

JMY/4

From: Yates John - SOHQ
Sent: 18 July 2011 09:47
To: 'catherine.crawford@' [redacted]
Cc: Saleh Naz - DLS; Godwin Tim J - TPHQ; Simmons Mark - HR6
Subject: RE: Please see
Importance: High

Catherine

We discussed this and related issues last night. I apologise if I appeared a little self-obsessed. In these difficult circumstances, I am sure you will have understood.

I am very happy for all the below information to be put before the Committee.

Re the Amy Wallis matters, some key points:

I forwarded an email in January 2009, some 6 months before any indication that there might have been any issues in relation to the original phone hacking investigation from 2005/6 and four months before I was appointed AC of Specialist Operations. At this time therefore as AC SCD I had no knowledge or involvement with the phone hacking investigation. The Guardian article that first sparked interest in this matter only materialised in July that year.

The email in question was a straightforward referral in which I made it clear to the recipient that I was simply passing it on and was indifferent as to the outcome. The last sentence about 'managing expectations' highlights this. In the

light of very recent events, the context about Wallis' background and knowledge of the hierarchy of the MPS may be seen in a different light.

I had nothing to do with her subsequent selection either on an interim or permanent basis - this is confirmed by Martin below but I should emphasise that these referrals and work-experience placements are common-place, as Martin has also stated.

On separate points, as we discussed on Saturday night, despite best efforts, we/I have not been able to get out the narrative and timeline about how we got to where we are. I have a binder of material including a detailed synopsis time-line available for you should you or others on the Authority wish to see it.

It is clear that the events of July 2009, and since, are not well understood. I have been heavily criticised for failing to re-open the investigation at that time but it is too easily forgotten that there was no new evidence to justify this at this that time and this decision was endorsed soon after by both the DPP and Leading Counsel. Moreover it has been forgotten in the media clamour there have been *massive shifts* in the lay of the land since that time, chiefly:

- the new legal advice re s.1 RIPA provided in Dec 2010 which - in lay terms - changed beyond recognition our understanding of what constitutes evidence of a 'phone hack' (fundamental in every decision made since 2006) and what defines a 'victim' and,

- the recent full 180 degree u-turn by News Int'l as a consequence of the groundswell of lobbying by MPs and media which resulted in them effectively sacrificing NotW as a title and - seemingly - offering extensive new evidence about the involvement of suspects beyond those that my predecessors in SO successfully prosecuted in 2006.

In addition to these seismic changes, finer details of great significance have similarly been overlooked it seems. The law about production orders and the inability of police to apply for such an order if we cannot prove deliberate and pre-meditated deception is not widely understood. The material included in our timeline contains numerous well-crafted letters from News International (NI) lawyers that, with hindsight, appear deliberately designed to spike our ability to apply for a production order. The original investigation team did in fact prepare an application but this was not taken forward on the advice of CPS lawyers.

The Op Weeting investigation commenced in January 2011 solely as a result of new information, highly pertinent and dating back to 2006, provided by NI. As Peter Clarke said in evidence last week, it does appear now that NI have deliberately covered up and lied.

I have been very open about my association with Wallis at all times and to all relevant people, from the Commissioner through to a succession of SIOs. Additionally, I have always been open with the 2 Select Committees on this. It is apparent that any evidence against him has only emerged very recently and was not available in 2005/6 or 2009/10.

I hope the above helps and provides some context for the Prof Standards Committee who I know will take their duty to review matters in a clinical and evidential way very seriously. There is massive amount of gossip, innuendo and worse being bandied about my role in these matters. The political heat, point-scoring are obvious. I am looking forward to explaining matters in the proper environment of a judge-led public inquiry.

Best wishes

John

From: JOHN YATES
Sent: 17 July 2011 22:38
To: Yates John - SOHQ
Subject: Fw: personal

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "mjtlplad"
To:

Sent: Sunday, 17 July, 2011 21:57:43

Subject: personal

John

My recall as I sit here is that about 3 years ago - late 2008 or very early 2009 - you sent me an email with a cv attached (I think) that referred Amy Wallis to me as being someone who was bright, wanting a change of career and Hr was one of her potential considerations. The note - as I recall - simply invited me to consider her if we had any opportunities.

I don't recall any conversation at all with you - in fact I don't think we had one - at all about her but at the time we were managing a lot of stuff with THR and were losing some HR people . Accordingly we were recruiting quite a lot of temporary staff (we didn't want to stack up a redundancy bill later once THR was implemented) and so I referred her details to the THR team (clare Hunt was in charge at that time) and I am aware that she was recruited on a temporary contract to join the development team. I do not know what happened to her thereafter though. I have a feeling that she may have actually done rather well and had her contract extended or even applied for and got a permanent role. Whatever, I had no direct involvement in her selection. Equally neither did you. Nor did I feedback to you (at least I do not recall so doing) nor did you pursue her potential appointment with me. As I recall, all you did was send me the note with her CV.

It is a matter of routine that many of the Mets people have referred relatives and friends to us for appointment, attachment and holiday employment. At the senior end, I can recall Steve House's son being selected (twice) for temporary employment. I can recall Peter Clarke's son doing an extended period with us. I recall Catherine Crawford referring her daughter to us. Steve, Peter and Catherine referred their juniors to us, Catherine's daughter is now permanently employed and is a special. She has been very successful. I recall Tim Godwin referring his neighbours two sons to us for prospective attachment. Ronnie Flanagan spoke to me concerning his (legally qualified) son who DLS took on temporarily and was then employed permanently. I recall Victoria Borwick talking to myself and Ann McMeel about her son and potential temporary work. None of this implies any suggestion of impropriety on the part of the referrer. They simply referred the relevant person to us and the system then took over. There is no difference as I see it with your own referral to me concerning Amy. As is the case with Steve, Catherine, Tim, Ronnie, Victoria and Peter, you had nothing to do with what happened thereafter. All you did was pass over someone who may be of use to the Met. Had any of you tried to do otherwise, I would have counselled you to back off and used my office to abort any consideration.

One other thing, do not underestimate the no of people who are referred to us by all employees and officers across the organisation. We receive several referrals to us from officers whose children, and friends want to join us.

Martin

The Metropolitan Police Service is here for London - on the streets and in your community, working with you to make our city safer.

Consider our environment - please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

NOTICE - This email and any attachments may be confidential, subject to copyright and/or legal privilege and are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the permission of the sender. MPS communication systems are monitored to the extent permitted by law. Consequently, any email and/or attachments may be read by monitoring staff. Only specified personnel are authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of the MPS by email. The MPS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. Email messages are routinely scanned but malicious software infection and corruption of content can still occur during transmission over the Internet. Any views or opinions expressed in this communication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).