

- Mr Vernon, who Donnelly spoke to on the evening of the 29th, was apparently so concerned that he prolonged the consultation to delay the interviews (statements p. 13.), yet despite his fourteen years post qualification experience, chose not to report his concerns to the custody staff.
- It seems unusual that in his evening consultation with Mr Vernon (his second and final consultation - 29th June 1998, 20.25 until 21.25) that Mr Donnelly, having only just returned from interviews with the officers he was complaining about, was unable to be more specific as to which officer said the comments or made the threats (Vernon statement. p.13), especially when considering the detail in his statement of 1.9.98 some 3 months later.
- Mr Vernon only had two consultations with Mr Donnelly. If he was so worried why did Mr Vernon not attend more than twice and more quickly?
- Of interest is the entry at 09.42 on 30.6.98 in the Occurrence book p.99 (exhibit G.E.2. p18.) by R/Constable [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 'Donnelly requested to see his solicitor' 09.45 'for info Mr Vernon of R. Nelson's office said he will not be able to attend until late this afternoon'. This contradicts Mr Vernon's statement (p.13.) that 'I was aware that there had been a phone call to the office later that day asking me to return to Castlereagh but before I left the office I had received information that he had been released.' Donnelly was released at 16.57 on 30th June 1998.
- Mrs Nelson's statement, as she herself admitted, is mostly hearsay but does mention sending the two faxes of complaint once she had spoken to Mr Vernon. However, she says she spoke to him shortly before 15.45 on the 30th June (p.1), whilst he says he spoke to her the same morning (i.e. morning of 30.6.98) and that she immediately sent a fax complaining about the conduct of the case to Castlereagh (p.10.).
- The interviewing officers all appeared very professional and competent, detectives who readily answered the questions asked of them and strongly denied the allegations made against them.
- The interview notes which Mr Donnelly had the opportunity to sign and comment on do not reflect any comments similar to those alleged.
- The video, although only visual, supports the accounts of the monitoring officers that nothing untoward, evident from a visual perspective, occurred in the interviews.
- There is nothing in the documentary exhibits that supports Mr Donnelly's version of events other than non-contentious points that are not in dispute.