,10 13:6
31:14 38:22	powers 11:4 17:5			reading 13:7	61:3,5	13:11 14:13

18:19 40:25 54:6 reports 10:10,13 13:11 14:13 31:15 68:17 70:5 representations 26:13 reputation 18:5 require 6:6 11:4 22:18 64:2 71:10 required 17:4 31:21 requirement 22:21 resign 10:2 36:15 46:16,22 48:7 resignation 9:18 34:17 36:8,11 36:12 47:3,5 64:18 resigned 9:12 50:25 resigning 48:8 resolved 22:15 respect 38:6 55:21 respects 7:21 respond 19:6 58:8 70:18 response 4:4 responsibility 52:8 responsible 2:20 17:8 34:1 42:7 61:1 restores 58:13 restrained 11:5 result 13:1 51:12 54:16 56:7,8 56:17 58:11 70:17 retired 25:19 50:2 retiring 64:23 returned 40:19 reveal 35:16 revealed 1:15 35:15 45:20 review 12:13,16 12:19,22,24 16:12 19:20 20:23 26:1,2 27:21 32:5 37:25 65:12 66:11 reviewed 37:23 39:11 reviewing 39:9 39:10,23 revisit 66:15 right 1:9 2:10,17 9:20 11:19 14:25 16:18,24 19:4 20:11	22:2,22 23:21 31:1 32:23,25 36:7 37:20 40:11,14 48:12 48:24 49:19,20 50:13 51:18 53:4,20,21 54:5,8 57:7 59:2,18 62:7 66:21,22 68:8 72:13 74:17 rights 9:2 56:20 rigid 70:16 ringing 21:19 rise 52:20 59:23 risk 24:19 26:21 28:17,20 risks 42:2 45:6 risky 38:23 43:22 role 10:20 21:21 24:23 29:8 44:10 roles 35:14 51:22 Rolls 21:7 22:9,9 25:17 28:16 room 64:25 row 8:13 13:25 Royce 22:9,9 28:16 Royces 21:7 25:17 rubbish 8:4 ruled 45:24 run 24:6,18 25:1 25:13 28:1 running 21:11 41:4 <hr/> S <hr/> safe 1:19 3:15 safes 8:25 safety 26:12 27:14 satisfaction 18:18 satisfy 32:9 Saturday 26:9 saw 35:8 41:10 51:5 Sawyer 32:6 73:18,20 saying 14:15 18:4 23:8 48:10 53:19 says 34:9 scare 25:4 scenario 56:14 scenes 16:2 schools 53:24 scoops 43:25 scoping 1:13,15 Scotland 14:12 14:25 15:6 41:10 65:9 scrutiny 10:25	63:20 search 5:4,8 7:1 28:16 searches 4:22 second 37:20 39:4,21,24 secret 9:8 32:10 32:15 Secretary 1:16 1:18 8:23 34:24 36:5 37:17 Secretary's 3:15 secretive 50:9 72:3 section 19:22 20:21 security 9:8 24:19 25:4 27:21,25 34:25 security's 8:24 see 3:21 9:22 11:10 13:9,21 19:8 24:10 25:6 32:9 33:15 38:13 64:4 68:11 71:2,6 seeing 41:15 64:22 seek 59:7 62:5 seeking 3:4 8:3 28:14 43:24 seen 36:21 56:13 56:25 57:11 58:21 59:2 69:25 70:5 seized 2:15 12:1 73:16 Select 37:12 self-explanatory 63:13 semi 12:23 40:12 senior 6:14,15,18 14:12,24 25:24 26:3 30:9 32:1 55:15 56:2,3 59:1 sense 18:11 19:12 21:23 34:8 44:21 sensed 8:16 18:9 41:20 sensible 32:6 sensitive 8:25 9:8 17:9,10 32:10 35:13 sensitivities 4:24 sensitivity 1:11 sent 3:24 sentence 70:7 Sentencing 49:13 separation 55:7 74:6 September 3:23	sequence 36:14 series 30:4 40:20 serious 9:24 12:5 16:8 38:11,11 39:3 51:23 servant 2:8,13 service 21:5,6,9 22:8,17 29:1 34:25 52:15 60:17 72:10,18 services 4:17 22:18 28:25 72:11 serving 24:7 set 16:13 18:12 38:25 53:25 54:5 55:14 sets 55:16 60:9 severely 7:13 Shadow 2:15 36:5 Shami 68:20 share 62:5 shared 8:20 29:19 sheer 57:4 sheet 35:8 she'd 21:12 shift 50:18,24 shine 58:12,14 shined 11:1 shocked 9:21 short 15:5,20 48:25 49:3 73:6 shortly 6:21 siege 56:14 sights 32:21 signals 3:11 signed 49:17 significant 66:23 significantly 58:13 similar 21:10 51:5 56:23 57:20,20 Simmons 68:19 simply 14:7 18:10 20:11 42:11 59:4 single 6:6 sir 2:2,22 3:17 4:7 6:24 7:19 8:7 9:12 10:1,3 11:3 12:13 13:7,19,23 14:10,18 16:19 17:21 18:20 20:10,15 26:13 27:1 28:4,21 29:14,24 30:11 31:23 33:2,21 34:3 37:11,16 37:23 38:2,5,5 39:8,9,11,14 39:15,22 45:10	45:15 46:4,7 46:10,11,15,21 47:12,19 48:5 48:11,17,22,25 49:5,20 50:12 50:14 55:18 56:7 57:22 61:9 64:17 65:10,10 66:18 70:6,21 71:16 72:14,24,25 73:5,21 situation 16:5 situations 41:16 41:17 six 2:20 sixth 2:12 slightly 8:16 20:20 32:17 44:22 48:3 slim 12:25 slow 4:23 smear 34:12 Smith 28:20 smoothly 35:25 snapped 35:11 social 41:15,17 41:23 53:9 54:19 56:23 57:15,20 59:19 socialising 41:12 socially 40:11,12 soldiers 43:16 somebody 62:23 soon 2:7 sorry 31:17 33:16 55:11 sort 16:4 36:2 50:20 55:4,5 57:5,11 72:11 sorts 16:6 42:18 sought 23:23 26:5 source 14:6,8 25:24 26:3 57:10 60:6,7 61:2,5 sources 57:17 sparked 33:13 speak 62:12 speaking 26:16 special 6:9,22 21:17 specialised 40:25 specialist 6:15,18 specific 15:3 59:16 specify 4:10 speculate 63:2 spell 58:6 spent 24:16 sports 25:9,15,23 stable 25:17 staff 6:15,18 39:23 59:7,9 65:11	stage 4:16 23:1 23:20 45:24 47:17,19 stand 20:9 44:22 standard 10:8 49:17 53:14 68:15 standards 58:2 62:1 68:19 72:13 standing 64:21 Starmer 31:19 started 22:16 49:21 63:16 starting 5:19 starts 20:18 state 1:18 8:23 43:10 62:13 stated 36:5 19:23 29:11 32:14 34:19 43:9 49:16,17 59:3 63:8 64:20 67:15 States 50:22 stating 3:25 30:10 36:22 station 3:22 5:20 7:4 statutory 18:12 steam 31:24 Stephen 15:14 41:16 Stephenson 1:23 2:2 6:24 7:19 8:7 9:11,17 10:2 12:13 13:23 14:19 17:25 18:21 26:13 27:1 30:11 41:10 45:10 46:15,21 64:17 65:10 66:18 71:16 73:22 Stephenson's 14:11 65:11 stepped 35:7 steps 27:19 Stevens 50:12 71:19 stolen 3:14 stop 11:14,23 12:3 18:21 20:5 38:9 74:12 stopped 12:9 19:5 stories 43:25 57:3,3,4 story 14:8 24:11 24:18 26:6,11 26:12 straightforward 11:22	strange 17:16 strategic 6:14 50:11 strategically 50:9 strategies 34:14 strategy 50:15 straying 66:24 street 31:16 35:19 strong 2:9 strongly 14:19 45:17 65:21 struck 42:13,19 structure 70:17 study 39:8 stuff 64:3 style 55:22,24,24 56:1,4,11 57:8 styles 56:15,17 subcommittee 68:15,17 subject 54:11 57:25 subsequently 19:18 21:13 22:19,23 23:15 73:11 substance 45:21 substantiate 68:24 succeeded 36:19 success 17:6 successful 21:12 succumbing 12:9 sufficient 64:9 suggest 42:11 53:21 54:8 59:21 suggested 37:13 53:7 suggesting 18:13 42:9,12 55:20 74:1 suggestion 30:25 suggests 34:12 Sullivan 41:14 summary 50:3,4 summer 37:16 Sun 41:14 Sunday 8:8 21:2 22:5 23:18 24:5,5 25:7 29:12,20 30:14 33:12 34:5 67:4 68:7 support 6:15 11:12 13:12 26:8,23,23 43:13 68:9 supporting 39:18 suppose 11:16 sure 5:1 8:20 15:15 24:21 34:11 41:22
--	--	---	--	---	---	---

48:16 56:11	14:15 22:24	51:6 53:24	troubled 13:15	untenable 36:6	wasn't 1:24	31:6,15 33:12
62:5 64:1	36:9 40:7 52:7	54:4,12,14	truce 32:20	untrue 24:9	10:23 11:23	wife's 21:3,4,15
69:25 73:2	53:23 54:5,12	57:7 71:14,17	true 7:24 24:15	25:15,18	14:17,19 17:19	21:19 23:2
surname 28:19	54:19 55:1,2,6	thoughts 29:20	25:18 26:11	unusual 23:15	19:11 20:13	24:6,19 25:14
surprise 7:22,23	55:8,19 56:11	thought-through	30:2 59:22	35:5	21:16 22:21	28:4,9 29:3,7
surprised 9:21	56:19 58:19	51:2	truth 49:17	unwise 30:2	23:4,17 25:15	30:24 31:4
11:24 35:20	59:15 60:15	Thousand 53:14	try 38:8 39:4	42:12	26:18,19 29:6	67:4
42:16	63:7,14,21	three 20:22	59:14 68:9	upshot 31:6	30:5 31:10	wind 31:7
surprising 8:11	68:9 71:23	47:21 71:13	trying 15:8 16:3	USA 51:4	35:3 41:25	wine 3:16 41:9
8:13 41:23	72:7,7 73:14	thresholds 38:16	23:7,16 45:13	use 8:3 21:22	45:5 47:21	41:24
Surrey 43:10,11	territory 70:24	thrown 71:19	54:6	34:13 60:6	51:8 55:4 65:3	wires 48:3
43:14	terror 30:17	Tim 9:15 49:5	turned 35:9 36:2	61:2 62:1	74:10	withdraw 11:12
suspect 2:9 23:15	text 3:23,24	time 7:11 8:21	Turning 12:8	useful 3:1,5	way 4:22 6:8,8	30:8,11
66:14	thank 6:11 11:9	12:3 13:5,8	two 3:12 10:17	uses 24:6 25:16	8:6 11:13	witness 49:5,16
suspected 14:24	13:2 20:16	14:23 15:5,20	16:14 28:17	usually 53:3	12:11 16:1,8	witnessed 41:24
66:9	45:25 46:8,8	17:6 18:15	41:8 48:2 50:2	utterly 24:9	21:9,14 32:2	witnesses 62:10
suspects 66:6	46:10 47:12	25:21,21 26:9	53:24 67:7		37:22 42:22	women 72:10
suspicious 15:1	48:12,14,23	27:19 30:1	68:17	V	49:22 53:17	wonder 48:1
suspicious 23:5	49:6 50:4 62:9	32:14,14,17,25	type 42:4 59:19	valuable 72:18	64:11 70:16	word 39:8 60:14
Sussex 49:21	64:25 67:14	33:3,19 38:23		value 47:4 56:19	72:16	63:13
sworn 49:7	69:4 70:2,4	41:5,5,7,19	U	56:24 71:6	ways 9:5 11:4	words 53:1 54:11
sympathy 11:20	72:24 74:17,19	43:10,12,13	UK 27:23	values 55:14,16	web 28:11 29:2	54:18
system 38:15,25	thing 30:2 34:16	44:21 45:1,23	ultimately 6:17	55:19 56:1,18	35:21,21	work 39:23
56:24 60:3	47:22 52:3,3,5	46:2 47:21	52:9,10,12	72:14	website 23:3,9	44:14 71:5,11
systems 71:6	55:4 63:3	59:10 63:4	64:22	various 7:12	23:11	worked 21:15
72:3	things 18:14 51:7	68:10 69:5	unanimous 6:7	13:14 59:1	wedding 21:3,4,5	49:11,22
T	51:9 60:23	74:3,7,8,21	Unauthorised	62:4 63:18	21:5,8 22:17	working 1:16
tab 10:5 13:21	think 1:24 2:2	timeframe 71:1	37:1	67:10 68:3	25:12 28:16,25	world 35:21
25:6 30:15	4:2,10,14 5:18	times 33:4	unaware 7:14	vast 72:10,16	29:1 33:12	41:14 43:22
32:18 33:1	6:12,21 9:12	TIMOTHY 49:7	uncomfortable	vernacular 8:4	weddings 22:17	worry 8:12
tactic 23:3,11	11:3,24 13:22	tired 7:6	56:22,22	version 19:21	wedding-conn...	worse 25:3
take 6:21 18:14	19:23 20:22	tittle-tattle 52:21	underlying	viciously 42:15	21:10	wouldn't 17:21
20:20 21:8	22:12,21 24:2	60:24	39:11	Victoria 3:22	week 23:6	18:24 28:15
23:14 27:19	24:11,12,17	today 4:1 52:10	undermine	view 1:11 12:12	weekend 8:19	29:7 31:25
56:10 60:15	27:11 28:15	told 3:6 6:2 8:12	29:21	18:24 39:10	10:14 13:9	42:11 48:18
62:9 72:24	29:10,14 31:15	9:17,19 11:11	undermined	60:10 65:14,22	30:15	53:21 55:25
taken 7:3 13:4	32:22 33:4	19:16 21:16	51:6	66:2,7 68:23	weeks 16:14	63:2
35:23 72:21	35:14,15 38:7	23:16 24:4,10	underneath 52:1	72:22 73:9	welcome 71:15	Wright 15:14
takes 48:16	38:11,14,23	40:4,5 47:3	underpinning	views 14:1 19:6,7	welcomed 67:23	41:16 42:6,9
talk 4:5 41:2	39:3,14,21	64:13,17	60:16	37:14 39:22	well-placed	42:13
target 34:5	40:15 41:25	tone 8:17	understand 8:19	71:5,15,21,23	33:14	write 71:17,25
targeted 27:24	42:2,24,24	top 15:23 30:17	22:7 23:13	village 31:14	went 29:22 35:25	72:14,25
team 13:15 14:22	43:4 44:1,9,14	35:8 50:12,20	30:22 31:2	vintage 23:1	53:22	written 9:18
techniques 62:4	44:15,15,18	topic 46:13	33:16 36:14	25:17	Westminster 7:2	47:1,3,4 48:6
Telegraph 13:22	45:2,18 48:6	Tories 33:11	39:13 47:16	violent 27:24	we'll 44:6 47:12	64:18
telephone 5:25	48:19 51:1,21	Tory 33:14	48:17,18 71:7	28:14	52:24 60:4	wrong 9:19
8:7 62:14	52:6,9,10,14	tracks 12:10	74:14	virtue 24:19	64:10	30:10 48:9
67:10	52:21 53:19,21	trading 28:24	understanding	visible 35:12	we're 52:9 59:4	54:16
telephoned	54:10,24,25	traditional 21:9	27:4 45:19	vital 63:10	62:9 63:20	
45:11	55:1,3,13,18	tragic 43:15	48:5	voluntarily 5:20	64:3	Y
telephoning 45:9	55:21 56:7,12	transferred	understood 19:8	vulnerable 43:11	we've 20:20	Yard 14:12,25
television 36:12	56:15 57:2	49:22	undertake 1:13	57:6 59:24	21:14 44:4	15:6 25:24
tell 1:14 5:25	58:11 61:20	transparency	unease 41:20		50:6 58:23	26:3 41:10
57:23 60:3	63:8,16,19	45:4 56:13	unfolded 56:8	W	65:5	65:9
64:10	64:1 66:10,16	60:15 63:9,12	unfolds 66:12	wait 60:4	whatsoever	Yates 11:9,20
telling 10:12	66:22 67:8	63:15 72:5	unfortunate	Wales 49:11	17:22	15:18 36:19
temporary 50:1	71:8,22,23,24	transparent	34:17 55:4	Wallis 68:21	whilst 4:21 36:9	38:19 41:10,15
58:3	72:1,4,5 74:2	40:17 50:11	uniform 21:22	want 24:10 48:18	56:9	42:10 45:10
ten 24:17	thinking 18:10	56:16 70:16	unique 44:10,16	62:5 63:3	wholesale 72:9	54:10,18 68:14
tenable 12:7	32:16	transpire 70:19	44:18	71:22 72:2	Wide 35:21	year 44:5 49:16
tendered 36:10	thorough 37:5	Transport 12:15	unlawful 65:15	wanted 3:7	widely 43:20	56:8 68:16
tenure 42:8	38:17 39:2	travelling 40:7	unpopular 9:4	wanting 56:13	wider 63:17	years 15:9 23:2
64:22	thoroughly	trawled 70:24	39:1	warnings 56:25	70:25 71:1	38:25
term 6:12 60:6	16:11 39:4	treat 66:5	unrealistic 16:14	warrant 5:8	wife 20:25 21:24	
terms 2:5 14:10	thought 17:3,14	treatment 43:7	unscrupulous	34:15	22:14 23:5,14	0
	33:23 50:10	66:8	61:22	warranted 20:3	25:20 27:18	01580 10:7

01595 13:22	43 5:13				
01603 30:16	44 60:5				
01606 32:19	47 61:12				
06949 59:5	48 61:18				
06952 60:5					
	<u>5</u>				
<u>1</u>	5 50:3				
1 9:11 46:14	52 7:12				
64:13	54 8:9				
10 34:23 74:20	57 62:11				
74:22,24	58 62:11				
101 37:16	59 62:11				
104 40:9					
105 40:9	<u>6</u>				
107 41:8	6 16:15 65:7				
11 51:11	61 16:15 65:6				
12 10:5 74:25	62 17:23				
123 43:9	67 19:17				
128 44:1	68 20:1				
130 25:23					
14 13:21	<u>7</u>				
15 25:6	7 25:23 50:6				
16 19:15 30:15	70 20:19,21 63:7				
17 32:18 33:1	72 22:23				
18 21:11	73 23:24				
19 2:14 20:22	77 67:13				
1999 49:23	78 26:25				
<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>				
2 16:13	8 50:17				
2.00 1:2	81 29:10				
20 4:13 24:4	84 31:11				
2000/2001 60:17					
2002 49:25	<u>9</u>				
2008 2:7,14 3:24	9 45:10 50:17				
4:13 16:13	95 36:8				
25:7 46:14					
64:13 65:7					
67:9					
2009 37:16 38:23					
45:10 46:3					
49:25					
2011 57:23					
2012 50:3 74:25					
21 25:7 67:8					
24 3:23					
26 55:10 57:23					
27 49:16					
28 7:12					
<u>3</u>					
3.23 49:2					
3.32 49:4					
30 8:8 23:2					
32 38:25					
35 2:7					
37 3:12 36:25					
59:3					
38 3:23					
39 4:9 59:25					
<u>4</u>					
4.13 74:23					
41 4:13					
42 5:3					
42-day 33:8					