

<p>1 Thursday, 15 March 2012 2 (10.08 am) 3 Discussion 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, Mr Garnham? 5 MR GARNHAM: Sir, I apologise to you and the other core 6 participants that the statement of Mr Driscoll was 7 circulated very late yesterday evening. 8 It was, however, the result of a great deal of hard 9 work by those who instruct me and Ms Allen of Bindmans 10 who prepared this statement with Mr Driscoll during the 11 course of yesterday afternoon and yesterday evening. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I understand. Thank you. 13 Mr Caplan, yes, if you want to say this is timing 14 that verges on the unacceptable, you don't need to say 15 it; I agree. 16 MR CAPLAN: Thank you. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The real question is what you want to 18 do about it. 19 MR CAPLAN: Sir, I was going to say that. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There you are. 21 MR CAPLAN: Thank you for saying it first. The position as 22 you know obviously is I'm back again today because the 23 crime correspondent of the Daily Mail, Mr Wright, is 24 here and some of what Mr Driscoll says touches very much 25 on Mr Wright's reporting of the Stephen Lawrence matter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 that he is really addressing many of my terms of 2 reference, but again it's all a question of trying to 3 find out what people say, because it's only on 4 investigation that one really learns who advances the 5 work of the Inquiry and who provides a diversion from 6 it. 7 Your point is well made. Now, having made it, what 8 do you want me to do? 9 MR CAPLAN: I wish the matter to proceed. Mr Wright can say 10 a lot of positive things about his own reporting and how 11 this matter has been dealt with. 12 The only thing I would say, please, is this: I have 13 not had an opportunity to put questions to Inquiry 14 counsel in advance in relation to Mr Driscoll's 15 evidence. If something arises, then I may well want to 16 ask for leave under Rule 10. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Caplan, that's entirely 18 reasonable. 19 MR CAPLAN: Thank you very much. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But there's nothing else in this that 21 you are concerned about? 22 MR CAPLAN: Well, I think we'll just have to see how it 23 goes, if I may say so. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I was actually thinking of the sort 25 of point that Mr Garnham was making yesterday, but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 He's been reporting about it for the last 15 years. 2 I will say this: the Daily Mail and his reporting has 3 been the subject of a lot of positive comment and 4 awards, and he will deal with it, but it comes very 5 late, he does not want to come back, he'd rather deal 6 with his evidence today. It's extremely unfortunate 7 that it's come as late as it has. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, Mr Caplan, to some extent I'm 9 responding to a criticism that I got yesterday that 10 material comes into the Inquiry after witnesses have 11 been and they haven't dealt with it. So I understand 12 why there was an anxiety that we should do it the right 13 way round. If you want more time, then you shall have 14 it and I will make sure it happens. I can understand 15 why Mr Wright wouldn't want to come back; that was the 16 complaint I got yesterday. I can't win, or the Inquiry 17 can't win, whatever we do. We're trying to cope with 18 a fast-moving Inquiry in circumstances where evidence is 19 being generated which we don't know about, we don't know 20 what is out there, so when it's provided, it's 21 inevitable that it's going to cause difficulty. 22 I intend to be very careful about this in the light 23 of what happened yesterday. I've now reviewed with care 24 what the particular witness who was the subject of 25 yesterday's complaint said and I'm not entirely sure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 I can't remember whether Ms Hartley was here at that 2 moment. It doesn't really matter. 3 Right, Mr Jay, let's crack on. 4 MR JAY: Sir, I omitted to ask for a statement from 5 yesterday to be read into the record. It's 6 Mr Mark Hughes, the Daily Telegraph. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good, thank you. 8 MR JAY: The first witness today is Mr Clive Driscoll, 9 please. 10 MR CLIVE DRISCOLL (sworn) 11 Questions by MR JAY 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Please sit down. Thank you very much 13 for doing this work. It's at something of a pace. It's 14 important that we try and keep these things in order so 15 that people can deal with it appropriately. Yes. 16 MR JAY: First of all, Mr Driscoll, I'm going to ask that 17 a copy of your witness statement is placed in front of 18 you, there is a spare copy to my left, so that you can 19 confirm it's true. There is of course a statement of 20 truth on it and your signed statement. This is your 21 formal evidence to the Inquiry; is that right? 22 A. That's correct. 23 Q. In relation to your professional career, you're 24 currently a Detective Chief Inspector of the crime 25 department of the Metropolitan Police Service. You</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 joined that service in May 1979. You've obviously 2 worked your way up through the ranks and you've occupied 3 a number of important and difficult positions, for 4 example you have been in charge of policy for sexual 5 offences, domestic violence, child protection and the 6 paedophile unit; is that right?</p> <p>7 A. That is correct, sir.</p> <p>8 Q. Thank you. But what is material to your evidence is 9 your involvement in the Stephen Lawrence murder inquiry. 10 You, I think, were the senior investigating officer of 11 Operation Fishpool, which was the reopened investigation 12 into the murder of Mr Lawrence; is that correct?</p> <p>13 A. That is correct. On 20 June 2006, I assumed the role of 14 senior investigating officer in what started as 15 a forensic review and then blossomed into an 16 investigation.</p> <p>17 Q. Thank you. You tell us in paragraph 4 of your statement 18 that you made a decision that you would not speak to 19 journalists direct. Before I ask you to explain why 20 not, can we just understand the context, please, in 21 paragraph 3, when you tell us in relation to an earlier 22 investigation, Operation Yewland, you had contact with 23 a journalist from the Sunday Mirror.</p> <p>24 A. That's correct, sir.</p> <p>25 Q. Were there any difficulties about those contacts which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 assist us or not.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You're probably understating it 3 somewhat when you say there's a degree of press interest 4 in that murder. It was probably one of the defining 5 murders of its time.</p> <p>6 A. Absolutely correct.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's always press interest in 8 murder investigations.</p> <p>9 A. Absolutely correct, sir.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Therefore the real point is that 11 because of the extent of press involvement and 12 commitment to the inquiry and all the trouble that it 13 created for the Metropolitan Police, this case was 14 different. Is that the point?</p> <p>15 A. It is the point, sir. I think that -- yes, I do believe 16 it is different and I do believe that as a result, 17 whenever Stephen's name is mentioned, it does generate 18 a great deal of press interest.</p> <p>19 MR JAY: So although some journalists had your work mobile 20 number, and you explain how that happened, you did not 21 respond substantively to any requests for information 22 they gave you; is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. No, in the initial we actually tried to stay completely 24 under the radar. I couldn't say it was a secret 25 operation because it wasn't, but we didn't wish</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 caused you to adopt a different strategy, as it were?</p> <p>2 A. No, not at all, sir. In fact, I would say that the way 3 they actually dealt with that particular witness that 4 was going to deliver their story was impeccable, really. 5 They treated her with great respect and I was actually 6 very impressed with the way they dealt with the witness, 7 so I had no issues at all.</p> <p>8 Q. Thank you. So this is Mr Justin Penrose who is the 9 journalist you spoke to?</p> <p>10 A. That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q. Notwithstanding that positive experience, as it were, 12 why did you adopt a different strategy in relation to 13 the reopened Lawrence investigation?</p> <p>14 A. I think young Stephen's investigation has always had 15 a degree of press interest, because of the type of 16 murder that it was, indeed certainly previous 17 investigations had suffered from what are described as 18 leaks, which had made the investigation somewhat 19 difficult, and what I actually found was that whenever 20 there was an article in the newspaper, it almost set 21 a ball rolling, so there became like a bit of a frenzy. 22 There was normally articles on the television, there was 23 radio articles, and I felt that that was not conducive 24 to a good investigation and not helpful when witnesses 25 were making the decision whether to come forward and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 publicity, we didn't feel that would be in any way 2 helpful to us.</p> <p>3 Q. You were appointed the senior investigating officer on 4 20 June 2006. Of course we know the outcome, the 5 successful outcome, and the commendation you received in 6 open court by the judge at the conclusion of the trial. 7 But if I can sort of rewind the tape, chronologically at 8 least, and ask you to look at paragraph 8 of your 9 statement, Mr Driscoll, you say:</p> <p>10 "For all of these reasons [many of which are patent] 11 we decided to keep information about the progress of the 12 investigation very close and disseminate information 13 only on a 'need to know' basis."</p> <p>14 A. That's correct, sir.</p> <p>15 Q. It's clear in your mind that the Assistant Commissioner 16 who assumed gold responsibility as head of the serious 17 crime directorate would not have discussed these matters 18 with the management board, is that so?</p> <p>19 A. Absolutely not, sir. I'm under no illusion, my team's 20 under no illusion, if it wasn't for the dedication, hard 21 work and support of AC Dick we wouldn't have got across 22 the finish line, so I have no doubt that ma'am would not 23 have done anything to jeopardise the investigation and 24 the decision wasn't to go outside the inclusion zone.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You'd better just explain for those</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

<p>1 who don't understand what you mean by "gold 2 responsibility".</p> <p>3 A. It was her responsibility, sir. The actual 4 investigation, if in fact I needed extra resources, the 5 investigation, when significant moments occurred, would 6 be a matter of discussion I would have had with 7 Cressida Dick. She also had an input with the wider 8 political matters around Stephen, and it was really -- 9 I suppose her role was to shield me, as the senior 10 investigating officer, to allow me to focus entirely on 11 trying to solve young Stephen's murder.</p> <p>12 So the role of gold is quite pivotal, I believe, in 13 high-profile and sensitive cases, because it allows the 14 SIO to get on with what everybody would expect of us, 15 which is to try and solve the matter, rather than be 16 going on matters which are equally as important but 17 don't really -- if you focus on the core investigation 18 that will eventually go before the Crown Court.</p> <p>19 MR JAY: In terms of the forensic evidence, and of course we 20 now know what it was since it was fully ventilated at 21 the trial, in terms of the Metropolitan Police Service, 22 could you identify, without naming names, the limited 23 number of people who had this information?</p> <p>24 A. It would have been within my team, we formed a forensic 25 team to deal with the continuity and the integrity of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 forensic advance that was being made.</p> <p>2 Q. You say in paragraph 10 that the forensic scientists 3 were aware of the nature of the forensic evidence, 4 self-evidently, but they were not told about other 5 developments in the investigation. So you're saying 6 that their knowledge was limited to the scientific 7 analysis of the blood on the jacket; is that right?</p> <p>8 A. And we would tell them what they needed to know to allow 9 them to make the investigations we were asking, so they 10 would know that we were taking saliva samples off the 11 witnesses, because that was one of the tests they 12 performed, but other non-related scientific matters we 13 wouldn't have talked to them about at all. There was no 14 need to.</p> <p>15 Q. In your decision log it indicates that you took 16 a positive decision not to share findings with the 17 press, but you say in paragraph 11 of your statement: 18 "On 18 October 2007 a significant amount of 19 information about the investigation was leaked to the 20 media." 21 And you name the paper, it was the News of the 22 World. We don't have the article in the News of the 23 World to hand, but can you remember anything about it 24 which might assist?</p> <p>25 A. It identified that there was a forensic review going on,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 the exhibits, because we knew that would be important to 2 the court, so they would have been aware of it. It 3 would have been myself, it would have been DI Keep, who 4 was my deputy. Then I did have probably three 5 supervisors prior to the last supervisor, which was 6 Detective Superintendent Jill Bailey, and it would have 7 been then Cressida Dick and Mr Gary Pugh, who was head 8 of our forensic department in the Metropolitan Police 9 Service, and Mr Alan Tribe, who was attached to me as my 10 forensic adviser.</p> <p>11 Q. In due course the forensic exhibits were passed to 12 scientists, this is April 2007, and therefore the range 13 of people who had access to this material broadened; is 14 that correct?</p> <p>15 A. That would be correct, sir.</p> <p>16 Q. You make it clear in paragraph 9 that the forensics 17 press officer, the MPS press officer and the CPS, you 18 say, would have known what progress was being made in 19 general terms, but not all of these people would have 20 known the sensitive detail, which suggests that some of 21 them did know the sensitive detail; is that right?</p> <p>22 A. No. To manage the press interest we put all of the 23 press departments together, so the Crown Prosecution 24 Service and LGC Forensics, but there was no need for the 25 press officers to know the intricate detail of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 it identified the fact that we had a team working on 2 Stephen's case, which up until then we'd managed to keep 3 fairly quiet. It was never -- I think they talked about 4 a secret location. It was never that secret, but it 5 identified that the Metropolitan Police Service had 6 moved on and were moving on within Stephen's 7 investigation.</p> <p>8 Q. Does it follow that that which appeared in the News of 9 the World was unauthorised inasmuch as no one had been 10 permitted to disclose it to the media?</p> <p>11 A. There was no permission for disclosure on the 12 investigation we were doing at all.</p> <p>13 Q. Then two or three weeks later, there was a meeting at 14 New Scotland Yard on 7 November 2007, paragraph 12 of 15 your statement. You say who was there: Mrs Lawrence, 16 her solicitor and barrister. In relation to the MPS, it 17 was you, Assistant Commissioner Dick, two members from 18 your team and a representative from the CPS?</p> <p>19 A. That is correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And that was it, was it?</p> <p>21 A. That was correct, sir, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And the purpose of the meeting was to update --</p> <p>23 A. We had at that stage, I think -- to progress this case, 24 we always needed new and compelling evidence, and it 25 might -- well, we did have new evidence that we wanted</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 to share with Mrs Lawrence just to keep them abreast,</p> <p>2 and also her legal team, to show the advancement that we</p> <p>3 had made.</p> <p>4 Q. You say the meeting ended at 8.30 pm. You were</p> <p>5 astonished to find out less than two hours later that</p> <p>6 press enquiries were being made about the meeting?</p> <p>7 A. It was actually before I got home. I received a phone</p> <p>8 call whilst I was on the train that there was an article</p> <p>9 that was going to be printed the following day which</p> <p>10 followed the meeting that we'd just had, or appeared to</p> <p>11 follow the meeting we'd just had.</p> <p>12 Q. The fact, however, that the meeting was taking place,</p> <p>13 that was known to a wider group of people than those</p> <p>14 you've mentioned in paragraph 12, is that fair?</p> <p>15 A. Well, it would have been known. Obviously, you do lose</p> <p>16 a degree of control once you invite other people into</p> <p>17 a meeting, but the people that were coming are, I think,</p> <p>18 well-known, I think people would recognise them. So</p> <p>19 when they came in to New Scotland Yard, the people who</p> <p>20 saw them would recognise them, and, yes, I think that</p> <p>21 the people within that meeting on the prosecution side</p> <p>22 would have been who knew on the prosecution side, the</p> <p>23 police side, but I couldn't say how many people outside,</p> <p>24 after we'd started the invites, would have known.</p> <p>25 Q. Then the piece in the Daily Mail, 8 November 2007. Of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Q. Can I ask you just a couple of points on the text of the</p> <p>2 article. Apparently, it says:</p> <p>3 "The discovery so long after the killing is said to</p> <p>4 have 'horrified' senior officers at Scotland Yard."</p> <p>5 Were you or any of your colleagues horrified?</p> <p>6 A. No, we were actually delighted, sir. We felt that we</p> <p>7 were making progress, so that's not a term I would use.</p> <p>8 In fact, I felt nothing but optimism, and I think the</p> <p>9 people within the inclusion zone felt the same optimism.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, you might be horrified for</p> <p>11 a slightly different reason. Not horrified with the</p> <p>12 discovery of the information, but horrified that it had</p> <p>13 been missed.</p> <p>14 A. Sir, I don't believe it was missed.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see.</p> <p>16 A. I never believed it was missed, and I think that's quite</p> <p>17 unkind to the scientists --</p> <p>18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm only trying to explain --</p> <p>19 A. I understand that, sir, but I think it's quite an</p> <p>20 important point because they didn't find it, I would</p> <p>21 agree with you 100 per cent they never found it. What</p> <p>22 I wouldn't agree with you is that they missed it because</p> <p>23 they didn't have the technology, they didn't have the</p> <p>24 technology available to them.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Okay.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 course, the very next day. That's an exhibit to your</p> <p>2 statement, the online version, that is, CD1. We don't</p> <p>3 have the paper version. To the best of your</p> <p>4 recollection, are we looking at Mail Online or are we</p> <p>5 looking at the online version of the Daily Mail?</p> <p>6 A. No, my understanding that's the Mail Online, so the</p> <p>7 Daily Mail article was slightly -- it appears on the</p> <p>8 Mail Online to have one line as opposed to like</p> <p>9 a narrative story. So that is the Mail Online, but</p> <p>10 I think there would be others far better than myself to</p> <p>11 fully judge what the Mail would actually put on its</p> <p>12 onliner now.</p> <p>13 Q. For our purposes it's not going to matter whether it's</p> <p>14 the Mail Online, Daily Mail or whoever.</p> <p>15 A. It outlines what was discussed in the newspaper,</p> <p>16 certainly.</p> <p>17 Q. Is there information in what we read in this paper which</p> <p>18 came out of that meeting on 7 November?</p> <p>19 A. The information within the Mail certainly was the</p> <p>20 information we gave at that meeting. So with the</p> <p>21 exception of the terminology used, we did discuss the</p> <p>22 scientific progress of the case and therefore some of</p> <p>23 the earlier scientific findings which had involved the</p> <p>24 very tapings that eventually formed a major part of my</p> <p>25 trial being looked at by earlier scientists.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 A. So I did feel -- and that caused us a slight problem,</p> <p>2 because in young Stephen's case, there are quite a few</p> <p>3 people who feel quite badly damaged by it and we were</p> <p>4 trying to encourage people to have the belief and</p> <p>5 confidence in us to come forward and tell their story in</p> <p>6 court. That's my duty. And I think people -- it's</p> <p>7 a human reaction that people can go very defensive and</p> <p>8 people can then not tell you the full story, and that</p> <p>9 damages an investigation.</p> <p>10 For me, Stephen Lawrence is a word which is</p> <p>11 synonymous with improvement and learning, and I suppose</p> <p>12 the only way I can describe this, sir, is if -- and</p> <p>13 I believe the press can learn, but if I, one of my</p> <p>14 officers wrote down that -- you know, wrote down the</p> <p>15 forensic findings, wrote down the fact we might have new</p> <p>16 witnesses, then wrote down that we were going to arrest</p> <p>17 in two days' time, put that in an envelope and went out</p> <p>18 and handed that to the suspects, how would the press</p> <p>19 report that? How would the criminal justice view that?</p> <p>20 I think they view that as corruption. But place it in</p> <p>21 the newspaper, that isn't any different. It's just to</p> <p>22 get a wider reader.</p> <p>23 What we were trying to do, and I have nothing but</p> <p>24 respect for Mr Wright, and I echo with what the</p> <p>25 gentleman said. No one has tried harder, no one -- no</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

<p>1 organisation has tried to bring justice to Stephen's 2 parents, but we were getting there, and it was 3 undermining that inquiry, and I can't understand that, 4 because after almost winning that battle to get the 5 police to -- you know, to use all of the resources we 6 can to bring justice, it almost seemed that that was 7 being undermined, and that's the part -- I would 8 never -- you know, to agree with what sir put when he 9 stood up, I have admiration for what the paper did in 10 supporting the family, I have admiration in Mr Wright 11 pursuing it. The bit I can't understand is why, when 12 you get there, you would then do anything to undermine 13 it. That's the part I can't understand, sir, and I'd 14 like to think that maybe there's a lesson learnt in the 15 memory and honour of Stephen.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I now understand precisely why you 17 are concerned about that word. But could you explain 18 the impact that it had on your inquiry?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, because, your Honour, without confidence -- and I'm 20 not being flippant -- the police are probably about as 21 much use as a chocolate teapot, because we need people 22 to feel confident to come to us, we need people to be 23 able to tell us their story, and if it's intimate 24 details or mistakes they may or may not have made, we 25 need people to do that to allow us to give to the court</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 what we're doing, to try and chance guess what we're 2 doing undermines that criminal prosecution and I guess 3 nobody would want that because we all want an ordered 4 society.</p> <p>5 MR JAY: Thank you. The other point which arises on this 6 piece, it says: 7 "Sources insisted that forensic experts rather than 8 police appeared to be to blame for the errors and an 9 internal investigation is likely." 10 Is that --</p> <p>11 A. What paragraph?</p> <p>12 Q. Sorry, immediately after the "horrified" sentence. The 13 line underneath.</p> <p>14 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>15 Q. Could that be right?</p> <p>16 A. That sources insisted forensic experts rather than 17 police appeared, is that what you're talking about?</p> <p>18 Q. Yes.</p> <p>19 A. No. No, sir. No, sir. Because, as I've already 20 explained, it's always been the view of our 21 investigation that they never missed it. They didn't 22 find it, that's accepted, but they never missed it. 23 They didn't really have the technology, and I suppose, 24 with everything, you move on in method as well, and they 25 couldn't have found it, actually, with the way it was in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 a very factual -- so that people can make very difficult 2 decisions.</p> <p>3 If people feel threatened -- and it is a fact that 4 after this report that a witness was visited by one of 5 the suspects. Now, that could have been a coincidence, 6 that could have been a complete and utter coincidence, 7 but I'm a police officer so I'm cynical at birth, 8 I suppose, and we would worry about that, and so it had 9 a negative effect on the investigation. It had 10 a negative effect on my team. It had a negative effect 11 on how we react to our partners, because one of the 12 things -- I don't know who leaked this, so therefore 13 everyone becomes a suspect, and that is the negative 14 effect that it has, because we have to work with our 15 partners, and any SIO, not just Stephen's, would have to 16 work with his partners and have a degree of trust, they 17 have to trust you, so that it all works. Otherwise it 18 just stops. Everyone thinks, "Oh, I can't tell him 19 that", and it just stops.</p> <p>20 So for me the lesson learnt here is that if you 21 think I'm going down the pub and if you think I'm 22 playing golf, the press have an absolute duty to expose 23 that because I'm paid by the public, but if I'm 24 investigating, as you'd all expect me to, a criminal 25 investigation, then I think that to try and find out</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 1993. So I don't believe -- no, that isn't right.</p> <p>2 Q. As you say in paragraph 13 of your statement, there was 3 a "media frenzy" thereafter?</p> <p>4 A. That's correct, sir.</p> <p>5 Q. There was -- I don't know whether you call it a leak 6 inquiry or a review, and you understand that Mr Wright 7 was spoken to; is that correct?</p> <p>8 A. That is correct, and once again, I mean I would pay 9 tribute to Mr Wright, because he didn't publish the 10 second story. I know that he didn't publish the second 11 story, I know that. So he was spoken to and certainly 12 on the correspondence that I've read he gave an 13 explanation of how it happened.</p> <p>14 Q. But he confirmed apparently that no police source had 15 been involved?</p> <p>16 A. That's what he confirmed, yes, sir.</p> <p>17 Q. And the reference to "sources" in the article was 18 apparently an assumption by a junior copy writer; is 19 that right?</p> <p>20 A. That was certainly what Mr Wright said.</p> <p>21 Q. We can follow that up in due course a bit later this 22 morning, actually. 23 In terms of relations between the police and the 24 Lawrence family, it's self-evident that relations would 25 be harmed, but can you in your own words explain that to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 us, please?</p> <p>2 A. I've enjoyed total support from Mr and Mrs Lawrence, but</p> <p>3 along the way there has been moments where I've really</p> <p>4 felt for them, because they felt that it was just same</p> <p>5 old, same old, that in fact the police were deliberately</p> <p>6 releasing information, therefore slowing down their</p> <p>7 investigation.</p> <p>8 So on several occasions that I had some meetings</p> <p>9 with Mrs Lawrence and Mr Lawrence, and I can only pay</p> <p>10 tribute to them, because they've always supported me,</p> <p>11 but the upset that was caused was evident, and really it</p> <p>12 just reinforced our belief, as Mrs Lawrence has just</p> <p>13 recently commented, that it was corruption that played</p> <p>14 a part in her having had 18 years prior to getting</p> <p>15 partial justice now.</p> <p>16 Q. In paragraph 17 you make it clear that there was some</p> <p>17 reporting in the Sunday Times in February 2008 that</p> <p>18 resulted from a genuinely mistaken release of</p> <p>19 information by LGC?</p> <p>20 A. That is correct. We went straight into leak mode and</p> <p>21 believed it was a leak, but upon investigation, it was</p> <p>22 an error by the press office -- a genuine, an innocent</p> <p>23 error. Whilst briefing the Sunday Times of what LGC</p> <p>24 Forensics could offer as a company, they drifted into</p> <p>25 talking about what they had done on Stephen's murder.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 But I felt what other reason would you do it?</p> <p>2 I suppose if he was a suspect, why cases are eventually</p> <p>3 discontinued is of no great interest to you, as long as</p> <p>4 they are, and I just couldn't see -- the reporting, it</p> <p>5 wasn't as if they were exposing wrongdoing by police or</p> <p>6 wrongdoing by anyone else, it was actually focusing on</p> <p>7 what would always be evidence in the Crown Court and</p> <p>8 maybe evidence that we would have liked to put to</p> <p>9 suspects in a controlled way, because it's a search for</p> <p>10 the truth. Any investigation's a search for the truth,</p> <p>11 and you try to put disclosure in a controlled way, and</p> <p>12 that was being thwarted if you'd already walked in</p> <p>13 knowing full well what the police may have or may be</p> <p>14 going to do.</p> <p>15 Q. It might not be deliberate, though, it might be</p> <p>16 a journalist seeking to do his or her job, but of course</p> <p>17 in so doing it will interrupt the police investigations?</p> <p>18 A. That was included within my decision log that I had</p> <p>19 considered poetic licence, I'd considered a genuine</p> <p>20 mistake, but as the police officer in charge of a murder</p> <p>21 investigation, you also have to consider that it could</p> <p>22 be an act designed to undermine the path of justice.</p> <p>23 Q. You eventually obtained the formal order from the court?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct, sir.</p> <p>25 Q. Under the Criminal Justice Act. That was on 7 September</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 That was obviously outside the agreement that we'd had</p> <p>2 with them. That was dealt with by Mr Gary Pugh, and</p> <p>3 I think it was a learning curve for the press officer</p> <p>4 involved. I know there was no deliberate intention to</p> <p>5 in any way be disrespectful to the investigation. It</p> <p>6 was a genuine mistake.</p> <p>7 Q. When you say in paragraph 18 you became convinced that</p> <p>8 someone was deliberately attempting to disrupt the</p> <p>9 investigation, and you recorded that in the decision</p> <p>10 log, why did you draw that inference?</p> <p>11 A. Because there was a considerable amount of information</p> <p>12 being put in which was correct, but there was an awful</p> <p>13 lot of information that wasn't, and that information</p> <p>14 would have made it difficult for witnesses, as I've</p> <p>15 already spoken about, to have the confidence to come</p> <p>16 forward. That would have put a strain upon</p> <p>17 a relationship which we had ongoing, which was the</p> <p>18 Forensic Science Service who originally had Stephen's</p> <p>19 investigation, to LGC Forensics, who had it now, and it</p> <p>20 generally was placing quite a difficulty on everybody</p> <p>21 that we were requiring to give evidence at court to have</p> <p>22 confidence that we were trying our hardest and in fact</p> <p>23 we were going towards where we wanted to do, which was</p> <p>24 to place the evidence before the Crown Court to allow</p> <p>25 them to make a decision.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 2010.</p> <p>2 A. That's correct, sir.</p> <p>3 Q. I think two days before -- this is paragraph 21 of your</p> <p>4 statement, Mr Driscoll -- you received information that</p> <p>5 Mr Wright had got hold of some information which he</p> <p>6 proposed to publish, including information about the</p> <p>7 forthcoming arrest/charges and the fact that you were</p> <p>8 making an application for an order for reporting</p> <p>9 restrictions. Did you speak to Mr Wright personally</p> <p>10 about this?</p> <p>11 A. No. That was significant because it was only two days</p> <p>12 after the Director of Public Prosecutions had given us</p> <p>13 permission to move forward, so 48 hours later it was the</p> <p>14 Press Bureau that contacted me on a Sunday and told me</p> <p>15 that there would be this article appearing in the</p> <p>16 Daily Mail the following day, which would have had a --</p> <p>17 the effect -- and again I thank the Daily Mail, because</p> <p>18 they didn't print the article, but if they had, that</p> <p>19 would have had quite a serious consequence on the</p> <p>20 operation we were planning.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Paragraph 22, Mr Driscoll. You tell us that in</p> <p>22 the lead-up to the trial --</p> <p>23 A. That's correct.</p> <p>24 Q. Can you remind us when the trial was?</p> <p>25 A. The trial started on 14 November 2010 and was concluded</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<p>1 on 5 January 2012.</p> <p>2 Q. I think it was 14 November 2011 then, wasn't it?</p> <p>3 A. My apologies, sir.</p> <p>4 Q. But at all events you say a contact who had provided</p> <p>5 information to the investigation asked you to keep their</p> <p>6 name and address secret because they were concerned</p> <p>7 about what the defendants might do now that they had</p> <p>8 been arrested, so this was obviously in the period</p> <p>9 before November 2011?</p> <p>10 A. It was January actually that I was contacted and that</p> <p>11 was when he asked me to keep the name of a very senior</p> <p>12 member of the Metropolitan Police Service, that -- well,</p> <p>13 I wasn't to share any information about that individual</p> <p>14 at all with the other individual.</p> <p>15 Q. And the contact asked you to give him or her your word</p> <p>16 that this person -- that's the senior member of the</p> <p>17 Metropolitan Police Service -- would not have any</p> <p>18 involvement and would not be told. So you're referring</p> <p>19 to there the fact of the contact speaking to you; is</p> <p>20 that correct?</p> <p>21 A. That is correct, and also the fact that potentially that</p> <p>22 contact could have been a witness in the trial.</p> <p>23 Q. And the contact originally said it was well-known in</p> <p>24 Fleet Street that this person -- that's the senior</p> <p>25 person -- briefed outside official meetings and later</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 enjoy the confidence of the public, because we are not</p> <p>2 as effective as we should be without it, and I do</p> <p>3 believe that maybe lessons could be learned which would</p> <p>4 benefit other investigations and other families that</p> <p>5 have tragically lost children.</p> <p>6 Q. Apart from the matters you draw attention to in your</p> <p>7 statement, your opinion of the role of the Daily Mail</p> <p>8 probably since 1997 is clear, isn't it?</p> <p>9 A. No, I think the Daily Mail -- and recently I know that</p> <p>10 Mr Wright was a guest of Mr Lawrence and I know how much</p> <p>11 Mr Lawrence respects the support that Mr Wright gave</p> <p>12 him. I also know that I was at a criminal justice</p> <p>13 lecture, which was sponsored by the Daily Mail, and how</p> <p>14 they're helping that excellent charity the 1818 Charity,</p> <p>15 so I have respect for the Daily Mail.</p> <p>16 I would just ask it to reflect on what I said. It's</p> <p>17 once having got the police to be in a position where we</p> <p>18 were conducting an investigation, which I'm delighted to</p> <p>19 say resulted in some justice for Mr and Mrs Lawrence,</p> <p>20 just to reflect on how reporting can affect the family,</p> <p>21 how reporting can affect witnesses and how it can, even</p> <p>22 though I would be 100 per cent sure this was not the</p> <p>23 intention from the Daily Mail, it can undermine a good</p> <p>24 investigation.</p> <p>25 MR JAY: Thank you very much, Mr Driscoll.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 added a more serious allegation?</p> <p>2 A. That is correct.</p> <p>3 Q. You have no wish today, presumably, to identify that</p> <p>4 senior member of the MPS?</p> <p>5 A. My understanding is that an investigation did take place</p> <p>6 and that in fact that information has been passed across</p> <p>7 to the Independent Police Complaints Commission and</p> <p>8 indeed also to Operation Elveden, so I would</p> <p>9 respectfully ask that I don't give that name for fear of</p> <p>10 undermining what could be an ongoing investigation.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I wouldn't want it anyway, because</p> <p>12 I'm not concerned with the individual specifics, but</p> <p>13 a rather wider question.</p> <p>14 A. I'm very grateful, sir.</p> <p>15 MR JAY: For the avoidance of doubt, it's not being</p> <p>16 suggested, is it, that this senior member of the MPS was</p> <p>17 the source of the leaks in 2007, or is it?</p> <p>18 A. Regrettably, sir, I don't know who leaked, so I could</p> <p>19 not say one way or the other.</p> <p>20 Q. As you say, the matter has been taken up through formal</p> <p>21 channels and there's nothing more that we could or</p> <p>22 should say about it.</p> <p>23 Is there anything, Mr Driscoll, you'd wish to add to</p> <p>24 the evidence you've given?</p> <p>25 A. No, only that I do think it's essential that the police</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Just one moment.</p> <p>2 MR CAPLAN: I wonder, sir, could I possibly have five</p> <p>3 minutes?</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, you could.</p> <p>5 MR CAPLAN: There may be a few questions I would like to put</p> <p>6 to him.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, you could, certainly.</p> <p>8 (10.46 am)</p> <p>9 (A short break)</p> <p>10 (10.56 am)</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Please sit down.</p> <p>12 MR CAPLAN: Thank you very much for the time and, sir,</p> <p>13 I have no questions.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed. Right,</p> <p>15 thank you very much indeed, Detective Chief Inspector.</p> <p>16 MR JAY: May we move on to Mr Sullivan, please.</p> <p>17 MR MICHAEL JOHN SULLIVAN (sworn)</p> <p>18 Questions by MR JAY</p> <p>19 MR JAY: Mr Sullivan, your full name, please?</p> <p>20 A. Michael John Sullivan.</p> <p>21 Q. Thank you. Mr Sullivan, you've provided the Inquiry</p> <p>22 with a witness statement with a standard statement of</p> <p>23 truth, signed and dated by you on 28 February 2012. Is</p> <p>24 this your formal evidence to the Inquiry?</p> <p>25 A. It is.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 Q. You're currently the crime editor of the Sun. You have 2 been working at the Sun newspaper since 1990. September 3 1990 you were made a crime reporter and in 2001 you were 4 promoted to crime editor. Is that correct?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. So we understand some important background and therefore 7 the necessary parameters of any questions I might ask 8 you, have you been arrested pursuant to Operation 9 Elveden?</p> <p>10 A. I have.</p> <p>11 Q. Can I ask you first of all about the CRA? You are 12 a committee member, I think, of the CRA; is that 13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Does that -- not the fact that you're a committee 16 member, but the fact you're a member, does that in your 17 view give you any form of privileged access to the 18 police?</p> <p>19 A. I suppose yes. I mean you are -- one would hope that 20 you are regarded as being a reporter who is trustworthy. 21 The purpose of the CRA is really a group of journalists 22 who specialise in crime reporting. Through the group, 23 as it were, we would hope to be trusted with information 24 perhaps brought in on -- not sensitive information, but 25 could be told things in confidence which might put</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 papers, had home affairs correspondents who would be 2 required to cover crime material or police material, so 3 there were some questions amongst our own organisation: 4 do you accept home affairs correspondents to become 5 members of the Crime Reporters Association?</p> <p>6 This took a little while to sort out, a period of 7 years, in fact, but the common consensus on that was as 8 a result of police making their argument that we should 9 accept a wider group of people who are covering these 10 issues, common consensus in the end was to broaden out 11 and accept home affairs and people who may not 12 specifically cover just crime, but people whose jobs 13 actually involved reporting crime.</p> <p>14 MR JAY: You mentioned the build-up of trust, because 15 confidential information is provided by the police. 16 Have there ever been situations over the years where the 17 police have complained that a trust has been broken, to 18 your knowledge?</p> <p>19 A. There was one occasion, sir, and that was -- I hadn't 20 long been a crime reporter, but there was a briefing 21 given by -- actually it was the head of the 22 counter-terrorism unit, or anti-terrorist squad, as they 23 were in those days, and I can't remember or recall the 24 actual details of the briefing, I'm not even sure I was 25 present, actually, but there was a reporter from one</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 context to a story, might not necessarily be for 2 publication, but would influence what we've -- what 3 we're writing in the newspaper, or indeed broadcasting 4 through radio or television.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's self-selecting, isn't it? 6 It's a group of reporters appointed by the committee, if 7 you like?</p> <p>8 A. Well, sir, it's -- if you become a crime reporter, 9 a dedicated crime reporter, it is in your interests and 10 in the interests of others you are working with, 11 including the police and other law enforcement agencies, 12 to be a member of the Crime Reporters Association.</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I understand and I see the value 14 in it, but I just wanted to understand. The police have 15 no input into who is a member of the association?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's controlled within the 18 association?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's a peer review thing rather than 21 anything else?</p> <p>22 A. It is, but there's a caveat there, sir, in the sense 23 that a few years ago it was mainly crime reporters. Not 24 every news organisation had a dedicated crime 25 correspondent, so some newspapers, particularly Sunday</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 newspaper who hadn't long been a member, who went back 2 to his office, presumably told his news desk what he'd 3 heard, and was then required to write the story. This 4 caused a lot of problems, as you can probably imagine, 5 sir, and this particular reporter was excluded from the 6 CRA and we obviously offered our sincerest apologies to 7 the Metropolitan Police and particularly the senior 8 officer who gave that briefing. That's the only 9 occasion, sir, I can recall.</p> <p>10 Q. It might be said that one of the advantages of having an 11 experienced group of journalists in an association such 12 as this is that they over the years understand the rules 13 and do not violate them.</p> <p>14 A. That's correct, sir.</p> <p>15 Q. You make a general point, Mr Sullivan, about the change 16 in culture in relations between the MPS and the media, 17 and this is really to do with the growth of electronic 18 media and 24/7 reporting, particularly the broadcast 19 media; is that right?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, sir. It's obvious, self-evident, really, that the 21 media has mushroomed, hugely so, since when I first 22 started. Typically back in the early 1990s, before 23 satellite television had really taken off and before the 24 advent of the Internet, you would have -- even a big 25 story would only be -- a press conference would</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

1 typically be attended by reporters from the national
 2 newspapers. There would be an agency reporter or two,
 3 perhaps one or two people from the BBC and independent
 4 television and radio.

5 The same type of story now would be attended by
 6 perhaps three, four times as many people. The BBC in
 7 particular would have an Internet, they would have
 8 a national television crew, they would have a local
 9 television crew. So in that sense, you've also added to
 10 that got the 24-hour news dimension, so back in the
 11 early 1990s most of us would be covering a conference
 12 perhaps in the morning and you'd then have all day to
 13 develop the story or all day to file it, to file
 14 a finalised version of it. Nowadays a version is
 15 required for online and a version is required for the
 16 newspaper. That's as a newspaper point of view.

17 If you're a broadcaster, then you'll be going on air
 18 very, very shortly afterwards, if it's not live.

19 Q. You make it clear Mr Sullivan that as a matter of
 20 policy, and for obvious reasons, really, you would wish
 21 to speak to the investigating officer or the police
 22 officer at the coalface rather than the press office; is
 23 that right?

24 A. That's the ideal situation, sir, but in reality, if
 25 you're a crime correspondent, you're in it for the long

Page 33

1 run, it's a marathon, it's not a sprint, and that's what
 2 we abide by. Over a period of time, you become aware of
 3 the workings of the police and how -- if, say, for
 4 instance, you have an incident that occurred overnight,
 5 you would realise that the following morning they would
 6 be busy in holding meetings, office meetings, and doing
 7 the job, as it were, of investigating.

8 There are so many journalists now that you also have
 9 to have an appreciation, I think, that it is impossible
 10 for an officer, dealing with an incident, to talk to any
 11 journalist on some occasions. Most of the time you
 12 won't even know the officers, so it's sort of academic,
 13 but ideally you would want some kind of access to an
 14 officer who was investigating at some point, just to
 15 give texture, colour to a story, and get it from the
 16 horse's mouth, as it were, rather than the third party,
 17 which carries -- which -- most press officers,
 18 particularly at the Metropolitan Police and other police
 19 forces are very good, but there is only so much detail
 20 they'll be aware of.

21 Q. It's common sense, really, but is it your experience
 22 that if you do speak to the horse's mouth, as it were,
 23 you get a more reliable account?

24 A. Yes, you do. On most occasions, sir. And sometimes --
 25 and having listened through some of the evidence in this

Page 34

1 Inquiry, it's become evident as well that you do get
 2 different types of police officers. Some are very
 3 happy, sir, to engage with the media and others aren't.
 4 The austere or the expansive approach. And that
 5 perhaps, sir, I would suggest is as much to do with
 6 personality as anything else.

7 Q. In paragraph 16, please, Mr Sullivan --

8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just before you go there, you
 9 actually describe the expansion of the media means that
 10 press officers -- you used the word -- constitute an
 11 "essential barrier" between journalists and
 12 investigating officers.

13 A. I would say so.

14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You put it as high as that?

15 A. I would say so, sir, because there's simply so many of
 16 us, the media has simply become so big that there is no
 17 possible way that a police officer would have enough
 18 time to deal with media queries.

19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. Sorry, Mr Jay.

20 MR JAY: Paragraph 16 gives us the flavour of your daily
 21 interactions, although they have changed over the years.
 22 You refer to an email system. Another witness has
 23 referred to that as well. This puts out information on,
 24 is this right, high-profile cases on a daily basis?

25 A. I wouldn't necessary say high-profile cases, sir. It

Page 35

1 puts out what the Met want put out. If there were
 2 significant developments on a case which was high
 3 profile, it may well be that an email would go out with
 4 the barest of lines. I would say again the email
 5 system, where you have got a story of interest, will
 6 contain mainly the bare skeleton of the story, so it
 7 would then be incumbent upon the journalists to try and
 8 develop that.

9 That would mean in the first instance contacting the
 10 press office, and if it were then possible and there
 11 were enough time and the officer -- an officer was
 12 willing, it could mean talking to the police officer who
 13 was investigating whatever it was that, you know,
 14 whatever the subject material was.

15 Q. In terms of your professional/social interactions with
 16 senior officers, you cover this at various points in
 17 your statement. First of all, paragraph 26, you say
 18 you:

19 "... attended dinners with two of those
 20 commissioners on three or four occasions, but always in
 21 the presence of other crime reporters and directorate of
 22 public affairs staff."

23 I think those commissioners, from our analysis of
 24 the records, were probably Lord Stevens and Sir Paul
 25 Stephenson; is that correct?

Page 36

1 **A. That's correct, sir, and Lord Condon.**
 2 Q. Would you say that your professional relationship
 3 between the -- must be about six or seven commissioners
 4 now since when you started -- was it the same with each
 5 commissioner or did you get on better with some rather
 6 than others?
 7 **A. As I mentioned just a short while ago, it's a matter of**
 8 **personal style, and so -- and also, I suppose, in my own**
 9 **instance as you mature and -- one hopes you mature, but**
 10 **as you get a bit older and more experienced, then you**
 11 **become aware, sir, of broader policing issues and so in**
 12 **terms of engaging with commissioners, when I first**
 13 **became a crime correspondent, Lord Imbert was the**
 14 **Commissioner for the Metropolitan Police. I never had**
 15 **any personal engagement with him, or interaction. At**
 16 **that time Kelvin McKenzie was the editor and I think**
 17 **it's perhaps a point of interest worth noting that**
 18 **Mr McKenzie's approach to the police was that he**
 19 **respected Lord Imbert, but he didn't want to socially**
 20 **engage with him on the grounds that if he had to be**
 21 **critical, he would feel in an awkward position to do so.**
 22 **So moving on, Lord Condon was somebody who -- well,**
 23 **we had a change of editor, so the new editor who came**
 24 **in, Stuart Higgins, was more engaging and had a more --**
 25 **I mean, we had perhaps a softer focused approach at the**
 Page 37

1 Sun to be more user-friendly and more engaging in the
 2 wider community or wider outside circles, so Mr Higgins,
 3 I think, met up -- I don't know this for absolutely
 4 sure, but there was an interaction of sorts between him
 5 and Neil Wallis, who was the deputy, I think, editor at
 6 the time or went from head of news to deputy editor.
 7 Mr Wallis, I think, became friends with or struck up
 8 a reasonable relationship with Sarah Cullum, who was the
 9 head of the DPA at the time, and Lord Condon -- it's
 10 quite ironic actually in some ways some might suggest,
 11 but it was Mr Wallis who wrote a story announcing the
 12 Metropolitan Police or the Metropolitan Police
 13 Commission, at the time, his belief that there were 250
 14 corrupt officers in the police.
 15 So there was a reasonable relationship there
 16 obviously. Moving on from there, from Lord Condon,
 17 Lord Stevens became Commissioner, who had a very
 18 engaging style. The Metropolitan Police at that point
 19 were -- had been on the back foot over Stephen Lawrence,
 20 when there was a charm offensive by the Met, so that
 21 Lord Condon, Dick Fedorcio visited newspaper offices but
 22 not just one newspaper office, not just one group, but
 23 as many as possible to try and get their message across,
 24 because there was a real concern that Lord Condon,
 25 Sir Paul as he was then, might be forced to resign if
 Page 38

1 **the politics and public opinion went against him over**
 2 **the Lawrence Inquiry.**
 3 Q. Then Lord Blair?
 4 **A. Lord Blair, well, Lord Blair -- the Sun, and I can**
 5 **really only answer for the Sun, had a fairly ambivalent**
 6 **approach to Sir Ian, as he then was. I don't think he**
 7 **was our cup of tea and I dare say we wouldn't have been**
 8 **his cup of tea, but there was a pragmatic working**
 9 **relationship, which -- I say that, we weren't overtly**
 10 **critical of him for the sake of it.**
 11 Q. Okay. Paragraph 27 of your statement. On internal
 12 numbering, page 5, our page 09841. You refer to
 13 a dinner attended by Dick Fedorcio, Lord Stevens was
 14 there as well, another member of the CRA. We think it
 15 probably was a dinner which took place on 21 January
 16 2002, from records we've looked at, but it might not
 17 matter exactly when it was. Do you think that may be
 18 right?
 19 **A. It could well be, sir. In that case -- I was under the**
 20 **impression he was still -- Lord Stevens was still Deputy**
 21 **Commissioner, but I could have been wrong in my**
 22 **assumption there.**
 23 Q. You say in your statement that it was to discuss:
 24 "... what we needed as a group from the Met and vice
 25 versa."
 Page 39

1 What did you need as a group from the Met?
 2 **A. Can I just put that into context, sir? I mean, the two**
 3 **people who were there, present from the CRA, I was**
 4 **secretary at the time and John Steele, who was the Daily**
 5 **Telegraph crime correspondent, was chairman. So we were**
 6 **invited along purely with regards our status within the**
 7 **CRA to that particular dinner. We were their guests.**
 8 **The Metropolitan Police, or Lord Stevens, they wanted to**
 9 **move forward from the problems around the Lawrence**
 10 **scenario, and -- or Stephen Lawrence scenario, my**
 11 **apologies for that -- they wanted to move forward and**
 12 **they wanted to engage with the community, and a very**
 13 **good way of doing that is obviously through the media.**
 14 **So in that sense they were trying to ask us, you**
 15 **know, ideas on the best way forward, and those ideas are**
 16 **still basically applied to best practice today, and that**
 17 **is for the Metropolitan Police to try and promote itself**
 18 **on the good work it does by having the confidence to**
 19 **engage with the media, and that's easier said than done,**
 20 **because at the time, at that particular time when**
 21 **Lord Stevens took over as Commissioner, the Metropolitan**
 22 **Police were on the back foot, it had been heavily**
 23 **criticised and there was a degree of scepticism,**
 24 **I suppose is the best word, about -- cynicism, even,**
 25 **about any -- about the media in general and perhaps**
 Page 40

<p>1 even, to a certain degree, the wider public, because</p> <p>2 they felt that they'd been hung out to dry on many</p> <p>3 occasions and criticised, scathingly so, for issues</p> <p>4 which were perhaps wider than just the police.</p> <p>5 Q. We also know from the records that you had a number of</p> <p>6 one-to-one meetings with Mr Fedorcio, about five, over</p> <p>7 the years between 2004 and 2008. What was the purpose</p> <p>8 of those meetings?</p> <p>9 A. Purely, really, to keep myself in the loop of</p> <p>10 information, sir. And, you know, from -- also to offer</p> <p>11 him the opportunity, any concerns he may have about</p> <p>12 coverage of Metropolitan Police matters in our newspaper</p> <p>13 and to maintain a good relationship. There was no --</p> <p>14 there was no overriding, you know, aim, as it were, from</p> <p>15 any of those social engagements.</p> <p>16 Q. The information you referred to, was it gossip, ever?</p> <p>17 A. I wouldn't put it down to gossip, sir, I really</p> <p>18 wouldn't, but it could involve some discussion around</p> <p>19 internal politics within the Met, but not gossip,</p> <p>20 I wouldn't use that word, or tittle-tattle. It might</p> <p>21 be -- I mean, Dick and I became fairly -- you know, we</p> <p>22 had a reasonably close working relationship forged over</p> <p>23 many years and I felt -- he felt on occasions that he</p> <p>24 could be -- not necessarily open up with any great</p> <p>25 personal detail on anyone, but talk about his concerns,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 straightforward manner.</p> <p>2 On occasions, and these are where problems could</p> <p>3 arise, they could be around issues of personalities and</p> <p>4 involvement with the law, so celebrity arrests, that</p> <p>5 kind of thing, which I must admit from a personal point</p> <p>6 of view I never got any real satisfaction from</p> <p>7 professionally, but in common with the rest of the</p> <p>8 media, there does seem to be more of a focus on</p> <p>9 celebrity stories, certainly in the last few years, and</p> <p>10 so some of those type of instants would obviously be as</p> <p>11 you described, Mr Jay, meat and drink.</p> <p>12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But let me just understand, as the</p> <p>13 crime reporter, is it just a matter of stories that are</p> <p>14 straightforward reporting, or isn't it rather more than</p> <p>15 that, with some pretty aggressive crime-related</p> <p>16 campaigns?</p> <p>17 A. Yes. I mean, the Sun in particular, sir, campaigned</p> <p>18 against knife crime. 2008 or "2000 and hate", as it was</p> <p>19 billed in our newspaper, was a year when there were 27</p> <p>20 teenagers murdered in London. It was an issue which</p> <p>21 I didn't think the Metropolitan Police got to grips with</p> <p>22 until fairly late on in the year. When they did so,</p> <p>23 they did apply resources, it was one that was then</p> <p>24 picked up politically, but -- so yes, it has formed --</p> <p>25 crime has formed the basis of campaigns organised by the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 I suppose, and use me in some ways, as I used him, as</p> <p>2 sounding boards. Obviously under Lord Stevens' regime</p> <p>3 I think for the people, for the Metropolitan Police,</p> <p>4 they found it easy to work and it seemed to be,</p> <p>5 particularly with the media as well, things ran pretty</p> <p>6 smoothly. When Sir Ian or Lord Blair took over, there</p> <p>7 were difficulties.</p> <p>8 Q. Were you made aware by Mr Fedorcio of tensions and</p> <p>9 frictions within the management board?</p> <p>10 A. Not specifically, other than I could tell through not</p> <p>11 just speaking to Mr Fedorcio but others that there were</p> <p>12 some frictions, but, I mean, these weren't things I was</p> <p>13 particularly interested in writing a story about, sir,</p> <p>14 because there was no appetite for that kind of</p> <p>15 information within my office. It wasn't work -- we, as</p> <p>16 a newspaper, we weren't particularly interested in</p> <p>17 getting involved in recording internal police politics.</p> <p>18 Q. So what was meat and drink for the Sun newspaper when it</p> <p>19 came to crime reporting?</p> <p>20 A. I wouldn't say, sir, that -- meat and drink, is that the</p> <p>21 right phrase? If we're going to put it that way, we</p> <p>22 would just simply cover events of the day, and we'd be</p> <p>23 looking for anything which we saw as being of interest</p> <p>24 to our readers. Mostly this involved covering</p> <p>25 robberies, murders, crimes, and doing those in a pretty</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 Sun, and that will probably be a good example of that,</p> <p>2 sir.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, and you have very strong views</p> <p>4 about sentencing.</p> <p>5 A. The paper certainly does, sir.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but is that through you or is</p> <p>7 that through some other --</p> <p>8 A. This would be through the editor or --</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Oh, obviously the editor is</p> <p>10 ultimately responsible.</p> <p>11 A. It would also, sir, be through perception of what the</p> <p>12 readers would require, but it would depend really what</p> <p>13 the sentencing was for, sir.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but -- I'm sorry, I'm not making</p> <p>15 myself clear. I'm trying to get to grips with what</p> <p>16 you're doing. You're writing these stories, presumably?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: As the crime reporter, editor.</p> <p>19 A. I'm the crime editor, but there are other people within</p> <p>20 the organisation, within the paper, who cover crime</p> <p>21 stories, but yes, I mean in the back of your mind you</p> <p>22 know what you have to -- you know what the audience is,</p> <p>23 you know what the paper requires, so you are working to</p> <p>24 get those type of stories or put them in those -- that</p> <p>25 type of light that --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Sullivan, I'm not being
 2 critical --
 3 **A. I understand, sir.**
 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The Sun is entitled to maintain
 5 whatever profile it likes on the issues of the day,
 6 I have no difficulty with that at all.
 7 **A. Yes.**
 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what free speech is all about.
 9 **A. Thank you, sir.**
 10 MR JAY: Do you think you were part of Mr Fedorcio's inner
 11 circle of favoured journalists?
 12 **A. I would probably say I was, sir, yes. If -- "favoured**
 13 **journalists"? I don't know that that was -- that**
 14 **wouldn't necessarily tell the whole story, sir. I think**
 15 **Dick, if I can call him that since he's a friend as well**
 16 **as professional contact, over a period of time you get**
 17 **to know someone well and therefore you would normally**
 18 **expect to perhaps have more contact with that person,**
 19 **not just Dick, but with plenty of others, rather than**
 20 **someone arriving -- say, for instance, another newspaper**
 21 **has appointed a crime reporter. In the same way that**
 22 **I didn't know Mike Brammett(?) or Sarah Cullum, because**
 23 **I was an inexperienced reporter at the time, there would**
 24 **perhaps be reporters arriving or being made crime**
 25 **reporters who would then take -- it does take a number**
 Page 45

1 of years to build up a good working relationship, so
 2 I think that would -- "favour" is perhaps not totally
 3 applicable but perhaps I would regard myself as part of
 4 a group of crime -- long-serving crime reporters who
 5 would have been in a circle of trusted journalists for
 6 Mr Fedorcio to talk to.
 7 Q. In terms of what you might have been trying to get out
 8 of him -- I'm not suggesting anything improper now --
 9 were you expecting him to tip you off, for example, if
 10 celebrities were going to be arrested? Is it that sort
 11 of thing?
 12 **A. Certainly not, sir. And I -- no, certainly not.**
 13 Q. Because you told us about five minutes ago about
 14 celebrities, and this may or may not tie in with
 15 paragraph 57 of your statement. You tell us there that
 16 you've been invited on mass raids with other
 17 journalists. The Inquiry has received evidence of
 18 photographers turning up when celebrities are of
 19 interest to the police. Do you know anything about
 20 that?
 21 **A. Well, I am not aware of any stories or -- in terms of**
 22 **turning up home addresses. There was only one I can**
 23 **recall, and that was actually not a tip from a police**
 24 **officer, it was a tip from a journalist, and that was**
 25 **a few years ago. That was the only one I can recall**
 Page 46

1 where we were present when the police arrived.
 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not uncommon, though, is it?
 3 **A. No, I think there's a misconception here, sir. I think**
 4 **what you're seeing on television and in the newspapers**
 5 **where there are photographs of celebrities or well-known**
 6 **people who have been arrested then coming out of**
 7 **a police station, what will happen is if the newspapers**
 8 **become aware through whichever means that somebody is**
 9 **under arrest, a group of photographers, reporters from**
 10 **all papers and camera crews may well go to -- try and go**
 11 **to the police station where that person is being held.**
 12 **They won't necessarily be told where they're being held**
 13 **by the police. In fact, in my experience it's quite**
 14 **rare that they would. But you would split it up in a**
 15 **practical working, practical way, split up the work of**
 16 **one paper or one photographer goes to this police**
 17 **station, another goes to that police station. I mean**
 18 **I've known occasions in our own office where we've had**
 19 **teams of three, perhaps four photographers going out to**
 20 **different police stations trying to find out --**
 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Which one.
 22 **A. -- which one they're being held at, sir.**
 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you got some information about
 24 the fact that it is at one. It's come from somebody.
 25 **A. Well, there are various different means, sir, for --**
 Page 47

1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Okay.
 2 **A. -- information about the arrest of people to come out,**
 3 **and very often it might be released by that person or**
 4 **the arrested person's own PR.**
 5 MR JAY: You say in paragraph 59:
 6 "There have been one or two occasions where I have
 7 also been told informally by contacts that they are
 8 going out on a raid by way of conversation, but I have
 9 never tried to utilise that."
 10 Are the contacts you're referring to there
 11 journalist contacts?
 12 **A. Mixture of both, really, sir, but it would be by way of**
 13 **conversation. It wouldn't be necessarily as anything**
 14 **for a story, but that's happened on a couple of**
 15 **occasions. But it wouldn't be for me to act on.**
 16 **I mean -- you know, there are cases I don't think it**
 17 **would have perhaps been of any interest anyway to the**
 18 **paper, sir, but I just was trying to be -- explain that**
 19 **sometimes as a crime correspondent you might be in**
 20 **a social setting where somebody mentions that there**
 21 **could be something of -- that they might be doing some**
 22 **work related to whatever subject. If that was a police**
 23 **officer, rarely the case. Or that you might have**
 24 **knowledge from even -- I don't know, I don't want to get**
 25 **too specific, but a lawyer, for instance, who might be**
 Page 48

<p>1 told they were going to perhaps recommend somebody or --</p> <p>2 so you might have advance knowledge that there could be</p> <p>3 some kind of police action, sir, but you wouldn't</p> <p>4 necessarily act on it.</p> <p>5 Q. I've been asked to raise this with you, back to</p> <p>6 paragraph 57, where you refer to "increasing political</p> <p>7 involvement in policing". What do you mean by that?</p> <p>8 A. I've noticed over the last few years that certainly</p> <p>9 Mayor Johnson and Kit Malthouse while he was chair of</p> <p>10 the MPA had gone out on operations with the police. To</p> <p>11 my mind it was potentially crossing over a barrier there</p> <p>12 from being, if you like, the political guardians of the</p> <p>13 police to getting directly involved with operations.</p> <p>14 I must admit I didn't feel that it was particularly</p> <p>15 appropriate.</p> <p>16 Q. Can I go back to your social or semi-professional</p> <p>17 interactions. Assistant commissioners. We haven't</p> <p>18 found any evidence of you lunching or having dinners</p> <p>19 with AC Yates, but there's one with AC Hayman. Do you</p> <p>20 think we have it right from our analysis of the records?</p> <p>21 Does that accord with your memory, in other words?</p> <p>22 A. I met both those on rare social engagements, but on</p> <p>23 John Yates, I'd known -- I think it's probably worth</p> <p>24 putting it into context. I knew -- I first met John</p> <p>25 back in 1995, and that was a dreadful murder of a police</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 again, if I may expand on this, there's been a lot of</p> <p>2 mention in this Inquiry about long lunches and reporters</p> <p>3 or journalists entertaining lavishly, bottles of</p> <p>4 champagne. My experience actually is that those</p> <p>5 lunching and buying dinners have become an increasing</p> <p>6 rarity over the last few years, and that was really</p> <p>7 perhaps as Fleet Street sobered up or perhaps as the</p> <p>8 police became more professional with alcohol taken</p> <p>9 during working hours.</p> <p>10 The normal social setting would be in a pub, or</p> <p>11 possibly a wine bar, but more likely a pub, and it</p> <p>12 wouldn't be a case of the reporter handing over a credit</p> <p>13 card behind the bill and let's all go and drink as much</p> <p>14 as possible. It would be a case of the journalist</p> <p>15 buying a round of drinks and the police officer buying</p> <p>16 a round of drinks in those social settings. And I don't</p> <p>17 know whether they would be -- whether a note would be</p> <p>18 made of those. I don't know. I mean, I'm not -- that's</p> <p>19 one -- that would be one for those officers.</p> <p>20 Q. When witnesses speak of drinking at a wine bar near New</p> <p>21 Scotland Yard, this links in with your evidence, it's</p> <p>22 just a couple of drinks is it?</p> <p>23 A. It does. I think, sir, you may be referring to the</p> <p>24 evidence given by Bob Quick, when he said that he</p> <p>25 noticed myself, Lucy Panton and, I can't remember, it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 mechanic by the name of Alan Holmes. At the time he was</p> <p>2 working in the north west London area murder command.</p> <p>3 He invited two or three reporters, I think there were</p> <p>4 three of us, who were aware of what had happened,</p> <p>5 I think it had happened over a Christmas period. We</p> <p>6 were invited up to Hendon and it was the first time I'd</p> <p>7 met him.</p> <p>8 As it transpired, we were given a little briefing by</p> <p>9 Mr Yates. The two other reporters -- I was relatively</p> <p>10 new to crime reporting -- went away and wrote up the</p> <p>11 story, even though it had been strictly off the record</p> <p>12 and not for publication, so I lost out, as it were, but</p> <p>13 in a different sort of way the fact that I didn't break</p> <p>14 that trust probably stood me in good stead later with</p> <p>15 Mr Yates, and I think it's a mark -- I've heard lots of</p> <p>16 things said about Mr Yates during this Inquiry, but it's</p> <p>17 a mark of his true character, I would say, that when we</p> <p>18 did ever meet socially, Mr Yates always brought up the</p> <p>19 subject of Alan Holmes and his regrets about not finding</p> <p>20 the killers of Mr Holmes and the hope that he would</p> <p>21 eventually still find them.</p> <p>22 I don't know if that particularly answers your</p> <p>23 question, Mr Jay. There would be with -- you mentioned</p> <p>24 those two ACs by name. I think I had social interaction</p> <p>25 perhaps once a year with both of them, and mainly --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 may have been Stephen Wright, drinking at this wine bar,</p> <p>2 which is a Davy's Wine Bar, around the corner from</p> <p>3 Scotland Yard, and in fact I referred to that in my</p> <p>4 statement because it was one of the occasions I met Sir</p> <p>5 Paul Stephenson when he was Deputy Commissioner, and</p> <p>6 from memory, I can't recall exactly, but I think there</p> <p>7 had been a leaving reception held at the Yard that</p> <p>8 night. A number of people including press officers and</p> <p>9 a number of journalists had gone across the road to the</p> <p>10 wine bar, which is fairly near to New Scotland Yard.</p> <p>11 That was the only time I can ever recall meeting</p> <p>12 John Yates late at night, or later in the evening.</p> <p>13 I think there may have been one other occasion where we</p> <p>14 bumped into each other earlier in the evening. So</p> <p>15 I rather took exception to Mr Quick's assertion that we</p> <p>16 were there specifically for one purpose, and haven't we</p> <p>17 got homes and families to go to, because he was talking</p> <p>18 about one incident there, which I recorded faithfully in</p> <p>19 this statement, and completely making the wrong</p> <p>20 interpretation.</p> <p>21 Q. You made it clear, Mr Sullivan, that you weren't</p> <p>22 particularly close to Mr Hayman and Mr Yates. Who were</p> <p>23 the assistant commissioners who you were closer to?</p> <p>24 A. I didn't say I wasn't close to them. I don't think</p> <p>25 Mr -- I knew Mr Hayman and Mr Yates relatively well.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 Going back in time, I can't recall being particularly 2 close to any assistant commissioners. 3 Q. Yes. May I move forward, please, to paragraph 39. I've 4 been asked to put this to you. You say: 5 "The Sun is largely supportive of the Met and police 6 in general." 7 Do you think that that's right, or should the Sun be 8 neutral? 9 A. It's generally supportive of the police position, and 10 particularly of what we would regard -- well, what are 11 described as rank and file officers. I think the Sun, 12 back in the mid-1990s, identified that it was a paper 13 that was widely read in police canteens, as it is in 14 army NAAFI's, et cetera, so we saw rank and file officers 15 as being part of our core readership, and therefore we 16 tried to be largely supportive to -- in their 17 interests -- you know, of their interests. But that is 18 not to say that we were blind in our support, and there 19 were plenty of occasions where, you know, when required, 20 we were -- well, rightly critical of police actions or 21 the behaviour of police officers. But in general terms, 22 we were supportive. 23 Q. Okay. Paragraph 60, off-the-record briefings. You've 24 attended a substantial number of those over the years, 25 although they're much less frequent nowadays, you say.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 forces have used the same tactic, I suppose you could 2 say. So journalists would remain and then there would 3 be an off-camera section where you could put questions 4 and senior officers would try and put a context into the 5 investigation. So, for instance, if you -- if one 6 newspaper or TV company had been speculating rather 7 unhelpfully about suspects, you might be given sort of 8 detail around that. 9 Q. You say in paragraph 65 you were led to understand that 10 analysts -- this is analysts within either the DPS or 11 the DPA -- are used to scan stories looking for 12 potential leaks. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Do you know from the information you've received who 15 within the police is carrying out these scanning 16 exercises? 17 A. Well, I've just been told on reasonable authority that 18 it refers to the director of the DPA as one of his 19 tasks. I mean, this is where I've written the -- this 20 particular part of the statement in answer to that 21 question. One of his jobs is to look out for potential 22 leaks. 23 I have additionally been told that there is a system 24 whereby reporters are graded in terms of whether they're 25 favourable to the Metropolitan Police or not, and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 There may be a distinction between off-the-record 2 briefings, as it were, which are authorised, they come 3 from someone of inspector level or above, and within 4 that person's bailiwick, and off-the-record briefings 5 where unauthorised information is provided. Were you 6 ever the recipient of information which fell into the 7 second category? 8 A. I don't think I was, sir, actually. I mean 9 off-the-record briefings, there has always been 10 a problem understanding what the term "off the record" 11 means. To some people it can mean "not for 12 attribution". For others it can mean "not to be used 13 at any cost, Chatham House rules". I would understand 14 "off-the-record briefings" in the way the question was 15 put to mean: typically you've been -- I might give 16 one -- well, an example where there is a press 17 conference held about a high-profile murder, and this is 18 a general press conference with everybody invited. It's 19 held on camera, and there could be reasons why 20 investigating officers want to put their inquiry into 21 context. There will be specific operational reasons. 22 So on those occasions, when the cameras have been 23 switched off and the crews have gone away, journalists 24 will be -- will remain in the press room typically at 25 New Scotland Yard, in reference to the Met, but other</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 I don't know how they do that, on what basis they make 2 their judgment, but I'm told that -- I don't suggest 3 it's a top 20, who's the person that's going to be more 4 favourable to the Met than others, but I was told that 5 that system existed and I quite believe it. 6 Q. From the way you phrased that answer, you're probably 7 unwilling to tell us who it was who told you that; is 8 that right? 9 A. I think -- 10 Q. Or if you are willing, perhaps you could share it with 11 us? 12 A. I don't think it would be appropriate for me to say so, 13 sir. 14 Q. Hm. So the marking's on the basis of who's been 15 favourable or not towards the Met, rather than which 16 journalists are more likely to be the recipients of 17 leaked information; have I correctly understood it? 18 A. I don't think you have understood it properly. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: These are separate things. 20 A. No, it's got nothing to do with who's likely to receive 21 leaks. 22 MR JAY: No, no. 23 A. It's everything to do with a set of circumstances 24 happen, there is a story around it, and I think this 25 marking system is -- and I'm not quite sure what the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 criteria for the marking system is, but it's done on the 2 number of -- presumably the number of stories 3 journalists ask which are critical of the Met and the 4 number of stories which they do which are praising of 5 the Met. I don't think it -- my understanding was that 6 it didn't have anything to do with the number of leaks 7 a journalist might receive, sir. 8 MR JAY: No, no. No, I didn't think it did, but I was just 9 making sure that that's the way your evidence is to be 10 understood. It's direct hearsay or multiple hearsay. 11 You understand the difference, Mr Sullivan? Have you 12 been told by someone who has direct knowledge of this 13 marking system, or have you been told by someone who -- 14 A. I believe so sir. I believe so. 15 Q. There have been leak inquiries, you tell us about those 16 in paragraph 75. 17 A. Yes, sir. 18 Q. You personally have received a number of calls from the 19 Met DPS? 20 A. Mm. This is, to put it into context, sir, since last 21 summer and the events -- subsequent to the events of 22 last July, the DPS called where we've run stories using 23 the term "police source", and also where there have been 24 stories which they might perceive to have come from 25 within the police, originated within the police. I do Page 57</p>	<p>1 you disfavour acceptance of the HMIC recommendation that 2 police officers should record all meetings with 3 journalists. I don't quite follow your reasoning there, 4 Mr Sullivan. Could you help us? 5 A. Okay. As a -- sir, as I mentioned earlier, I wrote this 6 statement in January, and I don't think I mentioned it 7 here, but having heard some of the evidence that's come 8 out of this Inquiry, sir, I have changed my stance on 9 several points. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'd be very interested to learn each 11 point that you'd like to moderate to such extent as 12 you're able to share it with me. 13 A. Well, if I could perhaps just start firstly with the -- 14 this particular sentence: 15 "... runs the risk of a journalist meeting somebody 16 who notifies their line manager and then getting 17 information for a story later in the day which casts 18 unfair suspicion on that officer." 19 What I meant there, sir, was that there was one 20 occasion, it happened a number of years ago, and it 21 involved a high-profile murder, where a reporter got 22 quite a good story on this particular high-profile 23 murder investigation and he deliberately took out the 24 press officer who was dealing with that particular 25 investigation or stories on the day before he then Page 59</p>
<p>1 stress that. 2 Q. Is this the right inference then, that you often use the 3 term "police source" when in fact the source is not 4 a police officer? 5 A. I've been aware for some time, since last summer, about 6 the issues of "police source". It is a very difficult 7 one for me to answer, actually, because there could be 8 ramifications around the police investigation which I'm 9 currently subject to. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't want you in any sense to 11 embarrass yourself, Mr Sullivan. That's not the purpose 12 of this Inquiry at all. But are you able to say what 13 you understand by the phrase, just using neutral 14 language, "police source"? 15 A. Well, sir, I mean "police source" could be anything, it 16 really could. There is a lack of clarity around that, 17 and I think that's about as far as I could possibly go. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good. 19 MR JAY: So you say that when the MPS had made enquiry of 20 you in relation to particular stories, you make it clear 21 at the end of paragraph 75: 22 "On none of these occasions was the information 23 I received given to me by a police officer." 24 A. That's correct, sir. 25 Q. You just deal with the point in paragraph 76 and 77 that Page 58</p>	<p>1 published his story around that investigation. And of 2 course the press officer got the blame for that from 3 police officers who were investigating, but 4 I subsequently learnt that it wasn't the press officer 5 who had leaked that story. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So the press officer had been set up 7 by the reporter? 8 A. He'd been set up by the reporter. So I've always borne 9 that in mind to be very careful around any kind of 10 engagement with somebody who's working on an inquiry 11 which I might be doing a story on, lest they should be 12 blamed for being the source of the leak. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's a problem, isn't it? But what 14 you've just described was duplicitous by the reporter. 15 A. It was, sir, yes, it was. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You won't be surprised to hear that 17 that doesn't enormously impress me. 18 A. I'm not surprised at all, sir, but I only mention it to 19 put it into context, sir. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I understand the point, 21 I understand the point. 22 A. It was a rare occasion, sir, and I'm not aware of any 23 other -- I mean, they may well have happened, but I'm 24 just saying that made that particular press officer very 25 vulnerable, well, to being accused of being the source Page 60</p>

<p>1 of the leak.</p> <p>2 So that's why notifying could run some kind of --</p> <p>3 notification could run some kind of risk that somebody</p> <p>4 who you'd perhaps met the night before and who</p> <p>5 faithfully recorded as required that they met with</p> <p>6 a particular journalist, sir, then that particular</p> <p>7 journalist writes a story and it's that person they've</p> <p>8 seen the night before, perhaps in a group situation or</p> <p>9 whatever, but from the particular inquiry team he gets</p> <p>10 the blame, when he could be somebody entirely different.</p> <p>11 MR JAY: It might be said that a notification requirement</p> <p>12 would have a stultifying effect on unauthorised</p> <p>13 disclosures by police officers on journalists, but would</p> <p>14 have no impact on authorised off-the-record disclosures.</p> <p>15 Do you see the point?</p> <p>16 A. I do see the point, sir. It really is -- clearly,</p> <p>17 I mean listening to this evidence, I accept that there</p> <p>18 is a need for -- to protect journalists and police</p> <p>19 officers alike, you need a framework of some sort,</p> <p>20 a system. I personally recognise that. But it's</p> <p>21 then -- if you like, it's how do you go about that, how</p> <p>22 do you find that middle ground or the drunken</p> <p>23 clairvoyant, as it were, the happy medium, to use that</p> <p>24 analogy, which is the crux of it, in my opinion.</p> <p>25 I mean, I can move on at this point, Mr Jay, to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 see any harm of that, sir. At this point in time,</p> <p>2 looking back and having heard the evidence in this</p> <p>3 Inquiry, I think it might be the best thing, all ways</p> <p>4 around. But it's different from a group situation.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I suppose the professionals involved,</p> <p>6 that is both the reporters and the police, on your</p> <p>7 retirement party example, would have to accept that you</p> <p>8 simply don't mix business with pleasure, and if you're</p> <p>9 going along to see somebody because you've retired, then</p> <p>10 the one thing you don't do under any circumstances is</p> <p>11 talk business.</p> <p>12 A. It very rarely is, sir. The most that you're most</p> <p>13 likely to hear is, "I've got an interesting case, I'll</p> <p>14 be in touch, or a press officer will", and that's the</p> <p>15 reality. That's the working reality.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, that may be, but provided</p> <p>17 everybody understood the framework, the ground rules,</p> <p>18 then that might be sufficient to cope with your</p> <p>19 everybody having to report presence at the retirement</p> <p>20 party. I'm not saying it would be, I'm merely just</p> <p>21 trying to deal with your example.</p> <p>22 A. Where you do have a problem, though, sir, and it is</p> <p>23 worth mentioning this in terms of the Metropolitan</p> <p>24 Police, like any other -- or any police force, like any</p> <p>25 other organisation, wants to protect its own interests,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 HMIC report, ask this question in the context of that,</p> <p>2 and the Elizabeth Filkin report, both of which seem to</p> <p>3 recognise that there is a requirement for a framework --</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, can you tell me of a framework</p> <p>5 that might work? You've knocked around this area</p> <p>6 forever, as it were.</p> <p>7 A. I think if there were clear guidelines, sir, on what is</p> <p>8 acceptable and what is unacceptable, it would be</p> <p>9 helpful. What it needs to be is practical, so for</p> <p>10 instance every now and again I am invited to a -- mostly</p> <p>11 these days, because of my age, retirement party from</p> <p>12 a police officer who I may have known, or press officer,</p> <p>13 for many years. If I were to turn up, or indeed any</p> <p>14 other journalist could turn up to such a social</p> <p>15 occasion, would everybody present then have to record</p> <p>16 the presence -- my own presence or the presence of any</p> <p>17 other journalist? I think you're getting into realms</p> <p>18 of -- layers of bureaucracy which would be impossible to</p> <p>19 manage.</p> <p>20 If I were to have a one-to-one or any other</p> <p>21 journalist were to have a one-to-one meeting, a cup of</p> <p>22 tea, a drink, to discuss any particular case or incident</p> <p>23 which a police officer may be or press officer might be</p> <p>24 trying to promote or promote some good work, then if</p> <p>25 there was a record of that, I personally couldn't really</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 and where there is a story or something which is quite</p> <p>2 critical of that police force, you're hardly going to</p> <p>3 expect them to open up. So if somebody wants to come</p> <p>4 forward to a journalist and tell a true story, something</p> <p>5 that is in the public interest that needs to be known</p> <p>6 about, then guidelines such as ones we're talking about</p> <p>7 would make that very difficult, if not impossible.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, you might have to have some</p> <p>9 whistle-blowing policy that's rather more effective than</p> <p>10 whatever whistle-blowing policy presently exists, but</p> <p>11 that's a slightly different point, isn't it?</p> <p>12 A. I understand that, sir, but it does -- I mean, the point</p> <p>13 being it needs to be part of the equation, I would</p> <p>14 argue, sir.</p> <p>15 MR JAY: Let me ask you a couple of some more general</p> <p>16 questions now that have been put by others. Did you</p> <p>17 learn in 2006 that the Metropolitan Police had</p> <p>18 discovered that it was possible to intercept mobile</p> <p>19 phone voicemails?</p> <p>20 A. The first I knew anybody was able to intercept messages</p> <p>21 on a mobile phone was when Clive Goodman and</p> <p>22 Glenn Mulcaire were arrested.</p> <p>23 Q. So it follows from that answer you didn't know anything</p> <p>24 about it before 8 August 2006, then?</p> <p>25 A. No, sir.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

<p>1 Q. Did you hear rumours that these activities were going on 2 at the News of the World? 3 A. No, sir, not at all. 4 Q. Can I ask you, please, about the Daniel Morgan murder. 5 There was, I think, a photograph in the Sun, it was an 6 horrific murder. I think it was -- I don't know the 7 precise details, but it involved an axe. Do you know 8 anything about how that photograph came to be in the 9 Sun? 10 A. That photograph was provided by -- the best put it as 11 a member of the public, or a -- a journalistic source 12 would be as far as I could go on that, sir. It is an 13 investigation case which I know very well, actually, and 14 again in relation to Mr Quick's statement, if I can go 15 back to that -- and I don't mean it personally to 16 Mr Quick, but he did say in his statement or in his 17 evidence to this Inquiry that Southern Investigations, 18 which Mr Morgan was a partner of, an investigation 19 agency which was used by some of the media, he mentioned 20 that it was used by News of the World and the Sun. 21 I would like it to be absolutely crystal clear that I am 22 not aware of the Sun ever having used Southern 23 Investigations for any purposes, and given my knowledge 24 on that particular case, I think I would know that, sir. 25 Q. In terms of the photograph, which you say was provided</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 that Elizabeth Filkin's report was an honest and decent 2 attempt to grasp what was obviously a very complex 3 issues, and issues, I hasten to add, which could have 4 some impact on democracy, because if we get to 5 a position in this period of austerity, as it's so been 6 described, the police period of austerity, if you get to 7 a position where police officers become agents of the 8 state, I do think there's a real risk that they would 9 lose the political independence and could be, who knows, 10 potentially utilised by any government of the day for 11 its own purposes, which might not be in the interests of 12 its -- of the general position, so that there are 13 some -- I mean, taking it forward even more, I think 14 some real crucial points around the public profile of 15 the police. 16 I felt that the Filkin report, in particular, was 17 naive in the sense that it required absolute openness to 18 work, and we've heard from Mr Paddick, or this Inquiry 19 has heard from Mr Paddick about his report on rape and 20 the quality of rape investigations. I thought it was an 21 interesting point because subsequent to that you had two 22 absolute scandals, in my opinion, John Worboys and 23 Kirk Reid, where it could be argued, certainly more than 24 argued, that the Met had been culpable and had failed in 25 apprehending those rapists. Had that report -- who</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 to you by a journalistic source, do you know who took 2 the decision that the photograph should be published? 3 A. Presumably it would have been our editor or perhaps 4 someone on our back bench at the time, sir. 5 Q. Were you involved in that decision-making? 6 A. I wasn't, sir. 7 MR JAY: Okay, I think that's as far as I can take that 8 issue. Indeed, those are all the questions I have for 9 you, Mr Sullivan. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: During the course of your evidence, 11 Mr Sullivan, you said that reflecting on your statement, 12 which actually is dated -- the signed version is dated 13 28 February, but you said you prepared it in January -- 14 in the light of what you'd heard, there were a number of 15 things that you'd thought again about. 16 A. I have -- 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You mentioned one of them, but 18 I would be very keen to know if there's any other aspect 19 of your statement, whether it's a fact or an expression 20 of opinion that's contained within it, that we have 21 perhaps not covered, that you'd like to modify. 22 A. I was thinking more around Elizabeth Filkin's report, 23 sir, which I think I described the HMIC report to 24 media/police relations as being more reasonable, and on 25 reflection I would like to take that back. I do accept</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 knows. Had that report from Mr Paddick been released 2 earlier, perhaps it might have had an effect, 3 a political effect, in beefing up the -- or reinforcing 4 resources for rape investigation, sexual offenders 5 investigation, which has always been a Cinderella of 6 policing anyway, and come secondary to political 7 considerations of the day. 8 So I have concerns about the Filkin report in that 9 sense, and I also felt that it was let down by 10 a patronising tone, sir, towards journalists, that 11 journalists do not practice abstinence well. Nor do the 12 police in my experience and nor, if I may be so bold to 13 say, nor do lawyers. We're picked out there as people, 14 and I'm talking about journalists in general, who go 15 along to buy a lunch and pour as much wine down 16 somebody's throat to get a story, and I don't know any 17 reporters that have ever operated like that, not crime 18 reporters. 19 There's a warning to police officers: be careful 20 because journalists could be tape recording everything 21 you say. I don't know any crime reporters that would 22 ever have tape-recorded conversations between themselves 23 and police officers, and so I felt there was a negative 24 approach to moving forward. 25 At least the HMIC report does accept that the media</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

<p>1 is part of police life, that there needs to be openness 2 and a maturity around engaging with the media, and so in 3 that sense I just wanted to make the point, clarify that 4 I felt that the HMIC approach was a more mature one and 5 perhaps one that might be -- we might be -- 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, you actually said that in 7 paragraph 74. 8 A. Right, all right, okay. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. 10 MR GARNHAM: Sir? 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, Mr Garnham? 12 MR GARNHAM: Sir, I would apply either to ask a question of 13 this witness or alternatively to indicate openly the 14 Met's position in respect of one allegation made by this 15 witness, namely that in paragraph 65, to the effect that 16 the Met either have charts on individual reporters with 17 a system of marking to show if they're regarded as being 18 favourable or not towards the Met. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If you want to ask a couple of 20 questions about that, you can do so. 21 MR GARNHAM: Thank you, sir. 22 Questions by MR GARNHAM 23 MR GARNHAM: You mentioned in answer to Mr Jay, Mr Sullivan, 24 that it was your understanding that the Met had such 25 a system?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 a slight break before, but we need another five minutes 2 before we go to the next witness. 3 (12.08 pm) 4 (A short break) 5 (12.16 pm) 6 MR JAY: The next witness is Mr Stephen Wright, please. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 8 MR STEPHEN JOHN WRIGHT (sworn) 9 Questions by MR JAY 10 MR JAY: Your full name, please, Mr Wright. 11 A. Stephen John Wright. 12 Q. Thank you. You provided the Inquiry with a witness 13 statement which you have signed and dated, 21 February 14 2012. There isn't a statement of truth on it but is 15 this your formal evidence to the Inquiry? 16 A. It is. 17 Q. Mr Wright, you currently are associated news editor at 18 the Daily Mail? 19 A. Associate news editor. 20 Q. And you were promoted to that position in September 21 2010. But before then for about 15 years you were the 22 crime editor; is that right? 23 A. I was crime editor at the end, Mr Jay. 24 Q. Yes, pardon me. You joined the crime desk in January 25 1996 and you were promoted to crime editor, I don't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 A. That's correct, sir. 2 Q. Can I suggest to you that there is no such system by 3 which the Met grade journalists according to how 4 favourable their stories are towards the Met and ask you 5 whether you're able to give us any indication as to how 6 you think you know that? 7 A. As I mentioned earlier, sir, I can't give you -- tell 8 you who told me, but there may not be such a system now, 9 but I can certainly tell you that I was reliably 10 informed, perhaps three or four years ago, could be five 11 years ago, sir, that there was such a system. 12 Q. Might it be possible that you or your source are 13 confusing arrangements to detect policing themes in the 14 media, although even that didn't isolate particular 15 journalists? 16 A. No, it's not possible at all. I'm quite confident that 17 what I said is correct. 18 Q. Then I formally suggest to you that your source is 19 inaccurate. 20 A. I hope that -- 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's the problem about unnamed 22 sources. 23 A. Absolutely, sir. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. Thank you. 25 Well, shall we have five minutes? We did have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 think you say when, but when was that? 2 A. I think it was around 2006. 3 Q. Thank you. Your statement makes it clear that you 4 received a significant number of awards. Reporter of 5 the year in 2007, that's BBC, "What the Papers Say" 6 specialist writer of the year in 2009 at the British 7 Press Awards and joint winner of the Cudlipp award, 8 that's twice, for excellence in journalism, and then 9 you've been shortlisted and runner up for various other 10 prestigious awards. Can you tell us a small amount 11 about the stories which secured you those awards? 12 A. In 2007, reporter of the year -- I'm just looking at the 13 screen here -- I can't -- 14 Q. It's an unfair question, I didn't give you warning of 15 it. 16 A. I don't actually remember, but I think what those 17 stories were, I think one was to do with Bob Woolmer, 18 and that investigation into the murder that never was, 19 I think it was something to do with the cash for honours 20 investigation, and I believe it may have been something 21 to do with the Rachel Nickell case, but please don't 22 hold me to that because I didn't look it up before 23 I came. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's across the range of crime? 25 A. That's right, sir.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 MR JAY: I think it probably follows from your evidence for 2 the 14 or 15-year period when you were working in crime, 3 if I can put it in those terms, you were a member of the 4 Crime Reporters Association? 5 A. I was indeed. 6 Q. This is a general question about the Crime Reporters 7 Association. Does it give you privileged access to the 8 police? 9 A. I wouldn't actually say it does, actually. 10 Q. Well, you hesitated, but -- 11 A. No, because I think it's a definition of what it 12 projected or not, because I don't actually go into a CRA 13 briefing, I didn't necessarily believe that I should 14 believe what I'm being told, so, you know, whether 15 that's privileged or not is a matter for debate. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: With great respect, that's a quite 17 different point, isn't it? Whether you believe it or 18 not is a matter for you. The question is whether you're 19 being given access to briefings which weren't generally 20 given to everybody else. 21 A. Oh, I see, perhaps I didn't understand the question 22 properly. Well, clearly, yes, there were some 23 briefings. There would be a situation, particularly 24 during 2005, the terror attacks, situations, if I 25 remember rightly, where there would be a general press Page 73</p>	<p>1 Lord Condon, Sir Paul as he was then: "If the MacPherson 2 Inquiry is critical of you, personally, will you 3 resign?" And jaws dropped amongst Metropolitan Police 4 personnel there. I thought it was a perfectly 5 legitimate question. 6 After the meeting, one of Sir Paul's aides came up 7 to me and asked why I was asking that question, which 8 I thought was a legitimate question, so I said, 9 "Actually, I asked that question because it's an 10 important question, not because I have anything 11 personally against Sir Paul Condon. I'm an independent 12 journalist and that's the question I wanted to ask". He 13 answered the question, but I felt uncomfortable that it 14 was a cosy situation where you couldn't ask difficult 15 questions. 16 Q. I understand that. It's different, though, from being 17 given misleading or incorrect information during such 18 briefings, would you agree? 19 A. I think perhaps I was unfair there, but what I was 20 getting at was sometimes I felt that the CRA briefings 21 were a way for some senior officers to control the flow 22 of information, which just went against my principles. 23 Q. Okay. May I ask you, please, about paragraph 7 of your 24 statement, our page 07729, when you're covering the West 25 case. You say towards the end of that paragraph that Page 75</p>
<p>1 conference and then there would be a CRA meeting 2 afterwards where crime reporters would be able to ask 3 additional questions. To the best of my knowledge, 4 those additional questions didn't result in any further 5 sort of -- any additional lines in newspaper copy, which 6 disadvantaged people who weren't in the CRA. 7 MR JAY: It gave you background context -- 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. -- which you couldn't use directly because of the nature 10 of the briefing, but gave you a deeper understanding of 11 some of the issues, would you agree? 12 A. Yes. Yes. Yes. And of course you're aware of the 13 monthly CRA briefings with the Commissioner as well, 14 which, to use your words, might be a sort of privileged 15 situation. 16 Q. You also suggested though that you didn't always accept 17 everything that you were being told during these 18 briefings. You're the first witness who has said that. 19 A. No, I think in 1999, a couple years after I'd started 20 working on the Stephen Lawrence case, there was 21 a briefing, CRA briefing of Lord Condon, and I was asked 22 at the end of that -- just a monthly briefing at 23 Scotland Yard, crime reporters, and at the end of that 24 briefing the questions were open to the floor, "Anything 25 you'd like to ask Lord Condon?", and I asked Page 74</p>	<p>1 you looked into the backgrounds of the Wests and spoke 2 to a number of family members and then, I paraphrase, 3 you did some research. It's implicit in what you're 4 saying, Mr Wright, that you avoided in your reporting 5 the sort of problems this Inquiry has seen in relation 6 to the Jefferies case. Do you understand the question? 7 A. Yes, I do. 8 Q. How do you feel that you were successful in doing that? 9 A. Well, I hadn't really thought about my answer on that, 10 on the West case in relation to the Jefferies case, 11 until this morning. The only reason I mentioned that 12 was because I was a young reporter at the time at the 13 Mail, it was a highly competitive Fleet Street bun 14 fight, you could say, really. That's what it was. It 15 was chaotic down in Gloucester during the first few 16 weeks of the developing story. A lot of competition. 17 I even had a situation where the senior investigating 18 officer, Mr Bennett, rang me to ask me to withdraw from 19 someone's -- a witness's address, and I said to 20 Mr Bennett, "I'm actually in London at the moment, could 21 you please give a description of someone who is saying 22 they are Stephen Wright and write for the Daily Mail?" 23 I hadn't met Mr Bennett at that stage, and it's fair to 24 say that the description of that individual proved it 25 wasn't me, but there was some real skulduggery going on Page 76</p>

<p>1 there in that story.</p> <p>2 As I said in my statement, a number of media</p> <p>3 organisations, broadcasters, not just newspapers, were</p> <p>4 found to have been paying witnesses, and I'm very proud</p> <p>5 that the Daily Mail wasn't amongst those.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's a trial about which I know</p> <p>7 really quite a lot.</p> <p>8 A. I remember you very well, sir.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But I'm going to ask a slightly</p> <p>10 different question, which is this: you've described what</p> <p>11 you did in relation to that trial, that case. Has the</p> <p>12 way in which crime investigation has changed in the last</p> <p>13 16 years meant that this sort of background work is no</p> <p>14 longer possible?</p> <p>15 A. Do you mind me asking what you mean by "background</p> <p>16 work"?</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, you explain that you spent --</p> <p>18 A. Oh, I see, yes.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- three or four months researching</p> <p>20 the case, you spent the entire trial, seven weeks, in</p> <p>21 Winchester, and therefore you got a picture.</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I would say -- yes, I get your question now.</p> <p>23 I would say most definitely yes, and sadly, with the</p> <p>24 exception of one or two papers, my newspaper included,</p> <p>25 the resources aren't there now to do that type of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 A. I beg your pardon.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Much as I'm very happy for you to</p> <p>3 agree with me. My question was: how are such stories</p> <p>4 being developed and are corners being cut because you</p> <p>5 can't do the sort of work that you did in that trial?</p> <p>6 A. All I can do is talk for my newspaper and say that we</p> <p>7 still can devote the sort of resources we devoted 20</p> <p>8 years ago. It may well be -- I don't want to be in</p> <p>9 a situation where I am criticising other newspapers.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, Mr Wright, that's very noble of</p> <p>11 you, but I'm looking at the culture, practices and</p> <p>12 ethics of the press as a whole.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not going to spend a great deal</p> <p>15 of time focusing on individual titles --</p> <p>16 A. Fine.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- as I've made clear. I'm very keen</p> <p>18 to understand what's happening.</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I won't ask you to name names --</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But here you are, you have an</p> <p>23 enormous amount of experience in the area. I'd be very</p> <p>24 grateful for your help.</p> <p>25 A. Right. Well, I think, yes, definitely some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 thorough background investigations. It's very sad.</p> <p>2 Very sad.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that may be part of the problem</p> <p>4 about the resource implications of what's happened.</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But the question then arises: how are</p> <p>7 such stories being developed and are corners being cut</p> <p>8 because you can't do the sort of work that you did in</p> <p>9 that trial?</p> <p>10 A. I would agree, I would agree. I would agree. I can't</p> <p>11 agree enough. I find it very sad, I find it very sad</p> <p>12 that, you know, actually I enjoyed having rivalry with</p> <p>13 other journalists and other news organisations. Very --</p> <p>14 if you had a Rose West -- an appalling, appalling crime,</p> <p>15 some of the stuff which we heard in that trial, which</p> <p>16 wasn't printed, I will never ever forget. But it was</p> <p>17 appalling, but it was also very important to investigate</p> <p>18 all aspects of that case, not just the grisly details of</p> <p>19 what happened in that house, but obviously the failures</p> <p>20 by the various sort of government departments, but</p> <p>21 I don't think -- if that was a similar case today,</p> <p>22 I don't think any -- most newspapers would put any real</p> <p>23 resources into it.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, but my question doesn't</p> <p>25 permit of you to say "I agree".</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 newspapers -- resources aren't there and inevitably</p> <p>2 corners could be cut. The quality of journalism is not</p> <p>3 what it may have been 20 years ago. I think that's ...</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And how might that happen? How would</p> <p>5 you go about collecting this sort of story?</p> <p>6 A. I would say it's more about research, sir, having the</p> <p>7 time. You know, when I was -- sorry to talk about</p> <p>8 myself, but in terms of what I did down there, I was --</p> <p>9 you know, in the old days you would knock on hundreds of</p> <p>10 doors, you wouldn't have mobile phones really in those</p> <p>11 days. You knocked on lots of doors, you pieced -- you</p> <p>12 approached the relatives and victims in a very organised</p> <p>13 way, and that's very, very time-consuming, to get the</p> <p>14 whole story.</p> <p>15 MR JAY: So in terms of your practice, Mr Wright, the</p> <p>16 position has remained constant because the resources are</p> <p>17 available, but if one was going to look more widely,</p> <p>18 particularly in the context of crime reporting, the</p> <p>19 stringency of resources has meant, is this right,</p> <p>20 a lowering in standards?</p> <p>21 A. I'm thinking carefully about this. (Pause).</p> <p>22 I think there's a danger, yes. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Now paragraph 8, you tell us you covered the</p> <p>24 Soham murders, the Shipman case and the murder of</p> <p>25 Milly Dowler, all of which brought you into contact with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

1 different police forces. Self-evidently different
 2 police forces will have different styles of dealing with
 3 the press. It's an open question: is there anything you
 4 can draw to the Inquiry's attention which would assist
 5 us in relation to differing police/press contacts over
 6 the different police forces who covered or were
 7 responsible for those different murders?
 8 **A. I think it's not a secret in the Police Service that the**
 9 **Soham murders, Cambridgeshire police found it very**
 10 **difficult in the first week to deal with the huge press**
 11 **interest in that case. It was really the first case**
 12 **I covered where 24-hour news really gave a domestic**
 13 **high-profile crime real, real publicity. That was**
 14 **unprecedented. So they were deluged and I think within**
 15 **a week they sort of got extra help from the Metropolitan**
 16 **Police press officers and stuff like that, so I think**
 17 **they were -- as a result of not being able to field some**
 18 **questions, you know, they were just completely**
 19 **inundated, there was -- there were dangers in terms of**
 20 **press accuracy, I would say.**
 21 **The Shipman case -- well, Manchester police is**
 22 **obviously a big force and I think they're able to deal**
 23 **very -- able to deal with that quite easily. And also**
 24 **it wasn't -- it didn't have the intensity -- the story**
 25 **didn't have the intensity that the murders of Holly and**
 Page 81

1 **Jessica had.**
 2 **Milly Dowler, as well, I think -- let me think, that**
 3 **was 2002, wasn't it? Surrey's a small force. I think**
 4 **at the start of that case, there was quite a lot of**
 5 **publicity in the first two or three days and it drifted**
 6 **off after a while, so it wasn't that intense, the**
 7 **coverage or the media interest in it, after a few days.**
 8 **So they were able to handle the sort of media interest.**
 9 **Q. You tell us in paragraph 9 that it's self-evidently**
 10 **necessary to build up relationships of trust with police**
 11 **officers so that you have a reputation of being trusted.**
 12 **How do you achieve that, Mr Wright?**
 13 **A. I think it's -- as a -- as a crime reporter, it's not**
 14 **just what you are told and print which makes an**
 15 **impression on police officers, it's what you were told**
 16 **and don't print, and that's a sign of trust.**
 17 **Obviously the normal human traits of integrity and**
 18 **honesty are important. What I have discovered over the**
 19 **last 18, 19 years is that in the Police Service**
 20 **nationally, a lot of -- word gets around quite quickly**
 21 **if you are perceived to be a good journalist -- someone**
 22 **who can be trusted -- and obviously the opposite applies**
 23 **too.**
 24 **So what I'm saying is if you get a reputation for**
 25 **being someone who's unprofessional, word gets round**
 Page 82

1 **quickly and your career may not progress.**
 2 **Q. Are these issues which are discussed either privately or**
 3 **formally within the Crime Reporters Association? In**
 4 **particular, journalists who are perhaps regarded as not**
 5 **as trustworthy, for whatever reason?**
 6 **A. I must say that in my time when I was a crime**
 7 **reporter -- I'm not any more -- I thought all the crime**
 8 **reporters were people who were trustworthy, definitely.**
 9 **I wouldn't -- they were rivals, they were competitors,**
 10 **and it would be very easy for me to say to other**
 11 **officers or press officers, "Oh, this person can't be**
 12 **trusted", but that would be completely self-serving and**
 13 **completely wrong, because they were honest, decent**
 14 **people.**
 15 **Q. You've correctly told us that you're no longer a member,**
 16 **the reason being that on your promotion, you're no**
 17 **longer crime editor?**
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 **Q. So you lose the credentials, as it were?**
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 **Q. But looking back at or on the Crime Reporters**
 22 **Association, is it a positive force or not, in your**
 23 **opinion?**
 24 **A. What, the Crime Reporters Association?**
 25 **Q. Yes, does it work in the public interest, if I can ask**
 Page 83

1 it more widely? (Pause).
 2 **A. Yes, I would say it does. It can. It has on occasions.**
 3 **I'm thinking about 2005, that momentous month in July,**
 4 **particularly the July 21 attacks, when there were four**
 5 **very dangerous men on the run, and the -- obviously**
 6 **a time of unprecedented national security concerns, and**
 7 **the Crime Reporters Association worked quite closely**
 8 **with the press officers and the Scotland Yard officers**
 9 **to be -- I think there's -- I believe there's -- at that**
 10 **time the CRA was slightly extended because it was an**
 11 **unprecedented situation, but there were confidential**
 12 **briefings about the case, about the hunt, which were**
 13 **massively in the public interest, information about what**
 14 **the police were doing which could be reported and, more**
 15 **importantly, what they might be doing but couldn't talk**
 16 **about, which can't be reported. So I think it was an**
 17 **excellent example of teamwork between the press and the**
 18 **police. And the CRA was at the heart of that.**
 19 **Q. Okay. Speaking more widely about the relationships you**
 20 **built up over the years, paragraph 10 of your statement,**
 21 **Mr Wright, you say the officers:**
 22 **"... tended to be those of senior and middling ranks**
 23 **as they were given discretion to talk to the media."**
 24 **So you're looking at those at inspector level and**
 25 **above --**
 Page 84

<p>1 A. That's correct.</p> <p>2 Q. -- on the policies we've seen.</p> <p>3 "Who would initiate contact would depend on the</p> <p>4 circumstances."</p> <p>5 So there's circumstances when police officers would</p> <p>6 contact you; is that right?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, on occasion. I mean, I think if a murder squad</p> <p>8 officer was looking for some publicity on an unsolved</p> <p>9 murder, I might get a call. I can't think of any case</p> <p>10 off the top of my head. I'm not being awkward, but</p> <p>11 I just can't think -- I guess conversely I might contact</p> <p>12 officers on occasions as well. It would depend on the</p> <p>13 circumstances, as I said in my statement.</p> <p>14 Q. From a journalist's perspective, the journalist just</p> <p>15 listened to the information he or she received. That</p> <p>16 information can either be authorised, in the sense that</p> <p>17 the police authorises its dissemination, even off the</p> <p>18 record, or unauthorised.</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So it's information which is leaked. Do you draw any</p> <p>21 distinction between the two? (Pause).</p> <p>22 A. Well, clearly I'm aware of what might be in the</p> <p>23 Scotland Yard press release, and what isn't in the</p> <p>24 Scotland Yard press release, so my job as a journalist</p> <p>25 is to probe beyond the press release to find out what's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 in receipt from time to time of unauthorised</p> <p>2 information, namely leaked information?</p> <p>3 A. I received information from people of a certain rank who</p> <p>4 were authorised to speak to me. Are you thinking about</p> <p>5 a particular case or --</p> <p>6 Q. No, I'm speaking generally, that I'm sure most of the</p> <p>7 information you received, Mr Wright -- and I'm not</p> <p>8 suggesting for one moment any impropriety in what you're</p> <p>9 doing, because a journalist has to act on information</p> <p>10 the journalist receives -- most of the information you</p> <p>11 got was authorised in the sense that it was from an</p> <p>12 officer of inspector level or above --</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. -- and it was within their area of competence?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. But there must have been circumstances, situations, when</p> <p>17 you received information either from junior officers</p> <p>18 below inspector rank level, or from officers at</p> <p>19 inspector rank level and above but it was outside their</p> <p>20 area of expertise or competence; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A. On your former point I'd say no, that I can't think of</p> <p>22 occasions when I've spoken to anyone below inspector</p> <p>23 rank.</p> <p>24 Q. Fair enough.</p> <p>25 A. My only dealings with constables normally are family</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 going on.</p> <p>2 Q. Your probing may just be to obtain information which</p> <p>3 hasn't publicly been disseminated but is still</p> <p>4 authorised, in other words it's coming from an inspector</p> <p>5 rank officer or above, and it's within his or her area</p> <p>6 of responsibility.</p> <p>7 A. That's right.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you follow me?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. But there may be circumstances where you're receiving</p> <p>11 information which is unauthorised, either because it's</p> <p>12 coming from the wrong rank or because it's outside that</p> <p>13 person's area of responsibility. Do you accept that?</p> <p>14 A. There would be occasions.</p> <p>15 Q. Because you say at the end of paragraph 10:</p> <p>16 "However, at all times what they decided to tell me</p> <p>17 was a matter for them."</p> <p>18 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>19 Q. Which, of course, is strictly speaking 100 per cent</p> <p>20 right, but implicit in that is the assertion that on</p> <p>21 occasions you might be being given information which the</p> <p>22 person who was providing it to you ought not really to</p> <p>23 have provided to you. Do you follow me?</p> <p>24 A. I follow your argument, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Over the years, have I correctly understood it, you were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 liaison officers, and that's dealing with setting up</p> <p>2 interviews with victims and that's organised through --</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The big working rank, certainly when</p> <p>4 I was a junior barrister, was the detective sergeant.</p> <p>5 A. Right.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: They were the ones that locked up the</p> <p>7 burglars and the people. You didn't have conversations</p> <p>8 with the detective sergeant in your local --</p> <p>9 A. Well, I was conscious of the media guidelines in the</p> <p>10 Met, which gave authority to inspectors and above.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you're entitled, as Mr Jay has</p> <p>12 just said to you -- you can listen to anyone, you're not</p> <p>13 doing anything wrong, and if somebody wants to say</p> <p>14 something to you which -- that's their problem, it's not</p> <p>15 your problem.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think all he's trying to ask you is</p> <p>18 whether actually people did go behind what they should</p> <p>19 have done, perhaps because they trusted you, perhaps</p> <p>20 because they had a wonderful relationship with you and</p> <p>21 they knew you wouldn't misuse the information --</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- but you were aware that actually</p> <p>24 really you shouldn't be getting the information.</p> <p>25 I think that's what Mr Jay is asking you.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

<p>1 MR JAY: I hope he was. 2 A. Yes. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. 4 MR JAY: That's really what you're saying, isn't it, in the 5 last clause in paragraph 10? 6 A. I am a journalist. 7 Q. Yes. 8 A. And I'll be wanting to gather information. But what we 9 hear and whether we use it is a completely different 10 matter. 11 Q. Of course. Well, let's see how this plays out in the 12 individual cases in a moment, but can I move forward to 13 paragraph 14. You deal with the Rachel Nickell case, 14 and you say about a third of the way down through that 15 paragraph that in 2001 you conducted a five-page 16 interview with Rachel Nickell's partner, in which he 17 issued an emotional appeal for the police to catch her 18 killer. It was a very poignant article, as you were the 19 first journalist to meet Rachel's son, who had witnessed 20 her murder. 21 "I later alerted a very senior police officer to the 22 article which, I believe, may have helped restart the 23 inquiry." 24 What was it in the article which reignited the 25 investigation? Page 89</p>	<p>1 relationship between a journalist and a police officer. 2 In this case, I was doing -- I wanted to do -- I wanted 3 to, if I could at all, just raise this issue with 4 a senior officer who had a lot of influence at the Yard 5 and to say, "Is there anything can be done to get 6 justice for this family?" That is it, I don't want 7 anyone to think it's anything beyond that. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I am very comfortable with that 9 proposition. I think I've given the example before in 10 the Inquiry, I am happy to repeat it, that the Sun 11 newspaper found a photograph of Charmaine West, which 12 was extremely important in dating the time of her death. 13 A. Right. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So that hadn't been found by the 15 police, that was found by the Sun, and the police then 16 got hold of it. So you do not need to convince me -- 17 A. No. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- that there are enormously powerful 19 tools available to the press that can and do 20 dramatically help the pursuit of criminal justice in 21 this country. 22 A. Yes. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's something I've talked about with 24 some of the very senior police officers. Everybody must 25 be harnessed to encourage people to come forward, Page 91</p>
<p>1 A. Can I make this clear. I don't want anyone here in this 2 room to think that I restarted the Rachel Nickell 3 inquiry, because I didn't. That was obviously 4 a decision for officers at the Met to decide. I showed 5 my -- the article was deemed by other people to be very 6 poignant. A young father bringing up a son alone, 7 crying out for justice. And I said to Rachel's partner, 8 Mr Hanscombe, that I would try and find out or try and 9 use any influence I could to get some sort of new 10 investigation launched. The big difference between that 11 and actually me being responsible, I just want to make 12 that absolutely clear. 13 But I did show my article to a very senior officer, 14 left it with him and just said this, "Please read this, 15 this man and this son need justice." 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So would it be right if we crossed 17 out the word "helped" -- because I'm very conscious that 18 this sort of thing is very sensitive. 19 A. Yes of course. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So if we crossed out the word 21 "helped" and put "contributed to the decision by the 22 Metropolitan Police"? 23 A. I think, sir, that might even be a bit too strong. The 24 reason I put this in my statement was because there's 25 been a lot of emphasis on the negative side of the Page 90</p>	<p>1 otherwise we don't solve crimes. 2 A. Yes. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You can't do it at one remove. 4 A. Yes. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I repeat the story now, just so 6 that again, as I have said about the value of other 7 journalism, I am not seeking to place the concerns that 8 have been expressed out of context, and I'm not seeking 9 to redefine the context at all. 10 A. Thank you. 11 I just say the Metropolitan Police solved 12 Rachel Nickell's murder. I want to make that clear and 13 I congratulate them. 14 MR JAY: Yes, en route to that, though, in chronological 15 terms, there was a piece in the Mail on 6 September 16 2003, which you wrote under the headline "Hope of DNA 17 breakthrough in search for Rachel's killer". You said 18 in that piece: 19 "Detectives have made a potentially vital 20 breakthrough in their hunt for the killer of 21 Rachel Nickell." 22 It was finding a DNA sample. 23 A. Mm. 24 Q. And apparently police sources made a comment about that. 25 Was this information which was leaked to you by the Page 92</p>

<p>1 police?</p> <p>2 A. I only became aware of this article being the subject of</p> <p>3 scrutiny in this Inquiry last night, and I have been</p> <p>4 thinking about where it came from, that information. It</p> <p>5 either came from a police source in the -- speaking to</p> <p>6 me in -- a police source in the generic sense -- the</p> <p>7 definition mentioned by Sandra Laville yesterday is one</p> <p>8 which I would agree with -- or it came from a freelance</p> <p>9 journalist, and I cannot say for sure, I'm afraid.</p> <p>10 Q. In this case, though, it's likely to have been within</p> <p>11 the police, owing to the nature of the investigation,</p> <p>12 would you agree?</p> <p>13 A. Yes. Oh, the origins of it, yes, definitely, but I'm</p> <p>14 just saying I can't be certain whether it was something</p> <p>15 which I picked up myself or whether it was a freelance</p> <p>16 journalist.</p> <p>17 Q. It's going to be very difficult for you now to remember</p> <p>18 the details of what occurred seven or eight years ago.</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. But I think the suggestion is, and this may well be</p> <p>21 right, that the disclosure to you was unauthorised in</p> <p>22 a sense that it's not something that the police would</p> <p>23 have wanted to enter the public domain at this stage.</p> <p>24 Would you agree with that?</p> <p>25 A. What I would say is this, is that I've covered the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 Again was that information which was provided to you</p> <p>2 by a police source?</p> <p>3 A. That information came from Mr Stagg turning up at</p> <p>4 a police station with a Sky News TV crew in attendance.</p> <p>5 I made some enquiries in the last 24 hours.</p> <p>6 I understand Mr Stagg's publicist may have had a role in</p> <p>7 that situation.</p> <p>8 Q. That disposes of that one. The last one is 10 January</p> <p>9 2007, which relates to Mr Stagg's award of compensation</p> <p>10 from the Home Office. Again, the suggestion is that you</p> <p>11 obtained that information from a source, but perhaps,</p> <p>12 though, within or close to the Home Office. Is that</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. Is it correct it came from the Home Office?</p> <p>15 Q. Mm.</p> <p>16 A. It did not come from the Home Office.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you --</p> <p>18 A. I'm not, I'm afraid, able to go into any more detail,</p> <p>19 but Mr Stagg's solicitor is making assumptions there,</p> <p>20 and perhaps his assumptions are flawed because of the</p> <p>21 passage of time.</p> <p>22 Q. I think the point may be made in this way, Mr Wright,</p> <p>23 that provided that there's no prejudice to an ongoing</p> <p>24 police investigation, number one, and provided that</p> <p>25 self-evidently you haven't paid for this information,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 Rachel Nickell case since 1996. It was a horrific</p> <p>2 murder and I had written a number of articles</p> <p>3 chronicling developments in the case. It was my job to</p> <p>4 find out what was going on, but also a case hugely in</p> <p>5 the public interest. It wasn't my job to jeopardise the</p> <p>6 inquiry, and I don't think that story jeopardised the</p> <p>7 inquiry in any way.</p> <p>8 Q. One can accept that because of the general way in which</p> <p>9 you were speaking in the article, it would not have</p> <p>10 prejudiced a police investigation, nor indeed would it</p> <p>11 have fallen with the Contempt of Court Act because</p> <p>12 no one had been arrested. It's just whether you felt</p> <p>13 that you were being provided with information which you</p> <p>14 knew that the police would not have wanted to enter the</p> <p>15 public domain at that stage?</p> <p>16 A. Mr Jay, I didn't actually -- before writing that</p> <p>17 article, my main concern was: would this jeopardise --</p> <p>18 would the -- my main concern was whether the article</p> <p>19 would jeopardise the police investigation. Just to</p> <p>20 repeat, it's a story hugely in the public interest, and</p> <p>21 as crime reporters we act ethically but we are soon out</p> <p>22 of work if we rely on press releases for our stories.</p> <p>23 Q. There was another piece, as you know, the following</p> <p>24 year:</p> <p>25 "Police refuse Stagg DNA test."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 well, then you say it's in the public interest to</p> <p>2 publish it so you'll go ahead and publish it, provided</p> <p>3 your editors agree, of course?</p> <p>4 A. We think very carefully about what we write and what we</p> <p>5 publish. There's a lot of things to take into</p> <p>6 consideration on sensitive inquiries, on less sensitive</p> <p>7 ones. As I said earlier, you know, I'm a reporter and</p> <p>8 I don't -- we don't rely on press releases for our</p> <p>9 stories, and it's getting that balance right. It's</p> <p>10 about judgment. It's about judgment, but -- and</p> <p>11 occasionally we get it wrong, we get it wrong, but</p> <p>12 I think certainly the Daily Mail crime desk and the</p> <p>13 fantastically talented colleagues I work with, we get it</p> <p>14 right most of the times. We get it right most of the</p> <p>15 times. Nothing worse for me as a journalist -- a crime</p> <p>16 editor, nothing worse for the editor than to be accused</p> <p>17 of -- of -- of genuinely, and I stress the word</p> <p>18 genuinely -- jeopardising a successful outcome in</p> <p>19 a police investigation.</p> <p>20 Q. Although reliance on this type of source, there's</p> <p>21 nothing inherently proper in that for the reasons I've</p> <p>22 explained --</p> <p>23 A. Yes, I know, I am not being too defensive, but in terms</p> <p>24 of Mr Stagg's solicitor's assertions, they are wrong.</p> <p>25 They are wrong, okay?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

<p>1 Q. If you're relying on a source which may or may not be 2 providing you with unauthorised information, of course 3 self-evidently you're taking a risk as to whether the 4 source is accurate. Would you agree with that?</p> <p>5 A. Absolutely, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And there's little way of substantiating what the source 7 is saying, is that also right?</p> <p>8 A. Well, it's -- it's -- it's very rare that you would 9 write a story based on unofficial sources and not put it 10 to the police force in some way or another, give them an 11 opportunity to comment or, if they wish, to make strong 12 representations for us not to write it, because any 13 strong representations for us not to write something 14 would be taken very seriously by me and the editor.</p> <p>15 Q. This may not be an altogether fair question, but do you 16 recall in the cases of the three articles I've been 17 taking you to whether you did seek formal -- the formal 18 police view on those stories as to whether they should 19 be published and whether they were accurate?</p> <p>20 A. I think -- well, certainly, Mr Jay, the first story 21 about the DNA breakthrough, yes, I did. And I think 22 they decided to comment they're not prepared to give 23 a running commentary. If they had said, "Please don't 24 run this, it will cause us a problem", it would have 25 been taken very seriously. I can't say what the outcome</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	
<p>1 would be, but certainly it would be really 2 unprofessional to ignore it.</p> <p>3 The second story, well obviously it's self-evident, 4 with the Sky TV camera, I was just following up that 5 story. So I don't know if we spoke to the Yard.</p> <p>6 And the third case, I did speak -- I did put in 7 a call to the Home Office and they gave me a full 8 statement.</p> <p>9 MR JAY: Thank you. I'm moving on to another topic. Would 10 it be convenient to break now?</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Certainly. Thank you very much. 12 2 o'clock. 13 (12.57 pm) 14 (The luncheon adjournment)</p> <p>15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	

A	advantages 32:10	anyway 26:11 48:17 68:6	89:18,22,24 90:5,13 93:2 94:9,17,18	34:2,20 37:11 42:8 46:21 47:8 50:4 58:5	beyond 85:25 91:7	burglars 88:7
abide 34:2	advent 32:24	Apart 27:6	articles 6:22,23 94:2 97:16	60:22 65:22 74:12 85:22 88:23 93:2	big 32:24 35:16 81:22 88:3 90:10	business 63:8,11
able 17:23 58:12 59:12 64:20 70:5 74:2 81:17,22,23 82:8 95:18	adviser 10:10	apologies 25:3 32:6 40:11	asked 25:5,11,15 49:5 53:4 74:21,25 75:7 75:9	awful 22:12	bill 51:13	busy 34:6
abreast 13:1	affairs 31:1,4,11 36:22	apologise 1:5	asked 25:5,11,15 49:5 53:4 74:21,25 75:7 75:9	awful 22:12	billed 43:19	buy 68:15
absolute 18:22 67:17,22	affect 27:20,21	appalling 78:14 78:14,17	asking 11:9 75:7 77:15 88:25	awkward 37:21 85:10	Bindmans 1:9	buying 51:5,15 51:15
absolutely 7:6,9 8:19 38:3 65:21 70:23 86:18 90:12 97:5	afraid 93:9 95:18	apparently 15:2 20:14,18 92:24	aspect 66:18	axe 65:7	birth 18:7	call 13:8 20:5 45:15 85:9 98:7
abstinence 68:11	afternoon 1:11	appeal 89:17	aspects 78:18	back 1:22 2:5,15 32:1,22 33:10 38:19 40:22 44:21 49:5,16 49:25 53:1,12 63:2 65:15 66:4,25 83:21	bit 6:21 17:11 20:21 37:10 90:23	called 57:22
AC 8:21 49:19 49:19	age 62:11	appeared 12:8 13:10 19:8,17	assertion 52:15 86:20	background 29:6 74:7 77:13,15 78:1	Blair 39:3,4,4 42:6	calls 57:18
academic 34:12	agents 67:7	appearing 24:15	assertions 96:24	backgrounds 76:1	blame 19:8 60:2 61:10	Cambridgeshire 81:9
accept 31:4,9,11 61:17 63:7 66:25 68:25 74:16 86:13 94:8	ago 30:23 37:7 46:13,25 59:20 70:10,11 79:8 80:3 93:18	appears 14:7	assist 7:1 11:24 81:4	badly 16:3	blamed 60:12	camera 47:10 54:19 98:4
acceptable 62:8	agree 1:15 15:21 15:22 17:8 74:11 75:18 78:10,10,10,11 78:25 79:3 93:8,12,24 96:3 97:4	applied 40:16	assistant 8:15 12:17 49:17 52:23 53:2	Bailey 10:6	blind 53:18	cameras 54:22
acceptance 59:1	agreement 22:1	applies 82:22	Associate 71:19	bailiwick 54:4	blood 11:7	campaigned 43:17
accepted 19:22	ahead 96:2	apply 43:23 69:12	associated 71:17	balance 96:9	blossomed 5:15	campaigns 43:16 43:25
access 10:13 29:17 34:13 73:7,19	aides 75:6	appointed 8:3 30:6 45:21	association 30:12,15,18 31:5 32:11 73:4,7 83:3,22 83:24 84:7	ball 6:21 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	board 8:18 42:9	canteens 53:13
accord 49:21	aim 41:14	appreciation 34:9	assumed 5:13 8:16	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	boards 42:2	Caplan 1:13,16 1:19,21 2:8 3:9 3:17,19,22 28:2,5,12
account 34:23	air 33:17	apprehending 67:25	assumption 20:18 39:22	bare 36:6	Bob 51:24 72:17	card 51:13
accuracy 81:20	Alan 10:9 50:1 50:19	approach 35:4 37:18,25 39:6 68:24 69:4	assumptions 95:19,20	barrier 35:11 49:11	bold 68:12	care 2:23
accurate 97:4,19	alcohol 51:8	approached 80:12	astonished 13:5	barrister 12:16 88:4	borne 60:8	career 4:23 83:1
accused 60:25 96:16	alerted 89:21	appropriate 49:15 56:12	attached 10:9	based 97:9	bottles 51:3	careful 2:22 60:9 68:19
achieve 82:12	alike 61:19	appropriately 4:15	attacks 73:24 84:4	basic 36:4	Brammett 45:22	carefully 80:21 96:4
ACs 50:24	allegation 26:1 69:14	April 10:12	attempt 67:2	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	break 28:9 50:13 71:1,4 98:10	carries 34:17
act 23:22,25 48:15 49:4 87:9 94:11,21	Allen 1:9	area 50:2 62:5 79:23 86:5,13 87:14,20	attempting 22:8	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	breakthrough 92:17,20 97:21	carrying 55:15 case 7:13 12:2,23 14:22 16:2 36:2 39:19 48:23 51:12,14 62:22 63:13 65:13,24 72:21 74:20 75:25 76:6,10,10 77:11,20 78:18 78:21 80:24 81:11,11,21 82:4 84:12 85:9 87:5 89:13 91:2 93:10 94:1,3,4 98:6
action 49:3	allow 9:10 11:8 17:25 22:24	argue 64:14	attendance 95:4	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	break 28:9 50:13 71:1,4 98:10	careless 80:21 96:4
actions 53:20	allows 9:13	argued 67:23,24 86:24	attended 33:1,5 36:19 39:13 53:24	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	briefed 25:25	careless 80:21 96:4
activities 65:1	alternatively 69:13	argued 67:23,24 86:24	attention 27:6 81:4	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	briefing 21:23 31:20,24 32:8 50:8 73:13 74:10,21,21,22 74:24	careless 80:21 96:4
actual 9:3 31:24	altogether 97:15	arises 3:15 19:5 78:6	attributed 54:12	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	briefings 53:23 54:2,4,9,14 73:19,23 74:13 74:18 75:18,20 84:12	careless 80:21 96:4
add 26:23 67:3	ambivalent 39:5	army 53:14	audience 44:22	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	bring 17:1,6	careless 80:21 96:4
added 26:1 33:9	amount 11:18 22:11 72:10 79:23	arrangements 70:13	August 64:24	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	bringing 90:6	careless 80:21 96:4
additional 74:3,4 74:5	analogy 61:24	arrest 16:16 47:9 48:2	austere 35:4	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	British 72:6	careless 80:21 96:4
additionally 55:23	analysis 11:7 36:23 49:20	arrested 25:8 29:8 46:10 47:6 48:4 64:22 94:12	austerity 67:5,6	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broadcast 32:18	careless 80:21 96:4
address 25:6 76:19	analysts 55:10 55:10	arrests 43:4	authorised 54:2 61:14 85:16 86:4 87:4,11	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broadcaster 33:17	careless 80:21 96:4
addresses 46:22	announcing 38:11	arrest/charges 24:7	authorises 85:17	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broadcasters 77:3	careless 80:21 96:4
addressing 3:1	answer 39:5 55:20 56:6 58:7 64:23 69:23 76:9	arrived 47:1	authority 55:17 88:10	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broadcasting 30:3	careless 80:21 96:4
adjournment 98:14	answered 75:13	arriving 45:20 45:24	available 15:24 80:17 91:19	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broaden 31:10	careless 80:21 96:4
admiration 17:9 17:10	answers 50:22	article 6:20 11:22 13:8 14:7 15:2 20:17 24:15,18	avoidance 26:15	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broadened 10:13	careless 80:21 96:4
admit 43:5 49:14	anti-terrorist 31:22		avoided 76:4	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broader 37:11	careless 80:21 96:4
adopt 6:1,12	anxiety 2:12		award 72:7 95:9	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	broken 31:17	careless 80:21 96:4
advance 3:14 11:1 49:2	anybody 64:20		awards 2:4 72:4 72:7,10,11	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	brought 29:24 50:18 80:25	cash 72:19
advancement 13:2			aware 10:2 11:3	bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	build 46:1 82:10	casts 59:17
advances 3:4				bar 51:11,20 52:1,2,10	build-up 31:14	catch 89:17

celebrity 43:4,9	64:21	complained	85:3,6,11	cost 54:13	78:14 80:18	Davy's 52:2
cent 15:21 27:22	close 8:12 41:22	31:17	contacted 24:14	cosy 75:14	81:13 82:13	day 13:9 14:1
86:19	52:22,24 53:2	complaint 2:16	25:10	counsel 3:14	83:3,6,7,17,21	24:16 33:12,13
certain 41:1 87:3	95:12	2:25	contacting 36:9	counter-terror...	83:24 84:7	42:22 45:5
93:14	closely 84:7	Complaints 26:7	contacts 5:25	31:22	94:21 96:12,15	59:17,25 67:10
certainly 6:16	closer 52:23	complete 18:6	48:7,10,11	country 91:21	crimes 42:25	68:7
14:16,19 20:11	coalface 33:22	completely 7:23	81:5	couple 15:1	92:1	days 16:17 24:3
20:20 28:7	coincidence 18:5	52:19 81:18	contain 36:6	48:14 51:22	crime-related	24:11 31:23
43:9 44:5	18:6	83:12,13 89:9	contained 66:20	64:15 69:19	43:15	62:11 80:9,11
46:12,12 49:8	colleagues 15:5	complex 67:2	Contempt 94:11	74:19	criminal 16:19	82:5,7
67:23 70:9	96:13	concern 38:24	context 5:20 30:1	course 1:11 4:19	18:24 19:2	deal 1:8 2:4,5
88:3 96:12	collecting 80:5	94:17,18	40:2 49:24	8:4 9:19 10:11	23:25 27:12	4:15 7:18 9:25
97:20 98:1,11	colour 34:15	concerned 3:21	54:21 55:4	14:1 20:21	91:20	35:18 58:25
cetera 53:14	come 2:5,7,15	17:17 25:6	57:20 60:19	23:16 60:2	criteria 57:1	63:21 79:14
chair 49:9	6:25 16:5	26:12	62:1 74:7	66:10 74:12	critical 37:21	81:10,22,23
chairman 40:5	17:22 22:15	concerns 41:11	80:18 92:8,9	86:19 89:11	39:10 45:2	89:13
champagne 51:4	47:24 48:2	41:25 68:8	continuity 9:25	90:19 96:3	53:20 57:3	dealing 34:10
chance 19:1	54:2 57:24	84:6 92:7	contributed	97:2	64:2 75:2	59:24 81:2
change 32:15	59:7 64:3 68:6	concluded 24:25	90:21	court 8:6 9:18	criticised 40:23	88:1
37:23	91:25 95:16	conclusion 8:6	control 13:16	10:2 16:6	41:3	dealings 87:25
changed 35:21	comes 2:4,10	Condon 37:1,22	75:21	17:25 22:21,24	criticising 79:9	dealt 2:11 3:11
59:8 77:12	comfortable	38:9,16,21,24	controlled 23:9	23:7,23 94:11	criticism 2:9	6:3,6 22:2
channels 26:21	91:8	74:21,25 75:1	23:11 30:17	cover 31:2,12	crossed 90:16,20	death 91:12
chaotic 76:15	coming 13:17	75:11	convenient 98:10	36:16 42:22	crossing 49:11	debate 73:15
character 50:17	47:6 86:4,12	conductive 6:23	conversation	44:20	Crown 9:18	decent 67:1
charge 5:4 23:20	command 50:2	conducted 89:15	48:8,13	coverage 41:12	10:23 22:24	83:13
charity 27:14,14	commendation	conducting	conversations	82:7	23:7	decide 90:4
charm 38:20	8:5	27:18	68:22 88:7	covered 66:21	crucial 67:14	decided 8:11
Charmaine	comment 2:3	conference 32:25	conversely 85:11	80:23 81:6,12	crux 61:24	86:16 97:22
91:11	92:24 97:11,22	33:11 54:17,18	convince 91:16	93:25	crying 90:7	decision 5:18
charts 69:16	commentary	74:1	convinced 22:7	covering 31:9	crystal 65:21	6:25 8:24
Chatham 54:13	97:23	confidence 16:5	cope 2:17 63:18	33:11 42:24	Cudlipp 72:7	11:15,16 22:9
Chief 4:24 28:15	commented	17:19 22:15,22	copy 4:17,18	75:24	Cullum 38:8	22:25 23:18
child 5:5	21:13	27:1 29:25	20:18 74:5	CPS 10:17 12:18	45:22	66:2 90:4,21
children 27:5	Commission	40:18	core 1:5 9:17	CRA 29:11,12	culpable 67:24	decisions 18:2
chocolate 17:21	26:7 38:13	confident 17:22	53:15	29:21 32:6	culture 32:16	decision-making
Christmas 50:5	commissioner	70:16	corner 52:2	39:14 40:3,7	79:11	66:5
chronicling 94:3	8:15 12:17	confidential	corners 78:7	73:12 74:1,6	cup 39:7,8 62:21	dedicated 30:9
chronological	37:5,14 38:17	31:15 84:11	79:4 80:2	74:13,21 75:20	currently 4:24	30:24
92:14	39:21 40:21	confirm 4:19	correct 4:22 5:7	84:10,18	29:1 58:9	dedication 8:20
chronologically	52:5 74:13	confirmed 20:14	5:12,13,24	crack 4:3	71:17	deemed 90:5
8:7	commissioners	20:16	6:10 7:6,9,22	created 7:13	curve 22:3	deeper 74:10
Cinderella 68:5	36:20,23 37:3	confusing 70:13	8:14 10:14,15	credentials	cut 78:7 79:4	defendants 25:7
circle 45:11 46:5	37:12 49:17	congratulate	12:19,21 20:4	83:19	80:2	defensive 16:7
circles 38:2	52:23 53:2	92:13	20:7,8 21:20	credit 51:12	cynical 18:7	96:23
circulated 1:7	commitment	conscious 88:9	22:12 23:24	Cressida 9:7	cynicism 40:24	defining 7:4
circumstances	7:12	90:17	24:2,23 25:20	10:7		definitely 77:23
2:18 56:23	committee 29:12	consensus 31:7	25:21 26:2	crew 33:8,9 95:4	D	79:25 83:8
63:10 85:4,5	29:15 30:6	31:10	29:4,5,13,14	crews 47:10	daily 1:23 2:2	93:13
85:13 86:10	common 31:7,10	consequence	32:14 36:25	54:23	4:6 13:25 14:5	definition 73:11
87:16	34:21 43:7	24:19	37:1 58:24	crime 1:23 4:24	14:7,14 24:16	93:7
clairvoyant	community 38:2	consider 23:21	70:1,17 85:1	8:17 29:1,3,4	24:17 27:7,9	degree 6:15 7:3
61:23	40:12	considerable	87:20 95:13,14	29:22 30:8,9	27:13,15,23	13:16 18:16
clarify 69:3	company 21:24	22:11	correctly 56:17	30:12,23,24	35:20,24 40:4	40:23 41:1
clarity 58:16	55:6	consideration	83:15 86:25	31:2,5,12,13	71:18 76:22	deliberate 22:4
clause 89:5	compelling	96:6	correspondence	31:20 33:25	77:5 96:12	23:15
clear 8:15 10:16	12:24	considerations	20:12	36:21 37:13	damaged 16:3	deliberately 21:5
21:16 27:8	compensation	68:7	correspondent	40:5 42:19	damages 16:9	22:8 59:23
33:19 44:15	95:9	considered 23:19	1:23 30:25	43:13,18,25	danger 80:22	delighted 15:6
52:21 58:20	competence	23:19	33:25 37:13	44:18,19,20	dangerous 84:5	27:18
62:7 65:21	87:14,20	constables 87:25	40:5 48:19	45:21,24 46:4	dangers 81:19	deliver 6:4
72:3 79:17	competition	constant 80:16	correspondents	46:4 48:19	Daniel 65:4	deluged 81:14
90:1,12 92:12	76:16	constitute 35:10	31:1,4	50:10 68:17,21	dare 39:7	democracy 67:4
clearly 61:16	competitive	contact 5:22 25:4	corrupt 38:14	71:22,23,24,25	dated 28:23	department 4:25
73:22 85:22	76:13	25:15,19,22,23	corruption 16:20	72:24 73:2,4,6	66:12,12 71:13	10:8
Clive 4:8,10	competitors 83:9	45:16,18 80:25	21:13	74:2,23 77:12	dating 91:12	departments

10:23 78:20	40:7	dramatically	emphasis 90:25	65:17 66:10	failed 67:24	Fine 79:16
depend 44:12	dinners 36:19	91:20	en 92:14	71:15 73:1	failures 78:19	finish 8:22
85:3,12	49:18 51:5	draw 22:10 27:6	encourage 16:4	evident 21:11	fair 13:14 76:23	first 1:21 4:8,16
deputy 10:4 38:5	direct 5:19 57:10	81:4 85:20	91:25	35:1	87:24 97:15	29:11 32:21
38:6 39:20	57:12	dreadful 49:25	ended 13:4	exactly 39:17	fairly 12:3 39:5	36:9,17 37:12
52:5	directly 49:13	drifted 21:24	enforcement	52:6	41:21 43:22	49:24 50:6
describe 16:12	74:9	82:5	30:11	example 5:4 44:1	52:10	64:20 74:18
35:9	director 24:12	drink 42:18,20	engage 35:3	46:9 54:16	faithfully 52:18	76:15 81:10,11
described 6:17	55:18	43:11 51:13	37:20 40:12,19	63:7,21 84:17	61:5	82:5 89:19
43:11 53:11	director 8:17	62:22	engagement	91:9	fallen 94:11	97:20
60:14 66:23	36:21	drinking 51:20	37:15 60:10	excellence 72:8	families 27:4	firstly 59:13
67:6 77:10	disadvantaged	52:1	engagements	excellent 27:14	52:17	Fishpool 5:11
description	74:6	drinks 51:15,16	41:15 49:22	84:17	family 17:10	five 28:2 41:6
76:21,24	disclose 12:10	51:22	engaging 37:12	exception 14:21	20:24 27:20	46:13 70:10,25
designed 23:22	disclosure 12:11	Driscoll 1:6,10	37:24 38:1,18	52:15 77:24	76:2 87:25	71:1
desk 32:2 71:24	23:11 93:21	1:24 4:8,10,16	69:2	excluded 32:5	91:6	five-page 89:15
96:12	disclosures	8:9 24:4,21	enjoy 27:1	exercises 55:16	fantastically	flavour 35:20
detail 10:20,21	61:13,14	26:23 27:25	enjoyed 21:2	exhibit 14:1	96:13	flawed 95:20
10:25 34:19	discontinued	Driscoll's 3:14	78:12	exhibits 10:1,11	far 14:10 58:17	Fleet 25:24 51:7
41:25 55:8	23:3	dropped 75:3	enormous 79:23	existed 56:5	65:12 66:7	76:13
95:18	discovered 64:18	drunken 61:22	enormously	exists 64:10	fast-moving 2:18	flippant 17:20
details 17:24	82:18	dry 41:2	60:17 91:18	expand 51:1	father 90:6	floor 74:24
31:24 65:7	discovery 15:3	due 10:11 20:21	enquiries 13:6	expansion 35:9	favour 46:2	flow 75:21
78:18 93:18	15:12	duplicitous	95:5	expansive 35:4	favourable 55:25	focus 9:10,17
detect 70:13	discretion 84:23	60:14	enquiry 58:19	expect 9:14	56:4,15 69:18	43:8
detective 4:24	discuss 14:21	duty 16:6 18:22	enter 93:23	18:24 45:18	70:4	focused 37:25
10:6 28:15	39:23 62:22		94:14	64:3	favoured 45:11	focusing 23:6
88:4,8	discussed 8:17	E	entertaining	expecting 46:9	45:12	79:15
Detectives 92:19	14:15 83:2	earlier 5:21	51:3	experience 6:11	fear 26:9	follow 12:8
develop 33:13	discussion 1:3	14:23,25 52:14	entire 77:20	34:21 47:13	February 21:17	13:11 20:21
36:8	9:6 41:18	59:5 68:2 70:7	entirely 2:25	51:4 68:12	28:23 66:13	59:3 86:8,23
developed 78:7	disfavour 59:1	96:7	3:17 9:10	79:23	71:13	86:24
79:4	disposes 95:8	early 32:22	61:10	experienced	Fedorcio 38:21	followed 13:10
developing 76:16	disrespectful	33:11	entitled 45:4	32:11 37:10	39:13 41:6	following 13:9
developments	22:5	easier 40:19	88:11	expertise 87:20	42:8,11 46:6	24:16 34:5
11:5 36:2 94:3	disrupt 22:8	easily 81:23	envelope 16:17	experts 19:7,16	Fedorcio's 45:10	94:23 98:4
devote 79:7	disseminate 8:12	easy 42:4 83:10	equally 9:16	explain 5:19 7:20	feel 8:1 16:1,3	follows 64:23
devoted 79:7	disseminated	echo 16:24	equation 64:13	8:25 15:18	17:22 18:3	73:1
DI 10:3	86:3	editor 29:1,4	error 21:22,23	17:17 20:25	37:21 49:14	foot 38:19 40:22
Dick 8:21 9:7	dissemination	37:16,23,23	errors 19:8	48:18 77:17	76:8	force 63:24 64:2
10:7 12:17	85:17	38:5,6 44:8,9	essential 26:25	explained 19:20	fell 54:6	81:22 82:3
38:21 39:13	distinction 54:1	44:18,19 66:3	35:11	96:22	felt 6:23 15:6,8,9	83:22 97:10
41:21 45:15,19	85:21	71:17,19,22,23	et 53:14	explanation	21:4,4 23:1	forced 38:25
difference 57:11	diversion 3:5	71:25 83:17	ethically 94:21	20:13	41:2,23,23	forces 34:19 55:1
90:10	DNA 92:16,22	96:16,16 97:14	ethics 79:12	expose 18:22	67:16 68:9,23	81:1,2,6
different 6:1,12	94:25 97:21	editors 96:3	evening 1:7,11	exposing 23:5	69:4 75:13,20	forensic 5:15
7:14,16 15:11	doing 4:13 12:12	effect 18:9,10,10	52:12,14	expressed 92:8	94:12	9:19,24 10:8
16:21 35:2	19:1,2 23:17	18:14 24:17	events 25:4	expression 66:19	field 81:17	10:10,11 11:1
47:20,25 50:13	34:6 40:13	61:12 68:2,3	42:22 57:21,21	extended 84:10	fight 76:14	11:2,3,25
61:10 63:4	42:25 44:16	69:15	eventually 9:18	extent 2:8 7:11	file 33:13,13	16:15 19:7,16
64:11 73:17	48:21 60:11	effective 27:2	14:24 23:2,23	59:11	53:11,14	22:18
75:16 77:10	76:8 84:14,15	64:9	50:21	extra 9:4 81:15	Filkin 62:2 67:16	forensics 10:16
81:1,1,2,6,7	87:9 88:13	eight 93:18	everybody 9:14	extremely 2:6	68:8	10:24 21:24
89:9	91:2	either 55:10	22:20 54:18	91:12	Filkin's 66:22	22:19
differing 81:5	domain 93:23	69:12,16 83:2	62:15 63:17,19	F	67:1	forever 62:6
difficult 5:3 6:19	94:15	85:16 86:11	73:20 91:24	fact 6:2 9:4 12:1	finalised 33:14	forged 41:22
18:1 22:14	domestic 5:5	87:17 93:5	evidence 2:6,18	13:12 15:8	find 3:3 13:5	forger 78:16
58:6 64:7	81:12	electronic 32:17	3:15 4:21 5:8	16:15 18:3	15:20 18:25	form 29:17
75:14 81:10	doors 80:10,11	Elizabeth 62:2	9:19 11:3	21:5 22:22	19:22 47:20	formal 4:21
93:17	doubt 8:22 26:15	66:22 67:1	12:24,25 22:21	24:7 25:19,21	50:21 61:22	23:23 26:20
difficulties 5:25	Dowler 80:25	Elveden 26:8	22:24 23:7,8	26:6 29:15,16	78:11,11 85:25	28:24 71:15
42:7	82:2	29:9	26:24 28:24	31:7 47:13,24	90:8 94:4	97:17,17
difficulty 2:21	DPA 38:9 55:11	email 35:22 36:3	34:25 46:17	50:13 52:3	finding 50:19	formally 70:18
22:20 45:6	55:18	36:4	49:18 51:21,24	58:3 66:19	92:22	83:3
dimension 33:10	DPS 55:10 57:19	embarrass 58:11	57:9 59:7	factual 18:1	findings 11:16	formed 9:24
dinner 39:13,15	57:22	emotional 89:17	61:17 63:2		14:23 16:15	14:24 43:24,25

forthcoming 24:7	72:14 73:7 76:21 97:10,22	group 13:13 29:21,22 30:6 31:9 32:11 38:22 39:24 40:1 46:4 47:9 61:8 63:4	Hendon 50:6 hesitated 73:10 Higgins 37:24 38:2 high 35:14 36:2 highly 76:13 high-profile 9:13 35:24,25 54:17 59:21,22 81:13	immediately 19:12 impact 17:18 61:14 67:4 impeccable 6:4 implications 78:4 implicit 76:3 86:20 important 4:14 5:3 9:16 10:1 15:20 29:6 75:10 78:17 82:18 91:12	21:6,19 22:11 22:13,13 24:4 24:5,6 25:5,13 26:6 29:23,24 31:15 35:23 41:10,16 42:15 47:23 48:2 54:5,6 55:14 56:17 58:22 59:17 75:17,22 84:13 85:15,16 85:20 86:2,11 86:21 87:2,2,3 87:7,9,10,17 88:21,24 89:8 92:25 93:4 94:13 95:1,3 95:11,25 97:2	interactions 35:21 36:15 49:17 intercept 64:18 64:20 interest 6:15 7:3 7:7,18 10:22 23:3 36:5 37:17 42:23 46:19 48:17 64:5 81:11 82:7,8 83:25 84:13 94:5,20 96:1 interested 42:13 42:16 59:10 interesting 63:13 67:21 interests 30:9,10 53:17,17 63:25 67:11 internal 19:9 39:11 41:19 42:17 Internet 32:24 33:7 interpretation 52:20 interrupt 23:17 interview 89:16 interviews 88:2 intimate 17:23 intricate 10:25 inundated 81:19 investigate 78:17 investigating 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 18:24 33:21 34:7,14 35:12 36:13 54:20 60:3 76:17 investigation 3:4 5:11,16,22 6:13,14,18,24 8:12,23 9:4,5 9:17 11:5,19 12:7,12 16:9 18:9,25 19:9 19:21 21:7,21 22:5,9,19 23:21 25:5 26:5,10 27:18 27:24 55:5 58:8 59:23,25 60:1 65:13,18 68:4,5 72:18 72:20 77:12 89:25 90:10 93:11 94:10,19 95:24 96:19 investigations 6:17 7:8 11:9 23:17 27:4 65:17,23 67:20 78:1
found 6:19 15:21 19:25 42:4 49:18 77:4 81:9 91:11,14 91:15	given 24:12 26:24 31:21 50:8 51:24 55:7 58:23 65:23 73:19,20 75:17 84:23 86:21 91:9 gives 35:20 Glenn 64:22 Gloucester 76:15 go 8:24 9:18 16:7 35:8 36:3 47:10,10 49:16 51:13 52:17 58:17 61:21 65:12,14 68:14 71:2 73:12 80:5 88:18 95:18 96:2	guardians 49:12 guess 19:1,2 85:11 guest 27:10 guests 40:7 guidelines 62:7 64:6 88:9	hold 24:5 72:22 91:16 holding 34:6 Holly 81:25 Holmes 50:1,19 50:20 home 13:7 31:1,4 31:11 46:22 95:10,12,14,16 98:7 homes 52:17 honest 67:1 83:13 honesty 82:18 honour 17:15,19 honours 72:19 hope 29:19,23 50:20 70:20 89:1 92:16 hopes 37:9 horrific 65:6 94:1 horrified 15:4,5 15:10,11,12 19:12 horse's 34:16,22 hours 13:5 24:13 51:9 95:5 house 54:13 78:19 huge 81:10 hugely 32:21 94:4,20 Hughes 4:6 human 16:7 82:17 hundreds 80:9 hung 41:2 hunt 84:12 92:20	importantly 84:15 impossible 34:9 62:18 64:7 impress 60:17 impressed 6:6 impression 39:20 82:15 improper 46:8 impropriety 87:8 improvement 16:11 inaccurate 70:19 inasmuch 12:9 incident 34:4,10 52:18 62:22 included 23:18 77:24 including 24:6 30:11 52:8 inclusion 8:24 15:9 incorrect 75:17 increasing 49:6 51:5 incumbent 36:7 independence 67:9 independent 26:7 33:3 75:11 indicate 69:13 indicates 11:15 indication 70:5 individual 25:13 25:14 26:12 69:16 76:24 79:15 89:12 inevitable 2:21 inevitably 80:1 inexperienced 45:23 inference 22:10 58:2 influence 30:2 90:9 91:4 informally 48:7 information 7:21 8:11,12 9:23 11:19 14:17,19 14:20 15:12	informed 70:10 inherently 96:21 initial 7:23 initiate 85:3 inner 45:10 innocent 21:22 input 9:7 30:15 inquiries 57:15 96:6 inquiry 2:10,16 2:18 3:5,13 4:21 5:9 7:12 17:3,18 20:6 28:21,24 35:1 39:2 46:17 50:16 51:2 54:20 58:12 59:8 60:10 61:9 63:3 65:17 67:18 71:12,15 75:2 76:5 89:23 90:3 91:10 93:3 94:6,7 Inquiry's 81:4 insisted 19:7,16 inspector 4:24 28:15 54:3 84:24 86:4 87:12,18,19,22 inspectors 88:10 instance 34:4 36:9 37:9 45:20 48:25 55:5 62:10 instants 43:10 instruct 1:9 integrity 9:25 82:17 intend 2:22 intense 82:6 intensity 81:24 81:25 intention 22:4 27:23 interaction 37:15 38:4 50:24	
four 33:6 36:20 47:19 70:10 77:19 84:4	goes 3:23 47:16 47:17 going 1:19 2:21 4:16 6:4 9:16 11:25 13:9 14:13 16:16 18:21 22:23 23:14 33:17 42:21 46:10 47:19 48:8 49:1 53:1 56:3 63:9 64:2 65:1 76:25 77:9 79:14 80:17 86:1 93:17 94:4 gold 8:16 9:1,12 golf 18:22 good 4:7 6:24 27:23 34:19 40:13,18 41:13 44:1 46:1 50:14 58:18 59:22 62:24 82:21 Goodman 64:21 gossip 41:16,17 41:19 government 67:10 78:20 grade 70:3 graded 55:24 grasp 67:2 grateful 26:14 79:24 great 1:8 6:5 7:18 23:3 41:24 73:16 79:14 grips 43:21 44:15 grisly 78:18 ground 61:22 63:17 grounds 37:20	hand 11:23 handed 16:18 handing 51:12 handle 82:8 Hanscombe 90:8 happen 47:7 56:24 80:4 happened 2:23 7:20 20:13 48:14 50:4,5 59:20 60:23 78:4,19 happening 79:18 happens 2:14 happy 35:3 61:23 79:2 91:10 hard 1:8 8:20 harder 16:25 hardest 22:22 harm 63:1 harmful 20:25 harnessed 91:25 Hartley 4:1 hasten 67:3 hate 43:18 Hayman 49:19 52:22,25 head 8:16 10:7 31:21 38:6,9 85:10 headline 92:16 hear 60:16 63:13 65:1 89:9 heard 32:3 50:15 59:7 63:2 66:14 67:18,19 78:15 hearsay 57:10,10 heart 84:18 heavily 40:22 held 47:11,12,22 52:7 54:17,19 help 59:4 79:24 81:15 91:20 helped 89:22 90:17,21 helpful 6:24 8:2 62:9 helping 27:14	H	immediately 19:12 impact 17:18 61:14 67:4 impeccable 6:4 implications 78:4 implicit 76:3 86:20 important 4:14 5:3 9:16 10:1 15:20 29:6 75:10 78:17 82:18 91:12 importantly 84:15 impossible 34:9 62:18 64:7 impress 60:17 impressed 6:6 impression 39:20 82:15 improper 46:8 impropriety 87:8 improvement 16:11 inaccurate 70:19 inasmuch 12:9 incident 34:4,10 52:18 62:22 included 23:18 77:24 including 24:6 30:11 52:8 inclusion 8:24 15:9 incorrect 75:17 increasing 49:6 51:5 incumbent 36:7 independence 67:9 independent 26:7 33:3 75:11 indicate 69:13 indicates 11:15 indication 70:5 individual 25:13 25:14 26:12 69:16 76:24 79:15 89:12 inevitable 2:21 inevitably 80:1 inexperienced 45:23 inference 22:10 58:2 influence 30:2 90:9 91:4 informally 48:7 information 7:21 8:11,12 9:23 11:19 14:17,19 14:20 15:12	interactions 35:21 36:15 49:17 intercept 64:18 64:20 interest 6:15 7:3 7:7,18 10:22 23:3 36:5 37:17 42:23 46:19 48:17 64:5 81:11 82:7,8 83:25 84:13 94:5,20 96:1 interested 42:13 42:16 59:10 interesting 63:13 67:21 interests 30:9,10 53:17,17 63:25 67:11 internal 19:9 39:11 41:19 42:17 Internet 32:24 33:7 interpretation 52:20 interrupt 23:17 interview 89:16 interviews 88:2 intimate 17:23 intricate 10:25 inundated 81:19 investigate 78:17 investigating 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 18:24 33:21 34:7,14 35:12 36:13 54:20 60:3 76:17 investigation 3:4 5:11,16,22 6:13,14,18,24 8:12,23 9:4,5 9:17 11:5,19 12:7,12 16:9 18:9,25 19:9 19:21 21:7,21 22:5,9,19 23:21 25:5 26:5,10 27:18 27:24 55:5 58:8 59:23,25 60:1 65:13,18 68:4,5 72:18 72:20 77:12 89:25 90:10 93:11 94:10,19 95:24 96:19 investigations 6:17 7:8 11:9 23:17 27:4 65:17,23 67:20 78:1	
framework 61:19 62:3,4 63:17 free 45:8 freelance 93:8,15 frenzy 6:21 20:3 frequent 53:25 frictions 42:9,12 friend 45:15 friends 38:7 front 4:17 full 16:8 23:13 28:19 71:10 98:7 fully 9:20 14:11 further 74:4	G	hard 1:8 8:20 harder 16:25 hardest 22:22 harm 63:1 harmful 20:25 harnessed 91:25 Hartley 4:1 hasten 67:3 hate 43:18 Hayman 49:19 52:22,25 head 8:16 10:7 31:21 38:6,9 85:10 headline 92:16 hear 60:16 63:13 65:1 89:9 heard 32:3 50:15 59:7 63:2 66:14 67:18,19 78:15 hearsay 57:10,10 heart 84:18 heavily 40:22 held 47:11,12,22 52:7 54:17,19 help 59:4 79:24 81:15 91:20 helped 89:22 90:17,21 helpful 6:24 8:2 62:9 helping 27:14	immediately 19:12 impact 17:18 61:14 67:4 impeccable 6:4 implications 78:4 implicit 76:3 86:20 important 4:14 5:3 9:16 10:1 15:20 29:6 75:10 78:17 82:18 91:12 importantly 84:15 impossible 34:9 62:18 64:7 impress 60:17 impressed 6:6 impression 39:20 82:15 improper 46:8 impropriety 87:8 improvement 16:11 inaccurate 70:19 inasmuch 12:9 incident 34:4,10 52:18 62:22 included 23:18 77:24 including 24:6 30:11 52:8 inclusion 8:24 15:9 incorrect 75:17 increasing 49:6 51:5 incumbent 36:7 independence 67:9 independent 26:7 33:3 75:11 indicate 69:13 indicates 11:15 indication 70:5 individual 25:13 25:14 26:12 69:16 76:24 79:15 89:12 inevitable 2:21 inevitably 80:1 inexperienced 45:23 inference 22:10 58:2 influence 30:2 90:9 91:4 informally 48:7 information 7:21 8:11,12 9:23 11:19 14:17,19 14:20 15:12	interactions 35:21 36:15 49:17 intercept 64:18 64:20 interest 6:15 7:3 7:7,18 10:22 23:3 36:5 37:17 42:23 46:19 48:17 64:5 81:11 82:7,8 83:25 84:13 94:5,20 96:1 interested 42:13 42:16 59:10 interesting 63:13 67:21 interests 30:9,10 53:17,17 63:25 67:11 internal 19:9 39:11 41:19 42:17 Internet 32:24 33:7 interpretation 52:20 interrupt 23:17 interview 89:16 interviews 88:2 intimate 17:23 intricate 10:25 inundated 81:19 investigate 78:17 investigating 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 18:24 33:21 34:7,14 35:12 36:13 54:20 60:3 76:17 investigation 3:4 5:11,16,22 6:13,14,18,24 8:12,23 9:4,5 9:17 11:5,19 12:7,12 16:9 18:9,25 19:9 19:21 21:7,21 22:5,9,19 23:21 25:5 26:5,10 27:18 27:24 55:5 58:8 59:23,25 60:1 65:13,18 68:4,5 72:18 72:20 77:12 89:25 90:10 93:11 94:10,19 95:24 96:19 investigations 6:17 7:8 11:9 23:17 27:4 65:17,23 67:20 78:1		
Garnham 1:4,5 3:25 69:10,11 69:12,21,22,23 Gary 10:7 22:2 gather 89:8 general 10:19 32:15 40:25 53:6,21 54:18 64:15 67:12 68:14 73:6,25 94:8 generally 22:20 53:9 73:19 87:6 generate 7:17 generated 2:19 generic 93:6 gentleman 16:25 genuine 21:22 22:6 23:19 genuinely 21:18 96:17,18 getting 17:2 21:14 42:17 49:13 59:16 62:17 75:20 88:24 96:9 give 17:25 22:21 25:15 26:9 29:17 34:15 54:15 70:5,7	Goodman 64:21 gossip 41:16,17 41:19 government 67:10 78:20 grade 70:3 graded 55:24 grasp 67:2 grateful 26:14 79:24 great 1:8 6:5 7:18 23:3 41:24 73:16 79:14 grips 43:21 44:15 grisly 78:18 ground 61:22 63:17 grounds 37:20	hard 1:8 8:20 harder 16:25 hardest 22:22 harm 63:1 harmful 20:25 harnessed 91:25 Hartley 4:1 hasten 67:3 hate 43:18 Hayman 49:19 52:22,25 head 8:16 10:7 31:21 38:6,9 85:10 headline 92:16 hear 60:16 63:13 65:1 89:9 heard 32:3 50:15 59:7 63:2 66:14 67:18,19 78:15 hearsay 57:10,10 heart 84:18 heavily 40:22 held 47:11,12,22 52:7 54:17,19 help 59:4 79:24 81:15 91:20 helped 89:22 90:17,21 helpful 6:24 8:2 62:9 helping 27:14	H	immediately 19:12 impact 17:18 61:14 67:4 impeccable 6:4 implications 78:4 implicit 76:3 86:20 important 4:14 5:3 9:16 10:1 15:20 29:6 75:10 78:17 82:18 91:12 importantly 84:15 impossible 34:9 62:18 64:7 impress 60:17 impressed 6:6 impression 39:20 82:15 improper 46:8 impropriety 87:8 improvement 16:11 inaccurate 70:19 inasmuch 12:9 incident 34:4,10 52:18 62:22 included 23:18 77:24 including 24:6 30:11 52:8 inclusion 8:24 15:9 incorrect 75:17 increasing 49:6 51:5 incumbent 36:7 independence 67:9 independent 26:7 33:3 75:11 indicate 69:13 indicates 11:15 indication 70:5 individual 25:13 25:14 26:12 69:16 76:24 79:15 89:12 inevitable 2:21 inevitably 80:1 inexperienced 45:23 inference 22:10 58:2 influence 30:2 90:9 91:4 informally 48:7 information 7:21 8:11,12 9:23 11:19 14:17,19 14:20 15:12	interactions 35:21 36:15 49:17 intercept 64:18 64:20 interest 6:15 7:3 7:7,18 10:22 23:3 36:5 37:17 42:23 46:19 48:17 64:5 81:11 82:7,8 83:25 84:13 94:5,20 96:1 interested 42:13 42:16 59:10 interesting 63:13 67:21 interests 30:9,10 53:17,17 63:25 67:11 internal 19:9 39:11 41:19 42:17 Internet 32:24 33:7 interpretation 52:20 interrupt 23:17 interview 89:16 interviews 88:2 intimate 17:23 intricate 10:25 inundated 81:19 investigate 78:17 investigating 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 18:24 33:21 34:7,14 35:12 36:13 54:20 60:3 76:17 investigation 3:4 5:11,16,22 6:13,14,18,24 8:12,23 9:4,5 9:17 11:5,19 12:7,12 16:9 18:9,25 19:9 19:21 21:7,21 22:5,9,19 23:21 25:5 26:5,10 27:18 27:24 55:5 58:8 59:23,25 60:1 65:13,18 68:4,5 72:18 72:20 77:12 89:25 90:10 93:11 94:10,19 95:24 96:19 investigations 6:17 7:8 11:9 23:17 27:4 65:17,23 67:20 78:1	

investigation's 23:10	Johnson 49:9	78:3,6,24 79:2	62:12 64:5	28:11,14 30:5	79:11 83:21	71:18 76:13,22
invited 13:16	joined 5:1 71:24	79:10,14,17,20	knows 67:9 68:1	30:13,17,20	84:24 85:8	77:5 92:15
invited 40:6	joint 72:7	79:22 80:4	<hr/> L <hr/>	35:8,14,19	loop 41:9	96:12
46:16 50:3,6	journalism 72:8	88:3,6,11,17	lack 58:16	43:12 44:3,6,9	Lord 1:4,12,17	main 94:17,18
54:18 62:10	80:2 92:7	88:23 89:3	language 58:14	44:14,18 45:1	1:20 2:8 3:17	maintain 41:13
invites 13:24	journalist 5:23	90:7,15,16,20	largely 53:5,16	45:4,8 47:2,21	3:20,24 4:7,12	45:4
involve 41:18	6:9 23:16	91:6,8,14,18	late 1:7 2:5,7	47:23 48:1	7:2,7,10 8:25	major 14:24
involved 14:23	34:11 46:24	91:20,23 92:3	43:22 52:12	56:19 58:10,18	15:10,15,18,25	making 3:25
20:15 22:4	48:11 51:14	92:5 98:11	launched 90:10	59:10 60:6,13	17:16 26:11	6:25 15:7 24:8
31:13 42:17,24	57:7 59:15	Justin 6:8	Laville 93:7	60:16,20 62:4	28:1,4,7,11,14	31:8 44:14
49:13 59:21	61:6,7 62:14	<hr/> K <hr/>	lavishly 51:3	63:5,16 64:8	30:5,13,17,20	52:19 57:9
63:5 65:7 66:5	62:17,21 64:4	keen 66:18 79:17	law 30:11 43:4	66:10,17 69:6	35:8,14,19	95:19
involvement 5:9	75:12 82:21	keep 4:14 8:11	Lawrence 1:25	69:9,11,19	36:24 37:1,13	Malthouse 49:9
7:11 25:18	85:14,24 87:9	10:3 12:2 13:1	5:9,12 6:13	70:21,24 71:7	37:19,22 38:9	man 90:15
43:4 49:7	87:10 89:6,19	25:5,11 41:9	12:15 13:1	72:24 73:16	38:16,17,21,24	manage 10:22
ironic 38:10	91:1 93:9,16	Kelvin 37:16	16:10 20:24	77:6,9,17,19	39:3,4,4,13,20	62:19
isolate 70:14	96:15	killer 89:18	21:2,9,9,12	78:3,6,24 79:2	40:8,21 42:2,6	managed 12:2
issue 43:20 66:8	journalistic	92:17,20	27:10,11,19	79:10,14,17,20	43:12 44:3,6,9	management
91:3	65:11 66:1	killers 50:20	38:19 39:2	79:22 80:4	44:14,18 45:1	8:18 42:9
issued 89:17	journalists 5:19	killing 15:3	40:9,10 74:20	88:3,6,11,17	45:4,8 47:2,21	manager 59:16
issues 6:7 31:10	7:19 29:21	kind 34:13 42:14	lawyer 48:25	88:23 89:3	47:23 48:1	Manchester
37:11 41:3	32:11 34:8	43:5 49:3 60:9	lawyers 68:13	90:16,20 91:8	56:19 58:10,18	81:21
43:3 45:5 58:6	35:11 36:7	61:2,3	layers 62:18	91:14,18,23	59:10 60:6,13	manner 43:1
67:3,3 74:11	45:11,13 46:5	Kirk 67:23	lead-up 24:22	92:3,5 98:11	60:16,20 62:4	marathon 34:1
83:2	46:17 51:3	Kit 49:9	leak 20:5 21:20	LGC 10:24	63:5,16 64:8	March 1:1
<hr/> J <hr/>	52:9 54:23	knew 10:1 13:22	21:21 57:15	21:19,23 22:19	66:10,17 69:6	mark 4:6 50:15
jacket 11:7	55:2 56:16	49:24 52:25	60:12 61:1	liaison 88:1	69:9,11,19	50:17
January 25:1,10	57:3 59:3	64:20 88:21	leaked 11:19	licence 23:19	70:21,24 71:7	marking 56:25
39:15 59:6	61:13,18 68:10	94:14	18:12 26:18	life 69:1	72:24 73:16	57:1,13 69:17
66:13 71:24	68:11,14,20	knife 43:18	56:17 60:5	light 2:22 44:25	74:21,25 75:1	marking's 56:14
95:8	70:3,15 78:13	knock 80:9	85:20 87:2	66:14	77:6,9,17,19	mass 46:16
jaws 75:3	83:4	knocked 62:5	92:25	liked 23:8	78:3,6,24 79:2	massively 84:13
Jay 4:3,4,8,11,16	journalist's	80:11	leaks 6:18 26:17	likes 45:5	79:10,14,17,20	material 2:10 5:8
7:19 9:19 19:5	85:14	know 1:22 2:19	55:12,22 56:21	limited 9:22 11:6	79:22 80:4	10:13 31:2,2
26:15 27:25	judge 8:6 14:11	2:19 8:4,13	57:6	line 8:22 14:8	88:3,6,11,17	36:14
28:16,18,19	judgment 56:2	9:20 10:21,25	learn 16:13	19:13 59:16	88:23 89:3	matter 1:25 3:9
31:14 35:19,20	96:10,10	11:8,10 16:14	59:10 64:17	lines 36:4 74:5	90:16,20 91:8	3:11 4:2 9:6,15
43:11 45:10	July 57:22 84:3,4	17:5,8 18:12	learned 27:3	links 51:21	91:14,18,23	14:13 26:20
48:5 50:23	June 5:13 8:4	20:5,10,11	learning 16:11	listen 88:12	92:3,5 98:11	33:19 37:7
56:22 57:8	junior 20:18	22:4 26:18	22:3	listened 34:25	lose 13:15 67:9	39:17 43:13
58:19 61:11,25	87:17 88:4	27:9,10,12	learns 3:4	85:15	83:19	73:15,18 86:17
64:15 66:7	justice 1:4,12,17	34:12 36:13	learnt 17:14	listening 61:17	lost 27:5 50:12	89:10
69:23 71:6,9	1:20 2:8 3:17	38:3 40:15	18:20 60:4	little 31:6 50:8	lot 2:3 3:10	matters 8:17 9:8
71:10,23 73:1	3:20,24 4:7,12	41:5,10,14,21	leave 3:16	97:6	22:13 32:4	9:16 11:12
74:7 80:15	7:2,7,10 8:25	44:22,22,23	leaving 52:7	live 33:18	51:1 76:16	27:6 41:12
88:11,25 89:1	15:10,15,18,25	45:13,17,22	lecture 27:13	local 33:8 88:8	77:7 82:4,20	mature 37:9,9
89:4 92:14	16:19 17:1,6	46:19 48:16,24	led 55:9	location 12:4	90:25 91:4	69:4
94:16 97:20	17:16 21:15	50:22 51:17,18	left 4:18 90:14	locked 88:6	96:5	maturity 69:2
98:9	23:22,25 26:11	53:17,19 55:14	legal 13:2	log 11:15 22:10	lots 50:15 80:11	Mayor 49:9
Jefferies 76:6,10	27:12,19 28:1	56:1 64:23	legitimate 75:5,8	23:18	lowering 80:20	ma'am 8:22
jeopardise 8:23	28:4,7,11,14	65:6,7,13,24	lesson 17:14	London 43:20	Lucy 51:25	McKenzie 37:16
94:5,17,19	30:5,13,17,20	66:1,18 68:16	18:20	50:2 76:20	lunch 68:15	McKenzie's
jeopardised 94:6	35:8,14,19	68:21 70:6	lessons 27:3	long 15:3 23:3	luncheon 98:14	37:18
jeopardising	43:12 44:3,6,9	73:14 77:6	lest 60:11	31:20 32:1	lunches 51:2	mean 9:1 20:8
96:18	44:14,18 45:1	78:12 80:7,9	let's 4:3 51:13	33:25 51:2	lunching 49:18	29:19 36:9,12
Jessica 82:1	45:4,8 47:2,21	81:18 94:23	89:11	longer 77:14	51:5	37:25 40:2
Jill 10:6	47:23 48:1	96:7,23 98:5	level 54:3 84:24	83:15,17	<hr/> M <hr/>	41:21 42:12
job 23:16 34:7	56:19 58:10,18	knowing 23:13	87:12,18,19	long-serving	MacPherson	43:17 44:21
85:24 94:3,5	59:10 60:6,13	knowledge 11:6	LEVESON 1:4	46:4	75:1	47:17 48:16
jobs 31:12 55:21	60:16,20 62:4	31:18 48:24	1:12,17,20 2:8	look 8:8 55:21	Mail 1:23 2:2	49:7 51:18
John 28:17,20	63:5,16 64:8	49:2 57:12	3:17,20,24 4:7	72:22 80:17	13:25 14:4,5,6	54:8,11,12,15
40:4 49:23,24	66:10,17 69:6	65:23 74:3	4:12 7:2,7,10	looked 14:25	14:7,8,9,11,14	55:19 58:15
52:12 67:22	69:9,11,19	known 10:18,20	8:25 15:10,15	39:16 76:1	14:14,19 24:16	60:23 61:17,25
71:8,11	70:21,24 71:7	13:13,15,24	15:18,25 17:16	looking 14:4,5	24:17 27:7,9	64:12 65:15
	72:24 73:16	47:18 49:23	26:11 28:1,4,7	42:23 55:11	27:13,15,23	67:13 77:15
	77:6,9,17,19			63:2 72:12		85:7

means 35:9 47:8 47:25 54:11	method 19:24	61:25 89:12	never 12:3,4 15:16,21 17:8 19:21,22 37:14 43:6 48:9 72:18 78:16	76:2 77:2 94:2 95:24	15:4 16:14 34:12,17 35:2 35:10,12 36:16 38:14 51:19 52:8 53:11,14 53:21 54:20 55:4 59:2 60:3 61:13,19 67:7 68:19,23 75:21 81:16 82:11,15 83:11,11 84:8 84:8,21 85:5 85:12 87:17,18 88:1 90:4 91:24	opposed 14:8 opposite 82:22 optimism 15:8,9 order 4:14 23:23 24:8 ordered 19:3 organisation 17:1 30:24 31:3 44:20 63:25 organisations 77:3 78:13 organised 43:25 80:12 88:2 originally 22:18 25:23 originated 57:25 origins 93:13 ought 86:22 outcome 8:4,5 96:18 97:25 outlines 14:15 outside 8:24 13:23 22:1 25:25 38:2 86:12 87:19 overnight 34:4 overriding 41:14 overtly 39:9 owing 93:11 o'clock 98:12				
meant 59:19 77:13 80:19	4:25 7:13 9:21 10:8 12:5 25:12,17 32:7 34:18 37:14 38:12,12,18 40:8,17,21 41:12 42:3 43:21 55:25 63:23 64:17 75:3 81:15 90:22 92:11	moved 12:6 moving 12:6 37:22 38:16 68:24 98:9 MPA 49:10 MPS 10:17 12:16 26:4,16 32:16 58:19 Mulcaire 64:22 multiple 57:10 murder 5:9,12 6:16 7:4,8 9:11 21:25 23:20 49:25 50:2 54:17 59:21,23 65:4,6 72:18 80:24 85:7,9 89:20 92:12 94:2 murdered 43:20 murders 7:5 42:25 80:24 81:7,9,25 mushroomed 32:21	new 12:14,24,25 13:19 16:15 37:23 50:10 51:20 52:10 54:25 90:9 news 11:21,22 12:8 30:24 32:2 33:10 38:6 65:2,20 71:17,19 78:13 81:12 95:4 newspaper 6:20 14:15 16:21 29:2 30:3 32:1 33:16,16 38:21 38:22 41:12 42:16,18 43:19 45:20 55:6 74:5 77:24 79:6 91:11 newspapers 30:25 33:2 47:4,7 77:3 78:22 79:9 80:1 Nickell 72:21 89:13 90:2 92:21 94:1 Nickell's 89:16 92:12 night 52:8,12 61:4,8 93:3 noble 79:10 non-related 11:12 normal 51:10 82:17 normally 6:22 45:17 87:25 north 50:2 note 51:17 noticed 49:8 51:25 notification 61:3 61:11 notifies 59:16 notifying 61:2 noting 37:17 Notwithstanding 6:11 November 12:14 13:25 14:18 24:25 25:2,9 nowadays 33:14 53:25 number 5:3 7:20 9:23 41:5 45:25 52:8,9 53:24 57:2,2,4 57:6,18 59:20 66:14 72:4	numbering 39:12	O	obtain 86:2 obtained 23:23 95:11 obvious 32:20 33:20 obviously 1:22 5:1 13:15 22:1 25:8 32:6 38:16 40:13 42:2 43:10 44:9 67:2 78:19 81:22 82:17,22 84:5 90:3 98:3 occasion 31:19 32:9 52:13 59:20 60:22 62:15 85:7 occasionally 96:11 occasions 21:8 34:11,24 36:20 41:3,23 43:2 47:18 48:6,15 52:4 53:19 54:22 58:22 84:2 85:12 86:14,21 87:22 occupied 5:2 occurred 9:5 34:4 93:18 October 11:18 offences 5:5 offenders 68:4 offensive 38:20 offer 21:24 41:10 offered 32:6 office 21:22 32:2 33:22 34:6 36:10 38:22 42:15 47:18 95:10,12,14,16 98:7 officer 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 10:17 10:17 18:7 22:3 23:20 32:8 33:21,22 34:10,14 35:17 36:11,11,12 46:24 48:23 51:15 58:4,23 59:18,24 60:2 60:4,6,24 62:12,12,23,23 63:14 76:18 85:8 86:5 87:12 89:21 90:13 91:1,4 officers 10:25	official 35:25 off-camera 55:3 off-the-record 53:23 54:1,4,9 54:14 61:14 Oh 18:18 44:9 45:20 60:22 83:11 93:13 okay 15:25 24:21 39:11 48:1 53:23 59:5 66:7 69:8 75:23 80:23 84:19 96:25 old 21:5,5 80:9 older 37:10 omitted 4:4 once 13:16 20:8 27:17 50:25 ones 64:6 88:6 96:7 one-to-one 41:6 62:20,21 ongoing 22:17 26:10 95:23 online 14:2,4,5,6 14:8,9,14 33:15 onliner 14:12 open 8:6 41:24 64:3 74:24 81:3 openly 69:13 openness 67:17 69:1 operated 68:17 operation 5:11 5:22 7:25 24:20 26:8 29:8 operational 54:21 operations 49:10 49:13 opinion 27:7 39:1 61:24 66:20 67:22 83:23 opportunity 3:13 41:11 97:11	originally 22:18 25:23 originated 57:25 origins 93:13 ought 86:22 outcome 8:4,5 96:18 97:25 outlines 14:15 outside 8:24 13:23 22:1 25:25 38:2 86:12 87:19 overnight 34:4 overriding 41:14 overtly 39:9 owing 93:11 o'clock 98:12		
meet 50:18 89:19	Met's 69:14 Michael 28:17 28:20 middle 61:22 middling 84:22 mid-1990s 53:12 Mike 45:22 Milly 80:25 82:2 mind 8:15 44:21 49:11 60:9 77:15 minutes 28:3 46:13 70:25 71:1 Mirror 5:23 misconception 47:3 misleading 75:17 missed 15:13,14 15:16,22 19:21 19:22 mistake 22:6 23:20 mistaken 21:18 mistakes 17:24 misuse 88:21 mix 63:8 Mixture 48:12 Mm 57:20 92:23 95:15 mobile 7:19 64:18,21 80:10 mode 21:20 moderate 59:11 modify 66:21 moment 4:2 28:1 76:20 87:8 89:12 momentous 84:3 moments 9:5 21:3 month 84:3 monthly 74:13 74:22 months 77:19 Morgan 65:4,18 morning 20:22 33:12 34:5 76:11 mouth 34:16,22 move 19:24 24:13 28:16 40:9,11 53:3	Murder 5:9,12 6:16 7:4,8 9:11 21:25 23:20 49:25 50:2 54:17 59:21,23 65:4,6 72:18 80:24 85:7,9 89:20 92:12 94:2 murdered 43:20 murders 7:5 42:25 80:24 81:7,9,25 mushroomed 32:21	N	NAAFIs 53:14 naive 67:17 name 7:17 11:21 25:6,11 26:9 28:19 50:1,24 71:10 79:20 names 9:22 79:20 naming 9:22 narrative 14:9 national 33:1,8 84:6 nationally 82:20 nature 11:3 74:9 93:11 near 51:20 52:10 necessarily 30:1 41:24 45:14 47:12 48:13 49:4 73:13 necessary 29:7 35:25 82:10 need 1:14 8:13 10:24 11:14 17:21,22,25 40:1 61:18,19 71:1 90:15 91:16 needed 9:4 11:8 12:24 39:24 needs 62:9 64:5 64:13 69:1 negative 18:9,10 18:10,13 68:23 90:25 Neil 38:5 neutral 53:8 58:13	never 12:3,4 15:16,21 17:8 19:21,22 37:14 43:6 48:9 72:18 78:16 new 12:14,24,25 13:19 16:15 37:23 50:10 51:20 52:10 54:25 90:9 news 11:21,22 12:8 30:24 32:2 33:10 38:6 65:2,20 71:17,19 78:13 81:12 95:4 newspaper 6:20 14:15 16:21 29:2 30:3 32:1 33:16,16 38:21 38:22 41:12 42:16,18 43:19 45:20 55:6 74:5 77:24 79:6 91:11 newspapers 30:25 33:2 47:4,7 77:3 78:22 79:9 80:1 Nickell 72:21 89:13 90:2 92:21 94:1 Nickell's 89:16 92:12 night 52:8,12 61:4,8 93:3 noble 79:10 non-related 11:12 normal 51:10 82:17 normally 6:22 45:17 87:25 north 50:2 note 51:17 noticed 49:8 51:25 notification 61:3 61:11 notifies 59:16 notifying 61:2 noting 37:17 Notwithstanding 6:11 November 12:14 13:25 14:18 24:25 25:2,9 nowadays 33:14 53:25 number 5:3 7:20 9:23 41:5 45:25 52:8,9 53:24 57:2,2,4 57:6,18 59:20 66:14 72:4	numbering 39:12	O	obtain 86:2 obtained 23:23 95:11 obvious 32:20 33:20 obviously 1:22 5:1 13:15 22:1 25:8 32:6 38:16 40:13 42:2 43:10 44:9 67:2 78:19 81:22 82:17,22 84:5 90:3 98:3 occasion 31:19 32:9 52:13 59:20 60:22 62:15 85:7 occasionally 96:11 occasions 21:8 34:11,24 36:20 41:3,23 43:2 47:18 48:6,15 52:4 53:19 54:22 58:22 84:2 85:12 86:14,21 87:22 occupied 5:2 occurred 9:5 34:4 93:18 October 11:18 offences 5:5 offenders 68:4 offensive 38:20 offer 21:24 41:10 offered 32:6 office 21:22 32:2 33:22 34:6 36:10 38:22 42:15 47:18 95:10,12,14,16 98:7 officer 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 10:17 10:17 18:7 22:3 23:20 32:8 33:21,22 34:10,14 35:17 36:11,11,12 46:24 48:23 51:15 58:4,23 59:18,24 60:2 60:4,6,24 62:12,12,23,23 63:14 76:18 85:8 86:5 87:12 89:21 90:13 91:1,4 officers 10:25	official 35:25 off-camera 55:3 off-the-record 53:23 54:1,4,9 54:14 61:14 Oh 18:18 44:9 45:20 60:22 83:11 93:13 okay 15:25 24:21 39:11 48:1 53:23 59:5 66:7 69:8 75:23 80:23 84:19 96:25 old 21:5,5 80:9 older 37:10 omitted 4:4 once 13:16 20:8 27:17 50:25 ones 64:6 88:6 96:7 one-to-one 41:6 62:20,21 ongoing 22:17 26:10 95:23 online 14:2,4,5,6 14:8,9,14 33:15 onliner 14:12 open 8:6 41:24 64:3 74:24 81:3 openly 69:13 openness 67:17 69:1 operated 68:17 operation 5:11 5:22 7:25 24:20 26:8 29:8 operational 54:21 operations 49:10 49:13 opinion 27:7 39:1 61:24 66:20 67:22 83:23 opportunity 3:13 41:11 97:11	originally 22:18 25:23 originated 57:25 origins 93:13 ought 86:22 outcome 8:4,5 96:18 97:25 outlines 14:15 outside 8:24 13:23 22:1 25:25 38:2 86:12 87:19 overnight 34:4 overriding 41:14 overtly 39:9 owing 93:11 o'clock 98:12
meetings 21:8 25:25 34:6,6 41:6,8 59:2 member 25:12 25:16 26:4,16 29:12,16,16 30:12,15 32:1 39:14 65:11 73:3 83:15 members 12:17 31:5 76:2 memory 17:15 49:21 52:6 men 84:5 mention 51:2 60:18 mentioned 7:17 13:14 31:14 37:7 50:23 59:5,6 65:19 66:17 69:23 70:7 76:11 93:7 mentioning 63:23 mentions 48:20 merely 63:20 message 38:23 messages 64:20 met 36:1 38:3,20 39:24 40:1 41:19 49:22,24 50:7 52:4 53:5 54:25 56:4,15 57:3,5,19 61:4 61:5 67:24 69:16,18,24 70:3,4 76:23 88:10 90:4	Mirrored 5:23 misconception 47:3 misleading 75:17 missed 15:13,14 15:16,22 19:21 19:22 mistake 22:6 23:20 mistaken 21:18 mistakes 17:24 misuse 88:21 mix 63:8 Mixture 48:12 Mm 57:20 92:23 95:15 mobile 7:19 64:18,21 80:10 mode 21:20 moderate 59:11 modify 66:21 moment 4:2 28:1 76:20 87:8 89:12 momentous 84:3 moments 9:5 21:3 month 84:3 monthly 74:13 74:22 months 77:19 Morgan 65:4,18 morning 20:22 33:12 34:5 76:11 mouth 34:16,22 move 19:24 24:13 28:16 40:9,11 53:3	Murder 5:9,12 6:16 7:4,8 9:11 21:25 23:20 49:25 50:2 54:17 59:21,23 65:4,6 72:18 80:24 85:7,9 89:20 92:12 94:2 murdered 43:20 murders 7:5 42:25 80:24 81:7,9,25 mushroomed 32:21	N	NAAFIs 53:14 naive 67:17 name 7:17 11:21 25:6,11 26:9 28:19 50:1,24 71:10 79:20 names 9:22 79:20 naming 9:22 narrative 14:9 national 33:1,8 84:6 nationally 82:20 nature 11:3 74:9 93:11 near 51:20 52:10 necessarily 30:1 41:24 45:14 47:12 48:13 49:4 73:13 necessary 29:7 35:25 82:10 need 1:14 8:13 10:24 11:14 17:21,22,25 40:1 61:18,19 71:1 90:15 91:16 needed 9:4 11:8 12:24 39:24 needs 62:9 64:5 64:13 69:1 negative 18:9,10 18:10,13 68:23 90:25 Neil 38:5 neutral 53:8 58:13	never 12:3,4 15:16,21 17:8 19:21,22 37:14 43:6 48:9 72:18 78:16 new 12:14,24,25 13:19 16:15 37:23 50:10 51:20 52:10 54:25 90:9 news 11:21,22 12:8 30:24 32:2 33:10 38:6 65:2,20 71:17,19 78:13 81:12 95:4 newspaper 6:20 14:15 16:21 29:2 30:3 32:1 33:16,16 38:21 38:22 41:12 42:16,18 43:19 45:20 55:6 74:5 77:24 79:6 91:11 newspapers 30:25 33:2 47:4,7 77:3 78:22 79:9 80:1 Nickell 72:21 89:13 90:2 92:21 94:1 Nickell's 89:16 92:12 night 52:8,12 61:4,8 93:3 noble 79:10 non-related 11:12 normal 51:10 82:17 normally 6:22 45:17 87:25 north 50:2 note 51:17 noticed 49:8 51:25 notification 61:3 61:11 notifies 59:16 notifying 61:2 noting 37:17 Notwithstanding 6:11 November 12:14 13:25 14:18 24:25 25:2,9 nowadays 33:14 53:25 number 5:3 7:20 9:23 41:5 45:25 52:8,9 53:24 57:2,2,4 57:6,18 59:20 66:14 72:4	numbering 39:12	O	obtain 86:2 obtained 23:23 95:11 obvious 32:20 33:20 obviously 1:22 5:1 13:15 22:1 25:8 32:6 38:16 40:13 42:2 43:10 44:9 67:2 78:19 81:22 82:17,22 84:5 90:3 98:3 occasion 31:19 32:9 52:13 59:20 60:22 62:15 85:7 occasionally 96:11 occasions 21:8 34:11,24 36:20 41:3,23 43:2 47:18 48:6,15 52:4 53:19 54:22 58:22 84:2 85:12 86:14,21 87:22 occupied 5:2 occurred 9:5 34:4 93:18 October 11:18 offences 5:5 offenders 68:4 offensive 38:20 offer 21:24 41:10 offered 32:6 office 21:22 32:2 33:22 34:6 36:10 38:22 42:15 47:18 95:10,12,14,16 98:7 officer 5:10,14 8:3 9:10 10:17 10:17 18:7 22:3 23:20 32:8 33:21,22 34:10,14 35:17 36:11,11,12 46:24 48:23 51:15 58:4,23 59:18,24 60:2 60:4,6,24 62:12,12,23,23 63:14 76:18 85:8 86:5 87:12 89:21 90:13 91:1,4 officers 10:25	official 35:25 off-camera 55:3 off-the-record 53:23 54:1,4,9 54:14 61:14 Oh 18:18 44:9 45:20 60:22 83:11 93:13 okay 15:25 24:21 39:11 48:1 53:23 59:5 66:7 69:8 75:23 80:23 84:19 96:25 old 21:5,5 80:9 older 37:10 omitted 4:4 once 13:16 20:8 27:17 50:25 ones 64:6 88:6 96:7 one-to-one 41:6 62:20,21 ongoing 22:17 26:10 95:23 online 14:2,4,5,6 14:8,9,14 33:15 onliner 14:12 open 8:6 41:24 64:3 74:24 81:3 openly 69:13 openness 67:17 69:1 operated 68:17 operation 5:11 5:22 7:25 24:20 26:8 29:8 operational 54:21 operations 49:10 49:13 opinion 27:7 39:1 61:24 66:20 67:22 83:23 opportunity 3:13 41:11 97:11	originally 22:18 25:23 originated 57:25 origins 93:13 ought 86:22 outcome 8:4,5 96:18 97:25 outlines 14:15 outside 8:24 13:23 22:1 25:25 38:2 86:12 87:19 overnight 34:4 overriding 41:14 overtly 39:9 owing 93:11 o'clock 98:12
means 35:9 47:8 47:25 54:11	method 19:24	61:25 89:12	never 12:3,4 15:16,21 17:8							

paraphrase 76:2	perceived 82:21	35:7 53:3 65:4	91:1,15,15,24	16:13,18 18:22	62:24,24	41:17 42:21
pardon 71:24	perception 44:11	71:6,10 72:21	92:11,24 93:1	21:22 22:3	promoted 29:4	44:24 53:4
79:1	perfectly 75:4	75:23 76:21	93:5,6,11,22	24:14 32:25	71:20,25	54:15,20 55:3
parents 17:2	performed 11:12	90:14 97:23	94:10,14,19,25	33:22 34:17	promotion 83:16	55:4 57:20
part 14:24 17:7	period 25:8 31:6	pleasure 63:8	95:2,4,24	35:10 36:10	proper 96:21	60:19 64:16
17:13 21:14	34:2 45:16	plenty 45:19	96:19 97:10,18	52:8 54:16,18	properly 56:18	65:10 73:3
45:10 46:3	50:5 67:5,6	53:19	police/press 81:5	54:24 59:24	73:22	78:22 90:21,24
53:15 55:20	73:2	pm 13:4 71:3,5	policies 85:2	60:2,4,6,24	proposed 24:6	97:9 98:6
64:13 69:1	permission	98:13	policing 37:11	62:12,23 63:14	proposition 91:9	puts 35:23 36:1
78:3	12:11 24:13	poetic 23:19	49:7 68:6	72:7 73:25	prosecution	putting 49:24
partial 21:15	permit 78:25	poignant 89:18	70:13	79:12 81:3,10	10:23 13:21,22	
participants 1:6	permitted 12:10	90:6	policy 5:4 33:20	81:16,20 83:11	19:2	Q
particular 2:24	person 25:16,24	point 3:7,25 7:10	64:9,10	84:8,17 85:23	Prosecutions	quality 67:20
6:3 32:5 33:7	25:25 45:18	7:14,15 15:20	political 9:8 49:6	85:24,25 91:19	24:12	80:2
40:7,20 43:17	47:11 48:3	19:5 32:15	49:12 67:9	94:22 96:8	protect 61:18	queries 35:18
55:20 58:20	56:3 61:7	33:16 34:14	68:3,6	prestigious	63:25	question 1:17 3:2
59:14,22,24	83:11 86:22	37:17 38:18	politically 43:24	72:10	protection 5:5	26:13 50:23
60:24 61:6,6,9	personal 37:8,15	43:5 58:25	politics 39:1	presumably 26:3	proud 77:4	54:14 55:21
62:22 65:24	41:25 43:5	59:11 60:20,21	41:19 42:17	32:2 44:16	proved 76:24	62:1 69:12
67:16 70:14	personalities	61:15,16,25	position 1:21	57:2 66:3	provided 2:20	72:14 73:6,18
83:4 87:5	43:3	63:1 64:11,12	27:17 37:21	pretty 42:5,25	25:4 28:21	73:21 75:5,7,8
particularly	personality 35:6	67:21 69:3	53:9 67:5,7,12	43:15	31:15 54:5	75:9,10,12,13
30:25 32:7,18	personally 24:9	73:17 87:21	69:14 71:20	previous 6:16	63:16 65:10,25	76:6 77:10,22
34:18 42:5,13	57:18 61:20	95:22	80:16	principles 75:22	71:12 86:23	78:6,24 79:3
42:16 49:14	62:25 65:15	points 15:1 36:16	positions 5:3	print 24:18	94:13 95:1,23	81:3 97:15
50:22 52:22	75:2,11	59:9 67:14	positive 2:3 3:10	82:14,16	95:24 96:2	questions 3:13
53:1,10 73:23	personnel 75:4	police 4:25 7:13	6:11 11:16	printed 13:9	provides 3:5	4:11 28:5,13
80:18 84:4	person's 48:4	9:21 10:8 12:5	83:22	78:16	providing 86:22	28:18 29:7
partner 65:18	54:4 86:13	13:23 17:5,20	possible 35:17	prior 10:5 21:14	97:2	31:3 55:3
89:16 90:7	perspective	18:7 19:8,17	36:10 38:23	privately 83:2	pub 18:21 51:10	64:16 66:8
partners 18:11	85:14	20:14,23 21:5	51:14 64:18	privileged 29:17	51:11	69:20,22 71:9
18:15,16	phone 13:7 64:19	23:5,13,17,20	70:12,16 77:14	73:7,15 74:14	public 18:23	74:3,4,24
party 34:16	64:21	25:12,17 26:7	possibly 28:2	probably 7:2,4	24:12 27:1	75:15 81:18
62:11 63:7,20	phones 80:10	26:25 27:17	51:11 58:17	10:4 17:20	36:22 39:1	Quick 51:24
passage 95:21	photograph 65:5	29:18 30:11,14	potential 55:12	27:8 32:4	41:1 64:5	65:16
passed 10:11	65:8,10,25	31:2,8,15,17	55:21	36:24 39:15	65:11 67:14	quickly 82:20
26:6	66:2 91:11	32:7 33:21	potentially 25:21	44:1 45:12	83:25 84:13	83:1
patent 8:10	photographer	34:3,18,18	49:11 67:10	49:23 50:14	93:23 94:5,15	Quick's 52:15
path 23:22	47:16	35:2,17 36:12	92:19	56:6 73:1	94:20 96:1	65:14
patronising	photographers	37:14,18 38:12	pour 68:15	probe 85:25	publication 30:2	quiet 12:3
68:10	46:18 47:9,19	38:12,14,18	powerful 91:18	probing 86:2	50:12	quite 9:12 15:16
Paul 36:24 38:25	photographs	40:8,17,22	PR 48:4	problem 16:1	publicist 95:6	15:19 16:2,3
52:5 75:1,11	47:5	41:4,12 42:3	practical 47:15	54:10 60:13	publicity 8:1	22:20 24:19
Paul's 75:6	phrase 42:21	42:17 43:21	47:15 62:9	63:22 70:21	81:13 82:5	38:10 47:13
Pause 80:21 84:1	58:13	46:19,23 47:1	practice 40:16	78:3 88:14,15	85:8	56:5,25 59:3
85:21	phrased 56:6	47:7,11,13,16	68:11 80:15	97:24	publicly 86:3	59:22 64:1
pay 20:8 21:9	picked 43:24	47:17,20 48:22	practices 79:11	problems 32:4	publish 20:9,10	70:16 73:16
paying 77:4	68:13 93:15	49:3,10,13,25	pragmatic 39:8	40:9 43:2 76:5	24:6 96:2,2,5	77:7 81:23
peer 30:20	picture 77:21	51:8,15 53:5,9	praising 57:4	proceed 3:9	published 60:1	82:4,20 84:7
Penrose 6:8	piece 13:25 19:6	53:13,20,21	precise 65:7	professional	66:2 97:19	
people 3:3 4:15	92:15,18 94:23	55:15,25 57:23	precisely 17:16	4:23 37:2	Pugh 10:7 22:2	R
9:23 10:13,19	pieced 80:11	57:25,25 58:3	prejudice 95:23	45:16 51:8	purely 40:6 41:9	Rachel 72:21
13:13,16,17,18	pivotal 9:12	58:4,6,8,14,15	prejudiced 94:10	professionally	purpose 12:22	89:13,16 90:2
13:19,21,23	place 13:12	58:23 59:2	prepared 1:10	43:7	29:21 41:7	92:12,21 94:1
15:9 16:3,4,6,7	16:20 22:24	60:3 61:13,18	66:13 97:22	professionals	52:16 58:11	Rachel's 89:19
16:8 17:21,22	26:5 39:15	62:12,23 63:6	presence 36:21	63:5	purposes 14:13	90:7 92:17
17:25 18:1,3	92:7	63:24,24 64:2	62:16,16,16	professional/so...	65:23 67:11	radar 7:24
31:9,11,12	placed 4:17	64:17 67:6,7	63:19	36:15	pursuant 29:8	radio 6:23 30:4
33:3,6 40:3	placing 22:20	67:15 68:12,19	present 31:25	profile 36:3 45:5	pursuing 17:11	33:4
42:3 44:19	planning 24:20	68:23 69:1	40:3 47:1	67:14	pursuit 91:20	raid 48:8
47:6 48:2 52:8	played 21:13	73:8 75:3 81:1	62:15	progress 8:11	put 3:13 10:22	raids 46:16
54:11 68:13	playing 18:22	81:2,6,8,9,16	presently 64:10	10:18 12:23	14:11 16:17	raise 49:5 91:3
74:6 83:8,14	plays 89:11	81:21 82:10,15	press 6:15 7:3,7	14:22 15:7	17:8 22:12,16	ramifications
87:3 88:7,18	please 3:12 4:9	82:19 84:14,18	7:11,18 10:17	83:1	23:8,11 28:5	58:8
90:5 91:25	4:12 5:20 21:1	85:5,17 89:17	10:17,22,23,25	projected 73:12	29:25 35:14	ran 42:5
perceive 57:24	28:11,16,19	89:21 90:22	11:17 13:6	promote 40:17	36:1 40:2	rang 76:18

range 10:12 72:24	24:4 46:17 55:14 57:18	38:8,15 39:9 41:13,22 46:1	29:22 31:13 32:18 42:19	33:23 35:19,24 39:18 42:21	Science 22:18	sentencing 44:4
rank 53:11,14 86:5,12 87:3 87:18,19,23 88:3	58:23 72:4 85:15 87:3,7 87:17	88:20 91:1 relationships 82:10 84:19	43:14 50:10 76:4 80:18	49:20 53:7 56:8 58:2 69:8 69:8,9 70:24 71:22 72:25 79:25 80:19	scientific 11:6,12 14:22,23	separate 56:19
ranks 5:2 84:22	receives 87:10	relatively 50:9 52:25	representations 97:12,13	85:6 86:7,20 88:5 89:3 90:16 91:13 93:21 96:9,14 96:14 97:7	scientists 10:12 11:2 14:25 15:17	September 23:25 29:2 71:20 92:15
rape 67:19,20 68:4	receiving 86:10	relatives 80:12	representative 12:18	96:14 97:7	Scotland 12:14 13:19 15:4	sergeant 88:4,8
rapists 67:25	reception 52:7	release 21:18 85:23,24,25	reputation 82:11 82:24	rightly 53:20 73:25	51:21 52:3,10 54:25 74:23 84:8 85:23,24	serious 8:16 24:19 26:1
rare 47:14 49:22 60:22 97:8	recipient 54:6	released 48:3 68:1	requests 7:21	risk 59:15 61:3 67:8 97:3	screen 72:13	seriously 97:14 97:25
rarely 48:23 63:12	recognise 13:18 13:20 61:20 62:3	releases 94:22 96:8	require 44:12	robberies 42:25	scrutiny 93:3	service 4:25 5:1 9:21 10:9,24 12:5 22:18 25:12,17 81:8 82:19
rarity 51:6	recollection 14:4	releasing 21:6	required 31:2 32:3 33:15,15 53:19 61:5 67:17	role 5:13 9:9,12 27:7 95:6	search 23:9,10 92:17	seriously 97:14 97:25
react 18:11	recommend 49:1	reliable 34:23	research 76:3 80:6	rolling 6:21	second 20:10,10 54:7 98:3	set 6:20 56:23 60:6,8
reaction 16:7	recommendati... 59:1	reliably 70:9	researching 77:19	room 54:24 90:2	secondary 68:6	setting 48:20 51:10 88:1
read 4:5 14:17 20:12 53:13 90:14	record 4:5 50:11 54:10 59:2 62:15,25 85:18	reliance 96:20	resign 38:25 75:3	Rose 78:14	secret 7:24 12:4 12:4 25:6 81:8	settings 51:16
reader 16:22	recorded 22:9 52:18 61:5	rely 94:22 96:8	resource 78:4	round 2:13 51:15 51:16 82:25	secretary 40:4	seven 37:3 77:20 93:18
readers 42:24 44:12	recording 42:17 68:20	relying 97:1	resources 9:4 17:5 43:23 68:4 77:25 78:23 79:7 80:1,16,19	route 92:14	section 55:3	sexual 5:4 68:4
readership 53:15	redefined 92:9	remain 54:24 55:2	respect 6:5 16:24 27:15 69:14 73:16	Rule 3:16	secured 72:11	share 11:16 13:1 25:13 56:10 59:12
real 1:17 7:10 38:24 43:6 67:8,14 76:25 78:22 81:13,13	refer 35:22 39:12 49:6	remained 80:16	research 76:3 80:6	rules 32:12 54:13 63:17	security 84:6	shield 9:9
realise 34:5	reference 3:2 20:17 54:25	remember 4:1 11:23 31:23 51:25 72:16 73:25 77:8 93:17	resigning 77:19	rumours 65:1	see 3:22 15:15 23:4 30:13 61:15,16 63:1 63:9 73:21 77:18 89:11	Shipman 80:24 81:21
reality 33:24 63:15,15	refers 55:18	remind 24:24	resource 78:4	run 34:1 57:22 61:2,3 84:5 97:24	seeing 47:4	short 28:9 37:7 71:4
really 3:1,4 4:2 6:4 9:8,17 19:23 21:3,11 29:21 32:17,20 32:23 33:20 34:21 39:5 41:9,17 44:12 48:12 51:6 58:16 61:16 62:25 76:9,14 77:7 80:10 81:11,12 86:22 88:24 89:4 98:1	reflect 27:16,20	remove 92:3	resources 9:4 17:5 43:23 68:4 77:25 78:23 79:7 80:1,16,19	run 34:1 57:22 61:2,3 84:5 97:24	seek 97:17	shortlisted 72:9
realms 62:17	reflection 66:25	reopened 5:11 6:13	respect 6:5 16:24 27:15 69:14 73:16	rules 32:12 54:13 63:17	seeking 23:16 92:7,8	shortly 33:18
reason 15:11 23:1 76:11 83:5,16 90:24	referring 25:18 48:10 51:23	repeat 91:10 92:5 94:20	respected 37:19	rumours 65:1	seen 61:8 76:5 85:2	show 13:2 69:17 90:13
reasonable 3:18 38:8,15 55:17 66:24	refers 55:18	report 16:19 18:4 62:1,2 63:19 66:22,23 67:1,16,19,25 68:1,8,25	respectfully 26:9	run 34:1 57:22 61:2,3 84:5 97:24	self-evident 20:24 32:20 98:3	showed 90:4
reasonably 41:22	reflect 27:16,20	reported 84:14 84:16	respects 27:11	runner 72:9	self-evidently 11:4 81:1 82:9 95:25 97:3	side 13:21,22,23 90:25
reasoning 59:3	reflection 66:25	reporter 29:3,20 30:8,9 31:20 31:25 32:5 33:2 43:13 44:18 45:21,23 51:12 59:21 60:7,8,14 72:4 72:12 76:12 82:13 83:7 96:7	respond 7:21	running 97:23	self-selecting 30:5	significant 9:5 11:18 24:11 36:2 72:4
reasons 8:10 33:20 54:19,21 96:21	refuse 94:25	report 16:19 18:4 62:1,2 63:19 66:22,23 67:1,16,19,25 68:1,8,25	responding 2:9	runs 59:15	self-serving 83:12	similar 78:21
recall 31:23 32:9 46:23,25 52:6 52:11 53:1 97:16	regard 46:3 53:10	reported 84:14 84:16	responsibility 8:16 9:2,3 86:6 86:13	sad 78:1,2,11,11 sadly 77:23	semi-professio... 49:16	simply 35:15,16 42:22 63:8
receipt 87:1	regarded 29:20 69:17 83:4	reporters 30:6 30:12,23 31:5 33:1 36:21 45:24,25 46:4 47:9 50:3,9 51:2 55:24 63:6 68:17,18 68:21 69:16 73:4,6 74:2,23 83:3,8,21,24 84:7 94:21	responsible 44:10 81:7 90:11	Sandra 93:7	senior 5:10,14 8:3 9:9 15:4 25:11,16,24 26:4,16 32:7 36:16 55:4 75:21 76:17 84:22 89:21 90:13 91:4,24	sincerest 32:6
receive 56:20 57:7	regrets 50:19	result 1:8 7:16 31:8 74:4 81:17	responsibility 8:16 9:2,3 86:6 86:13	Sarah 38:8 45:22	sense 30:22 33:9 34:21 40:14 58:10 67:17 68:9 69:3 85:16 87:11 93:6,22	SIO 9:14 18:15
received 8:5 13:7	regrettably 26:18	result 1:8 7:16 31:8 74:4 81:17	responsible 44:10 81:7 90:11	satellite 32:23	sentence 19:12 59:14	sir 1:5,19 4:4 5:7 5:24 6:2 7:9,15 8:14,19 9:3 10:15 12:21 15:6,14,19 16:12 17:8,13 19:14,19,19 20:4,16 23:24 24:2 25:3 26:14,18 28:2 28:12 30:8,22 31:19 32:5,9 32:14,20 33:24 34:24 35:3,5 35:15,25 36:24

37:1,11 38:25	60:10 61:3,10	staff 36:22	20:10,11 30:1	66:9,11 69:23	84:15,23	themes 70:13
39:6,19 40:2	63:9 64:3	stage 12:23	32:3,25 33:5	summer 57:21	talked 11:13	they'd 41:2
41:10,17 42:6	88:13	76:23 93:23	33:13 34:15	58:5	12:3 91:23	thing 3:12 30:20
42:13,20 43:17	somebody's	94:15	36:5,6 38:11	Sun 29:1,2 38:1	talking 19:17	43:5 46:11
44:2,5,11,13	68:16	Stagg 94:25 95:3	42:13 45:14	39:4,5 42:18	21:25 36:12	63:3,10 90:18
45:3,9,12,14	someone's 76:19	Stagg's 95:6,9,19	48:14 50:11	43:17 44:1	52:17 64:6	things 3:10 4:14
46:12 47:3,22	somewhat 6:18	96:24	56:24 59:17,22	45:4 53:5,7,11	68:14	18:12 29:25
47:25 48:12,18	7:3	stance 59:8	60:1,5,11 61:7	65:5,9,20,22	tape 8:7 68:20	42:5,12 50:16
49:3 51:23	son 89:19 90:6	standard 28:22	64:1,4 68:16	91:10,15	tape-recorded	56:19 66:15
52:4 54:8	90:15	standards 80:20	76:16 77:1	Sunday 5:23	68:22	96:5
56:13 57:7,14	soon 94:21	start 59:13 82:4	80:5,14 81:24	21:17,23 24:14	tapings 14:24	think 3:22 5:10
57:17,20 58:15	sorry 19:12	started 5:14	92:5 94:6,20	30:25	tasks 55:19	6:14 7:15 12:3
58:24 59:5,8	35:19 44:14	13:24 24:25	97:9,20 98:3,5	Superintendent	tea 39:7,8 62:22	12:23 13:17,18
59:19 60:15,18	80:7	32:22 37:4	straight 21:20	10:6	team 9:24,25	13:20 14:10
60:19,22 61:6	sort 3:24 8:7	74:19	straightforward	supervisor 10:5	12:1,18 13:2	15:8,16,19
61:16 62:7	31:6 34:12	state 67:8	43:1,14	supervisors 10:5	18:10 61:9	16:6,20 17:14
63:1,12,22	46:10 50:13	statement 1:6,10	strain 22:16	support 8:21	teams 47:19	18:21,21,25
64:12,14,25	55:7 61:19	4:4,17,19,20	strategy 6:1,12	21:2 27:11	teamwork 84:17	22:3 24:3 25:2
65:3,12,24	74:5,14 76:5	5:17 8:9 11:17	Street 25:24 51:7	53:18	team's 8:19	26:25 27:9
66:4,6,23	77:13 78:8,20	12:15 14:2	76:13	supported 21:10	teapot 17:21	29:12 34:9
68:10 69:10,12	79:5,7 80:5	20:2 24:4 27:7	stress 58:1 96:17	supporting	technology 15:23	36:23 37:16
69:21 70:1,7	81:15 82:8	28:22,22 36:17	strictly 50:11	17:10	15:24 19:23	38:3,5,7 39:6
70:11,23 72:25	90:9,18	39:11,23 46:15	86:19	supportive 53:5	teenagers 43:20	39:14,17 42:3
75:1,6,11 77:8	sorts 38:4	52:4,19 55:20	stringency 80:19	53:9,16,22	Telegraph 4:6	43:21 45:10,14
80:6 90:23	sounding 42:2	59:6 65:14,16	strong 44:3	suppose 9:9	40:5	46:2 47:3,3
sit 4:12 28:11	source 20:14	66:11,19 71:13	90:23 97:11,13	16:11 18:8	television 6:22	48:16 49:20,23
situation 33:24	26:17 57:23	71:14 72:3	struck 38:7	19:23 23:2	30:4 32:23	50:3,5,15,24
61:8 63:4	58:3,3,6,14,15	75:24 77:2	Stuart 37:24	29:19 37:8	33:4,8,9 47:4	51:23 52:6,13
73:23 74:15	60:12,25 65:11	84:20 85:13	stuff 78:15 81:16	40:24 42:1	tell 5:17,21 11:8	52:24 53:7,11
75:14 76:17	66:1 70:12,18	90:24 98:8	multiflying 61:12	55:1 63:5	16:5,8 17:23	54:8 56:9,12
79:9 84:11	93:5,6 95:2,11	station 47:7,11	style 37:8 38:18	sure 2:14,25	18:18 24:21	56:18,24 57:5
95:7	96:20 97:1,4,6	47:17,17 95:4	styles 81:2	27:22 31:24	42:10 45:14	57:8 58:17
situations 31:16	sources 19:7,16	stations 47:20	subject 2:3,24	38:4 56:25	46:15 56:7	59:6 62:7,17
73:24 87:16	20:17 70:22	status 40:6	36:14 48:22	57:9 87:6 93:9	57:15 62:4	63:3 65:5,6,24
six 37:3	92:24 97:9	stay 7:23	50:19 58:9	surprised 60:16	64:4 70:7,9	66:7,23 67:8
skeleton 36:6	Southern 65:17	stead 50:14	93:2	60:18	72:10 80:23	67:13 70:6
skulduggery	65:22	Steele 40:4	subsequent	Surrey's 82:3	82:9 86:16	72:1,2,16,17
76:25	spare 4:18	Stephen 1:25 5:9	57:21 67:21	suspect 18:13	tended 84:22	72:19 73:1,11
Sky 95:4 98:4	speak 5:18 24:9	9:8 16:10	subsequently	23:2	tensions 42:8	74:19 75:19
slight 16:1 71:1	33:21 34:22	17:15 38:19	60:4	suspects 16:18	term 15:7 54:10	78:21,22 79:25
slightly 14:7	51:20 87:4	40:10 52:1	substantial	18:5 23:9 55:7	57:23 58:3	80:3,22 81:8
15:11 64:11	98:6	71:6,8,11	53:24	suspicion 59:18	terminology	81:14,16,22
77:9 84:10	speaking 25:19	74:20 76:22	substantiating	switched 54:23	14:21	82:2,2,3,13
slowing 21:6	42:11 84:19	Stephenson	97:6	sworn 4:10 28:17	terms 3:1 9:19	84:9,16 85:7,9
small 72:10 82:3	86:19 87:6	36:25 52:5	substantively	71:8	9:21 10:19	85:11 87:21
smoothly 42:6	93:5 94:9	Stephen's 6:14	7:21	synonymous	20:23 36:15	88:17,25 90:2
sobered 51:7	specialise 29:22	7:17 9:11 12:2	successful 8:5	16:11	37:12 46:7,21	90:23 91:7,9
social 41:15	specialist 72:6	12:6 16:2 17:1	76:8 96:18	system 35:22	53:21 55:24	93:20 94:6
48:20 49:16,22	specific 48:25	18:15 21:25	suffered 6:17	36:5 55:23	63:23 65:25	95:22 96:4,12
50:24 51:10,16	54:21	22:18	sufficient 63:18	56:5,25 57:1	73:3 80:8,15	97:20,21
62:14	specifically	Stevens 36:24	suggest 35:5	57:13 61:20	81:19 92:15	thinking 3:24
socially 37:19	31:12 42:10	38:17 39:13,20	38:10 56:2	69:17,25 70:2	96:23	66:22 80:21
50:18	52:16	40:8,21 42:2	70:2,18	70:8,11	terror 73:24	84:3 87:4 93:4
society 19:4	specifics 26:12	stood 17:9 50:14	suggested 26:16	T	test 94:25	thinks 18:18
softer 37:25	speculating 55:6	stops 18:18,19	74:16	tactic 55:1	tests 11:11	third 34:16
Soham 80:24	speech 45:8	stories 43:9,13	suggesting 46:8	take 26:5 45:25	text 15:1	89:14 98:6
81:9	spend 79:14	44:16,21,24	87:8	45:25 66:7,25	texture 34:15	thorough 78:1
solicitor 12:16	spent 77:17,20	46:21 55:11	suggestion 93:20	96:5	thank 1:12,16,21	thought 66:15
95:19	split 47:14,15	57:2,4,22,24	95:10	taken 26:20	3:19 4:7,12 5:8	67:20 75:4,8
solicitor's 96:24	spoke 6:9 76:1	58:20 59:25	suggests 10:20	32:23 51:8	5:17 6:8 19:5	76:9 83:7
solve 9:11,15	98:5	70:4 72:11,17	Sullivan 28:16	97:14,25	24:17 27:25	threatened 18:3
92:1	spoken 20:7,11	78:7 79:3	28:17,19,20,21	talented 96:13	28:1,12,14,15	three 10:4 12:13
solved 92:11	22:15 87:22	94:22 96:9	32:15 33:19	talk 34:10 41:25	28:21 45:9	33:6 36:20
somebody 37:22	sponsored 27:13	97:18	35:7 45:1	46:6 63:11	69:21 70:24	47:19 50:3,4
47:8,24 48:20	sprint 34:1	story 6:4 14:9	52:21 57:11	79:6 80:7	71:12 72:3	70:10 77:19
49:1 59:15	squad 31:22 85:7	16:5,8 17:23	58:11 59:4		92:10 98:9,11	82:5 97:16

throat 68:16	31:14,17 50:14	2:11,14 5:20	violate 32:13	west 50:2 75:24	78:8 79:5	51:21 52:3,7
Thursday 1:1	82:10,16	9:1 15:19 17:3	violence 5:5	76:10 78:14	83:25 94:22	52:10 54:25
thwarted 23:12	trusted 29:23	17:11,13,16	visited 18:4	91:11	96:13	74:23 84:8
tie 46:14	46:5 82:11,22	20:6 29:6	38:21	West's 76:1	worked 5:2 84:7	85:23,24 91:4
time 2:13 7:5	83:12 88:19	30:13,14 32:12	vital 92:19	we'll 3:22	working 12:1	98:5
16:17 28:12	trustworthy	43:12 45:3	voicemails 64:19	we're 2:17 19:1,1	29:2 30:10	Yates 49:19,23
34:2,11 35:18	29:20 83:5,8	54:13 55:9	vulnerable 60:25	30:3 42:21	39:8 41:22	50:9,15,16,18
36:11 37:16	truth 4:20 23:10	57:11 58:13		64:6 68:13	44:23 46:1	52:12,22,25
38:6,9,13 40:4	23:10 28:23	60:20,21 64:12	W	we've 30:2 39:16	47:15 50:2	year 43:19,22
40:20,20 45:16	71:14	73:21 75:16	walked 23:12	47:18 57:22	51:9 60:10	50:25 72:5,6
45:23 50:1,6	try 4:14 9:15	76:6 78:24	Wallis 38:5,7,11	67:18 85:2	63:15 73:2	72:12 94:24
52:11 53:1	18:25 19:1	79:18 95:6	want 1:13,17 2:5	whichever 47:8	74:20 88:3	years 2:1 21:14
58:5 63:1 66:4	23:11 36:7	understanding	2:13,15 3:8,15	whilst 13:8 21:23	workings 34:3	30:23 31:7,16
76:12 79:15	38:23 40:17	14:6 26:5	19:3,3 26:11	whistle-blowing	works 18:17	32:12 35:21
80:7 83:6 84:6	47:10 55:4	54:10 57:5	34:13 36:1	64:9,10	World 11:22,23	41:7,23 43:9
84:10 87:1,1	90:8,8	69:24 74:10	37:19 48:24	widely 53:13	12:9 65:2,20	46:1,25 49:8
91:12 95:21	trying 2:17 3:2	understating 7:2	54:20 58:10	wider 9:7 13:13	worry 18:8	51:6 53:24
times 21:17,23	9:11 15:18	understood	69:19 79:8	16:22 26:13	worse 96:15,16	59:20 62:13
33:6 86:16	16:4,23 22:22	56:17,18 57:10	90:1,11 91:6	31:9 38:2,2	worth 37:17	70:10,11 71:21
96:14,15	40:14 44:15	63:17 86:25	92:12	41:1,4	49:23 63:23	74:19 77:13
time-consuming	46:7 47:20	unfair 59:18	wanted 12:25	willing 36:12	wouldn't 2:15	79:8 80:3
80:13	48:18 62:24	72:14 75:19	22:23 30:14	56:10	8:21 11:13	82:19 84:20
timing 1:13	63:21 88:17	unfortunate 2:6	40:8,11,12	win 2:16,17	15:22 26:11	86:25 93:18
tip 46:9,23,24	turn 62:13,14	unhelpfully 55:7	69:3 75:12	Winchester	35:25 39:7	yesterday 1:7,11
titles 79:15	turning 46:18,22	unit 5:6 31:22	91:2,2 93:23	77:21	41:17,18,20	1:11 2:9,16,23
tittle-tattle 41:20	95:3	unkind 15:17	94:14	wine 51:11,20	42:20 45:14	3:25 4:5 93:7
today 1:22 2:6	TV 55:6 95:4	unnamed 70:21	wanting 89:8	52:1,2,10	48:13,15 49:3	yesterday's 2:25
4:8 26:3 40:16	98:4	unofficial 97:9	wants 63:25 64:3	68:15	51:12 73:9	Yewland 5:22
78:21	twice 72:8	unprecedented	88:13	warning 72:7	80:10 83:9	young 6:14 9:11
told 11:4 24:14	two 12:13,17	81:14 84:6,11	warning 68:19	winning 17:4	88:21	16:2 76:12
25:18 29:25	13:5 16:17	unprofessional	72:14	wish 3:9 7:25	Wright 1:23 2:15	90:6
32:2 46:13	24:3,11 33:2,3	82:25 98:2	wasn't 7:25 8:20	26:3,23 33:20	3:9 16:24	Z
47:12 48:7	36:19 40:2	unsolved 85:8	8:24 22:13	97:11	17:10 20:6,9	zone 8:24 15:9
49:1 55:17,23	48:6 50:3,9,24	unwilling 56:7	23:5 25:2,13	withdraw 76:18	20:20 24:5,9	0
56:2,4,7 57:12	67:21 77:24	update 12:22	42:15 52:24	witness 2:24 4:8	27:10,11 52:1	07729 75:24
57:13 70:8	82:5 85:21	upset 21:11	60:4 66:6	4:17 6:3,6 18:4	71:6,8,10,11	09841 39:12
73:14 74:17	type 6:15 33:5	use 15:7 17:5,21	76:25 77:5	25:22 28:22	79:10 80:15	1
82:14,15 83:15	43:10 44:24,25	41:20 42:1	78:16 81:24	35:22 69:13,15	82:12 84:21	10 3:16 11:2
tone 68:10	77:25 96:20	58:2 61:23	82:3,6 94:5	71:2,6,12	87:7 95:22	84:20 86:15
tools 91:19	types 35:2	74:9,14 89:9	way 2:13 5:2 6:2	74:18	Wright's 1:25	89:5 95:8
top 56:3 85:10	typically 32:22	90:9	6:6 8:1 16:12	witnessed 89:19	write 32:3 76:22	10.08 1:2
topic 98:9	33:1 54:15,24	user-friendly	19:25 21:3	witnesses 2:10	96:4 97:9,12	10.46 28:8
total 21:2	U	38:1	22:5 23:9,11	6:24 11:11	97:13	10.56 28:10
totally 46:2	ultimately 44:10	utilise 48:9	26:19 35:17	16:16 22:14	writer 20:18	100 15:21 27:22
touch 63:14	unacceptable	utilised 67:10	40:13,15 42:21	27:21 51:20	72:6	86:19
touches 1:24	1:14 62:8	utter 18:6	45:21 47:15	77:4	writes 61:7	11 11:17
tragically 27:5	unauthorised	V	48:8,12 50:13	witness's 76:19	writing 30:3	12 12:14 13:14
train 13:8	12:9 54:5	value 30:13 92:6	54:14 56:6	wonder 28:2	42:13 44:16	12.08 71:3
traits 82:17	61:12 85:18	various 36:16	57:9 75:21	wonderful 88:20	94:16	12.16 71:5
transpired 50:8	86:11 87:1	47:25 72:9	77:12 80:13	Woolmer 72:17	written 55:19	12.57 98:13
treated 6:5	93:21 97:2	78:20	89:14 94:7,8	Worboys 67:22	94:2	13 20:2
trial 8:6 9:21	uncomfortable	ventilated 9:20	95:22 97:6,10	word 16:10	wrong 39:21	14 24:25 25:2
14:25 24:22,24	75:13	verges 1:14	ways 38:10 42:1	17:17 25:15	52:19 83:13	73:2 89:13
24:25 25:22	uncommon 47:2	versa 39:25	63:3	35:10 40:24	86:12 88:13	15 1:1 2:1 71:21
77:6,11,20	undermine	version 14:2,3,5	week 81:10,15	41:20 82:20,25	96:11,11,24,25	15-year 73:2
78:9,15 79:5	17:12 23:22	33:14,14,15	weeks 12:13	90:17,20 96:17	wrongdoing 23:5	16 35:7,20 77:13
Tribe 10:9	27:23	66:12	76:16 77:20	words 20:25	23:6	17 21:16
tribute 20:9	undermined	vice 39:24	well-known	49:21 74:14	wrote 16:14,14	18 11:18 21:14
21:10	17:7	victims 80:12	13:18 25:23	86:4	16:15,16 38:11	22:7 82:19
tried 7:23 16:25	undermines 19:2	88:2	47:5	work 1:9 3:5	50:10 59:5	1818 27:14
17:1 48:9	undermining	view 16:19,20	went 16:17 21:20	4:13 7:19 8:21	92:16	19 82:19
53:16	17:3 26:10	19:20 29:17	32:1 38:6 39:1	18:14,16 40:18	Y	1979 5:1
trouble 7:12	underneath	33:16 43:6	50:10 75:22	42:4,15 47:15	Yard 12:14	1990 29:2,3
true 4:19 50:17	19:13	97:18	weren't 39:9	48:22 62:5,24	13:19 15:4	
64:4	understand 1:12	views 44:3	42:12,16 52:21	67:18 77:13,16		
trust 18:16,17			73:19 74:6			

<p>1990s 32:22 33:11 1993 20:1 1995 49:25 1996 71:25 94:1 1997 27:8 1999 74:19</p> <hr/> <p>2</p> <p>2 98:12 20 5:13 8:4 56:3 79:7 80:3 2000 43:18 2001 29:3 89:15 2002 39:16 82:3 2003 92:16 2004 41:7 2005 73:24 84:3 2006 5:13 8:4 64:17,24 72:2 2007 10:12 11:18 12:14 13:25 26:17 72:5,12 95:9 2008 21:17 41:7 43:18 2009 72:6 2010 24:1,25 71:21 2011 25:2,9 2012 1:1 25:1 28:23 71:14 21 24:3 39:15 71:13 84:4 22 24:21 24 95:5 24-hour 33:10 81:12 24/7 32:18 250 38:13 26 36:17 27 39:11 43:19 28 28:23 66:13</p> <hr/> <p>3</p> <p>3 5:21 39 53:3</p> <hr/> <p>4</p> <p>4 5:17 48 24:13</p> <hr/> <p>5</p> <p>5 25:1 39:12 57 46:15 49:6 59 48:5</p> <hr/> <p>6</p> <p>6 92:15 60 53:23 65 55:9 69:15</p> <hr/> <p>7</p> <p>7 12:14 14:18 23:25 75:23</p>	<p>74 69:7 75 57:16 58:21 76 58:25 77 58:25</p> <hr/> <p>8</p> <p>8 8:8 13:25 64:24 80:23 8.30 13:4</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <p>9 10:16 82:9</p>					
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--