

- The concerns arising from the pre-interview prepared statements were conveyed in writing to the Investigating Officer. His reply contained a denial on behalf of the Chief Inspector that any such requests had been made by him. However, in response to a question from one officer he had indicated that written statements could be provided. The Investigating Officer confirmed that it was inappropriate for either confirmations of this nature to be provided or for statements to be requested.
- The degree to which the Chief Inspector's rebuttal stands at variance to the reply given to the Supervising Member's direct questioning of the police officer who arrived at the interview with a prepared statement, has not been satisfactorily explained.
- In the report of the investigation drafted by the Chief Inspector he makes a number of assertions which constitute judgements on the moral character of Mrs Nelson and others.
- Although early in the report the Chief Inspector stated that he had no reason to doubt Mrs Nelson's reliability as a witness he subsequently recorded that he in fact did harbour doubts on her reliability. This change of opinion appears to rest primarily on the difficulties that the Chief Inspector experienced in his efforts to arrange interviews with Mrs Nelson.
- In another part of his report the Chief Inspector questioned the circumstances in which Mrs Nelson's clients' evidence had been prepared and forwarded. This concern is not matched by any supporting substantial evidence.
- The Chief Inspector cited the volume and timing of correspondence received from various international groups on behalf of Mrs Nelson as giving rise to what he claimed was the reasonable suspicion that the complaints were more to do with generating propaganda against the RUC than establishing the truth.
- Another senior officer, reporting on the investigating, coupled the quality of the evidence given by Mrs Nelson, a solicitor and officer of the court in good professional standing, with that of her clients, whose reliability was deemed by him to be questionable. The evidence given by Mrs Nelson was seen as being "no better" than that given by her clients.

Geralyn McNally

Supervising Member

22nd March 1999